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Executive Summary

The Docking Institute of Public Affairs was commissioned by the United Way of Ellis County to gather and analyze trends across a number of social, economic, and demographic indicators for the county. This report documents change in multiple social, demographic and economic indicators for up to 25 years of the most recent data available.

For the smaller towns within the county the overall depopulation trend has likely resulted in negative effects on communities such as the loss of small local independently owned businesses and loss of active downtown business districts. Depopulation has also led to increased state government pressure for school consolidation in rural districts and an overall social and economic stagnation of some local, rural communities.

The implications for Ellis County residents’ ages leaning toward middle-ages and retirement ages are multi-faceted. Some rural schools are experiencing declining enrollments. Also, as our population ages, there is the need for increased health care providers and increased prescription drug availability. However, due to the national increase in longevity and historic levels of health wellness by seniors, there is the potential for the increased integration of more senior citizens into the local job market.

Ellis County should expect the number of resident Hispanics to continue growing. Following the growth patterns on the state and national levels, we have every reason to believe that our county’s residents of Hispanic ethnicity will continue to steadily climb. Progressive programming facilitates the process by which Hispanic minority members become fully integrated into the life of the community. Many communities that have increasing numbers of Hispanic citizens have community-oriented multi-cultural awareness programs, have increased the number of English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in schools, and have training sessions for police and social workers in “working” Spanish language classes. In many locations across the U.S. churches have also incorporated Spanish language masses or worship services into their regular weekly activities.

There are several possible explanations for the K-12 student enrollment trends as indicated from data covering the period from 1992-2005. Baby Boom “Echo” accounted for the steady Ellis County K-12 student headcount enrollment patterns from 1992-1999. However, the “Echo” dropped off beginning in 2000 and the declines in enrollment continued through 2005. Another explanation of the recent school enrollment declines in county schools is that while depopulation was occurring in smaller northwestern communities in the mid and late 1990s, Ellis County having Hays as a population center was not affected until several years later by this phenomenon. By the time other northwestern Kansas school districts had
already been dealt the blow of losing significant numbers of students, Ellis County school districts were just beginning to feel the pangs of these declines in enrollments. The Hays area was insulated longer from this phenomenon because some of those who were leaving the northwestern Kansas towns were relocating to the Hays area. Thus, the loss of students from some northwestern school districts was a boost mainly for the Hays school system. By 2000 and especially, 2001, most Ellis County schools were experiencing the effects of this demographic shift of depopulation. In 2005, we saw a continuation of this pattern, with declines reported in student enrollments across the vast majority of the grade categories within Ellis County school districts.

Student headcount totals are the basis for school funding formulas. As a result of the regional depopulation trend, not only had Ellis County school districts lost a significant percentage of their most precious resources—the students, they were also receiving less money to provide educational services and programs, and teacher salaries, for remaining students.

The towns and rural areas of Ellis County should be considered quite safe, so long as one is not involved in risk-attracting behavior such as illicit drug use or manufacture, sex crimes, or other types of activities that would make one more vulnerable to accidents and death such as drunk driving, driving at excessive rates of speed, or similar actions that endanger the well-being of oneself and others.

The City of Hays is a very safe location for residents and for those who come to the area each day for services or for jobs. According to City of Hays Assistant Police Chief Hartsfield (personal interview, July 2006) during an average weekday approximately 10,000 additional persons are in town for their work, for school, to shop or attend cultural events at the University, or attending to their health care needs at Hays Medical Center. Then there are the thousands who travel through the Hays area on the interstate. Many of these travelers refill at local gas stations or take time out to eat in nearby restaurants, or take even less time to grab a drive-thru meal. Yet the amount of crime in Hays is very low with the majority of those incidents being reported as non-violent property crimes. During the past 15-year period increases in the City of Hays population have resulted in proportional increases in crime.

The data collected indicate the real value of incomes and housing to have remained fairly flat since 2001. While the per capita personal income was rising, the per capita real personal income, adjusted for inflation, was not showing nearly as much upward movement.
From 1990 to 2000, the national trend in rental housing indicated that while “median gross rents were above the national level in the West and the
Northeast [and] below it in the South and Midwest, renters in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming
spent the lowest share of their income on rent (23.4 percent or less)” (Housing Costs of Renters: 2000. www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-21.pdf, pp. 5-7). In Kansas, in 1990, the median gross rent was $474 with the average percentage of household income spent on rent at 24.5
percent. Ten years later, the median gross rent paid in Kansas was averaging $498 with the median gross rent as percentage of household income
having slightly decreased to 23.4 percent, according to the above cited U.S. Census Bureau report.

From the mid-1990s through 2002, the Kansas state poverty rate experienced decreased. According to U.S. Census Bureau data, using 3-year
averages beginning in 1988 and ending in 2002, the rates of poverty with in Kansas were highest during the mid-1990s. The annual average from
1992-1994 was 13.0 percent and the next 3-year average, from 1994-1996 was 12.3 percent annually. There was a decrease in the next poverty
measurement, from 1996-1998, the average annual rate was 10.1 percent, which remained essentially unchanged at 10.3 percent from 1998-2000.
From 2000-2002, there was another slight decrease in the state poverty rate to 9.4 percent.

The citizens of Ellis County have a variety of health care professionals available to provide a wide array of health care options. We no longer have
a shortage of primary health care professionals in the county. Both medical doctors and osteopathic doctors provide emergency and routine patient
care. Nurse practitioners provide health maintenance care to many of the residents of our area. Because of the presence of the Fort Hays State
University nurse training program, the universal shortage of nursing professionals has been somewhat mitigated. Residents also have dental care
services provided to them with a number of local dentists and their staffs providing surgical, orthodontic, as well as the typical routine exams.
While there is a national shortage of pharmacists, we are well served by 30 registered pharmacists within Ellis County.

The data gathered by the U.S. Census Bureau for Small Area Insurance Estimates indicated, in 2000, that the percent uninsured for all ages in Ellis
County was an estimated 9.9 percent with an estimated total number of 2,618 persons lacking health insurance. For individuals under age 18 there
was an estimated 7.4 percent uninsured rate for an estimated number of 419 minors who did not have health coverage. The percentage of Kansas
residents who lacked health insurance has slowly been decreasing according to data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau. Over a 3-year interval
the average was reported as 11.8 percent from 1995-1997, 11.0 percent for 1998-2000, and 10.9 percent for 2001-2003. The percentage of
persons living in the state of Kansas who lacked health coverage was measured using this same type of 3-year average for the years 2002-2004.
For the years indicated the Kansas annual average percentage of uninsured persons was 10.8 percent (same source as below, Table 11). For the
United States for the years 2002-2004, the 3-year average for the percentage of people without health insurance coverage was 15.5 percent (same source as below, Table 11). Within the same U.S. Bureau of Census report was contained the differences in 2-year average uninsured rates by state. Examining the uninsured rates in 2003-2004 and those same rate measurements from 2002-2003 for the state of Kansas, there was no change in percentage point differences between the two periods. (Source: Figure 10. Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2004, p. 26).

In 1990, the total numbers of Ellis County residents employed numbered 13,673, and by 2000 this total had increased to 15,228, an 11 percent increase. At the national level, over 108 million Americans were employed in 1990 (not including household employees or self-employed individuals). By 2000, this number had increased by 19.7 percent to approximately 130 million workers. The national trend during that ten-year period demonstrated strong growth in the service sector with decreases in manufacturing and mining industry employment numbers. Private industries experienced twice the rate of employment growth than government employment.

Kansas Department of Labor data from 2000-2004 show that the largest employment sectors are health care and social assistance, all government work (includes state and local government workers), and retail trade. In general, however, the number of state and local government workers in Ellis County remained quite stable during this five-year period. It’s important to note that FHSU employees are counted as state employment, and the unified school districts of Hays, Ellis, and Victoria are counted as local government employees. While retail trade experienced a growth in the numbers of individuals employed, the manufacturing industries within the county saw a slight decline, especially between 2001-2003. There was a slight increase in the number of local government employees from 2003-2004.
Population Profile

Ellis County’s total population grew by 5.5 percent during 1990-2000, from 26,004 in 1990 to 27,507 in 2000. However, from 2000 through 2005, the county experienced a decrease of 2.8 percent in the number of residents. This loss of population during the last five years fits with the overall trend being experienced by all other northwest Kansas counties, many western Kansas counties, and much of the Great Plains, in general.

Figure 1.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The overall aging of the Ellis County population reflects the “Graying of America” national trend. Americans are older, on average, than we used to be. This trend is particularly pronounced in Great Plains states. The percentage of county residents aged 65 years and older increased from 13.5 percent of the total county population in 1990 to 14.3 percent of the total by 2000. From 1996-2000, there had also been an increase in the number of individuals in both the 20-64 and 65 years and older categories, but there was a reduction in the number of county residents who were 20 years old and younger (not shown). However, the under-five age group has shown an upturn since a low in 2001.

Figure 2.
From 1994-1999, the largest local racial minority group, African Americans, had a relatively constant number of residents. Data did indicate an increase in this portion of the county population from 1999 to 2000.

Hispanics make up the largest ethnic group within Ellis County. The Hispanic segment of the Ellis County population had a dramatic upsurge in the number of members from 1999 to 2000. As has been the historical pattern with most minority group geographic relocations, the earlier Hispanic residents most likely shared their knowledge and experiences regarding quality of life conditions and information about the local job market with family and friends who then decided to relocate here.

Figure 3.
Figure 4.


Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The most notable change in the way that households are organized in Ellis County is also reflected in state level data. During the last ten years there has been an increase in the rate of non-family cohabitation.
Figure 6.

Household Type, 1990-2000

- Married couple with children
- Married couple without children
- Female-headed household with children
- Female-headed household without children
- Male-headed household with children
- Male-headed household without children
- Non-family household, single person
- Non-family household, two or more persons

Kansas
Source: CensusScope (http://www.censusscope.org)
Ellis County marriage data indicates a pattern of stable marriage rates from 2000-2004. In 1995 there was a slight peak in the marriage rate, but this summit was followed by two years of decreases in 1996 and 1997 with a steady rebound in the number of individuals marrying from 1998 through 2000. The divorce rate in Ellis County has been extremely stable from 1992-2004. The divorce rate also includes legal annulments, which according to Kansas statute K.S.A. 60-162, may be granted by a district court if certain conditions are met that would cause the marriage to be void or if the marriage were “induced by fraud” (http://www.divorcenet.com/states/kansas/groundsforannulmentinkansas).

Figure 7.

Source: Kansas Department of Health and the Environment
During the last fifteen years there has been an overall increase in the number of live births to mothers who reside in Ellis County. Ellis County has had nearly 300 live births annually. The year with the lowest annual live births was 1992 with a total of 298. And the year with the most live births was 2004 with a total of 365, the highest number within this data collection period. From 1999-2004 the annual live birth average was 355.

Figure 8.
The number of infant deaths has remained very low. For no year during this time span were there more than four infant deaths per year. For eight of the 14 years within this period, there were two or fewer infant deaths per year.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.aecf.org](http://www.aecf.org) – The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count, Community Level Information on Kids (CLIKS)
The majority of women giving birth in Ellis County are in their twenties and early thirties. Generally women within two age ranges, 20-24 and 25-29, account for well over 60 percent of those giving birth. 80-85 percent of the live birth totals were accounted for when combining the counts for the following age categories: 20-24, 25-29, and 30-34. The national trend has shown an increase in the number of women aged 35 and over giving birth. From 1990-2004, women aged 35 and older accounted for slightly more than 8.5 percent of the total live births in the county. The particular years in which this age group had relatively high birth rates include: 1994, 1996, 2001, and 2003. The 15-17 year old age range accounted for the smallest annual percentage of live births with a annual average of 2.5 percent.

Figure 9.

Source: Kansas Vital Statistics
The average annual number of reported pregnancies for those aged ten to 19 in Ellis County during this seven year period was 35 (34.71). There were four years during this span when those aged 15-19 accounted for all teenage pregnancies. The general trend over this seven year period is in decline for the 15-19 year old age group. During the three years when there were pregnant girls aged 10-14, for two of those years there was a single case of pregnancy. The other year there were two pregnancy cases reported.

