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About Vision for Children at Risk

At Vision for Children at Risk, our focus is on reducing the wide disparities that exist in the well-being of children across the St. Louis region related to poverty and racial inequity, as illustrated in this report. We work to mobilize community action to help overcome these disparities, so the fundamental needs of all St. Louis-area children will be met. We work at the systems level, building collaboration and targeting strategic action. We do this by:

**Informing the community with data and policy information.**
- We track more than 40 key indicators of child well-being in the St. Louis metropolitan area at the ZIP code level. Data is disseminated to the community through this report and on the Vision for Children at Risk website, www.visionforchildren.org. This data calls attention to children’s needs, disparities and inequities, and provides a basis for planning initiatives that strategically target these needs. In addition, Vision for Children at Risk regularly shares information on trends and best practices in child advocacy and stimulates discussion through community forums, webinars and our website.

**Building and driving collaboration and strategic action for children.**
- Vision for Children at Risk builds and facilitates coalitions dedicated to improving child well-being and engages community members in activities promoting healthy children and strong families. Among the collaborative initiatives we support are the St. Louis Regional Early Childhood Council, building a regional system for early childhood development; the St. Louis Child Abuse & Neglect Network, working to prevent child abuse and provide safe, permanent homes for children; and Project LAUNCH, improving health and mental health services to children ages 0-8. In addition, we hold periodic Children’s Summit conferences to focus action and interest on aspects of child well-being. VCR has long-served as an incubator to support strategic initiatives to address newly emerging needs of children, youth and families.

**Advocating for investments and policies that support children and families.**
- The overall well-being of the St. Louis community is linked directly to how well children and families fare. By promoting the well-being of children, youth and families, St. Louis can reverse the negative trends of recent decades related to the region’s lagging population growth and economic development. A rising tide lifts all ships.

Vision for Children at Risk’s advocacy and investment strategies are carried out on a variety of tracks. Legislative advocacy has been pursued through our successful efforts over many years to establish the Missouri Children’s Leadership Council – soon to be renamed Kids Win Missouri – as a statewide, child-focused legislative advocacy initiative. Additional advocacy and investment efforts focus on fostering civic and business engagement in addressing children’s issues. In the public arena, VCR pursues establishing county-level commissions focused on advancing child well-being, such as the Mayor’s Commission on Children, Youth and Families in the City of St. Louis. Working with the private sector, VCR seeks to increase investment and engage leaders in strategies to more effectively address the needs of St. Louis area children, youth and families.

Please join Vision for Children at Risk in promoting regional action to improve the lives of children and youth. To learn how you can get involved, visit www.visionforchildren.org, or our Facebook page visionforchildren.
The strength, vitality and viability of the St. Louis region is inextricably linked to the well-being of its children, youth and families. If we want the St. Louis region to thrive, we must ensure that children thrive. For the past quarter-century, the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis* data book has provided the community with an unflinching picture of child well-being across the St. Louis region.

Over the past 25 years, Vision for Children at Risk has produced ten editions of the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis* report. Over the years, the report has evolved. We have expanded the geography for which we collect data, increasing from two counties to the five core counties that comprise the St. Louis region. We have also expanded the number of child well-being indicators included in the report. We have added indicators to ensure we are presenting a holistic picture of child well-being, as well as in response to trends that have been identified in the community. However, over the past 25 years there is one thing that has not changed: the alarming, persistent disparities in child well-being found throughout the St. Louis region. Until these disparities and inequities are appropriately addressed, the entire St. Louis region will continue to be adversely impacted.

**Child Well-being is at Risk**

More than 508,000 children reside in the five core counties of the St. Louis region (St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and St. Charles County in Missouri and Madison and St. Clair counties in Illinois). These children are the future residents, workers, and leaders of St. Louis. They are vital to the prosperity of our region. Analysis of the data reported in the 2017 edition of the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis* data book finds that more than 127,000 children – an astonishing 25 percent of children living in the St. Louis region – reside in ZIP codes where risks to their well-being are severe. An additional 65,889 children reside in ZIP codes where risks to their well-being are high.1 This means that the well-being of an alarming 1 out of every 3 children in the St. Louis region is significantly at risk. The data are clear: St. Louis is failing its children, and in doing so we are jeopardizing the well-being of the entire region.

**Inequities in Child Well-Being**

The significant risks to child well-being confronting more than one-third of the children in our region are not uniformly distributed across all ZIP codes. The data consistently show patterns of inequity in ZIP codes where risk and need are highly concentrated. Many of these high-risk ZIP codes are located in the City of St. Louis. Of the 18 ZIP codes that fall within the boundaries of St. Louis City, 13 of them – or 72 percent – have a "severe" risk rating. This compares to 20 percent of St. Louis County ZIP codes, 20 percent of St. Clair County ZIP codes, 10 percent of Madison County ZIP codes, and zero percent of St. Charles County ZIP codes. Further, Black children are disproportionately affected by risks to their well-being. The data show that Black children are much more likely to live in ZIP codes with a severe risk ranking. Of the ZIP codes where the majority of the population is Black/African American, 95% have a severe risk rating.

On many measures of child well-being the St. Louis region ranks close to the national average. However, on almost every measure we attain this average in a perilous way: we have many children faring exceedingly well and many children facing severe risks to their well-being. And increasingly, we have fewer children in the middle. As long as we have some ZIP codes where less than one percent of children live in poverty and others where 80 percent of children live in poverty, we cannot thrive as a region. As long as the median family income ranges from $8,750 in one ZIP code to $180,954 in another, St. Louis will not reach its full potential. As long as we have some school districts where every child graduates from high school and others in which only 64 percent of students graduate, we will continue to see the St. Louis region struggle to grow and prosper. By targeting investments, resources, policies, and programs to those most in need throughout our region, we can start to address these long-standing inequities, thus benefiting the St. Louis region as a whole.

---

1Vision for Children at Risk calculates a “Risk Rating” for all 138 ZIP codes in the five county St. Louis region. Risk ratings are derived from a comparison between a ZIP code’s data and the national norm.
The Power of Data

Data is powerful. Data can tell a story. Data can mobilize community action. And data can influence public policy. Over the past quarter-century, Vision for Children at Risk has remained steadfast in its commitment to provide the St. Louis community with accurate, reliable data on the well-being of our children. This is more critical than ever in a social and political climate where facts are disputed, refuted, and at times, simply ignored. During the 25 years Vision for Children at Risk has been tracking indicators of child well-being, the data have largely told the same story: while we have certainly seen improvements in some measures of child well-being, overwhelmingly, there are stark disparities in child well-being throughout our region. Furthermore, the data illuminate where these inequities in child well-being are concentrated. We know what the problems are and we know where the problems are. Now we must find the public and political will to address these issues. The well-being of our children and the strength of the entire region is dependent upon it.

The data reported in the Children of Metropolitan St. Louis report are intended to provide a foundation for informed, strategic, collaborative community action aimed at addressing the well-being of all children in the St. Louis region, but particularly those children who face the most severe risk. However, we are acutely aware that simply providing the St. Louis community with this data will not change outcomes. We must use this data to increase the public and political will needed to promote child well-being in our region. There is an extensive amount of research documenting the strong connection between the well-being of children and their families, community and economic development, and the overall strength of a region. Furthermore, we know the kinds of policies, programs, interventions and supports that are proven to help improve child well-being outcomes, regardless of race or ZIP code.

Vision for Children at Risk will continue to provide the community with critical data on the status of children and families in the St. Louis region. We will continue to celebrate when we see improvements in child well-being in the data and advocate when we see inequities. However, we cannot expect to see significant improvements until we as a region acknowledge the importance of child well-being to the health and prosperity of the region, commit to improving the well-being of all children, and make child well-being a civic priority through targeted investments, resources, and policies.

Liz Hoester
Research Coordinator
Vision for Children at Risk
About this Book

This is the tenth edition of the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis (CMSL)* report published over the past 25 years. The CMSL provides data on more than 40 key indicators related to child well-being for the five core counties in the St. Louis region: St. Louis City, St. Louis County and St. Charles County in Missouri and Madison and St. Clair counties in Illinois. The majority of the data are provided at the ZIP code level. Educational data is reported at the school district level; crime statistics are reported for each individual municipality or, in the case of St. Louis City, the individual neighborhood.

Material presented in the CMSL data book is intended to provide the best available and most comprehensive data and information regarding the status and well-being of St. Louis area children. This report is produced for the community. We encourage the use of this information for any purpose intended to promote and improve the well-being of children in our region.

Efforts to address the needs of children must be data-driven, strategic, and focused if they are to be successful. The goal of this report is to provide accurate, reliable data to serve as the foundation for informed, strategic, collaborative community action. This report begins with reference maps that support the data that are presented throughout the report. Next, basic population and demographic data are presented. Then, in the remaining sections of this book, data are presented related to six areas of fundamental childhood needs. These six categories are:

**Children's Fundamental Need Areas**

- Family Support
- Maternal and Child Health
- Early Childhood Development
- Quality Education
- Youth Development
- Safe Neighborhoods and Strong Communities

Indicators in the CMSL are grouped under one of these six fundamental need areas. Each group of indicators provides a window into the status of St. Louis area children within that fundamental need area. When considered collectively, the indicators paint a picture of child well-being in the St. Louis region across the cradle-to-career spectrum.

**Advocacy and Civic Engagement**

Following the presentation of the risk assessment data, a brief analysis focuses on advocacy and community capacity-building efforts in the St. Louis region meant to develop the resources and infrastructure to promote the well-being of children and youth. The St. Louis community must recognize the direct link between the well-being of children and the vitality and viability of the region as a whole. Many of the metropolitan areas with which St. Louis compares and competes have already recognized this link and have adopted policies and programs to promote the well-being of children in order to advance the interests of the broader community. As a result, these communities fare better on many standard measures related to the quality of community life. To avoid falling farther behind, it is essential that business and civic leaders in St. Louis recognize this link and begin to integrate the well-being of children into the broader community and economic development agenda of the region.

**Why Zip Codes?**

For over 25 years, Vision for Children at Risk has been reporting child well-being data at the ZIP code level. The use of ZIP code boundaries allows for a far more detailed examination of the issues confronting the St. Louis region. Examining county level data can be useful at times. However, county level data aggregates high- and low-risk neighborhoods into an overall figure, often masking the large disparities and inequities in child well-being that continue to plague our region. ZIP codes allow the community to clearly identify where need and risk are located in the region. This enables us to take informed, data-driven, strategic action to address the needs of children. Furthermore, ZIP codes are a part of our everyday language and experience. And while some data are available at even more detailed geographies, such as the census tract, people are less familiar with those geographies and for many indicators data are not available at this level of detail.

Where ZIP code data was not available, we used school districts as the unit of measure for educational data, and jurisdictional boundaries for crime data.
Notes on the Data

Vision for Children at Risk strives to report the most current, accurate data. Throughout the report percentages and rates have been calculated for each of the indicators. For a variety of reasons, in some cases data are simply not available for a particular geography. In these cases, this is noted on the data tables. In order to provide the most accurate picture of how children are faring in our region, we used population estimates to make many of the calculations; however, the U.S. Census Bureau does not track yearly population figures at the ZIP code level. In addition, some ZIP codes have very small populations, which may distort rates and percentages. Therefore, we have noted ZIP codes that have lower populations on the data tables. A number of other factors, such as changes in ZIP code boundaries, in legislation, in reporting systems, and in funding streams, can also influence the indicators and should be taken into account when interpreting the data.

Notes on the Maps

Vision for Children at Risk acknowledges that while the data that are displayed on the tables throughout this report have extensive utility, they can be hard to digest and quickly analyze. To that end, we produce maps that visually display the data for every indicator included in this report (with the exception of the crime and violent crime rate indicators, which we currently are unable to map due to limitations of the mapping software). The monochromatic, choropleth maps featured in this report allow the user to better visualize the data and get a sense of how child well-being “looks” in the St. Louis region. These maps also enable the user to more easily identify trends in the data. Furthermore, the maps help illuminate areas where risk and need are concentrated and patterns of inequity in the region.

For mapping purposes, the data were analyzed with the U.S. norm as a reference point. The maps display the data in categories that fall above or below the national norm (or, in cases where the national norm was unavailable, the state or regional norm). Geographies in which the data reflect need/risk greater than the national norm appear on the maps in the two darkest shades of blue; geographies which reflect less need/risk than the national norm appear in the two lightest shades of blue.
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<table>
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<td>St. Louis County ZIP Code Boundaries</td>
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1. Affton
2. Bayless
3. Brentwood
4. Clayton
5. Ferguson-Florissant
6. Francis Howell
7. Ft. Zumwalt
8. Hancock Place
9. Hazelwood
10. Jennings
11. Kirkwood
12. Ladue
13. Lindbergh
15. Mehlville
17. Orchard Farm
18. Parkway
19. Pattonville
20. Ritenour
21. Riverview Gardens
22. Rockwood
23. St. Charles
24. St. Louis Public
25. University City
26. Valley Park
27. Washington
28. Webster Groves
29. Wentzville
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illinois School District Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bethalto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cahokia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Collinsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dupo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>East Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Edwardsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Granite City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>High Mount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Highland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Marissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Millstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>New Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Roxana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Smithton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>St. Libory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Staunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Triad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Whiteside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Wood River-Hartford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of St. Louis Neighborhoods

## Neighborhoods, Alphabetical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carondelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clifton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Columbia Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clay-Clayton-Tamm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bevo Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Botanical Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Central West End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St. Louis Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Covenant Blu-Grand Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DeBaliviere Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Downtown West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dutchtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dutchtown West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ellendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fayette Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Greater Ville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hi-Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kings Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kingsway East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kingsway West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lafayette Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lewis Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lewis Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lindenwood Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Marine Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Marine Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Marine Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mark Twain I-70 Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mark Twain I-70 Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>McKinley Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Old North St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Old North St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Old North St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Old North St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Old North St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>O'Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>O'Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>O'Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Peabody Darst Webbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Princeton Heights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Neighborhoods

1 Carondelet
2 Patch
3 Holly Hills
4 Boulevard Heights
5 Bevo Mill
6 Princeton Heights
7 South Hampton
8 St. Louis Hills
9 Lindenwood Park
10 Ellendale
11 Clifton Heights
12 The Hill
13 Southwest Garden
14 North Hampton
15 Tower Grove South
16 Dutchtown
17 Mount Pleasant
18 Marine Villa
19 Gravois Park
20 Kosciusko
21 Soulard
22 Benton Park
23 McKinley Heights
24 Fox Park
25 Tower Grove East
26 Compton Heights
27 Shaw
28 Botanical Heights
29 Tiffany
30 Benton Park West
31 The Gate District
32 Lafayette Square
33 Peabody Darst Webbe
34 LaSalle Park
35 Downtown
36 Downtown West
37 Midtown
38 Central West End
39 Forest Park South East
40 Kings Oak
41 Cheltenham
42 Clayton-Tamm
43 Franz Park
44 Hi-Pointe
45 Wydown Skinker
46 Skinker DeBaliviere
47 DeBaliviere Place
48 West End
49 Visitation Park
50 Wells Goodfellow
51 Academy
52 Kingsway West
53 Fountain Park
54 Lewis Place
55 Kingsway East
56 Greater Ville
57 The Ville
58 Vandeventer
59 Jeff Vanderlou
60 St. Louis Place
61 Carr Square
62 Columbus Square
63 Old North St. Louis
64 Near North Riverfront
65 Hyde Park
66 College Hill
67 Fairground Neighborhood
68 O’Fallon
69 Penrose
70 Mark Twain I-70 Industrial
71 Mark Twain
72 Walnut Park East
73 North Pointe
74 Baden
75 Riverview
76 Walnut Park West
77 Covenant Blu-Grand Center
78 Hamilton Heights
79 North Riverfront
# POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Introduction by: JOHN POSEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population Under Age 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population Under Age 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS
The first edition of the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis* report was published in 1991. In the quarter-century covered by the various editions of the publication, three broad population and demographic trends stand out:

1. **The number of children in the region is declining, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the regional population.** In 1990, there were 546,000 children under the age of 18 in the five-county region (which includes St. Louis City, St. Louis, and St. Charles counties in Missouri and Madison and St. Clair counties in Illinois). This number was down from 775,000 in 1970, near the height of the baby boom.\(^1\) The count of children increased from 1990 to 2000, as baby-boomers became parents and expanded their families. But as the region has aged, the number of children has fallen to an average of 509,000 over the period from 2011 through 2015. Children made up 25.8% of the region’s population in 1990, a figure that fell to 22.8% in 2011-2015. The East-West Gateway Council of Governments projects that in the absence of changes in migration patterns, the number of children in the five-county region could decline by 15,000 by 2030, and by an additional 20,000 by 2040.

