



Oakland Equity Indicators



**Measuring Change Toward
Greater Equity in Oakland**

Contents

Overview	5
Report Structure	6
Background	7
Methodology	9
Key Findings	13
Appendices	16
Appendix A: Full Framework Structure	16-17
Appendix B: Ratio to Score Conversion Table	18
Appendix C: Data Sources List	19
Appendix D: Full Framework with Scores	24
Appendix E: Racial and Ethnic Disparities by Census Tract and Zip Code	26
Acknowledgements	28



“Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced.”

James Baldwin



City of Oakland Equity Indicators 2018 Report

33.5

Score

Overview

Oakland has a long history of activism around issues of inequity and social justice. It is, therefore, not surprising that Oakland was chosen in 2017 to be among the first cohort of five cities to develop local Equity Indicators tools in partnership with the City University of New York’s Institute for State and Local Governance (CUNY ISLG) and with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation. The project began as a joint effort between the Resilient Oakland Office and the Department of Race and Equity. It has resulted in a product that will be useful across City departments as we strive to advance equity by using strategies determined through an intentional focus on racial and ethnic disparities and their root causes.

In Oakland, we define equity as fairness. It means that identity—such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation or expression—has no detrimental effect on the distribution of resources, opportunities and outcomes for our City’s residents. One key assumption in our work is that race matters, and this assumption is supported by the data: almost every indicator of well-being shows troubling disparities by race. The purpose of Oakland’s Equity Indicators Report is to develop a baseline quantitative framework that can be used by City staff and community members alike to better understand the impacts of race, measure inequities, and track changes in the disparities for different groups over time. This framework can then be used to guide and inform policies that address these disparities.



EQUALITY



EQUITY

Report Structure



Oakland Equity Indicators

Citywide

The Citywide framework consist of 6 themes that cover broad areas of people's lives.

Themes

1. Economy
2. Education
3. Public Health
4. Housing
5. Public Safety
6. Neighborhood and Civic Life.

Topics

Within each theme there are 4 topics.
Whithin each topic there are 3 indicators, for a total of 12 indicators per theme and 72 indicators in the whole framework.

Indicators

Indicators represent the best proxy we could find for the complex disparities we set out to measure.
Every indicator receives a score, created by calculating the ratio between the outcomes for the least and most advantaged racial/ethnic group.

Ratios & Scores

The ratio is then converted to an Equity Score using an algorithm developed by CUNY ISLG.

Scores & Scales

Scores are on a scale from 1 to 100.
1 represents the highest possible level of **inequity**.
100 represents the highest possible level of **equity**.

Background

The Equity Indicators Report originated as an action in the Resilient Oakland Playbook (funded by and created in partnership with 100 Resilient Cities—pioneered by the Rockefeller Foundation). Joining the CUNY ISLG cohort allowed Oakland to implement this action while also learning and collaborating with other cities around the country around best practices in measuring and tracking progress toward increasing equity. The Department of Race and Equity collaborated on the development of this report because access to data is critical to Oakland’s progress toward addressing inequity through systemic, transformational change.

The purpose of Oakland’s Equity Indicators Report is to develop a baseline quantitative framework that can be used by City staff and community members alike to better understand the impacts of race and measure inequities. It will support City department and staff efforts to make data-driven decisions about programs and policies to address these inequities and increase equitable access to opportunities and services that we administer or deliver, directly or by contract. It will enable community members to monitor our progress or setbacks and advise improvement. Future reports will measure change in the disparities for different groups over time and will offer an opportunity for City staff and community members to work in collaboration to devise and implement course correction and to celebrate progress.

A Brief Racial History of Oakland

Social inequities in life outcomes that are predictable by race are the inevitable result of our nation's history. Oakland is today one of the most racially and ethnically diverse cities in the country ⁽¹⁾, but before the arrival of European explorers, it was the home of one group, the Ohlone, one of the many indigenous tribes who populated the territory that became California. In the late 1700s, California was home to more than 300,000 native people in more than 200 tribes, but by 1848, disease spread by contact with outsiders had reduced California's native population by more than two-thirds.

By 1860, the state's native population had been reduced to 30,000, decimated by disease, removal from their land and further historical mistreatment. Just 40 years later, in 1900, this population had plummeted to 20,000.