Figure 10.

Teenage Pregnancy: Age of Mother, 1997 - 2003

Source: Kansas Vital Statistics
The most consistent trend in births by non-married females is an increase among those in the 20-24 age group. There are no consistent discernible trends among other age groups. In recent years since 1997, the trend for 18-19 year olds has been flat. The overall level of pregnancies for that age group has been higher since 1997 than prior to that year.

Figure 11.

Source: Kansas Vital Statistics
During 1990-2004 the most common causes of death were (listed in the order of highest percentage of the total): heart disease, cancer, and chronic lower respiratory disease. Beginning in 1998, the percentage of total deaths attributed to the chronic lower respiratory disease began to decrease at the same point when the number of deaths in the “Other Causes” category began to increase. In general, number of deaths due to heart disease decreased. Yet there were notable increases in the percentages of deaths caused by, or due to complications resulting from Alzheimer’s disease, strokes, and diabetes. Figure 12.
Trends Pertaining to Population in Ellis County

For local businesses, the depopulation trend may translate to increased difficulty in finding available individuals to fill existing and future jobs. For the smaller communities within the county this overall depopulation trend has likely resulted in several negative effects on communities such as the loss of small locally-owned businesses; the demise of once active church congregations, multiple Catholic congregations sharing one priest, and the resultant shuttering of some church buildings. Depopulation has also led to increased state government pressure for school in rural districts and an overall stagnation of some local, rural communities.

In general rural schools are experiencing declining enrollments, current and future retirements have created labor market pressures. The implications for Ellis County residents’ ages leaning toward middle-ages and retirement ages are multi-faceted. As our population ages there is the need for increased health care providers and increased prescription drug availability. However, due to the national increase in longevity and historic levels of health wellness by seniors, there is the potential need for the increased integration of more senior citizens into the local job market.

Ellis County should expect the number of resident Hispanics to continue growing. Following the growth patterns on the state and national levels, we have every reason to believe that our county’s residents of Hispanic ethnicity will continue to steadily climb. Many communities that have increasing numbers of Hispanic citizens have community-oriented multi-cultural awareness programs, have increased the number of English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in schools, and have training sessions for police and social workers in “working” Spanish language classes. In many locations across the U.S. churches have also incorporated Spanish language masses or worship services into their regular weekly activities. Such progressive programming facilitates the process by which Hispanic minority members become fully integrated into the life of the community.

A good indicator regarding the health and well-being of mothers and infants in Ellis County is the inverse correlation that while live birth numbers have been steadily increasing, the number of infant deaths has been generally falling from the year 2000 onward within this data collection period.

Regarding the upward trend in unmarried women ages 20-24 giving birth, we cannot say that our local communities are any less stable. What this data does not tell us is how many of these young women are marrying after the child’s birth or how many of these children are being born into stable, permanent non-marital or co-habitation relationships. Both the rises in co-habitation and non-wed mothers can be attributed to the
lessening of the social stigmas that have traditionally been attached to individuals in those two categories. Finally, due to gradual changes in social norms, many younger unmarried women feel that they have more opportunities to obtain college educations as a means of better financially caring for themselves and their children rather than choosing the traditional path of marrying as a means of financial stability.

Heart disease has decreased chiefly due to a near revolution in its treatment. Because of the extensive use of stints, the advances in techniques used in heart surgeries, and the major preventative effects of cholesterol-lowering drugs such as statins (some of which are marketed under the names Zocor, Vytorin, and Crestor), heart disease as a cause of death have been lowered nation-wide. The acknowledgement and dissemination of information regarding dietary patterns and making healthy food choices might also have played roles during this time span in the decreases in county deaths due to heart disease. During the fifteen-year period being analyzed there were also improved prescription drugs available on the market for the treatment of blood pressure. Because high blood pressure is often associated with increased chances of experiencing a heart attack or heart disease, the reduction of blood pressure then lessens the chances of one experiencing these even more severe occurrences, which as our data indicates, are often causes or major contributing factors of death.

As in the case of all respiratory diseases, the acknowledgement of the detrimental effects of smoking and the decrease in smoking in the U.S. across most age groups are probable explanations for the decrease in the percentage of deaths attributable to chronic lower respiratory disease (CLRD). Another possible explanation for the decrease in deaths associated with CLRD is that from 1990-2004 there were also improvements in the category of drugs known as broncho-dialators, which are for the treatment of asthma and other breathing difficulties.

Noticeable from the 1997 county-level data, but particularly striking within 2001-2004 Vital Statistics information is that Alzheimer’s Disease is being found to be an ever increasing cause of death in Ellis County. However, usually it is not to Alzheimer’s Disease itself that its victims succumb, but rather from the complications that are associated with Alzheimer’s. During our study period there were noticeable improvements in the recognition of the symptoms of this disease and improvements in the diagnosis techniques used to detect the onset of this condition. Prior to the increased public awareness and medical practitioner awareness of this disease many people with the symptoms typical of this condition were labeled as having senile dementia, or just being senile. Unfortunately, there is still quite a lot to be learned about Alzheimer’s disease, such as which lifestyle choices or specific genetic patterns might pre-dispose some persons to have a much higher likelihood of condition development than others.
Similar to the dynamic of Alzheimer’s, in that it is a condition that kills indirectly through its complications, is diabetes. Though there are differences in current estimates on the exact percentages of the American population that are overweight and obese, it would be safe to say that over half of all U.S. residents fit into one of these two categories. Being overweight does raise one’s chances for developing diabetes. Thus, we can say with reasonable assurance that unless all segments of the American public turn the tables on the weight-loss battle, diabetes will continue to be a major health care issue in the future. Our national population is becoming increasingly older and increasingly heavier, on average, and these factors make it all the more likely that an increasing number of people will become at-risk for the development of this condition. For those individuals who already have diabetes, improvements have occurred that allow them to monitor the condition more closely than ever, such as improvements in blood-testing monitors, thinner insulin injection needles, and an improvement in the dissemination of knowledge about diabetes. Lifestyle changes in the form of diet and exercise have also been used as tools by people maintaining their independent and active lives at the same time as they are successfully coping with diabetes.
Education

By comparing the 1990 and 2000 levels of educational attainment by Ellis County citizens over the age of 25, we find that there have been trend shifts at the lower and higher ends of the achievement continuum. Comparing U.S. Census data collected in 1990 and in 2000, we see that by 2000 there were fewer individuals with less than 9th grade educations and also fewer persons who had completed only some portions of grades 9-12, and who had not graduated with a diploma. The percentage of the county population having graduated from high school remained nearly the same at roughly 30 percent (30.77 percent and 29.87 percent, for 1990 and 2000, respectively). Compared to 1990, the 2000 Census indicated a slight rise in residents that have attained some college credit. There is no change between 1990 and 2000 counts in the percentage of residents reporting having attained an associate degree. In 2000 there were increases both in the percentages of individuals who reported that they had attained a bachelor’s degree and in the category of those reporting that they had earned a graduate or professional degree compared to 1990.
Figure 13.

Educational Attainment of People Over Age 25: Comparing 1990 and 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The kindergarten class cohorts for the years 2003, 2004, and 2005 are larger than most of the cohorts covered within this fourteen-year data span.

Figure 14.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
From 1997 to 2004, the 12th grade steadily grew relative to grades 7-11. Over the same period, 7th and 8th grades were stable to declining relative to other grades. Those trends seem reversed with the most recent data point, 2005.

Figure 15.
Interestingly, while the percentages of men and women within the county was split 50/50 during this time, school enrollment figures indicate that boys were a higher percentage than girls of the total headcount enrollment for every year within this fourteen-year data collection period. There was a very stable pattern of boys constituting slightly over 52 percent and girls accounting for slightly under 48 percent of the total. Enrollment total patterns for males and females over this time span were steady to slightly climbing from 1992-1998. There was a slight decline in 1999, and then generally stable again for the next two years. 2002 began a downward trend in enrollment.

Figure 16.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
Student enrollment totals for white male and female students were steady from 1992 until 1997. There was a decline in white student enrollment in 1998 that leveled out in 1999. From 2000-2005 there were decreases each year in the number of white male and female students enrolled in Ellis County school districts.

Figure 17.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
From 2000-2005, there were more African American males enrolled in county schools than African American females. This is a trend shared with the white student population. From 1994 to 2002, there were enrollment increases for African American students for all but two years. During this time period, 2002 had the highest African American student enrollment numbers with a total of 92 male and female students being reported. From 2003-2005, the African American student enrollment trend was very similar to the declining pattern for white students.

Figure 18.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
For each of the years reported there have been more Hispanic students enrolled in Ellis County schools than African American students. Hispanic student enrollment peaked in 2001 with 227 individuals having been enrolled in schools. There was a significant drop in the number of Hispanic male and female students enrolled in schools in 2002. For 2003 and 2004 the data indicated a very interesting difference in the enrollment patterns for Hispanics, whites, and African American students. For these two years, the male and female counts within both the white and African American categories decreased, but Hispanic females and males increased. In 2005, while the downward enrollment pattern continued for the male and female counts within both the white and African American categories of student enrollment totals, there were continued increases in Hispanic male enrollments, but a decline in the number of Hispanic females enrolled in Ellis County schools.

Figure 19.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
In the school data for 2003, there were four female, multiethnic students enrolled and seven male, multiethnic students reported in the headcount totals. For 2004, the number of females in this ethnic category had increased to 22 and for males, an increase to 19 occurred. One year later, the female count was still the same, but two more males were enrolled for this school year, this brought the male, multiethnic student enrollment count to 21 for 2005. Coinciding with this three-year time frame, there was also an increase in the number of persons of diverse ethnic backgrounds who moved into the Hays area because of employment opportunities.

Figure 20.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
For most of these years there were increases in enrollment in Special Education classes. There were some fluctuations in student numbers in these programs from 1998-2000. The apex in the number of students enrolled in Special Education programs was reached in 2002 with a total of 631.

Figure 21.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
Figure 21b.

Special Education Enrollment: 1993 - 2004
Counts from the Hays West Central Kansas Special Education Cooperative

Counts include special education enrollment in Hays, Ellis, and Victoria public schools, as well as private schools in Ellis County and schools in LaCrosse.

Source: Mark Hauptman with the Hays West Central Kansas Special Education Cooperative
Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Head Start program is always enrolled at full capacity.
2 Head Start is available for children ages three to five. Before 2005-2006, all Head Start numbers include Head Start and At Risk numbers. During 2005-2006, numbers include Head Start, At Risk, and West Central Kansas Smart Start, which is funded by a grant from the Kansas Children’s Cabinet.
3 Parents’ and Teachers’ Early Head Start is available for prenatal children up to age three.

It is fairly difficult to discern whether there was actually any trend in the rate of K-12 suspensions during this eleven-year period. Years that are indicated as having increases might simply be a reflection of multiple incidents by the same person or rash of illicit activities by a group of students. Any one individual could have been suspended any number of times on the basis of varying justifications by administrators, thus the nature of the data make any pattern regarding suspensions rather illusive.

Stereotypically, the general pattern of suspensions is that more boys than girls are suspended. The drop in suspensions in 1996 may be explained in that kids who might otherwise have been suspended had the opportunity to attend the new Westside Alternative School. In 2001, the Learning Center opened its doors to students with behavioral issues and educational processing issues that placed them at risk for either being suspended or dropping out. During this same year school resource officers began on-site duties displaying the most presence in middle and high schools. Administrative changes at Hays High School also affected the number of individuals being suspended. Then, in 2002, Zero Tolerance policies went into affect that likely played a role in the increased percentage of males being suspended.
Figure 22.

