

- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Welcome to Minnesota Milestones 2011! Minnesota Milestones began in 1991 in the belief that a shared vision, clear goals and measurement of results would lead to a better future for Minnesota. The report uses 60 progress indicators to determine whether the state is achieving 19 publicly determined goals. The goals are grouped in four broad areas: People, Community and Democracy, Economy and Environment.

As a starting point, readers are encouraged to read the <u>summary</u> of Minnesota Milestones 2011. The summary provides a brief overview on how Minnesota is progressing toward each goal. <u>Read more about</u> <u>Minnesota Milestones...</u>

- Our children will not live in poverty.
 - 1 Child Poverty
 - 2 Low-income School Children
- Families will provide a stable, supportive environment for their children.
 - 3 Teen Pregnancy
 - 4 Kids Count Rank
- All children will be healthy and start school ready to learn.
 - 5 Low Birth Weight
 - 6 On-time Immunization
 - 7 School Readiness

Minnesotans will excel in basic and challenging academic skills and

- knowledge.
 - 8 Third-grade Reading
 - 9 11th Grade Math
 - 10 High School Graduation
 - 11 College Readiness

Minnesotans will be healthy.

- 12 Health Insurance
- 13 Infant Mortality
- 14 Life Expectancy
- 15 Diabetes
- 16 Obesity
- 17 Tobacco Use
- 18 Suicide
- 19 Index of Well-Being
- 20 Traffic Injuries and Fatalities

Our communities will be safe, friendly and caring.

21 Volunteering

22 Violent and Property Crime

23 Homicide Rate

24 Juvenile Apprehensions

All people will be welcomed, respected and able to participate fully in Minnesota's communities and economy.

25 Food Shelf Use

26 Homelessness

27 Employment of People with Disabilities

28 Bias Crimes

29 Voter Turnout

Government in Minnesota will be cost-efficient, and services will be designed to meet the needs of the people who use them.

30 Price of Government

31 Bridges in Good Condition

32 Commute Times

Minnesota will have sustainable, strong economic growth.

33 Growth in Gross State Product

34 Employment of Working-age Population

35 Employment/population ratio

36 Change in Number of Jobs

37 Change in Number of Establishments

38 Unemployment Rate

Minnesota's workforce will have the education and training to make the state a leader in the global economy.

39 High School Education

40 Some College Education

41 College Graduation

All Minnesotans will have the economic means to maintain a reasonable standard of living.

42 Median Household Income Compared to U.S. Median

43 Poverty Rate

44 Average Wage

All Minnesotans will have decent, safe and affordable housing.

45 Home Ownership

46 Housing Costs

47 Foreclosures

Rural areas, small cities and urban neighborhoods throughout the state will be economically viable places for people to live and work.

48 Counties with In-Migration

49 Regional Disparity in Unemployment

50 Income by Congressional District

Minnesotans will improve the quality of the air, water and earth.

51 Energy use per person

52 Air quality

53 Greenhouse gas emissions

54 Lake water quality

55 Water use

56 Drinking water quality

Minnesotans will restore and maintain healthy ecosystems that support diverse plants and wildlife.

57 Frogs

58 Loon populations

59 Breeding bird populations

Minnesotans will have opportunities to enjoy the state's natural resources.

60 Outdoor Recreation





Indicator 33: Growth in Gross State Product

Milestones 2011

- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



data to draw conclusions Desirable or

positive.



Rationale: Economic growth creates jobs and may increase opportunities for better jobs and improved living standards. Sustainable, strong economic growth puts Minnesota in a better position to achieve other Minnesota Milestones goals. Gross state product is the most commonly used measure of overall economic production. Continuous growth in



login

gross state product is a strong indication of a healthy economy.

About this indicator: Minnesota's gross state product declined by 2.3 percent in 2009, after four years of tepid growth. Growth was stronger in the late 1990s, when annual growth rates ranged between 3 and 5 percent.

