

APPENDIX

- **DATA TABLES.....2**
- **POVERTY DEFINITIONS AND MEASUREMENT.....6**
- **CHILD POVERTY CAUSES AND RISK FACTORS.....8**
 - **REFERENCES..... 12**



Table 1: Poverty in Oregon—2009

POVERTY RATES

	100% of the poverty level	50% of the poverty level
TOTAL POPULATION		
All ages	14.3%	6.3%
Female	15.1%	6.6%
Male	13.4%	6.0%
Seniors 65 years and over	8.4%	2.5%
Individuals 18 to 64 years	13.7%	6.4%
Individuals with less than high school degree	23.8%	8.7%
Individuals with high school degree or equivalent	13.0%	5.1%
Individuals with some college or associate's degree	10.5%	4.7%
Individuals with Bachelor's degree or higher	4.8%	2.4%
CHILDREN		
Individual 0-17 yrs.	19.2%	8.1%
Related Children 0-17 yrs.	18.7%	7.7%
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN		
White	13.1%	5.7%
Black or African American	24.2%	11.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native	25.8%	13.8%
Asian	14.9%	7.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	20.0%	9.6%
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)	24.4%	9.5%
Some other race	27.0%	11.5%
Two or more races	17.4%	8.3%
FAMILIES		
All families	9.8%	*
Families with related children 0-17 years	16.3%	*
All married couple families	5.0%	*
Married couple families with children 0-17 years	7.7%	*
All female householder, no husband present	29.6%	*
Female householder, no husband present with children 0-17 years	38.2%	*
White female householder	27.3%	*
Black or African American female householder	33.4%	*
American Indian and Alaska Native female householder	38.7%	*
Asian female householder	27.8%	*
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander female householder	49.5%	*
Hispanic or Latino origin female householder	51.0%	*
Some other race female householder	54.3%	*

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey, Tables S1702 and S1703



Table 2: County Poverty in Oregon—2009

POVERTY NUMBERS, RATES AND MEDIAN INCOME FOR ALL AGES

	Number All Ages	Rate All Ages	Number 0-17 yrs.	Rate 0-17 yrs.	Median HH Income
BAKER	3,042	19.4%	898	27.9%	\$37,120
BENTON	14,037	18.0%	2,316	15.1%	\$47,931
CLACKAMAS	35,864	9.4%	11,640	13.1%	\$60,051
CLATSOP	5,617	15.3%	1,761	23.2%	\$39,375
COLUMBIA	5,846	11.9%	1,857	16.2%	\$55,920
COOS	11,806	19.1%	3,156	27.0%	\$35,562
CROOK	3,606	16.2%	1,306	26.2%	\$42,342
CURRY	3,255	15.5%	838	25.6%	\$35,427
DESCHUTES	18,625	11.8%	6,764	19.1%	\$51,959
DOUGLAS	16,870	16.6%	5,491	26.0%	\$38,887
GILLIAM	218	13.3%	57	19.5%	\$46,018
GRANT	1,128	16.9%	328	24.9%	\$36,252
HARNEY	1,220	18.5%	425	29.7%	\$34,066
HOOD RIVER	2,747	12.9%	1,097	19.9%	\$47,967
JACKSON	29,520	14.9%	9,957	22.9%	\$45,212
JEFFERSON	3,432	17.4%	1,606	29.9%	\$38,132
JOSEPHINE	16,357	20.4%	5,438	33.5%	\$35,509
KLAMATH	13,098	20.2%	4,165	27.9%	\$39,057
LAKE	1,300	18.5%	396	27.6%	\$35,303
LANE	58,935	17.2%	12,153	17.7%	\$40,363
LINCOLN	7,545	16.5%	2,252	27.5%	\$38,089
LINN	17,140	14.9%	5,380	19.7%	\$46,717
MALHEUR	6,356	23.3%	2,503	32.2%	\$35,788
MARION	50,546	16.4%	20,410	24.6%	\$43,388
MORROW	1,627	14.2%	665	20.7%	\$46,279
MULTNOMAH	107,551	15.1%	30,115	20.0%	\$50,604
POLK	9,987	13.2%	3,335	18.6%	\$53,874
SHERMAN	284	16.7%	76	24.3%	\$47,473
TILLAMOOK	3,800	15.6%	1,170	24.2%	\$40,953
UMATILLA	11,381	16.4%	4,449	23.5%	\$47,693
UNION	4,084	16.8%	1,199	21.5%	\$40,160
WALLOWA	1,035	15.3%	310	23.6%	\$38,209
WASCO	3,841	16.2%	1,363	24.8%	\$42,015
WASHINGTON	53,333	10.0%	16,987	12.5%	\$61,022
WHEELER	280	20.6%	86	38.9%	\$31,570
YAMHILL	11,500	12.3%	4,125	17.0%	\$51,676

