



The State of Women in America

A 50-State Analysis of How Women
Are Faring Across the Nation

By Anna Chu and Charles Posner September 2013

Center for American Progress



The State of Women in America

A 50-State Analysis of How Women
Are Faring Across the Nation

By Anna Chu and Charles Posner September 2013

Contents

1 Introduction and summary

- 2 How women are faring across the states

6 Economic security

- 9 The wage gap
- 11 Minimum wage
- 13 Poverty
- 15 Paid family and medical leave policies
- 17 Early childhood education

19 The leadership gap

- 22 Women's leadership in public office
- 24 Women's leadership at work

26 Women's health and healthy families

- 29 Access to reproductive health services
- 34 Implementation of Affordable Care Act protections
- 37 Ensuring healthy pregnancy and delivery

39 Conclusion

40 Methodology

- 41 Ranking the states
- 46 Grading the states

47 Author bios & Acknowledgements

48 Endnotes

Introduction and summary

The role of women in the United States has changed dramatically over the past few decades. For one, more and more women have taken on new responsibilities outside the home by joining the paid workforce. While women made up only about one-third of the workforce in 1969, women today make up almost half of all workers in the United States.¹ Women are also stepping up to lead the country; a record number of women ran for public office in 2012, and a record-high percentage of women are serving in Congress.² In addition to making progress on issues of economics and leadership, women have made progress on health issues, which impact women's personal well-being, as well as their economic security. Over the past few years, women have been able to end gender discrimination by big insurance companies and gain free contraception coverage because of the Affordable Care Act.

Despite women's advancements, however, substantial inequalities remain. Although an increasing number of women are either the sole breadwinner for their family or share the role with their partners, women in the United States are paid only 77 cents for every dollar a man makes.³ The pay gap is even larger for women of color. On average, African American women make 64 cents for every dollar that white men make.⁴ While 2012 was a watershed year for women in terms of getting elected to public office, women still comprise only 18.1 percent of Congress, despite making up more than half of the U.S. population.⁵ They also face challenges on health issues, as 2012 saw continued conservative efforts to erode women's ability to make their own decisions about their health and well-being.

A deeper examination shows that disparities for women also exist among states. Women in Vermont, for example, make on average close to 85 cents for every dollar a man makes, while women in Wyoming make only 64 cents—more than 25 percent less than women in Vermont.⁶ On leadership, 15 states have no female elected leaders in the House of Representatives or the Senate. Lastly, while less than 10 percent of women in Vermont, Wisconsin, Hawaii, and Massachusetts are uninsured, nearly 25 percent of women in Texas do not have health insurance.⁷

How women are faring across the states

In this report, we examine both the progress made and the challenges remaining for women across the country. We do so by reviewing three categories that are critical to women’s overall well-being: economics, leadership, and health. Within each of those three categories, we analyze multiple factors—36 factors overall. In selecting the factors, we were unable to include every metric available but strove to include a broad array of factors that would help illustrate the multitude of issues facing women. We also included data on women of color in order to show the challenges that different communities face.

Factors examined

Factors	Source
Economic security factors	
Overall wage gap for women	Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2013).
Wage gap for African American women	Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey.
Wage gap for Hispanic American women	Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey.
Percentage of total female population that would be impacted by raising the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour	Economic Policy Institute, “Characteristics of workers who would be affected by increasing the federal minimum wage to \$10.10 by July 1, 2015” (2013), available at http://www.epi.org/files/2013/EPI-federal-minimum-wage-state-impact.pdf .
Overall poverty rate for women and girls	U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey, Table C17001.
Poverty rate for African American women and girls	U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey, Table C7001B.
Poverty rate for Hispanic American women and girls	U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey, Table C17001I.
Poverty rate for Asian American women and girls	U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey, Table C17001D.
Poverty rate for Native American women and girls	U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey, Table C17001D.
Paid family leave laws	National Partnership for Women & Families, “Advancing a Family Friendly America: How Family Friendly Is Your State?,” available at http://www.nationalpartnership.org/issues/work-family/family-friendly-america/family-friendly-america-map.html (last accessed September 2013).
Temporary disability insurance	National Partnership for Women & Families, “Expecting Better: A State-by-State Analysis of Laws That Help New Parents” (2012), available at http://www.nationalpartnership.org/research-library/work-family/expecting-better.pdf .
Paid sick leave	National Partnership for Women & Families, “Advancing a Family Friendly America: How Family Friendly Is Your State?”
Access to early childhood education	W. Steven Barnett and others, “The State of Preschool 2012” (New Brunswick, New Jersey: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2012), available at http://nieer.org/sites/nieer/files/yearbook2012.pdf .
Spending on early childhood education	Barnett and others, “The State of Preschool 2012.”

Leadership factors

Women in Congress	Center for American Women and Politics, "State by State Information," available at http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/resources/state_fact_sheet.php#states (last accessed September 2013).
Women in elected executive statewide office	Center for American Women and Politics, "State by State Information."
Women in state legislature	Center for American Women and Politics, "State by State Information."
Minority women elected to Congress, executive statewide office, and state legislature	Center for American Women and Politics, "Facts on Women of Color in Elective Office," available at http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/women_of_color/elective_office.php (last accessed September 2013).
Overall management gap	U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder," available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=EEO_10_5YR_EEOALL1R&prodType=table (last accessed August 2013).
Management gap for African American women	U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder."
Management gap for Hispanic American women	U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder."
Management gap for Asian American women	U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder."
Management gap for Native American women	U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder."

Health factors

Overall percentage of women uninsured	U.S. Census Bureau, "Model-based Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) for Counties and States," available at http://www.census.gov/did/www/sahie/ (last accessed September 2013).
Percentage of African American women uninsured	U.S. Census Bureau, "Model-Based Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) for Counties and States."
Percentage of Hispanic American women uninsured	U.S. Census Bureau, "Model-Based Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) for Counties and States."
State position on Medicaid expansion	Kaiser Family Foundation, "Status of State Action on the Medicaid Expansion Decision, as of September 3, 2013," available at http://kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/state-activity-around-expanding-medicaid-under-the-affordable-care-act/ (last accessed September 2013).
Defunding Planned Parenthood and other providers' preventative health services	Guttmacher Institute, "Laws Affecting Reproductive Health and Rights: State Trends at Midyear, 2013," available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/updates/2013/statetrends22013.html (last accessed September 2013).
Percentage of contraceptive needs met	Jennifer J. Frost, Mia R. Zolna, and Lori Frohworth, "Table 6." In "Contraceptive Needs and Services, 2010" (New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/win/contraceptive-needs-2010.pdf .
States with forced ultrasound provisions	Guttmacher Institute, "Requirements for Ultrasound" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_RFU.pdf .

