on the table
your voice matters.
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On November 7, 2017, residents of Columbus and the surrounding areas came together in conversation to talk about issues that impact the region and its quality of life. This conversation-oriented initiative known as On the Table was an opportunity for friends, families, neighbors, colleagues, and even people who were meeting for the first time to gather around a shared meal and have a real dialogue about what is important to them with the intention of fueling meaningful change.

On the Table created a space for members of the Chattahoochee Valley to convene and discuss opportunities and challenges in their communities, as well as how to make their communities even better. As a community-focused event, it encouraged residents to consider how to make their communities more sustainable, just, safe, strong, and vibrant, and as a civic engagement initiative, it supported their efforts to become more involved in and committed to their communities. On the Table was oriented around the notion that small conversations can generate big ideas, and that people are willing to invest in the ideas they create. While organizers of On the Table recognize there is no “quick fix” to the region’s problems, they believe residents, organizations, businesses, foundations, and government agencies can together spur progress by contributing in ways that together add up to a greater solution than one can achieve on his/her own. By providing an occasion for residents to talk about their own experiences within their communities and to listen to the experiences of others, the opportunity for connection was all the more ripe and residents were given the chance to learn more about what matters to others in their communities.

The Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley (CFCV) organized On the Table with support from The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Knight Foundation brought On the Table to 10 cities across the country in 2017: Lexington, KY (March 15); Philadelphia, PA (May 23); Long Beach, CA (September 23); Gary, IN (September 26); Akron, OH (October 3); Detroit, MI (October 4); Miami, FL (October 17); Charlotte, NC (October 25); Columbus, GA (November 7); and San Jose, CA (November 15). This On the Table replication project draws from an initiative that originated in Chicago in 2014 as part of The Chicago Community Trust’s Centennial celebration. Since its inception and expansion into other cities, On the Table has been an occasion for residents of a city or region to convene and discuss local opportunities and challenges while focusing on strategies to make their communities safer, stronger, and more dynamic.

All 10 cities designated their own specific day in 2017 to convene residents in mealtime conversations for discussions on how to make their city a better place to live, work, and play. Following the conversations, participants had the opportunity to take a survey about their On the Table experience. This survey featured 27 questions that were standard across all 10 cities, plus up to five additional questions that were unique to each city. Following the collection of survey data, all cities receive a report summarizing and analyzing the survey data and a link to a data exploration tool. Community foundations can use insights from the data to inform strategic planning, and local decision-makers, organizations, and residents can use the data to collaborate around improving the quality of life in their cities. A national report incorporating data from all 10 cities and exploring correlations and comparisons in the full data set will be produced in early 2018.
Research Methodology

Knight Foundation invited the University of Illinois at Chicago's (UIC) Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) to serve as the research partner for this On the Table initiative. We set out to gain a deeper understanding of the conversations through results gathered from a survey of On the Table participants.1 This report presents the results of the survey and incorporates analyses to provide insight into the summary data. The data can be accessed and explored through ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTCHAT17.

The central questions guiding this research include: Who responded to the survey? How did the conversations go? How did the conversations impact respondents? Additionally, CFCV was interested in learning more specifically about respondents’ level of optimism regarding the future of their communities; their views on the quality of life in the Columbus area, including what they are happy and unhappy about in their communities; how much trust and confidence they have in local leadership; and barriers to involvement. The research questions and learning objectives influenced the formatting of the survey, which included a total of 32 questions.

We collected survey data using three methods: a public web link to the Qualtrics survey, an e-mailed unique link to the Qualtrics survey, and distributed print surveys. To accommodate non-English speakers, the survey was translated into Spanish. The collection of survey data began the morning of the On the Table conversations (November 7) when the public web link opened; CFCV promoted the web link on social media in the weeks following On the Table to encourage participation in the survey. On the same day of and immediately following conversations, print surveys were made available to participants. Following the conversations, participants for whom we had e-mail addresses received an e-mail invitation to take the survey.2 Surveys were collected through December 1, 2017.

The respondent population discussed in this report is a self-selected sample of participants who partially or fully completed the survey.3 All three survey sources yielded a total of 1,182 responses (684 through the e-mailed link, 396 through the web link, and 102 through the print survey).4 Because this group constitutes a non-random sample of total participants, conclusions cannot be scientifically generalized beyond the respondent group. However, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits, and backgrounds of a number of engaged Chattahoochee Valley residents.

1 See Appendix A for the full survey.
2 We had e-mail addresses only for those who provided it through the registration process or during sign-in on the day of the conversation. Registration and signing in were not required for participation, and those who did not register or sign in were able to access the survey through the public web link shared by CFCV or through print surveys.
3 See Appendix B for a summary report featuring visualizations of responses for all survey questions.
4 The estimated survey participation rate is 20%. This is calculated by dividing the total number of survey respondents (1,182) by the estimated number of On the Table participants (5,960). CFCV provided the estimated number of On the Table participants.
The Conversations

Who Responded?

Given that the perspectives, ideas, and experiences of over 1,000 respondents inform this report, it is worth exploring what we know about who responded to the survey. This section summarizes data about respondent demographics such as gender, age, educational attainment, race and/or ethnicity, geography, length of residence, and homeownership status; it also presents information about respondents’ civic attitudes and engagement behaviors. Additionally, it incorporates Muscogee County comparison data and national comparison data, where available. When comparing to Muscogee County resident data, only those respondents who live in Muscogee County (and not the full data set) are compared to the regional data.

Without having survey data for everyone who participated in the *On the Table* initiative, we are unable to explain differences, if any, between our respondent group and regional and national comparison groups. While we have survey data for respondents, this data does not fully reflect participation in *On the Table*. This study represents a subset of *On the Table* participants—itself a subset of the Chattahoochee Valley population—who self-selected to respond to the survey.

Demographics

Each demographic subsection opens with a presentation of noteworthy findings with regard to all respondent data. The subsections then transition to a comparison of data from Muscogee County respondents to data on all Muscogee County residents. Only for length of residence are all respondents compared to national rates.

Gender and Age

Nearly three-quarters (71%) of respondents identified as female, and 29% identified as male (see Figure B.1). With regard to age, at 27%, the largest proportion of respondents were those 60 years old and up. The smallest age group was made up of respondents who were 18 to 29 years old, which was 12% of respondents (see Figure B.2).

Compared to Muscogee County resident data, Muscogee County respondents were slightly overrepresented in the 60 years old and up age group, and they were underrepresented in the 18 to 29 year old age group. While 29% of Muscogee County respondents were 60 years old and up, 22% of all Muscogee County residents are in this age group. Additionally, whereas 11% of Muscogee County respondents were 18 to 29 years old, 27% of Muscogee County residents are within this age range (see Figure B.3).

---

5 For example, the respondent group is 73% female and 27% male. While it is possible that this accurately reflects participant make-up, it is also possible that the participant breakdown was closer to 50/50, but females responded to the survey at disproportionately higher rates. Without having data for all participants, we cannot know if the rate at which certain groups participated was proportional or disproportional.

6 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).
**Educational Attainment**

Respondents reported high levels of educational attainment. Both respondent data and Muscogee County data reflect highest degree obtained. Forty-two percent of respondents reported having earned a graduate degree, and 33% reported having earned a bachelor’s degree (see Figure B.4).

When compared to Muscogee County data as a whole, there was notable overrepresentation of Muscogee County respondents who said they are in possession of a graduate degree and a bachelor’s degree. Whereas 9% of all Muscogee County residents have a graduate degree, 46% of Muscogee County respondents reported earning the same, which is five times the county rate. Likewise, whereas 15% of all Muscogee residents have a bachelor’s degree, 34% of Muscogee County respondents reported earning the same (see Figure B.5).

**Race**

In terms of race and/or ethnicity, 60% of respondents identified as White and 32% identified as Black or African American. Much smaller percentages identified as Multiracial (4%), Hispanic or Latino/a (2%), and Other (2%) (see Figure B.6).

Compared to all Muscogee County where 45% of the population is White, 61% of the Muscogee County respondent pool reported being White. While 43% of Muscogee County residents are Black or African American, 32% of Muscogee County respondents identify as Black or African American. Furthermore, 6% of the Muscogee County resident population is Hispanic or Latino/a, compared to 2% of Hispanic or Latino/a respondents (see Figure B.7).

**Geography**

A majority (80%) of respondents said they currently live in Muscogee County, GA, with much smaller percentages also reporting Russell County, AL (6%), Harris County, GA (5%), and Lee County, AL (3%) (see Figure B.8). A notable percentage (81%) of respondents also said they currently live in Columbus, GA, though much smaller percentages also reported living in Midland, GA (6%); Phenix City, AL (6%); Fortson, GA (2%); Hamilton, GA (1%); Smiths Station, AL (1%); and Cataula GA (1%) (see Figure B.9). The top respondent ZIP codes include 31906 (15%), 31907 (15%), 31904 (14%), 31909 (14%), 31820 (10%), 31901 (8%), 36867 (3%), 31808 (3%), 36869 (2%), and 31811 (1%) (see Figure B.10).

**Length of Residence**

Nearly one-half (47%) of respondents indicated they were long-term residents who have lived in their local community for 20 or more years. Additionally, 21% of respondents said they were newcomers, or those who have lived in their local community for zero to four years.

---

7 For the education variable, in addition to including only those respondents who live in Muscogee County when comparing to representative data, only those 25 years of age or older are included as well (as opposed to the full data set).

8 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).

9 Unlike census data, the On the Table race variable features an “Other” response option. Because of this, the On the Table race percentages are very modestly lower than they would be if the “Other” was not a featured category.

10 U.S. Census Bureau; 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, Voting Age Population by Citizenship and Race (CVAP), published 02/01/2017.
Compared to national rates, long-term resident respondents were an overrepresented group, as 32% of people nationally have lived in their community for 20 or more years (see Figure B.11).\textsuperscript{11}

**Homeownership Status**

Regarding homeownership status, 71% of respondents indicated they own their primary residence, and 24% said they rent (see Figure B.12).\textsuperscript{12}

Homeowners were an overrepresented group, as 74% of Muscogee County respondents reported owning their primary residence, compared to 50% of all Muscogee County residents (see Figure B.13).\textsuperscript{13}

**Relationship to CFCV**

When asked about their relationship to CFCV, 46% of respondents said they had not heard of the Foundation, and 34% said they have attended one of the Foundation’s events. Fifteen percent of respondents indicated having some other relationship to CFCV than that which were listed. Furthermore, 12% said they are a grantee of CFCV, 6% said they have volunteered with CFCV, 5% said they are a funder, and 1% said they work there (see Figure B.14).

