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WHAT IS WELLBEING?

There are many definitions of wellbeing. The Canadian Index of Wellbeing has adopted the following as its working definition:

The presence of the highest possible quality of life in its full breadth of expression focused on but not necessarily exclusive to: good living standards, robust health, a sustainable environment, vital communities, an educated populace, balanced time use, high levels of democratic participation, and access to and participation in leisure and culture.
A movement is underway not only in Ontario and Canada, but internationally that recognises the value of having accurate, relevant data to assist in decision-making and in the development of policy. “Evidence-based decision-making” is not just a catchphrase. It is a meaningful strategy leading to better community processes and outcomes that can enhance the quality of life of all Ontarians. It helps us recognise innovative solutions to the problems and issues, rather than relying on conventional practices that might not have produced the results we hoped for.

The Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW) recognises how important data are in helping us understand a complex society — a society that is made up of a number of interconnected systems — the domains of the CIW framework — where different sectors, our communities, and our governments interact, influence, and have impacts on the wellbeing of Ontarians. Efforts to improve wellbeing in one system, such as leisure and culture, will inevitably have positive impacts on others, such as community vitality, healthy populations, and the environment, and ultimately, on the entire community or society. This is a “systems thinking” approach, and a key goal of the CIW is to identify and understand the interconnections among the eight domains — each of which represents a system — and the many factors that comprise them to influence overall wellbeing. This approach leads to greater collaborations and to new and innovative solutions that have collective impact in our communities. At the core of the approach is the evidence.

SO, WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE RESIDENTS OF TORONTO?
WELLBEING IN TORONTO

Toronto has a population that is the youngest in the province overall, has the fewest married people and the most living on their own, the highest percentage of renters, and is by far the most ethnically diverse.

People in Toronto have the lowest after-tax median incomes of anywhere in the province as well as one of the highest levels of unemployment. Not surprisingly, then, the region has the highest percentage of people in the province in low income and facing food insecurity. Further, more Toronto residents are paying above 30% of their income on housing than anywhere else in the province. Even though Toronto has a high number of people in the upper-most income categories, the city overall is quite economically insecure, which is a reflection of the breadth of wealth distribution in the city.

Although three-quarters of the people in Toronto feel safe in their communities, this is the lowest level in the province, despite having one of the lower rates of incidence of severe crime. More than 1 in 10 people in this diverse city experience discrimination, one of the highest levels in the province. The percentage of people volunteering, both generally and for recreation and cultural organisations specifically, is the lowest in the province, and further, fewer people provide support to others in need. In contrast, more people in Toronto do volunteer for a political or advocacy organisation and express greater confidence in federal Parliament than anywhere else in the province. Relatedly, the people of Toronto elected the largest percentage of women MPs to Parliament.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Even though Toronto residents encounter the lowest levels of smog and greenhouse gas emissions than elsewhere in the province, they must still face similar environmental issues. However, they boast the highest participation rates in waste reduction through the Blue Box program, so they are doing their part.

Toronto has the highest percentage of adults with a university degree and who take advantage of educational activities as well as arts and cultural programs offered by libraries, which they visit in-person to a greater degree than residents of any other region. Toronto also has the highest percentages of children having their progress measured in creativity and in their social-emotional skill development by the elementary schools. However, there are fewer general programs and events available to children by libraries on a per capita basis.

Despite the highest percentages of employees with regular weekday work hours and greater flexibility in those work hours, Torontonians not only report the highest levels of time pressure, they participate less so than any other residents of Ontario in social leisure activities, monthly physical activity, and take shorter vacations. In contrast, they report the highest participation rate in arts and culture activities, presumably because of the wide array of arts-based opportunities in the city.

Finally, Toronto’s residents report levels of overall health, mental health, and health or activity-related limitations to their day-to-day living that are quite similar to the province as a whole. Overall, a majority of residents (81.0%) report being satisfied with their lives — yet, this is the lowest level by far in the province.

There is much to celebrate about living in Toronto. As this portrait of wellbeing illustrates, however, there are numerous factors across all domains of life that contribute to and detract from the residents’ quality of life. By recognising how these circumstances interact and intersect to affect the lives of Toronto’s residents in different ways, we are in a better position to make informed decisions that can lead to enhanced quality of life in this diverse city, and ultimately, the province overall.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IMPLICATIONS

The results of this exploration has provided some interesting insights as well as intriguing questions concerning the wellbeing of residents living in Toronto that could be considered when deciding on action. For example:

- In what ways might residents be encouraged to adopt more active lifestyles, both socially and physically? Are there programs or services not currently available that would broaden their choices and access to opportunities?

- What steps can be taken to reduce experiences of discrimination felt by people in this highly diverse city? How might the incidence of these experiences be related to high levels of economic insecurity and low levels of civic engagement?

- How can residents become greater stewards of the environment? Are there ways in which they could help reduce, or work with industry to reduce, the overall carbon footprint of the region?

- Given levels of low income and food insecurity that are the highest in the province, what more can be done to ensure fewer people face such economic hardships?

- What can be done to encourage more civic participation through volunteering and in the democratic process, so residents to feel more connected to their fellow citizens and to their community?

These questions are not presented as challenges. Rather, they are intended to stimulate further conversations among those with local knowledge and who are positioned to enhance the wellbeing of Ontarians. By reflecting on these questions and considering innovative solutions that could have an impact on many aspects of people’s lives, we hope community leaders will have an even greater understanding of the interconnectedness of the domains that define the wellbeing in people’s lives. Doing so leads more often to strategies that will advance policies, services, and programs for — and with — residents of the region and thereby create more interest, awareness, and participation in activities that will enhance their wellbeing.
WHY WE NEED THE CANADIAN INDEX OF WELLBEING (CIW)

The United Nations and the OECD agree — the true measure of a country’s progress must include the wellbeing of its citizens. The Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW) shifts the focus from solely on the economy to include other critical domains of people’s lives.

Increasingly, citizens and their government are thinking “beyond GDP” as a measure of our progress and quality of life. Even though Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is an important measure of our economic performance, it does not capture those areas of our lives that we care about most like education, health, the environment, and the relationships we have with others. GDP also is not sensitive to the costs of economic growth such as environmental degradation, loss of farmland, or growing income inequality.
The Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW) was created through the combined efforts of national leaders and organisations, community groups, international research experts, indicator users, and in particular, consultation with hundreds of Canadians. Those efforts and consultations led to the identification of the following eight areas or domains that contribute to, and continuously affect, the wellbeing of Canadians:

- **Community Vitality**
- **Democratic Engagement**
- **Education**
- **Environment**
- **Healthy Populations**
- **Leisure and Culture**
- **Living Standards**
- **Time Use**

We selected valid, reliable, and relevant measures as the indicators of the various aspects of a domain’s contribution to wellbeing. By integrating the indicators and domains and revealing their complex interconnections, the CIW provides a comprehensive portrait of quality of life in Canada and in Ontario.