2. **St. Charles County has increased its share of the region’s child population, while the City of St. Louis has seen a declining share.** In 1990, the city had 18.3% of the region’s child population, a figure that dropped to 12.8% in 2011-2015. By contrast, St. Charles County increased its share of the region’s child population from 11.7% to 18.2%. The shares of child population residing in Madison, St. Clair, and St. Louis counties have remained almost unchanged, as about a quarter of the region’s children live in the two Illinois counties, with about 45% in St. Louis County. Despite its increasing share of the child population relative to 1990, children still make up a smaller proportion of the population in St. Charles County.

3. **There are still relatively few Asian and Hispanic children, but their numbers are growing.** The number of white and black children declined from 2000 to 2011-2015, but the number of Hispanic children doubled from 2 to 4%, and the Asian percentage increased from 1.5 to 2.6%. Also noteworthy is that the number of children reported as multi-racial more than doubled.

The declining child population in the St. Louis region should be of great concern to everyone in the region. The underlying causes contributing to this decline must be examined and addressed if we are to reverse this trend and begin to grow and thrive as a region once again. When the needs of children, youth, and families are met the region is much more likely to produce a strong, capable workforce. This in turn facilitates greater economic investment and development in the region. This reinforces the critical importance of ensuring that every child in the St. Louis region, regardless of ZIP code, reaches his or her potential. Furthermore, the decline in the overall child population highlights the importance of the growth in the Asian and Hispanic child population. This growth is partially offsetting the overall decline in the child population in the region. Providing a welcoming environment for these children and families would be a smart, strategic move for the region.

The well-being of children, youth and families is inextricably connected to the growth, strength, and vitality of the region. If we want the region to thrive, we must ensure that children thrive.

*John Posey*
*Director of Research*
*East-West Gateway Council of Governments*

---

It is essential to monitor where young children reside in our region, areas in which there are higher concentrations of young children, and the demographic trends of this age group. Young children are a particularly vulnerable population. Issues such as maternal and infant health and access to quality, affordable childcare uniquely affect children under age five and influence their future well-being. It is especially important to consider this data when making policy recommendations for the region, implementing strategic initiatives, and investing limited resources that are aimed at improving early childhood outcomes.

**LEGEND**

- No Data Available
- 0.7 – 3.5%
- 3.6 – 6.3%
- 6.4 – 11.6%
- 11.7 – 16.9%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

**COMPARATIVE NORMS**

- US: 6.3%
- MO: 6.2%
- IL: 6.2%

St. Louis County: 5.8%
St. Louis City: 6.7%
St. Charles County: 6.3%
Madison County: 5.9%
St. Clair County: 6.5%
**Percent of Population Under Age 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Under 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62004</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Under 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62200</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62222</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Under 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**
The percentage of the total population under 5 years of age.

**SOURCE**

**CALCULATION**
(Population under age 5/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Percent of Population Under Age 18

Importance of this Indicator
It is essential to monitor where children reside in our region, areas in which there are higher concentrations of children and youth, and the demographic trends of this age group. It is particularly important to consider this data when it comes to making policy recommendations for the region, implementing strategic initiatives, and investing limited resources that are aimed at improving child well-being outcomes throughout the cradle to career spectrum.
### Percent of Population Under Age 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>% Under 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63332</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63395</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**Definition**

The percentage of the total population under 18 years of age.

**Source**


**Calculation**

\[
\text{Percent Under Age 18} = \left( \frac{\text{Population under age 18}}{\text{Total population}} \right) \times 100
\]

Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

1 Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
White Population

Importance of this Indicator

Public policies, institutional practices and cultural representations, past and present, work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial and ethnic group inequities. These policies and practices within and across institutions and social, economic and political systems produce outcomes that chronically favor, or put a racial or ethnic group at a disadvantage. The ramifications of these policies and practices are evident in the significant disparities that often exist in child well-being outcomes among children of different races and ethnicities. It is critical that this is taken into consideration when making policy recommendations for the region, implementing strategic initiatives, and investing limited resources that are aimed at improving child well-being outcomes throughout the cradle to career spectrum.

## White Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**
The percentage of the total population self-identifying as “White” on the American Community Survey.

**SOURCE**

**CALCULATION**
(Total White population/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**
Census Bureau categories were used for the demographic indicators included in this report. Data was not published for “American Indian and Alaska Native” or “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” as the population for each of these groups was one percent or less in every ZIP code included in this report.

*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Black/African American Population

Importance of this Indicator

Public policies, institutional practices and cultural representations, past and present, work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial and ethnic group inequities. These policies and practices within and across institutions and social, economic and political systems produce outcomes that chronically favor, or put a racial or ethnic group at a disadvantage. The ramifications of these policies and practices are evident in the significant disparities that often exist in child well-being outcomes among children of different races and ethnicities. It is critical that this is taken into consideration when making policy recommendations for the region, implementing strategic initiatives, and investing limited resources that are aimed at improving child well-being outcomes throughout the cradle to career spectrum.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 6.3%
- 6.4 – 12.6%
- 12.7 – 55.4%
- 55.5 – 98.1%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 12.6%
- MO: 11.5%
- IL: 14.3%

Black/African American Population

DEFINITION
The percentage of the total population self-identifying as “Black or African American” on the American Community Survey.

SOURCE

CALCULATION
(Total Black or African American population/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

NOTE
Census Bureau categories were used for the demographic indicators included in this report. Data was not published for “American Indian and Alaska Native” or “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” as the population for each of these groups was one percent or less in every ZIP code included in this report.

*No Data Available.
†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

Data Notes

DEFINITION
The percentage of the total population self-identifying as “Black or African American” on the American Community Survey.

SOURCE

CALCULATION
(Total Black or African American population/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

NOTE
Census Bureau categories were used for the demographic indicators included in this report. Data was not published for “American Indian and Alaska Native” or “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” as the population for each of these groups was one percent or less in every ZIP code included in this report.

*No Data Available.
†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hispanic/Latino Population

Importance of this Indicator

Public policies, institutional practices and cultural representations, past and present, work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial and ethnic group inequities. These policies and practices within and across institutions and social, economic and political systems produce outcomes that chronically favor, or put a racial or ethnic group at a disadvantage. The ramifications of these policies and practices are evident in the significant disparities that often exist in child well-being outcomes among children of different races and ethnicities. It is critical that this is taken into consideration when making policy recommendations for the region, implementing strategic initiatives, and investing limited resources that are aimed at improving child well-being outcomes throughout the cradle to career spectrum.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 1.6%
- 1.7 – 3.2%
- 3.3 – 14.6%
- 14.7 – 26.0%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the regional average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 17.1%
- MO: 3.9%
- IL: 16.5%
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# Hispanic/Latino Population

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of the total population self-identifying as “Hispanic or Latino” on the American Community Survey.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Total Hispanic or Latino population/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**

Census Bureau categories were used for the demographic indicators included in this report. Data was not published for “American Indian and Alaska Native” or “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” as the population for each of these groups was one percent or less in every ZIP code included in this report.

*No Data Available.*

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.*

### Data Notes

**ATEGORY**

The percentage of the total population self-identifying as “Hispanic or Latino” on the American Community Survey.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Total Hispanic or Latino population/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

### Hispanic/Latino Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63020</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63306</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63390</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asian Population

Importance of this Indicator

Public policies, institutional practices and cultural representations, past and present, work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial and ethnic group inequities. These policies and practices within and across institutions and social, economic and political systems produce outcomes that chronically favor, or put a racial or ethnic group at a disadvantage. The ramifications of these policies and practices are evident in the significant disparities that often exist in child well-being outcomes among children of different races and ethnicities. It is critical that this is taken into consideration when making policy recommendations for the region, implementing strategic initiatives, and investing limited resources that are aimed at improving child well-being outcomes throughout the cradle to career spectrum.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 2.5%
- 2.6 – 5.1%
- 5.2 – 8.6%
- 8.7 – 12.0%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 5.1%
- MO: 1.8%
- IL: 5.0%

Asian Population

**DEFINITION**
The percentage of the total population self-identifying as “Asian” on the American Community Survey.

**SOURCE**

**CALCULATION**
(Total Asian population/Total population) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**
Census Bureau categories were used for the demographic indicators included in this report. Data was not published for “American Indian and Alaska Native” or “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” as the population for each of these groups was one percent or less in every ZIP code included in this report.

*No Data Available.*

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.*
## FAMILY SUPPORT

*Introduction by: RUTH EHRESMAN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Under Age 5 Living in Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Under Age 18 Living in Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Households Headed by Single Mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Receiving TANF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Receiving SNAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Enrolled in Medicaid/CHIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Living in Alternative Care per 1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Substantiated Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children (MO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Indicated Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children (IL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAMILY SUPPORT
When caring individuals discuss child well-being, the conversation most often focuses on how to provide services and supports that are external to families. We tend to overlook the critical fact that children grow up in families. If we want to support children to reach their full potential, we should first think of how we support the families in which they live.

All humans experience a common hierarchy of needs. We need to meet our most basic physical needs before we have the time, energy and imagination to pay attention to higher needs. It is critically important that families are able to put food on the table, keep the lights and heat on, and keep a roof over their heads so they are able to focus on these higher needs.

The data in the Family Support section of the Children of Metropolitan St. Louis paint an alarming picture. Alarming because of the disturbing inequities they expose. Median family incomes range from $8,750 to $181,000 across the zip codes in the region. In some zip codes, fewer than two out of every 100 children live in families with incomes below the federal poverty level. (The federal poverty level is currently $20,090 for a typical three-person family.)\(^1\) In other zip codes, more than three out of every four children live in poverty. These disparate income levels consistently align with patterns of racial inequity.

The effects of poverty on children and youth have been extensively documented.\(^2\) We know that poverty has a particularly adverse effect on academic success, especially during early childhood. Chronic poverty contributes to toxic stress that takes a toll on parents and children. Poverty is not a mere inconvenience that children need the moral strength to overcome. Children who live in poverty are more likely to experience illness, difficulty getting along with peers, emotional problems, exposure to violence, risk of injury, and involvement with the juvenile justice system. They are more likely to drop out of high school, less likely to complete college, and more likely to die sooner.

The child welfare system also feels the impact of parents who do not have adequate resources to meet their families’ needs. Data from January 2017 indicate that inadequate housing was a factor in about one-third of the instances in which children were removed from their home and placed in alternative care.

Yet, there is a tremendous disconnect between what we know and what we do as a society to support families. Missouri policy makers enacted welfare reform in 2014 that has resulted in many families across Missouri losing TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) benefits. In January 2016, 43,805 children received TANF benefits. By June 2017, only 21,330 children received TANF benefits.\(^3\) The Missouri Legislature voted down the St. Louis efforts to raise the minimum wage, and have turned their backs on opportunities to provide health insurance to low-income working families.

There are positive steps that we can take to better support families. Far too many families work full time or work multiple part-time jobs, and still cannot support themselves. We need to make educational and training opportunities available, raise the minimum wage and provide subsidized child care to families. We can reward work and improve child well-being outcomes by enacting an earned income tax credit. When families are unable to work, we need to support them with adequate public assistance.

Citizens in the region from across the political spectrum share the belief that each child should have the opportunity to achieve success as an adult. To create that opportunity we have to come to grips with the concept of equity. It also requires a commitment to strengthening families with resources so they can be a positive force in their children’s lives, rather than merely providing services to children that can mitigate the negative impact of poverty.

Ruth R. Ehresman
Advocacy Coordinator
Vision for Children at Risk

---

In 2015, approximately 1 in 5 children lived in families with incomes below the poverty line. Poverty levels among Black and Hispanic children, children living in single-mother families, and children under five are higher. Being raised in poverty (defined as income of $24,036 or less in 2015, for a family of four with two children) places children at higher risk for a wide range of problems. They are more likely to have poorer health and chronic health conditions, to experience violence in their neighborhoods, to live in inadequate housing and to be exposed to environmental toxins. They are less likely to have cognitive stimulation as young children, to have access to quality schools, to graduate from high school, to enter and graduate from college, and to have higher earnings. Additionally, recent research shows that very young children, who experience poverty while their brains are developing, are at highest risk for poor educational outcomes. There are significant, persistent disparities in the poverty rates of children of different races and ethnicities. In 2015, 12 percent of both non-Hispanic white and Asian children were poor, compared with 29 percent of Hispanic children, and 33 percent of Black children. Decreasing the number of children living in poverty, focusing particularly on communities where poverty is highly concentrated, would have a dramatic impact on every measure of child well-being. It would also strengthen the viability and vitality of the entire St. Louis region.
### Percent of Children Under Age 5 Living in Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**
The percentage of children under age five living below the Federal Poverty Level.

