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Executive Summary

During last year’s presidential campaign, Barack Obama proposed an initiative to combat urban poverty called Promise Neighborhoods. A Promise Neighborhood (PN) is a multifaceted anti-poverty program that addresses the needs of children and their families in areas of concentrated poverty. Obama drew inspiration from the accomplishments of the Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ). HCZ, founded by Geoffrey Canada, is a results-driven, place-based initiative that aims to break the generational cycle of poverty and transform Harlem. Since January 2009, the Chicago Policy Research Team (CPRT) in the Public Policy Studies Program at the University of Chicago has analyzed the possibility of implementing a Promise Neighborhood in Chicago through policy analysis and extensive field research. For more information, please visit http://cprt.uchicago.edu.

HCZ Programs

Following HCZ’s successful model, each Promise Neighborhood (PN) will implement a comprehensive and continuous “conveyor belt” of high-quality educational and social service programs to support children from birth through college. In HCZ, these programs begin with prenatal classes for parents and intensive pre-kindergarten programming for children and continue through pre-collegiate programs for high school students. They also incorporate a wide range of after-school, health and nutrition, community revitalization, and other programs.

Baby College
Baby College offers a nine-week program of parenting workshops to expectant parents and to parents and caregivers of children up to three-years-old.

Harlem Gems Preschool Program
The Harlem Gems preschool program is an all-day pre-kindergarten program that HCZ founded in 2001. Classes have a 4:1 child-to-adult ratio and operate from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

HCZ Asthma Initiative
Since asthma is more prevalent and dangerous in poor urban communities, HCZ began its Asthma Initiative in 2001 with the goal of reducing the rates of asthma attacks and the problems that accompany them, such as hospital visits and missed school days.

Promise Academies
HCZ created its own charter schools, the Promise Academies, in 2004. They started with two academies serving two grade levels, kindergarten and 6th grade, which each had 100 students. The goal was to increase the size of these elementary and middle schools by one grade each year and eventually add a high school. The schools now serve a large part of Harlem.

After-School Programs and Community Centers
As part of its comprehensive plan to provide services to those in need, as well as its goal of turning around central Harlem, HCZ offers a variety of programs that both target children who attend Promise Academies as well as those who do not. Included are programs devoted to fitness and nutrition, arts and media, technology, and college preparation. These programs take place before and after school days, on weekends, and during the summer.
Harlem Children’s Zone’s Achievements

A recent study by Harvard economists Will Dobbie and Ronald G. Fryer, Jr., found that students enrolled in HCZ programs made enormous academic gains. The Promise Academies I and II were successful in eliminating the achievement gap between its black students scores and the city average for white students in the state achievement tests for mathematics.

Other accomplishments of HCZ in 2008 include:

- 93% of Promise Academy I students and 100% of Promise Academy II students tested at or above grade level on the state math exam. The average across New York City was 74%.
- 93% of four-year-old Harlem Gems children attained a school classification of average or above average.
- 92.5% of 2008 Baby College graduates said that they had learned a lot from the classes.

Why Harlem Children’s Zone is Successful

HCZ has been successful in part because the HCZ model has a strong social scientific basis as an educational and anti-poverty strategy and because of its early, comprehensive, continuous, and concentrated intervention. HCZ can also attribute much of its success to the strong leadership and staff at HCZ and a large amount of private funding it receives to support its programs.

Early Intervention

Intervention is most effective at a young age due to the effects of early brain development on future ability. In addition, early intervention has been shown to benefit society both monetarily and socially. For example, children from disadvantaged homes are statistically more likely to commit crimes, have out-of-wedlock births and drop out of school. High-quality, early intervention programs can diminish the likelihood of such events and yield significant social dividends.

Comprehensive Intervention

HCZ offers multi-faceted support for students through a wide array of programs. In this way, HCZ seeks to eliminate all aspects of poverty that could impede students’ academic success.

Concentrated Intervention

HCZ is unique because it concentrates its efforts on a specific geographic zone. Concentrating the efforts of an anti-poverty program within one neighborhood enables it to target a higher percentage of children within that neighborhood than most other programs. It can overcome the adverse impact of structural poverty and allow for the creation of a more effective set of programs through a community-based approach.

Leadership and Staff

Geoffrey Canada is a strong, dynamic leader who can be credited with much of the success of HCZ. His charisma, passion, and daily personal sacrifices have helped to make HCZ what it is today. Canada demands success from HCZ and ensures that teachers and administrators are well-qualified and held to high standards. He also communicates quite effectively in policy and finance circles.
Prospective Chicago Neighborhoods: A Comparative Overview of Ten Areas

The remainder of this report addresses the feasibility of implementing a Promise Neighborhood (PN) in Chicago. Under Obama’s proposed guidelines, a PN candidate must have a childhood poverty rate of at least 40% (or 30% if the neighborhood has additional characteristics that disadvantage children) to be considered. After examining demographic characteristics and consulting with the City, the CPRT chose ten neighborhoods in two different geographic clusters in Chicago:

- **West Side Community Areas**
  - Austin
  - East and West Garfield Park
  - Humboldt Park
  - North Lawndale
  - South Lawndale/“Little Village”

- **South Side Community Areas**
  - Englewood
  - Greater Grand Crossing
  - The Quad Communities
  - South Shore
  - Washington Park/Woodlawn

The description of each community area in the CPRT report includes the following information:

- **Population Demographics:**
  1. Total Population
  2. Population Density
  3. Projected Change in Child Population between 1990 and 2010
  4. Median Household Income

- **School Demographics and Performance Statistics**
  1. Public and/or Charter Elementary Schools
  2. Percentage of Students from Low-Income Households
  3. Racial Demographics
  4. Probation Status
  5. Standardized Test Scores

- **A Description of Relevant Key Assets:**
  1. Access to Transportation
  2. Availability of Services
  3. Number of Youth-Centered Programs in the Community

In consultation with our client, the City of Chicago’s Department of Family and Support Services, the CPRT chose three neighborhoods to study more closely: Englewood, South Lawndale (“Little Village”), and South Shore. Because of some strong interest at the University of Chicago in the possibility of being involved in a Chicago Promise Neighborhood, we added Washington Park/Woodlawn as a fourth in-depth case study.

With the exception of South Lawndale/Little Village, the CPRT completed approximately 100 surveys, two focus groups, and at least five key informant interviews in each community area in order to determine the feasibility of implementing a PN in these four final neighborhoods. The following information is based, in large part, on the data collected as part of this fieldwork.
Four Potential Chicago Promise Neighborhood Locations

Englewood

Challenges Facing the Community

- Education: In 2004 the majority of Englewood schools were on academic probation and the percentage of students in special education or foster care were among the highest in the city.

- Health: Englewood ranks in the top five of all Chicago community areas for a range of negative health outcomes, including sexually transmitted diseases and low birth weight. More than half of all children at local elementary schools have not received required immunizations for their age group. Lead contamination, which can lead to learning disabilities, is prevalent.

- Unemployment: In 2000, the unemployment rate was 25%, more than twice the citywide median of 10%, and the median income was $18,955, which is less than half the citywide median.

- Crime: Several focus group participants raised concerns about police corruption and ineffectiveness. Residents say that conflict between gangs prohibits movement throughout the neighborhood.

Community Assets

- Service Organizations: Englewood is home to several service organizations that could be involved in the implementation of a PN, including Teamwork Englewood, Beloved, and Imagine Englewood If… Teamwork Englewood serves as a catalyst for community development and planning, Beloved offers health prevention and education initiatives, and Imagine Englewood If… oversees a variety of youth programs. Kennedy-King Community College is a crucial social asset in the community. Kennedy-King has physical capital such as a gym, bookstore, meeting spaces, and computer labs, and offers community programs. In Englewood, eight schools offer Head Start programs and ten offer after-school programs. Other assets include the Children’s Home and Aid Society of Illinois (CHASI), several food pantries, a library, and Ogden Park.

- Location: Greater Englewood is comprised of West and East Englewood. It is centrally located and in close proximity to the University of Chicago and downtown Chicago by public transportation. We suggest the possibility of the implementation of a Promise Neighborhood in East Englewood that would eventual expand westward.

South Lawndale (“Little Village”)

Challenges Facing the Community

- Immigration: A large foreign-born population in Little Village (LV) poses several unique challenges for a PN in this community. A significant portion of LV residents have limited or no English proficiency, many residents are unauthorized immigrants, and there is a high rate of
mobility; as new residents gain socio-economic stability, they tend to relocate to other Chicago neighborhoods, most notably Pilsen.

- Cultural Dynamics: The culture of LV is one that largely emphasizes employment over higher education according to our field research. Also, there exists a sharp cultural boundary between South Lawndale and its majority African-American neighbor, North Lawndale. Many African-Americans living in South Lawndale consider themselves to be residents of North Lawndale.

- Structural, Safety, and Environmental Concerns: LV is affected by a high level of underemployment. Gang presence in the area poses a threat to resident safety. In addition, the community lacks green and recreational spaces.

Community Assets

- Service Organizations: El Instituto del Progreso Latino provides educational services to area youth. Enlace Chicago provides after-school, youth enrichment and adult education programs. Enlace also partners with local schools to utilize them as community centers.

- Infrastructure and Location: LV has a large child population and numerous newly constructed schools. The northern portion of LV has ample access to public transit. The community is home to several thriving commercial corridors.

- Leadership and Community Involvement: There are generally high levels of efficacy and involvement among LV residents. Residents actively participate in church, community events, and social service programs. Alderman Muñoz (22nd Ward) has an impressive track record of working for reform in education, environment, and other issues within LV.

South Shore

Challenges Facing the Community

- Political Fragmentation: South Shore is divided amongst three aldermen, who are reported to be territorial. This division may impede the planning process and implementation of a PN.

- Community Fragmentation: Demolitions of CHA high-rise public housing buildings in the last several years produced some in-migration of low-income families to South Shore. This population shift has produced tension between newcomers and long-time, middle-income residents, our field research showed. Also, unlike our three other areas of in-depth study, South Shore does not have a New Communities Program agency to coordinate community-planning efforts at the grassroots level.

- Crime: South Shore has been plagued by a history of gang violence and high crime rates. This year there has been an upsurge in violent crime, renewing concerns about children’s safety.
Community Assets

- Demographics: South Shore offers a unique mix of demonstrated need for anti-poverty programs and solid housing stock with a stable middle class population. The middle class could be a valuable asset if the PN were able to garner the support of the middle class.

- Service Organizations: Connections of South Shore is currently drafting a holistic plan for community revitalization. It is a coalition of stakeholders in the community including church leaders, business owners, service providers, school officials, and representatives of the aldermen. Connections of South Shore is currently led by the Black United Fund of Illinois, but in the next few years will most likely become a new legal entity.

Washington Park/Woodlawn

Challenges Facing the Community

- Community Identity: Washington Park and Woodlawn see themselves as separate communities with few shared characteristics according to our field research.

- Population Decline: Both communities have declining populations. The child population in both community areas is decreasing and residential mobility is high.

- Education: Schools have very low achievement rates and have been declining in recent years.

- Crime: Violence, drugs, and gangs cause fear and distrust in the community, and may prevent residents from taking advantage of programs if getting to them entails crossing gang territories.

- Housing and Gentrification: Residents are concerned that increasing rents and housing prices are (or will) drive low-income residents out of Washington Park and Woodlawn.

- Olympics: It is unclear as to what effect the 2016 Olympics would have on Washington Park, but it may lead to a further increase in housing prices, gentrification, and the displacement of the low-income residents that a PN would seek to assist.

Community Assets

- Service Organizations: There are various agencies in the community, such as faith-based organizations and existing community organizations that could collaborate to build a Promise Neighborhood. Bishop Arthur Brazier, of the Apostolic Church of God, recently began Woodlawn Children’s Promise, a school-based initiative inspired in part by HCZ.

- Location: The nearby University of Chicago could be an asset in providing expertise and evaluative capabilities to a Promise Neighborhood.
Conclusion

This report summarizes the Chicago Policy Research Team’s assessment of the challenges and opportunities for reinventing the Harlem Children’s Zone in Chicago. Like Harlem, each of the community areas mentioned in this report has unique needs, assets, and challenges that are relevant to successful Promise Neighborhood implementation. In addition to an in-depth examination of these areas, this report provides the initial guidelines for CPN design and implementation. For more information, please visit our website at: http://cprt.uchicago.edu.
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Foreword

Dear Reader,

May 28, 2009

In January 2009, sixty undergraduates in the Public Policy Studies Program at the University of Chicago, three teaching assistants and I set out with an admittedly ambiguous mission involving field research, anti-poverty policy, and the often ignored communities outside of Hyde Park on the South Side of Chicago.

As we began, we were intrigued by what we learned about the ambitious place-based, anti-poverty model developed by Geoffrey Canada known as the Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ). HCZ was receiving a good deal of media attention at the time – in part because of Paul Tough’s *Whatever It Takes: Geoffrey Canada’s Quest to Change Harlem and America* and President-elect Obama’s intention to create “Promise Neighborhoods” modeled after Canada’s HCZ.

At the start most of us had little experience with field research, anti-poverty policy or, for that matter, the environs outside of campus. After five months of policy research, school and population data collection, key informant interviews, focus groups, and an extensive multi-neighborhood survey, we present this report about the possibility of reinventing the HCZ in Chicago. In this report we provide a detailed policy, best practices and social science background on the HCZ in the context of New York City’s recent anti-poverty efforts. In addition we analyze comparative data on ten potential Chicago Promise Neighborhood (CPN) locations, chosen based on demographic criteria and with some guidance from our client, the City of Chicago. The bulk of the report, however, is devoted to a fine-grained analysis of our four focus areas: Englewood, Little Village, South Shore and Washington Park/Woodlawn. For these areas we present a rich collection of survey results, focus group and interview findings, and site-specific recommendations to assist in selecting, designing, and implementing a Promise Neighborhood in Chicago.

Despite ample time and effort put into this task and the pride we have taken in our budding expertise on this important topic, I think it’s fair to say that we have been humbled by the complexities of undertaking an endeavor such as this one. Indeed, as with most successful research, we may have uncovered more questions than we’ve answered. Can a Promise Neighborhood thrive without the singular leadership of Canada? Will it work without the same organic, grassroots course of development HCZ experienced in Harlem? What will starkly different school, population, political and financing characteristics in Chicago mean for a CPN?

The Chicago communities we examined present challenges, some quantitatively and some qualitatively different from Harlem’s. Would a Promise Neighborhood be successful in Englewood given its high foreclosure rate and level of gang activity? In Little Village, given its high percentage of undocumented Mexican residents? In South Shore, given its conflict between long-time residents and new arrivals displaced from public housing demolitions further north? In Washington Park or Woodlawn, given each neighborhood’s low population density and nearly ubiquitous vacant lots? At the same time, Chicago offers a wealth of opportunities. Amongst its proud tradition of progressive organizing and its citizens’ relentless dreaming of big dreams, Chicago is home to Jane Addams Hull House, which 100 years ago had established itself as a remarkably successful, place-based anti-poverty program.

So it is with a good measure of humility that we present our findings and recommendations to our client, the City of Chicago’s Department of Family and Support Services, and also to the University of Chicago’s Office of Civic Engagement, the Public Policy Studies Program, and the public. It is our hope that this report lends some insight to the important discussion about addressing entrenched child poverty that Chicago and many other cities across the United States will have in the forthcoming months. There are few policy endeavors quite so critical; we must get this right.

Sincerely,

Chad Broughton
Senior Lecturer, Public Policy Studies
The College, The University of Chicago
Introduction

During last year’s presidential campaign, Barack Obama proposed an initiative to combat urban poverty called Promise Neighborhoods. A Promise Neighborhood (PN) is a multifaceted anti-poverty program that addresses the needs of children and their families in areas of concentrated poverty.

Obama drew inspiration from the accomplishments of Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ). Following HCZ’s successful model, each PN will implement a comprehensive and continuous “conveyor belt” of high-quality educational and social service programs to support children from birth through college. These linked programs will begin with prenatal classes for parents and intensive pre-K programming for children and continue through pre-collegiate programs for high school students. Promise Neighborhoods will also incorporate a wide range of after-school, health and nutrition, community revitalization, and other programs in an effort to radically transform an entire area.1

Since January 2009, the Chicago Policy Research Team (CPRT) in the Public Policy Studies Program at the University of Chicago has analyzed the possibility of implementing a Promise Neighborhood in Chicago through policy analysis and extensive field research. For more information, please visit our website: http://cprt.uchicago.edu.

Key Criteria for Locating a Promise Neighborhood

- **Concentrated Poverty and Minimum Population Threshold.** A PN candidate must have a substantial child poverty population (HCZ started with 3,000 and now serves over 8,000) and a childhood poverty rate of at least 40%, or 30% if the neighborhood has additional characteristics that create disadvantages for children.

- **Established Social Assets.** A PN candidate should already have established social assets, such as free clinics and after-school programs, or at least have no barriers to their development on a relatively short timeline. The area would also benefit from a strong partner/lead agency for program coordination, community outreach and, if there exists the capacity, evaluation.

- **Geographic Proximity and Accessibility.** A PN should not be geographically isolated, allowing for the possibility of future expansion. A PN candidate should be easily accessible by public transit and have access to cultural and academic resources such as museums and libraries.

- **Existing Infrastructure.** The process of choosing a PN should include consideration of the physical infrastructure available, especially existing schools or suitable locations for new schools.

- **Community Interest and Participation.** A PN will depend heavily upon the willing investment and participation of residents. Candidate areas should be comprised of populations who are receptive to a PN and are willing to make long-term investments in the initiative’s success.

Considering the importance of the HCZ’s model for the President’s Promise Neighborhoods initiative, we begin this report with an in-depth look at HCZ’s programs and philosophy.
1. HCZ History in the Context of the NYC Anti-Poverty Effort

1.1. History of the Harlem Children’s Zone

The Harlem Children’s Zone grew from the Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families. Rheedlen was an undistinguished charity until Geoffrey Canada joined as Education Director in 1983. Canada ascended to the position of CEO in 1990, and Rheedlen grew considerably under his leadership.

While these successes were considerable, Rheedlen’s leadership was concerned that its efforts were not comprehensive enough. Canada wanted to beat poverty itself, instead of helping some people get out of it. To this end, Rheedlen launched HCZ in 1997, and selected a geographically bound area to focus its efforts on.

Three questions were critical for the establishment of HCZ:

- What, specifically, did HCZ want to achieve, and how would it reach its goals?
- How would Rheedlen adapt its current programs and services to fit these new goals?
- What levels of funding and what performance metrics would be required?

To answer these questions, and to help HCZ realize its full potential, Canada retained The Bridgespan Group. The Bridgespan Group found that Rheedlen needed to streamline its processes and focus on a select geographic area.1 Thus, the shift from Rheedlen to HCZ represented a change in the organization’s goal: from a hodgepodge of programs grew an efficient, comprehensive organization.

Rheedlen’s leadership decided to focus on a 24-block area in Harlem and offer comprehensive services. This project became so instrumental to Rheedlen that in 2002, five years after this zone was created, the organization renamed itself the Harlem Children’s Zone. Along with this change came a shift in the organization’s administrative structure. Rather than allowing all members of the team to have direct access to Canada, HCZ moved towards a more corporate environment with many leadership positions.2

There are many important implications for replication of a PN to draw from the development of HCZ. First and foremost is the importance of a dynamic leader such as Geoffrey Canada to the success of the project. Not only did he make good organizational decisions, but he utilizes his social connections to secure private financing and political backing.

Canada’s success was in part due to his unique upbringing and personal ties to New York City. He grew up in South Bronx during the 1950s, and had to endure many of the same trying circumstances as those he would eventually try to help. Although Canada benefited from the efforts of his teachers, he was unable to succeed in the trying environment of South Bronx, and went to live in Long Island with his grandmother. There, he completed high school, went on to Bowdoin College, and eventually earned a Master’s Degree in Education from Harvard University.3
Of similar importance is HCZ Chairman of the Board, Stanley Druckenmiller. A former hedge fund manager, Druckenmiller has a net worth of nearly $3.5 billion. While he has declined to mention publicly his individual contribution to HCZ, Canada estimates it to be well over $100 million. This huge financial commitment can, in part, be traced back to Canada. Beyond his influence on the running of the organization, Canada inspires confidence in private donors, a critical element of HCZ.

In addition to vital leadership, the development of HCZ entailed a long period of continual honing which resulted in a far more efficient organization. When considering replication, it is imperative that one does not lose sight of the unique development of HCZ, and the sometimes fortuitous factors that came into play.

1.2. New York City’s Anti-Poverty Efforts

Early Childhood Programs

Many of the organizations and programs whose purpose is to combat problems facing young children are run through New York City’s Administration for Children’s Services (ACS). Instituted in 1996, it administers the largest government-funded childcare system in the country, serving approximately 75,000 children through hundreds of contracted private and non-profit daycare centers throughout the city. ACS also administers 250 Head Start centers in neighborhoods across New York City, one of which is the HCZ-run Harlem Gems program. The goal of the Head Start programs is to ameliorate the effects on low-income children of historical discrimination, poorly maintained and staffed schools, and the child-raising styles and techniques of many poor families. By teaching three- to five-year-olds the skills they will need in language, math, and science before they enter public school, as well as by providing health services and working with families, the Head Start Program prepares students to succeed.

Education

There are limited educational options available to Harlem students outside of HCZ. Student choices include poorly performing public schools and unsuccessful charter schools. The most successful New York City educational program for poor and minority students are schools run by the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP).

New York City Public Schools: Student test scores and graduation rates at these schools are low, especially for minority students. For example, only 40.2% of African American students graduated New York City high schools in 2005, compared to 75% of white students. The Harlem school district features nine elementary schools, two middle schools and one high school.

New York City Charter Schools: New York City charter schools have a mixed record of success. Traditionally, charter schools tend to outperform their peer public institutions. However, in 2004 a city report determined that “results at the John A. Reisenbach Charter School in Harlem were so poor that it should close. A second Harlem school, Sisulu Children's Academy, has had
mixed results and should get a probationary two-year extension.”

In essence, the Harlem charter school alternatives, outside of HCZ’s Promise Academies, are not significant improvements of the public school alternatives.

**The Knowledge is Power Program:** KIPP is an anti-poverty program that advertises itself as “a national network of free, open-enrollment, college-preparatory public schools with a track record of preparing students in underserved communities for success in college and in life.”

The KIPP organization solicits parents to enroll their children into KIPP-run public schools, promising strong teachers and additional class time, both in terms of days and hours per day. KIPP targets poor and minority students and consistently gets these traditionally low-scoring demographics to score above average on state tests and gets over 80% of alumni to attend college.

### After-school Efforts

New York City funds a variety of efforts to enrich the lives of its students during the time when they are not in school. Extensive research on the subject has shown that out-of-school time plays a key role in the development of youth. “National evaluations of school-community collaborations have shown that quality programs result in positive outcomes for youth.”

**Beacon Program:** The Beacon initiative “enables community-based, not-for-profit agencies to create school-based community centers as ‘safe havens’ providing stimulating, structured, supervised activities for children, youth and families in New York City neighborhoods.” These institutions are meant to build communities by providing extensive programs for students and adults during out-of-school time.

**Out-of-School Time Program:** The Out-of-School Time programs were started in 2005 and are composed of 644 free programs run through 200 community-based organizations. Serving as a more widespread implementation of the Beacon initiative, the Out-of-School Time programs served 78,364 youth aged 5-21 in 2006-2007, providing a variety of individual programs.

### Community Outreach

Though HCZ is not specifically cited as an influence, New York City’s Community Partnership Initiative (CPI) seems to have taken it as a model. Begun in the fall of 2006 and overseen by the ACS, CPI is part of the effort “to bring child welfare services closer to the community by engaging other community stakeholders in creating a safety net for every child and family.” To accomplish this throughout NYC, CPI brings disparate organizations together for the purpose of child welfare. Not only are these organizations brought together in a way that increases accessibility to all the services available for the neighborhood, but it also allows ACS to create a closer bond with the people who need them. The direct results of CPI’s efforts are “increased service coordination… [and a] movement toward a more honest, open dialogue between ACS and the community.” This initiative has currently been implemented in eleven communities across New York City; plans are underway to increase this number.
2. HCZ Model and Critique

2.1. HCZ Programs

The multifaceted HCZ model focuses on the comprehensive enrichment of the children and families of a specific community. In order to transform an entire neighborhood and to give children the best possible chance of succeeding, HCZ developed what Geoffrey Canada refers to as the conveyor belt system of programs. Each program leads directly into the next, creating a continuous network of education and support that spans from birth to college. Early childhood programs aimed at improving parenting, preventing diseases and nurturing brain development, begin as early as possible – even before the birth of the child.

Figure 2.1: Program Pipeline Overview

Early Childhood Programs

The Harlem Children’s Zone operates a wide array of early childhood programs. The Harlem Gems preschool program, the Baby College parenting workshops, and other programs like the HCZ Asthma Initiative seek to improve the lives of young children who are living in poverty. Though none of these programs are themselves revolutionary, the fact that their effects are carried through HCZ’s conveyor belt system could help prevent the fade-out phenomenon.

Baby College: First implemented in 2001, the Baby College offers a nine-week program of parenting workshop to expectant parents and to parents raising a child up to three-years-old. According to HCZ’s Business Plan, the Baby College program cost $639,629 in fiscal year 2003. The Baby College curriculum was created by experts in child rearing and child psychology, and seeks to educate low-income families regarding their child-raising practices. In 2008, 469 individuals participated in Baby College, of which 346 were evaluated on a number of criteria:

- 92.5% of respondents (320 of 346) said they had learned a lot from the classes.
- At post-test, 96.8% (333 of 344) had health insurance to pay for medical care for their children and 99.5% of parents (223 of 224) reported their children had up-to-date or scheduled immunizations.
At post-test, 97.4% of participants (339 of 348) reported having smoke detectors, and 95.0% of participants (324 of 341) reported having window guards.

At post-test, 94.4% of participants (318 of 337) reported having safety latches for cabinets, a significant increase from the 29.1% (94 of 337) at pre-test.

76.3% of parents who read to their children less often than 5 times per week at pre-test (71 of 93) increased the amount of time they spent reading to the children.

75.4% of parents who sang to their children less often than 5 times per week at pre-test (46 of 61) increased the amount of time they spent singing to the children.

Parents were more likely to agree that children could learn good discipline without being spanked at post-test (94.7%: 321 of 339) than at pre-test (88.5%: 300 of 339).

Harlem Gems Preschool Program: The Harlem Gems preschool program is an all-day pre-kindergarten program that HCZ founded in 2001. The HCZ Business Plan states that in fiscal year 2003, $526,149 was spent on Harlem Gems. Classes have a 4:1 child-to-adult ratio, teach English, Spanish and French, and run from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. HCZ operates three of these pre-kindergarten sites, Original Gems, Head Start, and Uptown Gems, which together serve over 250 children. HCZ has released evaluation information that shows an impressive amount of improvement among the 165 four-year-olds that were pre-tested in the fall of 2007 and post-tested in the spring of 2008. They were tested using the Bracken Basic Concept Scale – Revised, which has result classifications of ‘very delayed,’ ‘delayed,’ ‘average,’ ‘advanced,’ and ‘very advanced.’ According to the evaluation:

- At pre-test, 20% (33 of 165) of children had a school readiness classification of delayed or very delayed. At post-test, 93% of students (154 of 165) attained a school readiness classification of average or above.
- 70.3% (116 of 165) have higher school readiness scores and percentile rankings at post-test than at pre-test.
- 36.4% (60 of 165) made gains large enough to improve their school readiness classification.
- At pre-test, 27% of children (43 of 165) had a school readiness classification of advanced or very advanced; at post-test, 38% (62 of 165) were in these categories. For comparison, the expected percentage of students in the advanced or very advanced categories is 15.9%.

The HCZ Asthma Initiative: Asthma is one of the more common illnesses affecting children across the country, especially in low-quality urban housing. To combat this, the Harlem Children's Zone began its Asthma Initiative in 2001 with the goal of reducing the rates of asthma attacks and their negative consequences, like hospital visits and missed days of school. By 2008, they found that 30% of the surveyed children were either diagnosed with asthma or had symptoms of asthma. This result is significantly higher than the national average, which is around 5-7%.
The Asthma Initiative also reported its results:

- Children in the programs missed fewer days of school. At pre-test, 25.7% of children had missed school due to asthma in the previous 14 days. Thirty-six months later, only 6.8% had missed school due to asthma in the previous 14 days.
- Children in the programs made fewer emergency room visits. At pre-test, 45.7% of children had visited the emergency room for treatment of asthma in the last three months. Thirty-six months later, 14.8% of children had visited the emergency room for treatment of asthma in the last three months.
- More children were using daily preventive medication as prescribed. At pre-test, 44.2% were taking daily medication. Thirty-six months later, 65.9% took preventative medications daily.

The programs operated by HCZ in the area of early childhood appear to be having a positive effect on the enrolled children. If positive results can be maintained through the conveyor belt system, these early childhood programs will greatly impact their lives. The Baby College and Asthma Initiative programs, in particular, attempt to improve the students’ home lives, as well as their academic performance. Such programs make the HCZ early childhood efforts unique; the mission of the HCZ is to transform the circumstances of children, not just their test scores. If such aspirations are to be actualized in the Chicago Promise Neighborhood, then CPN implementers should incorporate programs such as these into its early childhood initiatives.

**Education**

To achieve his tipping point, Canada needed to do more than just make sure the children within the Zone started life on the conveyor belt. He needed to graduate enough children from college so that when they returned home, college-educated adults would become standard in the neighborhood. Canada believed that “the only way to save large numbers of poor children in a neighborhood like Harlem was to give them all a high-quality education, even the least motivated and least prepared, beginning at a very young age.” He determined that the conveyor belt needed a consistent educational program that ran through graduating high school and going to college. With the goal of saturating society with college graduates who had passed through the conveyor belt, education was at the heart of the whole HCZ program.

*Promise Academies*: Initially Canada worked with Harlem’s public school, providing services such as reading programs, computer labs and tutors. However, these programs had little effect on students’ test scores and sometimes met resistance from school administrations. Canada decided that HCZ must work outside of the public school system, so HCZ created its own charter schools, the Promise Academies, in 2004. They started with kindergarten and 6th grade classes, each with 100 students. The goal was to increase the size of the elementary and middle schools by one class size each year, adding a high school when the oldest students reached that point. The schools eventually branched out into a series of schools that serve the neighborhood today.

The five Promise Academies currently established are:


Canada and KIPP: A logical model for the Promise Academies would have been the KIPP schools. They were the leading national organization for running successful charter schools aimed at poor and minority students. However, Geoffrey Canada had important philosophical differences with KIPP's methodology:

- KIPP emphasizes that they “build a partnership among parents, students, and teachers that puts learning first.”12 However, Canada’s goal of rescuing an entire neighborhood from poverty could not rely on active parental involvement. KIPP lets parents self-select, such that the majority of their applicant pool are students with parents already actively involved in their children’s education.
- KIPP schools do not saturate neighborhoods. Canada’s goal was not to help a few children beat the odds, but to change society as a whole. In this case, creating an upper segment of high achievers would be insufficient.

For these reasons, Canada sought to create his own program to educate Harlem’s youth.

Methodology of Promise Academies: Classes at the Promise Academies are small in size and run from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., with after-school programs lasting until 6:00 p.m. Promise Academies operate under extended school years to maximize the educational rigor to which their students are subjected. There is a very strong emphasis placed on getting as close as possible to 100% of students at or above grade level on statewide exams. To this end, students are provided with two hours literacy and ninety minutes math focus daily and there are additional classes for students who are behind. Each classroom has a minimum of two adults, and teachers are required to have a Bachelor’s Degree and New York State teaching certification. The Promise Academies also feature a clear disciplinary structure and place an emphasis on group work.

Successes of Promise Academies

- 93% of Promise Academy I students tested at or above grade level on the math exam, outperforming their peers in New York State (NYS), New York City (NYC), and District 5 and African American students throughout the state.
- All (100%) Promise Academy II third graders met or exceeded the standards, outperforming their peers in all comparative groupings.
- Promise Academy II was one of 9 NYC Charter Schools and 14 NYS Charter Schools to receive perfect scores in math for third grade.
- Promise Academy I third graders outperformed NYC and District 5 peers, as well as African American students in NYS.
- Promise Academy II students showed strong performance in ELA, outperforming NYS, NYC, District 5, and African American third grade students throughout the state.13
After-School Programs

As part of its comprehensive plan to provide services to those in need, as well as its goal of turning around central Harlem, Harlem Children’s Zone provides a variety of programs targeted towards children when they are not in school. These programs are active not only after-school, but also before school, during weekends, and during the summer.

HCZ’s out-of-school time programs are an integral part of the Zone as a whole. These programs provide the tutoring and college support to help those who have not been part of HCZ since birth to catch up. The programs also supply the enrichment opportunities and college counseling to provide the opportunities that children living in these areas would not otherwise have. [Annual costs of each program are included in brackets below next to the program name].

**Peacemakers [$1,796,144]:** Harlem Children’s Zone employs workers ages 18-24 years in the local schools and in HCZ out-of-school time initiatives, whether through area Beacons or through the school they are working. Peacemakers are selected from around the country to serve in the Harlem Children’s Zone as role models for those in the Zone.

**A Cut Above:** A program designed for those within HCZ not enrolled in the Promise Schools, A Cut Above focuses on middle school students, but also provides support during the high school admittance process, high school, the college admittance process, and college.

**TRUCE Fitness and Nutrition [$475,854]:** In this program, middle school students are given a program that not only provides academic assistance and high school preparation, but a fitness-based curriculum designed to teach healthier lifestyles.

**TRUCE Arts and Media [$961,132]:** With a focus on the arts, the TRUCE Arts and Media program provides an opportunity for high school students to express themselves creatively and provides academic support throughout high school and the college application process.

**Employment and Technology Center (ETC) [$698,152]:** Focusing on computer skills, job readiness, and internships, the ETC serves high school students. The program offers tutoring and counseling to help students achieve in high school and to prepare them for college.

**College Success Office (CSO):** Developed for college support, the CSO works with high school students to prepare them for college, helping students apply for scholarships and grants and providing scholarships and support when none is available. The CSO continues its relationship with students who have entered college, advising them and offering academic and financial support in an effort to prevent students from dropping out of college.

Other Harlem Children’s Zone Projects

**Beacon Community Centers:** HCZ operates two Beacon community centers and one community center not recognized as an official Beacon program: the Countee Cullen Beacon, the Booker T. Washington Beacon, and the HCZ Community Center. The two Beacons, according to HCZ’s 2003 data, cost $2,293,546 combined. Situated in and around the HCZ Project, these Beacons provide community meeting places as well as a variety of cultural and academic enrichment opportunities for students. Although not specifically part of the HCZ Project, these community centers...
centers provide many of the same academic opportunities offered by some of the programs in the HCZ Project to those who would not otherwise have a chance to experience them. The HCZ Beacons work in conjunction with other HCZ programs and supplement elementary and middle school support, as well as provide some high school and college support. Beacons thus provide some overlap with the HCZ Project with regards to after-school activities, but they are essential pieces of the HCZ puzzle when it comes transforming the broader community.

**Community Outreach Programs**

Harlem Children's Zone’s focus is naturally on the children within their 97 blocks, but supporting and involving the entire community is also an integral part of the HCZ mission.

_Foster Care Prevention Services:_ Foster care prevention services are contracted out to HCZ from ACS. HCZ is aided by the fact that its comprehensiveness means that families in the Zone easily have some sort of contact with HCZ, and can drop in at any time to take advantage of any of its services. HCZ occupies a uniquely qualified position to help stabilize households through “coordination with the foster care agency… Harlem Children's Zone will outreach to the family prior to discharge to explain Harlem Children's Zone services and programs.”

A stable family environment is key in preventing foster care and smoothing the process of reunification when a child returns home from foster care. HCZ’s high rating of success with ACS has led to more families being placed in direct care with HCZ. HCZ’s foster care prevention services falls into five programs, as shown in the figure below.

Again emphasizing the importance of place-based services, “the Harlem Children's Zone believes that key to understanding a family is understanding the community in which they live.” As embodied in the recently implemented Community Partners Initiative of ACS discussed above, foster care prevention works best through community-based organizations.

**Figure 2.2: Foster Care Prevention Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy Prevention ([$564,830])</td>
<td>Serves 90 families with at-risk children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Family Development Program ([$1,884,668])</td>
<td>Serves 120 families, specializes in mental health services and therapies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project CLASS (Clean Living And Staying Sober) ([$461,996])</td>
<td>Serves 50 families, specializes in drug treatment services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Family Support Center ([$758,490])</td>
<td>Serves 90 families, specializes in crisis interventions services and parenting groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown Family Place ([$465,943])</td>
<td>Serves 45 families, provides comprehensive services in Hell’s Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beacon Community Centers: The three community centers run by the Harlem Children’s Zone primarily serve as an after-school haven for children. However, the Beacons also serve adults in the community. “HCZ has developed a model of service delivery, which allows parents to ‘shop’ for the needs of their families under one roof.” Service delivery is just one of three levels at which the Beacons provide services to adults:

**Figure 2.3: Beacons Level of Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Services Supports</th>
<th>On-site social services, provides referrals to various HCZ programs as well as outside organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Social Gatherings and Workshops</td>
<td>Hosts family dinners, block parties, dance and sports classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Programmatic Components</td>
<td>Includes parent computer training, parent support programs and family video nights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HCZ’s Beacons also provide Substance Abuse Preventive Services. In fact, “[b]oth Beacons were intentionally located on blocks with heavy drug trafficking and are dedicated to providing positive alternatives to substance abuse.” Another advantage of the Beacons is the ability to refer families impacted by substance abuse to Project CLASS, part of HCZ’s foster care prevention services.

Though they serve far fewer adults than children, HCZ’s Beacons still strive to provide useful services to the adults in the community, regardless of whether or not they are parents.

SingleStop USA: SingleStop is an organization that began in New York City, and then continued to expand throughout the U.S. The basic premise is that many of the working poor do not take full advantage of the resources available to them. “Recent data confirms the public benefits system is vastly underused, especially by the working poor.” At SingleStop, people can find out quickly what aid they qualify for that they may have previously been unaware of through a web-based program, the self-sufficiency calculator. Experts are available to help in applying for these benefits, as well as providing general financial and legal advice. HCZ runs three full-service SingleStop locations. Like HCZ’s own programs, SingleStop puts the emphasis on prevention of poverty’s ill effects rather than intervention after the fact. This philosophy is aimed at helping people break out of the cycle and stabilize their situation rather than allowing some setback that leads them deeper into poverty. SingleStop is almost exclusively focused on economic benefits such as tax credits and government subsidies.

Community Pride: Community Pride is the only branch of the Harlem Children’s Zone that is targeted at adults. The purpose of Community Pride is to revitalize Harlem as a neighborhood through community organizing and housing stabilization. The costs for fiscal year 2003 of Community Pride were $396,680. “Community Pride aimed not only to create and cultivate social capital, but to spend it on rebuilding Harlem, inside and out.” Community Pride’s success stems largely from its open-to-everybody community meetings and its desire to listen to
the residents of the community. Residents are then – it is hoped – more invested in creating a vibrant community that is conducive to the success of the children living there. Community Pride’s outreach workers knock on doors and meet regularly to discuss outreach strategies. They take an asset-based approach, getting to know the families, then the building, and then the block, to have a good idea of what the community is involved in.

2.2. HCZ Finance

Figure 2.4 below is a broad summary of Harlem Children’s Zone’s financials. By 2007, HCZ was well developed in terms of programs, staff, outreach, and growth. Thus, the figures represent a large and comprehensive neighborhood program. HCZ’s massive budget reveals its sheer size; its total revenue in June 2007 was almost $70M, and its expenses were close to $40M. The positive end-of-year balance reveals the organization’s profitability and sustainability.

Figure 2.4: Timeline of Harlem Children’s Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Summary (Fiscal Year Ending 06/2007)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage of Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Contributions</td>
<td>$68,723,455</td>
<td>98.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Short Term Investments</td>
<td>$340,899</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of Assets</td>
<td>$292,153</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net of Special Events/Activities</td>
<td>-$66,578</td>
<td>-0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$132,110</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,422,039</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and General Expenses</td>
<td>$7,811,754</td>
<td>19.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td>$30,506,330</td>
<td>77.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Expenses</td>
<td>$834,912</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,152,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEO Compensation (approx)</strong></td>
<td>$355,819</td>
<td>This is approximately 1% of total revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Year Balance</strong></td>
<td>$30,269,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points**

Reviewing HCZ’s annual budgets and expenditures proved to be very helpful for two reasons: First, for understanding how the financing changed as years passed and programs grew, and second, for
understanding in retrospect what worked and what did not. The following are the key takeaways and lessons learned from HCZ’s financial snapshot.

- 78% of HCZ’s expenses are for program services.
- HCZ’s ratio of total revenue to program expenses (FY 2007) is 2.28.
- HCZ’s fundraising efficiency is 0.0121 [fundraising expenses/direct contributions].
- HCZ’s average annual growth rate of program expenses from 2003 to 2007 is approximately 27%.
- The special events and activities held in 2007, which were independent of fundraising and programs, incurred a loss of $66,578.
- Mr. Canada has been quoted to say that 20% to 30% of HCZ’s annual revenue has come from Wall Street in recent years.31
- Other organizations that are comparable in mission statements and type of programs, while much smaller in size and budget, are able to (on average) maintain a higher percentage of program expenses versus administrative costs.

Budget History and Growth

In 2000, Rheedlen (now known as HCZ) collaborated with The Bridgespan Group, a non-profit strategy-consulting firm, to create a nine-year business plan comprised of three distinct three-year phases. As explained in Bridgespan’s HCZ Case Study, Phase I (2001-2003) would be devoted to refining the basic program model, while Phase II (2004-2006) and Phase III (2007-2009) would focus on systematic expansions of the HCZ model.

Figure 2.5: Projected/Actual Operating Budget of HCZ (in millions)
Key Points

- From 1999 to 2003, HCZ’s budget realized a 20% compound annual growth rate (CAGR).
- Anticipated CAGR of 17% between 2003 and 2009.
- While the CAGR between 2003 and 2007 was actually 27%, HCZ overestimated the size of the budget by $3M in 2004, $5M in 2005, and $6M in 2007.

Primary Expenditures: Phase I

The majority of the $43M of this phase was used to make investments in technology and infrastructure, to get four new programs off the ground, and to create a distinct evaluation department within the management team. This evaluation department would prove critical for HCZ’s success; the consistent hard data it produced on the performance and future growth of HCZ programs were the most compelling fundraising tools.

