

We Hear You Task Force
Midland County Diversity, Equity, Inclusion Community Assessment Report
Executive Summary

Following this Executive Summary is a list of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice terminology which may help further understanding of this initiative and the information presented in this Executive Summary and larger We Hear You report.

We Hear You Executive Summary

Just days following the May 25, 2020 killing of George Floyd by Minneapolis Police, Midland City Council Member Diane Brown Wilhelm, Mayor Maureen Donker, and Chief of Police, Nicole Ford issued a public statement on June 4, 2020, condemning the killing of George Floyd.¹ On Sunday, June 7, 2020 an estimated 1,200 people demonstrated at the Rally for Racial Justice at the Ashman Circle in Midland, Michigan to protest George Floyd's murder in addition to the murder of Breonna Taylor by Louisville police March 13, 2020, and Ahmaud Arbery, an African American man, murdered while jogging in Glynn County, Georgia, February 23, 2020.² Speakers at the Midland rally shared their own experiences with racism, condemned institutional oppression, and demanded justice.

In addition to issuing the statement, the We Hear You (WHY) task force was convened to develop strategies and consider actions to advance and ensure equity, inclusion and justice in our community.³ The task force agreed a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) community assessment was needed to help inform these actions and identified the following six areas of study⁴:

- Demographics
- Housing
- Socioeconomics
- Healthcare
- Policing and Criminal Justice
- Government Structure/Representation

¹ <https://cityofmidlandmi.gov/1862/We-Hear-You-Coalition>. On April 20, 2021, the police officer responsible for George Floyd's death was convicted of second and third-degree murder and second-degree manslaughter. On June 25, 2021 the officer was sentenced to 22 ½ years in prison.

² "Rally for Racial Justice' draws more than 1,200 to Midland: Organized by group of Midland college students, support from WOMAN" in *Midland Daily News*, Mitchell Kukulka, June 7, 2020, accessed August 13, 2020. See also Dan Chalk, "Hindsight 2020: Midlanders advocate for racial justice," in *Midland Daily News*, December 19, 2020, <https://www.ourmidland.com/news/article/Hindsight-2020-Midlanders-advocate-for-racial-15814570.php>

³ The We Hear You task Force is comprised of Jim Branson, Diane Brown Wilhelm, Alysia Christy, Maureen Donker, Ricky Fields, Nicole Ford, Perry Holman, Kenneth Jolly, Brad Kaye, Sharon Mortensen, Scott Noesen, Evelyn Ravuri, Billy J. Strawter, Sr., Gina Wilson.

⁴ The *We Hear You* study was not tasked with analysis of the local education system and the experiences of students in Midland County schools.

On July 13, 2020, the Midland City Council voted unanimously to support this initiative and on October 20, 2020 the Midland County Board of Commissioners similarly passed a resolution supporting this work.⁵

The We Hear You initiative comprises three components, a summary report; Community Survey; and Community DEI Dashboards. The first component consists of an analysis of data on Midland County demographics, housing, socio-economic characteristics, healthcare, policing and criminal justice, and government structure and representation by race/ethnicity within Midland County using such secondary data sources as the U.S. Census, the CDC, and the FBI. Analysis of data in these six areas for Midland County provided a baseline to assess the racial/ethnic climate in the community.

The full report repeatedly emphasizes collection and analysis of data is a first step to help develop intentional, strategic, assessed, accountable, and sustained actions to end inequity, injustice, and bias in our community. The report intentionally exposes areas of inequity and bias and draws attention to the intersecting and institutional, structural, and systemic location of inequity and the causes of disparities to help strategically develop sustained actions for inclusion, justice, and equity. Assistant Professor of African American Studies and Charles H. McIlwain University Preceptor at Princeton University, Dr. Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor explains,

Institutional racism, or structural racism, can be defined as the policies, programs, and practices of public and private institutions that result in greater rates of poverty, dispossession, criminalization, illness, and ultimately mortality of African Americans. Most importantly, it is the *outcome* [italics in original] that matters, not the intentions of the individuals involved. Institutional racism remains the best way to understand how Black deprivation continues in a country as rich and resource-filled as the United States.”⁶

In *White Fragility*, Robin DiAngelo explains racism “encompass[es] economic, political, social, and cultural structures, actions, and beliefs that systematize and perpetuate an unequal distribution of privileges, resources and power between white people and people of color.” DiAngelo adds, “This unequal distribution benefits whites and disadvantages people of color overall and as a group.” Further explaining, DiAngelo points out, “The direction of power between whites and people of color is historic, traditional, normalized, and deeply embedded in the fabric of U.S. society.”⁷

The We Hear You initiative aims to intentionally identify and focus attention on disparities, inequity, and bias to inform and direct sustained, assessed, and accountable actions for greater inclusion, justice, and equity to reach our community’s vision of “Together. Forward. Bold: An exceptional place where everyone thrives.”

⁵ <https://cityofmidlandmi.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/07132020-2235>

⁶ Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016), 8

⁷ Robin DiAngelo, “White Fragility,” in *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, Vol 3 (3) (2011), 56.

The second component, the We Hear You Community Survey, was developed to collect quantitative and qualitative data reflecting experiences and perceptions of equity in housing, socioeconomics, healthcare, policing and the criminal justice system, and government representation for racial/ethnic groups in Midland County⁸. These data provide a qualitative⁹ assessment that accompanies that of the quantitative data collected by government agencies (e.g. U.S. Census, CDC, FBI). The COVID-19 pandemic prevented availability of the survey in public locations, in-person interviews, and focus groups. We suggest that once the COVID-19 pandemic is less of an interruption to daily life that additional data concerning the socio-economic welfare and the experiences/perceptions concerning equity be collected for underrepresented populations in Midland County.

Data collected through the We Hear You study will be publicly available on the Community DEI Dashboards, the third component of the We Hear You initiative. These dashboards will present data from these six areas of focus and will include tools for data comparisons and additional analysis.

Characteristics of WHY Community Survey Respondents Compared to Midland County Residents:

The WHY Community Survey contained 89 questions and collected quantitative and qualitative data on Midland County demographics, housing, socioeconomics, healthcare and well-being, perceptions and interactions with the police and criminal justice system, local government representation, and personal experiences and perceptions of equity, justice and inclusion in the community. The WHY survey was launched online February 6, 2021 and closed on March 21, 2021. The final respondent count was 2,182. Respondents needed to be at least 18 years of age to participate in the survey.