Rate of K-12 Suspensions: Gender, 1994 - 2004

Source: Kansas Department of Education, Student Support Services
The initial starting number of students is so small that any changes are depicted as large swings in the suspension indicated by grade level. To drop out one must be 16 and have parental permission. The Learning Center, which opened in June 2000, gives students in vulnerable, at-risk categories for dropping out an alternative route leading to high school graduation. Progressive learning environments were directed at those students who otherwise might have “absented” themselves out, been kicked out, or just dropped out. There is a very discernable pattern of sharp declines in drop out numbers beginning in 2002, which would have been one full year since the Learning Center had opened. Dropout numbers in 2004 were almost negligible.

Figure 23.
The graphic representation of data on student participation in free and reduced meal programs at their schools inevitably undercounts the number of children whose families are actually eligible for this program. The lack of knowledge by parents about the program, reluctance to utilize government assistance, and the inability of some parents to complete the application form due to language barriers, illiteracy, or child neglect are factors that would reduce the numbers of students partaking of the free and reduced meal programs offered by Ellis County schools. We do not know the magnitude of under counting nor its trends. The data indicate rises in the numbers of those participating for the years of 1994, 1997, and 2001. In 1994, an economic recession accounted for the rise in the number of students having school meals at no cost or at a reduced cost based on family income. Local business layoffs of mostly unskilled females who had been working to supplement the family income meant that a number of families in Ellis County could no longer maintain their usual standards of living.

Figure 24.

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
Student to teacher ratios are obviously linked to headcount enrollment totals. USD 489 had larger classes than any other district in the county. During the mid-1990s the USD 489 Superintendent made a very concerted effort to lower these student-to-teacher ratios, but the declining enrollments of 1999 meant that the district received less money. Since teacher salaries are the single largest expense of schools and because there was less money for paying salaries the result was fewer teachers per student. USD 489 attempted to solve part of their mid-1990s financial difficulties by not replacing retiring teachers. While there were fewer kids and fewer teachers, the numbers were not proportionate, resulting in a rise in student-to-teacher ratio.

Figure 25.

Source: Kansas State Board of Education

_Docking Institute of Public Affairs: United Way of Ellis County 2006_
Changes in the patterns of the choices made by high school graduates regarding what paths to take following the graduation ceremony are likely highly influenced by a change in the strategies of Hays High School guidance counselors. There has been an increased recognition that not all students have the desire, ability, and financial resources to go straight from high school to a four-year college or university. Guidance counselors have increasingly been disseminating information about the myriad of other available options for graduating students.

In 2001, the concurrent classes system allowed Hays High School students to take courses at Fort Hays State University for high school and college credit. This had the effect of giving some high school students an advanced beginning to their college careers. Also in 2001, Barton County Community College began increasing its recruiting efforts directed at area high school students. Beginning in 2002, there was a strong push nationally by military recruiting officers to have a much more pervasive presence on high school campuses, as well as at two- and four-year colleges and universities. Military recruiting techniques have become much more aggressive as they reach out for students through the mail or through repeated telephone calls offering any number of enticements for enlisting. All of these factors have contributed to the changes in the post-graduation patterns of Ellis County high school students.

In the early to mid-1990s there were three main paths for county high school graduates: four-year university, employment, or the military. Beginning in 2000, the data indicates some changes in that earlier pattern. In a few of the recent years, contrary to the patterns of the early 1990s, more students had chosen two-year colleges than employment. Also, during the most recent years there has been an increase in alternative forms of education being chosen such as trade schools. For example, in 2005, prospective graduates of Hays High School students were surveyed about their plans for continuing their educations. Seventy-six percent of those students reported that they were planning on pursuing some type of post-secondary education training; 60% of those graduating were planning to attend a four-year university. 14% reported plans that included attending a two-year college or university, and 2% were planning on pursuing other types of post-secondary training. Of the 2006 prospective HHS graduating class, 88% were planning on pursuing some type of post-secondary education with 71% making plans for attending a four-year educational institution and seven percent planning on attending a two-year college or university. 10% of the future graduates were interested in pursuing some alternative form of post-secondary educational experience, such as specific vocational training.
Figure 26.

Post High School Graduation Vocations: 1992 - 2004

Source: Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services
Trends Pertaining to Educational Patterns in Ellis County

One possible contributing factor to the changes from 1990 to 2000 in the educational attainment levels of people over age 25 in Ellis County could be the presence of Fort Hays State University as it provides a convenient environment for non-traditional, working adults to attend college classes and complete entire degree programs or to enable them to return to a college environment to attain a degree program that was interrupted at a younger age due to parenting responsibilities, financial and/or occupational pressures, or other life issues. Also likely a contributing factor is that more occupations are requiring higher levels of employment from prospective workers. We have every reason to believe that as outsourcing continues, as globalization efforts continue, and as the American job market tightens in many areas because of these structural changes that competition for workplace positions and rewards will only continue to increase regionally, nationally, and internationally.

There are several possible explanations for the K-12 student enrollment trends as indicated from data covering the period from 1992-2005. Baby Boom “Echo” accounted for the steady Ellis County K-12 student headcount enrollment patterns from 1992-1999. However, “Echo” dropped off beginning in 2000 and the declines in enrollment continued through 2005. Another explanation of the recent school enrollment declines in county schools is that while depopulation was occurring in smaller northwestern communities in the mid and late 1990s, Ellis County as a magnet of immigrations for this region, was not affected until several years later by this phenomenon. By the time other northwestern Kansas school districts had already been dealt the blow of losing significant numbers of students, Ellis County school districts were just beginning to feel the pangs of these declines in enrollments. Also, the Hays area was insulated longer from this phenomenon because some of those who were leaving the northwestern Kansas towns were relocating to the Hays area. Thus, the loss of students from some northwestern school districts was a boost mainly for the Hays school system. By 2000 and especially, 2001, most Ellis County schools were experiencing the effects of this demographic shift of depopulation. In 2005, we saw a continuation of this pattern, with strong declines reported in student enrollments across the vast majority of the grade categories within Ellis County school districts.

Student headcount totals are the basis by which school funding formulas are based. As a result of the regional depopulation trend, not only had Ellis County school districts lost a significant percentage of their most precious resources-the students, they were also receiving less money to provide educational services and programs, and teacher salaries, in order to best care for their remaining students.

The recent declining enrollment pattern continued for the male and female counts within both the white and African American categories of student enrollment totals, there were continued increases in Hispanic male enrollments, but a decline in the number of Hispanic females enrolled in
Ellis County schools between 2004 and 2005. While white and African American families have been relocating out of Ellis County most likely to increase their chances for increased opportunities in the job market or to relocate to urban areas with more educational, retail, and entertainment alternatives, Hispanic individuals and families may have a more favorable view about the social and economic advantages that our local area has to offer. More recently Hispanic families with children have been moving into Ellis County, thus accounting for at least some of the growth in the number of Hispanic student enrollments.

There have been increases in the number of multiethnic children enrolled in county schools. In general, in the U.S., there have been increases in the numbers of children resulting from short and long-term interracial relationships. Individuals have had more opportunity in recent years to engage in intimate relationships with persons from diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds as many traditional or customary prohibitions against such relationships have been replaced by greater social acceptance in many parts of the country. Changes in Ellis County are simply reflecting broader social dynamics. The number of multiethnic families and children may be expected to continue on a gradual increase within the county, but particularly in Hays because of job availability attracting new workers into the area.

It is quite difficult to discern whether there was actually any trend present at all in the data regarding the rate of K-12 suspensions because while suspensions are less severe than expulsions, they also are more subjective in nature and require much less evidence by a teacher or administrator to justify.

There was a very clear trend present within the data collected on school dropout numbers from 1992-2004 for grades 9-12. The multi-faceted solutions offered by the Learning Center (opened June 2000) likely contributed to the decrease in the number of Hays teenagers who otherwise might have given up on learning and on themselves. The alternative teaching approaches offered by the staff at the Learning Center directly accounted for the significant declines in school dropout numbers from 2001-2003, with there being only single instances of dropouts indicated from the data for 2004.

There were rises in the numbers of students participating in the free and reduced cost meal programs at their schools, and the poverty figures for Ellis County would indicate that there are many more school children who are in desperate need than are utilizing the availability of these services. Pride, and the fear of being seen as taking a “handout,” is likely the most significant factor in explaining why more children and families do not
sign up for these meal programs. Until the social stigma, or “handout” label, is removed from those students or families taking part in these food service programs, then we should not expect to see any meaningful increases in the numbers of participating students.

The increase in student to teacher ratios from 1999-2003 was attributable to the overall decline in student enrollments, which resulted in reductions in school district’s budgets and necessitated educating with fewer teachers. Because of continued decreases in recent school enrollments this trend of cash-strapped school districts and higher student to teacher ratios can be expected to continue, even with the infusion of dollars from the new education spending packages approved during the 2006 Kansas legislative session and the special legislative session in 2005.

In the early to mid-1990s there were three main paths for county high school graduates: four-year university, employment, or the military. Beginning in 2000, the data indicates some changes in that earlier pattern. In a few of the recent years, contrary to the patterns of the early 1990s, more students had chosen two-year colleges than employment. This change is probably largely due to three factors: the concurrent credit program offered at Hays High School, increased recruiting by Barton County Community College and other regional two-year degree granting institutions, and an increase in aggressive military recruiting tactics. Because two- and four-year institutions must be so competitive with one another in recruiting new students and with the costs of tuition rising at almost every four-year higher education institution, it is quite possible that more students in the future will attend two-year colleges to complete their basic courses before transferring to a four-year university to complete their degrees.
Healthcare Delivery and Health Insurance Coverage

From 1992-1994, there was a critical shortage of primary care physicians in Ellis County. The recruiting strategies of the Hays Medical Center during the mid-1990s helped to bring a number of new medical doctors to the area. The data indicates a trend of general growth in the number of medical doctors from 1996-2001. During that same time frame, the number of osteopathic doctors also grew. The number of dentists trended every so slightly upward. There were 30 pharmacists registered with the Kansas Board of Pharmacy in 2005.

Figure 27.
During the five year period from 2000 to 2004 the total number of nurses in Ellis County remained relatively the same with only slight variations. At Fort Hays State University and nation-wide, the enrollment of new nursing students dropped in both 1998 and 1999. However, since 2001 enrollment has been increasing, with the current FHSU nursing program full and having a waiting list. Nursing is predicted to be one of the top career choices for the foreseeable future. Capacity constraints due to shortages in nursing faculty nationwide are likely to be the largest limiting factor on the supply of nurses in the near term. Currently the shortage of nurses is a universal problem found at the national, state, and local levels. In general, Hays Medical Center reports being “adequately staffed” for nurses. Hays Medical Center also reports that any current nursing shortages are due to institutional growth and new services that are being offered, requiring increases in nursing personnel. Shortages at Hays Medical Center have been mitigated through institutional networks with the MCK and FHSU nursing training programs and by offering tuition assistance with Hadley Foundation Scholarships and other types of financial aid incentives. HMC annually hires approximately 20 registered nurses, the center occasionally over-hires to compensate for any possible losses due to attrition by retirements or personnel who move away from the area.
Figure 28.

Source: Kansas Board of Nursing
There has been a stable trend in number of Adult Care Homes in Ellis County. From 2001-2004, there were four assisted living homes providing services to residents. Since the major medical merger in 1991 which produced Hays Medical Center, there has only been one hospital in the county.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Care Homes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kansas Vital Statistics
Bed capacities were reduced in 2000 due to the reduction in numbers of adult care facilities and in reduction of assisted living homes in the county. In 2001, the bed capacities of Hays Medical Center, assisted living and adult care institutions were back to roughly the 1999 levels. Also, from 2001-2004 the numbers of available beds within these institutions were indicated from KDHE Vital Statistics information to have remained constant.

