

Miami-Dade County
The Dr. Antonio Jorge Social and Economic Development Council (SEDC)

Dr. Raul Moncarz, Chairman
Stephen P. Clark Center, 111 NW First Street, 19th Floor Conference Room
Friday, September 19, 2014 at 2:00 pm

AGENDA

<u>Call to Order</u>	Dr. Raul Moncarz, Chairperson
<u>Welcome and Introductions</u>	Dr. Moncarz
<u>Approval of Minutes</u>	
<u>Chairperson's Report</u>	Dr. Moncarz
<u>General Discussion Items</u>	
➤ Dr. Antonio Jorge Conference Update	Dr. Brian Peterson/Dr. Alexandra Cornelius
➤ Scholarship Selection Criteria	Dr. Rolando Ochoa
➤ Budget Issues - Update	Dr. Moncarz
➤ Subcommittees for SEDC	Dr. Moncarz
➤ Objectives/Activities for FY 2014-15	Dr. Moncarz
➤ (TENTATIVE) Role of Consumer Affairs	Mr. Greg Baker, Director
➤ New Business	
➤ Public Comments	

ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting Date **September 19, 2014**

The Dr. Antonio Jorge Social and Economic Development Council Mission

To improve the quality of life of all residents of Miami Dade County by providing the County Commission and Mayor with timely, objective, transparent, and thoughtful advice on significant social and economic issues. The Council aims to pursue a balanced perspective among economic development, social justice, and environmental sustainability, both in the short and long term.

The Dr. Antonio Jorge Social and Economic Development Council (SEDC)
Meeting Minutes
Friday, August 15, 2014 at 2:00 pm

Members Present - Dr. Thomas Breslin, Dr. Alexandra Cornelius, Mr. Santiago Leon, Dr. Kenneth Lipner, Dr. Raul Moncarz, Dr. Rolando Ochoa, Dr. Brian Peterson, Mr. Reinaldo Valdes, Dr. Bernadette West

Staff Present – Dr. Robert Cruz, Mr. Robert Hesler, Ms. Lori Weldon

Guests Present – Maria Abreu, Office of Commission Audit, Ms. Jenna Lugonja, CAHSD

Excused Absence- Mr. Rosendo Castillo, Dr. Maria Espino, Mr. Marcos Kerbel, Mr. Jose Lopez-Calleja, Prof Elisa Moncarz, Dr. Pedro Pellet, Mr. Jesus Permuy, Mr. Robert Saco, Dr. Jorge Salazar-Carrillo, Dr. Eunju Suh

Absent - Dr. Wilbert Bascom

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions - The August 15, 2014 meeting of the SEDC was called to order by Chairman Dr. Raul Moncarz at 2:18 pm. followed by self-introductions.

Approval of Minutes - Dr. Thomas Breslin offered the motion to approve the minutes of the August 15, 2014 SEDC meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bernadette West and passed unanimously.

Chairperson's Report- Dr. Moncarz discussed the efforts of the SEDC Committee to draft a letter and meet with Commissioners to express their concern and opposition to items in the proposed budget, which would eliminate the Chief Economist position and other staff positions in the Economic Development Unit. Mr. Reinaldo Valdez suggested that all members of the SEDC sign the letter. Dr. West suggested the letter be forwarded to everyone via email and allowing everyone to reply if they agree to the letter. Dr. Peterson suggested listing the names of the members of the SEDC at the end of the letter. The consensus was to list the names of members.

A brief discussion ensued regarding establishing the criteria for the Dr. Antonio Jorge Economic Development Leadership Award. Dr. Rolando Ochoa volunteered to chair the Dr. Antonio Jorge Economic Development Leadership Award Committee. Mr. Valdes, Dr. Pedro Pellet and a member of the staff from Commissioner Javier Souto's office will serve on the committee.

General Discussion Items- Subcommittees- Dr. Alexandra Cornelius updated the Council on the progress on the Dr. Antonio Jorge Conference scheduled for September 30, 2014, 12:00pm at FIU. Dr. Moncarz thanked Dr. Cornelius, Dr. Thomas Breslin and Dr. Brian Petersen for their work regarding the conference.

