

# Backgrounder

Issue:

2006 Census Update on Social Risk Factors in the City's 13 Priority Areas

# Background:

In order to continuously monitor social conditions in the city's 13 Priority Areas (PAs), key "social risk" data were selected from the recent 2006 Census and the city's 2007 Employment Survey, to provide an updated picture of the socio-economic trends in the PAs. The findings in this briefing note are based on an analysis of a set of indicators and their difference as compared to the overall city average. This briefing note can be used in conjunction with the Priority Area Profiles which contain more detailed information. In addition, please refer to the Neighbourhood Profiles for information about all 140 neighbourhoods in Toronto.

# **HIGHLIGHTS:**

- Between 2001 and 2006, 9 of the 13 PAs experienced a population loss. The average PA rate of growth was -1.8% as compared to a growth rate of 1.5% in the remaining neighbourhoods.
- O The picture varies depending on the age group. The rate of decline in the childrens population (0-14) was higher than the city (-6.5% vs. -5.5%), while the number of youth (15-24) also showed declines, but to a lesser extent. Only seniors (65+) exhibited increases in all but 1 PA.
- o Most PAs have a higher than average number of at-risk populations: visible minorities, recent immigrants, and lone-parent families.
- o Low income remains a problem in the city and the 13 PAs. 11 of the 13 PAs had family median incomes (after tax) below the city average of \$46,240 (average for the 13PAs is \$42,400).
- o The average low-income rate in the PAs (24.1%) is higher than the city average (19.4%).
- O Unemployment rates for the population ages 15+ in 12 of the 13 PAs are higher than the city average. While the 13 PAs show higher than average rates of visible minorities and new immigrants, many PAs also have a higher than average proportion of residents with post-secondary education from outside Canada. When this information is compared against the higher rates of unemployment and low-income rates, it is reasonable to infer that many of these Torontonians are having difficulties finding employment and/or matching their skills and training to employment.
- While youth unemployment rates remain high, some PAs showed a change in youth unemployment rate lower than the city's increase of +3.4%: Steeles-L'Amoreaux (+2.1%), Crescent Town (+1.8%), and Eglinton East-Kennedy Park (+0.5%). Notably, 2 PAs showed a small decline in their youth unemployment rates between 2001 and 2006: Kingston-Galloway (-1.3%) Jane-Finch (-0.1%).

# **Demography:**

- The city's population is approximately 2.6 million people. Between the 2001 and 2006, Toronto's population grew by 21,787 residents net, an increase of only 0.9%. Many neighbourhoods across Toronto are experiencing declines in population (see Map 1). This is not entirely unexpected as the average household size has also declined, possibly as a result of children of baby boomers leaving home.
- The trend of population loss between 2001 and 2006 is experienced in 9 of the 13 PAs (although this loss could also be attributed to difficulties in reaching non-English speaking, or non-citizenship respondents during Census gathering). The PA with the greatest loss in population is Kingston-Galloway (-1,800 persons or a -7.2% change). Conversely, the PAs with the largest increases were Dorset Park (9.3%), and Lawrence Heights (6.2%). When comparing these changes to the overall city average of only +.9%, all PAs experienced greater rates in population loss compared to the city as a whole. Only Dorset Park, Lawrence Heights, and to a lesser degree Steeles-L'Amoreaux and Malvern, experienced increases in their populations between 2001 and 2006.
- In terms of children age 0-14,, all PAs have a higher proportion than the city overall, with the exception of Steele's-L'Amoreaux and Westminster-Branson. When comparing the change in the childrens population, only 2 PAs saw increases in the number of children: Dorset Park (6.9%) and Lawrence Heights (5.8%). The overall rate of decline in the childrens population was higher than the city (-6.5% vs. -5.5%). As compared to the city average, the following 3 PAs had higher than average rates in increased childrens population: Dorset Park, Lawrence Heights, and Crescent Town.
- The youth (15-24) picture differs from children. Five of the PAs showed increases in the number of youth between 2001 and 2006 the fastest growing communities were Dorset Park (9.6%) and Westminster-Branson (7.7%). In terms of their comparison to the average, 4 PAs showed higher than average rates of increase in the youth population: Dorset Park, Westminster-Branson, Lawrence Heights, and Weston-Mount Dennis.
- Unlike the children and youth age groups, the number of seniors were increasing in all but 1 PA (Westminster-Branson). The seniors population had the highest growth in Malvern, Dorset Park, and Jane-Finch. Again, only Westminster-Branson had a decrease in their seniors' population. Similarly, in terms of the difference from the city average, 11 PAs were higher or much higher than the city average in terms of growth in seniors between 2001 and 2006 only Westminster-Branson, and Crescent Town were much lower than average.
- The Dependency Population is defined as those that are younger than 16 and older than 64. The proportion of persons in this age range can be used to describe the extent of "dependency" (those more vulnerable). It is interesting to note that every PA has a similar or higher proportion of dependent population than the city average. The PAs with the fastest growth in persons younger than 16 and older than 64 were: Dorset Park and Lawrence Heights. When compared to the average, 6 of the 13 PAs had rates of growth in this population much higher than the city average.

