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Mission

Communities Count is committed to improving community conditions through information advocacy -- providing accurate and timely reports on the conditions that matter to King County families and communities in order to stimulate action.
Partners

- City of Bellevue, Parks & Com. Services
- City of Seattle Human Services Dept.
- City of Seattle Office of Sustainability
- King County Children and Family Commission
- King County Dept. of Comm. & Human Services
- Public Health - Seattle & King County
- Sustainable Seattle
- United Way
Participation to select indicators

- Over 1,500 King County residents participated in process
- Random-digit dial telephone survey
- Focus groups with 13 different groups
- 2 Civic Forums
- 5 Public Forums (held across county)
Indicator development

1. Community survey & focus groups
2. Advisors' review and input
3. Local community forums
4. Advisors' review and input
5. Community forum to prioritize & approve

Core set of indicators
Basic Needs and Social Well-Being

- Adequate food
- Affordable housing
- Living wage income
- Income distribution
- Social support
- Freedom from discrimination
### Living Wage Income

#### Percent Living Below 200% of Federal Poverty Level

**King County, 1979, 1989 & 1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Region</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Region</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Region</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **1979**
- **1989**
- **1999**
Positive Development through Life Stages

- Family friendly employment
- Parent/guardian involvement in child’s learning
- Quality, affordable child care
- Academic achievement
- Developmental assets/ Risk and protective factors in youth
- Positive social beliefs & behavior in youth
- Participation in life-enriching activities
## Family Friendly Employment Benefits

### Percent of King County Employers Who Offer Family, Medical and Personal Leave Benefits, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Employers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Employers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Large Employers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offered</td>
<td>Paid At Least 1 Day</td>
<td>Offered</td>
<td>Paid At Least 1 Day</td>
<td>Offered</td>
<td>Paid At Least 1 Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Adult</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Child</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Visit</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death in Family</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent Involvement in Child’s Learning

Households With Children Age 2-5 Where Child Was Read or Told Stories Every Day

By Respondent's Education King County, 2001

- High School or Less: 53%
- Some College: 75%
- College Graduate: 87%
Stress

Average Level of Stress
King County, 1999 & 2001

North Region 1999: 7.6  2001: 8.0
Seattle 1999: 7.7  2001: 8.5
East Region 1999: 7.3  2001: 7.9
South Region 1999: 7.5  2001: 8.5
King County 1999: 7.5  2001: 8.4
Average Level of Stress
By Education and Income
King County, 2001

Education
- High School or Less: 9.0
- Some College: 8.8
- College Graduate: 7.8

Income
- Less than $15,000: 11.7
- $15,000 to $24,999: 9.6
- $25,000 to $34,999: 8.8
- $35,000 to $49,999: 8.4
- $50,000 or more: 7.8
Social Support

Average Level
By Race, Income and Relationship Status
King County, 2001

- **Race**
  - White: 40.2
  - All Other Races: 38.0

- **Income**
  - Less than $15,000: 33.4
  - $15,000 to $24,999: 36.7
  - $25,000 to $34,999: 38.6
  - $35,000 to $49,999: 39.6
  - $50,000 or more: 40.9

- **Relationship Status**
  - In a Couple, Married or Unmarried: 41.4
  - Not in a Couple Relationship: 36.9
Neighborhood Social Cohesion

Average Level of Neighborhood Social Cohesion
King County, 1999 & 2001

North Region
Seattle
East Region
South Region
King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average scores show a slight increase in social cohesion from 1999 to 2001 across all regions.
Neighborhood Social Cohesion

Average Level
By Age and Education
King County, 2001

Age

- Age 18-24: 34.7
- Age 25-44: 37.9
- Age 45-64: 38.9
- Age 65+: 38.2

Education

- High School or Less: 36.5
- Some College: 37.0
- College Graduate: 38.9
Neighborhood Social Cohesion

Average Level
By Income and Relationship Status
King County, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in a Couple</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship Status
Not in a Couple Relationship
Rationale for Data Collection Partnerships

- **CONTEXT:** Exploration of concepts across multiple groups

- **COMPLEMENTARITY:** Focus group data complement survey data

- **COMMITMENT:** An inclusive process
Data Collection Partnerships

- **English** (11 groups)
  - Low income people (8) Statewide Poverty Action Network (2 with Welfare Rights Organizing Coalition)
  - African Americans (3) Center for Multicultural Health
- **Russian** (3 groups)
  - International Counseling and Community Services
- **Somali** (3 groups)
  - Somali Women and Children Skills for Change
- **Spanish** (6 groups)
  - Center for Human Services
- **Vietnamese** (6 groups)
  - Ruth Dykeman Children’s Center, Refugee Assistance Program

29 focus groups in five languages with 255 participants
Data Collection Partnerships approach

- Bilingual, bicultural staff from partner agencies

- Training and on-going technical support from Public Health

- Spirit of problem-solving and mutual respect for partners’ expertise and skills
Social support themes

- Where do people find social support?
- “Socializing is a beautiful thing”
- Isolation, lack of support, and stress
- Immigrants’ experiences of support
Neighborhood Social Cohesion themes

- What is it like to live in your neighborhood?
- “People of many origins”: Shared neighborhoods
- “Nobody knows anybody”: What keeps neighbors apart?
- “A smile is worth a thousand words”: Developing a sense of community
Data Collection Partnerships: Summary

- Qualitative methods as complementary
  - Inclusion of perspectives otherwise missed
  - Quotations add words to the numbers
- Findings can inform the next phase of data collection
Accomplishments

- Report disseminated widely
- Website:  http://www.communitiescount.org
- Building support for actions and funding from public and private sectors to address indicators of concern
- Update report every 2 years to follow our communities’ progress over time
Accomplishments

Examples of actions in response to Communities Count 2000 Report

- Budget decision in response to findings
- Program developed in response to a region concern
- Indicators used to guide allocation and contracting