EXPERIENCE ALL THAT THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE 
STATE OF BLACK AMERICA® HAS TO OFFER!

**Beginning in 2015 and for the first time in its history, the State of Black America is an all-digital experience.**

In addition to the key findings and insights highlighted in this executive summary, the *State of Black America* offers a multi-media and social experience that will encourage more interaction, deeper learning and year-round updates and contributions.

THE SUITE OF STATE OF BLACK AMERICA OFFERINGS FOR 2015 INCLUDES:

**E-Book**
Including full data sets and analysis for the 2015 National Equality Index™; full 70-city list of Black–White and Hispanic–White Metropolitan Area Equality Index rankings for unemployment and income; 50-State Education Equality Index and full rankings based on Black–White and Hispanic–White achievement gaps (with supporting data on contributing factors); full articles from the 2015 *State of Black America* contributors; available for purchase ($9.95) at www.stateofblackamerica.org.

**Web Series**
Seven-part series that gathers the nation’s leaders, political pundits and executives for a lively discussion around the 2015 *State of Black America* theme, “Save Our Cities: Education, Jobs and Justice,” the State of Black America Equality Index topics and content highlighted in the report. View it on YouTube, Interactive One’s universe of websites—including NewsOne, HelloBeautiful, GlobalGrind, and The Urban Daily—and on www.stateofblackamerica.org.

**New Website**
A digital hub where visitors can access all-things *State of Black America*—select data and report findings, the Web Series, press materials, infographics and charts, information to order the 2015 e-book online, full articles from the book, and year-round updates with new contributors addressing issues impacting the state of Black America in real-time; www.stateofblackamerica.org.

Tell us what you think and follow the *State of Black America* conversation on Twitter. #SaveOurCities
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About the State of Black America

The State of Black America, the National Urban League’s seminal annual publication now in its 39th edition, has become one of the most highly-anticipated benchmarks and sources for thought leadership around racial equality in America across economics (including employment, income and housing), education, health, social justice and civic engagement. Each edition of the State of Black America contains thoughtful commentary and insightful analysis from leading figures and thought leaders in politics, the corporate arena, NGOs, academia and popular culture.

The State of Black America also includes the Equality Index™, a quantitative tool for tracking racial equality in America, now in its 11th edition of the Black–White Index and its sixth edition of the Hispanic–White Index. The 2015 book features the second edition of the Metropolitan Equality Index, ranking approximately 70 metro areas based on unemployment and income equality for Blacks and Hispanics. New to the 2015 Equality Index is a special feature on state-level racial and ethnic disparities in K–12 education that documents the extent of Black–White and Hispanic–White achievement gaps in states across the country. The State Education Equality Index also includes supporting data on some of the factors that contribute to narrowing or widening these gaps, including teacher quality, pre-school and course enrollment, and student status and risk factors.

WHY DOES NUL PUBLISH AN EQUALITY INDEX?
Economic empowerment is the central theme of the National Urban League’s mission. The Equality Index is a way to document progress towards this mission.

THE 2015 EQUALITY INDEX OF BLACK AMERICA IS 72.2%.
WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?
That means that rather than having a whole pie (100%), which would mean full equality with whites, African Americans are missing about 28% of the pie (Figure 1).

WHAT IS THE EQUALITY INDEX TRYING TO DO?
Imagine if we were to summarize how well African Americans and Hispanics are doing, compared to whites, in the areas of economics, health, education, social justice and civic engagement, and represent that by a pie. The Equality Index measures the share of the pie that African Americans and Hispanics get. Whites are used as the benchmark because the history of race in America has created advantages for whites that continue to persist in many of the outcomes being measured. Each category is weighted, based on the importance that we give to each (Figure 2).

IS IT POSSIBLE TO SEE HOW WELL AFRICAN AMERICANS AND HISPANICS ARE DOING IN EACH OF THE CATEGORIES?
Yes. We show this in the tables included with the Equality Index. Each category can be represented by a mini-pie and interpreted in the same way as the total Equality Index. So, the index of 55.8% for the economics category for African Americans in 2015 means that African Americans are missing close to half of the economics mini-pie.