As explained in the Notes on Methodology and Limitations of Data Sources section of the full report, the WHY Survey completion rate, defined as the percentage of individuals who began the survey and completed the last question, was 62 percent¹⁰. Of the total 2,182 respondents, 1,758 respondents completed question 2, “What is your race?”; 1,752 answered question 3, “Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?”; and 1,745 answered question 4, “Are you of Middle Eastern or North African ethnicity?” With this in mind, we urge caution when drawing conclusions based

⁸ The City of Dubuque, Iowa in their racial/equity study (2015) followed a methodology close to our methodology⁸. They consulted representative quantitative data on racial/ethnic groups using U.S. Census data and used this as a basis for their city equity profile. They then implemented a convenience survey in online and written format that was administered to about 2,000 residents. The survey focused on the experiences of residents in economics, housing, the criminal justice system, education, arts/culture, transportation, and healthcare. Additionally, the City of Dubuque conducted focus groups with 600 individuals divided among the seven different thematic areas.

⁹ The Seattle Racial/Ethnic survey (2017) and the 2019 ‘Race in America Survey’ by the Pew Research Center provided the original framework for our survey. Members of the WHY committee tailored these questions to more appropriately fit circumstances in Midland. Unlike the Seattle and Pew Surveys that were representative of the City of Seattle and the U.S., the WHY Survey is a convenience survey and is NOT representative of the population of Midland County. Please see the Notes on Methodology and Limitations of Data Sources section of the full report for a larger discussion of the limits of this data.

¹⁰ Almost 20 percent of respondents ended the survey during the first 10 questions. These questions collected demographic data on respondents (e.g. race, age, gender identification, median household income).

on the WHY Community Survey data as the respondent size was too small and not representative of the larger community to draw conclusions. Please also note, all percentages provided in the tables presenting WHY Survey data are based on the number of respondents who answered that particular question. These numbers are noted for each table. When referencing WHY Survey data, “total respondents” refers to the total respondents who answered that particular question rather than the total survey responses (2,182)¹¹.

The *We Hear You* Survey was a convenience survey and was not representative of the population of Midland County. While attempts were made through social agencies and community organizations to contact underrepresented groups, respondents to the *We Hear You* Survey were largely those of higher socioeconomics and individuals under the age of 55.

Table 1 displays demographic and socio-economic characteristics of WHY Survey Respondents in comparison to the residents of Midland County. The data for Midland County are from the ACS 2018 5-year estimates from the U.S. Census¹². These census data are the most recent data but lag the WHY survey responses by a few years. The importance of including these data is that the ACS data are representative of Midland County’s population and provide an overview of demographic, economic, and housing characteristics of Midland County¹³.

According to 2018 ACS data, non-Hispanic whites comprised the greatest percentage of Midland County’s population (91.5 percent) and accounted for the greatest percentage of WHY respondents (83.2 percent). However, African American, Asian American, Hispanic, Multiple Race, and Other Race were overrepresented in the WHY Survey in comparison to their representation in Midland County. For example, only 1.3 percent of Midland County’s total population was African American in 2018, but African Americans accounted for 6.7 percent of WHY respondents. The overrepresentation of African Americans, Asian Americans, Multiple Race, Other Race, and Hispanics in the WHY Survey may in part be due to concerted outreach efforts of the WHY committee.

WHY respondents in the 35-54 age range (46.0 percent) were overrepresented in comparison to their representation in Midland County (25.5 percent). Conversely, the over-65 population only accounted for 11.7 percent of respondents compared to 18.6 percent of Midland’s population. For additional discussion of the limits of the WHY Survey please see the Notes on Methodology and Limitations of Data Sources section in the full report.

Table 1 presents demographic and socio-economic characteristics of WHY Survey Respondents compared to Midland County residents.

¹¹ Most questions in the experiences/perceptions component of the survey consisted of questions based on a Likert Scale. ‘The Likert scale is a five (or seven) point scale which is used to allow the individual to express how much they agree or disagree with a particular statement’. Most questions came with comment boxes so that respondents could elaborate upon their experiences and perceptions as they pertain(ed) to racial/ethnic equity.

¹² U.S. Census. 2018. 5-yr. estimates. Midland County.

¹³ The Notes on Methodology and Limitations of Data Sources section in the full report also includes national representative data from the 2018 U.S. Census report concerning the percentage of population with an internet connection to highlight differences in internet accessibility by demographic and socio-economic characteristics. This provides additional explanation for differences between the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the WHY respondents and Midlanders as represented through ACS data.

Those with less than a high school diploma or equivalent were underrepresented in the WHY survey. Only 0.7 percent of respondents had less than a high school diploma in comparison to 5.7 percent of Midland County’s population. Conversely, 40.0 percent of respondents had a bachelor’s degree and 31.8 had at least a master’s degree in 2018 compared to 22.0 percent of Midland County’s population with a bachelor’s degree and 14.3 with at least a master’s degree.

Median household income of WHY respondents was also vastly different from median income of Midland County residents. Only 2.0 percent of WHY respondents made less than \$15,000 annually compared to 9.3 percent of Midland’s population. Conversely, 25.4 percent of WHY respondents made more than \$150,000 dollars a year compared to 15.1 percent of Midland County residents.

Table 1. Characteristics of WHY Survey Respondents and Midland Residents.

	WHY Survey Respondents (%)	Midland County Demographics (%)
Race/Ethnicity¹⁴		
Non-Hispanic White	83.2	91.5
African American	6.7	1.3
Asian	2.5	2.3
Native American	0.6	0.4
Multi-Race	4.1	1.6
Hispanic	4.6	2.7
Another Race	0.9	0.2
Middle Eastern/North African	1.2	X ¹⁵
Age		
Age 18-24	5.8	X ¹⁶
Age 25-34	17.9	12.2
Age 35-44	23.7	12.7
Age 45-54	22.5	12.8
Age 55-64	16.5	14.2
Age 65+	11.7	18.6
Homeowner/Rental		
Percent of Population Living in Owner-occupied versus Rental Housing	86.3	81.2
Education		
Less than High School	0.7	5.7
High School Diploma or Equivalent	5.0	28.8

¹⁴ Total race/ethnicity sums to over 100 percent because race and ethnicity are not mutually exclusive categories.