**Civic Attitudes and Activities**

Each subsection incorporates noteworthy findings with regard to all respondent data. Where applicable, each subsection also includes comparisons of all respondent data to national data.

**Personal Impact, Community Attachment, and Level of Optimism**

Respondents reported largely positive attitudes toward their own potential for influencing change and toward their local community. With regard to how much impact respondents think people like themselves can have in making their community a better place to live, 55% said they believe they can have a big impact, and 33% said they believe they can have a moderate impact. The 55% of respondents who think they can have a big impact was greater than the 32% of people nationally who believe they have this level of efficacy (see Figure B.15).\textsuperscript{14}

Respondents also reported high levels of attachment to their local community. Nearly one-half (49%) of respondents indicated they are very attached to their local community, and 40% of respondents said they are somewhat attached. In comparison, 19% of people nationally are very attached to their local community, and 48% of people nationally are somewhat attached (see Figure B.16).\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Just like the race variable, the On the Table homeownership variable also features an “Other” response option (unlike in the Census data), which has slight implications for the On the Table homeownership percentages showing lower than they otherwise would.
\textsuperscript{14} Pew Research Center, November 2016, “Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits.”
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
Furthermore, respondents expressed being largely optimistic about the future of their community. In looking ahead to the next 10 years, 92% of respondents said they are somewhat-to-very optimistic about the future of their community (see Figure B.40).

“I am happy/unhappy about my . . .”
When asked what they are happy about in their community, 56% of respondents indicated their neighborhood, and 55% said their house or apartment. Additionally, 52% of respondents reported they are happy with their recreational opportunities, 50% selected their city or town, 46% said their personal finances, and another 46% chose their air and water quality (see Figure B.42). On the contrary, when asked what they are unhappy about in their community, 56% of respondents said their public safety. Following public safety, 44% of respondents reported they are unhappy with their job opportunities, 38% said their local government, 34% selected their public transportation, 30% chose their local school, 28% indicated their healthcare, and 27% said their local news (see Figure B.43).

Social Issues
When respondents were asked to identify the social issues that are most important to them, 58% said education and youth development, 42% said economic issues and poverty, 29% said family, and 27% said public safety and the judicial system (see Figure B.17). Following this, using the same set of issue areas, respondents were asked to identify the social issues to which they primarily contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources. Nearly one-half (48%) of respondents said education and youth development, 38% said family, and 34% said religion and morals (see Figure B.18).

Engagement Habits
Respondents reported high levels of engagement across all measures considered. Over one-quarter (27%) of respondents said they are very involved in community and neighborhood activities where they live; in comparison, only 11% of people nationally indicate this level of involvement. An even larger percentage (47%) of respondents reported that they are somewhat involved, which is higher than the 39% of people nationally who said the same (see Figure B.19).

With regard to how they engaged with their community over the past year, respondents were most likely to have donated, volunteered, and attended a public meeting. Eighty-three percent of respondents said they donated more than $25 to a charitable organization within the past year; 77% said they did volunteer activities through or for an organization within the past year; and 60% said they attended public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs within the past year.

Additionally, 37% said they worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something in the past year. With regard to how respondents compare to national percentages, respondent involvement exceeded national involvement for all activities.

---

16 We used our issues codebook (see Appendix C) to populate the response options for these two questions highlighting important social issues and contributions to social issues.

Nationally, 50% of people donated this past year (compared to 83% of respondents), and 24% volunteered this past year (compared to 77% of respondents). Only 8% of people in the U.S. attended a public meeting about community affairs within the last year (compared to 60% of respondents), and 8% worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something (compared to 37% of respondents) (see Figure B.20). When it comes to voting in local elections, 70% reported that they always vote (see Figure B.21).

**Barriers to Involvement**

While 48% of respondents consider themselves actively involved in the issues they care about most, a number of respondents find themselves prevented from engaging in and with the community. Nearly one-third (32%) said they are too busy and do not have enough time, and 29% said they are unsure of how to get involved. Only 8% reported they believe their efforts will not make a difference, and 2% indicated they are not interested in getting involved (see Figure B.41).

**Trust in Local Leadership**

When respondents were asked how much trust and confidence they have in local leadership in the area where they live when it comes to handling local problems, 55% of respondents said they have a fair amount of trust and confidence, which was higher than the 48% of people nationally who reported the same. Additionally, 27% of respondents reported not very much trust and confidence in their local leaders, which, again, was higher than the 20% of people nationally who report the same level of trust and confidence. Only 13% of respondents said they have a great deal of trust and confidence in the local leadership where they live; in comparison, 23% of people nationally report a great deal of trust and confidence in local leadership (see Figure B.45).

**Places to Connect**

Respondents reported connecting with others in a variety of places. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of respondents said they like to connect with others at religious institutions. Additionally, 43% cited schools, 29% selected parks, 26% named public squares, 26% indicated library, and 26% specified a place other than those provided in the response options, with the top three “other” responses being community events and meetings (6%), restaurants (4%), and work (4%). Finally, 19% said shopping centers, 19% chose community rec center, and 9% identified community garden as places they like to connect with others (see Figure B.22).

**Engagement with News Sources**

Respondents also reported the frequency with which they get information about their local community from common online and offline sources. Over two-thirds (69%) of respondents said they receive information about their local community from word of mouth several times a week to every day, which was more than twice the percentage of people who rely on word

---

of mouth this frequently nationally (31%) (see Figure B.29). In terms of local television news, 59% of respondents said they watch the news several times a week to every day, which was greater than the 51% of people nationally who watch the news this frequently (see Figure B.24). Over one-half (55%) of respondents indicated they rely on social networking sites several times a week to every day to consume information about their local community, which was five times the percentage at which people nationally use social media sites to get local information this frequently (11%) (see Figure B.27). With regard to local newspapers, 53% of respondents said they consult a newspaper for information about their community several times a week to everyday, while 28% of people nationally do the same (see Figure B.23). The 48% of respondents who reported tuning in to local radio for information about their community several times a week to every day was higher than the 35% of people nationally who listen to the radio for news this frequently (see Figure B.25). Nearly one-quarter (24%) of respondents reported gathering information from newsletters or e-mail listservs several times a week to every day, which was three times greater than the 8% of people nationally who rely on a newsletter or e-mail listserv this frequently (see Figure B.28). Finally, 11% of respondents indicated they read blogs for information about their local community several times a week to every day, which was greater than the national percentage of 5% for this level of frequency (see Figure B.26).19

How Did the Conversations Go?

An essential aspect of this research is exploring the conversations themselves. This section groups data on why respondents were drawn to the conversations, the relative familiarity or unfamiliarity with other participants in the conversation, and where the conversations took place. It also uncovers the range of issues respondents raised in conversation, it describes solutions or next steps that respondents reported were generated from their conversations, and it incorporates youth voices around issues and solutions that came out of their own unique reflection activity. Finally, it discusses content shared about On the Table on social media.

Conversation Dynamics

Respondents reported participating in On the Table for a number of reasons. Nearly three-fourths (72%) of respondents said they participated to discuss and address important issues in their community, and 58% said they wanted to learn from and listen to others. Forty-two percent of respondents participated to get more involved in their community, 40% wanted to meet and build relationships with new people, and 35% intended to support the organizer of the conversation (see Figure B.30).

In terms of how familiar respondents were with the other people at the conversation, 39% of respondents said that there was an equal mix of both people they knew and did not know before the conversation, and 38% of respondents said the other participants were mostly people they did not know before the conversation. Nearly one-quarter (23%) of respondents said that the other participants were mostly people they knew before the conversation (see Figure B.31).

A large majority (92%) of respondents said their conversations took place in Muscogee County, GA; additionally, 4% indicated Russell County, AL, and 1% said named Chattahoochee

Similarly, 92% of respondents said their conversation took place in Columbus, GA; 4% said Phenix City, AL and 1% said Midland, GA. In terms of ZIP codes, at 28%, 31901 featured the most respondents, followed closely by 31906 (26%). Other conversation ZIP codes include 31904 (8%), 36867 (8%), 31903 (4%), 31820 (4%), 31907 (4%), 31909 (3%), 31999 (3%), and 31805 (2%) (see Figure B.34).

**Issues Raised**

*On the Table* provided an opportunity for participants to raise and discuss issues that impact the quality of life in and around Columbus. A majority of respondents (79%) reported raising an issue of concern in their conversation. The issues that emerged help identify respondents’ priorities and concerns and where they would like to see their communities headed. As seen through survey responses, respondents touched on a range of issues, with the top four being public safety and the judicial system, education and youth development, economic issues and poverty, and equity and social inclusion (see Figure B.35).

**Public Safety and the Judicial System**

Nearly one-third (31%) of respondents raised an issue related to public safety and the judicial system. Respondents largely mentioned crime in their conversations, such as the “high crime rate” and “widespread crime” that is affecting their communities. “My biggest concern,” one respondent explained, “was the recent crime in our city as a whole.” Several respondents noted that “the crime in our city has increased” and that there is “increased crime in various neighborhood and communities,” especially with regard to “homicides, gangs, [and] shootings.” Violent crime was of particular concern to a number of respondents. Many described “ris[ing] crime,” “too much crime,” and “crime is extremely high in our area.” According to one respondent, the “elevated crime rate [is] impacting [the] city’s . . . image.” Some respondents said they talked about “how to reduce crime,” “solutions to [the] reduction of crime,” and “building partnerships to end violence.”

Additionally, respondents did not just talk about crime, but they also reported discussing interrelated factors that may have an impact on crime levels. For example, a few respondents cited “links between lack of education and crime in our community” and talked about “how education impacts crime and violence.” One respondent also discussed “crime and ways to stimulate educational opportunities to prevent it.” Other respondents talked about crime as an “economic issue,” arguing a need for “better education and opportunities out of . . . poverty and crime.” As one respondent indicated, “generations of poverty and lack of value for education are continuing to allow kids to ‘drop through the cracks’ and grow up in violence and crime.” Furthermore, there is the “growing epidemic of drug abuse in our community[, which] leads to greater crimes such as theft and murder.”

A number of respondents focused their attention in conversations on “crime among youth,” given that there is “so much youth crime in the city,” as one respondent said. One respondent indicated that there is an “increased number of children and young adults involved in crime,” and another described how “crime, specifically gang activity and crimes committed by our youth[,] are on the rise.” Some respondents attributed the increase in

---

20 More detail on these four themes and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in our Issues Codebook in Appendix C.
youth crime to a “lack of structured activities[,] including jobs for youth and young adults,” as well as a “lack of positive relationships for youth.” “Dealing with violence of young people in the community” was a topic numerous respondents discussed, as several suggested “keeping kids out of trouble with productive things to do,” “youth development in regards to crime prevention,” and “motivat[ing] the young people to finish school, get a job, [and] stay away from gangs and drugs.”