#### At-Risk Populations:

#### Visible Minorities

Nearly half of the city's population (47% or 1,162,635 people), are visible minorities, up

- from 42.8% (1,051,125) in 2001. The city of Toronto's visible minority population has increased by 10.6% since 2001, and by 31.8% since 1996. The non-visible minority population in Toronto declined by 6.5% and 11.3% over 2001 and 1996, respectively.
- The South Asian population has now overtaken Chinese as the top visible minority group in Toronto. The top five visible minority groups in Toronto were:
  - South Asian at 298,370 or 12.0% of our population
  - Chinese at 283,075 or 11.4%
  - Black at 208,555 or 8.4%
  - Filipino at 102,555 or 4.1%
  - Latin American at 64,860 or 2.6%
- From 2001 to 2006, the fastest growing single visible minority groups in Toronto were Latin Americans (up 19.3%), Filipinos (up 18.6%), South Asians (up 17.5%), Koreans (up 15%), and West Asians (up 14.5%). At the same time, the number of persons identifying themselves with multiple visible minority origins increased by 56.6%.
- Most PAs exhibit a higher than average number of visible minorities. Only Westminster-Branson and Lawrence Heights have somewhat lower than average number of visible minorities.
- Another dimension is the extent of homogeneity (similarity) or heterogeneity (difference) in the composition of visible minority populations in these PAs. 10 of the 13 PAs are fairly homogeneous in that visible minorities represent a significant proportion (near or greater than 2/3) of the resident population. Only Westminster Branson, Weston-Mt.Dennis, and Lawrence Heights have a lower proportion of visible minorities with Westminster-Branson having the most "non" visible minority populations and being the most heterogeneous, with no single group dominating their neighbourhood's population numbers. Further research on 'ethnic origin' will provide more information on the diversity of Toronto's neighbourhoods.

# **Recent Immigrants**

- Toronto received almost one-quarter of all new immigrants to Canada between 2001 and 2006. In 1996, the City received 30% of all new immigrants to Canada. The city has received an average of 55,000 new immigrants annually between 2001 and 2006.
- The top regions of origin for recent immigrants settling in City of Toronto were:
  - South Asia (26% predominantly India at 12%)
  - East Asia (22% predominantly China at 18%)
  - Europe (14% primarily Eastern European countries)
  - Middle East and West Central Asia (11%)
  - Caribbean, Central and South America (10%)
  - South East Asia (10% predominantly Philippines at 8%)
  - Africa (6%);
  - United States (2%); and
  - Oceania (less than 1%).
- Similar to the profile of visible minority populations, almost every PA has a higher than average proportion of recent immigrants (those arriving between 2001 and 2006). Only 2 PAs showed a lower than average proportion of recent immigrants when compared to the city: Kingston-Galloway and Lawrence Heights.