A discussion ensued regarding the criteria for the Dr. Antonio Jorge Scholarship. The scholarship will be for low-income students. Dr. Cornelius will chair the committee and be assisted by Dr. Breslin, Dr. Petersen and Dr. Ochoa.

Mr. Santiago Leon, Mr. Jose Lopez-Calleja, Mr. Reinaldo Valdez, Dr. Kenneth Lipner, and Dr. Maria Espino will serve on the government affairs committee, to strengthen the relationship between the SEDC and the Miami Dade Commissioners.

A discussion ensued regarding various SEDC issues and the role of the SEDC. Dr. Petersen will chair the committee charged with assessing economic disparity in Miami-Dade County.

Dr. Cruz stated that the SEDC was created by an ordinance and that the immediate future of the SEDC was secure, but did not know who would provide future staff support to the SEDC as is noted in the ordinance creating the Council. Mr. Valdes suggested the staffing issue be brought to the attention of the Mayor and/or Commissioners via a letter or meeting.

Dr. Cruz also requested a 50 word bio and pictures from Council members for the webpage.

The meeting adjourned. **The next SEDC meeting is scheduled for September 19, 2014.**

2015 Doctor Antonio Jorge Entrepreneurial Excellence Award

Nomination Guidelines

The 2014 Entrepreneurial Excellence Awards - recognizing and building entrepreneurship in Miami Dade County.

Honorees should demonstrate the best traits of entrepreneurship, including willingness to take risk, drive, perseverance and business creativity.

In order to qualify, a nominee's company or organization must be based in, have been founded in, or have a significant presence in the Miami Dade County.

Click here for nomination form (to be developed)

Nomination Procedure:

- Nominations must be submitted on or before December 31, 2014.
- A statement either from business management, customers, employees or others familiar with the nominee can be very helpful to the judges.
- Nominees will be contacted and asked to submit a nomination portfolio consisting of supporting materials.
- Self-nomination is permitted.
- All supporting materials are due on January 16, 2015 to Dr. Rolando M. Ochoa Miami Dade College 300 NE 2 Ave Miami Florida 33132. Your information can also be emailed to: rochoa4@med.edu

Selection Process:

- Judges' decisions are made from personal knowledge of the nominees and/or the quality of the supporting materials that are submitted.
- All nominees will be notified of their status following the judging.

Primary Criteria for Entrepreneurial Excellence:

- Entrepreneur must be the founder of the business, or have been critical to its growth.
- The entrepreneur's company must be based in, or have been founded in, or have a significant presence in Miami Dade County.
- The company should demonstrate profitability.
- The company should demonstrate significant growth and long-term potential.
- The entrepreneur should note contributions to the community through charitable or leadership roles.
- The company should demonstrate innovative employee programs and corporate culture.
- The entrepreneur should demonstrate the ability to overcome adversity.
- Entrepreneur's company has received local, regional, national or international recognition.

Additional Considerations:

- Entrepreneurial spirit: Demonstrates vision and perseverance, a willingness to take calculated risks, the capacity to learn from mistakes, an ability to overcome obstacles and a resolve to succeed that requires both independence and a reliance on trusted advisers.

- Strategic thinking: Identifies and evaluates business opportunities in terms of the required resources. Effectively translates business ideas into meaningful, actionable business plans. Utilizes strategic partnerships, alliances, and internal and external advisers to expand the company's capabilities.
- Emphasis on innovation: Views opportunities and challenges of the business through a lens of innovation and takes actions that advance the methods, products or services in that field.
- Business performance: Leads a growth-oriented business as measured by revenues, profitability, number of employees and other characteristics indicating progress toward long-term sustainability. Company success is also reflective of the entrepreneur's ability to align all of the company's resources (human resources finance, etc.) for maximum efficiency.
- Community impact: Represents a positive impact on the local community as demonstrated by the company's relationships with its employees, vendors and other business associates. Nominee is also involved in philanthropic or charitable activities.
- Personal integrity/influence: Models one's personal values in such a way as to earn the genuine respect of employees, competitors and others in the community. Has also achieved a measure of influence and is recognized for his or her professional expertise as well as leadership contributions outside the company.

