A NOTE ABOUT THE VITAL SIGNS 2015 INDICATORS AND SOURCES

The purpose of this report is to give an overview of Lincoln using seven categories (Community Profile, Economy and Workforce, Basic Needs, Education, Health, Safety, Community Involvement and Culture). Wherever possible, this report updates data presented in the 2014 report. This report also features new measures in five of the categories:

- **Community Profile**
  - Personal and community perceptions of well-being (University of Nebraska Omaha Center for Public Affairs Research, Nebraska Metro Poll)

- **Economy and Workforce**
  - Annual average child care costs (Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services)
  - Average household income (U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey)

- **Education**
  - Percentage of at risk children enrolled in high quality preschool programs (original research)
  - Post-secondary enrollment and graduation (Lincoln Public Schools, National Student Clearinghouse)

- **Health**
  - Behavioral health crisis services utilization (Region V Systems)

- **Safety**
  - Domestic and child violence (Nebraska Crime Commission Annual Domestic Violence Reports)

As was the case for the 2014 Lincoln Vital Signs report, indicators for this study are measures of the strength and health of our community as well as the challenges. The indicators are meant to:

- Reflect fundamental interests and concerns of the community, families, and individuals
- Be reliable sources using valid sampling and measurement approaches
- Be available for multiple, recent past years, and repeatable for future years
- Measure outcomes, rather than inputs or outputs

For a number of indicators, national, state, peer, or aspirational community data are provided. The authors have noted in various sections of the report where data are lacking for important aspects in our community’s life. The only original data collected as a part of this study were those regarding high quality preschool enrollment of at risk children. Otherwise, data already available from public sources were used. The Appendix provides information about the data sources. Data were selected, where possible, that represents the City of Lincoln. The authors have noted when other geographic units were used.

---

1. Peer and aspirational communities used for some comparison are those identified in the 2013 Lincoln Economic Dashboard created by the Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development. Lincoln’s seven peer communities are: Des Moines, Iowa; Lexington, Kentucky; Lansing, Michigan; Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Springfield, Missouri; Topeka, Kansas; and Urbana-Champaign, Illinois. Lincoln’s five aspirational communities are: Austin, Texas; Colorado Springs, Colorado; Madison, Wisconsin; Raleigh, North Carolina; and Salt Lake City, Utah.
(Lancaster County, of which Lincoln comprises 90% of the population; the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is Lancaster and Seward Counties; or Nebraska as a whole).

There is some variation in reporting of racial and ethnic categories within the study based on availability from the data source. For most data used in the study, categorization is based on self-identification. At a minimum, the Census Bureau reports five racial categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Persons may choose more than one race. When population sizes of racial groups are small, access to specific data about these populations may be suppressed by the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau also collects Hispanic origin (popularly called “ethnicity”). Ethnicity is a separate and distinct concept from race. That is, an individual may claim any race along with Hispanic origin.\(^2\) For purposes of presentation, race and ethnicity are often reported in a single graphic figure. Further, we have shortened titles of racial/ethnicity categories, in most cases.

Over the years, the U.S. Census Bureau has varied its approach to reporting about persons living in group quarters (including data from populations living in college dormitories, correctional facilities, nursing homes). For example, beginning in 2006 race and educational attainment data include persons in group quarters. Calculations for persons in poverty EXCLUDE institutionalized people, people in military group quarters, people in college dormitories, and unrelated individuals under 15 years old.

This report was written by Nancy Shank, PhD, MBA and Stacey Hoffman, PhD, of University of Nebraska Public Policy Center (ppc.nebraska.edu).

© 2015 Lincoln Community Foundation

\(^2\) http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf
At A Glance

Community Profile
Lincoln’s state of well-being is one of the highest in the country and the city benefits from population growth and increased diversity, primarily due to persons moving to the city.

Economy and Workforce
Lincoln has a highly educated workforce, high workforce participation, low unemployment, and tremendous physical infrastructure growth. Household incomes have declined and disparities among racial and ethnic groups exist.

Basic Needs
Lincoln’s poverty rate has increased dramatically over the past 10 years and is higher than the national average.

Education
While accommodating a 23% increase in enrollment and a 139% increase in the number of students receiving free lunch (a proxy for low income) since 2000, Lincoln Public Schools achievement and graduation rates continue to improve. Disparities in racial and ethnic minority achievement and graduation rates exist.

Health
American health is declining precipitously; in Lincoln the declines have not been as severe, but are cause for concern.

Safety
Lincoln is a safe community that has a low crime rate.

Community Involvement and Culture
Lincoln has many cultural organizations, but financial support of them lags.
TREND COMPARISONS: 2014 TO 2015

Last year, the Lincoln Vital Signs 2014 report identified three cross-cutting themes and Lincoln Vital Signs 2015 confirms these themes:

1. Lincoln does many things exceptionally well and these successes should be nurtured.
2. A growing proportion of Lincoln’s population faces real need.
3. Lincoln’s children fare poorly on many measures.

Highlights of the theme areas are:

- **Lincoln is rebounding from the Recession**
- **The average person in poverty is a white child with a single parent mother**
- **Most adults in poverty are employed**
- **Persons from racial and ethnic minorities and low-income persons face disparities in educational achievement, attainment, and employment**
Within the seven categories, some trends of note from 2014 to 2015 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Looking Good</th>
<th>Cause for Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln’s economy is continuing to rebound from the Recession:</td>
<td>Lincoln has a higher rate of poverty than the U.S. has a whole, and a higher rate of children in poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The value of commercial building permits has doubled to $463 million from a low in 2009</td>
<td>Real household incomes have declined over the past decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lincoln’s declining unemployment rate continues to be one of the lowest in the U.S.</td>
<td>Persons who are African-American and Hispanic/Latino have higher rates of unemployment and poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers report that they have jobs available for qualified workers</td>
<td>Children enrolled in free lunch continues to trend upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lincoln has a high workforce participation rates</td>
<td>Lincoln Public School students representing racial/ethnic minority populations continue to have lower educational achievement and attainment that those from non-minority backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln’s population continues to grow and grow in diversity</td>
<td>Lincoln continues to have six “extreme poverty” areas (40% or more of the individuals live below the poverty threshold).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rates continue on an upward trend; drop-outs continue on a downward trend</td>
<td>Two areas are additions from last year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln continues to be a safe community:</td>
<td>• Downtown east area extending from approximately the Capitol to Lincoln High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lincoln’s overall crime, property crime, and violent crime rates continue to fall</td>
<td>• Area directly east of the main campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln extending to 27th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The number of children in out of home placement has been halved</td>
<td>Two previous areas have moved just beyond the designation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of safety net mental health crisis services has declined, suggesting improved services and collaboration</td>
<td>• Area to the immediate west of I-180 to north to I-80 (39.5% individuals live below the poverty threshold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless continues to decline from a high in 2012</td>
<td>• Area northeast of the main campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln extending to Cornhusker Highway to 33rd street and southerly to Holdrege (39.2% individuals live below the poverty threshold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln’s national ranking for well-being continues to be high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**BE INFORMED**

Leaders of Lincoln’s largest public and private charitable organizations desired a more comprehensive understanding of Lincoln for themselves, as well as a way to share that information with the larger community -- resulting in the *Lincoln Vital Signs 2014* report. During the past 12 months since the publication of the report, sponsoring organizations have worked to inform the community about the findings of that report:

1. Lincoln does many things exceptionally well and these successes should be nurtured.
2. A growing proportion of Lincoln’s population faces real need.
3. Lincoln’s children fare poorly on many measures.

In 2014, the report achieved its intention to inform conversations, spark connections, and spur collaboration. This has been accomplished through dozens of presentations and print, television, radio, and web coverage; information shared through the Lincoln Vital Signs website (lincolnvitalsigns.org); and email updates to hundreds of people who want to receive information about the initiative. Lincoln Vital Signs has informed numerous organizations’ strategic planning efforts, significantly contributed to several successful federal grant proposals, and even inspired a new musical about hunger that will debut in 2016.

**GET INVOLVED**

*Lincoln Vital Signs 2015* updates the 2014 report. The three findings hold from the 2014 report. Lincoln appears to continue to recover from the Recession, yet some are being left behind.

During the coming year this report will be the centerpiece of a community-wide process that will catalyze action in areas of importance. From May to July 2015 input about how to move forward from the report will be solicited through events, meetings, and online. Over the remainder of the year and into 2016, Lincoln’s community agenda will be shaped and set in action.
Executive Summary

Lincoln is in an enviable position with its strong economy, highly-educated workforce, strong public educational system, strong well-being, good health outcomes, and effective civic services. However, Lincoln has not escaped the worldwide recession unscathed. A growing proportion of Lincoln’s population faces real need; among these are Lincoln’s children. Lincoln’s diversity is growing and this presents opportunities, as well as challenges, to the community.

1. Lincoln has exceptional strengths and these successes should be nurtured.
   - Lincoln has grown 19% since 2000; largely attributable to people moving to the community.
   - Unemployment in Lincoln continues to be much lower than the rest of the nation and employers report having job vacancies.
   - Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (Lancaster and Seward counties) is ranked 18th in the country for percent of workers with a college degree.
   - The value of commercial building permits in Lincoln in 2013 was nearly 250% higher than those issued in 2003.
   - The cost of housing in Lincoln is approximately 76% of the national average.
   - Lincoln has a high graduation rate and students score well in third, fourth, and eighth grades achievements tests.
   - Lincoln’s overall crime rate has averaged 87% of the rate of other comparably-sized cities.
   - Lincoln ranked 10th in overall well-being in the 2012-13 Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index®.
   - Lincoln generally receives high marks for lower rates of disease and death for health risks attributable to behaviors.

2. A growing proportion of Lincoln’s population faces real need.
   - The number of people in Lincoln below the poverty threshold increased 58% since 2005 and the city now has a higher rate of poverty than the nation or Nebraska.
   - Residents’ average and median household income has declined, when adjusting for inflation.
   - Persons from minority populations and those with lower levels of education attainment have much higher levels of unemployment.
   - In 2000, Lincoln had no neighborhoods in extreme poverty (40% or more of individuals live below the poverty threshold). By 2013, Lincoln had six neighborhoods in extreme poverty and two less than one percentage point from that designation.

3. Lincoln’s children fare poorly on many measures.
   - The percent of children in poverty increased 78% since 2008, slightly lower than national rates. This translates to 12,100 children in Lincoln living in poverty. Since 2009, the age group with the largest proportion in poverty in Lincoln is children (20%).
   - Nearly 30% of all families with more than two children have incomes below the poverty threshold. For female headed households with more than two children, 60% are below the poverty threshold.
   - The rate of homeless children in Lincoln has increased 21% since 2007.
   - Approximately 43% of Lincoln Public Schools’ students participate in the Free or Reduced Price Lunch Program (n = 16,248). Most of these students receive free lunch (n = 13,679).
   - Lincoln’s racial and ethnic minority children and children living in poverty have lower educational achievement and attainment than do White children for most measures.
   - Lincoln has a much higher percentage of families with all parents in the workforce than the national average, suggesting that Lincoln may have an elevated need for high quality day care.
   - In Lancaster County, there continues to be a higher percentage of children in foster care than there are nationally. On any given day over 500 children are in out-of-home placements due primarily to parental neglect (67%), parental drug use (45%), and substandard/unsafe housing (29%).
   - Approximately one-third of elementary and middle school students are overweight or obese and are not proficient in cardiovascular fitness.
Introduction

Cities... are defined by the quality of the ideas they generate, the innovations they spur, and the opportunities they create for people living within and outside the city limits.3

Judith Rodin, President
Rockefeller Foundation

Lincoln is a growing and changing community. More people are choosing to live and move here. Many people enjoy Lincoln’s quality of life including good schools, livable neighborhoods, and arts and cultural opportunities. Lincoln Vital Signs 2014 and this update, Lincoln Vital Signs 2015, have been commissioned by philanthropic organizations, the business community, the City of Lincoln, and Lancaster County to create a shared understanding of Lincoln. This report presents Lincoln’s well-being in seven key areas: Community Profile, Economy and Workforce, Basic Needs, Education, Health, Safety, and Community Involvement and Culture. The key areas are presented to provide an overall orientation and then to focus on specific aspects of the community. It is hoped that this and the companion website (lincolnvitalsigns.org) will help Lincoln learn more about itself and potentially catalyze action that will make Lincoln even stronger.

Three cross-cutting themes emerge from the data:

1. Lincoln does many things exceptionally well and these successes should be nurtured. Lincoln is in an enviable position with its strong economy, highly-educated workforce, strong public educational system, strong well-being, good health outcomes, low housing costs, and effective civic services. As the United States struggled through the recent recession4, Lincoln maintained among the lowest unemployment rates in the nation. Lincoln ranked first in overall well-being among 189 cities. Lincoln has a significantly lower violent crime rate than other similarly-sized communities. Lincoln scores well on chronic disease risk factors with a relatively lower prevalence of diabetes and physical inactivity than other communities. Lincoln Public Schools reports high graduation rates. There have been

3 (Katz & Bradley, 2013)
4 The official dates of the recent recession were December 2007 – June 2009. The National Bureau of Economic Research defines a recession as a significant decline in economic activity spread across the economy, lasting more than a few months, normally visible in real GDP, real income, employment, industrial production, and wholesale-retail sales: http://www.nber.org/cycles.html
tremendous investments in Lincoln’s physical infrastructure, including high-profile private/public investments such as the new Pinnacle Bank Arena, the West Haymarket development, and the Antelope Valley Project. Lincoln should continue to foster a highly-educated workforce: cities with skilled workforces attract more jobs and those jobs pay higher wages, not just for those that are skilled, but also for the less skilled. A classic example of a rising tide raising the level of all boats.

2. **A growing proportion of Lincoln’s population faces real need.** The recent recession hit Lincoln later than most of the rest of the United States -- in 2009 -- at which time Lincoln experienced a 49% increase in persons with incomes below the poverty level from the previous year. The increase in poverty is primarily the result of persons falling into poverty who were not previously in poverty; not the result of persons in poverty moving to Lincoln. Since 2008, Lincoln has experienced a 77% increase in households receiving SNAP benefits (Food Stamps) and a 22% increase in the number of students receiving free lunch. Persons in poverty have over four times the rate of unemployment than persons not in poverty, yet 55% of persons (over 16 years of age) in poverty worked part-time jobs or worked part of the year, and 12% worked full-time the entire year. In 2000, Lincoln had no neighborhoods in extreme poverty but now Census estimates suggest that there are six neighborhoods in extreme poverty. Lincoln must find a way to help individuals move themselves out of poverty through better jobs, education/skills training, or social supports.