In following years, Oakland is the place where laws like the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act (the first law to prevent a specific ethnic group from immigrating to the United States) was first tested ⁽³⁾ and where in 1927 William Parker (a known KKK member) was elected to City Council ⁽⁴⁾.

The people of Oakland pushed back. Community groups born in the 1960s like the Black Panther Party, Oakland Community Organizations (OCO), Unity Council, Intertribal Friendship House and many others continued to organize and demand protections and equal access to jobs, housing, employment, transportation and services ⁽⁵⁾. These laws and policies helped people to address injustice at an individual level, but it was soon realized that more needed to be done to address the deep inequities created by years of blatantly discriminatory policies and practices and to change the systems that created oppression ⁽⁶⁾.

In the 1980s and 1990s, community organizations started new efforts to influence and encourage local governments to explore how to undo the legacy of institutionalized racism. In Oakland, PolicyLink, the Green Lining Institute and the Center for Racial Justice Innovation (Race Forward) amongst others led these efforts. By the early 2000s racial equity initiatives and tools began to be used by local government staff and elected government officials to figure out how to change the inequities in outcomes impacting communities of color in multiple cities across the country. In 2016 the City of Oakland launched its own Department of Race and Equity to advance equity change action in the City government.

Although we cannot change the past, we can learn from it to change the future. By focusing on the impacts of race, implementing intentional strategies to address disparities and measuring our progress we can eliminate rather than deepen disparities in our communities ⁽⁶⁾. If Oakland's history of struggle to achieve equity teaches us anything, it is that we cannot do this in isolation. We understand the need to work side by side with the community and partner institutions to undo the legacy of racism to create an Oakland where there is equity in opportunity that results in equitable outcomes for all.

1 Bernanrdo, Richie. (2018.1.13) Most and Least Racial and Ethnically Diverse Cities in the U.S.

<https://wallethub.com/edu/cities-with-the-most-and-least-ethno-racial-and-linguistic-diversity/10264/>. Oakland is the second most diverse City in the U.S.

2 University of California. (2009) Native Americans: Arts and Traditions in Everyday Life. (2009) [California Cultures](#) project
3 Zhang, Sheldon (2007). Smuggling and trafficking in human beings: all roads lead to America. Greenwood Publishing Group. p. 69. ISBN 978-0-275-98951-4.

4 Deniels, Roger and Olin, C. Spencer Jr, Editors. *Racism in California: A Reader in the History of Oppression*. (1972) The Macmillan Company.

5 Zinn, Howard (2003). A People's History of the United States. Harper-Collins. P. 126-210. ISBN-0-06052842-7

6 Hanks, Angela, Solomon, [Danyelle](#), and [Weller](#), Christine E. Systemic Inequality. (2018) Center for American Progress <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/reports/2018/02/21/447051/systematic-inequality/>

Methodology

The Equity Indicators methodology was originally developed by the City University of New York's Institute for Local and State Governance (CUNY ISLG) and then adapted for the Oakland context.

Process of Developing the Initial Framework

The process included the following steps:

- ~ Research inequities in Oakland, who experiences those inequities, and the City of Oakland's policy priorities, including the Resilient Oakland Playbook and the work of the Department of Race and Equity.
- ~ Create a draft framework, based on the research in Step 1.
- ~ Solicit feedback from a range of stakeholders, including community members, advocacy groups, government agencies, and City leadership. This step included two community workshops held in fall 2017.
- ~ Revise the draft framework in accordance with the feedback received.
- ~ Test the Indicators (see section below on *How Indicators Were Chosen*).
- ~ Revise the framework and solicit additional feedback as needed.
- ~ Finalize the tool and publish the first year of findings.

Structure of Oakland Equity Indicators Framework

The Oakland Equity Indicators framework is structured at 4 levels: Citywide, Theme, Topic, and Indicator. The Citywide framework consists of 6 Themes that cover broad areas of people's lives: 1-Economy, 2-Education, 3-Public Health, 4-Housing, 5-Public Safety, and 6-Neighborhood and Civic Life. These Themes are not exhaustive, but were chosen based on areas of inequity in Oakland. They are also not mutually exclusive; there are many relationships between the Themes. For example, education influences economic outcomes, economic status influences housing and health, etc.