Primary Expenditures: Phase II

The creation of the HCZ Promise Academy Charter School in 2004 would comprise the largest portion of this phase’s $74M budget, followed by the expansion of five programs, the creation of a Beacon-like services program at the Promise Academy, the establishment of the Practitioner’s Institute, and the launch of several health initiatives ranging from dental hygiene to smoking cessation techniques. It is important to note that Beacon services are very cheap per child because they require low overhead costs and maintain high participant-to-staff ratios.

Primary Expenditures: Phase III

There was no single overwhelming expenditure in this phase. Instead, HCZ simply planned to continue to expand its services northward in Harlem to serve an additional 3,100 children. By 2009, they hoped to reach 16,000 children overall. They estimated that this additional expansion would cost $110M.

2.3. HCZ Programs Critique

Early Education

The HCZ early childhood programs have many of the same evaluation problems as the organization’s other areas. The facts that these are relatively new programs and that HCZ has not published much evaluation information means that it is difficult to see exactly how effective these initiatives actually are. The available data looks promising, but much of it is published in HCZ’s fundraising material, so it is possible that negative outcomes are being suppressed.

Education

The Promise Academies have been largely successful, but have suffered some setbacks and been subject to criticism. The initial plan for the Promise Academy middle school students to advance
each year until entering a Promise Academy high school was delayed when initial test results were poor. This was taken by HCZ to indicate that starting with a class of students in 6th grade who have had a normal public school education beforehand was insufficient and incompatible with the conveyor belt strategy favored by Canada. The organization had promised the families of these students that they would educate them until they moved into college, but had to go back on this promise; this represented an early setback for HCZ.

A principle criticism of HCZ is its great focus on test results as the only performance metric. Especially in its initial stages, the first Promise Academy spent countless hours specifically preparing students for statewide exams in order to have them score well enough to stay a viable school. Some research suggests that these test results are not a measure of true learning. The International Reading Association (IRA) defines high-stakes testing as tests for which “the consequences for good (high) or poor (low performance) on a test are substantial.” HCZ certainly fits this mold, as the organization risks losing its substantial private financing should it not produce tangible test results. The IRA’s principal criticism is that, “in too many cases, the assessment is a single multiple-choice test, which would be considered high stakes and would not yield enough information to make an important instructional decision.” However, it must be noted that rigorous testing will provide consistent and fair data for constant program evaluations, which is arguably essential for improvements and implementation success. A balance between achieving education goals and program success must be found.

Finally, the Promise Academies attempt to serve as many students as possible from the Zone, regardless of background. This means that many students receive little or no parental guidance, to the point of parents believing that HCZ can raise their kids for them and they need not play a role in their children’s upbringing. This is the cost of working with all families, rather than only those willing to take on contractual obligations, like those demanded by KIPP schools.

Access to and Data on After-school Programs

It is important to consider whether HCZ programs are effective programs that have an impact on the lives of their participants. Looking at best practices and ideal structure, HCZ calls for a planned curriculum as well as trained staff that include teachers, community members, specialists, and older students that can serve as role models. What is unclear is the quantity of children helped by these programs. Numbers for these programs are not made available, but the few numbers released indicate that the more comprehensive programs such as TRUCE only enroll a small proportion of the youth in the area.

Community Outreach Programs

It is difficult to make concrete evaluations about the effectiveness of community outreach programs because they are so disparate. Clearly for those who participate, these programs are beneficial. But despite Community Pride’s intensive outreach efforts, these programs still require community residents to put some effort into utilizing these various programs. However, having these programs available under one umbrella has made it easier for those who most want to help themselves.
2.4. HCZ Finance Critique

Costs

- High overhead costs: for FY 2006, HCZ’s pure overhead costs accounted for 11.8% of the expenses.
- High consultant fees: in FY 2007, HCZ spent close to $1.5M on consultant fees.\(^3\)
- Expensive to produce evaluation metrics: over $250,000 spent per year to produce metrics.\(^4\)
  While these data are essential in order to raise funds, they do eat into the funds they raise.
- High building costs: HCZ spent around $41M on a new headquarter site in Harlem.

Strategy

- Growth is highly dependent on funding relationships with foundations and institution leaders; while this is common, it may be a weakness if circumstances in leadership, reputation, or donor’s attitudes change.
- Relies heavily on money that is available only in times of economic prosperity: HCZ has lost millions in the fallout of the current economic crisis, and Canada does not yet have a plan of action to dictate how the organization will emerge from the economic downturn.\(^4\)
3. Social Scientific Basis for a Promise Neighborhood

This section takes a step back from the specific context of the Harlem Children’s Zone to examine the social scientific basis for a Promise Neighborhood as an educational and anti-poverty strategy. An *early, concentrated, and comprehensive* approach to anti-poverty and educational interventions is integral to the HCZ approach. We describe the social scientific case for the importance of these three particular aspects, which have been shown to contribute not only to improved academic performance, but also to high net benefits for society as a whole.

**Early Intervention**

Early intervention is important due to the effects of early brain development on future ability. Studies have shown that early intervention leads to diminished crime rates.

*Early Experiences Affect Developing Brain Architecture:* Neural circuits in the brain are “wired” by the collective influences of genetics, environment and experience. Growing up in an impoverished environment may alter the biochemistry and architecture of neural circuits and increase the risk for learning and behavioral impairment later in life.

*Intervention is Most Effective at a Young Age:* The later cognitive intervention is, the less effective it is. There is a critical period in a child’s development during which cognitive adjustment can occur. The first three years of a child’s life is a time of rapid cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and motor development. Between the ages of three and five, increasingly complex social and emotional behaviors and skills begin to develop. Without intensive intervention during this critical period in a child’s development, behavioral and cognitive disparities will continue to magnify in children of lower socio-economic classes.

*Early Intervention Benefits All of Society:* Children from disadvantaged homes are statistically more likely to commit crime, have out-of-wedlock births and drop out of school. High-quality early intervention programs can diminish the likelihood of such side effects.

- **Crime:** Early intervention reduces crime by targeting the risk factors that lead to crime: dropping out of school, poor family background, lack of marketable skills, etc.
- **Workforce illiteracy:** American productivity and economic growth will be significantly hindered without skills improvements amongst the U.S. workforce. Approximately 20% of the US workforce is functionally illiterate, a much higher proportion than in the leading European nations, and this hurts U.S. competitiveness internationally. Early intervention can reverse this trend, producing a more literate—and therefore more competitive—workforce.
- **Positive rate of returns:** Cost-benefit analyses of early intervention programs conclude that they exhibit an annual rate of return of 16%. For comparison, a typical business investment in the US would exhibit a pre-tax rate of return of less than 10%. Of this 16%, 4% is for participants of early intervention programs and 12% is for society at large.
Comprehensive

Comprehensive programs are designed to counter the fade-out effect, which occurs as students who have received early intervention support lose their earlier achievement advantages as they are reincorporated into low-quality schools where they do not continue such intervention programs. A comprehensive method must provide support for levels of education above pre-kindergarten and for after-school hours. An ideal program would place the students into higher-quality schools with multiple layers of support that extend from morning through evening.

*Fade-out Effect:* Though early childhood education has many noted benefits for its participants, it is not sufficient in itself to combat the inequities and difficulties presented by childhood poverty. Research on child-focused early education programs shows that children who complete these programs have an initial average IQ advantage of eight points over children who do not complete these programs. This IQ advantage fades as the children enter formal schooling, however, until the IQ scores converge.\(^7\)

*The Complementary Nature of Early and Grade-School Education:* Examination of one particular early education program, Head Start, reveals why this fade-out phenomenon occurs. Lee et al. (1995) found that, after socioeconomic status and family background are taken into account, the reason former Head Start attendees experienced the fade-out phenomenon was due to their attendance at lower-quality schools in contrast to their counterparts who did not attend Head Start.\(^8\) Thus, no matter how much of an advantage Head Start initially gave its students, its benefits were continuously eroded by low-quality grade schools. By 3rd or 4th grade, the earlier advantage had diminished entirely. Lee et al. found that this decline is particularly rapid for those children who completed Head Start but did not participate in any type of follow-up program.\(^9\)

Such research on the fade-out phenomenon makes a strong argument that early childhood education alone is not enough to bring urban, low-income children out of poverty. Since research into childhood development shows that an achievement gap exists between low-income children and their higher-income peers even before formal schooling start, it is necessary to couple early childhood education with quality K-12 schooling. Addressing all of these issues successfully requires a comprehensive program that continues through grade school but also provides substantial after-school and perhaps weekend activities. The broader social setting must be addressed with particular attention to structure and security (e.g., fostering a stable family life, establishing regular homework time, providing a safe place to meet friends).

Concentrated

While comprehensive and early programming make up a significant portion of the Harlem Children’s Zone’s mission statement, perhaps the most unique aspect of HCZ is that the program targets children in a specific geographic zone. Concentrating the efforts of anti-poverty programs within one neighborhood targets a relatively high percentage of children within that neighborhood, thereby attempting to undo structural poverty through a community-centered approach.

*Logistical Advantage:* Both poverty and neighborhoods have spatial components, making them a natural combination. The target population is easily defined, it is accessible, and the program can be readily evaluated and held accountable.\(^10\) As a result, any programs will have
higher penetration rates and fewer families falling through the cracks. Combining early education and a concentrated neighborhood approach is designed to result in a “critical mass” of engaged, educated families and intervention that can change the growth trajectory of a child raised in a troubled neighborhood. When programs, such as Workfare, require that those in need opt in rather than opt out, those who are most in need tend not to take advantage of anti-poverty programs. By reaching the majority of residents in a specific community, the goal is to create a “tipping point” that will change the social characteristics of the neighborhood.

*Theoretical Justification:* Theories of poverty causation include individual explanations, in which individuals find themselves in poverty as a result of their own actions, as well as structural explanations, which theorizes that the environment plays a major role in producing and reproducing poverty. Geographically-concentrated poverty, however, has grown since 1970, prompting studies on the existence of neighborhood effects – including the impact of growing up in neighborhoods that lack certain social, educational, and economic resources. There is a significant body of research that points to lower educational achievement and higher dropout rates in inner city areas. If achievement and community are irrevocably linked, it becomes necessary to fight poverty as a spatial target.

**Concluding Thoughts**

We believe that the *early, comprehensive, and concentrated* approach of HCZ is one of the most important reasons for its successes to date. Based on a substantial body of social scientific research, this approach constitutes the most necessary aspect of HCZ for successful replication in Chicago and other cities. The following sections provide more specific best practices that could be applied in a CPN in education, administration, and finance.
4. Best Practices to Adopt in a Promise Neighborhood

4.1. Best Practices: Education and Program Services

The following sections discuss some general best practices useful for a CPN in the areas of education, program services, administration, and finance. The ideas in these sections are colored by the experience of HCZ, but primarily originate from outside research and expert knowledge; our intent is to give a broad guide to assist program implementers.

It is important to emphasize that these practices are simply guidelines that require adaptation to real-world settings. Past educational reforms have often suffered from taking best practices as ideology. While we believe that these guidelines may be helpful to policy designers and implementers, each situation is unique; it is the responsibility of local leadership to evaluate the particular challenges of their neighborhood and to tailor programs accordingly.

The most salient aspect of program implementation that best practices cannot address is how to negotiate the unique social and political structures of each neighborhood. In the past, educational reform policies have often neglected to consider social issues within schools like trust, respect, territoriality, competition for resources and responsibilities, and race, only to fail in implementation as a result (see, for example, Charles M. Payne, So Much Reform, So Little Change: The Persistence of Failure in Urban Schools). These issues are particularly relevant to CPN implementers, as they would need to navigate not only the social infrastructure of each school, but also the existing relationships and those that would be created among the many agencies and institutions involved.

Education

This section identifies and describes some critical factors that distinguish high-performing schools and educational programs from underperforming ones, and identifies some basic strategies that schools can use to attain better results. Though it is an extremely general survey across the entire field of educational best practices, it is primarily intended as an introduction for policymakers to some of the most salient differences between strong educational systems and the dysfunctional ones that afflict many low-income neighborhoods. This section’s primary source of information is a review of relevant social science research, but also includes suggestions drawn from case studies, feasibility studies, and from interviews with Chicago education experts and school principals.

Evidence from social science research that there are five key factors that distinguish high-performing schools from underperforming schools: discipline, school and social infrastructure, staff development and support, curriculum, and parent-community involvement. Some factors, such as student motivation, and parent-community involvement, are specifically affected by the outreach and conveyor belt strategy of the Promise Neighborhood, while factors like curriculum and schools' internal social networks are important for establishing a good educational system but are not specifically addressed as part of the HCZ model. Although identified independently, these five factors strongly resemble another more commonly known set of five factors identified by the Consortium on Chicago School Research, which we take as an independent confirmation of their validity. After discussing these five factors, we take a closer look at early childhood education by comparing two successful early education programs.
Discipline

One of the keys to success in Chicago Public Schools is in understanding and following the rules and policies that are conducive to a positive and safe learning environment. To ensure consistency and clarity in following CPS policy, the Chicago Board of Education developed the Student Code of Conduct (SCC) that is implemented in every CPS school. The SCC lists a number of examples of inappropriate behavior, with disciplinary responses that range from preventive teacher-student conferences to expulsion or alternative school placement.

The SCC clearly sets out the role of discipline in education as “instructional and corrective, not punitive.” Even in the case of behavioral offenses where students pose a threat to the school community, practices like “Alternative School Placement” reflect the philosophy of restorative justice that has been established in CPS. The uniform implementation and public availability of these practices is vital so that there is no ambiguity in what actions are deemed appropriate and are to be anticipated when students violate the SCC.

Codification and awareness of school policies is a practice common to many programs. Regular recitation of core goals or short songs that include the core goals of the school is a staple in several charter schools or other independently-run schools such as the KIPP schools and Urban Prep Academies in Chicago, a practice that may be beneficial to begin throughout CPS. The reasoning behind this practice is to instill a sense of purpose and accountability in and outside of the classroom.

Student self-evaluations and individual meetings are another practice that helps foster a motivated student body. Setting goals with children allows them to accomplish specific feats, increasing their satisfaction with school. This strategy has been successfully used with the male high school students at the Urban Prep Academy.2

Additionally, studies conducted by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) find that higher positive care-giving ratings and frequencies are associated with more non-authoritarian instruction and child rearing.3 Non-authoritarian instruction includes warm, caring interactions between teachers and children, in which teachers effectively praise and avoid criticizing children. Positive care-giving ratings mean that children are more engaged in the classroom and learn material in an effective and lasting manner.

Social and School Infrastructure

One of the most pronounced differences between a struggling school and a relatively successful one can be seen in the social infrastructure of the institution. Many reports have independently concluded that schools that promote a democratic atmosphere and where strong relationships between students, teachers, and administrators are the norm have better performance records.

In a personal interview, Charles Payne highlighted problems that arise when an adequate social network is not established. Schools often become dominated by strong personalities, and when there is inadequate infrastructure, there are fewer constraints on their behavior.4 Problems within the social and administrative infrastructure of schools are also manifested through inadequate allocation of resources, both physical and human, and difficulty in making and maintaining positive changes.5
Staff Development and Support

Teachers must be provided with periodic subject- and grade-specific professional development that give them specific strategies for teaching, advice on how to manage their classrooms, knowledge of the subject they are teaching, and hands-on experience. This professional development is particularly important in urban, low-income schools where teachers frequently teach subjects with which they have limited familiarity and teacher turnover is particularly high.

Maintaining effective teacher to student ratios is vital to building an intimate and quality early childhood environment. The high rates of teacher turnover in urban high-poverty schools (roughly 22% per year) interrupt the growth of skill and experience among staff and disrupt school cohesion. Promise Neighborhood schools should address the problem by attacking proximate factors for teacher resignation, including holding down class sizes to prevent teachers from feeling overwhelmed, increasing salaries and fringe benefits, enforcing high standards for student discipline, allowing faculty input into the school decision-making process (particularly over student behavioral rules), and providing teachers with opportunities for advancement within the school.

Postsecondary education is crucial for teachers specializing in early childhood education, particularly for those working in poorly-funded schools. To promote a quality-learning environment, lead teachers must have at least attained a BA postsecondary degree. In a comparative study, early childhood teachers without permits scored significantly lower on teaching assessments than those with a Master Teacher Permit, BA, or higher.

A strong and cohesive network of support and administrative personnel is necessary to help assist early childhood teachers and promote early childhood program quality. A particularly successful model for developing such a network of support personnel is the High/Scope Foundation’s professional development program called Training of Trainers (TOT). The TOT initiative demonstrates that teachers trained through systematic in-service training over and above their formal education promote a high-quality early childhood education environment that has lasting effects. In the High/Scope model professional trainers work with teachers through a 120-hour program called the Preschool Curriculum Course (PCC). The PCC spans an extended period of time so that teachers can practice what they are learning in the PCC in their classrooms. Teachers are provided with an extensive body of material, including texts, audiovisual materials, study guides and assessment tools.

Curriculum

The curriculum in a PN school should be standards-based and utilize research-proven methods of instruction. Moreover, a curriculum should go beyond just establishing benchmarks and providing examples of best practices that are loosely implemented. Predictable and structured activities are key to promoting an effective early childhood environment. The curriculum should encompass a comprehensive set of instructor and student materials, such as daily activities, lesson plans, and larger projects.

Early childhood intervention must be comprehensive to make a substantive and prolonged impact on a child’s development. To achieve this comprehensiveness, the curriculum for early childhood education programs should target multiple domains of development. These domains, based on the High/Scope curriculum model, include: language and literacy, mathematics and science, social-
emotional development, physical development and the arts.

Research performed by the Center for Social Services Research (CSSR) has led to similar conclusions for education beyond kindergarten as well. Their reports show that schools that emphasized not only fundamentals such as vocabulary, grammar, and basic math skills, but also integrated higher-level thinking had much greater levels of success.\textsuperscript{14} For example, at Murray Language Academy, a high performing public elementary school in Hyde Park, Chicago, children are required to take ‘thinking notes’ for all readings, and are given critical thinking assignments across all subjects. The emphasis on literature and critical thinking skills, coupled with a focus on fundamentals, provides a more engaging curriculum for the children and contributes to a well-rounded learning environment.

In secondary school, a curriculum focused on college admissions is a powerful way not only to direct the school’s resources but also to promote student motivation: in many schools, one of the most salient differences between high- and low-achieving students is that the low-achievers cannot visualize how school is relevant to them and their futures.\textsuperscript{15} A curriculum that focuses on and reinforces the importance of the final goal can be a powerful antidote to this problem.

Early childhood intervention, in particular, must be comprehensive to make a substantive and prolonged impact on a child’s development.\textsuperscript{16} To achieve this comprehensiveness, the curriculum for early childhood education programs should target multiple domains of development. These domains, based on the High/Scope curriculum model, include: language and literacy, mathematics and science, social-emotional development, physical development and the arts. Not only are scholastic activities important at an early age, but recent research has also shown that non-cognitive abilities are important predictors of scholastic outcomes later in a child’s development.\textsuperscript{17} Such non-cognitive traits include perseverance, motivation, self-esteem, self-control and conscientiousness, all of which begin to form at the age of three.

Parent-Community Involvement

Schools in which parents are actively involved with the education of their children – not just at home but in the form of collective cooperation with other parents and school faculty – tend to do much better than schools without this involvement.\textsuperscript{18} At home, parents have a tremendous influence on their children’s learning, through everything from homework help to goal setting. At school, parental involvement is crucial, but problems emerge when mistrust and low mutual expectations between parents and school faculty arise.\textsuperscript{19}

Coupling these two hindrances together creates severe obstacles in a child’s educational livelihood. For this reason, early childhood intervention must necessarily be supplemented by outreach to parents. The most important element of any strategy to promote parent involvement is, in the words of one CPS school principal, “outreach, outreach, outreach, outreach... and more outreach.”\textsuperscript{20} Specific practices schools can adopt are encouraging parents to volunteer, involving parents in school decision-making, and organizing parent workshops.\textsuperscript{21} In the context of a Promise Neighborhood, encouraging early parental involvement through programs like Baby College can have advantageous effects on later parent participation.

Early childhood intervention centers must develop sustained and positive home-school relationships
and can make a concerted effort to reach out to parents through initiatives like periodic home visits. Obtaining parental input through focus groups, surveys or parent councils is important to integrating parents into the school environment and providing curriculum workshops and learning resources to parents allows them to extend the learning environment into children’s homes. Assisting parents and families in finding community and social services further strengthens the relationships formed between parents and teachers.

**Final Thoughts on the Elements of Educational Success**

High-performing schools require these five elements – discipline, school and social infrastructure, staff development and support, curriculum, and parent-community involvement – to work in concert with one another. A good school has strong moral objectives that are inherent in the school's purpose, adopts standards, programs, and curricula that regulate and reinforce these values, employs faculty and administrators who are willing to continue their investments in education and offers resources to ensure the maximum output of these investments. Good schools also involve parents and leaders who are willing to collaborate with the schools to incorporate the purpose and objectives of the school into the values of the community.

**Comparison of Early Childhood Programs: Lessons Learned**

Much early childhood intervention research for children living in poverty is based on three specific early childhood programs that have been intensively evaluated. These programs are the Perry Preschool Experiment, which was conducted in the 1960s and aimed at poor African American children in Michigan, the Abecedarian Project, which was implemented in the 1970s and was largely modeled off of the Perry program (though it differed from Perry in certain key aspects), and the Chicago-Child Parent Center, which began in 1967 and still continues to serve public schools located in impoverished Chicago neighborhoods. All three of these programs differed in methodologies and results, and some comparative statistics from the programs are provided below:

**Figure 4.1: Methodologies and Results of the Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Abecedarian</th>
<th>Perry Preschool</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Entry and Exit Age</td>
<td>4 mos-5 yrs</td>
<td>3yrs-4yrs</td>
<td>3yrs-4yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program hours/day, days/week</td>
<td>8, 5</td>
<td>2.5, 5</td>
<td>2.5, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks/year, years</td>
<td>50, 5</td>
<td>35, 2</td>
<td>35, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Program Participants v Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placed in Special Ed</td>
<td>25% v 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained in Grade</td>
<td>31% v 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>67% v 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested by Age 21</td>
<td>45% v 41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Perry Preschool Project had more substantial effects in decreasing future crime rates of program participants. This reduction is due to the non-cognitive aspects of the Perry programming, which taught children to make plans and anticipate consequences. The other two programs neglected such non-cognitive effects.23

Intervention can begin as early as age four months. The Abecedarian program, which began intervention earlier than the other two programs, showed marginal superiority in academic outcomes. This result suggests that the earlier the intervention is the better its effects.

In terms of time intensity of the programs, it is important to again look to the Abecedarian program, which was more intensive and lasted longer than the other two programs, and placed significantly fewer students in special education and retained more in their original grades.

The CPC program is specifically tailored to serve students in low-income areas not served by Head Start or similar early intervention programs. It is the oldest extended early childhood program receiving federal funding in the United States. The program has three conditions for eligibility: the child must live in a community receiving Title I funding, the child must not be enrolled in any other program, and lastly, the parent of the child must commit at least on half-day per week, though many parents do not participate to this extent. The program seeks to find the neediest children and to avoid self-selection, a possible explanation for the discrepancies in graduation rates apparent in Figure 4.1.24
4.2. Best Practices: Administration

CPN Administration

The structure of a CPN administration will have direct impact on the character of the programs that administration implements, and should therefore be intentionally designed to support a CPN’s mission, values, and goals. Best practice recommendations for how to design this administration and define its role are drawn from precedent and sociological research in non-profit, business, and government administration.

Choices in designing an administration

The following are task-based concerns CPN should take into consideration in designing the administrative structure:

1. Defining and evaluating CPN’s specific mission, values, and goals
2. Defining success and appropriate measures of success
3. Designing and implementing programs to meet these endeavors
4. Defining and maintaining key relationships with existing programs, including service organizations, foundations, and government programs
5. Uniting programs under a single administration and/or mission
6. Expanding programs over time
7. Staffing successful leadership and management teams
8. Keeping employees, clients, and administrators motivated and invested as PNs become routinized and bureaucratized

1. Defining Mission, Values, and Goals: Design specific, unified goals towards which each program and individual is working before any other step is undertaken. HCZ did not succeed or attract funding until Canada rigorously defined the physical boundaries and specific tasks of his project, and a CPN should not begin by wasting resources through tentative or disparate initiatives.

1. Defining and Measuring Success: Develop measures for reporting and determining accountability within the organization. It is important to make both organization and staff accountable for successful service provision, rather than simply follow rules and procedures. Develop metrics system to measure and report results to outsiders, especially to foundations. Do not rely solely on donor and government criteria for self-reporting; a CPN will improve control over internal operations and external perceptions if it develops its own (equally rigorous) methods of assessment.

2. Designing and Implementing Plans: Involve community members in every possible aspect of design and implementation in order to foster community empowerment as well as to ensure programs are connected to the needs and wishes of community members and
A CPN must recognize that power structures already exist within communities, often based on who can mobilize resources. Co-opting local political and organizational power structures will strengthen a CPN by diverting potential competition with those forces as well as by engaging those forces as useful resources and by lending legitimacy to the CPN program. There are inherent drawbacks to this arrangement; alliances may constrict CPN’s ability to adapt and pursue its mission, outlive their usefulness, be difficult to dissolve, or impinge upon rather than improve CPN’s reputation. Free decision-makers and senior staff from day-to-day details of operations. Leaders who fixate too closely on the specifics of routine administrative tasks may lose the perspective necessary to guide the broader goals and vision of the organization.

Do not alienate directors from reality on the ground. In large bureaucracies, staff providing services do not always have access to leadership, nor does administrative leadership necessarily experience or have a good grasp on the realities of implementation. HCZ staff expressed concern when restructuring due to growth deprived them of direct access to the program’s director and CEO. A CPN might avoid this problem by building feedback mechanisms into administrative design, such as regular meetings between upper-level management and staff on the ground. Hold the HCZ model lightly enough that it may be abandoned in favor of more relevant or successful measures as established through best practices, precedent, or experience. HCZ itself had to adapt its mission as it grew in order to stop putting resources into ineffective programs that shared HCZ’s mission but did not contribute noticeable impact. Mission drift is a concern if this flexibility is taken to the opposite extreme.

3. Defining and Maintaining Relationships: Decide which community based organizations (CBOs) to bring under CPN administration and which should maintain administrative autonomy. Build broad coalitions. Networks between organizations within the same field have been shown to reduce transactions costs, improve “production” efficiency, and “product differentiation” by giving organizations access to useful knowledge, resources, and partners.

Outsource where feasible by working in cooperation with organizations whose administrations are already compatible or are easily made compatible with a CPN. This is a preferable option to co-opting certain organizations, in order to avoid excess overhead and bureaucracy. There is a degree of risk involved in networks with autonomous organizations, best mitigated by alliances with organizations that share personal ties, interlocks, common partners, missions, and/or organizational/administrative structures with a CPN.

Take over functions of less successful CBOs and service providers and provide missing services when this will streamline operations without creating unnecessary new bureaucracy. Historically, businesses have benefited from vertical and horizontal integration to improve efficiency in production. In the case of a CPN, providing certain services may be more efficient than partnering with incompatible or particularly inefficient organizations. Maintain a small, flexible administration with low overhead and transparent bureaucracy, while ensuring comprehensive service coverage and mission cohesion.
Facilitate communication with outside organizations and stakeholders (government, donors, CBOs, and neighborhood residents). As explained above, communication within networks of similar organizations provides valuable resources and reduces transactions costs. A CPN will need systems for internal communication, coordination, and regular self-assessment in order to communicate its needs, offers, and intentions to others.\textsuperscript{42} Administrators’ jobs should enable them to interact with peers from other organizations.\textsuperscript{43}

4. \textit{Uniting Programs:} Ensure all programs are working towards the same clearly defined mission through rigorous enforcement of principles, explicitly tying procedures to mission achievement, and assessing individual programs. Large bureaucracies managing multiple programs are likely to develop irrationalities in structure and process, and drift from a focus on the stated mission to a focus on rules and procedures.\textsuperscript{44} A CPN should avoid this if possible and maintain focus on service provision.

Convince pre-existing CBOs and local stakeholders of the validity of and their interest in a CPN’s methodology. Demonstrate problems a CPN will address (to those who are unaware of problems or their severity) and innovations of a CPN approach (to those who already know of and address these problems).\textsuperscript{45} An informed public will likely be more receptive to a CPN and more able to take advantage of the services it offers. Likewise, help community members/organizations understand their own stake in the CPN so they will be more willing to align their activities with specific CPN missions.

Give community significant ownership of and decision-making opportunities in development and implementation of the CPN, but beware how local politics and power dynamics surrounding service distribution might cause dissension within the CPN. This is especially pertinent when neighborhood members or organizations are included within CPN’s administrative framework.\textsuperscript{46}

Be willing to shed or find new roles for organizations or individuals who do not fit CPN’s objectives, either in ideology or ability, but remain aware that old loyalties may make this politically difficult and delicate.\textsuperscript{47} HCZ had to forego certain projects that did not contribute significantly enough to the project’s mission to justify the use of scarce resources.\textsuperscript{48} Facilitate communication between programs of expectations, ideas, challenges, resources, successful strategies, and failures.\textsuperscript{49} Network analysis has shown that organizations communicate more effectively internally when a combination of formal structural and informal links exists between staff members.\textsuperscript{50}

5. \textit{Expanding Programs:} Prepare for expansion by hiring employee capacity, both in number and in skill, to meet both future and current needs. Business practices suggest that hiring for growth saves costs in training new leadership and circumvents the inertia of leadership unsuited to push for the next phase of development.\textsuperscript{51} A CPN must bear in mind, however, that this is meant to prepare human capacity for future growth, rather than accelerate organizational growth immediately. Evaluate and shift resources and priorities as goals, situations, and programs evolve.\textsuperscript{52} Give directors sufficient autonomy and flexibility as well as measurable goals and appropriate information to reassess throughout the program.
6. **Staffing Teams:** Hire high-caliber senior staff, especially those who will direct other staff, because this is key to attracting and selecting employees of equal caliber to work under their direction.53 Highly-skilled and desirable employees may be unwilling to work under poor management, so highly-qualified managers are particularly important. In addition, those who might select the employees working under them will have proportionately greater influence on the caliber and tone of CPN staff than others.

   Hire staff with clear personal commitment to CPN’s mission and values to encourage motivation and investment beyond the minimum involvement.54 HCZ and many other social service providers require time- and labor-intensive jobs, requiring high levels of commitment. In addition, service provision, especially when working with children, is often characterized by the importance of personal investment in individuals, doing work above and beyond explicit minimal standards. Due to this and other factors, HCZ experienced high staff turnover in initial phases.55 A CPN might avoid some of these issues by accepting a higher ratio of salary expenditures to total budget in order to employ more staff.

   Hire directors for skill, especially leader (CEO, President, or COO), rather than attempting to recreate Canada’s personality-based authority.56 Charismatic leaders are inherently difficult to replace or replicate, suggesting this is an inappropriate criterion if a CPN is to be a model for other PNs.57 Value prior involvement in a CPN neighborhood, due to the knowledge and legitimacy a local person might lend to CPN. Note that community outsiders tend to be more destabilizing because they are not heavily invested in existing relationships, loyalties, and processes.58 This may or may not be desirable for a CPN, based on the alliances and organizations that exist in the chosen neighborhood and whether those forces can be co-opted or realigned, or will be, contrary to community wishes, detrimental to a CPN.

7. **Motivating Participants:** Offer staff incentives for innovation, especially by creating organic management structures characterized by contributive networks with emphasis on individual expertise. These structures engage employees on a creative, optimizing basis as opposed to a minimal-standard, satisficing basis.59 Be aware of a potential drop in personal investment on the part of staff as PNs become routinized, and avoid by providing opportunities for personal and professional growth (especially through continued education and training and career possibilities within a CPN) and peer assessment.60

4.3. **Best Practices: Financing**

- Develop and maintain efficient fundraising methods: HCZ uses only approx $0.01 to raise $1 in funds.
- Derive funds from diversified sources (mixture of individual high end donors, corporations, financial institutions, investments, primary sources, etc).
- Maintain a high working capital ratio: HCZ’s working capital ratio (FY 2006) is 1.88.61
- Maintain a positive end-of-year balance.
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- Build financing strategies from the bottom up on a program-by-program basis.62
- Leader of organization should spend time on fundraising; Canada spends 65% of his time on fundraising.63
- Develop a comprehensive set of metrics to measure the organization's performance. This will allow the organization to attract more donors who are interested in the quantifiable returns of their investments, in addition to social impact.
- Commit to operating the organization like a business.
- Use professional consultants who share a commitment to operating like a business.

4.4. Case Studies on Similar Place-based Anti-Poverty Initiatives

Case Study #1: San Francisco’s “Communities of Opportunity”

This case study of San Francisco’s Communities of Opportunity (COO) anti-poverty program will detail the key COO programs, how the program ultimately became a failure, and draw conclusions on the crucial lessons and best practices that need to be applied if a Promise Neighborhood is to be established successfully in Chicago.

Set-up and Methodology

The COO program began as a program with a purpose and basic methodology that is strikingly similar to what a Promise Neighborhood would entail, including a place-based approach and a continuum of services.64 Based on survey data, the San Francisco city government planned to coordinate services delivered to children and families in the four public housing developments in the isolated, most disadvantaged, southeastern region of the city.

These four areas contained 2,600 families with 5,800 children under the age of 18.65 The overarching idea was that this COO program could develop “on-ramps” and bridges between programs that would help residents access the services already provided by the city, which would make it easier and more likely for these families and children to use these programs to move out of poverty.66

Where COO differs greatly from the Harlem Children’s Zone is in its measurement of success and its actual programming. Client families were divided into three sub-groups, indicating their socioeconomic position, with “stable” describing those who earned more than 185% of the Federal Poverty Line and whose children were flourishing, “fragile” indicating those who earned less than 185% of the FPL and whose children had limited support systems, and “in crisis” describing those who were experiencing deep family crises, such as serious economic issues and a high probability of their children entering foster care or the criminal justice systems.67 COO aimed to move a set number of families from “in crisis” to “fragile” and from “fragile” to “stable” until most, if not all, families were classified as “stable.”

To accomplish this, COO implemented a series of programs, some of which are described below:

- RAP (Rental Assistance Plan) Eviction Prevention Program: Back-rent payoff program
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- On-Ramp to CityBuild: transitional employment opportunity
- Parent University: Parenting classes
- Community meetings
- Village Vans: Youth transportation program
- Opportunity Centers: community centers were built near each housing development to provide housing services, computer labs, and community events

Results

These programs varied in terms of results and successes. The RAP Eviction Prevention Program helped 67 residents either become current with their rent payments or enroll in a new, more affordable payment plan. The On-Ramp to CityBuild employed 60 residents while the Parent University enrolled 28 families in its program.

While these appear to be promising results, in comparison to the $3.9 million spent and additional resources dedicated to COO, these results seem minimal at best. In addition, COO was unable to report that it had met its annual goal of moving 100 families from “in crisis” status to “fragile” status and 110 families from “fragile” status to “stable” status each year (either the program had not met its goal or it never took the effort to measure its impact before it was shut down – it is unclear which alternative is true).

Problems

There are a number of reasons why COO had relatively few successes in proportion to the resources spent on it. The key reasons are outlined below:

- **Too many agencies involved and mismanagement**: COO had 15 city departments involved in managing the program, including everything from the Department of Public Works to the Juvenile Probation Department to the San Francisco Housing Authority.
- **Lack of oversight**: There was no clear leader or small group of leaders with a singular vision and enough power over the other agencies to create that vision. In addition, the fiscal committee met for the first time 1½ years after the program had started, which indicates a lack of oversight of the COO budget.
- **Overspending on operational costs**: Possibly related to the initial lack of a fiscal committee is the mismanagement of the fiscal resources COO had. COO’s spent over 55% of its budget on “planning, outreach, and administration,” as opposed to only 45% on programmatic aspects that had a direct impact on impoverished families.
- **Goals were difficult to reach and measure**: The goals that COO set were difficult to reach and even more difficult to measure. Though COO used a percentage of the Federal Poverty Line to distinguish between “stable” and “fragile” status families, it established no clear distinction between the “fragile” and “in crisis” statuses, making it difficult to establish if COO had truly met its goal of moving a certain number of families “in crisis” each year to a “fragile” status.
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- **Lack of community buy-in:** Another reason participation in COO programs might seem low relative to costs is because local residents were not completely sold on the program. Though COO’s website emphasizes its outreach efforts, local news outlets like the San Francisco Weekly report that community buy-in for the program was low.

**Key Takeaways for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood**

Though the COO program was considered a failure and cut short after two years, it offers some valuable insight into practices that must occur for any potential Promise Neighborhood to succeed. These insights are explained below:

- **Manage the budget carefully:** It is crucial to maintain a careful balance between administrative, operational costs and programmatic costs. The HCZ spends only 20% of its budget on operating costs, but many foundations require even lower levels, preferring that 15% or less of the budget be operating costs. Such a balance ensures that agency spending is actually having a direct impact on those who are being served.

- **Start small:** COO took on a large area with many families and children all at once. This large scope resulted in a number of problems. For one, they had to divide their attention among many areas, which led to few results and high administrative costs from large outreach efforts and a large staff. Starting small would eliminate these problems and provide a number of additional benefits.

- **Tailor the program to meet the goals:** COO struggled with sponsoring many programs that did not necessarily help it meet its goal. For instance, though the Conference of Community Development experts may have had some use, it was an extraordinarily large cost that did not produce direct benefits in the form of helping actual families.

- **Centralize the authority of the program and explicitly plan out the organization:** With a program that has many individual components, having one central leader prevents a conflict of vision and ensures that there is always someone who is overseeing and coordinating the actions of all the other actors in the program. As the COO and HCZ strategies demonstrate, a private organization might be more efficient and effective than a host of government agencies that are burdened with other tasks and bureaucracy.

- **Establish reachable and measurable results:** Though aiming high is important, establishing impossible goals will only result in failure and a disheartened staff. Furthermore, setting goals that cannot be easily measured makes it difficult to establish the success of the program, which in turn makes it difficult to obtain community buy-in and private and foundation donor support, much of which is contingent on demonstrated results.

- **Use grassroots-level outreach efforts to obtain community buy-in:** As COO learned, the successful outreach strategy to obtain interest and community buy-in from a low-income, urban neighborhood is not one that involves investing a lot of money in media efforts that never truly reach the community. Rather, a grassroots-level approach using outreach workers that operate within communities by developing personal relationships with community members is much more likely to succeed. Such buy-in is crucial to the participation levels and overall success of any potential Promise Neighborhood.
Case Study #2: The Rochester Children’s Zone

The Rochester Children’s Zone (RCZ), modeled off of the Harlem Children’s Zone, is a comprehensive anti-poverty program aimed at improving the “health, wellness, education, living conditions and livelihoods” of children and families in northeastern portions of Rochester, New York. Though the program has not yet come to fruition due to funding complications, lessons can be extracted from the planning and design phases of the project.

**Set-up and Methodology**

In developing the RCZ implementation plan, leaders identified several elements as being crucial to the planning process: inclusion, transparency, collaboration, deliberateness and being data driven. The RCZ board established the following timeline to chart their progress:

- **Visioning** (June 24 – August 1, 2006)
  - How to successfully address the challenges of the city of Rochester
- **Problem/Asset Identification** (August – September 2006)
  - Analysis of challenges and opportunities presented by the neighborhood
- **Solutions/Related Research** (October – November 2006)
  - Develop possible action items and initiatives
- **Implementation Planning** (November – December 2006)
  - Develop action plan with goals, tasks, allocated responsibilities, required resources, timelines and oversight provisions
- **Program Launch** (January, 2007)

**Problems**

Before the RCZ could get off the ground, the Zone ran into funding problems. With the current budget crisis, the state of New York was forced to substantially cut the RCZ’s state funding. Because of these funding shortfalls, the program has not yet been implemented, and there are questions about whether the RCZ will ever come to fruition. Therefore, there are no empirical results from which programmatic features and implementation procedures can be evaluated. However, the barriers that the project faced during its planning phase serve as valuable avenues of inquiry. The three main difficulties that the RCZ encountered as it was being designed were problems with leadership, community integration into the planning process, and funding.

- **Leadership**: From the onset of the project, community members questioned the capacity of the RCZ’s Executive Director, Iris Banister. Touted as a writer and educator by some community elites, her limited experience as an educational leader – serving as the principal of a failed charter school – disconcerted many neighborhood residents. Moreover, Banister was paid a fairly high annual salary of $125,000. Though her salary was not at the upper limit of comparable executive director salaries, her paycheck was negatively received by an already skeptical public. Instead of integrating herself into the Rochester city culture and
neighborhood (like Geoffrey Canada did with the HCZ), Banister used her salary to move from her city residence to a townhouse in the suburbs, further distancing herself from RCZ target residents.\textsuperscript{82} The largest problem in the leadership of the RCZ, however, stemmed from the constant tension that existed between Banister and the RCZ Board of Directors. The tension publicly reached a boiling point when Banister resigned from her position after she accused members on the Board of Directors of sending “caustic and rude” e-mails about her behind her back.\textsuperscript{83}

- **Integrating the community into the planning process**: Though the RCZ did an exceptional job integrating residents into the planning process, maintaining a constant emphasis on resident participation, the RCZ leadership ignored many community leaders in the planning process. These leaders criticized the RCZ from the beginning and felt that their leadership was ignored.\textsuperscript{84}

- **Funding**: Part of the dispute that the Executive Director had with the Board of Directors before she resigned was over the question of securing private funding for the RCZ. After massive state cuts to the RCZ’s budget, the inability of the Executive Director to raise a significant amount of private donations caused disputes between Banister and the board and prevented the project from moving forward.\textsuperscript{85}

As the project continued, these issues, combined with the slow pace of the project, caused public opinion for the RCZ to slowly erode.

**Key Takeaways for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood**

The poor management and planning decisions made by the RCZ leadership provide the following lessons for a CPN:

- **Director must be qualified and part of the PN community**: Choosing an Executive Director for a PN will involve many criteria, not the least of which must be leadership and educational experience. Once hired, the Executive Director of a PN will likely receive an annual salary large enough to enable him or her to move into a neighborhood far from the target PN area. However, it is crucial for the success of the project – both in terms of garnering public support and in having the leadership understand first-hand the daily problems the PN will have to deal with – for the Executive Director to remain in close geographic proximity to the PN.

- **Coordination and cooperation amongst leadership is important**: The public resignation of the RCZ Executive Director amidst scandal and finger pointing between her and members of the Board of Directors harmed the public face of the RCZ project. Coordination between leaders, a mutual understanding of the allocation of responsibility and a cooperative environment are key to program success.

- **Planning process must stress holistic community participation**: The planning of a PN should not only include the input of residents, but also self-appointed community leaders. These two groups may sometimes have conflicting opinions, but the PN should hear out the contributions and concerns of both of these groups equally.