3. **Lincoln’s children are particularly vulnerable.** Over 1 in 5 of Lincoln’s children live in poverty (this translates to 12,100 children living in poverty; most of those are white children living with a single parent mother). One-quarter of homeless persons in Lincoln are children. Poverty in childhood is linked to reduced academic attainment, higher rates of non-marital childbearing, worse health, and continuance of poverty into adulthood, particularly when children live in neighborhoods with high rates of poverty for extended periods of time. Children who are racial and ethnic minorities face even greater challenges: a higher percentage are in poverty and experience lower educational achievement than the White population. Today’s children will be Lincoln’s tomorrow. Efforts must be made to ensure that all Lincoln’s children experience the best possible start toward becoming productive, engaged citizens.

---

5 (Moretti, 2012)
6 Not including the Census Tract for the main campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln Regional Center, and the State Penitentiary.
7 (Magnuson & Votruba-Drzal, 2009)
What will be Lincoln’s future? Recent changes in government funding have created a void of services to those most in need in our community. Lincoln’s relatively small philanthropic community cannot single-handedly take up the slack, and neither can local governments or business communities alone. It is clear that complex issues will require collaboration among all sectors of our community: businesses, families and individuals, non-profit organizations, philanthropies, and government. This study may be a starting point for conversation and connection toward a common goal of ensuring that Lincoln continues to be a vibrant city that provides a high quality of life for all its residents.

Be Informed. Get Involved.

8 Nebraska was allocated over $1.3 billion through the Recovery Act (2009) which providing funding for a wide variety of infrastructure, services, and stabilization activities. (State of Nebraska, 2013; January 2013 ARRA expenditures. http://www.recovery.nebraska.gov/docs/pdf/ARRA%20Expenditures%20Summary%20%281-31-2013%29%20web%20copy.pdf). For example, the Recovery Act provided additional funding to state Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant funds for 2009 and 2010 only. However, Nebraska’s TANF Block Grant funds from the federal government when adjusted for inflation, declined 29% between fiscal years 1997 and 2012. (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2013; Nebraska TANF Spending Fact Sheet. http://www.cbpp.org/files/8-7-12tanf-factsheets/8-7-12tanf-NE.pdf). Nebraska also received less assistance than other states in some areas. For example, because Nebraska has a low unemployment rate, unemployed Nebraskans are eligible for a maximum of 40 weeks of unemployment insurance (compared to a maximum of 73 weeks available to residents of other states). (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2013; How many weeks of unemployment compensation are available? http://www.cbpp.org/files/PolicyBasics_UI_Weeks.pdf).
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COMMUNITY PROFILE

Lincoln is a growing community. In just eight years, Lincoln’s overall population has grown by over 42,681 residents. Since 2005, Lincoln’s growth in the number of children 0 to 19 years of age has been especially strong. Lincoln is also becoming more racially and ethnically diverse: Lincoln’s White-only (non-Hispanic/Latino) population has dropped from comprising 87% of Lincoln’s overall population (2005) to now comprising 82%. Compared to other cities across the United States, Lincoln gets high marks for overall well-being.

LINCOLN HAS GROWN 19% SINCE 2005

Similar to other urbanized communities in Nebraska, Lincoln has experienced population growth over the past decade (Figure 1). Lincoln now has more than 268,000 residents (up 42,681 persons, or 19%, from 2005). Since 2005, child/youth (0 – 19 years) age group has shown the largest gains (Table 1).

FIGURE 1. POPULATION BY AGE GROUP

![Population By Age Group](chart)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

TABLE 1. POPULATION GROWTH BY AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 to 2013</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 19 years</td>
<td>16,390</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 44 years</td>
<td>10,695</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>6,874</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
LINCOLN’S GROWTH IS ATTRIBUTABLE TO PEOPLE MOVING TO LINCOLN

Lincoln’s growth has been largely attributable to people moving to Lincoln. In 2013, the population that moved to Lincoln came from other places in Nebraska (3.3%), other places in the United States (3.0%), and other places in the world (0.9%). During the past 3 years, the rate of people moving from another Nebraska county has slowed, those moving from another country has remained level, and those moving from another state has increased. Over each of the last three years, on average, over 7% of Lincoln’s population moved to the city within the previous 12 months. In contrast, Lincoln’s natural growth rate (birth rate minus death rate) added only 1% to Lincoln’s population in 2012 (2013 data not yet available). Lincoln has slightly higher natural growth rate than the U.S. as a whole (Lincoln rate is 7.6 per 1,000 persons; U.S. rate is 4.5 per 1,000 persons).

Lincoln’s population growth has not been steady throughout the decade. Growth was faster in the middle part of the decade (over 5%). Since 2009, Lincoln’s population has grown annually only 1% - 2%.

HALF OF NEWCOMERS TO LINCOLN ARE YOUNG, WHITE ADULTS

For the past three years, approximately half of newcomers to Lincoln have been young adults between 18 to 24 years of age. The influx of young people is not surprising given Lincoln’s multiple post-secondary educational institutions.

Approximately 77% of persons moving to Lincoln were White, and most (73%) were non-Hispanic/Latino. The proportion of newcomers who were White and non-Hispanic Latino has declined somewhat since 2011, when the numbers were 85% and 78%. Given Lincoln’s relatively small minority population, newcomers to Lincoln may comprise a large proportion of those populations. For example, newcomers to Lincoln comprised 10% of the Black population (was 16% in 2011), coming mostly from other Nebraska counties and other states, and 14% of the Asian population (same as 2011), coming mostly from abroad.

NEWCOMERS HAVE HIGHER RATES OF POVERTY

Persons new to Lincoln have twice the poverty rate as persons who have lived in Lincoln for longer than one year. The percentage of persons below the poverty threshold who are new to Lincoln was 28% (down from 32% in 2011), while the rate for the population who has lived in Lincoln for longer than one year was 17% (same as in 2011).

NEWCOMERS HAVE A DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL PROFILE

Of newcomers to Lincoln that are 25 years or older, most are high school graduates or have some college, but newcomers have a different educational profile than the rest of Lincoln’s population (Figure 2). Newcomers have higher rates of persons with less than a high school diploma and with a graduate or professional degree, than the rest of Lincoln.

9 In 2013, the poverty threshold was $23,624 for a family of four that included two related children less than 18 years of age.
LINCOLN’S NON-WHITE POPULATION HAS INCREASED 68% SINCE 2005

As of 2013, the majority of Lincoln’s population identifies as White-alone (non-Hispanic/Latino) (82%). The proportion of the White-alone population has been steadily declining over many years (Figure 3). The past six years have seen dramatic changes as Lincoln is rapidly becoming a more ethnically and racially diverse community. From 2005 to 2013, Lincoln’s White-alone population increased only 12%, but the non-White population has increased 68%. Since 2005, Lincoln’s Hispanic/Latino population has nearly doubled (from 9,672 persons to 18,702 persons).

FIGURE 3. POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY
Lincoln’s diversity will increase as the 18 Years of Age and Under population grows into adulthood. Lincoln’s growing diversity is even more striking when considering the newest generation (Table 2). Within the age group of 18 years of age or younger, the White-alone population comprised less than three-quarters of the population in 2013 (73.6%).

**TABLE 2. RACE/ETHNICITY BY AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Years of Age or Younger</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 18 Years of Age</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Note: /Latino category has some overlap with other categories

**LINCOLN’S STATE OF WELL-BEING RANKS 10TH IN THE U.S.**

Of the 189 Metropolitan Statistical Areas whose residents were surveyed as a part of the 2012-13 Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index®, Lincoln (including Lancaster and Seward counties) was ranked 10th in overall well-being (Figure 4). In the four years that data have been available, Lincoln’s ranking was second in 2010, 20th in 2011, first in 2012, and 10th in 2012-13.

Through phone surveys, individuals are asked questions in six domains: Life Evaluation (present and future), Emotional Health (daily feelings), Physical Health (health experiences), Healthy Behavior (life style habits), Work Environment (job-related feelings and perceptions), and Basic Access (access to food, shelter, healthcare, and other basic needs). Lincoln’s work environment has ranked strongly (#2 ranking) in three of the four years. Lincoln has also scored well in areas of life evaluation (#11 ranking) and basic access (#13 ranking). Lincoln previously scored well in physical health but has dropped in the most recent survey (#50 ranking). Emotional health has also been declining in rank (#83 ranking). Lincoln has consistently scored low on healthy behaviors (#114 ranking).

State-level well-being information has been available since 2008. Among the 50 states and the District of Columbia, Nebraska has climbed from the middle of rankings to a high of 3rd in 2013, and 7th in the most recent survey (2014).

---

**FIGURE 4. RANKING FOR COMPONENTS OF THE WELL-BEING INDEX®**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Among 38 Communities</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2012-2013*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Behaviors</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Gallup Healthways Well-Being Index®

**Lincoln Residents Feel Their Community and Their Lives Have Improved**

Most Lincoln residents believe that Lincoln has improved for the better, as have their own lives, according to a new survey of Lincoln (and Omaha) residents. Over half of residents (56%) felt that over the past year Lincoln has changed for the better and 63% reported that they personally are better off than they were five years ago.

---

ECONOMY AND WORKFORCE

Metropolitan areas concentrate ideas, people, and technology to create a virtuous cycle that generates more innovation, attracts still more people, and makes many of the people and firms that are already there even smarter and more productive.\textsuperscript{12}

Bruce Katz & Jennifer Bradley
Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program

Lincoln has a strong economy, an educated workforce, low unemployment, a low cost of living, and investments in Lincoln’s built infrastructure (witness the changes in Lincoln resulting from the Pinnacle Bank Arena and West Haymarket Development, among the growing number large commercial investments). Despite these positive trends, Lincoln also has opportunities for improvement. Many economists believe that cities with jobs in science, technology, engineering, math, and creative and innovative industries will continue to grow while cities that lag in those areas will decline. Lincoln is only slightly above average in the percentage of science, technology, engineering, and math occupations. Lincoln has an average percentage of persons in creative and innovative occupations. Average household income has dropped, when accounting for inflation. The high percentage of children with all parents in the workforce signals the need for high-quality day care, but child care costs may consume a significant proportion of a household income. Along with state and local reductions to human services, reductions in federal funding present challenges in providing services to individual and families.

LINCOLN’S UNEMPLOYMENT IS LOWER THAN NEARLY ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE U.S.

Over the past five years, Lincoln’s unemployment has not only trailed the national rate, but has also consistently been one of the lowest in the U.S. (Figure 5).

\textsuperscript{12} (Katz & Bradley, 2013, pp. 34-35)
WORKFORCE PARTICIPATION IS HIGH

In Lincoln, a higher percentage of persons over the age of 16 participate in the workforce than is the average nationally (Figure 6). Over the past eight years, Lincoln has exceeded the national rate of persons 16 or older participating in the workforce by at least 7%. In 2013, Lincoln’s workforce participation was 72%, while the national rate was 64%.
Many of Lincoln’s Children Have All Parents in the Workforce

The Census Bureau reports the percentage of children that have all parents in the workforce. This figure includes children of two-parent families, both of whom work, as well as one-parent families, with that parent working. Lincoln has a much higher percentage of families with all parents in the workforce than the national average (Figure 7). Nebraska also regularly ranks as one of the top states for percentage of children with all parents in the workforce.

FIGURE 7. CHILDREN WITH ALL PARENTS IN WORKFORCE

The high proportion of children with all parents in the workforce suggests that Lincoln may have an elevated need for high quality day care. The cost of child care is often a significant proportion of working parents’ income and, in some cases, may be a barrier to participation in the workforce. Between 2005 and 2013, the average cost of child care increased 23%. In 2013, the annual cost of care in a child care center for any child younger than school-age was more than resident tuition and fees at a public 4-year university (Figure 8). This amounts to 11% of the median family income of married couples in Lancaster County, and 42% of the median income of single mothers. It should be noted that child care providers have fairly low wages: the average annual income of child care workers in the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (Lancaster and Seward Counties) was $18,160.
WORKFORCE PARTICIPATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT VARY BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

Workforce participation rates vary by race and ethnicity (Figure 9). Workforce participation of racial and ethnic minorities (Asian, African-American, and Hispanic/Latino) has been increasing since 2011. Hispanic/Latinos have mostly had a higher workforce participation rate than Lincoln’s overall rate. Black and Asians have a lower workforce participation rate when compared to Lincoln’s overall rate. White persons have a slightly higher workforce participation rate than for Lincoln overall.

FIGURE 9. WORKFORCE PARTICIPATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY
Unemployment rates vary by race or ethnicity (Figure 10). White persons have had a slightly lower unemployment rate than Lincoln’s overall population of persons 16 years old or older. Blacks have experienced the highest rates of unemployment among racial and ethnic groups, averaging 6 percentage points higher unemployment than Lincoln’s overall rate since 2009. The unemployment rate has decreased for Asians in the past year after a slight increase in 2012, and is now lower than the Lincoln average unemployment rate. Unemployment also increased for Hispanics from 2011 to 2012, and decreased again for 2013, although it is not yet back at 2011 (or earlier) levels.

FIGURE 10. UNEMPLOYED STATUS BY RACE/ETHNICITY

MOST ADULTS IN POVERTY ARE EMPLOYED

Of persons in poverty 16 years or older, 64% are in the workforce and of those, most are employed (Figure 11).

FIGURE 11. WORKFORCE STATUS OF ADULTS IN POVERTY
Adults in poverty and in the workforce have experienced an increase in unemployment since 2009, reaching a high of 28% in 2011 (Figure 12, Figure 13). The rate decreased to 15% in 2013, but has not yet returned to the pre-recession level of 7% experienced in 2008.

FIGURE 12. EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULTS IN POVERTY IN THE WORKFORCE

![Employment Status of Adults in Poverty in the Civilian Workforce](source)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

FIGURE 13. EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PERSONS IN POVERTY

![Employment Status of Persons 16 Years Old and Over in Poverty](source)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
LINCOLN’S WORKFORCE IS AMONG THE MOST EDUCATED IN THE U.S.

