Ei
EQUALITY INDICATORS

Measuring Change
Toward Greater Equality in New York City

Poverty

INDICATOR 1:
RACE & POVERTY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **+1**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of Asians and whites living below the poverty line	
Results:	2015: Asian (A): 25.8% White (W): 14.3% **A-to-W ratio = 1.804, score 48**	2018: Asian (A): 24.1% White (W): 13.4% **A-to-W ratio = 1.799, score 49**
More findings:	Asians had the highest NYCgov poverty rate of all racial and ethnic groups in the current year (24.1%), followed closely by Hispanics (23.9%) and blacks (19.2%). Whites had the lowest poverty rate by far (13.4%). The poverty rate decreased for all groups from baseline, but the disparity between Asians and whites remained almost unchanged. In the current year, poverty also varied by borough, with the highest rate in the Bronx (25.0%), followed by Brooklyn (20.5%), Queens (19.2%), Staten Island (16.9%), and Manhattan (13.9%).	
Data sources:	NYC Opportunity *New York City Government Poverty Measure 2005-2016*, 2013–2016	
Rationale for this indicator:	Poverty can have pervasive, debilitating effects on adults and children. In the US, whites have a much lower poverty rate than other racial and ethnic groups do. Although blacks have the highest rate of poverty nationwide, Asians and Hispanics have the highest rates in NYC.	

INDICATOR 2:
RACE & FOOD SECURITY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **-2**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of Hispanics and whites with low or very low food security	
Results:	2015: Hispanic (H): 29.3% White (W): 8.5% **H-to-W ratio = 3.447, score 31**	2018: Hispanic (H): 23.4% White (W): 6.4% **H-to-W ratio = 3.656, score 29**
More findings:	The rate of low or very low food security continued to be highest for Hispanics (23.4%), followed closely by blacks (19.2%). Low or very low food security was least likely among whites (6.4%), while the rate among Asians fell in the middle (11.7%). Rates decreased from baseline for Hispanics (from 29.3%), blacks (from 24.3%), and whites (from 8.5%), but increased for Asians (from 10.7%). When looking specifically at children, Asian children were the most likely to experience low or very low food security (12.4%), followed by black (12.2%), Hispanic (9.9%), and white (8.3%) children. Food security also varied by disability status: 31.2% of individuals with disabilities experienced food insecurity, compared to 11.3% of those without disabilities.	
Data sources:	Current Population Survey *Food Security Supplement*, 2014–2017	
Rationale for this indicator:	Hunger and poor nutrition can have severe consequences for people's health and wellbeing and jeopardizes children's development and learning. In the US, food insecurity is disproportionately high among racial and ethnic minorities, children, the elderly, and in low-income households.	

INDICATOR 3:
CITIZENSHIP STATUS & POVERTY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **+4**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of non-citizens and citizens living below the poverty line	
Results:	2015: Non-citizens (NC): 29.5% Citizens (C): 18.9% **NC-to-C ratio = 1.561, score 58**	2018: Non-citizens (NC): 26.5% Citizens (C): 18.0% **NC-to-C ratio = 1.472, score 62**
More findings:	The NYCgov poverty rate for non-citizens (26.5%) was almost 1.5 times higher than the poverty rate for citizens (18.0%), a slightly smaller disparity than in the baseline year, when 29.5% of non-citizens and 18.9% of citizens lived in poverty. In the current year, naturalized citizens were also more likely to live below the poverty line (19.1%), compared to citizens by birth (17.6%). Poverty rates also varied by educational attainment: those with less than a high school diploma were most likely to live in poverty (31.5%), compared to those with a high school diploma (22.9%), some college (16.9%), and a bachelor's degree or higher (8.0%).	
Data sources:	NYC Opportunity *New York City Government Poverty Measure 2005-2016*, 2013–2016	
Rationale for this indicator:	Poverty has severe, pervasive effects on people's health, education, employment opportunities, and housing, and on children's development. Nationwide and in NYC, immigrants, particularly those who are not US citizens, have substantially higher levels of poverty than citizens do.	

