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CHAPTER 1: BUILDING INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES: WORKING STATEWIDE

1.1 BUILDING INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW

Building Integrated Communities (BIC) is a community planning process used to develop comprehensive immigrant integration plans with city government and immigrant leaders. This initiative is a collaboration between the Institute for the Study of the Americas and the School of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Human Relations Commissions in three pilot communities in North Carolina. This program emerged to provide communities that want to be more welcoming and inclusive the toolsets to incorporate their immigrant population.

Since 2010, BIC has formed Community Integration Commissions in the City of Highpoint, the City of Greenville, and Orange County. These commissions, made up of elected officials, immigrant leaders, and other community stakeholders, serve to develop strategies to improve communication and trust between immigrants, city agencies, and law enforcement officials. Communities were chosen to participate though an RFP application process based in part on willingness of elected officials to expand opportunities for sustained immigrant leadership and civic engagement.

1.2 OUR PROCESS

After application approval, the BIC team at UNC Chapel Hill conducted research to identify demographic characteristics and assess needs of immigrant and refugee communities in each pilot site. We then facilitated a series of preparation meetings with city officials to begin identifying stakeholders and coordinating outreach efforts for future stakeholder meetings. Each jurisdiction was responsible for identifying and inviting necessary stakeholders to be present during this process. In preparation for these meetings, BIC staff identified best practices by looking at numerous local immigrant integration policies from across the nation that would be shared with the project sites. Throughout the course of this initiative, these shared practices became modified to better fit the local context through facilitated stakeholder meetings between city officials, immigrant leaders, and local community advocates.

After initial planning was completed and each pilot site outreached to the necessary stakeholders, a series of three workshops were held over the course of a year. Each of these meetings was facilitated by a trained professional with the purpose of creating consensus around specific action strategies that were delineated by the end of the first year through a community action plan. Each plan was tailored to the specific immigrant populations identified in each city (eg. Latino immigrants, refugees from Burma, and other diverse groups) and also to meet stakeholder goals.

In the following year, the pilot sites implemented their short-term actions plans and started the foundations to implement their longer-term strategies. In addition, because frequent evaluation is critical to policy innovation and evolution, the Building Integrated Communities team provided technical assistance in implementing these plans throughout the second year and also in designing evaluation protocols to help communities and scholars understand the effects of these innovative strategies in all stages of the three-year process.
The Building Integrated Communities team consisted of five core members that supported this multi-step and multi-year process:

- A professional facilitator helped lead all stakeholder meetings and construct an inclusive environment to engage in effective citizen participation.

- An Anthropologist, studying immigration to North Carolina at the Institute for the Study of the Americas at UNC-CH worked to coordinate the Building Integrated Communities Initiative.

- An Urban Planner specializing in working with underserved and vulnerable populations, especially around community development, provided presentations on best practices and expertise on local immigration policies.

- A program coordinator for BIC to help document and facilitate communication, as well as assist with logistics with the Building Integrated Communities project sites.

- A graduate student in City and Regional Planning provided information about best practices and worked to develop program evaluation materials.

**SOURCE: BUILDING INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE, 2012**
CHAPTER TWO:
OUR WORK IN GREENVILLE

2.1 OVERVIEW

Building Integrated Communities was a joint venture between the City of Greenville, the Greenville Human Relations Council, a board of local community leaders, the Institute for the Study of the Americas, the School of Government at UNC-Chapel Hill and their partners.

In February of 2011, the City of Greenville applied to be a pilot site in the Building Integrated Communities Initiative. In the application materials they expressed their interest in being part of this program to continue the work already started on their own. In particular, the work of the Human Relations Council (HRC), a board of community leaders had already spearheaded efforts to build an integrated community: a dialogue a few years ago to understand what inclusiveness meant in their community. In addition, the HRC had previously completed diversity training that also led to dialogues with the growing Islamic community in Greenville, an effort to engage youth in anti-bullying programs, and development of a program to bridge concerns about immigrant health. Greenville entered the BIC program with the hopes of making Greenville “an inclusive community where trust, acceptance, fairness, and equity are community norms” (BIC Application, 2011).

The application materials also showed the support institutions available for participating in this program and research that had already occurred to understand the needs of the underserved in their area. The representation from the City in this process would be mainly through the Human Relations Council, which boasts a current multi-ethnic and diverse body of members. Greenville also cited strong bonds with East Carolina University, Pitt Community College, the Association of Mexicans in North Carolina (AMEXCAN), and the Eastern North Carolina Latin America Coalition.

Although slightly outdated at the time of application, Greenville also included the Pitt County Health and Human Services needs assessment, Pitt County Voices, completed in 2006. This study was commissioned by the United Way of Pitt County and was conducted by East Carolina University’s Center for Survey Research and Regional Development Institute. The extensive survey administered to services providers, residents, and through community forums elucidated a number of issues facing the underserved. Although the responses were disparate, issues of crime, health, primary and secondary education, poverty, public transportation, and youth involvement dominated. The report has very little data directly relevant to immigrant and refugee communities. However, there are similarities in the challenges faced by immigrant and refugee communities and the survey population.

The BIC initiative was launched in Greenville in May 2011 to examine the challenges that immigrants experience and to take a look at the city’s efforts to build a community that welcomes immigrants and help them adjust to life. In particular, the driving mission for the city and HRC to enter this program was to “improve relationships and public safety.” Initial positive outcomes desired by the applicants were listed as:
“Make all citizens, including newcomers feel welcome.

Provide opportunities for all citizens to come together to learn, celebrate, and respect the various mosaics of culture [sic] that represent our community.

Improve the quality of life in Greenville for all citizens through consensus building and leadership development.

Identify and attract the involvement of more stakeholders.

Establish a process that will ensure citizens will be fully engaged.

To develop an action plan within the second year of the initiative.”

(BIC Application, 2011)

Greenville also stressed additional importance on “building relationships” and highlighted the already identified presence of a “strong network of stakeholders we would work to bring to the table” (BIC Application, 2011). The application also included four commitment letters from major partners including one from East Carolina University, two from Pitt Community College, and the Mayor of Greenville (BIC Application, 2011).

2.2 THE IMMIGRANT EXPERIENCE IN GREENVILLE

In order to get a sense for key issues facing Greenville’s immigrant/refugee communities, Building Integrated Communities staff conducted interviews with representatives in 12 different organizations in the Greenville area that serve immigrants and refugees. BIC also mapped assets in Greenville that currently exist for immigrant and refugee populations and analyzed demographic data from the most recent 2010 census. Their findings resonated with the previous research conducted by the city in Pitt County Voices.

2.2A UNDERSTANDING NEEDS: PITTCOUNTY AND GREENVILLE INTERVIEWS

The BIC staff contacted Greenville stakeholders for a semi-structured telephone interview generally lasting about half an hour. The questions addressed the most pressing issues facing the immigrant and refugee communities in the city, their causes, and possible solutions (Appendix Document 2). While there was a list of questions, they were fairly open-ended. In some cases, participants shared further information or responded to follow-up questions by e-mail.

Representatives were contacted from the following organizations: AMEXCAN, City of Greenville, College of Education, ECU, Greenville Human Relations Commission, Interfaith Refugee Ministry, NC Domestic Violence Commission (member), Pitt Community College, St. Paul’s Episcopal Church, School of Social Work, ECU, and United Way.
Results indicated that Greenville had a variety of community assets and support institutions in place that already catered to the immigrant population but critical issues still remained. Respondents answered that the key community assets included:

- **Human capital**: Greenville residents had a variety of life experiences, skills, and cultures of immigrants and refugees and also the dedication of volunteers and activists in community.