Gross state product is the value of all goods and services produced in the state.



YEAR DATA

Minnesota growth

GDP in Millions of dollars

Annual real growth in the gross state product, U.S. Department of Commerce Edit trend | Edit data Minnesota real GDP, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis Edit trend | Edit data

	YEAR	DATA	
1998		5.3%	189,260
1999		4.5%	197,810
2000		6.8%	211,177
2001		0.8%	212,802
2002		2.3%	217,705
2003		3.4%	225,073
2004		4.1%	234,347
2005		1.7%	238,367
2006		0.2%	238,938
2007		0.7%	240,548
2008		1.8%	244,759
2009		-2.3%	239,043
Annual real growth in the gross state product, U.S. Department of Commerce			
Edit trend Edit data			
Minnesota real GDP, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis <u>Edit trend Edit data</u>			

For comparison: Among 50 states and the District of Columbia, Minnesota ranked 46th in gross state product growth between 2000 and 2009. Minnesota's gain of 38 percent was below the national average of 43 percent percent. Per capita personal income (a major component of GDP) growth during the same period was also slower than the national average. Minnesota's rank in per capita personal income declined from 13th in 2000 to 18th in 2009.

Technical notes: The indicator used is millions of 2005 chained dollars. Because of changes in the industrial classification system, totals for 1996 and 1997 are not exactly comparable.

Sources:

 U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, regional accounts data, <u>http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/data.htm</u>

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

• Growth in gross state product





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 34: Employment of Working-age Population



login



Goal: *Minnesota will have* sustainable, strong economic growth.

Rationale: High labor participation rates, as measured by the proportion of the working-age population that is in the workforce, contribute to strong and sustainable economic growth. Economic growth creates jobs and may increase opportunities for better jobs and improved living standards.

About this indicator: The percentage of Minnesotans ages 16 to 64 who are employed has declined since 2000, from 81.3 percent to 74.8 percent in 2009. Minnesota continues to rank high among states, normally ranking in the top 5. These figures are subject to sampling error. Higher unemployment rates are a factor in the decline. Retirement of baby boomers in their late 50s and early 60s may also be contributing.



Percent of population 16-64 who are employed



YEAR	DATA
2000	81.3%
2001	81.3%
2002	80.9%
2003	80.0%
2004	79.1%
2005	79.4%
2006	80.0%
2007	78.7%
2008	77.6%
2009	74.8%

Percent of population 16-64 who are employed, Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau

For comparison: The American Community Survey also collects data on this topic. The 2008 and 2009 values in the ACS are similar to those in the Current Population Survey.

Sources:

• Current Population Survey data, provided by Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development.

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

• Employment of working-age population

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 35: Employment/population ratio

login

OS find your ca

Education Career



Goal: Minnesota will have sustainable, strong economic growth.

Rationale: A high

employment/population ratio means that a large fraction of the population is working and paying taxes. It contributes to greater economic growth because employed people have more money to spend.

About this indicator: The

employment to population ratio declined from 55.1 in 2000 to 53.1 in 2008 and then more sharply to 51.9 in 2009. The Great Recession is responsible for the sharp drop from 2008 to 2009, while slow job growth is probably a major reason for the earlier decline. Baby boomer retirements and lower workforce participation by young adults are other factors in the gradual downward drift.

505

Employment to population ratio



YEAR	DATA
2000	55.1
2001	55.3

Employment to population ratio, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development and U.S. Census Bureau

YEAR	DATA
2002	54.8
2003	54.5
2004	54.2
2005	54.1
2006	54.0
2007	53.6
2008	53.1
2009	51.9

Employment to population ratio, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development and U.S. Census Bureau

Things to think about: The aging of the baby boom generation is expected to produce a lower employment/population ratio in the future, with negative implications for state tax revenues.