The CIW composite index tracks all indicators and domains of wellbeing to measure our progress over time, highlighting where we are doing well and where we could be doing better. By 2014, we have seen GDP rise by 12.7% from its lowest point following the recession of 2008, yet the wellbeing of Canada’s residents continues to lag behind, recovering at a much slower rate.

The CIW’s call to action is to encourage all sectors to be guided by solid evidence, and to empower Canadians to advocate for change that reflects their needs and values. By putting wellbeing at the heart of policy development, funding decisions, programme development, and service delivery, we respond to our desire to know, “How can we do better?”
A REGIONAL PROFILE OF THE WELLBEING OF ONTARIANS: HOW ARE WE REALLY DOING?

Ontario’s GDP has recovered by 11.2% from its lowest point following the recession of 2008 — a good sign. However, the 2014 report commissioned by the Ontario Trillium Foundation, “How are Ontarians really doing?”1, showed that Ontarians’ overall wellbeing continues to lag well behind our economic growth.

While economic productivity in Ontario continues to recover, although not as quickly as for Canada overall, the wellbeing of Ontarians has not shown signs of rebounding from the recession in the same way that GDP has. To help address this gap, these reports provide evidence-based illustrations of the wellbeing of Ontarians in five different regions. These reports will therefore help us better understand the different challenges and opportunities that each region faces. We hope that everyone working to help improve wellbeing across the province can use the data provided in these reports to make more informed decisions when choosing how to focus their efforts.

A SNAPSHOT OF ONTARIO

DEMOGRAPHICS

Statistics Canada estimates that the population of Ontario in 2016 is 13,873,933 people, which represents 38.5% of the population in Canada. Since 2011, this represents an almost 8% growth in number of residents in Ontario.

The median age of Ontarians in 2011 was 40.4 years with just over 35% being 50 years of age or older. There are three persons per family on average, and of these families, 16.7% are led by a lone parent. In all of these characteristics, Ontario is very much like Canada overall.

Almost 11% of Ontarians have knowledge of both of our official languages, and overall, just under 30% reported that another language other than English or French was their first language. In contrast, across the country, many more Canadians (17.5%) report having knowledge of both official languages, but many fewer people (20.2%) report another language as their first language.

Also in 2011, the unemployment rate had dropped to 8.5% as Ontario continued to emerge from the 2008 recession albeit more slowly than the country overall where unemployment stood at 7.8%. The median after tax annual family income in Ontario was just under $72,000, which is much lower than the national median income of over $78,000 per year.
In this section, we provide an overview of wellbeing in Ontario and how it compares to Canada as a whole based on selected indicators representing each of the CIW’s eight domains. The majority of these indicators are from 2014.

Beyond basic demographic information, the Living Standards domain highlights areas where economic risk affects Ontarians’ wellbeing. In this regard, 13.9% of Ontarians are living in low income (i.e., where “low income” is defined as household income that is less than half of the national median income), and over one-quarter (27.0%) are paying in excess of 30% of their income on housing, which is a recognised benchmark for assessing the affordability of housing relative to income.\(^2\) In both cases, these percentages are higher than the national rates which are just under 10% and slightly over 25% respectively.

Just under 1 in 10 Ontarians (8.3%) report moderate to severe food insecurity, which is slightly higher than in the country as a whole (7.7%). Similar to Canadians overall, over one-quarter of working Ontarians (28.2%) report feeling stressed because of work, which can have an impact on the health and wellbeing of a significant proportion of the working population.

In terms of the Healthy Populations domain, almost 6 in 10 Ontarians (59.2%) rate their overall health as very good or excellent and almost three-quarters (70.4%) of residents rate their mental health as very good or excellent — both of which are very similar to what Canadians overall report. Over seven per cent (7.4%) of Ontarians report having diabetes — up significantly from 6.7% in 2013 — and higher than the national rate of 6.7%. In contrast, among teens (12 to 19 years of age), 

---

only 5.8% report smoking daily or occasionally, which is much lower than the national average of almost 8%. Over a third of Ontarians (35.4%) received immunization for influenza in the past year — slightly more than elsewhere in Canada (32.5%) — but still down from previous years.

With respect to the Community Vitality domain, over two-thirds of Ontarians (68.1%) have a somewhat or strong sense of belonging to their community, which is an increase over previous years, and well over half (57.3%) feel many or most people can be trusted, which is slightly down from previous years. In both instances, these percentages are higher than in Canada overall (65.9% and 51.8%, respectively). Similar to Canada overall, a majority of Ontarians (79.2%) feel safe walking alone after dark in their neighbourhoods, and under 1 in 10 residents (9.6%) report experiencing discrimination due to their ethnicity or cultural background. The Crime Severity Index in Ontario (50.0) is not only much lower than for Canada overall (66.7), but is lower than any other province. Further, the Index dropped 4.6% in Ontario between 2013 and 2014 — the fifth year in a row the Index has fallen.

The Leisure and Culture domain contributes to the wellbeing of Ontarians through their participation in a variety of free time pursuits and access to recreation opportunities. For example, on average, Ontarians spend 13.0% of their time on the previous day engaged in social leisure activities and another 4.1% in arts and culture activities. Over 90% of Ontarians engage in some form of physical activity (e.g., sports, walking, exercise) and do so about once per day for at least 15 minutes. In all of these activities, Ontarians are participating at rates very similar to Canadians overall. Ontarians volunteered for culture and recreation organizations for an average of 30.5 hours in the past year, which is, however, quite a bit lower than the national average of 34.3 hours.
In terms of Democratic Engagement, two-thirds of eligible Ontarians (67.8%) voted in the last federal election — up from previous elections — and about 4 in 10 people (39.6%) report that they have quite a lot or a great deal of confidence in Parliament — down from previous years (although this measure was taken prior to the last election). These figures and recent trends are similar to those in Canada overall. Ontario can, however, boast a higher percentage of female Members of Parliament (31.4%) than for Canada overall (26.0%).

As part of setting the stage for life, the Education domain shows that over half of Ontario elementary schools are measuring progress both in their learning environments (51.9%) and in their students’ health and wellbeing (55.7%). Related to the role of education in preparing students to be engaged in the democratic process, under one-third of elementary schools (29.0%) are measuring progress in students’ citizenship skills. As a positive developmental activity for children, Ontario adults spend on average almost 40 minutes per day in interactive, talk-based care of children from 0 to 14 years of age — more than the 35 minutes spent by Canadians overall. With respect to lifelong learning, only about 5% of Ontarians and Canadians 25 years of age and older are participating in education-related activities.

With respect to Time Use, almost 1 in 5 Ontarians (19.8%) report high levels of time pressure. This could in part be attributable to the almost one hour spent commuting to and from work (53.7 minutes per day on average) and the work weeks (i.e., over 50 hours per week) in which 14.3% of Ontarians are engaged — both of which are higher than for Canadians overall. Further, only about one-third of residents (30.5%) are getting the recommended 7 to 9 hours of quality sleep, which is a smaller percentage than in Canada overall (35.9%).

