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Definition of Poverty

How the Census Bureau measures poverty:

- Family income
- Number of persons in family
- Ages of family members

In 2005, a family of four with an income of less than $19,350 was considered poor.

In 2007, a family of four with an income of less than $20,650 is considered poor.
2005: City of Cleveland Ranked Number 1 in Poverty

- Cleveland’s 2005 Poverty Rate = 32.4%
- Nearly 1 in 3 Cleveland residents live in poverty
- Highest poverty rate among U.S. cities with 250,000 or more residents
## Percent of Persons in Poverty for Big Cities, 2003-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Poverty Rate, (Confidence Interval), 2003</th>
<th>Rank, 2003</th>
<th>Poverty Rate, (Confidence Interval), 2004</th>
<th>Rank, 2004</th>
<th>Poverty Rate, (Confidence Interval), 2005</th>
<th>Rank, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>31.3 (27.8, 34.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.2 (19.4, 27.0)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4 (30.2, 34.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>30.1 (26.8, 33.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.6 (30.1, 37.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.4 (29.4, 33.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>27.9 (23.4, 32.4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28.3 (23.3, 33.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.3 (25.9, 30.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>24.5 (20.6, 28.4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.8 (25.1, 32.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.2 (25.0, 29.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>23.5 (19.5, 27.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.8 (23.6, 32.0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.9 (24.5, 29.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>22.0 (17.5, 26.4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.9 (21.2, 30.6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.9 (24.1, 29.7)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>21.8 (18.2, 25.4)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.6 (17.8, 25.4)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4 (22.9, 27.9)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>21.1 (16.9, 25.3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.6 (15.7, 23.5)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.0 (22.3, 27.7)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>22.1 (18.1, 26.1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.0 (22.8, 29.2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.9 (23.3, 26.5)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>30.4 (24.1, 36.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.1 (22.0, 34.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.8 (21.7, 27.9)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.3 (4.8, 7.8)</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development Analysis of U.S. Census Bureau -- American Community Surveys in 2003, 2004, and 2005
Percent of People Living in Poverty for Selected Counties, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Poverty Rate, (Confidence Interval), 2005</th>
<th>Rank, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache County, AZ</td>
<td>44.5 (37.3, 51.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron County, TX</td>
<td>41.2 (37.5, 44.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo County, TX</td>
<td>41.0 (38.7, 43.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley County, NM</td>
<td>34.7 (27.2, 42.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robeson County, NC</td>
<td>32.9 (28.7, 37.1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Landry Parish, LA</td>
<td>31.7 (27.8, 35.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb County, TX</td>
<td>31.4 (27.0, 35.8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazos County, TX</td>
<td>30.4 (27.5, 33.3)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke County, GA</td>
<td>29.5 (26.9, 32.1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest County, MS</td>
<td>29.2 (24.8, 33.6)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx County, NY</td>
<td>29.2 (27.9, 30.5)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso County, TX</td>
<td>29.2 (27.2, 31.2)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County, OH</td>
<td>16.9 (15.9, 17.9)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall County, IL</td>
<td>1.2 (0.5, 1.9)</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development Analysis of U.S. Census Bureau -- 2005 American Community Survey
Suburban Poverty Rates in Cuyahoga County, 2000

Source: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development analysis of Census 2000 SF3 data
Poverty: An Investment Framework

Human Capital

Social Capital

Economic Opportunity

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Human Capital: Being Able to Compete in Today’s Economy

New jobs require complex thinking and behavioral qualifications

Development of these capacities starts early

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development

- Skilled Occupations: 20% (1950), 20% (2000)
- Professional Occupations: 20% (1950), 65% (2000)

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Literacy Defined

“...an individual's ability to read, write, speak in English, compute and solve problems at levels of proficiency necessary to function on the job, in the family of the individual, and in society.”