¹⁵ Middle Eastern or North African data not collected by ACS. When Census 2020 results released, Middle Eastern or North African data will be included.

¹⁶ Census includes 15-19 in one category which does not allow disaggregation of data.

Some College/Technical or Associate's Degree	22.0	29.1
Bachelor's Degree	40.0	22.0
Master's/Professional/Doctoral Degree	31.8	14.3
Median Household Income		
Under 15,000	2.0	9.3
15,000-49,999	12.2	27.4
50,000-99,999	28.0	33.3
100,000-149,000	22.1	14.9
150,000+	25.4	15.1
Prefer not to answer	10.2	X

Source: 2021 Midland WHY Survey and 2018 ACS data, U.S. Census.

The *We Hear You* report is not intended to be comprehensive, static, or definitive. It is not comprehensive in its methodology or approach and caution must be taken when drawing conclusions from this work. The report aims to provide data in several key areas to encourage larger considerations and understanding of our current context and help inform sustained, assessed, and accountable actions to end inequity, injustice, and bias in our community. The *We Hear You* initiative reflects our local community's commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and justice, to understand and recognize the intersecting and systemic nature of inequity located along personal/individual and systemic/institutional levels, and take intentional and strategic actions to address these issues.

Racial/Ethnic Relations:

Seventeen questions on the WHY Survey asked about the respondent's perceptions of racial/ethnic relationships in the U.S. and Midland.

Responses to the WHY Community Survey suggest the community is polarized with some respondents dismissing and denying inequity, bias, and injustice exist in our community and have negative opinions of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice (DEIJ) efforts. Other respondents confirmed inequity, bias, and injustice exist in our community, recognize that not all racial/ethnic groups experience belonging, inclusion, and equity in Midland County, and support DEIJ efforts.

When asked about racial/ethnic relations in the U.S., 60.7 percent of WHY respondents indicated that race/ethnic relations were poor or very poor. When asked about racial/ethnic relations in Midland, only 29.6 percent of respondents indicated that they were poor or very poor; substantially less than what these respondents indicated for the U.S. in general. While 27.3 percent of non-Hispanic white respondents and 26.3 percent of Middle Eastern or North African respondents indicated poor/very poor relations in Midland, 52.2 percent of African American, 49.1 percent of Hispanic and 45.9 percent of Asians indicated this to be the case. These responses indicate perceptions regarding race/ethnic relations in Midland differ significantly

between non-Hispanic whites and minorities groups. There were 187 written comments to the question, ‘In general how do you rate racial/ethnic relations in Midland’. Approximately 122 or 65% of these written comments reflect negative perceptions of race/ethnic relations, reference incidents, and/or note the lack of diversity in the community.

WHY respondents also varied greatly on their responses to the following statement: ‘Midland is a welcoming and inclusive community where *I* am respected, supported, valued, and can enjoy my life to the fullest without barriers (Question 38)’. Middle Eastern or North African respondents recorded the highest satisfaction with 78.9 percent agreeing with the statement, followed closely by non-Hispanic white respondents at 72.2 percent. Conversely, only 43.6 percent of African Americans, 48.6 percent of Asians, and 41.7 percent of Hispanics agreed with this statement.

When asked about Midland being a community where *everyone* is respected, 57.9 percent of Middle Eastern or North African respondents and 44.6 percent of non-Hispanic white respondents indicated yes compared to only 32.9 percent of African American, 32.4 percent of Asian and 24.9 percent of Hispanic respondents. Over half of non-Hispanic white respondents recognized that not everyone in Midland is respected or treated fairly. These questions did not specifically reference race/ethnicity and any plan moving forward will need to consider gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, religious identity, age, socio-economic status, disability, additional identities, and the intersection of these identities.

When asked if Midland has done enough to ensure that racial/ethnic minorities have equal rights, 38.6 percent of non-Hispanic white respondents strongly/agreed while 27.3 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed. In contrast, only 27.7 percent of African Americans strongly agreed/agreed while 45.7 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed with the statement. 63.2 percent of Middle Eastern or North African respondents strongly agreed/agreed with the statement compared to 10.5 percent disagreeing. For Asian/Asian American respondents, 29.7 percent strongly agreed/agreed with the statement while 24.3 disagreed/strongly disagreed. 31.7 percent of Hispanic respondents strongly agreed/agreed Midland has done enough to ensure that racial/ethnic minorities have equal rights while 31.6 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed.

Fourteen percent of non-Hispanic white respondents indicated that they have considered moving out of Midland because of biased or discriminatory treatment. For African American (42.7), Hispanic (35.6), Middle Eastern or North African (26.3) and Asian/Asian American (21.6) respondents, the percentages were much higher. Survey results show that a large percentage of Midland’s racial/ethnic minorities may be dissatisfied with their daily experiences in Midland.

There were 216 written comments for survey question 49, “Considering the past 5 years, do you know of anyone who left Midland because that person(s) perceived Midland to be unwelcoming to racial/ethnic minorities or because they experienced biased or discriminatory treatment?” The following table estimates the largest number of reasons specifically mentioned in the written comments of question 49.

Reason	Number of Survey Comments
--------	---------------------------

Lack of diversity in the community	39
Feeling unwelcomed	44
Incident(s)	49

* Note - numbers are approximated from written comments and some survey comments are open to interpretation.

One encouraging finding from the survey was that almost two-thirds (65.5 percent) of WHY respondents reported an awareness of local organizations in Midland promoting racial equity, anti-racism, and social justice. When asked about support and participation in these organizations, 51.9 percent of respondents indicated that they were involved in Black Lives Matter activities. This is not surprising given the support for the Rally for Racial Justice event June 7, 2020.

WHY Community Survey responses suggest our community is polarized regarding perceptions and experiences of race/ethnic relations. When asked if Midland has done enough to ensure that racial/ethnic minorities have equal rights, respondents provided 147 written comments. Approximately 97 written comments (approximately 66%) reflected four responses,

- recognize effort has been or is being made but more work needs to be done
- do not know or see what has been or is being done
- note the lack of diversity in the community
- disagree/strongly disagree enough has been done to ensure racial/ethnic minorities have equal rights in our community

Housing:

According to Census data, several block groups in the southern half of the city had higher percentages of African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans than the county as a whole and could be considered ‘overconcentrated’. One block group (northwest corner of the city – block group 1 in census tract 2910) was composed of 11.5 percent African American population (the highest of any block group in Midland County) in 2018 and had the fifth highest median housing value in Midland County. In general, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians/Asian Americans are more concentrated in block groups in Midland City (compared to block groups in the townships) and likely reside in rental properties. Median housing values are low, housing is older, a greater percentage of the housing stock consists of rentals, and single-family detached units are low in block groups in the central and southern parts of Midland City. These block groups also have high percentages of minorities.