- **Support Institutions**: Respondents predominately mentioned AMEXCAN (The Association of Mexicans in North Carolina), an organization that promotes the active participation of Mexicans and Latinos in their new communities and encourage the appreciation, understanding, and prosperity of the Mexican and Latino community in Greenville and Pitt County.

- **Educational system**: Pitt Community College, in particular, provides ESL, job training, and mentoring programs to immigrant and refugees in the area.

While the numbers of community assets are valuable, respondents also highlighted a number of existing problems in two main areas:

- **Lack of access to services**: This particularly refers to Latino immigrants since refugees were described as receiving more support because of their access to legal status and refugee program resources.

- **Lack of information and communication**: There is a lack of communication and interaction between the immigrant and the host communities.

Many respondents saw these two problem areas as linked. For example, service providers lacked cultural and linguistic knowledge that would help them to better serve immigrant communities or immigrants lacked information on how to access services. Respondents also cited numerous causes for these problems: primarily the lack of bilingual and bicultural skills from service providers, the lack of data about immigrants needs, and the lack of a forum or infrastructure for people to learn about each other. In addition, lack of capital and capacity in social service programs and support for newcomers when they initially arrive in the community were also seen as critical issues.

Respondents did offer solution to tackle these that consisted mainly of mutual outreach, education, and leadership development between the general population and the local immigrant community.

This aggregated category can be subdivided into three groups (Andrew, 2012):

- Outreach, education, and leadership development for immigrant community (3 respondents)
- Outreach, education, and leadership development for general community (2 respondents)
- Institutionalized outreach, education, and leadership development through staff dedicated specifically to that end (1 respondent)
Respondents also cited the need for bilingual and bicultural training for service providers and data gathering within the immigrant community so that people can be protagonists in identifying needs and solutions for future projects.

2.3 UNDERSTANDING GREENVILLE DEMOGRAPHICS: QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION

To better understand Greenville and its residents, BIC staff created a profile based on available secondary data. The following is a more extensive assessment of Greenville and its residents based on current data from the Census, the Bureau or Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The following analysis is based on the Greenville Metro area, not the City of Greenville exclusively, because there is evidence that many of the immigrant and refugee population live outside of the city limits.

Greenville is an increasingly diverse area with many residents moving to enjoy the beautiful landscapes, a high quality of life, and education and economic opportunities. Greenville is the health, entertainment, and education hub of North Carolina’s Tidewater and Coastal Plain regions and is considered the tenth largest city in North Carolina based on population. Because it serves as the home to Eastern Carolina University, Forbes Magazine recently named it one of the “100 Best Communities for Young People” according to America’s Promise Alliance and one of the “Best Places for Business and Careers.”

POPULATION

The city's official population as of the 2010 United States Census is 84,554 (up from 60,385 in 2000) residents but the Greenville Metro Area includes around 183,000 people. Of these residents 52 percent are females and 48 percent are males. In 2010, the median age of Greenville residents was 31.7 years. Greenville is the Home of East Carolina University and Vidant Medical Center, one of the largest hospitals in North Carolina and employs over 6,000 people. Greenville is also home to many families with twenty-three percent of the population being under the age of 18 years and 10 percent was 65 years and older. Figure 2.1 shows further general demographic information for the Greenville metro area and Pitt County.

The Greenville metro area is home to a diverse community. Minorities, as a whole, make up a large portion of the population, with the African-American community being the largest group at 36% of the total number of residents. The immigrant or foreign-born population, while still relatively small, has increased in recent years. While this is true for all groups, the Hispanic population, in particular, has trended upward in recent years. When considering immigrant populations, it is worth keeping in mind that these groups, and particularly Hispanics, tend to be undercounted. The following are the five main causes hypothesized to cause the Hispanic undercount:

1) disbelief in the confidentiality of the census; 2) distrust of government authorities (Brownrigg and Martin 1989); 3) fear of losing public assistance; 4) fear of deportation among undocumented immigrants; and 5) cultural differences in defining household structure (Harwood 1970, cited by de la Puente 1990; Bourgois 1990; Rodríguez and Hagan 1991).

(Duany 1992: 1)
Figures 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 provide more detailed information on the immigrant population.

FIGURE 2.1: GREENVILLE DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Greenville 2010</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Pitt County 2010</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>60,476</td>
<td>84,554</td>
<td>39.81</td>
<td>133,798</td>
<td>168,148</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in NC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27,997</td>
<td>38,762</td>
<td>38.45</td>
<td>63,441</td>
<td>79,360</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32,479</td>
<td>45,792</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td>70,357</td>
<td>88,788</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37,133</td>
<td>47,579</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>83,061</td>
<td>99,075</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20,649</td>
<td>31,272</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>45,019</td>
<td>57,257</td>
<td>27.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Ind./Alaska Nat.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>67.40</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>63.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Islander</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>83.19</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>80.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>143.70</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>5,136</td>
<td>113.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>138.05</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>133.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>155.87</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>9,202</td>
<td>118.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>164.52</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>114.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>203.89</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>158.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>117.65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>122.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>128.07</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>114.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 0 – 17</td>
<td>11,375</td>
<td>15,832</td>
<td>39.18</td>
<td>31,554</td>
<td>37,798</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 – 64</td>
<td>43,791</td>
<td>61,685</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>89,416</td>
<td>113,731</td>
<td>27.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>12,828</td>
<td>16,619</td>
<td>29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Household</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple Families</td>
<td>7,781</td>
<td>9,762</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>22,794</td>
<td>26,372</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family Households</td>
<td>13,201</td>
<td>19,386</td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>20,302</td>
<td>27,912</td>
<td>37.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE: CENSUS 2010**

FIGURE 2.2: WORLD REGION OF BIRTH OF PITT COUNTY FOREIGN-BORN RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Estimate 2009*</th>
<th>Estimate 2010*</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born population**</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>7,774</td>
<td>27.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>28.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>39.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-6.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE: AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY, 5-YR ESTIMATES, 2009 & 2010**

*American Community Surveys’ five-year reports compile data over a five-year period in order to have a sample size large enough to be statistically valid for smaller communities. Thus numbers are approximate.

**Excluding population born at sea.
FIGURE 2.3: GRAPH OF WORLD REGION OF BIRTH OF PITT COUNTY FOREIGN-BORN RESIDENTS

![Graph of world region of birth of Pitt County foreign-born residents]

**SOURCE:** AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY, 5-YR ESTIMATES, 2009 & 2010

FIGURE 2.4: LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PITT COUNTY FOREIGN-BORN RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 5 years and over</td>
<td>150,623</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>139,842</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than “very well”</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than “very well”</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than “very well”</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander languages</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than “very well”</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than “very well”</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY, 5-YR ESTIMATES, 2009 & 2010
HOUSEHOLDS
According to both the American Community Survey and the Census, in 2010 there were 70,000 households in Greenville, NC Metro Area. The average household size was 2.6 people. Families made up 60 percent of the households in the Greenville Metro Area. This figure includes both married-couple families (41 percent) and other families (19 percent). Of other families, 10 percent are female householder families with no husband present and children under 18 years. Nonfamily households made up 40 percent of all households in the Greenville Metro Area. Most of the nonfamily households were people living alone, but some were composed of people living in households in which no one was related to the householder. Thirty-three percent of all households have one or more persons under the age of 18; 20 percent of all households have one or more persons 65 years and over. A closer examination of Hispanic or Latino households follows as this was the only largely immigrant group that showed any identifiable settlement patterns. This information could facilitate the targeted implementation of programs.
### FIGURE 2.6: TENURE BY LATINO OR HISPANIC ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner-occupied households total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,904</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic or -Latino households</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,743</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renter-occupied households total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,673</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic or -Latino households</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,327</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pitt County householder total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,577</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Census 2010*

### FIGURE 2.7: PERCENTAGE OF RENTER-OCUPIED VS. OWNER-OCUPIED HISPANIC OR LATINO HOMES IN PITT COUNTY, NC

![Pie chart showing the percentage of renter-occupied vs. owner-occupied Hispanic or Latino homes in Pitt County, NC.](image)

*Source: Census 2010*
FIGURE 2.8: Number of Hispanic or Latino Homeowners
This map was created for Building Integrated Communities Research in Pitt County, North Carolina, by DC Million Hill C 2012.

Map displays unit: Census Tract

City of Greenville boundary

75.01 - 100.00%
50.01 - 75.00%
25.01 - 50.00%
> 25.00%
None

This map illustrates the number of homeowners who are Hispanic as a percentage of the total number of homeowners for all ethnicities and races in each census tract in Pitt County.

Note: According to US Census conventions, households are assumed to be Hispanic if the household identifies as Hispanic.

FIGURE 2.9: Hispanic or Latino Homeowners as a Percentage of All Homeowners
FIGURE 2.10: Hispanic or Latino Homeowners as a Percent of All Households
FIGURE 2.11: Number of Hispanic or Latino Renters
Figure 2.12: Hispanic or Latino Renters as a Percentage of All Renters
HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS
In 2010, Greenville, NC Metro Area had a total of 83,000 housing units, 15 percent of which were vacant. Of the total housing units, 54 percent were in single-unit structures, 31 percent were in multi-unit structures, and 15 percent were mobile homes. Fifty-four percent of the housing units were built since 1990. In 2010, there were 70,000 occupied housing units - 41,000 (59 percent) owner occupied and 29,000 (42 percent) renter occupied. Seventy-one percent of householders of these units had moved in since 2000. Seventy-one percent of the owner occupied units had a mortgage.
The median monthly housing costs for mortgaged owners was $1,187, non-mortgaged owners $436, and renters $680. Thirty-three percent of owners with mortgages, 26 percent of owners without mortgages, and 54 percent of renters in the Greenville Metro Area spent 30 percent or more of household income on housing.

FOREIGN BORN
Ninety-five percent of the people living in the Greenville Metro Area in 2010 were native residents of the United States. Sixty-eight percent of these residents were living in the state in which they were born. Only five percent of the people were foreign born.

FIGURE 2.14: GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY OF RESIDENTS OF GREENVILLE, NC METRO AREA

SOURCE: AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY, 2010 1YEAR ESTIMATES
Of the foreign born population, 29 percent were naturalized U.S. citizens, and 56 percent entered the country before the year 2000. Forty-four percent of the foreign born entered the country in 2000 or later. In 2010, 80 percent of the people that were at least one year old were living in the same residence one year earlier.

EDUCATION

In 2010, 26 percent of people 25 years and over had at least graduated from high school and 27 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher. Sixteen percent were dropouts; they were not enrolled in school and had not graduated from high school.

The total school enrollment in Greenville, NC Metro Area was 69,000 in 2010. Nursery school and kindergarten enrollment was 5,800 and elementary or high school enrollment was 29,000 children. College or graduate school enrollment was 34,000.

FIGURE 2.15: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PEOPLE IN GREENVILLE, NC METRO AREA IN 2010

SOURCE: AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY, 2010
ECONOMY & WORKFORCE

In the Greenville Metro Area, 58 percent of the population 16 and over were employed; 33 percent were not currently in the labor force. Seventy-nine percent of the people employed were private wage and salary workers; 17 percent were federal, state, or local government workers; and 4 percent were self-employed in their own (not incorporated) business.

FIGURE 2.16: CIVILIAN EMPLOYED POPULATION IN GREENVILLE METRO AREA 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilian employed population 16 years and over</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>32,725</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>16,384</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>20,651</td>
<td>23.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>8,314</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, 2010

FIGURE 2.17: WORKFORCE BY INDUSTRY IN GREENVILLE METRO AREA, 2010

SOURCE: BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, 2010
Figures 2.16 and 2.17 indicate that the Greenville workforce is concentrated in education and healthcare services. This is most likely because of the large hospital and university presence in the area. Among the civilian non-institutionalized population in Greenville, NC Metro Area in 2010, 85 percent had health insurance coverage and 15 percent did not have health insurance coverage. For those under 18 years of age, 6 percent had no health insurance coverage. Both private and public health insurance, with 66 percent having private coverage and 27 percent having public coverage. In addition, manufacturing and construction also employ a significant number of the workforce, jobs that are often dominated by immigrants.

**INCOME**

The median income of households in Greenville, NC Metro Area was $39,664. Twenty-one percent of households had income below $15,000 a year and 6 percent had income over $150,000 or more. Eighty-one percent of the households received earnings and 13 percent received retirement income other than Social Security. Twenty-three percent of the households received Social Security. The average income from Social Security was $15,084. These income sources are not mutually exclusive; that is, some households received income from more than one source.

In 2010, 26.1 percent of Greenville residents lived below the poverty line, as opposed to 14 percent for the state and 12.3 percent for the nation. This is an increase in the MSA from 20 percent in 2000. Twenty-seven percent of related children under 18 were below the poverty level, compared with 13 percent of people 65 years old and over. Fourteen percent of all families and 35 percent of families with female-headed households had incomes below the poverty level.

**SUMMARY**

This quantitative profile is used for a number of reasons. First, this will help to analyze the general health of the community. Census information helps communities assess the changes in the foreign born population in their community while data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Bureau of Labor Statics help elucidate opportunities for immigrants in the workforce.

**2.4 STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

With the results of this initial analysis and through target outreach, the City of Greenville and the Human Relations Council have hosted five BIC Stakeholders’ meetings on the following dates: Tuesday, May 3, 2011: a Wednesday, June 22, 2011 (conference call); Thursday, October 6, 2011; Friday, November 18, 2011; and Wednesday, February, 8, 2012. Those meetings were held to discuss new ideas and innovative strategies to facilitate a greater understanding between existing (residents) communities and immigrants in the community. Each of these meetings was supported by BIC program staff including the presence of a professional facilitator who helped structure the agendas for each meeting and also facilitated the entirety of each meeting. BIC staff also supplied best practice presentations at each meeting to help inform each community.
2.4A STAKEHOLDER MEETING 1: OCTOBER 26, 2011

Meeting Objective: Define “success” in Civic Engagement and Empowerment

Attendees: There were a total of 20 community stakeholders present at this meeting including the former mayor of the City of Greenville, members of the Human Relations Council, leaders from the immigrant community -- including AMEXCAN, representatives from Pitt Community College, the deputy police chief, representatives from religious institutions, representatives from the Greenville City Council and from the Greenville City Government, including Neighborhood Services.

This facilitated meeting asked stakeholders to develop a vision for the future of Greenville, identify stakeholder resources that can be leveraged, and list three things that would make Greenville a successfully integrated community. The responses to these questions are listed below.

FIGURE 2.18: GREENVILLE VISION FOR THE FUTURE

“Once we are able to engage our new population we will be able to ____ better.”