INDICATOR 4:
FAMILY COMPOSITION & POVERTY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **-1**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of people in single-parent and two-parent households living below the poverty line	
Results:	2015: Single-parent households (SP): 29.5% Two-parent households (TP): 16.2% **SP-to-TP ratio = 1.821, score 48**	2018: Single-parent households (SP): 29.2% Two-parent households (TP): 16.0% **SP-to-TP ratio = 1.825, score 47**
More findings:	Almost one in three (29.2%) people in single-parent households lived below the NYCgov poverty line in the current year, compared to 16.0% of those living in dual-parent households. Poverty rates for both groups remained similar to the baseline year, and there was negligible change in the disparity. Poverty was particularly pervasive among children: just under one in four (22.2%) children lived in poverty, compared to 18.3% of individuals aged 18-64, and 20.8% of those 65 and older.	
Data sources:	NYC Opportunity *New York City Government Poverty Measure 2005-2016*, 2013–2016	
Rationale for this indicator:	Poverty has damaging short- and long-term effects for children and adults. It affects almost every area of life, from health to education to criminal justice outcomes. Nationwide, people in single-parent households are markedly more likely to live in poverty than those in two-parent households.	

Employment

INDICATOR 5:
RACE & UNEMPLOYMENT

CHANGE FROM BASELINE: **+10**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the unemployment rates for blacks and whites
Results:	**2015:** Black (B): 9.7% White (W): 3.5% **B-to-W ratio = 2.771, score 35** / **2018:** Black (B): 7.2% White (W): 3.8% **B-to-W ratio = 1.895, score 45**
More findings:	The unemployment rate was highest for blacks (7.2%), followed by Hispanics (4.7%). The group with the lowest unemployment rate in the current year was Asians (2.4%), followed by whites (3.8%). Unemployment decreased from the baseline year for blacks (from 9.7%), Hispanics (from 8.1%), and Asians (6.6%), but increased for whites (from 3.5%), contributing to the smaller disparity between blacks and whites in the current year. There were also disparities based on educational attainment: the unemployment rate among those without a high school diploma was 10.1%, compared to 5.2% for those with a high school diploma and 3.1% for those with a bachelor's degree.
Data sources:	Current Population Survey *Annual Social and Economic Supplement*, 2015–2018
Rationale for this indicator:	In addition to its importance to individuals' and families' wellbeing, the unemployment rate is a reflection of the labor force and the broader economy. In the US and in NYC, the unemployment rate among blacks is dramatically higher than the rate among whites.

INDICATOR 6:
DISABILITY & UNEMPLOYMENT

CHANGE FROM BASELINE: **-3**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the unemployment rates for people with and without disabilities
Results:	**2015:** With disabilities (WD): 16.0% Without disabilities (WOD): 7.9% **WD-to-WOD ratio = 2.025, score 40** / **2018:** With disabilities (WD): 14.7% Without disabilities (WOD): 6.0% **WD-to-WOD ratio = 2.450, score 37**
More findings:	The unemployment rate among people with disabilities (14.7%) was higher than the rate among those without disabilities (6.0%). Unemployment decreased from baseline for both groups, but the disparity between the two got slightly worse. Employment status varied by type of disability: 23.6% of individuals with cognitive disabilities were unemployed, compared to 13.7% of those with hearing difficulty, 13.1% of those with vision difficulty, and 12.7% of those with ambulatory difficulty. It is important to note that more than half of people with disabilities (58.8%) were not in the labor force, and not included in these rates, compared to 21.0% of those without disabilities.
Data sources:	American Community Survey *1-year estimates*, 2014–2017
Rationale for this indicator:	Employment is important to most adults' quality of life and that of their families, and it is one measure of the state of the labor force and the broader economy. Nationally and in NYC, people with a disability have a higher unemployment rate than those without a disability.