How Indicators Were Chosen

The Indicators chosen represent the best proxies we could find for the complex disparity themes we set out to measure. The following criteria were used to determining the indicators included in each of the topics in the final framework:

1. Data is available, high quality, and from a reliable source.
2. We will be able to calculate change over time (i.e., data is updated and accessible on an annual basis and changes from year to year can be meaningfully interpreted).
3. There is a strong causal model for why this Indicator matters (i.e., we understand the context behind the Indicator and how disparities affect people).
4. The data accurately represents the impact of inequity on people's lives (e.g., not measuring quantity when what matters is quality).

How Indicators Are Scored

Per CUNY ISLG, Equity Indicators are designed to be scored in two ways. Static Scores capture findings for a given year, and Change Scores capture change from the baseline to the most recent year. Given that this is the first ever report for Oakland, all scores presented will be Static Scores. We intend in future years to include Change Scores to allow for discussions about whether and where progress toward equity is being made.

The standard approach for scoring Indicators is to calculate the ratio between the outcomes for the least and most advantaged racial/ethnic groups. This ratio is then converted to an Equity Score using a standard algorithm developed by CUNY ISLG (see Appendix B for the ratio-to-score conversion table). Scores are on a scale from 1 to 100, with 1 representing the highest possible inequity and 100 representing highest possible equity. For example, for the Unemployment Indicator, we calculated the ratio between the unemployment rates of African Americans and Whites because these two groups had the highest and lowest rates respectively. The ratio for this Indicator is 2.12, meaning that African Americans were 2.12 times more likely than Whites to be unemployed. This ratio yields an Equity Score of 40, representing substantial room for improvement.

There are some exceptions to this standard approach. While most Indicators measure negative outcomes, some Indicators measure positive outcomes (e.g., business ownership). In this case, the ratio is flipped to compare the most and least advantaged groups so that scores can align on the same scale. Also, whenever possible, data was used that directly contained the reported race/ethnicity of the people affected by that Indicator, however sometimes we used geographic data as a proxy for racial and ethnic groups. Nine of the 72 Indicators in the framework measure racial and ethnic disparities based on the majority race/ethnicity of census tracts.

Four of the 72 Indicators in the framework measure racial and ethnic disparities based on zip code. Due to the low number of zip codes in Oakland, these Indicators compare zip codes in which more than 60% of the population is non-White and zip codes in which more than 60% of the population is White. These demographics are all based on American Community Survey 5-year estimates, 2012-2016. For full details on census tract and zip code calculations, see Appendix E.

In addition, while the majority of Indicators measure racial and ethnic disparities, 3 Indicators measure geographic disparities (1 by Police Area and 2 by City Council District), and 2 Indicators are citywide measures (equal access accommodations and curb ramps). Finally, there are some exceptions to which racial and ethnic groups are used for the scored comparison (i.e., for some indicators we do not compare the least and most advantaged). Any exception is noted and a reason given. Regardless of any exceptions, within the explanation of each Indicator, data is presented for all available groups or geographic areas, and it is made clear which groups/areas are used for scoring.

Scores for Topics are calculated by averaging the 3 Indicator scores within each Topic, and Theme Scores are calculated by averaging the 4 Topic Scores within each Theme. Finally, the Citywide score is calculated as the average of the 6 Theme scores. By having multiple measures, we aim to generate more fair and accurate scores for the broader Topics, Themes, and ultimately the single Citywide Equity Score. By choosing a standard number of Indicators and Topics per Theme, we avoid skewing the results too heavily towards any one area. By using a simple average to calculate higher level scores (as opposed to assigning weights to Indicators or Topics), we also avoid potential personal bias.

It is important to remember with this scoring system that a high score indicates high levels of equity, not necessarily overall quality of outcomes. If everyone is doing poorly in a particular area but doing equally poorly, that area would get a high equity score, but that does not indicate that outcomes are necessarily as good in that area as we might ultimately want them to be. Additionally, low scores mean there is a lot of inequity, but do not directly measure whether the outcomes for the groups are objectively good or bad. This equity baseline measurement can, however, inform our choices and policies so that as our City grows and prospers, all residents are able to benefit from that prosperity.