Unconstitutional bans on abortion	Guttmacher Institute, "State Policies on Later Abortions" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_PLTA.pdf .
Restrictive counseling and waiting-period restrictions	Guttmacher Institute, "Counseling and Waiting Periods for Abortion" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_MWPA.pdf .
Targeted regulation of abortion provider, or TRAP, laws	Guttmacher Institute, "Targeted Regulation of Abortion Providers" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_TRAP.pdf .
Maternal mortality rate	National Women's Law Center, "Maternal Mortality Rate (per 100,000)," available at http://hrc.nwlc.org/status-indicators/maternal-mortality-rate-100000 (last accessed September 2013).
Infant mortality rate	National Center for Health Statistics, "Infant Mortality Rates, By State: 2010" (2010), available at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/states/INFANT_MORTALITY_RATES_STATE_2010.pdf .
Rate of availability of obstetrician-gynecologists, or OB-GYNs	U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2012," available at http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes291064.htm (last accessed September 2013).

We ranked each state on all 36 factors and then arrived at overall rankings in the categories of economics, leadership, and health by taking the averages of how states ranked on the factors within those categories. We then gave each state an overall national ranking, taken from an average of how the states rank across the three categories.

Our analysis determined that on matters of economics, leadership, and health, women, on average, fare the best in Maryland and the worst in Louisiana. More than 22 percent of women in Louisiana are in poverty, compared to 11 percent of women in Maryland. Additionally, taking in all of the leadership factors considered, Maryland ranks first in the nation in terms of women reaching leadership positions in the public and private sector. Meanwhile, Louisiana receives a D- on overall leadership factors.

Table 1 details how all 50 states rank on issues of economics, leadership, and health for women based on the 36 factors examined in this report. For a full explanation of our methodology, please see the appendix.

TABLE 1

The state of women in America: Overall state rankings and grades

State rank	State	Overall grade	State rank	State	Overall grade
1	Maryland	A	26	Florida	C
2	Hawaii	A	27	Wyoming	C
3	Vermont	A	28	Pennsylvania	C-
4	California	A	29	Wisconsin	C-
5	Delaware	A	30	Ohio	C-
6	Connecticut	A-	31	Missouri	D+
7	Colorado	A-	32	Kentucky	D+
8	New York	A-	33	Montana	D+
9	New Jersey	A-	33	Nebraska	D+
10	Washington	A-	35	South Carolina	D
11	Minnesota	B+	36	Idaho	D
12	Alaska	B+	37	North Dakota	D
13	Illinois	B+	38	Kansas	D-
14	Rhode Island	B	39	North Carolina	D-
15	Massachusetts	B	40	Tennessee	D-
16	Oregon	B	41	Georgia	F
17	Nevada	B	42	Indiana	F
18	New Hampshire	B-	43	South Dakota	F
19	New Mexico	B-	44	Arkansas	F
20	Maine	B-	45	Texas	F
21	Iowa	C+	46	Mississippi	F
22	Arizona	C+	47	Alabama	F
23	Virginia	C+	48	Oklahoma	F
24	Michigan	C	49	Utah	F
25	West Virginia	C	50	Louisiana	F

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on 36 factors related to economic security, leadership, and health for women. For more information on how rankings and grades were calculated, please see the Methodology section.

Economic security

Women play an increasingly important role in our nation's economy and our families' pocketbooks. In 1967, women made up less than 29 percent of the U.S. workforce;⁸ today, they comprise nearly half of the nation's workforce.⁹ Their incomes are also critical to their families' economic security, as one in four U.S. families now have a mother who is either the sole or primary breadwinner for the family.¹⁰

Despite how important women are to our national economy and to their families, women are struggling to achieve economic security for themselves and their families and to balance the competing demands for their time. Women still receive only 77 cents for every dollar men make¹¹ and make up the majority of minimum-wage workers. And too many women live in poverty.

Table 2 ranks how women are doing economically across the nation, looking at the following 14 key measures that affect the economic standing of families:

- Overall wage gap
- Wage gap for African American women
- Wage gap for Hispanic women
- Percentage of the population that would be impacted by raising the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour
- Percentage of women in poverty
- Percentage of African American women in poverty
- Percentage of Hispanic women in poverty
- Percentage of Asian American women in poverty

- Percentage of Native American women in poverty
- Paid family leave policies
- Temporary disability insurance policies
- Paid sick leave policies
- Early childhood education
- Pre-K average spending per child

We used these measures because they often have a unique impact on women and can reveal attitudes about women and their roles in the workplace. Based on these factors, women are faring the very worst economically in Mississippi, followed closely by women in Wyoming and Alabama. In contrast, women are doing best economically in Maryland.

Women in Mississippi, Wyoming, and Alabama all face similar challenges. Women in all three states suffer from high wage gaps.¹² In fact, Wyoming has the largest wage gap for women in the country.¹³ Meanwhile, women in Mississippi and Alabama have some of the highest rates of poverty in the country.¹⁴ Mississippi actually has the worst poverty rate for women in the nation.¹⁵ What's more, none of these three states have any sort of paid family, sick, or temporary disability leave policies.

In contrast, Maryland, and Nevada are tied for having the lowest wage gap for women in the country.¹⁶ Maryland also has the third-lowest poverty rate for women nationwide.¹⁷

TABLE 2

The state of women in America:

State rankings and grades for economic security

State rank	State	Economic security grade	State rank	State	Economic security grade
1	Maryland	A	26	New Hampshire	C
2	California	A	27	Ohio	C
2	New Jersey	A	27	Texas	C
4	Hawaii	A	29	New Mexico	C-
5	New York	A	29	Wisconsin	C-
6	Delaware	A-	31	Pennsylvania	D+
7	Connecticut	A-	32	Iowa	D+
7	Virginia	A-	32	Massachusetts	D+
9	Florida	A-	34	West Virginia	D
10	Vermont	A-	35	Kentucky	D
11	Alaska	B+	36	South Carolina	D
11	Washington	B+	37	South Dakota	D
13	Rhode Island	B+	38	Maine	D-
14	Nevada	B	39	Missouri	D-
15	Colorado	B	40	Georgia	D-
16	Illinois	B	40	Nebraska	D-
17	Oregon	B	42	Idaho	F
18	Oklahoma	B-	43	Utah	F
19	Arizona	B-	44	Louisiana	F
19	Arkansas	B-	45	Montana	F
21	Kansas	C+	46	Indiana	F
21	Minnesota	C+	46	North Dakota	F
21	North Carolina	C+	48	Alabama	F
21	Tennessee	C+	49	Wyoming	F
25	Michigan	C	50	Mississippi	F

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on 14 factors related to economic security for women. For more information on how rankings and grades were calculated, please see the Methodology section.

The wage gap

The past few decades have seen an increase in the percentage of women that are either the sole breadwinner for their family or share the role with their partners. Only 1 in 10 mothers were the sole or primary breadwinner for their families in 1960,¹⁸ compared to 4 in 10 mothers in 2011.¹⁹

Although women are playing an increasingly important role in the livelihoods of their families, they continue to face unfair pay practices that undermine their economic security and that of their families. Nationally, women earn 77 cents on the male dollar, putting all families at a disadvantage.²⁰ The pay disparity is more dramatic for women of color: African American women make 64 cents for every dollar white men make, and Hispanic women earn only 53 cents.²¹ The pay disparity also varies across states. Women in Wyoming, for instance, make only 64 cents for every dollar men make.²²

Table 3 details the wage gap facing U.S. women. Data on the wage gap facing African American and Hispanic women are also included.

