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ABOUT TORONTO FOUNDATION

Established in 1981, Toronto Foundation is a community foundation and registered charity. We pool philanthropic dollars and facilitate charitable donations for maximum community impact. Our individual, family and organizational funds number more than 500, and we administer close to $500 million in assets. Through strategic granting, thought leadership and convening, we engage in city-building to strengthen the quality of life in Toronto.

Philanthropists come to us to help simplify and enhance their charitable giving in Toronto and across Canada. We also offer a community of like-minded people for those who want to make connections, learn and amplify their impact by collaborating with others.

ABOUT THE REPORT

Toronto’s Vital Signs Report is compiled from current statistics and studies, serving as an annual consolidated snapshot of the trends and issues affecting the quality of life in our city. For the first time this year, Toronto Foundation has used an equity lens to identify data for inclusion and analysis. This new framing aims to surface the gaps and opportunities for improvement and make the report a more actionable tool for policy-makers, practitioners and philanthropists.
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What is a “just” city?

It's a place where everyone has the opportunity to thrive. And where everyone has the ability to contribute too, with time, talent and treasure.

Since you're reading this, you likely call Toronto home. I'll bet you also care deeply about its future - for your own self-interest but mostly for the benefit of all - your neighbours and those you may never meet. It’s people like you who make this city not just a pulsing metropolis but a community with heart.

I’m not going to tell you what to think. The data in this report and the voices of those we’ve engaged in writing it speak for themselves. I do have an agenda, however.

I want you to care that the infant mortality rate for low income Torontonians is 50 per cent higher than it is for the most affluent. Or that 91 per cent of Indigenous people in Toronto are living below the low-income cut-off.

Even more, I want you to do something about it.

Read this report from cover to cover. Talk about it. Share it with your family, friends, colleagues and neighbours, maybe by hosting a “Vital Conversation” over dinner (see the conclusion section for more information). Ask your elected officials and candidates what they think about the growing inequities in our city.

And when you’re finished, ask yourself: Have I done enough? What more can I do?

Consider using this report as your giving guide. Decide what issues matter most to you. Set a personal target for your charitable giving and focus your contributions on bringing about change.

Give what you can but if you’re looking for a reason to give more, here are some things to consider:

- The top 1 per cent bring home about $250,000 or more in income (are you in the one per cent?);

- People with incomes of less than $50,000 per year are giving 2.3 per cent of their gross income to charity each year; those with incomes of $100,000 are giving 1.6 per cent and those earning $800,000 give at a rate of two per cent.

I believe that philanthropy has an essential role to play in making Toronto a kinder and more equitable city.

We have a lot to be proud of. And a lot to give.

Thanks for reading.
INTRODUCTION

In many ways, Toronto is one of the best places to live in the world. Our population is growing, our skyline is rising, our economy is booming and the vibrancy, diversity and richness of our cultural communities continue to expand. The population of the City of Toronto has increased to 2,731,571 people, according to the 2016 census, which is up 4.5 per cent over 2011.¹ The economy of the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), or the Toronto Region, is now roughly the size of Quebec’s.² Our technology startups are gaining recognition around the world, the city’s “Discovery District” at University Avenue and College Street is a national leader in biotechnology and we remain an international banking leader and a global figure in film and television.

The richness and diversity of our economy is matched by the diversity of our communities. As Canada’s top immigration destination, Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) are a magnet for people from around the world who seek a place to apply their skills, raise their families or find a safe home in a caring nation. Not only is Toronto rich with opportunity, but it is also a beautiful city — few global cities’ have the combination of a burgeoning skyline nestled within an expanse of ravines, rivers and a vast tree canopy, situated next to one of the Great Lakes and with a long and lively waterfront its residents can benefit from and enjoy.

As one of the 100 Resilient Cities identified by the Rockefeller Foundation, Toronto has carved a path toward building physical, social and economic well-being for all of its residents. Resiliency is the ability to adapt to and manage change successfully in rapidly evolving circumstances. From the strength of our economy, to our strong neighbourhoods and community connections, we have a lot to be proud of. But to achieve our potential, it is vital that we build on the assets we have worked so hard to achieve.

However, divisiveness is still a threat in a city that celebrates diversity. While Toronto has a wealth of opportunity, we are seeing a growing divide in terms of who has access to those opportunities. Enclaves are deepening, as is income inequality. Increasingly, neighbourhoods are divided into rich and poor, with fewer mixed communities. Though we are a wealthy city, we are also a city where too many are being left behind. And we have a long road ahead to meaningfully address the systemic biases in our society rooted in racism, colonization and oppression. As we move forward in a world of change and uncertainty, we need to work together to build a city that not only celebrates, but also lives up to its commitment to fairness.

Building fairness and greater equity means ensuring all Torontonians have access to and can capitalize on the positive opportunities on offer in our city. To do so, we need to be thoughtful stewards of what makes our city an excellent place to live.

EQUITY

This year, Toronto Foundation chose to look specifically at equity: we wanted to explore the ways in which our culture, systems, institutions, behaviours, mindsets and frames of reference may be putting up barriers that block some populations from accessing Toronto’s immense opportunities and where government, the corporate sector, philanthropy and

* The term “global cities” refers to the most economically influential cities across the globe.
everyday citizens can direct their attention and resources to help level the playing field. The data on equity points to many areas of concern — not as an indictment of our city, but to help us build a road map for what needs to be addressed.

Toronto has seen enormous growth and progress over the years. We often take pride in its economic, social and cultural successes, but many continue to be left behind. The opportunities and assets our city offers do not reach everyone, and the gap between the haves and have-nots has been growing.

Our continued well-being depends on building a Toronto where all communities can share in emerging opportunities and improved quality of life. To do this, we need to look at our differences. We need to intently study the disparities in opportunity and access, and reflect on where we are succeeding and where we are failing to bridge those gaps.

We can achieve that by applying an equity lens — reflecting on the variations and disparities among our circumstances, rather than erasing them with averages. Understanding the differences among us and seeing the gaps in equity are the best ways to determine where to focus the attention and resources of policy-makers, everyday residents and philanthropists.

FOR THIS PUBLICATION, WE HAVE FOUND IT HELPFUL TO LOOK AT EQUITY IN THREE DISTINCT WAYS:

- **What are we starting with?**
  Are we starting out with the same tools and opportunities? Do we get enough to eat? Do we speak the predominant language? Do we have access to clean air and water?

- **What do we experience?**
  What access do we have to the tools and opportunities that support success, and what exposure do we have to harmful environments? Can we get health care? Do we have adequate opportunities to learn? Are we protected from violence or disruption?

- **What are our outcomes?**
  Do we achieve the same results, regardless of background or geography? Do we have the same life expectancies, graduation rates or wealth?

These three dimensions of equity are used to explore the issues that Toronto’s Vital Signs Report has always tracked, to see if, in each of those areas, we see the same starting points, access and outcomes for Toronto’s residents. What we found tells us a lot about what work we still have to do as a city.

**METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS**

To understand how inequity is playing out in Toronto, we analyzed how subgroups of people were doing, compared to city averages, and we also looked at trends among specific populations. These differences are easiest to identify by using disaggregated data to examine different subgroups separately. When we disaggregate data by gender, race, income, geography and immigration status, we can see if women earn the same as men, or if racialized* people get the same employment opportunities as non-racialized people, or if refugees have the same educational outcomes as others. In some cases, the results were predictable, but at other times, they revealed unanticipated outcomes that haven’t previously been captured or recognized in any analyses.

---

* The term “racialized” refers to the process of ascribing racial identities to a relationship, social practice or group by another. It’s a sociological term that has gained popularity in everyday discourse to better understand identity. Racialization is the complex process through which people and groups come to be designated as belonging to a particular “race” based on social, economic and political forces and on that basis subjected to differential and/or unequal treatment. It emphasizes how racial categories are constructed, but are also socially and culturally very real.
Unfortunately, there is limited access to disaggregated data. One of the major challenges that we face as researchers is the inability to link different data sets, or to break down data according to different groups of people or characteristics, to paint a more detailed picture of the lived realities of different populations. For example, there are extensive statistics on health that often show data by age and gender, but they rarely include related variables according to income group, immigration status, sexual orientation or race. While some educational institutions and government bodies gather data showing variations by race or immigration status, many do not. The data presented in this year’s Vital Signs Report reflects those constraints. We have decided to only publish data that provides credible, disaggregated information, but we acknowledge that our findings have been limited based on what we could obtain, rather than all we would like to know.

One major gap pertains to the lack of reliable data on Toronto’s Indigenous communities. Because the sampling methodology utilized through Statistics Canada’s Census Program often seriously under-represents Indigenous communities, we decided not to include it in this report. Well Living House, located at the Centre for Research on Inner City Health at St. Michael’s Hospital, is currently in the process of undertaking statistically inclusive community action research on health and well-being outcomes for Indigenous infants, children and their families in our city, and it is expected to be publicly released in 2018. We recommend readers keep an eye out for this crucial data once it becomes available.

Intersectionality, or the impact of intersecting interwoven factors such as gender, race and sexual orientation, is also critically important to understanding the complex realities of equity, but is also particularly hard to track. Thanks to the sharing of and directing toward hard-to-find data by multiple research partners and colleagues, we have been able to source and cite intersectional data in some cases. However, availability and access are limited. And far more work needs to be done to gather, monitor and share disaggregated and intersectional data, so that we can use that information and continue to work together to help all Torontonians experience a good quality of life.

As a result, disaggregated data is used from years previous to 2017 and 2016, where no more recent data was available at time of writing. Where disaggregated data is not available for the City of Toronto specifically, data is used from larger geographies such as the Greater Toronto Area or the Toronto CMA, Statistics Canada boundaries that describe the Toronto Region.
Toronto, like many parts of Canada, is experiencing significant demographic change. Family structures in particular are changing dramatically in Toronto. According to Statistics Canada, couples with children have historically been the most common family constellation, but they have slipped from almost one-third of households to just above one-quarter. People living alone now make up the most common household type by far. Almost 70,000 homes in Toronto are made up of unrelated people, and almost one-third of all families with children are lone-parent families.

The aging population has also created a stark shift in the social makeup of the city. For the first time in history, there are more seniors in Toronto than children. The youth population continues to grow for now, but the steady decline in the number of young children will soon be even more noticeable.

Toronto’s diverse population has always been a strength, and that diversity continues to grow and change. In 2016, 47 per cent of the population was immigrants, much higher than the national rate of 21.9 per cent. And as Toronto’s immigration patterns shift, so does its population base. Over the last 20 years, South Asian populations have grown rapidly, while East Asian communities have grown steadily and European backgrounds have remained far more fixed, keeping less pace with our growing city. In 2016, over half of Torontonians (51.5 per cent) identified as belonging to a visible minority group, the first time this figure has ever surpassed 50 per cent.

Appreciating the full diversity of Toronto can be difficult, but mapping the kaleidoscope of languages that make up our city is one way to do it. More than 20 languages comprise the top languages spoken in each Toronto neighbourhood, thanks to ongoing shifting immigration patterns. Mandarin, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese are widespread, well-established languages across Toronto. Tamil and Punjabi, once less spoken, are now prominent through much of the northeast and northwest of our city, respectively. Dozens of other spoken languages, from Persian to Serbian to Gujarati, are predominant and ever-growing in smaller local enclaves.

While linguistic diversity is considerable in Toronto, its intensity varies. Older enclaves, such as the Chinatowns in north Scarborough and downtown and the Portuguese and Italian neighbourhoods on the west side of the city, show some of the densest populations who speak neither of Canada’s official languages. For example, in some parts of north Scarborough, over 25 per cent of residents do not speak English or French.

Toronto’s population also continues to shift geographically, with rapid growth in the urban centre and gradual declines in north Scarborough, North York and north Etobicoke. Condominium development is a key driver in this process, as much of the growth matches
larger-scale condominium developments on the central waterfront, in south Etobicoke and along the Yonge Street, Bay Street and Sheppard Avenue corridors.

While Toronto is a wealthy city, the level of wealth inequality can be striking. In some areas, barely one person in 30 lives below Statistics Canada’s poverty line (the Low Income Measure), while in others, two out of every three residents live in poverty. The situation is even starker for children: more than one in four children live in poverty in Toronto, and that number rises to almost one in two for newcomers and for some ethno-cultural groups. The patterns of poverty continue to reflect the worrying divide that faces our city, with far more people living with low incomes in the inner suburbs than in the city’s core.