INDICATOR 7:
PROBATION STATUS & UNEMPLOYMENT

CHANGE FROM BASELINE: **0**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the unemployment rates for probation clients and the general population
Results:	**2015:** Probation clients (P): 62.4% General population (GP): 6.2% **P-to-GP ratio = 10.065, score 1** / **2018:** Probation clients (P): 44.2% General population (GP): 4.0% **P-to-GP ratio = 11.050, score 1**
More findings:	We saw a large decrease in the reported unemployment rate among those on probation, dropping from 62.4% in the baseline year to 44.2% in the current year. While there is reason to believe that unemployment has decreased among people on probation , the magnitude of the change is also driven, in part, by improvements in the process of collecting and reporting employment data at the Department of Probation. Previously, employment data was only collected once during the probation intake process, and last year the Department began regularly updating the employment status of those on probation as they gained employment. However , unemployment for the general population also decreased from baseline, leading to an increase in the disparity between the two groups and a static score remaining at 1.
Data sources:	Department of Probation *by request* and NYS Bureau of Labor Statistics *website*, 2015–2018
Rationale for this indicator:	A criminal record often creates numerous barriers to employment, even eliminating eligibility for some jobs. More than 3.9 million adults are on probation in the US, and this population has a substantially higher rate of unemployment than people not under such supervision.

INDICATOR 8:
EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

CHANGE FROM BASELINE: **0**

Indicator defined:	Percentage of cash assistance recipients who were no longer employed 180 days after being placed in a job
Results:	**2015:** Cash assistance recipients no longer employed: **26.1%, score 74** / **2018:** Cash assistance recipients no longer employed: **26.2%, score 74**
More findings:	In fiscal year 2018, a total of 593,900 people received cash assistance from HRA and 105,300 received emergency assistance. In addition to monetary benefits, HRA provides employment assistance to current and former recipients of cash assistance. Approximately one quarter (26.2%) of current or former cash assistance recipients were no longer employed 180 days after HRA had helped them to obtain employment, demonstrating a continued lack of employment stability. These numbers have remained almost unchanged from the baseline year.
Data sources:	Human Resources Administration *Mayor's Management Report*, FY2015–FY2018
Rationale for this indicator:	Research suggests that programs that offer financial incentives, job coaching, and advice after job placement may improve job retention and earnings. Thus, programs that combine cash assistance with employment services may increase job retention and earnings, and help reduce poverty.

Business Development

INDICATOR 13:
RACE/GENDER & CITY CONTRACTS

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of small versus large contracts going to minority and women-owned business enterprises
Results:	2015: Small contracts ≤ $100k (S): 24.0% Large contracts > $1M (L): 13.6% **S-to-L Ratio = 1.765, score 50**	2018: Small contracts ≤ $100k (S): 46.7% Large contracts > $1M (L): 20.9% **S-to-L ratio = 2.234, score 39**
More findings:	Of the 6,829 City-certified MWBEs in fiscal year 2018, 1,396 (20.4%) were awarded City contracts. MWBEs still tend to be awarded smaller contracts: 46.7% of contracts with values less than $100,000 were awarded to MWBEs, compared to 20.9% of contracts with values over one million dollars. The percentages of contracts awarded to MWBEs increased in both categories from the baseline year, when 24.0% of small contracts and 13.6% of large contracts were awarded to MWBEs, but the disparity between the two increased. We note that these data exclude City contracts for goods, because all goods contracts are less than $100,000 dollars in value.	
Data sources:	Mayor's Office of Contract Services *Agency Procurement Indicators Report*, FY2015–FY2018	
Rationale for this indicator:	In the US, women and racial and ethnic minorities face greater challenges to starting and maintaining a business than white men. Minority and women-owned business enterprise certification should increase access to government opportunities, but it may not lead to City contracts.	

INDICATOR 14:
RACE & BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of blacks and whites who are business owners
Results:	2015: Black (B): 1.7% White (W): 4.9% **W-to-B ratio = 2.882, score 35**	2018: Black (B): 1.4% White (W): 6.0% **W-to-B ratio = 4.286, score 25**
More findings:	Blacks remain the racial and ethnic group least likely to be business owners at 1.4%, compared to 2.3% of Hispanics, 4.4% of Asians, and 6.0% of whites. The disparity between blacks and whites increased in the current year due to a decrease in business ownership among blacks (from 1.7% at baseline) and an increase in business ownership among whites (from 4.9%). There were also disparities by marital status: married individuals were more likely to be business owners (5.4%) than those who were divorced (4.2%), widowed (3.9%), separated (2.4%), or never married (2.1%).	
Data sources:	American Community Survey *1-year PUMS*, 2014–2017	
Rationale for this indicator:	Starting a business fuels economic development and can help alleviate income disparities for racial and ethnic minorities. In the US, blacks and Hispanics own businesses at much lower rates than whites and Asians do, and when they do, their businesses are typically smaller and have less favorable outcomes.	