#### **Lone Parent Families**

- The structure of the family in Toronto continues to change. Among Toronto families, 70% were married couples, 9% were common-law couples and 20% were led by lone parents in 2006. The number of common-law families increased by 10.4%, lone parent families by 4%, while married couple families experienced a decline of 0.8% between 2001 and 2006.
- Most PAs (9 of 13) exhibit a higher than average proportion of lone-parent families, with the highest being Kingston-Galloway (where 1 in 3 families are single-led).
- In terms of change over time, the 4 PAs with higher than average increases in the proportion of single-led families are: Westminster-Branson, Lawrence Heights, Steele-L'Amoreaux, and Eglinton East-Kennedy Park.

#### **Seniors Living Alone**

- There were 89,790 seniors living alone in Toronto in 2006, an increase of 5.4% since 2001.
- While almost every PA experienced higher than average increases in seniors population (which corresponds to the trend noted above in the increases in those age 65+), only 1 PA showed higher than average numbers of seniors living alone and that was Westminster-Branson.

# **Labour Force Characteristics:**

# Persons with Post-Secondary Education from Outside Canada

- 3 out of 5 Toronto residents with post-secondary qualification received their highest degree in Ontario. Reflective of Toronto's large immigrant population, 35% of Toronto residents acquired their degree outside of Canada.
- The 13 PAs show higher than average rates of visible minorities and new immigrants, while 9 of 13 PAs have a higher than average proportion with post-secondary education backgrounds from outside Canada. Three PAs in particular stand out: Jamestown, Westminster-Branson, and Crescent Town. Further study needs to be done with respect to the income dimension to determine the extent of underemployment and unemployment, in relation to other social risk factors.

# **Unemployment:**

- From 2001-2006, the number of unemployed in the city grew from 92,365 to 102,610, an increase of 11%. Change in the number of unemployed is reflected in Toronto's overall unemployment rate, which rose from 7.0% in 2001 to 7.6% in 2006.
- Unemployment rates for population age 15+ in 12 of the 13 PAs are all higher than the city average (with some like Scarborough Village that are much higher than the city overall). The exception is Lawrence Heights, which is only slightly lower than the average, at 6.4%.
- While the overall change in the unemployment rate for the 13 PAs was comparable to the city average (.8% vs. .6%), there were improvements for some PAs. In terms of the rate of change in unemployment between 2001 and 2006, 4 of 13 PAs showed improvement (rates of decline in the unemployment rate that were much lower than the city average), although

- they still exhibit high rates of unemployment: Jane-Finch, Westminster-Branson, Lawrence Heights, and Kingston-Galloway.
- Youth (15-24) unemployment rates are often double that of the whole population. The unemployment rate for all the 13 PAs (17.6%) is only slightly higher than the city average (16.6%).
- The following PAs showed higher than average increases in the youth unemployment rate between 2001 and 2006: Lawrence Heights, Flemingdon Park-Victoria Village, Dorset Park, and Eglinton East-Kennedy Park. While youth unemployment rates remain high in all PAs, some PAs showed a change in the youth unemployment rate that was lower than the city's change of +3.4 %: Steeles-L'Amoreaux (+2.1%), Crescent Town (+1.8%), and Eglinton East-Kennedy Park (+0.5%). In fact, 2 PAs showed a small decline in their youth unemployment rates between 2001 and 2006: Kingston-Galloway (-1.3%) Jane-Finch (-0.1%).

# Local Employment:

- Local employment is an important measure of the local neighbourhood vitality due to its contribution to local neighbourhood employment opportunities. The latest employment data (2007) from the Planning Division's annual employment survey is compared to a 2005 baseline. The 13 PAs experienced only a modest .8% growth in total employment since 2005 (compared to 3% for the entire city). Most (8) of the PAs experienced a decline in total employment: Scarborough Village (-12.6%), Weston Mount Dennis (-7.2%), and Jamestown (-6%) were the PAs with the greatest decline in local employment numbers. In terms of the difference from the city average, the following 4 PAs showed progress with much higher than average rates of growth in total employment: Westminster-Branson, Flemingdon Park-Victoria Village, Crescent Town, and Malvern.
- In terms of local part-time jobs, only 3 PAs showed above average rates in growth of part-time employment: Flemingdon Park-Victoria Village (16.7%), Kingston-Galloway (7.2%), and Lawrence Heights (7.1% possibly affected by the location of Yorkdale Shopping Centre).

