RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE TOOL

COMPREHENSIVE VERSION

Racial Equity
& Social Justice Initiative

Racial Equity Analysis Tool
Comprehensive Version

INSTRUCTIONS

Use this tool as early as possible in the development of City policies, plans, programs and budgets.

For issues on a short timeline or with a narrow impact, you may use the RESJI Racial Equity Analysis Tool – Fast Track Version.

This analysis should be completed by people with different racial and socioeconomic perspectives. When possible, involve those directly impacted by the issue. Include and document multiple voices in this process.

The order of questions may be re-arranged to suit your situation.

Mission of the Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative (RESJI): To establish racial equity and social justice as core principles in all decisions, policies and functions of the City of Madison.

Equity is just and fair inclusion into a society in which all, including all racial and ethnic groups, can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential. Equity gives all people a just and fair shot in life despite historic patterns of racial and economic exclusion (*www.policylink.org*).

Purpose of this Tool: To facilitate conscious consideration of equity and examine how communities of color and low-income populations will be affected by a proposed action/decision of the City.

The *"What, Who, Why, and How"* questions of this tool are designed to lead to strategies to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts and unintended consequences on marginalized populations.

BEGIN ANALYSIS

Name of topic or issue being analyzed:

Tuition Assistance Revamp NOTE: **BLACK** = Tuition Assistance through the City of Madison **ORANGE** = Shifting to Stabilization Funds through Centers

Main contact name(s) and contact information for this analysis:

Rommel Tijerino Garrett Tusler Monty Marsh

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

Shalandar Byas – Animal Crackers
Sarah Lim – City of Madison
Marlo Mielke-Barnes – 4C's
Lorena Ramirez – Reach Dane
Blake Roberts – UW Madison
Jessica Miller – Dane County

1. WHAT

a. What is the policy, plan or proposal being analyzed, and what does it seek to accomplish?

Looking for the most equitable and efficient way to disburse funding to child care.
I am hoping to learn more about the barriers that families have in accessing the funds. My understanding of the goal of this program is to provide funding for families so that children have consistent access to high-quality child care options.
For now, **I would encourage the group to review the stabilization program through that lens**. I know that there isn't a lot of time left so my suggestion is to do what you can and provide a review for a stabilization program that focus on children having access to high-quality care options.

b. What factors (including existing policies and structures) associated with this issue might be affecting communities of color and/or low-income populations differently?

Multistep Process
-Families that do not qualify for shares, will have to do *another* process through the city. Additional steps.
-The process is not quick/easy, caring for young kids makes it an additional barrier
-The waiting time while applying, they are receiving bills during that 30 days etc. (wait time is an issue),
-Timeliness within application component

-Families don't want to fill out application unless they are sure they will qualify.

Access to technology/Digital Literacy
-Access to technology (wifi, computer)
-Communication with families experiencing homelessness (no phone, communication, does the intake process have "alternate contact methods" such as agency numbers instead of personal cell etc.)

City Resident Criteria
-The "must be city resident" is a huge barrier, -If Shares applies to Dane county, it is a barrier that this process only available to "city residents"

Power Dynamic/Shifting of responsibility and/or burden
-Could be a burden to the center…pushing off the responsibility of the decision, -Are we creating unfair power dynamic by shifting funds to centers

Documentation/verification
-verification documents to prove they are eligible or not (burden)
-recertification process? Showing that they are working/looking for work etc.
-"Cliff effect"

-If you are not happy with the center, it may be difficult for families. Do they have choice?.
-Voucher

~~Questions (Revisit 4/4/23)~~
-Why do we have certain criteria for application (re: working, in search of work, etc.) Revisiting these aspects

c. What do available data tell you about this issue? (See page 5 for guidance on data resources.)

-Demographic information of agencies (must serve at least 20% low-income families – NOT NGOS)
 -How many people are participating in TA program now?
-How much money is available?
-List of providers (they let us know) – must qualify
-10-13 providers (fit 20% low income requirement)
-Decrease in numbers seen at state level as well (Shares)

d. What data are unavailable or missing?

County data regarding shares application? Client is forced to share denial letter
-low feasibility in establishing data sharing between County and TA due to system requirements ($$$)
- who have the need but are not being served

e. Which focus area(s) will the policy, plan or proposal primarily impact?
   Please add any comments regarding the specific impacts on each area:

☐ Community/Civic Engagement
☐ Criminal Justice
☒ Early Childhood
☐ Economic Development
☐ Education
☐ Employment
☐ Environment

☐ Food Access & Affordability
☐ Government Practices
☐ Health
☐ Housing
☐ Planning & Development
☐ Service Equity
☐ Transportation

☐ Other (please describe)

Comments:

2. WHO

a. Who (individuals or groups) could be impacted by the issues related to this policy, plan or proposal?