- **Private funding is key**: Securing private funding is an obvious necessity for the success of the PN. Relying on state and federal funding will prevent the PN from either getting off the ground or being sustainable once initiated.
Draft a realistic timeline: Public opinion for the RCZ partly declined because community members believed the project was moving too slowly. Community members complained that the program had still not been implemented two years into the planning process. PN leadership must recognize that developing a successful and comprehensive anti-poverty program takes a significant investment of time, and must be realistic when drafting a timeline of project completion. The RCZ timeline, which spanned half a year from the onset of planning to the beginning of the implementation phase, was far too ambitious. As a result, community members were disappointed and morale declined.
5. Prospective Chicago Neighborhoods: A Comparative Overview of Ten Community Areas

5.1. Introduction and Methodology

In this section of the report, we present data for ten communities areas as potential sites for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood. These ten community areas, each of which meets the threshold poverty criteria for a Promise Neighborhood, are located in two distinct geographic clusters:

**West Side Community Areas**
- Austin
- East and West Garfield Park
- Humboldt Park
- North Lawndale
- South Lawndale (“Little Village”)

**South Side Community Areas**
- Englewood
- Greater Grand Crossing
- Quad Communities
  - Douglas
  - Grand Boulevard
  - Kenwood
  - Oakland
- South Shore
- Washington Park/Woodlawn

![Figure 5.1: Map of Ten Potential Promise Neighborhoods in Chicago](image)
For each community area, we provide:

- Population demographics
- School demographics and performance statistics
- A description of relevant key assets

Our methodology for selecting statistics and categories by which to judge community areas’ populations, schools, and key assets is explained in detail on the following pages. Maps created with ArcGIS and Google Map software are interspersed throughout the report and provide a visual counterpart to our statistics and qualitative assessments of each community area.

Population Demographics

After comparing the ten community areas across twenty statistical categories, we isolated four demographic criteria that proved useful for assessing Promise Neighborhood viability:

**Total Population:** A community area’s total population is indicative of both its initial capacity to host a Promise Neighborhood and the degree to which such a program can grow over time within the region. All else being equal, a larger population means more options for choosing a particular starting point and a greater number of ways to expand it.

**Population Density:** A community area’s population density helps to indicate the relative ease of access to the area’s assets. Higher population densities are also desirable since they allow for increased contact between Promise Neighborhood program’s participants and non-participants, thus potentially paving the way for the transformation of entire areas at a time.

**Projected Change in Child Population:** An area’s projected change in child population carries the neighborhood’s population trends into the future. Since child demographic changes are frequently followed by high population turnover, a high rate of child population loss will likely impede any program’s efforts to engage what Geoffrey Canada described as the “critical mass” of 65% of the community.

**Median Household Income:** Median household income provides a quick and easily understandable glimpse into a community area’s economic health, relative to both other areas of Chicago and to the city as a whole. Keep in mind, though, that all ten of the community areas under consideration are impoverished and feature median incomes that lag far behind both city and national averages.

In our preliminary analysis, we considered a variety of other metrics including: ethnic make-up of the population, percentage of the population under five years old, percentage of families earning less than $15,000 per year, and home-ownership rates.

For a list of all categories considered, see Appendix E. Though each of these factors affects the viability of Promise Neighborhood in unique ways, none of them vary dramatically across regions. All ten of the community areas, for example, feature similar child-population percentages of between 10-12%. These metrics, then, make for relatively unhelpful comparisons. In the case of
extreme outliers, however – the high rate of home-ownership in Little Village, for example – we note the discrepancy in our description of the community.

**Status of Schools**

In this section of the case study, we present a broad comparison of school demographics and performance across the ten community areas under consideration for a Promise Neighborhood status. We collected school data for each community area in many categories including:

- School Type (i.e. public or charter)
- Grades Served
- Percentage of Students from Low-Income Households
- Racial Demographics
- Probation Status
- Standardized Test Scores

The state of Illinois uses two main achievement tests:

*The Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT):* This test measures individual student achievement relative to the Illinois Learning Standards. Grades three through eight are given the ISAT, which consists of a reading, math, and science section. The science section is only given to 4th and 7th grade students (Illinois State Board of Education 2009). The overall Chicago Public School average for the ISAT is 64%. That score broken down by category is:

- Reading (61%)
- Mathematics (69%)
- Science (60%)3

*The Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE):* This test measures eleventh-grade students’ abilities in reading, writing, mathematics, and science. This test is made up of three components:

- The ACT Plus Writing
- An ISBE-developed science assessment
- Two Work Keys assessments4

**Key Assets**

In this section, we look at social assets available in the community, including:

- Access to Transportation
- Availability of Services
- Number of Youth-centered Programs in the Community

We also describe social assets that could serve as partner organizations: already existing non-profits or community-based organizations that could potentially coordinate or expand into a Chicago Promise Neighborhood.
5.2. West Side Community Areas

Austin

Predominantly African-American, Austin is the most populous community area in Chicago. According to the Metro Chicago Information Center, Austin has seen a rise in both low- and high-income families over the last two decades. The first Wal-Mart within Chicago city limits recently opened in Austin. Wal-Mart has become a major employer in the community area; the store hires for approximately 400 people and has committed itself to helping bring further business investment and development to the neighborhood.

Austin has the highest median income of the neighborhoods under consideration, and the lowest percentage of families earning less than $15,000 a year (17%).

Figure 5.2: Population Demographics of Austin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>115,730</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>1st/10</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Density</strong></td>
<td>16,533 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>3rd/10</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Δ Child Population</strong></td>
<td>-4,720 (-13%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>6th/10</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td>$37,123</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>1st/10</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children in Poverty</strong></td>
<td>16,009 (45%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2nd/10</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”

Status of Schools

Austin has the following types of schools: nine public elementary schools (one of which is a small school) and two high schools (both small schools). African-American children make up 96% of the student body in Austin’s elementary schools and 98% in its high schools. Within the public elementary schools, ISAT% scores are: Reading (51%), Math (49%), Science (38%). Data for Austin Polytechnical Academy High School and Austin Business and Entrepreneurship High School are not available.

Within the public elementary schools in Austin, the average low-income level is 95.2%. The public high schools – Austin Polytechnical Academy and Austin Business and Entrepreneurship – have an average low-income level of 89.3%. The average enrollment in public elementary schools in Austin is 584 students. Within Austin Business and Entrepreneurship High School there is a total enrollment of 259 students in the year 2008 and a total enrollment of 129 students at Austin Polytechnical High School.

Key Assets

Austin is notable for its high number of schools, child support services, and church-based organizations. As of 2007, Austin had twenty-six elementary schools, several of which had after-school programs, Head Start, and state pre-K programs. The area is also the site of extensive church-based affordable housing initiatives. The Blue and Green CTA lines run through the region and connect it to downtown Chicago.
Potential CPN Partner Agency

Circle Family Care and Circle Urban Ministries, a Christian community-based health organization, has four locations within Austin that provide a variety of clinical, emotional/mental, and educational services as well as parenting classes, counseling, youth development, adult education, a soup kitchen and a food pantry.

East/West Garfield Park

Over the last fifty years, East Garfield Park’s population has dropped from 70,000 residents in 1950 to 21,000 in 2000. Migration out of the area began in the late 1960s following race riots; rent strikes, unemployment, drug sales, and prostitution flourished during the 1970s and 1980s. Since then, economic recovery has been mediocre at best; East Garfield Park’s median income of around $25,000 is still only 60% of Chicago’s average and less than half of the national average.

With a population density of near 7,000 people per square kilometer compared to East Garfield Park’s 4,000 people per square kilometer, West Garfield Park is much denser than is its eastward neighbor. Both East (60%) and West (72%) Garfield, however, have extraordinarily high rates of residents without any college education. In addition, most middle- and high-income families have moved out, leaving high concentrations of low-income families in both neighborhoods.

Status of Schools

East/West Garfield Park has the following types of schools: twelve public elementary schools (one of which is a magnet school), two charter elementary schools, and one charter high school.

African American students are 99% of the student population in public elementary schools. African Americans make up an average of 97.8% of students within charter elementary schools in East Garfield Park—Locke Charter Elementary School and KIPP Ascend Charter School. African Americans also make up 98.3% of the student population in ACT Charter High School in West Garfield Park. In the public elementary schools in East and West Garfield the average ISAT% scores are: Reading (57.2%), Math (62.8%), Science (52.9%). The charter elementary schools have the average ISAT% scores: Reading (76.1%), Math (83.7%), Science (72%). The average ACT score at Marshall High School and at ACT Charter High School in 2008 were 13.9 and 15.4, respectively. The Illinois state average is 20.3 and the test is out of a maximum of 36.

In the public elementary schools in East and West Garfield Park, the average low-income level is
93.5%. The charter elementary schools in East Garfield Park have an average low-income population of 78.6% and the charter high school in West Garfield Park has a low-income of 65.9%. Marshall High School is the only public high school in both communities; it has a low-income population of 79%. The average enrollment in public elementary schools in East and West Garfield Park is 426 students whereas the elementary charter schools have an average enrollment of 296 students in the year 2008. The charter high school has a total enrollment of 296 students, but Marshall (Public) High School currently has about 1,270 students. Manley High School currently has 1,221 students.

**Key Assets**

Garfield Park has a particularly high density of services for the poor, including at least twelve food pantries. As a result, everyone in the neighborhood is no more than one mile away from a pantry at any given time.

In terms of transportation, Garfield Park is well connected to the rest of the city. Green and Blue Line L trains from the CTA run through both sides of the neighborhood, and the 290 Eisenhower Expressway and Madison St run parallel to the CTA lines. CTA buses provide stops within a few blocks of any given location within the neighborhood.

As with many Chicago neighborhoods, Garfield Park is currently undergoing gentrification, although falling housing prices have slowed this process quite noticeably. The high density of social assets and schools suggests that any educational revitalization program would likely have to use existing assets rather than creating new buildings or organizations.

---

**Humboldt Park**

Humboldt Park is Chicago’s historical and symbolic center of Puerto Rican life. In recent years, sizable numbers of Mexican-Americans have also joined the community, along with African-Americans and Dominican immigrants. Humboldt Park has historically experienced high rates of drug trading and gang violence. In recent years, the northern and eastern parts of the neighborhood have become somewhat gentrified, as middle-class families have moved into newly built single-family homes. Of the ten areas, Humboldt Park has the second highest rate of individuals over 25 with no college education (74%) due partially to the large number of residents without any high school education (47%).

**Figure 5.4: Population Demographics of Humboldt Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Humboldt Park</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>62,625</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Density</strong></td>
<td>13,719 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Child Population</td>
<td>-2,626 (-13%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td>$29,018</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children in Poverty</strong></td>
<td>10,374 (50%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”
**Status of Schools**

Humboldt Park has the following types of schools: eight public elementary schools, two charter elementary schools, and two public high schools. Hispanics are 39% and African Americans are 59% of the student population of public elementary schools. In elementary charter schools, Hispanics make up 6.9% of the student population and African Americans make up 91.5% of the student body. There is no information about racial demographics for the Orr Academy High School. Within the public elementary schools in Humboldt Park the average ISAT% scores are: Reading (53%), Math (59%), Science (50%) and the average ISAT% scores at Galapagos Elementary Charter School are: Reading (63.3%), Math (70.7%), Science (37.5%). The average ACT score at Orr Academy High School is not available.

Within the public elementary schools in Humboldt Park, the average low-income level is 97%. The elementary charter schools – Galapagos Charter School and Polaris Charter School – have an average low-income level of 85%. There is no information about the low-income level of Orr Academy High School. The average enrollment in public elementary schools in Humboldt Park is 704 students, whereas within the two charter elementary schools there is an average of 195 students. There is no information about the enrollment numbers for Orr Academy High School.

**Key Assets**

Humboldt Park is accessible by the Green Line and the Metra. The area has a large number of services including twelve Head Start programs, sixteen elementary schools, twenty-four youth development programs, and six community health care centers.

**Potential CPN Partner Agency**

The Association House, the largest non-profit in Humboldt Park, serves over 20,000 families health care and runs child welfare services, job training, after-school care, and its own high school.

---

**North Lawndale**

North Lawndale became a predominantly African American neighborhood as a result of the desertification of the neighborhood’s heavy Jewish population during the 1950s. This desertification led to the rapid decline of the area’s commercial industry and population – the population decreased from 125,000 in 1960 to 41,000 in 2000. North Lawndale is one of the poorest of the ten neighborhoods – 36% of families in the area earn under $15,000 a year.

**Figure 5.5: Population Demographics of North Lawndale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Lawndale</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>38,809</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>11,034 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Child Population</td>
<td>-2,320 (-17%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$21,257</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty</td>
<td>9,158 (67%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”*
The 1990s saw renewed investment in the area, especially around Honan Square, a new development. North Lawndale is also notable for its high rate of home ownership (67%).

**Status of Schools**

North Lawndale has the following types of schools: ten public elementary schools (one of which is a magnet school), three charter elementary schools, two public high schools (both small schools), and one charter high school. African American students are 97% of the student population in public, elementary schools and 93.1% in public, high schools. Within the public, elementary schools in North Lawndale the average ISAT% scores are: Reading (53%), Math (55%), Science (44%). The three charter elementary schools have the following average ISAT% scores: Reading (60%), Math (70%), and Science (44%). The average ACT score at North Lawndale Charter High School is 16.8 as compared to the Illinois average score of 20.3 out of a maximum of 36 points.

Within the public elementary schools in North Lawndale, the average low-income level is 93%. The charter, elementary schools have an average low-income level of 80.2%. North Lawndale Charter High School has a 97% low-income level and Collins Academy Public High School has a 98.5% low-income level. The average enrollment in public elementary schools in North Lawndale is 496 students. Whereas in the three charter elementary schools – Catalyst charter School, LEARN Charter, and Legacy Charter – there is an average of 270 students. There are 463 students at North Lawndale Charter High School and 133 students in Collins Academy High School.

**Key Assets**

Rail mass transit is available in the southern part of the neighborhood, which is good for growth potential as South Lawndale shares similar access points.

**Potential CPN Partner Agency**

The Mount Sinai Community Institute offers a comprehensive range of services designed to address the social, economic, and environmental factors that impact the health of community members, including adult and senior health programs, employment services, drug counseling, parenting classes, free immunizations, youth and teen programs, pregnancy and family case management, and domestic violence intervention.

---

**South Lawndale (“Little Village”)**

South Lawndale – or “La Villita”, meaning “Little Village,” as it is commonly called (and as this report will refer to it) – is an ethnic community whose diverse roots stretch far. Once occupied by Italian, Czech, Lithuanian, Croatian, and Slovene populations from the 1870s until the 1970s, it has since become home to the largest Mexican-American population in the Midwest. Located five miles southwest of the Loop, Little Village’s 26th Street commercial strip has the second highest business revenue in the city behind North Michigan Avenue.

Over the past two decades, the median population age of Little Village has been decreasing (it has the youngest median age in the city) which has been a strain on the local public schools that are
approaching their threshold capacities. The residents of Little Village are also struggling to counteract the effects of gang violence in the area. At the same time, among the ten neighborhoods, Little Village has the second highest median income and the second lowest percentage of families earning under $15,000 a year (20%). Interestingly, Little Village has the lowest number of single-female headed households (11%), and the highest number of individuals over 25 without college (80%, 60% with no high school).

Figure 5.6: Population Demographics of South Lawndale (“Little Village”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little Village</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>89,983</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>2nd/10</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>15,480 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>4th/10</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆ Child Population</td>
<td>-893 (-3%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>2nd/10</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$31,443</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>2nd/10</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty</td>
<td>13,868 (50%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5th/10</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”

Status of Schools

Little Village has the following types of schools: thirteen public elementary schools, one middle school (year round school), one public high school, and one public charter school. Hispanic students are 89% of the student body. African American students are 10% of the student population in public, elementary schools. At Farragut Public High School in Little Village, Hispanics make up 79% of the student body and African Americans make up 19.8%. Within the public, elementary schools in Little Village the average ISAT% scores are: Reading (63%), Math (71%), Science (60%). The average ACT score at Farragut High School is 15.9 as compared to the state average of 20.3.

Within the public elementary schools in Little Village, the average low-income level is 97.4%. The public high school has an average of 98.6% low-income level. There is no low-income information available for Little Village Charter High School. The average enrollment in public elementary schools in Little Village is 734 students. The public high school has 2,114 students enrolled and there is no enrollment information available for Little Village Charter High School.

Key Assets

Little Village has somewhat mixed access to public transit. The northern portion of the community has ample access to downtown via the CTA Pink Line, which flanks the northern edge of the neighborhood. In contrast, Little Village’s southern half has minimal access to rapid transit, though this area is largely industrial. However, the community is easily accessed by car via the Stevenson Expressway, Little Village’s southern border. Little Village houses a plentiful and diverse set of social service providers and a particularly high concentration of schools in the neighborhood, including twenty-one elementary schools.

Potential CPN Partner Agency

Enlace Chicago and El Instituto del Progresso Latino are strong agencies in Little Village. Likewise, the Carole Robertson Center for Learning, which provides childcare, Early Head Start, preschool, youth development, and after-school programs and serves over 450 children.
5.3. South Side Community Areas

Figure 5.7: ArcGIS map detailing South Side school areas, transportation options
Englewood

Over the last few decades, Englewood has been steadily losing population and businesses. During the 1970s and 1980s, Englewood’s main shopping district struggled after the loss of its anchor stores – Sears and Wiebolt’s – and the area’s housing deteriorated. During the 1990s, Mayor Daley established a $256 million revitalization plan for the area, including the construction of the Kennedy-King College, a new Washburne Culinary Institute, a performing arts center and a TV studio for WYCC/Channel 20.

Figure 5.8: Population Demographics of Englewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Englewood</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>40,222</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>7th/10</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>12,975 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>7th/10</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Child Population</td>
<td>-3,847 (-32%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>10th/10</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$21,614</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>8th/10</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty</td>
<td>8,281 (68%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9th/10</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”

Status of Schools

Englewood has the following types of schools: thirteen public elementary schools, three high schools (one public, one magnet, one small school), and two charter schools (both high schools).

In the neighborhood of Englewood, African American students represent the majority within student populations. African American students make up 98% of the student populations within schools, a typical demographic characteristic within schools in this community. For the community of Englewood, average ISAT% for public elementary schools is as follows: Reading (50%), Math (49%), and Science (42%). Both Robeson and Hope High Schools have ACT averages of 13.7.

The majority of schools in Englewood have high low-income percentages represented. The average low-income percent in public elementary schools is 95.9%. Robeson High School has a low-income percent at 93%, and at Hope Magnet High School, a lower percentage of 80%. One of the three charter schools (high schools) in Englewood, Urban Prep Academy Charter School for Young Men, currently has a low-income percent of 93%. Low-income percent for the remaining charter high schools are unavailable. The average enrollment number for public elementary schools in Englewood is approximately 445 students. There are two major high schools in Englewood: Robeson which holds about 1,271 students and Hope Magnet which holds about 1,056 students. TEAM Englewood is a small school that currently holds about 139 freshmen and will grown into full capacity of 600 over the next three years. Perspectives Charter School currently holds about 176 students and will also add students over the next years. Urban Prep Academy Charter School for Young Men currently holds about 256 students.

Key Assets

Englewood provides close proximity to downtown Chicago and an extensive CTA network. It also contains extensive education assets: 14 elementary schools, 8 Head Start programs, and over 10
after-school and youth development programs. The Green line and Red Line run through Englewood, but the two Metra lines have no stops in Englewood.

The Chicago Department of Human Services-Englewood, located just to the east of Kennedy-King College, provides dental care, a mental health clinic, food pantry/soup kitchen/WIC, parenting classes, and a Head Start program.

Potential CPN Partner Agency

Located in the heart of Englewood, Kennedy-King College, a city college of Chicago could serve as a potential partner agency. Kennedy-King College is equipped with a gym, bookstore, meeting spaces, and computers. It also offers community programs, such as vocational workshops and job search assistance, and resume writing, as well as a child development center.

Greater Grand Crossing

Greater Grand Crossing is both the least populous and least dense of the community areas under consideration. Racially, the community area is 98% African American. Two thirds of Greater Grand Crossing’s population lives below the poverty line, while over 1/3 are second and third generation homeowners; poverty rates are increasing. Many of the Chicago Housing Authority tenants of Cabrini Green, the Robert Taylor Homes, and the Ida B. Wells complex relocated to Greater Grand Crossing following their closures in the late 1990s and early 2000s. This area is isolated from linking with northern community areas by highway and railroad boundaries, however agencies such as the Gary Comer Youth Center have linked it with the adjacent community areas to the east.

Figure 5.9: Population Demographics of Englewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gr. Grand Crossing</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>38,359</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th}/10</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Density</strong></td>
<td>13,053 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th}/10</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ <strong>Child Population</strong></td>
<td>+1,294 (+11%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}/10</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td>$30,755</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}/10</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children in Poverty</strong></td>
<td>5,649 (59%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}/10</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”

Status of Schools

Greater Grand Crossing comprises the following types of schools: seven public elementary schools, one public high school, and one charter school (grades K-12).

In the community of Greater Grand Crossing, African American students represent the majority within student populations. African American students make up an average of 98\% of the student populations within schools. Average ISAT\% for public elementary schools are as follows: Reading (50\%), Math (51\%), and Science (42\%). For Shabazz Charter school, the average ISAT\% are: Reading (82\%), Math (90\%), and Science (62\%).

The average low-income percent for public elementary schools in Greater Grand Crossing is 95\%.
For Hirsch High School, the low-income percent is 87.9%. Shabazz Charter School has a low-income percent of only 40.6%. The average enrollment number for public elementary schools in Greater Grand Crossing is approximately 481 students. There is one major high school in this community, Hirsch High School, which currently holds about 974 students. Shabazz Charter School currently holds about 741 students. For the 2008-2009 school year, Shabazz Charter School added eleventh grade students to their population, and thus average ACT scores are currently unavailable. ACT scores for Hirsch High School are also unavailable.

**Key Assets**

A Knock At Midnight, which aims to “develop community collaborations to provide community health and prevention education services to youth, adults, and community residents.” A Knock at Midnight offers numerous community-outreach programs, including Teen REACH, which is especially effective.

**Quad Communities**

The area now known as the Quad Communities was once the center of African American cultural life in Chicago. Over the past few decades, however, the total population has fallen by over 119,000 residents due in part to the demolition of the Ida B. Wells public housing development. In recent years, Bronzeville (as the region has been historically called) has been undergoing redevelopment as part of the Chicago Housing Authority’s “Plan for Transformation.”

**Figure 5.10: Population Demographics of Quad Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quad Communities</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>74,448</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>18,288 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Child Population</td>
<td>-3,924 (-26%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$26,812</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty</td>
<td>8,025 (54%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”*

**Status of Schools**

The following types of schools are comprised within the Quad Communities: seventeen elementary schools – eleven public, one magnet, and five charters; eight high schools – two public, one small school, one selective enrollment, and four charters.

In the Quad Communities, African American students represent the majority within student populations. Within public and charter elementary schools African American students make up an average of 98%. Within charter high schools, that average is about 75%. Chicago Military High School has an average of about 66%. School demographics for three out of the five elementary charter schools are unavailable. Average ISAT% for public elementary schools are: Reading (55%), Math (53%), and Science (50%). Shoesmith Elementary and Ariel Elementary had exceptional ISAT%. Shoesmith average ISAT% are: Reading (84%), Math (78%), and Science (73%). Ariel
Elementary average ISAT% are: Reading (84%), Math (87%), and Science (77%). The average ACT scores in Kenwood High School (public) is 18.6, and for Chicago Military (public) 17.6.

The average low-income percent for public elementary schools in The Quad Communities is about 95%, with the exception of Shoesmith Elementary and Ariel Elementary, which have a low-income percent of 71% and 78% respectively. Public and charter high schools have an average low-income percent of about 76%. Another notable exception is King College Prep, a selective high school that has an average low-income of 71%. The average enrollment number for public elementary schools in The Quad Communities is approximately 312. For charter elementary schools, the average enrollment is 357, with the exception of the University of Chicago Charter School – North Kenwood Oakland, which holds approximately 1046 students; it also holds more grade levels (pre-K and K-10). Kenwood High School has approximately 1,578 students and Chicago Military High School has about 507 students.

Key Assets

The Quad Communities have an extensive network of after-school programs, particularly in Kenwood. Kenwood boasts facilities in the Kenwood Academy as well as the Kenwood United Church of Christ. The Blackstone branch of the Chicago Public Library is in Kenwood as well, which is useful for school-related research projects and could also serve as an after-school event center for local students. The Hyde Park Arts Center, located on the southern border of Kenwood, has a well-rounded community outreach program.

In Douglas, the Illinois Institute of Technology and the liberal arts college Shimer provide opportunities for interaction with the local youth. The neighborhood also has a wide variety of after-school programs and childcare programs, which provide relief for local working parents. Depending on their levels of involvement with other aspects of the community child development, either college could be a potential partner agency. In Grand Boulevard, the Harold Washington Cultural Center offers free digital technology classes to children and performance art for the community. The large spaces and high-end facilities offered by the center make it another potential CPN partner agency candidate.

South Shore

South Shore is far less enmeshed with the University of Chicago than its neighbor to the north, Woodlawn. While the community’s median income (about $30,000 per year) and unemployment rate (15%) trail both city and national averages, the area is socioeconomically better off than essentially all of the other neighborhoods in consideration and is often referred to as a “solidly middle class African American community.” Like many South Side communities, South Shore flipped dramatically from 90% white in 1960 to over 97% African American by 1990. The Chicago Park District owns the South Shore Cultural Center, a former whites-only country club that has since been transformed into a cultural hub for a variety of performance and community activities.
Figure 5.11: Population Demographics of South Shore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Shore</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>61,532</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
<td>2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>20,698 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
<td>12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆ Child Population</td>
<td>+1,294 (+11%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
<td>-44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$30,755</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
<td>$40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty</td>
<td>6,421 (41%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;/10</td>
<td>247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”

Status of Schools

South Shore community currently encompasses the following schools: eight public elementary schools, and one cluster high school containing four specialized learning institutions. Student populations represented within schools in South Shore are predominantly African American – about 99% of student populations. For the community of South Shore, average ISAT% for public elementary schools is as follows: Reading (51%), Math (48%), and Science (42%). The South Shore high school cluster has an average ACT score of 14.6. Public elementary schools in the community of South Shore have an average low-income percentage of 91% represented. The South Shore high school cluster has an average low-income percentage of about 85%.

Average student enrollment for public elementary schools in South Shore is approximately 617 students. There are no elementary charter schools in this joint community. The South Shore high school cluster consists of four specialized schools: School of Leadership, School of Entrepreneurship, School of the Arts, and School of Technology. The average student enrollment for this cluster is about 471 students. Hyde Park High School has about 2,213 students. University of Chicago Charter School – Woodlawn Campus has about 590 students and will add students year by year until it is reaches full capacity.

Key Assets

South Shore has a relatively small number of social service organizations. The largest organization in South Shore is ABJ Community Services, which focuses primarily on foster care and child welfare. The Black Fund of Illinois is also an important local not-for-profit (for more, see Section 7 and 8 below). Two additional assets are South Shore’s accessibility to public transportation and its proximity to the University of Chicago. Two Metra lines run directly through the community.

Washington Park and Woodlawn

Given its small population of children, Woodlawn could not serve on its own as a site for a fully-established Chicago Promise Neighborhood. However, Woodlawn could begin as a CPN site and later could be paired with an adjacent community area such as South Shore, Greater Grand Crossing, or Washington Park. In this report, we chose to explore the possibility of pairing Woodlawn with Washington Park since such an arrangement would benefit from close proximity to and increased investment by the neighboring University of Chicago.
Woodlawn, site of the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893, has seen a consistent rise in unemployment, poverty, and crime rates paired with a rapid drop in population in recent decades. As recently as 1960, 81,279 people lived in the area; by 2000, Woodlawn's population had fallen to just 27,086. Recent businesses reinvestment and construction since 1990, however, have helped lead to a ten-percent decrease in the percentage of families living below the poverty level.

Washington Park, the former site of the public high-rise Robert Taylor Homes, houses a population poorer than Woodlawn's, with a median income of $18,153, the second lowest of all considered community areas, and the highest number of families earning less than $15,000 a year (47%). The population has also declined dramatically, from 57,000 in 1950 to just over 14,000 in 2000. City officials hope that the 2016 Olympic games would bring new commercial and industrial opportunities to the neighborhood.

**Figure 5.12: Population Demographics of Washington Park/Woodlawn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WP/Woodlawn</th>
<th>Ten-Area Average</th>
<th>Rank Across Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>40,205</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>8th/10 2,836,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>11,946 / sq mile</td>
<td>15,595 / sq mile</td>
<td>9th/10 12,747 / sq mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Child Population</td>
<td>-3,010 (-25%)</td>
<td>-2,067 (-14%)</td>
<td>8th/10 -44,092 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$19,664</td>
<td>$27,124</td>
<td>10th/10 $40,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty</td>
<td>8,556 (70%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10th/10 247,085 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: 2000 Census; Chapin Hall, “Chicago Children and Youth, 1990-2010”*

**Status of Schools**

Washington Park/Woodlawn comprises the following types of schools: eight public elementary schools, one public high school, and two charter schools (grades 6-12 and grades 9-12).

In the community of Washington Park/Woodlawn, African American students represent the majority within student populations – an average of 98% of the student populations. For the community of Washington Park/Woodlawn, average ISAT% for public elementary schools are as follows: Reading (50%), Math (48%), and Science (40%). Carnegie Elementary and Woodlawn Elementary had exceptional ISAT%: for Carnegie, Reading (82%), Math (80%), and Science (78%); for Woodlawn, Reading (82%), Math (82%), and Science (96%). Hyde Park High School has an average ACT score of 16.1. ACE Charter High School has an average ACT score of 15.9. University of Chicago Charter School – Woodlawn Campus currently has no ACT test score information due to its recent opening.

The average low-income percent for public elementary schools in Washington Park/Woodlawn is about 95%, with the exception of Carnegie Elementary, which has a low-income percent of 78.3%. Hyde Park High School in Woodlawn has a low-income percent of 66% and ACE Charter High School has a low-income percent of 76%. The average enrollment number for public elementary schools in Washington Park/Woodlawn is approximately 407; Carnegie Elementary holds approximately 665 students, atypical for these communities. The only major public high school in these communities, Hyde Park High School, houses about 2,313 students. There are two charter high schools: University of Chicago Charter School – Woodlawn holds about 590 students, and ACE Charter School has about 462 students.
Potential CPN Partner Agencies

The South Side YMCA, located at 63rd and Stony Island, has programs for all ages, including a popular Youth Basketball League. It is committed to making family-enriching, character-building activities available to everyone, and as such, offers membership scholarships for families in need of financial assistance. New Communities Program, Woodlawn highlights events in the Woodlawn Community. The Woodlawn Organization (TWO), founded in 1960, serves as a powerful force on local and citywide issues. Woodlawn’s Apostolic Church of God led by Bishop Arthur Brazier, is spearheading Woodlawn Children’s Promise, an attempt to dramatically reform Woodlawn’s schools.

5.4. Summary of Areas

In our process of gathering data, we identified two conflicting approaches regarding how to identify an ideal location for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood. Researchers seeking to assist those individuals most in need would choose the most impoverished area. Meanwhile, researchers more concerned with maximizing the success of the program itself would select the area most conducive to implementation. Given the fact that all of our prospective locations meet the baseline poverty criteria set down by the Harlem Children’s Zone, we believe that every one of these areas is potentially in need of a Promise Neighborhood. The analysis that follows, then, depends most heavily on the probability that implementation of a CPN will end in success.

Population Demographics

A side-by-side contrast of all ten neighborhoods reveals that three community areas – North Lawndale, Englewood, and Washington Park/Woodlawn – have statistics consistently below the ten-community average. “Below average” areas are those in which we believe it would be more difficult to implement a PN relative to other areas. Greater Grand Crossing, with its below-average population and population density, exhibits similar characteristics to the aforementioned three community areas, but is the only neighborhood with a projected increase in child population.

Figure 5.13: Relative Demographics of Ten Potential PN Community Areas

Note: Bold colors indicate that an area is above the ten-community average in a particular statistic. Subdued colors indicate that an area is below the ten-community average.
Figure 5.14: Potential PN Community Areas Ranked by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and West Garfield</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Park</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lawndale</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lawndale/“LV”</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>(7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Grand Crossing</td>
<td>(10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad Communities</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>(5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Park/Woodlawn</td>
<td>(8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>(10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings enclosed in parentheses fall below the ten-community average for that particular statistic. The three community areas that consistently return statistics below this average are highlighted in red.

North Lawndale, Englewood, and Washington Park/Woodlawn – the three community areas with already-low population and population density – face even more difficulty in the future in the form of their large projected losses of children. If Geoffrey Canada is correct in saying that a successful Promise Neighborhood depends on a “contagion effect,” these areas may pose obstacles since these would be the areas where a “virus” among children may be least likely to spread.

**Status of Schools**

Our broad comparison of school demographics and performance revealed several important differences across our chosen categories of: racial demographics, low-income percent, enrollment, and test scores.

**Racial Demographics**

South Shore, Washington Park/Woodlawn, Great Grand Crossing, Englewood, Quad Communities, East and West Garfield Park, Austin, and North Lawndale all have African American student population above 90% represented within schools. Schools in Humboldt Park have an average of 52% Hispanic while schools in Little Village have an average of 81%.
Low-income percent for public elementary schools appear to be slightly higher than for elementary charter schools. The community of East and West Garfield represents a notable difference; public elementary schools have an average of 93%, and charter schools an average of 79%. Factors such as enrollment are possible contributions to this disparity. For high schools, low-income for public schools is generally similar for charter schools, but there are exceptions. Greater Grand Crossing has an average low-income of about 79% for public and 40% for charter, a remarkable difference – however, only one of each type of school is represented in this community. The opposite is true for Washington Park/Woodlawn in which the average is about 76% for charter and 66% for public. Little Village has the highest averages for low-income percent within public elementary and high schools. North Lawndale has the highest averages within charter elementary and high schools.

Enrollment

Average enrollment is a difficult statistic to interpret – it could signify either smaller class sizes or lower rates of child participation in general. Further research is necessary to understand enrollment in terms of percent of child population and number of schools.

School Performance

Composite ISAT% for public elementary schools in all communities appears to be fairly similar. For charter schools, it is more distinct: charter schools in East and West Garfield produce the highest composite ISAT% of 78%, higher than the CPS average of 64%. Average ACT scores from high schools within all communities tend to be similar as well. Public high schools in the Quad Communities however produce an average ACT score of about 18, out-performing charter schools in general, and almost meeting the Illinois Average of 20.3.
Student population demographics were included to present an overall understanding of the population climate in the five focus neighborhoods. Enrollment numbers represented by the schools in the ten neighborhoods reveal which neighborhoods may have a sufficient population for accommodating the Promise School. All of the ten neighborhoods qualify as Promise Neighborhoods in terms of low-income level. ISAT and ACT (as a part of the PSAE) represent academic performance on a quantifiable level.
6. Four Potential CPN Locations: Survey Analysis

Englewood, Little Village, South Shore, Washington Park/Woodlawn

In this section we will analyze survey findings from four locations considered as a possible Chicago Promise Neighborhood: Englewood, Little Village, South Shore, and Washington Park/Woodlawn.

During the months of March and April, members of the Chicago Policy Research Team administered surveys regarding community programs and social infrastructure to residents in these areas (See Appendix A for survey questionnaire and details on survey administration).

There are two important, related ideas in Geoffrey Canada’s philosophy of change: contamination and wrap around services. In the survey we tried to measure both neighborhood cohesion and the severity of the underlying problems that a Promise Neighborhood would need to address.

Contamination refers to the idea that a tipping point of students invested in education can change the culture of an entire neighborhood. To this end, we used the survey to gauge the possibilities for contamination in each of the four neighborhoods by measuring community cohesion, which we define as trust among residents and the strength of community organizations.

Wrap around services take entire families as units of intervention. According to Geoffrey Canada, it is not enough to provide quality academic support, as children also need to be supported at home and in their community. At the same time, the goal of a Promise Neighborhood is getting children into college. Improving the community is thus a means to an end. Using the results of the survey we outline problems within the communities that a CPN would need to address. These include the presence of gangs and violence, availability of healthy food and medical care, availability of employment opportunities, parenting styles, and perceptions about the quality of schools. All of these issues regarding the social infrastructure of the neighborhoods should be taken into account before starting an educational intervention like a Chicago Promise Neighborhood.

Finally, based on the survey, we give a brief account of differences we found between Washington Park and Woodlawn. Although combined in our analysis, these are two distinct neighborhoods with individual histories and cultures, and each could pose unique implementation challenges. Results from the two neighborhoods are otherwise combined.

6.1. Community Cohesion

Community cohesion is an essential feature concerning the establishment of a future Promise Neighborhood. In order to provide an educational institution that will help not only children, but also the surrounding community, the idea of contamination becomes very relevant. In order for this contamination to occur, the whole community must be enveloped in the vision. In an effort to measure such community cohesion, we asked community respondents questions pertaining to the level of trust they have for others in their community.
We asked respondents to answer several questions about residents' relationships with each other. These questions included whether residents in their community trust other adults or youth within the community, whether residents get along with each other, and whether residents look out for kids who aren’t their own. Community residents across all four focus neighborhoods trusted youth in the community the least, with less than 50% agreeing or strongly agreeing on this subject. South Shore exhibited the least amount of trust across all questions about resident relationships (but tied with Englewood for whether residents get along with each other), suggesting that South Shore may demonstrate the least amount of community cohesion within the four neighborhoods (Figure 6.1).

**Figure 6.1: Percentage of respondents who agree or strongly agree with each statement**

Respondents across all four neighborhoods reported higher trust for local churches, local schools, and the University of Chicago: over 75% in each neighborhood agreed or strongly agreed that these institutions can be trusted to do what is best for the community. Less trust, however, was reported for the City of Chicago government and the Chicago Police Department in all four neighborhoods (Figure 6.2).

**Figure 6.2: Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree that the following organization can be trusted to do what is best for their community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Chicago government</th>
<th>Chicago Police Department</th>
<th>Local Schools</th>
<th>Local Churches</th>
<th>University of Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Englewood (n=89)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Village (n=53)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore (n=100)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park and Woodlawn (n=96)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the four neighborhoods, residents of Little Village trusted Chicago Police Department the least, with only 43% agreeing or strongly agreeing that the CPD can be trusted. South Shore trusted the Chicago Police Department the most, with 64% agreeing or strongly agreeing. The same trend is found regarding trust of the City of Chicago Government; Little Village residents reported agreeing or strongly agreeing the least (50%), and South Shore residents reported agreeing or strongly agreeing the most (68%).

6.2. Drugs and Violence

Drugs and violence are pressing issues for all four areas. When ranking the level of need for five different youth programs, the majority of respondents in all neighborhoods ranked “Drug and Violence Prevention” as a first or second priority.

A higher percentage of Washington Park and Woodlawn survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with statements such as “Children are safe walking to and from school” and “Children are safe traveling to after-school programs,” compared to the other three neighborhoods, and a lower percentage (66%) agreed that gang territory affects places children can go (Figure 6.3). By contrast, a low percentage of Englewood residents agreed with the first two statements (31% and 29% respectively) and had the highest percentage out of all four areas (82%) reporting that they agreed or strongly agreed, “Gang territory affects places children can go.”

Figure 6.3: Percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with statements concerning child safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children are safe walking to and from school</th>
<th>Children are safe travelling to after-school programs</th>
<th>Gang territory affects places children can go</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Englewood (n=89)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Village (n=53)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore (n=100)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park and Woodlawn (n=96)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, only 30% of Englewood respondents that are currently parents or caregivers of children reported that they often face the obstacle of gang presence or violence in raising their children, compared to 54% of South Shore residents who said they face this problem (Figure 6.4). The percentage of Washington Park and Woodlawn respondents who say they often face gang-related obstacles was also low by comparison while the percentage of Little Village residents who say this was relatively high.

While there is no conclusive trend, except that children’s safety before and after-school is an important challenge for all four neighborhoods, the survey does show a lower perception among respondents in Washington Park and Woodlawn that violence strongly affects children’s lives.
6.3. Access to Health Care and Healthy Food

At 32%, Englewood presented the highest percentage of residents that disagreed or strongly disagreed that health centers were of high quality, compared to 29% of Washington Park and Woodlawn and less than 20% in both South Shore and Little Village. Englewood also had a high number of residents who often face health-related obstacles to raising their children. High percentages of respondents in South Shore and Washington Park and Woodlawn also often faced obstacles, compared to lower percentages in Little Village (see Figure 6.5 below).
Nutrition and health programs, for both children and adults, were viewed across all neighborhoods as the least needed service in their community, with the exception of Little Village where residents ranked it fourth overall, just above tutoring and college prep. These findings suggest that health and nutrition components of a potential Chicago Promise Neighborhood would require some effort at developing community buy-in. Little Village was the neighborhood with the lowest percentage of residents who agreed that children have access to healthy food (45%).

At the same time, less than half of Englewood residents agreed that grocery stores in their neighborhood are high quality. This could simply reflect that Englewood respondents overall perceived institutions as lower quality compared to respondents in other neighborhoods. However, out of all the institutions asked about in that question (elementary schools, high schools, health centers, community centers, and after-school programs), the highest percentage of respondents disagreed with the statement “Grocery stores in Englewood are high quality.” In fact, out of all responses across all four neighborhoods, the question about grocery stores was the only one in Englewood in which a majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the program was high quality.

6.4. Jobs and Youth Employment

After drug and violence prevention, youth employment and training were cited as the second-most needed youth program in all four communities. Three in four respondents in Washington Park and Woodlawn said they at least sometimes face obstacles raising children because of financial concerns. In addition 37% of South Shore residents said they “often” face obstacles due to a job or a financial situation (Figure 6.6).

![Figure 6.6: Percent of respondents who say they often face obstacles raising their child due to a job or financial situation](image-url)
6.5. Parenting

Parenting classes were consistently ranked as the second most-needed family program across all four areas, behind substance abuse programs, with about half of respondents ranking it as either first or second. The exception is Little Village, where the majority of respondents ranked parenting classes as third or below (with substance abuse first and child care second).

The lowest percentage of residents who agreed or strongly agreed that parents in their neighborhood spank their children was in Little Village at 44% compared to about 60% for Washington Park and Woodlawn and South Shore, and 70% for Englewood. Little Village respondents also agreed in far lower percentages that they allow their child to question their decisions at 56% compared to 71-77% for the other neighborhoods. Little Village also agreed in far lower percentages that they discuss the future with their child at 79%, compared to 94-96% (Figure 6.7). This could reflect a difference in parenting culture among Little Village residents. Otherwise, there was little variation among respondents from the other neighborhoods regarding parenting.