Recognition:

- Award recipients will be honored at an evening reception to be held a date and location to be determined later.
- Honorees will be profiled in a special supplement of the Miami Herald Business Monday.

Click here for nomination form (to be developed)

Nominee Checklist

Please use this guide for providing supporting materials for your nomination portfolio. Include whatever information or materials you think would be helpful to the selection committee in considering this year's honorees. Remember, judging is conducted solely from the quality of the information and materials submitted. Please do not submit audio/visual materials or materials that must be returned.

Entrepreneur Biography: This may include the entrepreneur's resume and history, as well as mission/vision statements for the company or organization. Include information that tells the story of the entrepreneur. Include brochures if applicable, as well as testimonials or articles.

Growth: Describe how the entrepreneur has contributed to the growth of the company or organization. Please include measurable data such as statistics showing significant revenue growth over a period of time and how the entrepreneur contributed to this growth. Also describe the entrepreneur's potential for continued growth and achievement going forward.

Innovation: Describe a unique quality of the entrepreneur and/or their company or organization. This may be a tangible

product or technology, a customer service system or practice or something that distinguishes the entrepreneur, company or organization within its industry.

Workforce Potential: Describe how the entrepreneur has developed the potential of the company or organization's workforce.

Achievements: List honors, awards, or achievements that the entrepreneur and/or the company or organization has earned.

Service and Entrepreneurial Spirit: Describe how the entrepreneur and the company or organization has reinvested in its community. List any involvement with business organizations, charitable or civic causes or any involvement that would enhance quality of life and give back to the community.

Category: Describe how the entrepreneur fits the awards category.

FAQ's (Frequently Asked Questions)

What do you do with the nomination supporting materials that I provide?

A. The supporting materials that you provide are the basis for selection. The material is also used to profile your company at the recognition event and in the follow-up issue to the event. You should NOT submit any materials that you do not want disclosed either verbally or in print.

How much financial information must we disclose?

A. Not that much. **There is no need to disclose proprietary information.** We are looking for some general benchmarks of financial growth and success. Percentages are often used. (e.g. "the company grew by over 200 percent in the last five years and expects sales to exceed \$25 million in 2014.")

Why should our company participate in this awards program?

A. The awards provide a significant public relations opportunity and let's your entire company share in your success. You can send out your own press release to interested media. You can post your honor on your company's web page and insert copies of articles in your sales kits. You will also have the opportunity to meet other successful entrepreneurs who are being honored.

Who does the judging and what are they looking for?

A. The members of Doctor Antonio Jorge Social and Economic Council and its staff conduct the judging. Our goal is to select a representative of entrepreneurs who is successful in our community. We are looking for good business stories.

THE OPINION PAGES | CONTRIBUTING OP-ED WRITER

Does Moving Poor People Work?

SEPT. 16, 2014

Thomas B. Edsall

Twenty years ago, federal poverty experts, inspired by the forceful arguments in the landmark book “The Truly Disadvantaged,” as well as by definitive research on the harmful effects of segregation, initiated a government experiment that moved 855 low-income predominantly African-American and Hispanic families out of public housing in poverty-stricken urban areas into less impoverished neighborhoods.

The results of the project have provoked an intense debate.

Under the aegis of the “Moving to Opportunity” program, begun during the first administration of Bill Clinton, the Department of Housing and Urban Development randomly selected a large pool of low-income families with children living in public housing in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and New York. Ninety-eight percent of the families were headed by women; 63 percent were black, 32 percent Hispanic, and 3 percent white; 26 percent were employed, 76 percent were receiving welfare, and families had an average income of \$12,709 in 2009 dollars.

These families, 4604 of them, to be exact, were then divided into three groups. An experimental group of 1,819 families was offered “Section 8 rental assistance certificates or vouchers that they could use only in census tracts with 1990 poverty rates below 10 percent”; 855 accepted the offer and became part of the study. A second group of 1,346 families was offered more traditional “Section 8” rent subsidy vouchers that could be used in *any* neighborhood; 848 accepted.

