



KPL Racial Equity Assessment Process Guide

Purpose of the Racial Equity Assessment: To facilitate conscious consideration of equity and examination of how communities of color, low-income and other marginalized populations will be affected by a proposed action/decision.

Use of the tool: Individuals can utilize this tool as a preliminary review of an idea or concept but the assessment must be completed by a work group composed of staff members and stakeholders involved in the implementation of policies, services, programs and budgets. In the initial phases of use of this tool it is recommended that the work group include two members of the ARTT.

Work groups consisting of a minimum of 3-4 individuals are recommended but when evaluating issues which will have a broad impact on the library or the community it is recommended that consideration be given to increasing the size and diversity of the group.

Estimated time to complete: It is estimated that it will take a few hours to complete the assessment but more complex issues could potentially require additional time.

The Racial Equity Assessment

Is:	Is NOT:
A systematic examination of likely impacts of decisions, policies, programs, practices and budgets on racial and ethnic groups or low –income populations	The “answer”
Used to minimize adverse consequences, prevent institutional racism and identify new options to remedy existing inequities	To be used for political or professional gain
An intentional pause	To stop a process or slow it down beyond recognition
Best used early in the process	Only applicable at the beginning- can be used to evaluate ongoing issues or programs
To be conducted with a variety of perspectives and stakeholders whenever possible	The only way to engage stakeholders
A way to ensure racial equity impacts are at the core of decision making	Not to be used in place of other processes that are in place such as a fiscal analysis or a public safety analysis
A way to raise the voice of traditionally marginalized communities	A way to create token representation in decisions
A way to raise awareness of racial and social justice issues in the community	A guarantee that decision makers will follow the recommendations
An authentic, focused and intentional effort to consider the recommendations that come out of the analysis – transformational change	A “check box” activity that does not consider creative ways to implement the recommendations – transactional change

Step 1: Review Best Practices

- a. **Identify** groups and individuals most likely to be impacted by the policies, services, programs and budgets. Find ways to involve them in the assessment.
- b. **Conduct** the assessment in the way that works best for the decision being analyzed and those affected. Some examples include: survey, facilitated, full-group discussions; one-on-one conversations; or small group meetings.
- c. **Create** accountability by sharing the assessment widely with stakeholders, decision makers and the public. Be clear about how the process occurred, including who asked for the assessment, who participated, and identify missing elements such as data or stakeholder input.
- d. **Adapt** the assessment to your needs and reach out for assistance as needed. This is not a prescriptive or linear process.

STEP 2: Scoping & Decision Guide

These steps are designed to help you “scope” the nature of the request for tool use, and decide whether to use the tool in this situation. The following questions should be completed with as much detail as possible. Writing these down is a best practice to ensure clarity throughout the analysis process.

SCOPING QUESTIONS (attach separate sheets of paper as needed)

1. Who made the request to conduct the analysis?
2. Why did this request arise?
3. Why is there a desire to do this analysis now?
4. When did the project or issue that is the subject of the analysis begin? When is its anticipated end date?
5. What are the potential large-scale implications of this analysis with regard to public policy, budget, or impacts?
6. What is your plan for communicating: A) the potential large-scale implications listed above; as well as B) the Racial Equity Assessment process and recommendations to relevant department head(s), director, Board of Trustees, staff and/ or community stakeholders?

DECISION GUIDE

	Yes	Unsure	No	Notes
1. Has everyone involved in the analysis reviewed the best practices included in Step 1?				If there are questions about the best practices, consider asking ARTT for support.
2. Is your department prepared to make real change as a part of this tool?				If decision makers are not willing to make an attempt at change as a result of the analysis, it may not be recommended to use the tool.
3. Is the subject of the analysis in the early stages of planning?				If the subject of the analysis is already planned or is in its final stages, it may not be recommended to use a tool.
4. Does the subject of the analysis involve one or two (less than 3) departments?				If the subject of the analysis involves three or more departments, consider asking ARTT for guidance
5. Was the analysis requested from the ARTT, Department Head(s), or another employee?				If the analysis was requested by an external stakeholder or elected official, please contact ARTT for support.

Mostly ‘Yes’ column = It seems like this is an appropriate use of racial equity tools. Continue to Step 3. ARTT can provide technical assistance as needed.

Mostly ‘Unsure’ and Mostly ‘No’ columns = This may not be an appropriate use of racial equity tools. Email ARTT@kpl.gov for discussion & technical assistance and/or support.

STEP 3: CONDUCT THE ANALYSIS

STEP 4: FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

After the analysis is complete, please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge, incorporating input from those who participated in the analysis. You can complete these questions at this survey monkey link: www.surveymonkey.com/REA/2020

1. Department
2. Project name
3. Your name (optional)
4. What were the final recommendations?
5. How did you communicate the recommendations to your department’s management, the director, Board of Trustees, staff and/or community stakeholders?
6. Were these recommendations implemented? Why or why not?
7. In general, what went well with the assessment?
8. What did the analysis cause you and your team to consider that you wouldn’t have been considered otherwise? Did you consider the results to be a success? Did the Racial Equity Assessment contribute to the success of the project? Why or why not?