Relatedly, respondents brought up police issues in their conversations, with many comments focusing on the “decrease of police presence” amid the “increase in crime.” According to respondents, there is a “lack of law enforcement officers on patrol,” an “understaffed police [department],” “many vacant police jobs,” and “not enough support for [the] police force.” Therefore, as other respondents pointed out, there is a need for “more police patrols around the city,” an “enhanced police presence,” a “stronger police force,” and “more and better[-] paid police in our community.” Columbus needs, as one respondent said, “more police out in neighborhoods patrolling due to increased murder rates, robberies, and drug-related crimes.” However, a few respondents expressed that they feel that “police don’t care” about them and pointed out that there are “aggressive police practices” currently in place.

Finally, some respondents reported discussing “safety” and “community safety” in their conversations. “I’m very concerned about public safety in my community,” one respondent said. “Safety and security,” especially in “poor neighborhoods” and “in and around the downtown area,” was topic of conversation for a number of respondents. One respondent noted a need for “cameras and lights in the community” as a way to promote safety.

**Education and Youth Development**

Another 31% of respondents said they brought up an issue regarding education and youth development. Education and schools were a primary focus for respondents, particularly the “severe inequity in our school system” and the “need for quality education.” “Education was the main issue discussed,” said one respondent, “particularly the need for more teachers, dollars[,] and emphasis on teaching children from the poorest homes.” Another respondent indicated that there is a “need for better schools, especially elementary schools[,] in the areas with high poverty rates.” Some respondents reported discussing Muscogee County schools as a whole, such as “how most of Muscogee County Schools are not up to par education[-]wise,” the “poor quality of Muscogee County school system,” and “the disparity within the Muscogee County school district. Some schools are well staffed and provided for while others lack basic needs.” Respondents additionally brought up the “continued decrease of funding for public education” and the “availability of resources.” There should be, as one respondent indicated, “equal access to activities across the school district.”

In discussing the education system, one respondent described it as “ineffective and overwhelmed,” and another respondent brought up “low-performing schools.” Some respondents reported a “lack of quality school options in the Muscogee County, particularly middle school options” and indicated “a drop off in the education level when [students] enter in middle school. . . . Parents feel that their children are not learning in the middle schools.” “Improve education,” “better our public school system,” and “equal education for all children” were some of the calls for change made by respondents. Additionally, one respondent discussed “helping children [in] underprivileged and lower[-]ranking schools,” and another called for “more school choice, as children (particularly low-income children) are being left behind.” As one respondent said, “poor kids are behind in school on their very first day of
school.” Several respondents also talked about the “dropout rate” in their community’s schools, and others mentioned the “number of high school graduates not attending college after graduation.”

In order for students to succeed, respondents mentioned the value of “building parental support” and “parental involvement in schools.” One respondent described “the issue of encouraging parents of middle and high school students to continue to be involved with their child’s education and not leave it solely to teachers.” Other respondents discussed how the “Muscogee County school district needs to address the way students are taught.” According to one respondent, schools are “focusing on testing instead of making the kid a better future citizen.” According to another respondent, there is a “need for better educating the young people . . . in the school setting regarding real life situations they will face.” Respondents see a “lack of financial preparedness in children leaving high school” and a “lack of proper education on life skills with [regard] to children, jobs, handling finances, etc.”

Finally, some respondents focused on youth development through activities and programs. Respondents said there is “not enough activity for youth” and “little to nothing for young kids to do after school.” Furthermore, as one respondent noted, “there are very few positive places for youth to gather after school or on weekends in the community. This leads to negative activity by our youth in the community.” In response to this issue, respondents indicated they would like to see “affordable[, ] high quality after[-]school programs” and “more guidance [for] the youth.”

**Economic Issues and Poverty**

Just under one-quarter (24%) of respondents raised an issue related to economic issues and poverty. A large proportion of respondents talked about poverty in their conversations, such as the “effect of poverty” and “the impact that poverty has on the community as a whole.” “Poverty is a huge issue in our community,” explained one respondent, who went on to say, “I learned that Columbus is known to be a hard place to live if you’re in poverty.” Some respondents talked about “poverty and inequality” and how “there is an achievement gap between children that are in poverty and those that are not in poverty.”

A few respondents focused on “the perception of people experiencing poverty,” as well as “assumptions made about impoverished communities,” while others talked about “community awareness of poverty.” As one respondent indicated, there is “the need for more education and communication regarding poverty and homelessness in our community so people know where the needs are and how to get involved.” Similarly, another respondent brought up “the need to educate young and old about available community resources and financial responsibility to help avoid or move out of poverty.” Overall, many respondents expressed interest in “meeting [the] needs of people living in poverty.”

Other respondents reported talking about economic development, especially “that we need to bring more business and industry to the community.” One respondent explained that there is a “lack of economic development and thus few jobs available.” Another talked about the “need for more industry as a way of keeping young people in the community.” Some respondents want to find ways to “reduce the brain drain in this city” and to “provide employment opportunities to attract and retain ‘rising stars’ who can make a positive contribution to the growth enhancement of the community.” According to one respondent, “pay scales [are too] low to attract [and] keep young professionals,” and another respondent
brought up the need for “better paying jobs.” In addition to low-paying jobs, respondents noted a “lack of good jobs” and an overall “lack of employment,” and they talked about “how to bring more jobs into the community.”

Some respondents expressed wanting to see more business development. One respondent, however, lamented “Columbus being on a cul-de-sac[,] which inhibits some business and economic growth.” Another respondent noted the “recent and pending loss of Columbus[-]based companies.” Because of these factors, a few respondents talked about “creating more opportunities for training and development for existing small businesses and those looking to start one[,] as well as providing “African American business support.” However, according to one respondent, “Property Taxes [are] holding Columbus back from attracting businesses[, and there is] a lack of incentives for new businesses to come to the area.” This same respondent also noted the existence of “blighted neighborhoods in need of revitalization.” Some additional respondents talked about revitalization, especially in “much[-]needed areas besides downtown Columbus.” For example, one respondent indicated wanting to see “development and [growth] in the Southside of Columbus.”

**Equity and Social Inclusion**

Finally, 23% of respondents mentioned an issue regarding equity and social inclusion. Respondents who raised an issue related to this theme often did so with regard to a “lack of diversity” and a “lack of inclusiveness.” One respondent noted that “diversity is not fully embraced in the community,” and several respondents noticed this problem with regard to race. According to one respondent, there is an “ongoing need to have hard discussions about racial inequality and improving racial relations within the community.” Several respondents said they talked about “covert racism and White Privilege,” as well as “the racial divide in Columbus” and segregation. One respondent expressed wanting to find “ways to better reach across racial and socioeconomic lines.” Another “line” or “divide” mentioned by a number of respondents was the “noticeable community divide between north and south side.” Respondents noted a “social divide between north and south Columbus” and they talked about “erasing” that divide.

Additionally, respondents reported talking about “cultural equity,” with several respondents specifically mentioning the Hispanic/Latino population and the LGBT population, as well as youth and seniors. One respondent noted “the division between the Hispanic and non[-]Hispanic culture.” Relatedly, another respondent brought up “the difficulty of the Latinx population being able to trust and reach out to resources within the community.” With regard to the LGBT community, respondents talked about “the lack of a connected and engaged LGBT community.” And as one respondent said, “From an LGBT perspective, there isn’t necessarily a hub or resource to learn about the gay community in Columbus, GA. There is a lot of fragmented [information] and resources that [do not] appear to be entirely reputable.” Finally, in referencing youth and seniors, respondents mentioned “building bridges” between the two age groups. However, one respondent looked beyond these two age groups and mentioned “our need to respond to the needs of all members of the community—youth, young adults, middle agers, and seniors.” Overall, respondents indicated that they want to see “equal access to opportunities for a good life.”
Solutions Generated

*On the Table* is rooted in the idea that dialogue can spur new ideas for action. In addition to the discussion and dissection of issues in conversations, 61% of respondents said their conversation generated a specific solution. A total of 584 respondents provided a solution. We randomly selected a number of solutions to share for illustrative purposes only. These demonstrate the range respondents put forward—from high-level and complex ideas to simple actions that impact everyday life. Solutions submitted via the *On the Table* survey are available for viewing in the data exploration tool (ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTCHATT17).

A few of the solutions provided presented ideas for expanding youth participation and engagement in the community. For example, one respondent suggested encouraging youth to register to vote and helping them learn about and understand government processes. Another respondent gave a solution that seeks to provide more extra-curricular, after-school activities in which all students can participate, regardless of family income. Other solutions focused more generally on community engagement opportunities for the community as a whole. According to one respondent, churches need to become more engaged in their local community and work together to improve the community. A second respondent suggested that the community organize forums to educate people about mental health issues. Additionally, another respondent offered an idea for establishing a non-political dialogue council that would represent stakeholders and would function around seeking evidence-based solutions.

Furthermore, other solutions had to do with building up the community. One respondent proposed that the city offer incentives to companies looking to relocate to Columbus. Another respondent suggested expanding public transportation to the entire county, and a third respondent offered the idea to build an urgent care clinic next to the Emergency Room so that patients could be redirected immediately to the appropriate location as needed. A few respondents turned their attention to safety, such as affording to pay police officers a higher salary by finding ways to generate local revenue, and also, on an individual level, giving neighbors lightbulbs for their front porch until all homes in the area had lights.

Youth Voices

CFCV developed a youth component to *On the Table* in order to support engagement in schools and community youth programs across the Columbus area. After their *On the Table* conversations, youth were encouraged to reflect on their experience in a post-event activity. They were asked to use the outline of a person to reflect on the idea discussed in conversations that has the most potential to bring about change in their community (head), the most important issue facing their community that they care about (heart), and examples of an action they are most likely to take inspired by their conversation (feet). Given the activity’s focus on issues and ideas for action, we categorized the data according to these two classifications.

21 The mention of a specific solution does not indicate an endorsement from IPCE or CFCV. Furthermore, CFCV should not be assumed to take responsibility for a solution mentioned in this report. We randomly selected the ideas referenced above in order to show the types of solutions that respondents proposed.

22 The responses in the data exploration tool have been scrubbed of all identifying information.
While this data is not representative of the entire Columbus area, it does highlight what a collection of students who participated in the Head, Heart, and Feet reflection activity think and care about with regard to their communities.