IT DOESN’T APPEAR THERE’S BEEN MUCH IMPROVEMENT IN THE EQUALITY INDEX—WHAT’S THE POINT?
The Equality Index is made of many parts, so improvements in one area are sometimes offset by losses in another, leaving the overall index unchanged. The Equality Index offers solid evidence of how slowly change happens and highlights the need for policies that fight inequality.
Few times in a nation’s history is the conscience of its citizens shocked and awakened across racial, economic, generational and even ideological lines. These are the times when the collective consciousness of a people also unapologetically screams that it’s time for change—and that it must start today.

That time is now. 2014 was indeed a catalytic year that was propelled by cataclysmic circumstances—little accountability for law enforcement responsible for killing unarmed Black men, teenagers and children; a continual assault on voting rights; widening economic inequality gaps; and an increasingly partisan education debate far more rooted in political agendas than in putting our children first.

The theme of the 2015 State of Black America* “Save Our Cities: Education, Jobs + Justice” conveys the urgency of focus around each of these areas and their interconnectedness in our ongoing quest for full equality in America.

So, what is the state of Black America in 2015? In short, on many fronts, Black America remains in crisis—and we see justice challenged at every turn.

The world watched as non-indictments of the police officers responsible for the deaths of unarmed Black males including Eric Garner, Michael Brown and John Crawford signaled that police accountability for taking Black lives was reaching a modern-day low—and that the widespread and dangerous mistrust between law enforcement and too many communities of color in America was reaching a new high...

Justice was also challenged in 2014 with an assault on voting rights following the Supreme Court’s 2013 decision in the Shelby County case...In the aftermath, we’ve seen states across the nation move aggressively to enact new voter suppression laws aimed at making registration and voting more difficult for people of color...Organizations like ours will continue to fight...
to protect democracy via the protection of our voting rights and pushing Congress to move the bipartisan Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2014 forward, but the battle is not ours alone. Individually and collectively, we must take the first step in ensuring our voices are heard by ensuring our votes are cast in every election.

Justice also continues to be challenged on the jobs and economic front. The start of 2015 saw the most sustained period of job creation this century. However, the dark cloud inside this silver lining is that too many people are still being left behind. Black unemployment is twice that of white unemployment. Wages are stagnant. Many people who are working are simply not earning what they need or should earn to make ends meet. Whether one calls it income inequality, upward social mobility, decline of the middle class, eliminating poverty among working people or something different, it is one of the great challenges facing post-recession America...

We don’t have all of the answers, but we know the power of action—and we have a model that works. Through the National Urban League’s 50-city, $100 million Jobs Rebuild America initiative and our steadfast commitment to workforce development, we have made it our business to train and prepare people for good jobs that pay good wages. We have put more than 160,000 people to work during my tenure here alone.

We have also fought victoriously for the passage of bipartisan jobs bills like the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), which is allowing millions of unemployed and underemployed workers and urban youth of color to receive the job and skills training, as well as support services, they need to chart a path to a better future...

Lastly, justice has been challenged regarding education—undoubtedly one of the most pressing civil rights issues of our time. Disparities remain in both the K-12 and higher education system. Sixty years after the landmark ruling in Brown v. Board of Education ended segregation in America’s public schools, separate and unequal is still a pervasive reality...

Black and Brown students are less likely to share classrooms with white students. We also see separate and unequal levels of expectations and resources in our schools that continue to break down along economic, and thus largely color, lines. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) found that the U.S. is one of few advanced countries where more educational resources are provided to schools with richer students than to those serving poor children.

More must be done to ensure that all districts are held to high standards, that those standards are consistent across the country, and that schools, teachers and students in all schools and neighborhoods have the necessary resources to succeed.

In 2014, via the National Urban League’s 360-degree Put Our Children 1st television, radio, digital and social media platform, the Urban League Movement took an aggressive public posture in support of higher education standards (widely referred to as Common Core State Standards) and improved accountability combined with equitable resources and implementation... (To learn more about the campaign, visit www.putourchildren1st.org.)

In 2015, our stake in the ground around education continues to deepen... For the first time in the history of the State of Black America report, in addition to the National Equality Index™ and Metro Equality Index Rankings, we have included a 50-State Education Equality Index and ranking of Black-White and Hispanic-White equality in educational achievement...