Sources:

- Employment data from Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development LAUS data, <u>http://www.deed.state.mn.us</u> /Imi/Home.htm
- Population estimates from U.S. Census Bureau, <u>http://www.census.gov</u> /popest/estimates.html

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 36: Change in Number of Jobs



Rationale: Minnesotans need good jobs in order to provide for themselves and their families and to contribute to the overall economic well-being of the state.

About this indicator: From 2008 to 2009, jobs declined sharply by 4.7 percent in the private sector and 4.1



login

percent in the total economy. Between 2000 and 2008, the number of jobs in Minnesota increased only 2.7 percent. Employment declined in three of eight years since 2000.



YEAR DATA

	All ownerships	Private sector
2001	0.1%	-0.8%
2002	-1.0%	-1.3%

Change in the number of jobs (all sectors), Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Change in the number of jobs (private sector), Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development Edit trend | Edit data

	YEAR	DATA	
2003		-0.3%	-0.2%
2004		1.0%	1.1%
2005		1.3%	1.6%
2006		1.5%	1.6%
2007		0.4%	0.6%
2008		-0.3%	-0.5%
2009		-4.0%	-4.7%
Change in the number of jobs (all sectors), Minnesota Department of Employment and			

Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Change in the number of jobs (private sector), Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u>

For comparison: In the 1990s, the number of jobs grew 27 percent, a much faster rate than this decade. Between 2001 and 2008, job growth in Minnesota was slower than the national average, 2.6 percent compared to 4.0 percent.

Technical notes: The figures shown are for total employment in both public and private employment. The QCEW (Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages) is based on establishments covered by unemployment insurance. The QCEW system covers about 97 percent of Minnesota jobs. It does not include self-employed people.

Sources:

 Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, QCEW employment data, <u>http://www.deed.state.mn.us/lmi/tools/qcew/default.aspx</u>

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 37: Change in Number of Establishments login



Rationale: The creation of new businesses is an indicator of a strong, dynamic economy. Small businesses and start-ups are responsible for much of the job growth in Minnesota.

About this indicator: The number of Minnesota establishments

declined in 2009 by nearly 2,600, or 1.5 percent. The number of establishments also declined in 2007. Growth earlier in the decade had also been slow. There was a net gain of 9,100 establishments between 2004 and 2008. Between 2000 and 2008, the total number of establishments grew 2.7 percent.

The Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW), the source of this data, is based on all establishments covered under the Unemployment Insurance system.



YEAR DATA



Private sector

Percent change in establishments from previous year (all sectors), Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Percent change in establishments from previous year (private sector), Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u>



	YEAR	DATA	
2001		0.2%	0.1%
2002		0.3%	0.3%
2003		1.1%	0.9%
2004		1.3%	1.3%
2005		4.2%	4.2%
2006		2.4%	2.4%
2007		-1.8%	-2.0%
2008		0.9%	0.9%
2009		-1.5%	-1.6%

Percent change in establishments from previous year (all sectors), Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Percent change in establishments from previous year (private sector), Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u>

For comparison: Establishment growth in Minnesota has lagged the national average. Between 2001 and 2008, the number of establishments in the U.S. increased 13.8 percent, compared to 8.5 percent in Minnesota.

Sources:

 Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, QCEW establishment data, <u>http://www.deed.state.mn.us/lmi/tools/qcew/default.aspx</u>

Previous Indicator



Milestones is a product of the Minnesota State Demographic Center, a division of the Department of Administration

Next Indicator



- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002
- Children's Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability



Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.



Indicator 38: Unemployment Rate

Rationale: The unemployment rate affects people's financial well-being as well as overall state economic growth.

About this indicator: As the

economy slumped in the 2000s, the annual unemployment rate grew from 4.0 percent in 2000 to 8.0



percent in 2009. Unemployment has leveled and begun to decline in 2010. The US average for 2009 was 9.3 percent.