TABLE 3
Wage gap:

What a woman makes for every dollar a white man makes

State	Women overall	African American women	Hispanic women	State	Women overall	African American women	Hispanic women
Alabama	\$0.71	\$0.55	\$0.48	Montana	\$0.76	\$1.17	\$0.57
Alaska	\$0.74	\$0.49	\$0.55	Nebraska	\$0.78	\$0.59	\$0.54
Arizona	\$0.83	\$0.66	\$0.54	Nevada	\$0.85	\$0.62	\$0.53
Arkansas	\$0.77	\$0.67	\$0.52	New Hampshire	\$0.77	\$0.62	\$0.68
California	\$0.84	\$0.64	\$0.44	New Jersey	\$0.79	\$0.60	\$0.44
Colorado	\$0.80	\$0.62	\$0.55	New Mexico	\$0.80	\$0.63	\$0.57
Connecticut	\$0.78	\$0.60	\$0.47	New York	\$0.84	\$0.67	\$0.53
Delaware	\$0.81	\$0.69	\$0.58	North Carolina	\$0.82	\$0.64	\$0.49
Florida	\$0.84	\$0.64	\$0.60	North Dakota	\$0.74	\$0.55	\$0.57
Georgia	\$0.81	\$0.62	\$0.47	Ohio	\$0.77	\$0.66	\$0.64
Hawaii	\$0.83	\$0.66	\$0.64	Oklahoma	\$0.76	\$0.64	\$0.46
Idaho	\$0.75	\$0.71	\$0.52	Oregon	\$0.79	\$0.70	\$0.51
Illinois	\$0.79	\$0.66	\$0.47	Pennsylvania	\$0.76	\$0.67	\$0.53
Indiana	\$0.73	\$0.67	\$0.55	Rhode Island	\$0.81	\$0.58	\$0.50
Iowa	\$0.78	\$0.58	\$0.58	South Carolina	\$0.78	\$0.57	\$0.58
Kansas	\$0.76	\$0.66	\$0.50	South Dakota	\$0.78	\$0.82	\$0.63
Kentucky	\$0.76	\$0.65	\$0.57	Tennessee	\$0.78	\$0.66	\$0.48
Louisiana	\$0.67	\$0.48	\$0.55	Texas	\$0.79	\$0.57	\$0.45
Maine	\$0.83	\$0.56	\$0.96	Utah	\$0.70	\$0.71	\$0.46
Maryland	\$0.85	\$0.70	\$0.46	Vermont	\$0.85	\$0.40	\$0.64
Massachusetts	\$0.79	\$0.60	\$0.51	Virginia	\$0.79	\$0.60	\$0.52
Michigan	\$0.74	\$0.65	\$0.54	Washington	\$0.78	\$0.62	\$0.47
Minnesota	\$0.80	\$0.62	\$0.57	West Virginia	\$0.70	\$0.60	\$0.58
Mississippi	\$0.76	\$0.55	\$0.54	Wisconsin	\$0.78	\$0.65	\$0.53
Missouri	\$0.77	\$0.67	\$0.61	Wyoming	\$0.64	\$0.57	\$0.46

Source: Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2012 American Community Survey.

Minimum wage

On June 25, 1938, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Fair Labor Standards Act, establishing the first federal minimum wage in the United States. It was a landmark achievement for workers. But 75 years later, wages have not kept up with productivity and inflation. Wages as a share of U.S. gross domestic product, or GDP, have fallen to a record low, even though worker productivity increased 124 percent from 1968 to 2012.²³ Back in 1968, the federal minimum wage was \$1.60 per hour. If the minimum wage had kept up with inflation, it would be more than \$10.50 today.²⁴ But today's minimum wage is only \$7.25 per hour—31 percent lower than the value of the minimum wage in 1968.²⁵

Raising the minimum wage would greatly help women as they recover from the recession. Thus far, 60 percent of the job gains for women during the current economic recovery have been in the 10 largest occupations that typically pay less than \$10.10 per hour.²⁶ If the minimum wage were raised to \$10.10 per hour, more than half of the beneficiaries would be women.²⁷ In total, close to 17 million women would benefit from such a raise.²⁸

Table 4 shows the percentage of people that would benefit from this increase that are women, state by state. The data were compiled by the Economic Policy Institute and include women who would be directly affected by such a raise, as well as women who would be indirectly affected because of the spillover effects of raising the minimum wage.²⁹

TABLE 4
Minimum Wage:

Women benefitted by increasing the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour

State	Number of women affected	Percentage of total affected that are women	State	Number of women affected	Percentage of total affected that are women
Alabama	291,000	61.0%	Nebraska	116,000	57.1%
Alaska	27,000	55.1%	Nevada	135,000	52.5%
Arizona	316,000	54.7%	New Hampshire	71,000	60.2%
Arkansas	197,000	55.5%	New Jersey	408,000	56.0%
California	1,754,000	51.0%	New Mexico	106,000	54.9%
Colorado	230,000	55.8%	New York	953,000	53.6%
Connecticut	162,000	58.7%	North Carolina	571,000	54.9%
Delaware	48,000	55.2%	North Dakota	35,000	54.7%
Florida	1,011,000	55.1%	Ohio	711,000	56.0%
Georgia	563,000	59.6%	Oklahoma	222,000	55.6%
Hawaii	59,000	52.2%	Oregon	167,000	55.5%
Idaho	88,000	53.3%	Pennsylvania	725,000	58.9%
Illinois	698,000	56.9%	Rhode Island	57,000	55.3%
Indiana	402,000	58.5%	South Carolina	274,000	56.3%
Iowa	201,000	59.1%	South Dakota	53,000	57.0%
Kansas	187,000	59.9%	Tennessee	386,000	55.2%
Kentucky	271,000	56.5%	Texas	1,618,000	55.8%
Louisiana	302,000	62.4%	Utah	167,000	57.6%
Maine	75,000	56.4%	Vermont	34,000	59.6%
Maryland	262,000	55.5%	Virginia	422,000	55.7%
Massachusetts	301,000	58.6%	Washington	241,000	54.2%
Michigan	557,000	54.8%	West Virginia	114,000	59.7%
Minnesota	280,000	56.3%	Wisconsin	368,000	58.1%
Mississippi	207,000	64.7%	Wyoming	30,000	60.0%
Missouri	383,000	62.5%			
Montana	68,000	60.7%			

Source: Economic Policy Institute.