We are a nation that has to confront today’s challenges with a clear understanding of our past. This is our work, and we will succeed because we are resilient—buoyed by our victories of yesterday, our progress of today and our hopes for tomorrow.

The time is now, and as long as justice is challenged on any front, we will keep pushing on every front.

Read Marc’s full article in the 2015 State of Black America e-book and online at www.stateofblackamerica.org.
President Obama opened his January 2015 State of the Union address touting a lower unemployment rate than before the financial crisis, more children graduating than ever before and more people insured than ever before. While each of these milestones is reflected in the 2015 National Urban League Equality Index, it also tells a less popular, though all too familiar, story of persistent racial disparities in American life.

**BLACK–WHITE**

The 2015 Equality Index of Black America stands at 72.2 percent compared to a revised 2014 index of 71.5 percent. The largest increases in this year’s index were in the areas of social justice (from 56.9% to 60.6%) and health (from 78.2% to 79.8%) with only a small increase in economics (from 55.4% to 55.8%). The education (from 76.7% to 76.1%) and civic engagement (from 104.7% to 104%) indexes both declined slightly.

The increase in the social justice index was the result of fewer Blacks being victims of violent crimes and fewer Black high school students carrying weapons, while at the same time, the rates for white high school students increased. The increase in the health index resulted from increased health care coverage for Blacks since the Affordable Care Act went into effect and a decline in binge drinking among Blacks, while the rates for whites continued to climb.

The small increase in the economics index was the result of improvements in the income, poverty and home loan denial gaps. The unemployment and homeownership gaps widened.

**HISPANIC–WHITE**

The 2015 Equality Index of Hispanic America stands at 77.7 percent compared to a revised 2014 index of 75.8 percent. The increase in the Hispanic–White index resulted from improvements in all categories, except civic engagement. The greatest gains were in social justice (from 66.1% to 72.7%) and health (from 102.4% to 106.9%), followed by education (from 73.2% to 74.6%) and economics (from 60.6% to 61.7%). The civic engagement index declined modestly from 71.2 percent to 71.0 percent.

The large increase in the social justice index resulted from a lower Hispanic incarceration rate and fewer Hispanic high school students carrying firearms.

The increase in the health index was a result of lower death rates among Hispanics and increased health care coverage.

**EQUALITY INDEX OF BLACK AMERICA, 2014–2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REVISED 2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUALITY INDEX</strong></td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>104.7%</td>
<td>104.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQUALITY INDEX OF HISPANIC AMERICA, 2014–2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REVISED 2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUALITY INDEX</strong></td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
<td>106.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Last year, the National Urban League introduced rankings of unemployment and income equality between whites, Blacks and Latinos in the nation’s largest metropolitan areas. Comparison of the 2014 and 2015 Metro Unemployment Equality Index rankings reveals that there was quite a bit of shuffling of metros at the top of the list. In the Black–White rankings, only three of the cities in last year’s top 10 were also in this year’s top 10. In the Hispanic–White rankings, only four of last year’s top 10 metros remained at the top of this year’s list. On the other hand, many of the metros at the bottom of last year’s rankings remained at the bottom of this year’s rankings as well.

These patterns seem to represent differences in the pace of recovery across the country as metros at the top of the list averaged larger improvements in unemployment rates than those at the bottom of the list.

The tables herein highlight major cities, as well as the most & least equal metropolitan areas and those with highest & lowest unemployment.


BLACK–WHITE UNEMPLOYMENT EQUALITY
With an index of 65 percent, the smallest Black–White unemployment gap was in the Providence–Warwick, RI–MA metro area where the Black unemployment rate was 13 percent and the white rate was 8.5 percent. Last year’s most equal metro—Augusta–Richmond County, GA–SC—fell to #13 this year as the Black unemployment rate increased from 13 percent to 17 percent, and the white unemployment rate was essentially unchanged.

Similar to the 2014 rankings, the 2015 rankings reveal that metros with the greatest unemployment equality are not necessarily the metros with the best employment outcomes for either group. The metro with the lowest unemployment rate for both Blacks and whites (7.5 percent and 3.8 percent, respectively) was Omaha–Council Bluffs, NE–IA, #16 in the equality ranking. The metro with the highest Black unemployment rate (23 percent) was Toledo, OH, #60 in the equality ranking. Riverside–San Bernardino–Ontario, CA registered the highest white unemployment rate (10.8 percent) and came in at #4 in the equality ranking.