- Connect to one another and live as fully human as we can.
- Do something good for immigrant children.
- Serve our customers and the new population that we're trying to work together with and be more effective for all of our customers.
- Engage all members of the community to help us, help themselves.
- Serve and support our new populations.
- Empower our students more, show them what's in the community and help them participate more.
- Engage people with one another at the neighborhood level.
- Ensure public safety. I think our biggest challenge in law enforcement understands cultural differences, the culture, and why people behave or do the things they do.
- Face our challenges by focusing on better relationships.
- Engage within the community and in between this community and other communities, including those in other countries.
- Understand the everyday challenges faced by the Hispanic community.
- Include everyone’s perspective in planning programs and making decision on the front-end rather than after-the-fact.
- Utilize the talent that they bring to the community.
- Get many cultures to the table (a more diverse board of health, a more diverse board of education) to create institutional change.
- Engage and do more partnerships with community organizations.

SOURCE: MEETING TRANSCRIPT, MEGHAN ANDREW 2011

The wide variety of stakeholders brought many unique perspectives to the meetings. From the responses listed in Figure 2.1, there is one clear thing: the commitment of the Greenville community in trying to include immigrants and refugees into their community. Their next big task of the meeting was to assess the resources available in the community – and specifically present at that meeting – that could contribute to this initiative.
**Stakeholder resources that would benefit Greenville as a diverse, successful community:**

- Educational institutions in the area including East Carolina University and Pitt Community College. These resources will allow Greenville to share educational information about concepts of race, ethnicity, and culture. These institutions can also be a tool to build greater awareness, connect resources, and disseminate information.

- Human Capital- Greenville has made a commitment to immigrant integration and engaged stakeholders share a common willingness to interact on a personal level and also understand the experiences of others.

- The Faith community in Greenville is extensive and has many immigrant and refugee members. For example, the Interfaith Alliance of Eastern Carolina serves a number of immigrant groups and faith traditions.

- Stakeholders are also willing to invite newcomers to share something of personal significance with others in the community in order to build relationships.

Because of the vast number of community resources present that would enable Greenville to collaborate and come up with solutions, the stakeholders brainstormed initial actions that could be taken to make Greenville an integrated community.

**Three things that will make Greenville a successfully integrated community:**

- Create opportunities for multicultural training and participation in the community.

- Raise sensitivity to the issues that are facing the community by understanding the economic realities of migration and how these groups are contributing to the local community.

- Advocate for those whose voices are not always understood by dispelling immigrant myths.

- More properly harness resources already available in the community through programs or grants available through different organizations.

- Explore and learn about immigrant community to enable effective communication with all residents.

- Increased community relationships through cultural activities.

- Increased immigrant participation in planning and decision making processes.
By the end of the meeting, there was consensus among the stakeholders that rather than create an entire new system for immigrant integration; they should instead build on the existing community assets. The stakeholders decided that the best way to do this was by expanding the already established Greenville “Citizen's Academy” by making it more convenient and more appealing to a variety of communities, not just immigrants. Furthermore, targeted outreach would need to be done to the immigrant and refugee community to increase participation in the existing academy.

They also felt that the Human Relations Council could be a voice of advocacy by being the primary liaisons between the city, county and the immigrant community since it is already a politically recognized body. Others suggest the creation of an immigrant advisory board to support not only the city government but also the immigrant-oriented services already in place.

At the end of the meeting, the group decided test survey the immigrant and refugee population about what would be necessary for a successful citizens academy. The methodology for this focus group would be by connect Pitt Community College ESL students who represent a lot of different groups in Greenville and the citizens' academy and have students describe the issues that they face.

At the end of the day, stakeholders were asked to provide a one-word impression to sum up the day. Their responses included:

- Enthused
- Impressed and tired
- Energized
- Educated
- Excited

2.4B PITT ESL FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS:
While the idea of the citizen or resident academy resonated with many of the stakeholders in the initial meeting, the idea of a focus group was proposed to better understand the needs of the local immigrant community. During the initial meeting, the English As a Second Language instructor at Pitt Community College offered to host this endeavor by using her weekly language classes as a forum. The BIC team, in conjunction with BIC stakeholders, developed a survey (Appendix X) that was discussed in both the morning and evening language class. Fellow participants from the initial BIC stakeholder meeting engaged in facilitating this focus group. Fifty-five students participated in this survey with the average age being 37.4 years old. The native languages of these survey respondents were Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Thai, Ukrainian, and Vietnamese.
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION:
The immigrants in the focus group indicated that they do participate in community activities. They are frequent visitors of parks, go shopping, and visit downtown Greenville. To do so, their primary means of transportation is a bus, if they are not using their own car. They are also active in the community by working locally and have children who attend local schools. In addition, they also contribute to Greenville by recycling, going to the library, and volunteering in their free time. While there is a lot of active participation, one respondent commented that “I’m interested in participating, but not sure how” indicating the need for better communication to enhance community participation.

Bus + Parks + Schools + Shopping + Downtown + Fairs + Employment +

Recycling + Libraries + Volunteering

SERVICE ACCESSIBILITY
When asked what would make city services more accessible to the immigrant community, respondents highlighted a number of key issues. Many underscored the importance of quality transportation in order to access city-sponsored services. They also wanted more a visible police and firefighter presence that is connected through outreach to the immigrant community. One respondent noted that “Hispanics tend to hide, we need a better relationship with police.” Respondents also noted that attractions in parks, especially free ones, could be a fruitful mode of outreach between city agencies and the immigrant population.

Transportation + police /firefighter presence + attractions in parks

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Respondents answered that more information about all activities and events would help them be more informed and engaged in their community. In particular, this focus group responded that key issues for them would be around housing, important contact information for services, information about how to obtain a driver’s license. Respondents also noted that they are always looking for activities for their children and free community events, especially for children would produce more community engagement. Engaging the youth in immigrant integration is particularly beneficial because “In the school system, there’s a lot of countries represented and it’s nice.”

Housing + Important contact information + driver’s license information + free community events (especially for kids).
COMMUNICATION TOOLS

The focus group elucidated the most effective means of communication with the immigrant community. Their responses included the necessity of timely, written information through various media sources in native languages. This information could be disseminated through city websites, through the newspaper, in the mail, on the local news and through churches. The respondents also liked the use of the focus group method of having “meetings with immigrants so they can talk together about problems” seemed like a popular method for understanding the immigrant perspective in Greenville.

Website+ newspaper+ mail+ local news+ churches
SOLUTIONS
The focus group revealed a number of common themes: immigrants responded that their main issues concerned limited access to services and to information and transportation. Largely, the issue is being able to get more information about all activities and services such as how to apply for a driver’s license could be rectified by disseminating the information in different languages and through various forms of media. In addition, physical access to these services and also to cultural events is limited by the lack of transportation access in the areas. They also brainstormed a number of solutions to immigrant integration issues: to cultivate leadership in the different immigrant groups to be leaders in the community, produce a joint newsletter between the City and the ESL students to help disseminate information in native languages and help spread information in their own immigrant communities, and lastly to organize a speaker’s bureau at Pitt Community College to foster dialogue between differing groups in the community. The immigrant group concluded with a call to action for the stakeholder group to figure out methods of the local government to support these actions.

Cultivate liaisons for each immigrant group + produce a joint newsletter (translated by ESL students) + Organize: Speaker’s Bureau at Pitt Community College.