- 9. What challenges did you and your team experience in the analysis?
- 10. Were there any questions that worked particularly well for your assessment? Any that did not work well? Please explain.
- 11. Do you have any recommended changes for the tool or the assessment process? Please share:

KPL Neighborhood Data Sheet

Summary

Neighborhood	# POC	% POC	# White	% White	Income	Poverty	Renting	Paying over 50% income on Rent	Eviction Rate*	Home Value
Northside	4804	91.37%	454	8.63%	\$25,676	45.68%	53.59%	43.30%	13.91%	\$54,900
Eastside	2389	80.90%	564	19.10%	\$27,627	39.14%	40.91%	44.17%	14.13%	\$54,100
Edison	4504	55.07%	3674	44.93%	\$25,267	34.82%	51.22%	33.40%	12.94%	\$53,400
Milwood	2339	27.99%	6018	72.01%	\$46,842	12.33%	41.20%	20.72%	6.53%	\$104,600
Southside	247	26.62%	681	73.38%	\$40,288	24.36%	40.40%	40.43%	10.49%	\$102,500
Downtown	521	26.35%	1456	73.65%	\$22,009	31.26%	92.19%	19.66%	3.97%	\$124,600
Oakwood	384	25.05%	1149	74.95%	\$37,723	19.49%	38.35%	17.46%	10.28%	\$76,800
Vine	1188	23.13%	3948	76.87%	\$33,503	31.72%	82.62%	26.37%	5.28%	\$69,200
Oakland/Winchell	568	17.69%	2642	82.31%	\$68,917	8.76%	24.53%	15.30%	4.49%	\$161,800
Westwood Panhandle	229	13.86%	1423	86.14%	\$52,264	19.30%	45.26%	29.72%	3.99%	\$146,300
Westnedge Hill	492	12.56%	3426	87.44%	\$66,647	11.17%	29.12%	14.88%	4.34%	\$147,200

Source: Census, American Community Survey, 2012-2016
 Eviction Data Source: *Eviction Lab* (2018)
 last updated: 11/6/2019

As the yellow highlights show, a major pattern running through the data is that Kalamazoo's three segregated neighborhoods are on the bottom end of virtually every metric. I chose to ignore Downtown when it comes to renters because downtown is naturally a high rental community, with mostly luxury rentals. Downtown *income* should be interpreted with the knowledge that it includes the people living in the Gospel Mission. It certainly doesn't mean that downtown renters are poor. (M. Smith)

Neighborhood	Census Tract	Block Group(s)
Downtown	2.01	1
Eastside	1	1-3
Edison	9	1-2
	10	1-7
	11	1
Milwood	18.01	1-4
	18.02	1-3
Northside	2.02	1
	3	1-5
Oakwood	16.03	1,2
Southside	11	2
South Westnedge	17.01	1-4
	17.02	3-4
Vine	6	1-5
	11	3
Westnedge Hill	12	1,2
	17.02	1,2
Westwood Panhandle	15.06	1
Oakland/Winchell	16.01	1-3
	12	3

KPL Racial Disparities Among Community Identities Data Sheet

Population by Race (City)

White	Black	2+ Races	Asian	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Other	Hispanic/Latino (of all races*)
52755	16360	4457	1857	267	20	996	5152
68.77%	21.33%	5.81%	2.42%	0.35%	0.03%	1.30%	6.72%

Source: Census, American Community Survey 2012-2016
updated: 11/6/2019

*Hispanic/Latino is not a “race” but an “ethnicity” on the Census. 65% of the Latinx population reported their race as white. The non-white Latinx population of Kalamazoo is 4.4%, while the total Latinx population is 6.7%.

Poverty by Race (City)

Race	% Below Poverty
American Indian/Alaska Native	56.56%
2+ races	45.81%
Black	40.47%
Asian	40.17%
Hispanic	35.09%
White	28.38%

Source: Census, American Community Survey 2012-2016
updated: 11/6/2019

Households with Children in Poverty by Race (City)

Race	Below Poverty Line
American Indian/Alaska Native	84.75%
Black	44.68%
Hispanic	33.67%
2+ races	29.84%
White	23.58%
Asian	15.94%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0%

Source: Census, American Community Survey 2012-2016
updated: 11/6/2019

Population by Race (County)

White	213,751	81.28%
Black	28,004	10.65%
American Indian and Alaska Native	522	0.20%
Asian	6,890	2.62%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	303	0.12%
Some other race	1,098	0.42%
Two or more races:	11,738	4.46%

Hispanic	12,997	4.94%
----------	--------	-------

Median Family Income by Race (City)

City of Kalamazoo	\$46,935
White non-Hispanic	\$60,462
Black	\$29,565
American Indian/ Alaska Native	\$18,975
Asian	\$37,402
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	*Sample too small*
Other	\$45,556
2 or more races	\$32,311
Hispanic/Latino	\$40,789

Source: Census, American Community Survey 2012-2016

Adapted with permission from Process Guide, City of Madison, Wisconsin. <https://www.cityofmadison.com/civil-rights/programs/racial-equity-social-justice-initiative/tools-resources>