INDICATOR 15:
GENDER & BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of women and men who are business owners
Results:	2015: Women (W): 2.1% Men (M): 4.6% **M-to-W ratio = 2.190, score 39**	2018: Women (W): 2.7% Men (M): 4.8% **M-to-W ratio = 1.778, score 49**
More findings:	From baseline to the current year, business ownership rates for both men and women increased and the gender gap narrowed, resulting in a moderate increase in score for this indicator. However, men (4.8%) are still nearly 1.8 times more likely to own businesses than women (2.7%). The business ownership rate also varied across the five boroughs: the business ownership rate was highest among those residing in Manhattan (5.0%) and Staten Island (5.0%), followed by Queens (3.8%), Brooklyn (3.5%), and the Bronx (1.9%).	
Data sources:	American Community Survey *1-year PUMS*, 2014–2017	
Rationale for this indicator:	Owning a successful business benefits individuals, their families, and communities, and can alleviate income disparities. The number of businesses owned by women has grown in NYC and the US; however, they are still in the minority among business owners, and women business owners face greater challenges than men when accessing capital to grow their businesses.	

INDICATOR 16:
LOCATION & BUSINESS REVENUE

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of sales tax collected from businesses located outside and within Manhattan
Results:	2015: Non-Manhattan (NM): 36.1% Manhattan (M): 63.9% **M-to-NM ratio = 1.770, score 50**	2018: Non-Manhattan (NM): 36.9% Manhattan (M): 63.1% **M-to-NM ratio = 1.710, score 52**
More findings:	Manhattan continues to generate the majority of sales tax collected from the five boroughs (63.1%), generating more than 1.7 times the percentage of sales tax collected from all other boroughs combined (36.9%). This disparity has remained relatively stable from baseline to the current year, with a negligible change in score. Within the outer boroughs, 15.8% of sales tax was collected from Brooklyn, 14.2% was collected from Queens, 4.8% was collected from the Bronx, and 2.0% was collected from Staten Island.	
Data sources:	NYS Department of Taxation and Finance *by request*, 3/2014-2/2015–3/2017-2/2018	
Rationale for this indicator:	Business development fuels economic growth by creating new jobs, and successful businesses contribute to employment, self-sufficiency, and prosperity. An increase in the proportion of business taxes paid in given parts of a jurisdiction reflects business development in those areas.	

INDICATOR 21:
RACE & MATH PROFICIENCY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **-2**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of blacks and Asians in grades 3-8 rated less than proficient on the math Common Core	
Results:	2015: Black (B): 80.9% Asian (A): 33.2% **B-to-A ratio = 2.437, score 38**	2018: Black (B): 74.6% Asian (A): 27.8% **B-to-A ratio = 2.683, score 36**
More findings:	The percentages of students who were not proficient on the math Common Core decreased from baseline for all racial and ethnic groups, but there was very little change in the disparity between black and Asian students. Three in four black students were not proficient (down from 80.9% at baseline), compared to 69.7% of Hispanic students (down from 76.3%), 36.4% of white students (down from 43.3%), and 27.8% of Asian students (down from 33.2%). There was also a large disparity by disability status, with 84.6% of students with disabilities not proficient, compared to 49.7% of those without disabilities.	
Data sources:	Department of Education *Math Data File*, 2015–2018	
Rationale for this indicator:	Math skills are not only valuable in the context of school, but are needed for everyday calculations and can enhance employment opportunities. Nationwide, Asians have the highest math scores followed by whites, while blacks and Hispanics lag behind.	