![Figure 6.7: Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree with each statement on parenting](image)

6.6. Schools

Sentiment among residents about the quality of schools in the community can help explain some of the structural features a community has or lacks concerning the quality of education children are receiving in a given community. Among the four focus neighborhoods, residents in Little Village had the highest opinion of elementary and high school quality (see Figure 6.8). This may be a reflection of recent efforts in school reform in this community. All four communities reported that elementary schools were higher quality than high schools in their area.
After-school programs were mentioned the most by respondents in all four communities in a final open-ended question in which they were asked if they would like to provide any additional thoughts about their communities. They specifically stated the need for more programs, more community centers, or more affordable and accessible activities.

### 6.7. Comparison of Washington Park and Woodlawn

From the survey analysis it is evident that Washington Park and Woodlawn have many similarities amongst their residents’ views of their individual communities. However, some of the main differences are as follows:

- 59% of Woodlawn respondents believe gang territory affects places children can go versus 73% of Washington Park respondents.
- Lower percentages of Washington Park residents agreed or strongly agreed that they trusted organizations in their community (see Figure 6.9).
- Most Woodlawn respondents believe heads of non-profit organizations are positive leaders in their community whereas most Washington Park respondents cite religious leaders as the most positive.
- Overall, residents in Washington Park disagreed in higher numbers that institutions in their community were low quality compared to residents in Woodlawn (see Figure 6.10).
Overall, the results indicate lower perceptions of the quality of community organizations, and lower trust of local institutions in Washington Park. Based on this analysis, Washington Park could pose greater challenges for implementing a Promise Neighborhood.
7. Four Potential CPN Locations: Qualitative Case Studies
   Englewood, Little Village, South Shore, Woodlawn/Washington Park

In this section we will analyze four locations for a possible Chicago Promise Neighborhood: Englewood, South Lawndale (“Little Village”), South Shore, and the Washington Park/Woodlawn communities. Each of the locations was studied qualitatively using focus groups and interviews for the purpose of documenting community sentiment. This section examines education reform, community sentiment, social assets and potential obstacles for implementing a Promise Neighborhood in these locations.

7.1. Englewood

Figure 7.1: Existing Social Assets in Englewood

NOTE: The schoolhouses represent schools, buses represent transportation lines, green pins represent community service agencies, and the red cross represent medical care. The red triangle highlights a local transportation and public resource hub.

Context

Englewood is a community located on the southwest side of Chicago that has recently seen substantial investment by the City. There are roughly 80,000 residents who live within the approximately fifteen square miles of the Greater Englewood community, which includes East and
West Englewood. Most residents are at or below the poverty line (41.8%). Parts of Greater Englewood fall within the boundaries of five different wards. The population density of the community, 5,027 people per square mile, is low in comparison to other potential Chicago Promise Neighborhoods. Additionally, Englewood is currently classified as a depopulating community, with the lowest growth in child population (under age 16) among all potential CPNs and one of the highest foreclosure rates in Chicago (0.63%, highest in the South Side).

The Greater Englewood community is unique in that it contains two structurally distinct portions within its boundaries. East Englewood, which contains approximately 36,700 (45%) of the 80,000 Englewood residents and extends from 55th to 75th Street between Racine Avenue and LaSalle Boulevard, is much more structurally sound than its neighbor, West Englewood. East Englewood contains a majority of the community’s schools, stores, service providers, and is well connected through public transportation while West Englewood lacks access to citywide transportation and is considered a food desert. Therefore, we recommend that East Englewood be used for the initial target area for a CPN, leaving West Englewood to be encased by a later expansion. The following report will primarily evaluate the viability of East Englewood as a CPN.

Education

There are thirteen public elementary schools, three high schools (two public and one magnet), and two charter schools in Englewood (again, excluding West Englewood). In 2004 the majority of Englewood schools were on academic probation and the percentages of students in special education or foster care were among the highest in the city. In the past five years, however, changes have been made to improve these institutions. CPS closed Bunche Elementary School, suspended the admittance of freshman into Englewood High School, and re-opened Lindblom High School as a selective-enrollment college preparatory school. In 2006, Bunche re-opened as a school managed by St. Mel as part of the initiative to restructure Englewood as a campus of small schools.

Walter Reed Magnet Cluster Elementary School
6550 S Stewart Avenue, Chicago, IL 60621
According to CPS officials, Walter Reed Elementary is one of the worst, poorly functioning schools in the city. It has a student population of 300, with a mobility rate close to 50%, and is using less than 50% of building space. Despite Reed’s 40 plus years in the community, it was recently decided that it would be phased out due to decreased enrollment rates.

TEAM Englewood Community Academy
6201 S Stewart Avenue, 1st and 2nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60621
A high school created as part of CPS Renaissance 2010 that began two years ago. Its ninth grade class started with 148 students and it aims to take in 140-150 students each year until it is a full, grade 9-12, high school. Students have made higher than expected gains in their Explorer scores, moving from a mean score of 12.4 in 9th grade to a 14.1 in 10th grade, and attendance rates are high at nearly 90%. However, the school experiences challenges such as lack of parental involvement, as only 30-35 parents regularly participate despite intensive school efforts. Furthermore, there is tension with students of Urban Prep, as they share the building, and discipline issues. Additionally, safety concerns traveling to and from school impact attendance, though the school has taken measures to address this issue, such as having security guards or coaches escort children to public transportation.
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Urban Prep
6201 S Stewart Avenue, 3rd Floor, Chicago, IL 60621

Created three years ago, Urban Prep, Chicago’s only all-male charter high school, is noted for its innovative techniques and achievements, and serves both the Englewood and Woodlawn communities. It plans on opening other campuses in East Garfield Park and South Shore. One measure of its success was the jump in its students’ ACT scores; third-year students initially scored in the 35th percentile, but increased to the 76th percentile on their second try. The school attributes its success to its extended school days, six-week assessments that keep students on their toes, mandatory after-school programs, and a program called “pride” which forms a community of which students are a part for all four years of high school. They have three development programs for teachers – one weekly, one monthly, and one three times a year – and many teachers are black males from Englewood who want to give back to their community. As Urban Prep moves into its fourth year, the school will attempt to provide rising seniors with internships and help with college applications. The school faces similar challenges to TEAM Englewood and administrators note academic growth is nearly impossible without socioeconomic growth. The school tries to address this issue by having the students wear uniforms, but this contributes to safety issues and students often change out of their uniform to walk to and from school.

Paul Robeson High School
6835 Normal Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60621

Paul Robeson is one of the most consistently underperforming high schools in Englewood and Greater Chicago. The school faces many challenges, such as low attendance rates, a thirty-percent special needs population, and student representation from three gangs. Administrators have worked to address these problems by bringing together gang leaders and inducing them to call a truce while in the building, offering rewards to students who participate, creating a relatively successful support system for anger management, and giving students bus cards for transportation to and from school activities. Their optional after-school programs such as bowling or skating have a thirty-percent attendance rate. Administrators have identified a need for childcare, as students often cannot make it to class because they have to care for their own children. Eighty-two percent of students enter the school achieving significantly below grade level; the average reading level for students entering 9th grade is at a 4.3 grade level. This poses challenges to Robeson’s interactions with CPS and the state government as they expect the school’s students to reach a certain numerical goal, which is difficult when students are coming into the system performing at such low levels.
Snapshots from Englewood

An Arrest on 63rd Street: Drugs and gang violence is not a unique problem to Englewood. According to residents, the media unfairly present Englewood in a harsh light. As Daryl, a former gang member now working as a community ambassador for Teamwork Englewood said, “Somebody will be killed and it won’t even be in Englewood, but immediately, the media will say, ‘Englewood.’ A thousand of us jumped on the phone and said, ‘That ain’t Englewood.’ We get tired of getting a bad rap.”
Gated Homes (above, below): Our research showed that residents agree that the composition of the neighborhood has changed over the past few decades, and community members are less connected to one another.
Possible Challenges to Implementation of a CPN

Health Issues

A 2003 study by the Chicago Department of Health indicated that Englewood residents were dying of diseases such as cancer at a higher rate than other residents of Chicago. Englewood ranks in the top fifth of all Chicago areas for negative health findings, from sexually transmitted diseases to low birth weight, and more than half of all children at local elementary schools have not received required immunizations for their age group.

In key informant interviews, focus groups and surveys, the community is described as a “food desert” where there is a dearth of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other healthy food available. Another problem is that lead is prevalent in the community, which is poisonous if ingested. While negative effects of this can be high, such as impaired learning or lower IQ, the problem remains difficult to address; residents are often unable to pay to have their homes checked for lead or have it removed.

The City of Chicago, Cook County, and the State of Illinois have created programs to address some of these issues, such as “Closing the Gap” and “Greater Englewood Healthy Start.” Participants in Englewood planning meetings have identified several further steps that could be taken, such as creating walking clubs, attracting a full-service produce store to the area, and expanding the availability of healthy options at small-scale grocery stores. Teamwork Englewood has held health fairs with representatives from the Board of Health to offer lead screenings for children.

Lack of Community and Political Cohesiveness

There are five wards that encompass the Englewood community, the 3rd, 6th, 16th, 17th, and 20th wards, governed by the respective aldermen and alderwomen, Pat Dowell, Freddrenna Lyle, JoAnn Thompson, Latasha Thomas, and Willie Cochran. According to community members, the community appears fragmented due to these five political figures that cover a number of areas with diverse interests. However, this may be changing, as three of the six are currently on the board of Teamwork Englewood. Fragmentation in the community is also caused by the existence of formerly incarcerated individuals, wards of the state, single-parent households and “grand” families. In 2005, more than 6,300 of Greater Englewood’s 8,700 family households, with one or more children under the age of 18, were headed by single parents who were primarily mothers. Census data from 2000 showed more than 2,650 grandparents were responsible for raising one or more grandchildren, and many more made substantial contributions to their upbringing.

Since August 2004, the community has come together through efforts of Teamwork Englewood, whose motto is “Together Everyone Achieves More,” to create a Quality of Life Plan identifying the needs of the community and coming up with solutions to address these needs. More than 650 individuals, the majority of whom were residents, attended planning meetings held over 18 months in 2004 and 2005 to contribute to this plan, which was published in December 2005. The production of this plan was a requirement of LISC/Chicago’s New Communities Program. Between 30-40 community members attended the Wednesday evening meetings and another 80-90 concerned community members attended the Saturday morning meetings. Their goals, to be completed by 2010, include creating and attracting new housing, more retail stores, cultural activities, health and social services to the neighborhood.
Focus group participants agreed that, while Englewood used to be very close-knit, its composition had changed over the past few decades. Residents agreed that community members are now less connected to one another. “I used to be everyone’s grandma…we were all like an extended family,” said a participant in our first focus group. Another participant in our second focus group echoed this statement: “you didn’t just have one set of parents, you had several.” This cohesiveness and level of involvement has since disappeared. “Now people don’t even speak to each other,” said a participant in our first focus group. Community members attribute this change to the influx of young people. The neighborhood started changing, said a participant in our second focus group, “when children start[ed] having children and [didn’t] know how to take care of them.” An employee at Teamwork Englewood and former gang member cited the closing of the YMCA on 67th and Union (69th and Wentworth) as the moment of change. After this central location was torn down, he said, there was no longer a safe place in the community where everyone could go, and conflicts arose between the gangs.

Not all residents, however, are disconnected from their neighbors. Participants in our second focus group talked about coming together to form a block club, which set up a phone tree and burglar watch. Participants could only get three or four concerned people on their block. However, they were able to get other people on surrounding other blocks involved. They have a beat meet with the police so they can vent their problems and are recognized by the police. “We’re taking back our block,” one participant in our second focus group said. This block club also has contacts in vacant buildings, gangs, etc., and even aldermen are checking with them now. Community members have found their view of the local aldermen something to bond over. “We have to learn that the aldermen and them, we are not working for them, they’re working for us,” said a participant in our second focus group, as many nodded in agreement, “and we’re not going to let them put up signs in our windows unless they start doing stuff for us.”

Focus group participants seemed to feel that residents outside the community have a negative view of the neighborhood. A participant from our second focus group said, “When I moved out west for a time and people asked me where I was from, I would say, “the wood,” in Chicago, and they’d know what [I] was talking about.” A participant in our second focus group, however, said, “When I say I live in Englewood people say, ‘Good God!’” A Teamwork Englewood employee said that this is due, at least in part, to media misrepresentation. “We [in Englewood] get a bad rap. Everything that happens on the south side [of Chicago], they say it’s [in] Englewood.” Participants in our first focus group, however, stressed that they felt that the problems Englewood faces – such as violence – are not restricted to just their neighborhood, they are pervasive throughout the city of Chicago. Lack of community cohesiveness can be a problem because it may mean that residents are more inclined to move out of the community. This only exacerbates existing negative spirals: “That’s really part of the crisis – people who become successful, they leave…if there are professionals who stay, then the kids have someone to aspire to be like down the street,” said an employee at Teamwork Englewood.

**Need for Employment Opportunities**

A major challenge facing members of the community is a lack of employment opportunities. In 2003, the Illinois Department of Labor reported that there were 7,400 jobs available in Greater Englewood, one job for every three working-age residents. From a study done by Jeff Draper and Jenn Space in 2004-2005, Englewood had an unemployment rate of 15.8% and the average age was 31.4 with an average income of $32,641. The unemployment rate is high compared to low-risk
neighborhoods, whose average unemployment rate is 6.4%. Based on 2005 statistics, only 52% of residents over the age of twenty-five years have earned a high school diploma and only 9% have earned an associates degree or higher. In 2000, the unemployment rate was 25%, more than twice the citywide median of 10%, and the median income was $18,955, less than half the citywide median. Teamwork Englewood is currently developing an initiative that will focus on job training and community education.

Of our focus group participants, a large percentage of those who were not retired were unemployed and looking for work. Residents fit the requirements for many jobs, said a Teamwork Englewood employee, but “they [the managers] don’t give you a chance to get your foot in the door!” When more traditional forms of employment are proven to not be viable options, “they end up out here on the streets,” she continued. As a result, gang and drug activity increases, since people see it as a way to generate income. A gang member said, “Like I told my momma – I get a job, I’m ma gonna quit the gang.” This lack of employment opportunities exacerbates the drug and gang cycles, as more adults become involved and kids see it as a logical substitute for a more legitimate job.

Drug and Gang Activity

Drugs, gang activity and the resulting violence greatly affect the community. It’s “like you’re living in a war zone,” one participant in our first focus group stated. When asked, “What are the issues facing children?” another participant immediately answered, “Gangs.” While a participant in our second focus group stressed that gang violence had improved, others maintained that it is still prevalent, although the focus has shifted from turf wars to competition over who earns the most drug money. “Guys will kill each other when they’re in the same gang, just because one is making more than the other,” a participant in our second focus group said. According to a program coordinator at Teamwork Englewood, it is the combination of drug and gang activity that is especially harmful, because it leads to an endless, inescapable cycle. “The drug stuff is the worse,” he said, “because it causes violence and the addict is the one that’s going to rob you and take it back to buy the drugs.” The pervasiveness of this activity has far-reaching effects as youth in the community are exposed to it at a young age. “The youth only have the drug culture to look at,” he continued, “so that’s what the youth have to emulate.” Many second focus group participants also shared this sentiment.

Teen Pregnancy and High Dropout Rates

There seems to be a high prevalence of teen pregnancies and young mothers in Englewood. According to focus group participants, teen parents are less prepared and less able to care for their children. “We got 16-, 17-year-old parents, and they don’t know what to do,” said a participant in our first focus group. Many leave their children to “raise themselves,” and “leave kids to watch other kids,” as another participant said. Teen parents are also often forced to drop out of school to care for their children. “They don’t care about that,” said another participant. “Now school is on the backburner.” A participant in our first focus group summed up this phenomenon by answering the question, “what are the biggest obstacles to raising children in Englewood?” with, “no parenting and no education.”

Perceived Police Corruption, Disconnect from Elected Leaders

Many community members are unsatisfied with and feel disconnected from the leaders in Englewood. Several residents raised concerns of police corruption and ineffectiveness. A participant
in our second focus group described an example of this: “Every morning at 4 a.m. if you pass the gas station there’s drug dealers and people buying,” she said, “and there are police riding by, and they don’t do anything.” Even local gang members agree. One gang chief referred to the police as “rats” who are “out here sellin’ drugs too, shootin’ guns and killin’ people too.” Community members also do not feel as though their elected leaders are committed to identifying and addressing their needs. For example, community members do not believe, as they feel their leaders do, that the community needs more housing; instead, they wish to see things like more viable opportunities for employment.

Police should be effective and trusted in the community, so that community members are encouraged to reach out and notify them when they see crimes occur. A participant in our second focus group proposed that Englewood should “get rid of the bad police and start paying people here to do it. Give them jobs and they won’t be crooked because they live here.” Another issue that needs to be addressed is creating a safe passage to and from school for kids as well as ensuring that they are safe once they get there. A participant in our second focus group said, “kids aren’t safe in school,” and others added that they often carry guns or knives. A Teamwork Englewood employee stressed that we “have to educate the gang members to let them know how certain behavior [not allowing kids to safely get to and from school] is counterproductive to communities and families and everyday life.”

**Need for Improved Education System**

A major need in the Englewood community is a better education system. Many of the existing schools appear to be sub-par, uncommitted to students, and lack adequate after-school programs. Some community members believe some of the schools are so bad that they should not even be open: “I think they should close up a lot of the elementary schools in Englewood because they are not up to par,” said a woman in our second focus group. While residents acknowledged that teachers had to deal with misbehaving and unruly students, many of whom come in performing below grade level, many focus group participants characterized teachers as “not qualified” or “just looking to get a paycheck,” and stressed that they “need to understand kids’ needs better.” When the teachers encounter problems, “they suspend the kids so they don’t have to deal with them,” said a participant in our second focus group. “If the boss stops playing politics and hires educated teachers – instead of [his] girlfriend’s brother – the quality will be better,” said another participant in our second focus group. It is not just the teachers that residents are unhappy with; many are likewise unsatisfied with the principals and education system as a whole.

Part of the problem, said a service provider from Teamwork Englewood, is that the schools expect the kids to drop out. “If you tell a kid and make him go, he’ll go,” she said, “but if you don’t expect anything, you won’t get anything.” This attitude of expecting kids to fail, shared by both school administrators and faculty, according to residents, also needs to be changed; in his *So Much Reform, So Little Change*, Charles Payne makes the point that when teachers and administrators have faith in students, they are more likely to succeed.

It seems that there are better schools in surrounding communities and that many parents make use of them. While residents may benefit from this opportunity, many parents feel negatively about being forced to send their children outside of the community to be educated. “Why do we have to bus our children to other districts for better education?” asked an angry participant in our second focus group. “The good schools should be here too.”
Need for More Programs for Kids

Nearly all focus group participants agreed that there are not enough high-quality, accessible after-school programs for kids. “When we were coming up, they had all kinds of activities,” reminisced a participant in our second focus group, “but they don’t have programs like that anymore.” This lack of available programs exacerbates existing drug and gang activity problems. “[When] their parents can’t afford to put them in programs, they’re out here doing nothing,” a participant in our first focus group said. “Get them in constructive programs where they won’t get involved [in drug or gang activity],” a participant in our second focus group said. “Once they become teenagers, there’s not much [one] can do.” An employee at Teamwork Englewood said that youth are most influenced from 3rd through 6th grade; “you know if you’re gonna be in a gang from those ages pretty much. If you can get to a kid before then, then you got them, but that’s how the gangs see them too,” they said. Many participants in our second focus group agreed that the prevalence of gangs affected how they raised their children. One participant explained how you have to try to get them to see what they should see and shield them from “everything,” but it’s difficult, because “when they get outside, they see the money, and that’s the influence.” “You can’t let your child be a child,” added another.

Again, participants used this lack of programs for kids as an example of the government failing to address the real needs of the community. A woman in our second focus group said, “we don’t need housing, we need basketball hoops.” This sentiment was shared by a majority of focus group participants. Community members believe that they need a community center, and safe places for kids to go. Participants in our second focus group said they specifically wanted to see programs that would teach kids how to use a computer, make a resume, give them job-training skills, something “to better educate their minds.” While there are some already existing programs, residents complained that they cost money; “most of the kids that need it, can’t afford to pay for it,” said one participant in our second focus group. “You gotta pay bills too,” she added. Some of these programs are not in Englewood, and like the better schools, require bussing for children to get to, which create additional problems.

Social Assets

East Englewood has a wide variety of community organizations that provide varying services to residents. Nearly all the agencies listed below are in East Englewood, not because a lack of searching in West Englewood, rather because there is a lack of services in that area. The most likely candidate for a partner agency is Teamwork Englewood, which we will discuss more in more detail below.

Direct Service Organizations

Beloved
6430 S Harvard Avenue
Beloved is a major community-based organization, founded in 2004, with a health prevention and education initiative, youth services, and community corrections and interventions, including after-school programs such as After School Matters.

Imagine Englewood If… (IEi)
1854 W Garfield Boulevard
In 1997, IEi formed at the catalyst of one woman who attended classes on Imagine Chicago Citizen Leadership in order to learn how to improve the quality of life for Chicago residents.
Today it is one of the most prominent organizations in Englewood and oversees a variety of youth programs, including the following:

- **Youth In Media:** in weekly journalism class youth report on pressing community issues via CAN-TV (Channel 21) and “Speak-Out,” a quarterly written publication.
- **Poetry & Spoken Word:** youth develop this unique form of self-expression in weekly workshops and a quarterly newsletter.
- **Field Trips:** local and national trips expose Englewood youth to cultural activities and advocacy opportunities that inspire them to take active roles in their community and learn about the world around them.
- **Journalism Club:** allows youth the opportunity to voice their concerns, build writing and editing skills and influence social change through written word. The group meets every week to plan, design, write and edit a quarterly newsletter, Speak Out.11

**Department of Human Services (DHS)**
6430 S Harvard Avenue
Since 1997, the DHS site has coordinated state resources, a mental health clinic, food pantry, parenting training, and provides dental care, as well as supporting the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). WIC provides supplemental foods, health care referrals, and nutrition education for low-income pregnant, breastfeeding, and non-breastfeeding postpartum women, and to infants and children up to age five years who are found to be at nutritional risk.

**Kennedy-King College**
6301 S Halstead Street
Kennedy-King College, formerly known as Woodrow Wilson Junior College in 1935, is a $200 million project that rose from previously vacant lots on Halstead and 63rd Street. It is a Chicago Community College located in the center of the neighborhood, and has great potential to be involved in the implementation of a PN. Kennedy-King is equipped with physical capital, such as a gym, bookstore, meeting spaces, and computers, and also offers numerous community programs, such as the following:

- Vocational workshops,
- Job Searching Assistance,
- Preschool Services, and Child Development programs.

**Children’s Home and Aid (CHASI)**
Since 1883, CHASI serves nearly 40,000 children and families in need every year and strives to help children overcome poverty, abuse, and neglect.

**Salvation Army**
845 W 69th Street
Salvation Army invested $20 million in a new facility on 69th and Halstead, but residents do not perceive this as a useful or accessible asset, according to focus groups.
Indirect Service Organizations

Teamwork Englewood
815 W 63rd Street

Teamwork Englewood, formed in 2003 as a comprehensive vehicle for community development, could serve as an effective partner agency for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood. It was developed to serve the central role of a community-planning agency that is required for the New Communities Program. It now serves as a facilitator between many community-planning initiatives and catalyst for all the community programs and schools in the Greater Englewood area, as well as performing its role as a MacArthur Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) designated agency.

Additional Assets

- Transportation: The community is connected to the larger city by both the Red Line and Green Line of the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), as well as the Chicago Metra Rail; the Green Line terminal at 63rd St./Ashland sees 1,900 riders each day.
- Library: The new West Englewood Library opened a year and a half ago.
- Safety: A new police station is set to open in the summer 2009
- Ogden Park
- Food Pantries
- Healthy Start: Nutrition Programs, at eight area schools

Conclusion

Based on our research we believe Englewood to be a well-suited candidate for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood. While major challenges to the implementation of such a comprehensive neighborhood program do exist, including high rates of teenage pregnancy, drug and gang activity, and violence, they could be overcome through the implementation of new programs. Englewood has a strong base of existing assets and social service agencies, as well as recent City of Chicago investment and community support, as evidenced by the recently produced Quality of Life Plan. As one employee at Teamwork Englewood put it, “I would put emphasis on Englewood because there is a lot of focus on Englewood – it could be a model program for the city and the whole state and the country! I want to see something really great come from Englewood.”
7.2. “Little Village” (South Lawndale)

Figure 7.2: Existing Social Assets in Little Village

NOTE: The schoolhouses represent schools, green balloons represent community service agencies, and red crosses represent medical care.

Context

The South Lawndale, or “Little Village” (we will use the names interchangeably), community area located in the southwest part of Chicago has the highest density in the city. South Lawndale’s total population reached 91,071 in 2000 with the total Hispanic population estimated at 75,613 with a population density of 4,188 people per square kilometer. As an immigrant community, Little Village has a relatively young population with 40% of residents under the age of 25. There are a total of 10,994 family households, of which 8,132 have children under 18 and 12,271 total households with individuals under 18. Little Village is an emerging low-income community, meaning that there exists a decreasing number of high-income families and an increasing amount of low-income families. The average household income is $31,443 with a child poverty rate of 50%.

Education

In the past decade, there have been large-scale education reforms in this area due to the booming population. Alderman Ricardo Muñoz of the 22nd ward has dedicated his time to improving the quality of education within the community.
Elementary Schools: In 1993 and 1994 when schools in Little Village were at 160%–170% capacity, Muñoz launched the “educational renaissance advocacy effort” petitioning for more schools to be built in the Lawndale communities. By 1997, five new elementary schools were built within two miles of each other, and were operating at full capacity:

Finkl Elementary School
2332 S Western Avenue, Chicago, IL 60608
A pre-kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 679 students, of which 79% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 8.1 days absent per student per year.  

Josefa Ortiz de Dominguez Elementary School
3000 S Lawndale Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 2nd neighborhood school with 789 students and an average of 7 days absent per student per year. No academic progress is currently available.  

Little Village Academy
2620 S Lawndale Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 805 students, 70% of which are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 6.3 days absent per student per year.  

Madero Middle School
3202 W 28th Street, Chicago, IL 60623
A 6 – 8th neighborhood school with 327 students, 74% of which are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 9.4 days absent per student per year.  

Zapata Academy
2728 S Kostner Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 976 students, 81% of which are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 7 days absent per student per year.  

Previously Existing Elementary Schools

Cardenas
2345 S Millard Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 3rd neighborhood school with 606 students, 72% of which are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 8.8 days absent per student per year.  

Castellanos
2524 S Central Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A neighborhood 4 – 8th school with 554 students, of which 60% are meeting or exceeding state standards and with an average of 9 days absent per student per year.  

DePaul University “adopted” a 6th grade class at Rosario Castellanos Elementary School (the class is currently in 9th grade) and is tracking them throughout high school while providing the resources and support with college as an end goal. With the help of Renaissance 2010 a new charter school is planned to open soon and will emphasize careers in health.
Corkery
2510 S Kildare Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A neighborhood pre-kindergarten – 8th school with 660 students, of which 66% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 9.2 days absent per student per year.27

Gary
3740 W 31st Street, Chicago, IL 60623
A neighborhood 3 – 8th school with 1,232 students, of which 68% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 13.7 days absent per student per year.28

Hammond
2819 W 21st Place, Chicago, IL 60623
A neighborhood pre-kindergarten – 8th school with 506 students, of which 66% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 8.8 days absent per student per year.29

Kanoon Magnet
2233 S Kedzie Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th magnet school with 701 students, of which 61% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with has an average of 8.5 days absent per student per year.30

McCormick
2712 S Sawyer Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A neighborhood pre-kindergarten – 5th school with 916 students, of which 62% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 7.6 days absent per student per year.31

Paderewski
2221 S Lawndale Street, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 182 students, of which 47% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 19.6 days absent per student per year.32

Saucedo School
2850 W 24th Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th magnet school with 1269 students, of which 80% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 6.1 days absent per student per year.33

Spry
2400 S Marshall Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 838 students, of which 73% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 6.7 days absent per student per year.34

Telopchalli
2832 W 24th Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60623
A kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 232 students, of which 58% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 7.9 days absent per student per year.35
Whitney
2815 S Komensky Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A pre-kindergarten – 8th neighborhood school with 1092 students, of which 71% are meeting or exceeding state standards, with an average of 7.9 days absent per student per year.36

High Schools

Farragut Career Academy
2345 S Christiana Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
A 9 – 12th neighborhood school with 2,079 students, of which 19% are meeting or exceeding PSAE standards, with an average ACT score of 15.9 and an average of 48 days absent per student per year.37 Farragut Career Academy was serving 2,200 to 2,300 students in facilities made for only 1,700; though land had been purchased for a new school in 1998, construction had not yet begun in 2001.38 Organized by Enlace, community parents protested with a 19-day hunger strike, which ended when the Board of Education promised to build the Little Village Lawndale High School.39

Little Village Lawndale High School
3120 S Kostner Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
This high school recently opened in response to large community activism across Little Village and will graduate its first class in June 2009. The school follows a small school model and is broken down into four different high schools, each focusing on a different theme in their curriculum. These four high schools are: Infinity Math, Science and Technology, Multicultural Arts, World Language, and Social Justice. Infinity houses 340 students with an average ACT score of 16.1 and 13% meet or exceed state standards.40 Multicultural Arts houses 323 students with an average ACT score of 15.9 and 16% meet or exceed state standards.41 World Language houses 350 students with an average ACT score of 16.5 and 13% meet or exceed state standards.42 Social Justice houses 342 students with an average ACT score of 15.5 and 10% meet or exceed state standards.43
Snapshots from “Little Village” (South Lawndale)

*Cultural Dynamics:* Little Village is an immigrant community of predominantly Spanish speakers. While Little Village is a tight-knit and active community, many leaders are concerned about the legal status of their residents, persistent residential turnover, language difficulties, and cultural barriers in considering Little Village as a Promise Neighborhood.
Culturally Rich (above, below): Colorful murals reflect the vibrant neighborhood that is “Little Village”
Possible Challenges to Implementation of a CPN

Cultural Dynamics and Educational Norms

With its large youth population and numerous social service organizations, Little Village is a tight-knit community with mobilized and active members. However, many community leaders are concerned about cultural barriers, including the fact that families often underemphasize the importance of education. Melissa Gonzalez, the Advocacy and Community Education Coordinator for Latinos Progresando, realizes that the cultural emphasis on work often causes parents to undermine their children’s educational future. She explained, “Sometimes we have the issue with some of our girls who got accepted to DePaul but their parents won’t let them leave the house. ‘My mom says I’m only going to school 12 hours a week, why don’t I take on a full time job?’ They don’t understand that you go to school but you have another 30 – 40 hours of studying outside the classroom.”

While in general strong work ethic is beneficial to the community, in situations like this, it makes it difficult for students to motivate themselves towards college. This poses a potential challenge to the implementation of a Promise Neighborhood. Geoffrey Canada’s mission for the Harlem Children’s Zone is to graduate an entire generation of Harlem students from college, guiding both parents and students through the process; Harlem, however, did not appear to have this same cultural barrier.

During a focus group of community members, many individuals commented on the different levels of parent involvement in the elementary versus in high schools. At the elementary level, one participant commented, “in the morning you see a huge flock of moms who still take their kids to school. During recess they’ll go out there and stand and watch while they’re having their recess.” Unfortunately, by the time these students reach high school, many parents have lost interest. As one Little Village mom commented, “once they get to high school parents think their kids are grown and involvement tapers off.”

While the community is very active and there are numerous educational programs, there is still a cultural inclination in favor of vocation over higher education. As one community leader described, “most people are coming from poorly educated countries, so they don’t know what school entails and how important [its] role is.” Ensuring that parents have a vested interest in their child’s education through college would need to be a huge part of establishing a Promise Neighborhood in this community. A Chicago Promise Neighborhood in Little Village would need to invest in programming designed to impress upon parents the importance of college for their children’s future by emphasizing that going to college is an extension of their strong work values.

Legal Status of Residents

Gabriela Arismendi, the Youth Development Coordinator at El Instituto del Progresso Latino, finds that many undocumented students and parents feel helpless about their educational futures. She has had a few students with BAs that have been unable to find employment due to their citizen status. Gonzalez is concerned about this as well. She believes that this is often the reason drop-out rates are so high, as she said, “If [students] figure they have no way of funding for college, they wonder, ‘Why am I even going to bother? I’m just going to end up working at a factory or end up getting some illegal job. Why even finish high school?’” Not only do undocumented individuals feel helpless concerning their futures, many parents may feel unable to be actively involved in their child’s schooling process, as they fear that participation that may result in discovery, despite their children’s legal status. In order to address this issue, a Promise Neighborhood in this community
would need to make assurances to protect the children within the system so that they too could ride the conveyor belt without fear. Furthermore, the use of federal funding in a predominantly new immigrant community could pose an additional obstacle and would need to be addressed directly by the Obama administration, Chicago city officials and public relation representatives.

**Likelihood of Residential and Student Mobility**

Beyond the legal and political considerations that would surround the implementation of a Chicago Promise Neighborhood in Little Village, there is a third effect of a high immigrant community: new immigrants are continuously arriving. As Alderman Muñoz noted, Little Village is an immigrant community, and as individuals gain status they move to different neighborhoods while young people and new immigrants are continually flooding in. ESL teacher at Rosario Castellanos Elementary School, Milagros Otero, argues that this influx of children creates complications for her as a teacher. She struggles to find a way to help them pass exams despite the fact that they may have recently arrived and have only a minimal grasp of English. Because the central mission of the Harlem Children’s Zone is to provide a conveyor belt of programs, it would be extremely difficult to implement a similar structure when there is a continual fluctuation of students. The implementation of a Promise Neighborhood may bring some stability to this neighborhood by encouraging rising middle class families to stay; however, incorporating a revolving door policy and providing protections to undocumented families to enable their children to have equal opportunities at education would be essential.

**High Rates of Unemployment in Formal Economy**

Little Village, similar to Harlem, faces the problem of high rates of unemployment. Employment in Little Village, however, is unique in that qualified accountants and other professionals are working as bus boys or other low-status jobs. It is unclear whether this underemployment is the result of discrimination, undocumented status or the lack of jobs, but regardless it does contribute to disparity in the community. When asked what one thing would increase overall quality of life in Little Village, Arismendi answered “jobs.” This lack of employment opportunities creates stressful environments for families and gives way to higher rates of mobility. With high unemployment, families will be more likely to move in search of a better job.

**Safety Concerns for Children and Youth**

Aside from education, many community leaders also expressed safety concerns within the neighborhood. Gang violence is not uncommon; one focus group participant explained that there are two rival gangs in the community, Latin Kings and Two-Six.” Otero said that while she does not yet see gang conflicts within her young students, she realizes that gang culture is still an influencing factor outside of the school environment. Community members also see gang violence as a concern. During a focus group, when asked what the biggest safety concern was, one man stated, “Gangs. When I came home on Friday night I saw some gangsters hitting a woman. There isn’t any safety here.” Other focus group participants voiced their concerns about gang violence, most noticeably that gangs are entirely comprised of youth and that current security measures are ineffective. Community members recommended installation of police officers patrolling blocks on foot, not just in police cars. Residents expressed that officers in cars will not involve themselves directly and thus do not pose adequate deterrents. One participant stressed, “He [the police officer]
drives up the block and they [the gang members] hide and then he goes away and then they come back.”

Additionally, there is also a concern with indiscriminate police brutality towards youth. One woman in one of our focus groups described the brutality within the schools, stating, “I’ve seen it happen in Little Village High School with the Latino youth. The police… came and they pulled the boys out and pushed them up against the wall.” In this case, however, the police also targeted the teacher, as the officers did not take the time to identify the people involved and mistook the teacher for a student. These security issues are other obstacles facing the implementation of a Promise Neighborhood in this community. Participants in one of our focus groups suggested making after-school programs more accessible and providing more community programs for young males as to help minimize future gang problems.

Language Barriers

As Little Village is an immigrant community where members predominately are Spanish speakers, language creates an important barrier for the implementation of a Promise Neighborhood. One of the primary methods Geoffrey Canada employs for measuring academic achievement in HCZ is evaluating standardized test scores, which do not provide a true measure of capabilities of students who have yet to learn English. Otero explained that a new language adjusted test is in the process of being developed within her school to try to account for the limited language proficiency of ESL students. Only children who have been in the school for less than five years will qualify, however, and she is not sure that this is a sufficient length of time for students to develop the language skills to take the unadjusted version on the test.

Another problem stemming from a lack of proficiency in English is that it creates a barrier to parent involvement. Active parents are key components to HCZ; parents that do not have a strong grasp of English will be unable to assist their child with homework and will be unable to effectively advocate for their children at a school in which English is the dominant language. A child's rapid shift toward English and a decrease in Spanish could increase tension in child-parent relationships. Little Village, however, already has active agencies, such as Enlace, which provide ESL courses for adults. A Chicago Promise Neighborhood in Little Village would have to build on existing community organizations to provide language support for parents while incorporating additional curriculum designed to teach English to non-native speakers. Alternatively, a Promise Neighborhood could develop a curriculum that offers bilingual education. If bilingual education were provided, it might allow children with limited English capabilities to not fall behind in other subjects due to the language barrier and would also enable many parents to be more involved in academics of their children. If implemented, a PN would have to ensure balance between effective education and assimilation.

Insider/Outsider Effect: Barriers to Participation

In our data collection conducted in the community, we encountered a pronounced insider/outsider effect; it does not seem as marked in organizational interactions. During an impromptu session with our focus group a few days after the group convened, members discussed a variety of possible reasons for the lack of community involvement. Besides expressing a more general reluctance to participate in these types of programs, one individual in our second focus group explained that some community members, “Don’t pay attention to what is going on. It doesn’t interest them.”
Generalizing for the entire community, another participant in this focus group described community members as having the mentality that, “someday I’ll be back home so there’s no point in learning the system.” He drew attention to the some of the community’s culture coming from “country folk” back home, and added, “As long as they keep putting food on the table they are happy.” While it is impossible to quantify the effects of this particular mentality from our focus group participants, it is an issue to be explored further were a Promise Neighborhood to be implemented in this community. Building a Promise Neighborhood would require strong support from local leaders and local organizations, such as Alderman Muñoz, Enlace, El Instituto and others to establish legitimacy and to inspire reluctant of community members to be involved.

Social Assets

Carole Robertson Center for Learning
Provides childcare, Early Head Start, preschool, youth development, and after-school programs and serves over 450 children.

Instituto Del Progreso Latino
2570 S Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608
In addition to the schools, many organizations within the community also provide supplemental educational support to youth and residents. El Instituto del Progreso Latino and Enlace cover a broad range of adult and youth education programs. For over thirty years, El Instituto has been dedicated to serving Latino immigrants and runs a series of youth programs for ages 8 to 21 which serve around 14,000 individuals annually. The organization’s after-school program for youth ages 8 to 14 features homework help, field trips and life skills workshops. For high school students, the center is currently piloting a sophomore program, which balances two days of homework help and two days of workshops geared towards improving writing ability and starting students on a track towards college, and a junior/senior program called Escaleras. Students are provided with workforce preparation in March of their junior year, which includes résumé writing, interview skills and career nights. Throughout the summer students are placed in a six-week internship program where they take Internet resource courses each morning and then work from noon to 5 p.m. five days a week at a variety of jobs. On weekends, students tour various college campuses and have a chance to go on an array of recreational field trips. Senior year begins right away with college essays and scholarship applications help as well as assistance applying for financial aid. El Instituto also offers an alternative high school for youth between the ages of 17 and 21 and a program called Careras en Salud which helps those with schooling equivalent to a 6th grade education become licensed nurses.

Enlace Chicago
2756 S Harding Avenue, Chicago, IL 60623
Enlace Chicago, formerly known as Little Village Development Corps, was formed in 1990 and through various partnerships connects to approximately 5,000 people annually. According to Jaime de Leon, New Communities Program Director at Enlace, the organization provides “all sorts of after-school programs for students and their families. Parents can take classes for their GED or ESL and students can take enrichment classes like photography as well as tutoring, leadership development.” Enlace also partners with several schools, turning them into community centers at night and on weekends.
Latinos Progresando
3047 W Cermak Road, Chicago, IL 60623

Latinos Progresando, like many of the organizations in Little Village, focuses on the immigrant population. It was founded in 1998 and is the only not-for-profit legal service organization in Little Village. The organization primarily focuses on immigration services and aids residents from all over Illinois, generally 100-120 families per month. Latinos Progresando recently initiated a new program, College Bound Youth Group, in which college students come together to inform high school students about the college application process. The Advocacy and Community Education Coordinator, Melissa Gonzalez, expressed the need for expansion in youth and parental education regarding college, but also stressed that the organization’s main goal was to assist immigrants.

Aldermanic Initiatives

With many resources already being directed towards education, Alderman Muñoz is now focused on adding green space and recreational facilities within Little Village. The community has a YMCA and many recreational programs such as Bball on the Block, a basketball tournament that brings the whole community together through a series of basketball games hosted on each block. The alderman is currently asking the City for a new recreational facility that will allow local schools to hold track and field meets within the community rather than having to rent spaces elsewhere. Muñoz believes that providing recreational facilities is extremely important to the continual well being of the community, as these establishments will foster social cohesion. Other organizations that community members said they found helpful include Narcotics Anonymous, Proactive, Pro-health Advocates (which offers substance abuse services), and San Rafael (a medical center). Focus group members generally had strong respect for the quality organizations existing within the community. A resident of Calumet City commented, “Personally, I have lived in my community for ten years and I don’t know any organizations, or even if there are any organizations [in Calumet City]. The organizations that I know the best are here in Little Village.”

Transportation Assets

The Pink Line as well as the 60, 53, 82, x49, and 21 buses cover all of the major roadways through the Little Village community area. These transportation assets provide easy access to a strong network of community organizations and retail corridors, further facilitating the social cohesion required for the implementation of a Promise Neighborhood. This establishes the foundation for future possible expansion from Little Village into the Pilsen area, which could bring in multi-generational immigrants into the pipeline of a PN, thus increasing the average language proficiency of its students and fostering a stronger link between the two immigrant communities.

