Table of Contents

Board Letter ............................................................................................................................................ 3

Introduction ........................................................................................................................................... 6

Health-Care Access & Well-being .................................................................................................... 16
   Health-Care Access for Missouri Women ................................................................................... 17
   Infant Mortality ............................................................................................................................... 19
   Breast Cancer ................................................................................................................................... 20
   Diabetes ............................................................................................................................................ 21
   Control of Fertility among Missouri Women ............................................................................. 22
   Health-Care Access and Well-being Conclusion ........................................................................ 24
   WPA Policy Recommendations .................................................................................................... 24

Workforce & Education ..................................................................................................................... 26
   Missouri Women in the Workforce .............................................................................................. 27
   Ratio of Women’s to Men’s Educational Status ....................................................................... 28
   Ratio of Women to Men Enrolled in and Completing Higher Education .................................. 30
   Ratio of Women’s to Men’s Earnings with and without Degree .................................................. 32
   Ratio of Women’s to Men’s Earnings by County ....................................................................... 34
   Workforce and Education Conclusion ........................................................................................ 36
   WPA Policy Recommendations .................................................................................................... 36

Economic Justice ................................................................................................................................. 38
   Poverty .............................................................................................................................................. 39
   Housing Affordability ..................................................................................................................... 41
   Child Support Compliance ............................................................................................................. 42
   Child Care Assistance ..................................................................................................................... 44
   Births to Mothers without High School Diplomas ..................................................................... 46
   Teen Birth Rate ............................................................................................................................... 48
   Domestic Violence .......................................................................................................................... 49
   Economic Justice Conclusion ...................................................................................................... 50
   WPA Policy Recommendations .................................................................................................... 51

Civic Engagement ............................................................................................................................... 54
   Voter Registration Ratio ................................................................................................................ 55
   Voter Turnout ..................................................................................................................................... 56
   Women Representing Missourians in National and State Legislatures .................................... 57
   Women Appointed as County Commissioners ............................................................................. 60
   Women’s Participation on Local School Boards ......................................................................... 61
   Women’s Participation in the Judiciary .......................................................................................... 62
   Volunteerism .................................................................................................................................... 63
   Civic Engagement Conclusion ..................................................................................................... 64
   WPA Policy Recommendations .................................................................................................... 65

Conclusion ............................................................................................................................................. 66
Where to Find More Information ....................................................................................................... 67
County Ranking Tables ..................................................................................................................... 68
Letter from the Women’s Policy Alliance

The Women’s Policy Alliance is pleased to have partnered with the University of Missouri’s Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis to create the Missouri Women’s Report. Together we set out to document how women in Missouri are faring compared to the population as a whole. We wanted to create an accurate picture of the lives Missouri women are leading today.

The data tells us that the gaps between men and women in terms of income, access to health care, financial rewards of education, and women’s participation in the public sphere, are indisputable. The data also shows that women, one half of the adult population, are a huge asset; an enormous source of untapped potential for growing Missouri’s economy and for improving the health and education of our citizens.

Given this, and the hardship that the current economic situation has caused so many Missourians, the Women’s Policy Alliance encourages our state’s leaders, in the public and private sector, to look strategically at women as an asset to help Missouri thrive.

Finally, we hope this data and the picture it paints, will inspire the people of Missouri to create a future where women have the same opportunities as men to earn a living, support their families, be healthy, benefit from education, and engage in public life.

Margaret Eaton, Board Chair

The Women’s Policy Alliance is a non-profit organization formed in 2006 to improve the status of women in Missouri. We provide policy makers, advocates, and the media with data and evidence-based analysis of public policies that promote women’s opportunities for advancement and equity.
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Introduction

Why Focus on Women?

Though the status of women in this country has certainly improved over the past century, there is still much progress to be made. While women are better represented in the workforce than they were in the past, they are increasingly challenged to manage finances, family services, health care, and childcare in single parent, single income homes. At the same time, women have yet to achieve equal pay or equal rights and face barriers to job promotion, education, and access to quality and affordable health-care services.

The qualitative well-being of women has long been intuitively and empirically understood as a proxy for, or a way to gauge, the quality of life for communities and families. Women usually have less access to resources than men. Women typically are primary caretakers of dependent family members, and women are typically the head of household in single-family households that include dependents.

Prior Reports of Women’s Status

The need to examine and track economic and social indicators reflecting women’s lives has been recognized for at least 65 years. The United Nations formed the Commission on the Status of Women in 1946, stating:

The functions of the Commission shall be to prepare recommendations and reports to the Economic and Social Council [of the United Nations] on promoting women’s rights in political, economic, social, and educational fields. The Commission shall also make recommendations to the Council on urgent problems requiring immediate attention in the field of women’s rights.

Furthermore, the United Nations declared 1975 the International Women’s Year and 1976-1985 as the UN Decade for Women. Since then, the UN has encouraged countries to collect data that describe and track the status and quality of women’s lives.

In the United States, the President’s Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) was formed in 1961 to examine employment issues, education, and Social Security issues that pertain to women.

The Institute for Women’s Policy Research (IWPR) has become a leading source of analysis of women’s status across the country. In addition to its The Status of Women in the States report, between 1996 and 2004, IWPR produced individual reports on women’s status in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as biennially updated reports on national trends across the states. The IWPR reports have three main goals: 1) to analyze and disseminate information about women’s progress in achieving rights and opportunities; 2) to identify and measure the remaining barriers to equality; and 3) to provide baseline measures and to continue to monitor women’s progress throughout the country. The IWPR issued their comprehensive report on Missouri, The Status of Women in Missouri, in 2002.

More recently (March 2011), a Women in America report was released by the White House Council on Women and Girls. Its focus was on providing longitudinal data on the status of women with social and economic indicators, using data collected by Federal agencies. This landmark report also informed work on the Missouri Women’s Report, and further demonstrates the timeliness of examining the local contexts in which Missouri’s women live.
No comprehensive analysis of the status of women in Missouri has been conducted since the 2002 report issued by the IWPR. This Missouri Women’s Report builds upon work done by the IWPR and the White House Council on Women and Girls to examine how women and, by extension, communities, are faring within Missouri as a whole as well as counties within the state. It is clear these tools can play a critical role in indentifying strengths, and help to pinpoint areas in which policy changes could be instrumental in improving the lives of women.

**Who are Missouri’s Women?**

According to the 2010 U.S. Decennial Census, women comprise 51.0%, or approximately 3.1 million, of the state’s total population of 5,988,927 persons. Missouri’s total population is primarily White (82.8%), with Black or African Americans comprising the largest racial minority in the state (11.6%). Additionally, approximately 3.5% of the population identified as Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.

**Missouri Total Population by Race, 2010**

- White: 82.8%
- Black or African American: 11.6%
- American Indian and Alaska Native: 0.5%
- Asian: 1.6%
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander: 0.1%
- Other Race: 1.3%
- Two or More Races: 2.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 SF1
The shape of the population pyramid below provides important information about the composition of Missouri’s population. As the pyramid shows, the overall population is relatively evenly split between males and females. The Baby Boom population is evident in the pyramid as a bulge in the middle at ages 45 to 64. The uneven point at the top of the pyramid reveals the differences in the number of males and females at older ages. Variations significant enough to impact public policy do exist between males and females by geography, life cycle and household composition.

The population of Missouri and the United States has continued to grow older. Examining a population’s age and sex is a way to help understand variation over time. In 2010, 13.8% of the population was 65 and older in the United States; in the same time period 14% of the population was 65 and older in Missouri. Relative to the U.S., trends since 1980 in Missouri’s population percentages indicate there are slightly more women, a reflection of the state’s older-than-average demographic. In 2010 females 65 and older comprised 7.9% of the total U.S. population; females 65 and older comprised 8% of the total Missouri population.

Women have longer life expectancy than men, and aging women are more likely to live alone, be frailer, and live in poverty.
Generally, life expectancy for women is longer than it is for men. In the 2010 Census, there were approximately twice as many women as men at age 89, for both Missouri and the United States. As women age, particularly past 65, they are more likely to live alone, become frailer and poorer. As the Baby Boomers age, particularly in Missouri’s most rural counties, policy makers can anticipate the need for a shift in health care, transportation and housing resources for this population.

As can be seen in the accompanying map, in 2009, of the Missourians 65 and older, 57% were female. In twelve Missouri counties and the City of St. Louis, females comprised 52% or more of the total population. All of these 13 geographies had a greater percent of females age 65 and over, ranging from 58.4 to 64.1% of the total population age 65 and over, compared to 57.9% for the state overall. Women age 65 and older comprised 60% or more of the 65 and older population in nine Missouri counties and the City of St. Louis. With the exception of the City of St. Louis and Buchanan County, these counties are quite rural and clustered in the Northeast and Southeast quadrants of Missouri.
Missouri Population Age 65 and Over, Percent Female, by County, 2010

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2010 SF1
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 15, October 2011

US Median Age at First Marriage
(1950-2010)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2010 and earlier
Life cycle transitions also affect the social and economic opportunities and obligations of women. Traditionally, women who marry increase their economic and social status in a community. For the last several decades, the median age at first marriage has been increasing, both for men and for women. Women tend to marry men who are slightly older.

Similarly, the proportion of the adult population that has never been married has increased since 1980, and the proportion of the population that is currently divorced has increased slightly over this time as well. Women are consistently more likely than men to be widowed, which is not surprising given women’s greater longevity and tendency to marry older men.

In seven Missouri counties and the City of St. Louis, 20 to 40% of families are headed by single females, which tend to be more stressed financially and socially than family households with more than one income. Conversely, there are only 14 Missouri counties with less than 10% of families headed by single females. The most urbanized and the Bootheel counties in Missouri are likely to have the greatest percent of single female heads of households, while northern rural Missouri counties have the least. These findings are likely driven by the fact that Bootheel and urban counties have larger minority populations and minority women are more likely to be single heads of households than non-minority women.