YEAR

DATA

	Unemployment rate, MN	Unemployment rate, United States
1990	4.9%	5.6%
1991	5.1%	6.8%
Minnesota unemployment rate, Minnesota Department of Employment		

and Economic Development Edit trend | Edit data United States unemployment rate, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development Edit trend | Edit data

	YEAR	DATA	
1992		5.2%	7.5%
1993		5.1%	6.9%
1994		4%	6.1%
1995		3.7%	5.6%
1996		4%	5.4%
1997		3.3%	4.9%
1998		2.5%	4.5%
1999		2.8%	4.2%
2000		3.1%	4%
2001		3.8%	4.7%
2002		4.5%	5.8%
2003		4.9%	6%
2004		4.6%	5.6%
2005		4.2%	5.1%
2006		4.1%	4.6%
2007		4.6%	4.6%
2008		5.4%	5.8%
2009		8%	9.3%
Minnesota unen	nployment rat	e, Minnesota Department of Employment	

and Economic Development <u>Edit trend</u> | <u>Edit data</u> United States unemployment rate, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend</u> | <u>Edit data</u>

For comparison: In November, 2010 the state unemployment rate stood at 7.1 percent seasonally adjusted, lower than the U.S. rate of 9.8 percent. Unemployment has declined moderately during 2010.

Things to think about: The unemployment rate is estimated and does not always follow the trend in other labor market indicators such as the number of jobs. The unemployment rate can go down if people give up looking for jobs, or conversely it can go up if improved economic prospects draw more workers into the job market.

Sources:

• Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, http://www.deed.state.mn.us/Imi/Home.htm

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions



Indicator 39: High School Education



Rationale: A high school education is the minimal entry-level requirement for many jobs. The educational attainment of the workforce is important both for the state's economic development and the financial well-being of individuals.

About this indicator: The

percentage of Minnesotans ages 25 and older who have graduated from high school rose from 82.4 percent in the 1990 Census to 90.1 percent in the 2000 Census. The American Community Survey shows a 2009 rate of 91.5 percent, not statistically different from the 2008 rate.



Percent of population ages 25+ with at least a high school diploma



login

YEAR	DATA
1990	82.4%
2000	87.9%
2005	90.9%
2006	90.6%
2007	91%
2008	91.6%
2009	91.5%

Percent of population ages 25+ with at least a high school diploma, U.S. Census Bureau

For comparison: Minnesota is statistically tied for first with four other states in the percentage of adults who have completed high school, according to the 2008 American Community Survey. The national average was 85.3 percent.

Things to think about: Much of the increase in educational attainment is traceable to the replacement of older generations who typically had less education. Educational attainment among younger adults has shown little change.

Technical notes: The data includes people who have received a GED or other high school equivalency certificate. In 2008, 11 percent of Minnesotans who had graduated from high school but not advanced to college had received their diploma via a GED or similar certificate.

Sources:

• U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census and American Community Survey, http://www.census.gov/

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.



workforce will have the education and training to make the state a leader in the global economy.

Indicator 40: Some College Education

Rationale: A college education or technical training is increasingly seen as important both for the state's economic development and the financial well-being of individuals. College-educated workers are seen as more productive.



login

About this indicator: The percentage of Minnesotans ages 25 and older who have attended college rose from 45.5 percent in the 1990 Census to 59.1 percent in the 2000 Census. The American Community Survey shows a 2009 rate of 63.6 percent, down slightly from 2008, but the change was not statistically significant.

Percentage of Minnesotans age 25 and older with some college



YEAR DATA 1980 34.5% 45.5% 1990 1994 52.2%

YEAR	DATA
1995	52.2%
1999	61.6%
2000	59.1%
2005	62.9%
2006	62.1%
2007	62.4%
2008	64.1%
2009	63.6%

Percentage of Minnesotans age 25 and older with some college, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Things to think about: Much of the increase in educational attainment is traceable to the replacement of older generations who typically had less education. Educational attainment among younger adults has shown little change.