**SOURCE**

**CALCULATION**
(Number of children under 5 living below Federal Poverty Level/Total number of children under 5 for whom poverty status is determined) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*

* Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
In 2015, approximately 1 in 5 children lived in families with incomes below the poverty line. Poverty levels among Black and Hispanic children, children living in single-mother families, and children under five are higher. Being raised in poverty (defined as income of $24,036 or less in 2015, for a family of four with two children) places children at higher risk for a wide range of problems. They are more likely to have poorer health and chronic health conditions, to experience violence in their neighborhoods, to live in inadequate housing and to be exposed to environmental toxins. They are less likely to have cognitive stimulation as young children, to have access to quality schools, to graduate from high school, to enter and graduate from college, and to have higher earnings. Additionally, recent research shows that very young children, who experience poverty while their brains are developing, are at highest risk for poor educational outcomes. There are significant, persistent disparities in the poverty rates of children of different races and ethnicities. In 2015, 12 percent of both non-Hispanic white and Asian children were poor, compared with 29 percent of Hispanic children, and 33 percent of Black children. Decreasing the number of children living in poverty, focusing particularly on communities where poverty is highly concentrated, would have a dramatic impact on every measure of child well-being. It would also strengthen the viability and vitality of the entire St. Louis region.
### Percent of Children Under Age 18 Living in Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^62021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^62046</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^62058</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of children under age 18 living below the Federal Poverty Level.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of children under 18 living below Federal Poverty Level/Total number of children under 18 for whom poverty status is determined) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.*
Percent of Households Headed by Single Mothers

Importance of this Indicator

During the 1960-2016 period, the percentage of children living with only their mother nearly tripled from 8 to 23 percent and the percentage of children living with only their father increased from 1 to 4 percent.¹ Data show that both Missouri and Illinois are close to the national average of households headed by a single mother. Single-parent families tend to have much lower incomes than do two-parent families, with single-mother households having the lowest incomes. For family households, married-couple households had the highest median income in 2014 ($81,025), followed by households maintained by men with no wife present ($53,684). Those maintained by women with no husband present had the lowest median ($36,151).² Furthermore, in 2014, 30.6 percent of female-headed households had incomes under the Federal Poverty Level, while 6.2 percent of married-couple families lived in poverty.¹ Improving wages and economic opportunities, particularly in female-dominated sectors of the economy, is critical to improving the well-being of all children, but especially for children in single-mother families.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 12.4%
- 12.5 – 24.8%
- 24.9 – 57.8%
- 57.9 – 90.8%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 24.8%
- MO: 25.3%
- IL: 23.7%

### Percent of Households Headed by Single Mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Single Mom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62200</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63032</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63332</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of households with children under 18 that are headed by single mothers.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of female householders, no husband present, with own children under 18/Total number of households with own children under 18) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.*
Median Family Income

Importance of this Indicator

The median family income represents the midpoint of all family incomes, with half of the incomes falling above the median and half falling below. After adjusting for inflation, in 2015 the median household income increased in every state, although in eleven states the increase was statistically insignificant. The increase in median income indicates growth in wages. Wages for low-income workers (the bottom 10th percentile) rose fastest in states that increased their minimum wage in 2014-2015. Workers in states that legislated raising the minimum wage fared best, with an increase of 4.7 percent. Furthermore, women experienced a 5.2 percent increase when minimum wage increases were legislated. Every county in the region shows large disparities among the median family income across the ZIP codes that comprise them. In St. Louis City, St. Louis, Madison and St. Clair counties, the ZIP codes with the highest median family income are more than ten times greater than the ZIP codes with the lowest median family income. In St. Charles County, the ZIP code with highest median family income is approximately five times that of the ZIP code with the lowest median family income. Workers need to earn a living wage in order to adequately support their families. Advocating for and implementing legislation and policies that increase the wages of families in the St. Louis region will not only improve the well-being of area children, but also strengthen the economic vitality of the region.


LEGEND
- No Data Available
- $8,750 – $35,582
- $35,583 – $62,414
- $62,415 – $121,684
- $121,685 – $180,954

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors fall below the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS
- US: $62,414
- MO: $58,397
- IL: $68,145
**Median Family Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>$101,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>$39,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>$67,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>$61,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>$80,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>$50,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>$89,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>$93,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>$79,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>$57,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>$108,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>$49,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>$10,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>$19,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>$84,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>$115,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>$66,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>$107,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>$43,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>$30,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>$65,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**

Median family income represents the amount that divides the income distribution into two equal groups, half having income above that amount, and half having income below that amount. A family consists of two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related by birth, marriage, or adoption residing in the same housing unit.

**SOURCE**


*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Importance of this Indicator

The unemployment rate captures a point-in-time snapshot of the civilian labor force age 16 and over who were unemployed, were seeking employment for the previous four weeks, and were currently available for work. Nationally, the unemployment rate is near pre-recession levels after reaching the second highest peak since 1950 during the recession.1 Across Missouri, the unemployment rate for African Americans is more than twice that of white individuals. In Illinois, the unemployment rate for African Americans is more than three times that of white individuals.2 In the region, unemployment rates range from three to 33 percent across ZIP codes, reflecting the disparities observed in the other income related indicators. It is important to note that nationwide the unemployment rate does not capture an estimated 1.5 million potential workers who are not seeking work because of weak job opportunities.3 Underemployment and unemployment take a serious toll on families. Sixty percent of Americans who were unemployed for more than two years report that they have sold some of their possessions to make ends meet. More than 1 in 4 state that they missed a mortgage, rent or credit card payment. More than half cut back on doctor visits or medical treatments.4 It is critical, for both children and the region, that we maintain a strong, growing, diverse regional economy that provides families with the employment opportunities that allow parents to adequately support their families.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.7 – 4.5%
- 4.6 – 8.3%
- 8.4 – 20.8%
- 20.9 – 33.2%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 8.3%
- MO: 7.5%
- IL: 9.1%

### Unemployment Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source


*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of the population 16 years and over who did not have a job, had been looking for employment, and were available to start a job.
**Percent of Children Receiving TANF**

**Importance of this Indicator**

The basic purpose of TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), is to provide cash assistance to families with children when the caregiver(s) is unable to work. TANF is failing its core purpose in both Missouri and Illinois. Both states provide cash assistance to a very small portion of families with incomes below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). Low cash grants assure that recipient families remain in deep poverty. The monthly benefit for a typical family of three in Missouri is $292, only 17.4 percent of the FPL. The grant has not been increased or adjusted for inflation since 1996, and has lost 34.4 percent of its purchasing power in that time. In Illinois, the grant for a family of three is $432, only 25.7 percent of the FPL. Since 1996, its purchasing power has declined by 24.9 percent. (Note: In Illinois, benefit levels vary by region. This is the grant amount for most of the state. Grants in the southernmost part of the state are even lower.) Recent welfare “reform” in Missouri enacted stricter lifetime limits and stronger work requirements for TANF. This has resulted in a dramatic drop in TANF caseloads without evidence that families’ financial security has improved. When families are unable to meet their basic needs, child well-being is at great risk. Currently, both Missouri and Illinois are not providing adequate financial support to the most vulnerable families in our region through their TANF programs.

**LEGEND**

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 1.5%
- 1.6 – 3.1%
- 3.2 – 10.7%
- 10.8 – 18.2%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

**COMPARATIVE NORMS**

- US: 3.1%
- MO: 1.6%
- IL: 1.6%


### Percent of Children Receiving TANF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% TANF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% TANF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% TANF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

Percentage of children under age 18 receiving TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) benefits.

**SOURCE**


### CALCULATION

(Number of TANF recipients under age 18/Total population under age 18) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*

* Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) enables low-income families to purchase food products via electronic benefits cards. Federal rules for eligibility include three tests: gross monthly income of 130 percent of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) or less; net income after deductions of 100 percent of FPL or less; and assets of $2,250 or less. Benefit levels vary by income, family size and eligible deductions. The formula assumes that families spend 30 percent of their net income on food. The average monthly benefit for a typical family of three in 2015 was $379/month, which translates to approximately $1.40 per person per meal. SNAP is the largest anti-poverty program in the country, and lifts more children out of poverty than any program except the Earned Income Tax Credit. Additionally, SNAP has been shown to have a significant impact on multiple child well-being outcomes including reduced food insecurity, lower rates of infant mortality and low birthweight, better health in children and fewer school absences, better health and economic outcomes as adults, and positive external benefits to taxpayers. Given the significant role the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program plays in helping families make ends meet and in improving child well-being outcomes, it is important that we advocate for this program and ensure these funds are protected from budget cuts.
### Percent of Children Receiving SNAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% SNAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

Percentage of children under age 18 receiving SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) benefits.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of SNAP recipients under age 18/Total population under age 18) X 100.

*No Data Available.

† Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
In the United States, 43 percent of children are covered by government-sponsored health insurance programs, the largest of which are Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Medicaid coverage in childhood has been shown to have positive effects on a number of adolescent health outcomes including decreased reports of mental health problems, reduced BMI (body mass index), and less smoking and alcohol use. Medicaid coverage in early childhood is also associated with improvements in health from ages 25 to 54. These improved outcomes include lower likelihood of high blood pressure, heart disease/heart attack, adult-onset diabetes, and obesity. Moreover, childhood Medicaid eligibility has been linked with reduced mortality in adulthood, with particularly strong effects for Black children. Furthermore, children who receive Medicaid/CHIP coverage are more likely to have improved education and economic outcomes that benefit the community as a whole. Children with Medicaid coverage have better reading scores, increased rates of high school and college completion, and pay more in taxes than children without health insurance. It is likely that health care will continue to remain a contentious political and policy issue for years to come. Given the evidence that Medicaid/CHIP coverage is associated with multiple benefits that accrue into adulthood, it is critical that we advocate for these programs that provide essential health insurance coverage to a large percentage of children in our region.
### Percent of Children Enrolled in Medicaid/CHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Medicaid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62222</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62246</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63332</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

Percentage of children under age 18 enrolled in Medicaid/CHIP (Children’s Health Insurance Program).

**SOURCE**


---

### CALCULATION

(Number of children enrolled in Medicaid or CHIP under age 18/Total population under age 18) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

---

*(Children of Metropolitan St. Louis | A Data Book for the Community)*
Children Living in Alternative Care per 1,000

Importance of this Indicator

All children should live in a supportive, protective and caring environment that helps them reach their full potential. When a child's own family is unable, even with support, to provide adequate care for the child, the state is responsible for ensuring appropriate alternative care. Alternative care includes foster care (non-relative, kinship, and therapeutic homes), adoptive homes, group homes, residential treatment facilities, hospitals, and independent living. In 2015, 12,160 Missouri children lived apart from their families in alternative care, compared with 9,220 children in 2011. In 2015, 16,654 Illinois children lived apart from their families in alternative care arrangements. The increasing number of children being placed in alternative care creates stress on the child welfare workforce. Federal reviews demonstrate that the more time a caseworker spends with a child and family, the better the outcomes for those children and families.

Average caseloads in Missouri and Illinois are approximately twice the recommended level. This contributes to caseworker turnover rates that are 2 to 4 times that of the rate that is considered optimal. In Missouri, Children's Division is trying to address these issues by implementing a career ladder and by training and supporting workers to improve the consistency and quality of service provided to children and their families. There is a growing community awareness that strengthening families is the best way to prevent the issues that lead to a child being placed in alternative care. We must advocate for policies, programs, and investments that aim to strengthen families in our region, particularly the most vulnerable.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.3 – 3.0
- 3.1 – 5.8
- 5.9 – 24.7
- 24.8 – 43.5

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 5.8 per 1,000
- MO: *
- IL: 4.7 per 1,000


## Children Living in Alternative Care per 1,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Alternative Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The rate of children (per 1,000) placed in alternative care arrangements, which includes foster care (non-relative, kinship, and therapeutic homes), adoptive homes, group homes, residential treatment facilities, hospitals, and independent living arrangements.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

\[
\text{Calculation} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of children in alternative care}}{\text{Total population under age 18}} \right) \times 1,000
\]

*No Data Available.

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Rate of Substantiated Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children (MO)

Importance of this Indicator
The Missouri and Illinois child abuse/neglect data are displayed on separate maps/tables as these data are not directly comparable. Missouri uses a two-track system, responding to serious allegations with investigations, and to less severe allegations with family assessments. In both cases the goal is assuring each child’s safety. Data here reflect only investigations in which abuse/neglect was substantiated. This is not the entire picture. In an additional 518 incidents, abuse/neglect was unsubstantiated, but protective services were indicated. In family assessments, family-centered services are offered if children are considered at risk. Participation in these services is voluntary. The St. Louis Region completed 6,921 family assessments in FY 2016, and opened 1,741 family-centered services cases. African American children are over-represented in the child protection system, and substantiated abuse/neglect tends to be higher in lower-income zip codes. This raises concerns about implicit and explicit racial bias, and racial equity. The Missouri child protection system is implementing several positive initiatives to better serve families and children. There is a growing community awareness that strengthening families is the best way to prevent child abuse/neglect. We must advocate for policies, programs, and investments that aim to strengthen families in our region, particularly the most vulnerable.

Rate of Substantiated Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children (MO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Abuse Rate (MO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Abuse Rate (MO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Abuse Rate (MO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63150</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63151</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63152</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63153</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63154</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63155</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63156</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Abuse Rate (MO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'63373</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'63386</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Notes

DEFINITION
The rate of substantiated child abuse and neglect victims (per 1,000 children) as determined through Children’s Division investigations.

SOURCE

CALCULATION
\[
\text{Rate} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of substantiated child abuse/neglect victims} \times 1,000}{\text{Total population under age 18}} \right) \times 100
\]
Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.
†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
**Rate of Indicated Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children (IL)**

**Importance of this Indicator**

The Missouri and Illinois child abuse/neglect data are displayed on separate maps/tables as these data are not directly comparable. In Illinois, report of child abuse/neglect is “indicated” when sufficient evidence of abuse or neglect is found by investigators. Hotline calls are screened by trained social workers to determine if they warrant an investigation. About one in four calls received results in a formal report and investigation. Many calls that are not investigated result in referrals that connect families with community-based programs.¹ In 2015, in the state of Illinois, 66,866 reports of abuse/neglect were referred for investigation. Abuse was indicated for 29,993 children. Of these reports, almost one-third were instances of neglect, about one-fifth involved physical abuse, and about one-seventh involved sexual abuse.² African American children are over-represented in the child protection system in Illinois, but the data do not show a consistent correlation of indicated abuse/neglect and ZIP codes with high levels of poverty.³ There is a growing community awareness that strengthening families is the best way to prevent child abuse/neglect. We must advocate for policies, programs, and investments that aim to strengthen families in our region, particularly the most vulnerable.

---

### Rate of Indicated Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children (IL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Abuse Rate (IL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*62046</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*62058</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*62282</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*62289</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

#### DEFINITION
The rate of indicated child abuse and neglect victims (per 1,000 children) as determined through Children and Family Services investigations.

#### SOURCE

#### CALCULATION
\[
(\text{Number of indicated child abuse/neglect victims} \times 1,000) / \text{Total population under age 18} \times 100
\]
Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
# MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Introduction by: KENDRA COPANAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Babies Born with Inadequate Prenatal Care (MO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Babies Born Preterm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Babies Born with Low Birthweight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Tested with High Blood Lead Levels (MO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Under Age 6 without Health Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Under Age 18 without Health Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH
Healthy women, children and families are the foundation of a healthy and vibrant community. By nearly every measure, the St. Louis region is failing in caring for the most vulnerable in our community. It is clear that the well-being of women, children and adolescents today will determine the health of the next generation.

Maternal and child health issues are wide-ranging and cut across the entire spectrum of child well-being. Healthy birth outcomes and the early identification and treatment of developmental delays and disabilities, as well as other health conditions, can enable children to reach their full potential. Child health and well-being can be influenced by access to high-quality health care, such as that received through a medical home and maternity care practices.

However, health care alone is not enough to achieve optimal maternal and child health. Children reared in safe, nurturing families and neighborhoods, free from maltreatment and other adverse childhood experiences, are more likely to have better outcomes as adults. Conditions such as institutionalized racism, access to educational, employment and economic opportunities, social support, and the availability of resources in the places people live, learn, work, and play contribute to a wide range of health risks and outcomes.