When asked about housing affordability in Midland, at least 60.0 percent of non-Hispanic white, African American, Middle Eastern or North African and Asian WHY Survey respondents indicated that it was excellent or good. Only 49.3 percent of Hispanic respondents indicated that housing affordability in Midland was excellent or good. Given that WHY respondents indicated median household incomes (14.2 percent under \$50,000) on average that were greater than the

U.S. Census figures for Midland County (36.7 percent under \$50,000 in 2019), it is almost certain that housing affordability is a major concern in the larger community. Written comments, regardless of race/ethnicity, indicated that low-income and affordable housing (owner-occupied or rentals) is in short supply and not enough is being done by non-profits and government agencies to address this issue. WHY respondents indicated that 41.4 percent of African Americans; 38.6 percent of Hispanics; and 18.5 percent of Asian/Asian Americans experienced housing inequality in Midland¹⁷. African American (48.8) and Hispanic (40.9) respondents were more likely to indicate that they experienced housing inequality than what was perceived by respondents in general. Asian (17.4) respondents were less likely to identify their racial group as facing housing inequity in Midland in comparison to the rest of the respondents.

Socioeconomics:

Census data and WHY Survey responses reveal economic stratification in our community. Census data (2018) show that Asians/Asian Americans in Midland County had the highest median household incomes (\$104,653) and lowest poverty rates (4.1 percent) of the racial/ethnic groups examined. In 2018, non-Hispanic whites in Midland County had median household incomes of \$59,324 and poverty rates of 10.1 percent compared to median household income of \$24,539 and a poverty rate of 35.7 percent for African Americans. Thus, African American households only had incomes that were 41.4 percent of non-Hispanic whites while poverty rates were 3.5 times that of non-Hispanic whites. While Hispanic households earned 89.5 percent of non-Hispanic white households, poverty rates were about twice that of non-Hispanic white households.

ALICE (Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed) was constructed as a poverty level indicator more indicative of the level of poverty in the U.S. For example, poverty level for a family of four using ALICE methodology was 2.5 times that of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) in 2018¹⁸. While the FPL was \$25,100 using the traditional U.S. Census benchmark, the ALICE figure was \$66,890. The ALICE methodology not only allots more income for housing, food, transportation, and shelter than the FPL but includes childcare, healthcare, computer access, savings and taxes in its assessment. For Michigan, 40.0 percent of households were below the ALICE survival line in 2018¹⁹. For African Americans in Michigan, the percentage below the ALICE survival line was 63.0 percent. Furthermore, between 2010 and 2018, the percentage of African American households under the ALICE threshold increased by 11.0 percent while that for white households only increased by 1.0 percent²⁰.

¹⁷ Middle Eastern or North African was not a category included for this question.

¹⁸ United for ALICE. ALICE Research Methodology: Overview & Rationale. 2020. [file:///C:/Users/eravuri/Downloads/2020ALICE_Methodology_FINAL%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/eravuri/Downloads/2020ALICE_Methodology_FINAL%20(1).pdf)

¹⁹ United Way. ALICE in Michigan: A Financial Hardship Study. 2019.

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/52fbd39ce4b060243dd722d8/t/5c902a7e971a186c0a29dff2/1552951937149/H R19ALICE_Report_MI_Refresh_02.26.19b_Final_Hires+%283%29.pdf

²⁰ Ibid.

In 2017, 34.0 percent of households in Midland County were below the ALICE survival line. In Coleman and Warren Township those percentages were 61.0 and 48.0 percent, respectively²¹. A 2017 ALICE (using 2015 data) report disaggregated poverty levels using the ALICE methodology by race/ethnicity for the 83 counties of Michigan. The following were percentages of households by race/ethnicity in Midland County below ALICE survival levels: African Americans, 62 percent; Hispanics, 51 percent; Whites, 35 percent and Asians, 17 percent²². These are households that struggle daily to make ends meet and likely have income levels that are too high to qualify for government benefits.

African Americans and Hispanics in Midland County also experienced a decline in median household incomes from 2010 to 2018 (10.5 and 7.8 percent lower; respectively). Conversely, Asian/Asian American median household income growth was 45.2 percent over those eight years while non-Hispanic white median household income increased by 16.5 percent. The Great Recession and its immediate aftermath adversely affected those with lower educational attainment and lower skills, and added, enhanced, and multiplied additional challenges that disproportionately impacted African Americans and Hispanics²³.

WHY respondents had different opinions concerning their finances and economic potential in Midland. While 70.2 percent of non-Hispanic white respondents, 65.9 percent of Asian respondents and 54.6 percent of Middle Eastern or North African respondents indicated that there were enough economic resources in Midland to reach their full economic potential, less than fifty percent of African Americans and Hispanics (46.7 percent for both) felt this to be the case. While the majority (93.5 percent) of respondents indicated that they could consistently afford to meet weekly necessities, several groups worry that they will not be able to meet those expenses. When asked whether racial/ethnic minorities in Midland experience employment inequity, respondents indicated the following: African Americans (42.5 percent); Hispanics (40.0 percent); and Asian (20.0 percent). When paired with the race/ethnicity of respondent, African American respondents indicated 52.4 percent of African Americans experience employment inequity; Hispanic respondents indicated that 61.4 percent of Hispanics experienced employment inequity while 47.8 percent of Asians responded that Asians experienced employment inequity. What this indicates is that there is the perception that minorities experience employment inequity by all racial/ethnic groups (including non-Hispanic white), but that the perception for employment inequity for one's own minority group is greater than the perceptions from their counterparts in the other racial/ethnic groups.

Census data also reveals specific areas of focused need at the block group level (noted in full report). WHY Survey respondents similarly pointed out a strong recognition of economic stratification in the community, the need for greater visibility and consideration of poverty and economic stratification, and the need for greater supports and resources for low-income residents

²¹ Ibid.

²² Native American data not determined by ALICE.