More positively, about half of Ontarians (46.1%) have some flexibility in their work hours and they are allocating 90 minutes per day on average to be with their friends. In both cases, these measures are higher than in Canada overall (43.2% and 84.3 minutes, respectively).
For the **Environment** domain, Ontario has a relatively high carbon footprint — it emitted 170 megatonnes of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in 2014, which represents just under one-quarter of the GHG emissions for Canada as a whole. Ontario’s contribution in recent years, however, has been declining in part due to the slowing of manufacturing and especially in reductions in residential emissions. Concentrations of ground level ozone in Ontario are at 27.4 parts per billion, which is well below the threshold set by the World Health Organisation (WHO) where lung damage and inflammation can occur. Across Ontario, the waste diversion rate — that is, all Blue Box and other materials diverted by municipalities from landfill — is 47.3%, which has been slowly and steadily increasing in recent years.

In terms of overall wellbeing, 85.6% of Ontarians report that they are satisfied with their lives, which is slightly lower than in Canada overall, but up from the previous year.
WELLBEING IN THE REGIONS OF ONTARIO

In this series of reports, we provide portraits of each of the five regions of Ontario using the most recent data available on selected indicators for each of the domains of wellbeing. By examining selected indicators of wellbeing within and across the eight domains of the CIW, these portraits can help inform the planning, development, and implementation of programmes and services that have greater potential to enhance the wellbeing of Ontarians, especially those who might be most marginalised. Creating portraits based on the CIW also provides an opportunity to learn more about the complexity of wellbeing in people’s lives and to see how it varies across the five main regions of the province.

Based on boundaries used by several of the Ministries in Ontario, the five regions described in these reports are made up of the counties and districts listed in the table at the right.

We begin with a brief demographic profile of the region, highlighting characteristics that make it unique. In the sections that follow, we present the eight domains of the CIW with descriptions of indicators of wellbeing that reflect how well Ontarians are doing within the region. Finally, a summary section highlights the distinctiveness of the region and points to potential interconnections among the domains. Three appendices are included that provide more detail on the methods and data sources (Appendix A), the specific indicators for the region and Ontario overall (Appendix B), and a glossary of terms used throughout the reports (Appendix C).

In each section, we compare the indicators of wellbeing within the region to the province as a whole. Such comparisons help us understand how Ontarians are doing relative to the province overall and focuses our attention on areas where we are doing well and where we might choose to direct greater emphasis in planning and allocating resources.
### Ontario Wellbeing Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>County/District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central</strong></td>
<td>Dufferin, Halton, Peel, Simcoe, Waterloo, Wellington, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>Brant, Bruce, Chatham-Kent, Elgin, Essex, Grey, Haldimand, Hamilton, Huron, Lambton, Middlesex, Niagara, Norfolk, Oxford, Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td>Algoma, Cochrane, Kenora, Manitoulin, Nipissing, Parry Sound, Rainy River, Sudbury (District &amp; City), Thunder Bay, Timiskaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toronto</strong></td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHICS

Recognising the unique socio-demographic profile of a region is an important first step in understanding the needs and circumstances of its residents. How many people live here? Are the residents generally younger or older than elsewhere in the province? What do their families look like? How diverse is the population? Answers to these questions allow us to make more informed decisions about the types of programmes and services that will best contribute to the wellbeing of the region’s residents.

POPULATION

According to the 2011 Census of Canada, the city of Toronto is home to over 2.6 million people, which represents slightly more than one-fifth (20.4%) of the total population of the province. This population lives in 630 square kilometres of land area, which represents just 0.1% of the province’s total land area. The large number of people in Toronto who are concentrated in such a comparatively small area translates into just over 4,100 people per square kilometre.

By 2016, the total population is expected to grow by about 4.5% raising the total population to just under 2.8 million people. Overall, the growth in population in Toronto is slightly below the 5.7% growth in Ontario’s total population in 2016.
AGE

The population of Toronto is somewhat younger than in the province overall. The highest percentages of residents are in the age ranges from 25 to 34 years (15.8%) and from 40 to 49 years (15.5%), and in fact, Toronto has a higher percentage of residents in every age category from 20 to 44 years than in Ontario overall. This higher percentage of younger residents in Toronto is reflected in a median age of 39.2 years compared to 40.4 years for Ontario as a whole, and points to the draw of the city for students and young people seeking employment opportunities as they begin their careers.
FAMILIES

More than one in five families in Toronto are led by a lone parent, almost 5% more than the province overall. The large majority of these parents (84.0%) are female. About half of the residents are married or living in a common-law relationship (51.1%), which is much lower than the provincial rate (57.7%).

Like Ontario overall, families in Toronto have an average of almost 3.0 persons living in the household. Just over half of the population owns their homes (54.6%) — considerably lower than the provincial rate of 71.4% — and just under half of the population rents their dwellings (45.4%), which is much higher than the province overall (28.5%) and undoubtedly reflects the housing affordability challenge faced by many Torontonians.

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

Somewhat troubling, the after-tax median family income of just over $65,000 in 2011 was the lowest in the province and much lower than the provincial value of almost $72,000. Further, the unemployment rate of 9.3% in Toronto is among the highest in the province even though the employment rate (58.3%) is very similar to that of the province overall (59.0%).

ETHNICITY AND LANGUAGE

Toronto has, by a considerable margin, the highest level of diversity in the province with almost half of the population (48.4%) being part of a visible minority, which is almost twice as high as the percentage for the province (25.5%). Despite its diversity, Toronto has the lowest percentage of Indigenous peoples in the province living in private households (0.8%).
Given its diversity, it is not surprising that almost half of the population in Toronto report another language as their first language compared to the over 1 in 4 people across the province. Many other first languages reported by residents have Asian origins. The largest in that group are residents who speak Chinese (3.3%) and Cantonese (3.2%), both of which are more than twice as large as for the province overall. With respect to our official languages, fewer than 1 in 10 people in Toronto report having a working knowledge of both official languages, which is lower than the province-wide rate.
COMMUNITY VITALITY

Vital communities are those that have strong, active, and inclusive relationships among people, private, public, and non-governmental organisations that foster individual and collective wellbeing.

Their qualities reflect the power and potential of a community to pull together, to adapt, and to thrive. Those qualities include measures of community safety and of caring relationships, participation in organised activities, and residents’ sense of belonging to their communities.

SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

Like most Ontarians, residents in Toronto generally feel a strong connection to their community, which reflects the steady rise in sense of belonging in recent years throughout the province. Over two-thirds of the population report feeling a somewhat or strong sense of belonging to their community, which is quite similar to the province overall. Such a connection to community in Toronto suggests that the majority of residents feel supported and are better able to cope and are more resilient when faced with challenging situations.