As the number of college graduates in a metropolitan area increases by 10 percent, individuals’ earnings increase by 7.7 percent, no matter how educated they are. 13

Edward Glaeser
Harvard University

Lincoln’s workforce is more highly educated than that of Nebraska or the nation as a whole when looking at persons 25 or older with at least a high school degree and with a graduate or professional degree. Since 2005, Lincoln’s workforce with at least a high school degree has exceeded the Nebraska rate by at least 3% and the national rate by 8%. 14 The percent of the workforce with at least a high school diploma has been steady since 2005 averaging 93% for Lincoln, 90% for Nebraska, and 85% nationally.

One study ranked the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (Lancaster and Seward counties) as the country’s 18th highest for share of workers with a college degree (Table 3). 15 Among the top 20 cities with highest percentage of workers with a college degree, however, Lincoln had the lowest average wages for college and high school graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage with College Degree</th>
<th>Salary of College Graduates</th>
<th>Salary of High School Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$133,479</td>
<td>$107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC/MD/VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$80,872</td>
<td>$67,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA/NH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$75,173</td>
<td>$62,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$61,888</td>
<td>$52,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$87,033</td>
<td>$68,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$65,452</td>
<td>$55,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Durham, NC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$63,745</td>
<td>$50,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland, CA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$77,381</td>
<td>$60,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$57,391</td>
<td>$47,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Everett, WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$68,025</td>
<td>$55,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, NJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$81,914</td>
<td>$64,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, KY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$55,238</td>
<td>$44,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$62,289</td>
<td>$48,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$57,366</td>
<td>$48,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$69,955</td>
<td>$57,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver-Boulder, CO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$64,488</td>
<td>$50,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-Northeastern NJ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$79,757</td>
<td>$59,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln, NE</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td><strong>$50,401</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,837</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$64,801</td>
<td>$48,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, FL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$59,380</td>
<td>$46,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reproduced from Moretti, 2012, p.94.

13 (Glaeser, 2011, p. 253)
14 Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey
15 (Moretti, 2012)
Since 2005, Lincoln’s workforce with graduate or professional degrees has exceeded the Nebraska rate by 3% and the national rate by 2%. The percent of the workforce with graduate or professional degrees has been slightly increasing since 2005, averaging 12% for Lincoln, 9% for Nebraska, and 10% nationally.

**More Highly Educated Persons Are Less Likely to Be Unemployed**

Adults with higher educational attainment have higher incomes/earnings and are less likely to be unemployed than adults with lower educational attainment. Adults who did not graduate from high school earn half the income as an adult with a bachelor’s degree (Figure 14). Adults who did not graduate from high school are 300% more likely to be unemployed than are those who earned a bachelor’s degree (Figure 15).

**FIGURE 14. EARNINGS BY EDUCATION**

![Median Annual Earnings By Education Lincoln (2013)](source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey)

**FIGURE 15. UNEMPLOYMENT BY EDUCATION**

![Unemployed Rate By Education Lincoln (2013)](source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey)

---

16 Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey
**Mean Household Income Has Declined 4% Since 2008**

The income picture looks less positive when looking at household income and adjusting for inflation: Both mean and median real household incomes have declined (2012 dollars) (Figure 16). Since 2008, **mean income has declined 4%** and **median income has declined 9%**. The gap between the mean and the median income has widened meaning that there are an increasingly larger proportion of households with lower incomes and an increasingly smaller number of households with higher incomes.

*FIGURE 16. HOUSEHOLD INCOME (2012 DOLLARS)*

![Household Income](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

**Lincoln’s Cost of Living Is Low**

Living in Lincoln costs less, on average, than does living in other parts of the United States. In recent years the overall cost of living in Lincoln has been 90 - 93% of the national average, and in 2013 was **90% of the national average**.

Adjusting per capita income by the cost of living measures relative buying power and recognizes that a dollar of income in Lincoln has more buying power than a dollar of income in other areas of the U.S. When adjusting for Lincoln’s lower cost of living, Lincoln’s per capita income had trailed the national average for several years, but with the lower cost of living in 2013 is now **3% higher than the national average** (Table 4).

---

17 Source: ACCRA Cost of Living Index
TABLE 4. ADJUSTED PER CAPITA INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US average</th>
<th>Lincoln</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unadjusted Per Capita Income</strong></td>
<td>$46,177</td>
<td>$42,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unadjusted Percentage of US Per Capita Income</strong></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Living Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita Income Adjusted by Cost of Living Index</strong></td>
<td>$46,177</td>
<td>$47,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differential from U.S. Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ACCRA Cost of Living Index and Bureau of Economic Statistics

**MOST WORKERS ARE EMPLOYED BY PRIVATE COMPANIES**

In Lincoln (2013), 77% of people employed were private wage and salary workers; 19% were federal, state, or local government workers; and 4% were self-employed in their own (not incorporated) business (Table 5).

TABLE 5. CIVILIAN WORKFORCE EMPLOYER STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Worker</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary workers</td>
<td>112,215</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government workers</td>
<td>27,584</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in own (not incorporated) business workers</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey

**THE PROPORTION OF LINCOLN’S STEM WORKFORCE IS SLIGHTLY ABOVE AVERAGE**

There is general consensus that the United States long-term global competitiveness will partially hinge on the supply and quality of workers in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields. STEM careers are important to communities because they offer high wage jobs that will result in reinvestments back into local economies.

In the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (Lancaster and Seward counties), STEM occupations had decreased as a percentage of all occupations, but have rebounded in the last two years (Figure 17). In Lincoln 5.9% of all occupations are classified as STEM; this is slightly higher than the national percentage (5.4%) of all occupations that are STEM.

---

18 Adjusted per capita income is the product of Unadjusted Per Capita Income divided by Cost of Living Rate

19 (Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century, 2007)

20 (Rothwell, 2013)
**THE PROPORTION OF LINCOLN’S CREATIVE INDUSTRIES IS AVERAGE**

Arts-related businesses are an important component of a community’s culture. *Creative industries* are those with arts-centric Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC), including those in performing arts, visual arts/photography, film/radio/television, design/publishing, and museums. Lincoln has a smaller proportion of creative industry businesses (4.1%) than is the average nationally (4.6%) (Figure 18). When compared to two of its peer communities, Lincoln exceeds both Minnehaha County, SD (Sioux Falls) and Shawnee County, KS (Topeka). Lincoln trails three of its aspirational communities: Madison, Wisconsin (5.0%), Colorado Springs (5.0%), and Austin, Texas (6.7%).  

---

21 Peer and aspirational communities used in the study are those identified in the 2013 *Lincoln Economic Dashboard* created by the Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development. The communities presented in this comparison were based on availability of information. The peer communities in this comparison are: Minnehaha County, SD (Sioux Falls) and Shawnee County, KS (Topeka). The aspirational communities in this comparison are: Dane County, WI (Madison); El Paso County, CO (Colorado Springs); and Travis County, TX (Austin).
JOBS REQUIRING A MASTER’S DEGREE ARE EXPECTED TO GROW THE FASTEST NATIONALLY

It is difficult to know exactly what skills Lincoln residents will need to meet the demands of the future. Lincoln businesses report difficulty finding qualified applicants to fill the jobs they have available. Nationally, “jobs requiring a master's degree are expected to grow the fastest, while those requiring a high school diploma will experience the slowest growth over the 2010–22 timeframe” (Figure 19). Occupations experiencing the largest numeric growth include those in the fields of healthcare, office and administrative support, construction, personal care, food preparation and service, sales, and education. Jobs requiring a high school diploma or less will account for the majority (i.e., 56%) of new jobs between 2012 and 2022.

---

22 (Thompson, 2014)
23 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.)
PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN LINCOLN’S BUILT INFRASTRUCTURE IS GROWING

Lincoln continues to invest in new commercial buildings and residences. The value of commercial building permits has fluctuated, but has been on an upward trend for the last four years (Figure 20). Public/private investments have played a substantial role in commercial building activity. For example, in 2012, commercial building permits for the Pinnacle Bank Arena comprised 43% of the total value of commercial building permits.

Residential housing has followed a different trend. The value of residential building permits began rebounding in 2010. The 2013 annual value of new buildings, however, remains lower than 10 years ago. The overall pattern of precipitous declines in the middle part of the decade, with recovery slowly starting near the end of the decade mirrors the residential building pattern for the United States as a whole.

FIGURE 20. VALUE OF BUILDING PERMITS

Source: Commercial permit data from City of Lincoln; Residential permit data from U.S. Census Bureau
Note: Residential building permits are those for new privately-owned residential housing units, including multi-family dwellings.
Federal Funds Contributed to Lincoln’s Economy

The infusion of federal funds contributes to Lincoln’s economy in the form of salaries and wages, purchase of goods and services, grants, and cash transfers to individuals. In 2010, total federal funds expended in Lancaster County reached a new high of $2,822,569,000 (Figure 21). Federal grants increased nearly 50% ($439 million) between 2008 and 2009 as funds for economic recovery were awarded, notably funds through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. As those funds have been depleted, it is expected that federal funding will decrease over the next few years. The federal government no longer routinely reports total federal funds expenditures, so these data are not available beyond 2010.

**FIGURE 21. TOTAL FEDERAL FUNDS EXPENDED**

Federal government per capita expenditures in Lancaster County have accelerated to a greater extent than the national per capita increase. In 2010, approximately $9,900 in federal funds were expended for each person living in Lancaster County (Figure 22).

**FIGURE 22. FEDERAL FUNDS EXPENDED PER CAPITA**

Source: Consolidated Federal Funds Reports
The problem of joblessness should be a top-priority item in any public policy discussion focusing on enhancing the status of families.24

William Julius Wilson
Harvard Kennedy School

Basic needs are the fundamental requirements that must be met in order for individuals to live. Although Lincoln has not experienced the high unemployment rates seen in other areas of the United States, it would be incorrect to assume that in Lincoln residents have been unaffected by the recession. Lincoln’s poverty rate exceeds the national poverty rate. In Lincoln, the under-18 age group has a higher percentage of persons in poverty (20%) than the adult or elderly age groups. The number of students receiving free lunch has increased 139% since 2000.25 Lincoln has six neighborhoods in extreme poverty (those with more than 40% of residents in poverty). Homelessness rates in Lincoln continue to grow. In Lincoln, there has been an increase in the percentage of households receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP; formerly known as Food Stamps) but Lincoln’s rate still trails that of the nation. In other ways, Lincoln appears to provide positive opportunities for individuals to meet their basic needs: Lincoln has a lower percentage of the population that is uninsured and a lower cost of housing compared to other communities.

24 (William Julius Wilson, 1987)
25 In general, students are eligible for free lunch if their household income is less than 130% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $30,615 would be eligible for free lunch.
**Lincoln’s Number of Persons in Poverty Increased 58% Since 2005**

The Federal Poverty Level threshold is determined annually based on size of the family, the number of children, and a measure of income needed to purchase food and other essential goods and services.\(^{26,27}\) In 2013, for example, the poverty threshold was $23,624 for a family of four that included two related children less than 18 years of age. In Lincoln in 2013, 17% (translating to 43,455 persons) had incomes that placed them below the poverty threshold. This is a 58% increase in the number of persons below the poverty threshold since 2005 and represents the addition of 15,942 persons below the poverty threshold. In 2013, Lincoln has a higher percentage of its population below the poverty threshold than the national or Nebraska rate (Figure 23).

**FIGURE 23. PERCENT OF POPULATION BELOW POVERTY THRESHOLD**

![Percent of Population Below Poverty Threshold Lincoln, Nebraska, and U.S.](Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey)

The increase of the number of persons in poverty in Lincoln exceeds the city’s overall growth. This suggests that persons who previously did not fall below the poverty threshold have done so. The last year of the recent recession (2009) saw a nearly 50% increase in Lincoln’s poverty rate, from 28,012 (2008) to 41,319 (2009) (Figure 24). In 2013 there was an 18% increase in the poverty rate.

---

\(^{26}\) Critics have said that the Federal Poverty Threshold, developed in early 1960s, should be improved. The measure uses food costs and a multiplier of three to calculate needed income. Needed income is compared to gross income and does not include in-kind benefits, nor does it recognize increased labor participation of women (and related child care costs), variability in health care costs across populations, or variability of expenses across geographies. These and other factors may underestimate poverty for persons in working families and overestimate poverty for persons in families on public assistance.
The percentage of households below the poverty threshold is generally increasing. For those families that fall below the poverty threshold, nearly half had incomes less than 50% of the poverty threshold. Also increasing is the number of households between 100% to 200% of the federal poverty level (but generally still considered lower income) (Figure 25). In 2013, 35% of Lincoln households were in or near poverty.

FIGURE 25. 100% AND 200% OF POVERTY THRESHOLDS
THE PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN POVERTY HAS INCREASED 78% SINCE 2008

Children who live in poverty face tougher odds for achievement than do other children. Children who live in poverty for at least half their childhoods are 90% more likely to leave high school without a diploma and four times more likely to be an unwed teen parent when compared with people who were never poor as a child.  

Lincoln’s percent of children whose household incomes fall below the poverty threshold increased 78% from a low in 2008 (Figure 26). This translates to 12,100 children in Lincoln living in poverty. Most children in poverty are White children that are not Hispanic/Latino, given the composition of the community. However, minority children are more likely to live in poverty than are White children.

FIGURE 26. PERCENT OF CHILDREN IN POVERTY

![Chart showing percent of children in poverty in Lincoln and the U.S.](chart.png)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

Since 2009 in Lincoln, children are the age group with the largest proportion in poverty (20%), followed by persons 18 to 64 (18%), and persons 65 years or older (6%) (Figure 27).

---

28 (Fiester, 2013)
Female Head of Households and Households With Multiple Children Are More Likely to Be in Poverty

Single head of household families, particularly those headed by a female, are more likely to have incomes at or below the poverty threshold. Of all female-headed households, 42% have incomes below the poverty threshold, compared to 7% of married-couple families. In Lincoln, there are 1,400 married-couple families in poverty and 2,821 female-headed families in poverty.

Poverty rises with increasing numbers of children in a family. Nearly 30% of all families, including those that are married couples or single heads of household, with more than two children have incomes at or below the poverty threshold. For female-headed households with more than two children, 60% are at or below the poverty threshold.