Sources:

• U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census and American Community Survey, http://www.census.gov/

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 • Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.



Goal: Minnesota's workforce will have the education and training to make the state a leader in the global economy.

Indicator 41: College Graduation

Rationale: Higher education is required for many of the jobs in the new global economy. The educational attainment of the workforce is important both for the state's economic development and the financial well-being of individuals.

About this indicator: The

percentage of Minnesotans ages 25 and older who have graduated from college was 31.5 percent in 2009, according to the American Community Survey, unchanged form 2008. The percentage increased substantially from 21.8 percent in the 1990 Census and 27.4 percent in the 2000 Census.

Age 25 and older is the standard for computing educational attainment in

Census surveys. Most adults have completed their formal educations by that age, though a small number continue.

Percentage of Minnesotans age 25 and older with a Bachelor's degree



login



YEAR	DATA
1980	17.3%
1990	21.8%
1991	22.3%
1993	23.3%
1994	26.3%
1995	26.5%
1996	26.3%
1997	28.3%
1998	31%
1999	32%
2000	27.4%
2005	30.7%
2006	30.4%
2007	31%
2008	31.5%
2009	31.5%

Percentage of Minnesotans age 25 and older with a Bachelor's degree, U.S. Bureau of the Census

For comparison: In 2009, Minnesota ranked 11th among states on the proportion of adults who are college graduates. The national average was 27.9 percent.

Things to think about: Much of the increase in educational attainment is traceable to the replacement of older generations who typically had less education. Educational attainment among younger adults has shown little change.

Sources:

• U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census and American Community Survey, http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 42: Median Household Income Compared to U.S. Median

login



Rationale: The citizens who helped create Minnesota Milestones stated clearly that income slightly above the poverty level is not adequate for a reasonable standard of living. The indicators for this goal deal with several aspects of employment and income. Comparing Minnesota's



median income to the nation's median income indicates how Minnesota families are faring compared to the rest of the nation.

About this indicator: Between 2005 and 2008, the ratio of Minnesota median household income to U.S. median household income ranged from 1.15 to 1.13. This was just slightly higher than the ratio in the 2000 Census, 1.12. In 2009, the indicator dropped to 110.74. Minnesota ranks 13th in median household income, down from 10th in 2006.

Minnesota median household income as a percentage of U.S. median



YEAR DATA

Minnesota median household income as a percentage of U.S. median, U.S. Census Bureau

YEAR	DATA
1990	102.8%
2000	112.2%
2005	114.6%
2006	114.2%
2007	113.1%
2008	113.3%
2009	110.7%

Minnesota median household income as a percentage of U.S. median, U.S. Census Bureau

For comparison: In the 1990 Census, median income in Minnesota was 3 percent above the national average. Minnesota incomes grew rapidly relative to the national average in the 1990s, but in the 2000s income growth has been slower.

Sources:

• U.S. Bureau of the Census, Decennial Census and American Community Survey, <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html</u>

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

Median family income compared to U.S. median

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 43: Poverty Rate



Rationale: Measuring the percentage of Minnesotans who live in poverty gives an indication of how many Minnesotans are not financially able to maintain a minimum standard of living. Milestones respondents indicated that incomes must be well above the poverty level in order to be considered adequate.



About this indicator: Poverty rates

have risen since 2000 as the economy has slumped. The percent of Minnesotans in poverty decreased from 10.2 percent in 1990 to 7.9 percent in 2000. Since then, poverty rates have shown an upward trend. In 2009 the rate was 11.0 percent.

The 2009 federal poverty threshold for a family of four was \$21,954. Many Minnesotans with incomes above the poverty line still have difficulty making ends meet.

Minnesota poverty rate



YEAR DATA

Minnesota poverty rate,

login

YEAR	DATA
1990	10.2%
2000	7.9%
2005	9.2%
2006	9.8%
2007	9.5%
2008	9.6%
2009	11%

Minnesota poverty rate,

For comparison: In 2009, Minnesota had the 11th lowest poverty rate among all states. The national poverty rate was 14.3 percent.