A control group composed of 1,439 families stayed in public housing and became part of the study. The purpose of the relocation initiative, according to

Department of Housing and Urban Development, was to test the “long-term effects of access to low-poverty neighborhoods on the housing, employment and educational achievements of the assisted households.” Researchers also studied how relocation affected the health of those who accepted vouchers.

A paper published in the May 2013 issue of the *American Economic Review*, “Long-Term Neighborhood Effects on Low-Income Families: Evidence From Moving to Opportunity,” found that after 10 to 15 years, moving out of high-poverty public housing through the M.T.O. program showed mixed results.

There were some positive developments, according to the primary author of the paper, Jens Ludwig, a professor of economics at the University of Chicago and *the project director* for a final assessment of the M.T.O. program. Ludwig and his six co-authors found improvement in “several key adult mental and physical health outcomes.” These included significantly lowered risk of diabetes and obesity, as well an improved level of “subjective well-being.”

But the Ludwig study also found that “changing neighborhoods alone may not be sufficient to improve labor market or schooling outcomes for very disadvantaged families.” Ludwig reported that this particular form of assistance from HUD – a housing voucher that allowed recipients to move into a “low poverty” area – had “no consistent detectable impacts on adult economic self-sufficiency or children’s educational achievement outcomes, even for children who were too young to have enrolled in school at baseline.”

Ludwig reported similar findings in a follow-up essay published this week by Third Way, a Democratic think tank.

Some of the nation’s most prominent poverty researchers, including William Julius Wilson, a professor of sociology at Harvard and the author of “The Truly Disadvantaged,” consider that the design of the M.T.O. project was flawed, leading to unwarranted conclusions about the lack of improvement in employment and schooling.

Wilson pointed out in an email to The Times that the families in the study who left public housing moved into segregated neighborhoods nonetheless, far from employment opportunities and with equally bad schools – often the same schools. Social conditions were only marginally better than those they had left.

In addition, Wilson wrote, the adults in the program “had been exposed all their lives to the effects of severely concentrated disadvantage, and no matter how

long they are followed in their new neighborhoods, the effects of those earlier years are not fully erased.”

Robert Sampson, a professor of sociology at Harvard, argued in a 2008 essay published in the *American Journal of Sociology* that the project should have been called “Moving to Inequality.”

Sampson pointed out in an email that many of the adults in the program had lived in extreme poverty for decades and that the children, who were on average 11 years old when they entered the program, had spent their early years living in adversity. “The result,” he wrote, “is that developmental effects are difficult if not impossible to study in the research design,” which does not reveal the “lagged effects of severe disadvantage.”

While the M.T.O. participants moved to neighborhoods with somewhat less poverty and crime, their new homes were by no means in flourishing sections of the city. Sampson produced a map of Chicago showing that the overwhelming majority of families moved to areas that still qualified as communities of “high concentrated disadvantage” based on a measure combining poverty rates, unemployment, welfare receipt, female-headed households, racial composition and density of children.

In a separate study, Heather Schwartz, a researcher at the RAND Corporation, reached conclusions more in line with Sampson’s and Wilson’s. Schwartz examined the performance of low-income, mostly minority students in Montgomery County, Md., an affluent majority-white suburb of Washington.

The county adopted policies dispersing public housing so that many of the tenants, who were 72 percent black and 16 percent Hispanic, were housed in middle-class, largely white apartment complexes.

This allowed Schwartz to measure the performance of children from public housing who attended schools with large numbers of well-off white students, against the performance of those who attended schools with largely minority populations and much higher poverty rates.

The results are striking. The low-income minority children from public housing all started with similar math scores. But after seven years, those who went to schools where fewer than 20 percent of their classmates were poor shot ahead of those who went to schools where 20 to 80 percent of their classmates were poor. This difference in trajectories is shown in Figure 1, in which the green line

tracks math scores for poor children (defined as those receiving “free and reduced-priced meals” – a.k.a. FARM recipients) in relatively affluent schools, and the red line tracks math scores for poor children attending schools with much higher percentages of fellow students receiving FARM assistance.