---

In 2013, the poverty threshold was $23,624 for a family of four that included two related children less than 18 years of age.
Most individuals in poverty are White-alone (non-Hispanic/Latino) \( (n = 30,244) \) (Figure 28).

**Figure 28. Persons in Poverty by Race/Ethnicity**

Poverty rates in Lincoln vary by race and ethnicity (Figure 29). For example, rates of poverty among Whites have held steady at 14% since 2009 and have been the lowest of all races/ethnicities. The rate of poverty among African Americans has dropped from 60% to **40%**, but is the highest rate of poverty among major races/ethnicities. Given Lincoln’s increasingly diverse population, the high poverty rates among racial and ethnic minorities are cause for concern.
NEWER NEW AMERICANS HAVE HIGHER POVERTY RATES

Approximately 19,000 foreign-born persons live in Lincoln. Among that group, persons who entered the United States in 2000 or later have greater rates of poverty (44%) than those who entered the United States earlier. Those who entered the United States between 2000 and 2009 have poverty rate of 39%, while those who entered the United States prior to 2000 have half that rate (24%).

POVERTY RATES ARE HIGHER AMONG THOSE WITH LESS EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Lincoln residents with less than a high school diploma had greater poverty rates (27%) than those who achieved greater levels of educational attainment: high school graduates (14%), some college (11%), bachelor’s degree or higher (4%) (Figure 30).  

---

30 Educational enrollment is for the population 3 years old and older.
Of persons in poverty, 48% are not enrolled in school (Figure 31). One-third of persons in poverty are enrolled in college or graduate/professional schools. Approximately 19% of persons in poverty are children enrolled in nursery school through grade 12.

31 Calculated for persons 3 years of age and older
Neighborhoods in extreme poverty are generally considered to be those with more than 40% of residents in poverty. At this concentrated level of poverty, individuals begin to face cultural and social constraints that isolate them from opportunities for economic advancement.\textsuperscript{32,33} In 2000, Lincoln had no neighborhoods in extreme poverty.\textsuperscript{34} In 2013, Lincoln had six neighborhoods in extreme poverty (Table 6). In the Lincoln Vital Signs 2014 report, there were also six neighborhoods in extreme poverty: four are those identified as in extreme poverty in this report, two have fallen just below 40% and so are excluded (Census Tracts 4 at 39.5% and 31.03 at 39%), and two additional neighborhoods have been added (Census Tracts 7 and 17) (Figure 32).

### TABLE 6. LINCOLN CENSUS TRACTS IN EXTREME POVERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Percent of Individuals at or Below the Poverty Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Added since the Lincoln Vital Signs 2014 report

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

**NOTE:** Does not include Census Tract 6, situated directly over the main campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Census Tract 35 which is situated over the Lincoln Regional Center, or Census Tract 36.01 covering the State Penitentiary.

\textsuperscript{32} (Quane & Wilson, 2012)

\textsuperscript{33} (W. J. Wilson, 2010)

\textsuperscript{34} Due to changes in the Census’ methodology for sampling populations, caution must be exercised when comparing 2000 decennial data with the newer American Community Survey results. Lincoln has 72 Census Tract neighborhoods. Neighborhoods for which extreme poverty was calculated excludes Census Tract 6, situated directly over the main campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Census Tract 35, situated over the Lincoln Regional Center, and Census Tract 36.01 covering the State Penitentiary. Estimates using data samples collected 2009-2013 American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau).
FIGURE 32. POVERTY BY CENSUS TRACT

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Although each of the extreme poverty neighborhoods has a unique profile, there are some similarities:

- All are relatively young communities with a smaller proportion of persons older than 55 living in them
- All have fewer family households than Lincoln as a whole
- All have high percentages of all parents of children under 6 in the labor force, mirroring Lincoln as a whole
- Three have more than double the proportions of ethnic minority populations than Lincoln as a whole
- Five have relatively less educational attainment than Lincoln as a whole
- Three have a high proportion of college students
- Five have a higher unemployment rate than Lincoln as a whole

Presented in order of most pervasive poverty, below (Table 7) is a profile of each neighborhood.

TABLE 7. PROFILES OF EXTREME POVERTY NEIGHBORHOODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 5 – Young adult college student neighborhood, but for working adults one of high unemployment.</th>
<th>Poverty Rate: 47%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 39% of residents are between 20 to 24 years of age (230% higher than elsewhere in Lincoln).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households: Half the proportion of family households.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment of Adults 25 Years of Age or Older: Similar rate of high school graduates and much lower rate of bachelor’s graduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Enrollment: More than twice the percentage of college students than Lincoln as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status of Persons in Poverty: 63% of the persons in poverty are enrolled in college or graduate/professional school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment: Triple Lincoln’s unemployment rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity: Very similar to Lincoln’s overall profile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 20.01 – Diverse neighborhood of young adult working and young adult college student neighborhood with low unemployment but also with low incomes.</th>
<th>Poverty Rate: 46%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: Greater proportion of 20 to 34 year olds and more children under 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households: Half the proportion of family households.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment of Adults 25 Years of Age or Older: Lower rate of high school graduates but same rate of bachelor’s graduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Enrollment: More than twice the percentage of college students than Lincoln as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status of Persons in Poverty: 50% higher rate of persons in poverty not enrolled in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment: About one-fourth lower unemployment rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity: Lower proportion of Whites, with a higher proportion of Blacks and Asians, and more than twice as many persons with Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Census Tract 7 – Diverse neighborhood of adults with low educational attainment and high unemployment. | Poverty Rate: **46%**  
Age: **Greater proportion of 20 to 34 year olds.**  
Family Households: Two-thirds the proportion of family households.  
Educational Attainment of Adults 25 Years of Age or Older: Lower rate of high school graduates but higher rate of bachelor’s graduates, especially those with a Graduate or Professional degree.  
Educational Enrollment: Fewer college students than Lincoln as a whole.  
Enrollment Status of Persons in Poverty: 13% of the persons in poverty are enrolled in graduate/professional school.  
Unemployment: **Double Lincoln’s unemployment rate.**  
Race/Ethnicity: Less than half the proportion of Whites, with more than **6 times the percentage of Asians.** |
|---|---|
| Census Tract 17 – Diverse neighborhood with mix of family and non-family households with low educational attainment and high unemployment. | Poverty Rate: **45%**  
Age: Greater proportion of children under 18 years of age.  
Family Households: Two-thirds the proportion of family households.  
Educational Attainment of Adults 25 Years of Age or Older: Lower rate of high school graduates and bachelor’s graduates.  
Educational Enrollment: One-third fewer enrolled college students as Lincoln as a whole.  
Enrollment Status of Persons in Poverty: Higher rate of persons in poverty not enrolled in school.  
Unemployment: **Triple Lincoln’s unemployment rate.**  
Race/Ethnicity: Lower proportion of Whites, with a higher proportion of Blacks and Asians, and more than **twice as many persons with Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.** |
| Census Tract 33.01 – Neighborhood of families and non-family households with mix of college students and working young adults with lower educational attainment, making a wide range of incomes. | Poverty Rate: **44%**  
Age: Greater proportion of 20 to 24 year olds.  
Family Households: Half the family households as in Lincoln as a whole.  
Educational Attainment of Adults 25 Years of Age or Older: Slightly lower rate of high school graduates and of bachelor’s graduates.  
Educational Enrollment: Approximately same rate of enrolled college students as Lincoln as a whole.  
Enrollment Status of Persons in Poverty: 54% of the persons in poverty are enrolled in college or graduate/professional school.  
Unemployment: Slightly higher unemployment rate.  
Race/Ethnicity: Similar to Lincoln’s overall profile, with more Blacks. |
| Census Tract 20.02 – Young adult college student and diverse neighborhood, with low educational attainment and higher unemployment. | Poverty Rate: **44%**  
Age: **Greater proportion of 25 to 34 year olds.**  
Family Households: Half the proportion of family households.  
Educational Attainment of Adults 25 Years of Age or Older: Lower rate of high school graduates and bachelor’s graduates.  
Educational Enrollment: Almost double the percentage of college students than Lincoln as a whole.  
Enrollment Status of Persons in Poverty: Higher rate of persons in poverty not enrolled in school.  
Unemployment: **Double Lincoln’s unemployment rate.**  
Race/Ethnicity: Lower proportion of Whites, with a higher proportion of Blacks, and three times as many persons with Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. |

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey*
SNAP and Free Lunch Program Rates Have Increased Dramatically

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) program provides financial assistance for food purchases to households with incomes below 130% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. Participation in SNAP has increased 77% since 2008: mostly attributable to the large increase between 2008 and 2009 (Figure 33). However, a lower percentage of households in Lincoln receive SNAP benefits (9.4%) than nationally (13.5%). In Nebraska the average monthly benefit per household receiving SNAP is $277.82.

FIGURE 33. PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING SNAP BENEFITS

Approximately 43% of Lincoln Public Schools students participate in the Free or Reduced Price Lunch Program (for a total of 16,248 children) (Figure 34). The number of Lincoln Public School students receiving free lunch has increased 139% since 2000. Students receiving free lunches totaled 13,679 for the 2014-15 school year. Since 2000, students receiving reduced price lunch has held essentially steady (in 2014-15 school year there were 2,569 students receiving reduced price lunches), suggesting that families facing great economic hardship have

Federal Poverty Guidelines are based on size of household and income. In 2013, a four person household with an income less than $30,615 (the equivalent of 130% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines) would be eligible for SNAP benefits.

The increase in participation in SNAP may be partially attributable to an expansion in eligibility for benefits under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (2009). However, a report by the Congressional Budget Office reports that the increase has been primarily driven by the weak economy (Congressional Budget Office, 2012, April).

In general, students are eligible for free lunch if their household income is less than 130% of the Federal Poverty Guideline. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $30,615 would be eligible for free lunch.

In general, students are eligible for reduced price lunch if their household income is less than 185% of the Federal Poverty Guideline. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $43,568 would be eligible for reduced lunch.
enrolled, while families facing lesser economic hardship have not enrolled. Lincoln’s rate for participation in the free/reduced lunch program appears to be lower than national participation in which 70.5% of all lunches are to students in the program.39

**FIGURE 34. PERCENT OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN FREE/REDUCED LUNCH PROGRAM**

![Graph showing percent of students enrolled in free/reduced lunch program in Lincoln Public Schools.](source: Lincoln Public Schools Statistical Handbooks)

**HEALTH INSURANCE RATE IS BETTER THAN U.S. RATE**

To identify the uninsured, many researchers focus on the 18 to 64 population since there are programs that ensure availability of health insurance to children (the Children’s Health Insurance Program, called *Kids Connection* in Nebraska) and elders (Medicare and Medicaid). The percentage of the population 18 to 64 years of age without health insurance in Lincoln is lower than the U.S. average. In 2013 there were 27,438 uninsured people in Lincoln’s 18 to 64 age group (Figure 35).

---

39 Statistic for 2012-13 school year, as reported by the U.S.D.A. (http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/slsynt.htm)
In Lincoln, the percentage of persons 18 to 64 years of age with Medicaid only coverage is higher than elsewhere in Nebraska but lower than across the United States (Figure 36). In 2013 there were 7,197 people in the 18 to 64 age group in Lincoln with Medicaid only health coverage. This is about 2,000 fewer people than in 2012 (9,224 in 2012), but close to the 2011 number on Medicaid (7,668 in 2011).
HOUSING COSTS IN LINCOLN ARE LOW

In Lincoln, low housing costs are a significant component of the lower cost of living. In 2013, the cost of housing in Lincoln was approximately 76% of the national average. Low housing costs do not appear to be caused by oversupply: In Lincoln, homeowner and rental vacancy rates have been similar or slightly lower than those in the rest of Nebraska and the nation.

A standard measure of housing affordability is the percentage of household income devoted to housing costs. In general, many experts believe that housing costs should not exceed approximately 30% of a household’s income, and that the percentage should decrease for households with incomes that are lower. Since 2005, an average of approximately 38% of Lincoln’s renting population paid more than 35% of household income on rent (Figure 37). For households carrying a mortgage the percentage has fluctuated, but on average 16% of households paid more than 35% of their household income on housing. Homeowners with no mortgage have the lowest average percentage (7%) of households whose housing costs exceed 35% of income.

FIGURE 37. HOUSEHOLDS WHOSE HOUSING COSTS EXCEED 35% OF INCOME

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

40 ACCRA Cost of Living Index
41 U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
43 Data are limited to the household population and exclude the population living in institutions, college dormitories, and other group quarters.
44 Costs for households with without a mortgage may include home equity loans, real estate taxes, homeowner’s insurance, association fees, and utilities.
HOMELESSNESS IN LINCOLN HAS BEEN DECLINING

The homeless population in Lincoln has been declining since a high in 2012. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development mandates that an annual count be conducted of homeless individuals on a specified date. The most recent count was conducted on January 29, 2015. On that day, 715 individuals were counted as homeless (Figure 38). The homeless count hit high in 2012 of 981 persons (310 children and 671 adults). In 2015, one-quarter of homeless individuals were children 19 years of age or younger (n = 179). Since 2007, the number of homeless children on the day of the count has decreased 28% (from 247 to 179), and the number of homeless adults has increased 24% (from 431 to 536).

FIGURE 38. HOMELESS PERSONS IN LINCOLN AT POINT IN TIME COUNT

![Graph showing homeless persons in a 24 hour period in Lincoln](Image)

Source: Lincoln Homeless Point in Time Report

When homelessness is viewed as a proportion of the population, a larger proportion of the 19 and under population is homeless than is the 20 and over population (Figure 39). In 2013, four per thousand children and youth (aged 19 and under) were homeless, compared to 3.3 per thousand adults (aged 20 and older).

---

45 The HUD definition of homelessness for the purpose of a point in time homeless count includes only people who are living unsheltered on the streets, in a vehicle or another place not fit for human habitation, or in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. Many people and families considered homeless, or at risk of homelessness, including those in prison/jail, living in hotels/motels or “couch surfing” are NOT included in the count.