INDICATOR 22:
RACE & PRINCIPAL EXPERIENCE

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **+37**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the median years of principal experience in majority black and majority Asian schools	
Results:	2015: Black (B): 4.00 Asian (A): 8.30 **A-to-B ratio = 2.075, score 40**	2018: Black (B): 5.00 Asian (A): 5.80 **A-to-B ratio = 1.160, score 77**
More findings:	The median years of principal experience was highest in majority Asian schools (5.80), followed by majority Hispanic (5.30), majority white (5.25), and majority black schools (5.00), but the disparity between majority black and majority Asian schools saw a large improvement from baseline. This positive change was due to an increase in median years of principal experience in majority black schools (up from 4.00 at baseline), coupled with a decrease in majority Asian schools (down from 8.30). The median years of principal experience also decreased from baseline in majority Hispanic schools (down from 6.20) and majority white schools (down from 6.05).	
Data sources:	Department of Education *School Quality Report*, AY2013-2014–AY2016-2017	
Rationale for this indicator:	Principals with greater experience are more likely to support teachers' sense of self-efficacy and can lead to better student outcomes, such as performance on standardized tests, fewer absences and suspensions, and higher graduation rates. This may be particularly true of experienced principals in schools with a majority-minority student body.	

INDICATOR 23:
INCOME & SCHOOL SAFETY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **-1**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the average percentages of students in schools located in the bottom and top income areas who do not feel safe in the area outside their school	
Results:	2015: Bottom (B): 27.3% Top (T): 17.5% **B-to-T ratio = 1.560, score 58**	2018: Bottom (B): 26.3% Top (T): 16.5% **B-to-T ratio = 1.594, score 57**
More findings:	The average percentages of students who reported that they did not feel safe in the area outside their school decreased slightly from the baseline year in both the bottom and top 20% median income census tracts; however, the disparity between the two remained almost unchanged. Schools in low-income areas were also more likely than schools in high-income areas to have students report that they do not feel safe traveling to school (17.4%, compared to 11.4%), in the classroom (10.6%, compared to 8.3%), and in school hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, and cafeterias (16.8%, compared to 15.3%).	
Data sources:	Department of Education *NYC School Survey*, 2015–2018	
Rationale for this indicator:	School safety can affect both physical and mental health, as well as ability to thrive in school. In the US, parents with lower incomes are more likely than those with higher incomes to report school safety as a serious problem.	

INDICATOR 24:
DISABILITY & ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

CHANGE FROM
BASELINE: **-17**

Indicator defined:	Ratio between the percentages of students with and without disabilities in grades 3-8 rated less than proficient on the English Language Arts Common Core	
Results:	2015: With disabilities (WD): 93.1% Without disabilities (WOD): 63.2% **WD-to-WOD ratio = 1.473, score 62**	2018: With disabilities (WD): 84.2% Without disabilities (WOD): 44.8% **WD-to-WOD ratio = 1.879, score 45**
More findings:	Students in grades 3-8 with and without disabilities improved their proficiency on the English Language Arts Common Core, but there was a larger disparity between these groups than in the baseline year. Among students with disabilities, 84.2% were less than proficient on the English Language Arts Common Core, compared to 44.8% of students without disabilities. There were also large racial and ethnic differences in proficiency: 66.0% of black and 64.1% of Hispanic students were not proficient in English Language Arts, compared to 33.5% of white and 32.8% of Asian students. When broken down by gender, boys were more likely not to be proficient (59.3%) than girls (47.2%).	
Data sources:	Department of Education *English Language Arts Data File*, 2015–2018	
Rationale for this indicator:	More than 19% of students in NYC public schools are classified as students with disabilities, and students with disabilities often face substantial challenges in learning and at school. In the US, students with disabilities have dramatically lower levels of proficiency in math and reading than those without disabilities.	