Recent decades have seen an increase of women in the workforce, increases in the age of first marriage and the birth of first child, and more women who are heads of single-parent households. Although it is difficult to pinpoint the exact cause(s) of these highly interrelated changes, they highlight the critical importance of women in our social, political,

---

**Life cycle transitions affect women’s social and economic opportunities, as well as their obligations.**

---

**Marital Status**

(Percent Distribution of the Population Age 15 and Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; 1980, 1990, 2000 SF3; 2009 American Community Survey
and economic lives. As public policy makers prioritize need and deploy resources, they need to keep in mind the trends that increase the diversity of Missouri’s households particularly with respect to geography, life cycle, and family composition.

How Should This Report be Used?

The Missouri Women’s Report provides gender-specific data and analysis to legislators, advocacy groups, and Missouri citizens in order to highlight current issues that have both positive and negative impact on the lives of women in Missouri. All levels of government need reliable information to implement and evaluate programs and policies. In addition, the Missouri Women’s Report identifies opportunities for policy reform to significantly improve the lives of women in our state.

How We Measure the Well-being of Women in Missouri

Those interested in influencing women’s issue-oriented policy changes should be armed with the most accurate picture of the lives of women in their state. To that end the Women’s Policy Alliance and The Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis have partnered to publish The Missouri Women’s Report. This report will be disseminated to advocates, policy makers and citizens around the state in hopes of stimulating policy initiatives that will have a positive impact on Missouri women.
of women. The Women’s Policy Alliance and the MU Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis conducted focus groups throughout the state and established an advisory panel to provide input into the structure and content of the report.

**Indicators and Measures**

The indicators and measures presented in the *Missouri Women’s Report* are organized around four categories of information:

- Health and Well-being
- Workforce and Education
- Economic Justice
- Civic Engagement.

Because the cost of primary data collection is prohibitive, the *Missouri Women’s Report* relies on indicators derived from reliable secondary data sources such as the U.S. Census Bureau and Missouri state agencies.

Women’s lives and the role women play in Missouri communities are complex and multi-faceted. While it is necessary to use categories for purposes of analysis, it is important to acknowledge that these categories are artificial. They are useful for analysis and thinking through policy options, but a necessarily imperfect method for quantifying the evolving combination of contributions made by women to our communities and our economy, and the barriers to opportunities that women continue to face.

---


Health-Care Access and Well-being
Health is a critical element when evaluating one’s status in life. Health and access to health care play a significant role within this report because of their impact on quality of life. Besides affecting quality of life, health problems can negatively impact a woman’s ability to care and provide for her family. As long as health care is a commodity, health outcomes for women will be affected by women’s earning potential. In Missouri, women earn 26% less than men, \(^1\) and women are more likely than men to be employed in part-time jobs that fail to provide health insurance. The number of uninsured Americans rose by 4.4 million to 50.7 million between 2008-2009, the first increase in the number of uninsured Americans since data collection on this indicator began in 1987. \(^2\) Women are often single heads of households, raising children and solely bearing the cost of health care, education, housing, and food. As a result, many working women are caught in the middle: they earn too much to qualify for Medicaid yet cannot afford even basic health-care coverage.

Although women have a longer life expectancy than men, they do not necessarily live those extra years in good physical and mental health. In 2007, 54.7% of American women’s deaths were due to the chronic conditions of heart disease, cancer, and stroke; these chronic conditions are the leading causes of death for both women and men in the U.S. \(^3\) Women frequently experience gender disparity in the medical management of chronic health conditions, \(^4\) which can lead to reduced physical functioning and quality of life in later years.

Women in Missouri understand that the health of their family and themselves directly affects their ability to have a chance at a better quality of life, better paying jobs, and, ultimately, economic autonomy. Health care is a great need for many Missourians and can be linked to economic freedom and stability for most citizens. Based on the information in this report, it is evident that policy to improve health-care access and initiatives to improve preventative health issues such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and unintended pregnancy will improve women’s ability to achieve financial stability, workforce opportunity, and a better quality of life. In these depressed economic times, women in Missouri need and deserve the security of sound health care accessible throughout their lifespans.

**Health-Care Access for Missouri Women**

**Definition:** Health-care access is measured through women’s access to public and private health insurance.

**Significance:** Insurance coverage is a key indicator for access and utilization of the health-care system. Women who lack consistent insurance coverage are more likely to go without preventative, basic, and even acute care. While a large number of women utilize these social programs, there has been little improvement to them since the state’s Medicaid program was significantly cut in 2005.

**Missouri Findings:** Nearly one third of women with a household income less than 200% of the poverty level reported not having access to health insurance in 2008. The poverty threshold for a single-headed household with two children in 2008 was $17,346. \(^5\) During the period between 2004 and 2008, Missouri Medicaid recipients ages 19 and over were more likely to be women than men. Women age 19 to 64 received Medicaid coverage for pre- and post-natal and delivery care as well as other acute health issues. The ratio of women to men over 65 who received Medicaid benefits, in addition to Medicare coverage, reflects the general trend of women living longer than men and the use of Medicaid to cover long-term care costs.

**Regional Findings:** Poor and working poor women in rural northern and suburban Missouri were far less likely to access public health insurance benefits than poor and working poor women in the central Ozarks, Bootheel region, and St. Louis city. In the best case scenario, 10% to nearly 25% of working-age women living in or near poverty were uninsured.

**Policy Implications:** Policy makers have not addressed the core obstacle keeping Missouri’s low-income women and families from universal health care. Policy makers must recognize that women in Missouri need and deserve the security of sound health care accessible throughout their lifespans.
Percent Women (18-64) Uninsured with Household Income <200 Percent of Poverty by County, 2007

Source: US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Health Insurance Estimates (SAIHE), 2007
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 12, October 2011

Missouri = 32.4%

Missouri Medicaid Recipients by Age and Sex 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and Under</td>
<td>330,698</td>
<td>349,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 64</td>
<td>114,220</td>
<td>239,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and Over</td>
<td>26,786</td>
<td>73,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2004 - 2008 American Community Survey
income women healthy: the rising cost of quality health care. When combined with stagnating wages and a steady increase in job loss for Missouri’s working women, it is clear the recession has had a significant impact on the status of women’s health. It is not clear what impact the 2010 Affordable Care Act will have on women and girls in Missouri. For example, access to health insurance will be improved by the law’s provisions permitting a young adult’s ability to continue with parent’s coverage until age 26; preventing insurers from denying coverage to those with preexisting conditions will also improve access. However, will the insurance be affordable? Are there enough providers? Will the insurance coverage include basic reproductive and primary health needs for women? What kind of cost sharing will occur? These are all significant questions that are still unanswered.

**Infant Mortality**

**Definition:** Infant mortality is defined as deaths that occur within the first year of life.

**Significance:** Early prenatal care is imperative for positive maternal and infant pregnancy outcomes. Nationwide, maternal and newborn care accounted for 26.7% of Medicaid costs in 2008.\(^{vi}\)

**Missouri Findings:** Statewide, there were 7 infant deaths per 1000 live births during 2005-2009. In 2009, 48.4% of births in Missouri were to mothers who received Medicaid during pregnancy.\(^{vii}\)

**Regional Findings:** High infant mortality rates are correlated with concentrated poverty. High infant mortality rates are clustered in the central Ozark and Bootheel counties, some of the poorest counties in the United States. High rates are also seen in other counties across the state that are characterized by high rates of poverty.

**Policy Implications:** It is critical for the state to ensure that there are providers within reasonable distances for women to access prenatal care. One of the more difficult issues in rural counties is to have

---

**Infant Deaths per 1,000 Live Births by County, 2005-2009**

![Infant Mortality Map](image-url)
prenatal care available for the women that live there. Although there are large communities and academic centers that may provide prenatal care for uninsured and Medicaid patients, these facilities may require long travel distances for prenatal care and delivery. The results can be particularly dire for high-risk pregnancies or emergent perinatal care.

Breast Cancer

Definition: Breast cancer continues to be the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in the United States.\textsuperscript{viii} As screening for the disease and quality of treatment becomes more successful, breast cancer deaths become a proxy for lack of access to preventative care.

Significance: In 2010, an estimated 207,090 U.S. women were newly diagnosed with breast cancer, and nearly 40,000 women died from the disease;\textsuperscript{ix} the 5-year breast cancer survival rate was 77.5% for black women, compared with 91.4% for white women.\textsuperscript{x}

Missouri Findings: During the period between 1998 and 2008, women in Missouri died of breast cancer at an annual average rate of 26 per 100,000. In 2007, Missouri ranked 10th among all states for fewest breast cancer deaths.\textsuperscript{x1}

Regional Findings: The highest rates of breast cancer deaths (30 or more per 100,000) in Missouri all occur in relatively less affluent suburban and rural counties.

Policy Implications: Several recent studies have shown that in communities with fewer insured
populations, breast cancer screening declines. Cost sharing is also a barrier for such preventative screening, and these costs may be prohibitive for moderate-income women who do not receive employer-sponsored health insurance and whose earnings are too great to qualify for Medicare.

**Diabetes**

**Definition:** This indicator refers to the number of hospital and emergency room visits made per 10,000 women regarding diabetes and issues associated with diabetes.

**Significance:** Tracking diabetes-related care is a valuable proxy for health status because diabetes is both a predictor and precursor to many other health problems and effective preventive measures can reduce the incidence of diabetes and related health problems.

**Missouri Findings:** In 2008, approximately 10 per 10,000 women were hospitalized for complications related to diabetes.

**Regional Findings:** As with deaths from breast cancer, women in Missouri’s most rural and poor counties are more likely to be hospitalized for diabetes-related symptoms than women in counties that are both more affluent and have greater access to primary care and prevention resources and activities.

**Policy Implications:** Diabetes can be viewed as a bellwether disease, indicative of communities that lack the resources, knowledge, and skills to support their citizens in maintaining a healthy diet and lifestyle that is effective in preventing the disease. Diabetes, specifically preventable hospitalizations for diabetes, is also a powerful proxy for geographic and economic access to quality preventative care to decrease prevalence of the disease itself and complications from diabetes.

