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Executive Summary
On May 12, 2015, The Chicago Community Trust launched its Centennial celebration by convening its second iteration of On the Table. With a guiding Centennial goal of making the Chicagoland region the most philanthropic in the nation, On the Table 2015 was an opportunity for dialogue and collaboration on how to broaden and deepen philanthropy in the region. Originally devised as an initiative to bring people together in small mealtime conversations for the purpose of brainstorming innovative solutions to address their communities’ most pressing needs, this year’s On the Table grew into a campaign to celebrate philanthropy in all its forms—as the giving of time, treasure, and talent. The Trust called for action-oriented conversations around broadening what philanthropy means in Chicago and using it as a catalyst for engaging citizens in the work of addressing social problems and making commitments of action. Participants were invited to reimagine philanthropy by sharing stories of commitment and generosity and exploring how they are inspiring others to do the same.

The Trust invited the University of Illinois at Chicago’s (UIC) Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) to study the On the Table initiative. This 2015 report seeks to understand the On the Table conversations and serves as a study further exploring how and why Chicago-area residents are working independently and together to improve communities through the giving of their time, treasure, and talent.

WHO PARTICIPATED?

Residents across the Chicago region organized nearly 2,000 conversations with an estimated 25,000 participants. Out of the total number of participants, 2,386 responded to the survey. Provided below is summary data from questions about the respondents themselves to provide a better sense of who responded to the survey and whose ideas inform this report.

The analysis and findings provided in this report reference survey respondents rather than participants because the results of the survey cannot be scientifically generalized beyond the respondent population. Even with that caveat, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits, and backgrounds of a large number of civically engaged individuals.

The following details a brief summary of demographic information of On the Table respondents.

• The median age of respondents was 45 years old.
• Respondents were mostly white (60%), while African Americans accounted for 20%, Latinos for 12%, Asians for 4%, and multicultural for 4%.
• Women made up the majority of respondents at 72%.
• Respondents reported high levels of education, with 58% having attained a graduate degree and 30% having earned a bachelor’s degree.
• Residents of the city of Chicago comprised the majority of respondents at 69%; North Side neighborhoods were most heavily represented. Among suburban respondents, residents of Oak Park, Evanston and Waukegan had the strongest participation.
• A large majority of respondents’ conversations (81%) took place within the city of Chicago; of those events, 45% were held in the Loop, West Loop, or Near North Side.
On the Table survey respondents also reported high levels of civic engagement across a variety of measures.

- A large percentage (75%) of respondents indicated at least “some” level of community involvement; overall, 31% rated their participation as “very involved.”
- Respondents are primarily making donations (91%) and taking part in public meetings (75%). Most impressively, respondents are eight times more likely to attend public meetings about community affairs compared to residents in the region, and seven times more likely to work in their neighborhood to improve something.
- Nine of ten respondents have volunteered in the past 12 months, and a high number have engaged in electoral and political processes, such as voting (91%) and boycotting a product or service (63%).

**CONCERNS AND CAUSES: THE CONVERSATION, COMMUNITY PROBLEMS, AND INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

Respondents’ motivations for participating in On the Table largely came from wanting to effect change in their communities (70%) and collaborate with others to achieve it (67%). In order to determine just where their actions are needed, On the Table conversations served as an exploration of community concerns. An analysis of those reported concerns reveals the themes around which respondents’ priorities take shape. According to survey results, respondents who reported raising an issue of concern in their conversations did so primarily around:

- equity and social inclusion (29%)
- education and youth development (22%)
- economic issues and poverty (20%)
- philanthropy (18%)
- health (17%)

IPCE also asked survey respondents to share problems they perceive to be affecting their communities the most, unrelated to what was discussed in their conversations. While issues account for concerns respondents reported discussing during conversations, problems were not necessarily discussed. According to survey results, respondents identified the following as the most important problems facing their communities:

- economic issues and poverty (55%)
- equity and social inclusion (40%)
- education and youth development (38%)
- the judicial system and public safety (38%)

Related to problems, IPCE sought to identify to which causes respondents primarily contribute their time, treasure, and talent on a regular basis. Causes likewise were not discussed in conversations but rather reflect ongoing philanthropic action outside of On the Table. According to survey results, respondents identified the following as the most important causes:

- education and youth development (40%)
- equity and social inclusion (22%)
- health (20%)
- philanthropic efforts (16%)
- economic issues and poverty (15%)
- arts and culture (15%)
Of the top four problems, economic issues and poverty as well as the judicial system and public safety face high levels of disparity when compared to issues discussed and causes.

- With economic issues and poverty, while 55% of respondents have identified it as a problem, only 20% reported raising it as an issue in their conversations and 15% contribute to it as a cause. Likewise, while 38% have identified the judicial system and public safety as a major problem, only 13% raised it as an issue during their conversations and only 9% mentioned it as a cause.

- Although one might assume a similar disparity will be found for the other top problems, education and youth development challenges this notion and demonstrates that respondents are identifying and contributing to a high-priority problem. Indeed, respondents mentioned education and youth development as a problem (38%) at nearly the same rate that they mentioned it as a cause to which they contribute (40%).

While the On the Table initiative saw thousands of people across the region engaged at the table in mealtime conversations, it also featured thousands of conversations on social media.

- There were 10,096 total #onthetable2015 mentions.
- These mentions were amplified to source followers, generating potentially over 18,000,000 impressions.
- Twitter was the medium used most frequently throughout the #onthetable2015 campaign.
- Topics frequently mentioned with the #onthetable2015 campaign were #chicago, #disabilitymatters, #philanthropy, #trust100, and #otthyouthvoices.

**IMPACT AND ACTIONS: HOW CONVERSATIONS INFLUENCED RESPONDENTS**

When considering the impact of the conversations, it is important to acknowledge both the long-term and short-term effects on respondents.

- 2015 respondents who also participated last year revealed they were impacted by their 2014 conversations throughout the year. They were primarily building relationships and collaborating with 2014 attendees as well as participating in community engagement efforts.

2015 respondents were likewise impacted by their conversations.

- Respondents reported having a better understanding of important issues at the community, city and regional levels as well as how they can personally address the identified issues.
- The great majority of respondents (72%) indicated they spoke with attendees they did not know prior to the gathering.
- Additionally, 93% of respondents reported being “somewhat” to “very satisfied” with the diversity of people participating in the conversation.
- Nearly one-third of respondents (31%) made specific plans to work with one or more attendees to address a new idea, issue or project in the future.
- Half of respondents (51%) exchanged contact information with a newly made connection.
Given that a top motivator for participation was to work with others to improve communities, the data indicate that participants were following through with their conversational intentions and taking advantage of the conversation space to build their networks for new collaborations.

Respondents overwhelmingly reported a likelihood to take a specific action regarding a new idea, concern or issue discussed, with 90% at least "somewhat likely" to act and 47% "very likely" to do so. Respondents plan to take action by:

- building relationships and collaborating (32%)
- participating in their community (28%)
- raising awareness (17%)
- volunteering (15%)
- mentoring, motivating, and training (11%)

In naming how their communities can become more collaborative, respondents indicate they can collectively:

- build relationships and collaborate (45%)
- participate in community (42%)
- raise awareness (15%)
- self-improve (9%)
- mentor, motivate, and train (7%)

CONCLUSIONS

The following are key observations about the conversations:

- Although IPCE cannot scientifically generalize to the broader population of participants, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits and backgrounds of a large number of civically engaged individuals.

- A majority of the respondents were women (72%), the median respondent age was 45, and a majority (69%) were Chicago residents.

- The respondent group is very civically engaged, participating at higher rates than regional peers on all community, electoral and political activities measured in the survey.

- Important differences in racial groups were observed in regards to community satisfaction, modes of expressing dissatisfaction, issues discussed and impact of the conversations.

- Important differences in age groups were observed in regards to issues discussed, motivation for participation and engagement activity.

- Key differences were observed between how much respondents identified a social problem versus the frequency with which they mentioned that problem in their discussion and with which they contribute to that problem as a cause. Economic issues and poverty as well as the judicial system and public safety were themes most often mentioned as a top problem facing communities but not as an issue respondents discussed during conversations or a cause to which respondents contribute. Possible explanations for this disparity may be that respondents have no mechanism through which to address the problems, are unaware of how they might contribute to that cause, or perhaps feel these problems are too complex and systemic. Although one might assume a similar disparity would be found for the other top problems, education and youth development challenges this notion and demonstrates that respondents are talking about and contributing to a high-priority problem.
• *On the Table* is an initiative that draws on collaborative efforts and inspires new collaborations. Respondents report participating because they want to work with others in order to achieve change (67%). The conversations tapped the existing social connections of individuals to bring them together (about two-thirds received a personal invitation), made new connections and relationships among respondents who have found a common interest or bond (over half made new connections), and created opportunities for individuals to begin to explore how they might work collaboratively to address issues that matter to them (one-third made plans for working together). Additionally, the top action reported encompasses building relationships in the community and at work.

• Respondents who indicated they participated in the event last year reported activities such as coalition-building, serving on a planning committee for an event on youth violence, collaborating on events with other 2014 attendees, and even creating new programs. Given the high level of connections and plans made by participants at *On the Table* 2015, IPCE sees no reason not to expect a similar impact in terms of follow-up activities over the next year.

• A large number of respondents are likely to take action. This is a highly engaged group who is more dissatisfied with their communities than not and in which 84% believe they have “some” to a “great deal” of influence to bring about change and 90% plan to take action based on their conversations. On the whole, *On the Table* 2015 conversations achieved both their most basic aims as well as set the stage for longer-term impact. Clearly, an estimated 25,000 participants is significant for any initiative. As a highly engaged group who is confident in their ability to bring about change, who is largely dissatisfied with their communities, and who is likely to take action based on their conversations, respondents demonstrate great potential for impact following the conversations. *On the Table* generated robust conversations on a wide range of topics that improved a majority of respondents understanding of issues, and most are likely to take specific action regarding a new idea or issue discussed. Furthermore, the potential for collaboration brought many respondents to the table, and they are interested in sustaining collaborative efforts moving forward. As noted above, respondents took advantage of the opportunity to make new connections, and it is apparent in the year since *On the Table* 2014 took place that individuals have taken action together as a direct result of those conversations. This year, there are specific opportunities for collaborative action within economic issues and poverty and the judicial system and public safety, given that these are major problems identified but appear disproportionately low in issues discussed in conversations and causes to which respondents contribute. Individuals themselves can be powerful drivers of building the bonds of social capital that form the basis of civic engagement and philanthropic activity. However, it is clear that large public conversations initiatives such as *On the Table* can be important catalysts for building those bonds in ways that provide opportunities for individuals to work individually and together to build a Chicago region that works for all of its residents.
1. Introduction
The Chicago Community Trust is working to establish a new dynamic for the Chicago region, one that recognizes the giving nature of residents as they seek to improve their communities. In celebration of its Centennial in 2015, the Trust is working to “spark a civic movement that will make the Chicagoland region the most philanthropic in the nation,” according to President and CEO Terry Mazany. This movement began with On the Table 2015—an opportunity for dialogue and collaboration on how the region might achieve this goal of widespread philanthropy for the benefit of its future. The movement is also in line with the Trust’s core values and mission. As a community foundation, the Trust is dedicated to improving the Chicago region through grant making, civic engagement, and philanthropy.

On the Table is an initiative spearheaded by the Trust in which people convene in small mealtime conversations to brainstorm innovative solutions to address their communities’ most pressing needs. At its core, the initiative is an opportunity to strengthen existing collaborations, build new relationships, and make commitments of action and engagement moving forward. For the inaugural On the Table in 2014, the Trust encouraged participants to hold discussions on community issues and generate bold ideas to make communities “safer, stronger and more dynamic.” In 2015, On the Table marked the beginning of a yearlong campaign to celebrate philanthropy in all its forms—as the giving of time, treasure and talent. Building on the original premise, the Trust called for action-oriented conversations around broadening what philanthropy means in Chicago and using it as a catalyst for engaging residents in the work of addressing social problems and making commitments of action. Participants were invited to reimagine philanthropy by sharing stories of commitment and generosity and exploring how they are inspiring others to do the same.

Residents across the Chicago region responded to the Trust’s call, organizing nearly 2,000 conversations on May 12, 2015, to find ways to collaborate and address their communities’ needs through philanthropic action and engagement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Trust invited the University of Illinois at Chicago’s (UIC) Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) to study the On the Table initiative. IPCE produced a similar report last year documenting and analyzing the inaugural On the Table. This 2015 report seeks to understand the On the Table conversations and serves as a study further exploring how and why Chicago-area residents are working independently and together to improve communities through the giving of their time, treasure and talent.

To better understand the On the Table 2015 initiative, IPCE posed research questions related to 1) the conversation, 2) the impact of the conversation, and 3) participants’ community engagement habits and philanthropic actions. In examining the nature of the conversations, researchers asked: Who participated? Why did they participate? What did they discuss? What did people (participants and the public) say about these conversations? To explore the impact of the conversations, researchers asked: How did the conversations go? How were 2014 and 2015 participants impacted by their participation? What new commitments to individual and group action did participants make and share? Finally, researchers investigated participants’ community engagement habits and philanthropic actions with the questions: What are the
attitudes and beliefs of participants regarding their communities? How are Chicago-area residents engaging with each other to make our communities stronger?