HISPANIC–WHITE UNEMPLOYMENT EQUALITY
With an index of 148 percent, Deltona–Daytona Beach–Ormond Beach, FL topped the Hispanic–White metro unemployment rankings this year. Deltona was up from #29 last year due to a large drop in the Hispanic unemployment rate (from 9.4 percent to 5.8 percent). In addition to Deltona, there were four other metros with a Hispanic–White unemployment index greater than 100, indicating that the Hispanic unemployment rate was lower than the white unemployment—Indianapolis–Carmel–Anderson, IN, Lakeland–Winter Haven, FL, New Orleans–Metairie, LA and Nashville–Davidson–Murfreesboro–Franklin, TN. Last year’s #1—Memphis, TN—fell to #33 this year as the Hispanic unemployment rate more than doubled (from 3.8 percent to 8.2 percent).

Since unemployment disparities between Latinos and whites have narrowed more than those between Blacks and whites during the recovery, lower unemployment rates and greater unemployment equality seemed to be more closely linked. The metro with the lowest Hispanic unemployment rate (5.3 percent) was Indianapolis–Carmel–Anderson, IN, #2 in the ranking. The metro with the highest Hispanic unemployment rate (20.8 percent) was Modesto, CA at #59 in the ranking.

NOTES
1 The unemployment and income data used for the Metro Index rankings comes from the American Community Survey (ACS). The 2015 Metro Index is based on data from the 2013 ACS (most recent) and the 2014 Metro Index is based on data from the 2012 ACS.
## 2015 METRO AREAS UNEMPLOYMENT EQUALITY

### Black–White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 METROS FROM 2015</th>
<th>2015 Rank</th>
<th>Black Rate*</th>
<th>White Rate*</th>
<th>Black–White Index</th>
<th>2014 Rank</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence–Warwick, RI–MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha–Council Bluffs, NE–IA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York–Newark–Jersey City, NY–NJ–PA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans–Metairie, LA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami–Fort Lauderdale–West Palm Beach, FL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia–Camden–Wilmington, PA–NJ–DE–MD</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston–Cambridge–Newton, MA–NH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas–Fort Worth–Arlington, TX</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta–Sandy Springs–Roswell, GA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore–Columbia–Towson, MD</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte–Concord–Gastonia, NC–SC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach–Norfolk–Newport News, VA–NC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston–The Woodlands–Sugar Land, TX</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO–KS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington–Arlington–Alexandria, DC–VA–MD–WV</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit–Warren–Dearborn, MI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO–IL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago–Naperville–Elgin, IL–IN–WI</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland–Elyria, OH</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hispanic–White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 METROS FROM 2015</th>
<th>2015 Rank</th>
<th>Hispanic Rate*</th>
<th>White Rate*</th>
<th>Hispanic–White Index</th>
<th>2014 Rank</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deltona–Daytona Beach–Ormond Beach, FL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>148%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis–Carmel–Anderson, IN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside–San Bernardino–Ontario, CA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami–Fort Lauderdale–West Palm Beach, FL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego–Carlsbad, CA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas–Fort Worth–Arlington, TX</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston–The Woodlands–Sugar Land, TX</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco–Oakland–Hayward, CA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix–Mesa–Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago–Naperville–Elgin, IL–IN–WI</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York–Newark–Jersey City, NY–NJ–PA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver–Aurora–Lakewood, CO</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia–Camden–Wilmington, PA–NJ–DE–MD</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto, CA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio–New Braunfels, TX</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose–Sunnyvale–Santa Clara, CA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford–West Hartford–East Hartford, CT</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike the Black–White unemployment equality rankings, the Black–White Income Equality Index rankings were relatively stable between 2014 and 2015. Six of last year’s top 10 metros were again in the top 10 this year. On the other hand, the Hispanic–White rankings were less stable with only four of last year’s top 10 appearing at the top of this year’s list. Nationally, Hispanic households experienced the largest increase in median household income between 2012 and 2013. The extent to which this growth was concentrated in certain metros could help explain why there may have been more shuffling in the Hispanic–White ranking.