**Women’s Preventable Hospitalizations, Diabetes Rate Per 10,000 by County, 2008**

Source: Missouri Department of Health and Social Services, Missouri Information for Community Assessment, 1998-2008
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 16, April 2011
Control of Fertility among Missouri Women

Definition: To understand the capacity of women in Missouri to control their reproductive lives, two rates are reported: unintended pregnancies per 100 live births, and abortion rates per 1,000 pregnancies. Abortion rate data reflect induced abortions as well as spontaneous abortions (i.e., miscarriages).

Significance: Women need and deserve the ability to control the size of their families. With many families having lost jobs and or health insurance, access to reproductive health and contraception is changing. Economic recessions have a significant impact on the timing and spacing of children. According to a survey conducted by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, 3 out of 4 women worry more about money and providing for their families than they did a year ago. In addition, 64% of the women surveyed agreed they would not want to have a child in the current economic climate.

Missouri Findings: In 2008, 39 pregnancies of every 100 live births in Missouri were described by mothers as “unintended.” As a state, the abortion rate in 2008 was 124 abortions per 1,000 pregnancies. While not all abortions are elective, and not all elective abortions are due to an unintended pregnancy, when these two indicators are considered together, roughly 40 to 50% of all pregnancies were reported as unintended.

Regional Findings: Women in rural northern Missouri counties are the least likely to report births as unintended and the least likely to report terminating pregnancies, while generally, women in counties south of the Missouri River are the most likely to describe a pregnancy as unintended but least likely to abort a pregnancy. Missouri counties, such as Adair, Nodaway, Boone, Clay, Cass, St. Charles, and Greene, which combine relative affluence with relative greater levels

Unintended Births Per 100 Live Births by County, 2008

Source: Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services, Missouri Information for Community Assessment, 2008
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 26, August 2011
of educational attainment, are counties where women are less likely to describe a pregnancy as unintended—indicating a relationship between control over fertility and higher socioeconomic status.

**Policy Implications:** Regardless of individual beliefs about abortion, access to reproductive health care is necessary for ensuring the general health of the female population. Unintended pregnancy is a significant public health problem. This problem could be alleviated by responsible and supportive reproductive health policy that assists women in controlling their fertility and the size of their families. Unintended pregnancy affects the physical, emotional, and economic well-being of women and their families. Women with unintended pregnancies are less likely to obtain timely or adequate prenatal care and are at increased risk for low birth-weight babies and infant mortality.

In addition to these concerns, women with unintended pregnancies are less likely to attain educational goals and economic self-sufficiency. Access to comprehensive health-care services for women in the state of Missouri can decrease the number of abortions, thereby reducing the cost and burden on the state. Such policy changes will ultimately allow women and their families to better prepare and focus on their future goals.

Overall, women’s fertility control impacts their participation in the workforce, ability to complete education, immediate health needs, as well as long-term health needs for their family.
Health-Care Access and Well-being Conclusion

This report creates a vivid picture of how Missouri women’s health-care needs and ability to obtain care differ around the state. The gap between the health outcomes of insured women and women who lack access to care is wide.

Missouri’s poorest women qualify for state Medicaid in numbers that are disproportionate to men. However, even with this access to subsidized care, many low-income women still have poorer health outcomes in pregnancy and with some chronic conditions such as diabetes and heart disease.

Unfortunately, women who earn enough to exceed the income requirements for Medicaid and do not have employer-based health benefits are forgoing preventive care. Two factors may be contributing to this: the high cost of screening and treatment, and the lack of understanding of the benefits of preventive health care.

The health and well-being of women directly impacts their ability to improve their status in other areas of their lives, including their economic security, education, and ability to provide for and care for their families. While health insurance reform was passed in 2010, it remains unclear how these reforms will impact women in Missouri. One thing is clear: public policies that improve access to primary and preventive health, including reproductive health, will help women reach their fullest potential in all aspects of their lives and will improve the overall health of Missouri families for generations to come.

WPA Policy Recommendations:

Support and expand women’s health programs that provide primary preventive care, including screening and reproductive health services.

Expand programs that provide family planning services.

Improve access to Medicaid and private providers that provide prenatal care particularly in those areas of the state that have the poorest pregnancy outcomes.

Support programs that improve women’s health and decrease the smoking and obesity rates among women.

i U.S. Census Bureau, Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI), Public Use Data, 2009.
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Education and earning potential have a significant impact on economic autonomy. Not since the Great Depression has the U.S. seen such a decline in household incomes. Now more than ever households’ expenses are being shared and in some cases solely supported by women. In addition women, as single heads of households, are relying solely on their own earning potential. It is with this in mind that the report indicators reflect the status of women in the workplace and the education levels completed in order to compete at this level.

While women may have narrowed the gender wage gap throughout the United States in recent decades, it is incumbent upon state and local policymakers to understand how women in Missouri have, comparatively, narrowed the margin. As the federal government further embraces the strategy of delivering federal dollars to states in the form of block grants, state legislatures, governors, and administrative agencies will be increasingly responsible for ensuring that state policies, rules, and programs for economic and workforce development are structured and delivered in a manner fair to both the men and women of Missouri as they prepare for and contribute to the state’s workforce.

Though women may now have equity in their representation in higher education and workforce training opportunities, the key issue remains: Does women’s access to and success in preparing for the workforce result in equity between genders in career opportunity, earnings, and wealth? To understand the issues of gender equity and parity in Missouri’s economy, it is important to consider how the state’s women and men compare in completing different levels of education required for employment in different occupations. Currently, the quality of accurate information from reliable sources about differences in outcomes for women based on race, ethnicity, and age for comparable geographies is poor. However, because we know disparities exist in areas such as poverty, health status, and household composition, one can reasonably combine that knowledge with the understanding of the persistent wage gap to understand that these known disparities likely exist across workforce and education issues too.

Armed with this information women will be able to strategically plan their educational and professional goals, and state and local policymakers will have measurable outcomes on which to base their policy initiatives.

Missouri Women in the Workforce

Definition: This indicator refers to the percent of women, ages 16 and older, working full- or part-time in 2009 as reported through the Quarterly Workforce Indicators program of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Significance: The 62% of women participating in the workforce represent a significant contribution to the economic and social well-being of Missouri households and communities, as do the women who own and operate 27% of Missouri’s businesses. Whether as single heads of households or as a partner in a dual-earning household, women’s income and earnings stabilize household budgets, replace potential income lost to static wages, and contribute to economic activity and stability in the marketplace.

Missouri Findings: Overall, approximately 62% of Missouri’s women, age 16 and older, are working full- or part-time in Missouri. This represents an increase of 15.3% since 2000, when slightly less than half of Missouri women worked full or part-time.

Regional Findings: While the overall percent of women working in Missouri is over 60%, women’s workforce participation varies throughout the state. More than 50% of women in Missouri’s more urbanized areas work part- or full-time, including the Kansas City and St. Louis metropolitan areas, as well as the Cape Girardeau, Hannibal, Springfield, Joplin, Columbia, and Jefferson City metropolitan areas.

In rural Missouri, women’s participation in the workforce is more varied due to demographic and economic factors. In the lake region of south central and southwestern Missouri, 30% or fewer women report...
working, reflecting a generally older demographic of relatively affluent retirees in conjunction with relatively low-wage, low-skill jobs associated with a tourism and retirement-oriented economy. The percent of women in the labor force in the Bootheel is relatively high (approximately 40% to 75%) in the context of a region of persistently low job growth and persistently high rates of poverty, reflecting the comparatively high percent of female-headed households in this region. Women's workforce participation in the northern tier of counties also reflects the demographics of an aging rural population.

**Policy Implications:** The continued increase in women's labor force participation will require women, families, and communities to find strategies to replace women's historically uncompensated labor in areas such as child care, care for aging family members, community service and volunteerism, and household management.

**Ratio of Women’s to Men’s Educational Status**

**Definition:** This is a comparison of women's to men's level of educational attainment in 1990, 2000, and 2009. The 1990 and 2000 data are from the U.S. decennial census. The 2009 data are from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.

**Significance:** Educational attainment is strongly correlated with economic opportunity, income, wealth, and health. A mother's level of educational attainment is also an established and critical predictor of her children's success in school. Tracking educational attainment over time is a useful way to understand likely long-term outcomes for specific demographic groups.
groups, such as women, as well as to predict socioeconomic trends by geographies, such as school districts, neighborhoods, and communities.

**Missouri Findings:** Between 1990 and 2009, women in Missouri have essentially achieved parity with men in terms of holding two-year and four-year college and graduate degrees. Twenty-five percent of Missouri’s women have earned a college degree or higher, compared to 26% of men. However, in 1990, 35% of women completed high school, compared to 33% in 2000 and 31% in 2009. The percent of males in Missouri completing high school, on the other hand, has increased incrementally from 31% in 1990 to 32% and 33% in 2000 and 2009 respectively.

**Policy Implications:** The concurrent increase in women completing college and graduate education and women dropping out of high school reflects increasing economic stratification, a bifurcated culture of haves and have-nots. The opportunities for earners without a high school degree have become increasingly limited to low-skill, low-wage, no-benefit intermittent jobs. While this has been a growing economic reality for several decades, if Missouri is successful in implementing economic development initiatives focused on high-tech manufacturing and information technology, those without a high school degree will likely see the ‘opportunity for opportunity’ continue to decrease.

It is incumbent upon women and their advocates to ensure that the parity that has been achieved between women and men in completing higher education translates into parity in earnings, income, and wealth. Girls at risk for dropping out of high school and women without high school degrees should be afforded opportunities to complete their education and increase their skills and competitiveness.
Ratio of Women to Men Enrolled in and Completing Higher Education

Definition: This indicator is a ratio of females to males enrolled in and completing Missouri’s public and private institutions of higher education during the 2009-2010 academic year. Institutions of higher education include post-secondary technical schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities.

Significance: Completion of higher education is positively correlated with health status, social well-being, and economic security for women and men. Understanding the characteristics of who is likely to enroll and graduate with higher education degrees facilitates policy and programmatic responses that will encourage both enrollment and persistence in education completion. These data from the 2009-2010 academic year provide a contemporary snapshot of the relative status of women currently as well as a baseline measure from which to track the value of investment in higher education for women as they mature into the workforce.