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) Program



Table 3: Oregon County Child Poverty Trends

POVERTY RATES

	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2005-09 ACS* average
BAKER	27.9%	25.1%	25.8%	24.9%	26.5%	22.1%
BENTON	15.1%	12.6%	13.1%	13.0%	11.8%	12.8%
CLACKAMAS	13.1%	11.7%	11.7%	9.7%	10.8%	11.4%
CLATSOP	23.2%	20.8%	20.0%	20.2%	20.8%	17.8%
COLUMBIA	16.2%	14.7%	13.1%	13.6%	13.9%	10.2%
COOS	27.0%	26.2%	22.4%	25.1%	27.3%	21.6%
CROOK	26.2%	19.5%	19.3%	19.3%	21.4%	24.0%
CURRY	25.6%	21.6%	20.7%	22.9%	20.8%	16.7%
DESCHUTES	19.1%	15.2%	11.9%	14.9%	14.7%	11.9%
DOUGLAS	26.0%	20.7%	22.9%	24.1%	20.4%	19.5%
GILLIAM	19.5%	18.3%	17.1%	18.4%	15.7%	13.8%
GRANT	24.9%	22.3%	20.3%	23.0%	20.5%	15.6%
HARNEY	29.7%	25.5%	24.2%	24.9%	23.6%	21.0%
HOOD RIVER	19.9%	20.1%	18.4%	21.8%	23.4%	12.6%
JACKSON	22.9%	22.9%	18.7%	19.1%	18.5%	18.9%
JEFFERSON	29.9%	25.5%	28.5%	25.1%	24.6%	26.7%
JOSEPHINE	33.5%	30.2%	26.5%	23.8%	25.5%	27.1%
KLAMATH	27.9%	23.7%	24.3%	25.4%	26.6%	23.3%
LAKE	27.6%	25.9%	23.2%	24.2%	28.2%	27.7%
LANE	17.7%	16.7%	16.8%	18.1%	19.0%	16.2%
LINCOLN	27.5%	26.4%	25.8%	24.8%	28.3%	22.7%
LINN	19.7%	19.7%	20.0%	21.2%	21.3%	21.1%
MALHEUR	32.2%	29.1%	26.3%	28.7%	30.5%	25.6%
MARION	24.6%	22.5%	20.0%	20.8%	21.1%	22.5%
MORROW	20.7%	20.7%	20.7%	22.7%	22.2%	24.1%
MULTNOMAH	20.0%	18.1%	20.4%	19.6%	24.1%	20.6%
POLK	18.6%	15.2%	14.6%	16.2%	20.6%	17.4%
SHERMAN	24.3%	24.9%	22.7%	22.9%	23.9%	32.7%
TILLAMOOK	24.2%	23.5%	21.9%	22.1%	21.5%	23.7%
UMATILLA	23.5%	20.7%	19.8%	21.7%	20.4%	20.2%
UNION	21.5%	19.7%	20.0%	19.9%	17.6%	20.5%
WALLOWA	23.6%	21.1%	20.7%	19.5%	21.4%	13.1%
WASCO	24.8%	24.3%	21.6%	24.6%	23.8%	20.5%
WASHINGTON	12.5%	12.7%	10.9%	11.4%	12.0%	12.6%
WHEELER	38.9%	31.7%	29.1%	28.0%	29.1%	26.3%
YAMHILL	17.0%	15.5%	14.7%	17.3%	17.7%	18.1%