Appendix D:
Ratio-to-Score Conversion Table

SCORE RANGE	RATIO FROM	RATIO TO	INCREASE BY
100	1.000	1.004	n/a
99	1.005	1.009	+0.005
98	1.010	1.014	+0.005
97	1.015	1.019	+0.005
96	1.020	1.024	+0.005
95	1.025	1.029	+0.005
94	1.030	1.034	+0.005
93	1.035	1.039	+0.005
92	1.040	1.044	+0.005
91	1.045	1.049	+0.005
90	1.050	1.054	+0.005
89	1.055	1.059	+0.005
88	1.060	1.064	+0.005
87	1.065	1.069	+0.005
86	1.070	1.074	+0.005
85	1.075	1.079	+0.005
84	1.080	1.084	+0.005
83	1.085	1.089	+0.005
82	1.090	1.094	+0.005
81	1.095	1.099	+0.005
80	1.100	1.119	+0.020
79	1.120	1.139	+0.020
78	1.140	1.159	+0.020
77	1.160	1.179	+0.020
76	1.180	1.199	+0.020
75	1.200	1.219	+0.020
74	1.220	1.239	+0.020
73	1.240	1.259	+0.020
72	1.260	1.279	+0.020
71	1.280	1.299	+0.020
70	1.300	1.319	+0.020
69	1.320	1.339	+0.020
68	1.340	1.359	+0.020
67	1.360	1.379	+0.020
66	1.380	1.399	+0.020
65	1.400	1.419	+0.020
64	1.420	1.439	+0.020
63	1.440	1.459	+0.020
62	1.460	1.479	+0.020
61	1.480	1.499	+0.020
60	1.500	1.524	+0.025
59	1.525	1.549	+0.025
58	1.550	1.574	+0.025
57	1.575	1.599	+0.025
56	1.600	1.624	+0.025
55	1.625	1.649	+0.025
54	1.650	1.674	+0.025
53	1.675	1.699	+0.025
52	1.700	1.724	+0.025
51	1.725	1.749	+0.025

SCORE RANGE	RATIO FROM	RATIO TO	INCREASE BY
50	1.750	1.774	+0.025
49	1.775	1.799	+0.025
48	1.800	1.824	+0.025
47	1.825	1.849	+0.025
46	1.850	1.874	+0.025
45	1.875	1.899	+0.025
44	1.900	1.924	+0.025
43	1.925	1.949	+0.025
42	1.950	1.974	+0.025
41	1.975	1.999	+0.025
40	2.000	2.149	+0.150
39	2.150	2.299	+0.150
38	2.300	2.449	+0.150
37	2.450	2.599	+0.150
36	2.600	2.749	+0.150
35	2.750	2.899	+0.150
34	2.900	3.049	+0.150
33	3.050	3.199	+0.150
32	3.200	3.349	+0.150
31	3.350	3.499	+0.150
30	3.500	3.649	+0.150
29	3.650	3.799	+0.150
28	3.800	3.949	+0.150
27	3.950	4.099	+0.150
26	4.100	4.249	+0.150
25	4.250	4.399	+0.150
24	4.400	4.549	+0.150
23	4.550	4.699	+0.150
22	4.700	4.849	+0.150
21	4.850	4.999	+0.150
20	5.000	5.249	+0.250
19	5.250	5.499	+0.250
18	5.500	5.749	+0.250
17	5.750	5.999	+0.250
16	6.000	6.249	+0.250
15	6.250	6.499	+0.250
14	6.500	6.749	+0.250
13	6.750	6.999	+0.250
12	7.000	7.249	+0.250
11	7.250	7.499	+0.250
10	7.500	7.749	+0.250
9	7.750	7.999	+0.250
8	8.000	8.249	+0.250
7	8.250	8.499	+0.250
6	8.500	8.749	+0.250
5	8.750	8.999	+0.250
4	9.000	9.249	+0.250
3	9.250	9.499	+0.250
2	9.500	9.749	+0.250
1	9.750	9.999	+0.250