Figure 29.
The data gathered by the U.S. Census Bureau for Small Area Insurance Estimates indicated, in 2000, that the percent uninsured for all ages in Ellis County was an estimated 9.9 percent with an estimated total number of 2,618 persons lacking health insurance. For individuals under age 18 there was an estimated 7.4 percent uninsured rate for an estimated number of 419 persons who did not have health coverage.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Measured</th>
<th>All Ages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Under Age 18</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Insured</td>
<td>Number Uninsured</td>
<td>Percent Uninsured</td>
<td>Number Insured</td>
<td>Number Uninsured</td>
<td>Percent Uninsured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis County</td>
<td>23,830</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5268</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates Program

From the most recent publication of *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2005* (issued September 2006, see pages 26 and Figure D-1 on page 76) data indicated that the uninsured rate in western and southern states increased from 2004, while “the Midwest (the region in which Kansas is categorized) and the Northeast had the lowest uninsured rates in 2005, at 11.9 percent and 12.3 percent, respectively.” From 2004 to 2005, the position of Kansas improved from 10th to 9th in the ranking of states with the lowest reported percentages of uninsured persons. The two-year averages of uninsured rates by state measured no statistical difference in the 2003-2004 figures when compared to the 2004-2005 two-year average. This U.S. Census publication also indicates that “the uninsured rate was higher among people living within cities (18.7 percent) than among people living in suburbs (14.1 percent). The percentage of the uninsured that lived outside metropolitan statistical areas was 15.6 percent in 2005 (most representative of Ellis County’s residential area). According to September 2006 update of Kidscount (http:www.aecf.org/kidscoun.sld/profile_results), the percent of children in Kansas aged 17 and below without health insurance has decreased from 10 percent in 2000 to 9 percent in 2001 and remained steady at 7 percent for the years 2002 -2004. For the U.S. the rate uninsured within this age group was 11% in 2004.
Figure 30.  
Three-Year Average Percentage of People Without Health Insurance Coverage by State: 2003 to 2005

The most notable change in the levels of prenatal care quality in Ellis County for the years depicted below is that while for the years 1998-2001 the combined percentages of the Adequate and Adequate Plus categories were at least over 80 percent, in 2002, the combined percentages of these two categories dropped to just over 70 percent. A notable increase in the Intermediate category of prenatal care quality occurred in 2002.

Figure 31.

Source: Kansas Vital Statistics
Trends Pertaining to Health Care Services and Health Insurance Coverage in Ellis County

The citizens of Ellis County have a variety of health care professionals available to provide a wide array of health care options. We no longer have a shortage of primary health care professionals in the county. Both medical doctors and osteopathic doctors provide emergency and routine patient care. Nurse practitioners provide health maintenance care to many of the residents of our area. Residents also have dental care services provided to them with a number of local dentists and their staffs providing surgical, orthodontic, as well as the typical routine exams. While there is a national shortage of pharmacists, we are well served by 30 registered pharmacists within Ellis County.

The percentage of Kansas residents who lacked health insurance has slowly been decreasing (Health, United States, 2005). The annual average rate of uninsured persons in Kansas was 11.8 percent for from 1995-1997, 11.0 percent from 1998-2000, and 10.9 percent from 2001-2003. The annual average from 2002-2004 compared to the annual average from 2003-2005 would indicate a statewide trend in which more Kansans are covered by health insurance. For the United States for the years 2002-2004, the 3-year annual average rate of people without health insurance coverage was 15.5 percent (same source as below, Table 11). Within the same U.S. Bureau of Census report was contained the differences in 2-year average uninsured rates by state. By examining the uninsured rates in 2003-2004 with those same rate measurements from 2002-2003 for the state of Kansas, the data indicated no change in percentage point differences between the two periods. (Source: Figure 10. Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2004, p. 26. From the most recent publication of Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2005, (issued September 2006, see pages 26 and Figure D-1 on page 76) data indicate that the uninsured rate in western and southern states increased from 2004, while “the Midwest (the region in which Kansas is categorized) and the Northeast had the lowest uninsured rates in 2005, at 11.9 percent and 12.3 percent, respectively.” The two-year averages of uninsured rates by state measured no statistical difference between the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. This U.S. Census publication also indicates that “the uninsured rate was higher among people living within cities (18.7 percent) than among people living in suburbs (14.1 percent). The percentage of the uninsured that lived outside metropolitan statistical areas was 15.6 percent in 2005 (most representative of Ellis County’s residential area).

From all of these data, Ellis County does have a comparably low percentage of uninsured relative to both the state and the United States as a whole. The data gathered by the U.S. Census Bureau for Small Area Insurance Estimates indicated, in 2000, that the percent uninsured for all ages in Ellis County was an estimated 9.9 percent with an estimated total number of 2,618 persons lacking health insurance. For individuals under age 18 there was an estimated 7.4 percent uninsured rate for an estimated number of 419 minors who did not have health coverage.
From the information presented regarding the Prenatal Care Quality Levels for 1998-2002, it would be difficult to determine a particular pattern or trend. It is hard to determine the particular factor(s) that would account for the decreased percentage levels of Adequate Plus and Adequate prenatal care during this period. Because of the small base numbers in these data the wide variation may be explained by the medical treatment choices of just a few women.

The U.S. Census Bureau data indicates that the national rate of uninsured Americans without health insurance peaked in 1998 at 16.3 percent. In 2000, the percentage was 14.2 percent, then it increased for three years until 2004 when it had reached 15.7 percent. In 2004, nearly 60 percent of Americans had employment-based health insurance. Government health insurance programs have been increasing in the percentage and numbers of people being covered. The increases in 2003 and 2004 were linked to increases in the percentages and numbers of persons covered by Medicaid. During this period there was a decline in the total number of those covered by private health insurance.

The overall percentage of children, under age 18, without health insurance coverage was 11.2 percent and 8.3 million in 2004, unchanged since 2003. Children living in poverty were more likely to be uninsured than all other children. Nationally, the uninsured rate for children living in poverty was 18.9 percent in 2004. Non-Hispanic whites in 2004 had an uninsured rate of 11.3 percent and a number of uninsured of 22.0 million. For African Americans these figures were 19.7 percent and a number of uninsured of 7.2 million. Hispanics lacking health coverage increased in number from 13.2 million to 13.7 million, but had an unchanging percentage of uninsured at 32.7 percent for both 2003 and 2004. (Information cited in the two preceding paragraphs is from Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2004. p. 16-17.)
Crime

The data within this section has been chiefly derived from crime data information collected by the Kansas Bureau of Investigation and through interviews with local law enforcement officials. The majority of crimes reported in Ellis County are handled by the Hays Police Department.

During the 16-year time period indicated in the following table the total number of reported indexed crimes (includes violent and property crime) reached over 800 in seven of the years, but for only one year were there over 1,000 crimes. The next graph depicts indexed crimes in our county from 1990 until 2005. Violent crimes include: murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, and for the years 1996 through 1998, attempted murder. Indexed property crimes include: burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft.

Figure 32.

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
These report totals were compiled from all participating law enforcement agencies within Ellis County that data were reported to the KBI. As indicated by this graph, during this time span, there were few violent crimes reported to local law enforcement agencies.

Figure 33.

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
There were increases in the reports of thefts during the indicated available years. An increase in the number of reports does not always equal the actual number of separate perpetrators committing crimes. Marked increases in the numbers of reported burglaries may be explained by certain individuals or groups having been responsible for a spree of crimes within a given period.

Figure 34.
Property crimes comprised the majority of the reported offenses for the Ellis County Sheriff’s Department for all years in which data was available from 1995-2004. From 2000-2004, there was an increase in the total indexed crimes reported. The increase in the total from 2003-2004 is attributable to the increase in the number of total property crimes. Because of the small numbers contained within this data set a minor change in reported counts may appear as a large fluctuation in the graphic representation. Thankfully, there were very few actual reports of violent crimes made to the Sheriff’s Department. The most visible trend apparent in this graph is that the reports of violent crime in the county have remained quite low.

Figure 35.

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
Theft is the most commonly reported crime to the Ellis County Sheriff’s Department officials from 1995-2005. Burglary is the second most commonly reported offense. Depending on the year being analyzed, the third most commonly reported offense was either burglary or aggravated assault/battery. In the county jurisdiction, there was not one murder reported for any of the years in which there was available data. The only year with missing data from KBI was 1999. Attempted murder was only used as a category for reported offenses by the KBI from 1996 to 1998.

Figure 36.
For the available years, there were few violent crimes reported. By far the majority of the total reported indexed offenses were property crimes.

Figure 37.

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
The most common reported violent crime was aggravated assault. This type of crime occurs when one individual attacks another with the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. When an aggravated assault accompanies larceny or theft, then the crime is labeled as a robbery. Due to low overall indexed violent crime counts, even small changes in numbers result in much volatility seen in the line graphs.

Figure 38.
In Hays, the most commonly reported types of property crime were theft, followed by burglary, then motor vehicle theft.

Figure 39.
For the years indicated, the largest number of crimes reported to the Fort Hays State University Police Department officers was property crimes. There were very few reports regarding any types of indexed violent crimes.

Figure 40.
There were no discernable trends regarding the total indexed violent crimes reported to the FHSU Police from 1995-2004. According to KBI data the numbers of reported rapes, robberies, and aggravated assaults were very small.

Table 5.
Theft reports were the type of crime most often reported to FHSU Police officers. Burglary reports were the second most commonly reported crime. According to the KBI compiled data, there have been no reports of car theft on campus since the late 1990s. A number of the thefts can be accounted for as crimes of opportunity. In many cases of reported campus theft, car doors had been left unlocked, dorm rooms were ajar and the rooms left unoccupied, or property items had been unattended for unspecified periods of time.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHSU Police: Total Reported Property Crimes, 1995 - 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
For the years in which data were available from the KBI, the total number of reported indexed violent crimes was very low. Property crimes, while representing the largest number of reported crime, were also very low.

Figure 41.

City of Ellis Police Department: Total Reported Indexed Offenses, 1995 - 2005

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
Generally, the Ellis Police Department took property crime reports much more often than violent crimes. Excessive noise and property appearance issues account for some of the residents’ complaints to officers. Citizens taking notice of smaller irregularities and knowing more of the people with whom they come in contact may help to prevent larger crimes such as motor vehicle theft and robberies from occurring in a community the size of Ellis.

Figure 42.

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
Though there is the appearance of large increases in the numbers of incidents reported and arrests made for the crime of domestic violence by the Sheriff’s office, actually the overall incidents and arrests are quite low. Additionally, increases may be due to multiple reports or multiple arrests of the same individuals involved in different violent episodes.

Figure 43.
The numbers of domestic violence incidents and arrests is not indicative of more violent behavior among Hays residents than among county residents. Rather, because a higher number of the county’s residents reside in the Hays area, a larger incidence of any type of crime in the city environs would be expected. Since 2000, incidents and arrests associated with violent crime have been fairly stable. The number of incidents with dual arrests has been somewhat steady from 2001-2004, yet those totals are still quite small.

Figure 44.

![Domestic Violence Reported Incidents and Arrests: City of Hays Police Department, 2000 - 2004](image)

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
The numbers of reported incidents and arrests for domestic violence within the City of Ellis are very low. Although the numbers from 2002 appear quite high, multiple reports attributed to one couple or family might explain why there is the higher total for this year than others. Data from 2002 was certainly episodic in that in 2003 and 2004 there were either no incidents reported or just a single incident resulting in arrest, as in 2004.

Figure 45.
During the five-year period below, the data indicate few reported incidents of domestic violence recorded by FHSU Police officers. For both 2002-2003, both incidents of reported abuse resulted in arrests.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents with Dual Arrests</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
During this five year period there was a slight increase in the percentage of those youth (6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th graders) who reported using drugs other than tobacco or alcohol. While from 2000-2001, there was a slight decrease in the percentage of youths who reported binge drinking during the prior two-week period, that percentage had increased almost to its original level by 2004. The data indicated that the percentage of young persons who reported using tobacco in the last 30 days decreased overall, with upward fluctuation noted in 2003. There has also been an upward trend in youth using other drugs.

Figure 46.

![Graph showing percentage of youths reporting drug use: 2000 - 2004](source: http://www.aecf.org – Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count, Community Level Information on Kids (CLIKS))
From 1992-2001, there were steady, small incremental increases in the juvenile court filing rates for Ellis County. There is not a good explanation for why the filing rate dropped in 2002. There could be an error in the data. It might be reasonable to treat the 2002 juvenile court filing rate as invalid, as the 2003 data seem to return to the overall pattern.