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 SAIPE and 2005-09 American Community Survey (ACS)



Table 4: Oregon County Child Poverty Trends

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN POVERTY

	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	% change 2005-2009
BAKER	898	771	814	815	873	2.9%
BENTON	2,316	1,844	1,904	1,907	1,685	37.4%
CLACKAMAS	11,640	9,735	9,801	8,253	9,173	26.9%
CLATSOP	1,761	1,566	1,516	1,567	1,552	13.5%
COLUMBIA	1,857	1,606	1,444	1,520	1,561	19.0%
COOS	3,156	3,052	2,605	3,060	3,363	-6.2%
CROOK	1,306	971	962	982	1,054	23.9%
CURRY	838	712	709	841	782	7.2%
DESCHUTES	6,764	5,228	3,999	4,759	4,515	49.8%
DOUGLAS	5,491	4,256	4,772	5,170	4,407	24.6%
GILLIAM	57	54	50	65	55	3.6%
GRANT	328	297	276	350	311	5.5%
HARNEY	425	365	354	385	361	17.7%
HOOD RIVER	1,097	1,056	964	1,169	1,220	-10.1%
JACKSON	9,957	9,723	7,891	8,057	7,822	27.3%
JEFFERSON	1,606	1,414	1,592	1,393	1,343	19.6%
JOSEPHINE	5,438	4,832	4,251	3,884	4,190	29.8%
KLAMATH	4,165	3,563	3,667	3,872	4,063	2.5%
LAKE	396	360	333	357	423	-6.4%
LANE	12,153	11,414	11,377	12,289	12,958	-6.2%
LINCOLN	2,252	2,226	2,168	2,157	2,436	-7.6%
LINN	5,380	5,263	5,253	5,513	5,433	-1.0%
MALHEUR	2,503	2,276	2,104	2,371	2,481	.9%
MARION	20,410	18,489	16,158	16,683	16,508	23.6%
MORROW	665	647	659	765	733	-9.3%
MULTNOMAH	30,115	29,072	31,989	29,707	35,457	-15.1%
POLK	3,335	2,509	2,370	2,571	3,172	5.1%
SHERMAN	76	69	69	80	84	-1.0%
TILLAMOOK	1,170	1,152	1,074	1,104	1,058	10.6%
UMATILLA	4,449	3,860	3,715	4,158	3,850	15.6%
UNION	1,199	1,048	1,052	1,048	946	26.7%
WALLOWA	310	255	261	258	291	6.5%
WASCO	1,363	1,294	1,157	1,325	1,275	6.9%
WASHINGTON	16,987	17,330	14,696	15,151	15,254	11.4%
WHEELER	86	64	64	65	69	24.6%
YAMHILL	4,125	3,594	3,352	3,905	3,891	6.0%

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) Program

CHILD POVERTY IN OREGON

Poverty Definitions and Measurement



Introduction

Poverty has different meanings based on one’s perspective and purpose in using the term. The most commonly used definition is associated with an individual or household’s lack of means to provide for their material basic needs (food, shelter, clothing). For purposes of measurement, the U.S. Census Bureau defines poverty as the level of cash income before taxes, excluding capital gains or noncash benefits, in comparison to the household’s official poverty threshold. The poverty threshold is the federal government’s estimate of the income level below which a household has insufficient income to meet minimal food and other basic needs.

There is much debate about the “true” definition and measurement of poverty. The National Academy of Sciences has recommended alternative methods for measuring poverty that take into consideration current consumption needs, expenses and noncash income received from public assistance programs. It is becoming increasingly common to see organizations use 200% of the federal poverty guidelines to define who is low income and better capture the number of families and children actually experiencing poverty conditions. When educating communities about the breadth and depth of child poverty, it is important to understand the federal government’s definitions.