²³ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2018. Great Recession, Great Recovery? Trends from the Current Population Survey. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2018/article/great-recession-great-recovery.htm>

We Hear You Task Force, Midland County Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Community Assessment Report Executive Summary, pg. 10.

to address economic inequity and poverty. Census data also points to the need for greater support for education and training for higher wage employment.

Healthcare:

An examination of health characteristics of Midland County residents suggests inequalities in the health of racial/ethnic minorities in Midland County in comparison to their non-Hispanic white counterparts. These disparities begin at pregnancy where only one-third of African American mothers-to-be receive prenatal care compared to over eighty percent of their non-Hispanic white counterparts. For the under-19 population, African American children have health care coverage about ten percent below that of non-Hispanic white children (86.5 and 97.4, respectively). African American residents of Midland under age 65 were less likely to have health insurance coverage than their non-Hispanic white counterparts in 2018. These disparities return later in life in that minorities are less likely to utilize Medicare resources to the same extent as their non-Hispanic white counterparts. Additional analysis reveals racial/ethnic disparities in preventive care and mental health.

Over three-fourths (77.1 percent) of WHY Community Survey respondents noted their neighborhood was free or mostly free of environmental contaminants while 8.5 percent of respondents reported that their neighborhood was not free of environmental contaminants. Responses did not largely differ by race or ethnicity.

92.0 percent of WHY Survey respondents indicated they could easily access health care facilities in Midland. This ranged from a high of 93.2 percent for Asian Americans and 93.1 percent for non-Hispanic white respondents to a low of 85.3 percent for Hispanic respondents. Please note, WHY Survey respondents (as indicated by their median household incomes) are wealthier than Midland County as a whole. When asked ‘Can you easily access affordable health care in Midland (Question 21)?’; 7.3 percent of non-Hispanic white, 4.6 percent of Asian/Asian American, 7.6 percent of African American, 13.6 percent of Middle Eastern or North African and 13.3 percent of Hispanic respondents answered no to this question. Affordable healthcare is a significant concern in Midland County as it is in the rest of the U.S. At least 22.0 percent of WHY respondents could not access affordable healthcare (includes can “somewhat” afford and cannot afford responses). This is particularly an issue for Hispanic respondents. Given the paucity of responses to the WHY Survey from the over 60-years of age population and recognizing survey respondents had median household incomes well above the median for Midland County, it is almost certain the need for affordable healthcare is much greater than indicated in the WHY survey.

Policing and Criminal Justice:

In 2018, African Americans in Midland County had arrest rates over seven times that of non-Hispanic whites for crimes against persons; over six times that of non-Hispanic whites for property crimes; and 4.5 times that of non-Hispanic whites for crimes against society (e.g. disorderly conduct). African Americans in Midland County are overrepresented in arrests in

comparison to their non-Hispanic white counterparts.²⁴ Michigan State Police found *state-wide* that traffic stops in which the driver was African American made up a greater percentage of traffic stops than the percentage of African American population in the state of Michigan²⁵. Locally, data reveals in 2019 almost 90 percent of traffic stops in Midland County were of non-Hispanic whites who comprise 91% of the population in Midland County. African Americans comprise 1.3 percent of Midland County's population yet were 6.7 percent of traffic stops in 2019.²⁶ The percentage of African Americans involved in traffic stops in Midland County is greater than the percentage of African Americans in Midland County. Analysis of data from Midland County Sheriff's Department of crimes committed between 2014-2019 reveal African Americans comprised a greater percentage of violent crime victims than their representation of Midland's total population. African Americans were substantially less likely to have been victims of property crime. Whether this is because African Americans experience less property crime than their white counterparts or they are less likely to report property crimes is uncertain.

The WHY Survey also asked about policing and criminal justice, perceptions of police, and interactions with the police. A greater percentage of African American and Hispanic respondents (42.5 and 42.7 percent; respectively) perceived their neighborhoods to be crime-free in comparison to non-Hispanic white respondents (only 34.8 percent).

General perception of the police varied greatly by WHY respondents' race/ethnicity. Over three-fourths (77.3 percent) of non-Hispanic white respondents had a positive or generally positive perception of police compared to 72.2 for Middle Eastern or North Africans, 62.1 for Asian/Asian Americans, 58.6 for Hispanics and 48.9 percent of African Americans. African American respondents considered law enforcement to be more prejudiced/biased (46.07 percent) than non-Hispanic white (20.9 percent), Asian/Asian American (21.6) and Hispanic respondents (24.1). African American respondents were also less likely to indicate they were treated respectfully, equitably, fairly by Midland City and County Police than their non-Hispanic white counterparts. Over 80 percent of non-Hispanic white respondents reported that Midland City and Midland County police treated them respectfully, equitably, fairly. For African Americans respondents, only 60.0 percent indicated being treated respectfully, equitably, fairly by Midland City and 48.6 by Midland County police. Many non-Hispanic white respondents to the WHY survey also noted that being white gave them a layer of protection against mistreatment by law enforcement. Most interactions with law enforcement reported by WHY respondents, regardless of race/ethnicity, were traffic violations.

WHY Survey data reveals significant differences in perceptions of law enforcement between non-Hispanic whites and other racial/ethnic groups. Survey data suggests the need for implicit bias training and greater resources to address mental health, greater visibility of policing and criminal justice data, and greater diversity of police.

In addition, while the *We Hear You* study was not tasked with analysis of the local education system and the experiences of students in Midland County schools, an analysis of student

²⁴ MI Incident Crime Reporting

²⁵ MSP. Traffic Stop Data.

https://www.michigan.gov/msp/0,4643,7-123-1586_101168-534265--,00.html

²⁶ MI State Police

interactions with police in the school system along with a review of policing in the schools, school discipline policies and practices, collection of student/police interaction data, and public sharing of these policies, practices and data are strongly recommended.

Government Structure and Representation:

Unlike the five previous chapters in the WHY study, the government structure and representation chapter does not draw from census data or other nationally representative data bases. The data for this chapter was provided by the City of Midland and included racial/ethnic data on employment in Midland City's²⁷ government sector and elected positions in Midland County's Townships and the City of Midland. These data showed an underrepresentation of minorities in local government jobs and elected positions in comparison to their composition in the population. Specifically, according to available data, there are 13 elected officials in Midland County. These positions are held by 8 men and 5 women, all of whom identify as non-Hispanic white.²⁸ Outside of Midland City which has one individual who identifies as non-white, all elected officials are non-Hispanic white. For additional data on demographics of elected officials for Midland County Townships, City of Coleman, and City of Midland, please see Chapter 6 of the full report.