Missouri Findings: Of all students enrolled in Missouri institutions of higher education during the 2009-2010 academic year, 40% more were women than men. During the same academic year, of all students graduating, 50% more were women than men.

Regional Findings: Within Missouri regions and counties, the enrollment ratio of women to men varied widely. With the exceptions of urban Kansas City/Jackson County and St. Louis City, women and men were more equally represented in college enrollment along the relatively more metropolitan I-70 corridor. Similarly, in rural counties home to colleges and universities, the ratio was more even. However, in more rural, isolated counties, women tend to enroll in higher education programs at ratios ranging from 1.5 to more than 2-to-1 to their male counterparts.

While the general trend of parity between sexes holds in completion ratios in the more metropolitan regions of the state, the gaps between genders in both college enrollment and completion remain in rural Missouri. In a handful of counties in the central Ozarks and northern Missouri, the ratio of women to men completing a degree is as low as 4 in 10, some of which can be attributed to Missouri’s Amish and Mennonite populations which discourage the education of girls beyond the primary grades. Conversely, in the northwest, central Ozarks, and Bootheel regions, some counties graduate ratios of 2 to 4 women for every male graduate.

Policy Implications: In general, women have closed the higher education gap in regard to both enrollment, a reasonable proxy for the cultural expectation that women require skill and knowledge development to compete in the workforce, and graduation, a reasonable proxy for women’s ability to invest in long-term economic competitiveness. However, it is important to understand that these data include certification programs and degrees associated with relatively low-skill, low-wage occupations typically staffed by women such as licensed practical nursing, paraprofessional positions in primary and secondary public education, and administrative ‘pink collar’ positions. In many cases, the ‘blue collar’ jobs that have historically and currently remain the corollary to low and moderate income ‘women’s work,’ do not require legally-sanctioned certification and licensing applied to ‘women’s work’ (e.g., child care provider).

To fully understand the relative value of investment in higher education, it is necessary to understand how the relative value of educational attainment for women and men translates into earnings potential.

The higher education enrollment ratio of women to men varies widely within regions of Missouri.
Ratio of Women’s to Men’s Earnings with and without Degree

**Definition:** This indicator is reported per the Missouri Department of Higher Education's regions as a ratio of female to male earnings for students in Missouri enrolled in or graduating during the 2009-2010 academic year. Institutions of higher education include post-secondary technical schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities. 

**Significance:** Investment in higher education costs a great deal for students and their families. Upfront costs include tuition, fees, housing, travel, etc. Deferred costs include payment of principal and interest on student loans, foregone income that could have been realized during the time spent pursuing education and training beyond high school, and deferred investments that create wealth like buying a house or starting a business. The conventional wisdom remains, and research substantiates, that higher education continues to be a worthwhile investment in the long term for most students most of the time.

However, discrepancies remain between the payoff of the investment in higher education for women and men in Missouri. These data from the 2009-2010 academic year provide a snapshot of the relative earnings competitiveness realized by women today and can serve as a guide for women weighing the relative value of an investment in higher education.

**Missouri Findings:** Women graduating from Missouri institutions of higher education in the 2009-2010 academic year reported earnings that, on average, were 90% of what male graduates reported. Women, who were enrolled in the 2009-2010 academic year but did not graduate, earned 85% of their male counterparts.

**Regional Findings:** Women graduates in the northwest region and the Bootheel—both relatively low-wage, high-poverty regions of Missouri—achieved the greatest parity in earnings during the 2009-2010 academic year, while women graduates from the rural northeast counties and the retirement/tourist-oriented lakes corridor earned between 81 and 84% of what male graduates reported during this snapshot. In the remainder of the state, including the metro areas and I-70 corridor, women graduates earned between 85 and 94% of men’s earnings.

While the geographic trends are reasonably similar for non-college graduate women’s to men’s earnings during the same time period, the ratio of earnings expands importantly. In the north central Green Hills region of Missouri, non-graduating women enrolled in higher education earned 67 cents per dollar earned by non-graduating enrolled men. Non-college graduate women in the remainder of non-metropolitan Missouri earned between 68 and 83% earned by their male counterparts. Non-graduate women in the St. Louis metro region, the Columbia and Jefferson City metro regions, the Jackson County and northern Kansas City metro region as well as the Kansas City to Des Moines I-35 corridor, reported closer to parity—earning between 84 and 90% of their male counterparts.

**Policy Implications:** A continued lack of parity in earnings by women diminishes the value of investment in higher education. When women with consistent qualifications are systematically undercompensated for the same jobs and positions, it not only affects the well-being of their households, it diminishes their capacity to accrue wealth over time and diminishes their return on investment for higher education degrees and certifications.
Ratio of Women’s to Men’s Earnings by County

Definition: The average annual ratio of women’s earnings (income, salary, and dividends) to men’s earnings was calculated for all and selected occupations from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI) public-use database. These data include all earnings by workers, age 16 and over, for all full- and part-time employment.

Significance: While the earnings ratio between women and men enrolled and graduating from Missouri’s institutions of higher education provide a snapshot of women and men preparing for and entering the workforce, the QWI data provide a broader comparison between all women and men, throughout the career cycle, working in Missouri across all occupations.

Missouri Findings: In 2009, on average, women’s earnings were slightly less than three-fourths (74%) of men’s earnings, a nominal improvement from 73% in 2004. When considered by selected occupations, the story is more complex. In the field of education, women averaged 89% of men’s earnings in 2004 and 88% five years later. The wage gap in women’s earnings in the food services sector decreased slightly between 2004 and 2009 from 78% to 81% respectively. Women gained ground in the generally higher wage occupations in management and professional, technical, and scientific services, though women’s average earnings in these sectors were 58 and 57% of men’s respectively. In the typically “blue collar” occupations of manufacturing and utility services, women earn between approximately 70 and 75% of what their male counterparts do.

Between 2004 and 2009, the ratio of women’s earnings to men’s increased in the retail trade occupations from 60% to 65%. However, during the same period, the ratio of women to men’s earning in health-care jobs decreased from 46 to 43%.

Regional Findings: Interestingly, the ratio of women’s to men’s earnings is closest in the relatively affluent St. Louis County, 94%, and six of Missouri’s relatively poorer counties: Dallas (90%), Douglas (90%), McDonald (89%), Oregon (85%), Shannon (86%), and Stone (86%). The greatest disparities exist in counties in south central, southeast, and the Bootheel region, including Iron, Maries, New Madrid, and Ste. Genevieve. Women in those counties earn 51 to 62% of men.

Policy Implications: When the earnings of the entire population of women in the workforce is compared to men’s earnings, it becomes apparent that a significant gap continues to disadvantage women in their capacity to independently provide for their households, accumulate wealth, and contribute fully and equitably to the social well-being and economic vitality of their communities.

While it’s useful to understand the ratio of women’s to men’s earnings at the state level; earnings capacity, job and career opportunities, access to capital, and quality of life are inherently realities that are experienced and navigated at the local level. For this reason, it is important to understand the real differences between economic opportunities for women in the smallest geographic units (i.e., what types of jobs are available in a community) and to implement policy initiatives that address disparities in opportunity.

A significant earnings gap continues to disadvantage women.
Ratio of Women's to Men's Earnings by County, 2009
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI), Public Use Data, 2009
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Ratio of Missouri Women's to Men's Earnings by Occupation, 2004 and 2009

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
Workforce and Education

Conclusion

The number of Missouri women who are working is increasing, now reaching 62%. Many women are single heads of households and therefore rely solely on their own earning potential.

Educational attainment is positively correlated with economic security, social well-being, and health. So it is encouraging to note that between 1990 and 2009, women in Missouri achieved parity with men in terms of earning college and graduate degrees. Indeed, women now outnumber men as students enrolled in Missouri institutions of higher education, and in the number of students graduating, although within specific regions, ratios vary widely. Unfortunately, the percent of women dropping out of high school has increased, along with a decreasing number of high-wage jobs available to earners without a high school degree.

Despite great disparity between regions, women graduating from Missouri institutions of higher education report average earnings that were 90% of what male graduates reported. Highlighting the importance of obtaining a degree, a comparison between all working women and men indicates that women’s earnings were only 74% of men’s.

When the earnings of all women in the workforce are compared to men’s earnings, it is apparent that a significant gap continues to disadvantage women in their capacity to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

WPA Policy Recommendations:

Develop strategies to replace women’s historically uncompensated labor within families and communities, as women’s participation in the labor force increases.

Provide opportunities for girls at risk for dropping out of high school, and women without high school degrees, to complete their education and gain job skills.

Encourage women who are at high risk of underemployment to pursue higher education in order to maximize their economic autonomy.

Fund programs that help women investigate careers that are focused on math, science, and technology.

Initiate policies that reduce disparities in opportunity for women in regions of the state where these differences are the greatest.

Enhance collection of education, workforce, and employment data to facilitate analysis of differences in outcomes for women by race, ethnicity, and age.


4 U.S. Census Bureau, Quarterly Workforce Indicators, Public Use Data, 2009


6 Missouri Department of Higher Education, Research and Data Unit, Special Report, 2010

7 Ibid.
Economic Justice
Economic justice is an ideal which posits equality of opportunity and accessibility to economic participation. The lack of equity affects the individual and the social order. To better understand how women are faring with regards to economic justice, indicators were selected for this report to complement, update and expand upon the IWPR Missouri report and extend it to the county level: poverty, child support compliance, child care assistance, births to mothers without a high school diploma, and teen birth rate. Domestic violence, although underreported, is also added as an important justice issue affecting women. Together, these indicators tell a story of the economic and social stability and viability of Missouri women.

Poverty

**Definition:** Families are classified by the United States government as poor if their annual pretax cash income falls below a specific amount that is recalculated each year. This official threshold is called the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). The federal poverty threshold depends on the number of adults and children in a family. The FPL has been utilized since its inception in 1964 as a benchmark for understanding the impacts of poverty on families. It is used to determine eligibility for services, and for measuring the economic security of children and families. The poverty threshold in 2010 for a family of three (one adult and two children under age 18) was $17,568.