Census Metropolitan Area (Toronto Region) and the Greater Toronto Area

Census Metropolitan Area Boundary
Greater Toronto Area Boundary
TORONTO’S 140 NEIGHBOURHOODS
(as recognized by the City of Toronto)
Too often people think of art narrowly — as a personal activity, as experiences for individual artists or as audience members. But arts and culture industries are important driving forces behind Toronto’s economy. The economic benefits generated through theatre, film, music, visual arts and community arts industries are a significant contributor to Ontario’s gross domestic product (GDP). Additional benefits include enhancing our sense of well-being, connectedness and civic pride. Engaging people actively in art and creation is a key part of sharing and fostering culturally vibrant communities. The arts have a positive impact on social integration, as well as personal and community development. And in a multicultural city, those benefits should be a part of everyone’s lives.

Toronto is the powerhouse of Ontario’s arts and culture industries, contributing $11.3 billion to Ontario’s GDP in 2011. Based on the 2011 National Household Survey, Toronto is home to 23,700 professional artists — more than any other city in Canada. However, Toronto trails behind other major cities when it comes to artists per capita. Toronto ranks third, compared to other major Canadian cities in terms of concentration of artists, with 1.76 per cent of the population deriving their income from the arts, compared to Victoria at 2.36 per cent and Vancouver at 2.32 per cent. Recent analysis on arts and culture spending reveals that...
Participating in arts and cultural events provides many benefits to Torontonians: it brings family and friends together, it is entertaining and intellectually stimulating and it can be inspiring and motivational. Attending or participating in cultural activities is associated with many major indicators of health and well-being, including better overall health, mental health and life satisfaction. However, not all Torontonians have equitable access to the arts and their benefits.

Despite this, Toronto has one of the lowest rates of municipal arts funding per capita, compared to other cities. While per capita funding reached $22.38 in 2014, city council must increase the 2018 budget by $2 million in order to reach the long-standing goal of $25 per capita. Even so, Toronto will continue to lag behind the 2009 per-capita arts funding levels of other major cities such as Montreal ($55), Vancouver ($47), Calgary ($42) and Ottawa ($28).

Participation in arts and cultural events provides many benefits to Torontonians: it brings family and friends together, it is entertaining and intellectually stimulating and it can be inspiring and motivational. Attending or participating in cultural activities is associated with many major indicators of health and well-being, including better overall health, mental health and life satisfaction. However, not all Torontonians have equitable access to the arts and their benefits.

“Investment in the arts is good for quality of life in Toronto, and it is a source of significant economic growth.”

Investment in Toronto’s arts sector show positive returns for the city’s economy overall. For every dollar Toronto invests in its arts, the city brings back $8.26 in earned revenue. Investment in the arts is good for quality of life in Toronto, and it is a source of significant economic growth.

Participation in the arts varies widely by geography. According to a survey commissioned by the Toronto Arts Foundation in 2015, almost 60 per cent of downtown residents reported attending arts performances, and 50.5 per cent reported visiting cultural locations such as museums, galleries and concert halls. Residents in Scarborough (36.8 per cent) and Etobicoke (36.4 per cent) were far less likely to attend cultural events, compared to other regions within the City of Toronto.
Other socio-demographic characteristics are also shown to have a significant impact on participation in the arts. Over 85 per cent of households with incomes above $100,000 attend arts events, compared to 70 per cent of households with incomes below $100,000. Women (73.9 per cent) are significantly more likely than men (68.2 per cent) to attend. Immigrants (72.3 per cent) are slightly more likely than Canadian-born Torontonians (70.8 per cent) to visit arts events.33

Unfortunately, there are several issues that affect who can
While there is a noticeable amount of funding that goes to promoting and supporting the arts in Toronto, artists themselves face many challenges when compared to other professions. Growing up at Jane Street and Falstaff Avenue without a TV or computer, Faduma had no choice but to get creative. “I began writing out of sheer boredom. There was really nothing else to do.” Faduma credits her brother, who lives with autism, with deepening her empathy and teaching her how to put emotions into her writing. “He’s non-verbal,” she explains. “You have to learn new methods of communicating, but more importantly, you have to learn new methods of understanding.” By her late teens, Faduma was regularly sharing her writing at school, and in her first year of university, she began performing spoken word poetry with RISE Edutainment, a Scarborough-based performing arts collective. Since then, Faduma has worked with Unity Charity and performs throughout the city. At age 24, Faduma feels fortunate to make a living through spoken word poetry, but still faces challenges. Like many artists, she is sometimes asked to perform for less than the fee she charges, or for free in exchange for exposure. “Exposure won’t help me put food on the table,” she says. She also feels that increasing awareness of existing resources would help up-and-coming Toronto artists thrive. “I know that there are supports available for artists, but my questions are: ‘Where are the opportunities, and how do people get access?’” Adds Faduma: “Just not knowing is a barrier in and of itself.”
In 2016, 34,000 Torontonians enjoyed free arts events in their local parks. With the support of approximately 250 volunteers, more than 55 parks hosted dance, music, film and theatre performances, as well as temporary installations. Offering arts events in parks brings people together and fosters a stronger sense of community. It also brings the arts closer to communities with less access, increasing attendance in those areas.

There are higher participation rates in inner-suburban communities such as Rexdale and Fairview when local arts events are held nearby. A survey of 725 attendees at 30 events in 23 different parks found that the majority (79 per cent) of attendees live in the neighbourhood or region of the city where the arts event was being held.

The City of Toronto flows 60 per cent of its cultural funding through the Toronto Arts Council (TAC), which then administers it to artists and arts organizations. In 2016, TAC awarded approximately $12.5 million to organizations and collectives, and another $2 million to individual artists. While TAC is able to prioritize and fund the vast majority of operational funding requests across Toronto, smaller organizations and individual artists face a much more competitive funding environment. In 2016, TAC supported 97 per cent of applications for operating funds, but only 47 per cent of applications for projects supported by organizations and collectives, and 25 per cent of applications from individuals.

TAC investments in community-based arts grew by $1.4 million in the last four years, topping $2.2 million in 2016. The City of Toronto’s Arts and Cultural Services also delivers some grant programs directly. In 2017, 10 organizations received a total of $7.9 million in funding through the Major Cultural Organizations program. Grants were awarded to many major institutions such as the Art Gallery of Ontario, Canada’s National Ballet School and the Toronto International Film Festival and also to community arts programs such as Pride Toronto, Luminato and the Toronto Caribbean Carnival. Another $1.7 million was allocated through the Local Arts Service Organizations program.

“Our biggest challenge is lack of access to the arts, including available and affordable spaces and the need for more arts and culture opportunities outside the downtown core.”
In addition to providing grants for arts and culture, the city spends $47.8 million producing festivals and events, delivering and supporting community activities, classes, events and exhibits, and managing art venues and public art.45

While there is a noticeable amount of funding that goes to promoting and supporting the arts in Toronto, artists themselves face many challenges when compared to other professions. On average, Canadian artists made 32 per cent less than the average income of all working people in Canada in 2011. They are also more than twice as likely to work two jobs and more than three times as likely to be self-employed.46

Our biggest challenge is lack of access to the arts, including available and affordable spaces and the need for more arts and culture opportunities outside the downtown core. More resources are needed to support arts initiatives at a local level, as well as more incentives to create arts hubs, including supportive changes to municipal tax policy.

We need to recognize the contribution arts make to city-building and better understand how investment in the arts creates a more connected and dynamic city.

Arts organizations and artists living and working throughout Toronto contribute to an important diversity of arts practices in our city. Many areas outside the downtown core are arrival communities and home to newcomers and refugees, many of whom bring their arts practices with them, further enriching our city. The Toronto Arts Council, Toronto Arts Foundation and the City of Toronto value the power of the arts and develop policies in response to the sector’s needs and to support arts in every neighbourhood.

Overall, I would give us high marks for support for arts access and programming throughout the city, but a mediocre grade for lack of affordable arts and culture spaces.
Residents and visitors alike celebrate Toronto’s green spaces. Our abundant parks, rivers, ravines, and our glorious Great Lake and tree canopy all contribute to a green and natural setting that makes Toronto a uniquely welcoming city. However, with worrisome levels of air pollution and rapidly accelerating climate change, the physical environment is increasingly under stress, and we risk reducing its capacity to serve as a positive and important determinant of health.

Climate change in particular is a major challenging reality we face in Toronto. In addition to the devastating storms we see on the news, changing weather patterns also causes more frequent extreme temperatures, ice storms, heavy rains and flooding, all of which pose risks for the immediate and long-term health and well-being of Torontonians.

Toronto has seen some significant progress in air quality over the past few years. In 2014, Toronto experienced the first year without any smog advisory days in over a decade. This is a stark comparison to just nine years earlier, where 14 smog advisories were issued over 48 days in 2005. However, while Toronto has seen progress over the past decade with smog, air quality is still a concern in Toronto, compared to other parts of Canada. Fine particulate matter is a core component of smog and is associated with higher rates of cardiovascular and respiratory disease. Based on 2014 data,
annual averages for Toronto areas ranged from 8.7 to 9.8 micrograms of fine particulate matter per cubic metre. This is considerably higher than the Canadian national average of 7.7 micrograms per cubic metre. These figures also come close to Environment Canada’s national standard limit of 10 micrograms per cubic metre.

Toronto’s analysis of the impact of climate change predicts significant risks to health, with a four-fold spike in heatwaves, a tripling of high temperature days and more than a doubling of rainfall volumes over the next 20–30 years. Extreme heat can be dangerous for seniors, young children, people experiencing homelessness and those without cooling systems to prevent health-threatening temperatures. Intense rainfall can cause pollution levels to rise, as it overwhelms the sewer system and pushes contaminants into our lakes and rivers.

Toronto is seeing some improvements in the amount of household waste being produced and sent to landfill. Toronto’s overall residential diversion increased to 52 per cent from 44 per cent between 2008 and 2016, and it was projected to remain at 52 per cent in 2017. The City of Toronto passed the Long-Term Waste Management strategy in July 2016, which sets long-term targets for waste diversion, prevention and recycling. The plan expects that by 2026, 70 per cent of the waste generated by households will be diverted from landfills.
“Green space is an important component of building a healthy natural environment in Toronto.”

One of the many assets that makes Toronto a liveable city is the amount of green space and natural environments for residents to enjoy. Several studies show that exposure to green spaces can be psychologically and physiologically restorative, promoting mental health and reducing illness and mortality rates.

Green space is also an important component of building a healthy natural environment in Toronto. City trees improve air quality, reduce cooling and heating energy use and make urban environments esthetically pleasing. Tree canopies have been associated with reducing blood pressure and stress levels and promoting active living. One Toronto-based study found that the benefits of planting 10 more trees per city block are comparable to the positive health effects of increasing the income of every household in that city block by $10,000.

In 2013, Toronto had about one-quarter of forest cover, but the distribution is not equal. There is wide variation...
in the amount of tree cover in Toronto neighbourhoods. Based on data from 2009, the Rosedale-Moore Park neighbourhood had the highest percentage of forest cover at 61.8 per cent, while the Bay Street Corridor and Junction Area neighbourhoods had the lowest, both at 6.7 per cent. On average, the neighbourhoods that had the highest percent of tree coverage also have higher average real estate value and incomes.

Since Bob moved from Uganda to Jane Street and Wilson Avenue, known as “Chalkfarm,” as a refugee in 2016, he has witnessed economic despair and violent crime first-hand. Yet, he has empathy for those who turn to crime due to lack of economic opportunities. “These are youth. These are people who’ve been working for themselves, aiming for a good future to see their lives better,” says Bob. Like many people in the area, Bob knows the frustration of unemployment, as he struggles to find work despite a wealth of experience. “I feel like my hands are cut off. I want to do something,” he says.

For Bob, Toronto’s trees are a missed economic and environmental opportunity. In Uganda, mango trees and other fruit-bearing plants grow everywhere, and their fruit is available to everyone. Bob envisions a Toronto where public land is used to grow fresh fruits and vegetables, economically marginalized people are hired to harvest the food, and all Torontonians have access to fresh, healthy foods. Despite not yet being able to work, it is Bob’s love for Canada that drives his vision. “I can still be someone who will make an impact on my community.”

**City Voices**

**Bob Muwanguzi**

in Chalkfarm

Since Bob moved from Uganda to Jane Street and Wilson Avenue, known as “Chalkfarm,” as a refugee in 2016, he has witnessed economic despair and violent crime first-hand. Yet, he has empathy for those who turn to crime due to lack of economic opportunities. “These are youth. These are people who’ve been working for themselves, aiming for a good future to see their lives better,” says Bob. Like many people in the area, Bob knows the frustration of unemployment, as he struggles to find work despite a wealth of experience. “I feel like my hands are cut off. I want to do something,” he says.