#### Income:

- In 2005, median household income in Toronto was \$52,833, a drop of 4.7% compared to its 2000 level of \$55,421 (in 2005 dollars). Over the past 15 years, median household income, after adjusting for inflation, declined by 10%.
- Low income remains a problem. In 2005, there were 134,247 economic families and 165,156 persons in non-family households with before-tax income below Statistics Canada's Low Income Cut-off (LICO). This reflects a low income rate of 20.6% for families and 41% for non-family persons. The LICO for a single person and a family of four was \$20,778 and \$38,610, respectively.
- Virtually every PA had family median incomes (after tax) below the city average of \$46,240 (average for the 13 PAs is \$42,400). Only Malvern (\$50,700) and Steele's-L'Amoreaux (\$47,830) had higher median incomes.
- 12 of 13 PAs have low-income rates (# persons in low-income after-tax) higher than the city average (19.4%). One PA stands out as much higher than the city average: Scarborough Village (30.4%). Malvern is the only PA that is similar to the city average at

19.1%.

In conclusion, the PAs continue to be home to many of our most vulnerable - with growing numbers of children and seniors, along with high concentrations of new immigrants and visible minorities. These communities continue to show high rates of low-income and unemployment, but also high rates of post-secondary education obtained outside Canada. While some gains have been achieved in the PAs, (e.g., total employment, and improvements in unemployment levels), these communities, with their large at-risk populations, are likely to be most effected by negative changes in the economy.

# Prepared by:

Social Policy Analysis and Research Section, Social Development Finance & Administration Division.

# Contact for further information:

Harvey Low, Planning Analyst, Social Development Finance & Administration Division, 416-392-8660