However, research has found that many families whose incomes are up to two times the FPL, still struggle to meet basic needs. Therefore, 200% of the FPL is a guideline used for understanding the reality of low-income families (National Center for Children in Poverty, 2009). In 2010, 200% of the FPL for a family of three was $35,136.

**Significance:** Poverty is a multi-faceted social issue. It is included in a women’s report as women are more likely than men to be in poverty. According to the U.S. Census Current Population Report issued March 2011, female-householder families have a higher episodic and chronic poverty rate than married couple families.

When examining the occurrence of poverty in different populations, there are obvious differences which suggest broader social and economic injustices are also at play.

**Missouri Findings:** In 2009, 14.6% of all people in Missouri were living below the federal poverty level compared with 14.3% nationally. Missouri and the U.S. percentages are very close, especially given the 0.4 margin of error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MO Rank</th>
<th>MO Percent</th>
<th>US Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percent of all population that has a yearly income below the federal poverty level
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, 2006-2009
The chart below shows that Missouri women are more likely to live in poverty, which follows the national trend. Approximately 36% of all women are 200% of the poverty ratio, whereas 31% of all men fall into this category. Between the ages of 18 – 64, approximately 33% of women are 200% of the poverty threshold, compared to approximately 28% of men in the same age group. The widest disparity is in the population 65 and older. Nearly 38% of women live on incomes that are 200% of the poverty threshold compared with 26% of men.

Franklin, St. Louis, Jefferson and St. Charles Counties in the east part of the state. In 13 counties in the southern part of the state, between 49 and 59 percent of the female population 65 and younger live below 200% poverty. These counties are Hickory, Wright, Ozark, Washington, Reynolds, Shannon, Oregon, Carter, Ripley, Mississippi, Dunklin, Wayne, and Pemiscott Counties. A look at the map reflects the severity in which poverty afflicts the southeastern region of Missouri.

Regional Findings: Looking at regional and county variation in poverty levels within Missouri tells an even more interesting story. In eleven counties between 14 and 26 percent of females 65 and younger are living below 200% of poverty level. These counties are Andrew, Platte, Clinton, Clay in northwest Missouri; Cass County in west central Missouri; Cole and Osage Counties in the middle of the state; and

Policy Implications: Missouri’s poverty ranking for men and women is in the nation’s top third. In addition to examining the issues challenging Missouri’s poorest women, it is important to understand the services available to help them become more economically stable. Several services exist that are targeted to a low income population, however, many more families are eligible for services than receive them. The data show poverty is associated with lower
rates of high school graduation. The American Community Survey five-year estimates show relatively lower rates of high school completion in south central Missouri and the Bootheel. These regions are associated with lower income levels and higher poverty rates. Missouri needs to target certain counties with programs designed to enhance enrollment.

**Housing Affordability**

**Definition:** The conventional public policy indicator of housing affordability in the United States is the percent of income spent on housing. The U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines a household as “cost burdened” when more than 30 percent of its annual income is spent on housing.iii Housing costs include mortgage or rent, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

**Significance:** Low-income families that do not have access to affordable housing often find that they have inadequate income to meet basic needs, such as health care, and to establish savings for their future.iv The percent of income spent on housing is included as an indicator of women’s economic status and can be tracked by the number of women receiving assistance from HUD. Women are more likely than men to receive HUD assistance. In the U.S. in 2008, female-headed families accounted for 77% of households receiving HUD assistance. HUD administers federal aid to local housing agencies that manage housing for low-income residents. Nearly 5 million households lived in HUD-subsidized housing in the United States in 2008.v

**Missouri Findings:** Five year estimates from 2005-2009 from the Missouri Census Data Center show that 42% of renters in Missouri spent 30% or more of their income on housing costs. Twenty-eight percent
of owners with mortgages and 12% of owners without mortgages spent 30% or more of their income on housing costs.

In 2008, 80% of Missouri households receiving any HUD assistance were headed by women; and 41% of all program recipients were female-headed families with children. In Missouri, the average time on a waiting list among new admissions to HUD was 16 months, compared to the U.S. average of 19 months.

Regional Findings: From 2005 – 2009, the top six counties in terms of housing owners spending more than 30% of their household income on housing were: Ripley, Knox, Cedar, St. Louis City, Hickory and Putnam. In this same time frame, the top six counties in terms of housing owners without a mortgage spending more than 30% of their household income on housing were: Harrison, St. Louis City, Putnam, Knox, Sullivan and Mercer. Renters in Adair, Boone, St. Louis City, Wayne, Jasper, and Pemiscot were the top six counties in terms of percent of renters spending more than 30% of their incomes on housing.

Policy Implications: As housing is the single largest expenditure for most households, housing affordability has the potential to affect all other expenditures. High housing and rent burdens leave the poor with less for other necessities.

Child Support Compliance

Definition: This indicator describes the percent of parents meeting their child support payment responsibilities through Child Support Enforcement (CSE). There are child support payments made outside of the Child Support Enforcement system. Cases go to CSE only if there is a problem with collection.

Missouri’s Child Support Enforcement program was established by Executive Order in 1977 and was created by statute in 1986 (Family Support Division, Missouri Department of Social Services, 2009). CSE works to establish paternity and locate parents, to monitor and enforce compliance with child support orders, and to distribute support collections. When parents receive either Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or MO HealthNet services, they are referred to CSE, which then works to collect payments on behalf of parents receiving support.

Significance: Obtaining child support payments for their children is crucial to the economic security of single women who head up households.

Missouri Findings: In Missouri $2,300,000 in Child Support payments are collected and distributed each day. Over $661 million were collected by Missouri Child Support Enforcement in fiscal year 2010. Even though child support collection trends are improving, in 2009, 42% of parents who were required to pay child support through the state did not meet their commitment. Although child support collections have increased, the overall rate of collection remains low.

Regional Findings: There is a large range in the number of compliance payments being collected between counties. Cole County had the lowest percent of payments collected at 11% and Knox County had the highest percent at 100 percent. In 2009, the counties with the lowest percentage of parents meeting their child support payments were Cole, Butler, St. Louis City, Dunklin, Pemiscot, Warren, and Boone. The counties with the highest percentage were Knox, Atchison, Chariton, Carter, and Clark.

Policy Implications: Collecting and dispersing child support payments not only improves the finances of single-parent households, it reduces the cost incurred by Missouri taxpayers for public assistance. Even though collection rates are going up, only 58% of payments due were paid in 2009. The Missouri State Auditor, in a report on child support payments, stated that
improvements are needed to ensure timely child support administrative hearings — some custodial parents may not be receiving payments for as long as 4 to 5 months while waiting for a hearing.\textsuperscript{v}

---

### Child Support Collections in Missouri 2005 - 2010

![Graph showing child support collections in Missouri from FY-2005 to FY-2010.](image)

Source: Missouri Department of Social Services, Family Support Division, 2005-2009

### Percent of All Child Support Payments Paid, 2009, by County

![Map showing the percentage of child support payments paid by county in Missouri.](image)

Missouri = 58.1%

Source: Missouri Department of Social Services, 2009

Map Prepared by: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)

Map Generated On: 12, October 2011
Child Care Assistance

Definition: This indicator is represented by two separate but equally important elements: children receiving subsidized child care and child care capacity. Subsidized child care tracks the number of children participating in the Missouri Child Care Assistance program. This program provides assistance with payment for child care on a sliding fee basis. Eligibility is based on reason for care, family gross monthly income, and family size. Child care capacity tracks the number of spaces in family child care homes, group child care homes, and child care centers.

Significance: In a household economics study published by the U.S. Census Bureau issued August 2010, child care has become the norm for U.S. children. In terms of women’s economic justice, receipt of child care subsidy has been linked to higher employment for single mothers.

Subsidized Child Care: Child care subsidies allow more families to access reliable, affordable and quality child care in Missouri. Receiving assistance with child care not only helps mothers enter and maintain employment and attend school or job training, it also helps ensure that young children are provided with safe environments that help them become school ready.

The National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (NACCRA) considers 10% of family income to be the threshold for affordable childcare. To frame this issue, the median annual family income of single parent female-headed families with children under 18 is $22,261. The cost of child care differs depending on the location, the size of center and the age of the child. The average cost of care in a full-time center in Missouri is $6,722 for an infant and $4,628 for a four-year old. The average yearly cost to place an infant in a child care center exceeded the average amount families spent on food in every region of the United States.

Child Care Capacity: While the number of families receiving child care subsidies provides an illustration of economic justice with regards to access to care, licensed child care capacity helps elucidate the quality of care that is available in the market place. There are three categories of childcare: licensed, license-exempt, and unregulated. The type of child care children receive varies extensively. A child’s development is fostered by care offered in a safe facility, staffed by trained and qualified providers, where health is protected and educational growth is promoted. The Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services licenses and inspects child care centers, group child care homes, and in-home child care centers. A licensed center has standards for health and safety, staff/child ratios, discipline restrictions, and staff education. A license-exempt child care center is inspected for compliance with basic health and safety standards, but is exempt from other licensing standards. Child care centers that are license-exempt are regulated, but are not licensed. These centers are often operated by churches or part-day nursery schools. An uncounted number of children are cared for by unregulated providers.

Accreditation is a voluntary process that child care facilities, including afterschool care programs, go through to demonstrate that the programs they offer meet the accrediting entity’s standards for quality. Accreditation standards go beyond licensing requirements and address every aspect of a facility’s operations.

Missouri Findings: As can be seen in the accompanying table, in 2010, the percent of child care centers that were accredited in Missouri was 19.4%, compared to 9.8% of child care centers accredited in the United States as a whole. The percent of family child care homes that were accredited was less than one percent (0.6%), compared to 1.4% in the United States as a whole.
According to Child Care Aware, Missouri had 149,849 spaces available in licensed child care facilities in 2010, an increase from the 145,851 slots available in 2006. According to a referral specialist from Child Care Aware, the number of spaces in child care reflects a snapshot of child care capacity in Missouri during a given time; the numbers vary daily and will be slightly different from week to week. For example, the 2010 number reflects the capacity as of December 2010. The referral specialist underscored that there are counties in Missouri that have many slots available and not enough children to fill them. However in other areas of the state there are not enough slots leaving parents to drive out of town for care. The economy, expansion grants and many other factors affect the change in numbers from year to year.