Families denied by SHARES, Community Based Organizations who receive stabilization funds, individuals who are already being served through TA – would this transition drop them? Also who COULD have received the TA?
-

b. Who would benefit?

*Families applying for TA through centers who already have an established relationship with Center staff, stronger support system while going through tedious paperwork (possibly)

c. Who would be burdened?

Possibly the centers if we shift away from TA program towards Stabilization funds,
-Not any center, must go through accreditation process
-Is there carry-over (individual gets funding at center x but wants to go to y)

d. Are there potential disproportionate impacts on communities of color or low-income communities?

Accessibility to selected SF centers, are they by bus routes?

e. Have stakeholders from different racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups—especially those most affected—been informed, involved and represented in the development of this proposal or plan? Who is missing and how can they be engaged? (See page 6 for guidance on community engagement.)

> 2016/2017 – provider/client outreach. Questions during screening. Child care sanction is a barrier (child support order). Don't like the application, though appreciate that it is easy to apply.

f. What input have you received from those who would be impacted and how did you gather this information? Specify sources of comments and other input.

> Indirect input – low registration numbers for TA program

3. WHY

a. What are the root causes or factors creating any racial or social inequities associated with this issue? (Examples: Bias in process; Lack of access or barriers; Lack of inclusive engagement)

> Bus routes, Access to transportation, Where are the agencies located?
> -Accreditation process for centers (licensing, education/safety, one step higher)
> -Staffing issues may be a barrier (capacity of centers to take on the work if funds are all shifted)

b. What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits or burdens may result? (Specifically consider social, economic, health and environmental impacts.)

> (re: Sarah mentioning about who is being served)
> It does seem like moving to center-based funds could have the unintended consequence of reducing the number of families who receive tuition assistance funds cause they can now go to center X, but if we switch to providers, center X may not be eligible.

c. What identified community needs are being met or ignored in this issue or decision?

> communities outside of Madison,

4. WHERE

a. Are there impacts on geographic areas? (Select all that apply.)

☒ All Madison neighborhoods   ☐ Park Edge/Park Ridge
☐ Allied Drive   ☐ Southside
☐ Balsam/Russet   ☐ East Madison (general)
☐ Brentwood/Northport Corridor   ☐ North Madison (general)
☐ Darbo/Worthington   ☐ West Madison (general)
☐ Hammersley/Theresa   ☐ Downtown/Campus
☐ Leopold/Arbor Hills   ☐ Dane County (outside Madison)
☐ Owl Creek   ☐ Outside Dane County

Comments:

5. HOW: RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION

a. Describe recommended strategies to address adverse impacts, prevent unintended negative consequences and advance racial equity (program, policy, partnership and/or budget/fiscal strategies):

Access/Technology
-Texting option is more accessible for homeless communities

Revisiting/Opening Eligibility Criteria
-Why only City of Madison residents? Money comes from city of Madison Tax payers. Can this be removed? Perhaps money comes from different "pot" so we can remove this barrier.
-Include language around "use of city agencies" – ex. Family lives in Fitchburg, but uses child care services from city agency, or individual works in city of Madison.
-Look into demographic information of agencies providing funds? (serves % of city of Madison residents)
-replicate this process to allow county residents apply instead of just city residents.

Fast Track Application – 1 Stop shop
--Can the city just look at eligibility process and just see if they will be denied, instead of sending individual to go through this process themselves? (Special circumstances: stretches out the application so you don't need to do the process so quickly) B.) -What about simply skipping the denial aspect from Wisconsin SHARES. Families may have hesitation to being involved in this process off the jump.

Strengthen network of providers
-Collaboration between agencies/community based orgs
-How can the city support staff at centers? Informal network, informing staff so that they can guide individuals/family units

Making application process seamless easier – put application on the website

One idea for a recommendation: Run an outreach/marketing campaign (similar to the one the state is doing that Jessie mentioned) with the goal of increasing awareness with eligible families, and/or conduct a survey of families to better understand their limitations to applying for or using tuition

Changing Ordinances?

Lowering thresholds from 20% to 10% for providers (currently 10-13 agencies) to open up availability for qualified agencies to distribute funds.

b. Is the proposal or plan:

- ☐ Realistic?
- ☐ Adequately funded?
- ☐ Adequately resourced with personnel?
- ☐ Adequately resourced with mechanisms (policy, systems) to ensure successful implementation and enforcement?
- ☐ Adequately resourced with provisions to ensure ongoing data collection, public reporting, stakeholder participation and public accountability?