46 The decrease in homelessness is believed to be attributable to increased support of homeless persons through the Rapid Rehousing, Permanent Supportive Housing, and domestic violence housing programs.
FIGURE 39. HOMELESS RATE BY AGE

Homeless Rate By Age
Lincoln

Source: Compiled from Lincoln Homeless Point in Time Report and U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
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Per capita productivity rises sharply with metropolitan area size if the city is well educated, but not if it isn’t.47

Edward Glaeser
Harvard University

Educational achievement impacts individuals and communities. Individuals with at least a high school diploma earn, on average $9,000 more per year than do individuals who do not have a diploma.48 Communities with educated populations are more productive, more innovative, and pay higher salaries.49 This section of the report focuses on educational achievement of Lincoln’s residents.

Lincoln is a highly educated community. Lincoln’s school age population is growing as is enrollment in Lincoln Public Schools. Lincoln Public School students have been more proficient than the state averages for third grade reading and fourth grade writing proficiency. Additionally, Lincoln Public Schools’ graduation rate is high compared to national averages. But there are areas where Lincoln can do better. Only approximately one-third of at-risk 3-5 year olds are enrolled in high quality preschool programs. Children who are racial and ethnic minorities and those who are in poverty fare worse educationally than other children. This gap in achievement appears from the first standardized test in third grade and carries through to lower rates of high school graduation. Three of five high school graduates enroll directly into postsecondary institutions (primarily four-year schools), but only 38% graduate within six years. In Lincoln, there is less variation, by race, in enrollment in college or graduate school.

THERE IS LITTLE INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN BIRTH TO AGE 5

Policymakers should invest in young children, where the return on investment is stronger than low-skill adults. The real question is how to use available funds wisely. The best evidence supports the policy prescription: invest in the very young.50

James Heckman, Nobel Laureate Economist
University of Chicago

47 (Glaeser, 2011, p. 253)
48 (Carnevale, Rose, & Cheah, n.d.)
49 (Glaeser, 2011)
50 (Heckman, 1999, p. 6)
Evidence continues to mount that early childhood relationships and experiences impact future physical and mental health, educational attainment, earnings, and relationships.\(^{51}\)

**ONE-THIRD OF 3-5 YEAR OLD AT-RISK CHILDREN ARE ENROLLED IN HIGH QUALITY PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAMS**

The Nebraska Early Childhood Data Coalition suggests that the percent of at-risk children\(^{52}\) enrolled in quality early childhood programs is a good metric since participation in high quality early childhood care and education programs are “associated with positive effects on children’s cognitive language and social development and overall school readiness, particularly among children at risk.”\(^{53}\) Researchers estimate that **approximately 35% percent of at-risk children aged 3-5 are enrolled in high quality preschool programs.**\(^{54}\) This translates to approximately 1,757 at-risk children in high quality programming; however, many of these programs have waiting lists. For example, Lincoln Public Schools’ preschool program regularly has a **waiting list of over 600 children.**

**LINCOLN LACKS KINDERGARTEN-READINESS DATA FOR THE POPULATION**

The concept of kindergarten readiness as an important predictor for future achievement has gained much traction. Nebraska is not one of the **34 states and the District of Columbia that have mandated readiness assessment,**\(^{55}\) and Lincoln Public Schools does not currently conduct assessments of the entire Kindergarten population.

**K-12 ENROLLMENT IS GROWING**

In Lincoln, a majority of children attend public schools (Figure 40). In 2013 (the most recent year that data about private school enrollment is available), approximately 87% of Lincoln students were enrolled in public schools. **Public school enrollment has increased 23% since 2000.** The number of children enrolled in private schools has decreased 2% since 2000. Lincoln Public Schools provides services, such as special education, to eligible private school students.

Although the percentage of children attending private schools is relatively small, the number is large enough that without private schools, Lincoln Public Schools’ infrastructure would have to expand. For example, there are, on average, approximately 500 students in one public elementary school, equivalent to about 8% of private school students. If a large number of children stopped attending private school, or one of the schools closes, this could have a large impact on the public school system.

---

51 (Shonkoff, 2009)

52 Defined by the Nebraska Early Childhood Data Coalition as children whose household incomes are less than or equal to 185% of the poverty threshold.

53 (Nebraska Early Childhood Data Coalition, n.d., p. 3).

54 To estimate the percent of at-risk children who are enrolled in quality early childhood programs, enrollment data were collected from the nine early childhood providers accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and programming operated by Lincoln Public Schools (the largest single accredited provider, offering early child care programs at 33 sites, including Head Start). Simply using enrollment in state licensed programs was not recommended as a proxy for high quality programs, given that Nebraska has among the lowest state standards for child care licensing (Child Care Aware of America, 2013). Nebraska Department of Education’s **Step Up to Quality program** ([http://www.education.ne.gov/StepUpToQuality/](http://www.education.ne.gov/StepUpToQuality/)) will provide more information about quality programs in the coming years.

55 (National Center for State Legislatures, 2014)
The Nebraska Department of Education collects no data on private school students other than the number of students enrolled. The remainder of the data presented in this section includes only public school students.

**Third Grade Reading Proficiency Is Strong But Varies by Student Characteristics**

Third grade reading proficiency is the earliest comparable standardized reading test given to all Lincoln Public School students. Third grade reading proficiency measures student achievement at a critical transition point in their educational careers: “until the end of third grade, most students are learning to read. Beginning in fourth grade, however, students begin reading to learn.”

Third grade students who do not read proficiently at third grade are four times more likely to leave school without a diploma while third graders who read at or above their level are more likely to graduate and attend college, even when demographic characteristics were included as controls.

Over the past five years, a higher proportion of Lincoln’s third grade students were reading proficient than Nebraska third graders: Lincoln 82% and Nebraska 79% (2013-14 school year). However, reading proficiency varies depending on student characteristics (Figure 41). Students who receive free/reduced lunch (a proxy for low income students) have a third grade reading proficiency rate approximately 11 percentage points lower than...
the overall rate. White and Asian students consistently have higher third grade reading proficiency than other major racial and ethnic groups. These other racial and ethnic minorities do less well than the overall student population. Since 2009, Black students trailed the overall rate by 13%, and Hispanic/Latino students trailed the overall rate by 10%. It should be noted, however, research suggests that the source of variation in educational achievement is primarily linked to family economic status and not race/ethnicity alone.60,61

FIGURE 41. THIRD GRADE READING PROFICIENCY

![Graph showing third grade reading proficiency by race/ethnicity and poverty over years 2009-10 to 2013-14.](source: Nebraska Department of Education, Nebraska State of the Schools Reports)

FOURTH GRADE WRITING PROFICIENCY IS STRONG BUT VARIES BY STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Along with reading, writing is an important component of literacy. In fourth grade, students take a writing proficiency test. Over the past two years, a greater proportion of Lincoln fourth graders are proficient writers (78%) when compared to fourth graders across the state (Nebraska 69%, 2013-14 school year).

would be eligible for reduced lunch. The vast majority of children enrolled in the free/reduced lunch are eligible for free lunch.

60 (Entwisle & Alexander, 1992)

61 (Hernandez, 2011)
Students receiving free/reduced lunch (a proxy for low income students)\textsuperscript{62} have a fourth grade writing proficiency rate approximately 7 percentage points lower than the overall rate (Figure 42). There is no consistent pattern in fourth grade writing proficiency among major racial and ethnic groups, except that Whites consistently outperform students of other racial/ethnic categorizations. Since 2009, Asians trailed the overall rate by an average of 2%, Black students by 7%, and Hispanic/Latino students by 5%. As noted earlier, research suggests variation in educational achievement is primarily linked to family economic status.\textsuperscript{63,64,65}

**FIGURE 42. FOURTH GRADE WRITING PROFICIENCY**

---

\textsuperscript{62} In general, students are eligible for free lunch if their household income is less than 130% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $30,615 would be eligible for free lunch. In general, students are eligible for reduced price lunch if their household income is less than 185% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $43,568 would be eligible for reduced lunch. The vast majority of children enrolled in the free/reduced lunch are eligible for free lunch.

\textsuperscript{63} (Entwisle & Alexander, 1992)

\textsuperscript{64} (Hernandez, 2011)

\textsuperscript{65} (Persky, Daane, & Jin, 2003)
Eighth Grade Math Proficiency Is Strong but Varies by Student Characteristics

In eighth grade, students take a math proficiency test. Students who have fallen behind in math by eighth grade are most likely to continue to fall behind. Basic math proficiency is required for day-to-day adult decisions. Higher-level mathematics and science courses are needed to attend and complete college. Over the past two years, a greater proportion of Lincoln eighth graders are proficient in mathematics (72%) when compared to eighth graders across the state (Nebraska 66%).

Students receiving free/reduced lunch (a proxy for low income students) have an eighth grade math proficiency rate nearly 17 percentage points lower than the overall rate (Figure 43). Whites and Asians consistently perform better than students of other racial/ethnic categorizations. Since 2010, White and Asian students outperformed the overall rate by an average of 6% and 5%, respectively. Black students trail the overall proficiency rate for Lincoln Public Schools by an average of 26% and Hispanic/Latino students trail by 19%.

FIGURE 43. EIGHTH GRADE MATH PROFICIENCY

Source: Nebraska Department of Education, Nebraska State of the Schools Reports

---

66 (Rock, Owings, & Lee, 1994)

67 In general, students are eligible for free lunch if their household income is less than 130% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $30,615 would be eligible for free lunch. In general, students are eligible for reduced price lunch if their household income is less than 185% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines. In 2013, students in a family of four with a household income less than $43,568 would be eligible for reduced lunch. The vast majority of children enrolled in the free/reduced lunch are eligible for free lunch.
LINCOLN AND NEBRASKA HAVE HIGHER GRADUATION RATES AND LOWER DROP-OUT RATES WHEN COMPARED WITH THE REST OF THE NATION.68,69 NATIONALLY, 80% OF PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE THEIR HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA WITHIN FOUR YEARS OF STARTING HIGH SCHOOL (2011-2012 SCHOOL YEAR).70 IN THAT YEAR, LINCOLN’S RATE WAS 83% AND NEBRASKA’S 88%.71

(Note: Lincoln Public Schools uses a slightly different method of identifying the cohort of students for graduation than the method used by state and federal agencies. For the purposes of comparability, this report uses the state/national methodology. This methodology results in a slightly different rate. For example, the state/national methodology resulted in a graduation rate of 83% for school year 2011-12, while the Lincoln Public Schools methodology resulted in a rate of 85%).

Similiar to the rest of the nation, Lincoln’s and Nebraska’s graduation rates are on an upward trend (Table 8). Lincoln and Nebraska have lower drop-out rates than the national rate (3% in 2011-2012 school year).72 Lincoln’s dropout rate was 2% and Nebraska’s 1%. Similar to national trends, Lincoln’s and Nebraska’s drop-out rates have been declining.

68 In 2005, the U.S. Department of Education began publishing an official estimate of graduation rates, and all 50 states agreed to adopt a standard method of calculating those rates by 2013. In 2010, Nebraska started tracking graduation using a 4-year cohort rather than all current year seniors.
69 Dropout rates do not combine with graduation rates to total 100 percent because they do not include students who take longer than four years to graduate or those who earn GED certificates.
71 A 100% graduation rate is unlikely, in part because of student mobility out of districts and state and because some special education students continue to receive educational services beyond four years of high school.
TABLE 8. GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduation Rate Lincoln</th>
<th>Graduation Rate Nebraska</th>
<th>Dropout Rate Lincoln</th>
<th>Dropout Rate Nebraska</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11*</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nebraska Department of Education, Nebraska State of the Schools Reports

*In 2010-11 Nebraska started tracking graduation as the 4-year graduation rate (graduating within 4 years of starting 9th grade).

One study estimated that the impact of halving the non-graduation rate in the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area would mean a collective $1.4 million in increased earnings in an average year and $1.8 million increase in the Gross Regional Product by mid-career. 73

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES BY STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

High school graduation rates vary based on certain student characteristics, such as income and race/ethnicity (Figure 44). **Low income students (i.e., those receiving free/reduced lunch) trail the district rate by 6 percentage points.** Since 2010, White students have exceeded the graduation rate by an average of 3%. Students of other racial and ethnic groups trail the overall graduation rate with Asian students trailing by an average of 1%, Black students by 10%, Hispanic/Latino students by 12%, and Native American students by 17%.

---

73 Alliance for Excellent Education (http://www.all4ed.org/publication_material/EconMSAcal). Calculated based on 2010 data for the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (Lancaster and Seward counties).
HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT RATES BY STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Like graduation rates, high school dropout rates also vary based on student race/ethnicity (Figure 45). Data about dropout rates for low income students (measured by receiving free/reduced lunch) was not available. Over the past several years, White and Asian students have a dropout rate lower than the district average, while Black, Hispanic/Latinos, and American Indian/Alaska Native students have dropout rates higher than the average.

FIGURE 44. GRADUATION RATE

Source: Nebraska Department of Education, Nebraska State of the Schools Reports

FIGURE 45. DROP-OUT RATE

Source: Lincoln Public Schools, District Annual Dropout Data
Note: Lincoln Public Schools calculates dropout rate slightly differently than does the Nebraska Department of Education
THREE OF FIVE LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS GRADUATES ENTER POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Over the past eight years, 62% of public high school graduates have enrolled in postsecondary institutions within immediately after high school (Figure 46). Most students attend public, in-state institutions. The persistence rate (to the second year of college) averages 86%, and graduation within six years has averaged 38%.

FIGURE 46. POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

![Postsecondary Enrollment By Institution Type](image)

Source: Lincoln Public Schools, National Student Clearinghouse

MOST OF LINCOLN’S 18 TO 24 YEAR OLDS ARE POST-SECONDARY STUDENTS

Lincoln is home to several post-secondary educational institutions, including the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Nebraska Wesleyan, Union College, Southeast Community College, and several private schools. Of persons 18 to 24 years of age, 61% are enrolled in college or graduate school. Among this age group, females have slightly higher participation in post-secondary enrollment (62% to male 59%). Enrollment rates in post-secondary education are fairly steady across race and ethnicity, with the Asian-alone population having a slightly higher participation rate in graduate or professional school.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT VARIES BY RACE FOR THOSE 25 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER

In Lincoln, 93% of the population over 25 years of age or older has a high school degree, comparing favorably to Nebraska (90%) and national (87%) rates. Likewise, Lincoln has a higher proportion of residents who have a bachelor’s degree or higher (36%), when compared to Nebraska (29%) or nationally (30%).