U.S. Census Bureau Definitions

Absolute Poverty Threshold: dollar amounts used to determine poverty status at a fixed point in time and adjusted for inflation using the consumer price index

Relative Poverty Threshold: dollar amounts used to determine poverty status as referenced to actual expenditures or median income of the general population

Federal Poverty Guidelines: income guidelines set annually by the Department of Health and Human Services to determine program eligibility—commonly referred to as the federal poverty level (FPL) and closely aligned with the Census Bureau’s poverty thresholds

2009/2010 Poverty Guidelines*		2011 Poverty Guidelines*	
Persons in Family	Poverty Guideline	Persons in Family	Poverty Guideline
1	\$10,830	1	\$10,890
2	\$14,570	2	\$14,710
3	\$18,310	3	\$18,530
4	\$22,050	4	\$22,350
add \$3,740 for each additional person		Add \$3,820 for each additional person	

* ALL STATES AND D.C. EXCEPT ALASKA AND HAWAII

Annual Poverty Rate: percent of people who were in poverty in a calendar year—basis used by the Current Population Survey and the decennial census long form

Poverty in the past 12 months: measurement of poverty in the previous 12 months instead of the previous calendar year—basis used by the American Community Survey

Child Poverty Rate: percentage of all persons under the age of 18 yrs. whose income is below the poverty level—excludes unrelated children under the age of 15 yrs. (for decennial census and American Community Survey also excludes youth living in college dormitories and in institutional group quarters)

Related Child Poverty Rate: percentage of children related by birth, marriage or adoption to a reference person within the household whose income is below the poverty level—excludes unrelated children under 18 yrs. (for decennial census and American Community Survey also excludes youth living in college dormitories and in institutional group quarters)

U.S. Census Bureau Measurement Tools

Official federal measurements of poverty are done using four primary Census survey based tools.

- **Current Population Survey (CPS)**—used for national estimates of poverty levels and rates
- **American Community Survey (ACS)**—used for annual subnational estimates of income and poverty for all states and counties (refer to chart below)

Data collected between...	Data pooled to produce	Data published for areas with
January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2009	2009 ACS 1-year estimates	populations of 65,000+
January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009	2007-2009 ACS 3-year estimates	populations of 20,000+
January 1, 2005 and December 31, 2009	2005-2009 ACS 5-year estimates	populations of almost any size

- **Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE)** Program—utilizes multiple data sources including the American Community Survey (after 2005) to provide estimates for all states, counties and school districts
- **Decennial Census**—long form estimates are best measure for change between 1990 and 2000 for states, counties and other subnational areas and subpopulations

CHILD POVERTY IN OREGON

Causes and Risk Factors



Introduction

The number one cause of child poverty is being born into a poor family. Children growing up in poverty typically lack the advantages of children from families who are not low-income. They are more likely to move frequently, change schools, have fewer educational resources, and experience more family transitions and stress, as well as other related types of social and economic deprivation. This deprivation during childhood and adolescence can have a lasting impact that makes it more difficult for poor children to escape poverty in adulthood.

There are multiple circumstances and family characteristics that put children at higher risk of growing up in poverty.

Geographic Location Lacking Living Wage Jobs and Benefits

Both the availability and quality of employment significantly affect poverty. Oregon, like most of the nation, experienced large declines in job growth in 2008 and 2009 with an estimated loss of 149,000 jobs.¹ The state's continuing double-digit unemployment rates are among the highest in the country, with a 2010 annual rate of 10.8% compared to the national average of 9.6%.² Depending on where one lives, the rate is even worse, particularly in many of Oregon's rural counties like Crook County, where the 2010 rate was 17.5%.³ Per capita personal income (PCPI) is 9% less than the national average, ranking Oregon 32nd (2008 & 2009) amongst other states, its lowest ranking since 1929.⁴ There are several factors contributing to the low PCPI including Oregon's relatively low industry wages compared to their national counterparts, higher than national average of part-time workers and shorter workweek, and lower rate of wage earners, which has declined from 65% in 1996 to 58% in 2009.⁵