If you answered "no" to any of the above, what resources or actions are needed?

c. Who is accountable for this decision?

> Monty M, Jim O,
> Final decision from city council.

d. How will impacts be documented and evaluated? What are the success indicators and progress benchmarks?

> Amount of funds getting to families, amount of agencies distributing funds, # of families/family units, Which agencies are receiving these funds? Going beyond the 10-15 we currently work with -could be demographics of the families who use funds, in addition to the # of families

e. How will those impacted by this issue be informed of progress and impacts over time?

> Outreach campaign to inform families that may be impacted, Direct connection with families currently served through TA to talk about transition.
> -

DATA RESOURCES FOR RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPACT ANALYSIS

City of Madison

- Neighborhood Indicators (UW Applied Population Lab and City of Madison):
    http://madison.apl.wisc.edu
- Open Data Portal (City of Madison):
    www.cityofmadison.com/data
- Madison Measures (City of Madison):
    https://www.cityofmadison.com/finance/documents/MadisonMeasures-2016.pdf
- Census reporter (US Census Bureau):
    http://censusreporter.org/profiles/06000US5502548000-madison-city-dane-county-wi

Dane County

- Geography of Opportunity: A Fair Housing Equity Assessment for Wisconsin's Capital Region
    (Capital Area Regional Planning Commission):
    www.capitalarearpc.org
- Race to Equity report (Wisconsin Council on Children and Families):
    http://racetoequity.net
- Healthy Dane (Public Health Madison & Dane County and area healthcare organizations):
    www.healthydane.org
- Dane Demographics Brief (UW Applied Population Lab and UW-Extension):
    www.apl.wisc.edu/publications/Dane_County_Demographics_Brief_2014.pdf

State of Wisconsin

- Wisconsin Quickfacts (US Census):
    U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States
- Demographics Services Center (WI Dept of Administration):
    DOA Demographic Services Center (wi.gov)
- Applied Population Laboratory (UW-Madison):
    www.apl.wisc.edu/data.php

Federal

- US Census:
    Explore Census Data
- 2010 Census Gateway (US Census):
    www.census.gov/2010census

CITY OF MADISON RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONTINUUM

Adapted from *Community Engagement Guide: A tool to advance Equity & Social Justice in King County*

The continuum provides details, characteristics and strategies for five levels of community engagement. The continuum shows a range of actions from county-led information sharing that tends to be shorter-term to longer-term community-led activities. The continuum can be used for both simple and complex efforts. As a project develops, the level of community engagement may need to change to meet changing needs and objectives.

The level of engagement will depend on various factors, including program goals, time constraints, level of program and community readiness, and capacity and resources. There is no one right level of engagement, but considering the range of engagement and its implications on your work is a key step in promoting community participation and building community trust. Regardless of the level of engagement, the role of both the City of Madison and community partners as part of the engagement process should always be clearly defined.

Levels of Engagement				
City Informs City of Madison initiates an effort, coordinates with departments and uses a variety of channels to inform community to take action	**City Consults** City of Madison gathers information from the community to inform city-led projects	**City engages in dialogue** City of Madison engages community members to shape city priorities and plans	**City and community** work together Community and City of Madison share in decision-making to co-create solutions together	**Community** directs action Community initiates and directs strategy and action with participation and technical assistance from the City of Madison
Characteristics of Engagement				
• Primarily one-way channel of communication • One interaction • Term-limited to event • Addresses immediate need of City and community	• Primarily one-way channel of communication • One to multiple interactions • Short to medium-term • Shapes and informs city projects	• Two-way channel of communication • Multiple interactions • Medium to long-term • Advancement of solutions to complex problems	• Two-way channel of communication • Multiple interactions • Medium to long-term • Advancement of solutions to complex problems	• Two-way channel of communication • Multiple interactions • Medium to long-term • Advancement of solutions to complex problems
Strategies				
Media releases, brochures, pamphlets, outreach to vulnerable populations, ethnic media contacts, translated information, staff outreach to residents, new and social media	Focus groups, interviews, community surveys	Forums, advisory boards, stakeholder involvement, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony, workshops, community-wide events	Co-led community meetings, advisory boards, coalitions and partnerships, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony	Community-led planning efforts, community-hosted forums, collaborative partnerships, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony

NOTES

General Information
-Agency does not have to reside in city of Madison, must be accredited, individual must be city of Madison resident
--Translation services are available
-City ordinance (from the 70s): Why cant families get SHARES and Tuition Assistance?
--"5 quick questions" – do you qualify?