Entrepreneurship

Another asset to Little Village is the entrepreneurial spirit of its community members. One community leader explained, “People here are very entrepreneurial and if they can’t find a job they will find some work to do.” This can be seen in contrast to residents of North Lawndale, as an interview with two individuals who live on the border of South and North Lawndale informed us that while North Lawndale, a primarily African American community, has vast deserted lots, Little Village has a vibrant commercial sector with large community support for local vendors.
Conclusion

Little Village is a bustling community that has many attributes that could continue to thrive with the implementation of a Promise Neighborhood. The community is easily accessible through public transportation networks and major roadways – it is by no means gentrified – and has access to many commercial areas and resources. Also, as the community is tight-knit, residents would most likely be receptive to implementation, especially if the current organizations and activists in the community are able to collaborate with the PN leadership.
7.3. South Shore

Figure 7.3: Existing Social Assets of South Shore

NOTE: The schoolhouses represent schools, green balloons represent community service agencies, and the red cross represent medical care.

Context

The South Shore community, roughly bounded by 67th Street to the north, 79th Street to the south, Stony Island Avenue to the west, and Lake Michigan to the east, contains approximately 234 blocks within its borders. The majority of the community falls under the jurisdiction of the 8th City Ward while the remaining parts are contained within the 5th and 7th wards.

In a side-by-side comparison of demographic indicators for our ten potential CPN community areas, South Shore is placed first in population density, third in projected child population growth, and third in median household income. The data also shows that South Shore has a relatively stable, middle-class population. These data indicate that South Shore may be well positioned to satisfy the criteria for the implementation of a PN.

Education

South Shore has eight public elementary schools and four public high schools. Enrollment data from the public elementary school is consistent with that of other South Side community areas such as Englewood, Washington Park and Woodlawn, with African American students occupying 95% or more of the total enrollment. The racial composition of public elementary school enrollment in
South Shore is as follows: 98.75% African American, 0.28% Native-American, 0.20% Hispanic, 0.05% White and ≈0% Asian.\textsuperscript{76}

The average ISAT score for South Shore public elementary schools was 47\% in the most recently published result, while the citywide average was 64\%.\textsuperscript{77} Broken down by subject, the average ISAT scores for South Shore were: reading (51\%), math (48\%) and science (42\%), while the citywide averages were 61\%, 69\%, and 60\% respectively.\textsuperscript{78} The average ACT scores for the four high schools in South Shore, all below the state average, are included below:

\textbf{Figure 7.4: Average ACT scores for High Schools in South Shore}\textsuperscript{79}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Average ACT Score</th>
<th>Illinois Average ACT Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Leadership</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Technology</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent Initiatives in Education

The four high schools in South Shore, the School of Entrepreneurship, the School of Leadership, the School of Technology, and the School of the Arts, are the result of the recent splitting of South Shore’s single high school into smaller, specialized schools. The aim of this reform was to attract students to schools in South Shore.\textsuperscript{80} Previously, the school was not well attended; many students either left the community to attend different schools or demonstrated little desire to continue with schooling or college. Proponents of the specialized tracked school model sought to offer students a more attractive and engaging educational experience. Anecdotal evidence from Henry English, CEO of Black United Fund, suggests that graduation and college attendance rates have risen in response to the introduction of the specialized school system. However, the program has also encountered several problems. For example, when elementary schools withdrew from the planning process, transition to the new system became much more difficult due to a lack of coordination between elementary and high schools.\textsuperscript{81}

Currently, BUFI serves as the lead agency for Connections of South Shore, a coalition of community organizations and members working together to revitalize the South Shore community. Education is one of their primary concerns, and the Connections of South Shore Education Committee is currently discussing options for improving the high school system. Some are working to develop plans for a new high school.\textsuperscript{82} Henry English said, “We have to make some major changes on how we educate kids and how schools are structured.” Because the specialized schools have not been as successful as anticipated, the Education Committee is considering the creation of selective enrollment programs in the new high school for which they are developing plans. Implementation of these would hopefully help secure increased funding and preserve the quality of the new high school. The Education Committee is also concerned with keeping South Shore’s top students enrolled in local schools. At present, Mr. English estimates that the top 20\% of students from South Shore leave the community to attend school.\textsuperscript{83}
Snapshots from South Shore

*South Shore Cultural Center:* While the South Shore community area is home to rich cultural institutions like the South Shore Cultural Center, gang territories prevent children from crossing gang boundaries and fully taking advantage of established social assets. Seventy-three percent of survey respondents agreed that gang territory affects where kids can go in South Shore. Furthermore, as one resident says, “As far as my safety walking the street, I go as fast as I can. It’s crazy.”
Community fragmentation (above, below): While a relatively stable middle-class population exists and could help to build social assets and improve conditions in South Shore, this middle class is largely physically and socially isolated from the rest of the community.
Possible Challenges to Implementation of a CPN

The following section includes information on community sentiment regarding various issues in South Shore, much of which we gathered from survey and focus group data. Our focus groups were held on Wednesday, April 15, 2009, at 6:30 p.m. and on Tuesday, April 28, 2009, at 6:30 p.m. at the Black United Fund of Illinois. Three community members participated in the first, and eleven community members participated in the second focus group. Demographic information on these participants is contained in Appendix C.

Crime

One important issue that a Chicago Promise Neighborhood in South Shore would need to address is crime. In our focus groups, participants explained that their biggest concern was gang activity that leads to violence on the streets. Many aspects of their daily lives are affected by high rates of violent crime, and they felt the need to be cautious at any time of the day. “As far as my safety walking the street, I go as fast as I can. It’s crazy,” said one participant in our first focus group. Parents are also cautious about letting their children play outside after dark, or even outside in their front yards if close supervision isn’t possible. Participants in our first focus group also expressed concern about street robberies. Violent robberies are often not committed by locals, said participants; instead, criminals come from other neighborhoods and areas of the city to perpetrate crimes. “The people who do these robberies, they don’t live in this neighborhood, they come here to rob,” stressed a focus group participant. This is perhaps good news for a potential PN, but the prevalence of crime is still an issue that would need to be addressed.

Gang Activity

Gangs form a large component of the problems relating to crime and safety in South Shore according to community members. School zones often cross gang territory, which can affect the safety of kids going to and from school. Seventy-three percent of survey respondents agreed that gang territory affects where kids can go in South Shore. Pertaining to the reduction of gang involvement among youth, one concerned resident identified sparse youth employment as a contributing factor to the success of gang recruitment in the community. The implementation of a Promise Neighborhood in this neighborhood could help alleviate gang activity simply through providing jobs and programs as alternatives to gang involvement.

Children and Youth Safety

Over half (57%) of community members surveyed placed violence and drug use prevention programs among the top two most needed youth programs in South Shore and around one-third (36%) said children were not safe traveling to and from school. In our interview, Samantha Mitchell, Annie B. Jones (ABJ) Community Services’ COO, mentioned conversations with local youth at Connections at South Shore meetings in which students expressed concern over safety both in school and in transit.

Participants in our first focus group offered an actionable suggestion for combating the violence and crime in South Shore. They believed that if police officers would institute more foot patrols rather than simply driving by in patrol cars, criminal activity would clear off the streets. One focus group participant elaborated on such a plan: “Patrol. Get them out those cars, and do it at night. Not just...
in the daytime when the stores are open. Get them out there 24 hours. Get them out of those cars and let them walk the community instead of just driving through it; they’d catch a lot more crime.” Another participant added, “I’d vote for it any day. I’ve got grandkids, you know?” While there are some measures in place to try to address this issue, such as Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) meetings, which are community meetings focused on safety. They were generally regarded as useless by focus group participants. A participant in our second focus group remarked, “[At] CAPS meetings, everything that’s said, it’s going in one ear and out the other.”

Misleading Demographic Information

One unique element of South Shore demographics is that the community contains several pockets of relatively well-off middle class families. With these families included, South Shore’s median income is greater than $30,000 a year, which is much greater than what a large percentage of the population earns per year. Thus, broad comparisons between neighborhoods based on such numbers may underestimate the need for social services in South Shore. This distortion on the demographic information could add to potential political opposition to South Shore as the site of a CPN, but harnessing the social capital from the middle class community could be a great benefit to a potential CPN.

Isolationism Among Middle Class

The geographical layout of the Jackson Park Highlands speaks volumes about relations between middle class and low-income residents of South Shore. Because of the numerous one-way streets and cul-de-sacs in the Highlands, it is impossible to enter the community from either 71st Street or Jeffrey Boulevard, leaving only Stony Island and 67th as means of entry. This community was built in such a way as to keep the other residents of South Shore out, and the current residents reinforce this pattern. For example, as part of an after-school activity, ABJ led a group of children through the Highlands on their way to Jackson Park. Within minutes, Mitchell received a call from the Alderman’s office after the office received complaints from residents about a group of outside children walking through their community. This anecdote is highly representative of both the isolationist culture within the Highlands, and the political clout and tight organization of the Highlands residents. While isolationism may seem reasonable as a response to the gang activity about which many other South Shore residents complain, it cuts the rest of South Shore off from the valuable resource that South Shore’s middle class represents. The desire to harness the pro-neighborhood stabilization and pro-reform momentum was reflected in our conversations with Mitchell, English, and other community members. English was particularly interested in getting the middle class to buy into school improvement rather than bussing their children across the city to more competitive schools outside the neighborhood.

High Rate of Unemployment

South Shore has a high unemployment rate, particularly among youth aged 19-28. Working to combat this problem, the Black United Fund has funded a summer employment program that is executed by ABJ Community Services. The program expanded, employing several hundred teens last summer, but focus group participants believe that even more employment opportunities are needed. Visible employment opportunities offer a legitimate path to income and social status, without which many youth are more tempted by the offers of gang recruiters.
without visible employment opportunities, students have less incentive to take school seriously due to an eroded sense of control regarding the future.

Lack of High-Quality Health Clinics

Participants in our second focus group described a high rate of mental illness among the homeless population, which they believe is due to a lack of proper care facilities in the area. Further, they described the disappearance of free health clinics from the area, leaving only Jackson Park Hospital, which many residents do not trust. One focus group participant said, “If you go into Jackson Park, you got no choice. Jackson Park is all about the drugs.” In an interview, Reverend Dennis Langdon of South Shore United Methodist Church said, “My family and I have an agreement. If any of us gets sick, you get me in the car and you drive me to the U of C hospital, break whatever traffic laws you want to. Jackson Park Hospital is where people go to die.” Seventy-seven percent of survey respondents said that access to health care for their children was an obstacle to their parenting. Since sound health is a prerequisite for ability to perform in school, student health programs should be incorporated into the Promise Neighborhood pipeline.

Perceptions of Aldermen

Participants in both focus groups felt that the aldermen were generally unresponsive to their needs, even largely absent in the community. While some participants thought highly of Hairston, she was seen by others as primarily a talker, not an actor. As one person remarked, “She claims she wants more community output and outreach, but that’s not much. It’s just a drop in the bucket.” Focus group participants felt that Sandi Jackson was primarily in office due to the prominence and leadership of her husband, Jesse Jackson Jr., and had taken action to be less accessible to community members. For example, one focus group participant believed that the Jacksons move from a first floor apartment where “you could just walk in” to one where “now you have to buzz up” in an order to do so. Community members seem to be in a consensus that they want more involvement from all three aldermen, asserting that there are rarely, if ever, town hall meetings and that communication between government and citizenry is severely limited. For example, in reference to Hairston, one participant remarked, “You don’t see her on T.V. [and there are] no town meetings.” Others chimed in to remember the ‘good old days,’ when aldermen were more involved. “I remember Alderman Bloom…he did things for the children,” one participant said.

Need for Parenting Programs

Focus group participants voiced negative opinions on community parenting, claiming that “parenting is very bad,” and “some parents just don’t care.” Among survey respondents, 42% indicated that they do not believe parents in their neighborhood know where their children are after-school. Focus group participants noted that discipline seems to have become less strict, and young parents are often unable to deal with their children. Parenting was viewed as an essential feature in encouraging children to go to programs; however, parents were also seen as less able, less forceful and, therefore, largely responsible for suboptimal child participation rates in community based programs. Indeed, many parents were described as young and inexperienced; this opinion supports information obtained through survey analysis concerning the need for parenting programs within the community. According to survey results, over half of respondents ranked parenting classes as most needed or second most needed among family-related community programs.
Problems with Community Organization and Communication

According to Mitchell, Connections meetings were the first impetus for service agencies in South Shore to get to know one another. Reverend Langdon described Connections’ meetings as being derailed by competition between service agencies over ‘territory.’ This problem, however, was never mentioned by English in our interview, and the onus remains on BUFI to provide strong leadership to overcome this problem.

Residents in our focus groups described a complete lack of community organization, especially on the block level. English viewed the establishment of block clubs as one of the first steps in the reform plan being drafted by Connections of South Shore meetings to serve as a means of communicating with neighborhood residents, creating momentum for reform endeavors, and consolidating political clout. Mitchell cites organization in the Highlands as a great example of the level of community ownership that would lend itself to heightened safety through resident watchfulness. Community members noted a disconnect between residents and community organizations. The Connections of South Shore is looking into communication technology to enable discussion between residents and community organizations. This would ensure that residents are well notified of new programs offered by community organizations and the stakeholders are aware of issues faced by individual residents, and enable organizations to take into consideration the opinions and input from residents while planning for the greater community.

Need for a Better Education

A main problem South Shore faces is low-quality schools. Since education is one of the most important means of developing human capital and bringing about change within communities, it is a main priority for development. The Black United Fund of Illinois has worked with different agencies and schools to bring about school reform in the community. The Connections of South Shore has also set up an education committee to allow schools to come together and develop a redevelopment plan for education in South Shore.

Lack of After-school and Summer Activities

Focus group participants expressed concerns about the availability of youth programming in the neighborhood, asking for “more activities and stuff for the teenagers.” Participant responses indicated a belief that lack of activities has lead to crime, claiming “Nothing to do, that’s how they get into [gang-banging]” and “Good to have program for kids…show these kids that there is more to life than standing on the corner selling drugs.” Though technically accessible, some programs and facilities, like the community pool, were not considered available due to the administration of service fees and other such fiscal requirements. Furthermore, 56% of survey respondents reported often facing the obstacle of a lack of youth programs while raising their children. This was also listed as one of the primary needs in the community according to the focus group and survey analysis done by the Connections of South Shore.

Social Assets

Annie B. Jones Community Services, which provides anti-poverty and after-school programs, was the organization most talked about by our focus group participants. Respondents from the focus groups were overwhelmingly positive about the organization, saying, “They have great services.”
and “[ABJ is] for the people man. They get you bus tickets if you need them, find you jobs, job training. It’s a cool place to be. I have nothing bad to say about them.” However, programs at the ABJ have been scaled back, and residents noted that ABJ has cut its food pantry and limited foster and family care. Focus group participants also mentioned services at Nash Community Center and 79% of survey results reported that community centers in South Shore are high quality, though focus group participants only mentioned these two organizations. Although South Shore has a number of community-based organizations running different programs for the community, residents seem to not be aware of these programs and there is a lack of cooperation between service agencies. This lack of coordination is one of the primary needs identified by the community, and the Black United Fund of Illinois is currently addressing this problem through efforts by the Connections of South Shore. Connections of South Shore is bringing together all the stakeholders of the community — commercial institutions, schools, churches and block clubs — to develop a vision for South Shore, develop a strategic plan in the area based on existing social assets, and collaborate to bring about change in the community.

Direct Service Organizations

New Phoenix Assistance Center (NPAC)
7624 S Philips Avenue, Ste. #1, Chicago, IL 60649

NPAC was first started in 1991 and now operates three major programs:
- Transitional housing for women and children affected by HIV/AIDS.
- Outreach and prevention services for runaway youth.
- Housing and support for the homeless/near homeless with the goal of helping all clients achieve self-sufficiency within two years of entering the program.

Annie B. Jones Community Services (ABJ)
1750 E 71st Street, Chicago, IL 60649
1818 E 71st Street, Chicago, IL 60649

ABJ was founded in 1993 to provide a range of social services for families, children, and senior citizens, with a particular focus on child welfare services, and now serves more than 5000 clients a year. ABJ operates a number of different programs, some of which are targeted at South Shore residents while others are for residents throughout around Cook County. Unfortunately, funding for several of ABJ’s programs is not guaranteed and/or was recently pulled, though its main Foster Care program continues to receive stable funding. ABJ also offers a variety of other services, including but not limited to:
- Earnfare: This program collaborates with businesses to provide employment to childless adults who qualify for food stamps. ABJ also works with shelters and transitional homes to provide clients housing while they looking for employment.
- Abstinence Education: Through this program, ABJ works with schools and youth between the ages of 10 – 17 in an effort to provide information on the dangers of premature sexual activity with the goal of reducing the number of teenage pregnancies and Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs).
- GED Program: ABJ works with Olive Harvey College to help its clients obtain GEDs.
- Summer Teen Employment Program: Using funding from the government through the Black United Fund of Illinois, ABJ implemented a summer employment program targeted at teenagers. Since its inception three years ago, this program has expanded from working with 30 to approximately 300 teens.
The Don Nash Community Center
1833 E 71st Street, Chicago, IL 60649

The Don Nash Community Center, formerly a YMCA, is a large and popular gathering place for South Shore residents. The facility was purchased and remodeled by the city government in the early 1990s, a time when recreational facilities in and around the South Shore Community were scarce. The Nash Community Center – comprised of a number of facilities including club rooms, kitchens, a gymnasium, and a swimming pool – has become a thoroughly established and valued social asset in South Shore.

Bryn Mawr Community Church
7000 S Jeffery Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60649

Headed by Reverend Karl Wilson, this church is centrally located and active within the South Shore Community. Bryn Mawr receives systematic support and access to resources through membership in a coalition of churches under the Chicago Metropolitan Association. The Bryn Mawr Community Church operates a year-round food pantry.

Jackson Park Hospital
7531 S Stony Island Avenue, Chicago, IL 60649

Jackson Park Hospital and Medical Center is a short-term care facility that serves an area containing more than one million people. Capable of housing 336 patients at once with a staff of more than 560 employees, it offers a wide range of inpatient and outpatient diagnostic, therapeutic, and additional services. Jackson Park Hospital offers a variety of services to the community through the work of various departments, namely:

- Medical/Surgical
- Obstetrics and Pediatrics
- Emergency Services
- HIV/STD Clinics
- Diabetes Education Center
- Behavioral Medicine and Psychiatry

Dress for Success
2314 E 75th Street, Chicago, IL 60649

Dress for Success is an international not-for-profit organization seeking to help disadvantaged women on the path to career development and economic independence. They provide women with business attire as well as support in the form of two separate initiatives:

- The Profession Women's Group (PWG) program: This program seeks to supplement initial support and raise employment retention rates.
- Career Center: The career center offers assistance in job searches as well as opportunities to acquire important technological skills.

Boys and Girls Club
Park Manor Elementary School
7037 S Rhodes Street, Chicago, IL 60619

The Boys and Girls Club is a nationally recognized organization that aims to offer a safe and positive environment in which children and young adults can cultivate the talents and skills that will enable them to reach their full potential as adults. In particular, the Boys and Girls Club tries to prevent neighborhood children from becoming victims or offenders of violent crime by
providing after-school programming and supervision. The Park Manor club was recently opened in 2007 using a portion of a $600,000 grant from the Illinois State Board of Education.

Rebecca K. Crown Center (Chicago Youth Center)
7601 S Phillips Avenue, Chicago, IL 60649
This Chicago Youth Center provides a range of programs including early childhood education for children ages 3-5, an after-school program for children ages 5-12, summer day camps, a college and job readiness preparation program, and the Bradwell School 21st Century Community Learning Center. In particular, its after-school program is an excellent resource for the community as it serves youth ages 7-14 by providing tutors for homework assistance in all academic subjects at a low registration cost with fees on a sliding scale based on income.

Indirect Service Organizations

Black United Fund of Illinois (BUFI)
1809 East 71st Street, Chicago, IL 60649
The Black United Fund of Illinois was founded in 1985 as an independent affiliate of the National Black United Fund. Its purpose is to channel funding and provide technical support, assessment/evaluation services, and capacity building support to service providers and programs that address the needs of African American communities. Though BUFI operates throughout Illinois and Chicago, it has taken a lead in South Shore, where it is based, as one of the largest and most politically connected organizations in the neighborhood. BUFI in South Shore was one of the founding members of the South Shore Chamber, Inc., an organization of local businesses concerned with the economic and physical growth of the neighborhood. BUFI is also affiliated with the Shorebank Neighborhood Institute, which recruits and trains teens to become entrepreneurs. Additionally, BUFI provided funding for the ABJ Community Services’ summer teen employment program as a part of a larger summer employment program that operated throughout Chicago and provided over 2,000 temporary jobs.

The Safety Net Works (TSNW) and Connections of South Shore
In addition to the services that it provides, BUFI serves a prominent role in South Shore as the lead agency of Connections of South Shore, a coalition of community organizations and businesses dedicated to providing programs and services that reduce youth violence and killing in South Shore neighborhoods. The project is funded by the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS) under the Safety Net Works program, with South Shore being one of 17-targeted Illinois communities. As the lead agency, BUFI is responsible for creating and overseeing collaborations with community organizations, such as positive youth development programs, juvenile justice programs, employment services, physical and mental health services, and educational opportunities. Currently, Connections of South Shore includes most of the important stakeholders in the community, including the local Chamber of Commerce, the nine elementary schools and four high schools, all of the churches and social service organizations, and all three of the aldermen. It is also in the process of obtaining input and participation from the dozens of neighborhood block associations, though this is proving to be a greater challenge than obtaining the input of the larger community organizations. Connections of South Shore is currently two-thirds of the way through its planning phase of this initiative to get these organizations on board. The end goal is to finish this planning phase by June 2009, introduce the overall plan to South Shore residents via a community meeting to obtain
feedback, and begin implementing these programs through the direct service organizations involved in Connections shortly thereafter.\footnote{150}

**Coalition for Improved Education in South Shore (CIESS)**
1809 E 71st Street, Suite 203, Chicago, IL 60649

Originally founded in 1987 to help improve South Shore Community Academy, CIESS now focuses on issues facing students who are entering high school.\footnote{151} It has advocated for school reform legislation and provided technical assistance to schools and Local School Councils (LSCs). It has also helped group schools into support networks to encourage collaboration between different principals and increase knowledge transfer. CIESS undertook its largest initiative in leading the coalition of community organizations and schools – including BUFI, National-Louis University, and Leadership for Quality Education – to split South Shore High School into four specialty schools. CIESS’ current agenda includes establishing small schools in South Shore and developing a Parent Resource Center.\footnote{152}

**South Shore Cultural Center**
7059 S South Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60649

The Cultural Center was built in 1905 as a country club and in 1975 was purchased by the Chicago Park District. The Park District promotes the Cultural Center as follows: “With its magnificent country club-like interior, this facility is housed prominently on a 58 acre site that includes grandiose ballrooms, a nine-hole golf course, meeting rooms, lighted tennis courts, a beach, an art gallery, horse stables, the Parrot Cage restaurant, and the Washburn Culinary Institute.”\footnote{153} Though the Cultural Center offers a number of arts and recreational programs – such as Yoga, ceramics, and ballet – it is equally dedicated to renting space for wedding receptions and special events. Currently, the scope of the Cultural Center’s importance as a social asset within South Shore appears rather narrow but is not without potential for future development.

**Conclusion**

The implementation of a Chicago Promise Neighborhood in South Shore could help improve education drastically but could also address broader community issues such as crime, employment, community cohesion, health care, and lack of youth programs. The South Shore community presents both challenges and opportunities for improvement. Organizations such as BUFI have been giving a voice to the community despite the lack of a New Communities Program in the area, and with the Connections of South Shore program, could serve as an integral source of resources for the creation of a HCZ-style pipeline of service. The middle class community could also be looked towards as a source of human capital and resources and would likely be strong advocates for public investment in South Shore’s social infrastructure.
7.4. Washington Park/Woodlawn

Figure 7.5: Existing Social Assets in Washington Park/Woodlawn

NOTE: The schoolhouses represent schools, buses represent transportation lines, green balloons represent community service agencies, and red crosses represent medical care.

Context

Washington Park and Woodlawn are two Chicago neighborhoods directly west and south of the University of Chicago campus, respectively. The child population of any one of these two neighborhoods is too small for an effective Promise Neighborhood; thus this report explores the possibility of a PN that encompasses both the Washington Park and Woodlawn neighborhoods. While the proximity of both communities to the University provides an asset in creating a PN, the distinct characteristics of the two communities present a potential challenge that needs to be carefully addressed.

Woodlawn and Washington Park are both predominantly African American communities, 95% and 97% respectively. Since the 1950s, both neighborhoods have experienced disinvestment, depopulation, and increases in violence and property desolation. In the recent years, both neighborhoods embarked on community development with the leadership of the New Communities Program and its alliance with local stakeholders. The New Communities Program, a long-term initiative of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation/Chicago, was established to support comprehensive community development in challenged neighborhoods. The New Communities Program launched the Quality of Life Plan to help broaden opportunities for local residents through better education, broader housing choices, safer streets, stronger personal finances and new economic opportunities. While Woodlawn developed its Quality of Life Plan in 2005, Washington Park finalized its own in 2009. As is apparent from these dates, Woodlawn’s development efforts go further back in time and started to reap positive results: owner occupied housing has increased 18% and poverty levels decreased.
The child population is 4,427 in Washington Park and 7,310 in Woodlawn. Since neither of the two neighborhoods has a child poverty population large enough to serve as a Chicago Promise Neighborhood (once fully implemented, at least), we combine them in our analysis due to their proximity and potential relations with the neighboring University of Chicago.

Some leaders inside the University, including Ann Marie Lipinski, Vice President of the Office of Civic Engagement, are compelled by the prospect of a nearby Promise Neighborhood, which could aid relations between the surrounding communities and the University and benefit from University resources, including the Urban Education Institute and the University of Chicago Medical Center.

While Woodlawn and Washington Park share community borders, there seems to be no community organizing network or relationship between the two communities – though the two are linked under the jurisdiction of Alderman Cochran. According to our field research, residents of Washington Park and Woodlawn see their neighborhoods as two separate communities.

Education

Community leaders in both Washington Park and Woodlawn acknowledge the substantial need for improvement in local schools and have devised some initiatives to revitalize education in the area. According to the CPS website nearly all schools in Woodlawn and Washington Park are performing below CPS and state levels on standardized tests. Many schools are also on probation.

Woodlawn Children’s Promise

Led by Bishop Arthur Brazier, the Woodlawn Children’s Promise brings together various stakeholders, CPS, and experts, including the University of Chicago, in an effort to transform the schools in the area. Lipinski, and Wallace Goode, the Director of the University of Chicago University Community Service Center, explained that the initiative has all the schools in Woodlawn on board – 9 elementary schools, 1 private high school, and 2 public high schools – and the plan is set to be completed by 2010. The idea behind this initiative is to carve out some autonomy for these schools by replicating the charter schools idea and applying it to local public schools. Holding the same goals as a PN, the Woodlawn Schools Initiative looks to establish extended school hours and offer a multitude of support services in such a way that enables every child to be successful.

Renaissance 2010

Renaissance 2010 is a current initiative in Chicago Public Schools to reform schools that are performing below standards. This program has been very aggressive, closing schools and opening new charter schools in place of the old schools; it has both support and opposition in the community. Proponents believe it is vastly improving the education for many children as they have now opened around a hundred new schools. Opponents, however, believe it neglects too many children who are displaced when their current school is shut down, and that the new schools do not incorporate the surrounding community enough. Under this program a new school, CICS-Washington Park, has opened in Washington Park, and a new charter school has been opened by the University of Chicago in Woodlawn.
Generation Joshua Youth Council-BNB Youth Plaza

Della Mitchell, Founder and Director of Brand New Beginnings, explained that one of its the future projects, to be completed in five years, is to build the Generation Joshua Youth Council-BNB Youth Plaza. The philosophy and goal of the Plaza is to get youth involved; they will train them in entrepreneurship and how to run their own businesses. After five years of training youth, the Plaza will be turned over to BNB which will be the parent organization.160

New Communities Program/Sunshine Gospel Ministries

The New Communities Program has partnered with Sunshine Gospel Ministries to provide a technology center, computer training, and entrepreneurial training for community youth.161

Washington Park Schools

Elementary/Middle Schools

- Beasley Elementary School: Beasley is home to a Regional Gifted Center that provides accelerated instructional program in core content areas. The school offers world languages including Latin, laboratory science, computer science and fine arts. There are no academic requirements for lower grades while students in grades 5-8th must score above the 90th percentile in reading and math in the previous year's ISAT.
  - Burke Elementary
  - Carter Elementary
  - Dumas Elementary
  - Ross Elementary
  - Chicago International Charter School – Washington Park
  - Carter G. Woodson Middle School: This is the fourth of the University of Chicago Charter Schools that was opened in the fall of 2008. It served 250 students during its first year of operation.

High Schools

- ACE Technical High School
- Walter H. Dyett High School

Woodlawn Schools

Elementary/Middle Schools

- Carnegie Elementary: Offers IB Middle Years Program
  - Dulles Elementary
  - Fisk Elementary
  - Sexton Elementary
  - Emmett Till Math and Science Academy: This is a Math and Science magnet school where the program is directed towards concept-based mathematics and laboratory-based science education.
  - University of Chicago Charter School – Woodlawn

High Schools

- University of Chicago Charter School – Woodlawn
- Hyde Park High School
Snapshots from Washington Park/Woodlawn

*At the other end of State Street:* Washington Park and Woodlawn, two Chicago neighborhoods directly west and south of the University of Chicago campus respectively, have experienced long-term and significant depopulation and an increase in vacant property.
Accessibility and Community Cohesion (above, below): Washington Park and Woodlawn are easily accessible by public transportation, with access to many bus routes and the Red and Green L lines. 55th Street, or Garfield Boulevard, is shown above, and the Red Line stop is shown below. Despite their close proximity, residents of Washington Park and Woodlawn see themselves as separate communities, according to our focus groups and interviews.
Possible Challenges to Implementation of a CPN

Lack of Community Cohesion

In all the focus groups we held in Washington Park and Woodlawn, long-term residents mentioned the transformation they observed in their communities in terms of weakening of community ties. A participant in one of our Washington Park focus groups, who has lived in the Robert Taylor homes for 18 years, said that when she was growing up the community was close knit. She remembers sleeping with her door open, but remarked that now with the, “crime rate flooding in the way it did, it broke up the neighborhood and more chaos came in.” A participant in one of our focus groups in Woodlawn said, “This used to be a tight-knit community in the early ’70s, ’80s even, but things started turning around for the worse around the 1990s. Back in the day, older generations kept families together and provided an example to younger generations to be hard working and try and make a life for oneself. Now you can live your whole life on the block and not even know the people next door to you.” The reasons for this detachment of the resident in the community were, according to community members, safety concerns and depopulation.

In our focus groups in Washington Park, community members explained that they have, in recent years organized themselves on a small scale to stop crime in their areas. One participant said, “We used to hear that kind of thing [gang shoot-outs] nightly, but that’s not happening anymore…we were able to curtail that because we set up a chain (referring to a phone tree set up to inform police).” Former gang members informed community members how to identify gang members based on the color of their clothing and way of wearing their hats. Another participant says she and her boss used to see drug deals carried out in front of their establishment, but they would watch and call the police. Now they have not seen the dealers’ cars out front for two years because they knew they were being watched. The participant speculates that the dealers have simply moved down the street to where no one is watching, but suggests that if others were to be similarly watchful in front of their own homes and businesses that drug dealers could be pushed right out of the neighborhood.

Lack of Leadership, Poor Relations among Groups

Overall, Washington Park lacks the kind of robust central community organizing apparatus that has developed in Woodlawn. Residents regularly talk about the difficulties in exchanging information and communicating with other members of the community. For example, in meetings with the Alderman, residents said that the people who attend are engaged, but the attendees are few, often less than ten. These small numbers of attendees may be due to Washington Park’s declining population. Furthermore, the lack of an effective communication system contributes to difficulties in strengthening bonds within the community and with the dissemination of information. For example, Lipinski pointed out that many residents are unaware of church programs and community-based initiatives. An additional challenge to cohesion is the fact that Washington Park is divided between two wards, the 3rd and 20th.

On the other hand, Woodlawn has a historically successful community-organizing network. Also, residents seem more informed about current events in the Woodlawn community. For instance, ten survey participants from Woodlawn cited 20th Ward Alderman Willie Cochran as an effective leader in their community; only two survey participants from Washington Park acknowledged him. The University of Chicago, due to its proximity and nearby boundary, provides many resources to the community. As quoted in Woodlawn “Then & Now,” Bishop Arthur Brazier describes his
relationship with the University of Chicago, “We have a wonderful partnership now with the University of Chicago that has lasted nearly twenty years…with this kind of investment, the bureaucracy downtown ought to make better decisions about how the schools are being operated.”

**Relations between the University of Chicago and Washington Park/Woodlawn**

Lipinski explained that historically, The University of Chicago has had very little relationship with Washington Park. Last summer, the University bought property that is, for the most part, vacant with the thought that they needed to think ahead 30-40 years. In partnership with the community, the University is starting to figure out what the planning process looks like. The use for the land is at an embryonic stage and is not determined. They are at the stage where they are taking down the few buildings that exist on the land that the University purchased. Currently, apart from their land acquisition, many Washington Park residents are unaware of University of Chicago actions. One focus group member from Woodlawn said, “I don't know what they do here. It seems like they could do a lot. They have a lot.” Bouie noted that “the community doesn’t want the University to interfere because they really don’t know what the University has to offer. They see it as being this huge university plopped in the middle of Washington Park, with students from around the world attending, they see the university and they know that they do a lot of research, but they don’t know any of the hands on grassroots things that the University does. And so if the University were to partner with various community based agencies to do that, then the community would be more aware.”

The Woodlawn community area exists side-by-side with University facilities, which accounts for a greater awareness of University activities compared to Washington Park. Ms. Lipinski explains that in Woodlawn, “there are two narratives about the University around the community. One is a really warm narrative about the power of the University to do good, impact meaningful change and be a great partner. And our founders were very focused on this university as an outwardly and engaged citizen of our neighborhoods city and the world. The other narrative is the narrative of that the University drew the blinds and pulled the shutters and turned its back in ways that were, I think, more out of confusion.” Furthermore, the University is in collaboration with Bishop Arthur Brazier and TWO in the development program of Woodlawn spearheaded by the New Communities Program.

**Safety Concerns for Children**

One of the primary concerns expressed by members of the Washington Park and Woodlawn communities was the great amount of violence in the neighborhood. In one of our focus groups in Washington Park, one resident lamented that, “like every other day somebody gets shot.” Residents feel unsafe due to the prevalence of gangs, drug dealing, and other violence and this limits their ability to go out in the community, especially at night. Residents are particularly concerned about violence as it pertains to youth and children.

Gang violence is a major threat to safety in both Washington Park and Woodlawn. The various gangs in the community, often divided based on neighborhood geography, fight with one another. In one of our focus groups in Woodlawn, a resident said, “There are a lot of younger people in this area, and they’re in a lot of gangs. [There is] a lot of division between this block and that block, and
only one block is in between that's safe.” The gang problem is partially caused by a lack of alternative activities for youth in the community. Strange said in an interview, “There is a gang problem in Woodlawn...You have to give [the kids] an alternative to gangs.” This impacts not only the members of the gangs themselves, but everyone in the community. A participant in one of our Washington Park focus groups said, “there was a group of young guys, and they were warring with another group of young guys back over by 47th and 53rd and that’s where my children were. And knowing guys from both gangs, I put the cards on the table; I said there are too many kids around here. God forbid one of them get hit.” When asked what their biggest safety concern was, one Washington Park resident answered, “There are a lot of people here who don’t have regard for human life. They don’t care about anything but themselves. So to be violent, our main interest here is the children.” In order to keep children safe, parents don’t allow their children to go out on the streets alone, and even some adults are afraid to go out. One Woodlawn resident said, “I don’t feel safe daytime or night. I have to cross the alley to go to my house; I don’t walk close to the alley even if it’s daytime. I walk by the grass, or any grass, so neighbors may see me if something happen. You don’t feel safe around here, period.” While it is possible to avoid or decrease the threat of violence, safety is nonetheless a problem that greatly impacts children and other residents of the community.

**Housing, Development, and Depopulation**

According to Lipinski, some of the biggest weaknesses of Washington Park are “depopulation, increase in vacant property, decrease in household income, and few business developments.” She further explained that “public housing, getting rid of public housing, the influx and outflow of people created a weakness. There was no plan as there should have been about where and how to place people when public housing was torn down.” A Washington Park resident explained that the increase in housing prices and taxes is driving some of the longer-term residents out because they cannot afford to stay in the community. This is a common concern of community leaders and residents alike. Mitchell shared her fear that the condominiums that are currently being built in Washington Park will cause displacement in the community, since a majority of Washington Park residents cannot afford these newly built residences. Residents of Woodlawn also shared similar concerns. A focus group participant complained, “They’re trying to move everyone out.”

Washington Park and Woodlawn combined have one of the highest rates of declining child populations and the second lowest population density of the ten neighborhoods surveyed. It is unclear as to whether a Promise Neighborhood could slow the exodus of children from Washington Park and Woodlawn. Communication and social networks are extremely weak due to the mobile population, and a Promise Neighborhood relies upon these networks to build a reputation and reach out to residents. The majority of a Promise Neighborhood staff would ideally be from Washington Park and Woodlawn. However, since the populations are so low, this stipulation may be far less feasible. Moreover, the idea of “contamination” in the Harlem Children’s Zone, where educated residents return to the community to further values of education, would be greatly hindered by a community where most residents are leaving. The nature of Washington Park and Woodlawn’s child populations pose perhaps the biggest obstacle to the success of a Promise Neighborhood.

However, it is possible that housing fears are overstated. Bishop Arthur Brazier in “Woodlawn Then & Now” said, “One of the greatest challenges is to overcome this fear of gentrification...We need to convince people that we are not uprooting the present homeowners to bring new people in. We are
moving no one out. All we're using is vacant land.” Furthermore, he saw building affordable, mixed-income housing as “the best way we can build this community.”

**Divisive Politics and Community Organization**

At the moment, especially due to the possibility of the 2016 Olympics being held in Chicago, there is “a lot of politicking going on” in Washington Park, according to Mark Bouie, Director of the Beatrice Caffrey Youth Services. In addition, the community needs more networking and organization; some reasons for the lack of organization in Washington Park are:

- **Factions:** There are factions in organizing. For instance, people who have lived in Washington Park longer and have done some organizing see Brand New Beginnings as outsiders, according to Mitchell.

- **Inadequate congregation/church involvement:** One of the focus group participants explained that, “church congregations are now often made up of people who don't live in, and therefore are not invested in the community. The church might have programming, but congregants are only interested in making sure congregants are aware of this programming, not other community members.”

- **Little active participation in community organizations:** Another focus group participant complained from a lack of advertising for existing programs: “They have programs there, but they don’t send fliers around...They’re putting in a lot of programs here that don’t even serve the community.”

Overall, focus group participants noted that community participation has fallen in recent years. The declining mentality of “the block,” where everyone knew each other and looked after each other’s children, was cited as a reason why gang activity and delinquency have increased.

Woodlawn also faces community organization problems, but they are not as severe as those in Washington Park. When Woodlawn residents were asked if their neighborhood was tight-knit, they would respond, “no,” or “used to be.” Residents explained various reasons for the declining organization of the community:

- **Demographic Changes:** Several residents explained that community organization had declined because people moved out of the community. One focus group participant said, “[It] used to be a good neighborhood… It’s like, as the developments change and things get taken down and moved, the people moved.” Focus group participants believed that newer residents were not active in the community. One Woodlawn resident said, “There are a lot of new people move in. Those people are more like ‘I come in I come out’ they don’t mingle. Mainly the people who are close are the ones who watched each other grow up, whose families have been here forever. The only ones who still socialize with each other. Everyone else is shut in.”

- **Lack of Active Leadership:** People talk a lot, but don’t act on organizing, said community members. Focus group participants think that petitioning and talking to the alderman is an effective way to get one’s voice heard, but they said that no one does it. “There aren’t any leaders,” said one participant.
Geographical Division: According to Alvin Strange, there is a division between East and West Woodlawn. However, the New Communities Program, which he directs, is currently working to eliminate this division.

Despite these problems with community organization, Woodlawn may be better organized than other Chicago communities such as Washington Park. Some focus group participants said their blocks were still tight-knit, although these people seemed to be exceptions. As Strange said, “Woodlawn is a unique area because we have a few institutions that anchor our neighborhood.”

Lack of Services in the Area as a Possible Challenge

Many residents stated that Washington Park lacks social services. The services that most often came to people’s minds were those that churches provided; they pass out food and clothing. Two other organizations were mentioned, Clara’s House and Matthew House, the latter of which provides breakfasts and lunches, as well as clothes and computer/job training. The House also provides free medication and assists with housing if it is available.

Residents also explained that they have to travel long distances to reach grocery stores, cleaners, and laundromats, and as a result, one of the communities’ most urgent needs is to bring all kinds of services to the Washington Park. A specific service mentioned by many residents was youth programs to keep kids busy and out of trouble. Other people wanted services that provide computer training so that people could get higher-wage employment. Programs to stop recidivism were also mentioned.

Staff attitudes at existing programs kept some community members from utilizing them; some residents feel marginalized and believe the health and social workers are occasionally demeaning. One focus group member said, “I had a job before I got pregnant, and I’ve been unemployed since my baby was born. When I go to the aid office, they treat me like one of those people who never had a job.” Another member said, “they shut down the clinics because they think they draw in trash.”

Possibility that Community is a Food Desert

Multiple residents had complaints about the lack of quality food choices available in Washington Park. They mentioned that there were no, “quality supermarkets” in the area. A few residents mentioned that it would be nice if there were a Jewel or a Dominick’s in Washington Park. They said that if they wanted to get decent groceries, they had to take a bus for a few miles outside of Washington Park. One man suggested boycotting local stores in order to get better supermarkets in the area. Home to an urban farm and Aldi’s, Woodlawn does not face the same lack of fresh food sources as Washington Park does.

Community Perception of Schools as Barrier

In Washington Park, one challenge that the residents noted was that the schools were understaffed. The children-to-teacher ratio was simply too high to be effective in educating kids. They mentioned that often times, instead of making class sizes smaller in order to turn around poor performance, the City chooses to close schools altogether, which exacerbates the overcrowding problem. One person
who worked as a janitor in a Catholic school mentioned that at his school, there were at least two teachers/teaching assistants in every classroom; he was angry that this wasn’t the case in Washington Park’s public schools. A few residents mentioned that teachers have a rough time dealing with their students because they are put in a dangerous situation. One woman who worked at an after-school program talked about how one time she saw two boys fighting and wanted to intervene, but she stood aside thinking that she might get sued if she got in the middle of the fight. Mitchell explained that she finds it difficult to develop relationships with schools, possibly because they do not want outsiders to know of the problems in the school in an effort to keep their funding and to not have a bad reputation. Bouie underlines that the schools in Washington Park need help. “They need teachers in the community that are going to be committed to teaching this population. I think a lot of teachers come out with this ideal that ‘I’m going to be the best teacher in the world,’ which is good to have, but you also have to figure out the community that you’re in, the schools that you’re in,” he said.