In 2009, Oregon's bottom 20% year-round wage earners made an average of \$16,580 compared to \$32,993 for the bottom 50% and \$81,875 for the top 10%.⁶ Wage levels for the bottom 20% declined in 2007 through 2009 after experiencing modest increases from 2002 to 2006.⁷ Oregon is fortunate to have the second highest minimum wage in the country at \$8.50 for 2011. The state's minimum wage, which is automatically adjusted for inflation, is likely one the reasons the bottom 20% wage earners saw wage levels increase in the second half of the 1990s and 2002 to 2006.⁸ However, even Oregon's relatively high minimum wage is inadequate to move a full-time employed single parent with one child above the poverty level (\$14,570). In order to provide a family wage that minimally meets basic needs (estimated at 200% of poverty guidelines), a single parent with one child would need to earn 65% more than Oregon's current minimum wage or \$14.00 per hour. If work is the primary means for escaping poverty, then families must have access to jobs and benefits that not only meet basic housing, food, health care, transportation, child care and clothing needs, but also provide for educational and work-related expenses, asset accumulation to offset emergencies and access to experiences and opportunities that promote healthy childhood development.

Geographic Location Lacking Affordable and Accessible Basic Need Resources

All families have basic needs that must be met in order to provide a safe, secure and healthy home for children to live and develop. Low-income families are often forced to depend upon others for securing affordable housing, health and dental care, child care, transportation, food, clothing and other personal incidentals. Unfortunately, many Oregon communities do not have the safety net necessary to supplement low wage employment, partial year and part-time employment, job loss and/or inability to work. The assistance available in communities often comes with barriers related to transportation, stigmatization, complex and confusing eligibility requirements, disincentives to remain working or seek advancements, language and required asset depletion.

Parents/Caregivers with Low Educational Attainment

A rapidly changing and global economy has made it increasingly hard for parents with only a high school degree or less to earn a livable wage that will support a family. In 2009, 46% of Oregon children whose parents had no high school degree were poor, compared to 13% who had parents with some college education or more.⁹ Eighty-four percent of children with parents who had no high school degree were low-income (200% FPL), compared to 32% who had education beyond a high school degree.¹⁰

It is predicted that by 2018, 64% of jobs in Oregon will require post-secondary education.¹¹ Over two and a half more new jobs will require post-secondary education than those created for high school graduates and dropouts. Sixty-two percent of the jobs available for those with a high school degree or less will typically be lower paying occupations in food and personal services and blue collar such as construction, production, farming/forestry/fishing, equipment installation/repair, and transportation.¹²

Job security is also linked to educational attainment with lower unemployment rates for those with college degrees versus just a high school degree. Nationally, a worker without a high school diploma was more than twice as likely to be unemployed than a worker with a college bachelor's degree. The unemployment rate in 2009 for workers with less than a high school degree was 14.6%, compared to 9.7% for high school graduates and 5.2% for those with a Bachelor's degree.¹³ Sixty-five percent of Oregon's 2009 unemployment benefit recipients had a high school degree/GED or less compared to 11% who had a Bachelor's degree.¹⁴ It also appears that college graduates who have lost their jobs are finding work faster than high school graduates.¹⁵

Incarcerated Parent or Caregiver

Nationally, 54% of prison inmates are parents with children under the age of 18 years representing 2.7 million children. Of these children, 11.4% of African American children have an incarcerated parent, compared to almost 1.8% of white children and 3.5% of Hispanic children.¹⁶ A 2002 inmate survey revealed that approximately 20,000 children in Oregon have a parent who is incarcerated.¹⁷ According to the Oregon Department of Corrections, "Children whose parents are incarcerated are five to six times more likely to be incarcerated than are their peers." Research has shown that children with an incarcerated parent are negatively impacted both educationally and financially.¹⁸ Family income is reduced by as much as 22 percent when a

father is incarcerated and after release from prison, family income remains 15 percent lower than it was the year before incarceration. Former incarcerated parents experience multiple barriers to securing employment and economic mobility, including erosion of work skills, loss of social networks, substantial financial obligations, limited occupations in which to work, potential legal and financial liabilities and stigma that discourage employers from hiring a former inmate.