2.4C STAKEHOLDER MEETING 2: FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2011

Meeting Objectives:
- Discuss new developments and information gathered since the last meeting
- Determine logistics, dates
- Identify key issue areas for focus
- Identify stakeholders

Attendees: There were a total of 17 community stakeholders present at this meeting including the Mayor of the City of Greenville, members of the Human Relations Council, leaders from the immigrant community including AMEXCAN, representatives from Pitt Community College, representatives from religious institutions, representatives from the Greenville City Council and from the Greenville City Government including Neighborhood Services.

In this meeting, the stakeholder representatives that participated in the immigrant focus group presented their key findings that immigrants particularly struggle with lack of access to services and lack of information and communication between immigrants and the general population. Based on this, the stakeholder group decided to narrowed Greenville’s focus based on two themes: (1) Civic Engagement and (2) Leadership Development (see figure 2.5 for focus group summary).

Overall, the stakeholders found the findings of the focus group to be invaluable. Having a clear
understanding of how immigrants are currently participating in the community and what could be done to better shape their experience. Figure 2.20 elucidates some of the reactions of the stakeholders to the findings of the focus group.

\[\text{FIGURE 2.20: REACTIONS TO FOCUS GROUP PROPOSAL}\]

Reactions to Focus Group Proposal

- The newsletter is a great idea & it will be awesome to have students translate.
- Kids give new immigrants lots of information. Maybe we could focus distribution of newsletters in schools.
- Newsletter should also be distributed in places of worship.
- Liaisons will help: decide what information is important, navigate communities, and share information.
- How would liaison know where people live?
- This proposal is not expensive and a great place to start.
- Many ESL students are connected to religious communities this will help us link up with larger groups.
- Reach out to professional clusters
- As community leader, it’s important for me to have some information to share
- How will we get information to folks who can’t go to ESL but might be interested in being a liaison?
- We wouldn’t only be hooking people up to resources, but developing leaders in these communities.
- ESL classes for kids should teach about the community & city government & provide this information to parents
- We could do activities together, cultural exchanges
- We could create intercultural groups to share information
- Start where people already are. Don’t create new site for them to go.
- We have to learn something about what is expected in communities so we don’t come into conflict.
- How do we narrow the focus?

\[\text{SOURCE: MEETING TRANSCRIPT, MEGHAN ANDREW 2011}\]

Presentation of Promising Practices: Based on these new objectives, BIC presented some ideas from other communities from the areas identified by the focus groups: access to information, transportation, community and police relationship with the common theme that a centralized place or person to provide information seems to be most cost effective way to promote communication.

After discussing the options and viewing some different strategies, the stakeholder group decided that although the citizen’s academy did seem like a useful strategy in Greenville, there were more pressing concerns that immigrants faced that needed to be dealt with first. Instead building on the ideas from the focus group could be the creation of an immigrant advisory board to act as a liaison and also the creation of an intercultural center. One stakeholder concluded that, “We are on the same track, but in a different way than previously thought.”

At the end of the meeting the group concluded that in order to move forward a small subcommittee would articulate the concepts in a more comprehensive way through the creation of a strategic
2.4D PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Between stakeholder meeting 2 and meeting 3, a group primarily composed of members of the Human Relations Council outlined a strategy action plan of the four major goals that emerged from this initiative based on stakeholder consensus, and the specific steps needed to realize these goals. Goals are shown as both short term and longer-term goals, indicating projected completion between 1-2 years and 3-5 years.

ISSUE/CONCERN: ACCESS TO SERVICES AND INFORMATION

Immigrant communities reported challenges in their awareness of City services, programs and/or how to access them, especially during emergency situations.

GOAL: Make information about city services and events/activities more accessible to immigrant communities.

Actions Item A: Create a “Fact Sheet” disseminating information via more familiar, frequently used avenues, such as public libraries, community festivals, resource fairs, Spanish radio stations, faith based organizations, and local newspapers. (Short-Term)

Action Item B: Pitt Community College Speakers Bureau - Establish a speaker’s bureau that serve as an education/awareness program to promote better understanding of local government (including law enforcement and emergency medical personnel), different organizations and agencies. As part of the Speakers Bureau, immigrants can share their stories. (Short-Term)

Action Item C: BIC Newsletter – City of Greenville and Pitt Community College establish a joint newsletter. The primary purpose of the newsletter is to educate the community and to build awareness of the benefits of immigration, to increase the community's knowledge of immigration matters, the importance of diversity, and to highlight current events and activities that occur in the City/community. The newsletter will be published quarterly and ESL students at Pitt Community College and their advisors will translate one article in
Spanish.  (Long-Term)

**Action Item D:** Establish and distribute medical emergency brochures (English, Spanish) in the community with contact information.  [Could be a part of “Fact Sheet”] (Long-Term)

**ISSUE/CONCERN: TRANSPORTATION**
Immigrant communities reported challenges in having the ability to get to and from work, various appointments and community events.

**GOAL:**
Provide information and build awareness about the City’s transit (GREAT) system and other means of transportation (taxi, etc.). Hours of information, route information, etc.

**Action Item A:** Distribute the GREAT System transit schedule in the community.  (Short - Term)

**Action Item B:** Translate the GREAT System transit schedule in Spanish.  (Long-Term)

**Action Item C:** Establish and distribute medical emergency brochures (English, Spanish) in the community with contact information.  (Long-Term)

**ISSUE/CONCERN: OPEN LINES OF COMMUNICATION**
Limited opportunities exist for immigrants to interact with local government and the community, to have an active voice in sharing their perspectives, including knowing their rights and responsibilities and being protected.

**GOAL 1:**
Provide opportunities and encourage immigrant community members to become actively engaged, to serve on City’s boards and commissions, and to become aware of their rights and responsibilities.

**Action Item A:** Establish outreach efforts to immigrant communities to gain better knowledge regarding major immigrant needs and issues via community dialogues, town hall meetings, etc.; to include conversations with law enforcement, etc.  (Long-Term)

**Action Item B:** Establish an Immigrant Advisory Board to advise elected officials on their challenges and mobilize towards solutions.  (Long-Term)

**Action Item C:** Create a One-Stop Information Center where immigrants could readily find information.  (Long-Term)

**Action Item D:** Establish a Community Ambassador/Liaison Program to help build capacity to
serve immigrants in their own communities and in their own language. The goal is to acquaint immigrants with their rights and responsibilities for their safety and to develop communication between property owners, residents, service providers and local government. An Ambassador Program would allow volunteers to touch a community in many ways and open avenues for better communication between local government and its residents. (Long-Term)

GOAL 2: Provide opportunities for existing community members to learn about the cultures of newcomers in the community.

Action Item A: Develop cultural awareness training sessions. (Long-Term)

Action Item B: Establish a partnership with local newspapers and create a monthly article “Get to Know Your Neighbor” about immigrants and their contributions to the community. (Long-Term)

Action Item C: Expand the City’s free Lunch and Learn Sessions to increase cultural awareness for GUC staff. (Long-Term)

The goal of creating this comprehensive document was to be able to share the action plan with all members of the stakeholder group and help solidify the programs and procedures needed to actually implement these strategies.

2.4E STAKEHOLDER MEETING 3: WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012

Meeting Objectives:
• Discuss Building Integrated Communities’ draft report and its use.
• Identify suggestions for strengthening and clarifying the recommendations.
• Affirm group support for forwarding these recommendations to HRC, City Council.
• Explore ways UNC can be supportive and involved in the Implementation and Evaluation.