Following the May 12 conversations, IPCE emailed an online survey link to 7,884 On the Table registrants.1 The survey included a total of 41 questions with a mix of both close-ended and open-ended questions asking about the conversation as well as the civic engagement habits and demographics of the respondents. Additionally, both English and Spanish language versions of the survey were available by link on the On the Table website in order to reach participants who did not register for a conversation, those for whom IPCE did not have an email address, and those requiring Spanish language accommodation. English and Spanish print versions were also offered for those without Internet access. IPCE administered the online survey through SurveyMonkey and collected print version responses through the Trust, gathering responses over a period of 17 days.

The respondent population discussed in the report is a self-selected sample of participants who completed the survey. All three survey sources yielded a total of 2,386 responses and revealed a rich set of data addressing IPCE’s guiding research questions. In addition to survey data, IPCE collected social media posts related to the initiative (10,096 posts).

IPCE used qualitative data analysis software and made successive, iterative reviews of the data to extract findings and prominent themes. IPCE updated its thematic categorization system from 2014 and, after building a text classification dictionary to assist with the coding process, tagged all responses with high-level categories describing themes from the discussions. Open response data were tagged with one of two codebooks: Issues or Actions.3 As with last year, IPCE was deliberate and systematic in its organization of themes and its assignment of themes to responses.

It should be noted that conversations may have been given a focus topic at the behest of the individual or organization hosting the conversation. It is unknown what impact such focused conversations had on survey responses.

Furthermore, while the data discussed constitute a large, nonrandom sample of total participants, conclusions cannot be scientifically generalized beyond the respondent group. Even with that caveat, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits and backgrounds of a large number of civically engaged individuals.

---

1 Because IPCE only had contact information for those who registered, IPCE targeted these registrants for the survey. Registration was not required for participation. In total, IPCE sent a survey invitation to 7,884 unique and valid email addresses.

2 Of these 2,386 respondents, 1,975 partially or fully responded through the e-mail link for a response rate of 25%. In addition, 361 responded through the weblink posted on the Trust’s website, and 50 responded through a print version of the questionnaire.

3 The Issues codebook was used to categorize issues, problems, and causes. The Actions codebook was used for actions, community collaboration, and related to the initiative (10,096 posts). See Appendix I for short descriptions of the themes.
2. Who Participated?

On May 12, 2015, On the Table held nearly 2,000 mealtime conversations with an estimated 25,000 participants. Out of the total number of participants, 2,386 responded to the survey. Having a sense of background information about the survey respondents provides context on the nature and impact of the On the Table conversations. It also provides a basis for making group comparisons of their responses. This section summarizes data from questions about the respondents themselves to provide a better sense of who responded to the survey and whose ideas inform this report. Where helpful, comparisons are made between respondent data and data from other local sources or studies. As a quick preview, a majority of the respondents were women (72%), the median respondent age was 45, and a majority (69%) were Chicago residents. The respondent group is also very civically engaged, based on a variety of measures mentioned below.
RESPONDENTS BY AGE

The median age of *On the Table* respondents was 45 years old. There was strong respondent representation in the pool of 25-34 year olds, who made up the largest cross-section of respondents at 24%. The percentage of total respondents for the remaining age groups are 18-24 (3%), 35-44 (22%), 45-54 (22%), 55-64 (20%), and 65 and up (10%). Figures 1 and 2 show the age distribution of respondents compared to Chicago and suburban residents. Chicago respondents were younger compared to their suburban counterparts; within the city of Chicago, the median age of respondents was 42 years old, while in the suburbs the median age was 51. This difference in age is highlighted by the fact that the highest percent of Chicago respondents were 25-34 year olds compared to 45-64 year olds in the suburbs.

**Fig. 1: Age of Chicago Respondents**
*Chicago respondents (n=1,350) vs. All Chicago residents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Chicago Respondents</th>
<th>All of Chicago, ages 18+ (ACS 2009-2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and up</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2: Age of Suburban Respondents**
*Suburban respondents (n=601) vs. All Suburban residents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Suburban Respondents</th>
<th>All of Suburbs, ages 18+ (ACS 2009-2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and up</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Throughout the report, references are made to survey respondents rather than *On the Table* participants. This is because results cannot be generalized beyond the survey population.

5 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; data retrieved using Social Explorer; [http://www.socialexplorer.com]; (17 August 2015).
RESPONDENTS BY RACE

Of the total respondent pool by race, white individuals comprised 60%, while African-American individuals accounted for 20%, Latinos for 12%, Asians for 4%, and multiracial for 4%. White respondents were overrepresented in the City of Chicago. African American respondents were under-represented in Chicago and over-represented in the suburbs, and Latinos were underrepresented in both Chicago and the suburbs. Figures 3 and 4 show the racial distribution of respondents as compared to Chicago and suburban resident populations.

Fig. 3: Race of Chicago Respondents
*Chicago respondents (n=1,332) vs. All Chicago residents*

![Bar chart showing the racial distribution of Chicago respondents compared to all Chicago residents]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Chicago Respondents</th>
<th>All of Chicago, ages 18+ (ACS 2009-2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4: Race of Suburban Respondents
*Suburban respondents (n=1,332) vs. All Suburban residents*

![Bar chart showing the racial distribution of suburban respondents compared to all suburban residents]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Suburban Respondents</th>
<th>All of Suburbs, ages 18+ (ACS 2009-2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

Women made up the majority of On the Table respondents at 72%. Males made up 27% of the total respondent pool.\(^7\) This difference in responses from women and men may be reflective of the high degree of participation in On the Table discussions from individuals who work in the nonprofit sector, where women outnumber men.\(^6,9\)

**Fig. 5: Sex of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of all respondents (n=2,063)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong> - 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong> - 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Survey respondents reported very high educational attainment relative to the city and region.\(^10\) In total, 88% of respondents reported being at least college educated. The majority (58%) reported having attained a graduate degree and nearly one-third (30%) reported having earned a bachelor’s degree. Nine percent report having completed some college (which includes associate/vocational degree), 2% report earning a high school diploma or GED, and 1% report having completed less than high school. Figures 6 and 7 show the distribution of respondents compared to Chicago and suburban residents.

**Fig. 6: Education Level of Chicago Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chicago respondents (n=1,265) vs. All Chicago residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7: Education Level of Suburban Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban respondents (n=578) vs. All Suburban residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Respondents were given multiple options that allowed them to identify as neither male nor female. A total of 0.4% respondents identified as such.
9 “Civic, social, advocacy organizations, and grantmaking and giving services” occupations and “social assistance” occupations are used here as a proxy for the nonprofit sector. Respectively, 66% and 85% of the total percent employed in these occupations are women.
10 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2009–2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; data retrieved using Social Explorer; <http://www.socialexplorer.com>; (17 August 2015).
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Overall, respondents are a very highly engaged group and in fact are more engaged than the typical regional resident on all measures asked.\textsuperscript{11} Survey respondents were asked a wide array of questions on their civic engagement activities. This section summarizes various measures of engagement, looking into civic, electoral, and political activities. A summary visual for many of these measures appears at the end of this section (Figure 8), capturing the extent to which respondents are engaged compared to residents in the region. Figure 8 also presents the measures of engagement used to calculate respondent engagement scores, which convey the combined scope of respondent’s engagement across 16 different engagement measures.

Civic activities are those that improve the community through hands-on activities,\textsuperscript{12} and respondents are more highly engaged on various civic activity measures compared to regional data presented in the 2010 Chicago Civic Index.\textsuperscript{13} When asked about the specific kinds of groups with which they engage, 49\% of respondents indicated involvement with a school or community group and 48\% with a religious group. Regionwide involvement with religious institutions is at 22\%, and involvement with school groups or neighborhood or community organizations is at 17\%. When asked about specific types of civic activities, 91\% of respondents reported making donations, 75\% take part in public meetings, 67\% have been involved in community projects, and 56\% have worked with others in their neighborhoods to fix or improve something. Most impressively, respondents are eight times more likely to attend public meeting about community affairs compared to residents in the region, and seven times more likely to work in their neighborhood to improve something.

Further supporting that On the Table respondents are generally more involved in their communities than most members of the general population, 89\% of respondents reported having volunteered in the past 12 months, compared to a 27\% volunteer rate in the Chicago region. Survey respondents primarily volunteer with social and community service groups (57\%). More than one-third volunteer with youth service groups (39\%), cultural or arts organizations (38\%), religious organizations (34\%), and children’s recreational or educational organizations (33\%). Among respondents who reported having volunteered, 57\% do so by providing professional or management assistance, and 56\% participate in fundraising. In comparison to 2013 “Volunteering in America” data on the region, respondents are more likely to participate in all volunteer activities examined, 4.5 times more likely to offer professional or managerial services, and three times more likely to “engage in music, performance, or other artistic activities” and “mentor youth.”

In line with the high rates of civic activity are high rates of electoral participation. Fully 91\% of survey respondents reporting sometimes or always voting. In contrast, 2013 “Volunteering in America” data on the region indicates that 61\% of the Chicago-area population votes in local elections at least some of the time.

As for political activities that communicate the public’s values and opinions to the elected officials and bureaucrats,\textsuperscript{14} 63\% of On the Table respondents

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Only regional data is available for civic engagement measures.
\end{itemize}
claimed within the last year to have boycotted a product or service because of an organization’s political or social beliefs, 62% contacted an elected official, and 35% participated in a protest. The Chicago Civic Index data paints a picture of a far less engaged regional public, with respondents nearly 10 times more likely to take part in a protest and five times more likely to participate in a boycott or contact a public official.

### Fig. 8: Respondent Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Respondent data</th>
<th>Region Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Take part in a school group, neighborhood, or community association (n=2089)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Take part in a church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious institution (n=2089)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Take part in a service or civic organization (n=2089)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Take part in a sports or recreation organization (n=2089)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Donated more than $25 to a charitable organization*** (n=2096)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Attended any public meetings about community affairs (n=2096)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Worked on a community project* (n=2096)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something (n=2096)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC: Volunteer Rate (n=2071)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTORAL: Always or often vote in local elections** (n=1955)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL: Taking part in a march, rally, protest, or demonstration (n=2048)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL: Contacted or visited a public official (n=2048)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL: Purchasing or boycotting a product for political reasons (n=2048)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL: Wrote a letter to an editor of a magazine or newspaper (n=2048)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: All comparison data comes from the 2010 Chicago Civic Health Index, except
* DDB Needham Life Style survey archive 1975-1998 (national data)
To assess the extent to which respondents are civically engaged across the engagement measures presented in Figure 8, survey responses were combined to create scores for each respondent. Scores in the index range from 1 to 16. The lowest third of respondents make up the “lower engagement” group with scores from 1 to 7; the middle third of respondents make up the “medium engagement” group with scores from 7.33 to 9.66; and the top third of respondents make up the “highest engagement” group with scores from 10 to 15. Overall, 37% of respondents are in the “lower engagement” group, 31% are in the “medium engagement group,” and 32% are in the “highest engagement” group.

The median respondent score in the engagement index is 8.33, meaning that middle-of-the-pack respondents responded affirmatively and answered “yes” just over eight times to questions about their community, electoral and political engagement, such as whether they attend public meetings, work on community projects, volunteer or participate in protests. Figure 9 shows the complete distribution of respondent engagement scores, making it clear that most respondents (78%) fall between 5 and 11, with only 5%, the most highly engaged respondents, falling between 13 and 15 points. When comparing across groups by age, race and sex, Figure 10 shows that respondents in their 50s, male respondents, respondents in their 60s, and black or African-American respondents have the highest proportion of respondents that belong to the “highest engagement” group.

---

15 See questions 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30 in Appendix II. All of these questions and response variables come from the Census Volunteer or Civic Engagement supplements, with the exception of “worked on a community project” in Q25 and “wrote a letter to an editor of a magazine or newspaper” in Q30, which come from the national DDB Life Style Survey. Only the 1,902 respondents who provided answers to all five of these questions were included in the engagement index so as to not disadvantage those who answered fewer questions.

16 Each “yes” response to the engagement question counted as one point, and each “no” response received zero points. All questions require yes or no responses except for Q29. In this case “always vote” receives one point, “sometimes vote” receives 0.66 points, “rarely vote” receives 0.33 points, and “never votes” receives zero points. This ensures that each question response is given equal influence in the index. The two questions included in this index that do not appear in Figure 8 are the “other” options in Q24 and Q30.
Among suburban respondents, residents of Oak Park, Evanston and Waukegan were the most highly represented. At the county level, the breakdown of respondents is as follows: Cook (87%), Lake (6%), DuPage (3%), Will (2%), McHenry (1%), Kane (0.5%) and Kendall (0%). Respondents are residents of 159 different cities or towns.

As further evidence of the high level of engagement of respondents, 75% of respondents indicated at least “some” level of community involvement. Of that portion, 31% rated their participation as “very involved.” In a recent Pew national study,17 50% of individuals consider themselves “involved,” while 11% consider themselves “very involved.”