Residents of Toronto may feel this greater sense of belonging even though a comparatively higher percentage of people (12.7%) live alone compared to the province as a whole (9.6%). Perhaps because of the relatively higher proportion of singles in the city, well over half of Toronto’s residents (57.1%) report having five or more close friends who provide important social support. This percentage is higher than anywhere else in the province and 4% higher than the provincial rate (53.7%).
People in Toronto participate in organised activities, such as a union, a sport or recreation organisation, or a cultural or educational group, to a lesser degree (52.2%) than Ontarians overall (55.2%) even though these types of engagements would serve to reinforce their sense of belonging to their communities.

COMMUNITY SAFETY

The Crime Severity Index compiles all Criminal Code violations for each year and weights them by their seriousness, thereby providing an index that reflects the severity of criminal activity in an area. Toronto’s Index is slightly higher than the overall rate for Ontario, but still closer than anywhere else in the province. More positively, the Index has been dropping steadily over the years in all parts of the province, including Toronto. Further, even though the percentage is the lowest in the province, over three-quarters of Toronto’s residents (76.2%) report feeling safe walking alone after dark in their neighbourhood. This percentage is only slightly lower than the provincial rate of 79.2%, which has been rising in recent years throughout Ontario.
SOCIAL NORMS AND VALUES

The stronger sense of belonging people in Toronto feel appears to be related to a shared value to support their neighbours. Over three-quarters of residents in Toronto provide unpaid help to others in their communities who are on their own (77.1%), and this represents just a slightly lower percentage than for the province as a whole (81.0%).

Similar to the province as a whole, a little more than half of the residents in Toronto believe that many or most people can be trusted (56.4%). Building trust can lead to the development of strong interpersonal and community relationships so this low rate is of concern.

Just over 1 in 10 residents in Toronto report experiencing discrimination due to characteristics such as one’s ethnicity, race, or sexual orientation. This rate is one of the highest in the province, although only slightly higher than for the province as a whole (9.6%), which has remained largely unchanged in recent years. As a factor affecting not only the sense of belonging residents feel, but also their mental and emotional wellbeing, relatively low rates of discrimination are encouraging. However, we can always strive to do even better to help people feel welcome in our communities, especially in areas like Toronto which is the most ethnically diverse region in Ontario.
Democratic engagement means being involved in advancing democracy through political institutions, organisations, and activities. A society that enjoys a high degree of democratic engagement is one where citizens participate in political activities, express political views, and foster political knowledge; where governments build relationships, trust, shared responsibility, and participation opportunities with citizens; and where citizens, governments, and civil society uphold democratic values at local, provincial, and national levels.

A healthy democracy needs citizens who feel their votes count, are informed, participate, debate, and advocate. It needs governments at all levels to be transparent, inclusive, consultative, and trustworthy. In essence, political leadership, citizen participation, and communication demonstrate the level of democratic engagement.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

In the most recent federal election in October 2015, about two-thirds of eligible voters in Toronto voted (67.2%). This turnout is almost identical to the province as whole, which was up significantly from previous elections by 6%. Only slightly more than 4 in 10 residents of Toronto, however, have a great deal of confidence in our federal Parliament, although that measure was taken prior to the last election and might not reflect the renewed enthusiasm for democratic engagement resulting with a new government. Nevertheless, people in Toronto have the highest level of confidence in federal Parliament and much more than Ontarians overall, of which 39.6% expressed confidence, a level which has dropped considerably in the past decade. Perhaps their turnout at the polls is a reflection of their desire to have their voices heard and to effect change.
Very few residents in Toronto participate directly in the democratic process by volunteering for a law, advocacy, or political group (5.3%). However, this rate of volunteering is the highest in the province, and quite a bit higher than in Ontario overall, where only 3.8% of the population is engaged with such groups and down from previous years. These levels of engagement in the region and province are unfortunate because participation in political organisations connects citizens with one another and provides them with a forum to share and express opinions about a society they desire.

**POLITICAL LEADERSHIP**

About one-third of Members of both the provincial and federal Parliaments representing Toronto are women. These levels of representation are slightly below that for all women in the provincial Parliament and above that for all women representing Ontario in the federal Parliament and is in fact the highest rate in the province. Nevertheless, with over 50% of Ontario’s population made up of women, our democratic and decision-making institutions should fairly reflect their values and opinions, so more work is needed to encourage women to become involved in our governments and remove barriers to their involvement.
COMMUNICATION

Members of Parliament for Toronto dedicate 6.2% of their total eligible expenses to communications, typically in the form of newsletters or pamphlets mailed directly to householders in their ridings. These expenses are very slightly below the provincial average of 6.9%. Politicians’ investments in communications is a reflection of the strength of the connection between citizens and their local representative in Parliament, and a means of sharing activities and progress towards goals. With the advent of social media, print materials are relied upon less so the recent decline in budgets dedicated to this form of communication is not unexpected.
Education is the systematic instruction, schooling, or training given to the young in preparation for the work of life, and by extension, similar instruction or training obtained in adulthood.

Societies that thrive encourage a thirst for knowledge — at every age and stage of life. Education is a process that begins before school age and is reflected in pre-school arrangements such as childcare and early childhood education. It also continues beyond elementary and high school, to college, university, and professional training through apprenticeships. Education continues as lifelong learning.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Four in ten residents in Toronto, 25 to 64 years of age, have a university degree, considerably higher than the provincial rate, which has risen steadily in recent years. Further, many more residents participate in other education-related activities such as formal courses, special interest, and self-development classes (7.7%) than anywhere in the province. Across the province, the participation rate is 5.2% of the population, and although low, the rate has increased steadily over recent years both in the province and in Toronto.

Participation in education is critical for preparation for work as well as for ongoing personal development and its positive impact on our living standards and social networks. Creating more opportunities and encouraging greater participation in education-related activities would serve to enhance wellbeing because of their influence in many domains.
MEASURING PROGRESS

Elementary schools in Ontario make important contributions to the early development of our children and their preparation for life. In the past year, the Ontario Ministry of Education added “wellbeing” to its goals for the education system and many schools are now including softer skills such as creativity and social-emotional skills among their key measures of progress.³


In Toronto, the majority of schools are measuring student progress in areas such health and wellbeing and in the school learning environment. However, many fewer schools are measuring progress in the areas of the development of citizenship skills (28.6%) and creativity (25.6%). In the case of creativity, however, a much higher proportion of Toronto’s elementary schools are measuring progress than any other region in the province.

CONTRIBUTION OF LIBRARIES

Beyond their traditional role in providing citizens with the content they need to succeed, libraries in our communities have evolved to play a central role as a hub for community development, learning, and sharing. The many instructional programs and services they offer promote literacy, skill development, and access to technology for people of all ages.⁴


The public libraries in Toronto offer an average of an additional 4.7 programs per
1,000 children in areas such as arts and culture, health and wellness, and play groups, which is almost four times lower than the level of offerings overall in the province at an average of 16.5 programs. The libraries do, however, offer an average of 26.1 early literacy and leaning programs per 1,000 children, which is slightly higher than the province overall.

