


➤ POVERTY INDICATORS IN  
THE PRESCOTT QUAD-CITY  
AREA:  
A COMMUNITY BASED  
ASSESSMENT OF RESOURCES



“Poverty is not an accident. Like slavery and apartheid, it is man-made and can be removed by the actions of human beings.”

- *Nelson Mandela, 1918-2013*

# Poverty In Yavapai County


9% of families live in poverty (\$22,350/yr. for a family of four)

- ▶ 26% of households with children 0-5 live in poverty
- ▶ 62% of single mothers with children 0-5 live in poverty (median income: \$18,096)
- ▶ 19% increase in children 0-5 receiving nutritional assistance since 2010
- ▶ 1 in 4 children are food insecure
- ▶ 53% of children do not receive early education to prepare them for school
- ▶ 25% are senior citizens - many have lost their homes or have significant loss in retirement income
- ▶ 5% of grandparents are raising their grandchildren
- ▶ 17% are disabled
- ▶ County lost \$126,000 federal grants for food, shelter, emergency healthcare



# Arizona Children Living in Poverty

- According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2012 approximately 1.1 million Arizonans were living in poverty. For a family of four, this means an annual household income of less than \$21,954.
- **Arizona Children Living in Poverty**
- Households with persons under 18 years old 27%
- Households with persons 5-17 years old 25.3%
- Households with persons under 5 years old 30.5%



Food insecurity and low wages are directly related to a larger challenge for Yavapai County; our poverty rates are on the rise.

*“The notion that the problem of addressing a single issue such as individual behaviors or government interventions must be abandoned.”*

(prominent economist, Jeffrey Sachs as cited in Solanki, 2012)



# Sample Size By Group

- Leadership (Group 1) 230 Participants
- Poverty (Group 2) 123 Participants
- Incomplete 62 Participants
- Total Sampler Size 415 Participants



# Likert Scale

➤ **1 2 3 4 5**

1. inadequate
2. less than
3. adequate\*
4. somewhat adequate
5. good resource and availability



# Resource Likert Scores

Resource Likert score of Leadership (Group 1) Likert score of Poverty (Group 2)

- ▶ **1. Housing and Banking** (1) Inadequate (3) Somewhat inadequate
- ▶ **2. Predator Protection** (1) Inadequate (2) Less than adequate
- ▶ **3. Job Opportunities/Wages** (1) Inadequate (2) Less than adequate
- ▶ **4. Educational Services** (3) Somewhat inadequate (3) Somewhat inadequate
- ▶ **5. Transportation Services** (1) Inadequate (1) Inadequate
- ▶ **6. Health and Nutrition Services** (2) Less than adequate (3) Somewhat inadequate
- ▶ **7. Leadership** (1) Inadequate (2) Less than adequate





# Additional Findings:

## Additional Findings:

- **42.28%** of the sample living at or below the federal definition of poverty attended college.
- **22.47%** of the sample living at or below the federal definition of poverty hold a college degree or certificate of professional training.
- **74.11%** of Poverty group reported combined household earnings below the living wage of \$19.30/hour for a single person.
- **28.35%** of Leadership group reported earning more than \$100,000 per year.
- **55.90%** of Leadership group who reported earning over \$100,000 per year also self identified as middle class. (Table 5)



# Participants Willing to Engage Improvement Processes

Participants willing to engage in an improvement processes:

- 1. Housing and Banking 29.79% 101
- 2. Predator Protection 27.63% 92
- 3. Job Opportunities/Wages 32.23% 107
- 4. Educational Services 25.54% 83
- 5. Transportation Services 25.16% 81
- 6. Health and Nutrition Services 21.74% 70
- 7. Leadership 22.81% 73

# As Quad-Cities Continues to Grow, We Will Likely Witness Three Effects:

- (1) the continued migration of work eligible residents to communities where jobs, living wages and community resources are available; a trend already under way during the 2010 census as demonstrated by a 2-3% drop in the 21-35 year demographic,
- (2) Fiscal hardship: Despite our area's reliance on growth and development, in Yavapai County the majority of governmental revenue is generated by privilege/sales tax.
- (3) The growing number of people living in poverty will impact the city's bottom line impacting city systems further diminishing overall quality of life indicators for all residents.



## Possible Next Steps

**(1) Distribute Survey results to the community with full report available on the Web site:**

**(2) Convene a “Poverty Indicator Action Conference”**

The conference will highlight best case practices that positively impact poverty indicator resources.

# Possible Next Steps

## (3) **White Paper**

A summary of the proposed, “Poverty Indicators Action Conference”, including research and analysis of the poverty indicators used in the survey and an examination of short and long term implications for our community, will be presented in a white paper. The white paper will be used as a foundation for presentations and forums to encourage community officials, business leaders, nonprofits, and advocates to look at growing poverty populations in a new light. The paper will be available for distribution and on the United Way of Yavapai County Running head: POVERTY INDICATORS IN THE QUAD-CITY AREA 2014, website.



# Possible Next Steps

## **(4) Launch a “Campaign to End Poverty” - A Call to Action!**

Conference participants and community members will be invited to join a campaign to end poverty in our community. The campaign objective will be to reduce the rate of people living in poverty by 20% by 2020. Working together, we will be seeing poverty clearly by 2020



# YAVAPAI COLLEGE

- ▶ Thank You for this opportunity to present this critical information for your consideration.
- ▶ QUESTIONS



# Gerry Garvey

- ▶ Fellow Associate: Institute for Sustainable Change, Prescott College