It is now widely understood that women who are healthy across their life span have healthier babies and children. Thus, policies and programs to address women’s well-being before and after pregnancy, not just during, are being developed and implemented. Expanding maternal health beyond pregnancy care is especially pertinent in the St. Louis region where birth outcome data indicate that the health and well-being of women before becoming pregnant is the biggest driver of preterm birth, low birthweight births and infant deaths. Health risks before pregnancy include hypertension, diabetes, stress and depression, inadequate nutrition, substance use, and sexually transmitted diseases. The roots of these risks begin in childhood and adolescence.

The determinants that influence maternal health also affect pregnancy outcomes and infant and child health. These determinants can either enable or prohibit access to quality medical care and social services, as well as support or deter families from engaging in healthy behaviors. The impact of social and societal determinants of health is evident in birth outcomes. African American infants are three times more likely to die before their first birthday in St. Louis City and County than Caucasian infants.

The gap hasn’t always been this wide. Fifty years ago, African American infants were twice as likely to die in their first year of life. Public health and medical advances during the last half century advantaged some in our community more than others. Further, the For the Sake of All report illustrated that while higher levels of education for mothers are associated with better well-being for their children, it is not sufficient to explain racial disparities. African American women with a college degree or higher are still more likely to have a low birth weight baby than white women with less than a high school degree. Low birth weight and preterm infants are at an increased risk for health and school problems that last through adolescence and adulthood.

The differential rates of infant deaths by race in St. Louis reflect systemic issues that cross multiple sectors of our society. For St. Louis to increase child well-being, we must confront and dismantle systemic racism.

Kendra Copanas
Executive Director
Generate Health STL

“By nearly every measure, the St. Louis region is failing in caring for the most vulnerable in our community. It is clear that the well-being of women, children and adolescents today will determine the health of the next generation.”
Prenatal care is essential to ensuring the best possible outcomes for both the mother and child during pregnancy and after the baby is born. Prenatal care plays a critical role in decreasing adverse birth outcomes, such as preterm births and low birthweight births, which can have life-long effects on overall child well-being. Increasingly, practitioners are noting the importance of preconception care as a key component of improving both maternal and child health. Preconception care involves such things as developing a reproduction plan, controlling current health conditions, and discussing the importance of exercise, nutrition, and maintaining a healthy weight before a woman becomes pregnant. To give every child the best start in life it is imperative that all women have access to comprehensive, affordable preconception and prenatal care.
### Percent of Babies Born with Inadequate Prenatal Care (MO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Inadequate Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of babies born with inadequate prenatal care. (The Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services defines inadequate prenatal care as less than five visits for pregnancies lasting less than 37 weeks, less than eight visits for pregnancies of 37 weeks or longer or care beginning after the fourth month of pregnancy.)

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of births with no or inadequate prenatal care/Total number of births) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**

Data was suppressed for ZIP codes with fewer than 10 births.

Data was not available for Illinois at the time of this data collection.

*No Data Available.*

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.*
Infants born preterm have higher rates of immediate and long-term health complications, as well as higher rates of lifelong disability. There are significant costs, both economic and emotional, associated with premature births. The economic costs of premature births, which total in the billions every year in the United States, include health care costs of the baby, labor and delivery costs of the mother, early intervention and special education services throughout the child’s life, and costs associated with lost work and pay for the affected family.\(^1\) The underlying causes of premature birth are poorly understood, particularly as it pertains to the persistent racial disparities observed in birth outcomes, with Black women experiencing preterm birth at rates higher than every other race and ethnicity.\(^2\) However, it is likely that genetic, social, and environmental factors all play a role. Women who receive late or no prenatal care, who have medical conditions such as diabetes and high blood pressure, who use tobacco, alcohol or illicit drugs, and who experience extremely high levels of stress are at an increased risk of preterm birth.\(^3\) These factors, along with the inequity in birth outcomes, have particular importance given the significant segregation that exists in the St. Louis region and should be considered when discussing strategies to improve birth outcomes throughout the region.

---


**Percent of Babies Born Preterm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Preterm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Preterm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITION**
The percentage of infants born preterm (defined as infants who are born before 37 full weeks of pregnancy are completed).

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**
(Number of infants born prior to 37 full weeks of pregnancy/Total number of births) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**
Data was suppressed for ZIP codes with fewer than 10 births.

*No Data Available.
*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Percent of Babies Born with Low Birthweight

**Importance of this Indicator**

Infants born at a low birthweight are at an increased risk of many serious health conditions, as well as an increased rate of infant mortality. Furthermore, the lower the birthweight, the greater the risk for these complications. Additionally, infants born at a low birthweight are at an increased risk of adverse effects to their long-term well-being, effecting everything from their kindergarten readiness to high school completion. Low birthweight babies have an increased chance of having a school-age learning disability, being enrolled in special education classes, having a lower IQ, and dropping out of high school. There are also significant economic costs associated with low birthweight births that impact both the families affected by a low birthweight birth and the communities in which they live. Such costs include higher medical expenditures, special education and social service expenses, and decreased productivity in adulthood. The most effective way to reduce the number of infants born with low birthweight is to focus on preventative measures such as ensuring all women have access to affordable, comprehensive prenatal care, focusing intensively on smoking prevention and cessation, ensuring that pregnant women get adequate nutrition, and addressing specific demographic, social, and environmental risk factors as all these factors can influence the number of low birthweight births in a community.

**LEGEND**

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 4.0%
- 4.1 – 8.1%
- 8.2 – 17.7%
- 17.8 – 27.3%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

**COMPARATIVE NORMS**

- US: 8.1%
- MO: 8.2%
- IL: 8.3%

---


### Percent of Babies Born with Low Birthweight

#### Definition
The percentage of infants born weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds).

#### Source

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Low BW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Data Notes

**Calculation**
(Number of infants born weighing less than 2,500 grams/Total number of births) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**Note**
Data was suppressed for ZIP codes with fewer than 10 births.

*No Data Available.
†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

#### ZIP % Low BW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Low BW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five-Year Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births)

Importance of this Indicator

The Infant Mortality Rate is frequently used as a key measure of the overall health, well-being and quality of life of the people living in a given community. It is an important indicator to monitor, particularly since a high Infant Mortality Rate can be indicative of underlying problems in a community, such as poor access to prenatal care, violence in the community, and a lack of safe, affordable, quality early child care options. Furthermore, differences between infant mortality rates can point to inequities within a community. For example, different segments of the community may have unequal access to health care or safe places for children to play, or have different exposure to environmental toxins— all factors that can play a part in a community’s Infant Mortality Rate. Significant disparities in infant mortality rates by race exist, with the mortality rate for Black infants being more than twice that of white infants. It is critical that these disparities in infant mortality rates, as well as the underlying factors that can inequitably effect different segments of a community, be considered when initiatives and policies aimed at reducing the Infant Mortality Rate are implemented.
**Five-Year Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>IMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**
The infant mortality rate is the number of deaths under one year of age that occur for every 1,000 live births.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**
\[ \frac{\text{Number of infant deaths} \times 1,000}{\text{Total number of live births}} \]
Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**
Data was suppressed for Missouri ZIP codes with fewer than five infant deaths over the five-year period and Illinois Zip codes with fewer than ten infant deaths over the five-year period.

*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Percent of Children Tested with High Blood Lead Levels (MO)

Importance of this Indicator

Lead is a significant environmental threat to children, particularly those under the age of six. Exposure to lead can harm a child’s health and development, increasing their risk for neurological damage, speech and hearing problems, and learning and behavior problems. Childhood lead exposure can have life-long effects on both the individual child and the community since lead exposure has been linked to reduced IQ, juvenile delinquency and criminal behavior. Exposure to environmental toxins and contaminants and the health risks associated with this exposure is not uniformly distributed across all communities. Low-income and non-white communities are disproportionately exposed to significant environmental health hazards including lead, air pollution, pesticides, toxic waste sites, traffic congestion and lack of green space. It is important to consider both the historical and present-day practices that contribute to this disproportionate exposure to environmental health hazards when developing new policies and strategies aimed at addressing these inequities.

LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Data Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 – 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 – 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 – 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 – 3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 0.5%
- MO: 0.5%


### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of children under age six tested for lead who have blood lead levels over 10 micrograms per deciliter.

**SOURCE**


**NOTE**

Data was not available for Illinois at the time of this data collection.

*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63150</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63153</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63154</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63155</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63156</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63157</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63158</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63159</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63161</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63165</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63166</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63167</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63168</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health care can influence children's physical and emotional health, as well as influence their capacity to reach their full potential as adults. Health insurance plays a critical role in the early identification of physical and developmental delays in young children, in ensuring that children receive life-saving immunizations, and in the prevention/management of chronic health conditions that can have long-term effects on overall health and well-being. Furthermore, children who have health insurance are more likely to have improved education and economic outcomes that benefit the community as a whole. Children with health insurance have better reading scores, increased rates of high school and college completion, pay more in taxes, and collect less in Earned Income Tax Credit payments than children without health insurance. Currently, the vast majority of children in this country are covered by some type of health insurance: 52 percent by private insurance and 43 percent by a government-sponsored program. It is likely that health care will continue to remain a contentious political and policy issue for years to come. Given the evidence that children's health insurance coverage is associated with multiple benefits that accrue into adulthood, it is critical that we advocate for the programs and policies that maintain this high rate of coverage.
### Percent of Children Under Age 6 without Health Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^62021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^62046</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^62058</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^63140</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^63332</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^63373</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^63386</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of children under age six without health insurance.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of children under age 6 with no health insurance/Total number of children under 6) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

^No Data Available.

^Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Percent of Children Under Age 18 without Health Insurance

Importance of this Indicator

Health care can influence children’s physical and emotional health, as well as influence their capacity to reach their full potential as adults.¹ Health insurance plays a critical role in the early identification of physical and developmental delays in young children, in ensuring that children receive life-saving immunizations, and in the prevention/management of chronic health conditions that can have long-term effects on overall health and well-being. Furthermore, children who have health insurance are more likely to have improved education and economic outcomes that benefit the community as a whole. Children with health insurance have better reading scores, increased rates of high school and college completion, pay more in taxes, and collect less in Earned Income Tax Credit payments than children without health insurance.² Currently, the vast majority of children in this country are covered by some type of health insurance: 52 percent by private insurance and 43 percent by a government-sponsored program.³ It is likely that health care will continue to remain a contentious political and policy issue for years to come. Given the evidence that children’s health insurance coverage is associated with multiple benefits that accrue into adulthood, it is critical that we advocate for the programs and policies that maintain this high rate of coverage.


LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Data Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 – 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 – 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 – 14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 – 23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 6.5%
- MO: 6.7%
- IL: 3.4%

Madison County: 2.6%
St. Charles County: 4.2%
St. Louis County: 4.5%
St. Louis City: 6.9%
St. Clair County: 3.6%
### Percent of Children Under Age 18 without Health Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of children under age 18 without health insurance.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of children under age 18 with no health insurance/Total number of children under 18) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.*
EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Introduction by: LINDSEY NOBLOT

Percent of Families with All Parent(s) in the Workforce

Total Licensed Child Care Capacity

Licensed Child Care Capacity: Center-Based (Under Age 2)

Licensed Child Care Capacity: Center-Based (Ages 2-5)

Licensed Child Care Capacity: Home-Based

School District Pre-K Enrollment

Percent of Children Who Can Be Served by an Accredited Program (MO)

Percent of Children Who Can Be Served by a Quality/Accredited Program (IL)

Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Center-Based (Under Age 3)

Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Center-Based (Ages 3-5)

Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Under Age 3)

Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Ages 3-5)
EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT
Providing a strong start in early childhood is critical to a child’s future success. Research shows approximately 90% of brain development occurs in a child’s first five years. Being surrounded by caring adults in nurturing, safe educational environments provides critical support at a key developmental time. However, too many St. Louis-area children, especially those in low-income, minority families, do not have access to quality early childhood programs and services. While some programs produce excellent outcomes for the children they serve, the early developmental needs of far too many children go unmet.

Many challenges exist for our region’s families in accessing quality early childhood services, especially for families who are low-income. Currently, quality early childhood program spots are extremely limited and unlike most states (including Illinois), Missouri does not have an early childhood quality rating system. This leaves families in the challenging position of trying to identify and select high-quality programs on their own. Licensure only guarantees that basic health and safety standards are met. Accreditation indicates a higher level of teacher education and developmentally appropriate curriculum, but is an expensive and cumbersome process that few programs can afford to undertake. The limited supply of quality child care programs drives up costs. The very low subsidy support from the state makes quality care often unreachable for families struggling to meet basic needs such as food, transportation, and housing. Region-wide waiting lists for infant care are long even for those who can afford to pay. Parents working non-traditional or unpredictable hours are hard-pressed to find early childhood programs that support their schedules.

The need in St. Louis is for an early childhood system that can provide quality care and support for all children and reduce the racial and socio-economic inequities that undermine the well-being of so many of our children. Collaborative, coordinated action is required. In recent years, significant progress has been made on this front.

First, the Mayor’s Office in the City of St. Louis accepted the challenge from the National League of Cities to develop a Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Success. Subsequently, in 2011, the St. Louis Regional Early Childhood Council (RECC) combined a variety of early childhood initiatives to form a collaborative of dozens of organizations that are now working to build a coordinated system promoting educational readiness and healthy development of young children ages 0-8 in the St. Louis region, especially those in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas. The goal of that system-building is to bring promising practices to scale through partnership and collaboration to improve conditions for children, as well as supporting the overall economic vitality of our community. In October 2017, Vision for Children at Risk, in conjunction with the Regional Early Childhood Council, Ready by 21 St. Louis, and a wide array of community partners, sponsored the St. Louis Metropolitan Early Childhood Summit. The Summit puts forward and initiates implementation of the Comprehensive Regional Early Childhood Plan. The RECC will have a major role in coordinating the implementation of this plan.

Using the data contained within this report in combination with the expertise and experience of families, early childhood service providers, policymakers, and business leaders, key community stakeholders in the St. Louis region are working together to achieve the following goals:

- Broaden education and awareness regarding the early childhood landscape,
- Address gaps in early care and education programs and related support services,
- Make investments in improved safety and quality, and
- Dig deeper into what we don’t know. A better understanding of available program offerings and capacity has pushed us to ask more questions related to the quality of programs in Missouri and the ability of low-income and minority families to access quality early childhood programs.

Our region’s families need access to a full range of safe, affordable, quality early childhood options in order for children, and the region, to meet their full potential.