**Issues**

Youth respondents mentioned a variety of issues affecting their communities. The top issue brought up by youth respondents was with regard to violence, crime, and safety. Two other prominent topics were related to homelessness and health. Other issue areas raised by youth respondents include education and schools, littering and pollution, food insecurity, bullying, economic issues, transportation and infrastructure, and equity and unity.

A large proportion of youth respondents mentioned an issue related to violence, crime, and safety. While many youth respondents mentioned one or each of these topics as an issue, some youth respondents were more specific, noting the “increasing crime rate” and that “citizens feel unsafe.” One youth respondent said that “the crime rate and burglaries are very high,” and another youth respondent expressed being worried about “criminals in the city and the safety of people in our community.” Several youth respondents narrowed in on violence, often bringing it up with the issue of drugs. A few youth respondents also mentioned the “homicide rates.” “One issue that I care about the most is the violence that is going on,” said one respondent. According to another respondent, “violence [is] coming from communities [that are] ignored.”

Youth respondents also raised the issue of homelessness in their communities. They brought up “homeless people,” the “homeless,” “homeless shelters,” and “homelessness” as issues, with one youth respondent saying there are “lots of homeless and [they] need opportunities for education.” Another youth respondent, referring to homelessness, asked, “How are we changing it?” Furthermore, health was another top conversation theme for youth respondents. Within health, youth respondents mentioned either “healthy living” or “drugs.”

**Ideas for Action**

In addition to discussing issues, youth respondents brainstormed a variety of ideas for their communities and actions they could take inspired by their conversation. The top four ideas for action generated by youth respondents were support education and schools, build up and improve community, speak up and take a stand, and come together and organize. Other ideas for action less frequently mentioned but still important include understand others and unify, create programs, recycle and care for the environment, donate, offer more activities and events, volunteer, develop one’s character, share information and raise awareness, and communicate better.

Youth respondents provided many ideas around supporting education and schools. A few youth respondents said they want educators to “make education relevant” and have classes “with real life world problems.” Another youth respondent said “provide more opportunities for student[s] to be creative.” Some youth respondents commented on what teachers can do, such as “be more hands on [and] willing to get to know you,” as well as “care” about students’ “home lives.” Furthermore, other youth respondents indicated ideas for improving the school environment, such as “reduced vandalism in schools” and “build better schools.” A number of youth respondents had ideas around “more student involvement at school,” whether through “canned food drives,” “free after school programs,” or “start[ing] a school
newspaper.” Another youth respondent mentioned an idea for having “events at [their] school,” which could include a “stop drugs pep rally.”

With regard to build up and improve community, youth respondents mentioned a variety of ways to help the community. One youth respondent wanted to see people “fix the gap between the rich and the poor.” Relatedly, some youth respondents noted that their community “need[s] better jobs,” and they want to see their city “build more jobs” and especially provide “better job opportunities for the homeless.” Additionally, several youth respondents indicated that “people should get paid more for their jobs” and that jobs should have “more wages.” With regard to development, youth respondents said to “[build] up what we tear down,” and they mentioned “building up downtown,” “repairing the roads,” and “[taking] down abandoned houses and buildings.” They also think their communities can be improved by “hiring more police officers” and recruiting a “better police force.” Finally, they want to build up and improve communities by being “involved with the community,” such as through “community service” and “helping the community.” According to one respondent, an example of community involvement would be “organized projects to fix and build houses for [the] homeless.”

Youth respondents also mentioned ideas for speaking up and taking a stand. For several youth respondents, this means “talking about our issues” and “address[ing] issues openly.” As one youth respondent said, “get the issue out to [the] public,” and another youth respondent suggested “bring[ing] your concerns to the community.” A few youth respondents expressed wanting to be able to “address our city council” and wanting “easier access for citizens to speak to policy makers about the problems in their communities and ideas to fix it.” Other youth respondents brought up the act of “speak[ing] out about our feelings and ideas” and “standing up for what you believe.” One youth respondent suggested “speaking up against things that aren’t kind” and “standing up for others,” and several youth respondents proposed “stand[ing] up for kids who are being bullied.” Largely, youth respondents expressed wanting “an outlet to express yourself” and having the ability to “express my beliefs.”

Finally, a number of youth respondents brought up ideas around coming together and organizing. Some youth respondents said they wanted to see “more community-based discussions and/or panels” and expressed interest in “organiz[ing] groups for discussion” and “creating positive clubs and organizations for people to participate in.” As several youth respondents proposed, “bring everyone together,” “come together,” “get to know each other on a deeper level,” and “[make] changes together.” One youth respondent suggested planning “more social events that would bring the community together,” and another youth respondent offered the idea of a “community gathering to bring people together.”

As a method for modeling civic responsibility and encouraging students to learn about other perspectives and explore ways to become more engaged in their communities, the On the Table conversations and the follow-up ‘Head, Heart, and Feet’ exercises were unique learning opportunities for students. Students had the potential to grow more emotionally connected to their communities, to strengthen their active listening and critical thinking skills, and to make a difference in their communities.
Social Media

Social media provided an opportunity to deepen engagement efforts with *On the Table* and expand participation in the initiative. CFVC launched its social media campaign in August 2017 as a method of promoting *On the Table* and creating a virtual space where conversations could begin or continue. The campaign served as a useful tool in capturing live content from conversations as they occurred and providing opportunities for online engagement by those who were not able to participate in physical conversations.

We used the social media monitoring platform Meltwater Buzz to analyze social media activity and understand the influence of this initiative in the digital realm. We tracked the designated hashtag #ChattChat. In total, #ChattChat saw more than 160 public mentions; these mentions were amplified, generating 450,000 total impressions. The month of November saw the highest number of mentions, which not surprisingly, peaked on the day of the *On the Table* initiative.

Social media captured the enthusiasm surrounding the initiative through an array of posts and picture-sharing on various platforms, including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. These three social media sites were used nearly equally throughout the campaign, as Facebook saw 57 posts, Twitter featured 55 posts, and Instagram had 54 posts. Furthermore, in breaking down the levels of engagement on Twitter, 80% of tweets were original tweets, 18% were retweets, and 2% were @message tweets. Additionally, 62% of tweets featured links, and 16% contained media. In terms of tweeters’ platforms, 49% used a mobile device, 25% used a desktop, and 8% are unknown.

Social connections went beyond advertising the initiative and spreading the word. Many offered commentary on what social media users were thinking about in the context of *On the Table* or what they had discussed in conversations. Some comments from social media users include: “Powerful conversation with our youth today! #ChattChat #Chattchatyouth #OntheTable #KeyElementary”; “Great teen turnout at the Marion County GA Public Library’s *On the Table* discussion last week! #ChattChat”; and “Great discussions today at Enrichment Services & Feeding the Valley hosting #onthetable #chattchat.”

How Did the Conversations Impact Respondents?

The short-term impact *On the Table* conversations had on respondents demonstrates the significance and value of these types of civic conversations. This section brings together data regarding the outcomes of these conversations, including new connections forged and an understanding of how to address community issues. Additionally, it reports the likelihood of a respondent taking action following their conversation and the actions that respondents indicated they are most likely to take.

Conversation Outcomes and Future Actions

Nearly three-quarters (71%) of respondents reported connecting with others at their conversation by speaking with one or more attendees they did not already know before and/or after the conversation. Additionally, 36% exchanged contact information with one or more attendees they did not already know, and 23% made specific plans to work with one or more

---

23 See Appendix D for a visual summary of key findings from the social media analysis.
attendees. Furthermore, 13% indicated not connecting with other conversation attendees in any of the ways listed in the response options (see Figure B.36).

After participating in their conversation, 40% of respondents said they have a somewhat better understanding of how they, personally, can help address the issues facing their community. Additionally, 25% of respondents reported having a much better understanding, and, similarly, 24% of respondents reported having a little better understanding. Eleven percent indicated no change (see Figure B.37). In terms of how likely they are to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed, 89% of respondents indicated they are somewhat-to-very likely to take action (see Figure B.38). Of the actions or next steps respondents are likely to take, 73% said they are interested in building relationships and collaborating, and 67% said they want to raise awareness and educate others. Furthermore, 59% said they hope to get more involved in community, 52% said they intend to volunteer, 46% said they want to mentor or motivate others, 40% said they hope to take action through their job, and 37% said they want to improve themselves through personal development and learning (see Figure B.39).
Analysis

We conducted a set of analyses that go beyond the original guiding questions of this study. These analyses help deepen understanding of the survey response summary data and are useful in identifying areas of opportunity for further investigation or action. These additional analyses include an exploration of subgroup comparisons for groups such as gender, age, education level, race, and homeownership status across responses to a variety of questions. They also include two disparity analyses, with the first exploring differences between rates of happiness and unhappiness about given topics, and the second exploring disparities between the social issues respondents reported are most important to them and the social issues to which they said they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources. This section also features a comparison between two questions of interest to CFCV.

Subgroup Comparisons

Each question analyzed in this section contains comparisons between various subgroups based on gender, age, level of education, race, homeownership status, and geography. If a subgroup comparison based on these categories is not included in any of the below sections, that indicates that no notable differences between subgroups were found with regard to that question.

Gender
Regarding gender, we conducted analyses between male- and female-identifying respondents. While the survey provided an “Other” gender option, too few respondents selected this option for inclusion in subgroup analyses.

Age
Based on the survey question asking in what year respondents were born, we created five age groups categorized by decade: the youngest group (made up of respondents who were 18 to 29 years old), the 30s group, the 40s group, the 50s group, and the oldest group (made up of respondents who were 60 years old and older).

Education Level
Though we obtained specific information regarding respondents’ educational background, we dichotomized responses for the purpose of analysis. Respondents were divided into two categories: respondents with a college degree (made up of respondents with a college degree or higher) and respondents without a college degree (made up of respondents with some college or less).

Race
For an analysis by race, we created three racial subgroups: Blacks (consisting of respondents indicating Black or African American), Whites (consisting of respondents indicating White), and other racial or ethnic identity (which includes respondents indicating Latino/a, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Other).
**Homeownership Status**

We split respondents into two groups by their indicated homeownership status: homeowner versus renter. Respondents who responded “Other” to this question were not included in the analysis, as there were too few of such responses.

**Geography**

For analyses by geographic area, we used five ZIP codes that cover Columbus proper and contained the majority of *On the Table* participants: 31901, 31904, 31906, 31907, and 31909.

**Level of Optimism**

Survey respondents were asked to respond to the question, “Looking ahead to the next 10 years, how optimistic are you about the future of your community?”