For Bob, Toronto’s trees are a missed economic and environmental opportunity. In Uganda, mango trees and other fruit-bearing plants grow everywhere, and their fruit is available to everyone. Bob envisions a Toronto where public land is used to grow fresh fruits and vegetables, economically marginalized people are hired to harvest the food, and all Torontonians have access to fresh, healthy foods. Despite not yet being able to work, it is Bob’s love for Canada that drives his vision. “I can still be someone who will make an impact on my community.”
Toronto’s beaches are a widely appreciated feature of our city, especially for those who don’t have the means to leave the city in the summer, as they are a vital public asset for recreation and keeping cool. Yet, in 2017, there were a total of 91 warnings issued on 52 different days because of high levels of E. coli at all 11 of our beaches. This is compared to 57 warnings on 36 different days across 10 of our 11 beaches in 2016.

A 2015 study found that living near multiple roads can expose a person to up to 10 times more pollutants than not living near major roads. Traffic-related air pollution has many negative health effects. It can worsen asthma symptoms and result in the onset of asthma in children, in addition to negatively affecting the heart and lungs. According to a 2014-15 analysis, residents with asthma were more concentrated in the eastern and western parts of the city.

One way people are adapting to the effects of climate change in Toronto is through consistent and effective home cooling systems. Yet, those most vulnerable to experiencing health issues from extreme heat — isolated seniors, people with chronic and pre-existing illnesses, children and the marginally housed or homeless — are the groups who are less likely to have access to adequate housing (let alone housing with reliable cooling systems).
“Toronto residents continue to be exposed to unacceptable levels of air pollution, including fine particulates.”

either because of family income or due to a lack of affordable housing. Torontonians who live in older apartment buildings are also at greater risk due to the lack of air conditioning. These buildings are often home to low-income residents and those who are new to Canada. In 2016, Toronto Public Health issued 14 heat alerts and eight extreme heat alerts, making it one of the worst years on record.

Despite a marked decrease in the number of smog days (due to the closure of the coal-fired electricity plants and investment in transit and active transportation), Toronto residents continue to be exposed to unacceptable levels of air pollution, including fine particulates. We need to: 1. get people out of cars, by providing safe, reliable and accessible transit and infrastructure to promote active forms of transportation; and 2. move quickly to fulfill earlier policy commitments to increase the forest canopy cover in Toronto to 40 per cent (it’s currently 26 per cent). Trees help to mitigate air pollution, thereby reducing the exposure of local residents to a major driver of poor health.

The distribution of nature in the city is not equitable. While Toronto overall is the most-forested city in the country, many neighbourhoods, especially racialized and lower-income areas, lack a well-developed urban tree canopy.

Residents across the city can replace impermeable surfaces around their homes with gardens, rain gardens, trees and other greening interventions at the local scale. Philanthropists can fund community-led urban-greening programs, particularly in those neighbourhoods that lack a well-developed forest canopy.
Effective, efficient and accessible transportation is essential for any major city’s economic productivity and liveability. From an economic perspective, having a fast, reliable and efficient transportation system means that goods, services and resources reach their destinations and their markets more quickly, which has a positive impact on productivity and growth.

Access to good transit can also have positive upstream effects on a city’s health and well-being. When people spend less time travelling to and from their daily commitments, they can invest more time in their families, their friends, their neighbourhoods and themselves. This can mean having more time to eat well, exercise and use healthier modes of transportation such as biking or walking.

In 2017, the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) won the American Public Transportation Association Award for Outstanding Public Transportation System, due to “demonstrated efficiency, effectiveness, and system improvements and investments, as compared to other transit systems in North America.” Despite our award-winning public transit system, Toronto still struggles with traffic congestion, equitable transit access and long commuting times, especially for inner-suburban residents.
Toronto is certainly to some extent a transit-riding city, with only one-in-five residents reporting that they never use public transit, and 52 per cent reporting using it at least once a month. In 2016, the TTC provided 538,079,000 passenger trips on 161 passenger lines, including bus, streetcar and subway lines and the Scarborough RT.

However, car culture dominates. Use of a private motor vehicle (50.6 per cent), is the most commonly reported means of daily transportation in Toronto, followed by public transit (37 per cent) and walking or cycling (11.35 per cent).

On average, Torontonians spend 34 minutes commuting to work, longer than residents in any other major city in Canada and well above the national average of 26.2 minutes. Toronto also has the highest proportion (16.2 per cent) of people who spend more than 60 minutes travelling to work, the majority (75.9 per cent) of whom are public transit users.

Those who travel by car enjoy much shorter commute times, compared to those who rely on public transit. For those travelling by car, truck or van, 51.5 per cent spend 29 minutes or fewer getting to work on a daily basis, compared to only 17.4 per cent who rely on public transit. Yet, 30.2 per cent of public transit commuters in Toronto spend an hour or more getting to work every day, compared to only 7.2 per cent of drivers. Individuals who rely on active transportation (walking, cycling, etc.) enjoy the lowest commuting times by far, with 80.95 per cent spending 29 minutes or fewer on their daily commute.

Despite a heavy reliance on personal vehicles overall, Toronto is also a very accessible city for those who can rely on active transportation. Walk Score — which measures walkability on a scale from
Traffic congestion also has a big impact on overall productivity. Toronto’s congestion level results in 30 per cent extra travel time, when compared with an uncongested situation. On average, this results in 34 extra minutes of travel time per day or 130 hours per year.86

Affordable and efficient transportation is a key factor in the liveability of a city or neighbourhood. Accessing reliable and cost-effective transportation is necessary for all residents of Toronto, regardless of income or geography, but a 2015 public survey of GTA adults suggested that transportation options vary widely by income. Of those with an annual income of less than $50,000, 24 per cent reported taking public transit every day.87 This compares to only 12 per cent of people with incomes between $50,000 and $99,000 and 11 per cent of those who earn more than $100,000 annually.88 Moreover, the majority (53 per cent) in the highest income bracket reported using public transit less than once a month or never. The same poll found similar patterns among age groups: 26 per cent of those 18–34 rely on public transit, compared to 12 per cent of those between 35–54 and 9 per cent of people over the age of 55.89 Given that commute times are longer on average for public transit than travel by car, this data suggests
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### Reported Transit Use by Income Group, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>&lt;$50K</th>
<th>$50-99K</th>
<th>$100K+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday/It’s how you get around</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3 times per week</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3 times per month</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe once a month</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than that</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to get to work every day, Edith must stick to a razor-sharp schedule. She wakes up at 4:30 a.m. and is out the door by 6:00 a.m., first dropping off her son, 8, at daycare. She then walks 20 minutes to the GO station and takes the train to Ajax. Finally, the bus takes to her workplace. On the best days, she travels for a total of six hours — three hours in the morning, and three to get back home in the evening. But when the weather is bad, or when the trains are delayed, Edith’s commutes take nightmarishly long and cuts drastically into her workday. Since she is paid hourly, she earns less income on these days. Even worse is when Edith’s son is sick. No matter how quickly she leaves work, Edith is never able to rush to her son’s side, as she must commute for hours to get to him. Edith’s long journey stresses her out, and that daily grind has an effect on her health. “Sometimes I feel tired and I just want to go to bed early,” she says. “Why? Because I need to wake up at 4:30 again.”

“Toronto’s congestion level results in 30 per cent extra travel time, when compared with an uncongested situation.”
their overall income on transit, compared to middle- and high-income earners. Toronto city council adopted a low-income transit pass policy in principle in 2017, but we await the results of the 2018 budget to see if funding will be available to make it a reality.

High fares are especially problematic, considering that those who are living on low incomes are the ones who rely on affordable, accessible and reliable public transit the most, especially the working poor. Affordable public transit is an even bigger issue for individuals who rely on multiple regional transit systems in the GTA, where fares are not widely integrated. For example, individuals who need to travel from Toronto to York Region would have to pay additional fares in order to reach their destination. However, beginning January 2018, commuters who transfer between GO Transit and the TTC receive $1.50 break on their fares, thanks to a provincially subsidized co-fare agreement that will allow riders who use both agencies on a single trip to avoid paying two full-price fares, if using their Presto fare card.

Public transit (either TTC or GO) use is more heavily concentrated in the downtown wards. Based on the 2011 Transportation Tomorrow Survey, Toronto Centre-Rosedale (Ward 28) had the highest proportion of public transit trips at 40 per cent, followed by Parkdale-High Park (Ward 14) at 37 per cent. These findings are unsurprising, as public transit is highly accessible in terms of both proximity and frequency of service in these communities.

A true understanding of transportation patterns requires not only a breakdown of how people are travelling, but also where they are travelling to and from. Overall, the greatest single destination is downtown Toronto, but in the regions of North York, Etobicoke and Scarborough, most trips are taken locally. Toronto’s existing transportation infrastructure is often seen as a subway system that funnels travellers.
Leslie Woo
Chief Planning Officer,
Metrolinx

Toronto does not sit as an island in terms of where people need to get to and from. Interconnectivity to employment inside and outside of Toronto needs to be better physically connected, and the fare system needs to be more consistent across transit operators.

Our biggest opportunities include regional fare integration and a community benefits program linked to all transit construction projects, facilitating more apprenticeships and training in the rapid transit expansion build underway by Metrolinx.

Overall, there are four key things residents, policy-makers and philanthropists can do to improve how we get around: 1. Recognize that fare integration is one of the best ways to leverage the multibillion-dollar rapid transit infrastructure build currently underway; 2. Work better at collaboration so that integration of all modes — walking, cycling, transit car-sharing and auto use — are treated as a hierarchy of uses, and that investments should support that; 3. Recognize that evidence-based decision-making that takes the long view allows us to think about future generations and the transportation legacy we need to invest in; and 4. Realize Vision-Zero, a plan to eradicate road fatalities with concrete measures to ensure safer streets.

Active transportation is a key way that people can incorporate regular physical activity into their daily routines and enjoy the resulting health benefits. Opting to use active transportation also has environmental benefits by reducing road congestion and vehicle-related greenhouse gas emissions. Active transportation is far more prevalent in the downtown wards. The vast majority of Toronto’s most walkable neighbourhoods are in the downtown core and along major east-end roadways. The neighbourhoods with the lowest walkability scores tend to be in inner-suburban neighbourhoods in Etobicoke and Scarborough.
Health is one of the most important quality of life indicators, and it is strongly affected by social determinants. Individual and community health can be influenced by income and social status, social support networks, education and literacy, employment, social and physical environments, personal health practices, child development, biology and genetics, access to health-care services, gender and culture. Because health is affected by so many diverse factors, it can be one of the most telling indicators about the effect of inequity on well-being. For example, the Public Health Agency of Canada estimates that roughly 20 per cent of total health-care spending is dedicated to addressing the negative health outcomes associated with inequities. Toronto’s share of those costs represents about $2.2 billion annually, making health — and the social determinants that affect health outcomes — a significant factor in our economic and physical well-being.

Generally speaking, Toronto is a relatively healthy city and shows slightly better health outcomes when compared with provincial averages. Life expectancy, overweight and obesity rates, physical activity, lung cancer and breast cancer incidences are all slightly better in Toronto, when compared to Ontario overall. Torontonians also self-report relatively good measures of
As the largest Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) in the province (and the country), Toronto accordingly has a high number of people with disabilities compared to other CMAs in Ontario. In 2017, 116,886 people living in the Toronto CMA were in receipt of the Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP), representing 44 per cent of the overall ODSP caseload, which roughly compares to our population size relative to that of the entire province.

While socio-demographic characteristics of those receiving ODSP in the Toronto CMA are also mostly in line with provincial averages, Toronto does have a significantly higher proportion of older adults (aged 55–64) receiving ODSP, compared to other CMAs.

No health indicator offers a starker insight into health inequity than mortality rates. A Toronto Public Health analysis of 2008–10 data determined that residents in the lowest 20 per cent income group have a significantly higher mortality rate when compared to the highest 20 per cent income group. Adjusted for variation in age, the mortality rate for low-income Torontonians is 16 per cent higher than it is for the most affluent. For every 100,000 people, that translates to over 63 additional deaths resulting from the health effects of living in poverty, a number comparable to the city’s murder rate.

Infant mortality is another widely used public health indicator. It reflects the overall health of the population, as well as the quality of health care. Even in Toronto, with high-quality universal health care, infant mortality in the lowest income group from 2006–10 was 6.5 per cent, which is more than 50 per cent higher than in the highest income group. That translates to two more infant deaths for every 1,000 babies born to low-income families — an alarming result of inequity.