Lindsey Noblot
Project Director
St. Louis Regional Early Childhood Council

“The need in St. Louis is for an early childhood system that can provide quality care and support for all children and reduce the racial and socio-economic inequities that undermine the well-being of so many of our children.”
Percent of Families with All Parent(s) in the Workforce

Importance of this Indicator

Today, the majority of parents in this country participate in the workforce. This is overwhelmingly true of single-parent families, but is becoming increasingly true of two-parent families as cultural norms continue to evolve and having both parents in the workforce has become an economic necessity for many families. This underscores the importance of providing affordable, high-quality early childhood education options to all families. Analyses indicate that working families lose an estimated $28.9 billion in wages because they do not have access to affordable child care and paid family and medical leave.\(^1\) Child care options make it possible for parents to work, and to work more hours, enabling parents to provide additional income for their family in the short term, as well as increased attachment to the labor force and higher earnings in the long-term.\(^2\)

Additionally, research shows that child care assistance helps working parents experience fewer missed days, schedule changes, and lost overtime hours.\(^3\) With the overwhelming majority of parents participating in the workforce, child care is an issue that affects most families in this country. Providing access to affordable, high-quality early child care is critical to parents’ ability to participate in the workforce and support their families. Implementing policies and making investments that increase access to affordable, high-quality child care options would not only improve individual child well-being outcomes, but also strengthen the economic vitality of the region.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 38.4 – 55.1%
- 55.2 – 71.8%
- 71.9 – 84.0%
- 84.1 – 96.1%

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 71.8%
- MO: 75.2%
- IL: 73.1%

### Percent of Families with All Parent(s) in the Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Workforce</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Workforce</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Workforce</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Workforce</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6201</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>6209</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>6213</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>6301</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6202</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>6206</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>6220</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>6302</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>6311</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6203</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>6221</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>6223</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>6304</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>6312</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6204</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>6224</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>6225</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>6305</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>6313</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6205</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>6226</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>6226</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>6306</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>6314</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6206</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>6307</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>6315</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6207</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>6308</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>6316</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6208</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>6229</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>6229</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>6317</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>6317</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6209</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>6230</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>6230</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>6318</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>6318</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6210</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>6231</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>6231</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>6319</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>6319</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6212</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>6232</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>6232</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>6320</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>6320</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6213</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>6233</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>6233</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>6321</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>6321</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6214</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>6234</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>6234</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>6322</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>6322</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6215</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>6235</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>6235</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>6323</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>6323</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6216</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>6236</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>6236</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>6324</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>6324</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6217</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>6237</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>6237</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>6325</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>6325</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6218</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>6238</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>6238</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>6326</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>6326</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6219</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>6239</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>6239</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>6327</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>6327</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6220</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>6328</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>6328</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6221</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>6241</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>6241</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>6329</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>6329</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6222</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>6330</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>6330</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6223</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>6243</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>6243</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>6331</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>6331</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6224</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>6244</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>6244</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>6332</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>6332</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of families with children under 18 where both parents are in the workforce (in the case of married-couple families) or the parent is in the workforce (in the case of single-parent families).

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

$$\left(\frac{\text{Families with own children under 18 years, married-couple families, both husband and wife in labor force} + \text{Families with own children under 18 years, female householder, no husband present, in labor force} + \text{Families with own children under 18 years, male householder, no wife present, in labor force}}{\text{Number of families with own children under 18 years}}\right) \times 100.$$  Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

† Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Total Licensed Child Care Capacity

Importance of this Indicator

Licensing is a process by which the state evaluates the health and safety of a child care facility in order to protect children in center- and home-based care. Licensing ensures that programs meet basic health and safety standards related to child/staff ratios, staff training, indoor/outdoor environments, immunizations, and emergency preparedness, among others. Licensing provides an important foundation in building a quality program but does not guarantee additional measures of quality beyond these basic health and safety standards. The licensed child care capacity reflects a point-in-time snapshot of the number of children that can be served by licensed providers in a particular ZIP code. The “Total Licensed Child Care Capacity” provides an overall picture of how many children can be served by licensed providers. The licensed capacity of center-based programs verses the licensed capacity of home-based programs gives a sense of community preferences and what types of programs are more readily available in certain communities. Additionally, looking at the licensed child care capacity by age (this data is only available for center-based programs) reveals a significant shortage in the availability of infant/toddler care. Child care is a critical component of the economy as it enables parents to participate in the workforce. When examining the licensed child care capacity data it is important to consider additional related factors such as the number of children in a community, the need for particular types of care such as infant/toddler care, weekend care, and evening care, as well as issues related to the quality and affordability of care.
# Total Licensed Child Care Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**
The total number of licensed early child care “seats”.

**SOURCE**
MO: Child Care Aware of Missouri and United 4 Children. Data request. Data as of May 2017.


### CALCULATION
Data provided by Child Care Aware of Missouri, United 4 Children, and Children’s Home + Aid.

*No Data Available.

Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Licensed Child Care Capacity: Center-Based (Under Age 2)

Importance of this Indicator

Licensing is a process by which the state evaluates the health and safety of a child care facility in order to protect children in center- and home-based care. Licensing ensures that programs meet basic health and safety standards related to child/staff ratios, staff training, indoor/outdoor environments, immunizations, and emergency preparedness, among others. Licensing provides an important foundation in building a quality program but does not guarantee additional measures of quality beyond these basic health and safety standards. The licensed child care capacity reflects a point-in-time snapshot of the number of children that can be served by licensed providers in a particular ZIP code. The “Total Licensed Child Care Capacity” provides an overall picture of how many children can be served by licensed providers. The licensed capacity of center-based programs verses the licensed capacity of home-based programs gives a sense of community preferences and what types of programs are more readily available in certain communities. Additionally, looking at the licensed child care capacity by age (this data is only available for center-based programs) reveals a significant shortage in the availability of infant/toddler care. Child care is a critical component of the economy as it enables parents to participate in the workforce. When examining the licensed child care capacity data it is important to consider additional related factors such as the number of children in a community, the need for particular types of care such as infant/toddler care, weekend care, and evening care, as well as issues related to the quality and affordability of care.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0 – 78
- 79 – 157
- 158 – 236
- 237 – 313

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors show areas with less capacity.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: *
- MO: *
- IL: *
### Licensed Child Care Capacity: Center-Based (Under Age 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**
The total number of licensed, center-based early child care "seats" for children under age 2.

**SOURCE**

### Calculation
Data provided by Child Care Aware of Missouri, United 4 Children, and Children’s Home + Aid.

*No Data Available.

* Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Licensed Child Care Capacity: Center-Based (Ages 2-5)

Importance of this Indicator

Licensing is a process by which the state evaluates the health and safety of a child care facility in order to protect children in center- and home-based care. Licensing ensures that programs meet basic health and safety standards related to child/staff ratios, staff training, indoor/outdoor environments, immunizations, and emergency preparedness, among others. Licensing provides an important foundation in building a quality program but does not guarantee additional measures of quality beyond these basic health and safety standards. The licensed child care capacity reflects a point-in-time snapshot of the number of children that can be served by licensed providers in a particular ZIP code. The “Total Licensed Child Care Capacity” provides an overall picture of how many children can be served by licensed providers. The licensed capacity of center-based programs versus the licensed capacity of home-based programs gives a sense of community preferences and what types of programs are more readily available in certain communities. Additionally, looking at the licensed child care capacity by age (this data is only available for center-based programs) reveals a significant shortage in the availability of infant/toddler care. Child care is a critical component of the economy as it enables parents to participate in the workforce. When examining the licensed child care capacity data it is important to consider additional related factors such as the number of children in a community, the need for particular types of care such as infant/toddler care, weekend care, and evening care, as well as issues related to the quality and affordability of care.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0 – 449
- 450 – 899
- 900 – 1,349
- 1,350 – 1,797

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors show areas with less capacity.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: *
- MO: *
- IL: *

St. Louis County: 17,571
St. Charles County: 7,779
St. Louis City: 5,750
Madison County: 3,024
St. Clair County: 3,044
**Licensed Child Care Capacity: Center-Based (Ages 2-5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The total number of licensed, center-based early child care “seats” for children ages 2-5.

**SOURCE**

MO: Child Care Aware of Missouri and United 4 Children. Data request. Data as of May 2017.


---

### Calculation

Data provided by Child Care Aware of Missouri, United 4 Children, and Children's Home + Aid.

*No Data Available.

\(^*\)Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Licensed Child Care Capacity: Home-Based

Importance of this Indicator

Licensing is a process by which the state evaluates the health and safety of a child care facility in order to protect children in center- and home-based care. Licensing ensures that programs meet basic health and safety standards related to child/staff ratios, staff training, indoor/outdoor environments, immunizations, and emergency preparedness, among others. Licensing provides an important foundation in building a quality program but does not guarantee additional measures of quality beyond these basic health and safety standards. The licensed child care capacity reflects a point-in-time snapshot of the number of children that can be served by licensed providers in a particular ZIP code. The “Total Licensed Child Care Capacity” provides an overall picture of how many children can be served by licensed providers. The licensed capacity of center-based programs verses the licensed capacity of home-based programs gives a sense of community preferences and what types of programs are more readily available in certain communities. Additionally, looking at the licensed child care capacity by age (this data is only available for center-based programs) reveals a significant shortage in the availability of infant/toddler care. Child care is a critical component of the economy as it enables parents to participate in the workforce. When examining the licensed child care capacity data it is important to consider additional related factors such as the number of children in a community, the need for particular types of care such as infant/toddler care, weekend care, and evening care, as well as issues related to the quality and affordability of care.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0 – 81
- 82 – 163
- 164 – 245
- 246 – 326

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors show areas with less capacity.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: *
- MO: *
- IL: *

St. Louis City: 483
St. Louis County: 820
St. Charles County: 246
Madison County: 797
St. Clair County: 2,089
**Licensed Child Care Capacity: Home-Based**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**
The total number of licensed, home-based early child care “seats”.

**SOURCE**

MO: Child Care Aware of Missouri and United 4 Children. Data request. Data as of May 2017.


**CALCULATION**

Data provided by Child Care Aware of Missouri, United 4 Children, and Children’s Home + Aid.

*No Data Available.

* Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
School District Pre-K Enrollment

Importance of this Indicator

Increasingly, school districts are playing a larger role in the early childhood system by providing early childhood development opportunities through district-sponsored pre-kindergarten programs. Over the past several years there has been an increase in the number of school districts offering pre-kindergarten programs (generally serving children ages 3-4), as well as the expansion of pre-kindergarten programs by districts that already had programs in place. It is important to note that school districts are exempt from the licensing standards that apply to other early childhood programs and it is important that the proper mechanisms are in place to ensure that children are receiving safe, quality early childhood education in these district-sponsored pre-kindergarten programs. Additionally, we must keep in mind that while school districts may provide families with an affordable, quality early childhood education option for older children, we need to ensure that families have access to quality, affordable infant/toddler care (a type of care already in short supply) in their community as well. Furthermore, there are many families in need of care during non-traditional hours such as on the weekends or during the evening hours. We need to make sure families have access to a spectrum of early childhood development options that allow them to meet all their child care needs.
## School District Pre-K Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehville</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. CHARLES COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALCULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The total number of children enrolled in any district-sponsored pre-kindergarten program.

**SOURCE**


**NOTE**

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*
The significant short- and long-term benefits of high-quality early childhood education have been well established through decades of research. Children who receive high-quality early childhood education are less likely to repeat grades, need special education, or come in contact with the criminal justice system. Recent research also concludes that providing high-quality early childhood education can prevent the achievement gap, improve health outcomes, and boost life-time earnings. Furthermore, analysis of a wide variety of life outcomes, such as health, crime, income, schooling, and the increase in a mother’s income after returning to work because childcare is available, finds a 13 percent return on investment when high-quality early education is provided to the most disadvantaged children. Currently, Missouri is one of only a few states that does not have an early childhood quality rating system. Without a quality rating system, families lack the information they need to choose quality programs. It is critical to note that providing high-quality early childhood education is more costly, often making these programs inaccessible to the very children who would benefit most. We must advocate for implementation of an early childhood quality rating system, as well as for policies and investments that increase the quality of early childhood programs and make these programs accessible to the children and families who need them most.

St. Charles County: 6.1%
St. Louis City: 14.1%
St. Louis County: 14.3%

### Percent of Children Who Can Be Served by an Accredited Program (MO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of children who can be served by an accredited early childhood program (as accredited by MOA, NAEYC, NAFCC, NECPA, COA or CARF) located within the ZIP code in which they reside.

**SOURCE**

MO: Child Care Aware of Missouri and United 4 Children. Data request. Data as of May 2017.

**CALCULATION**

(Number of accredited early childhood “seats”/Total number of children under age 5) X 100. Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Percent of Children Who Can Be Served by a Quality/Accredited Program (IL)

Importance of this Indicator

The significant short- and long-term benefits of high-quality early childhood education have been well established through decades of research. Children who receive high-quality early childhood education are less likely to repeat grades, need special education, or come in contact with the criminal justice system. Recent research also concludes that providing high-quality early childhood education can prevent the achievement gap, improve health outcomes, and boost life-time earnings. Furthermore, analysis of a wide variety of life outcomes, such as health, crime, income, schooling, and the increase in a mother’s income after returning to work because childcare is available, finds a 13 percent return on investment when high-quality early education is provided to the most disadvantaged children. ExceleRate is Illinois’ early childhood quality rating system. It provides standards, guidelines, resources and supports to help licensed child care centers, licensed family/group child care homes, school-based preschool programs, and Head Start/Early Head Start programs make changes that lead to better quality outcomes. ExceleRate also makes it easier for families to find high-quality early childhood education opportunities. However, it is critical to note that providing high-quality early childhood education is more costly, often making these programs inaccessible to the very children who would benefit most. We must advocate for policies and investments that both increase the quality of early childhood programs and make these programs accessible to the children and families who need them most.

### Percent of Children Who Can Be Served by a Quality/Accredited Program (IL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Accredited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of children who can be served by a bronze, silver, or gold quality early childhood program (as determined by ExceleRate, Illinois’ statewide quality recognition and improvement system) or by an accredited early childhood program (as accredited by NAFCC, NAEYC, NAA, NECPA, NAC, or CDA/CCP) located within the ZIP code in which they reside.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

((Number of bronze, silver, or gold quality early childhood “seats” + Number of accredited early childhood “seats”) / Total number of children under age 5) X 100.

Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

†Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Center-Based (Under Age 3)

Importance of this Indicator

For many families, child care costs can exceed the cost of housing, college tuition, transportation, food, or health care. This often leaves families with few options but to make sacrifices in the quality, reliability, and potential safety of the child care they use in order to make ends meet. It is important to note that there are substantial differences in the average weekly cost of child care for different types of care with the cost of infant/toddler care being significantly higher than care for 3-5 year olds and the cost of center-based care being higher than that of home-based care. High-quality, affordable early childhood education is not only critical to improving child well-being outcomes and to producing a strong, competitive future workforce, but it also plays a key role in the strength of the current economy. A lack of affordable, quality child care has a significant impact on families and on employers’ bottom lines. Child care options make it possible for parents to work, and to work more hours, enabling parents to provide additional income for their family in the short-term, as well as increased attachment to the labor force and higher earnings in the long-term. Currently, there are some mechanisms in place to make child care more affordable for families, such as state child care subsidies for very low-income families, scholarships provided to children by some child care programs, and a small number of employers who offer childcare benefits to employees. However, these options by no means reach all the families struggling to afford high-quality early child care.

### Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Center-Based (Under Age 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>$248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>$212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>$167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>$157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>$219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>$232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>$211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>$227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>$203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>$197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>$217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>$196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>$183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>$153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>$161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>$219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>$177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>$202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>$293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>$279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>$294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>$236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>$276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>$272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>$218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>$261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>$166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>$254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>$196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>$277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>$268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>$256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>$133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>$189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>$144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>$305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>$194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>$222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>$262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>$204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>$186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>$138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>$338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**

The average weekly cost of center-based childcare for children under age 3.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

MO: \((\text{Avg. weekly cost [0-12 months]} + \text{Avg. weekly cost [13-36 months]})/2.\)

Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

IL: \((\text{Avg. weekly cost [6 weeks-14 months]} + \text{Avg. weekly cost [15-23 months]} + \text{Avg. weekly cost [24-35 months]})/3.\)

Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Importance of this Indicator

For many families, child care costs can exceed the cost of housing, college tuition, transportation, food, or health care. This often leaves families with few options but to make sacrifices in the quality, reliability, and potential safety of the child care they use in order to make ends meet. It is important to note that there are substantial differences in the average weekly cost of child care for different types of care with the cost of infant/toddler care being significantly higher than care for 3–5 year olds and the cost of center-based care being higher than that of home-based care. High-quality, affordable early childhood education is not only critical to improving child well-being outcomes and to producing a strong, competitive future workforce, but it also plays a key role in the strength of the current economy. A lack of affordable, quality child care has a significant impact on families and on employers’ bottom lines. Child care options make it possible for parents to work, and to work more hours, enabling parents to provide additional income for their family in the short-term, as well as increased attachment to the labor force and higher earnings in the long-term. Currently, there are some mechanisms in place to make child care more affordable for families, such as state child care subsidies for very low-income families, scholarships provided to children by some child care programs, and a small number of employers who offer childcare benefits to employees. However, these options by no means reach all the families struggling to afford high-quality early child care.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- $79 – $117
- $118 – $155
- $156 – $238
- $239 – $320

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the regional average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: *
- MO: *
- IL: *

## Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Center-Based (Ages 3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>62002</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>62010</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62024</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62025</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>62035</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>62040</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>62046</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62060</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62062</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>62067</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>62087</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62090</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**

The average weekly cost of center-based childcare for children age 3 to 5.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

Data provided by Child Care Aware of Missouri and Children’s Home + Aid.

*No Data Available.

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Under Age 3)

Importance of this Indicator

For many families, child care costs can exceed the cost of housing, college tuition, transportation, food, or health care. This often leaves families with few options but to make sacrifices in the quality, reliability, and potential safety of the child care they use in order to make ends meet. It is important to note that there are substantial differences in the average weekly cost of child care for different types of care with the cost of infant/toddler care being significantly higher than care for 3-5 year olds and the cost of center-based care being higher than that of home-based care. High-quality, affordable early childhood education is not only critical to improving child well-being outcomes and to producing a strong, competitive future workforce, but it also plays a key role in the strength of the current economy. A lack of affordable, quality child care has a significant impact on families and on employers’ bottom lines. Child care options make it possible for parents to work, and to work more hours, enabling parents to provide additional income for their family in the short-term, as well as increased attachment to the labor force and higher earnings in the long-term. Currently, there are some mechanisms in place to make child care more affordable for families, such as state child care subsidies for very low-income families, scholarships provided to children by some child care programs, and a small number of employers who offer childcare benefits to employees. However, these options by no means reach all the families struggling to afford high-quality early child care.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- $84 – $112
- $113 – $141
- $142 – $218
- $219 – $295

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the regional average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: *
- MO: *
- IL: *

### Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Under Age 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62011</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>$199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>$168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>$139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>$166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>$167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>$142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>$197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Under Age 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>$138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>$142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>$146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>$158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>$108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>$139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>$166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>$124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>$96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>$213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63148</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63149</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63150</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63151</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63152</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63153</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63154</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The average weekly cost of home-based childcare for children under age 3.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

MO: \( \text{Avg. weekly cost [0-12 months]} + \text{Avg. weekly cost [13-36 months]} \)/2. Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

IL: \( \text{Avg. weekly cost [6 weeks-14 months]} + \text{Avg. weekly cost [15-23 months]} + \text{Avg. weekly cost [24-35 months]} \)/3. Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

\[1\] Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Ages 3-5)

Importance of this Indicator

For many families, child care costs can exceed the cost of housing, college tuition, transportation, food, or health care. This often leaves families with few options but to make sacrifices in the quality, reliability, and potential safety of the child care they use in order to make ends meet. It is important to note that there are substantial differences in the average weekly cost of child care for different types of care with the cost of infant/toddler care being significantly higher than care for 3-5 year olds and the cost of center-based care being higher than that of home-based care. High-quality, affordable early childhood education is not only critical to improving child well-being outcomes and to producing a strong, competitive future workforce, but it also plays a key role in the strength of the current economy. A lack of affordable, quality child care has a significant impact on families and on employers’ bottom lines. Child care options make it possible for parents to work, and to work more hours, enabling parents to provide additional income for their family in the short-term, as well as increased attachment to the labor force and higher earnings in the long-term. Currently, there are some mechanisms in place to make child care more affordable for families, such as state child care subsidies for very low-income families, scholarships provided to children by some child care programs, and a small number of employers who offer childcare benefits to employees. However, these options by no means reach all the families struggling to afford high-quality early child care.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- $60 – $93
- $94 – $127
- $128 – $164
- $165 – $200

ZIP codes shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the regional average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: *
- MO: *
- IL: *

### Average Weekly Cost of Child Care: Home-Based (Ages 3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>$162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>$118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The average weekly cost of center-based childcare for children age 3 to 5.

**SOURCE**


### Calculation

Data provided by Child Care Aware of Missouri and Children’s Home + Aid.

* No Data Available.

† Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.
# QUALITY EDUCATION

*Introduction by: NORMAN WHITE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Who Are Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Who Are English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Who Are Homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students With An IEP (Individualized Education Program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Teacher Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spending per Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Proficient/Advanced in 3rd Grade Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Proficient/Advanced in 8th Grade Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Entering a 2/4-Year College or University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITY EDUCATION
Education represents an entryway to the future. Malcolm X stated that “Education is an important element in the struggle for human rights. It is the means to help our children and our people rediscover their identity and thereby increase their self respect. Education is our passport to the future, for tomorrow belongs only to the people who prepare for it today.” Success in school opens doors to diverse social and economic worlds. Yet for many that success and opportunity remains elusive.

The data on educational performance in the St. Louis region present a picture of divergent worlds. There are school districts in the region that provide evidence of great success, while there are others that reflect challenges that impede the progress and futures of children. Sadly, Jonathan Kozol has described an American educational system that is as separate and unequal as it was in 1953, before the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954. We still suffer a history that leaves some children’s future resting uneasily on a racial fault line that seems intractable. It is in this place of inequality and inequity that we are called to find ways to lift all of our children and in turn lift the region.

As we look at these data we can approach them in several ways. The most common is to look at school districts and assess them as failing our children, essentially affixing blame for the outcomes that are reported and absolving ourselves of responsibility. A different way is to look at these data and ask the question, “What do we need to do to create equity so that all students succeed?” The first approach contributes to the continued crisis because it is not reflective of an approach that more comprehensively explains the outcomes we see. The second approach rests on an assumption that there are factors producing disparate outcomes that reside in many places. “Fixing” the problem becomes one that takes a holistic approach targeting the broader causal factors. The For the Sake of All report provides a guide to the many factors that contribute to the educational outcomes we see.

The importance of education cannot be overstated. It is the key not only to the future of children but to the community itself. This section, and the data contained within, should serve as a call to all of us to begin to work in concert to support all school districts in ways that allow us to see their success. The Ferguson Commission’s report, Forward through Ferguson, encourages us to look at how racial inequality has contributed to the gross disparities we see. It guides us to look further at how we apportion resources and opportunity to produce the outcomes we see. It calls us to focus on creating equity by consciously looking at the way inequity was produced. Let these data help us examine more closely the sources of inequity and the ways to create sustainable changes that lead to enduring success.

The Maasai people of southern Kenya and northern Tanzania greet each other by asking “Kasserian Ingera,” which means, “and how are the children?” The question rests on an assumption that the entire community is responsible for the health and well-being of its children. It assumes that as a community all strive to be able to respond that the children are well. As a region we will only succeed when we can answer with assurance, “Yes, the children indeed are well!”

Norman White
Associate Professor
Criminology and Criminal Justice
Saint Louis University

---

Percent of Students Who Are Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch

Importance of this Indicator

The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) is a federally assisted meal program operating in public schools. It provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost or free lunches to children each school day. Children from families with incomes at or below 130% of the poverty level are eligible for free school meals. Those with incomes between 130% and 185% of the poverty level are eligible for reduced price meals. Because eligibility for this program is derived from the federal poverty level, the free/reduced price lunch data are frequently used as a proxy for school poverty. The National School Lunch Program is a critical program addressing childhood hunger and food insecurity, so much so that the program has been expanded to ensure that low-income children continue to receive regular, nutritious meals in the summer months when school is not in session. Food insecurity can have a dramatic impact on student achievement. Food-insecure children show smaller gains in math and reading achievement between kindergarten and third grade, and, among those ages 6 to 11, a higher likelihood of repeating a grade. Food insecurity, particularly when experienced in the earliest primary grades, also has a significant detrimental effect on non-cognitive classroom measures, such as interpersonal skills and self-control. Students cannot learn and reach their full academic potential if their most basic needs, like food, are not met.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 7.6 – 29.4%
- 29.5 – 51.3%
- 51.4 – 75.7%
- 75.8 – 100.0%

School districts shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 51.3%
- MO: 51.7%
- IL: 50.0%

### Percent of Students Who Are Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch

#### DEFINITION
The percentage of students in a district eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

#### SOURCE

#### CALCULATION
- **MO & IL:** Percentage provided by Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and Illinois State Board of Education.

#### NOTE
Some school districts with extremely high rates of student eligibility decide it is more efficient from an administrative or service delivery perspective to provide free lunches to all children in the district, thus resulting in a reported eligibility rate of 100 percent.

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehville</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Gardens</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School District</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethalto</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton-Wood River</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsville</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite City</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood River-Hartford</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of this Indicator

Nearly one in three U.S. children lives in a household where a language other than English is spoken. 1 English language learners are the fastest growing segment of the school-age population in the United States. They are a tremendously diverse group representing many languages, cultures, ethnicities, nationalities, and socioeconomic backgrounds.2 Most English language learners were born in the United States. However, their parents and grandparents are often immigrants or refugees who speak their native language at home. English language learners may face a variety of challenges that could adversely affect their learning progress and academic achievement, such as poverty, familial transiency, or non-citizenship status. Some English language learners are also recently arrived immigrants or refugees who may have experienced war, social turmoil, persecution, and significant periods of educational disruption.3 On average, English language learners tend, relative to their English-speaking peers, to underperform on standardized tests, drop out of school at significantly higher rates, and decline to pursue postsecondary education.4 Providing all students, including English language learners, with the funding, programs and supports needed to ensure they succeed academically is critical to producing a strong, educated, skilled workforce that is fully engaged and contributing to the growth and vitality of the region.

---

### Percent of Students Who Are English Language Learners

#### DEFINITION

The percentage of students in a district who are English Language Learners. English Language Learners (ELLs) are students whose English proficiency is not yet sufficient to provide the students with the ability to successfully participate and achieve in classroom settings where the language of instruction is English. Districts must provide additional services for ELLs to ensure that they meet the state's proficient level of achievement on state assessments, successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English, and participate fully in the school setting. Note: The state of Missouri uses the term "students with Limited English Proficiency." The state of Illinois uses the term "English Language Learners.)

#### SOURCE


#### CALCULATION

Percentage provided by Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and Illinois State Board of Education.

#### NOTE

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>&amp; ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>&amp; ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. CHARLES COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>&amp; ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>&amp; ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holiday</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>&amp; ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>&amp; ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethalto</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton-Wood River</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsville</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite City</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood River-Hartford</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Students Who Are Homeless

Importance of this Indicator

Homelessness can have a significant negative impact on child well-being and affect children academically, socially, and emotionally. Homeless students experience greater school mobility than their non-homeless peers. School mobility can cause interruptions to a child’s education and is associated with lower school achievement and increased risk of dropping out of school.\(^1\) Homeless students are at a greater risk of being chronically absent than their non-homeless peers.\(^2\) Chronic absenteeism is associated with lower academic achievement and higher dropout rates.\(^3\) Additionally, homeless students face significant gaps in high school graduation rates compared to their peers. The Education for Homeless Children and Youths (EHCY) program, authorized under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act), is designed to address the needs of homeless children and youth. The goal of this act is to ensure the educational rights and protections of homeless children by removing barriers to accessing a high-quality education. While this act does much to help support homeless students access the education they deserve, we must ensure that schools, particularly those that have a high number of homeless students, have the funding, resources, training, and policies and procedures in place to best meet the needs of these students.

---

Percent of Students Who Are Homeless

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Gardens</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School District</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. CHARLES COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**Definition**

The percentage of students in a district who are homeless. (The McKinney-Vento Act defines homeless students as individuals who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. The term includes students who are sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing or economic hardship, living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to lack of alternative adequate accommodations, living in emergency or transitional shelters, or living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations, or similar settings.)

**Source**


### Calculation

(Number of homeless students/Total district enrollment) X 100. Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

**Note**

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*
Importance of this Indicator

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is a law ensuring services to children with disabilities throughout the nation. IDEA governs how states and public agencies provide early intervention, special education and related services to eligible infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. Once a child is identified, evaluated, and found to be eligible for special education services under IDEA, an Individualized Education Program (IEP) is created. Each public school child who receives special education and related services must have an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Each IEP must be designed to meet the specific needs of the student and must be a truly individualized document. The IEP creates an opportunity for teachers, parents, school administrators, related services personnel, and students (when appropriate) to work together to improve the educational outcomes for children with disabilities. The IEP is critical to providing a quality education to each child with a disability. It is important that we support and advocate for laws and policies such as IDEA that provide children with disabilities critical support services like IEPs. IDEA is a critical policy and funding stream helping to ensure that all children reach their full potential.

Percent of Students With An IEP (Individualized Education Program)

### Definition
The percentage of students in a district who receive special education and related services in accordance with their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Each special education student receives an Individualized Education Program (IEP) that specifies supplemental services, modifications, and accommodations available to that student.

#### Source

#### Calculation
- MO: (Number of students with an IEP/Total district enrollment) X 100. Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.
- IL: Percentage provided by Illinois State Board of Education.

#### Note
Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*

---

### Data Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### St. Charles County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### St. Clair County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Madison County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethalto</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton-Wood River</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsville</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite City</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood River-Hartford</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student/Teacher Ratio

Importance of this Indicator

Student-teacher ratios are often used as a broad indicator of the overall quality of a school district because they are a general measure of teacher workloads and resource allocations in public schools, as well as the amount of individual attention a child is likely to receive from teachers. In addition, “ideal” student-teacher ratios will depend on a wide variety of complex factors, including the age and academic needs of the students represented in the ratio (younger children or higher-need student populations typically require more time, attention, and instructional support from teachers) and the experience, skill, and effectiveness of the teachers (highly skilled teachers may be able to achieve better academic results with larger classes than less skilled teachers with smaller classes). Student-teacher ratios also directly affect per-pupil spending. For example, the salaries and benefits paid to teachers and instructional staff can account for a large proportion of per-pupil expenditures, so higher student-teacher ratios will typically result in lower per-pupil expenditures. It should be noted that most districts count all “instructional staff” as teachers when calculating student-teacher ratios. The instructional staff in a given school may include librarians, speech therapists, and other academic-support specialists or licensed teaching staff who may not have traditionally defined classroom-teaching roles. For this reason, the student-teacher ratio should not be confused with average class size, which tends to be larger.
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- No Data Available
- 6.0 – 11.0
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School districts shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

» US: 16.1
» MO: 17
» IL: 19
### Student/Teacher Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. CHARLES COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

This ratio is calculated using the fall enrollment for the school year divided by the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers and excludes special education teachers.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

MO & IL: Data provided by Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and Illinois State Board of Education.