In comparison, libraries offer far fewer programs for adults. On average, libraries in Toronto offer about one program for every 5,000 adults related to career support and advice, job help, and skills training, which is the same as the provincial average. Libraries in Toronto are offering one-third as many learning programs for adults in other general topics of interest than the province as a whole. While these figures for the number of programs being offered might appear small, when one considers that for a city the size of Toronto (approximately 2.7 million people), a total of between 25,000 and 30,000 adult learning programs are being offered to the community. From this perspective, we can see the value of our public libraries’ contribution to education.

### CHILD CARE

The availability of quality child care, which has expanded in Ontario in recent years, contributes to our pre-school children’s social, emotional, developmental, and educational outcomes, especially for children living in lower income families. In Toronto, regulated, centre-based child care is available to about 1 in 4 children, which is more than anywhere else in the province, where overall, such spaces are available to about 1 in 5 pre-school children. Spaces made available to pre-school children extend the positive benefits derived from quality child care to more children, especially those most marginalised by income or access, and also provide families with more opportunity to allocate their time differently and reach work-life balance.

Children from 0 to 14 years of age benefit in their cognitive, linguistic, and social development from time spent in talk-based interactions with adults. In Toronto, adults spend an average of about 40 minutes per day in such interactions with children, which is almost identical to the rate in the province. These interactions contribute to our children’s overall development.
The environment is the foundation upon which human societies are built and the source of our sustained wellbeing. On a broader level, environmental protection involves the prevention of waste and damage while revitalizing our ecosystems and working towards the sustainability of all of our resources.

The environment is the basis for our health, our communities, and our economy. Despite its fundamental importance to human existence and the natural resource wealth it provides to Canada, we often fail to appreciate the various ecosystem services provided by nature that sustain human wellbeing. Indeed, how great is our wellbeing if we cannot breathe the air or drink the water?

**AIR QUALITY**

Ground level ozone — or “smog” — represents a potentially serious risk both to the environment (e.g., crop loss), to our health (e.g., respiratory issues), and to our health care system (e.g., increased hospital admissions). While ground-level ozone levels have been largely stable over the past two decades, they have increased in the province over the past year.

In Toronto, ground-level ozone is 24.3 parts per billion (ppb), which is lower than the provincial level of 27.4. Ozone levels tend to be lower in Toronto because ozone is depleted by reacting with nitrogen oxides emitted by vehicles and sources of local combustion. Nevertheless, while both city and provincial levels are well below standards that place people at risk, we can take action to prevent ozone production by increasing active transportation (i.e., walking, riding bicycles) or taking public transit and ensuring industry meets recommended targets.
Greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), which are a major contributor to climate change, have been declining slowly in recent years in Ontario. While much of this reduction is due to the slowing of manufacturing following the 2008 recession and especially the closure of coal-fired electricity generation plants, in recent years, the reduction of household emissions through conservation efforts also has been, on a proportional basis, a significant factor in helping to reduce overall emissions. Ontarians are doing their part.

Greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) from the largest facilities in Toronto were 1.2 megatonnes of CO$_2$ in the past year, which represents just 2.6% of the total emissions for the province as a whole (45.6 megatonnes)$^5$. Several other factors also affect the level of GHGs, including the intensity of economic activity and energy use due to variable climatic conditions throughout the year (e.g., increased use of air conditioning in the summer) — all of which are playing out in Toronto.

**WATER QUALITY**

The relative abundance of fresh water in the province is a tremendous benefit enjoyed by all Ontarians. The quality of fresh water in Ontario overall, as measured by its pH level, is 8.2, which is slightly alkaline (e.g., presence of calcium or magnesium), but well within acceptable limits and with no adverse effects. Fresh water in Toronto has an identical pH level to the province as a whole.

---

$^5$ Data on greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) in Ontario’s regions are taken from the Reported Facility GHG Data available from Environment and Climate Change Canada (http://www.ec.gc.ca/ges-ghg/default.asp?lang=En&n=8044859A), and represent only one part of total GHGs in the province; that is, only emissions generated by the largest operations in the province are reported.
**WASTE REDUCTION**

In Ontario, the percentage of all waste diverted from landfill, mainly through recycling programs, is about 25%. About 60% of all waste in Ontario is generated by the non-residential sector (e.g., factories, shopping malls, universities), yet it diverts only about 13% of the waste from landfill. In contrast, residential waste accounts for about one-quarter of the provincial total, yet Ontarians are diverting 47.3% of their waste from landfills, mainly through recycling through the Blue Box and Green Bin programs, and this rate has been improving in recent years.6

However, recycling rates overall have remained largely the same over the past decade.

In Toronto, the residential waste reduction rate is 52.6%, which is the highest rate among the regions. This higher rate is likely due to the more rapid expansion of recycling programs in urban centres and comparatively lower concentrations of heavy industry, which recycles less than residents.

---

HEALTHY POPULATIONS

The healthy populations domain considers the physical, mental, and social wellbeing of the population. It examines life expectancy, lifestyle and behaviours, and the circumstances that influence health such as access to health care.

Healthy populations captures both the overall health of the population ("health status") as well as factors that influence health ("health determinants"). This broad perspective is used because individuals’ lifestyles and behaviours are constrained and shaped by broader social factors such as how food is distributed and priced, how houses are constructed and located, how urban transportation is designed, how accessible health care and recreational services are, and how we interact with the natural environment.

SELF-REPORTED HEALTH

In terms of overall health, almost 6 in 10 residents in Toronto say their overall health is very good or excellent and 7 in 10 report that their mental health is very good or excellent. In both cases, these percentages are very similar to the provincial rates. While Toronto residents’ ratings of their health are not dramatically different from the province overall, they should be monitored because Ontarians’ ratings of their health, especially their mental health, have been declining somewhat in recent years.

Over two-thirds of the residents in Toronto are living with no health or activity limitations (69.3%), which is higher than the provincial rate of 67.9%. In fact, the percentage of residents living without such limitations is among the highest in the province, falling short of only of the residents in the Central region.
The incidence of self-reported diabetes has been increasing across the province in recent years, sitting currently at 7.4% of the population, but in Toronto, the rate is somewhat lower at just 7.0% of the population, the lowest incidence rate in the province.

**HEALTH-RELATED BEHAVIOUR**

Over the past decade, the number of Ontarians getting immunized against influenza each year has remained relatively unchanged at approximately one-third of the population. In Toronto, over one-third of residents got their flu shot (35.7%) in the past year.

Smoking is widely recognised as a health behaviour associated with a variety of illnesses that could otherwise be prevented. Preventing and reducing smoking at an early age, when such behaviour is typically adopted, is a strategy that ensures better health in later life.

Smoking rates among teens (aged 12 to 19 years) have been steadily decreasing across Ontario over the years. Considerably fewer teens (3.0%) living in Toronto report smoking, which is by far the lowest rate by almost half than anywhere else in the province.
HEALTH CARE ACCESS

Ontarians’ access to a regular health physician, such as a family doctor, is a useful indicator of the capacity and appropriateness of the primary health care system because such access is more effective in sustaining good health than episodic use of emergency care.