Parent and/or Child Disability

There is a strong link between disability (physical, mental, addiction) and poverty, both as a cause and consequence of poverty.¹⁹ A parent's disability can result in job loss, reduced employability, inability to acquire necessary education and employment related skills, loss of informal supports and increased expenses for health care, housing and transportation. It is estimated that 20.4% of disabled Oregonians live in poverty, with 8.4% living in extreme poverty (50% FPL).²⁰ Children with disabilities frequently require more intensive care, requiring parents to reduce hours of work or leave a job to be a full-time caregiver. Disabled children are more likely to fall behind academically, limiting their long term employment and income opportunities.

Family Structure

The increase in single parent families, particularly female headed households, contributes to the high and persistent child poverty rate. In Oregon, female parent families with children and no husband present have a poverty rate almost five times higher than married couple families. These same households who have children under the age of five have a poverty rate that is over six times higher than those who are headed by married couples.

Married couple families with children under 18 years	7.7% poverty rate
Female headed (no husband present) families with children under 18 years	38.2% poverty rate
Married couple families with children under 5 years	7.5% poverty rate
Female headed (no husband present) families with children under 5 years	46.4% poverty rate

Single parents not only have to typically rely on one income, but also lack the support from a spouse to share in the care of their children, which can result in increased child care cost and more restricted employment opportunities. The increasing mobility of families has also impacted the support that extended families have in the past been able to provide, i.e. child care, transportation and shared housing.

An increasing number of grandparents, who are more likely to be on fixed incomes, are becoming responsible for their grandchildren. In Oregon there are over 25,000 grandparents in this situation, with 37 percent of these households having no parent present. The poverty rate for families where grandparents are responsible for their grandchildren is 15 percent and goes up to 51 percent where there is no parent present and the grandparents are 60 years of age or older.

Lack of or Depletion of Family Assets

Financial assets such as savings, property ownership and access to credit provide a cushion against unexpected emergencies that arise due to loss of job, medical expenses, home and car repairs and other unexpected, sometimes catastrophic life events. More than half of American families with children are asset poor and more than two-thirds of female headed and African

American families lack adequate assets.²¹ It is estimated that over 26 percent of Oregonians do not have the recommended three month emergency fund, ranking the state 43rd in the nation in asset poverty.²² It is less likely that families in poverty have the social and family networks to turn to in times of financial crisis. Low-income families that turn to public assistance for help during a financial crisis frequently find what little assets they have may need to be disposed of in order to qualify for cash or service assistance. Families without financial assets are also more likely to rely on “fringe” financial services (i.e., check-cashers, payday lenders, pawnshops, auto title loans, tax refund loans) for emergency loans which have high fees and can result in greater indebtedness.

Family Intergenerational Poverty

Approximately half of the U.S. population experiences poverty before the age of 65.²³ Seventy-five percent of poor people stay in poverty less than four years, with approximately 50 percent leaving poverty after one year.²⁴ Unfortunately, for those who are poor for five or more years, the odds become greater that they will stay or return to poverty. Studies have found that those who are poor during childhood are more likely to be poor as adults.²⁵ The odds of being poor in early adulthood also increase based on the length of childhood poverty. On average, poor children spend 47 percent of their childhood living in poverty.²⁶ Studies of the intergenerational transmission of poverty find that while individuals can break out of intergenerational cycles of poverty, they are likely to move to the precarious position of being slightly less poor.