Poverty

Poverty affects women disproportionately more than men. In 2012, 13.6 percent of U.S. men lived in poverty,³⁰ while 16.3 percent of U.S. women lived in poverty.³¹ Communities of color also suffer from higher poverty rates—particularly women of color. Nearly 29 percent of African American women and nearly 28 percent of Hispanic women lived in poverty in 2012.³²

Table 5 below shows the percentage of women in poverty for each state, including poverty rates for African American, Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American women.

TABLE 5
Poverty

Percentage of women and girls living in poverty

State	Women and girls overall	African American women and girls	Hispanic women and girls	Asian American women and girls	Native American women and girls
Alabama	20.9%	33.6%	38.9%	15.9%	26.7%
Alaska	10.6%	14.7%	13.3%	11.4%	21.9%
Arizona	19.7%	28.5%	30.9%	14.4%	40.1%
Arkansas	21.6%	36.9%	36.2%	10.2%	27.0%
California	18.0%	27.0%	25.6%	12.8%	26.8%
Colorado	14.5%	29.3%	26.8%	11.7%	30.6%
Connecticut	11.7%	25.0%	30.5%	6.0%	23.4%
Delaware	13.6%	20.0%	27.3%	7.1%	
Florida	18.2%	30.3%	24.0%	12.4%	24.8%
Georgia	20.6%	29.9%	33.6%	15.7%	31.1%
Hawaii	12.8%	18.7%	21.4%	8.3%	
Idaho	17.1%		32.4%	16.1%	27.3%
Illinois	15.9%	33.3%	23.2%	12.9%	22.0%
Indiana	16.8%	34.5%	32.3%	18.8%	26.9%
Iowa	13.9%	40.1%	26.7%	17.7%	43.3%
Kansas	14.9%	26.6%	28.2%	13.9%	20.4%
Kentucky	20.9%	38.6%	32.5%	12.3%	37.7%
Louisiana	22.2%	36.1%	27.0%	25.6%	22.9%
Maine	16.2%	45.3%	32.6%	28.4%	40.7%
Maryland	11.4%	17.4%	16.3%	8.1%	11.5%
Massachusetts	13.0%	25.1%	33.4%	17.5%	31.2%

State	Women overall	African American women and girls	Hispanic women and girls	Asian American women and girls	Native American women and girls
Michigan	18.5%	37.3%	30.3%	16.1%	21.6%
Minnesota	12.2%	39.4%	27.7%	15.7%	35.0%
Mississippi	26.7%	41.0%	38.5%	17.7%	33.6%
Missouri	17.4%	32.9%	30.7%	17.0%	32.6%
Montana	17.1%		32.1%	15.7%	39.2%
Nebraska	14.4%	35.2%	30.2%	15.9%	41.8%
Nevada	17.5%	28.9%	26.6%	9.7%	26.8%
New Hampshire	10.7%	25.4%	25.4%	14.1%	
New Jersey	11.9%	22.0%	22.7%	6.9%	27.2%
New Mexico	22.2%	33.7%	27.4%	15.3%	36.8%
New York	17.2%	24.2%	29.8%	20.1%	29.8%
North Carolina	19.5%	30.2%	37.8%	13.2%	35.7%
North Dakota	12.8%	59.3%	20.0%	27.1%	36.2%
Ohio	17.7%	36.4%	32.6%	14.8%	26.8%
Oklahoma	18.7%	31.8%	32.1%	9.6%	24.7%
Oregon	17.7%	41.5%	32.4%	12.5%	35.8%
Pennsylvania	14.9%	30.4%	35.5%	17.1%	24.0%
Rhode Island	14.7%	26.0%	37.4%	16.5%	31.8%
South Carolina	19.9%	31.4%	33.5%	14.0%	26.3%
South Dakota	14.5%	39.0%	38.4%	6.8%	48.6%
Tennessee	19.4%	30.3%	39.4%	16.0%	20.4%
Texas	19.4%	26.6%	28.5%	12.1%	29.0%
Utah	13.6%	18.8%	30.6%	21.8%	28.0%
Vermont	12.3%	26.0%	20.7%	13.8%	
Virginia	12.7%	21.8%	18.6%	8.5%	15.9%
Washington	14.6%	28.3%	28.4%	13.6%	29.3%
West Virginia	19.3%	38.3%	26.4%	19.2%	
Wisconsin	14.4%	41.0%	31.4%	19.3%	27.4%
Wyoming	14.2%		18.4%		31.7%

Note: Blanks indicate that the sample size was too small to make a confident calculation for that subgroup.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey.

Paid family and medical leave policies

As women have moved out of the home and into the paid workforce, an increasing number of women find themselves playing the dual role of both the breadwinner and caregiver in the family. Women face special challenges because they often bear more of the responsibilities at home. In fact, American women spend nearly 100 more minutes per day on average than American men on household chores, child care, and other community activities.³³

One solution to this issue is to give workers paid time off so that they can respond to family needs without putting their economic stability at risk. The United States, however, remains the only developed country that does not have a national paid family and medical leave policy.³⁴ Nevertheless, some states and cities are passing leave policies that are good for workers, families, and women.

Table 6 details which states have laws—or contain major municipalities that have laws—that provide paid family leave, paid sick leave, or temporary disability insurance.

TABLE 6
State policies for paid family and medical leave

State	Laws establishing a program for paid family leave insurance	Laws establishing a program for temporary disability insurance	Laws that require employers to allow workers to earn paid sick leave
Alabama	No	No	No
Alaska	No	No	No
Arizona	No	No	No
Arkansas	No	No	No
California	Yes	Yes	Yes^
Colorado	No	No	No
Connecticut	No	No	Yes
Delaware	No	No	No
Florida	No	No	No
Georgia	No	No	No
Hawaii	No	Yes	No
Idaho	No	No	No
Illinois	No	No	No
Indiana	No	No	No
Iowa	No	No	No

State	Laws establishing a program for paid family leave insurance	Laws establishing a program for temporary disability insurance	Laws that require employers to allow workers to earn paid sick leave
Kansas	No	No	No
Kentucky	No	No	No
Louisiana	No	No	No
Maine	No	No	No
Maryland	No	No	No
Massachusetts	No	No	No
Michigan	No	No	No
Minnesota	No	No	No
Mississippi	No	No	No
Missouri	No	No	No
Montana	No	No	No
Nebraska	No	No	No
Nevada	No	No	No
New Hampshire	No	No	No
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	No
New Mexico	No	No	No
New York	No	Yes	Yes [^]
North Carolina	No	No	No
North Dakota	No	No	No
Ohio	No	No	No
Oklahoma	No	No	No
Oregon	No	No	Yes [^]
Pennsylvania	No	No	No
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	No
South Carolina	No	No	No
South Dakota	No	No	No
Tennessee	No	No	No
Texas	No	No	No
Utah	No	No	No
Vermont	No	No	No
Virginia	No	No	No
Washington	Yes*	No	Yes [^]
West Virginia	No	No	No
Wisconsin	No	No	No
Wyoming	No	No	No

* State has passed a law but has not implemented it due to budgetary constraints

[^] State has one or more major municipalities that have passed a law, but state has not

Source: National Partnership for Women & Families.

