What We Want:
Rethinking social goals and whether we are meeting them

James H. Lewis
Roosevelt University

2005

Introduction

As a regular part of my work in the past as an agency executive and now as a university professor, I am often called upon to participate in roundtables or give presentations where I am frequently asked, "what are the most important social problems to address?" or "What would be the most effective way to spend our money?" "What should our priorities be?" The easy answer, in a world filled with many needs, is to respond that practically anything can be a priority. And as long as the gift is made to a responsible service provider, it will probably do some good. But the tougher answer is to respond with another question: "What is it you really want to accomplish?" "What are your fundamental values?" Do you want people to be happier? Wealthier? Do you feel society merely owes them opportunity, whether or not they become happy or wealthy? Or do you merely want them to survive? Are there values such as civic or religious duty that actually would transcend those more self-directed ends?

A second, and related, question to ask them is, "do you want to tackle a problem that is a big problem or a little problem? One where there is evidence that interventions can make a difference, or one where gaps between the real and the ideal are so wide that either there is plenty of room for improvement or, conversely, no true hope of closing the gap in the foreseeable future?"

The first set of questions, relating to purpose, are rarely raised except by academic social philosophers. The second set of questions, regarding the scope of problems, is often raised, but the answers are often not well informed. This work is, therefore, aimed at reconceptualizing priority setting in the provision of financial support for human needs and community development in an urban environment in three significant ways.

The analysis is framed by three questions or problems:

First, most philanthropy or government programming is burdened by failure to fully consider what are the true end purposes of each activity undertaken. Is it to make people happy? To make them wealthy? Merely to insure their survival? To give them opportunity? To save them spiritually? Close study reveals that societies across the world, and our own society over time, actually have had a variety of root purposes grounded in different answers to these questions. To address this problem, the analysis considers the root purposes of individuals and societies so as to begin to provide meaningful standards for determining whether both individuals and societies are attaining goals that they value.

Second, this work argues that a social indicator system should reach high standards of what statisticians refer to as "construct validity" by providing assessment of as much of the relevant human experience as possible, both in terms of different dimensions of human activity and the developmental level of that activity. Validity can only be achieved when indicators are linked to specific social value outcomes so that assessment

can be made of how well the set of indicators represents the outcome. To put it another simple way, indicators indicate what?

Having established a set of indicators, the next step is to search for irreducible standards of priority by distinguishing different levels of urgency for each indicator. Simple logic leads us to three possible levels at which each indicator might be measured: 1) the number of persons whose very survival could be attained on the indicator (i.e. lives saved from starvation) 2) number of people who are living in a stable condition on the indicator, (i.e. Number with a minimally adequate diet) and 3) number of people actually improving their condition on the indicator. (i.e. number with a diet that actually extends their life chances, athleticism, etc.). By providing assessments of each indicator in this way, we are enabled to compare levels of social achievement at comparable levels of value.

Finally, many service providers are plagued by an inability to set appropriate and attainable goals and objectives. The root of this problem is a common presumption that a truly successful program attains 100% success in whatever it pursues, leading to initial overstatement of goals and public disappointment when they are not attained. Recall the lofty goals established at the outset of Chicago's school reform in 1988. Every child must be educated. Every client employed. Instead, this work takes as a precept that for any social indicator there is a level of structural deficit. In any area of human pursuit, some people will inevitably fall short of our ideal standard despite the best intentions and efforts. We live in an imperfect world with resource constraints and events happen to everyone that are beyond anyone's control. Thus this work asks for each social indicator, and each level of attainment, what is the gap between the current status of the indicator, and the best that any urban/suburban area in the United States has attained. In most instances, this represents the realistic distance that can be traveled by the service provider community.

The document is divided into five chapters

1. Values – an exploration of the basic purposes that motivate individuals and societies
2. Types of needs and predictors of happiness
3. Developing priorities among human needs
4. Indicators – a statistical appendix of the indicator system
5. Data appendix

I. VALUES

Different purposes

Governments and philanthropies have in common an interest in utilizing their resources to promote good. That is, to improve the lives of persons within their place or field of interest. The two institutions have in common a scarcity of resources compared to the variety of demands put upon them.   The wide variety of social and cultural institutions present a virtually unending variety and depth of needs to their potential benefactors. Both are then presented with the problem of how best to allocate their resources.

The most difficult aspect of making allocation decisions is to assess empirically the relative value of competing claims on resources, and the likelihood that a given intervention will mitigate the claim. In other words, to assess the depth and scope of various social needs, and then to assess which grantees are best equipped and able to address them.   Doing this entails a number of difficult assessments: What outcomes does the grantor value? How is the importance of each component concern measured? How can those measurements be placed in a common metric so as to be made comparable? How can the number of possible clients be accurately counted?

The following analysis provides a framework for answering these questions and, as far as time and resources allow, attempts to provide answers to them.   It begins by identifying five different domains within which people consider social outcomes. It then develops an indicator system that provides a basis for creating three levels of priority among the various indicators and assessing the depth and scope of deficits on each indicator.   Next the analysis assesses the relative power of various indicators to affect selected values and finally indicates the relative importance of each indicator for addressing selected social values.

Values

If you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there.

What types of projects or institutions a government or philanthropy chooses to support should depend ultimately on what social outcomes it values.   We all want a better world, but it is not simple to determine what, exactly, the characteristics of a better world are. Depending upon one's social orientation, the avenues to a high quality of life may be very different.   In a world, or place, that by most accounts falls far short of perfection on anyone's terms, there are many different ways of conceiving what our social goals should be. They vary by the setting within which people are found, by historical period, and by people's individual values.

This analysis requires consideration of fundamental questions. It is fairly easy to provide financial support for activities that are of at least some value. What is far more difficult

is to identify those activities that are the most valuable. In part it is a problem of measurement of the effectiveness of any social activity, but more fundamentally it is because across American society, we do not have consensus regarding what social and human ends are, in fact, of the most value.

This requires asking: What is life for? Most activities that are undertaken in the fields of human services or community development are not ends in themselves, but are, in fact, means toward achieving fundamental ends around which people value or dedicate their lives. Assuming one wants to spend limited financial resources on undertakings that are of the greatest significance, depending upon how one values the various ends of life, one might make very different choices about how to prioritize the charitable expenditure of millions of dollars.

A thorough consideration of the work of prominent social scientists and thinkers suggests that social goals can be considered along a number of dimensions which overlap to some degree but are, in fact, distinct:

The goal is for the most people to be as happy as possible.

For many social philosophers through the ages, individual happiness has been the highest purpose in life. For many, decisions surrounding the ethics of birth and death revolve around what is termed "quality of life" – a euphemism for "happiness." For many, extreme health cures that come at the expense of happiness may be deemed inefficient. The question of whether wealth can purchase happiness is at the root of any number of discussions of American social and cultural values. An extensive economics of happiness has developed that tends to find that once issues of basic survival have been addressed, quality of human relationships is, for instance, a more positive influence than is wealth or what it buys. To the extent that happiness might be deemed the ultimate goal of the human condition, the best use of resources after guaranteeing basic survival might be work aimed at improving human relations, rather than improving the material conditions of life.

The goal is for the most people to have the best material conditions so as to address as many human needs as possible and maximize the individual's personal utility.

Abraham Maslow placed physiological needs at the base of his hierarchy, arguing that goods such as safety, love, esteem and self-actualization were ultimately based on a foundation of physiological needs. Few people will say that their ultimate goal in life is material gain, yet it is such a pervasive part of the American culture that it deserves consideration as an end of life. Certainly people act as if it is, consistently trading time with family, raising their children and the like, to earn as much salary as possible. Americans are notorious for the length of hours they work. Clerics in most, if not all, of the major religions practiced in America decry how congregants consistently trade time that could be spent on their spiritual maturity or salvation on work. The Protestant work ethic developed during the 16th and 17th centuries went so far as to spiritually join and equate work and salvation. So there is much to suggest that if not the final goal in life,

material acquisition is for many a close derivative of it or seen as the chief means to happiness. One can argue that raising welfare benefits, improving the quality of public housing, job training, public education and many other public programs are ultimately about improving individual access to material goods.

The goal is to afford people equality of opportunity or life chances and maximize individual choice.   What they do with those chances is up to them.

Closely related to material well-being, the issue of life chances can be considered in at least two ways, fairness in how public institutions operate and access to resources that allow people to take advantage of opportunities.   At its most basic level, the concept of fairness of institutions has to do with the functioning of democratic decision-making in government, equal opportunity to be represented in legislative bodies, equality before the courts, fundamental rights guaranteed by constitutions and the like. Such a framework operates in a secular manner, assumes as little bias as possible regarding the individual preferences for one good or another. Choices are the individual's to make and value and there is no inherent means for assessing the value of one good over another. Thus the social obligation is achieved when a fair set of rules is put in place and enforced fairly.

Critics of this way of thinking emerged during the late 19th and 20th century who argued that it was not enough merely to create a set of unbiased rules, but that the conditions from which individuals sprung influenced the extent to which they would be able to take advantage of freedoms. These critics argued that a second requisite of fairness and justice was the maximizing of equality of life chances. Institutions such as public health, education, training, various forms of income redistribution, and other social welfare programs were created to address these concerns.

The goal is to preserve as much life as possible.

Before all else, we must survive. The primacy of the preservation of life has been a foundation of many aspects of American life. It was popularized by Maslow through his hierarchy of needs, and is operationalized every time campaigns are launched against abortion, extraordinary resources and litigation are expended and undertaken to maintain a life-support system, or decades of review and hundreds of thousands of dollars in prison costs are expended in the interest of not executing someone. Of all American social institutions, the health care system may be the most difficult to reform because of the public's association of it with fundamental survival.   Surveys show that communities cooperate best with one another around public safety and utilities such as water, gas and electricity, because at root, their survival is anchored in them. The military represents by far the largest area of discretionary spending by government because of the public perception that physical survival is at stake.

Physical survival takes on many forms. A medically proficient society faces issues surrounding the beginning of life (abortion) and the end of life (life support systems and the process of dying). Much of the debate around how best to combat crime involves questions of capital punishment and how best to maintain the population's life safety.

The health care system is in part aimed at improving quality of life, but ultimately it is in the service of simply keeping people alive for the longest possible time.

As industrialization becomes pervasive worldwide and humans undertake increasingly large projects such that industrial waste, exhaust, and consumption of the physical environment proliferate across the earth's surface, concerns about deforestation, destruction of the ozone, global warming, and air and water pollution become increasingly serious problems that could one day threaten the very existence of humankind. Arguably, in the long term addressing these problems will be essential for any other human endeavor to have meaning, or even to occur.

The goal is for as many people as possible to maximize their spirituality or to fulfill duty.

The Westminster Catechism, after the Bible the foundational document for the Presbyterian Church opens with the words, "Man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him forever." Thus the individual purpose is not something that necessarily serves him or herself, such as acquiring wealth, being happy, or even preserving one's own life; rather it is to do what one has been called to do. So too with duty. Like some religions, the call of duty requires the giving of one's self to a greater entity or ideal that may transcend value of an individual's own pleasure or pain. In recent history, the call of duty has been most obvious in war-time. Any happiness or satisfaction derived from military service is second to having fulfilled a selfless purpose.

In the Christian tradition, for the most devout this has simplified to following a call to perform service for humanity as a means of glorifying God, and hoping that this devotion will constitute a faith sufficient that one will upon death receive everlasting life. Other life purposes may have value, but those values are distinctly secondary. Buddhist religious practices entail very different aims, but share in devaluing or even renouncing pursuit of material wealth, personal happiness or longevity of life for its own sake. For both major religious traditions, in their purest forms preservation of life is a good, but not an end. In the Christian faith, one's life is not truly one's own; in the Buddhist one seeks to transcend many of the limitations of the material world and its goals. A set of social goals and related means based on the highest valuation of religious devotion or civic duty would help people achieve purity of that pursuit, from which material well-being, happiness or survival might derive, but would not be ends in themselves.

II. TYPES OF NEEDS

In order to prioritize human needs, we must create some basis for ranking them. One way is to consider how leading social philosophers have done this. Another, which will be explored further down, is to accord them priority based on their relative importance for attaining the philosophical ends we have just discussed, or by how efficiently they might be attained.   A final way, which is also explored here, would argue in Rawlsian fashion, that before we go about making people richer, we should make sure that everyone is at least stable. And before we can go about improving stability, we first must reduce or eliminate the number of unnecessary deaths.

Let us begin by considering some of the prominent schemes developed in the field of social philosophy for ranking basic human needs. Probably the most famous such ranking is a hierarchy of human needs attributed to Abraham Maslow as described in his book, *Motivation and Personality*. Aimed initially at describing the drives that shape human personality, Maslow's hierarchy has since been appropriated by policy-makers, scholars and analysts seeking to prioritize human need. Since then, others have broadened and developed the concept by moving beyond the human personality to attempt to generalize more fully about people in their social contexts. Below I present several such hierarchies:

1) 1973 OECD report -

The Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development concerns itself with human development on a world-wide level.   Its 1973 report presented the following as required for "high quality of condition:"

1. Adequate material support
2. Physical safety and security
3. Available friends and social support (including secure and accepted membership in society or at least in some niche in that society)
4. Opportunities for expression and receipt of love (because satisfaction with family life makes a large contribution to subjective well-being)
5. Opportunities for intrinsically challenging work marked by discretion and self-direction, The kinds and amounts of leisure that give scope to skills, creativity- and relaxation
6. An available set of values (especially moral values) that can give meaning to life,
7. Opportunities for self-development with the assistance of such help as may be needed, and objective justice. (As Quoted in Lane 230)

2. Essentialism

University of Chicago philosopher Martha Nussbaum argues that "human life has certain central defining features ... which things are so important that we will not count a life as human life without them." (Nussbaum, 205, 208)

Her "essentialist" approach begins from two "facts." "[F]irst, that we do recognize others as human across many divisions of time and space. … The essentialist account attempts to describe the bases for these recognitions, by mapping out the general shape of the human form of life. … Second, we do have a broadly shared general consensus about the features whose absence means the end of a human form of life." (Nussbaum, 235)

According to Nussbaum's survey of social philosophy across societies and cultures of the world, the following emerge as the basic list of essential human characteristics: (Nussbaum, 217)

1. Hunger and thirst: the need for food and drink
2. Need for shelter
3. Sexual desire
4. Mobility
5. Capacity for pleasure and pain
6. Cognitive capability, perceiving, imagining, thinking
7. Early infant development
8. Practical reason
9. Affiliation with other human beings
10. Relatedness to other species and to nature
11. Humor and play
12 Separateness

Nussbaum continues on to present a slightly more detailed listing of the "basic human functional capabilities":

1. Being able to live to the end of a complete human life, as far as is possible; not dying prematurely, or before one's life is so reduced as to be not worth living.
2. Being able to have good health; to be adequately nourished; to have adequate shelter; having opportunities for sexual satisfaction; being able to move from place to place.
3. Being able to avoid unnecessary and non-beneficial pain and to have pleasurable experiences
4. Being able to use the five senses, being able to imagine, to think, and to reason.
5. Being able to have attachments to things and persons outside ourselves; to love those who love and care for us, to grieve at their absence, in general, to love, grieve, to feel longing and gratitude
6. Being able to form a conception of the good and to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one's own life.
7. Being able to live for and with others, to recognize and show concern for other human beings, to engage in various forms of familial and social interaction

8. Being able to live with concern for and in relation to animals, plants and the world of nature
9. Being able to laugh, to play, to enjoy recreational activities
10. Being able to live one's own life and nobody else's; being able to live one's own life in one's very own surroundings and context. (Nussbaum, 222)

Nussbaum then argues that using these standards, two thresholds can be established, the first beneath which we might say is not to be human in any sense, and the second below which life lacks desirable quality. (Nussbaum, 221)   In Nussbaum's formulation, social institutions or government are responsible for creating in individuals the capability to act on these areas of human definition, but is not finally responsible for whether individuals choose to do so. (Nussbaum, 221)

3) Robert Lane

The Yale economist Robert Lane draws a distinction between quality of "conditions" and quality of "persons" and argues that one must have qualities of persons in order to take advantage of quality of conditions. (Lane 234) In Lane's formulation, quality of conditions tends to be a public matter and quality of persons a personal matter. (Lane 237)   Lane (240) argues that presence of poverty and reluctance of government to deal with religion has led to governmental focus on quality of conditions rather than on the more important quality of persons.   Liberal governments are more inclined to secure rights of persons than to attempt to guarantee their physical well-being.