Date: October 2008

Social Risk Factors in 13 PAs

Heighton   Pathachit   Crescent Town Dorbset Park   Heighton Pathachit   Color   Carbon Color								FLEMINGDON								0.8863.9	
Proprietion change since 2001 G. 50 G. 120 G. 20 <	#	PRIORITY AREA / INDICATOR	JAMESTOWN			VESTINGNSTER.	Lawkence Heights	PARK-VICTURIA VILLAGE		CRESCENT TOWN	PARK	Ŷ	9			(1) Sec.	ORONTO
We considered (0.54) Cast (0.54) </th <th><b>~~</b></th> <th>Population Change since 2001</th> <th>-5.0%</th> <th>%0'9-</th> <th>-1.3%</th> <th>~0.7%</th> <th>9</th> <th>-2.7%</th> <th>%8'0</th> <th>-6.1%</th> <th>%8"6</th> <th>-2,4%</th> <th>-8.3%</th> <th>%2.0</th> <th>-7.2%</th> <th>-1.8%</th> <th>%6'0</th>	<b>~~</b>	Population Change since 2001	-5.0%	%0'9-	-1.3%	~0.7%	9	-2.7%	%8'0	-6.1%	%8"6	-2,4%	-8.3%	%2.0	-7.2%	-1.8%	%6'0
Store North (15-24)   Carbon (15-24)	7	%	25.0%	22.5%	18.6%	14.0%	۳	19.6%	15.4%	20.2%	19.6%	20.3%	22.4%	22.2%		19.9%	16.4%
N. Change in Youth (16-24) (16-25) (17-75) (4.67) (11.75) (1.75) </th <th>m</th> <th></th> <th>-6.2%</th> <th>-9.5%</th> <th>-7.1%</th> <th>-8.7%</th> <th></th> <th>-8.3%</th> <th>-5.8%</th> <th>%9'0-</th> <th>%6.9</th> <th>-5.2%</th> <th>-16.7%</th> <th>-5.5%</th> <th>-15,6%</th> <th>-6.5%</th> <th>-5.5%</th>	m		-6.2%	-9.5%	-7.1%	-8.7%		-8.3%	-5.8%	%9'0-	%6.9	-5.2%	-16.7%	-5.5%	-15,6%	-6.5%	-5.5%
Columnia in Youth (16.24) since 2001 3.174 4.184 7.774 4.684 6.278 6.284	**		14.6%	13.8%	12.7%	14.6%			14.0%	11:1%	11.7%	13.1%	14.1%	15.2%		13.4%	12.7%
W. Change in Seniors (Seth) 8.278 14.78 12.18 12.39 16.59	\$	% Change in Youth (15-24) since 2001	-10.6%	-7.1%	4.8%	7.7%		%8*0-	%8'0-	-9.1%	%9'6	3.0%	4.1%	-1.5%		-1.7%	3.3%
W. Change in Seniore (94) since 2001 2.8 kB s   14.7 kb   10.2 kb   24.0 kb	9	% 2006 Seniors (65+)	8.1%	13.5%	16,0%	18.1%			15.8%	10.5%	13.6%	12.9%	13.3%	8.3%		13.9%	14.1%
W. Change in People of Size A size	7	%	8.8%	14.7%		-3.1%			9.3%	%9'0	15.3%	8.1%	5.9%	29.3%		9.8%	4.6%
Total Employment Y. Change since 2005	∞		33.1%	31.8%	34.6%	33.1%			31.2%	30.7%	33.3%	33.2%	35.7%	30.5%	33.8%	33.1%	30.5%
Total Employment W. Change since 2005 -4.0% -1.2% -8.2% -1.2% -8.2% -1.2%	6		-2.9%	-13.2%	0.4%	-5.6%		,	1.3%	-0.2%	10.2%	-0.4%	-9.5%	1.9%	'	-2.4%	-1.1%
Part-time Employment % Change since 2005 4.9% 5.0% 7.1% 1.67% 1.65% 1.7% 1.7% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 7.2% 2.50% 7.7% 2.50% 7.7% 2.50% 7.2% 2.5% 7.1% 1.65% 1.1% 1.7% 1.2% 0.5% 1.4% 1.7% 1.1% 1	2		~0.9%	1.4%	-7.2%	8.7%		80	-1.3%	8.2%	%0.0	-4.8%	12.6%	3.5%	-2.8%	0.8%	2.9%
% 2006 Visible Minorities 82.2% 70.3% 46.5% 30.7% 66.7% 79.5% 61.9% 66.4% 66.4% 66.4% 66.4% 66.4% 66.4% 66.4% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 66.2% 70.3% 70	=		4.9%	-5.0%	-14.3%	-23.3%			-15.8%	-1.7%	1.4%	-5.8%	-33.5%	0.6%		-2.3%	2.0%
% 2005 Popin titat are Recent Immigrants 22.24 12.49 9.87 16.27	12	**********	85.2%	70.3%	46.6%	30.0%			79.5%	61.9%	70.1%	65.4%	64.8%	86.5%		66.2%	46.4%
% 2006 Lone Parent Families 24.6% 22.1% 21.9% 21.3%	13		22.2%	12.4%		24.0%		Ì	16.5%		15.0%	11.6%	14.7%	11.2%		14.4%	10.7%