Early childhood education

Another way to help workers balance the demands of the family and the workplace is to provide access to high-quality child care and early education.³⁵ Making preschool more accessible would be one method to help working parents, who often struggle to find quality low-cost child care.

Providing access to quality preschool education also has other advantages. Multiple studies have shown that children benefit greatly from having a quality preschool education. The HighScope Perry Preschool Study, for example, found that people who were enrolled as children in a quality preschool program were more likely to be employed, earned more money, and committed fewer crimes in their lifetime.³⁶ At the same time, our economy benefits from these investments in our future workforce, which help strengthen our nation's long-term economic competitiveness.³⁷ One estimate suggests that investments in early childhood education yield a return of 12 percent for society in general.³⁸

The United States, however, does not provide access to free, publicly funded, quality preschool education. Access to high-quality preschool education varies greatly across the states. While states such as Oklahoma and Georgia serve the majority of their 4-year-olds in state pre-kindergarten programs, states such as Indiana and Montana do not have any state pre-kindergarten programs for their 4-year-olds.³⁹

Table 7 ranks each state based on two key indicators of high-quality preschool education: the percentage of 4-year-olds in the state that have access to these programs and the spending per child for those that participate in them.

TABLE 7
Early childhood education

Access to and resources for state pre-K

State	Percent of 4-year-olds enrolled in state pre-K	All reported spending per child enrolled in pre-K	State	Percent of 4-year-olds enrolled in state pre-K	All reported spending per child enrolled in pre-K
Alabama	6.3%	\$7,198	Montana*	0.0%	\$0
Alaska	2.0%	\$8,057	Nebraska	22.2%	\$2,094
Arizona	3.1%	\$3,496	Nevada	2.7%	\$3,584
Arkansas	37.4%	\$8,753	New Hampshire*	0.0%	\$0
California	18.1%	\$5,069	New Jersey	28.2%	\$11,659
Colorado	21.0%	\$3,445	New Mexico	15.5%	\$3,161
Connecticut	12.9%	\$11,725	New York	44.2%	\$3,707
Delaware	7.4%	\$6,795	North Carolina	19.2%	\$7,803
Florida	79.4%	\$2,281	North Dakota*	0.0%	\$0
Georgia	58.7%	\$3,490	Ohio	2.4%	\$3,980
Hawaii*	0.0%	\$0	Oklahoma	74.1%	\$7,427
Idaho*	0.0%	\$0	Oregon	9.7%	\$8,509
Illinois	27.7%	\$3,210	Pennsylvania	14.0%	\$5,474
Indiana*	0.0%	\$0	Rhode Island	0.9%	\$9,278
Iowa	52.5%	\$3,925	South Carolina	42.6%	\$2,888
Kansas	20.9%	\$2,123	South Dakota*	0.0%	\$0
Kentucky	30.4%	\$6,876	Tennessee	21.6%	\$5,814
Louisiana	31.6%	\$4,557	Texas	51.4%	\$3,291
Maine	31.6%	\$5,022	Utah*	0.0%	\$0
Maryland	34.5%	\$8,599	Vermont	65.2%	\$3,744
Massachusetts	14.3%	\$4,344	Virginia	16.0%	\$5,872
Michigan	19.4%	\$4,422	Washington	8.2%	\$6,800
Minnesota	1.4%	\$7,592	West Virginia	60.9%	\$8,901
Mississippi*	0.0%	\$0	Wisconsin	61.0%	\$5,111
Missouri	3.9%	\$2,682	Wyoming*	0.0%	\$0

* State has not established pre-K programs

Source: W. Steven Barnett and others, "The State of Preschool 2012" (New Brunswick, New Jersey: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2012).

The leadership gap

Although women make up more than half of our nation's population, far too few women are in positions of decision making and leadership. Having women in leadership positions in the workplace and in government would better empower women to chart their own futures.

In order to assess how women are faring in terms of attaining leadership positions, we examined the percentage of women in each state in elected office at the state and national level and the percentage of women in each state holding management positions in the private sector. Including minority data, we looked at nine factors overall:

- Percentage of U.S. congressional seats occupied by women
- Percentage of statewide elected executive offices occupied by women
- Percentage of state legislature seats occupied by women
- Percentage of minority women elected to Congress, statewide executive, or state legislature offices
- Management gap among women overall
- Management gap among Hispanic women
- Management gap among African American women
- Management gap among Asian American women
- Management gap among Native American women

Based on these factors, this report finds that women in Utah, Arkansas, and Kentucky have the fewest leadership positions relative to men.

Women in Utah and Arkansas are not reaching leadership positions in the private sector; both states rank near the bottom in terms of the percentage of managerial jobs held by women. According to Census data, Utah is the third-worst state in the country in terms of the percentage of managerial jobs held by women; Arkansas is the ninth worst.

Women in Kentucky are also particularly challenged on leadership. Out of the state's eight seats in Congress, none are occupied by women. Out of the eight statewide elected executive positions available, only one is held by a woman.

In contrast, based on the factors examined, women in Maryland are doing the best on leadership. Maryland ranks fourth in the nation in terms of the total percentage of elected positions in Congress, statewide elected executive office, and the state legislature that are held by women of color. Maryland ranks third in the nation in terms of the percentage of managerial jobs held by women.

Table 8 ranks the states on leadership matters for women, based on the factors examined.

TABLE 8

The state of women in America:

State rankings and grades for leadership

State Rank	State	Leadership Grade	State Rank	State	Leadership Grade
1	Maryland	A	26	New Hampshire	C
2	Colorado	A	27	Wyoming	C
3	Illinois	A	28	Wisconsin	C-
4	Arizona	A	28	Michigan	C-
5	California	A	30	Virginia	C-
6	Rhode Island	A-	30	Nebraska	C-
6	Nevada	A-	30	West Virginia	C-
8	Alaska	A-	30	Alabama	C-
9	Connecticut	A-	34	Kansas	D
9	Minnesota	A-	34	South Carolina	D
11	New York	B+	34	Montana	D
11	Hawaii	B+	37	Texas	D
11	New Mexico	B+	37	Ohio	D
14	Massachusetts	B	37	Pennsylvania	D
15	Washington	B	40	Louisiana	D-
15	Delaware	B	41	Oklahoma	F
17	Vermont	B	42	Iowa	F
17	Maine	B	43	Georgia	F
19	Florida	B-	44	North Dakota	F
19	Mississippi	B-	45	Tennessee	F
21	New Jersey	C+	46	Idaho	F
21	Oregon	C+	47	South Dakota	F
21	Indiana	C+	48	Kentucky	F
24	North Carolina	C	49	Arkansas	F
24	Missouri	C	50	Utah	F

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on nine factors related to leadership for women. For more information on how rankings and grades were calculated, please see the Methodology section.