**RESPONDENTS BY RESIDENCY**

Residents of the city of Chicago comprised the majority of *On the Table* respondents. Specifically, Chicagoans accounted for 69% of all respondents. North Side neighborhoods were most heavily represented, as displayed in Figure 11. Of the seven-county region, Chicago accounts for 32% of the population while non-Chicago accounts for 68%.18

---


18 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; data retrieved using Social Explorer; <http://www.socialexplorer.com>; (17 August 2015).
LOCATION OF CONVERSATIONS

A large majority of On the Table conversations (81%) took place within the city of Chicago. Of those events, 45% were held in the Loop, West Loop, or Near North Side. While it’s difficult to ascertain with certainty why this was the case, that the majority of events were held during business hours likely played a role in skewing the geographic layout of conversations toward the central business district.

Outside of Chicago, participants in Oak Park, Evanston, and Waukegan hosted the largest numbers of conversations. These figures strongly correlate with the high levels of survey respondents among residents of these three communities. It is important to note that IPCE does not assume in its analysis that respondents participated in an On the Table conversation in the same community where they live.

Fig. 13:
Where Respondents Attended On the Table Conversations

WHY DID THEY PARTICIPATE?

Examining the ways in which survey respondents first became familiar with On the Table can tell us about the dynamic of the conversations, such as whether they were community-based, work-based, or social conversations. In reaching out to potential participants, organizers drew upon many existing community, civic, and nonprofit groups and organizations and sought to engage metropolitan Chicago residents through channels that speak to their personal investment and community involvement.

Two-thirds of respondents (66%) reported having received a personal invitation to participate in a conversation. Of those who received an invitation, 57% were invited by a colleague, signaling that professional sector engagement played an important role in shaping this year’s On the Table landscape. Additionally, more than a quarter of respondents (28%) indicated “other” invitation sources, with 38% noting a nonprofit organization invited them. This is evidence that the nonprofit sector is also an influential partner in On the Table organizing efforts, with outreach happening both internally to employees and volunteers and externally to partners and other associated personnel. The small percentage of invitations received from friends, acquaintances, family and neighbors further suggests that hosts were perhaps making a concerted effort to reach out to an audience outside their immediate circles in order to bring together a diverse crowd for the possibility of new connections and collaborations.

Word of mouth was another significant recruitment method, as 29% of respondents heard about On the Table from someone sharing information about it. Others learned about it through advertisements and social media. While marketing future On the Table
initiatives through these channels will no doubt remain essential, the importance of personal invitations and relationships in cultivating engaging conversations remains of paramount importance.

Figure 14 details the full breakdown of how respondents became familiar with On the Table.

**Fig. 14: Who invited you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of all respondents (n=2,111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 15: Why did you participate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of all respondents (n=2,340)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help create positive change in my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with others to improve the quality of life in my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy having conversations with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about an issue or challenge in my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of a work commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an idea for addressing an issue in my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated last year and wanted to continue the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents left the conversation with much of the same motivation they had for wanting to participate; that is, respondents want to continue to seek out collaborations and commit themselves to actively building relationships with others as a way to improve communities.

Particularly noteworthy is that only 25% of respondents said they participated as part of a work commitment. This figure suggests that while many conversations were held in and around the Central Business District and facilitated by employers, respondents generally participated of their own volition. This factor is all the more impressive given the large proportion of survey respondents (57%) who were invited to the event by a work colleague.

**MOTIVATION TO PARTICIPATE**

Respondents’ motivations for participating in On the Table largely came from wanting to effect change and collaborate with others as part of that effort. As displayed in Figure 15, the majority of respondents said they wanted to participate in a conversation in order to help create positive change in their communities (70%) and/or work with others in order to achieve it (67%). This finding is especially significant because it demonstrates a strong desire for collective action and collaborative efforts. The data also indicate that while respondents want to instigate change, they also know they cannot do it independently. As is discussed later in this report, respondents perceive collaboration as a viable step toward addressing community issues and as an action they are capable of and willing to take.
3. Concerns and Causes: The Conversation, Community Problems and Individual Contributions
This section uncovers respondents’ priority concerns and details what they have been doing to address challenges facing communities. Specifically, it highlights the issues respondents discussed in their On the Table conversations, providing a detailed account of themes around which respondents’ priorities take shape and an in-depth analysis of what those themes reveal, particularly regarding respondents’ concerns. Beyond the issues respondents discussed, this section also reveals their perspectives generated by the survey regarding what they personally perceive to be the most important problems facing their communities and, relatedly, the causes to which respondents are most likely to give. These three categories—issues, problems and causes—provide a robust understanding of the cares and concerns of a highly engaged group of people and help contextualize the ideas respondents put forth, as discussed later in this section, and the proposed actions they are willing to take as means of resolving community concerns, as discussed in Section Four.

### ISSUES DISCUSSED

According to survey results, respondents who reported raising an issue of concern in their conversations regarding their community did so around equity and social inclusion (29%), education and youth development (22%), economic issues and poverty (20%), philanthropy (18%), and health (17%).

#### Fig. 16: Issues Discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% of all respondents (n=1,310) who brought up these issues of concern over conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC ISSUES AND POVERTY</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILANTHROPY</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA AND AWARENESS</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATION</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS AND CULTURE</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT AND PARKS</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD ACCESS</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHICS AND RELIGION</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRATION AND MIGRATION</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 This section considers responses that were categorized as “issues,” with 1,310 total survey respondents.
More than one-quarter of respondents (29%) discussed issues related to equity and social inclusion. This theme describes responses that use a social justice lens to account for forms of exclusion and issues of access and equality for underserved groups. Such responses largely attend to youth access and engagement concerns, including getting youth involved and increasing their connection to resources, programs, activities and jobs. A respondent’s question, “How do we provide youth more opportunities,” summarizes a common sentiment expressed by many as they communicate their concerns for youth, especially those in underserved communities. Respondents also widely discussed access issues related to mental health services for both youth and adults. They cited a need for expanded mental health care and for a “comprehensive community plan to ensure that residents are able to gain access to the services easily and quickly.”

In addition to issues of access within the theme of equity and social inclusion, respondents mentioned broader issues of inequality as noted across income levels, racial groups and neighborhoods. Respondents identified African-American, Latino, and female communities in particular as suffering from deep-rooted disparities and injustices, placing them in need of “an agenda to address the challenges” impacting their quality of life. They also noted segregation as a force at play in communities, with a “lack of community cohesion . . . [and] distrust of neighbors” surfacing as problematic attitudes prominent throughout the region.

Less than one quarter of respondents (22%) reported issues around education and youth development as a focus of their conversation. Expansive in scope, education and youth development encompasses a range of topics not limited to schools and students—although both were subjects widely discussed—but also inclusive of community relationships, parent involvement, research and general youth development; tellingly, while education and youth development is not a theme solely limited to youth-based discussion, it does, like equity and social inclusion, round out with a specific focus on this needs-based group. When discussing education and youth development, the majority of respondents spoke generally toward improving opportunities for students, especially those in low-income communities. “It is important to prioritize and support our neighborhood public high schools,” mentioned one respondent, “so that more CPS students have a guaranteed good quality education.” Additionally, respondents raised the necessity of college readiness and job preparation for high school students. Conversations focused on providing “encouragement and support for students to attend college” and “how to improve the access to quality jobs, including trades and manufacturing, through high schools and community colleges.”

Close behind education and youth development, 20% of respondents reported discussing economic issues and poverty. Issues categorized within this theme cover economic development on one end and move steadily toward economic insecurity on the other, covering in the intermediate unemployment and jobs as well as income inequality and wage issues. A wide margin of respondents talked about impoverished communities, citing a “need to support a holistic and comprehensive approach to ending poverty.” Many called for increased community revitalization through economic development (including business growth) and empowerment, particularly in communities of color and underserved communities. Comparisons were likely to be drawn between lack of economic opportunity and higher rates of violence. Jobs were a frequent topic of conversation in which respondents were intentional in mentioning employment as a scarcity and a need necessary for community improvement.
Eighteen percent of respondents made philanthropy a central theme of their conversations. When discussing philanthropy, or the giving of time, treasure and talent, respondents alluded to increased funding and support for programs and nonprofit organizations by donations and community foundations and cited a need for organizational capacity building, institutional community outreach and corporate social responsibility. Responses such as “funds are being cut from our programs in which they are there to help out our community” and “nonprofits need funds to work in our community” illustrate a critical urgency for the dedication of treasure to help keep nonprofits functioning. Other respondents indicated the need for funders to draw from the collective wisdom of residents to identify community needs and priorities that determine fund distribution. According to one respondent, “Philanthropy isn’t coming in and acting like you know everything a community needs and the solution, but actually asking and having the ability to listen.” On the individual level, respondents talked about philanthropy in terms of civic responsibility, volunteering and individuals taking action for the greater good. Many reported talking about how to get more people involved and “the importance of instilling the culture of service work or volunteering” into the behavior of communities. It should be noted that while philanthropy was designed as the conceptual frame for conversations, participants certainly had the flexibility to structure their conversations as they wished.

Rounding out the top five issues is health, with 17% of respondents reporting a focus around this theme. Most responses considered mental health in their exploration of health-related issues, although this theme is inclusive of other topics, including public health, quality-of-life issues, nutrition and wellness, and healthcare. Of those who reported discussing mental health in their conversations, they did so regarding access and improvement to mental health services in light of budget cuts and reduction in services, especially for at-risk populations, such as teenagers, the homeless, veterans, the undocumented, and the uninsured. According to one respondent, “Mental health issues in the community are a concern in the face of tragedy, but quickly forgotten when it’s time to balance the state budget.” Conversations on mental health also tended to revolve around “the stigma associated with mental illness and specific ways we can help erase it,” especially “in the language we use and in the understanding of equality.”

**IDENTIFYING COMMUNITY PROBLEMS: MAKING THE CASE FOR CHANGE**

IPCE also asked survey respondents to share problems they perceive to be affecting their communities the most, unrelated to what was discussed in their conversations. While issues accounts for concerns respondents reported discussing during conversations, problems were not necessarily discussed. Respondents identified economic issues and poverty (55%) as the most important problem facing their communities today. Equity and social inclusion (40%), education and youth development (38%), and the judicial system and public safety (38%) were also of high concern.

---

20 “Problems” differs from “issues” because the first reflects an individual perspective that stands outside the conversations, and the second refers to what was generally discussed in one’s conversation. The direction of the conversation, however, may not reflect all participants’ primary community concerns. In order to better grasp the concerns of all, IPCE explicitly asked survey respondents to identify the three most important problems facing their communities, unrelated to what was discussed in their On the Table conversations. This section considers responses that were categorized as “problems,” with 1,879 total survey respondents.
More than half of respondents (55%) cited economic issues and poverty as significant problems in their communities. Respondents mentioned poverty extensively, especially as a segregating force that perpetuates institutional racism and classism and creates “victims of discrimination” in which “people in certain social groups [cannot] access opportunities for growth and success.” To emphasize the deficiencies that result from poverty, respondents mostly mentioned problems in terms of a “lack,” such as a lack of economic development, a lack of jobs and employment opportunities, and a lack of resources. According to a number of respondents, their communities are experiencing low to no economic growth, which indicates a real need across impoverished communities for increased and strategic development. Jobs are also difficult to come by, particularly “quality and dependable jobs” that “pay a liveable wage,” and there’s urgency to get “families back on their feet after the loss of jobs or homes during the Great Recession.”
Forty percent of respondents mentioned problems related to equity and social inclusion as affecting their communities. Responses demonstrate that, foremost, greater accessibility to basic needs and opportunities are required in order to improve the wellbeing of both individuals and communities. Overwhelmingly, respondents cited access to quality education as a prominent concern as well as unequal access to housing, food and health care. Respondents observe great economic disparity in their communities and believe income inequality “will continue to grow” and access to resources will continue to diminish if action is not taken to reverse these patterns of injustice. They identified a lack in opportunities, jobs, programs, and resources, especially for youth, and want to see services provided in order to give those in need greater advantage to succeed. In addition to socioeconomic segregation, respondents are also concerned about racial segregation and gentrification “decreasing the existence [of] and opportunity for greater diversity.”

Respondents identified education and youth development as an additional problem within their communities, with 38% of respondents noting concerns regarding a lack of access to quality education and an insufficient public school system. According to one respondent, “As a parent of children in CPS schools, I’m worried about the viability of the system.” Many perceive CPS to be a “low performing [sic] public school system without strong leadership” that is “underfunded and mismanaged.” Respondents indicate that public schools need more resources, yet the “fractured governance of the school system and no long-term planning for fiscal responsibility that balances the needs of addressing the deficit and the needs of schools” prevent the allocation of resources that would better equip schools to promote the success of their students. One respondent notes, “Chicago Public Schools need[s] to continue to improve, with higher and meaningful high school graduation rates.” Respondents overwhelmingly agree that the quality of education needs to be enhanced, and that starts with resolving the inadequacies of the system.