Purpose of Scoring

Per CUNY ISLG, “scoring has two important and related benefits. It enables the standardization of data produced in different formats (i.e., percentages, and rates) and from different modes of data collection (i.e., administrative data and survey data). In turn, [scoring] makes it possible to synthesize findings across Indicators, Topics, and Themes to produce higher-level findings,” an important feature of the framework. Without scoring, the only conclusions from this process would be individual results for the 72 Indicators.

Data Sources

The specific data source for each Indicator is noted in the explanation of that Indicator. Generally, data came from two different types of sources: publicly available data and internal City administrative data. The two most frequently used publicly available data sources were the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey and the Oakland Unified School District’s dashboards. We also requested Oakland-specific data from the Alameda County Department of Public Health for many of our Public Health Indicators. Internal City administrative data was either already publicly available or obtained by request from specific departments (such as the Oakland Police Department). For a list of all data sources, see Appendix C.


We attempted to use the most recently available data for all Indicators. Usually that meant data from 2016 or 2017, but sometimes data was older than that or aggregated over multiple years. In those cases, the exact timeframe is noted in the explanation of each Indicator.



Key Findings

City-wide Result 33.5

Oakland's 2018 Citywide Equity score, which encompasses all Indicators in the framework, is **33.5** (out of 100), demonstrating substantial room for improvement. See Appendix D for the full framework with all the scores. The highest scoring Theme was Neighborhood and Civic Life (50.6), followed by Economy (41.8), then Housing (36.8), Education (29.0), Public Health (25.8), and the lowest scoring Theme was Public Safety (17.3).



Highest Scores

The five highest scoring Topics throughout the framework were Civic Engagement at 75.0 (within the Neighborhood and Civic Life Theme), Job Quality at 51.7 (within the Economy Theme), Employment (also within Economy) and Affordability (within the Housing Theme) both at 49.0, and Staffing (within Public Safety) at 48.3.

The five highest scoring Indicators were Equal Access Accommodations at 100 (within Neighborhood and Civic Life Theme: Civic Engagement Topic), Adopt a Drain at 80 (within Neighborhood and Civic Life: Civic Engagement), Homeownership with Mortgage at 78 (within Housing: Displacement), Life Expectancy at 77 (within Public Health: Mortality), and tied for fifth highest scoring were Labor Force Participation (within Economy: Employment) and Participation in Workforce Development Programs (within Economy: Job Quality), both at 72.

Lowest Scores

There were 12 Indicators that received the lowest possible score of a 1 indicating the most extreme levels of inequity exist between groups for these measures. They were (in the order they appear in the Framework) as follows:

- Education: Program Access – Suspensions
- Education: Teachers – Representation of Student Population
- Public Health: Child Health – Childhood Asthma Emergency Department Visits
- Public Health: Physical and Mental Health – Substance Abuse Emergency Department Visits
- Housing: Displacement - Homelessness
- Public Safety: Incarceration – Adult Felony Arrests
- Public Safety: Incarceration – Jail Incarceration
- Public Safety: Incarceration – Prison Incarceration
- Public Safety: Law Enforcement – Use of Force
- Public Safety: Community Stressors – Homicides
- Public Safety: Community Stressors – Juvenile Felony Arrests
- Neighborhood and Civic Life: Built Environment – Pedestrian Safety


These are significant findings, with potentially profound life changing impacts, disproportionately being experienced by our residents of color. In light of the City of Oakland’s commitment to equity, they provide meaningful markers of the greatest opportunities to make a difference for those in our marginalized communities.

Next Steps

Publishing this first year’s Equity Indicators Report is important because the information positions the City to use data to drive equity outcomes, but it is only a small step in a much larger effort to address these inequities. To complement this quantitative baseline, the Department of Race & Equity is also working with community partners to gather qualitative data from diverse community members in Oakland. This will provide important context and insights into the root causes of these disparities and meaningful solutions to the problems illuminated in the Equity Indicators Report.

Data-informed, transparent community involved decision-making is essential to transformational institutional change that will advance equitable outcomes in our communities of color.

The City of Oakland is energized to keep building on the foundation of this report, to promote dialogue with Oakland’s diverse communities, and to develop policies, programs and partnerships that reduce these inequities, so we build a future where every Oaklander can thrive.