The tables herein highlight major cities, as well as the most & least equal metropolitan areas and those with highest & lowest income.

## 2015 METRO AREAS INCOME EQUALITY

### Black-White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42,782</td>
<td>60,376</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45,205</td>
<td>58,065</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami–Fort Lauderdale–West Palm Beach, FL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36,869</td>
<td>58,672</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36,124</td>
<td>59,877</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte–Concord–Gastonia, NC-SC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,630</td>
<td>58,539</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36,518</td>
<td>63,770</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach–Norfolk–Newport News, VA-NC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40,567</td>
<td>65,475</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41,478</td>
<td>66,066</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta–Sandy Springs–Roswell, GA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41,872</td>
<td>68,595</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42,052</td>
<td>68,150</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston–Cambridge–Newton, MA-NH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48,326</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43,844</td>
<td>79,666</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington–Arlington–Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64,663</td>
<td>108,254</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63,617</td>
<td>108,111</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore–Columbia–Towson, MD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47,866</td>
<td>80,573</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44,283</td>
<td>81,630</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas–Fort Worth–Arlington, TX</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40,258</td>
<td>71,415</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40,084</td>
<td>71,672</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40,865</td>
<td>77,133</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39,643</td>
<td>74,914</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston–The Woodlands–Sugar Land, TX</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40,668</td>
<td>76,775</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40,699</td>
<td>76,269</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York–Newark–Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44,156</td>
<td>83,457</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45,105</td>
<td>83,027</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia–Camden–Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36,802</td>
<td>71,916</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>72,132</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31,214</td>
<td>61,254</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28,905</td>
<td>60,453</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit–Warren-Dearborn, MI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30,152</td>
<td>60,079</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>58,350</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago–Elyria, OH</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34,320</td>
<td>71,910</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34,152</td>
<td>71,897</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans–Metairie, LA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27,893</td>
<td>60,070</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29,747</td>
<td>59,145</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21,699</td>
<td>49,333</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21,352</td>
<td>49,445</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco–Oakland–Hayward, CA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39,902</td>
<td>95,285</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41,332</td>
<td>91,736</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Household Income, 2013 Dollars

## 2015 METRO AREAS INCOME EQUALITY

### Hispanic–White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECT METROS FROM 2015</th>
<th>2015 Rank</th>
<th>Hispanic Income, Dollars*</th>
<th>White Income, Dollars*</th>
<th>Hispanic–White Index</th>
<th>2014 Rank</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deltona–Daytona Beach–Ormond Beach, FL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,308</td>
<td>42,473</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38,473</td>
<td>47,217</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47,196</td>
<td>60,376</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46,564</td>
<td>58,065</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami–Fort Lauderdale–West Palm Beach, FL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41,547</td>
<td>58,672</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41,057</td>
<td>59,877</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39,924</td>
<td>56,483</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38,470</td>
<td>57,029</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35,596</td>
<td>51,598</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36,180</td>
<td>56,023</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego–Carlsbad, CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46,875</td>
<td>70,302</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45,381</td>
<td>67,359</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix–Mesa–Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38,704</td>
<td>58,591</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39,293</td>
<td>58,580</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio–New Braunfels, TX</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42,377</td>
<td>65,435</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42,642</td>
<td>66,595</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago–Naperville–Elgin, IL-IN-WI</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45,349</td>
<td>71,910</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46,535</td>
<td>71,897</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington–Arlington–Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65,736</td>
<td>108,254</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64,685</td>
<td>108,111</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver–Aurora–Lakewood, CO</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42,071</td>
<td>70,593</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42,511</td>
<td>70,396</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco–Oakland–Hayward, CA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56,269</td>
<td>95,285</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52,350</td>
<td>91,736</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose–Sunnyvale–Santa Clara, CA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59,150</td>
<td>100,281</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56,087</td>
<td>101,317</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45,202</td>
<td>77,133</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45,505</td>
<td>74,914</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas–Fort Worth–Arlington, TX</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41,622</td>
<td>71,415</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40,850</td>
<td>71,672</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands–Sugar Land, TX</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43,020</td>
<td>76,775</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42,759</td>
<td>76,269</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York–Newark–Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42,981</td>
<td>83,457</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41,685</td>
<td>83,027</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia–Camden–Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36,365</td>
<td>71,916</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36,689</td>
<td>72,132</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24,781</td>
<td>60,505</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21,057</td>
<td>59,380</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford–West Hartford-East Hartford, CT</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30,453</td>
<td>75,475</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32,569</td>
<td>76,334</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Household Income, 2013 Dollars
NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