**NOTE**

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*
Funding for public education comes from three sources: local, state, and federal money. On average, funding for public school districts consists of 45 percent local money, 45 percent state money, and 10 percent federal money. Over the past decade there has been a decline in federal funding. Federal agencies distribute money based on the number of poor and special needs children in a given district. However, these formulas are based on a percentage of the money that Congress appropriates. When Congress appropriates less, schools get less – even as the number of poor and special needs students in the school system rises. Furthermore, in general, during this time state funding has remained about the same, increasing the importance of local funding. This is of critical concern because a greater reliance on local funds results in greater disparities in educational funding and opportunities between rich and poor communities. This is reflected in federal data that shows a growing gap in education spending by the nation’s poorest and most affluent school districts. This is particularly alarming as students in poor districts tend to have more challenges that require greater resources to adequately address than students in more affluent districts. It is imperative that we advocate for policies and legislation that equalize education spending across low- and high-income areas if we want to improve child well-being outcomes for all children in the St. Louis region.
Average Spending per Student

Missouri defines “Average Current Expenditures Per ADA” as the average current expenditure per pupil, in average daily attendance (ADA), for the district. In Illinois, the “Operating Spending Per Pupil” includes all costs for overall operations, including instructional spending, but excluding summer school, adult education, capital expenditures, and long-term debt payments.

SOURCE


CALCULATION
MO & IL: Data provided by Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and Illinois State Board of Education.

NOTE
Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.

Data Notes
DEFINITION

SOURCE

Percent of Students Proficient/Advanced in 3rd Grade Reading

Importance of this Indicator

During the first three years of K-12 schooling children learn how to read. However, by fourth grade children must use their reading skills to learn and master all other subjects. By this point, if a child is not reading proficiently they are at risk of quickly falling behind in all academic areas. Reading proficiency continues to be alarmingly low among children from low-income families and children of color. This is of particular concern since the ability to read is critical to a child’s success in school, their chances of graduating from high school, their life-long earning potential, and their ability to contribute to the nation’s economy and its security.¹ Tellingly, research finds that children who are not reading proficiently by the end of third grade are four times more likely to drop out of school than proficient readers. Additionally, Black and Hispanic children who are not reading proficiently in third grade are twice as likely as similar white children to not graduate from high school.² It is imperative that the critical relationship between reading proficiency and long-term outcomes for children, the inequities related to which children are not reading proficiently by the end of third grade, and the fact that there are many communities and schools in the St. Louis area with high concentrations of low-income children and children of color be considered when discussing how to improve the reading proficiency of all children in the region.

LEGEND
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School districts shaded in the two darkest colors fall below the national average.
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- US: 35.0%
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- IL: 35.0%


1.16 Vision for Children at Risk | www.visionforchildren.org | ©2017
### Percent of Students Proficient/Advanced in 3rd Grade Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. CHARLES COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupo</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holliday</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of third grade students who are proficient/advanced in English language arts as measured by annual state tests. Note: The state of Missouri uses the terms proficient/advanced. The state of Illinois uses the terms met/exceeded. Please note that Missouri and Illinois use different tests to monitor student achievement and progress and therefore the results of Missouri school districts cannot be directly compared to those of Illinois districts. However, these test results give us some indication of how many students in each district are “on track” overall.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

MO: (Percentage of third grade students scoring “proficient” in English language arts + Percentage of students scoring “advanced” in English language arts on the MAP [Missouri Assessment Program] state test). Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.


**NOTE**

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*
Percent of Students Proficient/Advanced in 8th Grade Math

Importance of this Indicator

The level of proficiency students have in mathematics by 8th grade is linked not only to the number of higher-level mathematics and sciences courses students take in high school (and to their success in those courses), but also to numerous additional educational and economic outcomes. Competence in mathematics is essential for functioning in everyday life, as well as for success in our increasingly technology-based workplace. Students who take higher-level mathematics and science courses, which require strong fundamental skills in mathematics, are more likely to attend and to complete college.1

The importance of mathematics extends beyond the academic domain. Competence in mathematics skills is related to higher levels of employability. Furthermore, since 1976 the influence of high school students’ mathematics skills on later earnings has grown steadily.2 Overall, mathematics scores have been rising for all race and ethnicity groups, although white students continue to outscore their Black and Hispanic peers.3 The knowledge and skills needed to succeed in the labor market have changed dramatically over the past several decades and competency in mathematics is now more critical to future success.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
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- 16.1 – 32.0%
- 32.1 – 54.6%
- 54.7 – 77.1%

School districts shaded in the two darkest colors fall below the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 32.0%
- MO: 28.3%
- IL: 32.0%

### Percent of Students Proficient/Advanced in 8th Grade Math

**Q U A L I T Y  E D U C A T I O N**

#### DEFINITION

The percentage of eighth grade students who are proficient/advanced in mathematics as measured by annual state tests. Note: The state of Missouri uses the terms proficient/advanced. The state of Illinois uses the terms met/exceeded. Please note that Missouri and Illinois use different tests to monitor student achievement and progress and therefore the results of Missouri school districts cannot be directly compared to those of Illinois districts. However, these test results give us some indication of how many students in each district are “on track” overall.

#### SOURCE


#### CALCULATION


#### NOTE

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Gardens</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School District</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplo</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Holiday</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethalto</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton-Wood River</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsville</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite City</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood River-Hartford</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students who graduate from high school are more likely to experience success in college and career and to become productive, engaged members of society. High school graduates are less likely than high school dropouts to be unemployed, live in poverty, have poor health or have children who will also live in poverty. Additionally, dropouts are up to six times more likely than high school graduates to report ever having been arrested. Moving just one student from dropout to high school graduate would yield more than $200,000 in higher tax revenues and lower government expenditures over that student’s lifetime. Overall graduation rates have been steadily increasing for all students. However, there is still a significant gap between the graduation rates of white students and those of Black and Hispanic students, with graduation rates for white students remaining consistently higher than those of Black and Hispanic students. Ensuring students graduate from high school starts before they enter kindergarten. We must make sure students are ready for kindergarten by providing affordable, quality early childhood development programs, particularly in communities that experience low graduation rates. Additionally, we must continually monitor markers that can serve as early warning signs for increased risk of dropping out such as strength of reading skills by third grade, early chronic absenteeism, and behavior issues.

Importance of this Indicator
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## Four-Year Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>Grad Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes

#### DEFINITION

The percentage of students who graduated from high school within four years with a regular high school diploma. (The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. From the beginning of 9th grade, students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently adjusted by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during the 9th grade and the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during that same period.)

#### SOURCE


#### CALCULATION

Percentage provided by Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and Illinois State Board of Education.

#### NOTE

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*
Educational attainment is a powerful predictor of well-being. Young adults who have completed higher levels of education are more likely to achieve economic success than those who have not. Completing more years of education also protects against unemployment and qualifies one for a broader range of jobs. Furthermore, higher levels of educational attainment often lead to higher wages and income. Adults with higher levels of education also report being in better health and having higher levels of socio-emotional well-being. As the workforce continues to evolve to be more knowledge-based, it is critical that we provide all students with the foundation and opportunities that will best prepare them to fully participate in the workforce. The affordability of higher education opportunities is certain to remain an issue for years to come. Given the connection between educational attainment, individual well-being, and the overall strength of the economy, it is imperative that we implement policies that increase access to higher education opportunities, particularly for students for whom these opportunities would otherwise be out of reach.
Percent of Students Entering a 2/4-Year College or University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Public</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts.</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Schools Collab.</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. CHARLES COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howell</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Zumwalt</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Farm</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Valley</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville SD 118</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville TWP HSD 201</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County/District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplo</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CCSD 70</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg CHSD 77</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mount</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascoutah</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon CCSD 90</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Fallon TWP HSD 203</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac-W Hollyday</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Village</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County/District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/District</th>
<th>% College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Branch</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALCULATION**

MO: (Percentage of graduates entering a 2yr. college + Percentage of graduates entering a 4yr. college/university). Calculation by Vision for Children at Risk.

IL: Percentage provided by Illinois State Board of Education.

**NOTE**

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of students who graduated with a regular high school diploma from a public high school and enrolled in a two-year or four-year college in the U.S. within six months (for Missouri districts) or 12 months (for Illinois districts).

**SOURCE**


YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

Introduction by: DARLENE SOWELL

Percent of Babies Born to Teen Mothers

Dropout Rate
YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
In communities and households where there is sufficient discretionary income to invest in youth development activities such as sports, extracurricular activities, and social and academic clubs, children and youth are engaged, learning, and occupied during the critical afterschool hours. There is a significant reduction in risky behaviors and negative outcomes such as teen pregnancy and dropping out of high school when youth have access to positive youth development activities. In communities and households with limited resources, those opportunities do not exist for youth without greater community involvement, and risky behaviors and outcomes increase. Teen pregnancy and dropping out of high school are factors in the continuation of the cycle of poverty for many. Teen mothers and high school dropouts are less likely to complete high school or continue with post-secondary education, limiting their earning potential. Young mothers are also less likely to provide their children with the necessary cognitive stimulation due to their circumstance, limiting their child’s potential. In order to close this ‘opportunity gap’ we as a community must provide financial and programmatic support for these families so they can expose their children to experiences they otherwise could not.

The information provided in this section of the Children of Metropolitan St. Louis: A Data Book for the Community shows the importance of investing in youth development for our community. This is clearly shown by examining the teen pregnancy and high school dropout data, negative youth outcomes that increase when youth development opportunities are limited. A close look at the data shows that the ZIP codes in which the percent of births to teen mothers is greater than 10 percent are economically disadvantaged ZIP codes, the majority of which have an average annual household income of $26,000. The communities in which the percent of births to teen mothers is less than 2 percent have an average annual household income of $84,000.

We need to provide ample educational experiences for our children beyond the traditional classroom setting. These activities encourage young people to be creative, develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and foster a thirst for knowledge through experiential learning. Many times these development opportunities occur in after school programs and during the summer months.

The benefits of youth development opportunities for the individual child and the community are vast. One important aspect of youth development is the development of social emotional skills. Social emotional learning enables our children and youth to develop a sense of belonging and the ability to self-regulate and socialize. These societal cues are valuable throughout a lifetime and are necessary skills for productive individuals in our communities.

Youth development activities also provide children with opportunities to learn the “soft skills” of timeliness, accountability, responsibility, self-esteem, and self-worth in addition to job readiness and technical skills. By focusing on these competencies for children, one will be able to transition from a young child learning in an early childhood education setting to becoming an enthusiastic elementary school scholar. These elements will then help that elementary school scholar grow into a thriving high school student. The personal accomplishments of the high school student further develops the skills necessary to become a college graduate or an apprentice in the career of his or her choosing. This investment in youth development ensures that we produce a generation that makes significant contributions to the economic vitality of our community.

In order to maximize the potential of ALL our youth in the region, parents, schools, child and youth serving non-profits, government, and the business community must invest in a variety of preventative measures that reduce the occurrence of risky behaviors among our children, particularly those in under-resourced communities. Providing this support for ALL of our children capitalizes on the assets and resiliency they bring to our community, today and in the future.

Darlene Sowell
President/CEO
Neighborhood Houses
**Percent of Babies Born to Teen Mothers**

**Importance of this Indicator**

Children born to teen mothers are more likely to be born prematurely, to be born at a low birth weight, and to die as infants, compared with children born to mothers in their twenties and early thirties. They generally have poorer academic and behavioral outcomes than do children born to older mothers. Compared with older mothers, teen mothers are less likely to finish high school or go on to college, and more likely to be dependent on government benefits, especially in the first years after giving birth.

An analysis of the economic costs of teen childbearing suggests that it costs society $28 billion annually in lost productivity (of both the teenage parents and particularly their children) and increases burdens on the healthcare, child welfare, and prison systems. Because teen childbearing has detrimental effects on the well-being of both the baby and the teenage mother, it is critical that we invest and implement evidence-based strategies and programs proven to reduce the number of babies born to teen mothers.

---

## Percent of Babies Born to Teen Mothers

### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of infants born to women under 20 years of age.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

(Number of births to women under age 20/Total number of births) X 100. Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

**NOTE**

Data was suppressed for ZIP codes with fewer than 10 births.

*No Data Available.

*Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

### ZIP % Teen Births

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Teen Births</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZIP % Teen Births

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Teen Births</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62220</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62221</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62222</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63144</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63305</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63397</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dropout Rate

Importance of this Indicator

Dropping out of high school is associated with significant negative life outcomes that have a dramatic impact on the overall well-being of both the dropout and the wider community. The completion of high school is usually required for accessing post-secondary education opportunities and is a minimum requirement for most jobs.\(^1\) A high school diploma is also associated with higher incomes, while young adults with low education and skill levels are more likely to live in poverty and to receive government assistance. High school dropouts are also more likely to become involved in crime and have poorer health, including poor mental health. Such negative outcomes, along with diminished labor force participation, exact a high economic toll on society.\(^2\) A range of factors have been shown to increase a student’s risk of dropping out, including high rates of absenteeism, low levels of school engagement, low parental education, work or family responsibilities, problematic behavior, moving to a new school in the ninth grade, and attending a school with lower achievement scores.\(^3\) While the dropout rate has been declining among all youth for decades, disparities continue to persist, with Black and Hispanic youth continuing to drop out at the highest rates.

LEGEND

- No Data Available
- 0.0 – 2.9
- 3.0 – 5.9
- 6.0 – 11.7
- 11.8 – 17.4

School districts shaded in the two darkest colors exceed the national average.

COMPARATIVE NORMS

- US: 5.9%
- MO: 2.2%
- IL: 2.0%

---


Dropout Rate

**DEFINITION**

Illinois provides the percentage of students who are removed from the local enrollment roster before the end of a school term. Dropouts include students in grades 9-12 whose names have been removed for any reason, including moved not known to be continuing, transfer to GED-program, and aged out. The percentage does not include death, extended illness, graduation/completion of a program of studies, transfer to another public/private/home school, or expulsion. Missouri defines the dropout rate as the number of dropouts divided by the total of September enrollment, plus transfers in, minus transfers out, minus dropouts, added to September enrollment, then divided by two.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

MO & IL: Percentage provided by Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and Illinois State Board of Education.

**NOTE**

Due to the particularities of some school districts and limitations of the mapping software, the following school districts are not displayed on the map but are included on the data table: Belleville TWP HSD 201, East Alton-Wood River, Freeburg CHSD 73, O Fallon TWP HSD 203 and the Special School District. Some Illinois school districts only serve grades pre-K through 8th grade or grades 9-12 and therefore may not have corresponding data for certain indicators.