Appendices

Appendix A: Full Framework Structure

Topic 1 Economy	Business Development	Business Ownership	Topic 4 Housing	Affordability	Homeownership
		Prime Contracts Awarding		Loan Denial	
		Long-term Business Vacancy		Rent Burden	
	Employment	Disconnected Youth		Displacement	Homelessness
		Labor Force Participation			Homeownership with Mortgage
		Unemployment			Eviction Notices
	Financial Health	Access to Healthy Financial Institutions		Essential Services	Complete Plumbing Facilities
		Median Household Income			Energy Cost Burden
		Poverty			High Speed Internet Access
	Job Quality	Employment in High Wage Industries		Housing Quality	Housing Habitability Complaints
		Living Wage			Complete Kitchen Facilities
		Participation in Workforce Development Programs			Overcrowding
Topic 2 Education	Enrollment	Preschool Enrollment	Topic 5 Public Safety	Incarceration	Adult Felony Arrests
		Chronic Absenteeism			Jail Incarceration
		High School On-Time Completion			Prison Incarceration
	Achievement	3rd Grade ELA Proficiency		Law Enforcement	Police Response Times
		High School Readiness			Stops
		A-G Completion			Use of Force
	Program Access	AP Course Enrollment		Staffing	Representation
		Linked Learning Pathway Enrollment			Attrition from Academy
		Suspensions			Attrition from Field Training
	Teachers	Representation of Student Population		Community Stressors	Domestic Violence
		Teacher Experience			Homicides
		Teacher Turnover			Juvenile Felony Arrests

Topic 3 Health	Access to Preventive Care	Acute Preventable Hospitalizations	Topic 6 Neighborhood and Civic Life	Built Environment	Pedestrian Safety
		Chronic Disease Preventable Hospitalizations			Soft Story Buildings
		Health Insurance			Long-term Residential Vacancy
	Child Health	Childhood Asthma Emergency Department Visits		Civic Engagement	Adopt a Drain
		Physical Fitness			Voter Turnout
		SNAP Recipiency			Equal Access Accommodations
	Mortality	Infant Mortality		Environmental Health	Park Quality
		Life Expectancy			Abandoned Trash
		Premature Death			Pollution Burden
	Physical and Mental Health	Severe Mental Illness Emergency Department Visits		Transportation and Infrastructure	Access to a Car
		Substance Abuse Emergency Department Visits			Bus Frequency
		HIV New Diagnoses			Curb Ramps

Appendix B: Ratio to Score Conversion Table

Ratio From	Ratio To	Score Range	Ratio From	Ratio To	Score Range	Ratio From	Ratio To	Score Range
0.000	0.999	100	1.360	1.379	67	3.050	3.199	33
1.000	1.004	100	1.380	1.399	66	3.200	3.349	32
1.005	1.009	99	1.400	1.419	65	3.350	3.499	31
1.010	1.014	98	1.420	1.439	64	3.500	3.649	30
1.015	1.019	97	1.440	1.459	63	3.650	3.799	29
1.020	1.024	96	1.460	1.479	62	3.800	3.949	28
1.025	1.029	95	1.480	1.499	61	3.950	4.099	27
1.030	1.034	94	1.500	1.524	60	4.100	4.249	26
1.035	1.039	93	1.525	1.549	59	4.250	4.399	25
1.040	1.044	92	1.550	1.574	58	4.400	4.549	24
1.045	1.049	91	1.575	1.599	57	4.550	4.699	23
1.050	1.054	90	1.600	1.624	56	4.700	4.849	22
1.055	1.059	89	1.625	1.649	55	4.850	4.999	21
1.060	1.064	88	1.650	1.674	54	5.000	5.249	20
1.065	1.069	87	1.675	1.699	53	5.250	5.499	19
1.070	1.074	86	1.700	1.724	52	5.500	5.749	18
1.075	1.079	85	1.725	1.749	51	5.750	5.999	17
1.080	1.084	84	1.750	1.774	50	6.000	6.249	16
1.085	1.089	83	1.775	1.799	49	6.250	6.499	15
1.090	1.094	82	1.800	1.824	48	6.500	6.749	14
1.095	1.099	81	1.825	1.849	47	6.750	6.999	13
1.100	1.119	80	1.850	1.874	46	7.000	7.249	12
1.120	1.139	79	1.875	1.899	45	7.250	7.499	11
1.140	1.159	78	1.900	1.924	44	7.500	7.749	10
1.160	1.179	77	1.925	1.949	43	7.750	7.999	9
1.180	1.199	76	1.950	1.974	42	8.000	8.249	8
1.200	1.219	75	1.975	1.999	41	8.250	8.499	7
1.220	1.239	74	2.000	2.149	40	8.500	8.749	6
1.240	1.259	73	2.150	2.299	39	8.750	8.999	5
1.260	1.279	72	2.300	2.449	38	9.000	9.249	4
1.280	1.299	71	2.450	2.599	37	9.250	9.499	3
1.300	1.319	70	2.600	2.749	36	9.500	9.749	2
1.320	1.339	69	2.750	2.899	35	9.750	9.999	1
1.340	1.359	68	2.900	3.049	34	10.000	10.000+	1