For years, Missouri had one of the lowest levels of eligibility for child care assistance in the nation, meaning families had to be poorer than families in most other states to qualify for subsidized child care. In 2009, Missouri ranked 49th in the nation in terms of supporting the poor with child care. The maximum eligibility to receive assistance was 127% of the federal poverty level. Families could receive assistance until their income reached $24,756. That year, 43,765 children received subsidized child care in Missouri, a slight drop from the 2005 figure of 43,953.xiv

In 2010, the child care subsidy income eligibility
maximum was $25,740 or 128% of poverty level. Only Idaho and Indiana, with child care subsidy income eligibility of 127% of poverty level, were lower than Missouri.\textsuperscript{xv}

The number of child care providers participating in the Child Care Fee Assistance Program in 2009 (the latest data available) was 8,162.\textsuperscript{xvi}

**Regional Findings:** From 2005 to 2009, the counties that added the largest number of slots for subsidized child care were St. Louis, St. Louis City, Clay, Franklin, and Jefferson. The counties that lost the most slots during the same time period were Boone, Pemiscot, Cape Girardeau, Jasper, Randolph, Mississippi, and Scott.

From 2005 to 2009, the counties that added the greatest number of slots in licensed child care facilities were St. Louis City, St. Charles, Pettis, Greene, Pemiscot, Cass, and Jefferson. The counties that lost the greatest number of slots during the same time period were Jackson, St. Louis, Boone, Buchanan, Clay, and Randolph.

From 2005 to 2010, the counties that gained the most accredited child care facilities were St. Louis, Buchanan, Green, Marion and Polk. The counties that lost the most accredited facilities during the same time period were St. Louis City, Jackson, Phelps and Cole.

Although the state has slightly increased the number of accredited centers from 342 in 2006 to 451 in 2010, the number of accredited homes has decreased from 53 in 2006 to 35 in 2010. Some counties have greater access to quality care than others. Kansas City, Columbia, and St. Louis have the highest number of accredited facilities.

**Policy Implications:** Receipt of child care subsidy has been linked to higher employment for single mothers.\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{xvii}}} Without assistance, many women would be forced to go into debt, receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or choose lower quality child care arrangements. Especially in rural counties, there are very few children receiving child care assistance. The Child Care Assistance Map indicates that in some counties only five or ten children are receiving assistance. Cultural issues related to child rearing and accepting public assistance could be a factor at play in these areas.

---

**Births to Mothers without High School Diplomas**

**Definition:** This indicator represents women in Missouri who indicate they have less than a high school diploma on their child’s birth certificate.

**Significance:** Children who are born to undereducated parents face the highest odds of living in chronic poverty. Parental education level has shown to be a better predictor of grade repetition than family income, poverty status, family structure, ethnic group, or family size. Nationally, 33% of children whose parents had less than a high school diploma had repeated a grade, compared to only 21% of children whose parents had high school diplomas and 9% of children whose parents were college graduates.\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{xviii}}}

According to the Missouri School Improvement Program, Missouri parents who are high school graduates are almost twice as likely to report that their children make mostly A’s in school than those with less than a high school education.

This indicator is an important measure of future economic viability for mothers because higher education levels generally correlate with potential for higher future earnings. Children born to parents with higher levels of education have a better chance of academic achievement, are more likely to volunteer, and less
likely to smoke and drink. These positive outcomes remain later in life with regards to education, health and earnings (Child Trends, 2009).

**Missouri Findings:** In 2009, 17.1% of births were to women without a high school diploma. This percentage decreased slightly from 2008, and has been trending downward since 2005. In 2009, there were 13,504 live births to women without a high school diploma. The percentage of births to mothers without a high school diploma differs across racial/ethnic categories. In 2009, Hispanic mothers had the highest percentage of births to women with less than 12 years of education (43%), followed by non-Hispanic black mothers (25%), and non-Hispanic white mothers (15%).

**Regional Findings:** About 88% of children born in 2009 in Worth, Atchison, St. Charles, Platte, and Osage Counties were born to mothers with a high school diploma. In contrast, between 30 and 53% of births were to undereducated mothers in 16 counties. These counties include Audrain, Dallas, Dunklin, Davies, Grundy, Knox, Lawrence, Morgan, McDonald, Mississippi, Pemiscot, Ripley, Schuyler, Sullivan, Scotland, and Webster (It should be noted that some counties, like Scotland County, have large Mennonite communities. Because these families only require children to attend school through eighth grade, a majority of all Mennonite births are to women with less than 12 years of education.). In absolute numbers, Jackson County, St. Louis City, and St. Louis County account for 32.9% of births to undereducated mothers.

In 2009, 17% of Missouri births were to mothers without a high school diploma.
**Policy Implications:** Education pays. A high school diploma opens the door to future education and improves job prospects. Women with no high school diploma typically have lower incomes, which has a significant impact on their economic autonomy and impacts the economic health of their community.

**Teen Birth Rate**

**Definition:** This indicator measures the number of births to teen girls ages 15 – 19. The rate is expressed per 1,000 girls of that age.

**Significance:** Giving birth as a teen introduces social, economic, and health risks for both the mother and baby. Teen mothers are more likely than other young women to drop out of school, remain unmarried, live in poverty, and rely on public assistance. The children of teen mothers also face adverse consequences since teen mothers are less likely to have the necessary financial resources, social supports, and parenting skills to ensure healthy child development. Although figures have been declining, the United States still has the highest rate of teen births among comparable countries.

**Missouri Findings:** Births are down for Missouri teens. After trending upward during the past 5 year period, the teen birth rate declined in 2009 to 41.6 births per 1,000 teens age 15 – 19. This is the lowest rate since 2000. Teenage birth rates for 2009 were at the lowest levels ever reported in the United States. The U.S. rate was 39.1 births for 1,000 females age 15 – 19.

**Regional Findings:** In 2009, five counties had teen birth rates less than 20.0 (per 1,000 girls ages 15-19): Shelby, Worth, Adair, Davies and Mercer. High teen birth rates (above 80.0 per 1,000 teen girls ages 15-19) were found in Pemiscot, Putnam, Ripley, Mississippi, Grundy, Dunklin, and Butler.

**Policy Implications:** Having a baby as a teen carries emotional, physical, and financial costs. Teen mothers are at risk of poverty, unemployment or underemployment, and health problems. Teen mothers are more likely to live in poverty and rely on public assistance.

---

**Births to Missouri Teens Ages 15-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9,837</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9,308</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8,828</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8,656</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9,179</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9,232</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9,154</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8,496</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services, 2000-2009
About 8500 births annually are to Missouri teen mothers.

Births to Teens, Ages 15-19, 2009

Source: Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services, 2010
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (08EDA)
Map Generated On: 3. October 2011

Domestic Violence

Definition: Domestic violence, or intimate partner violence, is a pattern of coercive behavior characterized by physical and/or emotional abuse used by one person in an intimate relationship to control another. Despite the importance of the issue, comparable data to accurately compare the prevalence of domestic violence between counties does not exist. First, many victims decline to report incidents to law enforcement for a variety of reasons (including a fear of escalation of abuse from the partner). Incidents are officially reported by law enforcement when an officer “believes a dispute crosses an abuse threshold as indicated by harassment, stalking, coercion, assault, sexual assault, battery, or unlawful imprisonment.” As a result, officers make a subjective decision regarding whether the alleged assault is an incidence of domestic violence.

Significance: The victims of domestic violence are overwhelmingly female; females are approximately 84% of spouse abuse victims, and 86% of victims at the hands of an intimate partner. It is estimated that one out of four American women will report being raped or physically assaulted by an intimate partner in her lifetime. Furthermore, women experience chronic and more severe physical assaults by intimate
partners than do men, and the injuries that survivors experience are often serious and sometimes fatal.

Fleeing an abusive partner disrupts the survivor’s employment, housing, her children’s schooling, and ties to family and community. The cost of the survivor’s health care, mental health services, temporary safe housing, and relocation drains the survivor’s resources and put a strain on public safety and other community services. Nationally, the annual direct health-care costs of domestic violence total approximately $4.1 billion. In addition, many employers bear the cost of missed work days when employees are victims of domestic violence. Furthermore, it is estimated that domestic violence against women costs employers $1.8 billion per year in productivity losses associated with injuries and premature death. Each of these disruptions and losses create barriers to a woman’s ability to attain or maintain economic security.

Findings and Policy Implications: Consistent with national data, 21.8% of women in Missouri reported being physically hurt by an intimate partner at some point in their lives. Despite the difficulty in gauging the prevalence of domestic violence, 41,526 incidents of domestic violence were recorded by Missouri law enforcement in 2010, including 32 intimate partner homicides. Of those homicides, 27 were perpetrated by men against their current or former female intimate partners, and 5 were by women against their male intimate partners; there were no reports of intimate partner homicides among same-sex partners.

Domestic violence against women affects the entire community: the survivors, the men who perpetrate the vast majority of the violence, the children who witness the violence and whose lives are disrupted by it, public safety and health-care providers, and local employers. Domestic violence is found in every segment of our society—it crosses race, class, age, religious, and ethnic boundaries. It is a broad social problem that needs to be addressed from many angles. To positively impact it will require the attention and resources of both our private and public institutions.

In Missouri, women, especially older women, are more likely to be poor than men. An alarming 38% of women over the age of 65 are living in poverty. Stark regional differences in women’s poverty exist too; in the southeast part of the state, women are experiencing the most severe poverty.

A Missouri woman trying to lift herself out of poverty faces many challenges. If she is a single parent, the challenges are even greater. In addition to finding employment in a weak labor market, she must find safe and affordable housing for her family and quality child care to be able to attend school or work.

For working mothers, especially those earning low wages, access to affordable child care is essential. In Missouri a single mother who receives child care subsidies is more likely to be employed than one who does not, yet women in many Missouri counties have limited access to accredited child care centers. Another challenge for single mothers is the high percentage of children that do not receive all or any of the child support they are legally due.