Non-Hispanic whites over the age of 18 comprise 93.6% of Midland City's population but 97.7% of government employees. Non-whites over the age of 18 comprise 6.4% of the City population but 2.3% of government positions. The largest segment of employment for non-Hispanic whites is Financial Administration/General Control (20.0 percent). These are also some of the highest paid jobs in the city government sector²⁹ and some of the safest (in comparison to law enforcement and fire protection). Only 7 full-time positions in City government were held by non-white employees and 57.1 percent (4) of those employees were in law enforcement (less remunerative and more dangerous than financial positions).

This data is also reflected in perceptions offered by WHY Survey respondents. While 72.4 percent of non-Hispanic white respondents agreed to the statement 'I see people like me represented in decision-making positions throughout Midland, only 44.4 percent of Middle Eastern or North African, 27.6 percent of African American, 21.6 percent of Hispanic and 10.8 percent of Asian respondents agree with this statement.

We Hear You survey respondents consistently pointed out the lack of racial and ethnic diversity of Midland's population and their limited knowledge of local efforts to enhance and support diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice in the community. Yet it is important to point out, 65.0 percent of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that addressing racial/ethnic equality is a responsibility of the Midland government. These responses suggest a need for greater visibility of local diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, strong support for those efforts, and indicate the need and support for community initiatives to elevate visibility of those efforts. Racial and ethnic minorities are underrepresented in Midland County's and Midland Township's political

²⁷ Townships were approached about providing government employment data by race/ethnicity. These data were not provided and thus are not examined in this analysis.

²⁸ Data from personal communication with Midland County government officials.

²⁹ City of Midland. 2020. Form 164. State and Local Government Information

structure. Data points to the need to examine additional ways to diversify local government including appointments and hiring practices in city and county government.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

The We Hear You report emphasizes that collection and analysis of data in the six areas of demographics, housing, socioeconomic, healthcare, policing and criminal justice, and government structure/representation is a first step within a much larger effort to end inequity, injustice, and bias in our community. This data collection is therefore not an end but a means to help inform the next steps to sustain ongoing action to end disparities, injustice, inequity, and bias in our community. Analysis of these six areas reflects the intersecting and systemic nature of institutional inequity located along personal/individual and systemic/institutional levels. This analysis intentionally exposes areas of inequity and bias and calls attention to the intersecting and systemic location of inequity and the causes of disparities to help guide the development of sustained actions for inclusion, justice, and equity.³⁰

It is beyond the scope of this work to provide a comprehensive discussion of the historical roots and contemporary manifestations of systemic inequity, injustice, and oppression. Additional studies in areas such as housing, criminal justice, healthcare, transportation, food security, education, and environmental justice should be examined to further expand understanding of systemic racism, inequity, and injustice to inform next steps to bring greater inclusion, equity, and justice.

As noted in the Introduction of the full report, this study is a look at our recent context and is not intended to be comprehensive, static, or definitive. It is not comprehensive in its methodology or approach and caution must be taken when drawing conclusions from this work as the survey respondent size was too small and not representative of the larger community to draw conclusions.³¹ The report aims to provide data in several key areas to encourage larger considerations and understanding of our current context and help inform our next steps. Therefore, this report repeatedly emphasizes the critical necessity of sustaining this work. As previously stated, this report is but one step in a much larger effort. The *We Hear You* initiative reflects our local community's commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and justice, to understand and recognize the intersecting and systemic nature of inequity located along personal/individual and systemic/institutional levels, and take intentional and strategic actions to address these issues.

³⁰ See for example Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor's *Race for Profit: How Banks and the Real Estate Industry Undermined Black Homeownership*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2019; Douglas Massey's *Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2007; Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton's *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

³¹ As noted in the earlier section, Notes on Methodology and Limitations of Data Sources, the WHY Survey completion rate, defined as the percentage of individuals who began the survey and completed the last question, was 62 percent³¹. It was also pointed out, of the total 2,182 respondents, 1,758 respondents completed question 2, "What is your race?"; 1,752 answered question 3, "Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?"; and 1,745 answered question 4, "Are you of Middle Eastern or North African ethnicity?"

Moving forward, additional efforts must be made to include underrepresented groups in Midland County in data collection. This includes, for example, populations over age 55 and under age 18; the LGBTQ community; groups of lower socioeconomic status; and people with disabilities. Additional efforts should be made to engage in new community and business partnerships and/or enhance, support, and strengthen community partnerships already in place. Data indicates a large need to address healthcare and wellness disparities including disparities in prenatal and preventive care as well as mental health. It is also strongly recommended to build partnerships with the school system to support, enhance, and strengthen DEIJ initiatives in the school system. Employers and organizations in Midland County are advised to perform internal DEIJ studies and develop and promote equity and inclusion programs. Partnerships with local groups such as Anti-Racist Midland (ARM), the Cultural Awareness Coalition (CAC); and the Midland County Inclusion Alliance (MCIA), and additional regional, state, and federal organizations and agencies should be formed to develop and guide a comprehensive plan to address public safety, policing, and criminal justice. Racial and ethnic minorities are underrepresented in Midland County's and Midland Township's political structure. Efforts should be made to diversify local government including elected officials, appointments, and hiring practices in city and county government. Data also points to a need to support high school completion and higher education and training opportunities for higher wage employment. Greater focus should also be placed on economic stratification and poverty, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation. Further study of disparities at the block group level is also suggested.

The We Hear You initiative affirms that direct, intentional, sustained, ongoing actions, coupled with assessment and accountability, must be taken for greater inclusion, justice, and equity to reach our community's vision of "Together. Forward. Bold: An exceptional place where everyone thrives."