The Current Population Survey also provides poverty data. In 2009, the Minnesota poverty rate was 9.9 percent using the traditional poverty measure and 13.1 percent in the alternative CE-based measure.

Things to think about: The federal government is considering changes in the way poverty is measured. The current measure is often criticized because it does not account for shifts in spending patterns and does not factor in noncash benefits such as food stamps.

Sources:

• http://www.census.gov/

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

• Poverty rate

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 • Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

2000





Goal: All Minnesotans will have the economic means to maintain a reasonable standard of living.

Rationale: Hourly or weekly wages are the major determinant of income and spending power for the working-age population.

About this indicator: Wages have grown slowly in the 2000s. The average weekly wage for workers in all industries was \$874 in 2009, compared to \$851 in 2000. These



figures are adjusted for inflation. Between 2008 and 2009, Minnesota average wage decline by 0.8%, the second decline in two years



YEAR DATA



Department of Employment and Economic Development Edit trend | Edit data



	YEAR	DATA	
2001		855.9	0.5%
2002		861.7	0.7%
2003		868.2	o.8%
2004		885.6	2.0%
2005		865.4	-2.3%
2006		866.1	0.1%
2007		885.8	2.3%
2008		881.0	-0.5%
2009		874.0	-0.8%

Average weekly wage in 2008 dollars, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Average weekly wage in 2008 dollars, % change from previous year, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u>

N: No data

For comparison: Between 2001 and 2008, average wages in Minnesota and the U.S. grew at an almost identical rate. The 2009 average wage in the U.S., \$879, was close to the Minnesota average, \$874.

Technical notes: Data come from the QCEW system and are based on establishments qualifying for unemployment insurance coverage.

Sources:

• Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, http://www.deed.state.mn.us/lmi/tools/gcew/default.aspx

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 • Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.



affordable housing.

Indicator 45: Home Ownership

Rationale: A high home ownership rate is typically an indication that the housing stock is in at least fair condition and that housing is affordable.

About this indicator: The rate of home ownership in Minnesota has leveled off and fallen slightly since



2005. The rate was 73.7 percent in 2009, down from 75.8 percent in 2005. The crisis in the housing market has increased the number of foreclosures and made some families leery about buying a house.

Home ownership rose substantially in the 1990s and early 2000s. The 1990 rate was 71.8; this rose to 74.6 percent in 2000.

Home ownership in Minnesota, total (percent)



YEAR	DATA
1980	71.7%
1990	71.8%

Home ownership in Minnesota, total (percent), U.S. Bureau of the Census

login

YEAR	DATA
1991	68.9%
1992	66.7%
1993	65.8%
1994	68.9%
1995	73.3%
1996	75.4%
1997	75.4%
1998	75.4%
1999	76.1%
2000	74.6%
2001	76.1%
2005	75.8%
2006	76.3%
2007	75.2%
2008	74.7%
2009	73.7%

Home ownership in Minnesota, total (percent), U.S. Bureau of the Census

For comparison: In 2009, Minnesota had the highest home ownership rate among all states. The national average was 65.9 percent.

Sources:

• www.census.gov http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

Home ownership

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency
 Accountability

Goal: All Minnesotans will have decent, safe and

household income.

Rationale: This indicator defines housing affordability in relation to

Indicator 46: Housing Costs

About this indicator: Housing costs are rising relative to income for owners and declining for renters. The percentage of all households spending at least 30 percent of their



login

income on housing declined from 31.1 to 27.8 percent between 2005 and 2009. Among renters, 46.8 percent spent at least 30 percent of their income on housing. Among homeowners, the figure was 30.4 percent.