According to racial group analyses, Black and White respondents more frequently selected the “somewhat optimistic” or “very optimistic” response option as compared to respondents from other racial or ethnic groups. Whereas 92% of Black respondents and 95% of White respondents report being “somewhat-to-very optimistic” about the future of their communities, 83% of respondents of other racial and ethnic groups said the same.

**I am happy about my . . .**

Survey respondents were asked to select all responses that apply to complete the statement, “I am happy about my . . .”

Based on the results of the gender analysis, male respondents more frequently indicated being happy about air and water quality (55%), compared to female respondents (42%).

Compared to all other age groups, the oldest age group (60 years old and up) had the highest proportion of respondents reporting being happy about their public safety (27% of the 60-and-up age group versus an average of 16% of all other age groups); air and water quality (58% versus 41%); local news (29% versus 19%); recreational opportunities (62% versus 48%); healthcare (54% versus 31%); and personal finances (59% versus 40%). Regarding local government, the proportion of respondents indicating being happy about local government consistently decreased from the oldest age group to the youngest age group. Thirty percent of the oldest age group said they are happy with local government, compared to 23% of respondents in their 50s and average of 11% of respondents in their 40s, in their 30s, or 18 to 29 years old. At 28%, respondents in their 30s had the highest proportion of respondents indicating being happy about childcare, which was more than double the average of 12% of respondents in the other age groups. With an average of 41%, the three youngest age groups had lower proportions of respondents who were happy about their city or town, as compared to 59% of respondents in the two oldest age groups who said the same. One-third (33%) of the youngest age group reported being happy about job opportunities, which was more than the 23% of respondents of other age groups who said the same.

Analyses by educational attainment across all categories revealed that respondents with a college degree more frequently (36%) indicated that they were happy about aspects of their community than did respondents without a college degree (27%). Compared to respondents without a college degree, respondents with a college degree more frequently reported
being happy about their air and water quality (49% versus 34%); recreational opportunities (55% versus 40%); local government (22% versus 10%); healthcare (41% versus 28%); house or apartment (60% versus 42%); neighborhood (61% versus 43%); personal finances (50% versus 32%); and city or town (53% versus 39%).

When analyzed by racial and ethnic groups across all categories, at 38%, White respondents were more likely to indicate that they were happy with aspects of their community than Black respondents (28%) and respondents of other races and ethnicities (29%). Compared to respondents from other racial and ethnic groups and to Black respondents, White respondents more frequently indicated being happy about air and water quality, recreational opportunities, house or apartment, neighborhood, personal finances, and city or town.

Analyses by homeownership status showed that, compared to renters, homeowners more frequently reported being happy about air and water quality (50% versus 35%), healthcare (42% versus 29%), neighborhood (63% versus 44%), personal finances (52% versus 34%), and city or town (53% versus 40%).

Respondents from 31901 were much less likely to say they are happy with local schools than respondents from other ZIP codes. At 11%, 31901 respondents were two to three times less likely than were respondents from other ZIP codes to choose local schools. Respondents who live in 31906 were most likely at 32% to choose local schools, and an average of 24% of respondents from the other three ZIP codes did the same.

At 18%, respondents who live in 31907 were most likely to say they are happy with childcare, followed by 31909 respondents at 16%, 31904 respondents at 10%, 31906 respondents at 9%, and 31901 respondents at 1%.

Respondents who live in 31907 were least likely to say they are happy with their house or apartment at 49% and 31901 respondents were most likely at 72%. An average of 59% of respondents from 31904, 31906, and 31909 also indicated they are happy with their house or apartment.

I am unhappy about my . . .

Survey respondents were asked to select all responses that apply to complete the statement, “I am unhappy about my . . .”

When grouped by age, the youngest age group had the highest proportion of respondents who reported being unhappy with their recreational opportunities, and this proportion decreased with every subsequent age group. At 28%, respondents in the youngest age group (18 to 29 years old) were more than twice as likely to indicate being unhappy with recreational opportunities than the 13% of respondents aged 60 years old and up who did the same.

Regarding educational background, respondents without a college degree more frequently reported being unhappy about their house or apartment (14% versus 5%), neighborhood (18% versus 9%), personal finances (29% versus 9%), and city or town (23% versus 9%), compared to respondents with a college degree.

When analyzed by racial and ethnic groups across all categories, at 30%, respondents of other racial and ethnic groups were more likely to indicate that they were unhappy with certain aspects of their community, as compared to Black respondents (27%) and White
respondents (23%). Black respondents and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups more frequently indicated that they were unhappy with job opportunities, city or town, finances, recreation opportunities, and local schools than White respondents. White respondents and other racial or ethnic groups, however, were more likely to indicate that they were unhappy with public safety and local news than Black respondents.

Renters more frequently reported being unhappy about their recreational opportunities (27% versus 17%), house or apartment (17% versus 4%), and personal finances (34% versus 14%), compared to homeowners.

Respondents who live in 31901 were most likely to say there are unhappy with public transportation. Nearly one-half (46%) of 31901 respondents indicated they are unhappy with public transportation, followed by 41% of 31906 respondents and an average of 28% of respondents in the other three ZIP codes.

Respondents who live in 31901 were most likely to say they are unhappy with personal finances. At 31%, they were more than twice as likely as the 15% of respondents from 31904 and 31906 who said the same. In between, 24% of 31909 respondents and 21% if 31901 respondents were also unhappy with personal finances.

At 20%, respondents from 31907 were most likely to say they are unhappy with their city or town. Seventeen percent of 31904 respondents also said they are unhappy with their city or town, as are 10% of both 31906 and 31909 respondents and 7% of 31901 respondents.

At 55%, respondents from 31907 were most likely to say they are unhappy with local job opportunities, followed by respondents from 31901 (49%), 31906 (47%) and 31909 (42%). At 35%, respondents from 31904 were the least likely to say they are unhappy with job opportunities.

**Important Social Issue**

In this section, we analyzed subgroups by their responses to a close-ended, multiple-choice question asking, “Which of the following social issues are most important to you?”

Analyses by educational background revealed that respondents with a college degree more frequently selected economic issues and poverty (46%) compared to the 29% of respondents without a college degree who did the same. Conversely, respondents without a college degree more frequently selected religion and morals (22%) than the 13% of respondents with a college degree who did the same.

When respondents were grouped by race and ethnicity, differences were seen regarding social issues including arts and culture, education and youth development, environment and parks, and immigration and migration. Black respondents less frequently chose arts and culture (6%), compared to both White respondents (18%) and respondents from other racial groups (14%). At 3%, Black respondents were less likely to select environment and parks, compared to White respondents (16%) and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups (17%). Conversely, Black respondents were much more likely to select education and youth development (70%) than the 54% average of White respondents and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups. Lastly, respondents from other racial and ethnic groups most frequently selected immigration and migration (8%), compared to much smaller proportions of White respondents (3%) and Black respondents (0.3%).
At 38%, respondents who live in 31901 were far more likely to select arts and culture as an important issue than respondents in other ZIP codes. The next highest ZIP code was 31906 at 19%, followed by 31904 at 14%, 31909 at 12% and 31907 at 8%.

Respondents who live in 31901 were also most likely to select environment and parks as an important issue. One-quarter of 31901 respondents selected environment and parks, followed by 23% of 31906 respondents who also did so. These totals were more than twice as much as the next three ZIP codes, with 11% of 31904 respondents, 8% of 31907 respondents, and 7% of 31909 respondents also selecting environment and parks.

With an average of 19%, respondents from 31907 and 31909 were roughly twice as likely to select religion and morals as the average of 9% of respondents from the other three ZIP codes who also did so.

Respondents from 31901 were much less likely to select family. Eight percent of 31901 respondents selected family, compared to average of 29% of respondents from the other four ZIP codes who indicated that family is an important social issue.

Primary Social Issue Contribution

The following subgroup analyses were based off the closed-response, multiple-choice question, “To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?” Response options were identical to the question above regarding social issue priority.

Gender analyses revealed that, in comparison to their male counterparts, female respondents were more likely to report making contributions to education and youth development, but less likely to contribute to technology. Over one-half (52%) of female respondents indicated making contributions to education and youth development, whereas 40% of male respondents did the same. However, more than double the proportion of male respondents (8%) selected technology than did female respondents (3%).

The age group with the oldest respondents (60 years old and up) had the highest proportion of respondents contributing to arts and culture (31%), as compared to an average of 22% of respondents from all other age groups. At 14%, the youngest age group (respondents 18 to 29 years old) had the lowest proportion of respondents contributing to economic issues and poverty, with an average of 22% of respondents from all other age groups indicating the same. The proportion of respondents contributing to religion and morals was highest in the oldest group (41%) and steadily decreased with every younger age group, with less than half as many (18%) of the youngest respondents selecting religion and morals as the oldest respondents. The youngest age groups had the highest proportion of respondents contributing to the media. At 12%, the youngest respondents were four times more likely to select the media than the 3% of all other respondents who did the same.

With regard to educational background, respondents with a college degree more frequently indicated making contributions to arts and culture (27%), compared to respondents without a college degree (13%). Respondents without a college degree more frequently indicated making contributions to family (47%), compared to respondents with a college degree (35%).

Analyses by race revealed that Black respondents more frequently indicated contributing to education and youth development (59%) than White respondents (43%) and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups (44%). Black respondents were also nearly twice
as likely to indicate contributions to equity and social inclusion (19%), compared to 10% of respondents from other racial and ethnic groups and 10% of White respondents. Respondents from other racial and ethnic groups reported contributing to technology more frequently (13%) than the average of 4% of White respondents and Black respondents who indicated the same. White respondents more frequently indicated contributing to arts and culture (30%), compared to 20% of respondents from other racial and ethnic groups and 12% of Black respondents.

Regarding homeownership status, homeowners more frequently indicated contributing to religion and morals (37%) than renters (24%).

Respondents from 31901 were by far most likely to select arts and culture. Nearly one-half (49%) of 31901 respondents selected arts and culture, followed by 39% of 31906 respondents, 27% of 31904 respondents, 18% of 31909 respondents, and 12% of 31907 respondents.

Over one-half (56%) of 31907 respondents indicated they contribute to education and youth development, which was the largest proportion of any ZIP code. Respondents from 31901 were the least likely at 30%, and the three other ZIP codes averaged 46%.

With an average of 13%, respondents from 31901, 31904, and 31906 were more than twice as likely to select environment and parks than the average of 5% of respondents from 31907 and 31909 who did the same.

Compared to an average of 26% of respondents in 31901, 31904, and 31906, respondents from 31909 and 31907 were most likely to select religion and morals at 41% and 39%, respectively.