In Toronto, almost 90% of the residents have a regular health physician, which is somewhat lower than the provincial rate, and second only to residents in the North region in suggesting limited access to doctors.
LEISURE AND CULTURE

By participating in leisure and cultural activities, whether arts, culture, or recreation, we contribute to our wellbeing as individuals, to our communities, and to society as a whole. The myriad of activities and opportunities we pursue and enjoy benefit our overall life satisfaction and quality of life.

As forms of human expression, leisure and cultural activities help to more fully define our lives, the meaning we derive from them, and ultimately, our wellbeing. This remains true throughout our lives regardless of age, gender, or social group. The impact of participation in leisure and cultural activities is even greater for people in marginalized groups, such as those living with disabilities, living in poverty, and as members of a minority population.

LEISURE PARTICIPATION

Spending leisure time with others in pursuits of shared interest and in arts and cultural activities is an important way for people to connect, celebrate diversity, and develop and broaden their passions — all contributors to community social capital.

In Toronto, residents spend an average of 12.0% of their time on the previous day engaged in social leisure activities, such as socialising with others at home, going out, and volunteering with civic and family organisations, among other activities. This percentage of time is somewhat lower than the average for Ontario and is the lowest average in the province. In contrast, residents of Toronto spend on average 4.9% of their time on the previous day participating in arts and cultural activities (e.g., going to music concerts, visiting museums and galleries), which is higher than the overall provincial average, and the highest rate in the province.
An active lifestyle has numerous physical, social, and psychological benefits, and in Ontario, over 90% of the population reports participating in some form of regular physical activity during leisure time. In Toronto, residents report participating in physical activity lasting at least 15 minutes (and typically longer) an average of 24.4 times per month. This level of participation among Torontonians is not only lower than the provincial average, it is the lowest level of any region in Ontario.

When people volunteer, especially for recreation and cultural organisations, they not only derive important personal benefits from their commitment to activities in which they have a passion, but the community also benefits from the activities and programs that volunteering provides to residents. In the previous year, people in Toronto gave an average of 22.6 hours of their time to volunteering for recreation and culture organisations, which is significantly lower than the provincial average and is the lowest level of volunteering in the province. These lower volunteering rates might explain, in part, residents' lower amounts of time spent in social leisure activities.

Taking regular holidays provides relief from daily routines, opportunities to bond with friends and family, and revitalisation. The longer the vacation, the greater these benefits. Residents in Toronto report an average of 2.6 nights away per vacation trip in the previous year (to destinations at least 80 km away from home), which is slightly lower than the provincial average of 2.8 nights away and again the lowest rate in the province. Time away on holiday has been steadily decreasing in recent years in Ontario, and if the trend continues, residents will receive fewer of its benefits.
LIBRARIES

As noted earlier, libraries provide much more than just content to advance people’s education and interests. Indeed, they are important community hubs where people meet, engage in activities, and attend events, thereby strengthening community bonds. In this respect, for every 1,000 people in Toronto, over 130 in-person visits are made in a typical week to the libraries, and this is the highest rate of visitation in the province and significantly above the overall rate for the province as a whole.

In the past year, libraries in Toronto offered 12.4 library programs of various types to every 1,000 people, which is lower than the provincial rate of 16.6 programs per 1,000 people, and the lowest rate in Ontario. In contrast, the libraries offered 10.9 arts and cultural events and shows (e.g., Culture Days, poetry and story readings, art shows) per 10,000 people, which is more than double the provincial rate. So while Toronto’s libraries are offering comparatively fewer programs given its population, they are providing a much greater number of arts and cultural events than anywhere else in the province.

By making free computers and internet connections available in public libraries, access to information and resources is provided, especially to people who might otherwise not have it due to financial constraints. Providing such access at Toronto’s libraries (6.8 internet connections per 10,000 population) is somewhat lower than for the province as a whole (7.2 connections per 10,000 people), which might represent a challenge for marginalised people to get access.
LIVING STANDARDS

Living standards examines average and median income and wealth, distribution of income and wealth including poverty rates, income fluctuations and volatility, and economic security, including labour market security, and housing and food security.

Our living standards should reflect our capacity to transform economic growth into stable current and future income streams for everyone. Economic growth does not automatically translate into better living standards. A higher average income, for example, may be achieved at the cost of increased social inequality or greater economic insecurity. In contrast, achieving greater job quality, reducing poverty, and providing basic affordable housing and food security to individuals and families will raise wellbeing for everyone.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

As noted in the earlier section on Demographics, Toronto has an employment rate (58.3%) similar to the province overall, but one of the highest unemployment rates (9.3%), and the lowest after-tax median income ($65,335) of any region in the province. These characteristics might be suggestive of conditions of greater economic insecurity for its residents, who may feel there are fewer opportunities for a secure and stable job and less access to the necessities of life like food and shelter.

The percentage of persons in low income represents the proportion of Ontarians in families that are spending an additional 20% or more of their income than the average family on food, shelter, and clothing. The percentage of Ontarians in low income has edged up slightly in recent
years indicating that their economic security has lessened as well. In Toronto, the percentage of people in low income (19.3%) is by far the highest of any region in the province overall, and represents a significant concern as people struggle to make ends meet. This percentage represents approximately 500,000 people living in Toronto who are struggling economically so more could be done to support them.

Food insecurity occurs when nutritious food is not available to people, the amount of food is insufficient, and/or there are barriers to safe and effective food preparation, such as poor drinking water quality or sanitation issues. The numbers of people who are moderately or severely food insecure in Ontario has been rising in recent years, and now sits at 8.3% of the total population. As with low income, the percentage of residents in Toronto who are food insecure (11.6%) is the highest in the province overall, and given recent trends, suggests that the proportion of people who are food insecure is rising even more quickly in Toronto. This percentage represents well over 300,000 people in Toronto experiencing food insecurity.

**HOUSING SECURITY**

For housing to be considered affordable, housing costs should be less than 30% of a family’s before-tax household income.

Despite trends in economic security, Toronto has by far the highest percentage residents spending 30% or more of their income on housing (34.8%) than anywhere else in the province. Housing is a major part of a family’s expenses, and in Toronto, residents are much less secure than any other region in the province with respect to shelter, which might be linked to the comparatively higher percentage of people in Toronto who do not own their own homes.
WORK-RELATED STRESS

High levels of stress attributed to work can be related to a variety of factors including poor job quality and low stability — and hence, security — as well as longer hours of work and poor working conditions. About 3 in 10 working residents in Toronto report feeling high levels of work-related stress, which is the highest rate among the regions. These higher levels of stress, coupled with the stresses associated with greater economic, food, and housing insecurity evident in Toronto, can have a serious effect on the physical and mental health of Toronto residents.
TIME USE

Time use measures how people experience and spend their time. It considers how the use of our time affects physical and mental wellbeing, individual and family wellbeing, and present and future wellbeing. It examines the length of our workweek, our work arrangements, our levels of time pressure, and the time we spend with friends and in other free-time activities.