Source: http://www.aecf.org – Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count, Community Level Information on Kids (CLIKS)
Trends Pertaining to Crime in Ellis County

The Federal Bureau of Investigation compiles information, voluntarily submitted by law enforcement agencies, on eight indexed crimes: Murder, Attempted Murder, Forcible Rape, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Burglary, Theft, and Motor Vehicle Theft.

The towns and rural areas of Ellis County should be considered quite safe, so long as one is not involved in risk-attracting behavior such as illicit drug use or manufacture, sex crimes, or other types of activities that would make one more vulnerable to accidents and death such as drunk driving, driving at excessive rates of speed, or similar actions that endanger the well-being of oneself and others. Several aspects of informal social control may account for low crime rates within the county. One explanation for the low rates of reported crimes within Ellis County is that within most of our local tight-knit communities few outdoor activities occur without others noticing. Thus, occurrences which seem out-of-the-ordinary to neighbors may be reported to law enforcement whereas, in many urban areas, such events might go unnoticed due to population density and the lack of knowing one’s neighbors, let alone the typical routines of these near-strangers. Another possible explanation of the low rate of reported crimes could be that many residents of small towns may be more likely than their urban counterparts to attempt to resolve personal disputes with neighbors, with whom they might share bonds of friendship or kinship, than to choose to involve law enforcement officials in such a way as “to make a big deal.” Finally, many small town residents’ may be more strongly deterred from committing crimes by fears of recognition and stigmatization than by concerns about potential criminal charges. For example, if one is stopped by a police officer for not obeying posted speed limits in towns the size of Victoria or Ellis, any attempt at being inconspicuous in the vehicle is nearly impossible as numerous persons who would recognize the driver might be passing by while the officer is writing the ticket.

The City of Hays is a very safe location for residents and for those who come to the area each day for services or for jobs. During an average weekday approximately 10,000 additional persons are in town for their work, for school, to shop or attend cultural events at the University, or attending to their health care needs at Hays Medical Center. Then there are the thousands who travel through the Hays area on I-70. Many of these travelers refill at local gas stations or take time out to eat in nearby restaurants, or take even less time to grab a drive-thru meal. Yet the amount of crime in Hays is very low with the majority of those incidents being reported as non-violent property crimes. During the past 15-year period increases in the City of Hays population have resulted in proportional increases in crime.

Because many of the officers within the current Hays Police Department have been hired after reforms in domestic violence law they have never had the level of officer discretion in being dismissive about such reported incidents as have past generations of law officers. New protocols
regarding police response to domestic violence calls now require at least two officers answer these types of calls. This makes the environment somewhat safer for police as they answer what are usually considered the most dangerous category of calls for law enforcement personnel.

The Hays Police Department has had increases in the amount of formal education its officers have with it being very common for officers to have associate’s, bachelors, and even advanced degrees in specialized areas. In recent years deliberate attempts have been made to increase the number of female officers within the department’s rank and file. Improvements in vehicle fleet numbers, the uses of advanced technologies, and changes in administrative personnel have all lead to a more efficient, more direct-contact Hays Police Department. According to the most recent Crime in the United States report (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_78_ks.html), there were 27 officers employed by the Hays Police Department in 2005.

In maintaining a safe campus environment for students, faculty, staff, and the general public, the FHSU Police Department has instituted a Zero Tolerance for Violence initiative. Recent statistics from the FHSU Police Department might appear to indicate that there were higher incidents and arrests of assault; rather, these figures should be interpreted as less tolerance by law enforcement of this behavior. The FHSU Police Department has taken a proactive stance regarding drug issues. Residential life personnel in the dorms and Kelly Center staff members have actively been taking part in drug awareness and recognition programs. As these persons are the frontline against the fight against the use of drugs on campus, the FHSU Police Department has been actively working with these groups on drug prevention, awareness, and recognition programs. The FHSU Police Department is also the founding member of the Ellis County High Tech Crime Unit which is represented by the FHSU Police Department, Hays Police Department, Ellis County Sheriff’s Department, and the Ellis County Attorney’s Office. This High Tech Crime Unit has affiliations with the FBI Regional Computer Forensic Laboratory in Kansas City and the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force.

The cities of Ellis and Victoria are very safe places to live. As the towns’ populations have many second- and third- generation residents, many of Volga German ancestry, the towns have very stable resident populations. Informal social control exercised by neighbors, family, and friends undoubtedly accounts for the low numbers of total reported crimes within the town. Tourists and the newly relocated are noted quickly. Changes in Ellis Police Department leadership have occurred within the last two years. The Department’s newest community policing initiative has included the addition of a bicycling patrol program. The bicycle officer provides an opportunity for positive community policing and for more positive public relations between residents and local law enforcement officials. Including the Chief of Police, there are currently five full-time law enforcement officers employed by the City of Ellis Police Department. Most cases handled by the Ellis Police Department either involve
minor property damage incidents or traffic offenses. Victoria’s Police Department officers generally receive assistance from the Ellis County Sheriff’s Department for investigating felony cases, which occur very rarely. Information about felony incidents from Victoria are compiled and included in the Ellis County Sheriff’s Department reports. Incidents involving occasional misdemeanors which generally do not involve any jail time are counted in the town of Victoria’s annual reports. Most domestic disturbance cases in Victoria are verbal in nature, do not involve physical contact between suspects and are cause for police intervention, but not arrest of the involved parties. The City of Victoria currently employs two law enforcement officers, including the Chief of Police. Law enforcement duties in Victoria most frequently concern monitoring traffic flow through town, investigating traffic offenses and traffic accidents, and providing general law enforcement assistance to the public.

The appearance of an increase of domestic violence reported incidents and arrests by local law enforcement agencies for certain years may be less about actual increases in this crime and more reflective of an overall national trend to view violence in the home as a serious matter that warrants intervention. As the general public has become more aware of the repercussions for children of witnessing violent episodes between parents, there seems to be more general approval of reporting domestic violence to law enforcement personnel. The idea that violence between spouses or domestic partners is only a private issue is slowly being discarded in favor of the modern viewpoint that all violence damages the interests of the public good.

The perpetrators of domestic violence often try to alienate or separate the victim from relatives and friends as a means of achieving emotional and physical control. This might be more difficult to achieve in a thoroughly integrated community where regular church attendance and the presence of family members are common. However, the reports on the numbers of domestic violence incidents and arrests must be viewed with some skepticism. Domestic violence can happen anywhere regardless of the size town and it can happen to anyone regardless of race, ethnicity, or social class.

Domestic violence victims are often quite reluctant to file formal complaints against their abusers for fear of future retribution. Domestic abuse victims will hide what is going on at home and they often will deny it in order to protect themselves, their children, and sometimes, even the abuser. The victims are often in fear that their children, parents, or even pets will be threatened, maimed or killed by the abusers. Because the perpetrators of this type of crime are masters at convincing their victims that they are powerless and that no one would believe them or assist them, then those being abused—the majority of these being women, often do not ever report the years of endured violence or will leave only after multiple
failed attempts. While the national trend has been an increase in the recognition of domestic violence as a category of crime that is no longer considered a private matter, still it often remains hidden or cloistered from obvious notice.

The available data gives us some indications of the trends regarding law enforcement and crime within Ellis County. Most crimes in the county, in the towns, and on the FHSU campus are property crime related. In many of the cases these instances might have been prevented if precautions had been taken such as door having been locked and had property not been left unattended.

Also, community standards have changed over the last 15-year period. Overall public intolerance for more minor offenses have been increasing. Fist-fights and brawls that might have been ignored or just chalked up to the exuberance of youth are now much more likely to be reported to police. People tend to call the police more often for more minor offenses than in the past. In areas with a higher population, such as Hays, the general public increasingly seems to use the police as a means of communicating with persons in their local area with whom they are having disagreements. In the smaller towns, just walking over to visit about the problem or using the telephone to convey personal complaints often resolves the problem. However, more than ever the police are serving not just to maintain public order and safety, but also to offer a buffer between ourselves and those who annoy us.

That there is no data set available for Ellis County in 1999 is not unique and certainly not surprising. There are a number of explanations that might explain why this occurred. The Kansas Bureau of Investigation might have missed a deadline in submitting the data to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation may have had a delay in processing the Ellis County information which caused it to be omitted from the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), the annual publication regarding information about crime in the United States. Since the information was missing from the Kansas Bureau of Investigation site for all Ellis County law enforcement agencies, then most likely the omission was not due to local error. It is unlikely that all law enforcement agencies that normally submit such statistics would not have completed nor submitted any of the report paperwork during 1999 used to compile the UCR data. It actually is fairly common when researching state and county-level crime report and arrest data to encounter missing monthly or yearly data sets.

Some of the apparent increases in the number of violent crime reports within Ellis County may actually be numerous reports of the same alleged crime. Thus, one suspected aggravated assault incident may have had three reports filed with law enforcement by participating individuals or individuals on the periphery of the action.
Any data on the total number of rapes should be viewed with skepticism. Rape and sexual assaults have historically been under-reported due to possible knowledge of the perpetrator, fear of further harm by the perpetrator, embarrassment of having been intimately violated, fear that law enforcement officials will blame the victims or tell them that they were in some way responsible.

According to Crime in the United States: 2004, which is published by the U.S. Department of Justice and compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, from 2003-2004, forcible rape was the only violent crime in which the numbers increased for the Midwestern region of the country. For all other violent crimes included in the FBI’s Indexed categories, there were decreases from 2003-2004. However, according to the FBI data, the Midwest had a higher rate of rapes than any other region of the country.
Income, Housing, and Poverty

Several of the Ellis County indicators in this section are adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) “measures inflation as experienced by consumers in their day-to-day living expenses.” In order to do this, the CPI measures “the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for a market basket of consumer goods and services.” The CPI is used as “an economic indicator, as a deflator of other economic series, and as a means of adjusting dollar values.” In keeping rents, royalties, and child support payments in line with inflation and changing prices, some private firms and individuals also utilize the CPI in their business transactions. “Since 1985, [the CPI] has been used to prevent inflation-induced increases in taxes (http://www.bls.gov/cpi/cpifaq.htm).” Citizens are influenced and affected by inflation as measured by the CPI and by those federal income programs as they are linked with the CPI.

To interpret the CPI data and what it means to the consumer, directions for interpretation will be taken directly from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS): “Most of the specific CPI indexes have a 1982-1984 reference base. That is, BLS sets the average index level (representing the average price level for the 36-month period covering the years 1982, 1983, and 1984 equal to 100. The BLS then measures changes in relation to that figure. An index of 110, for example, means there has been a 10-percent increase in price since the reference period; similarly an index of 90 means a 10-percent decrease. Movements of the index from one date to another can be expressed as changes in index points (simply, the difference between index levels), but it is more useful to express the movements as percent changes. This is because index points are affected by the level of the index in relation to its base period, while percent changes are not.”

As we can see from the following chart, the trend of the CPI indicator has been steadily increasing from 1990-2004.
Figure 48.

Consumer Price Index

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics
According to the U.S. Census Bureau per capita income “is the mean income computed for every man, woman, and child in a particular group. It is derived by dividing the total income of a particular group by the total population in that group.”
(www.census.gov/acs/www/UseData/Def/Income.htm)

Figure 49.