Strange noted that out of the nine elementary schools in Woodlawn, seven of them received failing grades, meaning they failed to meet national standards for test scores. The major problems of the community schools identified by Goode were those of launching and implementing reform efforts, as well as teacher and classroom quality. Goode suggests that local schools face special challenges in attempting to launch reform efforts and that there are tensions within the school administration that undermine new programs: “Principals who have been there forever versus new ones who want to change the system.” He also indicates that many schools struggle to employ qualified staff, teachers are overwhelmed by overcrowded classrooms, and schools lack a coherent support system with other schools: “schools have trouble attracting the right teachers and there are too many students in the classroom (30 students per teacher). Each school is on its own. Carnegie Elementary has a gifted program, but all the schools need them.”

Focus group discussions indicate a general distrust and skepticism of the Board of Education. Repeatedly unsuccessful programs caused one Woodlawn resident to say, “That’s how they all start off (referring to charter schools)” and that the “Board of Education in Chicago is terrible.”

Lack of Youth Programs

The overall sentiment in Washington Park and Woodlawn was that there are not enough programs for children, and that this lack of youth programming leads to violence and gang activity. Community members also mentioned several problems in the schools, related to overcrowding and lack of parental involvement.

During focus groups in Washington Park, multiple residents mentioned the lack of programs and services for children in the area. Racial tensions also arose. One resident mentioned, “In the black community, it’s pretty hard. Kids want to go places and parents don’t have the money. Kids, you know, we don’t have a lot of things to do like in the white communities.” Another woman suggested free athletic camps. She mentioned that when she was a kid, “We used to go to the park, things people pay hundreds of dollars to do, we did for free.” Today, people report that families can’t afford these camps anymore and free camps would be greatly appreciated.

This same sentiment about the lack of free activities was also reported in Woodlawn. Woodlawn residents also noted the need for a stronger PTA and ongoing parenting classes. A few people also
mentioned the need for block clubs so that there would be more programs available for kids. One particular resident noted, “Back in the day, we used to fly kites, play softball in the vacant lots - but now no block clubs are around to coordinate activities.” Bouie said, “We need to put back into the school some programs that will invite the kids in after-school. What we’re seeing is 2:15-2:30 p.m. once school is over the school shuts down. When I was in grade school, we could stay there and we had activities at the school, and some of the teachers would stay over for those activities”.

Persistent Problems with Parental Involvement in Schools

The focus groups revealed a lack of parental involvement in children’s intellectual and emotional growth. Community members attribute a lack of good parenting to the prevalence of teen pregnancy. Most members of the Washington Park focus groups agreed that parenting was a huge problem in Washington Park, and much of it “comes from babies trying to raise babies. How are you going to be a mother – not saying that all young mothers are bad mothers – but it’s hard to discipline a child when you’re only 15 years old.” Another reason given for lack of parental involvement was the rise in single-parent families and the fact that parents usually worked 2-3 jobs. In Woodlawn, residents noted that a lot of parents were a bad influence on their children. One focus group participant said, “These parents they walking around selling drugs, smoking drugs, I’m serious. They’re worse than their kids. The kids watch this, they do it.”

Community Perception of the Future of Washington Park and Woodlawn

The future for the Washington Park community looks bleak according to a few of its residents. Several residents mentioned that Washington Park is likely to be full of condos in the new future, and as a result, black residents are likely to be priced out of the neighborhood. A lot of them mentioned the possibility of having the Olympics come to Chicago as a major cause of the migration of black residents away from Washington Park. Even though most participants in the focus group had bleak perceptions for Washington Park’s future, they had high hopes for their own children. Multiple people predicted that their kids would be in college in 10 years. One father said, “They ain’t got no choice. They gotta go.”

Community residents in Woodlawn had similar feelings. They felt that if Chicago gets the nod for the 2016 Olympics, Woodlawn may see a decline in the black population and a big increase in condo development reserved for middle to upper class citizens.

However, the Olympics should not be a categorical reason for avoiding Washington Park and Woodlawn as a location for a Promise Neighborhood. Establishing a Promise Neighborhood years prior to the Games might counteract any negative effect the Olympics may have. Yet, antipoverty and school reform initiatives do not necessarily have measurable effects within three to five years of implementation. Thus, the increase in property values may still have the effect of driving current residents out of the two communities.

Washington Park and Woodlawn: Divided Communities?

Developing a Promise Neighborhood relies on a concentrated effort in order to build a community. Washington Park and Woodlawn see themselves as extremely distinct entities with few shared characteristics. Attempting to build one community out of these two divided neighborhoods will
likely be unsuccessful and at best artificial. This sentiment was made clear in our focus groups. Washington Park residents in the focus groups were likely to identify themselves with Englewood or areas further south rather than Woodlawn. Woodlawn residents, on the other hand, identified themselves, both historically and culturally, with Hyde Park and Kenwood. Despite the proximity of Washington Park and Woodlawn, residents in focus groups rarely referred to the landmarks from these two neighborhoods or to resources from their own communities. Washington Park and Englewood express similar levels of community organization, unlike Woodlawn, which has a greater history of community involvement.

Social Assets

**Washington Park**

Although Washington Park does not have an extensive network of social services and community organizations, the community area has several organizations that serve families and at-risk youth.

*Beatrice Caffrey Youth Services*

4924 South King Drive, Chicago, IL 60615

Beatrice Caffrey Youth Services is a half-century old community-based agency that provides a variety of programs and services for local children and youth. Some of these services include foster care and independent living programs, a Teen Reach program that provides after-school tutoring and activities, and 21st Century which provides in-school homework help, a nutrition program, and a chess club. The agency’s central premise is that local residents should play an integral part of identifying and accessing resources available to assist community youth.

*Brand New Beginnings*

103 E 58th Street #115, Chicago, IL 60637

Brand New Beginnings is a faith-based organization that provides supportive housing for women and children in the Washington Park community. The organization currently owns two buildings that rent to 52 families. The organization’s goal is to provide safe, comfortable housing at affordable prices. Brand New Beginnings intends to bring a plaza into the area, providing grocery stores, and child recreation areas.

*Carter Elementary School*

5740 S Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637

Carter Elementary has close ties to Brand New Beginnings. An interview with Mitchell revealed that Carter Elementary calls BNB when children are misbehaving in order to calm them down.

*The University of Chicago*

5801 S Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637

The University of Chicago is not located within the Washington Park community area. However, the University’s proximity, the community area’s limited amount of community-based organizations, and the University’s considerable political influence may allow The University of Chicago to be considered a social asset. The University of Chicago would like to work with Washington Park to develop resources that benefit both the University and Washington Park residents. As part of a participatory development process, the University could provide resources, including expanded outreach and career initiatives, and increased local school involvement and after-school programs development.
CeaseFire: The Campaign to STOP the Shooting
1508 E 63rd Street, Chicago, IL 60637

CeaseFire trains volunteers in conflict mediation and street-level outreach, relying on community participation, public education, faith leader involvement, and police participation to reduce violence, especially shootings. CeaseFire is a statewide organization and has received backing from the School of Public Health at the University of Illinois. CeaseFire has shown promising results since its launch in West Garfield Park in 2000, was mentioned by a number of survey participants in Woodlawn and Washington Park, and has established a relationship in Woodlawn with TWO to provide CeaseFire volunteers outside elementary schools.

Korle Bu Medical Center
5517 S Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637

Opened in November 2006 by the Ghanaian Dr. John Awah, this three-story facility offers community-based healthcare services.

South Side Community Federal Credit Union
5401 S Wentworth Avenue, # 25, Chicago, IL 60609

The South Side Community Federal Credit Union is devoted to building financial assets within the community. The Union provides services to improve financial literacy and access to credit and saving services. The credit union has established a non-profit South Side Community Economic Development Center and provides free financial, education, and home ownership counseling.166

Washington Park Consortium
6357 S Cottage Grove Avenue, Chicago, IL 60626

The Washington Park Consortium is made up of neighborhood stakeholders that created the Washington Park Quality of Life Plan. The Washington Park Consortium’s plan for Washington Park development is titled, “Historic, Vibrant, Proud and Healthy.”167

St. Edmund’s Redevelopment Corporation
6105 S Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637

St. Edmund’s Redevelopment Corporation is the New Community Program lead agency in Washington Park. The mission of the organization is to renew the community by developing quality housing and fostering community revitalization opportunities.168

Faith-Based Organizations

Washington Park has numerous faith-based organizations. With over 20 churches, Washington Park church leaders are commonly in leadership positions and were cited in our survey as such.

Childcare Services

Washington Park has several childcare venues, including: Busy Bumble Bee Academy, Coppin Early Learning Center, Kids Count Too Daycare, The Love Learning Center Daycare, and Yancy Head Start.
Woodlawn

The Apostolic Church of God
6320 Dorchester Ave Chicago, IL 60637
One of the strongest social assets in Woodlawn, The Apostolic Church of God houses the Youth and Family Center (YFC). YFC, which opened in October 2007, is the latest addition to the Apostolic Church of God campus. It includes a gymnasium with a regulation-size basketball court, a recreation room, a nursery for toddlers, a soundproof room where musicians and the Youth Orchestra practice, a dance studio, and several meeting rooms.169

New Communities Program, Woodlawn
822 E 63rd Street, Chicago, IL 60637
Partnering with Woodlawn Preservation and Investment Corporation, The Woodlawn Organization, and The University of Chicago, New Communities Program, Woodlawn is a community initiative attempting full-scale community development. According to the Program Director, Alvin Strange, New Communities Program, Woodlawn has programs that target at-risk youth, provide jobs, and after-school programs for local youth.

Southside YMCA
6330 S Stony Island Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637
The Southside YMCA offers many programs and service for Woodlawn residents. Popular programs include: recreational service, childcare services, after-school programs, winter and summer day camps, and weekly community events.170

The Woodlawn Organization (TWO)
6040 S Harper, Chicago, IL 60637
The original goals of TWO were to block the University of Chicago’s south campus expansion program and to organize against unscrupulous merchants on 63rd Street. Current programs include housing for more than 10,000 citizens, daycare and Head Start for more than 200 children, child abuse counseling for 70 families, alcohol and substance abuse residential treatment for 2,500 individuals, crisis intervention for 150 mentally ill adults, welfare to work programs for more than 300 clients, and a comprehensive network of health, education and other human services focused on infant mortality reduction that reaches more than 3,000 teenagers and young adults.171

The University Community Service Center
5525 S Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637
The University of Chicago’s Community Service Center takes a slightly different approach to service in the community through partnering The University of Chicago students with Woodlawn community members. The University Community Service Center (UCSC) at The University of Chicago fosters the development of civic-minded students by providing substantive community service opportunities through community partnerships based on mutual trust and respect.172

Bessie Coleman Branch Library & Grand Ballroom
731 E 63rd Street, Chicago, IL 60637
The Bessie Coleman Branch Library and the historic Grand Ballroom has the potential to provide social and recreational activities for people of all ages.173
Conclusion

The decision to make Washington Park and Woodlawn into a Chicago Promise Neighborhood must include consideration of the various aforementioned obstacles to its success. However, these two communities have perhaps the greatest need for a comprehensive, concentrated intervention to mitigate the significant population outflow as well as the high levels of violence and gang activity. The Woodlawn Children’s Promise seems to be building a strong foundation onto which a Promise Neighborhood could build. Additionally, the University of Chicago could commit significant resources (including human capital training for teachers and administrators, rigorous evaluation capabilities, undergraduate volunteers, and possibly a youth center) to a Promise Neighborhood. These resources for a Promise Neighborhood certainly enhance its viability. After all, a PN could only be effective if it could counteract massive depopulation, build social infrastructure, leverage a wide range of resources, and address significant problems with children’s safety and movement within the communities.
8. Recommendations for Promise Neighborhood Design, Implementation, and Financing in Chicago

This section first offers a three-stage, idealized implementation strategy for a Promise Neighborhood based on the history of the Harlem Children’s Zone and similar programs. We consider the four neighborhoods – Englewood, Little Village, South Shore, Washington Park/Woodlawn – and suggest specific considerations for each neighborhood when adapting and implementing this idealized plan. In each neighborhood, we consider potential partner agencies, leaders, working group or board participants, target schools, existing assets, service gaps, community outreach and involvement opportunities, and plans for expansion.

Secondly, we offer a number of policy innovations on the HCZ model. These are programs or services not included or emphasized in HCZ or program alterations that we believe would benefit a Promise Neighborhood. These innovations include programs for healthcare and adult education, funding, and implementation opportunities particular to working within the Chicago school system.

8.1. Idealized Implementation Strategy

Stage One. Designating: Agency, Leader, Working Group, Schools

Partner Agency

The first step in establishing a Promise Neighborhood (PN) is finding a central partner agency to coordinate or assist with the project on the community level. The success of the PN is contingent on the anchor agency’s ability to collaborate with the partner agency (see below) and other community assets to accurately assess the needs and sentiments of the community and to use that perspective to organize, delegate, and create a comprehensive infrastructure of effective services.

Selecting an existing agency

Based on the Harlem Children’s Zone Project Model report, several criteria should be considered in selecting an extant organization as a partner agency:

- Agency must have a comprehensive and accurate understanding of the community; agency must be intimately familiar with the community.
- Dedicated, passionate, indefatigable leadership on all levels must be completely behind the child-centric goals of a Promise Neighborhood.
- Personalities associated with the agency must have positive relationships with schools and have solid preexisting relationships with community members.
- Agency must have the capacity for sustained, robust intervention; agency must also have the ability and desire to expand in the future if necessary.
Agency must have established relationships with many different CBOs and agencies operating in the neighborhood.

Agency must have staff that understand the needs of the community, and preferably live in the neighborhood.

Agency must have an inclusive board but the organizational capacity to override ineffective, though entrenched, organizations.

Agency will possess and be open to rigorous evaluation capabilities.

Agency will preferably be centrally located in the neighborhood.

Agency must build on the assets of citywide agents as well as local, community based organizations.

Agency’s vision must be aligned with the overall mission and goals of the Promise Neighborhood. In accordance with this, the agency must be willing to restructure existing programs and practices to align with Promise Neighborhood goals.

**Anchor Agency**

Barack Obama’s PN implementation plan states that every PN must have a central, leading anchor agency to coordinate the efforts of the PN. Co-opting a current organization for this purpose may be problematic in that it imposes the Problem Neighborhood paradigm over the existing goals and vision of the organization. The anchor agency must have a singular mission and vision. If no suitable agency is found within the community, which will be likely, the PN must enable or encourage the establishment of an original agency to implement and administer its programs. This may be less than ideal if an outside organization will have to establish anew the requisite networks, relationships, and reputation for running a successful PN. However, creation of a new organization may be beneficial in neighborhoods in which:

- No existing agency has or could have the capacity to implement a PN.
- Existing agencies do not work cooperatively, have negative reputations or antagonistic relationships, are not willing to commit entirely to the Promise Neighborhood goals and vision or are seen as divisive forces within the community.

In establishing a new agency or selecting an existing agency or group of agencies, the PN must be cognizant of including local organizations and finding practical ways of utilizing their pre-existing networks and resources without unduly restricting or complicating the PN’s implementation and administration.

**Leader**

When searching for a leader, similar considerations should be taken. A PN leader:

- Must have established and positive relationships with community members and leaders; one of the reasons Geoffrey Canada’s Harlem Children’s Zone was so successful was Canada’s
strong personality and his connections to powerful individuals within his community, such as prominent actors in the New York Public School system and city officials.

- Must have a clear understanding of the needs and assets of the community; taking, again from Geoffrey Canada’s experience, a quality PN leader can only guide the lead agency in the correct direction if that leader understands what community needs must be met. Canada’s acute knowledge of Harlem’s problems propelled his organization forward.

- Must have a good relationship with schools; because low-performing school staff and leadership are typically distrustful, skeptical and resistant to reforms, a PN leader must have good relationships with these individuals in order to overcome their bias against outsiders.

- Must be invested in the PN model and be committed to addressing poverty through the creation of a pipeline of resources for children; community leaders with inflexible, alternative visions for the needs of their community are not ideal PN leaders.

- Preferably lives in the community. The failure of the Rochester Children’s Zone showed that a PN leader who is not in tune with everyday life of the target community will breed resentment and create a disconnect between program staff and neighborhood residents.6

Choosing a leader goes hand in hand with choosing a partner agency. Because the PN leader must be intimately familiar with the community as well as with the partner agency, we recommend assigning the role of PN leader to the current leader of the agency that is chosen as the partner agency. Imposing an outside leader onto an established and functioning organization may problematize power and social relationships within the organization and create dysfunction. Should the PN create a new partner agency, leaders should still be found within the community if possible.

Creating a Working Group of Community Leaders and Members

Once a partner agency and leader have been identified, a working group of leaders and residents is instrumental to developing concrete goals for improving the community and ensures that the voices and opinions of community residents are heard. This working group can include community leaders, residents, academics, policy researchers, and government officials to provide a range of opinions and experiences. The working group not only provides an avenue for residents to directly participate in the decision-making process, it also establishes a positive, cooperative relationship between PN staff and the community. This relationship will generate resident buy-in into the development project and assist in the dissemination of PN goals, ideals, and information.

The working group has several tasks, including:

- Identify the major barriers to community improvement and devise strategies to overcome these obstacles, especially by matching community resources and community needs, uniting existing services in a comprehensive manner, and identifying resources to fill in apparent gaps in services.

- Choose an initial target school and setting geographic boundaries for concentrated PN programming, as well as a timeline for expansion.

- Research and coordinate community organizations to determine the capability and willingness of each organization to coordinate with a PN and in what capacity.
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- Develop a preliminary budget.
- Strategize a funding plan.

Choosing Initial Target School

The experience of the Harlem Children’s Zone has shown that focusing intervention on one target school is important. Even with a plethora of resources, robust school reform is difficult to accomplish; focusing efforts on one target school, preferably at the elementary school level, will improve the reform effort’s chances of success.

Though the HCZ created its own charter schools, it is likely that a Chicago Promise Neighborhood (CPN) would rely on CPS schools for at least part of its main K-12 educational component. This presents a potential problem, since a significant number of CPS schools in low-income neighborhoods function very poorly because of problems among staff, leadership, or the supportive bureaucracy (i.e., problems of internal capacity, not only problems with students or the neighborhood environment).

As such, we recommend that a CPN work primarily with CPS schools with relatively good levels of internal capacity; in terms of the Consortium on Chicago School Research’s Essential Supports for School Improvement,\(^8\) this would mean seeking out schools with above-average leadership and levels of professional development that nonetheless struggle with difficulties that stem from factors outside the school. These schools would have the most to gain from working with a CPN.

Marisa de la Torre of the Consortium on Chicago School Research suggests meeting with the Local School Council’s in schools of interest to further gauge whether or not a school would be able to reap all of the benefits that would come with the PN program.\(^9\) Community schools would be particularly viable candidates to be included in the program since their administrators have experience in working with outside institutions to receive funding. Because the concept of full-service community schools is very similar to that of HCZ, administrators and faculty in these schools are likely to be more receptive to the goals of a CPN, and thus implementation is likely to run smoother than in a traditional school.

Harlem Children Zone’s experience suggests it may be optimal to establish new schools rather than work within dysfunctional existing bureaucracies and failing schools. The decision whether to work within existing school system is case-specific and will depend on the schools and particular circumstances of the chosen neighborhood. This decision should consider local demographics, history of school reform, and the feasibility of establishing a new school as compared to the feasibility of reforming current schools.

If the PN chooses to target an existing school, the following criteria should be used when designating the first Promise School:

- School must be an elementary school. Studies show that early intervention is key to student improvement. Following the original Harlem Children’s Zone conveyor belt strategy, the PN should focus first on reforming elementary schools, and then remain with the children from those schools through high school.\(^10\)
School must be centrally located in the neighborhood.

School must have the capacity to implement the Promise program (the most important limiting fact in this criterion is building size).

Current school leadership must be receptive to reform and willing to massively overhaul school staff if necessary; power relationships in schools can significantly hinder reform efforts if principals are not open to change. PN implementers must ensure that target school leadership is genuinely committed to the reform effort and is not simply adopting reform rhetoric to appease reformers.

Relationships and social infrastructure among staff will preferably be functional and stable. Though this factor is very important, staff infrastructure is secondary to leadership, because the staff can be overhauled, while the leadership will likely remain.

Demographics served by the school should not be selective (e.g., only males). The goal of a PN is to reach a wide range of the target neighborhood’s population; if the PN target school is selective, efforts to spread PN ideas and goals will be hindered.

Stage Two. Building Capacity: Networking, Funding, Hiring

Integrating Current Assets into Cohesive Whole

A critical aspect of PN implementation will be improving existing social services, increasing the supply and community awareness of these services, and building a comprehensive and cohesive network of organizations. To accomplish these goals, the partner agency and leadership must:

- Create a cohesive marketing strategy and extensively publicize PN services. PN leadership must partner with local businesses, libraries, aldermen, and churches to disseminate information about PN services.
- Create a comprehensive list of services that are currently provided; centralize and publicize this information.
- Integrate currently disparate services into a cohesive whole while at the same time building the capacity of undersupplied services.
- Of the services that are provided, decide which ones need expansion and improvement; provide resources and support to assist organizations in extending the reach of these services and establish more outlets for distribution of the services.
- Create a strategy to make services accessible to all residents, including a comprehensive transportation system (especially for after-school activities) to increase access to services and to protect youth as they travel home from after-school activities.

Identifying Service Gaps

Building from these primary services, PN leadership must next pinpoint key gaps in services that are either absent or severely undersupplied. PN leadership must also decide which agencies will be charged with implementing these services and provide extensive support for these organizations in
establishing new programs. Some programs may require the creation of new PN organizations. The following programs must be created and integrated into the PN network of services:

- Parenting classes;
- Summertime programs for youth;
- Job training or internship programs for young adults;
- Drug intervention and violence prevention programs;
- Sports and recreational programming;
- Computer literacy and job skills for adults;
- General youth programming to keep children off of the streets after-school;
- Family support services, including foster care.

Hiring Initial Staff

PN leadership and the working group should work together, identifying key community leaders and members, to hire key PN staff, including Vice Presidents and other PN leadership, program directors, and school principals, followed by lower-level administrators, teachers, tutors, and outreach workers. The executive and Promise Neighborhood leadership must form a team that is unified in their approach and able to make necessary changes in strategy once the Promise Neighborhood is implemented. Hiring and staff training and development should take into consideration the best practices for administration detailed above.

Funding and Evaluation

PN leadership should develop a detailed budget and timeline, prioritizing programs, and defining strategies and benchmarks for finding funding for each element of the PN. This strategy should include plans for seeking:

- State and local government funding;
- Community development block grants;
- Private foundation and donor funding;
- Special fundraising schemes based on any particular resources available in the community.

This stage of implementation includes the submission of proposals and funding requests to relevant agencies once detailed budgets have been developed. PN leadership should also work with donors to develop evaluation criteria for individual programs as well as the PN overall. Retaining an outside assessor and maintaining control groups from the program’s inception will be key to demonstrating the PN’s effects and selecting specific goals for the program with help unify and direct staff and organizational efforts.
Stage Three. Implementation and Expansion

Community Outreach

Community outreach and involvement is essential to the success of the PN. Throughout implementation and the continued operation of PN schools and programs, PN leadership must be constantly mindful of publicizing its efforts widely throughout the community and of soliciting community feedback and involvement in developing needed programming. In addition to targeting children, the entire family is critical for the success of a Promise Neighborhood. In the Harlem Children’s Zone, many parents worked and participated in the programs. Strategies for maximum community penetration should be developed before programs begin and continue throughout.

Scaling Up and Expansion

When choosing an initial target zone, it is important to consider the centrality of the location to the neighborhood. Expansions should consider changes in the population reached, if any, possibility of connection to new community-based organizations or assets or other neighborhoods, the ability of all PN programs to provide coverage for the entire PN population, and maintaining cohesion, publicity, and reputation across a broader geographic area.
8.2. Site-Specific Implementation of a Promise Neighborhood in Four Communities

This section now applies the idealized model to the four Chicago communities we examine in depth in our report. Below we evaluate how the geographic location, social assets and political considerations of each neighborhood impact the idealized implementation scenario.

Englewood

Stage One. Designating: Agency, Leader, Working Group, School

Partner Agency

Given the criteria for the partner agency outlined in the Idealized Implementation Strategy above, we assess the viability of the following community-based organizations as possible partner agencies:

Figure 8.1: Englewood CBO Strengths and Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Teamwork Englewood</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ First central planning agency to exist in Englewood, created as a catalyst organization to strengthen other organizations and schools in the neighborhood;</td>
<td>▪ Many employees new to the organization, described by some community leaders as a “new team”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Assists other agencies with securing funding and resources, and with strengthening their services;</td>
<td>▪ Does not currently focus on children’s services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Worked in conjunction with Chicago’s New Communities Program and Englewood residents to create a Quality of Life plan; this plan identifies strategies to systemically improve the social and economic infrastructure of the community;</td>
<td>▪ Limited somewhat in staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Centrally located in the neighborhood;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A MacArthur LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation) designated agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Beloved</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Major social service organization in Englewood;</td>
<td>▪ Questions as to whether organization has the capacity to be an partner agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Has established a health initiative and after-school programs; also has a parenting skills component.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Imagine Englewood If…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operates several youth after-school programs and health initiatives;</td>
<td>Organization does not have much space;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered with five community agencies to spearhead community gardening initiative; has produced two community gardens in Englewood;</td>
<td>Located outside of East Englewood target area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a Difference Day: organized community day in 2000 to celebrate and share resources; over 700 individuals participated in the Make a Difference Day;</td>
<td>Questions as to whether the organization has the capacity to be a partner agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has organized town hall meetings to discuss problems plaguing Englewood community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the strengths and weaknesses delineated above, we recommend designating Teamwork Englewood as the lead partner agency in charge of coordinating community efforts in establishing a PN. Its integral involvement in creating the Quality of Life plan indicates that the organization has thought critically and rigorously about the needs and problems of Englewood from a macro perspective. Furthermore, Teamwork Englewood has already invested significant time to working with community members to strategize specific solutions to these problems. Imagine Englewood If… established a broad network of cooperation with many different CBOs in Englewood to produce the Make a Difference Day, which is key to a partner agency’s efficacy in organizing a comprehensive and coordinated network of services. However, the day was held nine years ago, and the organization does not seem to currently have the capacity to undertake a large community initiative. There are similar questions as to the capacity of Beloved to serve as a lead partnering agency in the establishment of the PN.

The University of Chicago is in relatively close proximity to Englewood. The University’s resources should not be overlooked when choosing partner agencies. The University could provide valuable resources, staff development, support services and a capacity for rigorous evaluation to assist the lead agency. Focus group participants did not seem to have any negative feelings towards the University.

Working with an existing CBO (such as Teamwork Englewood) as a partner agency must be contingent on that agency’s understanding of the unique vision and methodology of the PN, based on Geoffrey Canada’s vision of the Harlem Children’s Zone, as well as its willingness and ability to coordinate with the PN partner agency in carrying out PN goals. Specifically, the organization must understand and be willing to faithfully replicate Canada’s conception of the pipeline of integrated, comprehensive support services, focusing on early childhood intervention, and continuing through adulthood. While Teamwork Englewood has many established resources and connections that would lend significant assets to a PN, its potential inability to recognize and replicate Canada’s rigorous, intensive and concentrated ideal might undermine the success of the PN as it has been experienced in New York.
Leader

The PN leader should be chosen from the community according to the criteria outlined in the idealized implementation plan. Jean Carter-Hill, the director of Imagine Englewood If… and a key community organizer in Englewood for the past few decades, has suggested that the PN leader in Englewood should be chosen through a working group of community leaders and members; no prospective leaders immediately came to her mind as ideal candidates. However, the leader of the chosen partnering agency will also be a key figure in the implementation of the PN. The following are two community leaders:

Doris Jones (Teamwork Englewood):

- New Communities Project (NCP) Director at Teamwork Englewood; oversaw design and creation of Quality of Life Plan;
- Previous work experience: Director of Community Relations at the Christian Community Health Center; community developer for the United Methodist Church of Chicago; co-founder and Director of Englewood’s WILL FEED organization;
- Over 30 years of community development experience.

Jean Carter-Hill (Imagine Englewood If...):

- Previously worked at the Board of Education;
- Particularly attuned to needs of children in the Englewood community (only organization in Englewood to publicize the problem of child lead poisoning in the community).

Creating a Working Group of Community Leaders and Members

The working group in Englewood must identify major barriers to community improvement and must also devise strategies to overcome these obstacles. A comprehensive document with these components (the Quality of Life Plan) has already been created by Teamwork Englewood in conjunction with the New Communities Program. The working group should work from the Quality of Life Plan to determine whether any amendments need to be made to the plan and how to integrate the plan into the design of a Promise Neighborhood.

While the participants in our focus groups described many problems that they felt plague Englewood, the Quality of Life Plan delineates several additional major issues that exist in the Englewood community:

- High foreclosure rate and community desertification;
- Food desert; lack of nutritional food for children to eat;
- Large number of vacant lots and empty spaces; little green space;
- Political fragmentation; neighborhood is under the jurisdiction of six aldermen who do not coordinate with each other and are not politically efficacious;
- High rate of mental illness.

The working group must work to build off of the Quality of Life Plan to devise strategies to address these problems.
Choosing Initial Target School

Three viable target schools are listed below. Intensive fieldwork must be conducted in any potential target schools to assess those schools based on the criteria outlined in the idealized implementation plan (such as the schools’ social infrastructures or its capacities to implement reform efforts). The current assessment of these schools focuses mainly on their location and test performance.

**Figure 8.2: Englewood Elementary School Performance**

![ISAT Performance 2008 graph]

Mays Academy:\textsuperscript{16}

- Policy of open enrollment, but there is a location-based boundary that limits the geographic distribution of students; concentration of students into one limited area would prove very useful for enacting targeted and concentrated intervention efforts.
- School size is limited to 400 students per year, making it an intimate environment and making implementation of a reform program much easier.
- School principal, Dr. Patricia McCann, was hired seven years ago, and has since treated the school as a turn-around school; hired new staff and let go of underperforming teachers.
- School provides sports activities and after-school programs and has made an effort to include parents in school-related programs.
- Leadership and staff seem devoted to seeing their students succeed.
- Centrally located in the neighborhood.

Kershaw Elementary School:

- 252 students and 12 fulltime teachers;\textsuperscript{17}
- Centrally located in the neighborhood.
Benjamin Banneker Elementary School:

- 469 students and 34 teachers;
- Operates a number of programs, including Chicago Reading Initiative, Safe and Drug Free, Career Development, Young Authors, art programs, sports programs, and more;
- Centrally located in the neighborhood.

Based on comparative school performance, Mays Academy, which frequently outperforms the state average, is the best performing school out of the three. Kershaw, on the other hand, is the worst performing. Out of the three centrally located elementary schools, Banneker and Kershaw appear to be the best candidates for initial reform efforts. The PN leader and staff will have to decide whether their initial resources and capacity are developed enough to target the worst performing school (Kershaw) or the slightly better performing school (Banneker). This decision will be contingent upon information that will become available once the PN planning process has begun. The addition of an early education component to the target school (such as Three Year Old Journey and pre-K education) will be crucial to the success of reform efforts in that school.

A fourth option for the initial target school would be the establishment of a new school run entirely by PN-chosen teachers and administrators. While establishing a new school would curb the challenges associated with reforming dysfunctional and demoralized schools, we do not recommend this option due to the neighborhood’s depopulation trends.

Stage Two. Building Capacity: Networking, Funding, Hiring

Integrating Current Assets into Cohesive Whole

From information gathered through focus groups, four primary needs have been pinpointed as essential to enacting change in Englewood. These needs are: improving education, creating more programs for kids, creating employment opportunities, and improving neighborhood safety. Though many services exist in East Englewood, they are frequently not publicized well enough, or the organizations that run them do not have the capacity to disseminate their services to the entire community.

A critical aspect of PN implementation will be improving existing services, increasing the supply of these services, and building an integrated, comprehensive and cohesive network of organizations to provide a kind of safety net to Englewood residents. To accomplish these goals, the partner agency and leadership must:

- Create a cohesive marketing strategy and extensively publicize PN services. Our focus group participants reported that few service organizations were able to successfully publicize their services to the community, and consequently, many Englewood residents went unserved. PN leadership must partner with local businesses, libraries, aldermen and churches to disseminate information about PN services.
- Create a comprehensive list of services that are currently provided; centralize and publicize this information.
Of the services that are provided, decide which ones need expansion and improvement; provide resources and support to assist organizations in extending the reach of these services, and perhaps establish more outlets for distribution of the services.

Create a strategy to make services accessible to all Englewood residents. As part of this strategy, a comprehensive transportation system (especially for after-school activities) must be established to increase access of services to Englewood residents and to protect youth from gang violence as they travel home from after-school activities.

The following are examples of services currently provided by Englewood organizations:

- After-school programs (Beloved, Imagine Englewood If…);
- Nutrition programs (Healthy Start);
- Recreational programs (Ogden Park);
- Parenting classes (Beloved, Kennedy-King College);
- Adult education (Kennedy-King College);
- Community gardening and beautification (Imagine Englewood If…);
- Lead prevention programs (Imagine Englewood If…);
- Referrals to service providers (Department of Human Services, Teamwork Englewood).

The partner agency must work to integrate these currently disparate services into a cohesive whole while at the same time building the capacity of undersupplied services; for example though both Beloved and Imagine Englewood If… provide after-school programs for kids, these organizations do not have the capacity to serve all of Englewood’s children.

Funding

In the past few years, the city has shown increased interest in Englewood, designating it as a Team Illinois site and organizing a coalition of city department heads to look into neighborhood development. The PN should harness this mayoral interest in Englewood to secure city and state government funding for the PN. Englewood leaders expect the neighborhood to be at the top of the city’s list for stimulus resources, and should work to secure this funding. PN leadership should also leverage public investment to increase private investment in Englewood.

Stage Three. Implementation and Expansion

When choosing an initial target zone, it is important to consider the centrality of the location to the neighborhood. The suggested initial target zone (the dark blue portion of the map), is not only centrally located in Englewood, but also contains some of the most important assets to the community, including potential partner agency (Teamwork Englewood), Kennedy-King College and the Department of Human Services.

Englewood is bordered to the East by Greater Grand Crossing and Washington Park and to the West by West Englewood. West Englewood does not contain many assets or CBOs; therefore, we
recommend expanding eastward from the initial target zone. Eastward expansion will allow the PN to build off of the social infrastructures of Greater Grand Crossing and Washington Park, setting up the possibility of future expansion into the Northeast and Southwest and then West Englewood.

**Figure 8.3: Proposed Englewood Site-specific Implementation**

NOTE: We propose the dark blue area being the initial zone of implementation, followed by dark and then light purple as the PN expands.
Little Village (South Lawndale)

*Stage One. Designating Agency, Leader, Working Group, School*

**Partner Agency**

Though it features over a dozen churches and many schools, the bustling community of Little Village does not have a major community anchor. However, in accordance with the Idealized Implementation Plan, we suggest three possible candidates as partner agencies.

- **El Instituto Del Progreso Latino** runs programs for both youth and adults, which serve about 14,000 people per year. Youth programs range from after-school activities to partnerships with businesses to employ high school students and recent graduates. Adult programs include general education, workforce development, and citizenship test preparation. El Instituto has a facility with a cafeteria suitable for large community meetings as well as smaller conference rooms.

- **Enlace Chicago** (formerly known as Little Village Development Corp.) focuses on preventative improvement of the neighborhood conditions that negatively affect its residents. The organization does this through a series of programs, including community education, violence prevention, and economic development. Rather than keeping children inside for protection until they can move out of the neighborhood, Enlace Chicago attempts to make the neighborhood safer so that everyone can enjoy the neighborhood's public space. Enlace Chicago is a well-connected organization, partnering with universities, schools, and other communities throughout Chicago.

- **Latinos Progresando** was founded in 1998 and is the only not-for-profit legal service organization in Little Village.

Even though these three Partner Agency candidates have goals similar to that of the Promise Neighborhood, they are not large enough to serve as an anchor for the community. They will need to show that, given additional resources, they have the capacity to reach and serve more children and families in the Little Village community.

**Leader**

Our survey results suggest several possible community leaders.

- **Alderman Ricardo Muñoz** has strong community support. However, his current goals may not line up with the goals of the Promise Neighborhood. Muñoz feels that the community is already extremely focused on reforming education and more effort should be made in improving the neighborhood in other ways, such as its beautification. Another issue that may arise if Muñoz is chosen is a past scandal in Little Village involving his father who recently pled guilty to charges of criminal conspiracy involving profiting from fake identification documents and was sentenced to four years in prison. This limitation should be taken into account, particularly when coupled with likely public tensions over providing federal funding to the community with a possible large proportion of undocumented immigrants.
The Board of Directors of Enlace Chicago and their extended network of community advocates can be a valuable resource in finding a community leader.

Local schools and churches, tightly integrated into the community, can be another valuable source for community leadership.

**Creating a Working Group of Community Leaders and Members**

El Instituto Del Progreso Latino and Enlace Chicago have the capacity to create a strong working group through their already established contacts with politicians, volunteers, and community members. The key to creating this working group of community leaders and members is in ensuring the transparency and commonality of proposed goals.

**Choosing Initial Target School**

Little Village has five schools which are suitable candidates for the initial target school: Finkl Elementary School, Madero Middle School, Little Village Academy, Josefa Ortiz de Dominguez Elementary School, and Zapata Elementary Academy.

We also recommend building a new school on the border between North and South Lawndale as well as close to the Pilsen border. By choosing these locations, we can serve children who currently have to commute the longest distance to school.

**Stage Two. Building Capacity: Networking, Funding, Hiring**

**Building Network of Services, Determining Key Gaps in Services**

Services currently offered in Little Village address a range of community-specific needs. The following are examples of these services:

- Grow Your Own (GYO) Teachers Program (Enlace);
- Career Exploration and College Preparedness (Enlace);
- Adult Education (Enlace and El Instituto);
- Violence prevention in Schools, Safety Net Works (Enlace);
- Violence Intervention on the Streets, CeaseFire (Enlace);
- Workforce Development (El Instituto);
- Youth Development (El Instituto);
- Citizenship Preparation (El Instituto)

Our survey results indicate that the Little Village residents will benefit from expanding current programs or creating new classes addressing community concerns about English language acquisition and bilingual education at schools, gang and violence prevention and drug addiction.
Funding

We expect that the Little Village development will be funded from grants and donations. El Instituto and Enlace Chicago continuously solicit donations for their ongoing educational programs. Because of the Little Village’s high population density, entrepreneurial spirit, we propose partnering with these two community organizations in their fundraising as an effective strategy.

Stage Three. Implementation and Expansion

One of the major challenges to building a Promise Neighborhood in Little Village is a continuous influx of new immigrants into the community and out-migration of its past, better-adapted, residents. This high turnover rate and associated with fluctuation in student population require special consideration when designing outreach program, implementation timeline and expansion strategy for a Promise Neighborhood in Little Village.
South Shore

Stage One. Designating Agency, Leader, Working Group, Schools

Partner Agency

Of the social assets that exist in South Shore, only the Black United Fund of Illinois (BUFI) and Annie B. Jones Community Services, Inc. (ABJ) have the organization, experience, and capacity to be candidates for a Promise Neighborhood partner agency. However, neither possesses all of the qualities needed to be the ideal partner agency.

- The Black United Fund of Illinois appears to be the best candidate to serve as the community partner agency for a Chicago Promise Neighborhood. It is one of the largest and most politically connected organizations in South Shore, and it currently serves as the lead agency of Connections of South Shore.23 As the lead agency, BUFI is responsible for creating and overseeing collaborations with stakeholders in the community, such as community members, service providers, neighborhood block associations, businesses, schools, and politicians.24 BUFI exhibits strong leadership among other service agencies and is in a prime position to harness those agencies’ existing programs to create a conveyor belt effect for children in a Promise Neighborhood. However, BUFI has organizational goals outside of providing services to South Shore and may be unwilling to sever relationships with other organizations across Illinois to focus solely on South Shore. Even within South Shore, BUFI’s goals would differ from that of a Promise Neighborhood, as its leaders seem extremely committed to whole neighborhood revitalization, rather than just focusing on child poverty. BUFI does not have extensive experience in school reform and its leaders do not believe in the ability of charter schools to help the general student population succeed.25 Additionally, BUFI has historically been an indirect service organization and is not currently equipped to directly provide services to the community in the manner of the Harlem Children’s Zone. Nonetheless, this foundation could be instrumental in implementing a Promise Neighborhood in South Shore.

- Annie B. Jones Community Services, Inc., on the other hand, has experience in directly providing services to the community and is well known and liked by community residents for their services, such as their summer teen employment program. Like BUFI, though, ABJ has operational goals outside of South Shore. It runs the only Foster Care program in the area in conjunction with the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services and currently serves over 700 children across Cook County. The Promise Neighborhood partner agency must concern itself with only South Shore programs, but it may not be in the best interest of all those involved for ABJ to terminate its foster care program. Furthermore, ABJ is unfamiliar with obtaining and managing large sums of funds, which may speak to an inability in the future to scale up a Promise Neighborhood.26

A more promising candidate for a partner agency could emerge in South Shore in the next few years, though. BUFI does not plan to serve as the lead agency of Connections of South Shore indefinitely. Instead, the CEO of Black United Fund of Illinois, Henry English, desires to eventually create a new non-profit organization to carry out the functions of Connections of South Shore. This new non-
Having a non-profit organization serve as a permanent partner agency for a CPN in South Shore would be ideal. While the collaboration of Connections of South Shore is instrumental to creating a CPN, there are not currently any binding commitments within the coalition. A non-

profit organization in charge of the implementation of a CPN could create a more formal, collaborative effort that is entirely dedicated to the mission and goals of a Chicago Promise Neighborhood, rather than dividing its attention between CPN goals and its original mission. As prior experience has shown, coordinating multiple agencies responsible for implementing different programs can lead to inefficiency and an inability to follow one cohesive vision. Additionally, using one partner agency responsible for the design and implementation of all PN programs allows for accountability, where all similar programs can be evaluated using a standard metrics system and the causes of different problems are more easily pinpointed and addressed. The agency could be

profit organization would oversee the operations of the initiatives created by Connections of South Shore. He predicted that this new non-profit organization could start in two to three years.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 8.4: South Shore CBO Strength and Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black United Fund of Illinois (BUFI)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One of the largest and most established social assets in the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Politically well-connected, as exemplified by its successful bid to be the lead agency of the Safety Net Works grant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Currently leads Connections of South Shore and oversees collaborations of key community stakeholders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Centrally located in the neighborhood and close to other social assets like ABJ and Nash Community Center;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experienced with helping other organizations develop, implement, and evaluate services and initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does not operate solely in South Shore, but rather runs programs across Illinois;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dedicated to whole neighborhood reform and revitalization, rather than just child poverty;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key leaders in the organization are skeptical about the viability and advantage of charter schools for the general student population;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No experience with directly implementing programs and providing services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Annie B. Jones Community Services, Inc.**         |
| **Strengths**                                       |
| - Has experience working with children and teens through Foster Care Program and after-school program; |
| - Successfully ran summer teen employment program in South Shore for 300 teens; |
| - Centrally located in South Shore and across the street from BUFI and Nash Center. |
| **Weaknesses**                                      |
| - Inexperienced with obtaining and managing large amounts of funds; |
| - Only agency in the area to provide critical child welfare services – a program that might not be able to be sacrificed for other PN programs. |
centrally located with a sole focus on South Shore and draw on the support and resources of the organizations, agencies, and community leaders currently involved in Connections of South Shore.