Historical Concentration of Poverty

While the national percentage of children living in poverty is estimated to be 21 percent, representing over 15 million children, the concentration of poverty for racial and ethnic minorities is significantly worse.²⁷ Black children live in poverty at a rate three times that of white children, 36 percent compared to 12 percent. American Indian and Hispanic children are also disproportionately poor, with rates of 34 percent and 33 percent respectively.²⁸ Racial disadvantages impact the time spent in poverty and upward mobility for poor children. While 65 percent of all children have never lived in poverty, 72 percent of white children have not been poor, compared to just 30 percent of African American children.²⁹ Economic mobility is also impacted by race, as seen in the rate of low-income white children who remain in the bottom fifth of the income distribution as adults (31%), compared to the rate of low-income African American children (54%).³⁰ The high concentrations of poverty have left many minority communities socially isolated from the networks, role models for upward mobility and social supports needed to promote educational success and improved prosperity for future generations.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Nick Beleiciks. “2010: A Year of Highs and Lows,” Oregon Employment Dept., Worksource, Qualityinfo.org, Jan. 25, 2011.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Oregon Employment Dept., Labor Force Data, 2010 Annual Unemployment Rate, Worksource, Qualityinfo.org.
- ⁴ Nick Beleiciks. “Why Oregon’s Personal Income Trails the Nation,” Oregon Employment Dept., Worksource, Qualityinfo.org, Jan. 25, 2011.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Barbara Peniston. “A Look at Wage Inequality in Oregon,” Oregon Employment Dept., Worksource, Qualityinfo.org, March 9, 2011.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ “Demographics of Poor Children” from 2009 American Community Survey, National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, nccp.org.
- ¹⁰ “Family Economic Security Profile” from 2009 American Community Survey, National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, nccp.org.
- ¹¹ Anthony P. Carnevale, Nicole Smith, Jeff Strohl. “Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements Through 2018” Study, Georgetown University Center on Education and Workforce, June 2010.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Mary Bernert. “Characteristics of Unemployment Insurance Benefit Recipients, 2009,” Oregon Employment Dept., May 2010.
- ¹⁵ Anthony P. Carnevale, Nicole Smith, Jeff Strohl. “Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements Through 2018” Study, Georgetown University Center on Education and Workforce, June 2010.
- ¹⁶ The Pew Charitable Trusts, 2010. Collateral Costs: Incarceration’s Effect on Economic Mobility. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- ¹⁷ Oregon Dept. of Corrections, May 2003. “The Children of Incarcerated Parents Project.”
- ¹⁸ The Pew Charitable Trusts, 2010. “Collateral Costs: Incarceration’s Effect on Economic Mobility.” Washington DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- ¹⁹ Center for Economic and Policy Research, Sept. 2009. “Half in Ten—Why Taking Disability into Account is Essential to Reducing Income Poverty and Expanding Economic Inclusion.” Washington, D.C.
- ²⁰ U.S. Census Bureau American FactFinder, 2009 American Community Survey, Table S1703.
- ²¹ Yumiko Aratani, Michelle Chau. “Asset Poverty and Debt Among Families with Children,” National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, February 2010.
- ²² “2009-2010 Assets and Opportunity Scorecard,” based on 2007 ACS and 2004 SIPP, Corporation for Enterprise Development, Washington D.C.
- ²³ Signe-Mary McKernan, Caroline Ratcliffe, and Stephanie R. Cellini. “Transitioning In and Out of Poverty” Fact Sheet #1, The Urban Institute, Washington D.C., September 2009.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Robert L. Wagmiller Jr. and Robert M. Adelman. National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, November 2009.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Vanessa R. Wright, Michelle Chau, Ymiko Aratani. “Who Are America’s Poor Children? The Official Story” brief, data calculated from the U.S. Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, March 2010, representing 2009 calendar year data; National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, March 2011.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Julia Isaacs and Isabel Sawhill. “Reaching for the Prize—The Limits on Economic Mobility,” The Milken Institute Review, Fourth Quarter 2008.