Attendees: There were a total of 17 community stakeholders present at this meeting including the Mayor Pro-tem of the City of Greenville, members of the Human Relations Council, leaders from the immigrant community including AMEXCAN, representatives from Pitt Community College, representatives from religious institutions, representatives from the Greenville City Council and from the Greenville City Government.

During this meeting, the subcommittee presented their strategic community plan to the stakeholder group and the UNC facilitator led a group to determine next steps, define success, clarify roles, and identify resources. In particular, the BIC team wanted Greenville to start thinking about way their proposed action strategies could be evaluated. Figure 2.21 displays some of the responses to this prompt. These indicators became more refined as the evaluation proposal became more developed.
FIGURE 2.21: INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

- Unity, fair treatment, access, welcoming environment, broad mindedness, and change become a reality.
- Civic engagement
- Collaborative effort
- Greater appreciation of diversity
- Immigrants will be more knowledgeable about their new community and culture
- They will know their roles, responsibilities, and rights
- They will understand the political process and advocate as a group for their needs
- More diverse boards (create a statement that board membership should be representative of Greenville's diversity)
- Presence of a well-known immigrant advisory group
- Build bridges that connect the total community
- The elimination of fear on all sides
  - Demonstrate that we live in a safe community
  - Organize cultural celebrations
  - Develop greater economic opportunities
- More Latino businesses connected with the Chamber of Commerce
- Create a positive dialogue between immigrants and police
- A stronger community
- Everyone would feel a part of the city

**SOURCE: MEETING TRANSCRIPT, MEGHAN ANDREW 2011**

The group decided that the action plan would go to the Human Relations Council for comments, questions, and hopefully their approval and adoption. To help this process, UNC-CH provided more information about how immigrant advisory boards -- and other specific action items -- are structured in other cities as well as guiding questions to help the HRC think through all aspects of implementing these programs. This preparation would be with the goal to invite the Mayor and City Council members to attend the next BIC meeting to review the proposal and then eventually present the plan before Greenville City Council. To aid this process BIC would also create a poll so that participants can prioritize the various action items in the BIC proposal. Forming an evaluation subcommittee was proposed, but no final decision was made.

CHAPTER 3:
GREENVILLE PROGRAM EVALUATION

The following section is a proposal for short and long-term evaluation of the BIC programs. It is important to evaluate programs in order to document their current successes and identify ways they could be more successful in the future. The Greenville evaluation will consist of two parts:

- Part 1 will be a short-term program and community evaluation.
- Part 2 will consist of a long-term program and community impact evaluation.
3.1 SHORT-TERM PROGRAM EVALUATION

Performance indicators
Performance indicators illustrate that a program is making progress towards meeting its goals. Evaluators can collect data that indicate performance in a number of ways. The following tables below provide examples of short-term performance indicators and data collection options for Greenville’s proposed integration strategies.
### GOAL: Make information about city services and events/activities more accessible to immigrant communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item A: BIC Newsletter</strong> – City of Greenville and Pitt Community College establish a joint newsletter. The primary purpose of the newsletter is to educate the community and to build awareness of the benefits of immigration, to increase the community's knowledge of immigration matters, the importance of diversity, and to highlight current events and activities that occur in the community. The newsletter will be published quarterly and one article will be translated in Spanish by ESL students at Pitt Community College and their advisors.</td>
<td>Increase in access to information in native languages through translation services. Increase in access of immigrant group to the information through dissemination of resources. Increase in number of people receiving the information. Consumer satisfaction indicating usefulness and accuracy of the information and accessibility of the newsletters and/or factsheets.</td>
<td>A count of languages newsletter is translated A count of the number of drop- off places and the geographic variability of these places Track of how many leftover newsletters each period to determine how many people are receiving the information. Also keep track of newsletters at specific distribution centers to understand a sample. Track how many organizations disseminate the fact sheet. Also track the number of clients they serve and the racial/ethnic identity of clients. (e.g.: How many people is this potentially reaching from which ethnic groups?) Create a way for readers to give feedback about the publication through focus group evaluation on an annual basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item B:</strong> Create a “Fact Sheet” disseminating information via more familiar, frequently used avenues, such as public libraries, community festivals, resource fairs, Spanish radio stations, faith based organizations, and local newspapers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item C: Pitt Community College Speakers Bureau</strong> - Establish a speaker's bureau that serve as an education/awareness program to promote better understanding of local government, different organizations and agencies. As part of the Speakers Bureau, immigrants can share their stories. Include law enforcement agencies, EMS and other city staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Long-Term*
### ISSUE/CONCERN: TRANSPORTATION

**GOAL:** Raise awareness about the City’s transit (GREAT) system and other means of transportation (taxi, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item A:</strong> Distribute the GREAT System transit schedule and other means of transportation in the community. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td>Increase in count of immigrants using the GREAT system.</td>
<td>Track ridership rates in routes connected to immigrant communities through headcounts of surveys through the transit agency. A count of all the languages GREAT System transit schedule is translated in. Track how many schedules of each language are distributed (count leftovers) annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item B:</strong> Translate the GREAT System transit schedule in Spanish. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item C:</strong> Establish and distribute a medical emergency brochure in the community with contact information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL 1:** Provide opportunities and encourage immigrant community members to become actively engaged, to serve on City’s boards and commissions, and to become aware of their rights and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item A:</strong> Establish outreach efforts to immigrant communities to gain better insight regarding major immigrant needs and issues via community dialogues, town hall meetings, etc. Include law enforcement agencies, EMS and other city staff. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td>Increased outreach by city agencies to immigrant populations. Increased immigrant representation in decision making processes. Increase access to information of services and cultural events. Increase leadership development and civic participation.</td>
<td>Count agencies involved in outreach. Have agencies track number of outreach events and number of immigrants in attendance. Track representation on the immigrant advisory board. Track immigrant advisory board representation at meetings. Count number of clients served at the center. Count number of individuals that graduate from the program. Keep track of immigrant referrals to assess impact of liaison in immigrant community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item B:</strong> Establish an Immigrant Advisory Board to advise elected officials on their challenges and mobilize towards solutions. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item C:</strong> Create a One-Stop Information Center where immigrants could readily find information. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item D:</strong> Establish a Community Ambassador/Liaison Program to help build capacity to serve immigrants in their own communities and in their own language. The goal is to acquaint immigrants with their rights and responsibilities for their safety and to develop communication between property owners, residents, service providers and local government. An Ambassador Program would allow volunteers to touch a community in many ways and open avenues for better communication between local government and its residents. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION ITEMS**

- **Performance Indicator**: Count agencies involved in outreach. Have agencies track number of outreach events and number of immigrants in attendance. Track representation on the immigrant advisory board. Track immigrant advisory board representation at meetings. Count number of clients served at the center. Count number of individuals that graduate from the program. Keep track of immigrant referrals to assess impact of liaison in immigrant community.
GOAL 2: Provide opportunities for receiving community members to learn about the cultures of newcomers in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item A:</strong> Develop cultural awareness training sessions. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td>Increase training session attendance.</td>
<td>Survey of attitudes and knowledge about immigrants before and after training sessions. Keep track of how many people participate in training sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item</strong> Establish a partnership with local newspapers and create a monthly article “Get to Know Your Neighbor” about immigrants and contributions to the community. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td>Increase number of newspaper articles featuring immigrants and immigrant contributions to the community</td>
<td>Keep track of magnitude of the audience reached (how many people have newspaper subscription).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item C:</strong> Expand the City’s free Lunch and Learn Sessions to increase cultural awareness. <em>(Long-Term)</em></td>
<td>Increase number of topics around immigrant related issues at Lunch and Learn Sessions</td>
<td>Count how many people attend and which immigrant groups participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous tables provide a logical structure for determining indicators and developing data sources that determine the performance of the program in achieving the intended output.