Despite not surfacing as a top issue discussed in On the Table conversations, the judicial system and public safety was a significant community problem identified by 38% of respondents. When mentioning violence and crime, respondents identified it as “very disturbing” and “very sad.” Respondents described violence in a variety of capacities, including gun violence, gang violence, violence against women, youth violence, police violence, and community and neighborhood violence. One respondent broke it down into two categories: interpersonal and structural. When talking about youth violence in particular, respondents were likely to attribute it to “despair,” “lack of activities for youth,” and “lack of parental oversight.” Many perceive violence as a “symptom of poverty” and were likely to name a “culture of violence in poor neighborhoods” that is driving families out of Chicago because of public safety concerns. According to one respondent, “Our public safety is a serious threat and continues to make me rethink my belonging in this city.” “Sustaining a city,” says another respondent, “takes patience, respect, and the reassurance of safety.”
**TAKING UP THE CAUSE: CONTRIBUTING TO CHANGE**

Related to problems, IPCE sought to identify to which causes respondents primarily contribute on a regular basis. Causes were not discussed in conversations but rather reflect ongoing philanthropic action outside of On the Table. According to survey results, respondents contribute their time, talent, and treasure to a variety of causes aimed at fortifying the well-being of the Chicago region and improving individual communities. A large portion of respondents (40%) reported giving in some capacity to educational efforts. Within education and youth development, respondents most frequently give to youth development efforts, mentoring, and local schools.

**Fig. 18: Cause to which Respondents Contribute**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause to which Respondents Contribute</th>
<th>% of all respondents (n=1,791) who contribute their time, talent, and/or treasure to these causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Youth Development</strong></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and Social Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philanthropy</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Issues and Poverty</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Culture</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics and Religion</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Parks</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Homelessness</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judicial System and Public Safety</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Access</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Development</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media and Awareness</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Affairs</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Migration</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Affairs</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents next reported giving to causes of equity and social inclusion (22%), particularly to women and youth needs as well as to addressing health care access and social justice efforts. For those who give to causes related to health (20%), respondents overwhelmingly turn their attention to mental health care and concerns. When giving to philanthropic efforts (16%), respondents reported being involved largely in community organizations, volunteering at their church, and engaging in nonprofit work. They also support social services, donate to Chicago foundations, serve as board members and donate money to charitable causes. Within this category, respondents indicate they are most likely to give their time foremost.

---

21 This section considers responses that were categorized as “causes,” with 1,791 total survey respondents.
followed by talent and lastly treasure. Respondents who reported giving to causes of economic issues and poverty (15%) did so largely around poverty and low-income groups as well as economic development and jobs. Finally, those who give to arts and culture (15%) overwhelmingly support art in the generic and promote arts education for people of all ages.

BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER: ISSUES, PROBLEMS, AND CAUSES

In exploring issues, problems and causes, it is useful to consider these categories collectively in order to determine whether problems are being talked about as issues within conversations and if respondents are giving to causes in line with problems they have identified. This helps to illustrate in which areas respondents are already strongly focused and in which areas there requires more conversation and philanthropic action. For example, philanthropy, arts and culture, and technology are the themes respondents are most likely to mention as an issue of concern in conversation but not identify as one of the most important problems affecting their communities. Figure 19 shows that philanthropy is reported three times more frequently as an issue discussed as opposed to a perceived problem; both arts and culture and technology are reported 2.5 times more frequently as an issue rather than problem. Health and family are two themes that demonstrate parity, where respondents talked about them at nearly the same rate at which they identified them as problems. By contrast, respondents are most likely to mention the judicial system and public safety, economic issues and poverty, ethics and religion, and housing and homelessness as the most important problems facing communities but not mention them as issues discussed during On the Table conversations. Nearly three times more respondents identify the judicial system and public safety and economic issues and poverty as problems as opposed to discussing them as issues; 2.5 times more respondents identify the remaining two—ethics and religion and housing and homelessness—as problems without discussing them as issues in their conversations.

Likewise, respondents are identifying certain problems in their communities but not contributing to them as causes. As demonstrated in Figure 20, transportation, the judicial system and public safety, economic issues and poverty, and government are the themes with the greatest disparity from problems to causes. Transportation is mentioned nearly 11 times more frequently as a problem than as a cause; the judicial system and public safety is mentioned four times as frequently, economic issues and poverty 3.5 times as frequently, and government 2.5 times as frequently. Parity arises with community development and education and youth development, where respondents have named them as problems at the same rate at which they’re contributing toward them as causes. Respondents are also likely to contribute to a cause at higher rates than they identify it as a problem. International affairs, arts and culture, philanthropy, and environment and parks are themes respondents are more likely to mention as causes to which they contribute but not name as one of the top problems facing their communities. Specifically, eight times more respondents mention international affairs as a cause but not as a problem; six times more respondents for arts and culture, three times more for philanthropy, and two times more for environment and parks.
Respondents may see these causes as methods for addressing other problems. For example, the arts are likely seen as an accessible vehicle to remedy issues and create a sense of belonging to and pride in one’s community, thus improving its physical and social space. It may also suggest an imbalance between the problems respondents are actively addressing and the problems they care about the most.

It is significant to note that of the top four problems identified by respondents, economic issues and poverty as well as the judicial system and public safety face high levels of disparity when compared to issues discussed and causes. With economic issues and poverty, while 55% of respondents have identified it as a problem, only 20% reported discussing it in their conversations and 15% contribute to it as a cause. Likewise, while 38% have identified the judicial system and public safety as a major problem, only 13% discussed it in their conversations and only 9% mentioned it as a cause. Of the main problems identified by respondents, why are respondents relatively less likely to talk about economic issues and poverty and the judicial system and public safety as well as relatively less likely to contribute to a cause directly related to these problem areas? One reason for this might be attributed to the notion that these problems are complex, broad-scale concerns for which respondents might be unsure of how to talk about them and break them down as well as how to effect change. They may not be aware of current efforts underway to address specific aspects of these problems and thus are unaware of where to give their time, talent, or treasure. Although one might assume a similar disparity would be found for the other top problems, education and youth development challenges this notion and demonstrates that respondents are talking about and contributing to a high-priority problem, perhaps even to influence change in other problem areas. Indeed, respondents mentioned education and youth development as a problem (38%) at nearly the same rate that they mentioned it as a cause to which they contribute (40%). This finding suggests that, unlike other problem areas, respondents are presumably more aware of and willing to engage in opportunities that support education and youth development efforts.
Fig. 19: Themes Disparity Between Issues and Problems
For example, housing was mentioned 2.6 times more as a problem than as an issue discussed.

- **PHILANTHROPY**: 3.2
- **ARTS AND CULTURE**: 2.5
- **TECHNOLOGY**: 2.5
- **INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**: 2.3
- **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**: 1.8
- **COLLABORATION**: 1.4
- **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**: 1.4
- **MEDIA AND AWARENESS**: 1.2
- **ENVIRONMENT AND PARKS**: 1.2
- **HEALTH**: 1.1
- **FAMILY**: 1.1
- **FOOD ACCESS**: 1.3
- **EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION**: 1.4
- **GOVERNMENT**: 1.6
- **EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT**: 1.7
- **IMMIGRATION AND MIGRATION**: 1.9
- **TRANSPORTATION**: 2.4
- **HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS**: 2.6
- **ETHICS AND RELIGION**: 2.6
- **ECONOMIC ISSUES AND POVERTY**: 2.7
- **JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND PUBLIC SAFETY**: 2.9

- **Discussion more as an issue in conversation than as a top problem**
- **Identification more as a top problem than discussed as an issue in conversation**
Fig. 20: Themes Disparity Between Problems and Causes

For example, transportation was mentioned 10.7 times more as a problem than as a cause.
**BIG IDEAS: WORKING TOWARD SOLUTIONS**

As an event that brings together metropolitan residents from a wide array of backgrounds, *On the Table* encourages the generation of new ideas and strategies related to problems currently facing communities.

While this year’s conversations were action-oriented and focused more on expanding philanthropy, the unique space of *On the Table* is one that still promotes a collaborative problem-solving mindset and naturally allows for the formation of ideas around improving communities.

The following table details a selection of 10 big ideas identified by IPCE researchers. 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We came up with the idea of a Merit Badge app for CPS kids. It would marry the idea of Match.com with community service. It would be a way for kids to easily find community service projects that match with their interests and passions and thus meet their service hour requirements. There would be a social sharing aspect to it so that they could share what they are doing when they’re volunteering and hopefully exciting their friends and classmates to also meet their commitments.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Concept of ‘Girls Giving Grants,’ that turns youth from being victims to problem solvers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Creating a city-wide [sic] structure for linking institutions of higher ed to K-12 schools in mutually beneficial, sustained partnerships based on needs and assets; creating centers within institutions of higher ed that work with local K-12 schools to share resources, support efforts, learn (i.e., teams of students from university do practicum at elem school across range of disciplines based on school needs, process their experiences as a team).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Surveying parents to stimulate thinking and dialogue about the top five character values they most want to see in the children. We will then respond with how theatre can instill, inspire and encourage these.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Chicago Community Trust should sponsor a city-wide [sic] dialogue on de facto segregation by wealth and class in Chicago. The community where I live (Pilsen) is divided between the Mexican families who have lived here for decades and the new-comers, [sic] who are often white and with greater financial resources. I belong to the latter group but truly want to be a force for good in my new community. But it’s hard to see how to do so with the macroeconomic forces that are pushing everybody apart.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Creating a table at the city level where institutions of higher ed come together with other city systems supporting children and youth (CPS, CDPH, DFSS) and create deeper, sustained collaborations that enable universities to support K-12 schools and provide a structure for scaling up effective practices in those kinds of partnerships (Baltimore already does something like this).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Establish times and days to open up our school to share our tech resources with the community, collaborate with local nonprofits to get talent to teach local community members important computer skills, and continue teaching CS for free to local elementary students (and expand our current program to another elem school as well, whom we met at the <em>On the Table</em> meeting).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We talked about peer-to-peer counseling for the homeless; having shelters not only offer beds, but create AA-like networks that meet once a week, a few times a month &amp;etc. to allow for sharing of experiences and a support network.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Social media campaign, like ALS water bucket challenge, where people videotape themselves in front of favorite part of Chicago, e.g. on the lakefront, and talk about why they love Chicago and focus on an issue they are concerned about and an organization they are supporting, e.g. people could support programs being hurt as a result of the pension and city deficit crisis.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Already emailed a participant to work together on a youth curriculum in collaboration with the foundations mentioned to teach youth entrepreneurship in the form of social media — the monetization of Instagram, Snapchat, Twitter, Facebook and how to sell these skillsets to local businesses. No barrier to entry for youth who are digital natives and inherently understand virality. It gives their skills a purpose and allows them to apply their creative thinking toward something employable.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 IPCE ranked proposals through an in–house rubric designed to measure novelty, substance, uniqueness, and potential to improve community.
Certain ideas, such as the development of a community service merit badge app to facilitate community service projects, represent innovative uses of technology to address long-held concerns. Others, such as “Girls Giving Grants,” seek to empower marginalized groups for the benefit of themselves and others. Still others, such as a proposal to develop substantive partnerships between Chicago Public Schools and local universities, seek to alleviate longstanding social problems by focusing attention on strengthening municipal and regional institutions.

The selection of big ideas makes clear the creativity behind the ideas brought to *On the Table* and the unique brand of collaboration at play in the development of new ideas. It also demonstrates respondents’ thorough dedication to addressing community issues as raised in their conversations and their motivation to instigate change.

---

**YOUTH VOICES**

In partnership with Mikva Challenge and the Chicago Public Schools Office of Service Learning, The Chicago Community Trust developed a youth conversation guide to support engagement in the classroom and at various youth events held across the region. It was used in numerous classrooms in the Chicago Public Schools and in suburban school districts, as well as shared with numerous organizations serving youth including Leadership Greater Chicago and Get In Chicago. Overall, more than 1,000 youth from across the region participated in *On the Table* 2015.

The guide provided an array of lessons to help teachers, students, youth organizations, and youth-focused events get the conversation started. Youth engaged in conversations about the ways they could, and do, give their time, treasure and talents to strengthen their communities.

Participating youth had an opportunity to share photos, ideas, commitments, and other illuminating moments from their conversations using #onthetable2015 or #OTYouthVoices on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. The Trust and youth partners encouraged those using the guide to complete the post-reflection activity by uploading their exercise, Head, Heart and Feet, to social media and/or by sending them to IPCE. Students created an outline of a person or used the outline sketch provided in their guides and were asked to put promising ideas on the head, what they care about (passions) on the heart, and what they will do (the action) on the feet.
Students across the region participated in the guided activity, and over 150 students delivered or uploaded their completed images to social media. Of those reflections posted, the top five ideas included proposals to stop violence, improve schools, end bullying, raise money and implement recycling opportunities. Their passions were focused on violence, bullying, gangs, poverty, and litter. Their actions included helping, creating walkathons, cleaning, participating in their community, and creating programs. Specific themes stated from submissions included their time, treasure, and talents, such as, “I helped people get healthy by running and joining sports”; “create volleyball and basketball centers, help for homeless teens, more therapy and replace vacant lots with positive places”; and “I want to be a teacher so I can help others.”
SOCIAL MEDIA: ‘CONVERSATION ABOUT THE CONVERSATION’

While *On the Table* discussions occurred face-to-face around tables in physical spaces, the digital realm generated significant conversations of its own. Social media was influential in shaping the online conversation landscape and served as a useful tool in capturing live content from conversations as they occurred. In addition to the sharing of conversation themes, social media played a significant role in promoting the event, amplifying influential voices, and ultimately spurring “conversation about the conversation.”