Respondents from 31901 were by far most likely to say they contribute to equity and social inclusion. At 28%, 31901 respondents were more than twice as likely as the 14% of both 31906 and 31907 respondents who said the same, followed by the 12% of respondents from 31909 and the 10% of respondents from 31904.

**Barriers to Involvement**
Survey respondents were asked to select all responses that apply to the question, “What, if anything, prevents you from getting involved in the issues you care about most?”

Analyses by age group revealed that the 30s age group had the highest proportion of respondents selecting “too busy” (48%), compared to all other age groups (30% average). With an average of 35%, the three younger age groups (respondents 18 to 29 years old, respondents in their 30s, and respondents in their 40s) had greater proportions of respondents selecting “unsure how,” which was nearly twice as many as the average of 19% of the two older age groups who indicated they were unsure how to get involved. The oldest age group (respondents 60 years old and up) had the highest proportion of respondents indicating that they were “already involved” (62%), compared to all other age groups (42% average).

Regarding educational background, respondents with a college degree more frequently selected “already involved” (51%), as compared to 40% of respondents without a college degree who did the same.
When grouped by race, analyses showed that Black respondents more frequently selected “already involved” (55%), compared to White respondents (47%) and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups (33%). Conversely, Black respondents less frequently selected “too busy” (20%), compared to White respondents (38%) and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups (37%).

**Trust in Leadership**
Survey respondents were asked to respond to the closed-response question, “How much trust and confidence do you have in local leadership in the area where you live when it comes to handling local problems?”

The oldest group of respondents (60 years old and up) selected “a great deal” at the highest rates (22%), compared to an average of 9% of respondents from all other age groups. Conversely, the oldest age group had the lowest proportion of participants selecting “not very much” (22%), compared to all other age groups, which averaged 29%. The youngest age group (18 to 29 years old) had double the proportion of respondents selecting “none at all” (8%), compared to the average of all other age groups (4%).

Respondents from 31909 were much less likely to say they have a great deal of trust in city leadership than were other respondents. Only 6% of 31909 respondents said they have a great deal of trust in city leadership, compared to an average of 17% of respondents from the other ZIP codes.

**Issues Raised During Conversation**
Survey respondents were asked to respond to the question, “Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community? If yes, please specify.” We categorized their responses using our issues codebook.

Over double the proportion of male respondents raised an issue pertaining to government (13%) than their female counterparts (6%).

Black respondents much more frequently raised issues pertaining to education and youth development (39%) than both White respondents (27%) and respondents from other racial and ethnic groups (19%).

Respondents who live in 31907 and 31909 were the most likely to mention an issue related to education and youth development. At 39%, respondents from 31907 mentioned education and youth development issues most often, followed by 38% of 31909 respondents, 29% of 31906 respondents and 26% of 31904 respondents. At 12%, however, respondents who live in 31901 were by far the least likely to mention an issue related to education and youth development.

At 18%, respondents from 31906 were most likely to mention an issue related to transportation, followed by 15% of 31901 respondents, 12% of 31907 respondents, and 11% of 31904 respondents. Finally, at 4%, respondents who live in 31909 were much less likely to mention a transportation-related issue than were respondents from the other ZIP codes.
Happiness Disparities

Calculating the difference between rates of happiness and unhappiness regarding certain items demonstrated which features respondents were more happy than unhappy about and what respondents were more unhappy than happy about (see Figure B.44). The largest difference was seen with house/apartment, where 48% more respondents were happy than unhappy with their house/apartment. Respondents were also more happy than unhappy with their neighborhood and their city or town, with differences of 45% and 36%, respectively. On the other hand, the largest differences from unhappy to happy were for public safety (-37%) and public transportation (-26%), which indicates that respondents were 37% and 26% more unhappy than happy about these topics, respectively.

Disparity between Important Issues and Contributions

When considering the social issues that were most important to respondents (important issues) and the social issues to which they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources (contributions), the data reveal disparities between these two variables (see Figure E.1). These disparities can be useful indicators of social issues where greater contribution of time, talent, and/or financial resources are needed.

Public safety and the judicial system and transportation resulted in the greatest issues-to-contributions disparities. Among the respondents who mentioned public safety and the judicial system as a social issue, only 23% also reported that they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources to this cause. Transportation featured the same level of disparity, with 23% of those concerned with this social issue also contributing toward it. Notably, religion and morals and arts and culture were the two issues with the least amount of disparity. Eighty percent of respondents who were concerned with religion and morals also expressed contributing to it, and 75% of respondents who expressed concern with arts and culture also reported contributing toward it. The third issue with the least amount of disparity was family, with 68% of respondents concerned with this social issue also reporting contributing toward it.

Questions Comparison

We conducted a comparative analysis on a pair of questions that were of interest to CFCV. This analysis examined the relationship between what respondents are unhappy about in their local community and the issues they raised during their conversations.

As noted in the summary section, overall, the top four issues raised in conversation were public safety and the judicial system (31%), education and youth development (31%), economic issues and poverty (24%), and equity and social inclusion (23%), which is evident in Figure F.1, as these are the four darkest columns.

With regard to the top four categories, of respondents who reported being unhappy with public safety or their neighborhood, 38% raised the issue of public safety and the judicial system. Of respondents who reported being unhappy with their local school or childcare and pre-K, 36% raised an issue related to education and youth development. Of respondents who reported being unhappy with the local news, 31% raised an issue related to economic issues and poverty, and of those who reported being unhappy with local job opportunities,
28% also raised an issue related to economic issues and poverty. Of respondents who reported being unhappy with the local news, 28% raised an issue related to equity and social inclusion; of the respondents who reported being unhappy with their neighborhood or city or town, 27% raised an issue related to equity or social inclusion; and of respondents who reported being unhappy with public transportation or air and water quality, 26% raised an issue related to equity and social inclusion.

Another notable finding from this analysis is that, of the respondents who reported being unhappy with their neighborhood, 19% raised an issue related to housing. Additionally, of respondents who reported being unhappy about public transportation, 16% raised an issue related to transportation. Finally, of those respondents who reported being unhappy with job opportunities, 9% raised an issue related to health, which was a negative correlation, meaning that if you are unhappy with job opportunities, you are more likely to raise a health-related issue.
Conclusion

This report was an exploratory study examining the content of *On the Table* conversations and information about all survey respondents. While results cannot be generalized to the broader Chattahoochee Valley population, this study reveals important insights that are worth highlighting.

First, *On the Table* respondents were a highly engaged group across all measures considered, especially when comparing respondents to national data. The majority of respondents said they are involved in community and neighborhood activities, with notable proportions of respondents reporting having donated and volunteered this past year. Slightly smaller but still noteworthy percentages were seen for respondents who have been involved in less common but highly impactful engagement activities, such as attending a public meeting about community affairs and working with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something. For those who reported being prevented from getting involved, their primary barriers included being too busy or not having enough time and being unsure of how to get involved.

Second, survey respondents consistently highlighted education and youth development as a top priority, as it was the top social issue respondents reported being important to them, the top issue that respondents reported contributing to, and tied for the top issue raised in conversation. Additional top social issue priorities included public safety and the judicial system, economic issues and poverty, family, equity and social inclusion, and health. Of these most frequently mentioned issues, family, education and youth development, and health feature the smallest disparity in the disparity analysis (an analysis between the social issues respondents reported are most important to them and the social issues to which they said they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources). Notably, public safety and judicial system, which was tied for the top issue raised, was the issue with the greatest disparity, meaning respondents were highly concerned about it, but did report contributing toward it.

Third, although respondents reported raising a number of issues in their conversations, they also expressed happiness with different areas of their communities. When asked what they are happy about in their local community, large proportions of respondents indicated they are happy with their neighborhood, with their house or apartment, with their recreational opportunities, with their city or town, with their personal finances, and with their air and water quality.

*On the Table* was an opportunity for residents of the Chattahoochee Valley to get together with old friends and new acquaintances to have conversations about the issues that they care about the most. In doing so, many people came together to share their experiences about life in Chattahoochee Valley and how they would like to see it become an even better region that serves all of its residents. Conversations served as a catalyst for generating ideas and potential actions and created a space for participants to make personal connections so that they might find ways to ignite change with fellow residents.
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Appendix A: On the Table 2017 Survey

on the table
your voice matters.

Welcome, and thank you for taking part in this survey!

The purpose of this research is to understand who participated in On the Table and the nature and quality of the conversation event in which you participated on November 7, 2017, coordinated by the Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley. The University of Illinois at Chicago’s Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) is administering the survey.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Completion of this survey is voluntary, you may skip any question, and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept confidential. Collected data will be stored in locked offices in a locked suite, and data with direct identifiers will be password protected. Data will be kept throughout the research study period and will be deleted after five years. No personally identifiable data will be reported, and confidentiality will be protected to the fullest extent possible. IPCE and the Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley will have access to your e-mail address, but the Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley will not have access to your individual responses. Results of this study will be publicly available at www.ipce.uic.edu and www.onthetablechatt.com.

The principal investigator of this research is IPCE Director Joseph Hoereth. 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. You may also contact the Office for the Protection of Human Subjects (OPRS) by phone at 312-996-1711 or by e-mail at uicirb@uic.edu.

By responding to the survey, 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

Please mark your answers like this: ● not like this: X or ◐

Begin here

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

E-mail Address: ____________________________

2. Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table? (Select all that apply)

O To discuss and address important issues in my community
O To learn from and listen to others
O To meet and build relationships with new people
O To get more involved in my community
O To support the organizer of the conversation
O Other (please specify): ____________________________

If you participated in MORE THAN ONE On the Table conversation, please refer to only one of your conversations for the next two questions.

3. Where did your conversation take place?

County: ____________________________
City or Town: ____________________________
Neighborhood: ____________________________

4. The other people at my conversation were:

O Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation
O Mostly people I knew before the conversation
O An equal mix of both

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

O Yes
O No

If yes, please provide examples: ____________________________
6. Did your conversation(s) generate any specific solutions?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please provide examples:

7. How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)? (Select all that apply)
   - I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know before and/or after the conversation(s)
   - 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
   - None of the above

8. After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?
   - Much better
   - Somewhat better
   - A little better
   - No change

9. How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?
   - Very likely
   - Somewhat likely
   - Not too likely
   - Not at all likely

If you answered NOT TOO LIKELY or NOT AT ALL LIKELY, please skip to Question 11.