2015

STATE EDUCATION

EQUALITY INDEX™
New to this year’s Equality Index is a state-level education index. This portion of the index features achievement indicators based on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading and math test scores for grades 4 and 8, and high school graduation rates. These indicators are supported by additional data on some of the factors that can help to narrow these gaps, including teacher quality, pre-school and course enrollment, and student status and risk factors.


Figures depicting Black-White and Hispanic-White reading and math proficiency gaps as well as high school graduation gaps are presented throughout this section. These figures provide a simple way of summarizing and comparing achievement gaps across states.
READING PROFICIENCY GAPS

Reading proficiency gaps (measured by the Index) represent the percentage of Black (or Latino) students testing at or above proficient for their grade level in reading relative to the percentage of white students testing at or above proficient. As shown in Figures A and B, the largest grade 4 reading proficiency gaps were in the District of Columbia (DC) with a Black–White index of 19 percent and a Hispanic–White index of 30 percent. Among DC 4th graders, 14.7 percent of blacks, 76.6 percent of whites and 22.8 percent of Hispanic students tested at or above proficient in reading.

The smallest Black–White reading proficiency gap was in Hawaii, where the index was 81 percent. Among Hawaii 4th graders, 37.1 percent of Blacks and 45.7 percent of whites tested at or above proficient in reading. With an index of 75 percent, the smallest Hispanic–White reading proficiency gap was in Kentucky. Among Kentucky 4th graders, 29.4 percent of Hispanics and 39.2 percent of whites tested at or above proficient in reading.

Comparing the progression of these gaps between grades 4 and 8, we find that the Hispanic–White reading proficiency gap was more likely to narrow than the Black–White gap. The Hispanic–White reading index improved between grades 4 and 8 in 32 out of 47 states, while the Black–White reading index improved in only 16 out of 46 states. Greater improvement among Latino students may be partially attributed to increased English language proficiency among students for whom English is a second language as they progress through school.

MATH PROFICIENCY GAPS

Math proficiency gaps were measured in the same way as reading proficiency gaps. In this case, the Index measures the percentage of Black (or Latino) students testing at or above proficient for their grade level in math relative to the percentage of white students testing at or above proficient. As shown in Figure C, the largest grade 4 Black–White math proficiency gap was in Wisconsin with an index of 21 percent, and the smallest gap was in West Virginia with an index of 69 percent. Among Wisconsin 4th graders, 12.1 percent of Black students and 56.9 percent of white students tested at or above proficient in math. Though the gap between white and Black 4th graders in West Virginia was smaller, math achievement for both races was lower. Among West Virginia 4th graders, 24.7 percent of Blacks and 35.6 percent of whites tested at or above proficient in math.

Figure D shows math proficiency gaps for Latino students. The largest Hispanic–White math proficiency gap was in the District of Columbia with an index of 27 percent and the smallest gap was in Louisiana where the index was 72 percent. Among DC 4th graders, 23.3 percent of Hispanics and 87.7 percent of whites tested at or above proficient in math. Among Louisiana 4th graders, 28.9 percent of Hispanic students and 40 percent of white students tested at or above proficient in math.

Based on the progression of these gaps between grades 4 and 8, we find that both Blacks and Latinos saw less narrowing of math gaps than of reading gaps. Black–White math proficiency gaps improved in only 9 of 45 states, while Hispanic–White gaps improved in just 13 of 47 states. This limited progression is consistent with the fact that more advanced mathematical concepts are built upon concepts that are learned earlier. So, unless targeted interventions are made, students who struggle with math in grade 4 are likely to continue to face challenges in later grades.
High school graduation gaps are based on the percentage of entering freshman who graduated high school. The index is measured as the Black (or Latino) graduation rate relative to the white graduation rate. Figure E presents both Black-White and Hispanic-White graduation gaps. The largest Black-White graduation gap was in Nebraska with an index of 65 percent. In Nebraska, 57.6 percent of Black high school freshmen graduate high school, compared to 88.8 percent of whites. The smallest graduation gap was in Vermont with an index of 111 percent, indicating that the Black graduation rate actually exceeded the white graduation rate. In Vermont, 100 percent of Black freshmen graduate from high school, compared to 89.9 percent of whites. In fact, Black students had a higher graduation rate than whites in three other states as well—Maine, Arizona and North Dakota—all of which have relatively small black populations.