Appendix

1. *We Hear You* documentation

- a. https://cityofmidlandmi.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_07132020-2235
- b. <https://cityofmidlandmi.gov/1862/We-Hear-You-Coalition>
- c. County statement and resolution below

2. Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer's Executive Orders

- a. **Executive Order No. 2020-55**
https://www.michigan.gov/whitmer/0,9309,7-387-90499_90705-526476--,00.html
- b. **Executive Order 2020-163**
https://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/MIEOG/2020/08/05/file_attachments/1511602/EO%202020-163%20Black%20Leadership%20Advisory%20Council.pdf
- c. **Executive Directive 2020-9**
https://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/MIEOG/2020/08/05/file_attachments/1511606/ED%202020-9%20Addressing%20Racism%20as%20a%20Public%20Health%20Crisis.pdf

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice Terms

The following provides a brief introductory list of terms. There are many more terms, definitions, explanations, and examples but we offer the following as an initial introduction to encourage further work.

Anti-Racism:

“The work of actively opposing racism by advocating for changes in political, economic, and social life.” (<https://www.racialequitytools.org/glossary>)

“Active process of identifying and challenging racism, by changing systems, organizational structures, policies and practices and attitudes, to redistribute power in an equitable manner.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-vol1.pdf>)

Bias:

“... A preference in favor of, or against a person, group of people, or thing. These initial human reactions, which are often unconscious, are rooted in inaccurate information or reason and are potentially harmful. Biases are also part of being human. (“Talking About Race,” National Museum of African American History & Culture, <https://nmaahc.si.edu/learn/talking-about-race/topics/bias>)

Unconscious bias, hidden bias, implicit biases: “... negative associations that people unknowingly hold. They are expressed automatically, without conscious awareness. Many studies have indicated that implicit biases affect individuals’ attitudes and actions, thus creating real-world implications, even though individuals may not even be aware that those biases exist within themselves. Notably, implicit biases have been shown to trump individuals’ stated commitments to equality and fairness, thereby producing behavior that diverges from the explicit attitudes that many people profess. (<https://www.racialequitytools.org/glossary>)

Discrimination:

“The Unequal treatment of various groups based on race, ethnicity, gender expression, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, physical or mental ability, religion, citizenship status, a combination of those identifies, and/or other categories.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-vol1.pdf>)

Diversity:

The “Racial Equity Toolkit: A Roadmap for Government, Organization and Communities” of the Michigan Department of Civil Rights notes, “... diversity simply points to difference. On the other hand, inclusion describes the need to incorporate these

differences on a shared platform where they are accepted and valued. At times, the concept of diversity is used to imply something positive, yet the term by itself is neutral as there are many environments that are diverse but not necessarily inclusive.” (“Racial Equity Toolkit: A Roadmap for Government, Organization and Communities,” Michigan Department of Civil Rights, pg. 4.

https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdcr/racial_equity_toolkit_web_new4_628923_7.pdf

The MDCR concludes, “We must take proactive steps to create and sustain inclusion, recognizing that diversity does not necessarily lead to integration and inclusive practices.” (Ibid.)

The Center for the Study of Social Policy also explains, ““Diversity programs and cultural celebrations/education programs are not equivalent to racial justice or inclusion. It is possible to name, acknowledge, and celebrate diversity without doing anything to transform the institutional or structural systems that produce, and maintain, racialized injustices in our communities.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-voll.pdf>)

Equality:

“The effort to treat everyone the same or to ensure that everyone has access to the same opportunities. However, only working to achieve equality ignores historical and structural factors that benefit some social groups and disadvantages other social groups in ways that create differential starting points. (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-voll.pdf>)

Equity:

“Equality is often associated with justice and sameness, yet when its practice and implementation lack an equity lens through which physical, structural and historical differences are acknowledged, inequitable outcomes are created and sustained. Equity takes into consideration how the past has shaped the present and assesses social advantages/disadvantages in order to promote justice and fairness...” (MDCR “Toolkit,” 4)

“Equity is the state, quality or ideal of being just, impartial and fair. Equity is achieved when systemic, institutional and historical barriers based on race are dismantled and race no longer predicts socioeconomic, educational and health outcomes.” (United Way of Central Carolinas, <https://uwcentralcarolinas.org/racialequity/>)

“The effort to provide different levels of support based on an individual’s or group’s needs in order to achieve fairness in outcomes. Working to achieve equity acknowledges

unequal starting places and the need to correct the imbalance.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-vol1.pdf>)

Racial equity is when “Race is no longer a predictor of outcomes, leading to more just outcomes in policies, practices, attitudes, and cultural messages.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-vol1.pdf>)

Inclusion:

“... The action or state of including or of being included within a group or structure. More than simply diversity and numerical representation, inclusion involves authentic and empowered participation and a true sense of belonging.” (“Race Equity and Inclusion Action Guide: Embracing Equity, 7 Steps to Advance and Embed Race Equity and Inclusion Within Your Organization,” The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014, p. 5, https://assets.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/AECF_EmbracingEquity7Steps-2014.pdf#page=7)

Actively or intentionally “bringing traditionally excluded individuals and/or groups into processes, activities, and decision/policy making in a way that shares power...” (WWW.RACIALEQUITYTOOLS.ORG)

The Michigan Department of Civil Rights’ “Racial Equity Toolkit: A Roadmap for Government, Organization and Communities” notes, “... diversity simply points to difference. On the other hand, inclusion describes the need to incorporate these differences on a shared platform where they are accepted and valued. At times, the concept of diversity is used to imply something positive, yet the term by itself is neutral as there are many environments that are diverse but not necessarily inclusive.” (MDCR “Toolkit,” 4) The MDCR concludes, “We must take proactive steps to create and sustain inclusion, recognizing that diversity does not necessarily lead to integration and inclusive practices.” (Ibid.)

“A state of belonging, when persons of different backgrounds and identities are valued, integrated, and welcomed equitably as decision-makers and collaborators. Inclusion involves people being given the opportunity to grow and feel/know they belong. Diversity efforts alone do not create inclusive environments. Inclusion involves a sense of coming as you are and being accepted, rather than feeling the need to assimilate.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-vol1.pdf>)

Justice:

We Hear You Task Force, Midland County Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Community Assessment Report Executive Summary, pg. 18.