YEAR DATA

	TEAR DATA	
	Owners	Renters
2005	26.1%	48.1%
2006	28.3%	47.4%
2007	28.5%	46.9%

Share of income spent on housing, owners, U.S. Census Bureau <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Share of income spent on housing, renters, U.S. Census Bureau <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u>

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

	YEAR	DATA	
2008		28.7%	49.1%
2009		30.4%	46.8%

Share of income spent on housing, owners, U.S. Census Bureau <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u> Share of income spent on housing, renters, U.S. Census Bureau <u>Edit trend | Edit data</u>

For comparison: Among owner-occupied households with a mortgage, Minnesota ranked 29th on the percent spending 30 percent of more of their income on housing costs. The Minnesota figure was 37.5 percent in 2009.

Housing costs are considerably higher than in the 2000 Census, when 37 percent of renters and 22 percent of owners lived in unaffordable housing.

Technical notes: Spending more than 30 percent of income on housing is a widely accepted indicator of expenditure levels that most households cannot afford.

Sources:

• www.census.gov http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

Housing costs

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002 • Children's
- Services Report Card
- State Agency Accountability

How is Minnesota

Keep an eye out for these

images to quickly tell



doing?

Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 47: Foreclosures



Rationale: Foreclosures create severe stress for homeowners and contribute to lower property values,

abandoned housing and a depressed housing and construction industry.

About this indicator: The number of foreclosures in Minnesota rose



sharply from 6,472 in 2005 to 26,261 in 2008 and then dipped to 23,019 in 2009. In the first three quarters of 2010 there were 21,347 foreclosures. This suggests 2010 foreclosures will likely rival 2008 for the highest number recorded.

Number of foreclosures in Minnesota



YEAR	DATA
2005	6,472
2006	11,907
2007	20,398
2008	26,261

Number of foreclosures in Minnesota, Housing Link

login

YEAR	DATA
2009	23,019

Number of foreclosures in Minnesota, Housing Link

For comparison: The highest rates of foreclosure were in outer-ring suburbs of the Twin Cities, including Wright, Scott and Sherburne counties. These are rapidly-growing counties where many homes were purchased in recent years.

Minnesota has more foreclosures than many other states, and foreclosures are growing faster than the national average. According to RealtyTrac, in the third quarter of 2009 Minnesota had one foreclosure for every 217 households. Though lower than the national rate of one per 136 households, this rate was the 18th highest among states.

Between the second and third quarters of 2009, foreclosures in Minnesota grew 16 percent compared to the national average of 5 percent. From the third quarter of 2008 to the third quarter of 2009, Minnesota foreclosures increased 100 percent, the 9th highest gain among states. The national year-to-year figure was 23 percent.

The Housing Link and RealtyTrac numbers are collected using different methodologies and covering different time periods, so figures from the two sources will vary. Both show the volatility and rapid changes that have occurred in foreclosure activity.

Things to think about: The 2009 quarterly data indicate the number of foreclosures is declining, but some experts predict another upswing in the near future because of high unemployment.

Technical notes: Housing Link collects its data from Sheriff's sales.

Sources:

• Housing Link, http://www.housinglink.org/

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.





Rationale: Minnesotans value their freedom to choose where to live. Minnesotans in communities throughout the state also want their youth to be able to make a living without moving away. Migration is a good indicator of the relative attractiveness of an area.

About this indicator: Fewer

counties are experiencing in-migration in the 2000s. The number of counties with net in-migration declined from 51 in 2000-2001 to 22 in 2008-2009. Minnesota has 87 counties.

The decline in the number of counties with net-migration reflects

lower population growth in the state as a whole. Less statewide growth has translated into slower growth in most regions of Minnesota.

Net migration is calculated by subtracting natural increase (births minus deaths) from population change. Out-migration does not necessarily lead to population loss if there is sufficient natural increase to compensate.