Lane argues that individuals must have particular qualities in their persons in order to take advantage of the conditions that may be present in society that ultimately lead to an individual's well-being. Without the required personal qualities, the existence of various quality conditions may be rendered meaningless.

Opportunities (Quality of Conditions)	Qualities of Persons to Exploit Opportunities
Adequate material support	Cognitive complexity, sense of effectiveness, productivity orientation
Physical safety and security	
Available friends and social support	Ease of interpersonal relations, self-esteem
Opportunities for expressing love	Ease of interpersonal relations, personality integration, self-esteem
Opportunities for intrinsically challenging work	Cognitive complexity, sense of autonomy and effectiveness
Leisure for creativity and relaxation	Self-knowledge
An available set of values in the community	An ethical orientation, personality integration, self-esteem
Opportunities for self-development	Personality integration, self-knowledge, self-esteem
Justice (objective)	An ethical orientation

Predictors of Happiness and Public Policy

One value dimension that has been given to extensive evaluation in recent decades has been "happiness" or "subjective well-being."

Many things appear to contribute to an individual's happiness, but some more than others. There is considerable debate among economists in particular regarding whether happiness is a trait which can be improved in individuals, or whether each individual has a fairly fixed perception of their own happiness such that they continually readjust their perceptions relative to their current status, and in comparison to that of those around them. Diener, one of the foremost experts on happiness studies has suggested that there is a baseline level to which people return that may be determined by temperament, and that people alter their goals and expectations to match their circumstances. (Diener, 38) However, the most comprehensive study of this question argues that happiness does, in fact, appear to be variable, and "unhappiness is less constant than happiness." (Veenhoven, 7) As Veenhoven explains, "Even if there is a marked inner disposition to be happy or not, that does not mean a better society cannot make people any happier." (Veenhoven, 19)

Comparative studies of nations suggest that social structure impacts individual happiness. In general, it appears that people are happiest when they are able to maximize their freedom of expression and make choices in areas that matter to them, and are less happy when they face insecurity. As a result, happiness is associated with generalized trust in society, high levels of civic participation, low levels of perceived corruption, and a high degree of social safety net. (Bjornskov; Radcliff; Lindblom) While people do value many of the freedoms afforded by market economies, they also want to be protected from its most dangerous costs.

Economists have grappled with the paradox that, as Diener puts it (2000), "Why does the wealth of nations correlate with mean levels of life satisfaction, whereas changes in income in the wealthiest nations produce no increases in happiness?" The answer appears to be that around the level of subsistence, and where level of income bears on an individual's health, financial resources do contribute to levels of happiness. However, after one has become more secure, expectations do adjust upwards with each succeeding level of wealth so that more wealth fails to buy more happiness.

We can consider what the literature suggests contributes to happiness in a number of fields:

Income and employment

Analysts agree that in developed countries, there has been little overall improvement in happiness despite considerable increases in levels of income. (Frank, 15; Oswald, 1818) A secure source of income is important for happiness. (Clark & Oswald) For low wage workers, however, losing a job is not particularly injurious to a sense of well-being if another comparable job can be readily secured.

Mental health

Poor mental health, in a variety of forms, has been shown to depress happiness significantly. These include depression and anxiety, (Spitzer et al. 1995 and Packer, Husted, Cohen and Tomlinson (1997). In general, a focus on materialism diminishes happiness (Dowling et al 3 in Lane) and Ng (2003) found that materialists are more concerned than non-materialists about how well they are being treated. Rosenfield (299) found that the chronically mentally ill have lower life satisfaction but that improving their sense of mastery could mitigate it to some extent.

Relationships

A number of analysts have found that levels of happiness and well-being are closely tied to the quality of one's relationships. On average, married people are happier than divorced, moving and death of a partner, difficult family relationships, stressful work environment and social ostracism diminish happiness (Frank). Companionship and social support enhance it. (Lane, 7) Helliwell (2001) in Bjornskov finds a high correlation of happiness and social capital, arguing that "social capital makes life easier and more predictable by removing small obstacles in everyday life while friends, family, colleagues and acquaintances can provide moral backing and behavioural outcomes." In advanced countries, social capital appears to be a better predictor of happiness than income.

Recreation

Diener finds that "flow activities" – those that engage the mind in a non-stressful way – tend to correlate with individual happiness. These include mental pleasures, renewable physical pleasures, and work toward one's goals. (Diener, 41)

Children

Huebner et al (2004) found that among children age 10 to 13, positive relationships with parents, self-esteem, internal local of control and extraversion correlated with happiness. Authoritative parenting, strong feeling of parental support, continuous parental marital status and avoiding teenage pregnancy are also associated with greater happiness among teenagers.

Any number of indicator systems have been developed to measure change over time in the well-being of individual places or nations, and to allow comparisons between them. Most of these systems are limited in that the individual indicators which make up their

components were selected on the basis of informed common sense, which leaves the relative importance of the various indicators for representing progress or poverty, subjective.

In summary, two major categories, quality of relationships and economic security appear to be strong, and roughly of equal importance for predicting happiness. Also important are mental health/efficacy and recreation.

From national surveys conducted at the Survey Research Center at University of Michigan, Andrews and Withey (139) determined that an index of self-efficacy was the single strongest predictor of "global well-being". Together, the variables considered explained about 53% of the total variance in the measure.

Classification Variables	Multiple Classification Analysis B
Family life-cycle stage	.13
Age	.08
Family income	.05
Education	.03
Race	.03
Sex	.02
Concerns Measures	
Self efficacy index	.25
Family index	.15
Money index	.15
Amount of fun	.15
House/apartment	.12
Spare-time activities	.09
National government index	.09
Things do with family	.08
Consumer index	.07
Time to do things	.07
Your health	.05
Job index	.03

Frank M. Andrews and Stephen B. Withey. 1976. *Social Indicators of Well-Being: American's Perceptions of Life Quality*. New York: Plenum Press

A study conducted at the University of Michigan in the 1970s found similar patterns.

	Proportion of variance in index of well-being explained by individual domain satisfaction scores
Non-working activities	29
Family life	28
Standard of living	23
Work	18
Marriage	16
Savings and investments	15
Friendships	13
City or county	11
Housing	11
Amount of education	9
Neighborhood	8
Life in United States	8
Usefulness of education	8
Health	8
Religion	5
National government	5
Organizations	4

Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Willard L Rodgers. 1976 *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfactions*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation. p. 76.

These 17 measures explain 54% of the total variation in the index. In the authors' views, in order of statistical importance they simplify to health, marriage, family life, national government, friendships, housing, job, community, religious faith, non-work activities, financial situation, organizations.

NOTE:
Fuller development of this analysis will mine the research literature for correlates of attainment of the other value sets enumerated above.

III. DEVELOPING PRIORITIES AMONG HUMAN NEEDS

This work considers key issues and trends in the fields of basic human needs and community development within the context of the Chicago region. Because the individual constructs of these two broad fields are highly related, the following analysis discusses them in combination   The analysis synthesizes priorities from the presentation of indicators by utilizing several interpretive frameworks developed above.

1) *Survival needs*; can be conceived as the base level of needs or as basic survival/longevity of life.

2) *Personal Utility – Rights, Capability and Resources* grow and choose among various options for quality of life.

3) *Happiness/Subjective well-being*. An extensive economic and psychological literature has emerged in recent years aimed at understanding what social and personal characteristics correlate most highly with individuals' self assessment of their happiness and well-being.

4) *Duties, spiritual or civic*.

Each of these four areas is reviewed within the context of the indicator tables below, and includes recommendations for the field of human development that would seem to flow from them.

1) Survival Needs

A program based on the priority of securing the fundamental survival of persons would focus on work aimed at reducing or eliminating untimely loss of life in the region. The indicator analysis reveals a wide range in the mortal threat of various social conditions:

Relatively high loss of life

- Smoking results in thousands of premature deaths due to cancer and other related illnesses.

- The great loss of life tends to occur around dietary deficiencies and poor nutritional choices. Thousands of premature deaths occur each year because of coronary disease and diabetes related to poor nutrition.

- It is difficult to create direct causal linkage of environmental failure, but in the long run, global warming may constitute the single greatest threat to human survival.

Some loss of life

Several social problems are roughly comparable in the magnitude of loss of life caused. These are:

- Motor vehicle deaths (about 1,500 per year regionally)
- Homicides (about 800 per year regionally)
- Suicide (about 600 per year regionally)
- Infant mortality (although few are necessarily caused by neglect)

Relatively low loss of life

In the Chicago region very few persons die each year purely from starvation or exposure. About 15 children die each year from child neglect or abuse. About 50 murders each year stem from domestic violence.

If the goal is preserving life, the biggest gains are clearly to be had in areas related to nutrition and smoking, and in the long term to supporting both local and international policies that preserve the environment. While there is some correlation between race and socio-economic status and incidence in these areas, people of all races and economic levels smoke too much, eat food that contributes to heart disease, and all of us to some degree share a concern over the environment. All of these concerns have both health and more broadly social aspects and are properly addressed from both directions.

The gap analysis indicates that places across the nation vary substantially in their murder, vehicle, and suicide rates. However, these differences are largely out of the control of direct service programs and are subject to differences in social capital and public policies. Traffic deaths can be decreased by decreasing drunken driving, decreasing young drivers, and lowering speed limits. While there is much debate surrounding what reduces crime, in general wealthier places with stronger social capital probably have less, and the effectiveness of policing and certainty of punishment appear to reduce its likelihood. The gap analysis suggests that under no reasonable conditions can these problems be reduced to zero as there will always be some unaccountable human behavior.

Finally, we have almost no one dying of exposure or starvation because the Chicago region's social safety net functions sufficiently well between homeless shelters, food stamps, food pantries and social capital in general to prevent most of the worst tragedies. Clearly to keep these statistics as low as they are, this system must continue to operate at least at its current levels. Ironically, it is hard to classify lack of income as a life-threatening condition because the combined governmental and private charitable social safety net ultimately provides sufficient life-preserving services that at the most basic levels, nearly everyone can at least survive without their own financial resources.

2) Personal Utility – Rights, Capability and Resources

Another approach argues that people may have any number of individual goals – be they material, spiritual, happiness, or others - and that the social obligation of government and publicly spirited institutions is to provide people with sufficient personal resources and opportunities to make their own choices.

Yale's William Lane has proposed that this operates at two levels: first the opportunities that a society provides to persons such as food, shelter, work, transportation, education recreational opportunities and justice, and second, the individual capabilities of persons to take advantage of these opportunities – such as mental health, aspirations, physical health and social skills. Others such as the University of Chicago's Martha Nussbaum argue a more essentialist approach – that there exists a set of characteristics essential to live humanly. Harvard's Jonathan Rawls became the most celebrated social thinker of the 20th century for his arguments surrounding the need for equality of human capability.

To utilize their capabilities, persons must first meet at least the basic subsistence levels noted above under survival. However to have the potential to grow beyond a basic level of functioning, some combination of individual attributes of education, ability to communicate, financial resources, and mental health are required, along with social attributes such as protection of rights, transportation systems and job opportunities.

The difficulty in establishing priorities among these immediately becomes how dependent they are on one another.   In order to maximize the return on investment, we might then ask, 1) in which areas does the gap analysis suggest that the most gains possibly could be made? And 2) are there some areas that appear to be of more central importance to determining the outcomes of other areas?

Of these issues, education may be the most important, but it may also be among the most difficult to influence. The huge range in outcomes between the best and worst performing schools and children suggests that huge gains should be possible; yet the barriers to accomplishing this have proven vexing.   The public must provide quality schools, but the child must come to the school prepared to learn. Even the best school reform efforts are unlikely to achieve all that they might without corresponding strength of family and community life.

Educational improvement is thus a function both of what is conventionally funded and analyzed as "education", and of the family conditions that might fall under "human needs." To varying degrees, and for children of varying ages, educational outcomes are improved by raising family income, higher educational attainment of parents, higher child aspirations, avoiding teen parenthood, avoiding substance abuse and other family-related concerns. The problem is indeed deep: Across the city over 260,000 children are failing to meet or exceed standards, and in the suburbs another 300,000 fail to meet or exceed.

As a practical matter, the foundation is deeply committed to addressing education, and attacking the related human need problems would seem to be an important counterpart for providing true educational opportunities to each succeeding generation. This would seem to argue for developing program in the human needs and community development sectors of the foundation that address the family and community sides of this problem.

Adults, too, are in need of additional training in order to be able to take advantage of future economic opportunities. Across the region, about 400,000 adults have less than a high school education, and another 1.2 million no more than a high school education. Research suggests that job training resources are best invested in persons age 30 and older, persons who on average are sufficiently mature and experienced to make vocational decisions they will stick to. Surely large numbers of persons need employment training, but the most promising returns are in training provided by employers and through general education. The presence of employment training, and for that matter assistance with job search, tends to assist those who are less skilled at finding work to participate in the labor market. To some extent it reduces slightly economic "friction" by subsidizing the employer's search for workers, but in the end it rarely results in the creation of new job opportunities, or results in a firm remaining in the Chicago region that otherwise would have failed or left. So while the benefits to participants are real, it is unclear that there is a large net social benefit if the goal is to increase the total number of people who are working.

Surveys suggest that about 300,000 adults in the region may suffer from mental health problems sufficient to impair their ability to work consistently or attain goals, which is to say from 8 to 30 days per month. Severe mental health problems create costs to society, impair educational and work efforts and, perhaps most importantly, reduce the quality of life for individuals, often substantially. The gap analysis suggests that our society is not yet good at systematically improving mental health. Different communities are far more similar in their levels of mental health, and related problems like substance abuse and smoking, than they are in poverty rates, crime or educational outcomes. At this point, campaigns aimed at creating public awareness of the possibility of better mental health, de-stigmatizing problems people do have, and making local services available in middle and low income neighborhoods may be the most promising approaches, and would be well worth the investment. These problems are also tied to the strength of social capital and levels of trust within church, workplace, school and local communities which are largely outside the role of government.

Among immigrant populations, evidence indicates substantial barriers in the areas of capacity to communicate, where about 170,000 persons live in linguistic isolation regionally, and many thousands more lack citizenship, or are undocumented. These problems function in multiple ways: to limit potential for social contact, political participation, education, and work itself. Ironically, the presence of this supply of low-wage reserve labor is helpful to some businesses but contributes to low wages in the unskilled sector of the economy. Certainly the ability to reach a growth level of livelihood depends for most on the ability to communicate in English.

Turning to how the opportunity structure operates collectively, the region has made huge progress on basic civil rights over the past 40 years for racial/ethnic minorities, women, and other populations. And while instances of overt racial discrimination in housing and employment continue to surface, in the long run they are declining. The biggest current problem is the persistent social segmentation around race, which has led to the spatial mismatch of jobs growth and affordable housing which contributes to unemployment of African Americans in particular, limits the information flow to them that would facilitate economic opportunity, contributes to crime and to Chicago's comparatively low levels of social trust. It has led to controversy and the expenditure of millions of dollars of compensatory spending in regional school systems.

Like education, the racial divide touches on so many areas of life in Chicago and the region that it seems fundamental to address it. Comparison with other places suggests that Chicago could do much better; however, those who have done better have not had Chicago's contentious racial history to contend with. The issue differs from most others in the arena of human needs in that the greatest portion of the work of state and federal government is likely done and what is most needed is creative efforts among the residents, businesses, religious institutions, and local leaders.

Region-wide, survey data suggests that as many as 3 million persons may have their activities limited by traffic congestion. Clearly job opportunities are limited by lack of speedy public transportation to and around suburbs. For the most part, the transportation system functions adequately – at the regional level, jobs continue to grow and more people reside. For the most part, the issue hinges on large infrastructure decisions and so lends itself to policy research and advocacy rather than demonstration projects and direct service.

In spite of sprawl, Chicago's environment has been improving gradually over the long term. Both air and water quality have been gradually improving, and relative to a few decades ago, there is better awareness and better capacity for addressing brownfield issues. The survey data reviewed for this report indicate that relatively few Chicagoans consider the environment here an asset; yet most find it manageable. Nevertheless, the costs of environmental failure are high and, as with transportation, most of the work of environmental preservation from a public perspective is in research, public informing, and advocacy. For these reasons, in both transportation and environment, relatively large impact could probably be had for relatively little grant-making investment.

Perhaps the largest overall conclusion in the analysis of opportunity is that very large numbers of persons are involved and many involve the largest commitments of state and local governments. In the instances where the solutions lie in more or improved direct services, it would seem the best investment would be in working with government to provide them. In areas such as education, child care and employment training, there is social consensus around the appropriateness of quality public provision of these services, although there are clearly important differences of opinion around how best to provide them.

Maximizing economic opportunity and reducing the jobs-housing mismatch likely lies in improving public policies rather than in providing direct services. Policies that require diversified housing, reduce local property tax dependence and incentivize affordable housing would seem to be aimed in helpful directions.

The historical record suggests that gaps can only be partially closed.

3) Happiness/Subjective Well Being

About 3 out of 4 adults in the Chicago area indicate that at least "usually" they experience a sense of well-being each day. About 25 percent, then, do not. Regionally this ranges from a low of 69% in Chicago, to a high of 85.2% of persons in DuPage County. This is consistent with General Social Survey data from the nation that indicates about 20% of city residents and 15% of suburban residents say they are "unhappy." What are the likely causes of the unhappiness?

To the extent that maximizing the subjective well-being, or happiness, of persons is a desired social goal, we can focus on several well-established precepts that emerge from the work of Yale's William Lane, the University of Illinois' Edward Diener, sociologists at the University of Michigan and many others:

- Improving material well-being contributes strongly to greater subjective well-being for persons near the subsistence level but has little return once a person achieves basic security.

- Poor physical or mental health erode subjective well-being.

- Policies at the state or national level that provide high quality social services such as health care, retirement benefits and unemployment or disability insurance correlate with greater levels of happiness than do policies that increase individual wealth.

- Beyond the level of basic security, persons generally derive their greatest happiness from quality relationships with friends, relatives, spouse or children, and from pleasurable use of time outside of work.

What major issues exist around the subsistence level?

The greatest basic security problems in the Chicago area revolve around the number of persons living in poverty, about 600,000 in Chicago and another 200,000 in the suburbs. Levels of poverty contribute to the rent-burden and crowdedness of about 400,000 persons, and the lack of health insurance for several hundred thousand in the Chicago area. About 600,000 persons in the Chicago area indicate that their activities are limited in some way by a health problem, which could contribute to loss of happiness for many.

While relatively few persons are murdered each year in Chicago, the threat of lesser forms of crime is virtually pervasive. Only about 1 in 8 persons in the Chicago area live in a place that may be considered "safe" by the standards of the safest places, or by those of many foreign countries. Additionally, hundreds of thousands of persons in the region have lost, or are in the process of losing their own freedom, and surely much of their sense of well being, because of their own incarceration for the commission of crimes.

The twin pillars of subjective well-being alongside basic security are relationships and quality use of free time. Compared to other major metropolitan areas around the country, Chicago fares poorly on key measures of social capital. Chicago remains one of the most racially segregated places in nation. It rates low nationally on diversity of friendships, inter-racial trust, and informal socializing. Review of national data for cities and suburbs, considered in light of the locally-derived measures of social capital, suggests that about 1 in 8 area residents have low numbers of friendships and about twice that number don't spend as much time with friends as might be desirable. Chicago area residents tend to express high levels of satisfaction with their marriages, but that is within a long-term context of declining rates of marriage. Around 200,000 Chicago parents are likely "overwhelmed" every day by parenting and no doubt this exacts a cost in the quality of relationships between parents and children, and other family members.

The evidence suggests that if the goal were to close the gap in people's self-assessment of their well-being in a substantial way, the most promising strategies involve changes in public policy. While as discussed above, the charitable direct service net must continue to be maintained, its expansion at the local level, with local resources, likely buys little increased happiness.

International studies suggest that the most improvement in subjective well-being is gained by strengthening social supports in key areas that mitigate the effects of illness (universal quality health care), job loss (improved unemployment and retraining benefits) and secure retirement benefits (maintaining social security). To varying degrees these issues are mediated at the federal and state levels. Economic development that results in accessible jobs for low-wage workers and reduces their tax burdens would seem to contribute to happiness. Note that job security is less important than job availability, particularly when the skill level is unlikely to lead to significant job satisfaction. Unemployment levels fluctuate greatly over decades and while there are some things municipalities and regions can do to improve their competitive position for jobs, much of these fluctuations are subject to national, and even international, events and policies, and result from the decisions of individual firms that can be influenced, but not controlled.

As difficult as it is to move persons above the poverty line, improving the quality of personal relationships may be even more difficult. Strategies that would seem to have the most promise for this would seem to be urban design experiments consistent with the "New Urbanism", reducing levels of crime so that people feel safe freely interacting within their own neighborhoods, providing sufficient child care options to give women in particular flexibility to interact with others apart from their children as needed, providing and promoting mental health services that enable people to fully enjoy the company of

others, and providing opportunities for parents to improve their parenting abilities. Levels of social trust would likely rise from improved race relations. A particularly fertile ground for this work may be the many suburbs which have been undergoing significant racial/ethnic change in recent decades.

Duties – Spiritual/Civic

Designing philanthropic or government programming around duties is the most difficult of the categories. A significant gap exists between levels of spirituality people say they would like to have, and what they do have. Many would say beyond the gap calculated here, that there is an even larger gap in what they should have, and that it is in fact possible to close that gap. Beyond the "good" implied in closing the distance between where many people are spiritually, and where they would like to be, scholarly studies suggest a number of social goods that correlate, or perhaps derive, from religiosity. Among these are greater likelihood of better mental health, more two-parent families, and possibly benefits to physical health. At least two major barriers present themselves, however, to governments or most philanthropies acting on this data. One is that Americans consider religious devotion an almost wholly private matter, and second, our laws fairly consistently have maintained separation of the practice of religion from public life. Even were action legally or culturally permissible, no consensus exists on what the best practices would even be to promote religiosity among the general population in such as way as to be reasonably sure that true benefit would derive to the public. Beyond the campaigns for prayers in schools, public display of religious symbols, and teaching of creationism, it is not even clear that mainstream religious organizations would even be in favor of it themselves.

Civic duty, however, is a different story. With respect to promotion of civic duty, there is a long history of both government and philanthropy promoting it both abstractly and directly in any number of calls to service or selflessness in the political arena, and particularly in times of war. The statistical indicators used in this work, and many that are not included, suggest that at this time, we rate rather low collectively in our exercise of civic duty. Voting has reached historic lows in the recent past, mistrust of public officials is high – yet there is no corresponding evidence of voluntarism aimed at doing much about the problem. Despite the rhetoric surrounding the September 11th terrorist attacks, relatively little has been volunteered nor offered by the American public by way of real sacrifice compared even to the Vietnam era. Young people have not stepped forward in appreciable numbers to enlist in the military and the American public has done little to reduce dependence on foreign oil.

No shortage of prescriptions exist for improving levels of civic duty locally. Benjamin Barber, Robert Putnam and many others have argued for renewed localism and greater individual participation in the workings and decision-making of local government. Martin Wattenberg's compact "Where Have All the Voters Gone" provides a set of prescriptions based on the political science literature that taken together would help get people into the habit of voting again. Dating back to the citizen soldiers of the American Revolution, and even before, an American hallmark has been its mistrust of standing

armies and institutional expressions of patriotism. It was not, in fact, until after the Civil War that "These" United States became "The" United States. So while a strong tradition exists to support local civic duty, we have a more episodic and event-driven history of expressing duty to nation.   Compared to the types of nationalism that have been expressed at various points in this century in Japan, China and many European states, Americans have generally cared little for the notion of duty to nation as an end in itself.

Institutional frameworks within which human needs are more likely to be met

While the major emphasis of this analysis has been on the individual as the unit of analysis, good or bad local governance can facilitate or impede progress toward any of these objectives.   A number of principles are generally agreed upon and the foundation could be helpful at the policy level in working on them:

- Minimizing the impact of campaign contributions on policy decisions and government operations

- Helping the 260-plus municipalities in the region to work cooperatively where it is in the region's collective interest to do so.

- Removing barriers to political participation and encouraging citizens to vote.

IV INDICATORS

The indicator system created for this project is designed to allow for consideration of:

- A variety of possible value outcomes

- Weighing of the relative significance of different variables ranging from most to least relevant to consideration of human need, and

- Weighing the relative scope and magnitude of various social problems and the distance that would need to be traveled to address the problem adequately.

The search for irreducible standards

The grid presented below organizes the various components of human life (the indicators) into three levels.   It begins by searching for an absolute standard against which to measure all other variables. This is satisfied by identifying the first level as **"survival,"** i.e. for each variable the number of persons who lost their life during the most recent year for which data is available.

The second level in the variable sequence is what is termed "**functioning**." A functioning person may be said to be not in immediate fear of death, but lives an existence wherein if nothing further happens, we would expect them to remain in that basic condition, and their children might be expected to occupy it as well.   For many variables, two levels of functioning are presented, one more marginal, where most would consider the type of existence less than desirable, or even physically precarious, and a second level where the basic level of functioning appears to be stable.

The third level is called "**growth**." Growth is the condition on a variable where we would generally agree that the condition is a positive attribute which brings pleasure or possibility to life. This is the distinction between a college education and a high school education; between living in a smoggy but livable environment, and living in one where people actively seek it out – Los Angeles versus Aspen.

Certainly with such broad categories and the complexity of every variable, legitimate debate may take place around how to describe each variable construct. In each case, data was selected for the indicator that would not only correlate with the direction or magnitude of the underlying variable construct, but in many cases defines completely the construct. For instance, the number of murders defines fairly completely the cost in human life of crime in Chicago.   On the other hand, school test scores are only a proxy for child well-being. They no doubt correlate highly with our general sense of a child's well-being and potential for future well-being, but certainly numerous other factors for which data is not available across the population are also large components of the construct.

Computing Indicator Gaps

Having identified the three basic levels of social essence of each indicator, the scope and magnitude of deficit in each is described. Most, if not all, other indicator systems developed elsewhere utilize the face value of the indicator as its magnitude. For instance, if the overall unemployment rate for a city is 6%, that is assumed to be the deficit in the employment of members of that city's workforce. Utilizing data in that manner provides a general description of a social condition, but it does not really provide an accurate measure of the social challenge in solving related social problems. Are we to assume, in that instance, that our social goal is to eliminate all unemployment? Is "6%" then the true social deficit or gap?

The true social gap on an indicator is the current measure of the indicator compared to the best level that has been achieved, or could be achieved, with resources that are potentially available in a place, but because of policy choices have yet to be allocated toward addressing that problem. For instance, Connecticut, an urban, industrial state in many respects like Illinois socially and economically, achieved a 1.9% unemployment rate in 1999, the lowest rate of any state in the last 20 years. The gap between the present and the possible would seem, then, to be 6% less 1.9%, or about 4%. This is not to say that this could be achieved without great effort, and also good fortune. That rate was accomplished during the peak of an economically prosperous period. For that reason, it likely represents the percentage of "frictionally" or "structurally" unemployed. But it would seem to set the outer limit on what might be accomplished, certainly a good deal higher than "0". For each indicator a "gap" is calculated, or gap range (if for example we were to consider an alternative and higher best case unemployment level) in the number of people in a condition in Chicago, the suburbs, and the region combined, and in that way provide the basis for a comparison of the scope and magnitude of deficit on each indicator at each level.

Like with the category levels, each of these calculations could no doubt be subject to dispute regarding the appropriate ideal standard and how perfectly the indicator measures the underlying construct. However, this method, admitting its imperfections 1) allows for useful comparison across widely varying social issues, and 2) is preferable for policymaking purposes to making no attempt at all to weigh the relative magnitude of different types of social problems.

Relatedness

Each of the indicators is important not only because combined they describe the components of the most essential life experience for most people, but also because they have impacts upon one another. For instance, a murder affects not only the people immediately involved, but also the reputation, stability and feelings of personal safety of all those in a neighborhood. Poverty affects not only the material possibilities of the

poor individual, but also the likelihood that that person's child will do well in school and/or eventually be poor themselves. We might say, therefore, that all other things being equal, social indicators, or problems, that have widespread effects on other people or other indicators or problems are more significant than those whose impacts are more likely limited to a single individual, or which have few externalities. For instance, in an obvious example, ending homelessness would affect far fewer persons than would having all public school children reach the "meet or exceed" standard in the city's schools. We may, for some completely legitimate reason choose to address problems with smaller scope or magnitudes in a way disproportionate to their size, but this is a decision that should be made in the knowledge of their scope and size. Within the bounds of the time and resources available for this project, the report provides a summary of the current state of scholarly understanding of the relationship of the various indicators one to another, and what is known about their causes.

Methodology

Indicators are created in two broad ways:
1) Report of the absolute count of persons. For example, the number of people living in poverty in Chicago taken from the 2000 Census.

2) Imputations of a measure to the entire population by utilizing widely accepted survey findings from the Metro Chicago Information Center annual surveys conducted during the 1990s, and the General Social Survey conducted by NORC annually.

Where possible, figures are presented for Chicago and for the suburbs.

The "gap" on a particular indicator is calculated by comparing 1) the magnitude of the measure currently with 2) what the size of the measure would be in Chicago if the best comparable rate were applied to Chicago, and then 3) subtracting the higher from the lower. For instance, how many crimes would be committed in Chicago were it to have the same crime rate as nearby low crime suburbs? How many more children would meet or exceed test standards if they performed at the levels of children in places where large numbers of children meet or exceed standards? In some instances the "best practice" is found within the Chicago region, in other cases Chicago places are compared with high performers from elsewhere in the nation.

It is tempting to dismiss these comparisons as unreasonable – comparing apples with oranges, in some sense "unfair" to the city because so many disadvantages are so prevalent in it. Yet that is what the concern must be about. What, exactly, is it in a place that contributes to its residents performing or acting at substantially lower levels on various indicators than do the residents of a higher performing place? And is not the challenge, really, to recognize and address those preconditions such that people in the disadvantaged place can realize the same human potential that they share with those of the high-achieving places?

The following are two sets of indicator tables.

Set 1 provides actual counts and estimates of the total number of persons in the Chicago region subject to each indicator. In some instances this is drawn from the entire population, in others from among children, adults, workers or seniors as appropriate.

Set 2 provides the size of the computed "gap" – the distance between where the Chicago area is and the best that another place has accomplished.

1. Indicator Total

Fundamental Construct

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning		Growth

Food	Starvation 0
	
	Nutritionally related death coronary diabetic
		Low Nutritional adequacy
		Chi 737,968
		Sub 1,484,303
		
		Experienced hunger
		Chi 174,597
		Sub 146,668
			Adequate nutritional adequacy
			Chi 694,575
			Sub 1,433,035
				Choice of diet
				Chi 399,014
				Sub 674,574

Shelter	Homeless
	Chi 9,687
	Sub ~3,500
		Sub-standard housing people/room (Crowded)
		Chi 36,819
		Sub 58,793
			<u>Sub-standard housing people/room</u> (functional)
			Chi 248,757
			Sub 166,021
			
			<u>rent-burdened</u> under $10,000
			Chi 103,014
			Sub 40,147
			
			under $50,000
			Chi 237,818
			Sub 154,570
				Affordable housing options people/room (good)
				Chi 311,433
				Sub 246,652
				
				Not rent burdened

Safety	Homicides Chi 654 Sub 145	Not threatened with injury # people in places with crime Chi 2,660,935 Sub 4,464,994		Safe # people in safe places Chi 235,027 Sub 724,971
Environment	Lethal conditions Premature lung cancer deaths Chi 403 Sub 683	Poor conditions manageable Low functioning: Environment a neighborhood "dislike" Chi 467,840 Sub 795,520		Enhances individual Air quality "Outstanding" Chi 184,884 Sub 971,282

Infant and child well-being	Infant mortality Chi 447 Sub 521 Fatal abuse Chi 16	Basic health Low birth weight Chi 4987 Sub 5754 Cared for humanely Teen birth rate Chi 3,321 Sub 1,951 Single parent below poverty line Chi 60,340 Sub 25,121 Raised unsatisfactory neighborhood Chi 142,459 Sub 66,975 Parent overwhelmed every day Chi 97,493 Sub 84,267		Healthy Child develops assets Parents well-informed child development Chi 305,418 Sub 648,278 Parent almost never overwhelmed Chi 225,432 Sub 449,856
Adult health/disability	Untimely fatal illness	Illness managed Poor health Chi 78,242 Sub 108,858 Activities limited Chi 218,189 Sub 468,443	Illness managed Adequate health Chi 835,086 Sub 1,937,000	Physical condition Excellent Chi 960,547 Sub 2,074,070
Mental health	Suicide Chi 206 Sub 421	Purposeful behavior Sense well-being Chi 660,623 Sub 648,034		Creative capability Sense well-being Chi 1,475,553 Sub 3,126,995
		Activities limited 8-30 days Chi 114,939 Sub	1-7 days not good Chi 595,558 Sub 1,052,587	0 days mental health not good Chi 1,269,706 Sub 2,523,516

		178,048		
Spirituality	Failure to function	Peaceable existence (region) Truth 543,831 Belief 809,835 Abandoned 650,233 Not Happy 271,915		Spiritual goal attainment
Decision-making	Survive personal choices	Poor choices overcome Illinois felons: 691,529 Illinois incarcerated 43,142 Region total users 495,555		Choices advance interests

Instrumental Constructs

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning		Growth
Education – Youth	Survival skills Gap: 0	Basic skills – can meet some opportunities Not meeting/exceeding Chi 261,867 Subs 307,484		Can act on personal choices Meeting/exceeding Chi 172,946 Subs 652,551
Education – Adult	Survival skills Gap: 0	Basic skills – can meet some opportunities Less than high school Chi 224,497 Sub 197,010	High school Chi 418,113 Sub 821,137	Can act on personal choices Chi 462,783 Sub 1,097,793

Income		Poverty
		Rate
		Chi 556,791
		Sub 284,384
		
		Behind rent/utilities
		Chi 238,935
		Sub 206,404
				Achieve savings and personal goals
				
				Very satisfied health insurance coverage
				Chi 1,507,768
				Sub 2,994,530
				
				Persons with life insurance
				Chi 1,906,823
				Sub 4,556,976

Employment		Unemployed Chi 127,889 Sub 93,696	Working Less satisfied Chi 48.2%	Achieve vocational choice Very satisfied

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning	Growth
	Working poverty Chi 100,799 Sub 46,244	Sub 38.2%	Chi 51.8% Sub 61.8%

Transportation	Motor vehicle deaths
	
	Chi 556
	Sub 944
		Allows community to function
		
		Traffic adequate or less
		Chi 2,198,629
		Sub 3,783,687
		
		Public transit adequate or less
		Chi 1,288,311
		Sub 3,294,514
		
		Parking adequate or less
		Chi 2,037,141
		Sub 2,214,347
		
		Activities limited congestion
		Chi 1,083,982
		Sub 2,071,515
			Facilitates neighborhood growth
			Traffic excellent or very good
			Chi 670,492
			Sub 1,657,317
			
			Transit excl or vg
			Chi 1,580,810
			Sub 2,146,490
			
			Parking excl or vg
			Chi 831,930
			Sub 3,226,657

Recreation			Culture "very good or outstanding"
			Chi 565,326
			Sub 690,663
			
			Parks and recr "very good or outstanding"
			Chi 851,231
			Sub 343,153

Communal Constructs

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning	Growth
Collective decisions/governance		Basic functions accomplished Voting: 2004 Elect Chi 1,056,830 Sub 2,256,188 Rates low nationally on: conventional politics, civic leadership. Rates average on protest politics	Advances community, people choose location
Race relations	Mortal violence gang murders	Conflict managed hate crimes Chi 128	Interactions an asset

		Whites feel uncomfortable around blacks Chi 328,136 Sub 1,363,456 Blacks feel uncomfortable around whites Chi 362,628 Sub 541,418 Rates low nationally in diversity of friendships and inter-racial trust	
Racial Isolation **How densely relate**		segregation score Black/white Chi ALL Sub 827,420 Hisp/White Chi NONE Sub 14,184 Linguistic Chi 107,870 Sub 93,317 Non-citizen	segregation score Black/white Chi NONE Sub 505,908 Hisp/White Chi ALL Sub 2,340,416
Friends/partnerships	domestic violence deaths Chi 45	Sustains life Domestic violence incidents Chi 212,422 Sub 93,338 2 or fewer friends City 505,177 Subs 954,128 Several or less evenings with friends City 699,065 Subs 1,275,739 Not too satisfied with marriage City 48,718 Subs 60,727 Rates low nationally on informal socializing	Enhances life Very satisfied with marriage City 592,567 Subs 1,511,049
Social Capital		Rates Low nationally	Neighborhood

		on: social trust, giving and volunteering Rates average nationally on: faith-based engagement	satisfaction Chi 869,779 Subs 2,545,350

2. *Indicator Gaps*

Fundamental Construct

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning		Growth
Food	Starvation Gap: 0 Nutritionally related death Coronary, diabetic	Low Nutritional adequacy [Standard not identified] Experienced hunger Chi 105,738 Sub 16,084	Adequate nutritional adequacy [Standard not identified]	Choice of diet Chi Sub
Shelter	Homeless Chi 5,522 Sub	Sub-standard housing people/room (Crowded) Chi 36,819 Sub 21,974	Sub-standard housing people/room (functional) Chi 248,757 Sub 166,021 rent-burdened under $10,000 No large city does well	Affordable housing options people/room(good) Not rent burdened
Safety	Homicides Chi 533 Sub 98	Not threatened with injury Gap: Subs 161,301 crimes above best Persons in areas below best Chi 2,660,935 Subs 4,464,994		Safe Gap:
Environment	Lethal conditions Premature lung cancer death Gap: Chi 98 Sub 144	Poor conditions manageable Low functioning: Environment a neighborhood "dislike" Chi 317,552 Sub 510,516		Enhances individual Air quality "Outstanding" Chi 912,133 Sub 1,109,102

Infant and child well-being	Infant mortality Gap: Chi 267 Subs 231 Fatal abuse Chi 16	Basic health Low birth weight Gap: Chi 1742 Subs 544 Cared for humanely Teen births Chi 2,851 Sub 1,049 Single parent below poverty line Chi 60,340 Sub 25,121 Raised unsatisfactory neighborhood Chi 126,183 Sub 34,888 Parent overwhelmed every day Chi 97,493 Sub 84,267		Healthy Child develops assets Parents well-informed child development Chi 70,026 Sub 91,868 Parent almost never overwhelmed Chi 13,727 Sub 21,619
Adult health/ disability	Untimely fatal illness	Illness managed Poor health Chi 24,738 Sub 29,580 Activities limited Chi 22,871 Sub 103,411	Illness managed Adequate health Chi 82,268 Sub 61,549	Physical condition Excellent Chi 103,163 Sub 81,530
Mental health	Suicide Gap: Chi 104 Sub 247	Purposeful behavior Gap: Sense well-being Chi 404,282 Sub 195,031		Creative capability Gap: Sense well-being Chi 404,282 Sub 195,031
		Activities limited 8-30 days Gap: Chi 71,705 Sub 104,009	1-7 days not good Gap: Chi 144,986 Sub 193,115	0 days mental health not good Chi 172,968 Sub 228,727
Spirituality	Failure to function	Peaceable existence		Spiritual goal attainment
Decision-making	Survive personal choices	Poor choices overcome Felon gap: 0		Choices advance interests

		Incarceration Gap: (MN rate) 25,422 per year Drug use gap: 68,056 (Iowa rt)	

Instrumental Constructs

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning		Growth
Education – Youth	Survival skills Gap: 0	Basic skills – can meet some opportunities Chi 214,037 Subs 201,881		Can act on personal choices Chi 214,037 Sub 201,881
Education – Adult	Survival skills Gap: 0	Basic skills – can meet some opportunities		Can act on personal choices
		LT high school Gap: Chi159,294 Subs 75,008	High school only Gap: Chi 43,988 Subs 131,684	College Chi 293,795 Subs 296,462
Income		Poverty Chi 218,739 Sub 88,508		Achieve savings and personal goals Very satisfied health insurance coverage Chi 1,361,353 Sub 2,446,474 Persons with life insurance Chi 962,298 Sub 884,028
Employment		Unemployed Chi 103,236 Sub 50,840 Working FT in poverty Chi 75,450 Sub 33,015	Working	Achieve vocational choice
Transportation	Motor vehicle deaths Chi 556 Sub 944	Allows community to function Traffic needs to improve Chi 1,126,167 Sub 1,937,446 Public transit adequate or less Chi 520,911		Facilitates neighborhood growth Traffic excellent or very good Chi Sub Transit excl or vg Chi

		Sub 1,625,179	Sub
		Parking adequate or less Chi 1,214,853 Sub 736,816	Parking excl or vg Chi Sub
Recreation		Culture less than "very good" Chi 565,326 Subs 690,663 Parks and Rec Less than "very good Chi 851,231 Sub 343,153	Culture "very good or outstanding" Chi 565,326 Sub 690,663 Parks and recr "very good or outstanding" Chi 851,231 Sub 343,153

Communal Constructs

Construct	Survival	Basic Functioning	Growth
Collective decisions/governance		Basic functions accomplished Voting Chi 564,528 Sub 609,059	Advances community, people choose location
Human relations How well relate	Mortal violence gang murders	Conflict managed hate crimes Chi 109 Whites feel uncomfortable around blacks Chi 328,136 Sub 1,363,456 Blacks feel uncomfortable around whites Chi 362,628 Sub 541,418	Interactions an asset MCIC
Isolation How densely relate		segregation score Linguistic Chi 95,126 Sub 71,169 Non-citizen	segregation score
Friends/partnerships	domestic violence deaths Chi 45 Sub ??	Sustains life Domestic violence incidents Chi 206,397 Sub 81,951 Several or less	enhances life MCIC/GSS

		evenings with friends City Subs	
Social Capital		Sufficient for functioning

Rates Low nationally on: social trust, giving and volunteering

Rates average nationally on: faith-based engagement | Source of strength

Neighborhood Satisfaction Chi 723,809 Subs 270,822 |

DATA APPENDIX

FOOD

Survey Results on Food Needs, 1990s

	Couldn't afford food	Could not get out	Something else	Percent Hungry	Number persons hungry (functioning)	Gap
Chicago	3.3%	1.6%	1.1%	6.1%	174,597	105,738
Non-Chicago cook	1.1%	1.0%	0.4%	2.4%	61,297	
DuPage	1.2%	1.0%	0.6%	2.8%	26,032	3,842
Lake	1.6%	1.0%	0.5%	3.1%	20,998	4,801
Will	1.1%	1.1%	0.5%	2.7%	15,005	1,568
Kane	1.7%	1.7%	0.2%	3.5%	15,718	5,085
McHenry	0.7%	1.5%	0.3%	2.6%	7,097	431
Suburbs	1.2%	1.1%	0.4%	2.7%	146,668	16,084
Region	2.0%	1.3%	0.7%	4.0%	329,375	129,932

Source: MCIC survey and Bureau of the Census

Vegetable Servings Per Day

Location	Less than 3 servings (Low functioning)	3 to 4 servings (Adequate functioning	5 or more servings (Benefit)	Rate (functioning)	Rate (Benefit)
Chicago	737,968	694,575	399,014	78.2%	21.8%
Surburban Cook	711,661	712,446	304,525	82.4%	17.6%
DuPage	265,376	239,885	131,189	79.4%	20.6%
Lake	172,484	171,013	99,672	77.5%	22.5%
Kane	109,596	114,430	52,445	81.0%	19.0%
Will	146,525	130,345	55,199	83.4%	16.6%
McHenry	78,661	64,916	31,544	82.0%	18.0%
Region	2,222,271	2,127,610	1,073,588	80.2%	19.8%
Suburbs	1,484,303	1,433,035	674,574	81.2%	18.8%

SHELTER

State Homeless Rates for Cold Weather States

State	2000 homeless number	2000 state population	Rate per 100,000 persons
New York	31,856	18,976,457	168
Delaware	847	783,600	108
Washington	5,387	5,894,121	91
Alaska	558	626,932	89
Oregon	3,011	3,421,399	88
Massachusetts	5,405	6,349,097	85
Connecticut	2,291	3,405,565	67
New Jersey	5,500	8,414,350	65
Rhode Island	634	1,048,319	60
Minnesota	2,738	4,919,479	56
South Dakota	414	754,844	55
Wyoming	270	493,782	55
Idaho	703	1,293,953	54
Nebraska	913	1,711,263	53
Colorado	2,281	4,301,261	53
Montana	477	902,195	53
Illinois	6,378	12,419,293	51
Maryland	2,545	5,296,486	48
Michigan	4,745	9,938,444	48
Ohio	5,224	11,353,140	46
Pennsylvania	5,463	12,281,054	44
Oklahoma	1,478	3,450,654	43
New Hampshire	523	1,235,786	42
Vermont	239	608,827	39
Indiana	2,384	6,080,485	39
Missouri	2,164	5,595,211	39
Maine	458	1,274,923	36
Iowa	1,013	2,926,324	35
Wisconsin	1,700	5,363,675	32
West Virginia	525	1,808,344	29
North Dakota	178	642,200	28
Kansas	587	2,688,418	22

Source:

City of Chicago homeless count, 2004 Point In Time survey, 9,687
Kane County, 505 (2003) Kane County Continuum of Care
Lake County, 726 (2001) Lake County website
DuPage County, 827 (2004) DuPage County Consolidated Plan 2005-2009

Lowest state rate (Kansas) is 43% of Illinois.
Gap is difference between 43% of 9,687 and 9,687   is 5,522

Regional Rent Burden

	Total rental units	Rate of rent burden	Number of rental units burdened	Gap (Suburban rate)
Cook	830,295	37.1%	308,441	48,559
DuPage	76,702	32.1%	24,613	605
Kane	31,837	34.4%	10,955	990
Lake	47,760	34.6%	16,532	1,583
McHenry	14,652	35.4%	5,192	606
Will	27,825	32.4%	9,024	315
Chicago	596,060	40.1%	239,020	52,453
Suburbs	433,011	31.3%	135,737	
Region	1,029,071	36.4%	374,757	52,658

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Percent of Units Rent Burdened

Region	Percent rent burdened
Atlanta, GA MSA	38.6%
Austin--San Marcos, TX MSA	42.4%
Boston--Worcester--Lawrence, MA--NH--ME--CT CMSA	38.3%
Charlotte--Gastonia--Rock Hill, NC--SC MSA	34.9%
Chicago-Gary	38.4
Cincinnati--Hamilton, OH--KY--IN CMSA	36.4%
Cleveland--Akron, OH CMSA	39.0%
Dallas--Fort Worth, TX CMSA	34.9%
Denver--Boulder--Greeley, CO CMSA	40.7%
Detroit--Ann Arbor--Flint, MI CMSA	38.1%
Hartford, CT MSA	37.6%
Indianapolis, IN MSA	35.6%
Jacksonville, FL MSA	36.7%
Kansas City, MO--KS MSA	33.8%
Las Vegas, NV--AZ MSA	42.2%
Los Angeles--Riverside--Orange County, CA CMSA	45.7%
Memphis, TN--AR--MS MSA	40.3%
Miami--Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	49.2%
Milwaukee--Racine, WI CMSA	36.9%
New Orleans, LA MSA	43.0%
New York--Northern New Jersey--Long Island, NY--NJ--CT--PA CMSA	42.2%
Norfolk--Virginia Beach--Newport News, VA--NC MSA	40.7%
Philadelphia--Wilmington--Atlantic City, PA--NJ--DE--MD CMSA	41.4%
Phoenix--Mesa, AZ MSA	41.5%
Pittsburgh, PA MSA	38.6%
Portland--Salem, OR--WA CMSA	40.6%
Raleigh--Durham--Chapel Hill, NC MSA	40.0%
St. Louis, MO--IL MSA	36.9%
San Antonio, TX MSA	37.5%
San Diego, CA MSA	45.4%
San Francisco--Oakland--San Jose, CA CMSA	41.1%
Seattle--Tacoma--Bremerton, WA CMSA	40.5%
Tucson, AZ MSA	44.6%
Washington--Baltimore, DC--MD--VA--WV CMSA	36.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Rent Burden by Household Income

	Percent rent burdened income under $10,000	Percent rent burdened income under $50,000	Total units income under $10,000	Total units rent under $50,000	Rent burdened income under $10,000	Rent burdened income under $50,000
Cook	85.5%	53.1%	149124	609,365	127,546	323,766
DuPage	84.7%	55.5%	5531	45,090	4,682	25,010
Kane	84.0%	48.9%	3425	23,101	2,878	11,295
Lake	78.7%	52.9%	5273	33,035	4,150	17,488
McHenry	85.6%	53.5%	1251	10,031	1,071	5,368
Will	79.8%	46.9%	3552	20,193	2,834	9,461
Chicago	84.8%	52.9%	121540	449,643	103,014	237,818
Suburbs	86.1%	53.1%	46616	291,172	40,147	154,570
Region	85.1%	53.0%	168156	740,815	143,161	392,388

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Population per Room: Owner Occupied

	LT .5 per room (Growth)		.5 to 1.5 per room (high functional)		Over 1.5 per room (low functional)	
Cook	788,293	69.0%	334,495	29.3%	19,955	1.7%
DuPage	189,878	76.3%	57,219	23.0%	1,674	0.7%
Kane	72,564	71.3%	27,020	26.6%	2,143	2.1%
Lake	127,090	75.5%	39,399	23.4%	1,804	1.1%
McHenry	54,691	73.6%	19,268	25.9%	365	0.5%
Will	99,035	71.0%	39,653	28.4%	723	0.5%
Chicago	300,363	64.6%	152,290	32.8%	12,259	2.6%
Suburbs	1,031,188	73.1%	364,764	25.9%	14,405	1.0%
Region	1,331,551	71.0%	517,054	27.6%	26,664	1.4%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Population per Room: Renter Occupied

	LT .5 per room (Growth)		.5 to 1.5 per room (high functional)		Over 1.5 per room (low functional)	
Cook	444,849	53.5%	337,980	40.7%	48,609	5.8%
DuPage	45,570	59.3%	27,480	35.8%	3,780	4.9%
Kane	16,706	51.9%	13,200	41.0%	2,268	7.0%
Lake	25,652	53.4%	19,517	40.7%	2,835	5.9%
McHenry	8,905	59.1%	5,551	36.8%	623	4.1%
Will	16,403	58.3%	11,050	39.3%	678	2.4%
Chicago	311,433	52.2%	248,757	41.7%	36,819	6.2%
Suburbs	246,652	56.7%	166,021	38.2%	21,974	5.1%
Region	558,085	54.1%	414,778	40.2%	58,793	5.7%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Overcrowding Gaps

	Overcrowded rental gap 1%	Functional rental gap 27.7%
Cook	40,295	107,672
DuPage	3,012	6,198
Kane	1,946	4,288
Lake	2,355	6,220
McHenry	472	1,374
Will	397	3,258
Chicago	30,849	83,386
Suburbs	17,628	45,624
Region	48,476	129,009

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

CRIME

Murder

Crime Report- Murder, 2002 City comparison

Murders (deaths from crime all)
Best Rate for large cities (2002 Uniform Crime Report)
San Diego (or Portland)   3.7 per 100,000
New York   7.3 per 100,000
Chicago   22.1 per 100,000

Difference 18.4 murders per 100,000 residents between Chicago and San Diego (or Portland)
Gap: 533 (total Deaths averted)
If Chicago's rate were the same as San Diego's only 107 people would die from murder in a given year.
Number of cases San Diego 47
Number of cases Portland, 20
Number of cases Chicago 651
Number of cases New York 575

Chicago ranks highest in the murder rate of the eighth largest cities in the country, those with more than one million persons (New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Diego, and San Antonio). Chicago also ranks 24th in the nation for murder, out of 333 cities in 2002.

Comparisons were calculated using the largest 333 cities for murder in the country. Cities with a population smaller than 250,000 were not considered in the analysis.

Population by Region, City and Suburbs: Safety

Region	Functioning	7,125,929
	Safe	959,998
	Death	799
Suburbs	Functioning	4,464,994
	Safe	724,971
	Death	145
City	Functioning	2,660,935
	Safe	235,027
	Death	654

Data was collected from the Uniform Crime Report, 2002, State Data and Chicago Crime Report.
For suburban data, those who lived in those areas were considered with the lower crime rates (e.g. rate lower than 1,800 per 100,000 people) were considered "safe" while those who lived in areas with crime rates above this threshold were considered "functioning". Death is death by homicide.

Chicago's "safe" level was considerably higher (e.g. rate lower than 3,000 per 100,000 by community area) while those who lived in areas with crime rates above this threshold were considered "functioning". Death is death by homicide.

Regional "safe," "functioning" and death were calculated by adding Chicago and Suburban rates.

Crime Report Murder Chicago Metro Area by County, 2002
(Does not include Chicago)

County	Number of murders	Population	Murder rate
Suburban Cook County	85	2,488,714.00	3.415419
Will	15	532,785.00	2.815395
DuPage	10	916,277.00	1.091373
McHenry	3	277,710.00	1.080264
Lake	15	661,789.00	2.266583
Kane	27	425,230.00	6.349505

The gap between the County with the highest murder rate:

Highest	Kane	6.39
Lowest	McHenry	1.08

If Kane County's murder rate were equivalent to McHenry's, only 5 people would die.

Total deaths saved: 18.

Crime: County comparison to best places within county

	Lake County	Population	Crimes (number)
Crime Rate	2,385.8	661,789	15,789
Ideal Rate	1,378.9	661,789	9,126
Averted crimes			6,663

The crime index rate is based on all index crimes as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The ideal rate for Lake County was calculated by averaging 15

communities with the lowest crime statistics (e.g. lower than 1,800 per 100,000). "Crimes averted" was calculated on the population of the county times the ideal index.

Cook Crimes Averted

	Cook Suburbs	Population	Crimes (number)
Crime Rate	3,625	5,383,211	195,141
Ideal Rate	1,276	5,383,211	68,706
Averted Crimes			126,435

The crime index is based on all index crimes as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The ideal rate for Suburban Cook County was calculated based on averaging 18 communities with the lowest crime statistics (e.g. lower than 1,800 per 100,000). "Crimes averted" was calculated on the population of the county times the ideal index.

McHenry Crimes Averted

	McHenry	Population	Crime (in numbers)
Crime Rate	2,122.4	277,710	5,894
Ideal Rate	1,013.4	277,710	2,814
Averted Crimes			3,079.91

The crime rate index is based on all index crimes as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The ideal rate for Suburban Cook County was calculated based on averaging 14 communities with the lowest crime statistics (e.g. lower than 1,800 per 100,000). "Crimes averted" was calculated on the population of the county times the ideal index.

Crime: County comparison to best places within county (cont'd)

	Kane	Population	Crimes (number)
Crime Rate	2983.1	425,230.00	12,685
Ideal Rate	1,209.8	425,230.00	5,145
Crimes Averted			7,540

The crime index rate is based on all index crimes as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The ideal rate for Suburban Cook County was calculated based on averaging 8 communities with the lowest crime statistics (e.g. rate lower than 1,800 per 100,000 people). "Crimes averted" was calculated by the population of the county times the ideal index.

Will Crimes Averted

	Will	Population	Crimes (number)
Crime Rate	2,617.2	532,785	13,944
Ideal Rate	1,222.3	532,785	6,512
Crimes Averted			7,432

The crime index rate is based on all index crimes as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The ideal rate for Suburban Cook County was calculated based on averaging 8 communities with the lowest crime statistics (e.g. rate lower than 1,800 per 100,000 people). "Crimes averted" was calculated by the population of the county times the ideal index.

DuPage Crimes Averted

	DuPage	Population	Crime (number)
Crime Rate	2,445.7	916,277	22,409
Ideal Rate	1,337.7	916,277	12,257
Crimes Averted			10,152

The crime index rate is based on all index crimes as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The ideal rate for Suburban Cook County was calculated based on averaging 9 communities with the lowest crime statistics (e.g. rate lower than 1,800 per 100,000 people). "Crimes averted" was calculated by the population of the county times the ideal index

HEALTH

Location	Excellent	Good /fair	Poor	Rate Benefit	Adequate	Poor	Benefit Gap	Adequacy Gap	Poor Gap
Will	190,739	151,328	9,488	54%	43%	2.7%	14,771	13,438	2,096
Lake	236,673	202,520	15,609	52%	45%	3.4%	23,576	20,186	4,336
Kane	166,500	109,414	4,514	59%	39%	1.6%	4,373	5,023	
Suburban cook	962,904	628,578	58,954	58%	38%	3.6%	35,219	20,082	18,989
McHenry	106,327	70,105	4,943	59%	39%	2.7%	3,591	2,820	1,196
DuPage	410,927	235,055	15,350	62%	36%	2.3%			2,963
Chicago	960,547	835,086	78,242	51%	45%	4.2%	103,163	82,268	24,738
Surburbs	2,074,070	1,397,000	108,858	58%	39%	3.0%	81,530	61,549	29,580
Region	3,034,617	2,232,086	187,100	56%	41%	3.4%	184,694	143,817	54,318

Activities Limited by Health Problem

Location	Count yes	Count no	Rate	Gap (Kane rate)
Will	57,882	290,729	16.6%	21,433
DuPage	89,730	572,599	13.5%	20,481
McHenry	25,277	156,304	13.9%	6,292
Lake	57,621	394,844	12.7%	10,314
Suburban Cook	208,522	1,356,521	13.3%	44,891
Chicago	218,189	1,649,916	11.7%	22,871
Kane	29,411	251,889	10.5%	-
Region	686,632	4,672,802	12.8%	126,283
Suburbs	468,443	3,022,886	13.4%	103,411

Smoking

	Smokers	Rate	Gap (Lake rate)
Suburban cook	316,151	0.17	65,883
Chicago	434,887	0.21	144,007
DuPage	118,047	0.18	27,421
Lake	62,352	0.14	-
Kane	56,159	0.20	17,747
Will	96,059	0.27	48,049
Mchenry	42,812	0.24	18,170
Suburban total	691,580.00	0.18	177,270
Region	1,126,467	0.19	321,277

Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey and Centers for Disease Control Office on Smoking and Health

Lung cancer death before 65

Location	Premature deaths	Rate premature	Gap
Suburban cook	347	0.019%	85
Lake	75	0.017%	10
Will	84	0.024%	34
McHenry	34	0.019%	8
Kane	48	0.017%	8
DuPage	95	0.014%	0
Chicago	403	0.019%	98
Suburban total	683	0.018%	144
Region	1,086	0.019%	242

CHILD WELL-BEING

Infant Mortality

Location	Births	Deaths	Rate	Gap
Suburban cook	34,673	252	7.3	126
Cook	84,269	699	8.3	393
DuPage	13,393	93	6.9	44
Will	8,681	52	6	20
Lake	10,703	57	5.3	18
McHenry	4,125	15	3.6	0
Kane	8,054	52	6.5	23
Chicago	49,596	447	9	267
Region	129,225	968	7.5	498

Low Birth Rate

Location	Low birth weight	Total births	Rate	Gap
Suburban cook	2,605	34673	7.5	336
Cook	7,592	84269	9.0	2078
DuPage	899	13393	6.7	23
Will	613	8681	7.1	45
Lake	817	10703	7.6	117
McHenry	293	4125	7.1	23
Kane	527	8054	6.5	0
Chicago	4,987	49596	10.1	1742
Suburbs	5,754	79629	7.2	544
Region	10,741	129225	8.3	2285

Comparative National Child Deaths from Abuse/neglect (2002)

	Deaths	Child population under 18
Illinois	70	3,235,189
New Hampshire	0	
Vermont	0	
Alaska	1	189,824
Delaware	1	195,068
Kansas	1	699,180
Rhode Island	1	244,355

Illinois population times best rate (Kansas)   => 4.63
Gap between Illinois and Kansas per rate: 65
Chicago   16
Gap for Chicago   16

Child Functioning

Teen birth Rate (2000)

Location	Number teen births (10-17)	Total Teens	Rate	Gap (McHenry)
Cook	4,300	294,454	1.5%	3,417
Will	187	31,252	0.6%	93
Kane	272	25,081	1.1%	197
Lake	267	38,902	0.7%	150
DuPage	178	51,237	0.3%	24
McHenry	68	16,266	0.4%	19
Chicago	3,321	156,543	2.1%	2,851
Tot Region	5,272	457,192	1.2%	3,900
Suburbs	1,951	300,649	0.6%	1,049

Estimated Children Raised in "Unsatisfactory" Neighborhoods

	Percent unsatisfactory	Total unsatisfactory	Gap
Chicago	19.5%	142,459	126,183
Non-chicago Cook	5.1%	31,815	18,050
DuPage County	2.2%	5,215	-
Lake County	6.8%	12,408	8,327
Will County	5.6%	8,204	4,959
Kane County	4.7%	8,608	4,527
McHenry County	2.5%	1,911	212
Suburbs	4.6%	66,975	34,888
Region	10.4%	227,376	179,014

Source: MCIC regional survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Estimated Children Living in Households Where Parent Feels "Overwhelmed" with Child Rearing:

	% Everyday	1/Yr/Never	Everyday	1/Yr/Never	Gap every	Gap never
Chicago	23.4%	30.8%	171,144	225,432	97,493	13,727
Non-chicago Cook	17.7%	30.5%	109,714	189,046	47,422	13,228
DuPage County	13.7%	32.2%	32,209	75,462	8,611	1,164
Lake County	21.2%	31.0%	38,924	56,889	20,457	3,076
Will County	10.1%	31.8%	14,685	46,504	-	1,182
Kane County	12.2%	32.7%	22,487	59,965	4,020	-
McHenry County	14.0%	30.1%	10,685	23,013	2,998	1,946
Suburbs	15.9%	31.2%	229,463	449,856	84,267	21,619
Region	18.4%	31.0%	400,085	675,314	181,237	35,320

Source: MCIC regional survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Estimated Level of Awareness of Child Development:

	% Very well informed	Total children in households very well informed	Gap
Chicago	41.7%	305,418	70,026
Non-chicago Cook	47.0%	291,095	26,446
DuPage County	51.3%	120,293	-
Lake County	37.1%	68,092	26,044
Will County	41.2%	60,134	14,727
Kane County	37.7%	69,242	24,894
McHenry County	43.8%	33,441	5,741
Suburbs	44.9%	648,278	91,868
Region	43.6%	948,740	166,850

Source: MCIC regional survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Domestic Violence

Rates of Domestic Violence Incidents

Place	Domestic violence incidents	Population	Rate	Local gap (McHenry, .21%)
Cook	296,514	5,351,552	5.54%	285,276
Lake	2,568	685,019	0.37%	1,129
Will	2,094	586,706	0.36%	862
Kane	1,627	457,122	0.36%	667
Du Page	2,369	925,188	0.26%	426
McHenry	588	286,091	0.21%	-
Chicago	212,422	2,869,121	7.40%	206,397
Suburbs	93,338	5,422,557	1.72%	81,951
Region	305,760	8,291,678	3.69%	288,347

Chicago domestic violence murders   2002 36
                                                         2003   45

ENVIRONMENT

Estimated Assessment of Like/Dislike of Environment and Air Quality

	Percent rating air quality "Outstanding" Growth	Percent saying neighborhood dislike, "environment" Low Functioning	Persons outstanding	Persons dislike	Gap outstanding	Gap dislike
Chicago	6.4%	16.3%	184,884	467,840	912,133	317,552
Non-Chicago cook	12.9%	15.2%	330,300	389,903	648,888	255,758
DuPage	18.5%	16.9%	170,794	156,426	182,725	107,995
Lake	16.3%	16.8%	110,012	113,556	148,019	78,207
Will	21.4%	5.2%	119,970	29,326	94,094	-
Kane	26.6%	14.2%	117,731	62,864	51,667	39,657
McHenry	38.2%	18.8%	106,183	52,322	-	37,775
Suburbs	17.9%	14.6%	971,282	795,520	1,109,102	510,516
Region	14.2%	15.3%	1,180,829	1,272,961	1,996,572	837,669

Source: MCIC regional survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Premature Lung Cancer Deaths

Location	Lung cancer deaths before 65	Rate	Gap
Suburban cook	347	0.019%	85
Lake	75	0.017%	10
Will	84	0.024%	34
McHenry	34	0.019%	8
Kane	48	0.017%	8
DuPage	95	0.014%	0
Chicago	403	0.019%	98
Suburban total	683	0.018%	144
Region	1,086	0.019%	242

Source: American Cancer Society Surveillance Research

DuPage County rate is comparable to lowest state rates in the nation.

SPIRITUALITY

The best means available of assessing levels of popular spirituality is the General Social Survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). The survey is an annual probability survey conducted across the nation of several thousand households. The survey annually captures approximately 30 households in Chicago, too few from which to make meaningful assessments. However, the survey does capture an adequate number of households nationally in major cities and their suburbs.

The questions we have selected aim at capturing core elements of spirituality, as opposed to specific religious practices or beliefs in any particular denomination. We begin by considering a number of abstractions that sociologists typically as descriptive of spirituality, then consider several questions aimed at assessing a more theistic interpretation of spirituality, and then finally consider prevalence of particular practices such as prayer and meditation that tend to be associated more so with narrower definitions of spirituality such as religion.

Think about life as part of larger force

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
A great deal	24.1	21.3
Quite a bit	17.0	16.9
Somewhat	26.8	32.9
Not at all	32.1	29.0
N	112	1245

Source: General Social Survey

Consider self a spiritual person

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
Very religious	28.8	23.3
Moderately religious	27.9	31.9
Slightly religious	27.9	28.1
Not religious	15.3	16.7
N	111	210

We each make our own fate

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
Strongly agree	16.9	17.9
Agree	36.1	40.7
Not agree/disagree	27.7	23.5
Disagree	13.3	13.0
Strongly disagree	6.0	4.9
N	111	162

Consider self a religious person

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
Very religious	20.0	19.2
Moderately religious	33.9	35.5
Slightly religious	24.3	23.8
Not religious	20.0	20.6
N	115	214

Find strength and comfort in religion

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
Many times a day	20.0	16.8
Every day	22.6	22.0
Most days	11.3	12.6
Some days	8.7	10.7
Once in a while	14.8	17.3
Never/almost never	17.4	16.8
N	115	214

Religious practice

How often pray privately

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
More than once/day	29.6	20.6
Once a day	20.0	25.7
A few times/week	14.8	13.1
Once a week	7.8	7.5
Few times/month	3.5	3.7
Once/month	.9	1.9
Less once/month	2.6	7.0
Never	19.1	17.3
N	115	1245

How often meditate

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
More than once/day	9.8	6.4
Once a day	14.3	12.8
A few times/week	8.9	8.9
Once a week	3.6	3.4
Few times/month	4.5	6.4
Once/month	2.7	2.5
Less once/month	1.8	5.9
Never	54.5	53.7
N	112	203

Belief in life after death

	Cities 1998	Cities 1991	Suburbs 1998	Suburbs 1991
1	45.1%	40.2%	42.6%	40.4%
2	15.9%	21.3%	19.1%	21.2%
3	12.4%	14.8%	13.2%	12.6%
4	13.3%	9.8%	11.0%	9.9%
N	113	122	136	151

Belief in life after death

	Cities 1993-1998	Cities 1972-1977	Suburbs 1993-1998	Suburbs 1972-1977
Yes	63.6	54.1	64.9	59.7
No	22.8	32.3	21.1	27.9
Don't Know	13.1	13.4	12.8	12.2
n	505	464	1045	827

How often does respondent pray?

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
Several times a day	25.7	22.9
Once a day	32.2	31.6
Several times a week	12.2	11.6
Once a week	7.8	7.7
Less than once a week	19.5	22.8
Never	2.2	2.2
n	370	782

Strength of affiliation

	Cities 1993-1998	Cities 1972-1977	Suburbs 1993-1998	Suburbs 1972-1977
Strong	34.0	32.6	34.7	33.5
Not very strong	33.7	42.7	35.1	43.2
Somewhat strong	14.3	9.7	12.2	10.0
No religion	14.3	13.5	13.1	11.4
n	706	579	1459	1041

Look to god for strength, support

	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
A great deal	44.3	37.4
Quite a bit	18.3	18.7
Somewhat	20.9	25.7
Not at all	14.8	16.4
N	115	214

Importance of believing in god without doubt

	Cities 1998	Cities 1988	Suburbs 1998	Suburbs 1988
Very important	60.3%	47.0%	47.4%	41.4%
2	11.8%	15.7%	18.8%	17.8%
3	11.0%	13.0%	8.4%	16.1%
4	0	7.8%	9.7%	9.2%
Not important	13.2%	15.7%	8.4%	14.4%
N	136	115	154	174

Life is meaningful because god exists

	Cities 1998	Cities 1991	Suburbs 1998	Suburbs 1991
Strongly agree	15.0%	17.2%	16.2%	15.9%
Agree	20.4%	23.0%	18.4%	15.2%
Neither	18.6%	18.9%	25.7%	27.2%
Disagree	20.4%	13.9%	20.6%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	13.3%	14.8%	11.0%	18.5%
N	113	122	136	151

Describe your beliefs about god

	Cities 1998	Cities 1991	Suburbs 1998	Suburbs 1991
Not now/ever	5.3%	3.3%	2.9%	4.0%
Not now/did	8.0%	5.7%	5.1%	4.6%
Now but didn't	0	7.4%	4.4%	2.6%
Now and always	71.7%	70.5%	69.9%	78.8%
N	113	122	136	151

Life is meaningful because god exists

	Cities 1998	Cities 1991	Suburbs 1998	Suburbs 1991
Strongly agree	15.0%	17.2%	16.2%	15.9%
Agree	20.4%	23.0%	18.4%	15.2%
Neither	18.6%	18.9%	25.7%	27.2%
Disagree	20.4%	13.9%	20.6%	13.9%
Strongly agree	13.3%	14.8%	11.0%	18.5%
N	113	122	136	151

Confidence in churches and religious organizations

	Cities 1998	Cities 1991	Suburbs 1998	Suburbs 1991
Complete confidence	8.0	14.8%	7.4%	9.3%
Great confidence	29.2%	24.6%	32.4%	18.5%
Some confidence	38.1	27.9%	38.2%	46.4%
Little confidence	13.3%	17.2%	8.8%	11.9%
No confidence	8.0%	10.7%	5.1%	10.6%
N	113	122	213	166

Spiritual Gap Analysis

Spirituality is understood in so many diverse ways, and is so immune to measurement, that there is no consensus in any sense around about what constitutes an "adequate" level of spirituality, or in fact degrees of spirituality. The most appropriate measure, therefore, is to concede to each individual the question of whether they have attained the level of spirituality that they wish. The General Social Survey includes questions that assess what individuals consider their standards for spirituality, and other questions that when compared with the standards, suggest whether they are meeting them.

A spiritual gap may, then, be said to exist where a person desires a certain level of spirituality, but reports that he/she falls short of it.

9.2% nationally indicated what might be considered a gap between their beliefs about truth in religion and how religious they indicated that they were.

13.7% indicated that they felt it was very important or important to believe in god without doubt, but they indicated on another survey question that they either had doubts, only believed some of the time or not at all.

11.0 % indicated that they looked to god for strength or support, but felt that at least somewhat, god had abandoned them. This figure increased to 22.1% for people who said they were not too happy.

4.6% characterized themselves as not too happy, yet they said they were neither religious nor spiritual.

Feel deep inner peace or harmony

Cities	Cities 1993-1998	Suburbs 1993-1998
Many times a day	16.4	13.1
Every day	12.7	14.1
Most days	24.5	24.8
Some days	20.0	23.3
Once in a while	15.5	13.6
Never/almost never	10.9	11.2
N	110	206

Estimated Persons Falling Short of Own Spiritual Values (1998)

	Percent falling short of self-described goals	Total persons (region)
Truth gap	9.2%	543,831
Belief gap	13.7%	809,835
Abandoned	11%	650,233
Not happy and not religious	4.6%	271,915

MENTAL HEALTH

Estimated Have a Sense of Well Being Every Day

	Percent "usually" (Growth)	Total	Growth gap upper 3rd income 88%	Percent less than "usually" (functioning)	Total functioning	Functioning Gap (12%)
Chicago	69.1%	1,475,553	404,282	30.9%	660,623	404,282
Non-Chicago Cook	80.4%	1,481,962	139,656	19.6%	360,786	139,656
DuPage	85.2%	564,061	18,789	14.8%	98,268	18,789
Lake	85.0%	386,743	13,650	15.0%	68,249	13,650
Will	83.3%	292,735	16,634	16.7%	58,820	16,634
Kane	85.5%	240,980	7,025	14.5%	40,844	7,025
McHenry	82.7%	398,399	25,392	17.3%	83,182	25,392
Suburbs	82.8%	3,126,995	195,031	17.2%	648,034	195,031
Region	78.7%	4,652,523	549,338	21.3%	1,258,682	549,338

Source: MCIC regional survey and U.S. Census Bureau

General happiness

Cities	Cities 1993-1998	Cities 1972-1977	Suburbs 1993-1998	Suburbs 1972-1977
Very happy	23.1	23.4	27.8	27.9
Pretty happy	56.8	56.0	57.3	54.1
Not too happy	19.4	20.6	15.0	17.9
N	697	940	1444	1723

Happiness of marriage

Cities	Cities 1993-1998	Cities 1972-1977	Suburbs 1993-1998	Suburbs 1972-1977
Very happy	50.9%	62.3	58.8	63.4
Pretty happy	43.5%	33.3	37.4	32.9
Not too happy	5.6%	4.4	3.8	3.7
N	216	363	653	775

Source: General Social Survey

Zero Days Mental Health Reported as NOT Good in Past 30 days (2001/2002)

Location	Persons	Population	Rate	Gap
Suburban Cook	1,202,904	2,480,725	65.9%	38,347
Chicago	1,269,706	2,896,016	59.9%	172,968
DuPage	437,519	904,161	66.2%	11,957
Lake	292,799	644,356	64.4%	16,448
Kane	181,677	404,119	64.9%	8,836
Will	219,597	502,266	62.7%	18,517
McHenry	122,218	260,077	68.0%	-
Suburbs	2,523,516	5,610,995	62%	228,727
Region	3,726,420	8,091,720	64%	267,074

1 to 7 Days Mental Health Reported as NOT Good in Past 30 Days (2001/2002)

Location	Persons	Population	Rate	Gap
Suburban Cook	434,584	2,119,463	24%	46,920
Chicago	595,558	660,335	28%	144,986
DuPage	156,978	454,321	24%	16,599
Lake	96,583	279,887	21%	-
Kane	67,655	349,818	24%	8,155
Will	93,783	61,693	27%	19,416
McHenry	42,130	1823548	23%	3,959
Suburbs	1,052,687	3,629,602	26%	193,115
Region	1,487,271	5,749,065	25%	240,036

8 to 30 Days Reported that Activities were Limited Because of Emotional, Mental, or Physical Problems (2002):

Location	Persons	Population	Rate	Gap
Chicago	114,939	2,119,463	5.4%	71,705
DuPage	13,470	660,335	2.0%	-
Lake	20,017	454,321	4.4%	10,749
Kane	13,470	279,887	4.8%	7,761
Will	30,241	349,818	8.6%	23,105
McHenry	1,425	61,693	2.3%	167
Suburban cook	99,425	1823548	5.4%	62,227
Suburbs	178,048	3,629,602	4.9%	104,009
Region	292,987	5,749,065	5.0%	175,713

Suicide 2001

Location	Suicides	Rate	Gap national
Chicago	206	0.00009719	104
DuPage	72	0.00010904	40
Lake	45	0.00009905	23
Kane	35	0.00012505	22
Will	53	0.00015151	36
McHenry	21	0.00034040	18
Suburban Cook	195	0.00010693	107
Suburbs	421	0.00011599	247
Region	627	0.00010906	351

Washington DC rate best in nation 0.00004807

2002 Incarceration rates
Illinois incarceration rate: 339 per 100,000 population (sentences of at least 1 year)
Lowest comparable state, Minnesota, 139 per 100,000

Total incarcerated 43,142
Gap: 25,422
If Illinois incarcerated at Minnesota's rate, it would have only 17,688 prisoners.
Source: Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2002, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, U.S. Department of Justice

2001 Illinois 691,529 felons & 148,153 ex-prisoners
Source: Paul Street, The Vicious Circle: Race, Prison, Jobs, and Community in Chicago Illinois and the Nation. Chicago Urban League 2002

Estimated
Adult monthly drug users
Chi 64,085
Suburbs 113,250
Teen monthly drug users
Chi 31,308
Subs 60,129

Report of The Drug Use Prevention Strategy Project, Roosevelt University, 2000

Chicago Region users	495,554
Iowa rate	427,498
Gap	68,056

Illinois total rate 7.5% illicit drug use in past month
Lowest national rate Iowa, 6.47%

Source: SAMHSA, Office of Applied Studies, National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2002 and 2003

POVERTY AND EMPLOYMENT

	Percent in poverty	Number in poverty
Chicago	19.6%	556,791
Suburban Cook	6.4%	156,249
Cook County	13.5%	713,040
DuPage County	3.6%	32,163
Kane County	6.7%	26,587
Lake County	5.7%	35,714
McHenry County	3.7%	9,446
Will County	4.9%	24,225
Suburbs		284,384

Gap:

If Chicago had Indianapolis's poverty rate of 11.9%, would have 218,739 fewer persons in poverty.

If suburbs had Milwaukee suburbs poverty rate of 3.6%, would have 88,508 fewer persons in poverty.

Estimated Job Satisfaction and Adequacy

	Percent very satisfied with job	Total adults	Percent behind on rent or utilities	Behind on rent or utilities, total households
Chicago	51.8%		22.5%	238,935
Non-Chicago Cook	63.5%		11.3%	102,971
DuPage	62.5%		9.6%	31,144
Lake	63.8%		10.6%	22,979
Will	58.3%		12.6%	21,086
Kane	65.6%		13.8%	18,446
McHenry	47.8%		10.6%	9,436
Suburbs	61.8%		11.2%	206,464
Region	56.8%		15.6%	452,359

Source: MCIC regional survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Social Contract and Employment

Households in Poverty by Number and Tenure of Workers

	Total Households	Households below poverty line	Households below poverty line with 1 FT/FY and 1 PT/FY	Households below poverty line with 2 PT	Households below poverty line single householder FT	Households below poverty line single householder PT
Cook	1,278,745	135,038	1,787	4,102	87,664	32,571
DuPage	236,252	5,753	243	329	2,752	1,271
Kane	101,923	5,004	188	333	2,755	1,401
Lake	165,269	6,590	254	298	3,685	1,715
McHenry	69,794	1,738	124	129	807	394
Will	131,674	4,538	159	192	2,664	1,226
Chicago	628,290	105,752	1,199	2,884	71,367	25,349
Suburbs	1,355,367	52,909	1,556	2,499	28,960	13,229
Region	1,983,657	158,661	2,755	5,383	100,327	38,578

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Percentage of Households in Poverty by Number and Tenure of Workers

	Total Households	Households below poverty line	Households below poverty line with 1 FT/FY and 1 PT/FY	Households below poverty line with 2 PT	Households below poverty line single householder FT	Households below poverty line single householder PT
Cook	1278745	10.6%	0.1%	0.3%	7%	2.5%
DuPage	236252	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	1%	0.5%
Kane	101923	4.9%	0.2%	0.3%	3%	1.4%
Lake	165269	4.0%	0.2%	0.2%	2%	1.0%
McHenry	69794	2.5%	0.2%	0.2%	1%	0.6%
Will	131674	3.4%	0.1%	0.1%	2%	0.9%
Chicago	628290	16.8%	0.2%	0.5%	11%	4.0%
Suburbs	1355367	3.9%	0.1%	0.2%	2%	1.0%
Region	1983657	8.0%	0.1%	0.3%	5%	1.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

	Social Contract (gap)	Total poor working
Cook	93,553	126,124
DuPage	3,324	4,595
Kane	3,276	4,677
Lake	4,237	5,952
McHenry	1,060	1,454
Will	3,015	4,241
	-	-
Chicago	75,450	100,799
Suburbs	33,015	46,244
Region	108,465	147,043

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Employment

Place	Total in labor force	Total unemployed	Percent unemployed	National gap (CT, 1999, 1.6%)	Midwest gap
DuPage	527,950	23,853	4.5%	15,406	
McHenry	151,078	8,180	5.4%	5,763	
Lake	339,551	19,741	5.8%	14,308	
Kane	235,944	14,737	6.2%	10,962	
Cook	2,678,510	135,826	6.5%	92,970	
Will	286,309	19,248	6.7%	14,667	
Chicago	1,540,832	127,889	8%	103,236	
Suburbs	2,678,510	93,696	8%	50,840	
Region	4,219,342	221,585	8%	154,076	

Estimated Persons Living in Households "Very Satisfied" with Health Insurance Coverage

	% Very satisfied	Total	Gap
Chicago	52.6%	1,507,768	1,361,353
Non-chicago Cook	55.9%	1,432,312	1,128,641
DuPage County	54.1%	499,848	424,741
Lake County	53.4%	360,136	314,714
Will County	53.2%	298,108	261,753
Kane County	51.4%	227,508	215,533
McHenry County	60.7%	168,610	109,100
Suburbs	55.0%	2,994,530	2,446,474
Region	54.2%	4,506,791	3,803,334

Persons living in households without life insurance

	% with	Total	Gap
Chicago	66.5%	1,906,823	962,298
Non-chicago Cook	81.9%	2,097,093	463,860
DuPage County	87.7%	810,442	114,147
Lake County	85.2%	574,872	99,978
Will County	85.3%	477,735	82,126
Kane County	82.7%	366,506	76,535
McHenry County	84.9%	235,904	41,806
Suburbs	83.8%	4,556,976	884,028
Region	77.2%	6,413,623	1,896,502

Poor Single Parents

	Total Households	Single Parent below poverty line
Cook	1,278,745	74151
DuPage	236,252	2409
Kane	101,923	2539
Lake	165,269	3308
McHenry	69,794	765
Will	131,674	2289
Chicago	628,290	60340
Suburbs	1,355,367	25121
Region	1,983,657	85461

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

EDUCATION

Gap Between Best Rate (New Trier) and Chicago, Suburban and Regional Rates

Area	Rate	Population	Ideal Rate	Gap
Chicago High	30%	336,535	89%	57,885
Chicago (elem.)	42%	98,278	89%	156,152
Suburbs	68%	960,035	89%	201,881
Region	59%	1,394,848	89%	415,918

Students in Region by Area, Meeting Standards by Number and Percent

Population	Not Meeting/ Exceeding Standards	Percent	Meeting/ Exceeding Standards	Percent
Suburban Cook	127,799	35%	238,943	65%
DuPage	39,458	25%	120,862	75%
Kane	39,920	37%	69,194	63%
Lake	42,921	33%	88,048	67%
McHenry	14,580	35%	34,847	65%
Will	42,806	29%	100,657	71%
Chicago	261,867	60%	172,946	40%

Sources: Chicago data: Chicago Public Schools site:
http://research.cps.k12.il.us/resweb/SiteServlet?page=schoolwide
Elementary Schools at a glance; High Schools at a glance (excel document)
Illinois Report Card data: http://iirc.niu.edu/default.html

Gap was calculated by comparing highest testing non-competitive high school (New Trier) with school district scores. All county scores were calculated by school district. PSAE scores were used to calculate high schools while ISAT tests were used in elementary school calculations. In districts with combined elementary and high schools, PSAE scores were used to determine "Meeting or Exceeding Standards." In districts without a high school, ISAT scores were used to determine "Meeting or Exceeding Standards". For the City of Chicago, elementary schools and high schools were calculated independently, and then averaged.

Adult Education Levels

Geography Name	% 25 Years and over with Bachelor's Degree or higher	Population 25 years and over	# people attending college
DuPage	41.70%	589,120	245,663
Cook	28.00%	3,454,738	967,327
McHenry	27.70%	163,780	45,367
Kane	27.70%	245,486	68,000
Lake	38.60%	398,265	153,730
Will	25.50%	310,918	79,284
Region		5,162,307	1,559,371

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

ADULTS

Population Age 25 and Above Who Have Completed 0-8 Years of Education Only

	Total	Percent	Gap
Chicago	225,497	12.4%	159,294
Suburban Cook	107,131	6.5%	47,383
Cook County	332,628	9.6%	206,677
DuPage County	22,993	3.9%	1,515
Kane County	23,726	9.7%	14,776
Lake County	23,819	6.0%	9,299
McHenry County	5,971	3.6%	-
Will County	13,370	4.3%	2,035
Suburbs	197,010	5.9%	75,008
Region	422,507	8.2%	234,302

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Population Age 25 and Above Who Have Completed High School Diploma Only

	Total	Percent	Gap
Chicago	418113	23.0%	43,988
Suburban Cook	416562	25.4%	78,915
Cook County	834675	24.2%	122,904
DuPage County	121375	20.6%	-
Kane County	61331	25.0%	10,754
Lake County	85056	21.4%	3,002
McHenry County	46453	28.4%	12,710
Will County	90360	29.1%	26,302
Suburbs	821,137	24.5%	131,684
Region	1,239,250	24.0%	175,672

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Population Age 25 and Above Who Have Completed Bachelors Degree or Higher

	Total	Percent	Gap
Chicago	462,783	25.5%	293,795
Suburban Cook	505,859	30.9%	176,951
Cook County	968,642	28.0%	470,746
DuPage County	245,452	41.7%	-
Kane County	68,050	27.7%	34,230
Lake County	153,726	38.6%	12,208
McHenry County	45,436	27.7%	22,802
Will County	79,270	25.5%	50,271
Suburbs	1,097,793	32.8%	296,462
Region	1,560,576	30.2%	590,257

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Percent of Persons 25 Years and Over with Bachelor's Degree or Higher, National Comparison

Place	Percent of Persons 25 Years and Over with Bachelor's Degree or Higher	Population 25 years and over: Total
Iowa City, IA MSA	47.6	62,859
Corvallis, OR MSA	47.4	45,758
Lawrence, KS MSA	42.7	53,257
Columbia, MO MSA	41.7	77,919
Madison, WI MSA	40.6	269,998
Charlottesville, VA MSA	40.1	100,960
Santa Fe, NM MSA	39.9	100,692
Bloomington, IN MSA	39.6	65,489
Fort Collins--Loveland, CO MSA	39.5	156,426
Raleigh--Durham--Chapel Hill, NC MSA	38.9	763,470
Gainesville, FL MSA	38.7	123,524
Champaign--Urbana, IL MSA	38	100,559
San Francisco--Oakland--San Jose, CA CMSA	37.3	4,764,188
Burlington, VT MSA	37.2	107,603
Washington--Baltimore, DC--MD--VA--WV CMSA	37.1	5,036,513
Bryan--College Station, TX MSA	37	70,708
Tallahassee, FL MSA	36.7	166,469
Austin--San Marcos, TX MSA	36.7	768,147
State College, PA MSA	36.3	74,785
Bloomington--Normal, IL MSA	36.2	87,220
Denver--Boulder--Greeley, CO CMSA	35.5	1,670,518
Rochester, MN MSA	34.7	80,277
Boston--Worcester--Lawrence, MA-NH--ME--CT CMSA	34.4	3,906,653
Athens, GA MSA	34.1	85,196
Portland, ME MSA	33.6	167,256
Barnstable--Yarmouth, MA MSA	33.5	121,037
Minneapolis—St. Paul, MN--WI MSA	33.3	1,903,346
Missoula, MT MSA	32.8	59,298
Lincoln, NE MSA	32.6	152,747
Atlanta, GA MSA	32	2,630,798
Seattle--Tacoma--Bremerton, WA CMSA	32	2,351,904
Colorado Springs, CO MSA	31.8	320,420
Provo--Orem, UT MSA	31.5	166,240
Huntsville, AL MSA	30.9	223,845
New York—NNJ--Long Island, NY--NJ--CT--PA CMSA	30.5	14,142,132
Hartford, CT MSA	29.8	794,422
Flagstaff, AZ--UT MSA	29.5	69,818
San Diego, CA MSA	29.5	1,773,327
Fargo--Moorhead, ND--MN MSA	29.4	104,248
Santa Barbara--Santa Maria--Lompoc, CA MSA	29.4	246,729
Columbia, SC MSA	29.2	340,786
Richmond--Petersburg, VA MSA	29.2	657,222
Columbus, OH MSA	29.1	983,765
Chicago--Gary--Kenosha, IL--IN--WI CMSA	28.9	5,835,442

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Gap SF 37.3 to Chicago Region 28.9

Less than High School Education

	Total persons over 25	Percent less than high school	Total less than high school	Gap DuPage
Cook	3,454,738	22.3%	770,407	424,933
DuPage	589,120	10.0%	58,912	-
Kane	245,486	19.8%	48,606	24,057
Lake	398,265	13.4%	53,368	13,542
McHenry	163,780	10.8%	17,688	1,310
Will	310,918	13.1%	40,730	9,638
Region	5,162,307	19.2%	989,711	473,480

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Selected Places, Percent More Than High School

Place	Percent more than high school	Number of persons
Minneapolis--St. Paul, MN--WI MSA	90.6	1,903,346
Seattle--Tacoma--Bremerton, WA CMSA	89.5	2,351,904
Kansas City, MO--KS MSA	86.7	1,154,262
Denver--Boulder--Greeley, CO CMSA	86.6	1,670,518
Portland--Salem, OR--WA CMSA	86.2	1,470,754
Boston--Worcester--Lawrence, MA--NH--ME--CT CMSA	85.7	3,906,653
Washington--Baltimore, DC--MD--VA--WV CMSA	84.9	5,036,513
Atlanta, GA MSA	84	2,630,798
Indianapolis, IN MSA	84	1,039,892
San Francisco--Oakland--San Jose, CA CMSA	83.9	4,764,188
Chicago--Gary--Kenosha, IL--IN--WI CMSA	81.1	5,835,442

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Transportation

Number of Traffic Fatalities

Location	Fatalities	Rate	Gap (best state?)
Cook Suburbs	409	0.022%	
Cook	965	0.024%	
Chicago	556	0.026%	
DuPage	143	0.022%	
Kane	89	0.032%	
Lake	130	0.029%	
Mchenry	60	0.033%	
Will	113	0.032%	
Region TOTS	1,500	0.026%	
Suburbs TOTS	944	0.025%	

Assessment of Living Area's Traffic Management

	Percent outstanding or very good	Number of persons in households outstanding or very good	Number acceptable or less	Percent needs improvement	Number needs improve (gap)
Chicago	23.4%	670,492	2,198,629	39.3%	1,126,167
Non-chicago Cook	34.2%	875,331	1,685,622	30.2%	772,351
DuPage County	28.2%	260,995	663,594	34.8%	322,079
Lake County	21.4%	144,510	530,340	50.3%	339,530
Will County	34.7%	194,085	365,776	34.4%	192,841
Kane County	28.8%	127,635	315,406	37.7%	166,907
McHenry County	22.9%	63,501	214,209	46.3%	128,695
Suburbs	30.5%	1,657,317	3,783,687	35.6%	1,937,446
Region	28.4%	2,356,331	5,953,794	36.7%	3,048,958

Source: MCIC Regional Survey and U.S.Census Bureau

Assessment of Living Area's Public Transportation

	Percent outstanding or very good	Number of persons in households outstanding or very good	Number acceptable or less	Percent needs improvement	Number needs improve (gap)
Chicago	55.1%	1,580,810	1,288,311	18.2%	520,911
Non-chicago Cook	49.0%	1,254,225	1,306,728	22.8%	583,361
DuPage County	38.3%	354,003	570,586	30.5%	282,306
Lake County	32.5%	219,209	455,641	36.4%	245,827
Will County	24.4%	136,760	423,101	41.0%	229,358
Kane County	30.3%	134,376	308,665	30.9%	137,037
McHenry County	25.3%	70,392	207,318	45.5%	126,319
Suburbs	39.5%	2,146,490	3,294,514	29.9%	1,625,179
Region	44.4%	3,686,256	4,623,869	26.2%	2,176,817

Source: MCIC Regional Survey and U.S.Census Bureau

Assessment of Living Area's Parking Availability

	Percent outstanding or very good	Number of persons in households outstanding or very good	Number acceptable or less	Percent needs improvement	Number needs improve (gap)
Chicago	29.0%	831,980	2,037,141	42.3%	1,214,853
Non-chicago Cook	59.7%	1,530,095	1,030,858	15.1%	387,246
DuPage County	59.4%	549,233	375,356	11.8%	109,019
Lake County	59.0%	397,880	276,970	11.5%	77,327
Will County	59.8%	334,686	225,175	11.0%	61,523
Kane County	54.7%	242,559	200,482	16.5%	73,015
McHenry County	61.3%	170,374	107,336	11.3%	31,519
Suburbs	59.3%	3,226,657	2,214,347	13.5%	736,816
Region	50.3%	4,178,057	4,132,068	22.1%	1,838,178

Source: MCIC Regional Survey and U.S.Census Bureau

Traffic congestion limits activities

	Percent limited	Number limited (gap)
Chicago	37.8%	1,083,962
Non-chicago Cook	34.2%	875,783
DuPage County	42.0%	388,437
Lake County	52.3%	352,699
Will County	32.6%	182,280
Kane County	34.3%	151,961
McHenry County	40.6%	112,859
Suburbs	38.1%	2,071,515
Region	38.0%	3,156,559

Source: MCIC Regional Survey and U.S.Census Bureau

RECREATION

Assessment of Area Recreation

	Percent rating cultural activities access "Very good or outstanding"	Gap from suburban Cook	Percent rating parks and recreation "Very good or outstanding"	Gap from DuPage
Chicago	52.3%	565,326	53.2%	851,231
Non-Chicago cook	72.0%		78.4%	114,519
DuPage	59.4%	116,597	82.9%	
Lake	47.8%	163,074	73.3%	64,655
Will	41.3%	171,607	68.8%	78,990
Kane	59.5%	55,184	74.4%	37,808
McHenry	39.0%	91,662	71.0%	33,082
Suburbs	59.3%	690,663	76.6%	343,153
Region	57.1%	1,238,734	69.7%	1,100,835

Source: MCIC Regional Survey and U.S.Census Bureau

SOCIAL CAPITAL

People helpful or looking out for selves

Cities	Cities 1993-1998	Cities 1972-1977	Suburbs 1993-1998	Suburbs 1972-1977
Helpful	37.0%	43.5	41.6	42.4
Lookout for self	48.8%	49.7	46.0	49.5
Depends	13.3%	6.8	11.4	7.2
n	459	589	944	1216

Source: General Social Survey

Can people be trusted

Cities	Cities 1993-1998	Cities 1972-1977	Suburbs 1993-1998	Suburbs 1972-1977
Can trust	27.0	37.1	34.2	41.9
Cannot trust	64.5	56.7	57.7	52.1
Depends	7.7	5.3	7.3	5.3
n	493	660	1013	1216

Source: General Social Survey

Saguaro Seminar

The Saguaro Seminar is an academic center created by Robert Putnam (author of Bowling Alone) at Harvard University, dedicated to analyzing the prevalence and influence of social capital in communities. In 19XX the center commissioned a national survey based in 40 urban and rural sites nationwide. Survey responses were aggregated into measures that describe the various dimensions of social capital embodied in the survey. The measures are indexed to a mean of 100 with a standard deviation of 15. Thus a score of 115 would be roughly equivalent to receiving a 600 on an SAT.

The table below indicates that the Chicago region ranks low nationally on most measures of social capital, and very low on some measures. While the best measures of social capital are generally achieved in rural areas, that is not always the case. San Franscisans are far more inclined to engage in protest politics than are Chicagoans, and Seattle enjoys much greater levels of associational involvement and diversity of friendships. On many measures, large metro areas of Seattle, St. Paul, Boston, Phoenix and others perform substantially better than Chicago.

	Chicago Region Score	Best City/Region	Best Large Metro Area
Social Trust	81	Rural South Dakota (150)	St. Paul (120)
Inter-racial Trust	86	Rural South Dakota (143)	Seattle (111)
Conventional Politics	89	Bismarck, North Dakota (136)	Boston (118)
Protest Politics	100	San Francisco (140)	San Francisco (140
Civic Leadership	92	Rural South Dakota (161)	Seattle, (114)
Associational Involvement	93	Seattle (127)	Seattle (127)

Informal socializing	95	Lewiston-Auburn ME, (133)	Phoenix (112)
Diversity of friendships	90	Seattle, (148)	Seattle (148)
Giving and volunteering	85	Rural South Dakota (127)	Charlotte (125)
Faith-based engagement	99	Rural South Dakota (128)	Birmingham & Baton Rouge (124)
Social capital equality	94	New Hampshire (138)	Cincinnati (116)

Source: Saguaro Survey

Isolation

Persons Living in Municipalities with Selected Dissimilarity Scores

	Dissim score	Percent living in	Pop in
Suburbs	80 + Bl/Wh	17.5%	827,420
	80 + Hsp/Wh	0.3%	14,184
Region	80 + Bl/Wh	49.0%	3,735,823
	80 + Hsp/Wh	0.2%	15,248
Suburbs	- 50 Bl/Wh	10.7%	505,908
	-50 Hsp/Wh	49.5%	2,340,416
Region	- 50 Bl/Wh	6.6%	503,193
	-50 Hsp/Wh	30.7%	2,340,608
Chicago	Bl/Wh	88.3%	
	Hsp/Wh	.XXX	
Region	Bl/Wh	81.0%	7,624,129
	Hsp/Wh	62.0%	7,624,129

Source: Lewis et al. 2002.

	Population	Black	Dissim Score
Orange County	2,846,289	51,080	0.37
Las Vegas	1,563,282	133,244	0.43
Phoenix	3,251,876	127,227	0.44
		Latino	
St. Louis	2,603,607	39,677	0.29
Cincinnati	1,646,395	17,717	0.3
Galveston/Texas City	250,158	44,939	0.32
Baltimore	2,552,994	51,329	0.36
Sacramento	1,628,197	234,475	0.4

Source: Lewis Mumford Institute, University at Albany.

Estimated persons comfortable with cross-race relationships

	Percent of whites feel comfortable with blacks		Percent of blacks feel comfortable with whites	
Chicago	41.8%	328,136	53.0%	382,628
Non-Chicago cook	45.5%	588,462		
DuPage	47.4%	252,100		
Lake	53.7%	185,127		
Will	50.6%	141,049		
Kane	55.7%	112,322		
McHenry	49.2%	81,041		
Suburbs	48.4%	1,362,456		
Region	46.6%	1,678,525	51.9%	541,418

Number of Persons in Linguistic Isolation

Place	Total households	Linguistically isolated households	Percent isolated	National gap (WV, .3%)	Midwest gap (OH, 1.2%)
Cook	1974,408	162,272	8.2%	156,349	138,579
DuPage	326,011	13,504	4.1%	12,526	9,592
Kane	133,733	9,504	7.1%	9,103	7,899
Lake	216,484	10,488	4.8%	9,839	7,890
McHenry	89,377	2,044	2.3%	1,776	971
Will	167,602	3,375	2.0%	2,872	1,364
Chicago	1061,964	107,870	10.2%	104,684	95,126
Suburbs	1845,651	93,317	5.1%	87,780	71,169
Region	2907,615	201,187	6.9%	192,464	166,296

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, SF-3

Hate Crimes

Hate Crimes 2003

City	Number of hate Crimes	Population	Hate Crime Index
Jacksonville, FL	5	773,781	0.65
Houston	29	2,009,690	1.44
Philadelphia	40	1,479,339	2.70
Dallas	41	1,208,318	3.39
San Jose	31	898,349	3.45
New York	291	8,085,742	3.60
Chicago	128	2,869,121	4.46
San Diego	84	1,266,753	6.63
Phoenix	100	1,388,416	7.20
Los Angeles	276	3,819,951	7.23

Chicago gap based on Jacksonville is 109

Hate Crimes 1996

City	# Hate Crimes	Population	Hate Crime Index
Detroit	5	989,622	0.51
Houston	34	1,792,092	1.90
San Jose	21	838,596	2.50
Philadelphia	97	1,551,564	6.25
Chicago	175	2,766,911	6.32
Dallas	70	1,097,729	6.38
New York	535	7,665,421	6.98
San Diego	98	1,166,975	8.40
Phoenix	135	1,152,224	11.72
Los Angeles	481	3,590,109	13.40

Estimated Adults with Two or Fewer Friends

	Percent	Adults	Gap
City	23.6%	2,136,176	505,177
Suburbs	25.3%	3,775,029	954,128

Source: General Social Survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Estimated Adults Spend an Evening with Friends Only Several Times a Year or Less

	Percent	Adults	Gap
City	32.7%	2,136,176	699,065
Suburbs	33.8%	3,775,029	1,275,739

Source: General Social Survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Estimated Satisfaction with Marriage

	Percent very satisfied	Percent not too satisfied	Married persons	Total very satisfied	Total not too satisfied
City	60.7%	5.0%	976,787	592,567	48,718
Suburbs	62.8%	2.5%	2,404,705	1,511,049	60,727

Source: General Social Survey and U.S. Census Bureau

Voting

Voting Turnout, 2004 Election

	VAP, 2000	November, 2004 Election turnout	Turnout as % of VAP	Gap (19 Ward 75.9%)
DuPage	662,329	404,117	61.0%	98,591
Kane	281,824	171,336	60.8%	42,568
Lake	454,992	276,609	60.8%	68,730
McHenry	181,581	128,454	70.7%	9,366
Will	351,555	250,805	71.3%	16,025
Cook	3,978,924	2,081,697	52.3%	938,306
Region	5,911,205	3,313,018	56.0%	1,173,587
Chicago	2,136,176	1,056,830	49.5%	564,528
Suburbs	3,775,029	2,256,188	59.8%	609,059

Source: Illinois State Board of Elections

Neighborhood Satisfaction

MCIC	Percent very satisfied	Total	Gap (McHenry rate)
Chicago	40.7%	869,779	723,809
Non-Chicago cook	68.0%	1,253,485	121,205
DuPage	65.0%	430,514	63,584
Lake	73.3%	333,336	6,088
Will	65.7%	230,840	31,420
Kane	60.4%	170,311	39,930
McHenry	74.6%	359,145	
Suburbs	67.4%	2,545,350	270,822
Region	56.4%	3,335,948	1,073,811

Source: MCIC Survey