Consistent with findings on the largest Hispanic-White gaps in reading and math proficiency, the largest Hispanic-White graduation gap was also in the District of Columbia, where the index was 67 percent. In DC, 58.5 percent of Hispanic freshman graduate high school, compared to 87.8 percent of whites. The smallest gap was in Maine, with an index of 117 percent. In Maine, 96.1 percent of Hispanic freshmen graduate high school, compared to 82.4 percent of whites. Hispanic students also had higher graduation rates than whites in six other states—Vermont, Alaska, Louisiana, New Hampshire, Hawaii and Arkansas.

INTERPRETING THE STATE EDUCATION INDEX RESULTS

Educational outcomes are determined by a multitude of factors, many of which cannot be narrowed down to or captured by a few numbers. The State Education Index does not measure the cause of racial achievement gaps; rather, it presents a comparison of these gaps across states based on NAEP scores, a commonly used, standardized measure of student achievement, and high school graduation rates.

Still, some notable patterns emerge from this year’s data. The smallest gaps were commonly found in states with relatively small minority populations and in cases where test scores were relatively low for each group—white, Black or Hispanic. Higher graduation rates for Black and Latino students were also found in states where these groups are a smaller share of the population.

On average, larger gaps were present in states with large urban areas that are home to large minority populations that live in highly segregated neighborhoods with excessive rates of concentrated high poverty. This is important because racially and economically segregated neighborhoods create similarly segregated schools, a fact that remains even 60 years after Brown v. Board of Education. In fact, the majority of Black and Latino students enter kindergarten in highly segregated schools where nearly half of their peers live in poverty. On average, students in these heavily minority, high poverty schools are less prepared when they start in the fall and make less progress (relative to the average) over the course of the year than those in low poverty schools.

Universal early childhood education is commonly proposed as a way to start students out on more equal footing. The data presented in the State Education Index table show that similar shares of white, Black and Hispanic children were enrolled in pre-school, and in fact in some states, Black and Hispanic children had higher enrollment rates than whites. Since only a handful of states offer universal pre-k, the wider the divide in family economic status, the more likely it is that children with different backgrounds attend pre-schools of different quality and have varying early learning experiences.

Policies aimed at providing universal high-quality early childhood education, effectively integrating neighborhoods, and promoting full employment are critical to reducing the socio-economic barriers that limit student achievement for children of color. These policies should be combined with others aimed at directly improving the quality of America’s public K-12 education system for all students.

Lastly, while our analysis identified the significant Black-White-Latino gaps in education across the country, we must all recognize that the nation is struggling overall. There even appears to be a similarly significant gap between all students and what is considered proficiency. Strategies, supports and investments must be developed and implemented that close subgroup gaps in opportunity and achievement, but the nation must also consider which set of strategies, supports and investments are necessary to make all students proficient and truly bring about excellence and equity at scale.

On average, larger gaps were present in states with large urban areas that are home to large minority populations that live in highly segregated neighborhoods with excessive rates of concentrated high poverty. This is important because racially and economically segregated neighborhoods create similarly segregated schools...
“Transportation is a reflection of any society’s value system. Roads can be built to divide or they can be built to bring communities together...we have an opportunity to build better than we ever have: highways that enhance connections, not divisions; transit systems that bring people to jobs—and even jobs to people; air service and rail service that move us ever faster, cheaper and safer; neighborhoods that are always safe to walk and bike in, in part, because there are sidewalks, crosswalks and streetlights. That’s the work ahead, building a transportation system that reflects not our past—but our brightest ideals.”