Levels of Literacy

- **Level 1**
  - Locate the expiration date on a driver’s license

- **Level 2**
  - Locate an intersection on a street map

- **Level 3**
  - Use a bus schedule to choose the correct bus to take to get to work on time

- **Level 4**
  - Explain the difference between two types of benefits at work

- **Level 5**
  - Compare and summarize different approaches lawyers use during a trial

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Percent at Level 1 or Level 2 Literacy, 1990 vs. 2000

City of Cleveland: 72% (1990), 69% (2000)
Inner Ring Suburbs: 42% (1990), 41% (2000)
Outer Ring Suburbs: 33% (1990), 31% (2000)
Cuyahoga County: 49% (1990), 47% (2000)

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Why Do Low Literacy Levels Matter?

Costs Associated with Low Literacy:

- Lost earning power
- Lost family stability
- Lack of ability to help children learn
- Reduced productivity
- Increased costs to society

Nationally, low literacy skills cost businesses $20 billion in lost wages, profits, and productivity annually.
Literacy Factors: Early Childhood Population

- Mother’s Educational Attainment
  - Cuyahoga County, 1998 – 2002:
    - 16,593 babies born, or 18% of the births, were to mothers with less than a high school degree

- Children Living in Poverty
  - Cuyahoga County, 2005:
    - 28% of children under age 5 and their families live in poverty
Literacy Factors: School-Age Children

- Passage rate for 4th grade reading proficiency by school building, 2003-2004 school year:
  - 119 out of 193 Cuyahoga County public schools not meeting state requirement of 75% for 4th grade reading proficiency
    - 72 of 119 are in the Cleveland Municipal School District.
Percent of People Aged 25 and Older Who Have Completed High School for Selected Places, 2003 - 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Percent (Confidence Interval), 2003</th>
<th>Rank, 2003</th>
<th>Percent (Confidence Interval), 2004</th>
<th>Rank, 2004</th>
<th>Percent (Confidence Interval), 2005</th>
<th>Rank, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>93.4 (92.2, 94.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.9 (87.8, 92.0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91.9 (90.7, 93.1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td>92.7 (91.3, 94.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92.7 (90.8, 94.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92.5 (91.7, 93.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>92.1 (90.1, 94.1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.7 (88.7, 92.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.0 (90.9, 93.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>90.9 (89.5, 92.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.9 (91.0, 92.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.7 (90.5, 92.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>90.9 (88.7, 93.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.4 (89.4, 93.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.7 (89.5, 91.9)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>73.7 (70.1, 77.4)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74.8 (71.1, 78.5)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75.9 (74.0, 77.9)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>73.3 (71.0, 75.6)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76.5 (73.0, 80.0)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74.2 (72.8, 75.6)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>72.9 (71.5, 74.4)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71.8 (70.6, 73.0)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72.2 (71.4, 73.0)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>72.0 (70.1, 73.8)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70.5 (68.6, 72.4)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71.1 (69.9, 72.3)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>71.1 (69.9, 72.4)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.1 (68.8, 71.4)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72.0 (71.3, 72.7)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>49.4 (43.9, 54.9)</td>
<td>70 of 70</td>
<td>51.4 (45.6, 57.2)</td>
<td>70 of 70</td>
<td>50.1 (47.4, 52.8)</td>
<td>70 of 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development Analysis of U.S. Census Bureau -- American Community Surveys in 2003, 2004, and 2005
Percent of People Aged 25 and Older Who Have Completed a Bachelor’s Degree for Selected Places, 2003 - 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Percent (Confidence Interval), 2003</th>
<th>Rank, 2003</th>
<th>Percent (Confidence Interval), 2004</th>
<th>Rank, 2004</th>
<th>Percent (Confidence Interval), 2005</th>
<th>Rank, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>51.6 (49.0, 54.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.3 (48.1, 54.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.7 (51.4, 54.0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>49.5 (46.0, 53.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.7 (46.0, 53.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.1 (48.3, 51.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>48.6 (47.5, 49.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.0 (49.9, 52.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.1 (48.8, 51.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>44.2 (43.0, 45.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.7 (46.4, 49.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.3 (44.2, 46.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>42.5 (39.2, 45.7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.1 (37.7, 44.5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.2 (41.1, 45.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>18.0 (15.4, 20.5)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20.2 (16.7, 23.7)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.2 (18.2, 22.2)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>17.0 (14.8, 19.1)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.8 (19.3, 24.3)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.1 (17.7, 20.5)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>15.0 (11.6, 18.4)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.8 (12.7, 18.9)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17.0 (15.3, 18.7)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>14.3 (11.9, 16.6)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.3 (12.1, 16.5)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.6 (11.7, 13.5)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>11.4 (8.2, 14.6)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.2 (6.2, 14.2)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.6 (10.7, 14.5)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>10.7 (7.8, 13.6)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.7 (5.6, 9.8)</td>
<td>70 of 70</td>
<td>10.2 (8.3, 12.1)</td>
<td>70 of 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>10.5 (9.1, 11.9)</td>
<td>70 of 70</td>
<td>10.6 (9.0, 12.2)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.1 (11.3, 12.9)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development Analysis of U.S. Census Bureau -- American Community Surveys in 2003, 2004, and 2005
Ways to Invest in Human Capital