“In Toronto, infant mortality in the lowest income group is 50 per cent higher than in the highest income group — an alarming result of inequity.”
Self-reported general health is an effective indicator of physical well-being, so statistics showing sharp differences among demographic groups in self-reported health are cause for concern. In 2014, almost 60 per cent of Toronto residents rated their health as “excellent” or “very good.” However, there are significant differences in self-perceived health by geography, income level and immigration status:

- Only 46.5 per cent of residents in east Scarborough rate their health as “excellent” or “very good.” In some neighbourhoods, ratings were dramatically higher, including Toronto Centre at 64.1 per cent and Danforth and East York at 63.3 per cent;
- Fewer immigrants (53.7 per cent) rated their health as “excellent” or “very good,” compared with Canadian-born residents (66.9 per cent); and
- Fewer than half of low-income earners (47.6 per cent) and only 56.4 per cent of middle-income earners described their health as “excellent” or “very good,” a stark contrast to 72.6 per cent of high-income earners.

These variations in perceived health status reflect a wide range of causes, including low incomes, housing precarity and other stresses that disproportionately affect immigrants, people of colour and other marginalized residents. Despite our high-quality health-care system, these social factors play an enormous role in the well-being of Torontonians.

Accessing a family doctor is also a key component of health care. However, 2013 data indicates that access is uneven in our city. Far fewer residents on the west side of the city and downtown are enrolled with a primary physician than those in the north and east ends. For instance, in south Parkdale, 27.1 per cent to 30 per cent did not have a primary health-care provider, and in Rockcliffe-Smythe, which is just south of Jane Street and Eglinton Avenue, that figure was 30.1 per cent to 38.3 per cent.

![Self-Reported Health by Income and Immigration Status, Toronto, 2014](image)
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Adequate consumption of fruits and vegetables is a proxy for good eating habits and a building block of good health. A diet rich in these foods has many health benefits. Among Toronto adults, daily consumption of fruits and vegetables varies demographically. A Toronto Public Health analysis of eating habits from 2007–14 looking at daily consumption of fruit and vegetables five or more times per day found that:

- Females are more likely (43.3 per cent) than males (35.5 per cent);
- Adults over the age of 40 are more likely (40.5 per cent among those aged 40–64 years and 46 per cent among those 65 years and older) than those aged 20–39 years (35.8 per cent);
- Longer-term immigrants (41.6 per cent) and Canadian-born residents (41.4 per cent) are more likely than recent immigrants (32 per cent); and
- Middle- (40 per cent) and high-income (41.8 per cent) earners are more likely than low-income (36.4 per cent) earners.

Living in poverty is arguably the biggest barrier to food security, which can have devastating effects on an individual’s health. Daily Bread Food Bank’s annual statistics show that 64 per cent
of food bank users in Toronto relied on ODSP or Ontario Works (OW) as their primary source of income in 2016-2017. The disparity between current income support rates from ODSP and OW and the rising costs of living is increasing reliance on food banks. Effective fall 2017, the rate for a single person receiving OW is only $721 per month, and for a single person receiving ODSP it is $1,151 per month.118

Being in receipt of ODSP doesn’t tell the full story of how many people with disabilities live in Toronto and live in poverty. It can take several months and sometimes years for individuals to qualify for ODSP. As a result, many Ontarians with disabilities end up reliant on other types of income support, such as OW, while they complete the ODSP adjudication process. As of March 2017, there were 201,607 people in receipt of OW in Ontario, 51 per cent of whom live in the Toronto CMA. Of those, 54 per cent were in receipt of assistance for 19 months or longer, indicating long-term barriers to employment.119

Diabetes rates are also consistently higher among low-income populations, compared to middle- and high-income populations, and this holds true in Toronto. Diabetes prevalence for the City of Toronto is 10 for age-standardized prevalence per

Rosie Mensah at Jane Street and Finch Avenue

Rosie grew up at Jane Street and Finch Avenue, where there is a strong sense of community and a lot of resilience. It’s also a “food swamp” — where a high concentration of fast food exists, with very little access to nutritious food. As a result, Rosie experienced the “obesity-hunger” paradox, an ongoing cycle in which she went through regular periods of hunger, but was also overweight because she only ever had access to unhealthy food. At 13, she noticed the toll it was taking on her physical and mental health, and she worked hard to eat healthier while living within her means.

Now, at age 24, Rosie sees how people in her community are struggling with the destructive effects of poor nutrition, including high rates of diabetes, hypertension, arthritis and depression. Rosie is even more troubled by the ripple effects of bad health. “We’re losing human capital,” she says. “Your ability to thrive, to pursue education, to pursue any opportunities, is really difficult when you’re experiencing poor health.” As an active member of the Black Creek Food Justice Network and as a master’s of public health student at the University of Toronto, Rosie knows food is the key to revitalizing her community’s health. “Food is more than just nutrition: it’s culture, it’s identity. It’s a way of life.”
Our biggest challenge is our aging population and ensuring they get equitable access to the services that they need to stay well. The second biggest challenge will be keeping us all healthy in the face of the physical problems of affluence facing countries like Canada, such as diabetes and cardiac conditions linked to inactivity.

We all need to focus on our growing health disparities and the reasons for them. The truth is that the top 10 per cent of earners have better health than the other 90 per cent of people in Toronto. Rather than just focusing on the easy target of those in poverty, we should focus on how the 90 per cent can have the same level of health and well-being as the 10 per cent. This widening of the focus to true equity gives Toronto the strongest chance of improvements in health for all. It increases the chance of buy-in, too, because everyone can see themselves in the transformation toward fairness.

This gap is a social cancer. It produces barriers between communities and decreases people’s willingness to be active citizens. It decreases people’s knowledge and understanding of each other and reduces trust in government, too. Toronto is at the stage where we can rebuild trust and reinvigorate our institutions. This is what we need to do if we want a solid basis for developing connected approaches to health equity across government and other sectors.
Everyone deserves to have a safe place to live. Having a decent, stable, affordable home is one of the most important factors in creating a vibrant and healthy society. Research has shown that access to safe housing is also a key determinant of outcomes in education, health and overall well-being.\footnote{124}

Housing costs are also a key economic indicator of a city’s affordability. When households spend more than 30 per cent of their gross income on housing, it can result in greater financial strain, meaning fewer resources at their disposal to spend on other necessary goods such as food, clothing and transportation.\footnote{125}

Lack of safe and stable housing is also an aggravating factor for people struggling with other issues in their lives. Research has shown that for populations living with mental health issues, addictions and poverty, having a home significantly deepens the effectiveness of other supportive services.\footnote{126}

Our housing system is facing many challenges. Home ownership is now unaffordable to many who would have made the transition to ownership in earlier times when real estate was more affordable; this reality is now keeping more households in a rental market with a vacancy rate that is low and falling.\footnote{127} According to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, a healthy housing market has a rental vacancy rate of 3 per cent. The vacancy rate for the Toronto (CMA) rental market was 1.3 per cent in 2016.\footnote{128} Vancouver’s housing
squeeze is even more severe (0.7 per cent), while Montreal’s market sits around the traditional level (3.9 per cent) and Calgary’s rate is more than double the healthy level (7 per cent).\footnote{129}

Toronto is in desperate need of a full spectrum of housing that is accessible and affordable, and the system is failing to meet demand in every category. Subsidized housing is in short supply, with more people now waiting for social housing than there are people living in it. Each year, Toronto falls far short of addressing the need for affordable housing, while supportive housing, with the services that assist people facing severe challenges in maintaining housing, is even less accessible. For those in housing crisis, whether they are homeless or leaving an unsafe home, we have a shelter system that is full every night and turning people away. And residents in “transitional” beds spend years in a shelter, rather than moving to more stable housing because there are few places for them to go.

With the announcement of a National Housing Strategy, Many Torontonians are hopeful that progress will be made on these issues. The federal government has recognized that housing is “a right,” and that everyone ought to have access to housing, regardless of their income.\footnote{130} Going from recognizing housing as a right to having real and affordable homes that meet the city’s housing demands will require considerable work and investment that significantly exceeds what the federal government has committed so far; it will require drawing on all levels of government, the corporate sector and philanthropy for greater generosity and creativity in the housing sector.

Vacancy Rates for Selected Cities, 2013 to 2016

Toronto (CMA) | Montreal | Calgary (CMA) | Vancouver (CMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Toronto (CMA)</th>
<th>Montreal</th>
<th>Calgary (CMA)</th>
<th>Vancouver (CMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investments in housing are not simply good for the people they house; they provide broader benefits to society at large. As the City of Toronto’s Housing Opportunities report points out, “every 1,000 units of affordable housing built creates between 2,000 and 2,500 person years of employment.”

Creating housing is also a cost-saving measure. One unit of affordable housing costs, on average, $23 per day, compared to the much higher cost of the various other locations many homeless people find themselves in when affordable housing is not available: such as emergency shelters ($69 per day), jails ($142 per day) and hospitals ($665 per day).

Yet Toronto still struggles with access to affordable housing. In 2016, 494 affordable units of new housing were completed across all providers of affordable housing: 453 were designed for rental and 41 for ownership. This is a considerable improvement from previous years. In 2015, only 48 rental and 66 ownership units were completed. However, since Toronto city council set a goal in 2009 to create 10,000 new affordable rental homes and 2,000 new affordable ownership homes by the year 2020, the city has only once completed the required 1,000 homes in any one year.

Despite recent increases in the creation of affordable housing, the city’s most recent estimates indicate it will see less than half the target number of homes completed over the 10-year period.

While Toronto is in dire need of more affordable housing, the state of disrepair of the existing housing stock threatens to deplete supply. Since 2002, Toronto Community Housing, the city’s primary affordable housing provider, has created 277 net new units. However, Toronto Community Housing experienced a serious setback in 2017 with the closure of 134 homes in the Grassways community in North York. These homes, which are scheduled for demolition in 2018, were taken out of the housing stock because their advanced state of disrepair made them irreparable.

While new housing stock is required, adequate funding needs to be invested in existing housing stock, so that net increases to available affordable homes can be met.

Many housing units of all kinds in Toronto are in need of repair. Census data from 2016 shows that 7.1 per cent (78,595 units) of private dwellings are in need of major repair. Some areas of the city face bigger challenges than others. In many cases, these correlate strongly with lower-income neighbourhoods. In one census tract of the city, as much as 25.7 per cent of housing is in need of serious repair.

Statistics Canada also uses suitability to gauge the housing need. Housing suitability measures whether there are enough bedrooms for the size and composition of the household. Across Toronto (134,820 households), nearly one in eight (12.1 per cent) residents lives in housing that is considered not suitable.

From an equity perspective, it is important to note that the housing shortage does not affect all populations equally. Rental housing access in particular is affected by discrimination. According to data from Statistics Canada’s 2016 census, individuals and families in low-income neighbourhoods are far more likely to be in core housing need — meaning that they are spending 30 per cent or more of their income on housing costs.
As the new National Housing Strategy recognizes, the housing crisis has a disproportionate effect on women, especially women leaving violent domestic situations.\textsuperscript{147}

Renters are also more likely to be in core housing need, compared to home owners: in 2016, nearly half (46.8 per cent) of tenant households spent more than 30 per cent of their income on housing, compared to just over a quarter (27.4 per cent) of owner households.\textsuperscript{148}

And Torontonians of diverse backgrounds face additional and systemic challenges within the rental housing market. According to a 2009 study on rental housing discrimination, some populations face significant barriers to finding safe, adequate and affordable housing when compared to other groups. Certain demographic groups face much higher refusal rates or other barriers to rental applications. People facing a mental health illness (35 per cent), Black lone-parent families (26 per cent) and people receiving social assistance (24 per cent) confront the greatest rates of discrimination in Toronto’s rental housing market.\textsuperscript{149}

For most of her life, Shannon Holness called Firgrove community housing, a cluster of low-rise apartment blocks and townhomes in North York, home. “Growing up, I was able to have a community,” Shannon recalls. “There were lots of young people in the neighbourhood and it was very diverse.” Like many others in the area, Shannon’s mother paid rent geared to income, and was able to pursue her education to create a better life for her and her children. But last year, Shannon’s community got the news that 132 units of housing would be knocked down. She, along with more than 120 other families, would be forced to relocate to other community housing spread out across Toronto. Shannon’s entire life and community were uprooted, along with her schooling. She took the summer off to move, and changed her whole thesis to reflect her experiences. “I saw the underside of revitalization,” she explains. “Revitalization sounds so nice and pretty, but it’s also displacement.” Now, with a masters in environmental studies, Shannon is setting down a path dedicated to community development. “I’m committed to working in communities and making sure that communities’ voices are amplified,” she says.
Discrimination in the rental housing market perpetuates the socio-demographic trends we are seeing in Toronto’s homeless shelters. System failures and structural factors such as low rental vacancy rates and a lack of affordable options, as well as individual and relational factors such as mental health, substance abuse challenges or family violence, can lead some people to homelessness. In 2016, almost 3,150 individuals stayed in a homeless shelter every night, on average. At the same time, close to 1,000 individuals were accessing family shelters.