IPCE used social media management platform Meltwater Buzz, along with a social media analyst from Gelb Consulting, to analyze social media conversations as a way of understanding the influence and impact of this event on the community. The goals of this collaboration were to 1) measure the frequency, reach, amplification, engagement and topics occurring in social media conversations related to *On the Table* and 2) understand how the initiative and key influencers encouraged engagement with the community before, during and after the May 12 conversations.

While the *On the Table* initiative saw thousands of people across the region engaged at the table in mealtime conversations, it also featured thousands of conversations on social media, with 10,096 total #onthetable2015 mentions. These mentions were amplified to source followers, generating potentially over 18,000,000 impressions.

The Trust launched their social media campaign in February 2015. Conversations continued to grow prior to the event, reaching a total of 2,239 pre-event mentions. As expected, conversations peaked during the event date, with 6,843 mentions on May 12, 2015—the highest frequency of conversations during the campaign. Conversations continued following the event, with 865 mentions from May 13 to June 6, 2015.

While there were occasional posts from Facebook, blogs and mainstream news, Twitter was the medium used most frequently throughout the #onthetable2015 campaign. Social connections drove community engagement throughout the #onthetable2015 campaign, as messages were not just posted but shared with and viewed by others. Specifically, there were 4,292 original tweets, 4,368 retweets, and 617 direct messages, which generated 9,277 total tweets. Social connections also went beyond just messages, with 25% of all posts including media and over 25% of promotional posts including links to other content. Social connections for #onthetable2015 campaign were generated mostly by users on mobile devices.

Topics frequently mentioned with the #onthetable2015 campaign were #chicago, #disabilitymatters, #philanthropy, #trust100 and #otyouthvoices. At the launch and leading up to May 12, the conversation on social media primarily focused on excitement, ideas and promotion. On May 12, the conversation on social media focused on people, issues and impact. For example, social media users reported, “We need more programs like *[R]enew*... to help someone re-enter society”; “Urban conversation also has to be rooted in the well-being of the city”; and “Discussing the south suburbs as communities of choice for residents and businesses.” After the event, the conversations continued with excitement and progressed to action. Social media users stated, “We all have the responsibility to provide safe spaces for youth in all of our communities”; “Young people have the answers. We, as adults, just need to listen to them”; and “Be your authentic self. It’s okay to fail. It’s ok to ask for help.”

23 See Appendix III for a visual summary of key findings from the social media analysis.
24 Impressions refer to the number of times audience members view tweets.
DIFFERENCES BY AGE

IPCE ran comparisons of select survey responses across select groups of interest. Interesting age group differences were observed when IPCE analyzed the responses by decade using the following five age groups—“under 30,” “30s,” “40s,” “50s,” and “60s and older.”

Below we outline the largest between-group differences.

- With regard to issues discussed, “under 30” category respondents were most likely to mention the topic of “equity and social inclusion” as both an issue discussed at their events (38%) and as one of the top three social problems about which they are concerned.

- Among respondents who participated due to an invitation, younger respondents were more likely to be invited by a colleague. Of those who were invited, 70% of the “under 30” age bracket participated due to an invite from a work colleague, which is the highest percentage of all; the percentages decreased as respondents got older.

- Age also was an important difference among respondents indicating they participated due to a work requirement. Thirty-six percent of respondents under age 30 indicated work as their motivation for participation, the highest percentage of age groups. This percentage decreased as respondent age got older.

- Respondents under 30 were the least likely (44%) to have expressed a viewpoint or dissatisfaction by contacting government directly, such as writing a letter or calling the office of an elected official. In contrast, 74% of respondents in the “60 and older” age group indicated that they had contacted government directly through such methods.

- When asked about reasons why they contribute to causes they care about, young adults were more likely to be influenced by friends. Forty-five percent of “under 30” respondents indicated “friends” as a key reason, the highest percentage of all age groups.
4. Impact and Actions: How Conversations Influenced Respondents
On the Table is an initiative that reaches beyond the actual May 12 conversations, given its function as a planning space for continued collective action around community concerns. Designed to launch further action and engagement, the conversations greatly impacted survey respondents in that respondents are willing and ready to take action for the benefit of their communities. This section uncovers the outcome of the conversations and explains the attitudes and beliefs of respondents regarding their influence toward effecting change and how satisfied they are with their communities. Finally, this section explores respondents’ motivations for taking action and provides an in-depth analysis of the themes categorizing the actions respondents are likely to take individually and collectively as a result of their conversations.

**IMPACT OF THE CONVERSATIONS**

Given the collaborative nature of the On the Table conversations in which participants focus on real issues that concern them and then brainstorm innovative solutions and potential action commitments to address said issues, the conversations have the potential to impact respondents in a variety of ways. When considering the impact of the conversations, it is important to acknowledge both the short-term and long-term effects on respondents.

In 2014, respondents revealed they had a better understanding of issues, they made new connections, and they had a positive outlook on their own ability to influence change. Respondents in the 2015 survey who also participated last year revealed they were additionally impacted by their 2014 conversations throughout the year. Consequently, it appears that respondents were building on their 2014 takeaways in their follow-up actions.

Of the 16% of 2015 respondents who collaborated with one or more 2014 attendees over the course of the year to address a new idea, issue or project, their noted actions indicate a strong desire to maintain or improve their involvement in efforts to better their communities. Respondents were building relationships and collaborating this past year, primarily by addressing an issue or need in the community and making plans to meet throughout the year. One respondent “formed a coalition to address the obesity issue in our community and [is] working in getting funds to create a community kitchen, community gardens and bike paths.” Another “served on the planning committee for a community summit to address ways to reduce violence in our communities.” Respondents were also engaged in community participation efforts. After participating in a conversation last year, one respondent “hosted several events in collaboration with the attendees” that were “focused on arts and culture activities” in their neighborhood. Another respondent assisted in “getting volunteer attorneys and community members involved in creative solutions to issues of police accountability,” which included “open mics, community marketing, canvassing, and responding to police stations to provide pro bono advocacy.” Raising awareness; research, assessment and planning; volunteering; and creating a new program or organization were additional actions respondents reported taking since On the Table 2014.

2015 On the Table respondents were likewise impacted by their conversations. With regards to their communities, 67% of respondents said they understood important issues somewhat to much better after
participating in the conversations. On a larger scale, 61% of 2015 respondents said the same was true with regards to their city. At the regional level, the gain was less dramatic but just as significant. Nearly half of respondents (49%) reported having a some-
what to much better understanding of the issues facing the region. Notably, respondents indicated similar percentages in their understandings of how they can personally address identified issues on a community, city, and regional level.

![Fig. 21: Extent to Which Respondents Better Understand Issues Facing...](image)

As for the ability of *On the Table* to effectively empower residents with an understanding of both the issues facing their communities and possible remedies, respondents were clearly educating one another on issues of personal importance. More than two-thirds of respondents (68%) raised an issue of concern regarding their communities, and 71% contributed new ideas or perspectives to the conversations. Thoughtful dialogue was happening in conversations where participants were breaking down issues and inviting various perspectives so as to learn how they might best be individually and collectively capable of taking action around the explored issue.

One goal of *On the Table* is for participants to build new relationships and forge sustainable partnerships for the betterment of communities. Survey results reveal that respondents acted according to this mission, making new connections in a variety of capacities. A majority of respondents (72%) indicated they purposefully spoke with attendees they did not know prior to the gathering. Additionally, 93% of respondents reported being “somewhat” to “very satisfied” with the diversity of people participating in the conversation. These findings suggest that conversations were comprised of participants from separate and diverse social, professional and community networks who were highly interested in intentional conversations to expand their networks.

Apart from making new connections, respondents reported actions that are key for collaboration. Half of respondents (51%) exchanged contact information with a newly made connection, and nearly one-third of respondents (31%) made specific plans to work with one or more attendees to address a new
idea, issue, or project in the future. Given that a top motivator for participation was to work with others to improve communities, the data indicate that participants were following through with their conversational intentions and taking advantage of the conversation space to build up their networks for new collaborations. Certainly, respondents from work-based conversations may have used On the Table as a networking opportunity, and for those in the nonprofit sector especially, networking generates new collaborations and working partnerships.

Fig. 22: Satisfaction with the On the Table Conversation

As illustrated in Figure 22, nearly all respondents (93-98%) reported being “somewhat” to “very satisfied” with the diversity of views and opinions in the conversation, the diversity of people participating, and the overall quality of the conversation. Given this level of satisfaction, 98% of respondents are “somewhat” to “very likely” to recommend On the Table to their friends or colleagues.

One caveat of this result is the high degree of selection bias; many of those who were dissatisfied may not respond to the survey unless their dissatisfaction was extreme or specific.

ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS: CHANGE AGENTS AND COMMUNITY SATISFACTION

As an initiative that aims to foster increased community engagement, the attitudes and beliefs of On the Table participants regarding their ability to bring about change and their satisfaction with their communities are essential in determining just how the On the Table effort might lead to tangible results. Further research could explore the extent to which respondents are more likely to take action as a result of their conversations if they are already confident in their ability to influence change and if they are currently dissatisfied with their communities.

Survey respondents indicated high levels of faith in their personal capacities to effect change. Specifically, 84% claimed to have “some” to “a great deal” of influence to bring about change. With this level of confidence and their propensity to take action following
their conversations, respondents make up a unique group of people who have the potential to serve as change agents in their communities.

Respondents were split as to whether they were satisfied with their own communities, with 54% indicating dissatisfaction and 46% indicating the opposite. This ratio stands in stark contrast to national data which, since 1995, has indicated a median community satisfaction level of 73%. Interestingly, those who tend to be dissatisfied with their communities are involved in community and neighborhood activities at a higher rate than those who are satisfied. Of those who are dissatisfied, 36% are in the “highest engagement” group based on their engagement score, compared to 29% by those who are satisfied.25 Further research might explore the extent to which those who are more involved are presumably more frequently exposed to community difficulties and have a larger stake in improving their communities, or the extent to which awareness of community issues is typically a prompt for becoming involved and promoting change in the first place.

DIFFERENCES BY RACE

IPCE ran comparisons of select survey responses across select groups of interest. In particular, interesting differences were observed for data by race. Comparisons by race were done on responses of those identifying as African American, Latino and white. Other race categories of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and multiracial did not have enough numbers to support meaningful observations. Below we outline the largest between-group differences.

• African Americans as a whole reported a higher rate of dissatisfaction (72%) with their communities than whites (45%), and to a lesser degree Latinos also reported higher dissatisfaction with community (64%) than whites as well.

• African-American respondents are more involved with civic and service organizations (42%) than whites (27%) and Latinos (29%) by a significant margin.

• With regard to public expressions of dissatisfaction, white respondents boycott at higher rates (67%) than Latinos (56%) and African Americans (55%), while African Americans and Latinos reported protesting at much higher rates (46 and 45%, respectively) than white respondents (29%).

• Differences in responses by race were observed with regard to the types of volunteer organizations with which respondents engaged. Twenty-seven percent of Latino respondents volunteer with immigrant-serving organizations, with whites as the next highest respondent group (8.5%) volunteering at such organizations.

• In what was identified as the most pressing community problems, there was a difference by race in topics mentioned as problems. African Americans reported economic issues and poverty most commonly (67%), followed by whites (54%), and lastly Latinos (45%). A similar difference is observed with regard to problems with the judicial system and public safety, with African-American respondents much higher (50%) than Latinos (38%) and whites (33%).

• Higher rates of Latino and African-American respondents believe they have “a great deal” of influence in bringing about change (41% and 40%, respectively) compared to white respondents (24%).

• Differences among respondents by race were also apparent with regard to impact of the conversations. Latinos (40%) and African-American (35%) respondents reported they understand community issues “much better” after participating in On the Table, which is higher than whites (19%). This disparity is apparent for better understanding of city and regional issues by race as well.

25 See Section Two: “Civic Engagement.”
FUTURE ACTIONS AND ENGAGEMENT:
INFLUENCING CHANGE

A. MOTIVATION

Survey respondents are motivated to take action in their communities by a large variety of factors. As illustrated in Figure 23, a large percentage of individuals said they contribute in order to give something back, because of the fulfilling nature of service, because their value systems require it, or to address a specific problem in their communities. Data indicate that respondents are generally altruistic in their motivations for action and are willing to engage for the benefit of others.