- Healthy births and newborn home visits to reach families early

- Early Childhood Programs for at-risk children pay off ten fold
  - Quality child care
  - Home visiting and parent programs from birth to three
  - Universal preschool of high quality

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Ways to Invest in Human Capital, cont.

- **Adult job education and training** can raise employment rates

- **Attract and retain** educated workers and invest in their continued development
Economic Opportunity: Enables Individuals to Earn Their Way Out of Poverty

Industrial structure determines who gets jobs, what they pay, where they lead.
Trends in Employment and Manufacturing Employment in Cuyahoga County, 1980 - 2004

Source: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development Analysis of Labor Market Information from ODJFS and County Business Patterns data retrieved February 24, 2005 from the University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center
http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/cbp/
Annual Job Openings, 1995-2005
Cleveland-Akron Metropolitan Area by ZIP Code

Prepared by the Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development based on analysis conducted by Leete and Bania (1995)
Percent Change in Median Hourly Wages for Men by Education Level in Cuyahoga County, 1979 - 1999
(Adjusted to 1999 constant dollars)

Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development analysis of the Census Bureau’s Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS).
Extracted from the University of Minnesota’s Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)
Ways to Invest in Economic Opportunities

- **Inclusionary housing** development allows lower skill workers to live near jobs.

- **Regional economic development** reduces non productive competition, promotes winners.

- **Bridges to work** programs overcome spatial and racial divide.
Social Capital: Enables Individuals and Communities to Reach Goals

Poverty undermines social capital, especially in high concentrations

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Concentrated Poverty in High Poverty Tracts, 1970
Concentrated Poverty in High Poverty Tracts, 1980
Concentrated Poverty in High Poverty Tracts, 1990
Concentrated Poverty in High Poverty Tracts, 2000
Concentrated Affluence in Extreme Affluence Tracts, 1980
Concentrated Affluence in Extreme Affluence Tracts, 1990
Concentrated Affluence in Extreme Affluence Tracts, 2000
Ways to Invest in Social Capital

- Community development creates more stable and mixed income neighborhoods
- Community building strengthens networks and relationships within and between neighborhoods
- Civic society engages people and builds trust
- Social control promotes order and enables goal achievement

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Decades of Change in Cleveland

- Education of workforce has not kept pace
- Manufacturing declines – jobs move to suburbs
- Poverty concentration grows and spreads
- Affluence concentrates at outskirts
- Population spreads, leaves poor behind

Prepared by: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development
Conclusions

- In 1960, Cleveland *was* the region.

- Number 1 ranking in poverty resulted from 40 years of losses.

- Must invest in human and social capital and rebuild the opportunity structure of the region.

- Given the enormity of the problem, must adopt strategies with the greatest promise.
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