Estimates regarding the proportion of homeless youth in Toronto are considerably higher than Canadian averages. While approximately 18.7 per cent of homeless individuals across Canada are between the ages of 16 and 24, some estimates suggest that the youth homelessness rate in Toronto is as high as 28 per cent of the homeless population, representing as many as 850 or more homeless youth in Toronto on any given night.

Not only are structural and systemic issues forcing people to live without a home, but also year after year, many turn to the streets because our shelters are full. Trends in reliance on homeless shelters are also changing. While historically, Toronto has seen a decline in shelter occupancy rates over the summer season, 2016 saw consistent shelter use regardless of the season. Even as new beds are added to the emergency shelter system, this high demand is expected to remain. The average occupancy rate of homeless shelters in Toronto in 2017 was 95 per cent and was projected to grow to 97 per cent by the end of 2018, substantially above the target occupancy rate of 90 per cent. On January 2, 2018, the city reported a 30 per cent increase in average nightly use of shelter beds, compared to one year previous.

The high number of shelter use is due, at least in part, to the high cost of living, lack of affordable housing and long wait list for social housing. The wait list for social housing in Toronto was 98,928 people in 2016. It has grown exponentially over the past decade and is expected to reach 106,746 by 2020.

The lengthy wait list for affordable housing will not be addressed without a considerable increase in the production of new affordable homes. With only a few hundred affordable housing units created each year, Toronto builds at a small fraction of the pace needed to address the demand.
Toronto’s housing shortage results from a complex mix of factors. The proliferation of short-term rentals, linked to online hotel-style rental services such as Airbnb, has been a source of concern. The City of Toronto estimates that over one million nights of accommodation were provided through 20,000 short-term rental sites in 2016 alone.\textsuperscript{160} New City of Toronto regulations have put constraints on the rental of secondary suites in homes for this purpose, reserving those units for longer-term housing in an attempt to protect a key component of Toronto’s affordable housing market.\textsuperscript{161}

Housing mobility is our biggest challenge. Ask any provider of transitional housing and they will tell you that people are staying longer than the program intended because there are no affordable transition options.

A sustainable housing system requires a balanced supply of housing across the full spectrum of needs, from homelessness to supportive housing to affordable rental to market rental to affordable ownership and market ownership. Moreover, people in all parts of the housing spectrum require avenues through which they can aspire and enabling supports to help them move from one kind of housing to another.

Governments should create incentives for philanthropists to invest in housing. In parallel, government funding programs for housing should be designed to incent housing providers to secure matching commitments from individuals, businesses and groups in local communities.

Businesses and individual philanthropists should recognize that investing in housing is a huge aspect of community building and in laying the foundation for a vibrant, thriving city for their children and grandchildren.

Leaders in the development and real estate sectors who have been beneficiaries of the real estate market should make housing a central pillar of their community investment priorities. All stakeholders should work together courageously to counter not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) attitudes and change the way citizens think about housing and density, and what it means to live in a growing, world-class city.
The effects of poverty on health, security and social inclusion are evident, both through research and through lived experience. We have learned that the gap between the rich and poor does not just affect those living in poverty; the gap can also aggravate social, economic and community issues. Studies have shown that countries with high levels of income and wealth inequality experience more problems when it comes to physical health, mental health, drug abuse, poor educational attainment, imprisonment, obesity, social mobility, trust and community life, violence, teenage pregnancies and child well-being. When resources and income are shared more evenly across a population, it levels the playing field and makes access to opportunity more widespread.

Inequality is growing in Toronto, and it is playing out in concerning ways. One in five people in the city lives in poverty, the middle class has been consistently declining over the past 45 years, and income and wealth inequality is growing. Systemic issues such as the increase in precarious work, rising costs of real estate and high costs of living are increasingly making Toronto a city of “haves” and “have-nots.”
While many consider themselves to be “middle class,” according to analysis of the latest census data, a middle income, or the income range that is in the centre of the income spectrum (divided in quintiles or by fifths), in Canada in 2015 was only $24,000 to $42,000. And the average real employment income increase for this cohort was 6.1 per cent from 2005–15, whereas the top fifth of all earners saw an increase of 9.1 per cent. In 2015, the median total household income in Toronto was $65,829, lower than both the figures for the national and provincial levels, at $70,366 and $74,287, respectively, and the lowest of all regions in the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area (GTHA). Toronto has the second-highest proportion of households earning more than $100,000 annually in the country at 10.5 per cent, after Calgary, which is at 16.3 per cent, but higher than Vancouver at 9.8 per cent and almost double that in Montreal, which is at 5.9 per cent.

Recent data produced by United Way Toronto & York Region on income inequality between neighbourhoods shows that Toronto is the income inequality capital of Canada. In 2015, Toronto neighbourhoods had the highest levels of inequality as measured by the Gini coefficient (0.226), followed by those in Calgary (0.2118), Montreal (0.1715) and Vancouver (0.1643).

Toronto has also seen the second-highest growth rates of income inequality across the city over the past 45 years. Between 1970 and 2015, income inequality in Toronto grew by 68 per cent, after Calgary (70 per cent). Toronto’s rate was more than double that of Vancouver (30 per cent) and four times that of Montreal (17 per cent).

* The Gini coefficient is a measure used to determine how equally income is distributed within a population. A Gini coefficient of one would mean that all income would be taken by a single person, whereas a Gini coefficient of zero would mean that the income of an entire population would be shared equally among that population.
Income inequality is both a cause and an effect of high levels of poverty in Toronto. Census data from 2016 indicates that 20.2 per cent of Torontonians live on low incomes* — which is more than 25 per cent higher than across Canada (14.2 per cent) and Ontario (14.4 per cent) and almost double compared to the GTHA (11.9 per cent).\textsuperscript{173} Compared to other cities, there is also a greater prevalence of low-income residents in Toronto than in Calgary (9.3 per cent) and Vancouver (18.8 per cent), though it’s a slightly lower percentage than the proportion in Montreal (21.3 per cent).\textsuperscript{174} With such high levels of poverty overall, it is not surprising that Toronto remains the child poverty capital of Canada, with 26.3 per cent of young people under 18 living on low incomes. This is worse than Montreal (22.6 per cent), Vancouver (19.9 per cent) and more than double the figure in Calgary (12.9 per cent).\textsuperscript{175} An extremely troubling statistic for many reasons, child poverty has been shown to negatively affect an individual’s socio-economic mobility, often resulting in lower educational attainment, worse health and lower levels of income in the long-run.\textsuperscript{176} Even more troubling is that Toronto’s overall child poverty rate has consistently hovered around 30 per cent since 1997.\textsuperscript{177} Toronto’s rising cost of living, coupled with stagnating incomes among low-income populations and high rates of poverty, has significantly increased reliance on food banks. From April 2016 to March 2017, there were close to one million (990,970) food banks visits in Toronto. Of those who accessed a food bank, 56 per cent were born outside of Canada and 62 per cent had a disability.\textsuperscript{178} Older adults are also increasingly reliant on food banks. Over the past 10 years, food banks have seen a consistent increase in the number of visits of Torontonians aged 45 and older, with the greatest increase among those aged 65 and older.\textsuperscript{179}

\* based on the Statistics Canada 2015 Low-Income Measure, After-Tax
Over the past 40 years, the proportion of middle-income neighbourhoods has declined dramatically across large Canadian cities. Toronto (CMA) has fared particularly poorly, compared to Montreal, Calgary and Vancouver.180 In 1970, nearly 60 per cent of Toronto’s neighbourhoods were middle income, compared to only 29 per cent in 2015.181

Not only has the gap between the rich and the poor in Toronto grown substantially over time, but we are also seeing a shift in how this gap is distributed across Toronto’s neighbourhoods. Over the last 40 years, low-income residents have moved from being primarily in the inner city to the inner suburbs.182 The highest median incomes are now found in the centre of the city, roughly bounded by Bloor Street, Leslie Avenue, Wilson Avenue and Bathurst Street, as well as in the Royal York Road and Bloor Street West area. The pattern of lower median household incomes forms a U-shape, reaching from northwest Etobicoke, through the downtown core and then up through East York and central Scarborough.183

Paul in East York vividly remembers the first time he used the word “poor” to describe himself. “People were shocked,” he recalls. “They asked, ‘Are you sure you want to say that?’” In Paul’s experience, many people who struggle with poverty keep it hidden because they feel ashamed. Paul has a different perspective: “I’m not embarrassed by it. It’s the way things are.”

Paul’s ability to earn an income was cut short when he was just 39 years old. After being exposed to toxic carpet adhesive during workplace renovations, he was left with a lifelong disability and was unable to work. “From that point, I wound up going on welfare, then I wound up going on ODSP,” he explains. “It has crippled me, if you will, philosophically, as well as in the pocketbook.”

Now 65, Paul is finding the daily challenges of being poor more difficult than ever. “When your funds are limited, everything seems to be a struggle,” he says. “I don’t get to do the things I would like to do.” Paul draws comfort from his sister Maureen, and he has found purpose as a poverty justice advocate. “You can go up to every single person and depress them with what’s going wrong in your life, or you can get up and fight. I prefer to fight.”
According to their 2014–15 Our Health Counts Toronto study, 84 per cent of Indigenous families with children were living in poverty.\textsuperscript{189}

Inequity in Toronto also reflects gender divides in our city. Median after-tax income is persistently lower for women than it is for men. In 2015, women in Toronto earned approximately 15 per cent less than men, where the average median income was $30,661 for men, compared to only $25,918 for women.\textsuperscript{190}

In addition to income, inequality can also be measured in terms of wealth. While incomes vary, a person’s financial status is also supported by his or her level of wealth: the savings and other assets a person has accumulated over time.\textsuperscript{191} People may accumulate wealth by having higher incomes that allow for a greater proportion of savings, by receiving an inheritance or gift from a relative or by the appreciation of property they own. Not only does wealth offer a sense of security, but it also creates more opportunities for financial gain and economic growth over time. All of these economic assets tend to reinforce the financial advantages some groups have over those who are starting without similar economic assets and advantages. Recent research shows that wealth inequity is so severe in the United States that it would take over 200 years of generational accumulation for

While Toronto prides itself on being the diversity capital of Canada, systemic discrimination in our institutions and society at large has resulted in the racialization of poverty. Racialized residents continue to have less income on average and greater numbers live in poverty when compared to non-racialized groups.\textsuperscript{184} In 2016, 20.4 per cent of racialized individuals in Toronto lived below the poverty line, compared to only 10.5 per cent of non-racialized groups.\textsuperscript{185} According to the 2016 census, racialized men living in the Toronto Region have a median total income that is $19,000 less than non-racialized men. Racialized women have a median total income that is approximately $12,000 less than non-racialized women.\textsuperscript{186}

Poverty disproportionately affects children from certain households. There are more than twice as many children from racialized families in Toronto living in poverty (25.3 per cent), compared to those in non-racialized households (11.4 per cent).\textsuperscript{187}

The legacy and impact of both historic and current systems of discrimination, racism and colonialism continue to negatively affect the lived realities of Toronto’s Indigenous communities. Data generated through Well Living House showed that in 2016, 91 per cent of the estimated 34,000 to 69,000 Indigenous people who lived in Toronto were on incomes below the before-tax low-income cut-off (LICO).\textsuperscript{188}
Toronto is now the child poverty capital of Canada and the income inequality capital of Canada.

Not long ago, Toronto was a middle-class city, featuring nearly 60 per cent of neighbourhoods that were middle-income in 1970, as opposed to only 29 per cent in 2015.

Worsening poverty and a shrinking middle class is a recipe for decline: social instability, lack of inclusiveness, less faith that the system can work for everyone.

The corroding effect of high levels of income inequality touches every single indicator in this report. It makes every problem identified in this report harder to solve.

We take for granted the overall stability of this diverse and vibrant city, but the underlying fragility of a community that tolerates such high levels of income inequality cannot be understated. Destabilizers compound in a hurry.

The good news is that further decline is preventable, as long as we act now — when economically, times are good, and we still have means. We should be galvanized by the prospect that tackling income inequality and its discontents is a highly doable project.