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis
From 1990 to 1995 real (inflation-adjusted) per capita income declined by almost 0.5 percent per year during this period. However, from 1995 to 2003 (the most recent year of data) real per capita income increased by 2.8 percent per year. For the 13-year period, real per capita income grew by a moderate 1.6 percent per year.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELLIS COUNTY BEA PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME ($) (CENSUS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELLIS COUNTY PER CAPITA REAL INCOME ($) (CENSUS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: Policy Research Institute: Lawrence, Kansas; http://www.ku.edu/pri/  
CPI Calculator: http://www1.jsc.nasa.gov/bu2/inflateCPI.html  
Note: 1990 was used as the base year for real income calculations.
The table on the next page shows median household income generated from reporting of household income during the decennial U.S. Census of Housing and Population (Census) in 1980, 1990, and 2000. In 1980, the median household income for Ellis County was $15,623. In 1990 the median household income of $22,466 was worth $14,154 in 1980 dollars (adjusted for inflation with the base year being 1980). By 2000, a median income of $32,339 is reported, but this income is only $15,490 in 1980 dollars. So, median household income in the county has been relatively stagnant since 1980.
Income Analysis in Ellis County for 1980, 1990 & 2000 (from actual reported values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Income Analysis</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Income Earners Falling Below The Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>&lt;$5,000</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>$15,623</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>&lt;$5,000</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-7,499</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-7,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,500-9,999</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500-9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-15,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000-34,999</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,000-49,999</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>&lt;$5,000</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>$22,466</td>
<td>$14,154</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>&lt;$5,000</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-12,499</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-12,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,500-14,999</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500-14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-17,499</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-17,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,500-19,999</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,500-19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-22,499</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-22,466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,500-24,999</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000-27,499</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,500-29,999</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000-32,499</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,500-34,999</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,000-37,499</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,500-39,999</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000-42,499</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,500-44,999</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,000-47,499</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,500-49,999</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000-54,999</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,000-59,999</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60,000-74,999</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,000-99,999</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000-124,999</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125,000-149,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000+</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.008%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>$32,339</td>
<td>$15,490</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000-34,999</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000-32,339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,000-49,999</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000-74,999</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,000-99,999</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000-149,999</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000-199,999</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200,000+</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Statistics reported at: http://www.ku.edu/pri/ksdata/county.shtml
Inflation Calculator found at: http://www1.jsc.nasa.gov/bu2/inflateCPI.html

Note: Numbers and percentages are derived from the Actual Household Income and Median Income Analysis tables.
From 1967 to 2005, the median household income in the United States (unadjusted for inflation) was reported in 1967 as $35,379 and by 2005 was $46,326.

Figure 51.

**Real Median Household Income: 1967 to 2005**

Note: The data points are placed at the midpoints of the respective years. Median household income data are not available before 1967.

Numbers of housing units increased in all categories between 1990 and 2000. The total number of housing units in 1990 was reported as 11,115, and this increased to 12,078 by 2000. The latest figures indicate that by 2004 this number was 12,342. In 1990, there were 10,096 occupied housing units, rising to 11,193 by 2000. Owner-occupied housing units increased from 6,501 in 1990 to 7,089 in 2000. Renter-occupied housing increased from 3,595 in 1990 to 4,104 in 2000. Thus, the numbers of all housing unit types rose slightly (0.8 percent annually) within that ten-year period.

Figure 52.
Real median housing values of owner-occupied homes are fairly similar in 2000 to the values in 1980, but slightly downward over the whole time period. The median value of homes in Ellis County in 1980 was reported at $42,100. In 1990, the median housing value was reported as $50,200, but when adjusted to 1980 dollars, then the median house value had actually fallen to $31,626. By 2000, the reported median value of housing was $85,500. In real dollars at $40,955, the median housing value had almost recovered to 1980 dollars. [NOTE: these amounts are from households reporting the value of their home on the decennial Census in 1980, 1990 and 2000. Realtor data may not compare to these data, and certainly realtor data are the most accurate with respect to purchase prices]

Median rental fees show increases in both unadjusted and inflation-adjusted levels. Median rent was $157 in 1980 in Ellis County, and had increased to an inflation-adjusted $183 by 1990. By 2000, real rent was $206. This upward movement in real rent contrasts with the downward movement in median housing value in 1990 and the near recovery to near 1980 dollar values by 2000. “Many of the biggest jumps in the percentage of people paying a burdensome amount of their income for housing occurred in the Midwest and in suburbs nationwide, making it clear that the housing squeeze has reached deep into the middle class” (“Across Nation, Housing Costs Rise as Burden”, New York Times, Janny Scott and Randal C. Archibold, October 3, 2006). According to this same source, the expenditure of 30 percent of a household’s gross income on housing is “a percentage figure commonly seen as the limit of affordability.”
Figure 53.

Ellis County Housing Cost Analysis for Years 1980, 1990 & 2000 (from actual reported values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>$42,100</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>&lt;$50,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>80-99</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>100-119</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>120-149</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,000-39,999</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>150-169</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000-44,999</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>170-199</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000-59,999</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60,000-74,999</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>250-299</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,000-99,999</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>300-349</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000-149,999</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>350-399</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000-199,999</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>400-449</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200,000+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>No Cash Rent</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,947</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>$50,200</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>&lt;$200</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>$291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,001-19,999</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>250-299</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,000-39,999</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>300-349</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000-44,999</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>350-399</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,000-49,999</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>400-449</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000-59,999</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>450-499</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60,000-74,999</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>500-549</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,000-99,999</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>550-599</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000-124,999</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>600-649</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125,000-149,999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>650-699</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000-174,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>700-749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175,000-199,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>750-999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200,000-249,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250,000-299,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>No Cash Rent</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300,000-399,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400,000-499,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500,000+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Adjusted to 1980 Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>&lt;$50,000</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>$85,500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>&lt;$200</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000-149,999</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000 to 199,999</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>250-299</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200,000-299,999</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>300-349</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300,000-499,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>350-399</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500,000-699,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>400-449</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;1,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No Cash Rent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Statistics reported at: http://www.ku.edu/pri/ksdata/county.shtml
Inflation Calculator: http://www1.jsc.nasa.gov/bu2/inflateCPI.html

Note: All rent values are represented as monthly rent values

U.S. Census Bureau Statistics reported at: http://www.ku.edu/pri/ksdata/county.shtml
Inflation Calculator: http://www1.jsc.nasa.gov/bu2/inflateCPI.html
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The poverty threshold is the highest amount of money that a person could make and be considered living in a state of poverty. For example: if one person, under age 65, had an annual income of $10,160 or less, then that individual would be categorized as living in poverty. If a family of seven persons with an additional related child under age 18 made no more than $32,350, then they would be considered living in poverty. These threshold amounts are reported by the U.S. Census Bureau and are the references of most government agencies and local service agencies. This measurement is often used for means-testing in the determination if a family will receive governmental program assistance.

Table 9.

**Poverty Thresholds in 2005 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years**

(Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of family unit</th>
<th>Related children under 18 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person (unrelated individual):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 years</td>
<td>10,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>9,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder under 65 years</td>
<td>13,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and older</td>
<td>11,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people</td>
<td>15,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people</td>
<td>20,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five people</td>
<td>24,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six people</td>
<td>27,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven people</td>
<td>32,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight people</td>
<td>35,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine people or more</td>
<td>43,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
While “the federal poverty definition consists of a series of thresholds based on family size and composition, poverty status is not determined for people in military barracks, institutional quarters, or for unrelated individuals under age 18” (http://www.aecf.org/kidscount/sld/profile_results).

The graph below indicates the number of those in poverty who are aged 0-17 was lower in 2001 and 2002 than in the early 1990s.

It is very difficult to calculate the exact number of youth who are living in poverty and who are homeless. “National estimates [of homeless youth] range from 20 percent to 40 percent” and even social science experts describe “America’s homeless population is one of its least studied, with those 21 and younger among the least studied subsets.” R. Dean Wright of Drake University in Des Moines, a professor and sociologist who has spent decades devoted to chairing United Way committees and conducting research for the United Way has concluded that “counting the homeless is an impossible task, describe[ing] the task as ‘like nailing Jell-O to the wall’ (“Why are so many youths homeless?” Des Moines Register, Bill Reiter, July 13, 2003). From this same article, a number of different factors are linked as being associated with youth homelessness as “other researchers and social workers said that income levels tie into other issues that produce or are associated with homeless youth: domestic abuse, alcoholism, methamphetamine use, a lack of affordable housing, and shortages in mental health care.”
Figure 54.

Estimated Number of People in Poverty in Ellis County

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
From Census Bureau data it is indicated that from 2000-2002 that there were slight fluctuations in the poverty rate in Ellis County, but that the overall percent of those in poverty remained below 10 percent of the county’s general population.

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Data may not sum to totals due to rounding
The data represented in the chart below indicate that in 1990 the group with the highest percentage of its members living in poverty in Ellis County was those 65-years old and older. According to the September 2006 update of Kidscount (http://aecf.org/kidscount/sld/profile_results), the percentages of Kansas children in poverty is defined as “the share of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below the federal poverty level as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.” From this data source we have reported percentages for the State of Kansas as: 13 percent (2001), 16 percent (2002), 14 percent (2003), 12 percent (2004), and 15 percent (2005). In 2005, the percentage of children in poverty was reported as 19 percent for the U.S. The percentages of children under age 5 living in poverty in Kansas were reported as: 15 percent (2001), 21 percent (2002), 19 percent (2003), 16 percent (2004) and 21 percent (2005). In 2005, the percentage of children under age 5 living in poverty was reported as 21 percent for the U.S.

In Kansas, single-parent families with related children are much more likely to be living in poverty than are married-couple families with related children under age 18. Among single-parent Kansas families with related children living at home, the percentages living in poverty were: 31 percent (2001), 27 percent (2002), 30 percent (2003), 27 percent (2004) and 31 percent (2005). National 33 percent of single-parent families lived in poverty in 2005. This is in stark contrast to the percentages of married-couple families with related children under age 18 that have income below the federal poverty line, which were reported as: 5 percent (2001), 7 percent (2002), 4 percent (2003, 5 percent (2004), and 6 percent (2005). The percentage of married-couple families with related children under age 18 living in poverty was 7 percent in 2005.
Figure 55.

![Poverty Status by Age Group, 1990 and 2000](Source: CensusScope (http://www.censusscope.org))
In 1990, children aged 11-years and younger were the group with the highest percentage of its members living in poverty in Kansas. Statewide, the percentage of those living in poverty decreased between 1990 and 2000.

Figure 56.

![Poverty Status by Age Group, 1990 and 2000](http://www.censusscope.org)
Trends Pertaining to Income, Housing, and Poverty in Ellis County

The 13-year trend in the real value of incomes is slightly upward at an average of 1.6 percent per year. Values of owner-occupied housing as reported to the U.S. Census Bureau by owners of the homes moved slightly downward when the beginning and end points of the 20-year period beginning in 1980 and ending in 2000 are examined.

From 1990-2000, in Ellis County, there was a 13.3% increase in the number of available housing units. In Kansas from 1990-2000 total housing units increased from 1,036,733 in 1990 to 1,121,561 in 2000, an 8.2% increase. Within the state for that same time period, occupied unit numbers increased by 9.9%, owner-occupied rose by 12%, and renter-occupied housing units experienced a 5.4% increase (http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/ushmc/summer2001/sum_tab_1.html).

As renters tend to have fewer economic resources than do home owners, they were then more vulnerable to fluctuations in the job market and in real income. Median rent was $157 in 1980 in Ellis County, and had increased to an inflation-adjusted $183 by 1990. By 2000, real rent was $206. In Kansas, in 1990, the median gross rent was $474 with the average percentage of household income spent on rent at 24.5 percent. Ten years later, the median gross rent paid in Kansas was averaging $498 with the median gross rent as percentage of household income having slightly decreased to 23.4 percent, according to U.S. Census Bureau data. From 1990 to 2000, the national trend in rental housing indicated that while “median gross rents were above the national level in the West and the Northeast [and] below it in the South and Midwest, renters in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming spent the lowest share of their income on rent (23.4 percent or less)” (pg. 5-7). “Rents rose fastest in the South and the Midwest from 1990 to 2000,” with the median rent increases having risen by 5.3 percent in the Midwest over that decade period, the renters in the Midwest were paying below the national median gross rent amount, averaging $533 a monthly payment (Housing Costs of Renters: 2000, pg. 5).