Additionally, Missouri’s teen mothers are at a greater risk of being poor than women who start their families later. In 2009, in some counties, births to mothers without a high school diploma were as high as 53% of all births.
**WPA Policy Recommendations:**

*Work towards equity in pay between men and women and support economic policy that encourages high wage, high skill, and sustainable jobs.*

*Ensure an adequate supply of affordable rental housing and opportunities for affordable home ownership.*

*Maintain public resources and support for women who are emerging from economic challenges.*

*Support early childhood initiatives that seek to increase the number of high quality early childhood programs and that increase the quality of existing programs.*

*Expand prevention resources and promote programs that keep teens in school.*

*Advocate for prevention and criminal justice approaches that hold perpetrators accountable and that publicly articulate violence against women as a violation of human rights and a threat to public health and safety.*

---

**i** Center for Economic and Social Justice, Washington D.C. www.Cesj.org

**ii** More information about the poverty threshold is available online at: http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/about/overview/measure.html

**iii** http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/affordablehousing/index.cfm

**iv** Home and Communities. http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/affordablehousing/


**viii** From the 2006-2008 American Community Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau (www.census.gov).

**ix** 2010 Child Care in the State of Missouri, created by the National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agency, March 2010. Child care costs are reported by state Child Care Resource and Referral networks and state child care administrators.

**x** Parents and the High Price of Child Care: 2010 Update. Data are from a 2009 survey of Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) State Networks.
In Missouri, state approved accrediting entities are: National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Missouri Accreditation (MO-A), National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC), National Afterschool Association (NAA), National Early Childhood Program Accreditation (NECPA), Council on Accreditation (COA), and the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF).


From the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program data for FY 2009.


Casey (Annie E.) Foundation, Kids County Data Book, Missouri, 2010


NCHS Data Brief #58, February 2011, U.S. Teenage Birth Rate Resumes Decline.


ibid.


Civic Engagement

Civic engagement is a term that refers to the process of bettering communities. This process may occur through political activity (e.g., voting, running for elected office) or non-political actions (e.g., volunteering). A comprehensive picture of the civic engagement of Missouri women is difficult to achieve because data on several areas of interest are difficult to obtain or are not collected comprehensively.

Voter Registration Ratio

Definition: Records from the Centralized Voter Registration Database were analyzed to provide data for this indicator. Unfortunately, these administrative records only document registrants’ names and not their sex. Therefore, the sex of each registrant was inferred by comparing first names to a database of Medicaid recipients; names for which 66% or more Medicaid recipients were of one gender were assigned that gender. If the 66% threshold was not reached, the registrant was classified as “unknown” and removed from analysis. For each county, the number of females who were registered to vote in the November 2008 election was divided by the number of males registered to vote in that county. This creates a ratio of female to male registered voters.

Significance: Voter registration is a requirement in order to vote for elected officials at the local, state, and national levels. These elected officials are part of the governance structure that enact laws, protect citizens, and adjudicate offenses. Registered voters are also eligible to vote for legislative changes that affect state and/or local laws, and financial levies that can affect financial support for infrastructure.

Missouri Findings: In each county, women outnumber men as registered voters. Across the state, there are 116 female registered voters for every 100 male registered voters.

Regional Findings: Higher ratios of female: male registered voters were found in the southeastern part of the state.
of the state, the St. Louis metro area, and in a few counties across the northern half of Missouri. There did not appear to be a geographic pattern to the counties that reported relatively equal numbers of female and male registered voters (i.e., the lowest ratios), although these were all in rural counties.

**Voter Turnout**

**Definition:** Voting records from the November 2008 election were used to determine the percentage of women that voted among those women registered to vote in the election. Because this indicator uses the same data source as the Voter Registration Ratio, the same methods were used to determine which registrants were female or male.

**Significance:** Women’s votes help to shape the political landscape and the legislation produced by it. Scholars and political analysts examine the “gender gap” in voting behavior, which is the differential way women and men (may) form opinions over, value, and prioritize political issues. This gender gap affects how candidates and advocates frame their messages, as well as the issues on which they focus.

**Missouri Findings:** Without exception, women voters outnumbered men in every county in the state. Statewide, 79.6% of women who were registered to vote cast a ballot in the November 2008 election, compared to 77.2% of men.

**Regional Findings:** In the November 2008 election, higher percentages of women registrants voted in the Kansas City and St. Louis metro areas. Southeast Missouri (Bootheel) had the lowest percentage of women registrants who voted, despite having some of the highest ratios of female:male voters in the state. Reynolds county (southeast) had both a low female:male voter registration ratio as well as a low percentage of women registrants who voted.

---

**Estimated Percent of Female Registered Voters Participating in November 2008 General Election**

![Map showing the estimated percent of female registered voters participating in the 2008 general election.](source-map)

**Missouri = 79.6%**

Source: Missouri Secretary of State, Centralized Voter Registration Database, 2008
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 15, September 2011
Summary and policy implications: An analysis of registered voters who cast a ballot during elections can yield information to consider regarding local, regional, or statewide issues that differentially impact women and men, and the extent to which the gender gap may exist. It can also highlight locations where a base of registered voters exists, but who do not cast ballots. These conditions provide opportunities for voter education and advocacy work to mobilize these voters. It may also highlight areas in which women voters feel disenfranchised (lower turnout) or empowered (higher turnout).

Women Representing Missourians in National and State Legislatures

Definition: This indicator describes the number of women and men serving in the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, the Missouri Senate, and the Missouri House of Representatives.

Significance: Women’s voices provide important contributions to the legislative dialogues at state and national levels. The IWPR report last issued for Missouri in 2002 found that women accounted for only a quarter of the state legislature and of the state’s federal senators and representatives.

Missouri Findings: Little difference in the proportion of women in these elected offices has been found since the 2002 report. Overall, women now hold 23.7% of seats in the U.S. and Missouri Houses of Representatives and Senate. The lowest percentage of women is found in the Missouri Senate (17.6% of seats); women hold half (of two) U.S. Senate seats.

A closer inspection of the numbers of elected legislative officials provides a clearer picture of what progress women have made during the past generation. Compared to 1993-1994, 5 additional seats in the Missouri Senate are now held by women (6 of 34) in 2011, and women gained 4 additional seats in the Missouri House (40 of 163). Missouri elected a female U.S. Senator in 2008, and women now hold two of nine seats (22.2%) in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Disaggregating these data by political party, a greater proportion of women legislators at the state or national level belong to the Democratic Party, and a smaller proportion belong to the Republican Party.

Regional Findings: The two women who represent Missouri in the U.S. House of Representatives are from districts that fall primarily within the southern part of the state.
In the state legislature, the six Missouri state senators are from districts in the St. Louis and Kansas City metro areas. The 40 Missouri state representatives are more geographically dispersed, but still have a high concentration in the St. Louis metro area. There are no women in either legislative body that represent northern Missouri or extreme southern Missouri.

**Policy Implications:** Despite comprising approximately half of the adult population in Missouri, women hold less than one quarter of the seats that determine statewide and national legislative issues that affect Missourians. Not only do legislators affect what issues are brought forward and passed into law, they make important decisions regarding the allocation of economic resources for education, mental health resources, economic development, and programs that serve the underprivileged.

Research indicates that female candidates help to mobilize women voters in the candidate’s political party. Not only does an increased presence of women in legislative bodies help to ensure that women are represented in the legislative process, women political candidates help to mobilize other women to vote and become more engaged in the political process. With a lack of women in the higher political offices at the state and national level, particularly in northern Missouri, southwest Missouri, and the Bootheel, women may be less motivated to participate in the voting process.

**United States Representatives who are Women by US Representative District, 2011**

*Legend*

- Republican (2)

*Missouri = 2 (of 9 total seats)*

Source: United States House of Representatives, 112th Congress, March 2011

Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) Map Generated On: 14, August 2011
Missouri State Senators Who are Women by Missouri Senate Districts, 2011

Legend
- Democrat (4)
- Republican (2)

Missouri = 6 (of 34 total seats)

Source: Missouri Senate, 96th General Assembly Senate Roster, March 2011
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 14, August 2011

Missouri State Representatives Who are Women by Missouri Representative District, 2011

Legend
- Democrat (22)
- Republican (18)

Missouri = 40 (of 163 total seats)

Source: Missouri House of Representatives, 96th General Assembly Member Roster, March 2011
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 18, August 2011
Women Appointed as County Commissioners

Definition: The majority of Missouri’s counties (110 of 114 counties) are governed by a county commission system. Each of these 110 counties has one presiding commissioner and two associate commissioners. This indicator reflects how many of those appointed to these positions are women.

Significance: County commissioners are appointed by the state governor. County commissions are the governing body for the majority of Missouri’s counties (110 of 114); Jackson, Jefferson, St. Charles and St. Louis Counties do not operate under this governance structure.

Findings: Of the 330 commissioners and associate commissioners in the state of Missouri, 15 of these positions were held by women in the spring of 2011. This is down from 17 positions in 2008. Women account for the same proportion of Presiding Commissioners and Associate Commissioners (4.5% of each position).

Policy Implications: Less than 5% of the counties in Missouri that are governed by a county commission structure include women in the county governance leadership. County commissioners by state statute have a fiduciary responsibility for managing the county’s funds, and represent the county on regional councils. These regional councils oversee economic and health planning, law enforcement assistance, and infrastructure development. Without more women who are appointed as county commissioners, women’s opportunities for leadership in these areas are quite limited.

Source: Missouri Association of Counties, March 6, 2011
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 18, August 2011
Women’s Participation on Local School Boards

Definition: This indicator reports the number and proportion of local school board members who are female. The data were obtained from the Missouri School Board Association.

Significance: School board membership posts are elected positions. Each board is responsible for overseeing financial operations, policy, and personnel actions of the school district. Although these activities are usually initiated and recommended by school faculty and staff, they usually require the approval of the school board to be implemented.

Missouri Findings: As seen in the map, 29.3% of school board members across Missouri in the 2010-2011 academic year were women. This represents a modest 1.2% increase from the 2005-2006 academic year.