% Change in Lone Parent Families since 2001 -54% -5.9% -5.9% -6.9% -6.9% -6.9% -6.9% -7.7% -6.9% -7.7% -0.9% -2.2% 2.0%   % Seniors Living Alone 15.4% 15.7% 30.3% 32.1% 27.9% 18.5% 28.1% 6.9% 44.4% 6.1% 44.4% 44.4% 44.5% 44.5% 44.5% 47.5% 22.2% 20.2%   2006 Weighten Strong Living Alone 58.8% 38.4% 38.4% 51.1% 60.4% 50.6% 44.4% 44.5% 44.5% 44.5% 37.3% 47.5%   2006 Weighten Strong Living Alone 58.8% 9.4% 51.1% 60.4% 50.8% 9.4% 44.4% 44.5% 44.5% 37.3% 47.5%   2006 Voult (15.24) Unemployment Rate since 2001 10.9 17.7% 15.0% 16.4% 16.4% 22.0% 17.8 54.6% 27.6% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% <th>7</th> <th></th> <th>24.6%</th> <th>29.1%</th> <th></th> <th>19.2%</th> <th></th> <th>23</th> <th>19.2%</th> <th></th> <th>21.3%</th> <th>28.6%</th> <th>26.6%</th> <th>23.3%</th> <th></th> <th>%0'52</th> <th>20.3%</th>	7		24.6%	29.1%		19.2%		23	19.2%		21.3%	28.6%	26.6%	23.3%		%0'52	20.3%
W. Seniors Living Alone 15.4% 15.7% 30.3% 32.1% 28.3% 18.5% 28.1% 44.4% 44.4% 44.5% 44.3% 47.5% 47.5% 47.5% 44.4% 44.4% 44.5% 44.4% 47.5% 47.5% 47.5% 47.5% 44.4% 44.4% 44.5% 44.4% 47.5% 47.5% 47.5% 51.1% 60.4% 50.6% 50.6% 44.4% 44.5% 44.4% 44.4% 44.4% 44.4	15		-5.4%	-2.6%		18.7%			6.3%	9	-0.7%	8.7%	%2.2	%6'O-		%0'Z	4:0%
2006 % Pop'n with Post-Secondary Education 58.8% 38.4% 5.2% 69.4% 8.1% 69.4% 51.1% 60.4% 6	18	<del>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </del>	15.4%	15.7%		32.1%					19.1%	21.9%	25.5%	11.1%			25.4%
Change in Youth (15-24) Unemployment Rate since 5.4 kg 6.4 kg 10.8 kg 6.4 kg 10.8 kg 6.4 kg 10.8 kg 9.3 kg 9.8 kg 9.3 kg 9.8 kg 9.8 kg 9.8 kg 9.9 kg 9.0 kg 9.9 kg	17		58.8%	38.4%		69					50.6%	44.4%	44.5%	44,3%			35.2%
Change in Unemployment Rate since 2001 0.9 -0.1 1.0 0.5 1.1 0.0 0.0 1.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	82		%6'6	9.1%		%6'8	9	10	9.3%	9.8%	9.4%	10.5%	12.4%	8.8%	8	9.4%	7.6%
2006 Youth (15-24) Unemployment Rate since 17.6% 17.7% 13.2% 16.4% 22.0% 17.8% 18.6% 28.6% 26.6% 26.7% 18.6% 28.6% 26.6% 26.7% 18.6% 28.6% 26.6% 26.7% 27.8% 27.8% 27.8% 27.4% 27.8% 27.4% 27.8% <th>2</th> <th></th> <th>6.0</th> <th></th> <th>1.9</th> <th></th> <th>go-</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>8.0</th> <th>1.1</th> <th>0.7</th> <th>2.7</th> <th>1.2</th> <th></th> <th>0.8</th> <th>0.6</th>	2		6.0		1.9		go-			8.0	1.1	0.7	2.7	1.2		0.8	0.6
Change in Youth (15-24) Unemployment Rate since 4.3 -0.1 3.4 4.1 5.3 6.7 2.1 1.8 5.7 11.1 3.8 -1.3 3.1 3.1   Median 2006 After-Tax Income \$44,340 \$42,716 \$38,025 \$41,955 \$41,856 \$47,830 \$21,88 \$21,78 \$21,88	23		17.6%	15.0%		13.	,				18.0%	18.5%	24.6%	20.2%			16.6%
Median 2006 After-Tax Income \$44.340 \$42.715 \$35,715 \$38,716 \$47,830 \$42.170 \$36,170 \$38,326 \$50,695 \$42,400 \$40,400 \$40,400 \$40,400 \$40,400 \$40,800 \$4	21		4.3		3.4				2.1	1.8	5.7	0.5		3.8	1-		3.4
% Low-income After Tax 23.4% 24.0% 24.5% 24.9% 20.9% 28.4% 21.8% 27.8% 23.0% 26.5% 30.4% 19.1% 29.0% 24.1%	22	Median 2005 After-Tax Income	\$44,340	\$42,715	5.5	\$39,926					\$42,170	\$38,320	\$38,260	\$50,635			\$46.240
	23	% Low-income After Tax	23.4%									26.5%		19.1%			19.4%

Prepared by the City of Toronto Social Development Finance & Administration Division, Social Policy Analysis & Research Section, October 2008.