According to Housing Costs of Renters: 2000, issued by the U.S. Census Bureau in May 2003, “rents rose in every decade from 1950 to 2000 (pg. 2). In 1990, the median gross rent within the U.S. was $571, this increased to $602 by 2000. Amounts of rents paid tended to vary by age group of the householders. For those aged 15-24, “monthly rents were relatively low, $567” (pg. 4). Rent peaked among those aged 25-34 at $641. For those aged 65 to 74, rent declined to $479, increasing just slightly to $491 for those persons aged 75 and older. “Many of the biggest jumps in the percentage of people paying a burdensome amount of their income for housing occurred in the Midwest and in suburbs nationwide, making it clear that the housing squeeze has reached deep into the middle class” (“Across Nation, Housing Costs Rise as Burden”, New York Times, Janny Scott

Docking Institute of Public Affairs: United Way of Ellis County 2006
and Randal C. Archibold, October 3, 2006). According to this same source, the expenditure of 30 percent of a household’s gross income on housing is “a percentage figure commonly seen as the limit of affordability.” Renters are “considered to be financially burdened” when gross rent equals or exceeds 30 percent of household income. Nationally, renters where the householder was under age 25 spent 30.8 percent of their income on housing costs. Those renters 75 and over spent 33.7 percent of their income on housing.

U.S. Census Bureau, show a relatively steady pattern of stability regarding our national poverty rates. They just have not dropped significantly from the levels of the early 1990s. Despite social and economic changes that could have influenced poverty rates including: recessions, welfare reform, the economic growth in some sectors of the job market, and the increasing globalization that has occurred, we just did not experience much drop in the percentages of those who were experiencing poverty in America.

It is very difficult to calculate the exact number of individuals who are living in poverty and who are homeless. “National estimates [of homeless youth] range from 20 percent to 40 percent” and even social science experts describe “America’s homeless population is one of its least studied, with those 21 and younger among the least studied subsets.” R. Dean Wright of Drake University in Des Moines, a professor and sociologist who has spent decades devoted to chairing United Way committees and conducting research for the United Way has concluded that “counting the homeless is an impossible task, describe[ing] the task as ‘like nailing Jell-O to the wall’ (“Why are so many youths homeless?” Des Moines Register, Bill Reiter, July 13, 2003). From this same article, a number of different factors are linked as being associated with homelessness as “other researchers and social workers said that income levels tie into other issues that produce or are associated with homeless youth: domestic abuse, alcoholism, methamphetamine use, a lack of affordable housing, and shortages in mental health care.”

From the mid-1990s through 2002, the state poverty rate decreased. According to U.S. Census Bureau data, using 3-year averages calculated from 1988 through 2002, the rates of poverty with in Kansas were highest during the mid-1990s. From 1992-1994 the annual average was 13.0% and from 1994-1996 the annual average was 12.3% in Kansas. The annual average from 1996-1998, was lower than the preceding two time periods at 10.1%. This went essentially unchanged from 1998-2000, with an annual average of 10.3%. For the 2000-2002 period, there was a decrease, with the annual poverty rate in Kansas at 9.4% over those years. It is somewhat troubling to see Ellis County faring worse than Kansas as a whole in terms of direction of the trend, with an 8.8% level in 2000, a 9.6% in 2001, and a 9.8% rate in 2002.
Employment

Since approximately 60 percent of the Ellis County civilian labor force resides in the Hays area, the county-level labor force estimates for 1990-2004 are heavily influenced by dynamics in the Hays labor market. The civilian labor force and employment generally grew at similar rates through the 1990s, experienced a downturn in 1999 and 2000, and rebounded in 2001 through 2003. The most recent data (2004) shows a downturn.

Figure 57.

Source: Kansas Department of Labor
Kansas Department of Labor data from 2000-2004 show that the largest employment sectors are health care and social assistance, all government work (includes state and local government workers), and retail trade. While retail trade experienced a growth in the numbers of individuals employed, the manufacturing industries within the county saw a slight decline, especially between 2001-2003. There was a slight increase in the number of local government employees from 2003-2004. In general, however, the number of state and local government workers in Ellis County remained quite stable during this five-year period. It’s important to note that FHSU employees are counted as state employment, and the unified school districts of Hays, Ellis, and Victoria are counted as local government employees.

High growth rates from 1970-2000 in manufacturing can be accounted for by understanding that in Northwest Kansas we are actually dealing with a relatively small number of manufacturing workers, thus any fluctuations will appear as large increases in percentage changes for this time period. According to a University of Kansas Policy Research Institute report on regional Kansas industry trends, while our region experienced an increase in manufacturing growth, we did not keep pace with national patterns regarding “level and growth of earnings per worker” (Long-Term Industry Trends in the Regions of Kansas, 1969-2000, pg. 10).

Ellis County “draws much of its retail customer base from the surrounding counties,” according to a March 16, 2006 Hays Daily News article. For fiscal year 2005, the economic pull factor of the county was 1.43. “That number suggests that Ellis County was serving a population of 37,342 rather than the number actually living here.” (page A6)
Figure 58.

Source: Kansas Department of Labor
In the Ellis County industry sectors that employed the least numbers of workers from 2000-2004, construction and wholesale trade had more workers employed than did the other occupational areas. From 1990-2000, Kansas significantly outpaced the United States in construction-related employment with a annual growth rate of 3.94 percent compared with the national rate of 2.66 percent (Long-Term Industry Trends in the Regions of Kansas, 1969-2000). However, the growth can be attributed to the regional increases in two particular areas: East Central, encompassing Douglas and Johnson counties, and South Central, containing Sedgwick and Harvey counties. In general, the other industry occupational areas remained quite constant in the numbers of employed individuals. (The Docking Institute corrected an apparent data error for the professional and technical services employment. To correct for an apparent error in the data source in which the 2003 level of professional and technical services employment was dramatically higher than all other sectors for every other year, the Institute interpolated a corrected 2003 value by assuming linear increase in employment in this sector from 2002 to 2004.)
Figure 59.

Employment by Industry: Graph 2

Source: Kansas Department of Labor

Note: 2003 data for Professional and Technical Services appeared to be in error, with a value of 1047. The Docking Institute has corrected the data by assuming a steady increase between 2002 and 2004.
A “farm” as it is defined by the Kansas Agricultural Statistical Services must have at least 10 acres and either produce $1000 worth of products in a year or be able to be compensated for this amount of goods in a year’s time. According to data received from the Kansas field office of the National Agricultural Statistical Services of the United States Department of Agriculture, there were more farms in Ellis County, a total of 800, in 1991 than any year since. Number of farms declined in 1992 to a total of 760, followed by another decline in 1993 to 740. From 1993 to 2001, there were between 730-740 total farms in this county. In 2002, the number increased slightly to 750, where it remained through 2004. The data received was the result of the revisions of earlier estimates prior to the 1997 and 2002 Census of Agriculture, which is conducted every five years with earlier estimates then being revised in accordance with census findings.

Data collected from the University of Kansas Policy Research Institute indicated that from 1990-2003, there were fluctuations in the number of acres harvested in Ellis County, generally the acreage was within a range of slightly under 160,000 to slightly under 190,000. The least number of acres harvested were in 1991 and 1992, at 145,250 and 141,260, respectively. In 1997, the number of acres harvested spiked to 189,710, the highest amount of any year within the period examined.
Figure 60.

Agriculture: Total Acres Harvested

Source: Kansas Agricultural Statistics
Kansas Department of Labor data indicates rises in Ellis County unemployment rates from 1991-1994. Though there is volatility, in general the unemployment rate decreased from 1995-1999. From 1999 through 2004, there were annual increases in the unemployment rate. However, regarding these increases from 1999-2004, Ellis County’s annual unemployment rates never rose by a full percent within any two-year period. Generally, the state unemployment rate trends were similar to those experienced in Ellis County across the full time period. For this 15-year period, Ellis County always maintained a lower annual unemployment rate than did the state. Going back even further, information obtained from the Ellis County Coalition for Economic Development, indicated that the lowest unemployment recorded from 1976-2006 was in 1978 at 1.8 percent.

Figure 61.
Though with some volatility from 1990-1999, there was a general downward trend in the number of Ellis County residents officially unemployed. Since 1999 the number of people unemployed has consistently risen, trends in actual numbers of unemployed that tend to mirror the unemployment rates in the previous graph.

In considering pre 1990 trends, information from the Ellis County Coalition for Economic Development indicates that the county experienced marked increases in the unemployment rates in 1984 and 1985, with a peak in 1986 at 8.4 percent, which was the highest unemployment rate within the entire time span examined. Travenol leaving the area in 1986 left nearly 1200 persons jobless. The loss of this local business accounted for the spike in the unemployment rate that year. It was also during this same time period that the oil field work began to fold due to the decline in per barrel oil prices.

Figure 62.

Source: Kansas Department of Labor
Trends Pertaining to Employment in Ellis County

In 1990, the total numbers of Ellis County residents employed numbered 13,673, and by 2000 this total had increased to 15,228, an 11 percent increase. Over 108 million Americans were employed in 1990 (not including household employees or self-employed individuals). By 2000, this number had increased by 19.7 percent to approximately 130 million workers. The national trend during that ten-year period demonstrated strong growth in the service sector with decreases in manufacturing and mining industry employment numbers. Private industries experienced twice the rate of employment growth of government employment growth, at 25 percent and 12.5 percent, respectively.

Ellis County experienced steady levels in the numbers of those employed within local and state government. Dr. Peter F. Orazem of the University of Kansas School of Business reported in Long-Term Industry Trends in the Regions of Kansas, 1969-2000, published in August 2005, that “in all regions of Kansas (as well as the United States and Plains region), state and local government sector employment has grown significantly faster than population. In five of the seven regions of Kansas [which includes Ellis County in the North West region], (unlike the United States and Plains region), state and local government employment has grown significantly faster than total employment, even in the two regions with negative population growth.” Employees of the local public education system are recorded as local government employees, and employees of FHSU are counted as state government employees. It is very important to point out that almost regardless of political orientation, growth in government in the form of increased numbers of educators in both the public schools and universities represents ‘good’ growth, since growth in such employees is typically directly tied to increasing numbers of students.

Contrary to the cultural myth perpetuated by the film industry and those who have never taken the time to explore Kansas, we are not all farmers or in farm-related work. This area of employment has been steadily decreasing in Kansas, as well as across the United States and the Plains region. Between 1969 and 2000, there was a 34 percent decrease in the growth rate of farm employment. The data has also indicated that farm earnings per worker have not grown during this three-decade span.

The fallout in oil prices in December 1985 accounts for the dramatic decline in the number of persons employed within this occupational area from 1986-1996. The 1985 collapse of the oil market with prices declining all the way down to $7 and $8/ barrel created a situation whereby large numbers of oil wells were simply abandoned, no longer able to pay for themselves. As many local residents left the oil fields in 1986 and 1987, some of these displaced workers found work in the local manufacturing industries. Others though left Ellis County for good. Interest rates were
declining by this time. Bank prime lending rates peaked in 1981 and declined below 10% in 1985. Then there was the farm crisis as indicated by the increased numbers of bankruptcies and foreclosures. The local income analysis of Ellis County indicates that our median income levels have not recovered from these fiscal shocks.

There have been some interesting patterns of developments in the oil industry that have affected the number of local residents employed in the related areas of exploration, production, and maintenance. The boom times of $40/barrel oil in the early 1980s went bust in December 1985 when oil dropped from $28/barrel to $12/barrel seemingly overnight. There were many in the local oil scene who predicted that oil would never see $40/barrel again. The local oil business can be best described as in a depressed mode from 1986-1996. During the last two to four years, as there has been an increase in the price of oil so has there been an increase in the total numbers of drilling and exploration workers. From 1997 to present, there has been the ever-increasing use of 3-D Seismic imaging using sound waves to measure topography to depths of 4,000 feet and beyond for geological structural traps that might contain oil. As oil prices have increased, the job security levels have been shored up for workers within those most stable oil-related occupations of production and equipment maintenance.
Glossary

**Civilian Employed**: defined in the same manner as the term “employed” (U.S. Bureau of Census, The American Community Survey).