Educational attainment varies by race. The White-alone population has the lowest proportion of its population that has achieved, at most, a high school diploma or equivalency (Figure 47). The Black-alone population has the

---

74 U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
75 Data for educational attainment were only available for the race/ethnic categories reported. The Census Bureau did not have data, for example, for the Native American population. This is likely due the relatively small numbers
highest proportion of individuals who have some college, but did not complete a degree. The Asian-alone population has both a high proportion of individuals with less than a 9th grade education, as well as the highest proportion of individuals with graduate degrees. The Hispanic/Latino population has the highest proportion of individuals with less than a 9th grade education and with less than a high school diploma, and also has the smallest proportion of individuals having received a bachelor’s or graduate degree.

FIGURE 47. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY

![Educational Attainment By Race/Ethnicity]

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Note: Population is of those persons 25 years of age and older

of persons from certain racial/ethnic groups for which the Census would suppress the results so as not to risk individual identification.

76 Upon examining age data, the combination of the high proportion of Asian individuals with less than a 9th grade education, along with the high proportion of individuals with graduate degrees reflects a generational divide of older persons having achieved less education and younger achieving higher education.
It is widely known that Americans’ health status has declined. Measures of declining health status include: potential shorter life expectancy for today’s youth, behavioral risk factors as the leading cause of mortality (e.g., smoking, poor diet, physical inactivity), increasing rates of chronic disease, near epidemic rates of obesity, and rising health care costs. The health indicators in this section suggest that Lincoln is somewhat healthier than other communities in the United States. Although Lincoln has relatively better health, there is no denying that Lincoln and the United States have much ground to regain in reversing current poor health trends.

Adult Chronic Physical Health Risk Factors Are Better Than Those of U.S.

Of the ten leading causes of death in the United States, seven are chronic diseases, and almost half of all Americans live with at least one chronic illness. Underlying many chronic health conditions are risk factors such as tobacco use and exposure, physical inactivity, and poor nutrition. Engaging in healthy behaviors greatly reduces the risk for illness and death due to chronic diseases.

Since 2007, Lancaster County’s obesity rate has been lower than the national rate (Figure 48). Lancaster County’s rate for diabetes has fluctuated, but is generally lower than the national rate. Lancaster County’s physical inactivity rate has also been lower than national rate.

77 (Olshansky et al., 2005)
78 (Mokdad, Marks, Stroup, & Gerberding, 2004)
79 (Partnership to fight chronic disease, n.d.)
80 (Cutler, Glaeser, & Shapiro, 2003)
81 (Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 2011)
82 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011a)
83 Obesity is defined as having a Body Mass Index of 30 to 99.8 and is calculated based on responses to questions about height and weight. Lancaster County data comes from Lincoln Lancaster County Health Department and is from an over-sample of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention national sample for the Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance Survey. Over-sampled data is weighted in the same manner as the national data. National data come from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention national sample.
84 Diabetes rates are based on individual report that they have been diagnosed with diabetes. Lancaster County data comes from Lincoln Lancaster County Health Department and is from an over-sample of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention national sample for the Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance Survey. Over-sampled data is weighted in the same manner as the national data. National data come from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention national sample.
85 Physical inactivity is based on persons responding no to the question: "During the past month, other than your regular job, did you participate in any physical activities or exercises such as running, calisthenics, golf, gardening, or walking for exercise?" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.-b) Lancaster County and national data
**FIGURE 48. HEALTH RISK FACTORS**

*Significant changes to sampling occurred in 2011, and data from 2011 and later may not be comparable to data up to 2010.*

**Note:** Age adjusted data were used

**Source:** Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System: Lincoln Lancaster County Health Department and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

---

**LINCOLN’S RATE OF ACCIDENTAL DEATH IS LOWER THAN NEBRASKA OR U.S.**

Accidental deaths are those attributable to motor vehicle or farm accidents, falls, drowning, fire, discharge of firearms, inadvertent poisoning, or other causes. Over the years, **Lincoln has had a lower accidental death rate than Nebraska** as a whole (fluctuating from 4 percentage points lower than the State rate in 2008 to 16 percentage points lower in 2012. Over the years, most accidental deaths in Lincoln are attributable to **motor vehicle accidents, falls, and all other causes**) (Figure 49).

---

* are from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance Survey. Lincoln Lancaster County Health Department does not over-sample this item.
Figure 49. Accidental Death

Source: Compiled from Data from Vital Statistics, State of Nebraska

**Rate Sexually-Transmitted Diseases is Increasing in Lincoln**

There are national/local comparable data for two types of sexually transmitted diseases: chlamydia and gonorrhea. The rate of chlamydia has been increasing nationally and increasing, but at a lesser rate in Lincoln (Figure 50). The rate of gonorrhea has fluctuated nationally and locally with increases in Lincoln since 2010 (but not yet approaching a recent high in 2007). Researchers believe that changes in rates may be attributable to changes in screening, variability in the sensitivity of diagnostic tests, and changes in reporting practices.86,87

---

86 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011b, p. 1)
87 Health Indicators Warehouse, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (http://healthindicators.gov/Indicators/Gonorrhea-rate-per-100000_10062/Profile)
FIGURE 50. SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASE

![Differential in Sexually Transmitted Disease Rates](image1)

**Source:** Sexually Transmitted Diseases Surveillance, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

LINCOLN'S CHRONIC DISEASE MORTALITY IS LOWER THAN U.S.

Another measure of health is the number of individuals who die due to chronic diseases. Lancaster County trails the U.S. in death due to cancer, but rates have been increasing (Figure 51).

FIGURE 51. CANCER DEATHS

![Cancer Deaths Lancaster County and U.S.](image2)

**Source:** Health Indicators Warehouse, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Likewise, Lancaster County trails the U.S. in death due to heart disease (Figure 52).

**FIGURE 52. HEART DISEASE DEATHS**

![Heart Disease Deaths Graph]

Source: Health Indicators Warehouse, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Note: Age-adjusted data were used

Data (available only in multi-year aggregations) suggest that Lancaster County trails the U.S. in death due to diabetes mellitus (Figure 53).

**FIGURE 53. DIABETES DEATHS**

![Diabetes Mellitus Deaths Graph]

Source: Health Indicators Warehouse, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Note: Age-adjusted data were used

**YOUNGER EXPECTANT WOMEN ARE LESS LIKELY TO RECEIVE PRENATAL CARE**

Adequate prenatal care is an important component of healthy pregnancy. Mothers who do not receive prenatal care, or who do not receive it until the third trimester of pregnancy are more likely to have babies with health problems. Women under 20 and their babies have a higher risk for health problems; therefore, prenatal care for them in the first trimester is especially important. In Lincoln as across the U.S., women younger than 20 years of age are less likely to receive prenatal care in the first trimester of their pregnancies than are older women. The
percentage of women receiving care in the first trimester care has declined somewhat from highs around 2007-2008 (Figure 54). Because states use different standards for collecting this data, there are no comparable national data.

FIGURE 54. PRENATAL CARE BY AGE OF MOTHER

![Care in First Trimester by Age of Mother](source)

Source: Vital Statistics Report, Lincoln Lancaster County Health Department

**Lincoln Has a Lower Rate of Low Birth Weight Infants**

Children who are born at low birth weight (less than 5 lbs, 8 oz) have an increased risk of long-term disability and impaired development. Low birth weight may indicate inadequate prenatal care. **Lincoln has a lower percentage of low birth weight infants than does the U.S.** (Figure 55).

FIGURE 55. LOW BIRTH WEIGHT INFANTS

![Percentage of Low Birth Weight Infants](source)

Source: Health Indicators Warehouse, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
THE PERCENTAGE OF BIRTHS TO LINCOLN TEEN MOTHERS IS EQUIVALENT TO NATIONAL RATES

Teenage girls who give birth are more likely to drop out of high school and more likely to be in poverty. Research suggests that children born to teen mothers are more likely to be low birth weight, have long-term health problems and have worse educational outcomes; however these issues may be more likely the result of socio-economic (e.g., poverty) and cultural issues rather than the physical fact of young motherhood. In Lincoln the rate of births to teen mothers (aged 15 to 19 years of age) has fluctuated, some years much higher than the national rate and other years much lower (Figure 56). Lincoln’s average rate is about equivalent to the national rate: Lincoln has an average of 25 births per 1,000 women, since 2005 and the national rate has been 26 births per 1,000 women.

FIGURE 56. BIRTHS TO TEEN MOTHERS

![Births to Teen Mothers](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Note: “Teen mothers” are all childbearing women aged 15 to 19

RESIDENTS REPORT FEWER POOR MENTAL HEALTH DAYS THAN NATIONALLY

It is well known that mental health is a key component of overall well-being. Mental illness is the leading cause of disability in the United States. Nationally, between 5 to 7 percent of adults experience a serious mental illness (e.g., schizophrenia, manic-depressive illness, and severe depressive disorders). In Lancaster County, residents report experiencing fewer poor mental health days in a month than U.S. residents do (Figure 57).

---

88 (Geronimus & Korenman, 1993)
89 (Wang, Demler, & Kessler, 2002)
Mental Health and Substance Abuse Crisis Services Utilization Is Declining

Persons with severe mental illness comprise a significant percentage of the homeless, incarcerated, and unemployed populations. There is little information about the prevalence of severe and persistent mental illness and substance abuse in Lincoln. A recent study of Nebraska’s behavioral health and criminal justice populations found that over a five year period, 33% of those in the Department of Correctional Services were also receiving services through the publicly-funded behavioral health system and that 50% of the publicly-funded behavioral health consumers have had involvement with the county/city jail system. In Lincoln, a wide array of agencies provides to persons needing crisis services.

Focusing on the use of crisis-related services is one way to evaluate the strength of a behavioral health system. Declining use of Lancaster County Mental Health Crisis Center services likely signals improved services and coordination among a multitude of organizations rather than a declining need for services.

Admissions to the Lancaster County Mental Health Crisis Center Are Declining

The Lancaster County Mental Health Crisis Center provides crisis services to adults who present a danger to themselves or others and are too ill to voluntarily seek treatment. Admissions have been on a downward trend since 2005-06 (Figure 58). Likewise, the numbers of repeat admissions within one year to the Mental Health Crisis Center have declined from a high of 117 (2005-06) to 62 (2013-14, the most recent year available).

---

90 (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2006)
91 (James & Glaze, 2006)
92 (Dooley, Fielding, & Levi, 1996)
93 (Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, 2011)
POST-COMMITMENT DAYS SPENT AT THE LANCASTER COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS CENTER ARE GRADUALLY INCREASING

In some cases, individuals move from the Lancaster County Crisis Center to the Lincoln Regional Center. Because of capacity constraints, individuals are not always able transfer to the Regional Center when they are approved. Post-commitment days are those days spent at the Lancaster County Crisis Center prior to transfer to the Regional Center for treatment. Post-commitment days declined from 2006-07 to 2007-08 as more beds were added at the Regional Center (Figure 59). Since then, post-commitment days have been gradually increasing. Data from 2013-14 is not comparable to prior years.
YOUTH PHYSICAL HEALTH IS BEGINNING TO BE MEASURED IN LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In 2012, Lincoln Public Schools began tracking the physical health of public elementary and middle school students using measures of obesity (i.e., Body Mass Index) and cardiovascular fitness proficiency (Lincoln Public Schools Fitness Report). Approximately **two-thirds of elementary and middle school students are normal weight** and **one-third are overweight or obese**. Approximately **two-thirds of elementary and middle school students are proficient in cardiovascular fitness**, and **one-third of students are not proficient**. Lincoln Public Schools reports that cardiovascular fitness, but not obesity predicted performance on the Nebraska State Accountability tests for reading and math.

YOUTH DRUG AND ALCOHOL USE RATES ARE LOWER THAN U.S. RATES

Illicit drug and alcohol use by youth increases their risk for injury, violence, HIV infection, and other diseases and has a negative association with academic achievement. Since 2003, Lincoln has seen a **42% decline in alcohol use and a 30% decline in cigarette use**, while also having a **23% increase in marijuana use**. Approximately one-fourth of all high school students in Lancaster County used alcohol during a 30 day period (2013), 13% used cigarettes, and 16% used marijuana. These rates are lower than national rates: 35% alcohol, 16% cigarettes, 23% marijuana.

94 Approximately 3% of Lincoln elementary and middle school students are underweight.
95 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012).
96 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.-a).
SAFETY

Researchers from San Francisco State University found that people decide where to live based on whether the community offers opportunities to satisfy basic needs: first safety (93%), followed by factors such as jobs (83%), and housing (83%). People want to live in communities where they feel physically free from harm. Harm may occur through intentional victimization, as well as through accidents and health crises. In the United States, victimization rates since the early 1990s have declined. Urbanized areas now have lower overall injury-related mortality rates among all age groups than do more rural areas.

Although people in Lincoln do come to harm, on the whole, Lincoln is a safe place to live. Lincoln has less crime than other similarly-sized communities. Persons living in Lincoln report feeling safe most or all of the time, traffic crash injuries are decreasing, and medical and fire services are effective. However, Lincoln has a much higher percentage of children who have been removed from their homes for their safety, for reasons such as neglect, parental drug use, and substandard/unsafe housing.

LINCOLN’S CRIME RATE IS LOW

PROPERTY CRIME, VIOLENT CRIME, AND OVERALL CRIME RATE

Lincoln’s overall crime rate continues to decrease (Figure 60). In Lincoln, property crimes comprise most reported offenses. Lincoln’s property crime rate has consistently trailed the rates of other cities across the United States with populations between 250,000 to 500,000 persons (Figure 61). From 2005 to 2011, Lincoln’s property crime rate dropped from 96% of the property crime rate of other comparably-sized cities to 86%. Burglary comprises only a small portion of property crimes, but is a good indicator of the overall trend in property crimes. The City of Lincoln has maintained its new goal of having fewer than 755 burglaries per 100,000 persons.

The lowest rate of crime in Lincoln is for violent crime and it has declined 32% since 2005 (from 547 offenses per 100,000 persons in 2005 to 370 offenses per 100,000 persons in 2013). Since 2005, Lincoln’s violent crime rate has averaged 54% of the violent crime rate of other comparably-sized cities. The City of Lincoln has maintained its goal of having fewer than 555 violent crimes per 100,000 persons.