10. Please select the actions or next steps you are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed. (Select all that apply)
   - Build relationships and collaborate
   - Get more involved in community
   - Improve myself through personal development and learning
   - Raise awareness and educate others
   - Become more politically involved
   - Donate
   - Volunteer
   - Provide support for my family
   - Take action through my job
   - Mentor or motivate others
   - Other (please specify): ______________________

11. How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?
   - A big impact
   - A moderate impact
   - A small impact
   - No impact at all

12. In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?
   - Very attached
   - Somewhat attached
   - Not very attached
   - Not at all attached

13. Which of the following social issues are most important to you? (CHOOSE UP TO THREE)
   - Arts and Culture
   - Economic Issues and Poverty
   - Education and Youth Development
   - Environment and Parks
   - Religion and Morals
   - Equity and Social Inclusion
   - Family
   - Food Access
   - Government
   - Health
   - Housing and Homelessness
   - Immigration and Migration
   - Public Safety and Judicial System
   - The Media
   - Technology
   - Transportation
   - Other (please specify): ______________________
   - Other (please specify): ______________________
   - Other (please specify): ______________________
14. To which of the following social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent (knowledge or skills), and/or financial resources?  
(CHOOSE UP TO THREE)  
○ Arts and Culture  
○ Economic Issues and Poverty  
○ Education and Youth Development  
○ Environment and Parks  
○ Religion and Morals  
○ Equity and Social Inclusion  
○ Family  
○ Food Access  
○ Government  
○ Health  
○ Housing and Homelessness  
○ Immigration and Migration  
○ Public Safety and Judicial System  
○ The Media  
○ Technology  
○ Transportation  
○ Other (please specify):  
○ Other (please specify):  
○ Other (please specify):  

15. How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?  
○ Very involved  
○ Somewhat involved  
○ Not too involved  
○ Not at all involved  

16. Since November 2016, have you:  
(Select all that apply)  
○ Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something?  
○ Donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations?  
○ Done any volunteer activities through or for an organization?  
○ Attended any public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs?  
○ None of the above  

17. How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board? Across the nation, these elections have about 20% voter turnout.  
○ Always vote  
○ Sometimes vote  
○ Rarely vote  
○ Never vote  
○ Prefer not to answer / Not eligible to vote  

18. Where do you like to connect with others?  
(Select all that apply)  
○ Parks  
○ Library  
○ Community rec center  
○ Schools  
○ Public squares  
○ Religious institution, such as a church  
○ Community garden  
○ Shopping centers  
○ Other (please specify):  

19. How often, if ever, do you get information about YOUR LOCAL COMMUNITY from each of the following sources, whether online or offline?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Everyday</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Several times a month</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local television news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blog about your local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person or organization you follow on a social networking site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A newsletter or e-mail listserv about your local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

20. Where do you currently live?  
County:  
City or Town:  
Neighborhood:  
Zip Code:  

21. About how many years have you lived in your local community?  
Number of Years:  

---

*On the Table | Impact Report*
22. Do you own or rent your primary residence?
   ○ Own
   ○ Rent
   ○ Other (please specify): _________________________

23. What is your current gender identity?  
(Select all that apply)
   ○ Male
   ○ Female
   ○ A gender identity not listed here (please specify): _________________________

24. 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

25. In what year were you born? Year: __________

26. 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): _________________________

27. What is your relationship to the Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley? (Select all that apply)
   ○ Funder
   ○ Grantee (my organization has received funds from them)
   ○ I have volunteered with them
   ○ I work there
   ○ I’ve attended one of their events
   ○ I had not heard of the Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley before On the Table
   ○ Other (please specify): _________________________

28. Looking ahead to the next 10 years, how optimistic are you about the future of your community?
   ○ Very optimistic
   ○ Somewhat optimistic
   ○ Not very optimistic
   ○ Not at all optimistic

29. What, if anything, prevents you from getting involved in the issues you care about most? (Select all that apply)
   ○ I am too busy / I do not have enough time
   ○ I am unsure of how to get involved
   ○ I believe that my efforts will not make a difference
   ○ I am actively involved in the issues I care about
   ○ I am not interested in getting involved
   ○ Other (please specify): _________________________

30. I am happy about my: (Select all that apply)
   ○ Public safety
   ○ Air and water quality
   ○ Local school
   ○ Public transportation
   ○ Local news
   ○ Recreational opportunities
   ○ Local government
   ○ Healthcare
   ○ Childcare & pre-K
   ○ House/apartment
   ○ Neighborhood
   ○ Personal finances
   ○ City or town
   ○ Job opportunities

31. I am unhappy about my: (Select all that apply)
   ○ Public safety
   ○ Air and water quality
   ○ Local school
   ○ Public transportation
   ○ Local news
   ○ Recreational opportunities
   ○ Local government
   ○ Healthcare
   ○ Childcare & pre-K
   ○ House/apartment
   ○ Neighborhood
   ○ Personal finances
   ○ City or town
   ○ Job opportunities

32. How much trust and confidence do you have in local leadership in the area where you live when it comes to handling local problems?
   ○ A great deal
   ○ A fair amount
   ○ Not very much
   ○ None at all
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Appendix B: Summary Visualization of Survey Responses

On the Table 2017
Summary of Results for All Respondents

Following On the Table, 684 participants responded to the survey by clicking on an e-mail link, 396 responded by clicking on the web link, and 102 responded by submitting a print survey.

In total, 1,182 On the Table participants fully or partially responded to the survey. This document provides a summary of responses by question. The ‘n’ provided in each question is the number of respondents for that question.

Section 1: Who Participated?

Respondent Demographics

Figure B.1: What is your current gender identity?
% of respondents (n=1,101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Gender Identity</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.2: Age of Respondents by Decade
% of respondents (n=1,069)

- 18 to 29: 12%
- 30s: 18%
- 40s: 20%
- 50s: 23%
- 60s and up: 27%

Figure B.3: Age of Respondents by Decade, Comparison
% of Muscogee County RESPONDENTS (n=851) compared to Muscogee County RESIDENTS

- 18 to 29:
  - Respondents: 11%
  - Residents: 27%
- 30s:
  - Respondents: 18%
  - Residents: 18%
- 40s:
  - Respondents: 20%
  - Residents: 16%
- 50s:
  - Respondents: 23%
  - Residents: 16%
- 60s and up:
  - Respondents: 22%
  - Residents: 29%
Figure B.4: What is the highest level of education you have completed?
% of respondents (n = 1,110)

- Graduate degree: 42%
- Bachelor’s degree: 33%
- Associate / Vocational degree: 8%
- Some college: 13%
- High School Diploma or GED: 3%
- Less than high school: 1%

Figure B.5: Highest Level of Education, Comparison
% of Muscogee County RESPONDENTS ages 25+ (n = 814) compared to Muscogee County RESIDENTS ages 25+

- Graduate degree: 9% Muscogee County RESPONDENTS, 46% Muscogee County RESIDENTS
- Bachelor’s degree: 15% Muscogee County RESPONDENTS, 34% Muscogee County RESIDENTS
- Associate / Vocational degree: 7% Muscogee County RESPONDENTS, 8% Muscogee County RESIDENTS
- Some college: 10% Muscogee County RESPONDENTS, 26% Muscogee County RESIDENTS
- High School Diploma or GED: 3% Muscogee County RESPONDENTS, 28% Muscogee County RESIDENTS
- Less than high school: 0.4% Muscogee County RESPONDENTS, 14% Muscogee County RESIDENTS
Figure B.6: How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity?
% of respondents (n=1,095)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.7: Racial and/or Ethnic Identity, Comparison
% of Muscogee County RESPONDENTS (n=852) compared to Muscogee County RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Muscogee County RESPONDENTS**

**Muscogee County RESIDENTS**
Figure B.8: Where do you currently live? Top counties:
% of respondents (n=1,105)

- Muscogee County, GA: 80%
- Russell County, AL: 6%
- Harris County, GA: 5%
- Lee County, AL: 3%
- Chattahoochee County, GA: 1%
- Talbot County, GA: 0.8%
- Randolph County, GA: 0.8%
- Stewart County, GA: 0.8%
- Clay County, GA: 0.4%
- Macon County, AL: 0.3%

Figure B.9: Where do you currently live? Top cities:
% of respondents (n=1,096)

- Columbus, GA: 71%
- Midland, GA: 7%
- Phenix City, AL: 6%
- Fortson, GA: 2%
- Hamilton, GA: 1%
- Smiths Station, AL: 1%
- Cataula, GA: 1%
- Pine Mountain, GA: 0.9%
- Fort Mitchell, AL: 0.8%
- Cuthbert, GA: 0.8%
Figure B.10: Where do you currently live? Top Zip Codes:
% of respondents (n=1,077)

Where Residents Live
# of respondents by zip code
Figure B.11: About how many years have you lived in your local community?
% of respondents (n = 1,100) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 and up</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.12: Do you own or rent your primary residence?
% of respondents (n = 1,100)

- Own: 71%
- Rent: 24%
- Other: 4%

Figure B.13: Homeownership Comparison
% of Muscogee County RESPONDENTS (n = 839) compared to Muscogee County RESIDENTS

- Own: 74%
- Rent: 26%

Muscogee County RESPONDENTS: Muscogee County RESIDENTS
Figure B.14: What is your relationship to the Community Foundation of the Chattahoochee Valley?  
% of respondents (n=1,068 // select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had not heard of CFCV</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve attended one of their events</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have volunteered with them</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work there</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civic Attitudes and Activities

Figure B.15: How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?
% of respondents (n = 1,137) compared to National Rate
SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A big impact</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate impact</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact at all</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.16: In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?
% of respondents (n = 1,139) compared to National Rate
SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Level</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very attached</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat attached</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very attached</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all attached</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.17: Which of the following social issues are most important to you?
% of respondents (n=1,100 // choose up to three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*‘Other’ responses: Collaboration (0.2%) and Community Engagement (0.1%).
Figure B.18: To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?
% of respondents (n=1,097 // choose up to three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The top 3 ‘other’ responses are: Philanthropy (0.8%), Community Development (0.1%), and Collaboration (0.1%).
Figure B.19: How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?
% of respondents (n = 1,129) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too involved</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all involved</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.20: Engagement Activities in the Past Year, Comparison
% of respondents (n = 1,126) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did volunteer activities through or for an organization</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with people in my neighborhood to fix or improve something</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.21: How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board?
% of respondents (n = 1,122)

- Always Vote: 70%
- Sometimes Vote: 19%
- Rarely Vote: 4%
- Never Vote: 3%
- Prefer not to answer/Not eligible: 3%

*The top 3 ‘other’ responses are: Community Events and Meetings (5.5%), Restaurants (4.3%), and Work (3.5%).