*No Data Available.*
SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS AND STRONG COMMUNITIES

Introduction by: MAYOR LYDA KREWSON

Percent of Housing Units that are Vacant

Crime Rate per 1,000 Individuals

Violent Crime Rate per 1,000 Individuals
SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS AND STRONG COMMUNITIES
Safe neighborhoods and strong communities are essential to the vitality of a city, as well as in promoting the well-being of children, youth and families. Efforts to make neighborhoods safer and local communities stronger must be priorities throughout the St. Louis region. In the City of St. Louis, neighborhood safety is my number one priority.

Establishing and maintaining safe neighborhoods and strong communities are complex, multifaceted tasks that must be pursued through a variety of avenues. My administration has developed a broad range of strategies for achieving those goals. Since I became mayor, we have worked with law enforcement, consultants, residents, and City departments to develop a modern, collaborative, and more equitable approach to a safer city for all. Those efforts are proceeding on two primary fronts: improved law enforcement and community-building – because crime occurs at the intersection of poverty and despair and that is where our fight must begin.

Details, updates and progress of those efforts can be found on the Mayor’s Office website, www.stlouis-mo.gov. Some highlights of those efforts are outlined below.

Law Enforcement Strategies

- A new strategic planning process for the police department has been embraced and is being implemented under the guidance of consultants Paul Evans and Joan Sweeney, who are largely credited with significantly reducing violent crime in Boston.
- Precision Policing is being implemented. This is an approach that focuses on the most violent offenders to reduce gun violence.
- Police Commissioner Search – This is a central issue related to effective law enforcement. I have named an all-star Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to assist and advise in the search and selection of the Police Chief.
- Competitive Compensation for Police – In April 2017, St. Louis County passed a half-cent sales tax that will result in a 30% salary increase for County officers. With the promise of a big raise in the County, many City officers are considering a move. We need to keep our good, experienced officers, and recruit high-quality candidates for our Academy. In response, I have worked with the Board of Aldermen to ask voters to pass a half-cent sales tax in November 2017.

Safe neighborhoods are, in large part, a product of strong, stable and equitable local communities. To that end, we are working on a variety of community-building and strengthening efforts. Our goal is to provide excellent, efficient and reliable services to all residents, regardless of zip code or ward. We also will pursue policies to improve opportunities and the quality of life for all city residents. Highlights of those efforts include:

Community Building and Strengthening Strategies

- CityStat – Understanding that crime is not just a police problem, St. Louis has initiated and implemented CityStat. Every two weeks, police commanders and civilian department heads meet at CityStat meetings to pinpoint public safety concerns and marshal our resources to eradicate those problems.
- Community Relationships – Recognizing that both preventing and solving crime requires good community relationships, each officer is now required to spend at least 20 minutes per shift out of their vehicle, visiting with and getting to know folks in the neighborhood.
- Minimum Wage – We know well that that poverty rates and crime statistics are linked. The ability to earn a living wage is an issue of both equity and public safety. The City implemented an increase in the Minimum Wage from $7.70 to $10 per hour for city businesses with more than 15 employees. The Missouri State Legislature voted to preempt the city ordinance and return the minimum wage to $7.70 per hour effective in August 2017. We will continue to fight for better wages for working families.

Maintaining public safety and strengthening local communities are needs throughout the St. Louis region. It is an issue on which we need to work jointly. St. Charles County Executive Steve Ehlmann recently spoke to the importance of safe neighborhoods and outlined strategies for achieving safety. St. Louis County Executive Steve Stanger and I are working to achieve more St. Louis City-County cooperation across a range of issues. If we are to grow and thrive as a region, we must begin to think and act regionally.

Lyda Krewson
Mayor
City of St. Louis
Vacant properties not only have a negative impact on surrounding communities, but also are a significant financial burden on municipalities. Vacant properties strain the resources of local police, fire, building, and health departments, depreciate property values in surrounding neighborhoods, reduce property tax revenue, attract crime, and degrade the overall quality of life for remaining residents. There are many variables that contribute to a property becoming vacant. However, there are also numerous policies, patterns of disinvestment, and inequitable distribution of municipal resources that contribute to high concentrations of vacant houses in certain neighborhoods. All of these factors must be considered when implementing strategies and neighborhood plans aimed at addressing vacant housing and the issues created by these properties.

---

### Percent of Housing Units that are Vacant

#### Data Notes

**DEFINITION**

The percentage of total housing units that are vacant.

**SOURCE**


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62001</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62002</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62010</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62012</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62018</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62021</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62024</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62025</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62034</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62035</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62046</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62048</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62058</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62059</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62060</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62061</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62062</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62067</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62084</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62087</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62088</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62090</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62095</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62097</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62201</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62203</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62204</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62205</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62206</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62207</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62208</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62209</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62211</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62225</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62226</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62232</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62234</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62236</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62239</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62240</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62243</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62249</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62254</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62255</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62257</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62350</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62258</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62260</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62264</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62265</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62269</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62275</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62281</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62282</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62285</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62289</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62293</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62294</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62298</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63005</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63021</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63025</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63026</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63031</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63034</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63038</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63049</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63069</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63074</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63088</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63101</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63102</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63103</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63104</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63105</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63106</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63107</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63108</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63109</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63110</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63111</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63112</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63113</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63114</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63115</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63116</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63117</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63118</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63119</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63120</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63121</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63122</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63123</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63124</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63125</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63126</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63127</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63128</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63129</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63130</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63131</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63132</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63133</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63134</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63135</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63136</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63137</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63138</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63139</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63140</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63141</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63142</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63143</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63146</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63147</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63301</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63303</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63304</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63332</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63341</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63348</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63366</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63373</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63376</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CALCULATION**

(Number of vacant housing units/Total number of housing units) X 100.

Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.

Denotes ZIP codes with a child population less than 300. Extra caution should be used when interpreting this data.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63508</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63511</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63512</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63513</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63514</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63515</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63516</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63517</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63518</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63519</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63520</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63521</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63522</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63523</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63524</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63525</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63526</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63527</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63528</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63529</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Percent of Housing Units that are Vacant
### Crime Rate per 1,000 Individuals

**ST. LOUIS CITY**

- Academy: 422.9
- Baden: 91.5
- Benton Park: 72.2
- Benton Park West: 76.3
- Bevo Mill: 47.8
- Botanical Heights: 73.3
- Boulevard Heights: 28.2
- Carondelet: 81.2
- Carr Square: 59.5
- Central West End: 81.7
- Cheltenham: 151.6
- Clayton-Tamm: 55.1
- Clifton Heights: 35.1
- College Hill: 67.3
- Columbus Square: 148.7
- Compton Heights: 54.0
- Covenant-Blu/Grand Ctr: 83.7
- DeBaliviere Place: 62.0
- Downtown: 357.2
- Downtown West: 227.2
- Dutchtown: 88.9
- Ellendale: 69.2
- Fairground: 100.4
- Forest Park SE: 103.5
- Fountain Park: 109.8
- Fox Park: 76.0
- Franz Park: 36.9
- Gravois Park: 133.0
- Hamilton Heights: 105.0
- Hi-Point: 36.4
- Holly Hills: 41.1
- Hyde Park: 91.1
- Jeff Vanderlou: 106.5
- Kings Oak: 144.4

**ST. LOUIS COUNTY**

- Ballwin: 88.4
- Be Nor: 20.0
- Bel Ridge: 76.1
- Bella Villa: 23.1
- Bellefontaine Neighbors: 47.3
- Bellerive Acres: 10.6
- Berkeley: 54.1
- Beverly Hills: 82.4
- Black Jack: 0.0
- Breckenridge Hills: 29.0
- Brentwood: 47.0
- Bridgeton: 80.2
- Calverton Park: 17.1
- Champ: 0.0
- Charlock: 33.5
- Chesterfield: 17.7
- Clarkson Valley: 0.0
- Clayton: 19.3
- Cool Valley: 68.5
- Country Club Hills: 66.1
- Country Life Acres: 0.0
- Crestwood: 27.7
- Creve Coeur: 15.0
- Crystal Lake Park: 0.0

**COMPARATIVE NORMS**

- US: 28.7 per 1,000
- MO: 33.5 per 1,000
- IL: 23.0 per 1,000
Crime Rate per 1,000 Individuals (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagedale</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Hills</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lawn</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Heights</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Hill</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ann</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Hills</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Hills</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town &amp; Country</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Oaks</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplands Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velda City</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinita Park</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinita Terrace</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warson Woods</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellston</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodson Terrace</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ST. CHARLES COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottleville</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foristell</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake St. Louis</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Fallon</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peters</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ST. CLAIR COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Clair CO SO</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseyville</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centreville</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**CALCULATION**

\[
(\text{Total number of crimes} \times 1,000) / \text{Total population}
\]

Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*
## Violent Crime Rate per 1,000 Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS CITY</strong></td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Park</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Park West</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevo Mill</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Heights</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Heights</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carondelet</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr Square</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West End</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton-Tamm</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Heights</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Hill</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Square</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Heights</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant-Blu/Grand Ctr</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBaliviere Place</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown West</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchtown</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellendale</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairground</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park SE</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Park</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Park</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravois Park</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Heights</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Point</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Hills</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Vanderlou</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Oak</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiffany</strong></td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Grove East</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Grove South</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandevertor</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitaton Park</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Park East</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Park West</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells-Goodfellow</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wydown-Skinker</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballwin</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel Nor</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel Ridge</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Villa</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellefontaine Nghbrs</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleview Acres</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Jack</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge Hills</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calverton Park</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlack</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson Valley</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool Valley</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Hills</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Life Acres</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestwood</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creve Coeur</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. LOUIS COUNTY</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellwood</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Peres</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmundson</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellisville</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flordell Hills</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florissant</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Echo Park</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantwood Village</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanley Hills</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntleigh</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinloch</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake St. Louis</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshire</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Heights</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moline Acres</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwoods</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivette</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparative Norms**

- US: 3.8 per 1,000
- MO: 5.0 per 1,000
- IL: 3.7 per 1,000
Violent Crime Rate per 1,000 Individuals (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagedale</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Hills</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lawn</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Heights</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Hill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ann</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Hills</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Hills</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town &amp; Country</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Oaks</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplands Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velda City</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinita Park</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinita Terrace</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warson Woods</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellston</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willour Park</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodson Terrace</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. CHARLES COUNTY</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottleville</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foristell</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake St. Louis</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Fallon</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peters</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentzville</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. CLAIR COUNTY</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clair CO SO</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseyville</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centreville</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Notes**

**DEFINITION**

The following crimes are included in the St. Louis County and St. Charles County violent crime rates: criminal homicide, negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. The following crimes are included in the St. Louis City violent crime rate: homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. The following crimes are included in the Madison County and St. Clair County violent crime rates: criminal homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault/battery.

**SOURCE**


**CALCULATION**

$$\frac{\text{Total number of violent crimes} \times 1,000}{\text{Total population}}.$$ Calculations made by Vision for Children at Risk.

*No Data Available.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MADISON COUNTY</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison CO SO</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethalto</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Alton</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsville</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Carbon</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantfork</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoon Beach</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Roxana</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jacob</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood River</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let's break down the document into its main sections and paragraphs for better understanding:

**Afterward**

**Critical Issues and Needed Action to Promote the Well-Being of St. Louis Children**

It has been more than a quarter-century since the first edition of the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis* report was published. That 1991 report highlighted the stark disparities in child well-being that characterized the St. Louis region. Additionally, the report noted the large body of research documenting the strong connection between the well-being of children and their families, community and economic development, and the overall quality of community life. The report called for more study so the status of children and families could be more fully understood and efforts to address the problems and needs they faced would be better informed. The report concluded with a call-to-action, urging strategic, systematic community efforts to improve the well-being of St. Louis area children and families and, in the process, spur broader growth and development across the region.

In the intervening years, there has been an abundance of additional study in the region to further explicate the status and well-being of children and families and to outline steps that can (and should) be taken to promote their well-being: thereby, lifting up the entire St. Louis region. Reports from For the Sake of All and the Ferguson Commission, nine additional editions of the *Children of Metropolitan St. Louis* report, and a host of other studies have made us better informed about these problems and needs.

What the region has not yet done is take the systematic, strategic community actions required to address these critical issues and improve the problems that confront us. That raises the uncomfortable question of whether the St. Louis region is unable – or simply unwilling – to take the steps and make the changes required to achieve equity and promote prosperity and growth in the region. The data in this report suggest that time may well be running out on the opportunity to address and resolve these critical issues.

The St. Louis region has earned an unwanted – but not unmerited – reputation for negative outcomes related to its socio-economic disparity and racial inequity. Additionally, both population growth and economic development lag behind the metropolitan areas with which we compare and compete. In short, the St. Louis brand has been diminished.

We suggest that there are three primary causes for the failure of the region to act on the problems undermining our well-being:

1. **Denial** – Even in the face of compelling evidence, there is a civic unwillingness to acknowledge problems. A case in point is reaction to the 1997 CMSL report. That report moved the 63135 ZIP code (essentially aligning with Ferguson’s boundaries) into the high-risk category related to child and family well-being. The local response was to challenge the accuracy of the data, rather than to address the problems identified. Community inaction contributed to serious outcomes down the road.

2. **Weak Civic Leadership** – With a few notable exceptions, the political and business arenas have lacked the strong leadership required to address and resolve the critical issues facing the St. Louis region. Without such leadership, the region cannot muster the will to act on its most challenging problems.

3. **Governmental Fragmentation** – Even when St. Louis generates the political will to attempt action on significant problems, our fragmented, archaic governmental structures undermine the ability of the region to do so. Marshalling necessary resources and coordinating strategic community action become herculean – if not impossible – tasks.

In the face of these unfavorable circumstances, there is both motivation and opportunity for the St. Louis region to take the steps necessary to put itself back on track, promoting the well-being of children and families and simultaneously advancing the prosperity of the region. Reports from the Ferguson Commission and For the Sake of All provide motivation and direction, explicating the problems we face and outlining steps to address them. The St. Louis Regional Early Childhood Council is leading a coordinated effort to develop an early childhood development system. Ready by 21 St. Louis, a cradle-to-career initiative directed to building the systems required to promote the well-being of children, youth and families, offers a vehicle through which the region can move forward with this vital work. The St. Louis business and civic communities are expressing new interest in participating in key initiatives to address child and family needs.
The alternative courses for the St. Louis region are clear: we can put ourselves on an upward trajectory by acknowledging our problems and acting on available opportunities to correct them; or we can stay on our present course and accept more decline. The choice is ours.

**Community Strategies to Promote Child Well-being**

- Make promotion of the well-being of children, youth and families a community priority. Establish the link between the well-being of children and economic development and quality of life throughout the region.

- Engage community leaders at all levels in strategic efforts to advance child well-being. Work to ensure that top-level business, civic and political leaders are engaged, as well as grassroots community members. Inclusion of the populations most affected by decisions is essential.

- Establish measurable outcome goals to be achieved.

- Identify specific strategies to be pursued in achieving goals and build the system required to implement those strategies.

- Target goals and strategies to increase racial equity and focus on the communities facing the greatest risks and with the greatest unmet needs.

- Ensure required resources are in place to pursue identified strategies and build needed systems.

- Build data systems to inform the process. Data systems can: (1) identify problems and needs; (2) establish baseline measures; (3) track trends; and (4) measure progress toward achieving goals. Use data to monitor progress and refine strategies.
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