It’s time to get real about the need to raise taxes in order to invest in solutions that reduce inequality, increase social inclusion and increase inclusiveness. Collectively, we have the power to turn around the worst aspects of income inequality, through redistribution. If we do that, everyone benefits.
Leadership, civic engagement and a sense of belonging are critical to a healthy democracy. The extent to which people participate in social and democratic institutions and the diversity that is reflected in those institutions tell us how representative governance systems are and how equitably our societies are governed.

In Canada, the freedom to participate in political processes is guaranteed by law through the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; however, not all groups are proportionately represented across civil society.

Understanding how different groups engage in civil society and what barriers may exist to civic participation is important if we are to build a more inclusive, representative and democratic society. Civic participation also extends beyond the ballot box. Participating in civil society through volunteering, participating in non-profit groups or associations, or in acts of charity or philanthropy are important indicators for social cohesion and a vital, vibrant society. In large part, it’s the audible voices of social engagement that make our communities strong.
movements and organizations like Black Lives Matter Toronto, Commitment 2 Community and Fairbnb who speak out and bring attention to critical issues facing our city about policing, poverty and housing, and when local activists like Cathy Crowe and Desmond Cole remind us that Toronto is and must be open for debate. The community organizations and the people behind them who are leading these causes serve as critical functions in our democracy, and progress within our city and communities would not be possible without them.

The community organizations and the people behind them who are leading these causes serve as critical functions in our democracy, and progress within our city and communities would not be possible without them.

How are we doing overall?

Toronto is struggling to create a healthy environment for strong leadership and civic engagement. Many of the building blocks that reduce barriers to inclusive and democratic civic engagement are missing. This is evident in the under-representation of people from diverse backgrounds in our formal institutions and through an erosion of social cohesion. For example, young adults aged 20–34 are far less likely to report feeling a sense of belonging, compared to other groups.195 This is worrisome, as a lack of social belonging can be associated with declining community engagement and decreased civic participation.

However, Torontonians on the whole are generous and giving. In 2015, 31 per cent of families claimed $1,290,950,180 in registered charitable donations, an average of approximately $3,244 per family.196 Both the percentage of families claiming donations and the average donation in Toronto were higher than in Vancouver (30 per cent and $3,158, respectively) and Montreal (27 per cent and $1,592, respectively), although in Calgary, more families claimed donations despite having a lower average donation than those in Toronto (35 per cent and $3,184, respectively).197

Deep dive.

Voting on election day is one way that residents participate in and contribute to a democratic society. Voter turnout in Toronto in the last federal general election in 2015 was 67.2 per cent.198 However, the results vary significantly by electoral district (or riding), from a low of 57.5 per cent in Humber River-Black Creek to a high of 73.3 per cent in Parkdale-High Park.

Overall voter turnout in Toronto in the last provincial general election in 2014 was significantly lower than the federal election, at 50.7 per cent.199 Out of ridings in Toronto, York West had the lowest voter turnout, at 42.2 per cent, whereas St. Paul’s had the highest voter turnout, at 57.1 per cent.200

Voter turnout in municipal elections tends to be even lower than federal and provincial rates. In the last Toronto municipal election
in 2014, only 54.7 per cent of eligible voters made it to the polling stations; however, municipal trends have been improving over time. In 2014, an increase of nearly five percentage points occurred from the 2010 municipal elections that only saw a 50 per cent voter turnout, whereas voter turn-out rates in 2006 and 2003 were both between 38 per cent and 39 per cent.\textsuperscript{201}

Whether or not our political institutions reflect the diversity of our communities is important to the integrity and representativeness of our democratic systems. How elected officials identify and who they represent can impact how they see and experience the world, how they influence the priorities of their governments and which issues they give attention. Historically, certain groups have been under-represented in political office. Only eight out of 25 (32 per cent) members of Parliament (MPs) who were elected to hold Toronto seats in the 2015 federal general election were women.\textsuperscript{202} While this result compares somewhat to the national average (26 per cent), it is well below the 52 per cent of Toronto’s population whom women represent. Though no official statistics exist, MPs elected in 2015 to Toronto seats also include eight (32 per cent) visible minorities, which significantly under-represents the 51.5 per cent of Torontonians who identify as visible minorities.\textsuperscript{203}

Another way that Torontonians invest in social priorities and issues is through donating to charities, although despite our overall generosity, many with higher incomes are giving proportionately less to charity than those with lower incomes. Torontonians make up a portion of the growth of higher-income Canadian families seen over the past several years. From 2006–15, there was a jump in the amount of higher-income families in Canada, with 8.1 per cent gains among $150,000–$199,000 income families, 10.2 per cent gains among $200,000–$249,000 income families.
families and 8.4 per cent gains among $250,000+ income families.\textsuperscript{204} Despite these jumps, the growth rates of charitable giving within these income brackets have not reflected these jumps in income, and in fact, they have declined. There has been growth in charitable giving — 5.5 per cent for $150,000–$199,000 income families, 8.2 per cent for $200,000–$249,000 income families and 7.2 per cent for $250,000+ income families — but they are all significantly lower than the growth of the income brackets themselves, and these top three income groups are responsible for the greatest decline in average donation amount during this time period.\textsuperscript{205} What’s more, Canadians with incomes of less than $50,000 per year are giving more of their gross income away than those in some higher brackets. For those individuals earning $50,000 per year, they are on average giving 2.3 per cent of their gross income to charity each year whereas those with incomes of $100,000 are giving 1.6 per cent and those earning $800,000 give at a rate of two per cent.\textsuperscript{206}

In Toronto in 2014, giving correlated to some extent with income, with residents of some affluent areas in the centre of the city such as Rosedale, Forest Hill and the Bridal Path claiming higher average proportions of their incomes as gifts to charities, although some lower-income communities such as Lawrence Heights were also leading donors.\textsuperscript{207} Overall, only families in 22 of Toronto’s 140 neighbourhoods claimed on average more than 2.51 per cent of their incomes in charitable donations in 2014.\textsuperscript{208}

Experiences, relationships and our environment all influence the sense of belonging we feel within our neighbourhood and community. Sense of belonging is an important indicator for not only what makes the city a good place to live, but also connectedness to community and social relationships, which can also have significant impacts on health outcomes.\textsuperscript{209} In the 2015–16 Canadian Community Health Survey, many Torontonians reported a “somewhat strong” or “very strong” sense of belonging to their local community overall, with a rate of 69.4 per cent for those aged 12 and older. However, a sense of belonging varied significantly by age group. The age group with the smallest percentage reporting a “somewhat strong” or “very strong” sense of belonging to their local community was young adults aged 20–34, at just 58.9 per cent, whereas 88.5 per cent of youth aged 12–19 and 77.7 per cent of seniors (those age 65 and older) reported feeling that way.\textsuperscript{210} The good news is that across the board, a sense of belonging has been slowly improving overtime across all age groups over the last decade. Also, a greater proportion of Torontonians aged 12 and older report a “somewhat strong” or “very strong” sense of belonging, compared to those in Montreal (59.4 per cent), Calgary (67.6 per cent) and Vancouver (68.6 per cent).
Poverty once kept Agnes and her children, who live in the Kingston-Galloway-Orton Park (KGO) area, isolated and alone. “There were times when I had nothing to feed my kids, so I would isolate myself,” she says. “I didn’t ask for help because I didn’t want to hear the word ‘No.’ I would feel embarrassed and hurt.”

Over time, Agnes’s eternal optimism, a trait nurtured by her father growing up in Trinidad, helped her come out of her shell. After participating in a community leadership program four years ago, Agnes learned how to use sport and games to engage her community. Now, at age 59, Agnes regularly plans events for KGO residents, a lifeline for community members who are experiencing the isolation of unemployment, language barriers and old age. She also looks for the hidden signs of poverty, and she makes an extra effort to draw out those people. “They won’t come out and say, ‘I don’t have food today.’ They will just isolate themselves in their apartments,” she explains.

Though she is now an active leader in her community, she still feels the effects of her past isolation. “It has held me back from doing the things I wanted to do, like education,” she says. “I could have done more at the time to help myself education-wise, to build myself and have a better life now.”
And Toronto also scores higher than the national average (68.4 per cent).

Torontonians also possess high levels of trust and a firm belief that we can have an impact on the world. Trust is vital to building co-operative and productive relationships at the community, social and economic levels. Research from United Way Toronto & York Region showed that in 2015, despite high income inequality and growing uncertainty about the future, the majority of Torontonians (57 per cent) felt as though most people can be trusted. While many lower-income households have relatively high levels of trust (46.6 per cent), those living on medium and high incomes are far more likely to believe that most people can be trusted (58 per cent and 69.8 per cent, respectively).

In addition, there is almost unanimous agreement across the city that Torontonians can have a meaningful impact in their communities. In 2014, 95 per cent of people in Toronto reported feeling that they can have an impact on making their community a better place to live, with 70.8 per cent feeling like they could have a moderate to large impact.

Youth in Toronto are the least likely of any age demographic to feel a sense of belonging. That doesn’t bode well for our future. If young people don’t feel a connection to community, it’s likely that many won’t become involved as active citizens. This is even truer of youth who already face barriers to feeling that sense of belonging, particularly Indigenous youth, youth of colour and queer youth.

Our city needs strong leaders, now and in the future. If young people feel a sense of belonging today, they will be prepared to lead our public, private and non-profit sectors in the future.

Young people are deeply concerned with the idea of belonging, providing leadership and being engaged citizens. We see this through protests, organizing, student movements and other actions. There’s no question that young people have a clear vision for what they believe Toronto must look like for the next generation; the problem is that no one is listening.

Philanthropists, policy-makers and average city residents must create avenues to support youth being heard. There are many organizations that are actively working to create a sense of community, to encourage passionate and active citizenry and help foster a sense of belonging for young people, particularly from traditionally unheard backgrounds. They just need a platform and to be truly heard.
Within today’s fast-changing economy, post-secondary education is increasingly essential to finding meaningful employment. To that end, Ontario has set a target: by 2020, 70 per cent of Ontarians will have completed some type of post-secondary education.214

However, not all students are given the same start in their early years and throughout their childhoods. Our investments in early years programming, childcare and public education are arguably some of the most important investments we can make to secure a strong and profitable future. Understanding how our public school systems are generating a level playing field so that each child in Toronto has the opportunity to achieve their potential is instrumental to our future society and economy. Strong early years programming is key to this, as brain development in the first three years is integral to setting the baseline for competence and coping skills later in life, and it has potential effects on an individual's long-term earnings potential.215 Investing in programs that support high-quality childcare and early learning has enormous payback.

Toronto residents have higher levels of education than other Canadians.216 Almost 70 per cent (69.3 per cent) of Toronto residents aged 25–64 have some form of a post-secondary certificate, diploma or degree, compared to 65.1 per cent across Ontario and 64.8 per cent across Canada, the second-highest proportion in the GTHA, slightly behind York Region at 69.9 per cent.217 And 44.1 per cent of Torontonians aged 25–64 have at least a bachelor’s
By 2020, 70 per cent of Ontarians will have completed some type of post-secondary education.218

Degree, while 16.2 per cent have a graduate degree, which is up from 37.4 per cent and 14.8 per cent, respectively, in 2006. The rate in Toronto is also significantly higher than Canada overall, with 28.5 per cent and 9.6 per cent, respectively.218 Among all post-secondary certificate, diploma or degree holders in Toronto (aged 15+), 31.4 per cent obtained their credential outside of Canada.219 However, 10.3 per cent of Toronto residents aged 25–64 do not have a secondary school diploma and a further 20.4 per cent have no higher education credentials beyond high school. Toronto has the lowest percentage (2.9 per cent) of people with an apprenticeship, trade certificate or diploma in the GTHA.220

Toronto has a strong supply of post-secondary academic institutions, attracting many students both nationally and internationally. In 2016, there were 157,520 full-time students enrolled in Toronto’s four universities, and 92,505 full-time equivalent students enrolled in Toronto’s five colleges. Full-time enrolment in Toronto universities (undergraduate and graduate)
Ontario is seeing changes in who is enrolling in post-secondary education. Between 2006-07 and 2015-16, the number of males enrolling in Ontario colleges and universities had increased from 46 to 49 per cent and 43 to 45 per cent respectively, although the proportion of females to males enrolling slightly declined: between 2006-07 and 2015-16, the number of females enrolling in Ontario colleges and universities decreased from 54 per cent to 51 per cent and 57 to 55 per cent respectively.