Women’s leadership in public office

During the 2012 election cycle, a record number of women candidates filed to run for office, and women now comprise 18.1 percent of Congress—the highest percentage ever.⁴⁰ This record-high number, however, is far from representative of all U.S. women, who make up more than half of the nation’s population. Women are underrepresented at every level of government in the United States, making up only 10 percent of all governors, 12 percent of all mayors, and 24 percent of all state legislators.⁴¹ Out of 188 countries, the United States ranks 69th in terms of women elected to national office.⁴²

Table 9 shows the percentage of elected offices held by women across the country, including figures for Congress, statewide elected executive offices, and state legislatures. The table also includes the percentage of those three elected offices that are held by women of color.

TABLE 9
Women’s leadership in public office

Percentage of elected seats held by women

State	Percentage of U.S. congressional seats held by women	Percentage of statewide elected executive seats held by women	Percentage of seats in the state legislature held by women	Percentage of U.S. Congress, statewide elected executive, and state legislature seats held by minority women
Alabama	22.2%	40.0%	14.3%	6.9%
Alaska	33.3%	0.0%	28.3%	0.0%
Arizona	18.2%	33.3%	35.6%	10.0%
Arkansas	0.0%	0.0%	17.0%	2.0%
California	36.4%	25.0%	25.8%	13.1%
Colorado	11.1%	0.0%	41.0%	7.0%
Connecticut	28.6%	50.0%	29.4%	3.5%
Delaware	0.0%	16.7%	25.8%	2.8%
Florida	20.7%	20.0%	25.0%	8.8%
Georgia	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%	10.2%
Hawaii	75.0%	0.0%	31.6%	30.5%
Idaho	0.0%	0.0%	25.7%	2.6%
Illinois	20.0%	50.0%	32.2%	9.4%
Indiana	18.2%	42.9%	20.7%	3.6%
Iowa	0.0%	14.3%	23.3%	2.4%

State	Percentage of U.S. congressional seats held by women	Percentage of statewide elected executive seats held by women	Percentage of seats in the state legislature held by women	Percentage of U.S. Congress, statewide elected executive, and state legislature seats held by minority women
Kansas	16.7%	16.7%	23.6%	2.3%
Kentucky	0.0%	12.5%	18.1%	0.0%
Louisiana	12.5%	0.0%	11.8%	5.0%
Maine	50.0%	0.0%	28.5%	0.0%
Maryland	20.0%	0.0%	30.3%	12.9%
Massachusetts	18.2%	33.3%	25.5%	2.3%
Michigan	12.5%	25.0%	18.9%	1.2%
Minnesota	30.0%	60.0%	33.3%	0.9%
Mississippi	0.0%	25.0%	16.1%	8.0%
Missouri	30.0%	0.0%	21.8%	4.7%
Montana	0.0%	37.5%	27.3%	0.0%
Nebraska	20.0%	16.7%	20.4%	1.7%
Nevada	16.7%	50.0%	28.6%	9.3%
New Hampshire	100.0%	100.0%	33.0%	1.2%
New Jersey	0.0%	50.0%	29.2%	11.0%
New Mexico	20.0%	71.4%	27.7%	15.3%
New York	27.6%	0.0%	21.6%	6.9%
North Carolina	20.0%	50.0%	21.8%	6.7%
North Dakota	33.3%	21.4%	17.0%	0.0%
Ohio	16.7%	16.7%	23.5%	6.4%
Oklahoma	0.0%	36.4%	13.4%	1.2%
Oregon	14.3%	40.0%	28.9%	2.0%
Pennsylvania	5.0%	20.0%	17.8%	3.2%
Rhode Island	0.0%	40.0%	27.4%	1.6%
South Carolina	0.0%	11.1%	12.9%	3.2%
South Dakota	33.3%	10.0%	22.9%	0.0%
Tennessee	18.2%	0.0%	17.4%	4.8%
Texas	10.5%	22.2%	21.0%	9.6%
Utah	0.0%	0.0%	16.3%	2.6%
Vermont	0.0%	16.7%	40.6%	0.5%
Virginia	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%	6.4%
Washington	41.7%	11.1%	30.6%	2.4%
West Virginia	20.0%	16.7%	16.4%	1.4%
Wisconsin	20.0%	16.7%	25.0%	3.4%
Wyoming	33.3%	40.0%	16.7%	1.0%

Source: Center for American Women and Politics.

Women's leadership at work

Women make up nearly 50 percent of the workforce but are underrepresented in leadership positions. Only 4.2 percent of Fortune 500 CEOs are women.⁴³ Even outside of senior leadership positions at the most elite companies, few women find themselves leading the workplace. Overall, women hold only 38 percent of the management positions across the country.⁴⁴ This underrepresentation reflects missed opportunities to fully utilize all of our human capital, as well as structural barriers to women's equality in the workplace.

Table 10 details the percentage of managerial jobs held by women, including the percentage of managerial jobs held by African American, Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American women.

TABLE 10
Women's leadership at work

Percentage of management jobs held by women

State	Percentage of management jobs held by women	Percentage of African Americans in management jobs that are women	Percentage of Hispanics in management jobs that are women	Percentage of Asian Americans in management jobs that are women	Percentage of Native Americans in management jobs that are women
Alabama	37.26%	54.95%	32.78%	34.33%	36.05%
Alaska	43.80%	34.60%	53.41%	53.32%	56.59%
Arizona	39.06%	43.54%	43.22%	38.48%	52.55%
Arkansas	36.17%	55.48%	28.00%	24.40%	35.49%
California	39.06%	51.86%	40.94%	40.52%	46.07%
Colorado	41.36%	54.02%	46.09%	48.41%	65.01%
Connecticut	37.64%	46.53%	41.48%	33.75%	56.16%
Delaware	40.33%	51.77%	49.11%	33.75%	70.83%
Florida	38.68%	51.93%	39.38%	37.71%	37.47%
Georgia	38.38%	53.57%	33.32%	31.87%	42.11%
Hawaii	41.55%	35.50%	39.19%	43.00%	35.59%
Idaho	33.94%	31.55%	39.52%	23.39%	61.00%
Illinois	38.20%	59.15%	41.11%	34.75%	53.57%
Indiana	36.99%	55.51%	40.74%	35.76%	43.77%
Iowa	33.36%	31.43%	33.93%	44.21%	55.40%
Kansas	33.90%	43.88%	42.28%	35.61%	47.63%
Kentucky	38.11%	49.57%	33.25%	29.74%	59.12%