“The process required to move us from an unfair, unequal, or inequitable state to one which is fair, equal, or equitable, depending on the specific content. Justice is a transformative practice that relies on the entire community to respond to past and current harm when it occurs in society. Through justice, we seek a proactive enforcement of policies, practices and attitudes that produce equitable access, opportunities, treatment and outcomes for all regardless of the various identities that one holds.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-vol1.pdf>)

“... the systematic fair treatment of people of all races that results in equitable opportunities and outcomes for everyone. All people are able to achieve their full potential in life, regardless of race, ethnicity or the community in which they live. Racial justice — or racial equity — goes beyond ‘anti-racism.’ It’s not just about what we are against, but also what we are for. A ‘racial justice’ framework can move us from a reactive posture to a more powerful, proactive and even preventative approach.” (“Race Equity and Inclusion Action Guide: Embracing Equity, 7 Steps to Advance and Embed Race Equity and Inclusion Within Your Organization,” The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014, p. 5, https://assets.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/AECF_EmbracingEquity7Steps-2014.pdf#page=7)

Microaggression:

“Racial microaggressions are the everyday slights, insults, putdowns, invalidations, and offensive behaviors that people of color experience in daily interactions with generally well-intentioned White Americans who may be unaware that they have engaged in racially demeaning ways toward target groups (Sue et al., 2007). In addition to being communicated on an interpersonal level through verbal and nonverbal means, microaggressions may also be delivered environmentally through social media, educational curriculum, TV programs, mascots, monuments, and other offensive symbols. Scholars conclude that the totality of environmental microaggressions experienced by people of color can create a hostile and invalidating societal climate in employment, education, and health care (Clark, Spanierman, Reed, Soble, & Cabana, 2011; Neville, Yeung, Todd, Spanierman, & Reed, 2011; Solorzano, Ceja, & Yasso, 2000; Sue, 2010).” [Source: Sue, D. W., Alsaedi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Mendez, N. (2019). “Disarming Racial Microaggressions: Microintervention Strategies for Targets, White Allies, and Bystanders.” *American Psychologist*, 74(1), 128-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000296>]

Privilege:

“Unearned social power accorded by the formal and informal institutions of society to all members of a dominant group (e.g., white privilege, male privilege, etc.). Privilege is usually invisible to those who have it because we’re taught not to see it, but nevertheless

it puts them at an advantage over those who do not have it.” (Source: Colours of Resistance Archive, <http://www.coloursofresistance.org/definitions/privilege/>)

Racism:

In *White Fragility*, Robin DiAngelo explains racism “encompass[es] economic, political, social, and cultural structures, actions, and beliefs that systematize and perpetuate an unequal distribution of privileges, resources and power between white people and people of color.” DiAngelo adds, “This unequal distribution benefits whites and disadvantages people of color overall and as a group.” Further explaining DiAngelo points out, “Racism is not fluid in the U.S.; it does not flow back and forth, one day benefiting whites and another day (or even era) benefiting people of color. The direction of power between whites and people of color is historic, traditional, normalized, and deeply embedded in the fabric of U.S. society. (“White Fragility,” in *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, Vol 3 (3) (2011) 56)

“The systematic subjugation of members of targeted racial groups, who hold less socio-political power and/or are racialized as non-White, as means to uphold White supremacy. Racism differs from prejudice, hatred, or discrimination because it requires one racial group to have systematic power and superiority over other groups in society. Often, racism is supported and maintained, both implicitly and explicitly, by institutional structures and policies, cultural norms and values, and individual behaviors.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-voll.pdf>)

Systemic or Institutional Racism:

According to Dr. Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, “Institutional racism, or structural racism, can be defined as the policies, programs, and practices of public and private institutions that result in greater rates of poverty, dispossession, criminalization, illness, and ultimately mortality of African Americans. Most importantly, it is the *outcome* [italics in original] that matters, not the intentions of the individuals involved. Institutional racism remains the best way to understand how Black deprivation continues in a country as rich and resource-filled as the United States.” (Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*, Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016, 8)

“The practices that perpetuate racial disparities, uphold white supremacy, and serve to the detriment and harm of persons of color and keep them in negative cycles. Institutional/systemic racism also refers to policies that generate different outcomes for persons of different race. These laws, policies, and practices are not necessarily explicit in mentioning any racial group, but work to create advantages for white persons and disadvantages for people of color.” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-voll.pdf>)

“Historical, social, political, institutional, and cultural factors that contribute to, legitimize, and maintain racial inequities. Structural racism is not something that a few people or institutions choose to practice, it is the confluence of racist concepts and theories that control our economic, political, and social systems” (CSSP, 2019, “Key Equity Terms & Concepts: A Glossary of Shared Understanding. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, <https://cssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Key-Equity-Terms-and-Concepts-voll.pdf>)

White privilege:

“Refers to the unquestioned and unearned set of advantages, entitlements, benefits and choices bestowed on people solely because they are white. Generally white people who experience such privilege do so without being conscious of it... The accumulated and interrelated advantages and disadvantages of white privilege that are reflected in racial/ethnic inequities in life-expectancy and other health outcomes, income and wealth and other outcomes, in part through different access to opportunities and resources. These differences are maintained in part by denying that these advantages and disadvantages exist at the structural, institutional, cultural, interpersonal and individual levels and by refusing to redress them or eliminate the systems, policies, practices, cultural norms and other behaviors and assumptions that maintain them.” (Minnesota Education Equity Partnership, “White Privilege,” by wedgejack, October 4, 2018, <https://www.mneep.org/word/white-privilege/>)

References:

Inclusive Dubuque. 2015. Connecting People, Strengthening Community.
<https://inclusivedbq.org/community-equity-profile/#category-menu>

Martin, Michael. 2021. Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2018. U.S. Census.
[Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2018 \(census.gov\)](https://www.census.gov/computer-internet-use-in-the-united-states-2018)

McLeod, S. A. 2019, August 03. *Likert scale*. Simply Psychology.
<https://www.simplypsychology.org/likert-scale.html>

Michigan State Police (MSP). Traffic Stop Data.
https://www.michigan.gov/msp/0,4643,7-123-1586_101168-534265--,00.html

Pew Research Center. 2019. Race in America 2019.
<https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2019/04/09/race-in-america-2019/>

Seattle Office of Civil Rights. 2017. 2016 RSJI Community Survey.
<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/CivilRights/2016%20RSJI%20Community%20Survey.pdf>

U.S. Census. 2018. 5-yr. estimates. Midland County.
<https://www.census.gov/>

We Hear You Task Force, Midland County Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Community Assessment Report Executive Summary, pg. 21.

Weekly Time Spent by U.S. Population Accessing the Internet via Computer as of 1st Quarter 2018, by Age Group. Statista.

[U.S. weekly time spent on computer internet access by age 2018 | Statista](#)