The implicit assumption with Time Use is the notion of balance. Most activities are beneficial to wellbeing when done in moderation, but are detrimental when done excessively or not at all. There are only 24-hours in a day, so too much time directed towards one activity can mean not enough or no time at all allocated for other activities that are also critical for our wellbeing. Not only does the amount of time matter, but the pace of and relative control over timing of activities throughout the day can affect overall quality of life.

TIME

How much time Ontarians devote each day to certain kinds of activities may be beneficial — or detrimental — to their wellbeing. While some people might have the ability to allocate their time to achieve greater work-life balance, too often, factors beyond their control dictate how that time gets allocated.

In Toronto, 14.5% of the people are working 50 hours or more each week, well beyond the maximum 35 to 40 hours of most full-time employment. This proportion of the working population is very similar to the provincial rate (14.3%), and might reflect, too, recent trends that fewer people are working longer hours.

Residents in Toronto spend on average over an hour commuting to and from work each day (68.4 minutes). This commute time is by far the highest in Ontario. Not only is the length of a commute in Toronto a
concern for people’s wellbeing, but the high levels of traffic congestion make its negative impact even greater.

When work hours and commute times are long, one way of mitigating the negative impact is through social support systems like socialising with friends. Perhaps because more people are working long hours and facing lengthy commutes, residents in Toronto are, on average, spending less time with friends each day. People spend on average about four minutes less each day with friends than the provincial average of about 90 minutes per day. While this difference might appear low, the cumulative effect of more time with friends can have a significant impact on people’s wellbeing and connection to their communities.

**TIMING**

*Timing* considers when activities occur during the day, and how easy or difficult it might be for Ontarians to schedule activities like work, leisure, meals, or volunteer commitments. The more easily people can control their time, the greater their wellbeing.

Having regular, weekday work hours increases the sense of stability and security people feel about their jobs. In Toronto, 69.8% of people have regular working hours, which is the highest percentage of any region in Ontario, which sits at 65.9%. Further, the percentage of residents in Toronto who have access to flexible work hours (i.e., when they choose to begin and end their workday) also is the highest of anywhere in the province. Over half of the people have flexible working hours, which is much higher than the provincial rate. Overall, working people in Toronto appear to have more control over their time.
TEMPORALITY

Temporality focuses on the natural rhythms associated with time such as our sleep and waking time rhythms, transitions from day to night, and activities associated with the changing of the seasons.

Sleep is a biological necessity — we need good quality sleep in order to function. Adults require between seven to nine hours of sleep per day, and too much, too little, or poor quality sleep is detrimental to our wellbeing. Somewhat more than one-quarter of people in Toronto (27.0%) report getting between seven and nine hours of quality sleep, which is much lower than the provincial rate of 30.5%, and the lowest in Ontario. Even though the percentage difference appears small, a greater concern is that less than a third of the population report that they are getting a decent night’s sleep.

Taking into consideration the long work hours and much longer commute times that many working-age residents face might explain why more people in Toronto feel high levels of time pressure. Compared to the provincial rate, about 1 in 5 people in Toronto report high levels of time pressure — the highest rate in the province along with the West region. Levels of time pressure have remained relatively stable in recent years and suggest the ongoing challenge of achieving work-life balance for many Ontarians.
APPENDIX A: METHODS

To create these regional reports on the wellbeing of Ontarians, the most recent data available come from three main sources. These sources of data provided demographic characteristics and indicators for each of the eight domains comprising the CIW’s framework identified as critical to our overall wellbeing (i.e., community vitality, healthy populations, democratic engagement, the environment, leisure and culture, education, living standards, and time use).

1. National survey data and other federal sources — wherever possible, indicators used for the CIW’s national index comprising the eight domains are used. The most recent data, principally from Statistics Canada and other federal agencies (i.e., Ministry of Environment and Climate Change; Legislative Assembly of Canada; Elections Canada) are the main sources for creating portraits of wellbeing. Many of the indicators come from national surveys, including the Canadian Community Health Survey, the General Social Surveys (various cycles on Time Use; Victimization; Social Engagement; Canadian Survey on Giving, Volunteering, and Participating), and the Ethnic Diversity Survey;

2. Provincial data sources — when national data were not available, we chose proxy indicators for several of the domains from provincial agencies and not for profit organisations. The agencies from which indicators were drawn included the Government of Ontario’s Public Library Statistics; Government of Ontario’s Provincial Water Quality Monitoring Network; Ministry of Children and Youth Services; Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s After-School Program; Ontario Provincial Park Statistics; and People for Education; and

3. Census of Canada — primarily for the section describing the demographic characteristics of Ontarians, data have been taken from the most recent Census of Canada (2011) and augmented by selective use of data from the National Household Survey. The Census also provided the means to adapt selected indicators from national and provincial sources to per capita measures thereby allowing for direct comparisons between regions with quite different population sizes.
Almost all of the data from national sources are for the year 2014. We also used a few data sources from 2013 and at least two from 2015. For the section on demographics, we used the most recent Census of Canada (2011) along with selected indicators from the National Household Survey (2011), where appropriate. To ensure comparability across regions of different population sizes, some indicators have been converted to per capita measures (e.g., number of incidents per 100,000 people). In these cases, we base our population estimates on Statistics Canada guidelines.

The greatest limitation to securing indicators for all of the domains was availability of data at the regional level in Ontario. While indicators could typically be taken from national sources and reported for Ontario as a whole, they could not be disaggregated to the regional level. This limitation occurred for two main reasons. First, the national data simply may not have been available at the regional level, or second, when data were available, the sample was too small for valid reporting on the indicator. We addressed this limitation by seeking out provincial sources of data that could provide appropriate proxy indicators. Provincial sources were scrutinised carefully for conceptual fit, accuracy, and comparability across all provincial regions.

Once we identified, validated, and aggregated the data sources for the five regions of Ontario, portraits of wellbeing across Ontario emerged. These portraits offer a more comprehensive and interconnected understanding of different aspects of wellbeing and how they vary for residents in different regions across the province.
## Appendix B: Summary Statistics for Toronto and Ontario