Fig. 23: Major Reasons for Contributing Time, Talent, and Treasure

% of respondents (n=2,007) who contribute their time, talent, and/or treasure primarily for these reasons

- A feeling of wanting to give back to the community: 79%
- Concern about a particular cause of particular group I serve: 79%
- Personal values or beliefs (such as religious, political, or philosophical beliefs): 78%
- Personal satisfaction, enjoyment, or fulfillment: 72%
- A feeling that those who have more should help those who have less: 72%
- A belief that philanthropy can achieve change or bring about a desired impact: 69%
- Help individuals meet their basic needs: 69%
- Everyone has a duty to be involved in community activities to address local issues: 68%
- To address a social or political problem: 62%
- Family member’s, friend’s, co-worker’s, or roommate’s involvement: 62%
- School or work requirement: 44%
- Learn things through direct, hands-on experience: 44%
- Look for a way to make new friends: 23%
- Tax benefits: 13%
- Other: 10%
- Other: 5%
- Other: 2%
B. LIKELY ACTIONS

On the Table serves as a fundamental inspiration to action for respondents. Respondents overwhelmingly reported likelihood to take a specific action regarding a new idea, concern, or issue discussed, with 90% at least somewhat likely to act and 47% very likely to do so. Respondents intend to take action by building relationships and collaborating (32%), participating in community (28%), raising awareness (17%), volunteering (15%), and mentoring, motivating, and training (11%).

The most common way respondents plan to take action is by building relationships and collaborating (32%), which, for respondents, involves creating and strengthening partnerships between entities, such as individuals, organizations or neighborhoods, as well as building networks, working together toward a common purpose, sharing resources, and ultimately breaking down barriers and finding commonalities with others. Many respondents intend to work with others in their communities, beginning on a small scale and building toward greater effect. “I want to start a neighborhood block group,” and “I am working with others to try to coordinate a volunteer fair in our community” are just two examples of specific actions respondents plan on taking with the assistance of their peers.

Within building relationships, a number of respondents plan to “continue the conversation” or continue working with fellow participants from their On the Table conversations to address issues identified in their initial conversations. For example, one respondent wants to “convene monthly coffee meetings with community stakeholders to continue [the] On the Table conversation and deepen collective engagement around the issues highlighted,” and another “will definitely follow up with other participants from this On the Table Meeting [sic] and work to find ways we can support each other for the cause of our community development.”

Respondents also noted that connecting with others who are outside their immediate circle is a worthwhile act for addressing common issues: “I will pursue new opportunities to collaborate with entities that I wouldn’t have ordinarily thought to reach out to,” explained one respondent, “having now met some of the representatives of those organizations.” Indeed, On the Table is a useful initiative for convening disparate groups and expanding networks for advantageous collaborative opportunities.

26 This section considers responses that were categorized as ‘actions,’ with 1,567 total survey responses.
More than a quarter of respondents (28%) will take action by participating more in their neighborhoods or encouraging others to get involved, whether that is through involvement in forums and events, engaging in community organizing and outreach, or general involvement with efforts toward bettering the community. Rather than acting as “bystanders,” respondents intend to become “more involved in my neighborhood as a community member.” Many plan on volunteering as a way of becoming more involved in local issues of importance and to more appropriately serve the community’s needs. One respondent is “looking for ways to volunteer outside of work with organizations that meet social needs in the community.” Another respondent will “continue volunteering to both better the community on my own and to convince others that they can improve their communities if they contribute.” As these examples illustrate, respondents who mention volunteering confidently view it as an activity that has the potential to create impact at the neighborhood/local community level. Respondents also plan to attend more community meetings, forums and events as a way to “learn how I can best serve the community I live in” and “talk with people about possible actions.”

Additionally, respondents intend to take action by raising awareness (17%) around issues of importance and promoting ideas for improvement in their communities. Sharing information and “getting out the word” are
critical components of this action and are happening in various arenas, whether within communities, across organizations, among family and friends, or to key stakeholders. The media certainly play a significant role in the sharing of information, especially positive information, as respondents call for “getting more success stories placed in the media” and sharing experiences through social media. Respondents also identified raising awareness as particularly useful in connecting residents to services and resources in their community and are interested in sharing information about “all of the Agencies in our Community [sic]” in order to expand access and identify gaps in service areas.

A large portion of respondents expressed interest in raising awareness around issues talked about in their On the Table conversations by bringing information back to their colleagues, family and community, especially regarding mental health. They view it as an opportunity to broaden understanding and educate others on different perspectives so as to “clear up false conceptions,” challenge misguided thinking and dispel stigma. For one respondent, that means “continu[ing] the conversation among my own family and friends, helping them understand the stigma related to mental illness and what we can do about it.” Another plans to be “more deliberate in my use of language in an attempt to change the conversation on mental health,” which is also an act of self-improvement. Not surprisingly, raising awareness co-occurs with self improvement, where both actions rely on education and communication. Self-improvement incorporates personal learning and improved communication as efforts toward bettering oneself in order to enhance the functioning of the community.

As seen with community involvement, volunteering is an action respondents favor, with 15% planning to continue their volunteer efforts or make volunteer commitments following On the Table. Volunteer actions include general involvement in schools, churches, and nonprofit organizations. The issues respondents care about most influence their volunteer choices, as reflected by one respondent who explained, “I’m just going to keep on doing what I do, which is volunteer for issues I care about at organizations I believe are effective at getting things done.” Another respondent plans to “volunteer for more diverse issues in my community.” Service work is another facet of volunteering, and according to one principal, “I am continuing to expand upon ideas of service models for our students. Next year will be the year of service for our own students, in the ‘pay it forward’ concept.” Naturally, volunteering co-occurs with philanthropic giving and fundraising, in which respondents hope to create a “community of giving” represented by the donation of time and treasure. For many, the two acts are of equal value, and they will contribute one or both to projects and programs of interest. As explained by one respondent, “I plan to branch out to donate/volunteer to a new project in my community.”

Finally, respondents intend to take action through mentoring, motivating, and training others (11%). This action places emphasis on educational and supportive relationships that promote the development of individuals, particularly those who are disadvantaged and underprivileged, and, more broadly, the development of communities. Largely, respondents noted encouraging and motivating others as important responses to apathy in communities and necessary steps in helping others become more involved community.

27 Although community participation is inclusive of volunteering, volunteering under those conditions is specifically guided toward one’s neighborhood community; volunteering as referenced here has a much broader scope.
members. Respondents plan to encourage others to get involved and “to speak out in the community,” with one respondent committing to host “weekly conversations at my home to inspire others to act.” Another respondent perceives a “chain effect” to motivation, whereby in continuing “to encourage individuals to give back and share their passion about something,” they will ultimately “motivate others.” Another significant component to this action is mentoring and serving as a role model for others. Many respondents indicated wanting to become a mentor, create a mentorship program, or support mentorship programs. Youth, including youth of color, as well as women are primary target audiences of mentorship opportunities. Discussion around mentoring reinvigorated one respondent, who said, “I’ve been a mentor for a long time, but it made me want to continue to do that and do more of it.” Others expressed wanting to “continue being a mentor” or becoming “committed to find a program” in which they could serve as a mentor. One respondent values being in the role of both mentor and mentee, indicating wanting to “be a mentor to others and seek out mentors for my own growth as well.”

ISSUES TO ACTIONS

In considering the actions respondents are likely to take as a result of their conversations, it is worthwhile to note how their intended actions relate to the issues discussed. Respondents who mention education and youth development as an issue are nearly two times more likely to mention mentor, motivate and train as an intended action compared to those who do not mention education and youth development. Similarly, respondents who mention philanthropy as an issue are 2.5 times more likely to mention volunteering as an intended action compared to those who do not mention philanthropy. Finally, respondents who mention health as an issue are nearly two times more likely to mention raising awareness as an intended action compared to those who do not mention health. These findings may indicate that respondents have very specific and common actions they are likely to take in response to the named issue areas. No large differences were found in equity and social inclusion or economic issues and poverty.
C. COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

As confirmed by the top actions respondents are likely to take following their On the Table conversations, collaboration and peer engagement are critical components of individual efforts within communities. Respondents overwhelmingly believe in collaboration as a fundamental method for invigorating and improving the overall function of communities.

How to Make Communities More Collaborative

% of all respondents (n=1,063)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships and Collaboration</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise Awareness</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Improvement</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor/Motivate/Train</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Unsure</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assessment Planning</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Inclusion and Equity</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Electoral Engagement</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Giving and Fundraising</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Related Social Responsibility</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationships and Involvement</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce and Business Development</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Nothing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create New Program or Organization</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked how their communities can become more collaborative,28 45% of respondents provided answers thematized as building relationships and collaboration. Although a number of respondents cited their communities as already collaborative, most indicated the need to “work together toward a common goal” “that better the community or addresses an issue.” In order to accomplish this, respondents suggested

---

28 This section considers responses that were categorized as “community collaboration,” with 1,053 total survey responses.
bringing people together to work in groups around important issue areas and specific causes, which can then “snowball into increased and sustained engagement.” Respondents also called for improved “communication and collaboration with the many civic and neighborhood groups working in our community to distill goals, strengthen all efforts, and avoid duplication of work and the watering down of available resources” Groups working in similar issue areas need to find better methods of communication to connect and collaborate in order to increase efficiency and share resources. However, it is not just internal efforts that will make communities more collaborative. Several respondents called for more funding, arguing that “greater access to funding will aid collaborative endeavors.” For example, as one respondent explained, “if the organization that I work with was supported financially by foundations like CCT[,] I believe we could [be] more effective in using the tools at our disposal to become a catalyst to launch and foster collaborative spirit in the community.” Individual push, group organization and institutional assistance will ultimately create an environment that promotes healthy partnerships and fosters a collaborative community.

Respondents also widely believe that community participation will help communities become more collaborative, with 42% of respondents discussing how to increase engagement as a means of creating more opportunities for collaboration. They primarily suggested organizing more community events and meetings “that provide opportunities for diverse members of the community to come together to socialize and discuss issues, such as farmers’ markets, music and cultural events, community action days,” public forums, ward meetings, and block clubs. “When people in the community meet each other,” offered one respondent, “it opens up doors for collaboration.” For this reason, community events and meetings need to be publicized more and should intentionally engage community members “that represent the entire community, not just a group of people with power, wealth and privilege.” Respondents also believe it is important to have “public spaces where people can come together and reflect on community priorities,” especially using the On the Table model.

Additionally, respondents consider acts of raising awareness (15%), self-improvement (9%), and mentoring, motivating and training (7%) to be valuable components of making communities more collaborative. Sharing information and “educating people on the needs of the community” are critical for problem solving and providing the knowledge base to work together on issues of importance. The “first step is to become aware of community issues” so as to become “a committed advocate,” explained one respondent. Increasing awareness of issues, however, requires more than information sharing; respondents argue that communication must be improved and intention established in order to be prepared individually for collaboration. Acts of self-improvement, such as more listening and learning, needs to take place. One respondent emphasizes the importance of listening within conversation, suggesting that people should “listen, talk, listen, listen” as a means of learning from one another. Another provides the formula, “talk, share, learn, grow, and implement,” suggesting a progression for action that begins with a collaborative conversation. In some cases, collaboration may even manifest as encouraging others to get involved and finding sources of inspiration and motivation for community residents to become engaged and work with one another.
5. Conclusions
This report has sought to understand the outcomes and impact of the *On the Table* conversations and further explore how Chicago-area residents are working independently and together to improve communities through the giving of their time, treasure, and talent. IPCE developed three guiding research topics related to 1) the conversation, 2) the impact of the conversation, and 3) participants’ actual and intended community engagement habits and philanthropic actions. The in-depth survey and the 2,386 responses yielded data on more than 200 variables with hundreds of thousands of individual points of data about the respondents and their opinions, which have been presented and summarized above. This collection of data support several key observations and conclusions.

Although IPCE cannot scientifically generalize to the broader population of participants, the respondents are a highly civically engaged group—the most robust observation for the question of “who participated?” This pool of 2,386 respondents engage in a wide variety of civic engagement activities at rates higher than, and for some activities much higher than, regional comparable data from multiple sources. While it is unknown how well these respondents represent all participants, the study recognizes that respondents are a group of over 2,000 highly and very highly engaged participants, many of whom connected with others to plan and engage collaboratively to address issues of shared concern. Based on their current levels of engagement, these “champions” of engagement (the highest engagement group) represent a potential opportunity for institutions and organizations that work to address social issues, as they are individuals who may be open to new or additional opportunities for further engagement.

This report gave particular attention to group differences. Analysis of select data with regard to race revealed a few important differences by those groups. In particular, African Americans reported discussing economic issues and poverty as well as the judicial system and public safety at a rate of as much as 10% higher than did other races. African Americans as a whole reported a higher rate of dissatisfaction with their communities than whites, and to a lesser degree Latinos also reported higher dissatisfaction with community than whites as well. Latino and African-American respondents believe they can influence change at higher rates than white respondents. Interestingly, differences among respondents by race were also apparent with regard to impact of the conversations. Latinos and African-American respondents reported that *On the Table* helped them better understand community issues at higher rates than did whites. This disparity is apparent for better understanding of city and regional issues as well. Race was clearly the basis of some differences, and those differences require examination beyond the scope of this report to fully examine and understand.