Appendix C: Data Sources List

Notes:

American Community Survey 1-year and 5-year PUMS data was retrieved from DataFerrett, <https://dataferrett.census.gov/>. Oakland PUMAs extend beyond the city boundaries, see maps here: https://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/2010puma/st06_ca.html. American Community Survey 1-year and 5-year estimates were retrieved from American FactFinder, <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>. Full hyperlinks for other publicly available data sources are provided in each Indicator explanation.

Economy:

Business Development

- Business Ownership - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Prime Contracts Awarding - *Oakland Contracts and Compliance Division by request, FY2015-16*
- Long-term Business Vacancy - *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Aggregated USPS Administrative Data on Address Vacancies, Quarter 3 ending September 30, 2017; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*

Employment

- Disconnected Youth - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Labor Force Participation - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Unemployment - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Financial Health

- Access to Healthy Financial Institutions - *ReferenceUSA, data retrieved January 19, 2018; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- Median Household Income - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Poverty - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Job Quality

- Employment in High Wage Industries - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Living Wage - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Participation in Workforce Development Programs - *Workforce participation data from Oakland Economic and Workforce Development department by request. Data on population by race that was unemployed but in the labor force from American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016.*

Education:

Enrollment

- *Preschool Enrollment - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*
- *Chronic Absenteeism - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*
- *High School On-Time Completion - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2015-16*

Achievement

- *3rd Grade ELA Proficiency - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*
- *High School Readiness - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*
- *A-G Completion - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*

Program Access

- *AP Course Enrollment - OUSD by request, 2016-17*
- *Linked Learning Pathways Enrollment - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*
- *Suspensions - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*

Teachers

- *Representation of Student Population - OUSD Fast Facts report, 2016-17*
- *Teacher Experience - Student populations by race/ethnicity at schools from California Department of Education, 2016-17. Teacher salary step percents from OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17.*
- *Teacher Turnover - Student populations by race/ethnicity at schools from California Department of Education, 2016-17. Teacher turnover at schools from OUSD Data Dashboard, baseline year 2016-17.*

Public Health:

Access to Preventive Care

- *Acute Preventable Hospitalizations - California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development by request, 2013-3Q2015; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- *Chronic Disease Preventable Hospitalizations - California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development by request, 2013-3Q2015; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- *Health Insurance - American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Child Health

- *Childhood Asthma Emergency Department Visits - California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development by request, 2013-3Q2015*
- *Physical Fitness - OUSD Data Dashboard, 2016-17*
- *SNAP Recipiency - American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Mortality

- Infant Mortality - *Alameda County Public Health Department Community Assessment, Planning, and Evaluation, with data from Alameda County vital statistics files, by request, 2014-2016*
- Life Expectancy - *Alameda County Public Health Department Community Assessment, Planning, and Evaluation, with data from Alameda County vital statistics files, by request, 2014-2016*
- Premature Death - *Alameda County Public Health Department Community Assessment, Planning, and Evaluation, with data from Alameda County vital statistics files, by request, 2014-2016*

Physical and Mental Health

- Severe Mental Illness Emergency Department Visits - *California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development by request, 2013-3Q2015*
- Substance Abuse Emergency Department Visits - *California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development by request, 2013-3Q2015*
- HIV Diagnoses - *HIV in Alameda County, 2014-2016, Alameda County Public Health Department HIV Epidemiology and Surveillance Unit, March 2018*

Housing:

Affordability

- Homeownership - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Loan Denial - *Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, 2016*
- Rent Burden - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Displacement