---

97 (Citro & Michael, 1995).
98 (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2013)
99 (Myers et al., 2011)
FIGURE 60. CRIME RATE

![Crime Rate Graph]

Source: FBI Uniform Crime Reports; and Nebraska Crime Commission Annual Domestic Violence Reports

FIGURE 61. CRIME RATE COMPARED TO OTHER CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OF 250,000 - 500,000

![Crime Rate Comparison Graph]

Source: FBI Uniform Crime Reports
DOMESTIC AND CHILD VIOLENCE

Lancaster County’s rates of child abuse and neglect investigations vary from year to year, but have been fairly stable since 2005, as have rates of child sexual assault investigations. Rates of domestic assault investigations also vary from year to year, but overall have increased 36% since 2009 (Figure 62). Domestic violence protection order requests have been stable since 2007.

FIGURE 62. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

RESIDENTS FEEL SAFE

People in Lincoln report feeling safe. The Lincoln Police Department, through a contract with Gallup, surveys all individuals who have contact with city police officers. Since 2000, approximately 75-85% of respondents have indicated that they feel safe and secure either always or most of the time (Figure 63). Of that group, there has been a steady increase in the percentage of individuals who say they always feel safe and secure (from 29% in 2000 to 46% in 2013). The high percentage of feelings of safety and security among this population are particularly interesting since the group includes individuals who have had contact with the police department as the result of victimization. A random survey of Lincoln residents found similar results: the majority of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with their neighborhood safety and security (89% in 2010; 75% in 2012).

---

100 Data for domestic violence offenses are not available for only the City of Lincoln; therefore Lancaster County data are used.
101 The item was asked as a part of the Taking Charge survey conducted by the University of Nebraska Public Policy Center on behalf of the City of Lincoln. In 2010 the survey was offered as a phone survey and in 2012 the survey was mailed.
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE TRAILS CITY GOALS, BUT PROPERTY VALUE SAVED IS HIGH

Lincoln Fire and Rescue responds to medical emergencies with Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs). The City of Lincoln’s goal is to achieve on-scene presence of an EMT in less than 4 minutes for 90% of life threatening medical calls. The actual response rates have trailed the goal by an average of 7% for the past eight years. According to city officials, the city has been lagging in its goal because the city has been expanding through annexation and there are now housing developments that are not near existing fire stations.

Lincoln Fire and Rescue track the percentage of total property value they save. Over the past ten years, Lincoln Fire and Rescue saved 97% of property value. The only single year this percentage dropped below 97% was in 2011, the year the Lincoln Public Schools’ District office was destroyed by fire. In this year, Lincoln Fire and Rescue saved 89% of property value.

TRAFFIC INJURY RATES ARE DECLINING

The rate of traffic crash-related injuries has steadily declined since 2000, from 988 to 697 injuries per 100,000 persons (Figure 64). Since 2004, the rate has not exceeded the City of Lincoln’s goal of fewer than 850 injuries per 100,000 persons.
LINCOLN’S JUVENILE ARRESTS ARE LOWER THAN NATIONAL RATES

Similar to the overall crime rate, property crimes have been decreasing in recent years, locally and nationally. In Lancaster County, most juvenile arrests are for property crimes, and these have been 1% to 23% lower than the national rates (Figure 65). Similarly, Lincoln’s juvenile violent crime arrest rates have been lower than the national rate over the past eight years by 61% to 89%, as have the juvenile drug arrest rate (26% to 43% lower than the national rate).

FIGURE 65. JUVENILE ARREST RATES

---

103 Although juvenile arrest rates may largely reflect juvenile behavior, many other factors can affect the magnitude of these rates, such as the attitudes of citizens toward crime, the policies of local law enforcement agencies, and the policies of other components of the justice system.
THE RATE OF STUDENTS CARRYING WEAPONS IS SLIGHTLY LOWER THAN NEBRASKA OR NATIONAL RATES

One measure of school safety is student self-report of carrying a weapon to school. Since 1999, the percentage of Lancaster County students reporting they carried a weapon (such as a gun, knife, or club) to school has been fairly stable, averaging approximately 14%. This percentage is two percentage points lower than the Nebraska average and typically 3 percentage points lower than the national average.\(^{104}\)

THE PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT HAS DROPPED, BUT STILL EXCEEDS THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

“Even after considering background characteristics, poverty level, prior achievement and school effects, students who ever spent time in foster care—regardless of timing of entry, duration in care, or any other specification of that experience—have lower educational outcomes than their peers.” \(^{105}\)

Nebraska’s child protective custody system has been widely criticized for the high percentages of children that are placed in out-of-home care (such as foster care). In Lancaster County, there continues to be a higher percentage of children in foster care than there are nationally (Figure 66).\(^{106,107}\) Although the percentage of children in out-of-home placement (on a given day through a point in time count) is a relatively small percentage of the population of children in Lincoln, the percentage does represent almost 500 children on a given day (in 2013, 527 Lincoln children were in out-of-home placements). In 2013, the most common reasons children were placed in out-of-home care were:\(^{108}\)

- Neglect (failure to provide for a child’s basic physical, medical, educational, and/or emotional needs): 67%
- Parental substance abuse: 45%
- Substandard housing: 29%
- Children’s behavioral issue (often a symptom of the child’s mental health): 17%
- Parental incarceration: 15%
- Parental alcohol use: 15%
- Parent mental health diagnosis: 14%
- Physical abuse: 14%
- Abandonment by the parent: 11%
- Abuse/neglect of sibling: 9%
- Sexual abuse: 7%
- Child’s mental health: 6%

---

\(^{104}\) Sources: Nebraska Youth Risk Behavioral Survey – Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department; Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

\(^{105}\) (Lesnick, et al., 2010, p. 27)

\(^{106}\) All data is point-in-time. Lancaster County data 2006 through 2009 for December 30; 2011 and later for June 30. National data is for September 30 of each year.

\(^{107}\) These figures exclude children who are removed from homes due to juvenile justice interventions.

\(^{108}\) Figures do not total to 100% since children may be removed from the parental home for multiple reasons.
FIGURE 66. CHILDREN IN OUT OF HOME PLACEMENTS

Children in Out-of-Home Placements
(Point in Time)
Lancaster County and U.S.

Sources: The Nebraska Foster Care Review Office Annual Report (Issue date: December 1, 2014)
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND CULTURE

A vibrant community has residents that volunteer, vote, promote social causes, donate to charitable organizations, support the arts, and otherwise participate in creating a sense of place. Lincoln prides itself as being a place where neighbors look out for each other, where there are increasing cultural opportunities, and where people care about strengthening and enhancing our community’s amenities. Community involvement can be a difficult concept to measure since it can mean different things to different people and because some of the “connectedness” can be difficult to quantify. The measures we’ve selected each tap some component of involvement.

Our results suggest, perhaps counter to community perceptions, that Lincoln looks very much like the rest of the country in terms of voting and charitable giving. Per capita, arts organization revenues are on the lower end when compared to peer communities. Lincoln has somewhat greater numbers of charitable and cultural non-profit organizations, but support for these institutions lags. Nebraskans volunteer at greater rates than residents of other states; however, data is not available to evaluate whether this is true for Lincoln at the city or county level.

VOTER TURNOUT IS AVERAGE

Over the past 40 years the percentage of persons who vote in elections has steadily declined nationally, with voters typically being older, more affluent, better educated, and White. Voter turnout is usually higher in years of presidential elections. In Lancaster County, residents vote at about the same rate as the rest of Nebraska and the nation. Lancaster County voters follow the expected pattern of greater turnout in presidential election years (approximately 60% of the 18 and older population) and lesser in non-presidential election years (approximately 40% of the 18 and older population).

VOLUNTEERING IN NEBRASKA IS COMPARATIVELY HIGH, BUT DECLINING

Data on volunteering is only available at the state level. Nebraska ranks as the sixth highest for rate of volunteering of the 50 states and Washington DC. Even though rural individuals tend to volunteer at a higher rate than either suburban or urban individuals, Nebraska exceeds the national averages when accounting for place of residence (Figure 67). In 2013, Nebraskans contributed approximately 58.5 million hours of service. Like the rest of the nation, approximately one-third of volunteer hours were committed to religious organizations, followed by educational and social service organizations.109

109 http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/NE
INDIVIDUAL CHARITABLE GIVING IS AVERAGE, BUT HAS DECLINED

Two measures of charitable giving are individual giving and organizational charitable giving through foundations. Related to individual giving, the average household in Lincoln contributes about 3.3% of income to charitable organizations.\textsuperscript{110} This is equivalent to giving in Nebraska (3.3%) and nationally (3.0%). Charitable giving has declined since 2008 when giving rates were 4.3% in Lincoln, 4.1% in Nebraska, and 4.7% nationally.

LINCOLN HAS COMPARATIVELY LARGE GIVING BY CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

When compared to its peer communities,\textsuperscript{111} Lincoln foundations grant a comparatively large amount annually (Figure 68).

\begin{footnotes}
\item[110] Includes households with incomes of $50,000 and greater. National Center for Charitable Statistics (most recent data available is 2012).
\item[111] Peer and aspirational communities used in this study are those identified in the 2013 Lincoln Economic Dashboard created by the Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development. The communities presented in this comparison were based on availability of information. The peer communities in this comparison are: Minnehaha County, SD (Sioux Falls) and Shawnee County, KS (Topeka). The aspirational communities in this comparison are: Dane County, WI (Madison); El Paso County, CO (Colorado Springs); and Travis County, TX (Austin).
\end{footnotes}
Compared to peer communities, Lincoln has a large number of small private foundations that report disbursing $500,000 or less annually (Figure 69). Lincoln, and all but two peer communities, has no foundation giving $5 million or more annually.  

---

112 Data do not include charitable foundations that primarily direct giving to a single organization, such as the University of Nebraska Foundation.

113 Compiled from FoundationSearch
LINCOLN HAS MANY ARTS AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS BUT LAGS IN SUPPORTING THEM

Communities where people want to live have flourishing arts and cultural programs. At approximately 23 arts organizations per 100,000 population, Lincoln has a relatively large number of non-profit arts organizations when compared to its selected peer and aspirational communities (Figure 70). Only Madison, Wisconsin has a greater number at 26.

FIGURE 70. ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

The annual revenues generated by arts and cultural organizations are a proxy for community support of these organizations and for the overall cultural life of a community. Lincoln lags in per capita support of these organizations (Figure 71). In Lincoln, per capita expenditures toward non-profit arts is $85 annually, which is surpassed by Austin, Texas ($102), Sioux Falls, SD ($102), and Madison, Wisconsin ($160).
FIGURE 71. ARTS ORGANIZATION REVENUES

Per Capita Non-profit Arts, Culture, and Humanities Revenues

Source: Compiled from the National Arts Index
WHERE TO GO FROM HERE: USING THIS REPORT

Data are not enough. There is no super metropolitan computer that can take in information about every metropolis and mechanically spit out the right vision for each community. Once the data are gathered, leaders and stakeholders need to bring all their collective experience and intuition to bear in analyzing and assessing them.\textsuperscript{114}

Bruce Katz & Jennifer Bradley
Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program

How this report is used will depend on the people or combinations of people who decide to take action. Conversation, connection, and collaboration are needed. The ultimate message to those who call Lincoln home is: Be Informed. Get Involved.

How and where does a community start? Knowing what we know, we must plan for what is coming.
How will we continue to nurture the things we are doing exceptionally well?
How will we address the growing proportion of Lincoln’s population that faces real need?
How will we ensure that all Lincoln’s children become productive, engaged citizens?

How will the community create impact?\textsuperscript{115}
• Identify needs
• Convene doers
• Catalyze solutions
• Leverage resources
• Learn what works
• Share knowledge

It is clear that major initiatives and complex issues will require collaboration among all sectors of our community: businesses, families and individuals, non-profit organizations, neighborhoods, philanthropies, government, and private organizations. The question is not whether there are leaders, but whether leaders will work together to drive change to achieve a vision that matters. Outlined are essential steps to achieve change.\textsuperscript{116}

1. Common Agenda: all participants have a shared vision for change including a common understanding and a joint approach to addressing it through agreed upon actions.
2. Shared Measurement: collecting data and measuring results consistently ensures efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.

\textsuperscript{114} (Katz & Bradley, 2013, pp. 196-197)
\textsuperscript{115} Adapted from Michigan Foundations’ model for creating impact
\textsuperscript{116} Adapted from FSG research on collective impact
(http://www.fsg.org/OurApproach/WhatsCollectiveImpact.aspx)
3. **Mutually Reinforcing Activities**: activities must be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.

4. **Continuous Communications**: consistent and open communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives and appreciate common motivation.
Be Informed. Get Involved.

Visit the Lincoln Vital Signs website: lincolnvitalsigns.org

You’ll find:

- Latest information about the Lincoln Vital Signs project
- Downloadable copies of the full report and executive summary
- Links to relevant data
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APPENDIX

DATA SOURCES

Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) Annual Reports
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families
The Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) collects case-level information from state and tribal title IV-E agencies on all children in foster care and those who have been adopted with title IV-E agency involvement. Title IV-E agencies are required to submit AFCARS data twice a year.

American Chamber of Commerce Research Association (ACCRA) Cost of Living Index (COLI)
Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER)
http://www.coli.org/
Since 1968, the Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER) has collected and published cost of living data comparing city-to-city key consumer costs. However, the voluntary nature of the index means that not every area is covered. The Cost of Living Index is referenced in the U.S. Census Bureau's Statistical Abstract of the U.S. The index is cross-sectional in nature; the overall U.S. average is indexed to 100, and the individual area prices are expressed relative to the U.S. average. The data are reported quarterly.

American Community Survey
United States Census Bureau
http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
The American Community Survey (ACS) is a relatively new survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. It uses a series of monthly samples to produce annually updated data for the same small areas (census tracts and block groups) formerly surveyed via the decennial census long-form sample. Initially, 5 years of samples will be required to produce these small-area data. Once the Census Bureau has collected 5 years of data, new small-area data will be produced annually. The Census Bureau also will produce 3-year and 1-year data products for larger geographic areas. The ACS includes people living in both housing units (HUs) and group quarters (GQs). The ACS is conducted throughout the United States and in Puerto Rico.