Age of respondent was another important focus of group analysis. When IPCE analyzed the responses by age decade using the following five age groups—“under 30,” “30s,” “40s,” “50s,” and “60s and older”—differences by age were apparent. Younger respondents were more likely to mention equity and social inclusion as both an issue discussed at their events and as one of the top three social problems about which they are concerned. For many respondents, *On the Table* was a work-related event, but that observation was more robust for younger participants. Among respondents who participated due to an invitation, young adults were more likely to be invited by a colleague. More than two-thirds of the “under 30” age bracket who were
invited participated due to an invite from a work colleague, a figure that got smaller as respondents got older. Respondents indicating they participated due to a work requirement had a similar response pattern by age, with over one-third under age 30 indicating work as their motivation for participation, which is also a percentage that decreased as respondent age got older.

When looking more closely at the nature of respondents’ giving of their time, talent, and treasure, this analysis sheds light on what people care about as well as what they do about it. Key differences were observed between how much respondents identified a top problem facing their communities and the frequency with which they mentioned that problem in their discussions and with which they contribute to that problem as a cause. Economic issues and poverty as well as the judicial system and public safety were themes most often mentioned as a top problem facing communities but not as an issue respondents discussed during conversations or a cause to which respondents contribute. Possible explanations for this disparity may be that respondents have no mechanism through which to address the problems, are unaware of how they might contribute to that cause, or perhaps feel these problems are too complex and systemic. Although one might assume a similar disparity would be found for the other top problems, education and youth development challenges this notion and demonstrates that respondents are talking about and contributing to a high-priority problem.

When observations turned to impact, an important finding is evidence of On the Table contributing to building social capital—the bonds among people that form our social fabric—among residents of the city and region. On the Table is an initiative that draws on collaborative efforts and inspires new collaborations. Respondents reported participating because they want to work with others in order to achieve change (67%). The conversations tapped the existing social connections of individuals to bring them together (about two-thirds received a personal invitation), made new connections and relationships among respondents who have found a common interest or bond (more than half made new connections), and created opportunities for individuals to begin to explore how they might work collaboratively to address issues that matter to them (one-third made plans for working together). Additionally, the top action reported encompasses building relationships in the community and at work. Improved connections among participants are both an ingredient and a product of the success of On the Table.

The 2015 On the Table survey results offer the first opportunity to examine the impact On the Table 2014 had on respondents over the past year. Respondents who indicated they participated in the event last year reported activities such as coalition-building, serving on a planning committee for an event on youth violence, collaborating on events with other 2014 attendees, and even creating new programs. Given the high level of connections and plans made by participants at On the Table 2015, IPCE sees a high potential for impact in terms of follow-up activities over the next year.

On the whole, On the Table 2015 conversations achieved both their most basic aims as well as set the stage for longer-term impact. Clearly, an estimated 25,000 participants is significant for any initiative. As a highly engaged group who is confident in their ability to bring about change, who is largely dissatisfied with their communities, and who is likely to take action based on their
conversations, respondents demonstrate great potential for impact following the conversations. On the Table generated robust conversations on a wide range of topics that improved a majority of respondents understanding of issues, and most are likely to take specific action regarding a new idea or issue discussed. Furthermore, the potential for collaboration brought many respondents to the table, and they are interested in sustaining collaborative efforts moving forward. As noted above, respondents took advantage of the opportunity to make new connections, and it is apparent in the year since On the Table 2014 took place that individuals have taken action together as a direct result of those conversations. This year, there are specific opportunities for collaborative action within economic issues and poverty and the judicial system and public safety, given that these are major problems identified but appear disproportionately low in issues discussed and causes to which respondents contribute.

Individuals themselves can be powerful drivers of building the bonds of social capital that form the basis of civic engagement and philanthropic activity. However, it is clear that large public conversations initiatives such as On the Table can be important catalysts for building those bonds in ways that provide opportunities for individuals to work individually and together to build a Chicago region that works for all of its residents.
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APPENDIX I

Issues Codebook – DEFINED

ARTS AND CULTURE
An arts and culture code may refer to art initiatives such as art for social change as well as public art and art infrastructure, or it may acknowledge culture through cultural institutions (such as libraries) and city events (such as festivals) as well as through opportunities for ethnic cultural awareness.

COLLABORATION
A collaboration code refers to working together and building relationships to create partnerships and expand networks. It may function at the community or individual level and often involves crossing divides and building bridges while working toward collective impact. Sharing resources and holding dialogues/conversations are other indicators of collaboration.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
A community development code refers to identifying community assets and building up the community, particularly through local economic development, in order to improve quality of life. It also refers to building a sense of community and creating community for those who live there.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
A community engagement code refers to overall involvement and participation in one’s neighborhood or community in order to make a difference. Often there is an organizing element at the grassroots level as well as intentions for improved neighbor relations and opportunities for neighborhood gatherings.

ECONOMIC ISSUES AND POVERTY
An economic issues and poverty code refers to economic development on one end and economic insecurity, or poverty, on the other, covering in the intermediate unemployment and jobs as well as income inequality and wage issues.

EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
An education and youth development code refers primarily to schools (such as school system or curriculum) and students (often at the high school level) with additional focal points on mentoring and general youth development. It is also inclusive of other related topics such as community relationships, parent involvement and research.
ENVIRONMENT AND PARKS
An environment and parks code refers to overall environmental sustainability efforts and clean-up as well as recreational opportunities for all.

EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION
An equity and social inclusion code uses a social justice lens to account for forms of exclusion and issues of access and equality for underserved groups. Reference is largely made to youth access and engagement concerns as well as to issues of disparity as noted across income levels, racial groups, and neighborhoods.

ETHICS AND RELIGION
An ethics and religion code refers largely to personal attributes and attitudes, such as apathy or hope. It is also inclusive of faith-based community work.

FAMILY
A family code refers to the overall functioning and behavior of the family unit, particularly through parent involvement and support (or lack thereof) and child concerns, such as child care.

FOOD ACCESS
A food access code refers primarily to food insecurity, focusing on problems of hunger and food deserts and solutions regarding food assistance and urban agriculture.

GOVERNMENT
A government code refers to the governing habits of the state and regional municipalities, especially regarding fiscal issues and taxes, including pensions and cuts to social services, as well as transparency, accountability, and corruption. It also involves the function of government, particularly through elections, public engagement, and public policy.

HEALTH
A health code refers to the wellbeing of both people and communities, considering in particular mental health issues and also taking into account public health, quality-of-life issues, nutrition and wellness, and health care.

HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS
A housing and homelessness code primarily refers to homelessness and issues around home ownership and renting responsibilities.
IMMIGRATION AND MIGRATION
An immigration and migration code refers to the displacement, movement, and integration of immigrant communities, including those who are undocumented.

INTERNATIONAL
An international code refers to world affairs and Chicago positioned as a global city.

JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND PUBLIC SAFETY
A judicial system and public safety code may refer to the criminal justice system as well as public safety and crime, including instances of gang violence, gun violence, drugs, and trafficking, and how officials such as police can better provide community security.

MEDIA AND AWARENESS
A media and awareness code refers to raising awareness around issues of importance and addressing ignorance, particularly through the media and social media. It includes improving communication and building new narratives, especially around persistent stigmas.

PHILANTHROPY
A philanthropy code refers to increased funding and support for programs and nonprofit organizations and often incorporates a need for organizational capacity building, institutional community outreach and corporate social responsibility. On the individual level, it refers to civic responsibility and volunteering, with individuals taking action for the greater good.

TECHNOLOGY
A technology code refers to technology in a general sense and includes references to access, training and improvement.

TRANSPORTATION
A transportation code refers to transportation access and transportation infrastructure.
Actions Codebook – DEFINED

BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS AND COLLABORATION
A building relationships and collaboration code refers to creating and strengthening partnerships between entities such as individuals, organizations, or neighborhoods, as well as expanding networks, working together toward a common purpose, sharing resources, and ultimately breaking down barriers and finding commonalities with others. It can also indicate follow-up On the Table-style conversations and meetings.

CREATE NEW PROGRAM OR ORGANIZATION
A create new program or organization code refers to starting a new initiative as a means of addressing a need, absence, or issue in a community.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
A community participation code refers to community organizing and outreach efforts; community forums, meetings, and events; and general community involvement (such as volunteering in the community) done for the purpose of bettering the community. It is also inclusive of community conversations and dialogues unrelated to On the Table.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND INVOLVEMENT
A family relationships and involvement code refers to supporting other families in the community as well as providing better care for one’s own. It also includes more parent engagement within schools as a way to support children.

MENTOR/MOTIVATE/TRAIN
A mentor/motivate/train code refers to creating educational and supportive relationships that promote the development of individuals. It may involve serving as a role model and encouraging others in one’s community to get involved as well as mentoring those who are disadvantaged or underprivileged, including youth (especially youth of color) and women.

PHILANTHROPIC GIVING AND FUNDRAISING
A philanthropic giving and fundraising code refers to foundations and organizations providing more funding to projects and programs within communities. On an individual level, it refers to increasing personal giving in order to provide support to initiatives of interest.
POLITICAL AND ELECTORAL ENGAGEMENT
A political and electoral engagement code refers to communicating the public’s values and opinions to the elected officials and bureaucrats through actions like attending meetings, advocacy, and contacting representatives. It also refers to influencing the selection of people who make public policy through actions like voting or running for office.

PROMOTE INCLUSION AND EQUITY
A promote inclusion and equity code refers to taking action to provide equal opportunity for all and to advocate for inclusivity and diversity. It can involve dismissing stereotypes and empowering those who are marginalized and disadvantaged.

RAISE AWARENESS
A raise awareness code refers to sharing information and new ideas in order to educate others on important topics. It involves getting out the word, especially through word of mouth and social media, and changing the conversation to promote new narratives.

RESEARCH/ASSESSMENT/PLANNING
A research/assessment/planning code refers to learning more about one’s community and identifying issues, needs, assets, and resources. It can often incorporate an action plan to implement necessary research-based changes.

SELF-IMPROVEMENT
A self-improvement code refers to bettering oneself for the benefit of the entire community. It involves staying informed of what’s happening in the community, becoming more open-minded, improving personal communication (i.e., more listening), and taking responsibility to complete acts for the common good.

VOLUNTEERING
A volunteering code refers to general involvement in organizations, at church, in schools, and at shelters as well as serving on a council, committee, or board. It is also inclusive of service work.

WORKFORCE AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
A workforce and business development code refers to encouraging and supporting business and job creation to increase economic development in one’s community.

WORK-RELATED SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
A work-related social responsibility code refers to individual service through one’s work in order to provide better opportunities and improved quality of life for others. It can also refer to businesses better serving the community.
Welcome, and thank you for taking part in this survey!

This survey is for the purpose of understanding the nature and quality of the *On the Table* conversation event in which you participated on May 12, 2015, coordinated by the Chicago Community Trust. The survey is being administered by the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE).

We estimate the questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Completion of this questionnaire is voluntary, and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept confidential, and data will be reported in summary form only, with no personally identifiable data included. Privacy and confidentiality will be protected to the fullest extent technologically possible; however, complete security for any data can never be 100% guaranteed. Results of this study will be publicly available in summary form at www.ipce.uic.edu and www.cct.org.

If you have any questions about the survey, you may contact IPCE by phone at 312 355 0088, or by e-mail at jhoereth@uic.edu.

By signing below you acknowledge the following:

- You have read the above information
- You voluntarily agree to participate in this study
- You are at least 18 years of age

____________________________  ____________________________
Printed Name    Today’s Date

____________________________
Signature
1. Did you participate in an On the Table 2015 conversation?

( ) Yes
( ) No

If you answered NO, STOP HERE. This survey is for On the Table 2015 participants.

2. Please provide the e-mail that you used to register for On the Table. If you DID NOT register online, please provide your e-mail below.

E-mail Address: _____________________________________________________________________

3. How did you hear about the On the Table conversations? (Select all that apply)

( ) I received an invitation
( ) I saw or heard advertisement/s
( ) I learned about it through social media
( ) Someone told me about it
( ) Other (Please specify): _____________________________________________________________________

If you DID NOT receive an invitation, please skip to Question 5.

4. If you received an invitation to participate in a conversation, who invited you? (Select all that apply)

( ) Acquaintance
( ) Colleague
( ) Family Member
( ) Friend
( ) Neighbor
( ) Other (Please specify): _____________________________________________________________________
5. Why did you choose to participate in an On the Table conversation? (Select all that apply)

(____) I want to help create positive change in my community

(____) I want to work with others to improve the quality of life in my community

(____) I have an idea for addressing an issue in my community

(____) I am concerned about an issue or challenge in my community

(____) I enjoy having conversations with people

(____) It was part of a work commitment

(____) I participated last year and wanted to continue the experience

(____) Other (Please specify): __________________________________________________________

6. How many participants (including you and the host) were at the conversation you attended?
Enter number: _______

7. How did you connect with others at the conversation? (Select all that apply)

(____) I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know before and/or after the conversation

(____) I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know

(____) I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees to address a new idea, issue, or project in the future

(____) I did not make any new connections

(____) Other (Please specify): __________________________________________________________
8. How satisfied are you with . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The diversity of views and opinions in the conversation</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not too Satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The diversity of people at the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How likely are you to recommend On the Table to your friends or colleagues?