- Homelessness - *EveryOne Counts! 2017 Homeless Count and Survey. The 2017 Alameda County Point-in-Time Count was a community-wide effort conducted on January 30, 2017, and uses the 2015 1 year ACS data to compare to the general city population.*
- Homeownership with Mortgage - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Notice of Evictions - *Oakland, Rent Adjustment Program by request, 2016; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*

Essential Services

- Complete Plumbing Facilities - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Energy Cost Burden - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- High Speed Internet Access - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Housing Quality

- Housing Habitability Complaints - *Accela Housing Habitability Complaint Cases Calendar Year 2017, Oakland Planning and Building department by request; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates*
- Complete Kitchen Facilities - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Overcrowding - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*

Public Safety:

Incarceration

- Adult Felony Arrests - *Felony arrest data from Oakland Police Department by request, 2017. Population data from American Community Survey, 1-year estimates, 2016.*
- Jail Incarceration - *California Sentencing Institute, Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2015*
- Prison Incarceration - *California Sentencing Institute, Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2015*

Law Enforcement

- Police Response Times - *Oakland Police Department by request.*
- Stops - *Oakland Police Department 2016-2017 Stop Data Report*
- Use of Force - *Use of force data from Oakland Police Department by request, 2017. Population data from American Community Survey, 1-year estimates, 2016.*

Staffing

- Representation - *Sworn staff demographics from Oakland Police Department Monthly Staffing Report (dated April 4, 2018, with data as of February 28, 2018). Population data from American Community Survey, 1-year estimates, 2016.*
- Attrition from Academy - *Oakland Police Department Monthly Staffing Reports. Ending numbers were found in Table 5b from the report dated April 4, 2018, with data as of February 28, 2018. Starting demographics were collected and aggregated from older staffing reports (2015 to present) and from data supplied by request from OPD.*
- Attrition from Field Training - *Oakland Police Department Monthly Staffing Report (Table 12b from the report dated April 4, 2018, with data as of February 28, 2018,).*

Community Stressors

- Domestic Violence - *Domestic violence data from Oakland Police Department by request, 2017. Population data from American Community Survey, 1-year estimates, 2016.*

- Homicides - *Homicide data from Oakland Police Department by request, 2017. Population data from American Community Survey, 1-year estimates, 2016.*
- Juvenile Felony Arrests - *Felony arrest data from Oakland Police Department by request, 2017. Population data from American Community Survey, 1-year estimates, 2016.*

Neighborhood and Civic Life:

Built Environment

- Pedestrian Safety - *Oakland Vision Zero Team by request, 2012-2016; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- Soft Story Buildings - *OpenOakland, 2014; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- Long-term Residential Vacancy - *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Aggregated USPS Administrative Data on Address Vacancies, Quarter 3 ending September 30, 2017; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*

Civic Engagement

- Adopt a Drain - *Oakland Environmental Services Division by request, as of February 2018; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- Voter Turnout - *Alameda County Registrar of Voters, 2016*
- Equal Access Accommodations - *Equal Access to Services Annual Compliance Report, FY2016-2017*

Environmental Health

- Park Quality - *2016 Community Report Card on the State of Maintenance in Oakland Parks, Oakland Parks and Recreation Foundation*
- Abandoned Trash - *Service requests received by the Oakland Call Center, 2017; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- Pollution Burden - *CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Maps, updated on January 9, 2017; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*

Transportation and Infrastructure

- Access to a Car - *American Community Survey, 1-year PUMS, 2016*
- Bus Frequency - *Oakland GIS Department by request, 2017; American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, 2012-2016*
- Curb Ramps - *Oakland Curb Ramp Inventory Dashboard, 2017*