Community impact assessment
Also key to short-term evaluation is community impact assessments. These assessments can be done every year through small focus groups of immigrants and engaged community leaders to glean the impact of these programs on the immigrant and larger community. This should occur through a baseline focus group that Greenville already created during the Building Integrated Communities process. Continued access to this focus group should be maintained annually throughout the duration of these programs and policies.

3.2 LONG-TERM EVALUATION
Ultimately, communities hope to achieve sustainable and structural changes through comprehensive immigrant integration strategies. Communities can assess impacts of integration initiatives by measuring the long-term changes in both the immigrant and larger community. Here we outline a long-term evaluation plan that will assess changes in the entire community including attitudes towards immigrant populations, knowledge about the characteristics of the immigrant and refugee communities in the area, and available resources that service them. This evaluation will also use both quantitative and qualitative benchmarks to assess performance. This will be done in two stages. In the first stage, we measure baseline characteristics of the immigrant community, the receiving community, and the general health of the local and regional economy.
We also completed a baseline survey about perceptions and attitudes of larger community toward immigrant groups, and knowledge of resources and services provided by community.

In the second stage, we employ qualitative methods to ground the data in an understanding of changes in perceptions and attitudes of larger community toward immigrant groups, knowledge or resources and services provided by community, and relevance of integration strategies.

To better understand Greenville and its residents, BIC staff created a profile based on available secondary data (this can be found in section 2.3, titled “Greenville Quantitative Information”). The data compiled provide an extensive assessment of the Greenville metro area and its residents based on current data from the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The goal is to repeat this or a similar survey to evaluate the long-term impacts of bureaucratic incorporation policies. This could occur every 3-5 years.
CONCLUSIONS

Our work is ongoing as we continue to serve our increasingly diverse community. In the short-term, Greenville’s Building Integrated Communities team is committed to implementing the action items identified in meetings, beginning with the establishment of an Immigrant Advisory Board as a sub-committee of the Greenville Human Relations Commission in 2012.

As this report shows, with immigration come some challenges – including basic communication issues that occur when some newcomers have not yet mastered English. Other challenges include cultural differences manifested in the way that people express themselves, relate to family and friends, and interact with their communities. However, demographic shifts also provide increased opportunities to infuse a community with new ideas, energy and vitality. Through the hard work of Greenville citizens in the Building Integrated Communities Project, new information has been generated and exchanged, the ideas and experiences of people from diverse backgrounds shared, and professional and community relationships strengthened.
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Household
A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit. (People not living in households are classified as living in group quarters.) A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other people in the building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated people who share living arrangements. In the 2010 Census data products, the count of households or householder equals the count of occupied housing units.

Householder
One person in each household is designated as the householder. In most cases, this is the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home is owned, being bought, or rented and who is listed on line one of the questionnaire. If there is no such person in the household, any adult household member 15 years old and over could be designated as the householder. Households are classified by type according to the sex of the householder and the presence of relatives. Two types of householders are distinguished: a family householder and a nonfamily householder. A family householder is a householder living with one or more individuals related to him or her by birth, marriage, or adoption. The householder and all people in the household related to him or her are family members. A nonfamily householder is a householder living alone or with nonrelatives only (B4).

Tenure
Tenure was asked at all occupied housing units. All occupied housing units are classified as either owner-occupied or renter-occupied.

Owner-Occupied
A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid for. The owner or co-owner must live in the unit and usually is Person 1 on the questionnaire. The unit is “Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan” if it is being purchased with a mortgage or some other debt arrangement, such as a deed of trust, trust deed, contract to purchase, land contract, or purchase agreement. The unit is also considered owned with a mortgage if it is built on leased land and there is a mortgage on the unit. A housing unit is “Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage or loan)” if there is no mortgage or other similar debt on the house, apartment, or mobile home,
including units built on leased land if the unit is owned outright without a mortgage. Although most tables show total owner-occupied counts, selected tables separately identify the two owner categories.

**Renter-Occupied**
All occupied housing units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented or occupied without payment of rent, are classified as renter-occupied. “Rented” includes units in continuing care, sometimes called life care arrangements. These arrangements usually involve a contract between one or more individuals and a service provider guaranteeing the individual shelter, usually an apartment, and services, such as meals or transportation to shopping or recreation. The “no rent paid” category includes units provided free by friends or relatives or in exchange for services, such as a resident manager, caretaker, minister, or tenant farmer. Housing units on military bases are also classified in the “No rent paid” category (B21-B22)

**Census Tracts**
Census Tracts are small, relatively permanent statistical subdivisions of a county or equivalent entity that are updated by local participants prior to each decennial census as part of the Census Bureau’s Participant Statistical Areas Program. The Census Bureau delineates census tracts in situations where no local participant existed or where state, local, or tribal governments declined to participate. The primary purpose of census tracts is to provide a stable set of geographic units for the presentation of statistical data. Census tracts generally have a population size between 1,200 and 8,000 people, with an optimum size of 4,000 people. A census tract usually covers a contiguous area; however, the spatial size of census tracts varies widely depending on the density of settlement. Census tract boundaries are delineated with the intention of being maintained over a long time so that statistical comparisons can be made from census to census. Census tracts occasionally are split due to population growth or merged as a result of substantial population decline. Census tract boundaries generally follow visible and identifiable features. They may follow nonvisible legal boundaries, such as minor civil division (MCD) or incorporated place boundaries in some states and situations, to allow for census-tract-to-governmental-unit relationships where the governmental boundaries tend to remain unchanged between censuses. State and county boundaries always are census tract boundaries in the standard census geographic hierarchy. Tribal census tracts are a unique geographic entity defined within federally recognized American Indian reservations and off-reservation trust lands and can cross state and county boundaries. Tribal census tracts may be completely different from the census tracts and block groups defined by state and county (see “Tribal Census Tract”).

DOCUMENT 2: RESIDENTS’ ACADEMY FOCUS GROUPGREENVILLE BUILDING INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES:

Background:
The City of Greenville is participating in the “Building Integrated Communities” project with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The purpose of the project is to bring together members of the immigrant and refugee communities and others involved in making local public policy decisions (local government, business, faith-based groups, philanthropy, educational institutions, and nonprofits) to create and put into practice a plan for a more inclusive Greenville.

Objective: Understand the needs of immigrants in Pitt County to greater inform a collective initiative to engage them more in local civic life

Questions:
1. What is it like to be an immigrant in Greenville?
2. Where and how (if anywhere) do you participate in the greater Greenville community already? If so, what do you like about going there? If not, why haven’t you participated in many community events?
3. What sort of information or actions would help you become more informed and engaged in your community?
4. What is the best way to get this information to you (e.g., classes, website, brochures, workshops, word of mouth, etc.)?
5. What would make city services more accessible to you?

Agenda:
• Introductions
• Overview of city’s website/Citizens’ Handbook
• Overview of meeting objective; format; and ground rules
• Focus group
• Wrap-up and thank you

Format: Groups of 6–10 people with 1–2 facilitators who ask the questions and at least 1 recorder who writes responses. Groups should reflect homogenous demographics (e.g., age; country of origin; etc.).

Ground rules: a) stay focused; b) maintain momentum; c) get closure on questions; and d) be respectful of others’ time and opinions.