(____) Very likely
(____) Somewhat likely
(____) Not too likely
(____) Not at all likely

Please describe how you participated in the conversation:

10. Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community?

(____) Yes
(____) No

If yes, please provide examples:
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
11. Here is a list of topics discussed during conversations last year. Which of the following topics, if any, were discussed at your table this year? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety/Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Morals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Did you contribute new ideas or perspectives to the conversation?

( _) Yes

( _) No

If yes, please provide examples: 
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

13. Which idea discussed at your conversation do you think has the most potential to bring about change in your community?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

14. Please share the most inspiring story that you heard during your conversation, if any:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

15. How much do you better understand the issues facing your community, city, and the region after participating in your conversation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Somewhat Better</th>
<th>A little better</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. To what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community, city, and the region after participating in your conversation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Somewhat Better</th>
<th>A little better</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How likely are you to take specific action regarding a new idea, concern, or issue discussed?

(____) Very likely
(____) Somewhat likely
(____) Not too likely
(____) Not at all likely

If you answered NOT AT ALL LIKELY, please skip to Question 19.

18. Please provide an example of the action you are most likely to take inspired by the conversation.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

19. How much influence do you think you have in bringing about change?

(____) A great deal
(____) Some
(____) A little
(____) None
20. Thinking about the local community where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in your local community today?

(____) Satisfied

(____) Dissatisfied

21. What do you think are the three most important problems facing your community today?

Problem 1: ________________________________________________________________________ _________________

Problem 2: ________________________________________________________________________ _________________

Problem 3: ________________________________________________________________________ _________________

Questions 22 through 32 are related to your civic engagement activities.

22. To what causes do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent (knowledge or skills), and/or treasure (financial resources)?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

23. How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?

(____) Very involved

(____) Somewhat involved

(____) Not too involved

(____) Not at all involved
24. Here is a list of types of groups and organizations in which people sometimes participate. Have you participated in any of these groups during the last 12 months—that is, since May 2014? (Please circle Yes or No)

Yes | No  A school group, neighborhood, or community association, such as PTA or neighborhood watch group

Yes | No  A service or civic organization, such as American Legion or Lions Club

Yes | No  A sports or recreation organization, such as a soccer club or tennis club

Yes | No  A church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious institution or organization, NOT COUNTING your attendance at religious services

Other (Please specify): ____________________________________________________________________________

25. Since May 2014, have you: (Please circle Yes or No)

Yes | No  Attended any public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs?

Yes | No  Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something?

Yes | No  Worked on a community project?

Yes | No  Donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations?

26. Since May 2014, have you done any volunteer activities through or for an organization?

(_ _) Yes

(_ _) No

If you answered NO, please skip to Question 29.
27. We are interested in volunteer activities—that is, activities for which people are not paid, except perhaps expenses. We only want you to include volunteer activities that you did through or for an organization, even if you only did them once in a while.

For what type(s) of organization(s) did you volunteer? (Select all that apply)

(____) Civic organizations

(____) Children’s education, sports, and recreational groups

(____) Other educational groups

(____) Cultural or arts organizations

(____) Environmental or animal care organizations

(____) Health research or education organizations

(____) Hospitals, clinics, and healthcare organizations

(____) Immigrant/refugee assistance organizations

(____) International organizations

(____) Labor unions and business or professional organizations

(____) Political parties or advocacy groups

(____) Public safety organizations

(____) Religious organizations

(____) Social and community service groups

(____) Sports and hobby groups

(____) Youth services organizations

(____) Other (Please specify): ______________________________________________________
28. What types of volunteer activities did you do? (Select all that apply)

(____) Be an usher, greeter, or minister

(____) Coach, referee, or supervise sports teams

(____) Collect, prepare, distribute, or serve food

(____) Collect, make, or distribute clothing, crafts, or goods other than food

(____) Engage in music, performance, or other artistic activities

(____) Engage in general labor; supply transportation for people

(____) Fundraise or sell items to raise money

(____) Mentor youth

(____) Provide counseling, medical care, fire/EMS, or protective services

(____) Provide general office services

(____) Provide professional or management assistance, including serving on a board or committee

(____) Tutor or teach

(____) Other (Please specify): ____________________________________________________________

29. For LOCAL elections, such as for mayor or a school board, do you . . .

(____) Always vote

(____) Sometimes vote

(____) Rarely vote

(____) Never vote
30. Here is a list of some things people have done to express their views. Please tell us whether or not you have done any of the following in the last 12 months—that is, since May 2014: (Please circle Yes or No)

Yes | No  | Contacted or visited a public official—at any level of government—to express your opinion

Yes | No  | Bought or boycotted a certain product or service because of the social or political values of the company that provides it

Yes | No  | Wrote a letter to an editor of a magazine or newspaper

Yes | No  | Participated in a march, rally, or protest

Other (Please specify): __________________________________________________________________________

31. Why do you contribute your time, talent, and/or treasure (financial resources)? Please tell us if, for you personally, each of the following is a major reason, a minor reason, or not a reason at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Major reason</th>
<th>Minor reason</th>
<th>Not a reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help individuals meet their basic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling that those who have more should help those who have less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal values or beliefs (such as religious, political, or philosophical beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling of wanting to give back to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction, enjoyment, or fulfillment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that philanthropy can achieve change or bring about a desired impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for a way to make new friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about a particular cause or a particular group I serve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn things through direct, hands-on experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member’s, friend’s, co-worker’s, or roommate’s involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address a social or political problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone has a duty to be involved in community activities to address local issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or work requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. How can your community become more collaborative?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

To help us better understand who participated in On the Table, please respond to the following demographic questions. Your responses are confidential.

33. Please provide the town or Chicago community area where you currently live:

Zip Code: __________________________________________________________________________________________

City or Town: _______________________________________________________________________________________

Chicago Community Area: __________________________________________________________________________

34. In which town or Chicago community area did the CONVERSATION take place, if known?

Zip Code: __________________________________________________________________________________________

City or Town: _______________________________________________________________________________________

Chicago Community Area: __________________________________________________________________________

35. What is your gender?

(__) Male

(__) Female

(__) Other (Please specify): __________________________________________________________________________
36. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

(____) Less than high school
(____) High school diploma or GED
(____) Some college
(____) Associate/Vocational degree
(____) Bachelor’s degree
(____) Graduate degree

37. In what year were you born?

Year: ____________

38. How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity? (Select all that apply)

(____) American Indian/Alaska Native
(____) Asian
(____) Black or African American
(____) Hispanic or Latino/a
(____) Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
(____) White
(____) Other (Please specify): ________________________________

39. Had you heard of The Chicago Community Trust before taking part in *On the Table*?

(____) Yes
(____) No
40. Please use the comment section below for any additional comments, questions, or feedback:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

PLEASE ANSWER THIS FINAL QUESTION ONLY IF YOU PARTICIPATED IN ON THE TABLE LAST YEAR AS WELL.

41. Over the past year, in what ways did your On the Table 2014 conversation impact you?
   (Select all that apply)

   (___) I stayed in contact with one or more attendees I did not already know before the conversation

   (___) I participated in another conversation with one or more attendees

   (___) I worked with one or more attendees to address a new idea, issue, or project (If yes, please provide an example): ____________________________________________________________

   (___) I did not participate in On the Table 2014

   (___) Other (Please specify): _____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
Summary Findings

- There was a small, but consistent number of mentions pre-event with the campaign.
- Twitter was the most prominent source of mentions and conversations, with 25% of posts including media.
- As a sign of engagement, conversations continued after the event as well.
- Posts were overwhelmingly positive with key themes that varied upon launch, during the event and post-event. Many were focused on promoting the event.
- Overall, an estimated potential of almost 19M impressions, given the followers of each user.

Detailed Findings

Reach & Amplification

10,096 Mentions (All Media) during February 2 – June 6 2015
18,943,525 Potential Impressions

During the time period of February 2 through June 6, #onthetable2015 was mentioned a total of 10,096 times. These mentions were amplified to source followers, generating potentially 18,943,535 impressions.
Detailed Findings
Monitor & track social media conversations

Launch
February 2, 2015

Event
May 12, 2015

Post Event
June 6, 2015

Detailed Findings
Campaign Launch Conversations

2,239
Pre-event Mentions (All Media)
February 2 - May 11, 2015

#onthetable2015
#OTTyouthvoices

Following the launch of the #onthetable2015 conversations continued to grow prior to the event, reaching a total of 2,239 pre-event mentions spanning February 2 - May 11, 2015.
As expected, conversations peaked during the event date with 6,843 mentions on May 12, 2015, the highest frequency of conversations during the campaign.* This is approximately 68% of all mentions for the campaign.

*Based on hashtag tracking

Conversations continued in the week following the event with 865 mentions from May 12, 2015 until June 6, 2015.

Detailed Findings
Event Date Conversations

On May 12, 2015

6,843

Mentions (All Media)
of #onthetable2015
and #OttYouthVoices

Detailed Findings
Post Event Conversations

Conversations continued in the week following the event with 865 mentions from May 12, 2015 until June 6, 2015.

8.8%
Of total mentions occurred after the event

897
Mentions during May 13 – June 6

Launch
February 2, 2015

Event
May 12, 2015
Post Event
June 6, 2015
While there were occasional posts from Facebook, blogs and mainstream news, Twitter was the media type used most frequently throughout the #onthetable2015 campaign.

Social connections drove community engagement throughout the #onthetable2015 campaign as messages were not just posted but shared with and viewed by others.
Detailed Findings
Other Hashtags

Other topics frequently mentioned along with the #onthetable2015 campaign were #chicago, #disabilitymatters and #philanthropy.

Detailed Findings
Influencers

2,020
Influencers (Unique Sources - Twitter)
#onthetable2015
Detailed Findings

Buzz Words

Excitement, Ideas and Promotion

Issues, People, Impact

Conversation, Action, Excitement

Launch
February 2, 2015

Event
May 12, 2015

Post Event
June 6, 2015

Detailed Findings

Common Themes – Pre Event

So very excited and proud to announce that I’ve been selected as an ambassador for the Chicago Community @ChiTrust @Chi...

Parent engagement roadmap: @elonChicopeeBuzz parent eng moonshot can partner for the toolkit. We are doing one too! #onthetable2015

Bright Future Network: streamlining assets and support for 1st-in-line contacts. How might you give power to user too?

We’re planning an #OnTheTable2015 breakfast w/ students+mentors. Are there best practices to get max impact from our conversation?

CUA is excited to be a part of The Chicago Community Trust #OnTheTable2015 campaign this year. We are partnering

Demo Day! Turning ideas into action with @ChiTrust #onthetable2015

http://t.co/L0vscd6NjE

So very excited and proud to announce that I’ve been selected as an ambassador for the Chicago Community @ChiTrust @Chi...

Talking with @barnoch about inspiring community and celebrating @chitrust’s 100th birthday this year. #onthetable2015

Join @TomSchreader and the Trust on May 15, 2015 to commit to making our region better: http://bit.ly/1IFfwdx #onthetable2015...
Detailed Findings

Common Themes – Event

- "Teach youth to become leaders in the community and provide jobs" #onthetable2015
- "Urban conservation also has to be rooted in the well-being of the city." #onthetable2015
- Looking forward to sharing ideas on how to improve our communities tonight at @CatalyaRanch! #onthetable2015
- Discussing the south suburbs as communities of choice for residents & businesses #onthetable2015
- #onthetable2015 discussing strategies to engage overlooked populations during elections.
- "Survivors do best when they are helped by other survivors" #onthetable2015
- "We must come together, be more civically involved and more committed to our community. That's what #onthetable2015 is all abo…"
- Arlene Norsym, Alumni Assoc, praising UIC Open House that both recruits students, connects w community & reconnects w/Alumni #onthetable2015
- "We need more programs like "renew"...to help someone re-enter society is ultimate form of philanthropy"
- "Urban conservation also has to be rooted in the well-being of the city." #onthetable2015

We all have the responsibility to provide safe spaces for youth in all of our communities." #onthetable2015

"We must come together, be more civically involved and more committed to our community. That's what #onthetable2015 is all abo…"

"Be your authentic self. It's okay to fail. It's okay to ask for help." #onthetable2015!

Every voice matters. Take the #onthetable2015 survey by 5/29 and one lucky winner will receive an iPad Mini!

22 guest and 76% voted that the agenda was worth the conversation #onthetable2015
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The Chicago Community Trust, our region’s community foundation, partners with donors to leverage their philanthropy in ways that transform lives and communities. The Trust, together with its donors, grants more than $160 million annually to nonprofits working to develop new audiences to sustain the region’s vibrant arts organizations, protect the human services safety net for those hardest hit by the recession, stem the devastating effects of foreclosures on our neighborhoods, elevate teaching to meet world-class standards, and improve conditions for healthy and active lifestyles. By connecting the generosity of donors with the needs of the community, the Trust ensures that our region thrives today and for future generations.