Perhaps the most important factors in the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage are the long-term effects on infants of living in extreme poverty.

A study published by the American Academy of Pediatrics in 2011, “The Lifelong Effects of Early Childhood Adversity and Toxic Stress,” shows that “early experiences and environmental influences can leave a lasting signature on the genetic predispositions that affect emerging brain architecture and long-term health.” The pediatric study links “early adversity to later impairments in learning, behavior, and both physical and mental well-being.”

Early childhood stress affects the “developing architecture of the brain” in ways “that create a weak foundation for later learning, behavior and health.”

Looked at this way, the M.T.O. findings — that participants who were given vouchers for housing in low-poverty neighborhoods made no gains in employment and wage equality compared with those left behind in public housing and that their children showed no improvement in school performance — do not seem surprising.

For one thing, participants appear to have been given little or no support other than modest housing counseling. But the issue is deeper than that: Multigenerational poverty is self-evidently more than a question of housing. It is unlikely to yield to even the best-intentioned one-dimensional approach.

Multifactorial approaches may be more productive. Recent papers such as “The Legacy of Disadvantage: Multigenerational Neighborhood Effects on Cognitive Ability” and “Neighborhood Effects in Temporal Perspective: The Impact of Long-Term Exposure to Concentrated Disadvantage on High School Graduation” are part of a continuing research agenda looking more profoundly into the causes of the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage.

The criticism of the M.T.O. study (which is now complete) points to new avenues for exploration. Even though the interpretation of the results of the housing voucher program has become contentious and somewhat politicized, the debate itself has the potential to be constructive.

Significant change is possible, but more resources and more sophisticated research design will be a necessary next step.

Lines of possible future inquiry include evidence-based evaluations of total-immersion school systems like the KIPP program and a better understanding of the effects of poverty on brain development. Perhaps most importantly, in the debate over “neighborhoods or schools,” would be a concentrated focus on reducing racial and ethnic discrepancies in test scores, according to the economists Roland Fryer Jr. of Harvard and Steven Levitt of the University of Chicago. Fryer and Levitt argue that the elimination of “the test score gap that arises by the end of junior high school may be a critical component of reducing racial wage inequality.”

The two authors write, “we demonstrate that in stark contrast to earlier studies, the black-white test score gap among incoming kindergartners disappears when we control for a small number of covariates.” They add, “There is suggestive evidence that differences in school quality may be an important part of the explanation. None of the other hypotheses we test to explain why blacks are losing ground receive any empirical backing.”

We have to figure out a better way to approach intervention, whether it’s education-based or neighborhood-based or both. Otherwise how can we interrupt the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage we are only beginning to understand?



The New York Times | <http://nyti.ms/1qJlDmu>

POLITICS | NYT NOW

Number of Children Living in Poverty Drops Sharply, Census Bureau Reports

By ROBERT PEAR SEPT. 16, 2014

WASHINGTON — The poverty rate declined last year for the first time since 2006, the Census Bureau reported on Tuesday. But at the same time, it said, there was no statistically significant change in the number of poor people or in income for the typical American household.

The report showed significant improvements for children. The poverty rate for children under 18 declined last year for the first time since 2000, the bureau said, and the number of children in poverty fell by 1.4 million, to 14.7 million.

Over all, the bureau said, 14.5 percent of Americans were living in poverty last year, down from 15 percent in 2012.

Charles T. Nelson, a Census Bureau official, said the decline in the poverty rate resulted partly from an increase in the number of people working full time year-round. In particular, he said, the numbers show an increase in employment and earnings for parents with dependent children.

The bureau estimated that 45.3 million people were living below the poverty level in 2013. This was not a statistically significant change from the

estimate for 2012, the bureau said in its annual report on income and poverty.

Poverty thresholds vary with the size and composition of a family. A family of four was classified as poor if its income was less than \$23,830 last year; for one person, the threshold was \$11,890.