“Mayors of major American cities are on the front lines of ensuring that the state of Black America is strong. In 2015, we continue to confront issues that challenge our cities—African-American unemployment, affordable housing, unequal justice and gaps in educational opportunity...While growing gaps in income, good jobs, education, housing and opportunity stand in the breach, my administration is committed to developing an agenda to turn them around...I understand the great responsibility of leading the nation’s capital at this time. It is my duty to focus on those who have been left behind, as well as to find hope where it is missing and the path to opportunity where it has been lost.”

“There’s no more compelling data to show how little we value the lives of Black children in this country than the statistics that show the current state of their academic achievement. Essentially, we are systematically denying young Black kids the quality education that will ensure they can grow to be productive members of society. After all, U.S. schools are twice as likely to pair poor and minority students with brand new teachers and almost four times more likely to suspend Black students than white students. Our present education system is dooming our children’s future...The good news is it doesn’t have to be this way.”

“Gary, Indiana has often been referred to as one of the country’s legacy cities. This term recognizes the city’s contribution as the birthplace of the world’s largest steel mill and the devastating impact associated with the decline of steel and related industries. While Gary’s legacy has been a double-edged sword, since 2012 our New Day Administration has been building on the rich history of this city and creating new opportunities... Through the cultivation of partners in government, the private sector and the non-profit arena, the New Day Administration is working to create a new legacy for Gary, Indiana—one that will sustain generations.”

“When I first got called by the family of Michael Brown, an unarmed Black teenager...I wondered what could have possibly caused another Black man to be shot and killed by the police. I hoped that the criminal justice system would provide the answers...but as in other cases such as this one, the officer (e.g. the shooter) was exonerated by the grand jury...The symbiotic relationship between the Prosecuting Attorney and law enforcement, as well as the unbridled autonomy of the Prosecuting Attorney in the secrecy of a grand jury proceeding, often bar access to justice for people of color in these cases. We cannot afford to continue to trust their discretion.”

“The statistics paint a bleak picture, but they may not tell the entire story. What I clearly see is hope. The barriers created through racism are as prevalent as ever in the United States, but I sense that this is a special moment for our nation...if we want black children to have opportunities to succeed, we must intensify efforts to address the root causes of the education, health, housing and wealth disparities that their families face. We also cannot overlook the need to confront the racism that erects barriers in our communities. Multiple sectors in our society can mobilize to break down the barriers. It is happening in isolated instances and communities; now we must join together to initiate ways to expand it.”
“One of the main reasons I went into the entertainment business was to create positive images of African Americans in film and television. I grew up watching television and going to the movies. While I was conscious of the fact that I seldom saw myself in the images that were projected on screen, it wasn’t until I was older that I understood what that really meant. Those images did not just dictate how I viewed myself, I eventually learned that they very clearly influenced how the outside world viewed me and others like me...Now, whether some of the early images that we fought for here in Hollywood helped African Americans be better accepted in the world at large, or vice versa, is debatable. However, regardless of being the chicken or the egg, we can claim some victory that the images of Blacks in Hollywood have significantly diversified.”

“According to the U.S. Census Bureau, things are rapidly improving, but we have decades of entrepreneurial and economic disparity to contend with in the African-American community...I believe that business ownership is a must to truly dictate the long-term success and trajectory of one’s life, family and generations to come. In fact, it is African-American business ownership that will save our communities by stimulating the economy, generating jobs and decreasing crime. In short, the true color of freedom is green...So, how do we continue to change the tide, rebuild the Black financial ecosystem and sustain Black-owned businesses?”

“Unfortunately, although the Court outlawed segregation, it is still a reality today—and Brown v. Board of Education wasn’t simply about segregation. The Court wrote: ‘In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity...is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms...’ The Justices were unanimous and they were unequivocal: equal opportunity in education is a constitutional right of all students. Yet that right to equal opportunity is still being denied to millions of students...This disparity in opportunity is illegal, immoral and costly for our nation.”

“Our children cannot aspire to be what they cannot see. They need to see the many options before them of what they can do and who they can be. They need to know that they can make pacts like we did and understand that when they focus on education and college or university completion, they too can rise above and overcome their circumstances. But they cannot do this on their own. We need everyone—parents, teachers, mentors, celebrities—to help us do this...We compete daily with negative messaging from every side telling our children what they cannot achieve. Let’s fight back with the innovative, inspirational messaging that our children deserve.”
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