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Overview

• Big Trends – growth, economy, aging, immigration
• Emerging Characteristics in Missouri
  – Demographics
  – Economic Trends
  – Aging
  – Immigration
• New Forms of Information (ACS)
• Discussion
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America’s Perfect Storm

Three Forces Changing Our Nation’s Future

Educational Testing Service

www.ets.org
• Divergent skill distributions
• The changing economy
• Demographic shifts
• Divergent skill distributions
  – Flat NAEP scores
  – High school graduation slacking
  – Poor literacy and numeracy skills
  – Race and ethnic gaps
• The changing economy
  – Declining manufacturing – more service
  – Two thirds of job growth (1984-2000 was associated with college-level jobs
  – College grads earn 51% more than H.S. grads
  – Earning premiums reward education & skill
• Demographic shifts
  – Labor force will grow more slowly
  – Impact of the baby boom – its here now
  – Dependence on International migration
  – Increasing Hispanic population
  – Latino’s have lowest levels of educational attainment – more than 50% without H.S.
Is the Lake Area part of the “New Economy?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of competition</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational form</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Networked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production system</td>
<td>Mass production</td>
<td>Flexible production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key factor of production</td>
<td>Capital/labor</td>
<td>Innovation/ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key technology driver</td>
<td>Mechanization</td>
<td>Digitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive advantage</td>
<td>Economies of scale</td>
<td>Innovation/quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between firms</td>
<td>Go it alone</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Job-specific</td>
<td>Broad and changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Organization Man</td>
<td>“Intrapreneur”¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of employment</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Risky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The New and Old Economies¹²
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2007 Score</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1999 Score</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2002 Score</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rank Change from 1999* 2002**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>11 94.5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>14 76.3 -1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25 64.6 8 -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2 64.0 16 -6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16 72.1 -6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2 64.0 16 -6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16 72.1 -6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2  63.5 12 -6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2 64.0 16 -6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25 64.6 8 -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15 73.8 -2 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 2007: Score
- 1999: Score
- 2002: Score
- Rank Change from 1999* 2002**: Difference in rank from 1999 to 2002

---

**OSEDA**  
Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis

**University of Missouri Extension**
How flat the world is depends on where your standing.

- *The World is Flat*
  Thomas Friedman
- *Making Globalization Work*
  Joseph Stiglitz
- *Diverse Opportunities & Challenges*
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Population Age 60 to 80 Years, 2005 As A Percent of Total
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Figure 4-5.
Labor Force Participation Rates for the Population Aged 55 to 64 by Sex: 1950 to 2003

Note: The reference population for these data is the civilian noninstitutionalized population.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004c. For full citation, see references at end of chapter.
Enrollment Change
From 1.4% to 2.8% in 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Pct Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>896,910</td>
<td>894,855</td>
<td>-2,055</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12,633</td>
<td>25,166</td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missouri Hispanic Student (25,166) Enrollment Characteristics

- 61% of Hispanic students attend the 23 districts with at least 300 Hispanic students.
- 77% of Hispanic students attend the 45 districts with at least 100 Hispanic students.
- 24% of Hispanic students attend 2 districts.
- 10 of the top 23 districts are in the KC Metropolitan Area.
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Missouri Annual Employment Trends, 2000-2005
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Average Annual Wages: Missouri, 2000-2005
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It Pays to Have an Education...

Median Earnings (dollars)

- Bachelor's Degree or Higher: $46,582
- Associate's Degree: $31,910
- Some college, no degree: $30,250
- High School Graduate: $25,935
- Some High School, no diploma: $18,344

Unemployment Rate (percent)

- Bachelor's Degree or Higher: 2.7%
- Associate's Degree: 3.7%
- Some college, no degree: 4.5%
- High School Graduate: 5.0%
- Some High School, no diploma: 8.5%

St. Louis County (20.7%) and Jackson County (11.8%) together tally nearly one-third of the state’s economy.
Percent of Missourians who are Cost Burdened for Housing, 2005

- Owners w/ Mortgage 26%
- Owners w/out Mortgage 11%
- Renters 41%

Cost burdened is 30% or more of household income for housing

Source: 2005 American Community Survey
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