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of provincial population</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of provincial land area</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Median age in years</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population under 15 years of age</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population 50 years of age and older</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of population 15 years of age or older that is married or living common-law</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of families led by lone parent</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of lone-parent families led by females</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households</strong></td>
<td>Average number of persons per family</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population that owns their homes</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of private households occupied by Aboriginal peoples</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language and Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of population with English as first language</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population with French as first language</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population with another language as first language</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population with knowledge of both English and French</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of visible minority population</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and Income</strong></td>
<td>Employment rate</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After-tax median family income</td>
<td>$ 65,335</td>
<td>$ 71,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNITY VITALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TORONTO</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting somewhat/strong sense of belonging to community</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting participation in organised activities</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population living alone</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of population with five or more close friends</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>Crime Severity Index</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population who feel safe walking alone after dark</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL NORMS AND VALUES</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of population who provide unpaid help to others on their own</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population who believe that many/most people can be trusted</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting experience of discrimination</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TORONTO</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITIZEN PARTICIPATION</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of eligible population that voted in last federal election</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population who volunteer for a law, advocacy, or political group</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage with a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in federal parliament</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of female Members of Parliament (MPs) federally</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of female Members of Provincial Parliament (MPPs)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of total expenses used by Members of Parliament (MPs) to send communications to householders in their ridings</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TORONTO</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of population age 25 and older participating in education-related activities</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of 25 to 64 year olds in population with a university degree</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEASURING PROGRESS</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of elementary schools measuring progress in student health or wellbeing</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of elementary schools measuring progress in citizenship skills</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of elementary schools measuring progress in creativity</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of elementary schools measuring progress in socio-emotional skills</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of elementary schools measuring progress in school learning environment</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBRARIES</strong></td>
<td>Average number of early literacy and early learning programs per 1,000 children</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average number of other children’s programs per 1,000 children</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average number of careers, job help, and skills programs per 1,000 adult population</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average number of adult learning programs per 1,000 adult population</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILD CARE</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of children aged 0 to 4 years for whom there is a regulated centre-based child care space</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average minutes per day spent in interactive (talk-based) child care for children 0 to 14 years of age</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Ground level ozone (population weighted in parts per billion)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall total GHG emissions (megatonnes of CO2 per year)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of provincial GHG emissions (megatonnes of CO2 per year)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>pH levels (based on a 1 to 14 scale where 7 is considered neutral)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Reduction</td>
<td>Percentage of total residential waste diverted by municipalities (includes Blue Box and other materials)</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Healthy Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reported Health</td>
<td>Percentage of population who rate their overall health as very good or excellent</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population who rate their mental health as very good or excellent</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population with no health or activity limitations</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population with self-reported diabetes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-Related Behaviour</td>
<td>Percentage of daily or occasional smokers among teens aged 12 to 19 years</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of population getting influenza immunization</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Access</td>
<td>Percentage of population with a regular health physician</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Leisure and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Participation</td>
<td>Average percentage of time spent on the previous day in social leisure activities</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average percentage of time spent on the previous day in arts and culture activities</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average monthly frequency of participation in physical activity lasting over 15 minutes</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average number of hours in the past year volunteering for culture and recreation organisations</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average number of nights away per vacation trip in past year to destinations at least 80 km from home</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks</td>
<td>Number of provincial parks per 100,000 population</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average number of visitors ('000s) per provincial park in past year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Number of annual library programs in past year per 1,000 population</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Culture Days, poetry and story readings, and arts shows in past year per 10,000 population</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of in-person visits made to the library in a typical week per 1,000 population</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of library internet connections per 10,000 population</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIVING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TORONTO</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SECURITY</td>
<td>After tax median income of economic families</td>
<td>$ 65,335</td>
<td>$ 71,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of persons in low income</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of households that are moderately or severely food insecure</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING SECURITY</td>
<td>Percentage of households with shelter costs exceeding 30% of before-tax household income</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK-RELATED STRESS</td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting quite a bit or extreme self-perceived work stress</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TORONTO</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting working 50 hours or more per week</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average workday commute time (both ways) for individuals working for pay (minutes per day)</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average amount of time spent with friends (minutes per day)</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMING</td>
<td>Percentage of labour force with regular, weekday work hours</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of individuals working for pay with flexible work hours</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPORALITY</td>
<td>Percentage of population who report 7 to 9 hours of good quality essential sleep</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of 15 to 64 year olds reporting high levels of time pressure</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL LIFE SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TORONTO</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEING</td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting being somewhat to very satisfied with life</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPOSITE INDEX

A composite index is a grouping of factors, measures, or other indices that have been combined in a standardized way, providing a useful statistical measure of overall performance over time.

CRIME SEVERITY INDEX

The Crime Severity Index measures changes in the level of severity of crime in Canada from year to year. The Index includes all Criminal Code violations including traffic, as well as drug violations and all Federal Statutes, and is calculated using Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR2) data. In the index, all crimes are assigned a weight based on their seriousness. The level of seriousness is based on actual sentences handed down by the courts in all provinces and territories. More serious crimes are assigned higher weights, less serious offences lower weights. As a result, more serious offences have a greater impact on changes in the index (Statistics Canada, 2015).

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (GHGS)

Greenhouse Gases are any gaseous compounds in the atmosphere that absorb infrared radiation, which results in heat being trapped and held within the atmosphere. As trapped heat increases in the atmosphere, the greenhouse effect results, which leads to global warming. Some forms of human activity (e.g., burning fossil fuels, deforestation) lead to certain types of gas released into the atmosphere, which leads to more warming. Carbon dioxide is the primary gas responsible for the greenhouse effect, but methane, nitrous oxide, and water vapour also contribute to the effect.

GROUND-LEVEL OZONE

Ground-level ozone is a colorless and highly irritating gas that forms just above the earth’s surface. It is called a “secondary” pollutant because it is produced when two primary pollutants react in sunlight and stagnant air — nitrogen oxides and volatile organic
compounds (i.e., carbon-containing gases and vapors such as gasoline fumes and solvents) — which come from both natural sources and human activities (e.g., burning fuels). Ground-level ozone irritates the respiratory tract and eyes, and exposures to high levels result in chest tightness, coughing, and wheezing, so people with respiratory and heart problems are at a higher risk. Ozone also causes agricultural crop loss each year in Ontario and noticeable leaf damage in many crops, garden plants, and trees.

(See: https://www.ec.gc.ca/air/default.asp?lang=En&n=590611CA-1).

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY**

Affordable housing should cost less than 30% of a family’s before-tax household income. Shelter costs include, as applicable, mortgage payments (both principal and interest), property taxes, condominium fees, and payments for electricity, fuel, water, and other municipal services (CMHC, 2015).

**LOW INCOME CUT-OFF**

Low income cut-off (LICO) is an income threshold below which a family will likely devote a larger share of its income on the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing than the average family. The approach is essentially to estimate an income threshold at which families are expected to spend 20% more than the average family on food, shelter, and clothing (Statistics Canada, 2015. See: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75f0002m/75f0002m2015001-eng.htm).

**pH LEVEL**

pH level is a measure of the acidity of water and therefore its quality. Pure water is neutral and has a pH level of 7.0. As values fall below 7.0, water is increasingly acidic; as values rise above 7.0, water is increasingly alkaline. Changes in the pH level of water are important for the health of many organisms. Most organisms have adapted to life in water of a specific pH and may die if it changes even slightly. Factors that can affect the pH level include in the type bedrock and soil composition over which water flows; the amount of organic material in the water as it decomposes; and the release of chemicals into the water, typically from human sources.

**WASTE DIVERSION RATE**

The waste diversion rate is the percentage of the total amount of waste material that is kept out of landfills. In other words, the rate represents that part of all waste materials diverted as a percentage of the total amount of waste disposed.