Annual Domestic Violence Reports
Nebraska Crime Commission
http://www.ncc.ne.gov/documents/stats_report_and_research.htm#Domestic_Assault_Series
Data is reported by all local jurisdictions and compiled by the Nebraska Crime Commission on an annual basis. Data collection began in 1999.

Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/atlas/countydata/County_Methods.html#Data_Sources_and_Methodology_for
The BRFSS is an ongoing, monthly, state-based telephone survey of the adult population. The survey provides state-specific information on behavioral risk factors and preventive health practices. Major changes to BRFSS survey methods began in 2011, meaning that comparison of data prior to 2011 to that after 2011 is not recommended.
Consolidated Federal Funds Reports
U.S. Census Bureau
http://www.census.gov/govs/cffr/
The Consolidated Federal Funds Reports were summarized federal government expenditures (or obligations) in state, county, and subcounty areas of the United States, including the District of Columbia and U.S. Outlying Areas. Data was collected from federal departments and agencies and consolidated and tabulated in a standard format by the U.S. Census Bureau, under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Funding for the Consolidated Federal Funds Reports was terminated in 2011.

Crime in the United States
FBI Uniform Crime Reports
http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr-publications#Crime
Crime in the United States is an annual publication in which the FBI compiles the volume and rate of violent and property crime offenses for the nation and by state. Individual law enforcement agency data are also provided for those contributors supplying 12 months complete offense data. This report also includes arrest, clearance, and law enforcement employee data. Use the new online UCR Data Tool to research crime statistics for the nation, by state, and by individual law enforcement agency.

Decennial Survey
United States Census Bureau
http://www.census.gov/2010census/
The U.S. Census counts every resident in the United States. It is mandated by Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution and takes place every 10 years. The data collected by the decennial census determine the number of seats each state has in the U.S. House of Representatives and is also used to distribute billions in federal funds to local communities. The 2010 Census represented the most massive participation movement ever witnessed in our country. Approximately 74 percent of the households returned their census forms by mail; the remaining households were counted by census workers walking neighborhoods throughout the United States. National and state population totals from the 2010 Census were released on December 21, 2010.

FoundationSearch
FoundationSearch.com
FoundationSearch is an online database of over 100,000 US foundations. Data on more than 6.2 million grants are entered from IRS information returns.

Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index®
Gallup
http://www.well-beingindex.com/methodology.asp
Through phone surveys, individuals are asked questions in six domains: Life Evaluation (present and future), Emotional Health (daily feelings), Physical Health (health experiences), Healthy Behavior (life style habits), Work Environment (job-related feelings and perceptions), and Basic Access (access to food, shelter, healthcare, and other basic needs).

Lincoln/Lancaster County Youth Risk Behavioral Survey (Lincoln/Lancaster YRBS)
Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department
http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/health/data/epi/rptindx.htm
The Youth Risk Behavior Survey measures the prevalence of health-risk behaviors among adolescents through representative national, state, and local surveys conducted biennially. Data is available from surveys conducted in 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2011, and 2013. The national and state surveys use multi-stage cluster sampling to obtain samples of students in grades 9-12 reflecting the geographic, urban-rural, racial, gender, and grade makeup of the population in those grade levels. In Lancaster County, the survey is conducted in all high schools, in randomly selected classrooms of a required period (second or English period). Parental consent was required beginning in 1997. In the Lancaster County Oversample all public schools (urban and rural) have participated every survey year since 2005. The number of respondents has ranged from 1,095 in 2001 to 444 in 2007 to 1,145 in 2013. The numbers of respondents fluctuates from year to year due to the mix of schools and number of students with parental consent to participate. This disrupted the results to some degree, but was carefully considered in the survey sample and analysis of data. The survey methodology has varied. In the most recent year of the survey (2013), surveys were completed by 1,145 public high school students in Lancaster County and weighted to represent all county students.

Health Indicators Warehouse
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
http://www.healthindicators.gov/

The Health Indicators Warehouse (HIW) is the data hub of a collaborative effort among government and non-government partners to establish a network of suppliers and demanders of community health data, indicators, and interventions. Its purpose is to help Americans understand health and health care system performance in their communities, thereby sparking and facilitating action to improve performance and value.

How America Gives
Chronicle of Philanthropy

Data come from a comprehensive study The Chronicle of Philanthropy conducted to examine giving data by ZIP code and by income level in every city and town in the United States. The study is based on exact dollar amounts released by the Internal Revenue Service showing the value of charitable deductions claimed by American taxpayers. It is not based on extrapolations from spot surveys or statistical models. Comparing levels of giving is always a challenge in part because the cost of living varies greatly across America. To provide a fair analysis, The Chronicle’s rankings show the percentage of their income that households donated from the money they had left after paying their taxes and covering housing, food, and other essential expenses. The Chronicle obtained comprehensive tax records from the IRS for 2008, the most recent year for which such data are available, to examine income levels and the sums claimed in charitable contributions for taxpayers in each ZIP code. The IRS releases total amounts donated, but to protect privacy, the agency does not provide data about the specific charities people supported. Because of discrepancies in the data for people with income below $50,000, The Chronicle’s study includes only taxpayers who reported incomes of $50,000 or more. Readers can use the online edition of this report to find detailed breakdowns, by income level, showing the percentage of income donated by people in various income brackets for each ZIP code.

Lincoln Economic Dashboard
Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development

The Lincoln Economic Dashboard is a joint effort of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Bureau of Business Research, the Board of Directors of the Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development, and the Lincoln
Partnership for Economic Development Steering Committee. The Dashboard collects and presents data to measure Lincoln’s economic performance in comparison to other communities.

**Lincoln Homeless Point in Time Report**

**University of Nebraska-Lincoln Center on Children, Families and the Law**


The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development requires each Continuum of Care to conduct an unduplicated point-in-time count of all persons who are homeless. Since 2006 the Lincoln Homeless Coalition has conducted the unduplicated count through the Community Services Management Information System (CS-MIS) at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln Center on Children, Families, and the Law. CS-MIS counts the number of homeless persons sheltered in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs, and domestic violence shelters provide aggregate counts of unduplicated persons in their shelters. These persons represent the sheltered homeless counts. A street count (unsheltered persons) is conducted by the Lincoln Police Department, Matt Talbot Kitchen and Outreach, Cedars Street Outreach and U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Street count information is then cross referenced with CS-MIS sheltered information to remove duplicates identified in the street count from those identified as sheltered in the CS-MIS count.

**Lincoln Police Department Quality Service Audit**

**City of Lincoln Police Department**

Phone survey conducted by Gallup with people who had contact with a police officer (such as crime victims and people who received traffic tickets), but not arrested for a crime.

**Lincoln Public Schools Fitness Report**

**Lincoln Public Schools**

In 2012, Lincoln Public Schools began collecting data about elementary and middle school student physical fitness. Two dimensions of fitness are measured: cardio-vascular fitness and obesity. All students in grades 3 through 8 take the cardiovascular fitness test unless they have a physical disability or other compelling reason to not participate. Cardio-vascular health is measured using Progressive Aerobic Cardiovascular Endurance Run (PACER), a nationally standardized measure of aerobic fitness. Obesity is measured based on Body Mass Index calculations.

**Lincoln Public Schools Special Education Statistical Handbook**

**Lincoln Public Schools**


Lincoln Public Schools Special Education Student Information System (SESIS) data is collected from students’ Individual Education Program forms. Lincoln Public Schools reports data to the Nebraska Department of Education for the annual chidcount.

**Lincoln Public Schools Statistical Handbooks**

**Lincoln Public Schools**


The Annual Statistical Handbook contains basic statistical information about Lincoln Public Schools. It is intended to provide the user with current information about public education in the community of Lincoln, Nebraska.
Local Area Unemployment Statistics
Bureau of Labor Statistics
http://www.bls.gov/lau/
The Local Area Unemployment Statistics program is a Federal-State cooperative effort that produces monthly estimates of total employment and unemployment. These estimates are key indicators of local economic conditions. The concepts and definitions underlying LAUS data come from the Current Population Survey (CPS), the household survey that is the official measure of the labor force for the nation. State monthly model estimates are controlled in "real time" to sum to national monthly labor force estimates from the CPS. These models combine current and historical data from the CPS, the Current Employment Statistics (CES) program, and State unemployment insurance (UI) systems. Estimates for seven large areas and their respective balances of State are also model-based. Estimates for the remainder of the substate labor market areas are produced through a building-block approach known as the "Handbook method." This procedure also uses data from several sources, including the CPS, the CES program, State UI systems, and the decennial census, to create estimates that are adjusted to the statewide measures of employment and unemployment. Below the labor market area level, estimates are prepared using disaggregation techniques based on inputs from the decennial census, annual population estimates, and current UI data.

National Arts Index
Americans for the Arts
http://www.artsusa.org/information_services/arts_index/001.asp
The National Arts Index, created by Americans for the Arts, distills the health and vitality of arts in the U.S. It is composed of 83 equal-weighted, national-level indicators of arts and culture activity that covers a 13-year period, from 1998 to 2010. Each indicator is updated annually and a new report is produced.

National Center for Charitable Statistics
Urban Institute
http://nccsdataweb.urban.org
NCCS derives its data files primarily from information that tax-exempt nonprofit organizations file with the Internal Revenue Service. IRS databases offer the most comprehensive standardized data on tax-exempt organizations. NCCS employs a range of data checking procedures, but not systematic in-depth verification of every record.

National Center for Juvenile Justice
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime
Collects and presents information about juvenile participation in the justice system.

Nebraska Foster Care Review Office Annual Reports
http://www.fcro.nebraska.gov/annualreports.html
These are annual reports by the Nebraska Foster Care Review Office that summarize data about Nebraska children who are in out of home placement in Nebraska.

Nebraska General Election Official Results
Nebraska Secretary of State
http://www.sos.ne.gov/elec/prev_elec/
The Secretary of State collects and reports on election related data including election results, voter registration figures, and voter turnout.

Nebraska Metro Poll
Perceptions of Community, Personal Well-Being, and Outlook on the Future
Center for Public Affairs Research, University of Nebraska at Omaha
The random survey poses questions pertaining to aspects of community, well-being, and future outlook.

Nebraska Youth Risk Behavioral Survey (Nebraska YRBS)
Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services
http://bosr.unl.edu/wwwfiles/SHARP/2010NEH%20Questionnaire%20YRBS%20FINAL.pdf
The survey administered in Nebraska was designed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and matches surveys used in other states. The CDC selects a sample for Nebraska using a two-stage cluster sampling design. In the first stage, a random sample of public high schools was selected with probability proportionate to school enrollment. Schools were then recruited to participate. In the second stage, within each of the participating schools, a random sample of classrooms was selected and all students in those classes were targeted for participation. Upon agreeing to participate, schools are supported by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Bureau of Sociological Research (BOSR). BOSR assists the school in selecting an administration date, sends the school the surveys and instructions for administration, receives surveys back from the schools, and sends them to the CDC. The CDC weights the surveys to represent all public high school students in Nebraska.

Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates
Bureau of Labor Statistics
http://www.bls.gov/oes/oes_data.htm
The Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) program produces employment and wage estimates annually for over 800 occupations. These estimates are available for the nation as a whole, for individual States, and for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas; national occupational estimates for specific industries are also available.

Sexually Transmitted Diseases Surveillance
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats11/default.htm
Annual reports present surveillance information derived from the official statistics for the reported occurrence of nationally notifiable sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) in the United States, test positivity and prevalence data from numerous prevalence monitoring initiatives, sentinel surveillance, and national health care services surveys.

Statistical Briefing Book
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/
The OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book (SBB) is an online information source via OJJDP’s Website. Developed for OJJDP by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, the SBB presents information about juvenile crime and victimization and about youth involved in the juvenile justice system.
Statistics & Facts About Nebraska Schools Reports
Nebraska Department of Education
http://drs.education.ne.gov/quickfacts/Pages/DistrictandSchoolInformation.aspx
This is a series of reports that were included in a publication called Statistics and Facts About Nebraska Schools. The reports include state-level reports, district and school level reports for public districts, nonpublic systems and State Operated systems (Special Purpose Schools). Most of the reports relate to the Fall Membership (student counts as of the last Friday in September, Nebraska’s official counting day). Other reports include School District Census by County, and Full-Time Equivalency (F.T.E) of Certificated Personnel by Assignment and Gender.

Survey of Lincoln Area Businesses about Skill and Training Requirements
Bureau of Business Research, College of Business Administration
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
This report discusses the results from a survey of employers in the Lincoln Metropolitan Area, including the types of occupations Lincoln area employers are searching for and hiring, and the types of difficulties employers face when hiring. The survey also asks about the types of training which employers provide.

United States Elections Project
George Mason University
http://elections.gmu.edu/voter_turnout.htm
Summary of national and state turnout rates for the eligible population from 1980-2012.

Volunteering and Civic Life in America
Corporation for National and Community Service
http://www.nationalservice.gov/impact-our-nation/research-and-reports/volunteering-america
Volunteering and Civic Life in America is a report issued by the Corporation for National and Community Service in partnership with the National Conference on Citizenship. The data for the report was collected through two supplements to the Current Population Survey (CPS): the Volunteer Supplement and the Civic Engagement Supplement. The CPS is a monthly survey of about 60,000 households (approximately 100,000 adults), conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau on behalf of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data are collected on the volunteering, voting, and civic activities of adults age 16 and older for the volunteer supplement and adults 18 and older for the civic supplement. Volunteers are considered individuals who performed unpaid volunteer activities through or for an organization at any point during the 12-month period (from September 1st of the prior year through the survey week in September of the survey year).

Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/index.htm
The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), established in 1991, monitors six categories of priority health-risk behaviors among youths and young adults: 1) behaviors that contribute to unintentional injuries and violence; 2) sexual behaviors that contribute to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection, other sexually transmitted diseases, and unintended pregnancy; 3) tobacco use; 4) alcohol and other drug use; 5) unhealthy dietary behaviors; and 6) physical inactivity. In addition, YRBSS monitors the prevalence of obesity and asthma among this population. YRBSS data are obtained from multiple sources including a national school-based survey conducted by CDC as well as school based state, territorial, tribal, and large urban school district surveys.
conducted by education and health agencies. These surveys have been conducted biennially since 1991 and include representative samples of students in grades 9–12.
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