**Leader**

There is not a clear choice for a leader of a Promise Neighborhood partner agency in South Shore at this time. Successful implementation of a Promise Neighborhood in South Shore would require an executive who is in line with the goals, planning, and programming of the Promise Neighborhood. Since an ideal leader would be connected to and familiar with the community, though, a potential starting point for a leader search would be within Connections of South Shore. In particular, the search could begin with the committees focused on addressing children’s issues in South Shore, such as the Education committee. Potential sources of candidates include the Coalition for Improved Education in South Shore, leaders of the elementary and high schools and Local School Councils (LSCs), Annie B. Jones Community Services, Inc., and Black United Fund of Illinois.

**Creating a Working Group of Community Leaders and Members**

One advantage of South Shore as a potential Promise Neighborhood is that a working group of community leaders and members already exists in the form of Connections of South Shore. This group already includes most of the key stakeholders in the area. It is crucial, however, for Connections of South Shore to continue to bring in neighborhood block associations in order to increase their accessibility to and obtain the input of all South Shore residents. Connections of South Shore also needs to reach out to and include members of the middle class community, whose buy-in will be invaluable to the success of a Promise Neighborhood.

**Choosing Initial Target School**

A Promise Neighborhood in South Shore could either use the existing schools to implement the education program or build a charter school through which to begin the education program. Political constraints make it difficult to identify a potential school through which to build a Promise Neighborhood without consulting the three aldermen in South Shore. Furthermore, a more in-depth analysis of all nine elementary schools in South Shore is needed in order to determine which, if any, of the schools could become the first Promise Neighborhood Academy.

An important consideration to keep in mind when deciding whether to build a new school in South Shore or to use an existing elementary school is the failed initiative to split South Shore High School into four different schools. A large part of the reason the initiative failed was because the community leaders involved came into conflict with CPS rules and procedure. As a result, they were not able to close the school for a period of time to thoroughly plan and develop the new school, nor were they able to obtain the necessary funds to allow for smaller class sizes and additional programs that they wished to implement. It is likely that an attempt to restructure and change an existing elementary school will come across some of these same difficulties with CPS. One promising possibility for an initial target school is the new South Shore Fine Arts Academy (SSFAA) that CPS has proposed to be opened in South Shore by late 2009. This school is designed to be a performance school serving grades K-8 using the model of the South Loop Elementary School. This model has had remarkable success, as the percentage of students who meet or exceed standards on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test at South Loop has increased from 34% to 85.4% since 2002. An advantage of this school as a target school arises from the fact that the South Loop
Elementary model already contains many of the programs and methods that would be implemented in a Promise Neighborhood school, such as an Early Childhood Center, a Fine Arts program, extended school hours that include before-school and after-school programs, a commitment to parental involvement, and social and emotional support for students.30

Thus, using SSFAA as an initial target school would allow for the implementation of many of the key Promise Neighborhood programs in a public school without having to navigate the bureaucracy of CPS to obtain more funding for smaller class sizes and additional programs. As this school has already been built, using SSFAA would also save precious Promise Neighborhood funds for other uses. Though this school will open its doors in the fall of 2009, it will be limited to kindergarten to second grade. If this school was chosen as the first Promise Neighborhood school, expansion of the school into other grades could be delayed until the new partner agency is decided upon and organized. In the meantime, Connections of South Shore could become involved in the administration of SSFAA.

Stage Two. Building Capacity: Networking, Funding, Hiring

Integrating Current Assets into Cohesive Whole

While a new non-profit organization will not be created to lead Connections for several years, the planning phase of a South Shore Promise Neighborhood could begin now. Specifically, strategic planning should begin within Connections of South Shore to shape the future non-profit organization. Connections of South Shore currently has numerous committees addressing many different issues of interest to the community. While successfully addressing any one of these issues will better the community, the HCZ model has shown that a PN should focus its programs to specifically tackle the issue of child poverty. Narrowing the focus of Connections of South Shore and implementing on a small scale the programs that could eventually be scaled up by a Promise Neighborhood sets the stage for the successful development and implementation of a Promise Neighborhood. Such programs could include parenting classes, early childhood education programs, and after-school programs – all of which then could then be taken over and built upon by the new partner agency later on. These programs should utilize the existing social assets that are relevant for the mission of a Promise Neighborhood, including:

- After-school and recreational programs (ABJ, Don Nash Community Center, Park Manor Boys and Girls Club, Rebecca K. Crown Chicago Youth Center);
- Teen employment programs (ABJ and BUFI);
- Early Childhood Education (Rebecca K. Crown Chicago Youth Center);
- College preparation programs (CIESS, Rebecca K. Crown Chicago Youth Center).

Identifying Service Gaps

To become a successful Promise Neighborhood, South Shore would need to develop and implement some PN programs that currently do not exist in the community. These include:

- Parenting classes, such as Baby College for soon-to-be parents;
Drug intervention programs for both parents and youth;
- Emotional/Mental support services;
- HIV/AIDS preventions programs targeted specifically at youth;
- Increased sports and recreational programming.

**Funding**

An initial source of funds for a Promise Neighborhood in South Shore could be the funds allocated by the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS) for the Safety Net Works program. This pool of funding only amounts to approximately $280,000, though, and is to be used solely at the discretion of BUFI as the lead agency for Connections of South Shore. Thus, additional funding will need to be obtained in the form of grants from foundations and private donations.

*Stage Three. Implementation and Expansion*

**Community Outreach**

As mentioned before, a main goal of Connections of South Shore for the immediate future is to obtain the participation and buy-in of as many of the neighborhood block associations in South Shore as possible. Such block associations should prove to be a useful method of communication between residents and the leaders of Connections of South Shore.

**Scaling Up and Expansion**

Political constraints make it difficult to identify a potential starting zone for a Promise Neighborhood. Since South Shore is divided into three wards, there are three aldermen: Leslie Hairston in the 5th Ward, Sandi Jackson in the 7th ward, and Michelle Harris in the 8th ward. The three aldermen were described as “territorial” by Henry English, CEO of Black United Fund of Illinois. In order to identify a starting zone for a CPN, policy makers would have to facilitate open discussions and negotiations between these three aldermen. Ideally, if SSFAA was chosen as the initial target school, the initial zone of implementation would include both SSFAA and key community assets like BUFI, ABJ Community Services, and Nash Community Center.
Washington Park/Woodlawn

Stage One. Designating: Agency, Leader, Working Group, Schools

Partner Agency

Between Washington Park and Woodlawn, there is no one agency that has the resources for sustained intervention or influence to span both neighborhoods at the current time. One contributing factor is that residents understand these two communities to be quite distinct. The Woodlawn Organization and the Woodlawn Preservation and Investment Corporation could take on the role of partner agency in Woodlawn based on the criteria of understanding the community and having positive relationships with schools and community leaders, their central locations in Woodlawn, and locally based staff. However, neither organization has the comprehensive understanding of both Washington Park and Woodlawn that would be necessary in implementing and administering a Promise Neighborhood.

Repurposing an existing organization would likely be counterproductive due to the extensive histories, specific roles, and extant reputations of existing organizations; those organizations with the potential capacity to implement a Promise Neighborhood have not demonstrated that education and children are their primary concerns, and those organizations which focus on children’s services do not have the sufficient capacity.

A new anchor agency would be necessary to incorporate existing services and resources within both communities by coordinating existing assets and to ensure that services are equally distributed across both neighborhoods and geared specifically toward children and their families. Major challenges, however, arise in establishing credibility for a new organization as well as building essential social networks and relationships. Current community organizations would be instrumental in creating an anchor agency by providing relevant community perspectives, relationships and support.

Despite these challenges, one new education initiative in Woodlawn is situating itself to take on PN-style reform in that neighborhood. Bishop Brazier of the Apostolic Church of God has recently begun planning Woodlawn Children’s Promise in conversation with community leaders, Mayor Daley, and scholars from the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. This promising initiative plans to overhaul Woodlawn’s nine elementary schools through a number of measures inspired by HCZ. While still in the initial stages, the program Brazier and others have discussed extending the school day, bringing community members into schools to provide after-school programming from the end of the school day until 7:00 p.m., and providing Pre-K, anger-management, conflict resolution, and parenting classes.

Brazier recognizes the need to address high schools as well, especially Hyde Park Academy, which currently graduates only 25% of its students, but the initiative he has proposed plans to address elementary schools first. Woodlawn Children’s Promise has already received political support from Daley and key organization in Woodlawn, including Brazier’s church and The Woodlawn Organization, and Brazier is focused on gaining community, especially parental, support and involvement and reducing hostility and misunderstanding between parents and teachers before any reforms are undertaken. As mentioned above, Timothy Knowles and others believe these to be two crucial bases of support for any organization undertaking a PN in Chicago.32
Woodlawn Children’s Promise is centered first on Woodlawn alone and Brazier believes while it may serve as a model for other communities, the initiative and leadership will have to arise endogenously. The organization is not geared towards partnership with Washington Park or to target the combination of Woodlawn and Washington Park elementary schools proposed by this report. Community sentiment in focus groups has suggested that these neighborhoods understand themselves as distinct entities and Knowles believes that the unique power and cohesion of Chicago’s neighborhoods make the neighborhood the logical subject of reform as opposed to the school district. The potential strength and benefits of implementing a PN through Woodlawn Children’s Promise may outweigh this report’s recommendations for combining Washington Park and Woodlawn, but those designing the PN should remain aware of implementing a PN that might expand beyond neighborhood boundaries and still command sufficient interest and support.

**Leader**

Just as no one agency is poised to fill the role of an anchor agency in both Washington Park and Woodlawn, no one individual stands out to take leadership of such a Promise Neighborhood. HCZ experience suggests the search for a leader would have to be conducted from within the community. Preferably, a PN leader would already be respected within the community and have the clout to spearhead a coalition of transformative organizations and programs. Existing relationships with community members and leaders, especially if these ties exist with both Washington Park and Woodlawn communities, as well as a thorough understanding of the communities’ needs and resources would be essential in managing an effective Promise Neighborhood. These requirements are particularly consequential in a Promise Neighborhood that would tie two divided communities together. Preferably, this leader would live in either Washington Park or Woodlawn, ensuring exposure to community sentiment about the PN and reducing the “outsider” mentality that so many reforms seem to suffer from.

Bishop Brazier has been conducting a nation-wide search for a CEO, knowing of no suitable person who resides in Woodlawn. He believes the director of Woodlawn Children’s Promise should be focused on education and that it is up to the community to organize and advise the director on community sentiment and involvement.

Most importantly, the potential leader must buy in to the Promise Neighborhood’s focus on children and their families. The leader must be invested in the model and framework of a concentrated, comprehensive early intervention that helps a community from the bottom up. Conflicting goals and strategies will cause strife within an organization as well as inefficient growth and allocation of resources.

**Creating a Working Group of Community Leaders and Members**

A Promise Neighborhood should value the input, take advantage of the local expertise, and utilize the resources of the following people and organizations, with their established embeddedness and important role in shaping these communities, in order to build a sense of community ownership in a Promise Neighborhood:
Washington Park:

- Alderman Pat Dowell, 3rd Ward;
- Beatrice Caffrey Youth Services;
- Carter Elementary School;
- Della Mitchell and Brand New Beginnings.

Woodlawn:

- Alderman Willie Cochran, 20th Ward;
- Bishop Brazier and the Woodlawn Schools Initiative, Woodlawn Children’s Promise;
- Hyde Park High School;
- New Communities Program and Sunshine Gospel Ministries;
- The Woodlawn Organization (TWO);
- YMCA/YWCA.

There is no consensus about the University of Chicago’s potential involvement. The University is an enormous potential resource in the community, but there is ambivalent community sentiment as well as strong negative associations from a small, but vocal, minority in both neighborhoods. While the University has honored its 1963 agreement with Woodlawn not to build south of 61st Street, many still perceive the University as a powerful force working for its own interest in the community and recent land purchases in Washington Park raised local concerns.35

The working group, once established, must address the tasks outlined above. A specific concern for the Washington Park and Woodlawn working group will be to address the youth-oriented goals from these communities’ Quality of Life Reports, including:

Washington Park:

- Improving schools by raising attendance and achievement levels, increasing parental involvement, requiring service learning hours, providing computer and college resource centers, Junior ROTC-type programs, and GED programming, facilitating community events and organized sports, and creating a residential school for at-risk youth;
- Building the capacity of non-profit, faith-based, and cultural organizations;
- Establishing community advisory committees, community forums;
- Taking advantage of existing medical centers (University of Chicago, Korle Bu);
- Carrying out beautification and cleanup projects;
- Developing strategies to bring police and community together;
- Attracting one large employer to Washington Park.
Woodlawn:

- Improving schools by creating a school network, job/internship opportunities, intergenerational activities, programs to combat truancy and dropout rates, and expanded early childhood intervention programs;
- Providing youth activities, recreation activities for all ages;
- Improving communication and coordination among community organizations;

Choosing Initial Target School

Due to the small, declining population of children in both Washington Park and Woodlawn, it is suggested that the Promise Neighborhood work within the existing framework of public and charter schools. It is also recommended to begin with four, centrally-located elementary schools, as opposed to a single school, because in these neighborhoods, the benefits from cohering the two communities from the very beginning likely outweigh the difficulties posed by coordination of multiple sites. Geography suggests a natural expansion from central elementary schools in the south of Washington Park and northwest of Woodlawn to the more distant high schools in the north of Washington Park and east of Woodlawn.

Community sentiment in focus groups and interviews suggests effective implementation will require sufficient flexibility in use of funding, timing of the school day and the school year, staffing policies (especially through partnering with the Chicago Teachers Union), and governance (especially through partnership with AMSP and AUSL).

Current initiatives and resources associated with Washington Park and Woodlawn schools that could potentially be incorporated into PN educational programming include:

- Woodlawn Children's Promise;
- Private schools in Washington Park and Woodlawn, such as the ACE Technical School and Woodlawn's University of Chicago Charter, should be incorporated to ensure no child population is excluded;
- Renaissance 2010 is one of the programs currently focusing on turning around these neighborhoods’ schools and its involvement will be key to continuity and learning from the history of school reform efforts in this area;
Brand New Beginnings' involvement in Carter Elementary School has addressed lack of parental involvement, demonstrating how schools can be an appropriate site to encourage parents to invest personally in local schools.

Stage Two. Building Capacity: Networking, Funding, Hiring

Integrating Current Assets into Cohesive Whole

Washington Park and Woodlawn currently have various social services for their residents, provided by many different agencies, including:

- Youth recreational centers (Generation Joshua Youth Council-Brand New Beginnings Youth Plaza, Southside YMCA, YFC at Woodlawn's Apostolic Church of God, faith-based organizations);
- After-school Programs (New Communities Program/Sunshine Gospel, Southside YMCA);
- Job training, Welfare to Work Programs (The Woodlawn Organization, New Communities Program/Sunshine Gospel);
- Community-based Healthcare (Korle Bu Healthcare Center, The Woodlawn Organization, University of Chicago);
- Daycare and Head Start (The Woodlawn Organization, Southside YMCA);
- Adult Education (South Side Community Federal Credit Union);
- Housing Assistance (The Woodlawn Organization, Brand New Beginnings, St. Edmund’s Redevelopment Corporation);
- Counseling (The Woodlawn Organization).

Furthermore, there are resources in both Washington Park and Woodlawn that have the potential to be utilized by and participate in a larger series of programs:

- University of Chicago;
- Faith-based organizations;
- Washington Park Consortium;
- Bessie Coleman Branch Library & Grand Ballroom.

Although these services exist in both communities, most focus group participants cited a lack of knowledge about these programs. In addition to publicizing these programs across both Woodlawn and Washington Park, the potential anchor agency would need to consolidate all of these services, especially those targeting children, under a cohesive Promise Neighborhood umbrella with similar goals, quality, and programming. Moreover, certain programs could be targeted with PN resources to increase capacity to serve both communities while still supporting the services that fall outside the scope of a Promise Neighborhood, such as housing programs and economic development.
Determining Key Gaps in Services

While a Promise Neighborhood will eventually encompass all children in the community until college, our approach to a Promise Neighborhood cautions against doing too much too soon. Prioritizing the necessary programming by resources and relative importance as well as the necessity of building community trust and a “brand” determine the following course of action.

For both Washington Park and Woodlawn, safety, security, and gangs were cited as major concerns. As a result, the first priority is to establish after-school programming to keep children occupied and supervised with productive activities even after the school day ends. Specifically, residents in Washington Park cited a need for after-school programming for young children. Jackson Park in Woodlawn and Washington Park itself are useful assets for this sort of programming. Supervision of programs and transportation can be a key point for involving adult community members, which would serve as an extra measure to build community involvement and increase security.

One key element of Brazier’s Woodlawn Children’s Promise is to extend the school day from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. This would offer additional hours for instruction as well as a safe, supervised space during the hours in which most gang-related violence and drug activity occurs. The University of Chicago has an important role to play by providing the human resources to supervise and program those additional school hours. A constructive college student presence, providing instruction in a broad range of engaging, non-traditional subjects and extracurricular activities, would provide Woodlawn access to University human capital and educational resources as well as foster stable relationships and channels of direct communication between members of both communities.

The University, for its part, could encourage undergraduates to provide after-school programming at Woodlawn elementary schools by offering course credit; an integrated college curriculum on teaching, school reform, and human development. Registered Student Organization status and funding could facilitate programming through access to all the academic and instructional resources ordinarily available to undergraduates. Student interest and ability in this type of program has been amply demonstrated by Splash!. This annual event in which college students offer single-session classes in their areas of interest to local students has quickly become one of the most widely-supported and best-known community service initiatives at the university, engaging the talents and interests of our unique student body.

The next priority in building a Promise Neighborhood is establishing programming to serve new parents in raising their children. The Harlem Children Zone’s Baby College program is an ideal model. The Nurse-Family Partnership could be another possibility in Woodlawn and Washington Park due to the proximity of the University of Chicago Hospitals.

Funding

We combined Washington Park and Woodlawn into an unwieldy whole because of the potential involvement of the University of Chicago as well as their respective small child populations. The University of Chicago certainly has an interest in improving the quality of life in both of these communities and possibly aiding their transformation to mixed-income communities. With huge resources, an armada of academics at its disposal, and existing charter schools in both neighborhoods, the University is uniquely poised to support a Promise Neighborhood in these two neighborhoods. Although community sentiment against the University of Chicago’s southward
expansion and land acquisition has continually been an issue on the Southside, a comprehensive effort to improve the surrounding communities, while utilizing local leaders and resources, could burnish the University's reputation in Woodlawn and Washington Park.

Chicago's Olympic proposal to put Washington Park as the center of activities has highlighted concern for the community and outrage at a possible exodus of current residents. If Chicago wins the Olympic bid, Washington Park and Woodlawn should make an effort to lobby for more resources to go toward significant community improvement rather than simply exploiting the communities for the Olympics.

Stage Three. Implementation and Expansion

Community Outreach

The major key in insuring the comprehensive, concentrated nature of a Promise Neighborhood is getting people involved. Community residents in focus groups noted the difficulty of contacting and communicating with residents in their communities, and Washington Park certainly lacks a substantive communication network. For example, Brand New Beginnings offers a number of after-school programs, but employees expressed concerns that few children take advantage of programming they offer. A Promise Neighborhood must coordinate a massive outreach effort through fliers, phone calls, and personal visits. Personal visits are most effective because of the prevalence of disconnected phone numbers and highly mobile populations. Our own field experience in Washington Park and Woodlawn confirmed that face-to-face interactions were far more likely to elicit response than fliers and indirect solicitation.

Scaling Up and Expansion

Carter Elementary School's central location makes it a potential target for the first phase of PN implementation in Washington Park. Directly across from Brand New Beginnings, Carter already has a history of collaborating with neighborhood organizations and involving parents as members of community watches to protect children going to and from school, recess, and after-school programs. It is near the Oneida Cockerell Child Parent Center, which provides Head Start programming, as well as Austin Sexton School and John Fiske School, two elementary schools in Woodlawn that offer Head Start. John Fiske also offers a state Pre-K program, and is across the street from the Harris Child Development Center. Carter Elementary’s proximity to these other elementary schools and programs, as well as Washington Park itself, makes it a potentially effective location from which to launch a PN in these communities. It is closer to Woodlawn than the other schools in north Washington Park. The green line conveniently connects these neighborhoods, following the western edge of the park and turning east on 63rd Street, continuing the width of Woodlawn to Jackson Park.

First area of implementation: Four central elementary schools

The area outlined in the first area of implementation comprises four schools districts: those of Carter, Ross, Sexton, and Fiske Elementary Schools. While it may be desirable to tackle a single target school to begin with, there are advantages to targeting all four of these elementary schools at once, focusing on fostering cohesiveness between Washington Park and Woodlawn in this initiative and trying from the program's very inception to develop cooperative community sentiment.
Second area of implementation: Remainder of Woodlawn

The second area of implementation should expand south to include the remainder of Woodlawn. This area of Woodlawn is home to Hyde Park High School and the University of Chicago’s Woodlawn Charter High School, which make it a logical location for the expansion of the Washington Park and Woodlawn PN. The second area of implementation will provide high schools into which the PN can expand its programming as students graduate from the four previously mentioned elementary schools. The southern portion of Washington Park is ambiguously districted; according to CPS, students here may attend the above-mentioned high schools or Team Englewood High School in Englewood. The greater proximity of the latter might suggest students would be more likely to attend Teamwork Englewood’s High School; a concentrated PN pipeline would have to keep this in mind when deciding in which high schools to invest. Another factor to consider is the gang territories that cut across the middle section of Woodlawn. If the PN, however, wishes to remain within the boundaries of Washington Park and Woodlawn, as opposed to conforming to school districts, it would be logical for it to expand to the currently existing high schools in Woodlawn after the four most centrally-located elementary schools.

Figure 8.6: Implementing a Promise Neighborhood in Woodlawn/Washington Park

Third area of implementation: Remainder of Washington Park

The final area to incorporate will be the remainder of Washington Park, which includes ACE Technical High School. Since this is already a charter school, it remains to be seen how necessary and/or helpful it would be to include ACE in the implementation of a PN. ACE is a relatively new school, founded in 2004, with the specific purpose of educating high school students for architecture, engineering, and construction careers. While this school could be a useful asset for programming and learning opportunities for after-school activities and job training, it may not be beneficial to turn ACE into a PN school.
8.3. Recommended Policy Innovations for a CPN

Aside from the programs and methods used by the Harlem Children’s Zone and outlined above in the idealized implementation plan, there are other programs and means of implementation that could help a Promise Neighborhood achieve its goals. The policy innovations described below may hold particular relevance for some neighborhoods over others, but could be implemented in any one of the four target neighborhoods with success.

8.3.1. Program Innovations

Nurse-Family Partnership
A nurse-family partnership would serve as either a supplement to parenting classes to provide a more comprehensive, personal, and tailored approach to parental education or as a replacement in neighborhoods where implementation of such classes is not feasible. The partnerships are designed to counteract stressors that can cause gaps in development by having nurses visit mothers from the first trimester of pregnancy until the child is two years old with varying frequency depending on the stage of pregnancy. The content of these home visits include discussions of personal maternal health, environmental health, maternal role development, life-course development, and personal relationships. The goals of the program are to:

- Improve the outcomes of pregnancy by helping women improve their prenatal health;
- Improve the child’s health and development by helping parents provide more sensitive and competent care of the child;
- Improve parental life course by helping parents plan future pregnancies, complete their education, and find employment.

Justification
The Nurse-Family Partnership is based on three main theories: human ecology theory, self-efficacy theory, and attachment theory. Human ecology theory postulates that children’s development is based on how parents care for them, which is affected by their surrounding environment. Self-efficacy theory points out that most of women’s decisions made while pregnant are affected by what women think they are able to carry out themselves.

Introducing a nurse changes this perception and thus the decisions made through both education and establishing achievable goals. Attachment theory hypothesizes that children’s perceptions of the world and abilities to form relationships follow directly from early attachments to caring, giving individuals. Studies of nurse-family partnerships have shown that these partnerships produce such positive results as reductions in rates of smoking in pregnant mothers, sizable reductions in rates of low-weight and premature birth, and increases in rates of immunization and language acquisition. In addition, they have been shown to have positive effects on children’s cognitive development (includes IQ and achievement test scores) and behavioral and emotional development (such as scores on measures of social competence or behavior problems).
Implementation: A number of key practices need to be included in order to implement a nurse-family partnership successfully. Professional nurses rather than paraprofessionals are necessary for effectiveness. Additionally, such nurses should be trained by the national nurse-family partnership organization. If possible, the Olds model program, which utilizes uniform programming and professional nurses, should be implemented, as it was the most successful program tested in RAND studies. In addition, nurse-family partnerships should strive to include an early education component as programs that did so in the past outperformed programs that did not. In particular, the programs with only parental education were not statistically different from the controls.

This program can be operated using funding from current government budgets. In 2003, each program that was funded by the government was allocated approximately $8,000 for each family for a period of 2.5 years through existing programs such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Medicaid, the Maternal and Child Health Block-Grant, and child-abuse and crime-prevention dollars.

School-Based Healthcare

Another potential innovation involves providing school-based healthcare for students. Research has shown that poor health negatively affects low-income students’ ability to learn in school due to problems like missing school frequently from untreated illnesses and being unable to concentrate properly during class because of undiagnosed hearing and vision problems. School-based healthcare gives students more access to quality health services since children are already in schools. It is more convenient for families since they do not have to navigate work schedules and resolve transportation issues in order to find healthcare options in neighborhoods that typically have limited healthcare services, which is of particular concern in each of our four target neighborhoods. School-based healthcare is particularly effective in increasing the number of elementary school age, minority children who receive crucial childhood health services, such as immunizations and physical exams. Healthcare in schools is also more geared towards preventive care rather than responsive services, such as emergency care, that are only used when a child is already ill. Since preventive care is more cost-effective than emergency care, providing healthcare in schools also decreases the overall cost of health services for the families of these children.

An example of how school-based healthcare could be executed is Elev8 Chicago, which allows each of its schools to partner with a local healthcare partner, such as PrimeCare, Access, Alivio, and Komed. Health centers were constructed at each school to provide access to quality healthcare and to help students understand the basics of good health, such as regular exercise and a nutritional diet. Additional services range from a hygiene program, to dental care, mental healthcare, and a program on the prevention of pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. Aside from these basic services, individual schools also work with their healthcare partner to personalize their programs, from including a program for students to explore healthcare careers to having the healthcare partner plan nutritional meals to serve in the school cafeteria. The lead agency for a potential Promise Neighborhood could connect local healthcare providers with PN schools to set up a similar program.
**Adult Education**

In addition to educating children, a comprehensive anti-poverty program should include an adult education component. Though not as central to the program as early childhood education, adult education is critical to creating and maintaining a community environment in which learning and education are valued.

**Types of Adult Education Programs:** There are several different kinds of adult education programs. Literacy programs teach literacy skills and assist students in filling out necessary paperwork (job applications, applications for social services, etc.) and completing basic administrative tasks (paying the bills, searching for housing, etc.). Literacy programs can be run directly by the PN but should meet the curriculum and accountability standards outlined below. GED programs are programs that prepare students to obtain the General Education Development certificate (GED), the primary certificate for individuals who did not receive a high school degree. Finally, continuing education programs are programs in which adults enroll in college or university credit-granting programs. These latter two forms of adult education can be implemented directly by a PN agency, however, the curriculum and teacher qualification standards are much higher for these types of programs than for literacy programs. Therefore, Promise Neighborhoods should look to partner with local community colleges and accredited institutions of higher learning to provide program participants with easy access to these programs. City Colleges of Chicago offer GED preparation classes, and the Illinois Adult Literacy hot line can provide information about all GED preparation classes available in Chicago. If such programs are already being offered by local organizations in the target area, Promise Neighborhoods should incentivize participation in such programs by providing childcare during class times.

**Implementation:** Any course that is administered directly by a Promise Neighborhood agency should fulfill the following criteria:

*Convenience:* Location and timing of adult education programs is key to consistent program participation. Programs and courses should allow for flexibility and offer accelerated, evening, weekend and online options.47

*Advising:* Just as in elementary education, advising is key to an adult learner’s success. Advisers should assess their students’ individual needs and ensure that the programs in which they are enrolled accommodate those needs. Advisers should check in with students throughout the course of their enrollment in the program, and, ideally, after they complete the program.

*Connecting to social services:* Connecting adult learners to any necessary support services (e.g. counseling, substance-abuse, job searching offices, etc.) is critical to building strong relationships between program staff and students, as well as creating for the adult learners home environments that will be conducive to their success in the classroom. Social workers should work closely with program staff to ensure the needs of the students enrolled in an adult education program are being met.
8.3.2. Funding Innovations

NewSchools Venture Fund

NewSchools Venture Fund is a national nonprofit venture philanthropy firm that has funded many programs to transform public education, especially with regard to low-income and minority children in urban neighborhoods. NewSchools has already created two funds that supported and helped create major charter management organizations (CMOs) like KIPP and Noble Network of Charter Schools and Perspectives Charter Schools, the latter two of which operate in Chicago for students in grades 6-12. Though no numbers are given for the size of the first fund, the second fund totaled over $50 million for more than a dozen CMOs.

Currently, NewSchools is investing in its third fund, which differs slightly in strategy from its two previous funds. While this fund will continue to put emphasis on CMOs, it will also invest in school support organizations that provide infrastructure to schools, organizations that provide technology tools and professional development to improve instruction, and organizations that increase human capital by promoting outstanding teachers and school leadership.

NewSchools uses several key criteria for evaluating potential investments, such as:

- **Scalability:** Can the venture grow over time so that it impacts more children?
- **Financially stable:** Can the venture sustain itself over time?
- **Catalytic impact:** Can the venture have a larger impact besides its direct impact on the students that it serves?

Considering that a Promise Neighborhood school should meet all of the necessary criteria, as the PN should be designed with growth, financial stability, and overall neighborhood transformation in mind and should provide its schools with technical support, professional development, and human capital, a Promise Neighborhood would be an excellent candidate for funding from the NewSchools Venture Fund.

In addition, since NewSchools has had experience working with some of the key players in education reform in Chicago, such as the Academy for Urban School Leadership and the Noble Network, obtaining funding from NewSchools could also provide a beneficial resource in terms of experience and knowledge.

Community Development Block Grants

Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) are distributed by United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). These grants have been distributed yearly since 1974 on a formula basis. Over 1,100 communities in the US are allocated money, and Chicago already receives a portion of the $4.7B allocated annually.

**Formula Grants:** Formula grants are distributed according to a formula with parameters such as poverty rate, crime, population, etc. This impacts our project in that we will not be able to
specifically lobby the federal government for funds, as we will have to lobby the office of government in the city that is responsible for distributing the money instead. Chicago is an entitlement community; it is required to submit yearly reports on how it plans to use the CDBG. This process usually incorporates input from city leaders and residents.

**Further Considerations:** A Promise Neighborhood will not be eligible to receive large amounts of funding from these grants, partly because the program is only $4.7B nationwide, and partly because the city government has sole discretion over fund distribution. Projects termed “Promise Neighborhoods” may be ineligible for CDBG funds anyways, since the federal government will be funding PNs through the Department of Education. If a Promise Neighborhood were to collect CDBG funds, it would be double dipping into federal coffers.

*Philanthropic Reimbursements*

A possible scheme for funding a Promise Neighborhood privately is to offer reimbursement vouchers for donors. These vouchers can be granted according to statistics made by the philanthropist. Currently, the City of Chicago spends over $15,000 per student per year. Donors who contribute to projects that successfully graduate students at rates above the city's average can be rewarded based on a formula that incorporates a ratio of the state's per student cost and the original donation amount.

**Example:** If we have a Promise Neighborhood seeking out potential private donors, a reimbursement scheme could work in the following way. The Promise Neighborhood will hopefully have a high school, and for every percentage point higher the graduation rate is at this school than at the city schools' average, the city will reimburse the cost of educating those students, from kindergarten to 12th grade. This amount will add up to around $100,000 per student, and can then be distributed to the donors in an equitable manner, according to some preset formula that donors know at the time of their donation.

This reimbursement scheme will do two important things for a Promise Neighborhood. It will tie donors to the success of the organization at the time of donation, incentivizing them to seek out successful projects. Once they have donated, the donors will also be tied to the success of the organization. This will associate many successful, wealthy, influential members of the community to the success of poverty-reduction methods. Reimbursement vouchers will also incentivize potential donors to contribute because they are promised a monetary portion of the success of the program if it is successful.

There is also a positive externality associated with vouchers for donors. If the schools run by the Promise Neighborhood are graduating students at much higher rates than the City, and the city government is forced to reimburse wealthy donors with millions in taxpayer dollars, the City will be forced to improve other schools in order to stop the flow of funds out of the city school system and into private hands. A voucher system introduces competition into private education; even if competition is only local, the rewards can be realized across the entire CPS system.
8.3.3. Implementation Innovations

**Partnership with the Academy for Urban School Leadership and Turnaround Schools**

A partnership with the Academy for Urban Schools Leadership (AUSL) could take two different directions. One idea involves partnering with AUSL’s Urban Teacher Residency Program, which trains teachers specifically to succeed in urban Chicago schools. The training includes a year of campus-based residency in a Chicago Public School classroom with “training, education, certification, and mentorship” (AUSL) paired with a master’s degree in education. After six years of the residency program, AUSL has produced 243 new teachers and has a retention rate of 87% for AUSL program graduates in education. A large part of their success is due to their use of AUSL classroom coaches, who continue to provide in-classroom support after a resident graduates and is hired by CPS.

Alternatively, a Promise Neighborhood could partner with AUSL to develop a Turnaround School in lieu of creating a new charter or public school from the ground up. Creating a Turnaround school would mean choosing a currently failing school in the Promise Neighborhood and replacing much of its leadership and faculty with high-quality, well-trained staff. This new staff would be supported with professional development, a research-based curriculum, and additional time for teachers to plan and collaborate. Turnaround Schools also offer either longer school days or years and provide local authority over their budget and curriculum. The option to develop a Turnaround School would most likely be less costly than building a new school, as there is no need to build a brand new facility and the cost of hiring new teachers would be the same regardless. At the same time, it offers the Promise Neighborhood administrators the time and opportunity to plan and restructure an existing school, which has not been possible in past attempts to overhaul existing schools like South Shore High School.

The two main problems with using Turnaround Schools in a PN are 1) the initial public and parental resistance to an overhaul of the staff and 2) the fact that a Turnaround School would still be under the administration of CPS. With regard to the former problem, though parents are initially resistant to a changing staff, parents at other Turnaround Schools have gradually come to appreciate the program once they see the results, such as at the Sherman School of Excellence, where the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) score increased 11% from the past year’s ISAT in its first year as a Turnaround School.

With regard to the latter problem, there might be potential for the PN to work with Chicago Public Schools to enact greater changes in a Turnaround School since CPS already allows Turnaround Schools some leeway with administration. The question of whether or not a PN school can be effectively implemented as a public school requires further evaluation, though.

**CPS Contract Schools and Autonomously Managed Performance Schools (AMPS)**

Another means of implementing a Promise Neighborhood Academy should a charter school not be feasible or desirable would be opening the school as a CPS contract school or Autonomously Managed Performance School (AMPS). Contract schools are independently operated public schools run by non-profits and have a number of freedoms, including the ability to hire non-unionized employees at the nonprofit’s discretion, the ability to set employee salaries, and freedom from a
number of CPS policies and requirements. They are overseen by an advisory board that consists of parents, staff members of the nonprofit, and community members. Contract schools are still funded by CPS on a per pupil basis, though, so they offer less financial freedom than a charter school. AMPS designated schools, on the other hand, are still operated by CPS but can choose to opt out of area management oversight, have more control over their own budgets, and obtain extra funding to run their own new teacher induction program. While AMPS was originally a designation that could only be granted to high-performing schools, it has recently turned into an initiative to allow some schools to become more innovative and flexible in their approach to raise student achievement.

As of now, CPS has opened seven contract schools under the operation of various nonprofits in Chicago. Since contract schools are a relatively new initiative under Renaissance 2010, though, there is no evidence-based support yet for their success. Similarly, there are no evidence-based results for the effect of AMPS status on schools with traditionally low achievement levels. Though the AMPS initiative has been in place for some time, all of the schools initially granted the status were already high-achieving schools.

Conclusion: Policy Innovations

As described above, a number of policy innovations exist that could improve a Promise Neighborhood’s chances of success. These innovations include programmatic additions, such as Nurse-Family Partnerships and school-based healthcare programs, which would increase the direct impact a Promise Neighborhood has on community members. These innovations also include funding mechanisms like the New Schools Venture Fund and various methods of implementing the main education component of a Promise Neighborhood that use existing resources and schools to the Promise Neighborhood’s benefit. The combination of these policy innovations with the general implementation plans outlined earlier would provide for a Promise Neighborhood that is suited to the needs of particular Chicago neighborhoods while taking advantage of many of the opportunities that Chicago presents.
Appendix A: Surveys

To determine the assets and needs of the target neighborhoods, as well as the sentiments of residents living in these neighborhoods, information was gathered through surveys, interviews, public data sources and focus groups. Each of these methods had their own strengths and limitations. What follows is a documentation of all efforts taken to procure information on the four target neighborhoods: South Shore, Englewood, Little Village (South Lawndale), and Washington Park/Woodlawn. Washington Park and Woodlawn are separate community areas, but were combined in order to fit necessary criteria for a Promise Neighborhood.

During the first stages of the project one of our research teams was dedicated specifically to developing a survey that would accomplish the goal of obtaining data to be used on the final report. The same survey was used in all four areas, with the only exception being a version that was translated into Spanish for Little Village.

The survey covered a variety of topics and themes that were derived from key informant interviews and focus group sessions. These themes include safety, perceptions and use of local community organizations, community cohesion, perceptions of community and city leaders, quality of schooling, quality and accessibility of services, and parenting perceptions.

While the goal was to develop and carry out a survey to collect quantifiable data, it is important to note that our sample is not a random sample but a convenience sample. Surveys were conducted in public places such as commercial centers, which indicates that the people surveyed were not necessarily representative of the overall population in any given area. Additionally, there were incentives, including gift certificates or cash ranging from one to ten dollars, given to survey participants. These incentives might have attracted disproportionately low-income residents in the community.

There were many limitations and obstacles to the survey process. In the case of Little Village, surveyors frequently had difficulty explaining questions because of their limited knowledge of Spanish. In all neighborhoods, we found that participants did not always have the motivation, time, or patience to finish the entire survey. Several participants failed to read the questions fully and answered quickly in order to receive the incentive money. There were also people who were not sufficiently literate to complete the survey. Because of these issues, and to make sure the best possible data was collected, there were both face-to-face administered surveys and self-administered surveys. It is important to note that answers may vary depending on whether the survey was self-administered or given face-to-face. In general, the main obstacles lay in the ability to get a sample that was representative of the entire area population, getting the people to take the time to answer all questions thoroughly and thoughtfully, and to make sure those who were illiterate were comfortable enough to complete the survey to the best of their ability. See the following pages for copies of English and then Spanish versions of the survey questionnaire.
Community Research Survey

We are college students from the University of Chicago working to gain a better understanding of the concerns facing children and families in the community. At the completion of the survey you will receive a $5 payment and be entered in a lottery for a $150 cash prize. Thank you for participating!

- Please read questions thoroughly.
- Please make clear markings and write legibly.
- If you are uncomfortable with a question, you may skip it.

All information given in this survey is anonymous and will not be associated with your name.

Section 1: Current Living Situation
First, we’d like to ask you a couple of questions about your current living situation.

1. What community do you live in? ________________________________

2. What is the nearest intersection to your home? __________________________

3. How many years have you lived in your community? ____________ Years

Section 2: Relationships Between Residents
Now, we have a few questions about the relationships between residents in your community.

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Residents in my community...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Trust other adults in the community</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Trust youth in the community</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Get along with each other</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Look out for kids who aren’t their own</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: Community Organizations and Local Government
Now, we have some questions about organizations in your area and in Chicago.

5. Please name in order up to three well-respected and effective organizations that serve youth in the community. Possibilities may include the name of a good school, a community or youth center, a park program, a social service agency, a church, etc.

1. ________________________________

2. ________________________________

3. ________________________________
6. The following organizations can be trusted to *do what is best for my community.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The City of Chicago government</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Chicago Police Department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Local Schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Local Churches</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The University of Chicago</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Who do you consider to be positive leaders in your community? *(Please check all that apply)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Religious leaders (ministers, preachers, etc.)</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Heads of non-profit organizations</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Local business owners</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4: Services in the Neighborhood**

Next, we’d like to ask you about services in your neighborhood.

8. The following institutions and programs in my neighborhood are *high quality.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>After-School Programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Health Clinics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. *Circle* the institutions/programs listed in Question 8 that are *not* easily accessible to you.
Section 5: Programs Needed in the Community

10. Please rank these YOUTH programs according to the level of need in your community (1 = most needed; 5 = least needed; use each number only once). We welcome comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational (e.g., sports, arts, cultural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring/College preparatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug and violence prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth employment/training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition and Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please rank these FAMILY programs according to the level of need in your community (1 = most needed; 5 = least needed; use each number only once). We welcome comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family-friendly community events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition and Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6: Children’s Safety and Health

Next, we would like to know about children’s safety and health concerns in your neighborhood.

12. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Children are safe walking to and from school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Children are safe traveling to and from after-school programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. There are safe places for kids to go after school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Gang territory affects places children can go</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Children have access to healthy food to eat</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Halfway Done with Survey!
Section 7: Children and Schools in the Neighborhood

Now, we have some questions about children and schools in the neighborhood.

13. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements? Schools in this neighborhood...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Effectively communicate with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Provide safety for children in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Employ teachers who are qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements about the learning environment in local schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Teachers maintain the attention of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Students are exposed to drugs in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Students are distracted by disruptive students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. For students you know personally in the neighborhood, are the following statements true or false? If you don’t personally know any children, please skip to the next question, #16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. They like or would like to attend after-school programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. They struggle to complete their homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. They visit educational places outside of school <em>(museums, zoos, libraries, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 8: Parenting

16. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements? Parents in my neighborhood...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Know where their children are after school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Keep their children inside for safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Spank their children when disciplining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. If you are currently a PARENT or CAREGIVER of a school-age child, how often do you do the following with your child? If not a parent or caregiver, please skip to Section 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I help my child with his/her homework</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>My child and I discuss his or her future</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I allow my child to question my decisions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>My child talks to me about his/her classes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. As a current PARENT or CAREGIVER of a school-age child, how often do you face the following obstacles in raising your child?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Your job or financial situation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Your health, access to health care</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lack of youth programs, childcare</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Gang presence or violence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Access to health care for kid(s)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Access to affordability of healthy food</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 9: Additional Thoughts?

19. Before the final section, do you have comments about youth-related issues related to your community that you feel were not addressed in the survey?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
Section 10: Demographics
This is the last section. Please answer the following.

20. What is your gender?
☐ Female
☐ Male

21. What is your marital status?
☐ married
☐ divorced
☐ never-married
☐ widowed

22. Do you have children?
☐ Yes (List ages: ________________)
☐ No

23. What is your age group?
☐ 18-29 years
☐ 45-59 years
☐ 30-44 years
☐ 60+ years

24. Would you describe yourself as...
☐ African American/Black
☐ American Indian/Native American
☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
☐ Hispanic/Latino
☐ White/Caucasian
☐ Other (please specify) ________________

25. What is the highest level of education you have received?
☐ Some high school or less
☐ Two-year college degree
☐ High school diploma or GED
☐ Four-year college degree or higher
☐ Other, please specify (e.g., vocational): ________________

26. What is your total household income (all earners in your household)?
☐ Under $10,000
☐ $10,000 to $24,999
☐ $25,000 to $49,999
☐ $50,000 to $99,999
☐ $100,000 or more

Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey!
Encuesta Sobre la Comunidad

Somos estudiantes de la Universidad de Chicago trabajando para mejorar nuestro conocimiento de las preocupaciones de los niños y de las familias en la comunidad. Cuando usted complete las preguntas, recibirá $5 y entrará en una lotería con la oportunidad de ganarse $150. ¡Gracias por su participación!

- Por favor lea las preguntas con mucha atención.
- Por favor marque sus respuestas claramente y escriba legiblemente.
- Si se siente incomodo/a con una pregunta, no necesita responder.

Toda la información que usted da hoy es anónima y no será asociada con su nombre.

Sección 1: Situación de Vivienda Actual
Primero, queremos hacerle algunas preguntas sobre su situación de vivienda actual.

1. ¿En qué comunidad vive usted? ________________________________

2. ¿Cuál es la intersección más cerca a donde vive usted? ________________

3. ¿Por cuánto años ha vivido usted en su comunidad? ________________ años

Sección 2: Relaciones Entre Los Residentes de la Comunidad
Ahora tenemos algunas preguntas sobre las relaciones entre las personas que viven en su comunidad.

4. ¿Está o no está de acuerdo con las siguientes frases? Residentes de mi comunidad…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente De Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Tienen confianza en otros adultos de la comunidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Tienen confianza en los jóvenes de la comunidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Se llevan bien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Están pendiente de los niños de sus vecinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sección 3: Organizaciones Comunitarias y el Gobierno Local
Ahora tenemos algunas preguntas sobre las organizaciones en su área y en la ciudad de Chicago.

5. Por favor identifique en orden de importancia hasta tres organizaciones respetadas y efectivas que ayuden a los jóvenes en su comunidad. Posibilidades incluyen el nombre de una escuela buena, un centro comunitario, un programa de parques, una agencia del servicio social, una iglesia, etcétera.

1. ________________________________

2. ________________________________

3. ________________________________
6. Se puede confiar en las siguientes organizaciones para hacer lo que sea mejor para mi comunidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente De Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. El Gobierno de la Ciudad de Chicago</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. El Departamento de la Policía de Chicago</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Escuelas Locales</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Iglesias Locales</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. La Universidad de Chicago</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. ¿En su opinión, quiénes son líderes positivos en su comunidad? *(Por favor marque todos que apliquen)*

- [ ] El concejal
- [ ] Líderes religiosos (ministros, sacerdotes)
- [ ] Directores de organizaciones sin fines de lucro
- [ ] Dueños de negocios locales
- [ ] Otros líderes

Especifique:

---

**Sección 4: Servicios en el Vecindario**

Ahora queremos hacerle preguntas sobre los servicios en su vecindario.

8. Las siguientes instituciones y programas en mi vecindario son **de la mejor calidad**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente de Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Escuelas primarias</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Escuelas secundarias</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Programas después de la escuela</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Centros comunitarios</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Supermercados o tiendas de comestibles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Centros médicos o clínicas</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Circule** las instituciones/ los programas mencionados en Pregunta 8 que **no** son fácilmente accesibles para usted.
Sección 5: Programas Que Se Necesitan en la Comunidad

10. Por favor clasifique estos programas para JÓVENES según el nivel de necesidad en su comunidad (1= más necesitado, 5= menos necesitado; use cada número solo una vez). Le agradeceríamos cualquier comentario que quisiera darnos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importancia</th>
<th>Programa</th>
<th>Comentarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreativos (programas culturales, de deportes, de artes, etcétera)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoría/ Preparación universitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevención del uso de drogas/ de la violencia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empleo/ entrenamiento de los jóvenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrición y salud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Por favor clasifique estos programas para FAMILIAS según el nivel de necesidad en su comunidad (1= más necesitado, 5= menos necesitado; use cada número solo una vez). Le agradeceríamos cualquier comentario que quisiera darnos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importancia</th>
<th>Programa</th>
<th>Comentarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clases para padres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tratamiento para el abuso de drogas o alcohol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eventos para todos los miembros de la familia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuidado de niños</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrición y salud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sección 6: La Seguridad y La Salud de los Niños

Ahora queremos saber cuáles son las preocupaciones sobre la seguridad y la salud de los niños en su vecindario.

12. ¿Hasta qué punto está o no está de acuerdo con las siguientes frases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente De Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Los niños están seguros caminando a y regresando de la escuela</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Los niños están seguros viajando y regresando de la escuela</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hay sitios seguros donde los niños pueden ir después de la escuela</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. El territorio de las pandillas afecta donde pueden ir los niños</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Los niños tienen acceso a comidas saludables</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¡La Mitad Del Estudio!
### Sección 7: Los Niños y Las Escuelas en el Vecindario

Ahora tenemos preguntas sobre los niños y las escuelas en su vecindario.

13. ¿Hasta qué punto está o no está de acuerdo con las siguientes frases? Las escuelas en este vecindario…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente De Acuerdo</th>
<th>No Sé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Comunican efectivamente con los padres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Proveen seguridad para los niños en la escuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Emplean maestros que son calificados</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. ¿Hasta qué punto está o no está de acuerdo con las siguientes frases sobre el ambiente educativo en las escuelas locales?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente De Acuerdo</th>
<th>No Sé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Los maestros mantienen la atención de los estudiantes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Los estudiantes están expuesto a drogas en la escuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Los estudiantes se distraen a causa del mal comportamiento de otros estudiantes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Para los estudiantes que usted conoce personalmente en su vecindario, ¿las siguientes frases son veras o falsas? Si no conoce personalmente a ningún niño, por favor pase a la próxima pregunta, 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A ellos les gusta o les gustaría asistir a programas después de la escuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Tienen dificultades completando sus tareas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Van a lugares educativos fuera de la escuela (museos, el zoológico, bibliotecas, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sección 8: La Crianza de los Niños

16. ¿Hasta qué punto está o no está de acuerdo con las siguientes frases? Los padres en mi vecindario…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>Completamente de Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Saben donde están sus hijos después de la escuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mantienen sus hijos dentro de la casa para su seguridad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Les pegan a sus hijos para disciplinarlos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Día 4
17. **Si Usted es, en este momento, un PADRE o un GUARDIÁN de un niño que va a la escuela, ¿con qué frecuencia hace usted las siguientes cosas con su hijo/a? Si no es padre o cuidador, por favor pase a Sección 9.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Raras Veces</th>
<th>Algunas Veces</th>
<th>A Menudo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Ayudo a mi hijo/a con sus tareas</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mi hijo/a y yo discutimos su futuro</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Le permito a mi hijo/a que cuestione mis decisiones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Mi hijo/a me habla sobre sus clases</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Como un PADRE o GUARDIÁN de un niño que va a la escuela, ¿con qué frecuencia enfrenta los siguientes obstáculos en la crianza de su hijo/a?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Raras Veces</th>
<th>Algunas Veces</th>
<th>A Menudo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Su trabajo o situación económica</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Su salud y su acceso a asistencia médica</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. La falta de programas para los jóvenes y el cuidado de niños</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. La presencia de pandillas o de violencia</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. El acceso a asistencia médica para los niños</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. El acceso a los precios de comida saludable</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sección 9: ¿Pensamientos Adicionales?**

19. Antes de pasar a la última sección, ¿tiene usted algunos comentarios sobre temas relacionados con los jóvenes de su comunidad qué, en su opinión, no fueron cubiertos en esta encuesta?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Sección 10: Preguntas Demográficas
Esta es la última sección. Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas.

20. ¿Cuál es su sexo?
   □ Femenino
   □ Masculino

21. ¿Cuál es su estado civil?
   □ Casado/a       □ Divorciado/a
   □ Nunca casado/a □ Viudo/a

22. ¿Tiene hijos?
   □ Sí   (Lista de edades: ____________)
   □ No

23. ¿Cuál es su grupo de edad?
   □ 18-29 años   □ 45-59 años
   □ 30-44 años   □ 60+ años

24. Se describiría usted mismo/a como...
   □ Afro-Americano/ Negro   □ Indígena Americana
   □ Asiático/a/ De las Islas del Pacífico □ Hispano/a /Latino/a
   □ Blanco/a/ Caucásico/a   □ Otro (por favor especifique) ____________

25. ¿Cuál es el nivel de educación más alto que usted ha recibido?
   □ Un poco de escuela secundaria o menos   □ Grado asociado universitario (2 años)
   □ Diploma de escuela secundaria o equivalente □ Diploma universitario (4 años o más)
   □ Otro, por favor especifique (escuela vocacional o técnica, etc.) : ______________________

26. ¿Cuál es el ingreso total de su casa (de todos los asalariados que viven en su casa)?
   □ Menos de $10,000
   □ $10,000 a $24,999
   □ $25,000 a $49,999
   □ $50,000 a $99,999
   □ $100,000 o más

¡Gracias por completar nuestra encuesta!
Appendix B: Key Informant Interviews

B.1 Goals

During the first stages of the project there was also a team dedicated specifically to conducting key informant interviews. The interviews follow a general script of questions but differed depending on whether the interviewee was a part of an educational organization or a service organization. All of the interviews were related to one of the four potential PN community areas under in-depth analysis. Interviews involved asking participants to respond to a variety of questions about the community and were used to discover their concerns and insights about the community. Interviews were particularly useful for finding problems in the community, as the interviewer was able to pursue further information in a targeted manner.

B.2 Major Steps in Conducting Community Leader Interviews

- Identify community leaders – based on the opinion of the key informant interview group
- Set up interviews
- Conduct interviews
- Analyze/summarize information
- Set up and conduct follow-up interviews

B.3 Sample Script for Obtaining Interviews

“I am [name] and I am working with The Chicago Policy Research Team. I am calling to ask your help in identifying some aspects of your community. Our goal is to understand your community and learn about some of the needs your community has.

We would like to learn more about the needs and problems of the community here and how they might be solved. We are conducting interviews with people like you who play an important role in [community name].

The interview will be kept confidential; the results of all our interviews will later be combined. No ideas or opinions will be attributed to you. If we feel it would be helpful to attribute something specifically to you, we will contact you and ask for your permission. We estimate the interview will take no longer than 30 minutes. If you are willing to participate in an interview, I will send you a copy of the questions prior to the interview. Thank you for your time.”

B.4 General Script of Interview Questions

*Personal Questions*

- How long have you lived in the community?
- What changes have you witnessed?
- In your opinion, where are the physical boundaries of the community?
- Are there clear distinctions between this community and the surrounding areas?
- How would you describe the mission/goals of your organization?
- What are the organization’s biggest projects?
How many individuals does the agency serve?
Could you describe your daily routine at this organization?
In your opinion, what are the community’s biggest strengths? What needs improvement?

**Education Questions**

- What are the biggest strengths and weaknesses of local schools?
- What obstacles do schools face?
- How would you characterize the relationships between schools and the community?
- Could you describe your organization’s initiative with local schools? What challenges have been encountered? What progress has been made?
- What college prep programs are available for kids in the area?
- What extracurricular activities exist for kids in the area?

**Questions for Teachers**

- How do you feel your students are doing?
- What resources do you get from your school? From elsewhere?
- What resources do you wish you had?
- If you had more time with your students, what would you do and what effect do you think that would have?
- If you had more money to use in your classroom, what would you do with it? What effect do you think it would have?
- How accountable are you for the test scores of your students? To whom are you accountable?
- How would you react to greater accountability / a requirement for higher scores?

**Questions for Principals**

- How do you feel your students are doing?
- What resources do you wish you had?
- What sort of test scores do you get? What requirements are handed down about test scores? How do you feel about those requirements? How would you react to stricter requirements?
- How would you rate the skill / effectiveness of your teachers?
- What sort of discipline problems do you encounter on a day-to-day basis? How do you approach them? How would you like to be able to approach them?
- How involved are the students' parents?
- What is the student turnover rate?

**Community Characteristics Questions**

- What community-based organizations and volunteer associations exist in the area? (Block clubs, tenant associations, Neighborhood Watch)
- Do these organizations collaborate with one another?
- What kind of community pride events/opportunities for neighborhood cohesion exist?
What kind of religious groups are in the area? How do these groups work with your organizations?

Could you talk about your connections with local businesses, for-profit institutions?

What kind of attention does your organization receive from the city government? Outside organizations? Is it a high publicity area?

What makes the community unique, distinct from other communities?

How would you characterize safety in the community?

What are common perceptions of the police?

What can you tell us about local CAPS meetings?

What social services (government and non-profit) exist in the area?

In your opinion, which are the most effective? Why?

What do you think is the biggest challenge facing children in the community?

What do children do in their free time?

Is there anything else that you think we should know about the community?

**Promise Neighborhoods**

Have you heard about the Harlem Children’s Zone? (Explain if not)

Do you think your community would benefit from something like that? Why would it be a good candidate?

If such a program could come to Chicago, many communities throughout the city would advocate being the location for the implementation of Promise Neighborhood. What would you say to convince the City that [community] is the perfect community for a children’s zone?
Appendix C: Focus Groups

Focus groups are a pivotal tool for gauging residential perceptions on services, schools, and the community atmosphere and are essential for acquiring insight underlying the facts. In order to attain a cross section of views from a diverse population, focus groups were conducted in the four in-depth analysis community areas. Topics discussed in the groups were very similar to those addressed by the surveys – including safety, perceptions and use of local community organizations, community cohesion, perceptions of community and city leaders, quality of schooling, quality and accessibility of services, and parenting perceptions. Of course, each of the problems discussed can be related back to the idea of HCZ and can be used to assess programs that would be needed in combination with a CPN.

C.1 Recruiting

Recruitment for the focus groups was conducted in similar ways in each community. Flyers with information about the purpose of the focus groups and contact information were posted in several locations throughout each community. Flyers were posted at bus stops, businesses, stores, restaurants, and barbershops. In Woodlawn, parents were recruited after-school at Wadsworth Elementary School, and flyers were posted in the school with permission. The flyers included “tear-off” information so that individuals could contact us at their convenience. The contact number led callers to an answering machine instructing them to leave their name and number, and we personally called each one back. In addition to paper advertisements, face-to-face recruitment was also conducted by approaching individual residents in public places. Residents were approached on the street, at bus stops, at grocery stores, and at laundry mats. Residents were generally receptive towards our approach and interested in being able to discuss their communities.

Several of the phone numbers given by potential participants, however, were disconnected, unavailable, or incorrect, and in general, there was a very high rate of no-response from the recruited participants. Additionally, some participants also did not attend the focus group even after they had confirmed their attendance via telephone.

Aside from the two methods mentioned above, a small number of the participants at the focus groups were accompanying relatives or friends and had essentially heard about them through word-of-mouth. For one focus group in Englewood, at which participation was particularly low, an aggressive recruitment technique was employed by approaching pedestrians outside of the focus group location and asking them to join the discussion happening right then.

C.2 Limitations

It is important to note that our focus group participants were not a random or necessarily representative sample. Participants who were recruited after being approached or by seeing flyers and calling may be more motivated to see changes in the community or they may have simply been induced by the gift card incentive. Their decision to participate may be correlated with traits that affect the study, making the participants a non-representative sample. This self-selection bias is inevitable in conducting focus groups, but should still be noted. Participants recruited through community centers may represent a convenience, rather than a random or representative, sample.
As will be shown in the following section on the specific demographics of each of our focus groups, the different groups in all areas were not completely representative of the actual population due to different biases. In general, there was a strong female bias in each focus group. The South Shore focus group had an overly represented sample of the low-income residents, as 36% of the focus group had an income of less than $10,000 compared to the 22% in the actual neighborhood. The focus group in Washington Park was overly represented by the middle-aged, as well as the low-income.

As we recruited mainly through the use of flyers and by approaching individuals on the streets, those who had a lower income, hence a lower opportunity cost of their time may have been more willing to participate in the focus groups due to financial incentives. This may be why all focus groups were overly represented by the low-income. In addition, some of the focus group participants were recruited through a community center. These participants were most likely members of the lower income population who visited and obtained services from the community centers, which is another possible reason why the focus groups had an over-representation of the low-income. In conclusion, our focus groups were not representative of the actual community due to the inability to recruit individuals from the middle- to high-income class from the respective neighborhood.

Due to many challenges, including financial and time constraints, the focus group sample could not be representational of the actual community. However, despite these limitations, the demographics of the focus group participants suggest that opinions were received from many different, valuable sources.

C.3 Focus Group Information for In-Depth Analysis Community Areas

Englewood

Two focus groups were conducted in Englewood with a total of twenty-one individuals. Each focus group session lasted for approximately one-and-a-half hours. Both of the focus groups were held within the Englewood community. The first group was held on a weekday afternoon, April 16, at Teamwork Englewood, which is a community-based organization dedicated to community development, located at 815 W 63rd Street. The second group was held on a Saturday morning, April 18, at New Birth Christ Church, which is located at 1500 W 59th Street. Refreshments were served at both focus groups, and as an added incentive, each participant received a $10 gift card to the Walgreens Pharmacy and Drug Store.

The sample population for the two focus groups included more women and was older than the average age of Englewood residents according to census data. Although the Englewood community has a higher percentage of females at 55%, according to the 2000 census data, the first and second focus groups had 90% and 83% females, respectively. In addition, in the first focus group, 50% of the participants were over 60 years of age, with the rest spanning from 18-59 years. In the second focus group, 36% of the participants were between 45-59 years, with the rest evenly distributed between 18-44 years and 60 plus years. Aside from these two important factors, our sample from the focus group was similar to the Englewood census data in race and income. For example, 100% of the participants were African American, and according to the 2000 census data, Englewood is 97.8% African American. Further, 60% of participants’ households in the first focus group, and 63% in the second focus group earned between $0-$24,999/year, which is consistent with Englewood’s median.
household income of $18,955/year.

**Figure C.1: Summary of Englewood Focus Group Demographic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group One</th>
<th>Focus Group Two</th>
<th>Englewood (excluding West Englewood)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% female;</td>
<td>83% female;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% male</td>
<td>17% male</td>
<td>55% female;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% 60+ years old;</td>
<td>27% 60+ years old;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% 45-59 years old;</td>
<td>36% 45-59 years old;</td>
<td>15% 60+ yrs old;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% 30-44 years old;</td>
<td>9% 30-44 years old;</td>
<td>13% 45-60 yrs old;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% 18-29 years old</td>
<td>9% 18-29 years old</td>
<td>33% 20-44 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Community</strong></td>
<td>Average 16.3 years</td>
<td>Average 16.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% African American</td>
<td>100% African American</td>
<td>98% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% married;</td>
<td>18% married;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% single, never married;</td>
<td>56% single, never married;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% widowed</td>
<td>18% widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% some high school or less;</td>
<td>9% some high school or less;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% high school diploma/GED;</td>
<td>82% high school diploma/GED;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% college degree</td>
<td>45% college degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Household Residents</strong></td>
<td>Average 1.8 people</td>
<td>Average 2.1 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children in the Household</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Household Income</strong> (Median: $29,012)</td>
<td>40% under $10,000;</td>
<td>44% under $10,000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% $10,000 to $24,999;</td>
<td>18% $10,000 to $24,999;</td>
<td>27% $10,000 to $24,999;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% $25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>27% $25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>36% not in labor force;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% retired;</td>
<td>18% retired;</td>
<td>36% not in labor force;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% students;</td>
<td>45% unemployed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% unemployed;</td>
<td>9% employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The total for each category may not add up to 100% due to a no-response from participants.

**Little Village (South Lawndale)**

Due to the lack of interest on the part of residents and a language barrier, the Little Village fieldwork group had difficulty administering focus groups. After calling all the recruited individuals, only three participants were confirmed for the first attempted focus group time, which was subsequently cancelled and rescheduled for the following Thursday. For the second attempted time, eight participants were confirmed. However, on the day of the focus group, none arrived. Attempts were made to check-in with confirmed participants but no responses were received from the participants.

Eventually, a bilingual, predominantly Spanish speaking focus group was successfully held with nine participants who were recruited from a math class held at *El Instituto del Progreso Latino*, the host site for all the focus groups in Little Village. Due to the nature of this recruitment, the target population was not strictly reached – only one resident identified as a Little Village resident. However, 100% of the participants identified as Hispanic, Latino or some derivative thereof (e.g. Puerto Rican, Chicano/a). As Little Village is made up of mostly first-generation immigrants, the focus group participants were not representative of the population. However, these individuals provided strong
insight into the Hispanic/Latino context of Chicago and were familiar, via their ethnic connection and participation in Little Village community assets.

The third focus group attempt had nine confirmed participants. Again, none arrived on the scheduled day. An attempt was made with *El Instituto* to provide a replacement group, of which four female residents from Little Village were scheduled and confirmed to participate. However, as with the previous attempts, none arrived. The consistent failure to successfully facilitate Spanish-led focus groups despite wide-scale recruitment efforts seems to suggest that Little Village residents are not very receptive to outsiders and may not trust that outsiders will do what is best for the community. The possibility of this distrust was further examined through an additional interview with focus group participants and organization leaders.

Figure C.2: Summary of Little Village Focus Group Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Two</th>
<th>Little Village²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% female;</td>
<td>42% female;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82% male</td>
<td>58% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% 50-64 years old;</td>
<td>6% 60+ yrs old;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% 30-49 years old</td>
<td>10% 45-60 yrs old;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47% 20-44 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Community</td>
<td>Average 7.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64% Hispanic;</td>
<td>83% Hispanic/Latino;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% African American;</td>
<td>13% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% married;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% single, never married;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% divorced;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% some high school or less;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% high school diploma or GED;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% some college or less;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% college degree;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Household Residents</td>
<td>Average 3.6 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in the Household</td>
<td>64% children (ages 0-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Household Income (Median: $27,748)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% under $10,000;</td>
<td>14% under $10,000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% $10,000 to $24,999;</td>
<td>24% $10,000 to $24,999;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% $25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>37% $25,000 to $49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>18% employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The total for each category may not add up to 100% due to a no-response from participants.
South Shore

Two successful focus groups were administered in South Shore at the Black United Fund of Illinois, 1809 E 71st Street, and each group participated in a one hour, open-ended discussion. Like in Little Village, field workers in South Shore had difficulties recruiting individuals to participate in focus groups. For the first attempted focus group, only three individuals attended. For the second attempted focus group, four individuals turned up. However, due to miscommunication problems with the Alderman’s office, a venue was not secured for the focus group and thus the focus group was not administered. These seven individuals all received a $10 Walgreens gift card. For the third focus group, eleven individuals attended and received a $15 Walgreens gift card. No demographic information was recorded from the first focus group but the following data was gathered from notes taken by members of the research team. As the following figures are assumptions, they are not used for statistical discussion and breakdown further in this section.

- 3/3 individuals were African American/Black
- 3/3 individuals appeared to be in the 30-49 age group
- One individual was employed at the Black United Fund of Illinois
- 3/3 individuals expressed being long-time members of the South Shore community
- 2/3 individuals were male

The composition of our second focus group may have had a bias effect on our data. The possible effects include a strong 30-49 year old age bias, in which 73% of the focus group population identified themselves as 30-49 years of age, compared to the 37% of the community as a whole as demonstrated by 2000 census data. There is also a slight female bias as 64% of the focus group population was female, compared to the 56% of the community as a whole. If the first focus group is taken into account, this female bias vanishes, as our overall focus group population will be 57% female and 43% male. While our first focus group was small and hardly representative, the additional two male participants provide an appropriate balance against the female participation of the second focus group.

In addition, only 36% of the focus group population had children under age 17. Given that the purpose of the focus group was to gauge perceptions of education and youth issues in South Shore, this limits the amount of data we could gather from the focus group. While many individuals shared important and valuable data with us, our data would have been strengthened if more participants had children and were currently raising a child in South Shore, as it would have allowed us to gain more insight into parents’ opinions of schools, youth safety, and other youth-related issues.

One more note: according to field workers observations, the second focus group appeared to be composed entirely of African American/Black volunteers, though two identified themselves as “Native American” on our data sheets. We will keep the answers due to the integrity of the data, but we put forth this concern for consideration when looking at the ethnic demographics of our second focus group.
Figure C.3: Summary of South Shore Focus Group Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus Group Two</th>
<th>South Shore¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>64% female; 36% male</td>
<td>56% female; 44% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>73% 30-44 years old; 27% 18-29 years old</td>
<td>15% 60+ yrs old; 17% 45-60 yrs old; 37% 20-44 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Community</td>
<td>Average 20.2 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>82% African American; 18% American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>97% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>18% married; 82% single, never married</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>18% some high school or less; 36% high school diploma/GED; 27% some college or less; 18% college degree</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Household Residents</td>
<td>Average 3 people</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in the Household</td>
<td>36% children (ages 0-17)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Household Income (Median: $27,748)</td>
<td>36% under $10,000; 27% $10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>22% under $10,000; 23% $10,000 to $24,999; 32% $25,000 to $49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41% not in labor force; 9% unemployed; 50% employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The total for each category may not add up to 100% due to a no-response from participants.

Washington Park

Two focus groups were conducted in Washington Park and all participants were given a $10 Walgreens gift card. The first focus group was held on April 21, 2009, between 5:00-6:30 p.m. at Beatrice Caffrey Youth Services and 11 community members attended. The second focus group was held on April 22, 2009, between 9:00-10:30 a.m. at Brand New Beginnings and 14 community members attended.

The sample population from the first focus group had a strong male bias – 64% of the sample was male, compared to the 45% of the community as indicated by 2000 census data. The same sample population also had an age bias, as 82% of the population was 30-49 years old and 0% was over 50. This is significantly different from the composition of the community as a whole. The sample population from the first focus group was also predominantly unemployed and had a low household income compared to the general statistics for Washington Park.

The second focus group was more representative of the neighborhood as the demographic statistics were more similar to those for the community as a whole as indicated by 2000 census data. The sample population had a higher household income than that of the neighborhood, as 14% of the sample population had an income of $10,000 to $24,999 while 29% of the community was reported in 2000 to be in that income range.
Figure C.4: Summary of Washington Park Focus Groups Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus Group 1</th>
<th>Focus Group 2</th>
<th>Washington Park^4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>64% male; 36% female</td>
<td>36% male; 64% female</td>
<td>45% male; 55% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>18% 50-64 years old; 82% 30-49 years old</td>
<td>29% 50-64 years old; 43% 30-49 years old; 29% 18-29 years old</td>
<td>11% 60+ years old; 13% 45-60 years old; 33% 20-44 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in the community</strong></td>
<td>Average 16.9 years</td>
<td>Average 9.1 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>100% African American</td>
<td>93% African American</td>
<td>98% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td>18% married; 55% single, never married; 27% divorced</td>
<td>20% married; 57% single, never married; 7% divorced</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td>18% some high school or less; 45% high school degree/GED; 27% some college or less; 9% college degree</td>
<td>21% some high school or less; 21% high school degree/GED; 21% some college or less; 29% college degree</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of household residents</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.4 people</td>
<td>Average 3.5 people</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children in the Household</strong></td>
<td>36% children (0-17)</td>
<td>36% children (0-17)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Household Income (Median $19,606)</strong></td>
<td>73% under $10,000; 18% $10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>29% under $10,000; 14% $10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>34% under $10,000; 29% $10,000 to $24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td>10% retired; 70% unemployed; 20% employed</td>
<td>8% retired; 15% unemployed; 77% employed</td>
<td>50% not in labor force; 12% unemployed; 37% employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The total for each category may not add up to 100% due to a no-response from participants.

Woodlawn

Two focus groups were conducted at Ace’s Soul Food Café, located at 63rd Street and S Vernon Avenue. Food was provided for all participants in addition to a $15 Walgreens gift card.

The first focus group was held on March 3, 2009, between 9:30-11:30 a.m. with ten community members in attendance. The second focus group was held on March 3, 2009, between 6:00-8:00 p.m. with eleven community members in attendance.

There was an age bias in our sample population from the focus groups. There were no participants between the ages of 18-29 and therefore we received no input from that part of the population. However, it is typically individuals in that age group that are just starting to seek the services associated with the Harlem Children’s Zone’s purposes, and their input would have helped us gauge the challenges and concerns of a new parent raising children in the area. Additionally, 33% of our second focus group was 65+ years old, and these older residents displayed a negative attitude toward younger kids, classifying them as trouble, speaking about them as “those kids these days.” However, the same individuals had spent their lives in Woodlawn and were able to observe the changes that took place over the past half-decade or more.
### Figure C.5: Summary of Woodlawn Focus Group Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group One</th>
<th>Focus Group Two</th>
<th>Woodlawn$^5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% female;</td>
<td>100% female;</td>
<td>55% female;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% male</td>
<td>0% male</td>
<td>45% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% 65+ years old;</td>
<td>33% 65+ years old;</td>
<td>16% 60+ yrs old;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% 50-64 years old;</td>
<td>44% 50-64 years old;</td>
<td>15% 45-60 yrs old;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42% 30-49 years old;</td>
<td>22% 30-49 years old;</td>
<td>30% 20-44 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 18-29 years old</td>
<td>0% 18-29 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Community</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% African American</td>
<td>90% African American</td>
<td>95% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% married; 20% married;</td>
<td>42% single, never married; 20% single, never married;</td>
<td>42% divorced; 20% divorced;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42% divorced; 40% divorced;</td>
<td>8% widowed; 20% widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% some high school or less; 10% Some high school or less;</td>
<td>36% high school diploma/GED; 30% high school diploma/GED;</td>
<td>45% some college or less; 30% some college or less;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% high school diploma/GED; 30% high school diploma/GED;</td>
<td>9% college degree; 30% college degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% college degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Household Residents</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.9 people</td>
<td>Average 3.3 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children in the Household</strong></td>
<td>67% children (ages 0-17)</td>
<td>90% children (ages 0-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Household Income (Median: $18,266)</strong></td>
<td>55% under $10,000; 27% $10,000 to $24,999; 9% $50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>20% under $10,000; 30% $10,000 to $24,999; 20% $25,000 to $49,999; 10% $50,000 to $99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The total for each category may not add up to 100% due to a no-response from participants.
C.4 Sample Focus Group Flyer

TALK ABOUT YOUR COMMUNITY
AND RECEIVE A $15 GIFT CARD!
CALL 773-834-6729 TO SIGN UP!

Dates:
**Tues. March 3** – 9:30 AM – 11:30 AM
(Continental breakfast of muffins, coffee, bagels, juice)
**Thurs. March 5** – 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM
(rib tips, mac & cheese, red beans, and rice)

Location:
**Ace’s Soul Food Cafe**
432 E. 63rd Street (63rd and S. Vernon)

C.5 Sample Focus Group Moderator Script

*Introduction*

Welcome! We have invited you here today because you are all residents of Woodlawn who have raised or are currently raising children in the area. We are college students working with the Chicago Policy Research Team to gain a better understanding of the concerns facing children and families in Woodlawn.

We appreciate you taking the time out of your busy lives to help us today. Your contribution is extremely important and we will try to limit our meeting to 90 minutes. In return for your time, we will be giving you a $15 gift card to Walgreens at the end of the meeting.

All information shared in this meeting is completely confidential. We will be taking notes during this meeting to make sure that we have an accurate record of what is said, but these notes will only be accessible to members of our research team.
Before we begin, we would like to go over a few baseline rules:
We have asked you here today because we are interested in what you have to say. To make sure the meeting runs smoothly, we have a few ground rules that we would like you to observe:

1. Please speak up: We hope to hear from everyone, so please jump in and share your opinions.
2. It's OK to disagree: We are not trying to change anybody’s mind or come to an agreement. We want to hear all of your ideas on these topics, even if some ideas conflict with others.
3. Respect each other's privacy: We will not connect anything you tell us here with your name or identify outside of this group. We ask that you have the same consideration for your fellow participants. If you discuss this conversation later, please do not connect what individuals say here with their names. It is important that everyone feel free to speak his or her mind.
4. Don't be offended if we interrupt: We have a certain number of issues to get through during this meeting. This means we will sometimes have to cut off a conversation to have time for other subjects. This is just a time limitation and has nothing to do with the quality of your remarks.

Are there any questions before we start?

**Questioning**

First, we would like to ask you some general questions about your community. (20 minutes)

People have lots of names for different parts of the city. For example, people who live near Wrigley Field might say they live on the North Side or in Wrigleyville, or they might say something entirely different.

1. When someone asks you where you're from, what do you say? (Probes: South Side? Woodlawn? Your street address?)
2. Would you say that your neighborhood is a “tight-knit” community?
   - Are many community members long-term residents?
   - Do you talk often with your neighbors?
   - To what extent do you think residents look out for each other and each other’s children?
   - What neighborhood organizations do you know of in your community? (Probes: block clubs, neighborhood associations)
   - Do many people participate in these organizations?
3. Are there many places in Woodlawn where people come to socialize? (Probes: churches, farmer’s markets, community centers, etc.)

Now, we would like to talk to you about safety in your community. (15 minutes)

1. What are the biggest concerns regarding safety in your neighborhood? (Probes: drugs, gangs: something to bring up maybe even if nobody mentions it?)
2. How do safety issues influence your daily life?
   • Do you feel comfortable walking through your neighborhood during the day? How about at night?
   • Do you feel comfortable letting your kids play outside?
3. How could safety be improved in Woodlawn?

Next, we would like to shift the conversation toward programs and services for children and family in Woodlawn. (25 minutes)

1. What are the biggest challenges facing children in the community? (Probes: health, schools, violence, etc.)
2. How would you characterize social services in the community? (Probes: employment offices, public assistance)
   • Which ones are you most familiar with?
   • How accessible are these services?
   • How useful are they?
   • Where could they use improvement?
   • What services would you like to see in Woodlawn that do not currently exist?

Finally, we would like to talk briefly about schools and programs specifically for children. (25 minutes)

1. How would you describe the school your child attends?
   • What obstacles does the school face?
   • Do schools communicate well with families?
   • What is the school’s biggest strength?
   • What is its biggest weakness?
2. What do you think about the after-school programs offered for children in Woodlawn? (Probes: tutoring programs, art classes, sports teams)
   • What types of programs exist?
   • Do many children use these programs?
   • If kids are not involved in after-school programs through an organization, what do they do in their free time?
   • What youth programs would you like to see added to Woodlawn?
3. Where would you like to see your child in 10 years?
4. Where would you like to see your community, as a whole, in 10 years?

C.6 Focus Group Demographic Information Form

Below you will find a pasted copy of the CPRT Demographic form that was used to collect data at our focus groups.
Thank you for your participation in our community focus group! Below are a few questions about you that will help us better organize the data we collect. We want to be sure that we have spoken to a broad mix of people in this area.

Name ________________________________

Address_____________________________________________________

Phone Number ____________________________
  • I wish to remain anonymous

Are you …
  • Male
  • Female

What is your age group?
  • 18-29
  • 30-49
  • 50-64
  • 65+

How many years have you lived at your current address? ______________

How many years have you lived in the Woodlawn area? _______________

Would you describe yourself as…
  • American Indian/Native American
  • African American/Black
  • Asian/Pacific Islander
  • Hispanic/Latino
  • White/Caucasian
  • Other, specify ____________________________

What is your marital status?
  • Single, never married
  • Married
  • Divorced or Separated
  • Widowed
What is your highest educational degree?

- Less than a high school diploma
- High school diploma or GED
- Some college, no degree
- Two-year college degree (Associate’s Degree)
- Four or five-year college degree (Bachelor’s Degree)
- Master’s Degree
- Ph.D./J.D./M.D.
- Other, specify ____________________________ (i.e. trade/technical/vocational training)

How many TOTAL people including yourself, live in your household? _____

If you live alone, please enter “1”

How many of the following types of people (not counting yourself) live in your household?

Number of children in your household under age 5 _______
Number of children in your household ages 6-12 _______
Number of youth in your household ages 13-17 _______
Number of adult females in your household ages 18-60 _______
Number of adult males in your household ages 18-60 _______
Number of senior females in your household (women over age 61) _______
Number of senior males in your household (men over age 61) _______

What is your total household income, including all earners in your household?

- Under $10,000
- $10,000 to $24,999
- $25,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $199,999
- $200,000 or more

How would you describe your current employment status?

- Employed full-time; specify occupation/job:____________________________
- Employed part-time; specify occupation/job:____________________________
- Unemployed/ Looking for work
- Unemployed/ Not Looking for work
- Student
- Homemaker
- Retired
Are you currently registered to vote?

• Yes
• No
• Unsure

How many civic or community organizations do you belong to? Examples include Kiwanis Club, PTA, League of Women Voters, but are not limited to this list.

• None
• 1 or 2
• 3 or 4
• 5+

Please list their names: _________________________________________________

Any additional comments about the Focus Group Experience:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

We appreciate your time and your thoughts!

Thank you for your participation!
Appendix D: Main Data Sources

Focus groups, surveys, and interviews were all conducted in the four communities of interest: Englewood, Little Village (South Lawndale), South Shore, and Washington Park/Woodlawn. In order to address how representative our participants were of the larger community areas, information from the 2000 U.S. Census and the Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) was utilized.

The 2000 U.S. Census was used to gauge the demographic composition of the various communities. Information regarding gender, age, population, race, and income were used in narrowing down the communities for which creating a CPN would be feasible. The community chosen as a Promise Neighborhood must have a significant child population, as children are the main focus of replicating something like the Harlem Children’s Zone. Additionally, demographic information was recorded during the focus groups and surveys, allowing for comparison with the census data in order to determine how representative the focus groups and surveys were of their respective communities.

It must be noted that the U.S. Census is decennial and therefore the most recent census information is from 2000. The next U.S. Census will be in 2010, which is less than one year away. The use of 2000 U.S. Census data therefore poses many limitations as it is already nine years old. Many of the communities of interest have experienced a decrease in population over the past decades so the 2000 census data may not be accurate for current use. Communities like Little Village follow a cycle of influxes and exoduses of people as a result of the large immigrant population. The presence of a large number of illegal immigrants in Little Village also makes it harder to determine how truly representative the census data is.

The Consortium on Chicago School Research conducts high-quality research on Chicago’s public schools with a focus on policy and practice. This information was useful in identifying some of the best practices in Chicago public schools, and in acquiring data regarding the composition of the public schools. This information is also important since it identifies some of the more troubled schools, therefore allowing the CPRT to gauge whether or not it necessitates something like the Harlem Children’s Zone in the respective community.

**Appendix E: Other Population Data**

**Figure E.1: Comparative Population Data, Ten Potential Chicago Promise Neighborhoods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Geographic Area (sq mi)</th>
<th>Pop. Density (per Square Mile)</th>
<th>Population &lt; 5 Years Old</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Households &lt; $15,000/year</th>
<th>Percentage of all Households</th>
<th># of Single-Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage All Households</th>
<th>MCIC Income</th>
<th>Diversity Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>115,730</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>6338</td>
<td>11651</td>
<td>$37,123</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7,557</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Park</td>
<td>41,477</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>4973</td>
<td>4311</td>
<td>$26,322</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Park</td>
<td>62,625</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>7022</td>
<td>7219</td>
<td>$29,018</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lawndale</td>
<td>38,809</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>4435</td>
<td>$21,257</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad Communities</td>
<td>74,448</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>5649</td>
<td>7286</td>
<td>$26,812</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Grand Crossing</td>
<td>38,359</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>4188</td>
<td>3569</td>
<td>$30,755</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lawndale</td>
<td>89,983</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7920</td>
<td>9550</td>
<td>$31,443</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7,557</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>61,532</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8002</td>
<td>5768</td>
<td>$30,228</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>87,591</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>6764</td>
<td>8323</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park/ Woodlawn</td>
<td>40,205</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>4375</td>
<td>4065</td>
<td>$19,664</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Desertification/ Stable Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>20,736</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18,919</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>19,806</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35,310</td>
<td>-4,730</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Park</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6,601</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>12,919</td>
<td>-1,761</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Park</td>
<td>15,175</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10,552</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17,219</td>
<td>-2,626</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lawndale</td>
<td>7,474</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8,549</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>-2,320</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad Communities</td>
<td>11,641</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9,049</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25,188</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>30,866</td>
<td>-3,924</td>
<td>Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Grand Crossing</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9,042</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14,519</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>Emerging Bipolarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lawndale</td>
<td>27,645</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9,268</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12,115</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>-893</td>
<td>Emerging Low-Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>7,691</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9,459</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19,888</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>26,090</td>
<td>-922</td>
<td>Stable Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27,981</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>36,028</td>
<td>-3,084</td>
<td>Stable Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park/ Woodlawn</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6,059</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12,024</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>14,344</td>
<td>-3,010</td>
<td>Desertification/ Stable Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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