APPENDIX DOCUMENT 3: PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL

Interview questions:
Do you know of any previous needs assessments for refugee and immigrant communities that have been done for Greenville or Pitt County? (ASSESSMENT)
What are the most pressing issues facing the immigrant and refugee communities in your city? (PROBLEM)

Why are these the most pressing issues? (WHY?)

Do you see any public costs associated with these issues? (COSTS)

What do you think are the causes of these issues? (CAUSES?)

What are some possible solutions? (SOLUTIONS)

What are some of the obstacles (cost, regulation, or public or political will) to implementation of these solutions? (OBSTACLES)

Do you think there are any populations within the immigrant/refugee communities that particularly struggle with these issues? (VULNERABLE POPS)

What do you see as the most important assets your community has? (Assets Greenville has and/or assets the immigrant and refugee communities have) (ASSETS)

Can you think of anyone else I should speak with? (CONTACTS)

Would you like to stay informed about this project?
Hi. My name is Anisha Steephen and I am a graduate student in the Department of City Planning at UNC and am working with the Building Integrated Communities project.

Thanks for taking the time to speak with me today.

As you know, the intent of Building Integrated Communities is to help North Carolina city governments successfully engage with immigrants and refugee populations in order to improve public safety, promote economic development, enhance communication, and improve relationships.

As we are putting together this initiative, I am trying to learn about the current conditions of immigrant groups in your community to help you better evaluate the impacts of the programs that will emerge from this project. Today I am going to ask you a few questions related to the current status of immigrant integration in your community. This means I would like to know more about relationships between immigrant groups and the larger community and any current resources for integration that serve these groups from your perspective.

• Could you describe your immigrant community?
• What are the immigrant groups in your area right now?
  • Where do they come from?
• How much contact do you have with immigrants and immigrant community leaders?
• How have the immigrant communities in your area changed in the last few years?
  • What are some positive changes?
  • What, if any, are some negative ones?
• What are the perceptions about these immigrant groups in the larger community?
  • Have there been any recent incidents around a particular immigrant group?
  • What about your personal experience with these groups? Is there anything you’d like to share?
• Right now how are immigrants participating, if at all, in the local community?
  • Users of city services?
  • Participants in local cultural events?
  • Members of boards or groups?
  • Immigrant Community leaders?
  • If yes, why do you think they are interested in participating?
  • In your view, how does the larger community feel about this immigrant participation?
  • If no, what might keep them from participating?
• What are some local government resources and services that X provides to immigrants?
  • What are your thoughts about these resources and services provided by X?
• Are there challenges that local government cannot or do not currently provide that immigrants take responsibility for within their communities?
• How can local governments support these actions?
  • In what ways does the local government cooperate with other groups?
• What is your definition of immigrant integration?
• Where do you see the greatest need in resources and services that could be offered to encourage immigrant integration?
• Can you tell me why you think this important to X?
• Are there practices that your organization engages in that tries to make things more culturally appropriate for immigrants? (interpretation, child care, outreach to populations etc.)
  • If yes, can you tell me more about those practices?
  • If no, is there anything getting in the way of doing this?
• What are immigrant perceptions of law enforcement?
  • Are there recent incidents that bring this to mind?
• To what degree do immigrants participate in voting or have influence over decisions?
  • Does the local government try to increase voting in the immigrant community?
• How much contact do you personally have with immigrants?
• What would you consider a successful outcome of the Building Integrated Communities project?

APPENDIX DOCUMENT 5: IMMIGRANT ADVISORY BOARD HANDBOOK

Civic Participation & Leadership Development: Immigrant Advisory Boards

Immigrant Advisory Boards Case Studies

Immigrant and Refugee Advisory Board – Seattle, Washington
The Immigrant and Refugee Advisory Board was created as a result of Seattle's Immigrant and Refugee Report and Action Plan released in 2007. The Board is responsible to the Mayor and City Council by sharing knowledge to strengthen city government services to all members of the community, particularly the many immigrant and refugee groups in the Seattle area.

The Board is composed of 15 community leaders, 8 of which are appointed by the Mayor and the other 7 by the City Council. Each Board member is appointed for either 1- or 2-year terms and all have the option of reappointment for future terms. Objectives and responsibilities include:

• Advising the Mayor, City Council and city departments and offices on ways to enhance and improve access to city services and resources for immigrants and refugees, as well as strengthening opportunities for immigrants and refugees to participate in the civic life of the city;
• Advising the city on the successful implementation of the Immigrant and Refugee Action Plan and on future updates to the plan;
• Advising all city departments and offices in matters affecting immigrants and refugees, as
appropriate; and

• Encouraging understanding between and among the various immigrant and refugee communities and the larger Seattle community.

Considerations:

• The Immigrant and Refugee Board is part of a larger initiative of both the City and the County “Race and Social Justice Initiative”: http://www.seattle.gov/rsji/immigrants/http://www.seattle.gov/landRboard/


• Meetings are conducted at the same time and place every month. Agendas and meeting minutes are publicly available. http://www.seattle.gov/landRboard/meetings.htm

• The Immigrant and Refugee Board uses a work plan to delineate short-term tasks: http://www.seattle.gov/landRboard/documents/2011Workplan_final_I&RC.pdf

**Immigrant Advisory Committee – Boulder, Colorado**

The Immigrant Advisory Committee in Boulder, Colorado was developed in 2006. The Committee seeks to encourage immigrant involvement in the city government and to advise the city on issues relating to the immigrant community. The committee serves in an advisory capacity to the city manager in developing policy and services that better serve the immigrant community and to encourage access by this community to the full benefits, opportunities and services provided by the city.

The committee consists of seven members appointed by the city manager. All members are immigrant residents of Boulder, either citizens or non-citizens, and must be reflective of the demographics of the immigrant community of Boulder. They must also have some knowledge and interest in issues that affect immigrants in the city.

Considerations:

• This Committee is supported by the National League of Cities: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=15245&Itemid=5172

• Information can also be found on the City of Boulder’s website: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12023&Itemid=4046

**Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC) – San Francisco, California**

The Immigrant Rights Commission was created in 1997 to advise the mayor and board of supervisors on issues and policies related to immigrants who live and work in San Francisco. The commission consists of fifteen (15) voting members, eleven (11) who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and four (4) who are appointed by the Mayor. At least eight members must be immigrants to the United States and each member of the Commission serves for a term of two years.
Considerations:
• Extensive Commission Bylaws:
• Useful website including meeting agendas and notes, links to national and local immigration materials:

Questions to Consider When Creating a Plan for an Immigrant Advisory Board:
Defining Goals and Success
• What are the goals of the board?
• What will “success” look like for the board?
  o How will you measure progress towards achieving “success”?

Representation and Advocacy
• Who should the board advise?
  • The HRC?
  • The City Council?
  • The mayor?
  • All of the above?
• Is proportional representation by ethnicity or immigrant/refugee status necessary?
  • Yes?
  • No?
  • Nice to have but not a requirement?
• How will the board share information with others, and for what purpose?

Recruitment and Training
• How will you recruit for the board?
• Who will recruit board members?
• Will there be an application process?
  • If yes, what will that look like?
• What are the desired characteristics for board members?
  • Languages spoken?
  • Personal or professional skills?
  • Personal or professional connections?
  • Lives or works in Greenville?
  • Interest in/commitment to the board's goals?
• How will you train or orient new board members?
  • What would the content be?
  • Who would provide it?

Logistics
• How often will the board meet?
• Will board members have terms?
  • If yes, how long will they be?
• Who will provide logistical support or other resources to enable the work of the board?
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