State	Percentage of management jobs held by women	Percentage of African Americans in management jobs that are women	Percentage of Hispanics in management jobs that are women	Percentage of Asian Americans in management jobs that are women	Percentage of Native Americans in management jobs that are women
Louisiana	38.62%	55.48%	36.30%	44.16%	27.70%
Maine	42.71%	38.38%	43.58%	37.59%	46.34%
Maryland	42.35%	54.59%	42.49%	41.47%	65.02%
Massachusetts	40.75%	49.54%	47.24%	40.81%	44.01%
Michigan	38.33%	56.34%	41.32%	30.28%	52.28%
Minnesota	37.06%	44.61%	39.77%	42.43%	57.07%
Mississippi	38.36%	58.43%	33.60%	43.01%	71.22%
Missouri	37.58%	54.13%	40.26%	37.12%	43.52%
Montana	34.58%	36.45%	56.80%	40.76%	45.68%
Nebraska	32.39%	45.48%	36.33%	46.90%	49.42%
Nevada	39.55%	46.03%	48.76%	41.50%	33.00%
New Hampshire	37.44%	33.94%	45.34%	29.14%	24.68%
New Jersey	37.32%	53.09%	39.34%	32.07%	46.46%
New Mexico	40.44%	34.63%	42.08%	33.99%	44.41%
New York	39.96%	54.05%	44.07%	38.13%	47.99%
North Carolina	38.48%	54.15%	34.74%	36.16%	39.64%
North Dakota	28.82%	25.76%	38.39%	34.78%	50.13%
Ohio	37.19%	53.84%	39.24%	31.17%	39.58%
Oklahoma	37.18%	54.93%	35.59%	38.24%	48.31%
Oregon	39.60%	41.51%	37.64%	40.90%	45.06%
Pennsylvania	36.94%	54.58%	38.97%	34.17%	45.79%
Rhode Island	40.85%	53.82%	42.11%	51.00%	66.67%
South Carolina	39.47%	59.98%	41.55%	34.46%	44.27%
South Dakota	30.73%	53.07%	35.39%	31.93%	38.95%
Tennessee	37.30%	52.65%	36.78%	32.55%	32.93%
Texas	36.82%	52.77%	40.10%	34.09%	35.03%
Utah	31.80%	24.62%	35.67%	34.88%	28.01%
Vermont	40.09%	67.42%	43.77%	19.45%	61.80%
Virginia	39.49%	53.31%	38.10%	39.25%	48.97%
Washington	38.86%	46.23%	38.78%	43.28%	48.64%
West Virginia	38.97%	46.65%	34.64%	46.28%	50.00%
Wisconsin	37.44%	52.21%	38.03%	34.22%	53.58%
Wyoming	36.30%	0.00%	45.94%	56.86%	30.11%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder."

Women's health and healthy families

Health issues affect women's personal, everyday well-being. Having access to affordable health care, access to reproductive services, and the ability to ensure a healthy pregnancy and delivery can greatly impact a woman's life. Access to affordable health care is especially important, as medical bills are the number one cause of bankruptcy filings in America.⁴⁵ This year alone, about 1.7 million American households will file for bankruptcy because of rising medical bills.⁴⁶

What's worse, the 2012 elections showed that attacks on women's health are not subsiding. Instead, too many politicians—all too frequently men—continue to try to interfere with women's reproductive health. Despite the importance of access to affordable health care, more than 21 million women in the United States still lack health insurance.⁴⁷

This report examines how women are faring in each state on a multitude of health issues, including access to reproductive health services, implementation of Affordable Care Act protections, and the ability to ensure a healthy pregnancy and delivery. We examined the following 14 factors:

- Policies to defund Planned Parenthood's preventive health services
- Contraceptive needs met with public funding
- Policies requiring medically unnecessary ultrasounds
- Unconstitutional limits on abortion at a specific gestational age
- Number of mandatory waiting-period and counseling restrictions
- Targeted Restrictions on Abortion Providers, or TRAP, laws
- Percentage of nonelderly women uninsured

- Percentage of nonelderly African American women uninsured
- Percentage of nonelderly Hispanic women uninsured
- Medicaid expansion policy
- Maternal mortality rate
- Infant mortality rate
- Number of women per obstetrician-gynecologist, or OB-GYN, in the state

Based on the factors examined, this report finds that women fare the worst on health issues in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and North Carolina.

In Oklahoma, women suffer from the third-highest maternal mortality rate in the nation, meaning that women in Oklahoma are more likely to die from pregnancy-related complications than women in 47 other states in the nation. Oklahoma is also among the top 10 worst states in the nation in terms of infant mortality. Considering these factors, it is unsurprising that women in Oklahoma have difficulties accessing health care. Across the nation, the state has the second-lowest rate of OB-GYNs to the female population, with only one OB-GYN for every 18,713 women.

Meanwhile, Louisiana has one of the top 10 worst maternal mortality rates in the nation. In Louisiana, there is only one OB-GYN for every 13,136 women.⁴⁸ To put this in perspective, the United States already has a worse maternal mortality rate than 49 other countries.⁴⁹

Women in North Carolina are not doing much better. When it comes to accessing health care, nearly 18 percent of nonelderly women in the state are uninsured. North Carolina also has the fourth-highest rate of uninsured nonelderly Hispanic women in the country at 38 percent. Yet despite the high rate of uninsured women in North Carolina, the state is not expanding Medicaid, which could potentially provide health care coverage to nearly 300,000 more women in the state.⁵⁰

In contrast, based on the factors examined, women in Vermont are doing the best on health issues. Vermont has the second-lowest rate of uninsured women, the second-lowest maternal mortality rate, and the second-lowest infant mortality rate in the country. Vermont is also one of the highest-ranking states as far as access to reproductive health care.

Table 11 ranks how women are faring on health issues across the country, based on the selected factors.

TABLE 11
The state of women in America

State rankings and grades for health

State Rank	State	Health Grade	State Rank	State	Health Grade
1	Vermont	A	26	Pennsylvania	C
2	Hawaii	A	27	Idaho	C
3	Delaware	A	27	Montana	C
4	Connecticut	A	29	North Dakota	C-
4	Minnesota	A	30	Ohio	C-
6	Massachusetts	A-	31	Nebraska	D+
7	Iowa	A-	32	Virginia	D+
7	Oregon	A-	33	Wisconsin	D+
9	New Hampshire	A-	34	Utah	D
10	Colorado	A-	35	Missouri	D
11	Washington	B+	36	South Dakota	D
12	New York	B+	37	Georgia	D
13	Maine	B+	38	Arizona	D-
14	California	B	38	Arkansas	D-
15	New Jersey	B	40	South Carolina	D-
16	Alaska	B	41	Tennessee	F
17	Maryland	B	42	Mississippi	F
17	New Mexico	B	43	Kansas	F
19	Illinois	B-	44	Alabama	F
19	Rhode Island	B-	45	Indiana	F
21	Kentucky	C+	46	Florida	F
21	Wyoming	C+	46	Texas	F
23	Nevada	C+	48	North Carolina	F
24	West Virginia	C	49	Louisiana	F
25	Michigan	C	50	Oklahoma	F

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on 13 factors related to health for women. For more information on how rankings and grades were calculated, please see the Methodology section.