Regional Findings: It should be noted that these data were reported in 17 multiple-county regions, and the proportion of female school board members in the counties within each region may have differed. As a result, the map appears to provide a more homogenous view than what may really exist within the individual counties or school districts. Despite this caveat, there were areas of the state in which the multiple-county regions reflected a consistent level of women’s participation on school boards. The highest proportions of women school board members are seen in east central and northeast Missouri, as well as in the greater Kansas City area. Southern Missouri has the lowest proportion of female school board members, with women composing less than 25% of school boards in southeast and southwest Missouri.
Policy Implications: Although women may be a majority presence as employees and volunteers in Missouri’s elementary and secondary schools, women compose less than one third of the boards that oversee operations within the district. As a result, women have little authority over decisions that affect schools.

Women’s Participation in the Judiciary

Definition: The Missouri Supreme Court consists of seven judges, each serving a 12-year term. A judge may seek multiple terms. Missouri’s Appellate Court consists of 32 judges who serve in one of three districts.

Significance: Judges serving on Missouri’s Supreme Court are responsible for adjudicating cases involving the validity of United States or Missouri statutes, United States treaties, Missouri constitutional provisions, Missouri revenue laws, challenges to a statewide elected official’s tenure, and imposition of the death penalty in Missouri.

Although women have strong representation on Missouri’s Supreme Court, fewer women hold seats in Missouri’s Appellate Court.

Missouri’s Appellate Courts oversee appeals to rulings made by the state’s circuit courts, with the exception of cases that fall under one of the five areas under the Missouri Supreme Court’s jurisdiction.

Women’s Representation in Missouri’s Court of Appeals by District, 2011

Legend
- Southern District: 14.3% (1 of 7)
- Western District: 27.3% (3 of 11)
- Eastern District: 30.8% (4 of 13)

Missouri = 25.5% (8 of 31)

Source: Office of State Courts Administrator, April 2011
Map Prepared By: University of Missouri Extension, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)
Map Generated On: 15, August 2011
Judges who serve on Missouri’s Supreme Court or Appellate Court are appointed according to the Missouri Nonpartisan Court Plan; a judicial commission appoints judges based on merit and regardless of political affiliation. After a year in the appointment, judges must receive a majority vote in a judicial retention election that is part of the next general election.

**Findings and Policy Implications:** Women currently hold three of the seven seats (42.9%) on the Missouri Supreme Court. Eight of Missouri’s 32 Appellate Court seats (25%) are currently held by women. The largest proportion of female appellate judges are found in the Eastern District (30.8%) and the Western District (27.3%), which are the two districts in which the most appellate cases are heard. The Southern District only has one female appellate judge (14.3% of judges in the Southern District Court of Appeals).

Although women have strong representation on Missouri’s Supreme Court, women’s participation in adjudicating cases in Missouri’s Appellate Court is weaker. Women may help to craft Missouri’s policy, but there are proportionally fewer women involved in adjudicating criminal appeals.

**Volunteerism**

**Definition:** Volunteers provide unpaid service to an organization.

**Significance:** Information on volunteerism and informal leadership is difficult to locate. Furthermore, there are no data sources that provide information about the number of people who volunteer at the county level or for the different regions within the state.

**Missouri Findings:** Educational attainment and employment are each associated with volunteerism. Among all adults, those with higher levels of education (i.e., at least some college) have higher rates of participation in volunteer activities, but volunteer fewer hours than those with less education (e.g., less...
Those who were employed on a part-time basis had higher volunteer participation than full-time employees, those who were unemployed, or those who were not in the labor force.

Women volunteer at a higher rate than men, and women age 35 or older were more likely to volunteer than were younger women. These differences, however, largely may be due to women's decreased engagement in the work force over the life span, combined with longer life expectancies than men. Women, as primary caregivers of dependent children, are also more involved in children's schooling than are men; educational settings (24.0%) are second only to religious organizations (38.0%) as venues for volunteer activities.

The Independent Sector calculates the dollar amount of volunteer time by adding 12% to the average hourly earnings of non-farm employees in production or non-supervisory positions. The 2009 estimate for volunteers in Missouri was $18.57/hour, which was lower than the national average of $20.85/hour in 2009. Nonprofits use estimates of the value of a volunteer’s time to leverage additional assets and funding for their work.

Policy Implications: Volunteering and community service are more common in areas with greater numbers of nonprofit organizations. Missouri’s volunteer rate and the number of nonprofits are both higher than the national average. The state, however, is also characterized by high need, and has several areas where poverty and lack of employment opportunities may affect local volunteer rates as well as the need for volunteer services. It is difficult to examine these issues in more depth because local data do not exist.

Civic Engagement Conclusion

In the last decade, women have made great inroads in representation in all areas of public life; however, as the data in this report reveals, women do not have a proportional voice in Missouri’s public decision-making bodies. Women are under-represented in many areas of civic and political involvement reviewed in this report.

As evidenced by Governor Nixon’s (Missouri governor 2009-2013) record of appointing women to 42 percent of available board and commission seats, women are accepting non-paying community positions. Women often choose, however, not to accept or compete for paid political positions.
The lack of women seeking or elected to political positions is unfortunate for all women in Missouri as national research shows that regardless of party affiliation, female officeholders are more likely than male officeholders to support women’s agendas.

It is important for women’s advocacy organizations in Missouri to continue their work to break barriers that keep women from full participation in public life in Missouri.

**WPA Policy Recommendations:**

Appoint more women to state boards/commissions/committees.

Track and evaluate the significance of women’s participation at the state level on public boards that have decision-making power to impact people’s lives.

Strive toward gender-balanced legislation to ensure an equal number of women and men serve on all state boards, committees, and commissions.

Provide incentives for employers to make workplaces family-friendly by allowing flexible work schedules and work-at-home options so working parents have the freedom to participate in public life.

Make it easier for women to vote by instituting same day voter registration.

---


ii November 2008; Missouri Secretary of State Office, Centralized Voter Registration Database. The percent of registrants classified as “unknown” ranged from 0.48% (Worth County) to 3.07% (St. Louis City); 1.68% of registered voters across the state were classified as “unknown.”

iii November 2008; Missouri Secretary of State Office, Centralized Voter Registration Database. The percent of voters classified as “unknown” ranged from 0.64% (Moniteau County) to 3.02% (St. Louis City); 1.69% of voters across the state were classified as “unknown.”


vii Ibid.

viii Corporation for National and Community Service; http://volunteeringinamerica.gov/MO


x Corporation for National and Community Service; http://volunteeringinamerica.gov/MO
Conclusion
Conclusion

The status of women is a bellwether for the well-being of Missouri’s families. It is imperative for women to successfully manage their health and access to health care, to excel in education and compete in the workforce, to keep themselves and their families safe, and to meaningfully engage in the development and governance of their communities.

The *Missouri Women’s Report* provides a snapshot for understanding the status of Missouri’s women today and a framework for tracking improvement in their lives as well as for identifying continued and emerging challenges. The Women’s Policy Alliance and the University of Missouri’s Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis encourage readers to use the report, both indicators and policy recommendations, to inform dialogue about and advocacy for policies and actions that will improve the lives of Missouri’s women and provide opportunities for all Missourians to thrive and prosper.

Where to find more information

In addition to the content included in the printed report, additional data tools are available at missouriwomensreport.org. The website includes features that allow the user to access in tabular format the data used to calculate the outcome and status indicators as well as additional indicators related to women’s health and well-being. Specifically, the website includes the following features:

**Dynamic Reports Generator:** Produce tables for use in presentations and reports, using the county(ies) and indicators selected by the user.

**Download a print-ready (PDF) version of the Missouri Women’s Report.**
Composite Rankings
County Rank

The composite county rank is a ranked index of the sum of eight outcome measures and represents the relative position of a particular county in relation to all 114 Missouri counties and St. Louis City. A “1” indicates the highest overall score of the eight outcome measures chosen for this report. All ranks are out of 115.

Each county also has an individual rank for eight outcome measures. The eight outcome measures chosen for this report are:

- births to mothers without H.S. diplomas, a higher ranking indicates a lower rate of births to mothers without a H.S. diploma
- teen birth rate, a higher ranking indicates a lower rate of births to teens
- diabetes rate, a higher ranking indicates a lower rate of diabetes
- infant mortality rate (which is used as a proxy for access to maternity care), a higher ranking indicates a lower rate of infant deaths
- unintended births, a higher ranking indicates few births that were unintended.
- women completing a college degree, a higher ranking indicates a higher rate of women completing a college degree
- ratio of female to male median income index, a higher ranking indicates a higher ratio of female to male median income
- female voter turnout, a higher ranking indicates a higher rate of female voter turnout.

These measures were chosen as they are important to the overall well-being of women, are comparative across geographies and are indicators communities could use to affect change or improve circumstance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Composite Rank</th>
<th>Births to Mothers without H.S. Diplomas</th>
<th>Births to Teenagers</th>
<th>Preventable Hospitalizations of Females for Diabetes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atchison</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrain</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollinger</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaway</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunklin</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasconade</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laclede</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Composite Rank</td>
<td>Births to Mothers without H.S. Diplomas</td>
<td>Births to Teenagers</td>
<td>Preventable Hospitalizations of Females for Diabetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteau</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Madrid</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodaway</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemiscot</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettis</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralls</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francois</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis city</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Genevieve</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taney</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Infant Mortality</td>
<td>Unintended Births</td>
<td>Women with at least Associate Degree</td>
<td>Women's Earnings Relative to Men's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atchison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollinger</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaway</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunklin</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasconade</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laclede</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Infant Mortality Rank</td>
<td>Unintended Births Rank</td>
<td>Women with at least Associate Degree Rank</td>
<td>Women's Earnings Relative to Men's Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moniteau</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Madrid</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodaway</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemiscot</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralls</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francois</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis city</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Genevieve</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taney</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Established in 1980, the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) is a center at the University of Missouri. OSEDA collaborates with private and public partners in the analysis of demographic and socio-economic data, in order to contribute to improving the well-being of Missouri’s citizens and communities. OSEDA supports projects focusing on important public policy issues, striving to transform data into useful information to help Missouri’s leaders make informed decisions. http://oseda.missouri.edu
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