Appendix E:
Ranked Indicator Change Scores

Indicator	Change
Ind. 18 Income & child care facilities	+61
Ind. 95 Location & public library availability	+60
Ind. 22 Race & principal experience	+37
Ind. 94 Location & senior access to the arts	+35
Ind. 61 Race & neighborhood family friendliness	+34
Ind. 90 Disability & playground accessibility	+29
Ind. 73 Race & representation in government	+28
Ind. 62 Income & trust in neighbors	+26
Ind. 35 Income & senior flu vaccination	+24
Ind. 89 Income & access to parks	+21
Ind. 34 Race & medical care	+19
Ind. 33 Race & health insurance	+18
Ind. 70 Race & trust in police	+18
Ind. 29 Race & degree attainment	+15
Ind. 19 Income & pre-K quality	+13
Ind. 32 Incarceration & vocational training	+13
Ind. 83 Disability & taxi accessibility	+13
Ind. 88 Location & EMS response times	+13
Ind. 52 Age & length of shelter stay	+12
Ind. 57 Race & overcrowding	+12
Ind. 5 Race & unemployment	+10
Ind. 15 Gender & business ownership	+10
Ind. 79 Disability & voting access	+10
Ind. 71 Race & jail admissions	+9
Ind. 72 Religion & trust in police	+9
Ind. 96 Parental education & children's arts participation	+9
Ind. 39 Race & sexually transmitted diseases	+8
Ind. 9 Race & income	+7
Ind. 47 Income & smoking	+7
Ind. 26 Race & school discipline	+5
Ind. 48 Income & exercise	+5
Ind. 80 Location & participatory budgeting	+5
Ind. 3 Citizenship status & poverty	+4
Ind. 82 Disability & subway accessibility	+4
Ind. 93 Income & funding for the arts	+4
Ind. 10 Income & retirement savings	+3
Ind. 36 Immigration status/gender & personal doctor	+3
Ind. 74 Race & representation in City management	+3
Ind. 76 Education & political empowerment	+3
Ind. 92 Location & access to senior centers	+3
Ind. 16 Location & business revenue	+2
Ind. 17 Race & pre-K diversity	+2
Ind. 51 Age & homelessness	+2
Ind. 1 Race & poverty	+1
Ind. 40 Income & chronic hepatitis B	+1
Ind. 75 Gender & representation in government	+1
Ind. 77 Race & voter turnout	+1
Ind. 7 Probation status & unemployment	0

Indicator	Change
Ind. 8 Employment assistance	0
Ind. 30 Race & post-degree employment	0
Ind. 31 Gender & science degrees	0
Ind. 41 Race & cardiovascular deaths	0
Ind. 66 Race & domestic violence homicide	0
Ind. 4 Family composition & poverty	-1
Ind. 20 Family composition & early school enrollment	-1
Ind. 23 Income & school safety	-1
Ind. 38 Race & diabetes hospitalization	-1
Ind. 53 Race & severe rent burden	-1
Ind. 55 Race & home purchase loan denial	-1
Ind. 60 Public housing & murder	-1
Ind. 65 Race & violent victimization	-1
Ind. 2 Race & food security	-2
Ind. 21 Race & math proficiency	-2
Ind. 42 Race & infant mortality	-2
Ind. 44 Income & heroin deaths	-2
Ind. 45 Race & low birthweight	-2
Ind. 69 Race & misdemeanor arrest	-2
Ind. 6 Disability & unemployment	-3
Ind. 11 Immigration status & income	-3
Ind. 27 Disability & on-time graduation	-3
Ind. 46 Race & sugary drink consumption	-3
Ind. 50 Child homelessness status & school attendance	-3
Ind. 63 Income & neighborhood family friendliness	-3
Ind. 78 Income & voter turnout	-3
Ind. 64 Sexual orientation & housing stability	-4
Ind. 91 Disability & recreation center accessibility	-4
Ind. 87 Immigration status & stove/range	-5
Ind. 12 Gender & income	-6
Ind. 43 Race & HIV-related deaths	-6
Ind. 37 Race & asthma hospitalization	-7
Ind. 68 Hate crime victimization	-7
Ind. 84 Location & bicycle lanes	-7
Ind. 54 Race & homeownership	-8
Ind. 14 Race & business ownership	-10
Ind. 49 Recent immigration status/youth homelessness	-10
Ind. 58 Income & heat/hot water	-10
Ind. 59 Income & vermin infestation	-10
Ind. 13 Race/gender & City contracts	-11
Ind. 25 Race & academic performance	-12
Ind. 28 Income & on-time graduation	-12
Ind. 86 Race & Internet access	-13
Ind. 24 Disability & English proficiency	-17
Ind. 81 Race & commuting time	-19
Ind. 56 Sexual orientation & homeownership	-20
Ind. 85 Race & hot/cold running water	-26
Ind. 67 Foster care status & child abuse/neglect	-36