Overall, Toronto is a highly educated city, though post-secondary attainment varies across neighbourhoods. Data from the 2016 census shows that in some parts of city, more than 90 per cent of residents have a post-secondary certificate, diploma or degree. In other areas, only one-third of residents have a post-secondary education. Access to post-secondary education is influenced by many factors,
including personal ones such as negative perceptions of schools and external influences such as costs and entrance requirements. The educational pathway a student takes through high school has significant bearing on their post-secondary and career options. The current streaming system in Ontario requires students to choose courses that are classified as academic, applied and locally developed/essentials in grades 9 and 10. In grades 11 and 12, students then choose courses that are categorized as university, university/college, college or workplace, which prepare them for post-secondary opportunities, accordingly. For those students without a teacher or guidance counsellor who sees their potential, or a family member with time and skills to advocate or navigate the system, they are at a great disadvantage.

At 12 years old, Suzanna didn’t feel like going to school — or even getting out of bed. It was the beginning of her lifelong struggle with depression and anxiety. Though she turned to her parents for help, they had little understanding of mental health and weren’t equipped to support her. With no supports, Suzanna’s condition steadily deteriorated over the years. At age 16, she really started to struggle in school: she withdrew socially, began skipping classes and her grades suffered. By the end of her first year of university at age 18, she was failing all her classes and had to drop out.

Suzanna’s turning point came when she started the social service worker program at Centennial College, where she was able to access mental health supports and finally received a medical diagnosis. She also learned about mental health in her classes and bonded with classmates who were experiencing similar struggles. Now, at age 22 and living in Agincourt, Suzanna is working toward a bachelor of social work at Ryerson University and accesses counselling services through her school on a regular basis. “Counselling has helped me have a more positive outlook on life and motivates me to want to try harder,” she says. “Without it, I probably would have ended up dropping out of college.”

“Counselling has helped me have a more positive outlook on life and motivates me to want to try harder.”

Suzanna Su in Agincourt

At 12 years old, Suzanna didn’t feel like going to school — or even getting out of bed. It was the beginning of her lifelong struggle with depression and anxiety. Though she turned to her parents for help, they had little understanding of mental health and weren’t equipped to support her.
This inequity has a disproportionate effect on some racialized groups that have higher rates of enrolment in the applied and essentials streams. The Toronto District School Board (TDSB) is the largest school board in Toronto, serving approximately 70 per cent of the city’s public school students. While approximately 12.6 per cent of TDSB students identify as Black, they make up 22.7 per cent of students in the applied stream and 29.3 per cent of students in the essentials stream. Similar trends are seen among Latin American, Middle Eastern and Indigenous student populations. Conversely, white and East Asian students are modestly overrepresented in academic-level courses. In addition to the impact of streaming on post-secondary choices, research conducted by the TDSB found that 14.8 per cent of students taking applied courses drop out of school before graduating, compared to only 2.9 per cent of students taking academic courses.

The level of courses a student takes varies by neighbourhood, and in some Toronto neighbourhoods, applied course streams are becoming the most common pathway despite the more limiting future options they produce. According to data from 2012–13, students living in some neighbourhoods are not enrolling in academic programming at the same rate as other neighbourhoods. These trends mirror patterns of income distribution in Toronto. With more restricted educational experiences, these students have fewer chances to break the cycle of poverty and achieve their full potential.
Other school processes and practices are similarly not evenly experienced by students in communities and identity groups across Toronto. Expulsion is a disciplinary practice that removes a student from school for an indefinite amount of time. While expelled students should continue to receive academic supports, the process of being removed from school can have a significant impact on a student’s learning and socio-emotional well-being. Expulsion is disproportionately experienced by students from racialized groups. Between 2011–12 and 2015–16, almost half of expelled students at the TDSB self-identified as Black\(^\text{236}\), even though Black students only made up less than 13 per cent of the student body.\(^\text{237}\) Also, far more boys than girls experience expulsion. In 2015–16, 92 per cent of students expelled from the TDSB were male.\(^\text{238}\)

---

**CITY VOICES**

Dr. John Malloy  
Director of Education,  
Toronto District School Board

Our communities struggle to understand how institutional systems can impact the achievement of students. There is a belief that I keep coming across from our communities, that everything is about the individual aptitude, and that systems don’t have an impact.

We are engaged in a rich and important dialogue about public education right now in Toronto. Improving our system is not an either/or argument, which unfortunately is how things are often understood.

The key question is: “How can we meet the needs of all students by offering engaging programs and removing barriers?” Sometimes these things are seen as contradictory, but they do not need to be.

Every student deserves access to the programs and environments that will help them to excel. I believe everyone can relate to this statement. This needs to be the dialogue we all participate in.

Our main strength is that we care, we stay at the table and we prioritize principles of equity. We just have to let go of how things have always been if we intend to make a difference.

Overall, I think we are moving in the right direction. However, there is some resistance to the right direction for lots of reasons, so we need to remain vigilant.
SAFETY

What is it?

Physical safety and security are two critically important factors in measuring quality of life. Freedom from crime, injury, harassment and violence is essential to living a healthy, happy, productive and good life. However, the extent to which our city and neighbourhoods feel safe can also have a major impact on quality of life. The subjective perception of a threat or lack of safety threatens social cohesion, degrades trust and fuels risk-aversion in societies. Understanding the extent to which Torontonians experience threats to their physical, emotional and economic well-being is intrinsic to building a more inclusive, healthy and productive city.

How are we doing overall?

One way to measure safety is to look at the amount and severity of crimes taking place. In these regards, Toronto is a relatively safe city, with lower overall rates of crime per 1,000 residents than Vancouver, Montreal and Calgary. According to Statistics Canada’s Crime Severity Index, which calculates crime severity based on Criminal Code violations, including traffic and drug violations and all federal statutes, crime in Toronto is also less severe when compared to these three cities.

Crime statistics, however, are calculated based on police-reported incidents and cannot take into consideration crimes which go unreported. According to Statistics Canada’s 2014 General Social Survey on Victimization, the most recent data available on Canadians’ crime reporting behaviour, only 31 per cent of crimes
experienced by Canadians’ were reported to the police, unchanged from that last time this question was surveyed in 2009. There are many reasons why people make the choice not to report. According to the same survey, victims of violent crime and property crime who did not report their victimization to the police gave reasons related to their expectations of the justice system. In particular, 38 per cent of victims believed that the offender would not be adequately punished, 34 per cent believed that the police would not be effective, 25 per cent feared or did not want the hassle of dealing with the court process, and 17 per cent stated they had received unsatisfactory service from the police in the past.

Sexual assault is among the most under-reported crimes. In 2014, there were 22 incidents of sexual assault for every 1,000 Canadians aged 15 and older, or approximately 636,000 self-reported incidents. This rate of self-reported sexual assault was similar to that reported a decade earlier; in contrast, the rates for other types of self-reported violent and non-violent crime declined over the same time period. Among those most at risk of experiencing sexual assault include women, youth between the ages of 15–24, Aboriginal women, single women, non-heterosexual individuals and

* Data excludes Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut.
people with disabilities. In 2016 in Toronto, there were 2,258 sexual assaults reported, which represented a greater than 30 per cent increase from 2010. While the issue of sexual assault has received a lot of attention recently due to social media campaigns such as #MeToo, there is an urgent need for action to address the systemic roots and end sexual violence.

While Toronto is a relatively safe city, compared to other Canadian municipalities, 2016 was witness to a significant number of homicides in Toronto. There were 74 homicides in 2016, the highest level since 2007 and significantly higher than the 10-year average of approximately 63 homicides annually.

Distressingly, the number of traffic-related deaths surpassed the homicide rate. In 2016, there were 77 road deaths: 43 pedestrians, 16 drivers, 11 passengers, six motorcycle drivers and one cyclist. This is the greatest number of traffic-related deaths in almost a decade — a reason to take action on reducing unnecessary traffic-related deaths.

In 2017, Toronto released its Vision Zero Road Safety Plan, a five year (2017–21) action plan that includes over 50 measures targeted toward eliminating traffic-related fatalities and reducing serious injuries on Toronto streets, as well as prioritizing the safety of our
The “clearance rate” is a measurement of crimes solved by the police. It is affected by a variety of factors such as the number and type of criminal occurrences and the resources used to tackle them. While Toronto has a higher clearance rate than other major Canadian cities, clearance rates vary significantly across the city, from a high of 67 per cent in east Scarborough to a low of 39 per cent in Toronto’s northwest areas.

Police officers can use a variety of possible interventions to address critical incidents, including the use of force. One such intervention is the use of a Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW), more commonly known as a “taser.” Police incident reports show that people experiencing emotional distress or mental health crises are the most common subjects of taser use. In 2016, 48.6 per cent of taser incidents in Toronto involved someone in such a distressed state.

Some groups and communities are affected differently by crime and policing than others. One way that residents interact with police services is through “carding” — when a police officer stops and questions someone who is not being arrested. The details of each interaction are then recorded in a database. This practice has received significant attention in recent years, with critics citing it as a form of racial profiling. According to carding data obtained through a Freedom of Information request made by the Toronto Star, even though 2013 saw a decrease in the total number of carding incidences compared to previous years, the proportion of those carded who were Black actually increased to 27.4 per cent from 23.3 per cent. With Toronto’s Black population at approximately 8.1 per cent in 2013, that is 3.4 times the proportion of the population.

Reported Sexual Assaults, Toronto, 2009 to 2016
“In 2016, religion was the leading motivation for reported hate crimes.”

Although 2016 witnessed a slight decrease (-58) in the number of police-reported sexual assaults, overall there has been an increase of 29 per cent since 2009.\textsuperscript{259} Sexual assault is one of the most under-reported crimes, and so the scope of the issue is not fully captured in these statistics.\textsuperscript{260} The effects of sexual assault are far-reaching in an individual’s life. Not only can it be an emotionally and physically traumatic experience, but it can also result in negative health, social isolation, feelings of anger, anxiety and fear, as well as substance abuse, depression and suicidal thoughts.\textsuperscript{261}

Hate crime is another category of safety that affects communities disproportionately. Hate crime is down slightly from its 2009 high point at 174 reported incidences, with 145 occurrences occurring in 2016 in Toronto; however, despite this dip, this still translates to almost three occurrences each week, on average.\textsuperscript{262} Religion, sexual orientation and race have been

**CITY VOICES**

Mussarat Ejaz
in Flemingdon Park

A landing pad for newcomers, Flemingdon Park is home to a diverse community of warm, friendly people who speak more than 120 languages. There is an especially high number of children and youth in the area, but the lack of recreational opportunities means some young people are turning to crime and drugs. The local park is one of the only public recreation spaces in the community, but due to its isolation, it had become a hub for criminal activity. This summer, Mussarat, who is 49, and other residents enlisted the help of local youth, artists and police to paint a beautiful new mural in a corner of the park, where the incidence of drug trafficking was high. “While we were painting, lots of community residents came out and told us that we were doing great work,” says Mussarat. “We were also visited by some suspicious characters who wanted to know why we were in their space. But since the other residents of the community started to come over, those people stopped coming.”

Though the changes are recent, more families and children have been using the park to play, and the criminal element has decreased. Mussarat and her fellow community members will continue to revitalize the park, and they hope to transform it into a safe recreation space for everyone in the community.
The predominant motivation factors for hate/bias crimes over the past ten years. In 2016, religion was the leading motivation at 46 per cent, followed by race at 18 per cent, and sexual orientation 12 per cent. Religious motivations have grown steadily since 2007, when just 29 per cent were motivated by religion.

Child protection is an important public duty carried out by Children’s Aid Societies (CAS), which intervene when children have experienced or are at risk of experiencing neglect or abuse. According to data released by the Children’s Aid Society of Toronto, 31 per cent of children in care in 2013 were from Black families, even though they only made up approximately 8.5 per cent of the population. Overrepresentation of any one group in interventions that are disruptive to family units and social environments is an area of serious concern. This has been acknowledged as a serious issue by Black families, anti-racism advocates and the CAS.

CITY VOICES

Alok Mukherjee
Distinguished Visiting Professor, Department of Criminology and Office of Equity and Community Inclusion, Ryerson University

The three biggest challenges with respect to safety remain how effectively police: 1. truly engage in community-based policing; 2. guard against differential policing when dealing with racialized communities, especially Black people, Indigenous people and those experiencing mental health-related issues; and: 3. investigate incidents of sexual assault.

The biggest opportunities we have right now to make a difference are presented by the significant legislative changes being proposed to modernize the police act and systems of oversight, on one hand, and leveraging strong community support for transformation, on the other.

Our greatest asset is a mobilized community. Policy-makers and others must work collaboratively and not defensively to turn this asset into strength.
Employment and unemployment rates are some of the most closely watched and important indicators that tell us how our economy is doing. The extent to which Torontonians are able to participate in the labour force is a driving factor in our gross domestic product (GDP), an important predictor of measures of well-being such as income, health and social inclusion. And the labour force is a key driver of government revenue — it’s at the heart of what powers the economy.