Appendix D: Full Framework with Scores


Theme	Theme Score	Topic	Topic score	Indicator	Indicator score		
1-Economy	41.8	Business Development	33.7	Business Ownership	36		
				Contracts Awarding	31		
				Long-term Business Vacancy	34		
		Employment	49.0			Disconnected Youth	35
						Labor Force Participation	72
						Unemployment Rate	40
		Financial Health	32.7			Access to Healthy Financial Institutions	31
						Median household income	34
						Poverty Rates	33
		Job Quality	51.7			Employment in High Wage Industries	54
						Living Wage	29
						Workforce Development Programs	72
2-Education	29.0	Enrollment	22.3	Preschool Enrollment	22		
				Chronic Absenteeism	25		
				High School Completion	20		
		Achievement	32.0			3rd grade Reading Proficiency	20
						High School Readiness	37
						A-G Completion	39
		Program Access	33.3			AP Course Enrollment	37
						Linked Learning Pathways Enrollment	62
						Suspensions	1
		Teachers	28.3			Representation of Student Body	1
						Teacher Experience	55
						Teacher Turnover	29
3-Public Health	25.8	Access to Preventive Care	28.7	Acute Preventable Hospitalizations	39		
				Chronic Disease Preventable Hospitalizations	26		
				Health Insurance	21		
		Child Health	27.7			Childhood Asthma Emergency Department Visits	1
						Physical Fitness	63
						SNAP Reciprocity	19
		Mortality	42.0			Infant Mortality	16
						Life Expectancy	77
						Premature Death Rate	33
		Physical and Mental Health	4.7			Severe Mental Illness Emergency Department Visits	7
						Substance Abuse Emergency Department Visits	1
						HIV New Diagnoses	6

Theme	Theme Score	Topic	Topic score	Indicator	Indicator score		
4-Housing	36.8	Affordability	49.0	Homeownership	53		
				Loan Denial	40		
				Renter Cost Burden	54		
		Displacement	29.0			Homelessness	1
						Homeownership with Mortgage	78
						Notices of Eviction	8
		Essential Services	36.0			Complete Plumbing Facilities	35
						Energy Cost Burden	38
						High Speed Internet Access	35
		Housing Quality	33.0			Housing Habitability Complaints	40
						Kitchen Facilities	37
						Overcrowding	22
5-Public Safety	17.3	Incarceration	1.0	Adult Felony Arrests	1		
				Jail Incarceration	1		
				Prison Incarceration	1		
		Law Enforcement	18.3			Police Response Times	48
						Stops	6
						Use of Force	1
		Staffing	48.3			Representation	45
						Attrition from Academy	63
						Attrition from Field Training	37
		Community Stressors	1.7			Domestic Violence	3
						Homicides	1
						Juvenile Felony Arrests	1
6-Neighborhood and Civic Life	50.6	Built Environment	33.3	Pedestrian Safety	1		
				Soft Story Buildings	67		
				Long-term Residential Vvacancy	32		
		Civic Engagement	75.0			Adopt a Drain	80
						Voter Turnout	45
						Equal Access Accommodations	100
		Environmental Health	46.7			Park Quality	57
						Abandoned Trash	28
						Pollution Burden	55
		Transportation and Infrastructure	47.3			Access to Car	33
						Bus Frequency	60
						Curb Ramps	49

Appendix E: Racial and Ethnic Disparities by Census Tract and Zip Code

Nine of the 72 Indicators in the framework measure racial and ethnic disparities based on the majority race/ethnicity of census tracts. These calculations are based on American Community Survey 5-year estimates, 2012-2016.


Majority Race/Ethnicity	Number of Census Tracts	Total Population in Census Tracts
African American	6	17,025
Asian	2	7,326
Latino	16	76,414
White	28	90,289
Non-White/Mixed	61	220,986



Four of the 72 Indicators in the framework measure racial and ethnic disparities based on zip code. Due to the low number of zip codes in Oakland, these Indicators compare zip codes in which more than 60% of the population is non-White and zip codes in which more than 60% of

the population is White. These calculations are based on American Community Survey 5-year estimates, 2012-2016.




Non-White/White	Number of Zip Codes	Total Population in Zip Codes
>60% Non-White	10	294,289
>60% White	3	67,735
Mixed	3	83,445



With deep gratitude to all Oakland residents, community organizations, City Departments, staff and elected officials for their time, input and data for this report.





Special thanks to:



-  Victoria Lawson, Senior Research Associate
-  Jocelyn Drummond, Research Associate
-  Julia Bowling, Research Analyst



Department of Race and Equity

-  Darlene Flynn, Director
-  Jacque Larrainzar, Program Analyst

City of Oakland Resiliency Office

-  Ethan Guy, Acting City of Oakland Resiliency Officer
-  Jeanette Wickelgren, Intern

PIONEERED BY THE
ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

100

RESILIENT

CITIES