Figure B.22: Where do you like to connect with others?
% of respondents (n = 1,093 // select all that apply)

- Religious Institution: 65%
- Schools: 43%
- Parks: 29%
- Public Squares: 26%
- Library: 26%
- Other*: 26%
- Shopping Centers: 19%
- Community rec center: 19%
- Community Garden: 9%
Figures B.23 through B.29 present results on how often respondents get information about their local community from each of the following sources, whether online or offline.

SOURCE of comparison data: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

**Figure B.23: Local Newspaper**

% of respondents (n = 1,005) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Day</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.24: Local television news**

% of respondents (n = 1,011) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Day</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.25: Local radio
% of respondents (n = 960) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 26% respondents, 17% national rate
- Several times a week: 22% respondents, 18% national rate
- Several times a month: 12% respondents, 13% national rate
- Less often: 22% respondents, 25% national rate
- Never: 17% respondents, 26% national rate

Figure B.26: A blog about your local community
% of respondents (n = 880) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 5% respondents, 1% national rate
- Several times a week: 6% respondents, 4% national rate
- Several times a month: 14% respondents, 5% national rate
- Less often: 28% respondents, 20% national rate
- Never: 48% respondents, 48% national rate

Figure B.27: A person or organization you follow on a social networking site
% of respondents (n = 984) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 28% respondents, 3% national rate
- Several times a week: 27% respondents, 8% national rate
- Several times a month: 19% respondents, 11% national rate
- Less often: 19% respondents, 12% national rate
- Never: 59% respondents, 14% national rate
Figure B.28: A newsletter or e-mail listserv about your local community
% of respondents (n = 935) compared to National Rate

Respondents       National Rate

- Every Day
  - Respondents: 8%
  - National Rate: 3%
- Several times a week
  - Respondents: 16%
  - National Rate: 5%
- Several times a month
  - Respondents: 24%
  - National Rate: 10%
- Less often
  - Respondents: 27%
  - National Rate: 30%
- Never
  - Respondents: 26%
  - National Rate: 52%

Figure B.29: Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors
% of respondents (n = 1,037) compared to National Rate

Respondents       National Rate

- Every Day
  - Respondents: 33%
  - National Rate: 9%
- Several times a week
  - Respondents: 36%
  - National Rate: 22%
- Several times a month
  - Respondents: 30%
  - National Rate: 20%
- Less often
  - Respondents: 29%
  - National Rate: 10%
- Never
  - Respondents: 10%
  - National Rate: 0.8%
Section 2: Conversation Dynamics, Topics, and Impact

Conversation Dynamics and Topics

Figure B.30: Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in *On the Table*?
% of respondents (n = 1,176 // select all that apply)

- Discuss and address important issues in my community: 72%
- Learn from and listen to others: 58%
- Get more involved in my community: 42%
- Meet and build relationships with new people: 40%
- Support the organizer of the conversation: 35%
- Other: 2%

Figure B.31: ‘The other people at my conversation were …’
% of respondents (n = 1,165)

- An equal mix of both: 39%
- Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation: 38%
- Mostly people I knew before the conversation: 23%
Figure B.32: Where did your conversation take place? Top counties:
% of respondents (n = 1,158)

Muscogee County, GA 92%
Russell County, AL 4%
Chattahoochee County, GA 1%
Harris County, GA 0.8%
Randolph County, GA 0.7%

Figure B.33: Where did your conversation take place? Top cities:
% of respondents (n = 1,156)

Columbus, GA 90%
Phenix City, AL 4%
Midland, GA 1%
Cusseta, GA 0.8%
Cuthbert, GA 0.7%
Hamilton, GA 0.5%
Talbotton, GA 0.4%
Fort Gaines, GA 0.4%
Fort Benning, GA 0.3%
Buena Vista, GA 0.3%
Figure B.34: Where did your conversation take place? Top ZIP codes:
% of respondents (n = 485)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31901</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31906</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31904</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36867</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31903</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31820</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31907</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31909</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31999</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31805</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Respondents Attended On The Table Conversations
# of respondents by zip code
Figure B.35: Issues Raised During the Conversation
% of respondents (n=870)

- Public Safety and Judicial System: 31%
- Education and Youth Development: 31%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 24%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 23%
- Health: 12%
- Transportation: 11%
- Media and Awareness: 10%
- Government: 8%
- Family: 8%
- Housing and Homelessness: 8%
- Community Engagement: 7%
- Environment and Parks: 7%
- Arts and Culture: 6%
- Community Development: 5%
- Collaboration: 3%
- Religion and Morals: 3%
- Food Access: 3%
- Philanthropy: 2%
- Other: 1%
- Technology: 0.9%
- Immigration and Migration: 0.7%
- International: 0.1%
Impact of the Conversation

Figure B.36: How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)?
% of respondents (n = 1,137 // select all that apply)

- I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know: 71%
- I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know: 36%
- I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees: 23%
- None of the above: 13%

Figure B.37: After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?
% of respondents (n = 1,143)

- Much better: 25%
- Somewhat better: 40%
- A little better: 24%
- No change: 11%
Figure B.38: How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?
% of respondents (n = 1,142)

- Very likely: 47%
- Somewhat likely: 42%
- Not too likely: 9%
- Not at all likely: 2%

Figure B.39: Actions or next steps respondents are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed
% of respondents (n = 1,010 // select all that apply)

- Build relationships and collaborate: 73%
- Raise awareness and educate others: 67%
- Get more involved in community: 59%
- Volunteer: 52%
- Mentor or motivate others: 46%
- Take action through my job: 40%
- Improve myself through personal development and learning: 37%
- Donate: 24%
- Become more politically involved: 21%
- Provide support for my family: 14%
- Other: 0.6%
Section 3: Custom Questions

Figure B.40: Looking ahead to the next 10 years, how optimistic are you about the future of your community?
% of respondents (n = 1,110)

- Very Optimistic: 41%
- Somewhat optimistic: 51%
- Not very optimistic: 6%
- Not at all optimistic: 1%

Figure B.41: What, if anything, prevents you from getting involved in the issues you care about most?
% of respondents (n = 1,073 // select all that apply)

- I am actively involved in the issues I care about: 48%
- I am too busy/ I do not have enough time: 32%
- I am unsure of how to get involved: 29%
- I believe that my efforts will not make a difference: 8%
- Other: 4%
- I am not interested in getting involved: 2%
Figure B.42: I am happy about my:
% of respondents (n = 1,035 // select all that apply)

- Neighborhood: 56%
- House/apartment: 55%
- Recreational opportunities: 52%
- City or town: 50%
- Personal Finances: 46%
- Air and water quality: 46%
- Healthcare: 37%
- Local school: 28%
- Job opportunities: 23%
- Local news: 21%
- Public Safety: 19%
- Local government: 19%
- Childcare & pre-K: 14%
- Public transportation: 8%

Figure B.43: I am unhappy about my:
% of respondents (n = 980 // select all that apply)

- Public Safety: 56%
- Job opportunities: 44%
- Local government: 38%
- Public transportation: 34%
- Local school: 30%
- Healthcare: 28%
- Local news: 27%
- Recreational opportunities: 20%
- Personal finances: 20%
- City or town: 13%
- Neighborhood: 12%
- Childcare & pre-K: 12%
- Air and water quality: 11%
- House/apartment: 8%
Figure B.44: Happiness disparities
% difference between rates of happiness and unhappiness about the following topics. Respondents are more happy than unhappy about topics with a positive value.

- House/Apartment: +48%
- Neighborhood: +45%
- City or town: +36%
- Air and water quality: +35%
- Recreational opportunities: +32%
- Personal finances: +26%
- Healthcare: +9%
- Childcare & pre-K: +2%
- Local school: -2%
- Local news: -6%
- Local government: -19%
- Job opportunities: -21%
- Public Transportation: -26%
- Public Safety: -37%

More Unhappy | More Happy
Figure B.45: How much trust and confidence do you have in local leadership in the area where you live when it comes to handling local problems?
% of respondents (n = 1,098) compared to National Rate

- **A great deal**: 13% (Respondents) vs. 23% (National Rate)
- **A fair amount**: 55% (Respondents) vs. 48% (National Rate)
- **Not very much**: 27% (Respondents) vs. 20% (National Rate)
- **Not at all**: 9% (Respondents) vs. 5% (National Rate)
Appendix C: 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 childcare.

**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 as 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.
Appendix D: Social Media Analysis
Prepared by Meltwater Buzz

Hashtag Usage

166
Total mentions

455k
Total impressions

The event occurred on Nov 5th
37
Unique Twitter Influencers

Hashtag Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twitter User</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@katelynyosh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ColumbusState</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@MidtownColumbus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@KWilson318</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@atticusalan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ColsGaParks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@MaryCovington1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@TeenChallengeSE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@catlibraries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Valley_Rescue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Platform Breakdown

Unique Twitter Influencers

Tweeters Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bot</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/ Links</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Links</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/ Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Media</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Tweets</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Message Tweets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retweets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter for iPhone</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter for Web Client</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter for Android</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Visualization of Disparity between Important Issues and Contributions

Themes Disparity Between Important Issues and Contributions
For example, only 23% of respondents who mentioned Public Safety and Judicial System (n=288) as an important social issue also mentioned it as social issue to which they contribute their time, talent, or financial resources. The ‘n’ represents the number of respondents who chose the corresponding variable as an important issue and also responded to the contribution question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Contributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals (n=169)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture (n=152)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n=314)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development (n=629)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (n=223)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access (n=72)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks (n=125)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (n=43)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (n=82)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion (n=212)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty (n=447)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness (n=179)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration (n=23)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media (n=42)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (n=87)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System (n=288)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Visualization for Questions Comparison

Figure F.1

Relationship Between What Respondents are Unhappy About and Issues They Raised During Conversation

Shows the percentage of respondents who are unhappy with what appears on the bottom row, who during their conversation raised the issue listed in the left hand column. For example, 37.8% of respondents who are unhappy with their Public Safety also raised the issue of Public Safety and Judicial System. Note that these results include only respondents who answered both questions (n=759) and only the top ten ‘issues raised’ are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents are unhappy about their</th>
<th>Recreational opportunities</th>
<th>Public Transportation</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
<th>Personal Finances</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Local school</th>
<th>Local news</th>
<th>Local government</th>
<th>Job opportunities</th>
<th>House/apartment</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>Childcare &amp; pre-K</th>
<th>Air and water quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue raised during conversation
WHAT’S NEXT?

The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation has invited CFCV to continue the work of *On the Table*, and the CFCV board has committed to at least two more years of bringing people together through this exciting initiative. Stay connected with us for the latest!