But participation in the labour market is not just about having a job. In today’s labour market, the type of job you have and how secure your job is can have a big impact on your mental health, sense of security and ability to participate fully in your community. Research in the GTHA has shown that the increasing prevalence of job precarity in Toronto’s labour market has resulted in significantly negative consequences to workers’ well-being, especially for racialized communities and racialized women in particular.

Compared to other major Canadian cities, Toronto’s workforce is doing well on average, and unemployment rates have now fallen below pre-recession levels. The Toronto Census Metropolitan Area’s (CMA) unemployment rate reached 7 per cent in 2016, which is higher than Vancouver (5.4 per cent), but below Montreal (7.7 per cent) and Calgary (9.4 per cent).

For many reasons, a growing proportion of Toronto residents is becoming their own bosses. According to data from Statistics Canada’s Labour Force Survey, 18.3 per cent...
of Toronto residents were self-employed as of May 2017. This is up slightly from recent years: the monthly average in 2016 was 16.72 per cent, and in 2015 it was 16.31 per cent. Despite flexibility and other positive aspects of such work, self-employment also comes with tremendous personal and financial risks as well as stress, and can, in part, be a result of a lack of options caused by systemic racism and discrimination in the mainstream labour market. Discrimination in the labour market means that many immigrants and racialized communities are left with few choices other than to move into social enterprises and self-employment.

Work compensation varies based on socio-demographic characteristics. Based on 2016 census data, men who belong to a visible minority group in Toronto earn approximately $15,000 less than men who do not. Similar patterns are seen among women: the median income for a woman who identifies as a visible minority is approximately $10,000 less than a non-visible minority woman. Median income also varies significantly by gender. Women earn approximately 83 cents for every dollar a man makes. While increased levels of education among women have raised women’s income overall, research suggests that lower starting salaries and lower rates of promotion are among the factors that allow the gender wage gap to persist. Women’s lower earning power means that they are at higher risk of falling into poverty if they are or
“The median annual income for Torontonians who belong to a visible minority group is thousands of dollars less than for those who don’t.”

become single parents, and they have less capacity to save for retirement than men. Access to good quality and affordable childcare can also be serious challenges for women in the workforce in particular, as women are the ones who typically head single-parent households. Also, because men typically earn more than women, it’s mothers’ careers and job prospects that suffer more when insufficient or unavailable childcare is an issue for a family. In October 2017, there were 73,065 licensed childcare spaces in Toronto, an increase of 32 per cent, or 17,861 spaces, since January 2013. While the overall number of licensed childcare spaces has increased, access to affordable childcare remains an issue in Toronto.

In November 2016, there were 18,691 children waiting for affordable childcare in Toronto. Toront0 also has the highest median childcare costs in the nation. Toronto parents pay $1,758 a month, or $21,096 annually, for centre-based and regulated home childcare for infants, and they pay 1,212 a month, or $14,544 annually, for full-time preschool programs.

Young people aged 15–24 continue to struggle with unemployment more than other workers in all major cities. In the Toronto region, the unemployment rate for youth is 15.2 per cent (16.2 per cent for males and 14.2 per cent for females).
When Archana moved to North York in 2016 from India, she believed landing a job would be fairly straightforward. Despite 10 years of experience as a senior financial analyst at a multinational investment firm, she struggled to find work. Archana attended an employment skills workshop at North York Community House, applied for jobs on a daily basis and attended interview after interview. She worked temporarily at a call centre, where her co-workers were just like her: qualified, educated newcomers who were struggling to find work and make use of their skills. Without Canadian work experience and permanent residency, Archana wasn’t getting any job offers, but she didn’t get discouraged. “I wanted to come to this country. I was dreaming of it. So I thought that a little more hard work would get me the results I want.”

Archana’s persistence paid off in October 2017, when she was hired full time by a large national bank. Archana knows her past experience will help her quickly move beyond her entry-level position into a more senior role. Looking back, she thinks recruiters can do a better job at giving constructive feedback to candidates: “Newcomers have sacrificed a lot, and they have come here with some hope. If I were a recruiter, I’d want to be part of that hope.”

Higher rates of unemployment are also experienced among racialized workers. In Ontario, racialized workers have an unemployment rate of 10.5 per cent, compared to non-racialized workers at 7.5 per cent. However, even among visible minority groups there is vast difference in unemployment rates. Workers of Arab descent have the highest unemployment rate at 13.1 per cent, while workers of Japanese descent have the lowest rate at 6.4 per cent. Despite this, racialized workers have comparable, and even sometimes significantly higher, overall labour force participation rates, meaning that they are more likely to be working, or searching for a job even when they are unemployed, compared to non-racialized workers.

Racialized groups are more likely than non-racialized people to work in permanent part-time jobs or work precariously, without steady hours of work, benefits or paid sick time. More non-racialized workers have “Standard Employment Relationships” that include reasonable and expected hours, advance scheduling, predictability and access to benefits. While these are deep-seated issues, the recent passage of the Fair Work Act has brought some changes to the labour market.
Workplaces, Better Jobs Act shows promise in addressing some of the inequities that have been embedded in Ontario’s labour market. The act will not only raise the minimum wage to $15 per hour by 2019, but also implement a host of important legislative changes that will protect vulnerable workers in some sectors by extending job protection, providing emergency leave to all workers, providing equal pay for equal work for full-time, part-time, casual and temporary agency workers, introduce fairer schedule practices and make it easier for cleaners, security guards, home care and community service workers to join unions.286

Research has found that increases in rates of precarious employment are closely correlated with declining unionization levels.287 An analysis of Statistics Canada’s Labour Force Survey indicates that rates of unionization in Toronto fall below national and provincial levels.288 Average annual data collected through the Labour Force Survey in 2015 also demonstrates that unionization in Toronto also varies by gender, age and immigration status.289

“Toronto parents pay more for childcare than anywhere else in the country — the median cost for an infant spot is $1,758 per month.”
We have new labour law rights in 2018 that many workers in precarious and low-waged work have fought for. These new rights need to be enforced in every single workplace in our city.

All workers need to know their rights, especially if they don’t have union protection. Some of the new protections such as personal emergency leave are new in the workplace, so we need to educate employers and workers so that everyone is able to benefit from them.

Only 24 per cent of workers are fully covered by a basic floor of labour protection because of numerous exemptions. Temporary workers are particularly affected, as they have one of the highest workplace injury rates. No one’s health should be put at risk when they go to work.

I have witnessed incredible energy, commitment and hard work by many workers in low-wage and precarious jobs, who come forward and organize in order to improve conditions not just for themselves, but also for all workers in our city. The dedication by so many people to doing daily and weekly outreach in every neighbourhood, in many languages and with so many workers, has been truly inspiring. Whether we’re making policy, engaging in our communities or choosing what to support with our charitable dollars, we all must prioritize raising labour standards. This will ensure that everyone in Toronto and across Ontario has a decent job and wages. No one should be left behind.

Unionization rates also vary by demographic characteristics. Women (25.4 per cent) are slightly more likely to be in unionized jobs, compared to men (21.6 per cent). Only 11.4 per cent of youth (aged 15–24) are in unionized jobs, compared to 18.6 per cent of young adults (aged 25–34). A total of 24.9 per cent of those aged 35–44 are in unionized jobs, while 30.6 per cent of those aged 45–54 and 31.2 per cent of those aged 55–64 are in unionized jobs. Immigrants who have been in Canada for less than 10 years (13.8 per cent) are far less likely to have unionized jobs, compared to immigrants who have been in Canada for 10 years or longer (27.5 per cent) and people born in Canada (27.4 per cent). These groups are missing out on the many benefits of unionization and are at greater risk of low wages and precarious work.
CONCLUSION

Toronto’s continued success is contingent on building a city where everyone can share in emerging opportunities and an excellent quality of life. In order to do this, we need to reflect on the variations and disparities among our circumstances, rather than glossing over our differences through averages.

With this in mind, Toronto Foundation looked at data and stories in this report using a lens of equity. In the collection and analysis of data we looked at three dimensions of equity: our different starting points, opportunities for access, and outcomes.

This shift allowed us to gain a clearer grasp of where we are succeeding and where we are failing. Our aim? To better assist practitioners, policymakers and philanthropy in determining priorities.

What we found tells us a lot about the work we have in front of us.

Despite the overall rosy picture that can be painted about Toronto, and the many success stories, inequity is pervasive in our city. It exists in all aspects of life here.

There is vast income inequality, but the injustice runs much deeper. Too many Torontonians continue to face systemic gender, race and ethnic discrimination, indecent working conditions, and unacceptable health outcomes. Many are underserved by our transportation infrastructure, and political systems that do not adequately represent them. And many are shut out of higher education and workforce progression. A growing number struggle within our insufficient shelter and affordable housing system.

We incorporated close to 200 reports and data sources in the compilation of this report. And we consulted with more than three dozen subject matter experts and residents. All told, the solutions lead to one place — more resources are needed to reverse the pattern of inequity that is so starkly presented in this year’s Vital Signs.

The concept of inequity is not new. Perhaps this familiarity is why we continue to accept it. This report presents for the first time, however, an assessment of equity across such a broad set of indicators. It lays bare that inequity is not only commonplace but that it is interconnected. Insecure housing diminishes access to nutritional food which affects health and consequently, access to education and employment. Insufficient greenspace impacts negatively on community life thereby leading to social isolation. Countless research reports point to the damaging results for communities that are not well-connected or sufficiently mutually supportive.

While this report does not analyze cause and effect, we do have reason to believe — and many of our experts pointed to — the corrosive effects of inequity. One aspect of inequity can infiltrate another.

We don’t have all the answers. But we hope that this report serves to make us all stand up and take notice.

All three orders of government have embraced the principle of equity, and understand that there is work to be done. They have developed strong strategies and plans and have dedicated resources towards their goals. We hope that they use the research we have provided in this report to spur further action, to help them follow through on commitments, and to use the resources that are at their disposal to move forward on those agendas.
Let us all come together to build a city that works for everyone.

If reading this report is agitating — and you want to do something about it — might we humbly make three suggestions on how you could take action:

1. **TALK, SHARE & CHALLENGE**

Host a Vital Conversation — use this report to guide a discussion about what issues matter to you and what you can do about them (see page 76).

2. **USE IT TO MAKE SOME BIG VOTING DECISIONS THIS YEAR**

We have two elections coming up — our provincial election will be June 7, and our municipal election is set for October 22.

Use this report to ask your candidates data-driven questions. Do they know the city in the ways that count? Are they committed to making the changes you want to see?

3. **DISRUPT YOUR GIVING PATTERNS**

Many of the statistics in this report show that quality of life in our city for many is not getting better or is getting worse — and though we know that philanthropy isn't the silver bullet for the city, we know that philanthropy can go where government sometimes can’t. Do you find yourself giving to the same organization every year? Why not consider picking an issue from this report and targeting it instead of just “your usual”?

Many donors will say they don’t know anything about the small to medium sized organizations that are doing much of the heavy lifting on the issues of our city. Here are a few sources Toronto Foundation stands behind where you can go to find fantastic organizations, doing great work:

- Toronto Foundation’s most recent edition of [Good to Give](#) — our curated guide to donation-ready organizations, projects, and social enterprises in our community
- Ontario Trillium Foundation’s [2017 grantees](#) — an agency of the Government of Ontario, they work with local volunteers and staff to award grants to build healthy and vibrant communities
- [Canadahelps.org](#) — a non-profit organization with an online platform, featuring thousands of grassroots, high-impact community based registered charities

“Let us all come together to build a city that works for everyone.”
Toronto Foundation encourages you to host a gathering with family, friends, or colleagues who might be interested in the issues facing Toronto and improving our quality of life.

**Discussion Tips:**

1. **Choose a date and invite some colleagues, friends, and/or family members to join you.**

2. **Send them the link to Toronto's Vital Signs —**
   https://torontofoundation.ca/torontos-vital-signs-report/
   Ask everyone to read the report before the dinner, and highlight a specific section of interest or two, to ground the discussion.

3. **Once dinner is on the table and people are enjoying it, here are some questions that can get you started:**
   - What did everyone think about the report?
   - Is it in line with how you see Toronto and how you thought the city was doing?
   - What stood out for you as surprising or shocking?
   - What do you think is the most pressing issue facing this city?
   - What is standing in the way of addressing it properly?
   - How does equity factor into the disparities that surface in the report?
   - What would it take in Toronto to improve the quality of life in the city?

4. **Share your thoughts, conversations, and pictures with us through social media tagging Toronto Foundation:**
   - https://www.facebook.com/TorontoCF/
   - @TorontoFdn
   - @torontofdn
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