**Civilian Labor Force** – Consists of people classified as employed or unemployed in accordance with the criteria described above (The American Community Survey).

**Consumer Price Index**: “measures inflation as experienced by consumers in their day-to-day living expenses” – from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; measures “the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for a market basket of consumer goods and services; used as “an economic indicator, as a deflator of other economic series, and as a means of adjusting dollar values” (http://www.bls.gov/cpi/cpifaq.htm).

**Domestic Violence**: defined as any verbal and/or physical abuse ranging from simple assault to murder (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm).

**Domestic Violence Arrests**: The domestic violence section of the report includes “dual arrests” which refers to cases where more than one person was arrested for the same domestic violence incident. In a number of cases, this is the result of an incident where the primary aggressor cannot be determined so both the suspect and victim are arrested. There may also be a number of cases in which multiple arrests were made at the incident because a third party may have intervened. Because of this “dual arrest” procedure, some agencies have reported more arrests than incidents in a particular year. The reporting of more arrests than incidents may also have occurred because the incident report was not received or processed by the KBI until the year following the arrest or because the incident occurred in a previous year and the arrest was not made until later (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm).

**Domestic Violence Offenses**: The domestic violence section of the report only includes offenses that involve Part I crimes. The offenses include: murder, assault, aggravated assault, assault on a law enforcement officer, aggravated assault on a law enforcement officer, battery, aggravated battery, battery on a law enforcement officer, aggravated battery on a law enforcement officer, rape, theft, unlawful deprivation of property, burglary and aggravated burglary. Violations of these specific statutes were collected because Kansas Bureau of Investigation’s Crime Data Information Center enters only statistical data on Part I criminal offenses. The statutes listed in the report do not include all domestic violence related crimes, but do include the majority. Not included are: kidnapping, robbery, lewd and lascivious behavior, sexual battery, endangering a child, abuse of a child, arson, criminal damage to property, criminal trespass and disorderly conduct. (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm).

**Employed** --:This category includes all civilians 16 years old and over who either (1) were “at work” – those who did any work at all during the reference week as paid employees, worked in their own business or profession, worked on their own farm, or worked 15 hours or more as unpaid workers on a family farm or in a family business; or (2) were “with a job but not at work”--those who did not work during the reference week but had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent due to illness, bad weather, industrial dispute, vacation, or other personal reasons.
Excluded from the employed are people whose only activity consisted of work around the house or unpaid volunteer work for religious, charitable, and similar organizations; also excluded are all institutionalized people and people on active duty in the United States Armed Forces (U.S. Bureau of Census, The American Community Survey).

**Ethnic origin:** People of Hispanic origin were identified by a question that asked for self-identification of the persons’ origin or descent. Respondents were asked to select their origin (and the origin of other household members) from a "flash card" listing ethnic origins. People of Hispanic origin, in particular, were those who indicated that their origin was Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or some other Hispanic origin. It should be noted that people of Hispanic origin may be of any race. People who were Non-Hispanic White origin, were identified by crossing the responses to two self-identification questions: (1) origin or descent and (2) race. Respondents were asked to select their race (and the race of other household members) from a "flash card" listing racial groups. Beginning with March 1989, the population is divided into five groups on the basis of race: White, Black, American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Other races. The last category includes any other race except the four mentioned. Respondents who selected their race as White and indicated that their origin was not one of the Hispanic origin subgroups Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, were called Non-Hispanic White origin (www.census.gov).

**Farm:** defined by the Kansas Agricultural Statistical Services as having at least 10 acres and either producing $1000 worth of products in a year or being able to be compensated for this amount of goods in a year’s time (Kansas Statistical Services).

**Fforcible rape** as "The carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will," which is a different type of reported offense than statutory rape (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm).

**Hispanic:** an ethnic categorization for those who individuals who indicated that their origin was Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or some other Hispanic origin. It should be noted that persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race (http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic/hispdef.html).

**Labor Force:** All people classified in the civilian labor force plus members of the U.S. Armed Forces (people on active duty with the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard).

**Labor Force Participation Rate** – The labor force participation rate represents the proportion of the population that is in the labor force. For example, if there are 100 people in the population 16 years and over, and 64 of them are in the labor force, then the labor force participation rate for the population 16 years and over would be 64 percent.

**Live Birth Statistics:** calculated per county on the basis of the information reported to the Kansas Bureau of Vital Statistics. The number of births recorded at a particular facility may be different than the number of live births calculated for that particular county on the basis of the birth records program. For example: Hays Medical Center may have 550 births in a given year at the Women Infant Care Center, but only 350 of those births may be to mothers whose legal residence is Ellis County. Thus, the other 200 births are credited to the counties of legal residence of the other birth mothers. While paternity information may be recorded, all official state birth statistics are based on the biological mother’s information (Hays Medical Center, Women Infant Care Center).
Measure of need (poverty thresholds):

- Poverty thresholds are the dollar amounts used to determine poverty status
- Each person or family is assigned one out of 48 possible poverty thresholds
- Thresholds vary according to:
  - Size of the family
  - Ages of the members
- The same thresholds are used throughout the United States (do not vary geographically)
- Updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U).
- Although the thresholds in some sense reflect families needs,
  - they are intended for use as a statistical yardstick, not as a complete description of what people and families need to live
  - many government aid programs use a different poverty measure, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines, or multiples thereof
- Poverty thresholds were originally derived in 1963-1964, using:
  - U.S. Department of Agriculture food budgets designed for families under economic stress
  - Data about what portion of their income families spent on food

"Median household income (MHI)" : determined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census as adjusted by the DNR to reflect changes in household income since the most recent federal census. This definition is included in the CWFP and SDWLP statutes and administrative codes.

Multi-ethnic: involving several ethnic groups (http://www.thefreedictionary.com).

Not in Labor Force – All people 16 years old and over who are not classified as members of the labor force. This category consists mainly of students, housewives, retired workers, seasonal workers interviewed in an off season who were not looking for work, institutionalized people, and people doing only incidental unpaid family work (less than 15 hours during the reference week).

Non-family household: consists of a householder living alone (a one-person household) or where the householder shares the home exclusively with people to whom he/she is not related (www.census.gov).

Poverty: Following the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB’s) Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor. If a family’s total income is less than that family’s threshold, then that family, and every individual in it, is considered poor. The poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated annually for inflation with the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition counts money income before taxes and excludes capital gains and noncash benefits (such as public housing, medicaid, and food stamps).

Poverty statistics are based on a definition developed by Mollie Orshansky of the Social Security Administration (SSA) in 1964 and revised in 1969 and 1981 by interagency committees. This definition was established as the official definition of poverty for statistical use in all Executive
departments by the Bureau of the Budget (BoB) in 1969 (in Circular No. A-46); after BoB became The Office of Management and Budget, this was reconfirmed in Statistical Policy Directive No. 14.

The original poverty definition provided a range of income cutoffs or thresholds adjusted by such factors as family size, sex of the family head, number of children under 18 years old, and farm-nonfarm residence. At the core of this definition of poverty was the economy food plan, the least costly of four nutritionally adequate food plans designed by the Department of Agriculture. It was determined from the Department of Agriculture’s 1955 Household Food Consumption Survey that families of three or more people spent approximately one-third of their after-tax money income on food; accordingly, poverty thresholds for families of three or more people were set at three times the cost of the economy food plan. Different procedures were used to calculate poverty thresholds for two-person families and people living alone in order to compensate for the relatively larger fixed expenses of these smaller units. For two-person families, the cost of the economy food plan was multiplied by a factor of 3.7 (also derived from the 1955 survey). For unrelated individuals (one-person units), no multiplier was used; poverty thresholds were instead calculated as a fixed proportion of the corresponding thresholds for two-person units. Annual updates of these SSA poverty thresholds were based on price changes of the items in the economy food plan.

As a result of deliberations of a Federal interagency committee in 1969, the following two modifications to the original SSA definition of poverty were adopted:

1. The SSA thresholds for nonfarm families were retained for the base year 1963, but annual adjustments in the levels were based on changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rather than on changes in the cost of foods in the economy food plan.
2. The farm thresholds were raised from 70 to 85 percent of the corresponding nonfarm levels. The combined impact of these two modifications resulted in an increase in the tabulated totals for 1967 of 360,000 poor families and 1.6 million poor people.

In 1981, three additional modifications in the poverty definition recommended by another interagency committee were adopted for implementation in the March 1982 CPS as well as the 1980 census:

1. Elimination of separate thresholds for farm families.
2. Elimination (by averaging) of separate thresholds for female-householder families and "all other" families (earlier termed "male-headed" families).
3. Extension of the detailed poverty threshold matrix to make the largest family size category "nine people or more".

For further details, see the section, "Changes in the Definition of Poverty," in Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 133.

The poverty thresholds are increased each year by the same percentage as the annual average Consumer Price Index (CPI). The poverty thresholds are currently adjusted using the annual average CPI-U (1982-84 = 100). This base year has been used since 1988. From 1980 through 1987, the thresholds were adjusted using the CPI-U (1967 = 100). The CPI (1963 = 100) was used to adjust thresholds prior to 1980.
For further information on how the poverty thresholds were developed and subsequent changes in them, see Gordon M. Fisher, “The Development and History of the Poverty Thresholds,” Social Security Bulletin, vol. 55, no. 4, Winter 1992, pp. 3-14.


3 Poverty thresholds for 1959-1967 were recalculated on this basis, and revised poverty population figures for those years were tabulated using the revised thresholds. These revised 1959-1967 poverty population figures have been published in Census Bureau reports issued since August 1969 (including the present report). Because of this revision, poverty statistics from documents dated before August 1969 are not comparable with current poverty statistics.

Prenatal Care: Adequate Plus care means that prenatal care was begun by the 4th month and 110% or more of the recommended visits were received. Adequate care means that prenatal care was begun by the 4th month and 80% to 109% of recommended visits were received. Intermediate care means that prenatal care was begun by the 4th month and 50% to 79% of the recommended visits were received. Inadequate care means that prenatal care was begun after the 4th month or less than 50% of the recommended visits were received.

Race: The race of individuals was identified by a question that asked for self-identification of the person’s race. Respondents were asked to select their race from a "flashcard" listing racial groups. The population is divided into five groups on the basis of race: White; Black; American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut; Asian or Pacific Islander; and Other races beginning with March 1989. The last category includes any other race except the four mentioned. In most of the published tables "Other races" are included in the total population data line but are not shown individually (http://www.census.gov).

Special Education: Specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions. Education of the Handicapped Act (http://www.lectlaw.com/def2/s056.htm). This term also refers to a range of educational and social services provided by the public school system and other educational institutions to individuals with disabilities who are between three and 21 years of age (http://www.healthofchildren.com/S/Special-Education.html).

Suspension: The act of suspending or the condition of being suspended, especially: Also refers to a temporary debarment, as from school or a privilege, especially as a punishment. (http://www.thefreedictionary.com).
**Unemployed**: All civilians 16 years old and over are classified as unemployed if they (1) were neither “at work” nor “with a job but not at work” during the reference week, and (2) were looking for work during the last 4 weeks, and (3) were available to start a job. Also included as unemployed are civilians who did not work at all during the reference week, were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off, and were available for work except for temporary illness. Examples of job seeking activities are:

- Registering at a public or private employment office
- Meeting with prospective employers
- Investigating possibilities for starting a professional practice or opening a business
- Placing or answering advertisements
- Writing letters of application
- Being on a union or professional register

(U.S. Bureau of Census, The American Community Survey)

**Unemployment Rate**: The unemployment rate represents the number of unemployed people as a percentage of the civilian labor force. For example, if the civilian labor force equals 100 people and 7 people are unemployed, then the unemployment rate would be 7 percent (The American Community Survey).

**Uniform Crime Reports**: annual compilations of the non-mandatory submissions of over 17,000 law enforcement agencies throughout the United States and then compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with oversight by the U.S. Department of Justice. Information collected include offense information for murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny/theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson (http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm).