MEASURING NEIGHBOURHOOD VITALITY

FINAL REPORT

January 2005

GHK

Table of Contents

1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was written by Geoffrey Dobilas and Fraser Battye of GHK International (Canada) Ltd. We would like to thank several people whose help in conducting the research was invaluable. Much of the indicator data was provided by Harvey Low of the Community and Neighbourhood Services (CNS) Department, Social Development and Administration Division of the City of Toronto. Health related data were provided by CNS, Toronto Public Health, Planning and Policy. We would also like to thank Project Director, Sue Hunter, Research Coordinator, Enid Slack and the Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force for the helpful comments and suggestions received throughout the study process.

2 INTRODUCTION

This report forms the final output from Research Product 3 of the Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force: to develop a Neighbourhood Vitality Tool for Toronto neighbourhoods. The intention, in developing the neighbourhood vitality tool was to examine the extent to which such tools have been used in other jurisdictions, to identify best practices in the development and use of such tools and to employ, as far as possible, those best practices in the development of a system of neighbourhood vitality indicators for Toronto. The overall purpose in preparing the tool for Toronto was to identity the attributes that are important in defining neighbourhood vitality, to determine the best indicators and proxies for measuring those attributes of vitality and to, as far as possible given limited resources, populate the tool with the most current data available. In the end, it was hoped that the tool would be helpful in informing decisions and setting priorities for investment in regeneration at the neighbourhood level in Toronto.

The report provides a review of current international, national and local practice in the use of indicator systems at the neighbourhood level. In addition, it outlines the final set of domains and indicators chosen for analysing Toronto's neighbourhoods. Finally, the report, looks at neighbourhood vitality in Toronto by deploying the tool in 140 Toronto neighbourhoods. It continues in the following sections:

- Section 2 provides a brief background to indicators and includes a working definition as well as a history of their use;
- Section 3 provides examples of indicator systems developed in the UK, US, Toronto and Canada. It explores the uses of these systems, their institutional setting and the actual domains chosen;
- Section 4 outlines the final set of indicators chosen for the analysis, a rationale for their inclusion, results of the use of the tool in Toronto and a guide to the interpretation of the information in the Neighbourhood Vitality Tool; and
- Section 5 contains the key conclusions and recommendations arising from the work.

These Sections are supported by four Annexes:

- Annex A provides a long list of available indicators that might be used and the rationale for why they might be considered;
- Annex B lists the member cities from the National Neighbourhood Indicators Partnership in the US;
- Annex C provides more a more detailed listing of the actual domains and measures used in a selection of neighbourhood indicator systems; and
- Annex D provides the Neighbourhood Vitality Indicator data.

3 BACKGROUND TO NEIGHBOURHOOD INDICATORS

3.1 Introduction

Within the context of this exercise it is important to consider the background to the use of indicators at the neighbourhood level. Indeed, having a sense of what precedes this work is useful in guiding future developments. This section, therefore, outlines a brief background to indicators: what they are, what they can be used for and how they have developed in recent history.

3.2 What is an indicator?

There is no single accepted definition of what an 'indicator' is: some take the term to include only highly specific, precisely defined summary statistics of some attribute of the object(s) under investigation. Others are happy for the term to encompass more qualitative, subjective and textual descriptions of a situation [1]. It is not the purpose of this paper to engage in this debate and therefore a practical working definition of the term is used throughout.

For the purposes of this paper, indicators are broadly defined as statistics or measures that provide evidence of conditions or problems. Within this definition indicators can be both qualitative and quantitative in nature and can be generated by customized data collection systems as well as standard administrative systems such as the census, school board data, health records etc. More generally, the indicators chosen can be viewed as measures of neighbourhood assets (those attributes that contribute in a positive way to the overall make-up of a neighbourhood and its vitality) and deprivation. For example, income can be viewed as both an asset a measure of deprivation as well – high incomes being an asset and low incomes being a measure of deprivation. Similarly, the percentage of dwellings in need of major repair can also be viewed both as an asset and a measure of deprivation – a high percentage pointing possibly to deprivation and a low percentage being an asset.

3.3 What uses do they have?

It is accepted good practice for policy makers and planners to use evidence and research in the formulation of interventions. Interventions based upon accepted evidence about 'what works' promotes efficiency and efficacy. Policy formulated upon clear and robust information is more likely to be effective than that based upon weak information or 'intuition'. If good information does exist, several issues may be more easily addressed:

- *Hidden problems can be identified*. For example, an area may have especially poor health outcomes, but if there is no evidence to back this up, then it is not possible to accurately assess the scale or nature of the problem. This in turn means that the problem is more likely to go unaddressed. This is especially pertinent within the

[1] For a more complete discussion of this issue see: 'Assessing The Impact Of The Children's Fund: The Role Of Indicators.' National Evaluation of the Children's Fund. February 2004.

context of neighbourhood level indicators as information at the city level can disguise concentrations of problems in specific neighbourhoods. Good information which accurately describes health outcomes gets around this problem.

- *Interventions may be better designed*. If it is possible to assess the scale and nature of a problem then it is easier to design an appropriate response.
- *Resources may be distributed more efficiently*. Again, good information at the appropriate level can lead to a better allocation of available resources. For example, interventions aimed at boosting educational attainment may target those schools with students most in need of additional help.
- *Evaluation of interventions is easier.* With effective information at the correct level, assessing the impact of interventions is made easier. Again, the opportunity to inform policy is realized and the result may be initiatives that are better designed. Part of this information can be supplied by a system of indicators. For example, the impact of a programme aimed at raising educational attainment in specific neighbourhoods could be measured in part using comparative information obtained through the use of indicators: what happened in the targeted neighbourhoods? What happened in comparable neighbourhoods where there was no intervention?

In addition to the above, good indicator systems can lead to Information being collected in a more effective manner. Several agencies may collect information about an area and then share the information. Coordination is key and sharing information can promote effective service delivery. For example, school boards may collect information regarding levels of pupil non-attendance: information that could be pertinent to providers of services for young people or for local police in terms of predicting youth crime in an area. Making information collection a specific responsibility is also necessary to drive the process and to save 're-inventing the wheel'.

The increased use of indicators is therefore part of a wider drive towards evidence-based policy making and service delivery. The use of indicators should not be an 'add-on', but a central part of formulating responses to challenges faced by citizens in Toronto's neighbourhoods.

3.3.1 Brief history

The potential and desirability of collecting indicators for populations and areas has long been recognized. It is only comparatively recently, however, that constructing such systems has become a viable possibility. The Urban Institute characterises the period 1960-75 as a period where the potential for the development of neighbourhood indicators was recognized. However, due to the inadequate technology of the period, the development of neighbourhood indicators was described as an idea that had come too early[2].

The 1990s were the period where the development of such systems first began to be realized on the scale imagined in the 1960s. Technological improvements in terms of

[2] 'Building and Operating Neighbourhood Indicator Systems: A Guidebook' G.Thomas Kingsley (ed), March 1999, Urban Institute.

better more affordable hardware, user-friendly software (e.g. GIS) and increased use of information technology in storing administrative data were key factors in the supply of the indicator systems. There were also factors influencing the demand for this type of information, not least of which is the demand for more evidence from policy makers and the increasingly multi-faceted approaches to regeneration initiatives requiring similarly multi-faceted information.

As understanding of the nature of deprivation (and potential means of tackling it) has developed, so too have the neighbourhood indicator systems developed to measure and monitor it. At the same time, by looking into deprivation through the use of indicator systems, an unexpected by-product has been that these systems can often shed light on neighbourhood assets as well. In other words, an indicator can often be interpreted as both an asset and a measure of deprivation. In addition, more accurate measures and data are being produced that are becoming more wide-spread in their use. As a result, so have examples of good practice in the development and use of indicators. Examples of good practice in the use of indicators at the neighbourhood level is the subject of the following Section.

4 EXAMPLES OF INDICATOR SYSTEMS

The following Section provides examples of systems of indicators developed, predominantly at the neighbourhood level, in the UK, the US, Toronto and Canada. It is supported by Annex C, which provides fuller lists of domains (i.e. a grouping of indicators relating to a specific issue such as the economy, health, mobility etc.) and indicators used in similar initiatives.

This set of examples has been chosen for their use as comparisons and to set the relevant work of the Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force in some context. There has been no systematic screening for 'good practice', and as such it is not claimed that this is a definitive list. However, these are examples of sound current work upon which to base a similar system for Toronto.

4.1 Examples from the US - National Neighbourhood Indicators Partnership

The US is recognized as providing some key examples of good practice in the use of indicators at the neighbourhood level. Within the US, the most important initiative taken in this area is the National Neighbourhood Indicators Partnership (NNIP), which is guided and co-ordinated by the Urban Institute [3] in Washington.

The NNIP began in the mid-1990s with six partner organizations and the Urban Institute as co-ordinator. There are now over 20 cities in the US that have developed systems for measuring neighbourhood well-being, the full list and links to online systems is contained in Annex B.

The role of the Institute as the co-ordinating body is key in terms of:

- Adding value (e.g. through cross-site analysis);
- Sharing good practice (through conferences and seminars);
- Promoting cross-site learning, disseminating findings and contributing to policy debate;
- Sharing national-level information based on census data sets held at the Institute [4]; and
- Building similar capacities elsewhere through direct technical assistance, training, practitioner guides and products such as databases.

[3] The Urban Institute is a non-profit, non-partisan research and educational organisation, which works on themes connected to social, economic and governance issues facing the US. It has a specific focus on policy making and the impact of interventions.

[4] In 2002, NNIP incorporated 2000 census data in the form of the Urban Institute's new Neighbourhood Change Data Base. This is the only dataset that containing nationwide tract-level data from each census, 1970-2000 with consistently defined boundaries.

As the various indicator systems have been developed within specific local contexts and in a semi-autonomous fashion, there are naturally differences between them both in terms of the actual data used and ways in which it is presented. It is, however, possible to draw out commonalities. Members of the NNIP: [5]

- Maintain *automated data systems* with regularly updated neighbourhood-level indicators, which are drawn from multiple sources. Generally speaking, these organizations store large amounts of data, referred to as 'data warehouses', and then use a select set of indicators to provide standard information at the neighbourhood level. This provides for cost effectiveness (i.e. it is no longer expensive to update and store large amounts of information), and flexibility (i.e.it is possible to add new information incrementally);
- *Emphasise the use of the data* collected (i.e. they are not concerned with data for data's sake). Not one of the partner organizations exists purely to undertake research and the collection and use of indicators is undertaken as part of a wider mission which is generally the reduction of poverty and promotion of community capacity. The majority of NNIP partners are independent non-profit organizations,[6] and can therefore provide information from a position with greater distance from short-term political control. In addition, not one organization represents an agency or branch of government or works exclusively for any one faction in the community. As a result, there is less potential for conflict or 'biting the hand that feeds.' The central theme of all the projects is 'democratising information';
- Act as a *'one-stop shop'* for a variety of data users. As such, these organizations can provide a service to the organizations they collect the data from, e.g. education authorities can refer enquiries to these organizations; and
- Use information as a means to *promote local partnership and collaboration*. The collection and use of data from a wide variety of sources necessarily involves a wide range of organizations and stakeholders, many of whom will have formal long-term data sharing/confidentiality agreements. This has provided a basis for establishing partnerships amongst agencies that have no history of collaboration.

As noted above, because of the way in which the individual projects were developed, there are differences between them in terms of the information they collect. There are, however, some very clear similarities which are partly a function of the availability of data i.e. the census forms a central part of all of these systems and provides standard data. Generally speaking, indicators are collected under a variety of domains, such as: health, crime, demographic features, housing, local economy, physical environment, education and so on. Annex C contains examples of the way in which some cities have organized their systems. The following section presents three case studies from cities engaged in the NNIP.

[5] These points have been paraphrased from G.Thomas Kingsley (ed). March 1999. 'Building and Operating Neighbourhood Indicator Systems: A Guidebook'. Urban Institute.

[6] Within the context of the Strong Neighbourhoods research programme, it is interesting to note that several of the NNIP local partners are affiliated to the United Way.

4.1.1 Social and Vulnerability Indicators Project - Indianapolis

The Social and Vulnerability Indicators (SAVI) project are rooted in two pieces of research conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s, which attempted to use census information to provide a statistical analysis of social problems in Indianapolis neighbourhoods. From these origins, SAVI (launched in 1993) has developed into a comprehensive online database for the Indianapolis Metropolitan Statistical Area.

SAVI is developed and maintained by The Polis Centre at Indiana University and Purdue University, Indianapolis in partnership with United Way/Community Service Council. The goals of the project are to: [7]

- Build community capacity by empowering citizens and organizations with data, training them on its use for more effective decision-making;
- Build community capacity to make positive changes through more effective policies, programs, and actions;
- Improve decision making by providing relevant data and tools; and
- Create a community resource for information by developing SAVI as a community information system that provides:
    1. Relevant information.
    2. Tools to access and analyze information easily.
    3. Training and user support on how to use these resources effectively.
    4. Outreach and education to increase awareness of its resources.
    5. Integration of a variety of specialized resources across the Indianapolis MSA.

Data contained in the SAVI database can be interrogated online and viewed in tabular and/or mapped form (using GIS). A key feature of SAVI is that it not only contains social-demographic data relating to things such as income and population, but it also contains information relating to community assets such as schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, and community centres. This allows the user to see, for example, the location of families living below the poverty line mapped against community resources such as schools or hospitals; or concentrations of older people mapped against seniors facilities and public transport links. It does not appear, however, that SAVI provides more detailed information on access to community infrastructure such as hours of operation, services, etc.

As with all the NNIP partners, a central function performed by SAVI is in collecting and warehousing data from around 40 data providers. Some examples of SAVI partners responsible for providing the data: City of Anderson Transportation System, City of Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development Division of Planning, Indiana Department of Education Department of School Finance and Educational Information, Indianapolis Police Department and the US Census Bureau.

[7] Taken from the SAVI website http://www.savi.org/

SAVI has also been backed by the Community Connections Project, which aims to build community capacity to access the information contained on the SAVI website through a series of training sessions with community leaders.

4.1.2 Baltimore Neighbourhood Indicators Alliance

Baltimore Neighbourhood Indicators Alliance (BNIA) covers the neighbourhoods of Baltimore City. BNIA is a diverse group of agencies and incorporates several citywide non-profit organizations, businesses, universities, city and state level governments, neighbourhoods and other foundations involved in the area. The Alliance was formed in the late 1990s following a planning process that took over a year; partner organizations pooled resources and BNIA now has permanent staff and structures.

BNIA has three key components:

- *Vital Signs* is a framework of outcome indicators, which have been developed to "take the pulse of Baltimore neighbourhoods" and are tracked over time. Indicators used were narrowed down by an expert steering group from a long-list devised in consultation with community members. The original Vital Signs system has been developed and honed, and the third running of the analysis (Vital Signs III) is now due, alongside more comprehensive interpretive reports. The system has evolved through consultation with and input from interested community organizations and residents. For example, there is currently a pilot initiative to investigate better methods for measuring 'Neighbourhood Action and Sense of Community'. Indicators used in the system are grouped into the following domains:
    1. Housing and Community Development;
    2. Children and Family Health, Safety and Well-Being;
    3. Workforce and Economic Development;
    4. Sanitation;
    5. Urban Environment and Transit;
    6. Education and Youth; and
    7. Neighbourhood Action and Sense of Community.
- The *"One Stop Shop"* is BNIA's 'data-warehouse' and offers access to Vital Signs and other data from a variety of sources using GIS mapping technology through the website. Users are able to interrogate and view statistical and geographic data and indicators by community statistical area or census tract.
- The *Technical Assistance and Training Strategy* aims to promote and develop the use of the data collected through direct training for accessing and using data and indicators. In addition to this training, use is promoted through Access Points placed throughout the city in places such as public branch libraries and community centres.

4.1.3 Cleveland Area Network for Data Organizing

Cleveland Area Network for Data Organizing (CAN DO) is an initiative operated through the Centre for Urban Poverty and Social Change at Case Western Reserve University.

The School in which the Centre is based works directly with local citywide and community institutions to address the opportunities and problems in poor neighbourhoods.

The Centre first began assembling neighbourhood level data in the late 1980s, and in 1990 produced a full report on trends in Cleveland's neighbourhoods for the two previous decades. This work has continued and, as demand and the levels of data available have grown, the CAN DO system was developed in the early 1990s.

CAN DO stores a comprehensive set of data relating to Cleveland's neighbourhoods and is available through the website for the Centre on Urban Poverty and Social Change. Through the website, it is possible to interrogate the data set by theme, year, geography and individual indicator.

The CAN DO system also supports a set of 'Neighbourhood Profiles', which provide an overview of the demographic, social and economic characteristics of the city's thirty-six neighbourhoods. Indicators are organised by eight domains (the full list of indicators is contained in Annex C):

- Population Composition;
- Vital Statistics—Births;
- Residential Mobility;
- Economic Status;
- Educational Attainment;
- Housing Stock;
- Housing Investment; and
- Public Safety.

Information provided in the Profiles is given for the first year for which the data is available and the most recent year. Comparison is then made with the attendant figures for both Cleveland City and Cuyahoga County.

The CAN DO initiative shares a key feature with many of the other NNIP partner cities in that training is provided to community organizations and members to boost local capacity to use the data.

4.2 UK

The relative strength of central government in the UK and the fact that the key initiatives relating to the revitalization of neighbourhoods are driven centrally means that the key examples of the use of neighbourhood indicators come from the national level. Indeed, the general pattern is for local partnerships and agencies to draw upon these systems rather than develop their own (in contrast with the situation in the US). However, the following section does contain one example of a locally based system of neighbourhood indicators from Sandwell in the West Midlands region.

4.2.1 Neighbourhood Statistics

The development of neighbourhood indicators in the UK has been the responsibility of the Office for National Statistics (ONS) which is the organization in the UK equivalent to Statistics Canada, - and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit within the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). [8]

Impetus for the development of a system of indicators at the neighbourhood level came as part of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal [9]. In 1999, a series of reports were commissioned looking at central aspects of neighbourhood revitalization. One of these pieces, the 'Report of Policy Action Team 18: Better Information' concentrated on the need for better information to inform the overall strategy. Key questions asked were what is the scale of the current problem, where are challenges most acute and how can we best monitor progress?

This report noted the difficulties in compiling meaningful data to give an accurate assessment of problems at neighbourhood level,

> *"…no up-to-date data resource exists that provides a remotely comprehensive picture of these serious issues. Anyone could wander through some of these areas and know that something was very badly wrong – but the Government has never set out to record or analyse the issues in a comprehensive or systematic way."*

The main recommendation in terms of addressing this problem was the development of the 'Neighbourhood Statistics' service to map the key characteristics of neighbourhood deprivation in a consistent fashion over time. This recommendation has been taken forward by ONS.

Currently, one of the most important developments in delivering this service is the production of a new geographical hierarchy, which includes new 'Super Output Areas'. This has been done to mitigate against the frequent changes in administrative boundaries with the UK being one of the most frequent changers of boundaries in Europe and also to deal with variations in population levels between electoral wards. Previously, electoral wards were the smallest geographical unit for which consistent data was available.

Super Output Areas (SOAs) build up from the Output Areas introduced by the 2001 Census. Output Areas consist of approximately 125 households/250-300 people and, from that unit, three layers of SOA are being built. The lower layer of SOAs have been established and work is now underway (in consultation with other agencies such as the Police and Health Authorities) to define Middle Layer SOAs. It is expected that each level will contain a minimum of 1,000, 5,000 or 20,000 people respectively.

---

[8] ODPM is the government department responsible for policy on housing, planning, devolution, regional and local government and the fire service. As well as the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, ODPM also takes responsibility for the Social Exclusion Unit, and the Government Offices for the Regions.

[9] This Strategy is one of the key drivers of neighbourhood revitalization in the UK. The principle underlying the strategy is that within ten to twenty years no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live.

The goal for Neighbourhood Statistics is that by the start of 2005, England will have a web-based statistical system for small geographic areas, with data on the following topics: [10]

- Access to services;
- Community well-being;
- Community safety (including crime);
- Economic deprivation;
- Education, skills and training;
- Health;
- Housing;
- Physical environment;
- Work deprivation; and
- Population.

Again, a crucial feature of the Neighbourhood Statistics service is that information other than census data is utilized. The Policy Action Team report recognized that, in may cases, all the information required was being collected, but in a disparate and un-coordinated fashion, for different service areas, with poor sharing between agencies and departments (even at the same levels of government) and because of occasional bouts of data-hoarding.

Neighbourhood Statistics uses information from organizations such as the police, agencies distributing welfare payments, health authorities, housing authorities, education authorities and fire departments. All of the data used is collected nationally (although there is currently an exercise to look at the comparability of locally collected information) and over thirteen government departments are currently supplying data to the service.

Still, a central component of the data comes from the census. The key draw-back here is that the census is conducted only every ten years in the UK although an additional exercise for 2006 was considered and rejected. Links to current household surveys and ways of better exploiting output from other survey work is also being considered. This data sharing is being developed and built upon, in part, through the development of policies and procedures covering data protection issues and protocols.

4.2.2 The English Indices of Deprivation

Produced by the ODPM, the Indices of Deprivation provide a single measure of deprivation for areas in England and as with Neighbourhood Statistics, are driven by the need to measure progress against the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. This is done by combining one dimensional domains of deprivation into a single measure, using appropriate weighting, thereby allowing for the ranking of deprived areas based on a single score.

[10] Neighbourhood Statistics Report to Ministers 2001 - 2003

The model underpinning the index is based on the idea of distinct dimensions of deprivation that can be measured separately, and the design of the indices reflects the understanding that deprivation is multi-variate and does not simply consist of low income.

The latest (2004) indices have recently been released. They improve upon the previous (2001) indices in that they include the latest information and improved measures where better data has become available. The 2004 Indices were based upon a review of the 2001 index by the University of Oxford, through two periods of extensive public consultation and an independent academic peer review.

A further crucial improvement has been the use of the new geographic units outlined above, and the 2004 Index is produced down to SOA Lower Layer. This enables better identification of target areas and small pockets of deprivation.

The new IMD 2004 contains seven Domains:

- Income deprivation;
- Employment deprivation;
- Health deprivation and disability;
- Education, skills and training deprivation;
- Barriers to Housing and Services;
- Living environment deprivation; and
- Crime.

The theoretical model underpinning the Index provided the basis for the weighting of the various domains to allow for the production of a single composite figure. The weighting arrived at is as follows:

- Income deprivation - 22.5%
- Employment deprivation - 22.5%
- Health deprivation and disability - 13.5%
- Education, skills and training deprivation - 13.5%
- Barriers to housing and services - 9.3%
- Living Environment deprivation - 9.3%
- Crime - 9.3%.

The key criticism of producing a composite score and ranking concerns the weightings of the domains and the fact that the relationships between these aspects of deprivation are not entirely clear. For example, some research has shown a relationship between a mother's unemployment and improved educational outcomes for their children. [11] In other

[11] For a more complete discussion of some of these drawbacks, see: ODPM. 2003. 'Review for The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit of Blueprint for the Index of Multiple Deprivation – at Small Area Level'.

words, there is a clear possibility for conflating relationships amongst the measures making composite scores potentially, highly misleading. In addition, acquiring consensus as to what the actual weightings might be is highly problematic, consuming a considerable amount time, money and resources. So, in addition, there are practical, financial and logistical constraints associated with developing composite scores of deprivation. These constraints apply equally to the development of a composite score of vitality for Toronto. The key strength of the index is the corollary of this point i.e. it makes a complex phenomenon easier to understand and takes into account a range of factors. [12]

4.2.3 Sandwell Neighbourhood Intelligence Project

The borough of Sandwell in the West Midlands is one of the most deprived in the UK and contains several neighbourhoods experiencing severe deprivation. The Sandwell Partnership is a time-limited body composed of various representatives from both the public and private sectors. The Partnership has an ambitious vision for the area (in line with the ambition of the National Strategy), which says that: *"The Sandwell of 2020 will be a thriving, sustainable, optimistic and forward looking community."*

In order to support this vision, the partnership has produced the Sandwell Neighbourhood Strategy 2001. A central part of this Strategy has been an analysis of the 79 neighbourhoods identified in Sandwell (these 'neighbourhoods' were arrived at in conjunction with the local community, elected officials and service delivery agents and range in size from 150 households, to 5000 households). This analysis was undertaken by the Sandwell Neighbourhood Intelligence Project (SNIP), using an 'All Domains Index' not unlike the Indices of Deprivation outlined above, although with a notably less sophisticated weighting system [13].

This All Domains Index uses the following domains, under which 29 indicators are grouped (the full list of indicators is contained in Annex C):

- Access;
- Crime;
- Education;
- Health;
- Housing; and
- Income.

The Index allows all neighbourhoods to be ranked, and the 39 most deprived areas have been marked as a priority for action.

---

[12] For an example of how this type of indices and ranking works at a small geographic level, see Northern Ireland's Noble Index of Deprivation. This index was produced in part by Professor Michael Noble – a key member of the University of Oxford team responsible for the 2004 English Indices of Deprivation; he has also been involved in similar initiatives in Scotland and Wales.

[13] Each domain is given equal weight within the final score – meaning that, for example, access to bus routes is given the same importance as levels of crime.

SNIP also produced 'Neighbourhood Profiles', based on similar domains, but with a far greater number (over 50) of indicators. Data is supplied by partner organizations (such as the Police, health agencies and other Council service areas) and businesses local to Sandwell. For each indicator used, the neighbourhood's position relative to others in Sandwell is ranked. Where possible, the average for Sandwell and for England and Wales is also shown.

4.3 Toronto

Currently within Toronto there is no system of neighbourhood indicators as comprehensive as those outlined above. There are, however, various examples of ways in which the city has been profiled using indicators. A selection of these is outlined below. Unfortunately many do not provide information at the neighbourhood level.

4.3.1 Neighbourhood Profiles

The Social Policy Analysis and Research unit, based in the City's Community and Neighbourhoods Department, has produced a set of neighbourhood profiles with assistance from Toronto Public Health. The aim of the Profiles is to show the social characteristics of Toronto's neighbourhoods and develop plans based on past trends. As such, the Profiles are driven by the need for government and community agencies to plan their provision based on socio-economic evidence at the local level.

Production of a set of neighbourhoods was absolutely central to the work. Based on an agglomeration of census tracts within boundaries informed by service areas, 140 neighbourhoods have been 'created'. The criteria used for defining the neighbourhoods was: [14]

- Neighbourhoods were originally based on an Urban Development Services Residential Communities map, based on planning areas in former municipalities, and existing Public Health neighbourhood planning areas;
- No neighbourhood should be comprised of a single census tract;
- The minimum neighbourhood population should be at least 7,000 to 10,000;
- Where census tracts were combined to meet the criteria, they were joined with the most similar (by income) adjacent area;
- Neighbourhoods should respect existing boundaries such as service boundaries of community agencies, natural boundaries (rivers), and man-made boundaries (streets, highways, etc.);
- Neighbourhood areas should be small enough for service organizations to combine them to fit within their service area; and
- The final number of neighbourhood areas should be "manageable" for the purposes of data presentation and reporting.

[14] Taken from the website: http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/demographics/neighbourhood_profiles.htm

The process for arriving at the defined 140 neighbourhoods took two years and involved community consultation as well as consultation with key City departments (e.g. Police, Library, Parks and Recreation, Planning, etc).

Information contained in the Profiles is drawn from the census and is predominantly demographic in nature (i.e. age, gender, immigration, ethnicity and language). For each indicator, comparisons are made for each neighbourhood with the Toronto average.

The 140 neighbourhoods arrived at provide a sound basis from which to construct more in-depth profiles, based upon experience elsewhere and theoretical considerations concerning what makes a strong neighbourhood.

4.3.2 Toronto Report Card on Children

The 5th edition of The Toronto Report Card on Children measures the health and well-being of children using a variety of socio-economic indicators. Indicators used are grouped in domains based upon determinants of child health and well-being:

- Economic security;
- Health;
- Readiness to learn; and
- Safety and Positive Parenting.

Under each domain there are several indicators. For example to determine 'health', the following indicators are used: healthy birth weight, healthy eating and nutrition, dental and oral health, children's mental health, immunization and physical activity. In addition to information from the census, data is drawn from a number of sources including public health authorities, Children's Aid Societies, surveys and school boards.

4.3.3 Toronto Report Card on Housing and Homelessness

Following a recommendation from the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force in 1999, the City reports on housing and homelessness in Toronto. This is now undertaken every two years. The 2003 exercise used the following domains and indicators:

Income security and economic well-being

- Median Household Income
- Characteristics of Low-Income Families and Individuals

The state of Toronto's housing market

- Composition of the Rental Housing Market
- Changes to Rental Housing Supply
- Changes in Owner and Renter Households
- Rental Housing Completions
- Applications to Demolish Rental Units or to Convert to Condominium

- Rental Apartment Vacancy Rates
- Rent Ranges
- Social Housing Supply
- Supportive Housing Supply

People at risk of losing their housing

- Tenants Paying More than 30% of Income on Rent
- Average Rents Compared to Average Wages
- Households With Incomes Below Affordability Level of Average Rent
- Ontario Works Cases Paying Market Rents in Excess of the Shelter Benefit
- Social Housing Waiting List
- Eviction Applications for Rental Arrears and Eviction Orders Issued
- Use of Food Relief Programs

People who have lost their housing

- Use of Shelters
- Use of Shelters by Children
- Profile of People Using Shelters
- Episodic Use of Shelters
- Use of Out of the Cold Programs

Information was collected from a number of sources including: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Region Rental Market Survey, the 2001Census; and various City departments such as Urban Development Services.

4.3.4 Vital Signs

Vital Signs is a community report card on Toronto prepared by the Toronto Community Foundation, in partnership with each of the three Toronto universities, charitable foundations, local government agencies and departments, community based agencies, public interest and advocacy groups, corporations and individuals in the Greater Toronto Area. It was first undertaken in 2001 and was repeated in 2003. The central theme of Vital Signs is 'quality of life' and indicators used were grouped under the following domains: [15]

- The Gap Between Rich And Poor
- Safety And Health
- Learning
- Housing

- Getting Around
- Getting A Good Start – In Canada And In Life
- Arts, Culture And Recreation
- Environment
- Working
- Belonging And Leadership

Information was drawn from a number of sources, including the Police, health authorities, census, Toronto Transit Commission, Toronto Public Library and various City departments.

For each of the areas outlined above, the City was given a grade from the following list:

- In dire need of corrective action
- Of concern, needs attention
- Progress is being made
- We're doing well and headed in the right direction
- Awesome! Toronto's the tops!

It is also important to note that the 2001 exercise recognized the difficulty in drawing together a set of indicators that could be updated regularly and provide useful and comparable data. One recommendation of the report was to establish just such a resource for the GTA.

4.3.5 Economic Development Indicators

The City also produces indicators relating to the economic performance of the city, drawing on a number of sources such as the Labour Force Survey, Retail Trade Survey, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Toronto Real Estate Board and GO Transit. Topics covered include:

Labour Force Data

- Wages
- Part Time/Full Time

Real Estate Data

- Building Permits
- Other Residential Real Estate
- Industrial
- Office

[15] The 2001 exercise contained many more domains than the 2003 report.

Other

- Financial Activity
- Social Conditions
- Merchandising Activity
- Bankruptcies
- Innovation

The indicators are generally given at city and regional levels.

4.4 Other Canadian examples

This section provides two examples of other initiatives from within Canada where a system of indicators has been constructed in order to measure the 'health' of areas. One of the examples, Portraits of Peel, is especially pertinent as the data has been produced at neighbourhood level. The other example, from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, has been included due to its relevance in terms of subject matter and the comprehensiveness of the exercise.

4.4.1 Federation of Canadian Municipalities - Quality of Life Reporting System

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities established the Quality of Life Reporting System (QOLRS) in order to measure, compare and monitor the quality of life in 20 of Canada's urban municipalities (including Toronto). It draws on data from a variety of national and municipal sources and uses indicators grouped under the following domains:

- Demographic Background Information
- Personal Financial Security
- Personal & Community Health
- Personal Safety
- Affordable, Appropriate Housing
- Local Economy
- Natural Environment
- Education
- Employment
- Civic Engagement
- Community and Social Infrastructure

The QOLRS has drawn together a strong list of indicators and has provided the basis for some sound comparative analysis. It has however been criticized in a recent external evaluation for a lack of clarity in terms of a theoretical framework and justifications for inclusion/non-inclusion of specific indicators.

4.4.2 Portraits of Peel

The original Portraits of Peel was a handbook providing data on thirteen neighbourhoods in Peel. The Social Planning Council of Peel has recently produced an online version with funding from the Volunteer Action Online, the United Way of Peel, and the Region of Peel, Health Department.

The thirteen neighbourhoods were originally chosen because they best reflected the neighbourhoods that were commonly referred to at the time. The same thirteen neighbourhoods have been retained for subsequent updates. A variety of topics are included in the Portraits and it is possible to search either by neighbourhood or by indicator. Topics included are:

- Child Abuse
- Immigrants
- Citizenship
- Income
- Crime
- Labour
- Dwellings
- Language
- Education
- Marriage
- Families
- Mobility
- Health
- Population

Data used in the Portraits comes from a variety of sources including Statistics Canada, Peel's Children's Aid Society, Peel Regional Police, Caledon O.P.P., Peel Living and Canadian Institute for Health Information. It is worth noting that there are problems with the way in which the data is presented, in some cases using absolute numbers rather than, for example, rates per 1000. Some of the indicators, suicide for example, occur in such small numbers at neighbourhood level that identification of individuals would not be difficult.

Portraits of Peel is currently being built upon by the Social Planning Council of Peel, who are developing an indicator system and data warehousing capability in line with examples from the NNIP outlined above.

5 INDICATORS FOR TORONTO NEIGHBOURHOODS

5.1.1 Criteria for selection

The process undertaken to create the neighbourhood vitality tool involved a careful review of the long list of possible indicators show in Appendix A. These were narrowed down using a set of criteria agreed upon with the project steering group. This Section outlines the criteria by which the long list of indicators was narrowed down. The criteria draw heavily upon the work of the Urban Institute, who have previously undertaken this type of synthesis as part of their role in co-ordinating the NNIP and also from the Baltimore Neighbourhood Indicators Alliance, who have produced a set of principles and guidelines for their choice of indicators. In general, the criteria relate to three key questions: 1) What do we want to measure?; 2) Is the information useful for a range of stakeholders?; and 3) Is the data of sufficient quality?

In using the checklist, it was not intended that every 'test' should be met for each individual indicator, but rather that it should be used as a guide for discussion and selection. It must be recognized that, to some extent, the choice of indicator is influenced by expediency in that the availability/quality of data will be a factor. This is in addition to wider theoretical or policy concerns. It should also be noted that theorizing about neighbourhood improvement/decline is not an entirely objective pursuit and that there will necessarily be some subjectivity to choices made. Clearly though, there must be a logic and justification to each choice.

5.1.2 What do we want to measure?

As well as being useful to the community and policy makers/planners, the indicators chosen must have some anchor in wider theory about neighbourhood strength and vitality. In *Research Task 1 Why Strong Neighbourhoods Matter,* strong neighbourhoods are defined as:

1. Inclusive – this includes active community involvement; democratic processes, strong sense of belonging; a welcoming community; respect for diversity, tolerances.

2. Vibrant – This includes an active street life (e.g. cafes, shops and services, opportunities interaction; a string sense of place 'identity' and pride.

3. Cohesive – This includes a sense of mutual responsibility and strong bonds of reciprocity (e.g. neighbourhoods looking out for each other's children; trust (e.g. not having to worry about locking doors; negotiated solutions to conflicts.

4. Safe – This includes both subjective feelings of safety (people feeling they can go anywhere, feeling comfortable in public), as well as objective measures of safety (e.g. freedom from crime, absence of pollutants and contaminants, safe buildings).

In addition, Research Task 1 Why Strong Neighbourhoods Matter suggests that there are a set of conditions that are necessary to create neighbourhoods with these characteristics: These include:

- Strong social infrastructure
- Shared public spaces
- Heterogeneity/socially mixed neighbourhoods
- Physical attractiveness
- Open neighbourhood boundaries
- Walkability and mobility
- Density

In building the neighbourhood vitality tool, consideration was given to attempting to account for both the characteristics of strong neighbourhoods and the conditions that create them. In addition, however, because the focus was on developing a quantitative tool a number of other key considerations were part of the calculus in deciding on the indicators to be used. These included:

- Do the indicators chosen reflect the multi-faceted dimensions of poverty/neighbourhood health? Do they relate well to each other?
- Do they reflect wider academic work? Is there a research base?
- Do the indicators measure assets as well as liabilities and problems? Can they be used in a positive sense?

5.1.3 Is the information useful for a range of stakeholders?

The central point of collecting and presenting indicators investigating Toronto's neighbourhoods is that it should be of use to a variety of stakeholders. As such, when choosing the indicators the following should be considered:

- Can the indicator be used in a predictive fashion? Can it show causes as well as symptoms of improvement/decline?
- Is the indicator easy to understand and does it pertain to the majority of the community?
- Is it clear and does it relate directly to what it is trying to measure and not a by-product?
- Is there any need for specialist interpretation? Is it obvious to the general user what is being shown?
- Is the indicator relational and can it be used for wider comparison at a City level?
- Is the indicator relevant to priorities identified by the community itself? Will a change in this indicator really reflect improvement/decline in people's lives? Is the indicator credible to the community in terms of the way it is collected and by whom?

- Does the indicator have an application in policy? Can it by tied into wider strategies? What do policy makers and planners want to know about at the neighbourhood level?
- Can the indicator be used as a means of stimulating change and framing debate?

5.1.4 Is the data of sufficient quality?

A key test, which eliminates many indicators relates to the quality of the data available. If the indicator is unsuitable because of concerns over the data's quality then it must be removed from consideration. It is also vital that the indicators chosen have suitable caveats as to the limits of their interpretation. The following questions should be asked:

- Is the data collected on a regular and timely basis?
- Is the data available and valid at the chosen geographic level?
- Are indicators comparable and stable? Are definitions likely to shift frequently over time? Are they different across areas?
- Is the data readily available from a credible source(s)? Are there any confidentiality issues?
- Are indicators taken from a variety of sources?
- Is there a mix of qualitative and quantitative data? Is it possible to incorporate community perceptions?
- Is the information affordable, practical and sustainable? Does it come from standard administrative data sources or are special surveys needed?
- Are the indicators easily expressible in a suitable form (e.g. number, proportion, percentage) that prevents identification of individuals?
- Is it possible to remove factors such as monetary inflation?

5.1.5 An Ideal Neighbourhood Indicator System for Toronto

An ideal indicator system for Toronto neighbourhood vitality would include many of the quantitative indicators used in the indicator systems described in Section 4. It should be mentioned, however, that many of those quantitative measures are essentially measures of the attributes of the individuals in any given neighbourhood. A more comprehensive indicator system would include, in addition, a number of qualitative measures that focus more precisely on the community. Unfortunately, data like these are not generally available from conventional sources, often requiring the use of household and individual surveys to acquire them. Perhaps the most comprehensive indicator system in use today that incorporates both the quantitative and qualitative dimensions is the State of the City of Amsterdam program prepared every two years by the Netherlands Department for Research and Statistics.

Based on a sample of around 3,500 people, the Amsterdam model provides a reasonably detailed analysis of conditions and opinion at the neighbourhood and city level. The research provides a basic monitor that measures and analyses the participation of Amsterdam residents in the social life of the city. The monitor essentially acts as a 'social

thermometer' measuring vitality, social participation and trends over time, providing information designed to guide policy to improve the welfare, participation and integration of the residents of Amsterdam.

The approach taken is to use survey instruments to measure participation as it relates to education, work, prosperity and health – indicators that are used in the present study, as relevant data are available from conventional sources. In addition, however, the approach also attempts to elicit responses with respect to social participation, cultural participation, political participation and liveability and safety – indicators that are not used in the present study.

Within each of these eight domains, a range of information is sought. Table 1 shows the types of information sought after in each domain.

Table 1

Domains and Types of Questions in the Amsterdam Project

Domain	**Types of Questions**
Education	Level of attainment
Work	Employment status, occupation, commuting
Prosperity	Levels of home ownership, home amenities, income
Health	Physical activity undertaken, general levels of health, diseases and maladies,
Social Participation	Levels of interaction and comfort with neighbours, participation in neighbourhood issue, possession of library card, club membership, volunteering, religious affiliation
Cultural Participation	Attendance at cultural events
Political Participation	Interest in politics, voting behaviour
Liveability and Safety	Fear of walking alone at night, crime, mobility

With some modifications to make it context specific, the Amsterdam model would be ideal for use in Toronto. Were Toronto to follow the Amsterdam model, much of the data relating to education, work and prosperity is readily available. However, much of the data relating to social participation, cultural participation political participation and liveability and safety is not readily available and would require the use of a comprehensive survey. This fact, informed the selection of the indicators for the tool developed here.

5.1.6 The Indicators Chosen

This Section presents the final set of domains and indicators chosen, along with a brief justification for their inclusion. It should be read alongside Annex A, which presents a long list of indicators and criteria for selection. Where possible, justifications for the choice of domain and indicator are related to recent research and practice.

Safety

The selection of Safety as a key domain was informed by The 'Quality of Life in the GTA' research project (Environics Research Group, 1995). The study looked at conditions at Neighbourhood, Municipality and GTA level, and found that residents saw levels of crime as the most important factor in determining their quality of life. The research also showed that residents felt that this was the area where there had been the most deterioration in the last few years.

Research in the US [16] also showed that crime and lack of personal safety are the key factors in determining neighbourhood satisfaction. In addition to this, research from the UK[17] showed that crime had a disproportionately high effect in poorer neighbourhoods. The British Crime Survey has also consistently shown this.

The indicators chosen are fairly standard measures (see example indicator systems in Annex C) and reflect both personal safety and some measure of the physical environment.

- Violent crime charges per 1,000 total population (Source: Metro Police – not available as of Nov 3, 2004)
- Property crime charges per 1,000 total population – (Source: Metro Police – not available as of Nov 3, 2004)

Economy

The research cited above [18] showed that the factor second most commonly mentioned by residents was economic conditions. The economy was therefore selected as a key domain. According to a recent report prepared in the UK for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister entitled ' Breaking the Cycle, Taking Stock' (2004), poor economic conditions often pave the way for other factors such as crime and poor mental health which is a pattern commonly seen in areas that have experienced the negative effects of de-industrialization.

This set of indicators concentrates upon the incidence of low income and unemployment. These are perhaps the central factors in deprivation and social exclusion,

---

[16] E.g Miller, F. D., Tsemberis, S., Malia, G. P. and Grega, D. (1980) 'Neighbourhood Satisfaction Among Urban Dwellers', Journal of Social Issues, 36. Also, Taylor, R. B. (1995) 'The Impact of Crime on Communities', Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 539.

[17] Parkes, Kearns and Atkinson (2002) 'The Determinants of Neighbourhood Dissatisfaction', Centre for Neighbourhood Research.

[18] Environics Research Group (1995) 'Quality of Life in the GTA'

> *"…while people experiencing some forms of deprivation may not all have low income, people experiencing multiple or single but very severe forms of deprivation are in almost every instance likely to have very little income and little or no other resources"* [19]

Income inequality is also a key determinant of other problems such as poor mental and physical health [20]. In short, poverty matters a great deal in measuring neighbourhood vitality and we attempt to account for it in the tool. The percentage of household income spent on shelter costs is also a good, standard measure of household vulnerability.

- Median household income (Source: Census of Canada)
- % population spending 30% or more of household income on shelter costs (Source: Census of Canada)
- % population aged 25+ unemployed (Source- Census of Canada)

Education

Education was chosen as a domain because achievement in education is one of the ways in which cycles of intergenerational poverty may be broken. In addition, levels of education are central determinants of well-being and later outcomes such as earning power. Success in education reduces the likelihood of negative outcomes such as low pay, unemployment, living in social housing, delinquency and early parenthood [21].

The indicators here have been chosen to reflect both the 'flow' (children gaining qualifications) and 'stock' (adult qualifications). They can also be used in a predictive sense since levels of parental education are a key predictor of children's outcomes. Early levels of achievement are a good predictor of later attainment and poor levels of literacy hamper access to and ability to use information.

- % of students passing the Ontario Secondary School Literacy Test (Source: Toronto District School Board)
- % population with college or university qualifications (Source: Census of Canada)
- % population (15+) attaining less than Grade 9 Education (Source: Census of Canada)

[19] Townsend, P. (1987), 'Deprivation', Journal of Social Policy, Vol. 16, Part 2, pp125-146.

[20] E.g Scott K. (2002). 'A Lost Decade: Income Equality and the Health of Canadians.'

[21] See: Bynner, J. and S. Parsons (1997) 'It Doesn't get any Better; The Impact of Poor Basic Skill Attainment on the lives of 37 year olds'. London: The Basic Skills Agency. Also, Hobcraft, J. (1998) 'Inter-generational and Life-Course Transmission of Social Exclusion: Influences of Childhood Poverty, Family Disruption and Contact with the Police'. CASE Paper 15.

Urban Fabric

This is perhaps the 'widest' of the domains and covers both housing conditions and proximity to services [22]. The 'Quality of Life in the GTA' research project cited above showed that residents believed environmental factors to be the third most important factor determining quality of life. It is difficult at the neighbourhood level to obtain measures relating directly to the environment. Air quality measures, for example, are meaningless at this geographic level. It was also not possible to access data relating to commuting distance, which was considered a desirable measure as it has an impact on family life, social capital levels [23] and the way in which neighbourhoods are 'used' i.e. are they simply a base for commuting? There is also an environmental impact associated with long commutes. This domain therefore has a slightly different focus and concentrates upon housing conditions and the presence of certain services deemed important to neighbourhood vitality and the ability of citizens to participate fully in neighbourhood life.

- % of occupied private dwellings requiring major repairs (Source: Census of Canada)
- % population living within 1 km of a community space (other than a school) (Source: City of Toronto Community Services Division)

Health

According to the Breaking the Cycle, Taking Stock report mentioned above, the incidence of poor health is a key route for the transmission of poverty and the indicators chosen in this domain have been chosen largely because of their predictive value. Incidence of low birth weight (births weighing less than 2,500 grams - as against a typical birth weight of 3,400grams following a normal pregnancy) occurs at much higher rates in developing countries (in some counties around 50%) than in developed countries (typically less than 10%). As such, it is a proxy indicator for poor pre-natal conditions such as poverty, smoking, stress, poor nutrition and substance abuse.

Low birth weight children also typically have worse outcomes than normal birth weight children. For example, they are more likely to use special education services and repeat a grade in school [24].

Teenage mothers are less likely to finish schooling, are more likely to remain single parents, be unemployed and to bring their children up in poverty. Children of teenage mothers are more likely to themselves become teen parents, a key route for the intergenerational transmission of poverty. [25]

---

[22] It is recognised that 'access' to services is a separate issue; for instance, the grocery store may be local, but too expensive to shop at.

[23] In 'Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community' (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) Robert Putnam shows a clear relationship between long commute times and reduced social capital levels.

[24] Eugene M. Lewit, Linda Schuurmann Baker, Hope Corman, Patricia H. Shiono (1995) 'The Direct Cost of Low Birth Weight', The Future of Children, Volume 5, Number 1.

[25] Social Exclusion Unit (1999) 'Teenage Pregnancy'

.

- % Singleton low birth weight babies

Source: Ontario Live Birth Data (1996-2000), Ministry of Health & Long Term Care (MOHLTC)

- Teen births per 1,000 females aged 15-19

Source: Mothers Inpatient Records (1997-2001) Provincial Health Planning Database (PHPDB) Extracted Oct 2003, Health Planning Branch, Ministry of Health & Long Term Care (MOHLTC)

Demographics

Most indicators relating to demography are descriptive in nature. This set has been chosen with a concentration on risk factors and poverty. For example, those with no knowledge of official language are less able to access information and services, e.g. health services [26].

In addition, immigration and mobility measures have been included to provide some sense of neighbourhood stability. In any given year, depending on the tenure of the housing stock, from 15 percent (for owner-occupied, middle class neighbourhoods) to 40 percent (rental, low-income) of the residents leave any given neighbourhood. Some measure of mobility is desirable, as is a measure of neighbourhood stability. This indicator will allow the balance to be seen. [27]

- % no knowledge of official languages (Source: Census of Canada)
- % recent immigrants (Source: Census of Canada)
- % by mobility status 1 year ago (Source: Census of Canada)

[26] See: Bowen, Sarah (2001) 'Language Barriers in Access to Health Care', Health Canada

[27] For more on this topic, see the work of Professor Larry Bourne, University of Toronto.

6 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

6.1 A Guide to Interpreting the Data

Given the selection of indicators mentioned in the Section above, a useful exercise is to demonstrate how the data should be interpreted. In particular, it is useful to point out the types of instances in which a given indicator can be viewed as indicating a neighbourhood asset or liability .We have chosen 4 neighbourhoods for this demonstration that show how measures of income alone do not reflect unambiguously on neighbourhood deprivation or assets. That is not to say that income is not considered to be an important indicator of neighbourhood vitality. Indeed it is extremely important. Rather, other indicators need to be considered in assessing the overall vitality of a neighbourhood. The neighbourhoods chosen are:

- South Kingsway – Higher than average median income;
- Black Creek – Average median income;
- Moss Park – Lower than average median income; and
- Oakridge – lower than average median income.

The interpretation provided below, should be read along side of Annex D of this report.

Median household income in the South Kingsway Neighbourhood is higher than the citywide median income. This comparative asset is reflected favourably in the range of other indicators selected. Unemployment is lower than in the City as a whole. The percentage of dwellings in need of major repair is also lower as is the percentage of households spending more than 30% of income on housing. As might be expected in a neighbourhood with high incomes, rates of educational attainment are higher in South Kingsway than the city average rates. Comparatively low mobility rates in South Kingsway imply a stable neighbourhood. Clearly, in the case of South Kingsway, high incomes translate into positive assets across a range of variables.

At the opposite end of the Spectrum is Moss Park. Median Income in Moss Park is well below the citywide median. In addition, unemployment is higher, school performance is lower, but surprisingly, levels of educational attainment are about the city average. On the other hand, the rate of teen mothers is higher, as is the mobility status of the neighbourhood's residents. Generally, speaking the connections one might expect between low income and other outcomes holds in Moss Park but there is not an exact one to one mapping. This lack of correspondence between income and other outcomes is even higher in the Black Creek neighbourhood.

In Black Creek, the median household income is around the citywide level. Based on this, it might be expected that other measures would come in at around the city average as well. This is not the case in Black Creek. While incomes are at the City level, unemployment in Black Creek is higher, as is the percentage of tenants spending more than 30% of income on housing. In addition, school performance (measured by the percentage of students passing OSSLT), is lower, health is poorer (measured by teen motherhood rates and low

birth weight babies) and the percentage of dwellings in need of major repair is higher in 2001. Given that average incomes in Black Creek are at the City level, other measures indicate a surprising lack of correspondence with that fact.

The Oakridge neighbourhood also shows significant variations from what might be expected. In line with lower than average median income levels, unemployment rates in Oakridge are higher than the City average. As might be expected, this also translates into higher than average percentages of residents spending more than 30% of income on housing. Lower incomes do not, however, translate into poor school performance or levels of educational attainment, both of which are at about the city average. Interestingly, the percentage of recent immigrants in Oakridge is higher than for the City as a whole.

The following tables demonstrate the phenomenon mentioned above by extracting the 20 neighbourhoods facing the most challenges across several indicators. The indicators chosen for presentation here were agreed upon by the project steering committee. A summary table also shows the frequency with which a neighbourhood appears on an indicator's 'most challenged list.

For any given indicator, bolded numbers in the tables indicate a value that is more than one standard deviation different from the value for the city as a whole**.** The standard deviation is one of several indices of variability that statisticians use to characterize the dispersion among the measures in a given population. In the present case it is used to determine how different a neighbourhood observation is from the city as a whole.

6.1.1 Summary of Results

A detailed examination of the Neighbourhood Vitality Indicators for Toronto shown in Annex D reveals a considerable degree of variability amongst Toronto's neighbourhoods for the indicators chosen. Table 2 summarizes the data shown in Annex D by looking at the number of instances a neighbourhood indicator value is greater than or less than one standard deviation from the value for the City as a whole. The table also shows the range in values for each indicator across all neighbourhoods.

Table 2 Number of Neighbourhoods Greater than One Standard Deviation Above or Below the City Average

Indicator	**> 1 Standard Deviation Above City**	**> I Standard Deviation Below City**	**Highest Value**	**Lowest Value**
	# Neighbourhoods			
Median Household Income	14	7	$183,377	$15,357

2001			(Bridle Path-SunnyBrook, York Mills)	(Moss Park)
Unemployment Rate 2001	20	20	18.1% (Regent Park)	2.1 (Bridle Path-SunnyBrook, York Mills)
% Tenants Spending More than 30% of Income on Shelter Costs	24	25	44.3% (North St. Jamestown)	1.6% (Bridle Path-SunnyBrook, York Mills)
% Grade 10 Students Passing OSSLT (2003/04)	21	20	93% (Yonge-Eglinton)	34% (Beechborough-Greenbrook)
% Population with University or College Education, 2001	30	23	87.7% (Bay Street Corridor)	28.3% (Keelesdale-Eglinton West)
% Population with Less Than Grade 9 Education, 2001	18	21	30.8% (Weston-Pelham Park & Corso Italia-Davenport)	0.4% (Rosedale-Moore Park)
% Households in Need of Major Repair	17	15	30.5% (Black Creek)	3.2% (Waterfront Community-The Island)
% Population Living within 1 km of Community Space		16	100.0% (Many)	0.0% (Bayview Village)
Average Annual Teen Births/1000 Women of Child	12	8	66.0 (Broadview	4.71 (Milliken)

Bearing Age, 1997-2001			North)	
% Low Birth Weights, 1997 -2001	22	21	7.43 (North St. Jamestown)	2.03 (Mt. Pleasant East)
% No Knowledge of Official Languages, 2001	18	17	16.0% (Little Portugal)	0.1% (Yonge-Eglinton)
% Population that are Recent Immigrants	19	16	29.9% (Thornliffe Park)	0.7% (Kingsway South)
% Population Moved in the Last Year	20	16	26.2% (University)	7.0% (Eringate-Centennial-West Deane)

As the Table above shows, the range in values for any indicator is considerable. For example, median household incomes range from a high of roughly $183,000 in the Bridle Path to a low of $15,000 in Moss Park. In fact, wide ranges in values are evident for every indicator selected.

In addition to the variability identified in neighbourhoods by looking at the range in indicator values, the table also shows the number of neighbourhoods that are greater than one standard deviation above or below the City value. The table points to some interesting conclusions:

- There is a smaller number of neighbourhoods that are one standard deviation lower than the City in median household income than there are those that are higher;
- There are 21 neighbourhoods in which the attainment of less than Grade 9 is more than 1 standard deviation below the level attained throughout the City as a whole. This compares with 18 neighbourhoods that are 1 standard deviation higher;
- There are 23 neighbourhoods with levels of university or college attainment that are more than 1 standard deviation than the city as a whole compared with 30 that are more than one standard deviation higher;
- Teen births are more than one standard deviation higher than for the city as a whole in 12 neighbourhoods; and
- Percent low birth weights are more than one standard deviation higher in 22 neighbourhoods.

Given the variability in the data for Toronto neighbourhoods, it was decided by the steering group to identify neighbourhoods facing the most challenges with respect to their vitality across a selected number of key variables. The subset of variables chosen for this analysis was based on a desire to provide a simple but compelling indication of neighbourhoods facing the most challenges by using variables often of greatest concern in policy circles. In this light, the analysis was done with a view to providing an indication of the priority areas for attention in the City by accounting for more than simply income.

Table 3 shows these 20 neighbourhoods with the most challenges ranked in ascending order from the lowest performer according to each indicator selected. This represents a simple subset of the data shown in Annex D. Of particular interest is Table 4, which shows the number of times a given neighbourhood appears in a 'most challenged' list. According to Table 4, the most challenged neighbourhood is Black Creek, which appears in 5 of the 'most challenged' tables. Black Creek is followed by Glenfield-Jane Heights, Keelesdale-Eglinton West and Regent Park, each with 4 appearances in the 'most challenged' tables. Several other neighbourhoods are mentioned 3 times or less.

What this analysis indicates is that based on the number of appearances on a 'most challenged' table, Black Creek might be a high priority for attention. This may be the case, but it must be kept in mind that 'challenged', in this instance, is purely a function of the limited set of variables being used to measure a neighbourhood's attributes here. As mentioned above, additional measures, including more qualitative measures of neighbourhood vitality and deprivation, should inform such decisions.

Table 3 20 Most Challenged Neighbourhoods by Indicator

20 Neighbourhoods with Median Household Income Under $40K Per Year (2001)		
	1996	2001
City	**$45,134**	**$54,953**
Moss Park	**$16,529**	**$15,357**
Regent Park	**$17,715**	**$23,693**
North St.Jamestown	**$23,050**	**$28,396**
South Parkdale	**$22,365**	**$28,575**
Oakridge	**$26,914**	**$31,193**
Rustic	**$26,180**	**$32,361**
Kensington-Chinatown	**$26,026**	**$33,987**
Black Creek	$31,014	$37,081
Beechborough-Greenbrook	**$28,828**	$37,147
Victoria Village	$32,085	$37,604
Keelesdale-Eglinton West	$30,955	$37,976
Flemingdon Park	$32,612	$38,079
Rockcliffe-Smythe	$34,030	$38,415
New Toronto	$31,040	$38,762
Crescent Town	**$28,355**	$39,094
Englemount-Lawrence	$32,548	$39,200
Brookhaven-Amesbury	$30,928	$39,208
Mount Dennis	**$29,250**	$39,247
Thorncliffe Park	$32,190	$39,404
Weston-Pellam Park	$33,225	$39,542

20 Neighbourhoods with Highest Rate of Unemployment (2001)		
	1996	2001
City	**9.3%**	**5.9%**
Regent Park	**25.5%**	**18.1%**
Moss Park	**18.7%**	**11.5%**
North St.Jamestown	11.7%	**9.9%**
Thorncliffe Park	10.9%	**9.7%**
Flemingdon Park	**15.3%**	**9.6%**
Westminster-Branson	10.5%	**9.4%**
Scarborough Village	**13.2%**	**9.1%**
Kennedy Park	12.6%	**8.9%**
Glenfield-Jane Heights	**13.4%**	**8.9%**
South Parkdale	**15.9%**	**8.9%**
Henry Farm	12.6%	**8.7%**
Oakridge	**15.4%**	**8.5%**
Black Creek	**19.3%**	**8.5%**
Crescent Town	**14.5%**	**8.5%**
Kensington-Chinatown	13.1%	**8.3%**
Eglinton East	12.1%	**8.2%**
Woburn	12.7%	**8.1%**
Don Valley Village	8.4%	**8.1%**
Rustic	**14.5%**	**8.1%**
Mount Olive-Silverstone-Jamestown	**14.7%**	**8.0%**

20 Neighbourhoods with Highest Proportion of Population with Less than a Grade 9 Education (2001)	
	2001
City	**10.9%**
Corsa Italia-Davenport	**30.8%**
Weston-Pellam Park	**30.8%**
Caledonia-Fairbanks	**30.5%**
Little Portugal	**29.2%**
Glenfield-Jane Heights	**28.6%**
Keelesdale-Eglinton West	**28.1%**
Humber Summit	**27.0%**
Yorkdale-Glen Park	**26.8%**
Rustic	**26.5%**
Trinity-Bellwoods	**26.3%**
Maple Leaf	**25.5%**
Dovercourt-Wallace Emerson-Junction	**25.0%**
Oakwood-Vaughan	**22.9%**
Downsview-Roding-CFB	**22.3%**
Dufferin Grove	**21.7%**
Pelmo Park-Humberlea	**21.2%**
Humbermede	**21.1%**
Rockcliffe-Smythe	**19.1%**
Black Creek	18.1%
Palmerston-Little Italy	17.9%

20 Neighbourhoods with Highest Proportion of Major Dwellings in Need of Repair (2001)		
	1996	**2001**
City	**9.0%**	**9.0%**
Regent Park	**16.2%**	**17.9%**
Black Creek	9.8%	**15.6%**
Beechborough-Greenbrook	11.8%	**15.5%**
University	11.7%	**15.4%**
Roncesvalles	**15.7%**	**15.1%**
Blake-Jones	10.8%	**14.8%**
Greenwood-Coxwell	**14.4%**	**14.4%**
Woodbine-Lumsden	**14.6%**	**14.1%**
Etobicoke West Mall	10.9%	**14.0%**
Long Branch	**14.5%**	**13.7%**
Scarborough Village	**13.2%**	**13.6%**
South Riverdale	9.4%	**13.5%**
Woodbine Corridor	11.2%	**13.2%**
North St.Jamestown	**13.1%**	**12.9%**
Weston	11.7%	**12.8%**
Little Portugal	11.2%	**12.4%**
Junction Area	**13.2%**	**12.1%**
O'Connor-Parkview	11.4%	**12.1%**
Eglinton East	11.7%	**12.1%**
Flemingdon Park	**13.7%**	**12.0%**

20 Neighbourhoods with Highest Proportion of Average Annual Teen Birth Rate (per 1000 females aged 15-49, 1997-2001)	
	1997-2001
City	**23.33**
Broadview North	**66.00**
Moss Park	**58.82**
North Riverdale	**58.18**
Brookhaven-Amesbury	**49.58**
Weston	**44.71**
Black Creek	**43.10**
Beechborough-Greenbrook	**42.22**
Oakridge	**38.24**
Bendale	**37.52**
Downsview-Roding-CFB	**36.40**
Keelesdale-Eglinton West	**36.19**
Rockcliffe-Smythe	**34.77**
Mount Dennis	34.20
West Hill	32.80
Blake-Jones	32.56
Glenfield-Jane Heights	30.00
Woodbine-Lumsden	29.74
Regent Park	29.69
Ionview	28.66
New Toronto	28.47

20 Neighbourhoods with Highest Proportion of Population with No Knowledge of Official Languages (2001)		
	1996	**2001**
City	**5.7%**	**4.8%**
Kensington-Chinatown	**21.1%**	**17.4%**
Trinity-Bellwoods	**21.5%**	**16.3%**
Little Portugal	**20.2%**	**16.0%**
Weston-Pellam Park	**15.6%**	**14.5%**
Milliken	**13.8%**	**14.3%**
Agincourt North	**10.9%**	**13.8%**
Steeles	**11.4%**	**12.5%**
Agincourt South-Malvern West	**11.6%**	**12.5%**
Corsa Italia-Davenport	**14.7%**	**12.4%**
South Riverdale	**18.1%**	**12.0%**
Dovercourt-Wallace Emerson-Junction	**14.0%**	**11.5%**
Caledonia-Fairbanks	**13.4%**	**10.1%**
Keelesdale-Eglinton West	**12.0%**	**10.0%**
Glenfield-Jane Heights	**11.4%**	**9.6%**
Humber Summit	9.7%	**9.1%**
L'Amoureaux	8.4%	**9.1%**
Greenwood-Coxwell	**14.3%**	**9.0%**
Dufferin Grove	**13.9%**	**9.0%**
Palmerston-Little Italy	**14.0%**	8.2%
Blake-Jones	**12.6%**	8.2%

Table 4 Frequency of Neighbourhood Appearing in Most Challenged Lists

Neighbourhood	Number of Instances
Black Creek	5
Glenfield-Jane Heights	4
Keelesdale-Eglinton West	4
Regent Park	4
Beechborough-Greenbrook	3
Blake-Jones	3
Flemingdon Park	3
Kensington-Chinatown	3
Little Portugal	3
Moss Park	3
North St.Jamestown	3
Oakridge	3
Rockcliffe-Smythe	3
Rustic	3
Weston-Pellam Park	3
Brookhaven-Amesbury	2
Caledonia-Fairbanks	2
Corsa Italia-Davenport	2
Crescent Town	2
Dovercourt-Wallace Emerson-Junction	2
Downsview-Roding-CFB	2
Dufferin Grove	2
Eglinton East	2
Greenwood-Coxwell	2
Humber Summit	2
Mount Dennis	2
New Toronto	2
Palmerston-Little Italy	2
Scarborough Village	2
South Parkdale	2
South Riverdale	2
Thorncliffe Park	2
Trinity-Bellwoods	2
Weston	2
Woodbine-Lumsden	2
Agincourt North	1
Agincourt South-Malvern West	1
Bendale	1
Broadview North	1
Don Valley Village	1
Englemount-Lawrence	1
Etobicoke West Mall	1
Henry Farm	1
Humbermede	1
Ionview	1
Junction Area	1
Kennedy Park	1
L'Amoureaux	1
Long Branch	1
Maple Leaf	1
Mount Olive-Silverstone-Jamestown	1
North Riverdale	1
Oakwood-Vaughan	1
O'Connor-Parkview	1
Pelmo Park-Humberlea	1
Roncesvalles	1
Steeles	1
University	1
Victoria Village	1
West Hill	1
Westminster-Branson	1
Woburn	1
Woodbine Corridor	1
Yorkdale-Glen Park	1

6.2 Other Key Conclusions

In addition to the analysis of Toronto's neighbourhoods using the indicators chosen, the research undertaken as part of the project has produced some conclusions that will be useful to the further development of an indicator system for Toronto. These conclusions and their attendant recommendations for improvement are presented below.

The central conclusion of this study is that Toronto is behind comparable cities and countries in terms of developing a neighbourhood indicator system. While there have been some positive and indeed central developments (such as the definition of 140 neighbourhoods (thereby establishing the geography for analysis and response), Toronto lags in this area. It is not possible for citizens, researchers or community organizations to get information at a meaningful geographic level across a range of important issues.

Research for this project has revealed a situation comparable to that in other areas before they established comprehensive systems: there are several initiatives, measuring a variety of things, using different indicators at different geographic levels and for differing purposes. There is poor sharing of data between agencies and little overall sense of what is being collected and why. There were also delays and difficulties (eg trust and data protection issues) in getting data for this project. This is in line with what would be expected at this stage of development. The current situation lends itself to the sort of difficulties outlined in Section 2 in terms of inefficiency and poor sharing of potentially pertinent information.

Ameliorating this situation is not difficult and Toronto can use its late-starter status to its advantage by learning from initiatives undertaken elsewhere. Probably the best route is to combine approaches used in the UK, US and elsewhere. Ways in which this might be done are presented below. It should be mentioned, however, that no matter what approach is used, there are likely to some problems attached to acquiring an ideal set of indicators due to privacy issues.

6.3 Lessons Learned

6.3.1 What can be learned from the US?

In terms of learning from the experience of the US, the key resource here is G. Thomas Kingsley (Ed) (1999) 'Building and Operating Neighbourhood Indicator Systems: A Guidebook' The Urban Institute. This handbook outlines in detail all the key factors to take account of in developing a neighbourhood indicator system. The more pertinent suggestions from the Handbook are outlined below:

- *Design an indicator system for the explicit purpose of changing things and not just to monitor trends.* The key reason for measuring poverty and deprivation must be that it provides a sound basis for action to alleviate it. Collecting information to measure deprivation across a range of domains carries an implicit assumption about the nature of deprivation (i.e. it is more than just lack of income) and about the nature of interventions to address deprivation (i.e. they must be multi-faceted, comprehensive and strategic). This can be further embedded by encouraging the linking of data to strategies for renewal. What needs to be done and how will success be measured? From this, targets can be set and accountability promoted. Development in this area should lead to better strategies and better information.

- *Develop a single integrated system that can support one-stop shopping.* In order to tackle the problem of the same organizations being contacted for the same information, an integrated system should be developed, whereby those seeking information can access data on a wide range of subjects at a variety of levels. Partnership between agencies is a necessary feature of such a system and agreements may have to be reached on issues such as data sharing and possible joint funding. There are benefits to such a system in terms of central co-ordination and reduced inefficiencies; indeed partnership itself can be promoted through data collection.
- *Develop indicators at the neighbourhood level (and below) not just for the city as a whole.* Information must be collected at the smallest possible geographic level and built up from there. The UK example of output and super-output areas is instructive here. Again, partnership will be necessary to get agencies responsible for data collection (e.g. Police and School Boards) to use the same geography. It is worth mentioning, however, that the smaller the area for which data is to be collected, the greater the likelihood that privacy issues will arise.
- *Serve multiple users but emphasize using information to build capacity in poor communities.* A key feature of many of the NNIP members is that they include training and capacity building in order that local communities and community organizations can use information themselves, to either take action or make the case for external intervention.
- *Use available indicators but recognise their inadequacies.* As noted above, there is a wide range of information available from a variety of sources. It is obviously necessary to use what is available with care and to note weaknesses and limitations; in doing so, it is helpful to think about what the ideal situation would be and how that might be achieved. For example, a key weakness of most systems is that they do not contain information relating to the perception of residents. It may be possible to devise proxy indicators or to establish special data collection exercises to improve the situation. This point is addressed more fully below.
- *Ensure integrity in the data and the institution that provides them.* It is vital that those using the data have confidence in both the figures and organization providing them. Objectivity and independence is key here. Interestingly, the handbook states that,

  > *"…none of the NNIP partners is a part of any local government. It is not inconceivable that a neighbourhood indicators data initiative with the characteristics we have been discussing could function effectively in a government agency, assuming it were highly professional and appropriately insulated from short-term political influence."*

- *Develop a clear responsibility for co-ordinating and (crucially) updating the indicator system*. There is a need for central co-ordination as failure in this regard will lead to an incomplete and incomprehensive system. There are plenty of examples of partnerships and bodies established to do this within the NNIP. Currently within Toronto, it is the City that is doing the most in this area. It has developed the geography and produces indicator-based reports such as the homelessness

scorecard. Developing this responsibility is interesting within the institutional context of the Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force and it may be an appropriate forum to continue the discussion about the development of this work. Currently, the key deficiency in this regard is the lack of academic involvement. The latter should be addressed if the Task Force is to provide a means through which to develop the work.

6.3.2 What can be learned from the UK?

Perhaps the key feature of interest from the UK is the development of composite scoring systems for measuring deprivation. The 2004 English Indices of Deprivation represent the most current and sophisticated method of producing a single score (and attendant ranking) to measure deprivation. The Indices are used to determine funding levels and priority areas. For example, the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (which represents central government spending of more than CA$2 billion over three years) is allocated to England's 88 most deprived authorities as measured by a previous version of the Indices.

Clearly, the advantage of such a system is that it provides an objective and stark case for action and investment; an effective set of indicators and domains, appropriately weighted, would provide a clear list of neighbourhoods, ranked in order of deprivation.

The development of such an approach was considered to be well outside the remit of this project. It should be noted that the current Indices of Deprivation was arrived at following an extensive exercise by a specialist unit at the University of Oxford involving wide-spread consultation and an independent academic peer review. Within the confines of this project the only possible result would have been a crude and inaccurate oversimplification of a complex and demanding subject.

Clearly though, there is scope for development in this area and there is no reason why Toronto should not pioneer a similar system for its neighbourhoods. Any attempt to do so must, however, be driven by the latest research and academic thought as well as building on experience from elsewhere. The development of a single deprivation index and ranking system should be investigated.

6.3.3 What can be learned from other places?

As noted above, one of the key deficiencies in this and other indicator systems is the lack of qualitative information telling us how people view their neighbourhood. – Do the people living there think the area is improving/declining? Are there strong bonds and ties within the neighbourhood? To what extent do residents participate in the wider civic life of their neighbourhood? What do residents think are the key areas for action in their neighbourhood? These are all key questions.

Several systems use proxy measures for issues such as community engagement, such as turnout at elections, but these are incomplete measures that are sensitive to other factors that have no relation to what is being investigated (e.g. voter turnout is affected by controversial issues or a close ‘race’).

The best way of getting data on issues such as community engagement and perceptions of neighbourhood is through the use of surveys. As mentioned above, one of the best examples of the use of this method is Amsterdam's 'State of the City' report.

There is no reason why, in addition to developing a 'standard' indicator system, Toronto should not pursue a similar exercise to that in Amsterdam. In doing so, heed should be paid to questions asked elsewhere with a view to promoting international comparability (i.e. are Torontonians more satisfied with their neighbourhood than those from cities elsewhere?

ANNEX A: CRITERIA FOR SELECTION AND LONG LIST OF INDICATORS

Long list of indicators

The table below contains a long list of indicators from which the final set were chosen. Each indicator is reviewed briefly in terms of its availability and usefulness. This long list draws primarily upon examples from elsewhere, the Quality of Life Reporting System and existing Neighbourhood Profiles work. The list was intended to guide discussion and is comprehensive but not exhaustive. It should also be noted that some of the domains and indicators in the final set differ slightly from the way they are expressed in this table because of the need to respond to the exact format the data was available in and they way they worked together as a set.

Safety

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Youth Crime	Young Offender Charges per 1,000 youth	Police/ Statistics Canada	1991, 1996, 2001	Should be available at neighbourhood level	Predictive - this is another group that suffer poor outcomes, with clear economic and social costs	Numbers at neighbourhood level may be too small - also sensitive to changes in policy, e.g. soft drug use.	Possible
Violent Crimes	Violent Crime Charges per 1,000 total population	Police/ Statistics Canada	1991, 1996, 2001	Should be available at neighbourhood level	A key factor in neighbourhood health/ fear of crime	Possible problems with reporting/ recording and no sense of impact	Yes
Property Crimes	Property Crime Charges per 1,000 total population	Police/ Statistics Canada	1991, 1996, 2001	Should be available at neighbourhood level	A key factor in neighbourhood health/ fear of crime and quality of local environment	Problems with reporting and detection	Yes
Injuries & Poisonings	Mortality Rates, Injury and Poisoning	Statistics Canada	1991	Not known		Not clear what this indicator will show - safety at work? Not really related directly to neighbourhoods.	No
Injuries & Poisonings	Hospital Discharges, Injury and Poisoning	Canadian Institute for Heath Information	2001	Not known	May be useful information for health of people in neighbourhood	Not clear what is included - also sensitive to access issues.	No

Economy

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Bankruptcy	Consumer Bankruptcies per 1000 Population	Industry Canada	1991, 1996-2002	Not clear		Not a direct measure of neighbourhood vitality	No
Affordability	Market Basket Measure	Human Resources Development Canada	2000	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level	Provides context for income measures	Very unlikely to be available/pertinent at neighbourhood level	No
Government Transfer Income	Source of Income by family type, $, # reporting	Statistics Canada	1990, 1995, 2000	Not clear		Trends observed may be due to changes in policy regarding criteria	No
Poverty	% Unattached individuals living in poverty	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good measure of vulnerability - likely to have weaker social networks of support	May be too detailed for this indicator set	Possible
Hourly Wages	Median Hourly Wage	Statistics Canada	1998	Not clear	Slightly more 'qualitative' measure of employment than simple un/employment rates	Time series is not clear	Possible
Change in Family Income	Percentiles of Total Income, families and individuals, before and after tax	Statistics Canada	1990	Not clear	Could show trend of neighbourhood against city		Possible
Families Receiving EI/Social assistance	Source of Income by family type-Receiving EI or Social Assistance, #,$	Statistics Canada	1990, 1995, 2000	Should be available at neighbourhood level	Useful proxy measure for poverty	Observed trends may be due to changes in policy regarding eligibility	Possible
Families Receiving EI/Social assistance	Social Assistance recipients, by family type	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	1991, 1996-2002	Should be available at neighbourhood level	Useful proxy measure for poverty	Observed trends may be due to changes in policy regarding eligibility	Possible

Incidence of Low Income Families	Incidence of low income, by family type	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	May be helpful for targeting interventions by family type, eg single female headed families	Possible problems with creating stigma	Possible
Economic Dependency	Economic Dependency Ratio	Statistics Canada	1990, 1995, 2000	Should be available at neighbourhood level	Further context for employment rates	May be too detailed for this indicator set	Possible
Income	Median Household Income	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Key measure of poverty		Yes
Unemployment/ Employment Rates	Unemployment/ Employment Rates	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Employment is perhaps the central factor in preventing social exclusion - also vital for other aspects of neighbourhood vitality, eg local economy		Yes
Long Term Unemployment	Long Term Unemployment rates	Statistics Canada	2001	Not clear	Key measure of social exclusion		Possible
Business Bankruptcies	Business Bankruptcies per 1000 Establishments	Industry Canada	1998-2002	Not clear	Measure of private sector health in neighbourhood		Yes
Children Living in Poverty	LICO Economic Families by Children 0-12	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Useful predictive measure		Yes

Education

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Adult Learning	Participation in Adult Learning	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	2001	Not known	Could show desire to 'get on'	Is also a measure of access	No
Educational development	Achievement in Grades 3 and 6 - Education Quality and Accountability Office tests in reading writing and maths	Education Quality and Accountability Office	Every year	Not clear - possibly neighbourhood	Good predictor of later outcomes - regularly collected	Spatial level is not clear and may be collected by school rather than neighbourhood	Possible
Education Levels	Highest level of schooling, Pop. 25-34 years	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good predictor of later outcomes - also useful for predicting likely outcomes of children		Yes
Level of Literacy	Attainment of less than Gr 9 Education, Pop. 15+	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good predictor of later outcomes	Likely to be reporting problems with data	Yes

Urban Fabric/ Environment/ Housing

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Air Quality	Annual Average Air Quality levels, by pollutant	Environment Canada	1991-2001	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level		Useless at neighbourhood level	No
Wastewater Treatment	% population served by wastewater treatment type	Environment Canada	1991, 1996, 1999	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level	One of the few environmental measures in the set	Not an outcome measure	No
Recreational Water Quality	Days serviced water bodies were closed	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	1991, 1996-2002	Not known	Relates to leisure opportunities - one of the few in the set	Measure of services	No
Building Permits	Building Permits-all types	Statistics Canada	1991, 1996 - 2001	Not known	Demand to develop area/ show changing neighbourhoods	Quality of data is not clear	Possible
Building Permits	Annual Consumer Price Index, 1990-2001	Statistics Canada	1990-2001	Not known	Demand to develop area/ show changing neighbourhoods	Quality of data is not clear	Possible
Urban Transportation	Modes of Transport	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Shows use of infrastructure, good planning indicator - measure effects of transport plans	Sensitive to issues of access, not a clear measure of vitality	Possible
Urban Transportation	Average Commuting Distance	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Has implications for the way people view 'neighbourhood' and their ties to it. Also has impact on social capital levels		Possible
Population Density	Population Density	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good planning indicator	No clear relationship between density and overcrowding - also needs contextual information, eg regarding income	Possible

Solid Waste	Residential Recycling Rates	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	1991, 1996-2002	Not known	Measure of environmental awareness	Possibly reflection of service provision, eg recycling schemes	Possible
Substandard Units	Major Repairs: Number of Occupied Private Dwellings Requiring Major Repairs	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show miss-match between supply of housing and demand to live in area		Yes
Homelessness	Number of Permanent Beds, by shelter type	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	1991, 1996-2002	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level	May show location of homelessness	Indicator of service levels not outcomes	No
Social Assistance Allowances	Social Assistance Allowance Rates	National Council of Welfare	1991	Not known	May be useful proxy for poverty	Indirect measure of poverty	No
Vacancy Rates	Vacancy Rates	Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation	1996-2001	Not known	Can show miss match between supply of housing and demand to live in area	For private rental only - misses social housing	Possible
Rental Housing Starts	Housing starts by intended market (Rental, Home, Condo, Coop)	Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation	1991	Not known	Can see supply in an area and likely social make-up	Not an outcome measure - time series will be too long	Possible
Monthly Rent	Gross Rent	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Shows strength of demand and barriers to entry	Time series may be too long - every 5 years, can only see wide trends	Possible
Social Housing Waiting Lists	Households on Waiting List	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	1991, 1996-2002	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level	Shows demand to live in a neighbourhood (but only for social housing)	Unlikely to be by neighbourhood	Possible
Units of Rent-Geared-to-Income Housing	Rent-Geared-to-Income Housing	Federation of Canadian Municipalities	1991, 1996-2002	Not known	Shows mix of housing in an area	Indicator of policy rather than outcomes	Possible

Rent-Geared-to-Income Housing	Total # Occupied Private Dwellings - Rented	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Shows mix of housing in an area	Indicator of policy rather than outcomes	Possible
% Income spent on shelter	Gross Rent Spending: 30% or more of HH income on shelter costs	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good standard measure, can show vulnerability and risk of losing housing - generally picks up lower income households. May be predictive and allow preventative measures	Time series may be too long - every 5 years, can only see wide trends	Yes
Core Housing Need	In Core Housing Need and Spending at least 30% or 50% of income on shelter	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good standard measure, can show vulnerability		Yes
% Income spent on shelter	Owners Major Payment Spending: 50% or more of HH income on shelter costs	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Good standard measure, can show vulnerability		Yes
Renters/ Owners	Tenure - Owned, Rented	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Shows mix of housing and tenures; also likely stability		Yes

Health

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Suicide	Suicides Per 1,000	Statistics Canada	1991	Not known		Factors behind suicide may not indicate neighbourhood conditions and only shows 'successful' suicides – therefore more valid for males.	No
Premature Mortality	Premature Mortality rates per 1,000 population	Statistics Canada	1991	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level	Good 'headline' health indicator. Can provide stark figures	Probably not available at the neighbourhood level and very small numbers	Possible
Work Hours Lost	Hours Lost / Hours Worked, by sex and by age group	Statistics Canada	1996, 2001, 2002	Unlikely to be at neighbourhood level	Useful for seeing wider impacts of health problems	Not likely to be available at neighbourhood level	Possible
Infant Mortality	Infant Deaths per 1,000 Population	Statistics Canada	1991	Not known		Numbers may be too small at neighbourhood level	Possible
Low Birth Weight Babies	Low birth weight babies per 1000 live births (births weighing less than 2,500 grams)	Inner City Health Network/ Statistics Canada	1991	Neighbourhood	Good 'headline' health indicator, useful predictor of further poor outcomes and shows presence of pre-natal factors	Does not include unreported births, which include a higher rate of teen births and births to mothers on low-income.	Yes
Teen Births	Fertility rates per 1000, age 15-19	Inner City Health Network/ Statistics Canada	1991	Neighbourhood	Key route for intergenerational transition of poverty. Predictive	An underreported phenomena	Yes

Civic Engagement

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Charitable Donations	Average Donation per Donor	Statistics Canada	1990, 1995, 2000	Not known	Shows 'investment' in community	Needs to be read in conjunction with other information - poorer families tend to give a greater amount as % of income.	Possible
Voter Turnout	Federal Election Voter Turnout	Elections Canada	1993, 1997, 2000	Not known	Shows engagement in politics/public life	Measurement problems at neighbourhood level? Also may show wider trends - changing forms of politics etc.	Yes
Volunteering	Number of Volunteers and Volunteering Proportion of Population	Statistics Canada	1997	Not known	Shows engagement in community affairs. Good indicator of social capital levels	Time series may be too long.	Yes

Demographics

Issue	Indicator	Source	Time Series	Spatial Level	Strengths	Weaknesses	Rec. for Inclusion?
Ethnicity	% aboriginal origin	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show prevalence of demographic group with poor outcomes	Relates to small section of population	No
Official Status	% Canadian citizenship	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show neighbourhood stability/change	Not clear what this shows: attitude to status? Access to services? Transience?	No
Ethnicity	% immigrants by country	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show neighbourhood stability/change	Crude unless used in conjunction with information regarding country of origin	Possible
Ethnicity	% visible minority	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show neighbourhood stability/change	Too crude - different sets of visible minority have different needs/outcomes	Possible
Population	Family Composition	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	May be useful for targeting services by family type		Possible
Mobility	Total by mobility status 5 years ago	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Shows stability of neighbourhood	Not clear who is moving	Possible
Lone Parent Families	Total Lone Parent Families by sex of parent	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Useful predictive indicator - children from these families have less good outcomes	Risk of stigma	Possible
Age Group	% of people by age groups	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show population in terms of those of working age. Can be used predictively, eg numbers of older people		Yes
Immigration	% recent immigrants	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Can show neighbourhood stability/change		Yes
Mobility	Total by mobility status 1 year ago	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	Shows stability of neighbourhood - can monitor inflow/outflow to a point	Not clear who is moving	Yes

Language	% non-official home language	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	May be a good indicator for access to services. May show linguistic changes - useful for planning?	Does not show command of official languages	Possible
Language	% no knowledge of official languages	Census	Every 5 years	Neighbourhood	May be a good indicator for 'citizenship' and access to services. Useful for planning in conjunction with other information		Yes

ANNEX B: NNIP LOCAL PARTNERS

- Atlanta: Office of Data and Policy Analysis (DAPA), Georgia Institute of Technology http://www.arch.gatech.edu/~dapa
- Baltimore: Baltimore Neighbourhood Indicators Alliance (BNIA) http://www.bnia.org
- Boston: The Boston Foundation and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council http://www.tbf.org
- Camden, NJ: CamConnect, http://www.camconnect.org
- Chattanooga: Southeast Tennessee Neighbourhood Information Service (SETNIS), a project of the Community Council and University of Tennessee at Chattanooga http://www.researchcouncil.net
- Cleveland: Centre on Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University http://povertycentre.cwru.edu/cupsc.htm
- Denver: The Piton Foundation http://www.piton.org
- Indianapolis: Social and Vulnerability Indicators Project (SAVI), a project of the United Way Community Service Council and the Polis Centre http://www.savi.org
- Los Angeles: Neighbourhood Knowledge Los Angeles (NKLA), Advanced Policy Institute at the University of California Los Angeles http://nkla.sppsr.ucla.edu
- Louisville: Community Data Centre (a project of the Community Resource Network, affiliated with the United Way) http://www.crnky.org
- Miami: Community Services Planning Centre of South Florida, Florida Department of Children and Families http://www.dcf.state.fl.us/commserv/sfcspc/main_page.shtml
- Milwaukee: The Nonprofit Centre http://www.execpc.com/~npcm/
- New Orleans: Greater New Orleans Community Data Centre (affiliated with the United Way of Greater New Orleans) http://www.gnocdc.org/
- Oakland: The Urban Strategies Council http://www.urbanstrategies.org
- Philadelphia: The Reinvestment Fund http://www.trfund.com
- Providence: The Providence Plan http://www.providenceplan.org
- Sacramento: Community Services Planning Council http://www.communitycouncil.org
- Seattle: Epidemiology, Planning and Evaluation Unit (EPE) Public Health—Seattle and King County http://www.metrokc.gov/health
- Washington, D.C.: DC Agenda http://www.dcagenda.org

ANNEX C: EXAMPLE INDICATORS AND DOMAINS FROM OTHER INITIATIVES [28]

Charlotte, North Carolina

Social Dimension

- Percent of persons receiving food stamps
- Percent of persons over age 64
- Average kindergarten score
- Dropout rate
- Percent of children passing competency exams
- Percent of births to adolescents
- Youth opportunity index
- Number of neighbourhood organizations

Physical Dimension

- Appearance index
- Percent substandard housing
- Percent homeowners
- Projected infrastructure improvement costs
- Percent of persons why access to public transportation
- Percent of persons why access to basic retail
- Pedestrian friendliness index

Crime Dimension

- Violent crime rate
- Juvenile crime rate
- Property crime rate
- Crime hot spots

[28] Providence, Denver and Charlotte examples taken from Vivian Kim. May 2002. 'Independent study: Indicators used in 5 cities'. Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance and Johns Hopkins University. Cleveland example taken from website: http://povertycenter.cwru.edu/urban_poverty/dev/cando/overview.asp And Sandwell from 'Sandwell Neighbourhood Analysis 2003' Sandwell Neighbourhood Intelligence Project,Research Unit, Sandwell MBC.

Economic Dimension

- Percent change in income

Denver, Colorado

Demographic

- Population
- Number of children under 18
- Number of elderly over 65
- Percentage of population under 6
- Percentage of population 6-11
- Percentage of population 12-17
- Percentage of population 18-24
- Percentage of population 25-34
- Percentage of population 35-44
- Percentage of population 45-54
- Percentage of population 55-64
- Percentage of population 65 and older
- Percentage of African-American births
- Percentage of Latino births
- Percentage of non-Latino white births
- Percentage of other race births
- Percentage of births to teen (<18) mothers
- Teenage (15-19) birth rate
- Percentage of births to unwed mothers
- Percentage of children living with fathers only
- Percentage of children living with married parents
- Percentage of children living with mothers only
- Percentage of children living with no parent present
- Percentage of children living with single parents
- Percentage of population that is African-American
- Percentage of population that is American Indian
- Percentage of population that is Asian/Pacific Islander

- Percentage of population that is Latino
- Percentage of population that in is non-Latino white
- Percentage of population that is other race
- Households
- Persons per household
- Total births

Housing

- Number of housing units
- Percentage of households living at current address <1 year
- Percentage of housing units built before 1940
- Percentage owner-occupied housing units
- Percentage of renters paying more than 30% of income on housing
- Average home sale price
- Percentage of housing which is publicly subsidized

Economic

- Percentage of persons receiving public assistance
- Number of persons age 18 or older on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- Number of persons less than age 18 on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- Percentage of children (<18) on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- Number of licensed child care slots
- Percentage of children <12 in subsidized child care
- Percentage of Denver Public School (DPS) children receiving free school lunch
- Percentage of children (<18) in poverty
- Percentage of persons in poverty
- Percentage of construction jobs
- Percentage of finance, insurance and real estate jobs
- Percentage of government jobs
- Percentage of manufacturing jobs
- Percentage of retail trade jobs
- Percentage of service jobs

- Percentage of transportation, communication, and public utility jobs
- Percentage of wholesale trade jobs
- Percentage of other jobs
- Totals jobs
- Average annual wage
- Average household income

Education

- Denver Public School (DPS) enrollment
- Percentage of DPS students who are African-American
- Percentage of DPS students who are Latino
- Percentage of DPS students who are non-Latino white
- Percentage of DPS students who are of other race
- Percentage of births to women with <12th grade education
- Percentage of persons age 25 or older with less than a 12th grade education
- Percentage of persons age 25 or older with a high school only education
- Percentage of persons age 25 or older with some college but no degree
- Percentage of persons age 25 or older with a college degree (Associates degree or higher)
- Percentage of students not English-proficient
- Percentage of students reading in lowest quartile on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (score <25)
- Percentage of students reading in second quartile on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (score 25-49)
- Percentage of students reading in third quartile on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (score 50-74)
- Percentage of students reading in top quartile on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (score 75+)
- Percentage of 9th-12th graders who graduated
- Dropouts as percentage of 9th-12th graders

Health

- Percentage of births to women entering prenatal care in first trimester
- Percentage of births to women entering prenatal care in second trimester
- Percentage of births to women receiving late or no prenatal care

- Percentage of children (<18) on Medicaid
- Low birth weight rate

Safety

- Percentage of property crimes
- Percentage of violent crimes
- Percentage of other crimes
- Crime rate per 1,000 persons
- Burglary crime rate per 1,000 households
- Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons
- Confirmed child abuse and neglect rate

Providence, Rhode Island

Economic

- Number of business start-ups.
- Number of persons that are unemployed.
- Number of persons that are employed.
- Number of persons applying for a form of public assistance.
- Number of abandoned/vacant commercial properties.
- Office market vacancy rate.

Civic Culture

- Percentage of eligible voters who vote in local elections.
- Number of people who volunteer.
- Attendance at community planning meetings.

Education

- Percentage of high school graduates who go on to college.
- Percentage of high school graduates who are working within six months.
- Percentage of students who start but do not complete high school.
- Number of people who complete a job training program.
- Percentage of job training program graduates who are working within six months.

Urban Fabric

- Bus ridership per 1,000 people.

- Number of metered parking spaces downtown.
- Number of city public recreation sites.
- Miles of maintained greenway.
- Number of trees planted.

Housing

- Number of people with subsidized housing.
- Number of vacant/abandoned housing units.
- Number of buildable, vacant lots.
- Number of people receiving emergency shelter.

Cleveland – 'CAN DO' Neighbourhood Statistical Profiles

Population Composition

- Resident population
- Percent increase or decrease in the resident population
- Percent white
- Percent black
- Percent Hispanic
- Percent younger than 18 years of age
- Percent 18 years of age and older
- Percent 65 years of age and older
- Ratio of adults to children
- Number of families
- Number of families with children
- Percent of families with children, headed by a female

Vital Statistics—Births

- Fertility rate
- Teen birth rate
- Rate of births to unmarried mothers
- Low birth-weight birth rate
- Rate of births with adequate prenatal care
- Rate of births without prenatal care

- Rate of births that received prenatal care during the first trimester
- Percent of births to women without high school education

Residential Mobility

- Percent of persons that moved within the past 5 years
- Percent of occupied housing units with a householder in current unit for less than 1 year

Economic Status

- Percent of individuals with incomes below the poverty level
- Percent of families with children with incomes below the poverty level
- Median household income
- Unemployment rate

Educational Attainment

- Percent of adult population with at least a high school degree
- Percent of adult population with at least a college degree

Housing Stock

- Number of housing units
- Number of single-family homes
- Median value of single-family homes
- Percent of parcels that are vacant
- Percent of residential parcels that are tax delinquent
- Percent of commercial parcels that are tax delinquent

Housing Investment

- Dollar value of approved home improvement loans
- Percent of approved home improvement loan applications
- Dollar value of approved home purchase loans
- Percent of approved home purchase loan

Public Safety

- Serious violent crime rate
- Serious property crime rate
- Drug arrest rate
- Substantiated child maltreatment rate

Sandwell – All Domains Index

Access

- % Population within 400m of a Post Office
- % Population within 400m of a Bank or Building Society
- % Population within 400m of a Shopping Parade/Centre
- Access to Public Transport (Buses)
- % Population within 400m of a GP Surgery
- % of Households without a Car
- % Population within 400m of Public Open Space

Crime

- Total Recorded Crimes per 1000 Population
- Domestic Burglary per 1000 Households
- Cases of Anti-Social Behaviour per 1000 Households
- Young Offenders: Rate of arrest per 1000 popn aged 5-17 yrs

Education

- Average point score per Pupil at GCSE
- % Resident Pupils achieving Level 4+ at Key Stage 2 English
- % Resident Pupils achieving Level 4+ at Key Stage 2 Maths
- % Absenteeism Rate from School (Authorised + Unauthorised)
- % Population Lacking Higher Qualifications

Health

- Standarised Mortality Ratio
- % Births Below 2500 grammes
- % Population with Limiting Long Term Illness
- Hospital Admissions Standardised Ratio
- Child Referrals to Social Services per 1000 Population (0-17 yrs)

Housing

- % Housing Stock Lacking Central Heating
- % Housing Stock Overcrowded
- Average Cost of Disrepair (LA Properties)
- % of Void Dwellings (Public & Private)

Income

- % Economically Active Population (between 16 and 74 years)
- Claimant count unemployment as % economically active popn
- % Economically active popn who are permanently sick or disabled
- % of Households dependent on HB, CTB and IS or JSA

ANNEX D: NEIGHBOURHOOD VITALITY INDICATORS

Neighbourhood Vitality Indicators

(Bolded Numbers indicate a difference of greater than 1 standard deviation from the City Mean)

Domain	Economy					Education						Urban Fabric			Health				Demographics					
	Median Household Income			Unemployment Rate (aged 25+)		% of tenants spending 30% or more of household income on shelter costs		% Grade 10 Students passing Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) 2003/04	% Grade 10 Students passing Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) 2002/03	% Pop with either University or College Education (2001)	% Pop with less than Grade 9 Education (2001)	% of Dwellings in Need of Major Repair		% Living within 1km of Community Space	Teen Birth Rate/1000 females aged 15-49, 1997-2001	%Singleton Low Birth Weight Babies, 1996-2000	% popl. with no knowledge of offical languages		% popl. that are recent immigrants		% popl. that have moved in the last year	
Year	**1996**	**2001**	**%Change**	**1996**	**2001**	**1996**	**2001**					**1996**	**2001**	**2003**	**1997-2001**		**1996**	**2001**	**1996**	**2001**	**1996**	**2001**
Neighbourhood	**$45,134**	**$54,953**	**21.85169**	9.3%	5.9%	**22.7%**	**8.0%**	**61.6%**	**59.3%**	**56.4%**	**10.9%**	**9.0%**	**9.0%**	**84.1%**	**23.33**	**5.06**	**5.7%**	**4.8%**	**12.1%**	**10.4%**	**15.8%**	**14.5%**
1 West Humber-Clairville	$52,400	$59,797	14.11555	9.4%	3.9%	**12.0%**	**3.1%**	56.7%	51.64%	**39.8%**	12.2%	**4.0%**	11.5%	87.7%	19.02	**7.24**	4.8%	4.4%	11.6%	10.0%	13.0%	12.5%
2 Mount Olive-Silverstone-Jamestown	$39,461	$45,001	14.03887	**14.7%**	**8.0%**	**32.9%**	7.7%	**41.0%**	**34.10%**	**39.3%**	15.2%	8.9%	27.1%	96.4%	25.10	**7.22**	6.7%	6.5%	**22.1%**	**19.6%**	20.0%	**18.9%**
3 Thistletown-Beaumond Heights	$42,047	$49,570	17.89095	8.0%	6.6%	15.7%	**4.8%**	56.8%	**36.84%**	41.8%	16.2%	**5.7%**	15.5%	100.0%	26.42	4.70	3.9%	4.1%	10.2%	10.4%	**11.1%**	**9.8%**
4 Rexdale-Kipling	$42,806	$52,034	21.55773	8.2%	4.8%	21.3%	**6.2%**	**46.1%**	46.55%	42.7%	11.3%	7.2%	17.1%	69.1%	17.96	5.96	3.0%	3.5%	7.0%	8.1%	13.6%	11.1%
5 Elms-Old Rexdale	$42,957	$48,275	12.38113	9.5%	6.9%	21.4%	**6.8%**	**37.4%**	**36.26%**	**39.3%**	10.9%	6.3%	21.0%	100.0%	19.73	5.30	5.5%	3.2%	14.9%	10.5%	15.1%	13.0%
6 Kingsview Village-The Westway	$40,783	$49,150	20.51651	10.4%	7.8%	24.0%	**6.5%**	59.4%	49.39%	49.6%	10.9%	7.8%	18.4%	100.0%	19.16	5.15	7.3%	4.2%	15.7%	13.7%	13.3%	14.1%
7 Willowridge-Martingrove-Richview	$53,256	$61,328	15.15747	8.7%	5.1%	19.8%	**5.5%**	73.5%	68.75%	49.7%	12.6%	9.0%	15.5%	98.0%	14.68	4.98	4.9%	3.4%	10.4%	10.9%	11.4%	**8.6%**
8 Humber Heights-Westmount	$40,951	$47,473	15.92622	9.7%	5.2%	23.5%	10.3%	52.9%	51.92%	47.2%	15.8%	**5.1%**	24.3%	78.0%		5.44	4.5%	2.3%	6.8%	5.5%	11.7%	**10.5%**
9 Edenbridge-Humber Valley	$58,588	$66,089	12.80175	5.7%	4.7%	17.1%	7.5%	**80.5%**	**76.60%**	65.4%	6.1%	10.6%	18.7%	80.0%			2.7%	2.2%	7.4%	7.8%	**11.1%**	12.2%
10 Princess-Rosethorn	**$80,794**	**$106,107**	31.3303	6.4%	**2.9%**	**6.2%**	**1.8%**	**88.8%**	**89.52%**	**72.2%**	**3.6%**	6.1%	5.1%	84.4%			**1.0%**	1.4%	**3.1%**	**2.6%**	**8.4%**	**7.2%**
11 Eringate-Centennial-West Deane	$56,397	$67,325	19.37842	7.2%	**3.9%**	**8.1%**	**2.2%**	74.5%	69.92%	54.9%	8.4%	8.1%	6.2%	92.1%	**7.64**	4.53	2.3%	3.3%	6.2%	6.1%	**9.8%**	**7.0%**
12 Markland Woods	$54,958	$63,517	15.5728	**4.6%**	**3.5%**	**8.8%**	**3.4%**	**81.7%**	**76.74%**	62.4%	5.5%	**6.0%**	8.1%	96.1%			**1.3%**	1.2%	**3.8%**	4.6%	**9.7%**	**10.2%**
13 Etobicoke West Mall	$42,180	$46,980	**11.37862**	8.6%	6.6%	19.6%	**7.2%**	55.3%	61.46%	53.6%	7.5%	10.9%	18.9%	93.2%	13.77	5.84	3.0%	3.8%	14.7%	14.3%	14.6%	17.6%
14 Islington-City Centre West	$46,207	$55,929	21.03905	7.7%	4.8%	20.0%	**7.4%**	67.0%	60.63%	57.0%	9.0%	6.5%	18.7%	**57.0%**	**10.99**	**3.92**	4.3%	3.3%	12.4%	10.3%	13.4%	12.1%
15 Kingsway South	**$88,310**	**$117,334**	**32.86576**	**3.1%**	**2.5%**	**6.3%**	**2.0%**	**82.9%**	**76.32%**	**80.1%**	**3.2%**	**5.5%**	5.2%	63.6%			**0.3%**	**0.2%**	**1.3%**	**0.7%**	**7.2%**	**10.4%**
16 Stonegate-Queensway	$53,434	$65,087	21.80767	6.5%	4.7%	15.1%	**6.1%**	74.3%	72.19%	57.8%	9.8%	9.1%	14.5%	100.0%	**9.80**	**3.47**	3.4%	2.8%	8.4%	6.9%	**10.3%**	**10.7%**
17 Mimico	$41,783	$52,817	26.40646	8.2%	5.5%	26.3%	10.2%	55.7%	59.38%	57.0%	7.7%	10.8%	21.8%	84.9%	20.69	5.08	5.1%	2.9%	10.0%	9.5%	18.4%	16.2%
18 New Toronto	$31,040	$38,762	24.87784	12.0%	5.9%	30.9%	11.7%	57.0%	50.00%	49.5%	9.5%	10.7%	27.2%	100.0%	28.47	4.68	2.1%	2.3%	10.6%	6.9%	18.4%	15.2%
19 Long Branch	$37,170	$47,591	28.03777	10.9%	6.0%	24.9%	8.6%	55.4%	56.52%	50.6%	8.1%	**14.5%**	19.5%	100.0%	22.50		3.1%	1.8%	10.2%	9.8%	**20.3%**	15.7%
20 Alderwood	$47,699	$60,522	26.88344	6.0%	4.0%	**10.4%**	**3.0%**	72.5%	73.33%	**39.3%**	14.4%	7.9%	7.9%	91.2%			2.2%	2.0%	**2.9%**	**3.1%**	**9.4%**	**8.8%**
21 Humber Summit	$48,196	$51,106	**6.037154**	11.8%	6.3%	**12.0%**	**3.7%**	**41.6%**	43.28%	**32.6%**	**27.0%**	**4.6%**	12.4%	89.6%	13.16	5.94	9.7%	**9.1%**	10.5%	11.2%	**11.0%**	15.7%
22 Humbermede	$38,904	$41,346	**6.276133**	12.9%	6.4%	20.5%	**7.2%**	**39.5%**	48.36%	**32.9%**	**21.1%**	10.0%	23.7%	**54.4%**	19.15	**6.32**	**11.4%**	7.9%	17.4%	12.1%	11.4%	12.9%
23 Pelmo Park-Humberlea	$52,231	$59,838	14.56524	8.7%	**3.5%**	**10.5%**	**2.2%**	56.0%	**40.63%**	**37.9%**	**21.2%**	**5.3%**	6.8%	100.0%		**6.35**	3.5%	5.1%	**4.3%**	4.5%	**8.4%**	11.2%
24 Black Creek	$31,014	$37,081	19.56246	**19.3%**	**8.5%**	**34.4%**	9.1%	**35.0%**	**27.31%**	**33.0%**	18.1%	9.8%	30.5%	100.0%	**43.10**	**7.30**	9.7%	6.9%	**23.6%**	14.4%	16.3%	14.5%
25 Glenfield-Jane Heights	$36,157	$41,632	15.14242	**13.4%**	**8.9%**	23.9%	**7.0%**	**34.8%**	**27.49%**	**29.2%**	**28.6%**	8.9%	23.7%	100.0%	30.00	**7.17**	**11.4%**	**9.6%**	14.1%	11.1%	12.2%	13.0%
26 Downsview-Roding-CFB	$40,393	$47,389	17.31751	11.6%	5.4%	25.9%	8.4%	**42.9%**	**34.25%**	**35.7%**	**22.3%**	9.7%	23.3%	100.0%	**36.40**	5.72	8.6%	6.4%	13.7%	10.5%	15.2%	14.0%
27 York University Heights	$37,720	$40,216	**6.61824**	12.0%	7.2%	**32.1%**	10.8%	51.6%	46.53%	48.8%	17.3%	8.1%	31.1%	80.6%	22.41	**6.61**	7.7%	6.3%	17.1%	**18.2%**	**21.5%**	17.8%
28 Rustic	**$26,180**	**$32,361**	23.61008	**14.5%**	**8.1%**	28.1%	10.1%	**35.4%**	**24.19%**	**31.8%**	**26.5%**	8.1%	28.6%	96.1%	27.12	5.16	5.8%	5.0%	12.3%	8.6%	12.1%	**7.3%**
29 Maple Leaf	$38,399	$45,009	17.21399	**13.9%**	6.1%	24.2%	**7.1%**	**36.7%**	**42.59%**	**33.2%**	**25.5%**	9.7%	20.2%	78.8%	25.66	4.99	8.7%	7.7%	14.7%	14.6%	13.7%	**10.3%**
30 Brookhaven-Amesbury	$30,928	$39,208	26.77498	12.8%	7.0%	30.5%	10.1%	**37.1%**	**37.29%**	**39.6%**	15.4%	9.9%	29.4%	63.1%	**49.58**	4.73	6.9%	5.4%	17.5%	12.1%	16.6%	**18.6%**
31 Yorkdale-Glen Park	$36,441	$42,702	17.18013	11.1%	7.1%	23.4%	9.0%	56.5%	**42.62%**	**36.9%**	**26.8%**	7.6%	24.3%	100.0%	17.28	4.01	**11.4%**	8.1%	8.8%	5.8%	11.5%	12.5%
32 Englemount-Lawrence	$32,548	$39,200	20.43648	10.4%	5.2%	30.4%	10.3%	49.6%	45.76%	55.5%	10.6%	7.3%	27.5%	81.4%	22.91	5.49	3.2%	3.5%	12.9%	7.6%	13.5%	13.1%
33 Clanton Park	$36,854	$43,742	18.68861	10.6%	5.3%	23.9%	8.2%	63.0%	50.62%	55.6%	11.5%	9.0%	21.5%	**42.4%**		5.81	3.4%	2.4%	12.4%	9.9%	14.1%	**10.7%**
34 Bathurst Manor	$43,714	$53,607	22.63213	9.7%	4.5%	24.2%	8.6%	56.3%	63.53%	55.2%	11.9%	7.1%	21.6%	100.0%		5.46	5.1%	4.1%	12.0%	10.0%	12.4%	11.6%
35 Westminster-Branson	$37,839	$45,429	20.0584	10.5%	**9.4%**	**36.2%**	13.7%	54.9%	54.40%	63.2%	7.2%	8.9%	34.5%	82.6%		6.04	6.9%	6.4%	**24.5%**	**28.5%**	18.2%	16.2%
36 Newtonbrook West	$41,914	$47,058	12.27342	9.0%	6.6%	22.1%	8.7%	58.9%	51.55%	60.7%	8.0%	7.4%	23.6%	93.1%	**7.52**	4.83	4.8%	4.8%	15.2%	**18.4%**	15.4%	14.2%
37 Willowdale West	$45,532	$49,527	**8.775244**	6.4%	4.4%	16.8%	8.0%	70.1%	62.32%	61.9%	7.3%	**5.0%**	18.4%	95.5%		5.45	3.0%	3.2%	5.8%	9.8%	**8.5%**	18.2%
38 Lansing-Westgate	$53,148	$63,372	19.23685	5.8%	4.3%	19.9%	**6.0%**	74.0%	69.57%	70.5%	**3.6%**	9.1%	15.6%	**60.6%**		4.31	1.6%	2.2%	11.0%	10.1%	14.7%	12.9%
39 Bedford Park-Nortown	$57,989	**$78,218**	**34.88463**	**4.3%**	**3.2%**	**14.0%**	**5.4%**	**84.8%**	**82.22%**	**72.3%**	4.2%	6.9%	13.4%	91.7%		**3.34**	**0.9%**	**0.9%**	5.8%	**3.2%**	12.1%	12.5%
40 St.Andrew-Windfields	**$68,543**	**$84,974**	23.97227	**4.3%**	3.9%	**13.0%**	13.7%	**79.1%**	**84.52%**	**76.4%**	**1.9%**	11.9%	7.7%	**6.4%**		4.08	1.7%	1.9%	9.5%	8.6%	11.4%	12.1%
41 Bridle Path-Sunnybrooke-York Mills	**$143,294**	**$183,377**	27.97226	**1.7%**	**2.1%**	**0.8%**	**1.6%**	**90.5%**	**90.91%**	**83.9%**	**1.7%**	**3.5%**	**5.1%**	66.0%			1.6%	**0.8%**	**3.8%**	**2.1%**	12.2%	13.0%
42 Banbury-Don Mills	**$61,839**	$65,800	**6.406203**	**4.9%**	4.0%	17.4%	18.8%	**79.6%**	71.43%	**72.1%**	**2.6%**	**4.9%**	6.1%	**47.7%**		4.99	2.4%	2.1%	8.5%	9.6%	13.8%	11.5%
43 Victoria Village	$32,085	$37,604	17.2024	10.1%	7.6%	29.2%	**27.7%**	**47.0%**	48.92%	53.7%	10.9%	7.8%	6.4%	**56.7%**	21.37	5.75	4.5%	4.7%	13.8%	15.6%	16.2%	15.5%
44 Flemingdon Park	$32,612	$38,079	16.76453	**15.3%**	**9.6%**	**35.0%**	**29.0%**	49.5%	47.98%	57.9%	8.9%	**13.7%**	**12.0%**	100.0%	12.20	5.86	6.5%	6.7%	**28.2%**	**26.1%**	19.0%	**22.3%**
45 Parkwoods-Donalda	$46,415	$58,307	25.62037	8.9%	7.3%	25.8%	25.1%	58.7%	48.26%	62.9%	4.4%	9.8%	8.0%	**33.0%**	**8.21**	5.25	3.7%	3.6%	15.8%	**18.2%**	17.5%	16.5%
46 Pleasant View	$52,394	$58,316	**11.30289**	8.0%	5.7%	**11.2%**	13.4%	66.7%	70.63%	57.3%	13.4%	**5.4%**	7.3%	75.5%		4.63	6.8%	6.7%	14.2%	15.6%	11.8%	13.1%
47 Don Valley Village	$46,385	$53,922	16.24873	8.4%	**8.1%**	25.7%	22.9%	52.7%	51.44%	65.8%	5.2%	8.9%	10.6%	100.0%	**7.52**	5.59	5.7%	4.7%	**20.9%**	**21.7%**	14.7%	16.4%
48 Hillcrest Village	$51,055	$56,087	**9.856038**	9.2%	5.6%	15.4%	11.9%	70.1%	70.85%	64.1%	7.5%	**5.6%**	6.1%	74.0%		5.53	6.2%	8.1%	18.6%	16.2%	12.6%	10.9%
49 Bayview Woods-Steeles	$55,911	$60,230	**7.724823**	5.6%	6.3%	20.8%	20.1%	59.0%	59.13%	69.3%	4.5%	**4.8%**	**5.5%**	**60.8%**			3.9%	4.7%	10.6%	13.9%	11.4%	15.0%
50 Newtonbrook East	$49,511	$60,489	22.17285	7.0%	5.9%	19.5%	20.4%	61.7%	65.42%	67.0%	7.1%	**5.1%**	**4.2%**	67.5%			6.3%	5.3%	15.7%	**16.9%**	14.5%	15.3%
51 Willowdale East	$51,848	$58,554	12.93469	6.5%	5.6%	18.3%	20.0%	67.7%	72.15%	**71.8%**	4.5%	**5.0%**	**4.0%**	67.4%		4.70	4.6%	6.0%	**20.3%**	**21.2%**	20.2%	**21.8%**
52 Bayview Village	$57,352	$68,438	19.33137	7.3%	6.3%	16.3%	15.7%	72.7%	73.58%	**72.3%**	4.3%	8.2%	8.8%	**0.0%**		**6.41**	3.1%	3.7%	13.9%	13.5%	15.3%	12.4%

		Median Household Income			Unemployment Rate (aged 25+)		% of tenants spending 30% or more of household income on shelter costs		% Grade 10 Students passing Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) 2003/04	% Grade 10 Students passing Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) 2002/03	% Pop with either University or College Education (2001)	% Pop with less than Grade 9 Education (2001)	% of Dwellings in Need of Major Repair		% Living within 1km of Community Space	Teen Birth Rate/1000 females aged 15-49, 1997-2001	%Singleton Low Birth Weight Babies, 1996-2000	% popl. with no knowledge of offical languages		% popl. that are recent immigrants		% popl. that have moved in the last year	
53	Henry Farm	$43,216	$48,047	**11.17796**	12.6%	**8.7%**	**35.1%**	**30.6%**	55.7%	60.92%	**72.7%**	4.2%	8.5%	11.3%	**33.5%**		**6.45**	5.6%	3.6%	**26.8%**	**36.2%**	**25.0%**	**22.1%**
54	O'Connor-Parkview	$39,366	$44,150	12.15199	9.9%	5.6%	24.5%	24.3%	60.6%	55.28%	48.7%	9.2%	11.4%	**12.1%**	94.4%	22.53	5.13	2.6%	3.4%	12.0%	13.6%	15.2%	14.3%
55	Thorncliffe Park	$32,190	$39,404	22.40991	10.9%	**9.7%**	**42.5%**	**39.2%**	49.2%	46.38%	58.8%	8.6%	**12.8%**	9.3%	100.0%	21.25	**6.34**	5.2%	4.8%	**22.3%**	**29.9%**	**20.7%**	**19.0%**
56	Leaside-Bennington	**$65,806**	**$84,506**	28.41701	**1.8%**	**3.0%**	**9.1%**	8.5%	**89.3%**	**89.52%**	**78.8%**	**1.8%**	**4.8%**	6.7%	76.9%		**3.70**	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**1.5%**	**1.5%**	**10.6%**	12.1%
57	Broadview North	$32,278	$40,843	26.53355	9.2%	7.7%	**33.1%**	**29.4%**	56.8%	47.19%	56.9%	9.1%	11.6%	9.5%	100.0%	**66.00**	5.84	4.8%	5.8%	16.6%	**17.6%**	19.5%	15.2%
58	Old East York	$45,284	$54,730	20.85784	7.9%	**3.8%**	16.9%	14.2%	67.6%	59.32%	54.3%	11.3%	9.2%	10.9%	95.4%			2.7%	3.7%	**5.2%**	6.1%	**11.3%**	11.6%
59	Danforth Village - East York	$42,760	$51,195	19.72809	7.0%	5.3%	15.5%	13.3%	68.8%	71.21%	49.9%	16.1%	11.3%	10.1%	100.0%	12.84	4.56	6.3%	5.9%	**5.3%**	5.8%	11.6%	11.1%
60	Woodbine-Lumsden	$39,968	$48,504	21.35709	7.5%	5.0%	19.6%	15.0%	63.4%	57.81%	50.8%	12.0%	**14.6%**	**14.1%**	100.0%	29.74		6.1%	4.3%	**5.2%**	6.7%	15.3%	13.2%
61	Crescent Town	**$28,355**	$39,094	**37.87406**	**14.5%**	**8.5%**	**34.9%**	**26.6%**	61.0%	50.68%	59.8%	6.7%	**19.4%**	10.6%	100.0%	24.13	5.75	5.1%	5.1%	**25.9%**	**28.5%**	18.2%	18.0%
62	East End-Danforth	$38,984	$48,605	24.67829	8.2%	5.9%	23.7%	22.1%	62.4%	64.93%	59.6%	7.8%	9.4%	9.6%	100.0%	16.70	**3.98**	3.5%	2.5%	7.8%	7.0%	15.0%	16.5%
63	The Beaches	$56,568	**$85,465**	**51.08228**	**5.3%**	**3.5%**	16.4%	13.7%	**78.6%**	**76.69%**	**76.6%**	**2.7%**	**12.1%**	9.9%	100.0%		**2.93**	**0.3%**	**0.2%**	**2.1%**	**2.3%**	18.9%	16.4%
64	Woodbine Corridor	$39,998	$50,420	26.05525	8.6%	5.2%	17.7%	17.9%	60.8%	63.27%	56.3%	8.4%	11.2%	**13.2%**	100.0%	25.22	**3.05**	4.7%	4.3%	6.6%	**4.1%**	15.0%	13.5%
65	Greenwood-Coxwell	$34,101	$44,824	31.44709	11.8%	7.6%	23.2%	20.5%	**46.4%**	49.34%	48.9%	13.2%	**14.4%**	**14.4%**	100.0%	25.19	5.22	**14.3%**	**9.0%**	12.5%	7.8%	18.7%	15.7%
66	Danforth Village - Toronto	$49,253	$63,172	28.26151	8.4%	4.8%	19.7%	17.0%	52.0%	60.32%	54.3%	17.9%	11.6%	11.6%	100.0%	18.33	**3.95**	**10.7%**	7.8%	8.3%	6.6%	13.5%	15.4%
67	Playter Estates-Danforth	$46,636	$55,098	18.14371	7.6%	**3.6%**	23.8%	24.3%	**80.4%**	**92.16%**	**71.7%**	7.5%	11.4%	10.8%	100.0%			3.6%	2.7%	**4.0%**	5.6%	17.2%	16.2%
68	North Riverdale	$50,689	$61,744	21.80866	5.9%	4.1%	18.0%	17.2%	**78.1%**	72.28%	68.9%	8.2%	11.3%	10.5%	100.0%	**58.18**		6.7%	4.9%	6.4%	4.7%	15.3%	11.0%
69	Blake-Jones	$29,864	$44,798	**50.00921**	12.8%	7.1%	23.6%	19.7%	60.0%	48.31%	53.7%	13.7%	10.8%	**14.8%**	100.0%	32.56	**3.62**	**12.6%**	8.2%	11.8%	7.3%	16.7%	13.2%
70	South Riverdale	$33,449	$44,408	**32.7653**	10.8%	6.4%	23.0%	19.9%	52.2%	45.89%	51.7%	14.9%	9.4%	**13.5%**	100.0%	25.48	4.17	**18.1%**	**12.0%**	14.1%	9.4%	20.1%	14.5%
71	Cabbagetown-South St.Jamestown	$50,623	$61,597	21.67775	6.4%	6.1%	27.2%	23.8%	57.1%	**81.82%**	70.9%	4.1%	11.6%	7.2%	100.0%		4.76	3.6%	2.0%	8.8%	5.9%	**24.6%**	**18.3%**
72	Regent Park	**$17,715**	**$23,693**	**33.74637**	**25.5%**	**18.1%**	**33.2%**	**32.1%**	**39.6%**	**36.67%**	43.2%	13.8%	**16.2%**	**17.9%**	100.0%	29.69	5.56	**10.8%**	5.6%	**20.9%**	16.0%	18.8%	**18.3%**
73	Moss Park	**$16,529**	**$15,357**	**-7.09057**	**18.7%**	**11.5%**	**38.1%**	**36.9%**	**44.0%**	**27.27%**	56.1%	10.6%	8.3%	6.5%	100.0%	**58.82**	5.58	4.9%	2.4%	11.1%	6.5%	**24.4%**	**23.4%**
74	North St.Jamestown	**$23,050**	**$28,396**	23.19089	11.7%	**9.9%**	**41.5%**	**44.3%**	55.0%	45.63%	57.3%	8.5%	**13.1%**	**12.9%**	100.0%	17.14	**7.43**	7.7%	5.0%	**34.1%**	**26.1%**	**20.6%**	**18.9%**
75	Church-Yonge Corridor	$39,998	$48,609	21.52782	8.4%	6.3%	**38.9%**	**34.4%**	52.8%	62.96%	**77.9%**	**2.6%**	7.9%	8.1%	100.0%	17.63	4.76	2.5%	2.2%	10.9%	10.5%	**32.0%**	**25.7%**
76	Bay Street Corridor	$56,372	$60,855	**7.952973**	**5.4%**	5.4%	**33.8%**	**31.5%**	**81.6%**	60.00%	**87.7%**	**1.9%**	**4.9%**	**3.6%**	100.0%		4.14	3.0%	2.2%	14.8%	13.2%	**29.6%**	**24.7%**
77	Waterfront Communities-The Island	$46,014	$59,496	29.29865	6.7%	4.6%	23.1%	20.3%	67.2%	71.93%	**76.3%**	**2.1%**	**3.4%**	**3.2%**	79.8%	22.00	**3.87**	1.6%	1.7%	8.7%	7.1%	**25.2%**	**22.9%**
78	Kensington-Chinatown	**$26,026**	**$33,987**	30.5896	13.1%	**8.3%**	**37.8%**	**33.3%**	**41.9%**	45.37%	59.4%	16.2%	9.8%	10.0%	100.0%	17.66	5.32	**21.1%**	**17.4%**	15.6%	14.6%	**24.3%**	**18.8%**
79	University	$35,670	$45,350	27.13672	6.5%	5.7%	29.9%	**31.3%**	74.1%	70.37%	**72.4%**	9.9%	11.7%	**15.4%**	100.0%			9.4%	7.6%	10.8%	9.0%	**27.1%**	**26.2%**
80	Palmerston-Little Italy	$36,327	$49,842	**37.20279**	10.0%	5.1%	28.3%	24.1%	68.7%	72.00%	61.3%	17.9%	11.8%	11.4%	100.0%		**3.93**	**14.0%**	8.2%	6.3%	4.6%	18.3%	15.7%
81	Trinity-Bellwoods	$37,201	$46,864	25.97511	11.6%	6.9%	22.6%	17.8%	**43.2%**	54.37%	44.7%	**26.3%**	11.1%	11.5%	100.0%	12.95	**3.54**	**21.5%**	**16.3%**	11.2%	10.2%	15.2%	14.6%
82	Niagara	**$27,503**	$47,529	**72.81387**	10.6%	5.3%	**31.7%**	20.5%	72.7%	60.00%	69.0%	9.4%	11.6%	8.8%	100.0%	25.88		9.4%	6.1%	8.9%	9.2%	18.8%	**24.2%**
83	Dufferin Grove	$32,116	$44,016	**37.05318**	12.0%	5.9%	30.9%	**26.6%**	68.0%	55.00%	48.7%	**21.7%**	10.3%	11.9%	97.7%	17.44	**3.85**	**13.9%**	**9.0%**	13.7%	8.7%	**20.8%**	16.4%
84	Little Portugal	$35,842	$40,369	12.62939	13.0%	5.7%	24.1%	24.2%	53.0%	**38.96%**	**39.2%**	**29.2%**	11.2%	**12.4%**	100.0%	18.00	**3.85**	**20.2%**	**16.0%**	10.2%	8.1%	17.8%	15.8%
85	South Parkdale	**$22,365**	**$28,575**	27.77057	**15.9%**	**8.9%**	**46.1%**	**42.6%**	**40.2%**	**37.29%**	53.1%	9.8%	10.5%	9.7%	100.0%	28.31	5.21	6.2%	3.3%	**21.7%**	16.5%	**23.8%**	**18.5%**
86	Roncesvalles	$32,958	$43,533	**32.08553**	12.6%	6.1%	29.1%	**27.6%**	56.5%	56.25%	57.5%	13.0%	**15.7%**	**15.1%**	97.2%	16.00	**3.89**	8.4%	5.4%	13.6%	9.0%	18.2%	16.7%
87	High Park-Swansea	$46,508	$55,826	20.03548	5.8%	**3.3%**	16.7%	13.9%	**78.0%**	**83.33%**	**72.4%**	5.6%	10.2%	9.4%	80.0%	14.79	**3.73**	2.0%	1.5%	**4.6%**	**3.1%**	15.9%	13.4%
88	High Park North	$40,085	$49,614	23.77351	8.9%	6.5%	30.1%	**28.1%**	**76.2%**	75.00%	**74.6%**	4.9%	8.3%	9.8%	100.0%		**2.92**	2.7%	2.4%	13.5%	14.5%	**21.3%**	**19.6%**
89	Runnymede-Bloor West Village	$53,504	$66,805	24.86099	5.8%	4.2%	**10.7%**	7.8%	70.5%	73.20%	66.0%	10.0%	9.9%	10.9%	100.0%			2.8%	1.7%	**2.9%**	**2.0%**	**10.1%**	11.6%
90	Junction Area	$34,608	$45,983	**32.87077**	10.7%	4.5%	28.1%	21.0%	66.7%	50.00%	57.8%	12.8%	**13.2%**	**12.1%**	100.0%	26.47	4.26	5.4%	2.9%	10.3%	6.5%	**23.5%**	15.5%
91	Weston-Pellam Park	$33,225	$39,542	19.01458	**13.2%**	4.5%	24.0%	18.6%	**37.2%**	**36.25%**	**29.1%**	**30.8%**	10.3%	11.0%	100.0%	26.67	4.50	**15.6%**	**14.5%**	14.2%	7.3%	16.0%	14.5%
92	Corsa Italia-Davenport	$38,774	$47,236	21.82547	10.2%	6.4%	20.7%	15.6%	58.5%	46.99%	**38.7%**	**30.8%**	10.2%	11.4%	100.0%	20.19	**3.90**	**14.7%**	**12.4%**	9.8%	7.6%	16.9%	12.8%
93	Dovercourt-Wallace Emerson-Junction	$34,120	$44,576	30.64407	**13.1%**	6.8%	25.6%	21.3%	60.8%	44.22%	**40.8%**	**25.0%**	10.8%	10.2%	98.8%	19.41	5.49	**14.0%**	**11.5%**	13.1%	9.0%	16.3%	14.4%
94	Wychwood	$37,221	$46,885	25.96586	8.4%	4.1%	29.3%	25.0%	66.7%	69.90%	56.6%	15.9%	10.1%	11.6%	89.8%	14.05	5.33	8.4%	7.3%	7.8%	5.1%	14.2%	12.8%
95	Annex	$43,557	$51,454	18.12957	7.2%	5.0%	**31.5%**	**28.6%**	68.8%	69.44%	**81.0%**	5.1%	11.0%	9.1%	71.6%		**3.10**	2.1%	2.2%	6.9%	5.2%	**24.9%**	**20.4%**
96	Casa Loma	$54,251	$72,295	**33.26001**	**5.0%**	4.3%	24.2%	20.8%	71.1%	**84.38%**	**82.8%**	**1.7%**	9.0%	6.8%	100.0%			**0.9%**	**0.9%**	6.8%	**3.7%**	18.8%	17.5%
97	Yonge-St.Clair	$56,216	**$77,326**	**37.55142**	**4.1%**	4.4%	26.6%	24.3%	**78.6%**	**91.67%**	**83.3%**	**0.5%**	8.8%	11.4%	93.4%			**0.3%**	**0.3%**	6.5%	5.4%	**22.7%**	17.7%
98	Rosedale-Moore Park	**$87,491**	**$115,159**	31.62329	**2.6%**	**2.6%**	17.3%	16.7%	**84.0%**	**85.94%**	**85.7%**	**0.4%**	9.0%	8.6%	**61.9%**		**3.06**	**0.2%**	**0.3%**	**3.9%**	**3.1%**	16.3%	14.5%
99	Mount Pleasant East	$57,625	$71,530	24.13029	**3.9%**	**3.5%**	16.6%	15.7%	**81.9%**	**87.91%**	**80.4%**	**2.3%**	8.6%	9.6%	100.0%		**2.03**	**0.7%**	**0.7%**	**3.0%**	**3.3%**	17.3%	16.2%
100	Yonge-Eglinton	$53,402	$68,913	29.046	**3.7%**	**3.2%**	20.5%	19.2%	**93.0%**	**93.18%**	**82.2%**	**1.3%**	8.6%	9.2%	100.0%		4.57	**0.8%**	**0.1%**	**3.4%**	**3.1%**	17.6%	17.1%
101	Forest Hill South	**$71,034**	**$90,235**	27.03084	**2.8%**	**3.7%**	19.9%	19.7%	**86.0%**	**87.50%**	**81.5%**	**2.0%**	**17.2%**	9.2%	65.5%			**0.3%**	**0.3%**	**2.7%**	**2.8%**	14.3%	12.1%
102	Forest Hill North	$44,839	$57,024	27.17389	**4.8%**	5.7%	30.9%	**30.2%**	**80.9%**	71.13%	**74.1%**	**3.0%**	9.6%	8.8%	71.3%		**3.38**	1.6%	**1.2%**	11.6%	12.1%	15.0%	16.5%
103	Lawrence Park South	**$95,830**	**$131,981**	**37.72393**	**2.8%**	**3.0%**	**8.4%**	9.6%	**88.5%**	**81.94%**	**85.9%**	**1.4%**	6.6%	8.3%	83.8%		**3.34**	**0.2%**	**0.2%**	**2.9%**	**1.9%**	**11.1%**	**10.6%**
104	Mount Pleasant West	$35,752	$45,479	27.20757	7.0%	6.4%	**31.5%**	**31.2%**	75.6%	70.37%	**78.4%**	**2.4%**	10.6%	8.5%	86.3%		4.40	1.5%	1.4%	14.7%	12.4%	**24.6%**	**22.7%**
105	Lawrence Park North	**$71,304**	**$96,819**	**35.78387**	**3.2%**	**2.7%**	**10.4%**	8.7%	**87.1%**	**95.28%**	**81.2%**	**2.3%**	8.4%	8.4%	100.0%		**2.93**	**0.8%**	**0.6%**	**2.0%**	**2.0%**	12.5%	11.3%
106	Humewood-Cedarvale	$43,040	$52,581	22.1687	7.8%	**3.6%**	28.1%	25.5%	71.6%	**83.33%**	**72.7%**	6.3%	11.4%	11.8%	**54.5%**	15.17	5.14	2.4%	1.6%	14.0%	8.2%	19.3%	16.4%
107	Oakwood-Vaughan	$32,781	$42,974	31.09347	9.9%	5.0%	28.2%	23.4%	51.9%	60.71%	42.5%	**22.9%**	10.0%	9.9%	79.0%	22.22	**6.25**	9.8%	7.7%	12.0%	8.9%	16.1%	13.4%
108	Briar Hill-Belgravia	$32,104	$45,026	**40.2494**	11.6%	6.4%	29.0%	22.3%	62.6%	50.98%	48.1%	17.1%	9.5%	8.6%	95.9%	19.72	5.69	9.5%	7.1%	18.1%	15.2%	16.8%	12.9%
109	Caledonia-Fairbanks	$36,362	$44,827	23.2798	11.3%	5.9%	20.4%	15.7%	53.6%	57.41%	**30.9%**	**30.5%**	9.7%	9.7%	100.0%	26.67	5.86	**13.4%**	**10.1%**	11.5%	6.6%	16.5%	12.7%
110	Keelesdale-Eglinton West	$30,955	$37,976	22.68131	10.9%	6.0%	23.6%	20.2%	47.9%	**33.33%**	**28.3%**	**28.1%**	8.0%	**5.7%**	97.0%	**36.19**	5.28	**12.0%**	**10.0%**	12.4%	7.0%	18.4%	15.6%
111	Rockcliffe-Smythe	$34,030	$38,415	12.88576	12.9%	7.6%	21.0%	18.3%	53.6%	49.70%	**34.4%**	**19.1%**	9.8%	11.1%	100.0%	**34.77**	4.98	7.3%	4.9%	13.5%	6.9%	13.1%	12.1%
112	Beechborough-Greenbrook	**$28,828**	$37,147	28.85736	**15.2%**	6.9%	31.1%	**27.5%**	**34.0%**	**42.86%**	**35.6%**	17.3%	11.8%	**15.5%**	100.0%	**42.22**	4.44	7.2%	4.8%	12.7%	8.6%	12.3%	11.7%
113	Weston	$35,070	$40,902	16.62754	12.8%	6.0%	**33.4%**	**32.6%**	**41.6%**	43.75%	43.5%	12.4%	11.7%	**12.8%**	**34.2%**	**44.71**	**6.34**	4.1%	4.3%	13.8%	11.0%	**20.5%**	15.4%
114	Lambton Baby Point	$52,389	$66,554	27.03812	7.5%	6.1%	16.2%	13.8%	**84.1%**	70.91%	67.4%	6.2%	8.0%	10.1%	64.6%		4.75	2.6%	**1.1%**	10.1%	5.0%	13.5%	**9.1%**
115	Mount Dennis	**$29,250**	$39,247	**34.17892**	**17.8%**	8.0%	**32.3%**	24.0%	**45.3%**	**29.91%**	42.1%	12.0%	10.9%	9.3%	85.7%	34.20	**6.24**	4.9%	5.2%	**18.9%**	14.2%	18.1%	16.1%

		Median Household Income			Unemployment Rate (aged 25+)		% of tenants spending 30% or more of household income on shelter costs		% Grade 10 Students passing Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) 2003/04	% Grade 10 Students passing Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) 2002/03	% Pop with either University or College Education (2001)	% Pop with less than Grade 9 Education (2001)	% of Dwellings in Need of Major Repair		% Living within 1km of Community Space	Teen Birth Rate/1000 females aged 15-49, 1997-2001	%Singleton Low Birth Weight Babies, 1996-2000	% popl. with no knowledge of offical languages		% popl. that are recent immigrants		% popl. that have moved in the last year	
116	Steeles	$53,535	$60,716	13.41365	8.9%	5.9%	**13.1%**	8.8%	67.0%	74.60%	56.4%	13.4%	**3.1%**	**3.8%**	**34.3%**		4.51	**11.4%**	**12.5%**	**26.1%**	14.0%	12.0%	12.1%
117	L'Amoureaux	$43,242	$49,379	14.1906	11.0%	7.5%	19.9%	16.3%	58.8%	52.37%	50.2%	12.3%	**5.8%**	**5.6%**	**46.7%**	13.75	5.30	8.4%	**9.1%**	**19.7%**	13.8%	14.4%	13.2%
118	Tam O'Shanter-Sullivan	$46,200	$52,681	14.02865	8.8%	7.0%	24.3%	20.5%	63.3%	58.38%	52.2%	11.1%	7.5%	6.6%	80.5%	12.85	4.90	6.9%	7.3%	15.7%	15.7%	14.3%	13.0%
119	Wexford/Maryvale	$43,547	$51,073	17.28347	7.6%	5.2%	17.6%	13.8%	54.5%	56.49%	47.9%	10.4%	7.7%	8.0%	**45.1%**	20.00	5.62	3.3%	3.1%	10.1%	10.5%	13.3%	11.9%
120	Clairlea-Birchmount	$44,226	$49,069	**10.94866**	11.0%	6.1%	21.1%	18.0%	62.0%	50.31%	44.5%	12.1%	7.7%	7.2%	82.9%	17.27	5.10	4.9%	5.0%	10.7%	10.9%	14.0%	11.2%
121	Oakridge	**$26,914**	**$31,193**	15.90003	**15.4%**	**8.5%**	**38.0%**	**37.2%**	52.9%	48.00%	49.4%	11.4%	10.6%	9.6%	100.0%	**38.24**	5.34	5.2%	5.2%	**19.4%**	**20.6%**	18.4%	14.8%
122	Birchcliffe-Cliffside	$44,365	$51,435	15.93533	5.7%	5.2%	15.9%	13.3%	75.4%	68.86%	52.9%	7.8%	8.8%	9.1%	71.4%	20.22	4.85	1.9%	2.4%	**3.5%**	**4.0%**	13.4%	12.0%
123	Cliffcrest	$50,996	$61,371	20.34539	7.2%	4.4%	16.3%	15.4%	74.1%	66.19%	48.1%	7.4%	8.3%	8.6%	87.6%	25.88	4.58	1.7%	1.3%	**5.0%**	6.6%	12.0%	11.0%
124	Kennedy Park	$34,455	$40,132	16.47544	12.6%	**8.9%**	25.6%	20.4%	59.2%	**41.10%**	**41.4%**	13.0%	10.3%	9.0%	86.9%	25.06	5.11	6.5%	5.2%	18.4%	10.6%	17.6%	14.4%
125	Ionview	$33,721	$41,158	22.0573	9.7%	6.7%	28.0%	25.6%	51.6%	49.18%	42.4%	9.3%	11.6%	10.6%	78.5%	28.66	5.44	3.3%	3.4%	**19.1%**	15.4%	14.6%	17.4%
126	Dorset Park	$37,654	$49,720	**32.0422**	**14.1%**	7.5%	27.2%	18.2%	53.3%	48.13%	44.6%	10.1%	10.9%	8.3%	67.2%	22.96	6.06	6.2%	6.0%	16.8%	15.2%	14.5%	15.5%
127	Bendale	$45,976	$52,341	13.84472	9.6%	6.2%	**13.4%**	14.4%	56.2%	49.50%	46.0%	9.5%	9.5%	9.0%	**58.6%**	**37.52**	**6.70**	4.4%	3.9%	10.3%	11.6%	12.6%	13.6%
128	Agincourt South-Malvern West	$48,660	$53,239	**9.411269**	9.3%	7.2%	15.8%	11.5%	64.2%	71.43%	48.8%	13.5%	6.9%	6.3%	90.1%	**11.55**	5.34	**11.6%**	**12.5%**	**19.2%**	14.2%	15.6%	11.9%
129	Agincourt North	$55,659	$60,098	**7.974243**	8.5%	7.1%	**12.3%**	8.9%	56.1%	62.23%	54.1%	12.1%	**5.5%**	**5.1%**	**45.4%**		5.37	**10.9%**	**13.8%**	**22.4%**	14.9%	13.1%	11.1%
130	Milliken	$50,410	$60,864	20.73795	10.9%	5.9%	14.1%	10.3%	56.5%	67.92%	54.6%	12.1%	**2.8%**	**3.4%**	93.9%	**4.71**	4.77	**13.8%**	**14.3%**	**29.3%**	15.0%	13.8%	12.4%
131	Rouge	**$61,560**	$72,476	17.7331	6.5%	**3.4%**	**9.8%**	7.7%	75.1%	69.09%	60.7%	4.9%	**3.7%**	**4.4%**	**56.4%**	12.62	**6.21**	2.4%	1.9%	7.9%	5.7%	**10.5%**	11.9%
132	Malvern	$49,146	$57,977	17.97057	11.3%	5.9%	17.8%	13.4%	53.4%	53.52%	49.5%	8.3%	**6.1%**	6.2%	100.0%	20.18	**6.46**	4.7%	4.0%	17.6%	10.8%	15.8%	12.3%
133	Centennial Scarborough	**$82,966**	**$88,176**	**6.280321**	**4.5%**	**3.8%**	**3.4%**	**2.0%**	**78.0%**	71.69%	63.0%	4.0%	**4.6%**	**4.6%**	81.1%		4.45	**0.9%**	**0.8%**	**1.3%**	**2.8%**	**9.4%**	**9.8%**
134	Highland Creek	**$72,490**	**$83,227**	14.81249	7.7%	4.9%	**5.0%**	**3.4%**	70.6%	70.00%	59.5%	6.2%	**3.6%**	**3.9%**	**34.0%**	**8.93**	**6.60**	2.6%	1.9%	6.1%	6.0%	**10.1%**	**7.6%**
135	Morningside	$46,731	$52,767	12.91621	12.5%	6.9%	22.7%	20.8%	55.3%	56.67%	51.5%	5.2%	10.5%	9.0%	97.4%	21.85	6.03	3.8%	2.2%	16.0%	12.7%	13.6%	15.8%
136	West Hill	$37,230	$44,485	19.48869	10.6%	7.0%	22.6%	19.1%	54.9%	49.78%	46.3%	8.7%	9.5%	7.9%	86.8%	32.80	5.74	2.5%	1.6%	11.2%	7.7%	14.5%	13.1%
137	Woburn	$39,783	$47,824	20.2112	12.7%	**8.1%**	26.8%	22.4%	47.5%	46.09%	47.3%	9.1%	8.5%	8.3%	93.6%	21.26	**6.28**	4.2%	4.5%	18.4%	16.6%	15.2%	14.8%
138	Eglinton East	$37,396	$42,283	13.06771	12.1%	**8.2%**	28.3%	23.7%	**45.9%**	44.19%	46.6%	10.5%	11.7%	**12.1%**	**38.2%**	26.32	**6.38**	3.9%	4.9%	18.0%	16.2%	15.1%	15.1%
139	Scarborough Village	$33,430	$43,133	29.02383	**13.2%**	**9.1%**	**33.5%**	**32.4%**	52.6%	44.63%	48.8%	10.3%	**13.2%**	**13.6%**	100.0%	23.46	**6.38**	4.6%	4.5%	**22.9%**	**18.0%**	19.4%	16.2%
140	Guildwood	$60,665	$66,339	**9.353905**	**5.0%**	4.0%	**12.7%**	10.2%	67.5%	74.47%	56.1%	4.3%	**5.6%**	**4.6%**	85.9%			1.3%	**0.5%**	**5.2%**	**2.0%**	**10.3%**	**10.7%**

ANNEX E: CAVEATS TO THE DATA

1. TEEN BIRTH RATE

Source: Mothers Inpatient Records, (1997-2001) Provincial Health Planning Database (PHPDB) Extracted Oct 2003, Health Planning Branch, Ministry of Health & Long Term Care (MOHLTC) Prepared by: Toronto Public Health, Planning and Policy, Health Information and Planning, October 2004.

Significance of the Indicators

Teen birth rate is number of births (hospital deliveries used instead) to females age 15-19 years per 1,000 females in the same age group.

Teen birth rate may be used as an indicator of young women at risk for unintended pregnancy and early child bearing. Babies born to teen mothers are more likely to be of low birth weight. Research shows that pregnant teens are more likely to suffer from anaemia, prolonged labour, hypertension, renal disease, eclampsia and depressive disorders. Teens are at higher risk of having sexually transmitted diseases (STDs); babies born to mothers with STDs may contract congenital infections. Teen parents are less likely to complete their education or to be employed, and more likely to have lower incomes and require social assistance; however the relationship between teen parenting and poverty is complex.

The most recent hospitalization data available were used in calculating teen birth rates. Hospitalization data are collected for each hospital separation for both in-patient and out-patient events. A separation may be due to discharge home, death or transfer to another facility. These data are collected by the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI) and made available to the health units through the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care's (MOHLTC) Provincial Health Planning Database (PHPDB). The number of hospital deliveries among teens was obtained using CMG codes 601-611, excluding 605.

Data Notes

The teen hospital delivery data do not include births occurring "out-of-province" and at home.

The number of hospital births is actually slightly higher than the number of registered births collected through the Vital Statistics (Ontario Registrar General). Hospital delivery data are more current than the birth registration and are not affected by the problem of under counts resulting from unregistered births that may be more common in teens.

2. Low Birth Weight

Source: Ontario Live Birth Data (1996-2000) Ministry of Health and Long Term Care

Significance of the Indicators:

Low birthweight (LBW) rate is live births less than 2,500 grams, expressed as a percentage of all live births (birth weight known).

LBW rate is used as an indicator of a newborn's chances for survival. It is related to maternal health and socio-economic factors. It is a predictor of child growth and development, some conditions in adult life, increased health and social services cost and stress on families. Low birth weight infants are at a greater risk of having a disability and for diseases such as cerebral palsy, visual problems, learning disabilities and respiratory problems. Studies that link births and infant mortality have consistently shown extreme differences in survival rates by birthweight.

Low birth weight may be associated with premature birth or slow growth of the fetus or both. Effects of premature birth and multiple gestation (twins) can be eliminated by using only full term singleton live births. Birth weight is affected by mother's age, type of birth (i.e. multiple), gestational age, parity, lifestyle factors (e.g. smoking), weight gain during pregnancy, physical and social environment (e.g. intrauterine infection, diabetes mellitus, or low SES), and genetic factors.

LBW rate is one of the comparable health indicators selected and reported by the health ministries from all provinces and territories, and the federal government. There are 14 areas for comparable health status and health system performance indicators reporting, organized under the three headings of health status, health outcomes and quality of service.

Singleton low birthweight rate were calculated using Ontario vital statistics data (currently is the only source). The Ontario vital statistics data are the primary source of live birth data for Toronto Public Health. The data are collected under the authority of the Vital Statistics Act by the Provincial Office of the Registrar General (ORG) using the live birth registration (required by law) form completed by parents and the Physician Notice of Birth or Stillbirth form (PNOB). A live birth database is compiled on a yearly basis by the ORG and edited by Statistics Canada. The edited files are sent to the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care (MOHLTC) for distribution and analysis. The MOHLTC provides health units with access to the database through the Health Planning System (HELPS) and the Provincial Health Planning Database (PHPDB-Data Warehouse). There is currently a 3 year delay before annual live birth data are received by the MOHLTC. The most current data are for 2000.

Data Notes:

- Data using the parent registration form may be subject to some recall bias.
- Data are analyzed by the residence of the mother, not by where the birth occurred.
- There are possible errors in the birth data file related to assignment of municipality of residence/census subdivision of mother. The Central East Health Information Partnership (CEHIP) completed a report on this issue in July, 2000. For more

information see CEHIP's Data Quality Report: Effect of Residence Code Errors on Fertility Rates at http://www.cehip.org/.

- For a birth to be included in the live birth database, documentation must be received from both the parents and the attending physician. If the ORG does not receive both pieces of documentation, the birth event will not be entered into the database. A study by the Central East Health Information Partnership (Underreporting of live births in Ontario: 1991-1997) analyzed the prevalence of unregistered births (births not included in the live birth database) and the association with mother's age, birth outcomes and the introduction of birth registration fees for parents in some municipalities. Results of the study show that the percentage of unregistered births in Ontario increased from an average of 1% between 1991 and 1996 to 2.3% in 1997. Preliminary data for 1998 show a continued increase to 3.1%. The problem is more pronounced for Toronto residents where 3.2% of live births were unregistered in 1997. The percentage of unregistered births was higher among teen mothers and low birth weight babies. In 1997, 9.7% of births to mothers under the age of 20 were unregistered and 4.8% of low birth weight babies (<2500 grams) were unregistered.

- The introduction of birth registration fees for parents in Toronto in 1996/1997 (currently $27.50) appears to be associated with an increase in the number of unregistered births. The number of unregistered births is disproportionately higher among teen births and low birth weight births. Excluding unregistered births from the Ontario live birth data results is an undercount of births. Therefore birth and fertility rates based on these data, particularly rates of teen births and low birth weight births, are likely to be underestimated for Toronto and Ontario.

- Rates and proportions based on counts less than 5 are suppressed.