The official poverty levels are updated each year to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The income figures do not reflect the value of noncash benefits like food stamps, Medicaid, Medicare and public housing. Nor do they include capital gains or the effects of taxes and tax credits.

The official poverty rate indicates the number of poor people as a share of the total population. The rate can decline without a significant change in the number of poor people if the total population has grown.

Census officials said that income inequality did not change in a statistically significant way from 2012 to 2013. However, they said, inequality has increased substantially in the last two decades, and the most common measure of household income inequality, known as the Gini index, is up 4.9 percent since 1993.

Median household income in the United States was \$51,940 last year, the bureau said. This was not statistically different from median income in 2012, after adjustment for inflation. The number of households with income above the median is the same as the number below it.

Many households have not regained the purchasing power they had before the recession that began in December 2007. Median household income was 8 percent lower last year than in 2007, and the poverty rate was two percentage points higher.

“The typical family has still not seen its income recover from the deep recession, which came on top of a decade in which incomes stagnated for the middle class, itself part of a longer-term trend of increasing income inequality,” said Jason Furman, the chairman of President Obama’s Council of Economic Advisers.

The poverty rate is much lower than the 19 percent of 50 years ago, when President Lyndon B. Johnson declared “unconditional war on

poverty.” But it is higher than it was in the 1970s, when the rate dropped as low as 11.1 percent.

“If this report tells us anything, it’s that we can do better,” said Representative Paul D. Ryan, Republican of Wisconsin and chairman of the House Budget Committee. “The status quo simply isn’t good enough.”

Senator Sherrod Brown, Democrat of Ohio, said congressional Republicans were partly responsible because, he said, they were “blocking legislation that would raise the minimum wage, ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work and help Americans repay college loans.”

One-fifth of all American households had incomes of \$105,910 or more last year, the Census Bureau said, and the top 5 percent had incomes of \$196,000 or more. But median household income was still 8.7 percent below its peak in 1999.

The Census Bureau adopted a new set of questions in an effort to measure health insurance coverage more accurately. Using the new method, the bureau estimated that 42 million people, accounting for 13.4 percent of the population, were uninsured for all of 2013.

These figures are not directly comparable with prior years’ data on health insurance, or with estimates in surveys by other federal agencies. The National Center for Health Statistics, for example, said the number of Americans without health insurance had declined substantially in the first quarter of this year, in part because of the expansion of coverage under the Affordable Care Act.

The center said that the number of uninsured Americans had fallen by about 8 percent, to 41 million people, in the first quarter of this year compared with 2013, a drop that represented about 3.8 million people.

The Census Bureau report was based on interviews with 68,000 households chosen to be representative of the country. It also included these findings:

- The number of men working full time year-round increased by 1.8 million last year, and the number of women working full time throughout the year increased by one million.

■ Households headed by women with no husband present had less than half the income of married couples' households: \$35,150 versus \$76,500.

■ For Hispanic households, median income increased 3.5 percent, to \$40,960. This was the first increase for Hispanics since 2000. However, for non-Hispanic white, black and Asian households, income showed no significant change in 2013.

■ Among major racial and ethnic groups, only Hispanics experienced a significant change in their poverty rate (down two percentage points, to 23.5 percent last year). The number of Hispanics in poverty fell to 12.7 million, a reduction of 870,000.

■ Median income for households headed by noncitizens rose 6 percent last year, to \$40,580. There was no significant change in income for households headed by United States citizens, whether native-born (\$52,780) or naturalized (\$54,970).

In addition, the bureau said, nearly 20 million people lived in families with incomes below half the poverty level. One-third of them were children.

Data in the report showed the powerful effects of government benefit programs. In the absence of Social Security, it said, the number of people 65 and older in poverty would have been nearly 15 million higher last year. If food stamps had been counted as income, 3.7 million fewer people would have been classified as poor.

A version of this article appears in print on September 17, 2014, on page A17 of the New York edition with the headline: Number of Children Living in Poverty Drops Sharply, Census Bureau Reports.

© 2014 The New York Times Company