Number of counties with net in-migration



login



YEAR	DATA
2000	51
2001	49
2002	47
2003	49
2004	45
2005	29
2006	18
2007	33
2008	33
2009	22

Number of counties with net in-migration, Minnesota State Demographic Center

For comparison: Between 1990 and 2000, 55 counties experienced net in-migration.

Sources: Annual data calculated by Minnesota State Demographic Center

- <u>http://www.demography.state.mn.us/documents</u> /MigrationTrendsinMinnesota2000to2005.pdf
- <u>http://www.demography.state.mn.us/PopNotes/MigrationPN00</u> /MigrationPN00.pdf

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

<u>Counties losing population</u>

Next Indicator





- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative

No change, or not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.

Indicator 49: Regional Disparity in Unemployment login



Rationale: Differences in unemployment rates are a key indicator of variations in economic opportunity.

About this indicator: The ratio of

the highest regional unemployment rate to the lowest rate declined from 2.00 in 2000 to 1.55 in 2004, then rose again. In 2009 the ratio of the highest to the lowest was 1.56.

The regions used are Economic Development Regions. There are 13 regions.

Highest regional unemployment rate as a percentage of lowest regional unemployment rate



YEAR	DATA
2000	200%
2001	173.5%

Highest regional unemployment rate as a percentage of lowest regional unemployment rate, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development



YEAR	DATA
2002	162.2%
2003	156.1%
2004	155%
2005	159.5%
2006	161.1%
2007	167.5%
2008	169.6%
2009	156.3%

Highest regional unemployment rate as a percentage of lowest regional unemployment rate, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development

For comparison: In November, 2010 Region 8 (Southwest) had the lowest unemployment rate at 5.0 percent. The highest unemployment rate was 9.4 percent in Region 5, the North Central Region. The state unemployment rate in November was 6.6 percent, with a seasonally adjusted rate of 7.1 percent.

Technical notes: This indicator uses annual average unemployment rates.

Sources:

• Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, <u>http://www.deed.state.mn.us/lmi/tools/laus/Default.aspx</u>

Related 2002 Milestones indicator:

• Regional disparity in unemployment

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator





Indicator 50: Income by Congressional District

Milestones 2011

- Home
- Executive Summary
- Background
- Contact

More indicators

- Minnesota Compass
- Milestones 2002Children's
- Services Report
- State Agency
 Accountability

How is Minnesota doing?

Keep an eye out for these images to quickly tell which way the trend is going:



Undesirable or negative No change, or

not enough data to draw conclusions

Desirable or positive.



Rationale: Variations in household income are an indicator of differences in living standards and economic opportunities across Minnesota.

About this indicator:

Congressional District incomes have become more equal in the 2000s, though disparities remain large. In 2000, the median income in the bottom-ranking district was 57



login

percent of the median in the top-ranking district. Between 2004 and 2009, the percentage fluctuated between 60 or 61 percent.



Lowest district median as a percentage of highest district median

YEAR DATA

2000 57.1%

Lowest district median as a percentage of highest district median, U.S. Census Bureau

YEAR	DATA
2005	60.5%
2006	60.7%
2007	60.5%
2008	60.3%
2009	60.9%

Lowest district median as a percentage of highest district median, U.S. Census Bureau

For comparison: Incomes are highest in the Second and Third Congressional Districts and lowest in the Seventh and Eighth Congressional Districts.

Things to think about: Increased equality among districts may be the result of low income growth in the wealthier areas, rather than high income growth in less affluent districts.

Technical notes: Data is for the 110th Congressional Districts. The 2000 Census presents data for both the 110th and 106th Congressional Districts.

Households include both families and nonfamily households Example of nonfamily households are people living alone and unmarried couples. Nonfamily households typically have lower incomes. The mix of household types by District is one factor affecting income.

Median income marks the midpoint of the distribution. Half of all households have incomes above the median and half are below the median.

Sources:

• www.census.gov http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html

Previous Indicator

Next Indicator