Access to reproductive health services

States are enacting more and more restrictions on abortion rights and abortion providers every year, eroding the constitutional protections secured by *Roe v. Wade*. This year alone, Texas, Ohio, and North Carolina passed bills imposing new restrictions on women's access to reproductive health. The measure in Texas is so strict that it will shut down most abortion clinics in the state.⁵¹ Meanwhile, North Carolina's anti-abortion measure will likely lead to the closure of all of the state's clinics except one.⁵²

In analyzing the restrictions on reproductive health services across the states, we examined several factors: defunding of Planned Parenthood's preventive health services, percentage of contraception needs met, forced ultrasounds, unconstitutional limits on abortion based on a specific gestational age, counseling and waiting-period restrictions on women who seek an abortion, and TRAP laws. Each of these factors dramatically affects women's health.

- **Defunding Planned Parenthood and other providers' preventative health services.** Health care providers such as Planned Parenthood provide critical health services for women, including family-planning services, cancer screenings, pelvic and breast examinations, and contraception coverage. Nearly 3 million women and men visit Planned Parenthood each year.⁵³ Abortion services account for only about 3 percent of Planned Parenthood's activities.⁵⁴ Despite the value of services provided by Planned Parenthood, in recent years, state legislatures have been attacking and seeking to remove funding for Planned Parenthood and other health care providers that provide critical access to family-planning and preventive health services.⁵⁵
- **Access to publicly funded contraceptive services.** According to historian Elaine Tyler May, the female activists who pushed for and funded the invention of the pill realized that women "could not achieve full equality unless they had control over their reproductive lives."⁵⁶ The activists understood that birth control plays a critical role in giving women that control over their lives. More than 50 years after the introduction of the pill, however, birth control is still not accessible to all. In 2010, 19.1 million women were in need of publicly funded contraceptive services.⁵⁷ Yet only 8.9 million women received such services. The Affordable Care Act would improve the accessibility of publicly funded contraceptive services. In addition to guaranteeing that insurers cover birth control, the Affordable Care Act would also provide funding for states to expand Medicaid, the largest source of publicly funded contraceptive services.⁵⁸ Unfortunately, not all states are choosing to expand Medicaid.

- **Forced ultrasounds.** Ultrasounds are traditionally a sound medical procedure benefiting many women. Some states, however, have started mandating ultrasounds for women seeking an abortion in an effort to interfere with a woman's choice. Women in 10 states are now compelled to undergo an ultrasound when seeking an abortion, even if it is not considered medically necessary.⁵⁹ Some of the laws passed in these states would actually necessitate that a woman undergo an invasive transvaginal probe.⁶⁰ In 2012, for example, conservative lawmakers in Virginia attempted to pass a bill that would have required a vaginal ultrasound before an adoption procedure.⁶¹ The backlash against the measure led to language in the bill stating that women cannot be forced to undergo such an invasive procedure.⁶² Other states have not gone as far as to mandate medically unnecessary ultrasounds, but they still impede doctors' ability to recommend timely and necessary procedures to patients for abortions or other general medical procedures.⁶³
- **Unconstitutional limits on abortion.** In *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, the Supreme Court held that states may only restrict or ban abortions after fetal viability under certain conditions. In later opinions, the Court clarified that even after fetal viability, states may not prohibit abortions that are necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother. Despite the Court's requirements, however, some states continue to enact laws that place unconstitutional restrictions on abortions based on arbitrarily chosen time periods after fertilization. These include several states that have passed laws banning abortion at 20 weeks after fertilization—"well before viability."⁶⁴ North Dakota has gone even further in banning abortions by passing a law that declares that life begins at conception, effectively banning all abortions in the state.⁶⁵
- **Onerous counseling and waiting-period restrictions.** Before a patient undergoes medical treatment, the patient must give informed consent for the treatment. In order for that consent to be considered informed, a patient must be provided with adequate and appropriate information. Frequently, though, states pass abortion-counseling requirements that require information that is irrelevant or misleading to the patient. Additionally, some states require that patients wait at least 24 hours between counseling and an abortion, effectively requiring women to make at least two trips to the doctor to obtain an abortion.⁶⁶

- **Targeted regulation of abortion providers.** Another tactic used to impede women’s access to abortions is the regulation of abortion clinics. Since *Roe v. Wade*, several states have imposed strict regulations on abortion clinics, going beyond what is medically necessary for a patient’s safety through TRAP laws.⁶⁷ Some of these laws apply to physicians’ offices where abortions are performed or other sites where only medication abortions are administered.⁶⁸ Some of these measures are so strict—such as those in Texas—that they would shut down most abortion clinics in a state.⁶⁹ Currently, 28 states have TRAP laws.⁷⁰

Table 12 summarizes the above factors that limit a woman’s access to reproductive health care across the states.

TABLE 12
Reproductive rights

Policies and coverage to uphold or restrict women’s reproductive rights

State	Laws to strip funding or access to funding for Planned Parenthood and other health care providers	Percentage of need for publicly funded contraceptive services met by publicly supported providers	Laws requiring forced ultrasounds	Unconstitutional limits on abortion	Number of mandatory waiting-period and counseling restrictions*	TRAP laws
Alabama	No	36%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman’s abortion treatment	20 months	6	Yes
Alaska	No	63%	None	No	4	No
Arizona	Yes	23%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman’s abortion treatment	No	6	Yes
Arkansas	No	42%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	20 months	4	Yes
California	No	62%	None	No	None	Yes
Colorado	No	49%	None	No	None	No
Connecticut	No	42%	None	No	None	Yes
Delaware	No	48%	None	No	None	No
Florida	No	26%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman’s abortion treatment	24 months	None	Yes
Georgia	No	24%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	2	No

State	Laws to strip funding or access to funding for Planned Parenthood and other health care providers	Percentage of need for publicly funded contraceptive services met by publicly supported providers	Laws requiring forced ultrasounds	Unconstitutional limits on abortion	Number of mandatory waiting-period and counseling restrictions*	TRAP laws
Hawaii	No	35%	None	No	None	No
Idaho	No	29%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	5	No
Illinois	No	26%	None	No	None	Yes
Indiana	Yes	26%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	20 months	7	Yes
Iowa	No	46%	None	No	None	No
Kansas	Yes	28%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	22 months	10	Yes
Kentucky	No	38%	None	No	3	Yes
Louisiana	No	21%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	No	6	Yes
Maine	Yes	43%	None	No	None	No
Maryland	No	32%	None	No	None	Yes
Massachusetts	No	30%	None	27 months	1	No
Michigan	No	25%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	5	Yes
Minnesota	No	32%	None	No	3	No
Mississippi	No	39%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	No	5	Yes
Missouri	No	25%	Requires provider to offer woman ultrasound	No	8	Yes
Montana	Yes	57%	None	No	1	No
Nebraska	No	29%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	20 months	3	Yes
Nevada	No	21%	None	24 months	None	No
New Hampshire	Yes	37%	None	No	None	No
New Jersey	Yes	35%	None	No	None	No
New Mexico	No	47%	None	No	None	No

State	Laws to strip funding or access to funding for Planned Parenthood and other health care providers	Percentage of need for publicly funded contraceptive services met by publicly supported providers	Laws requiring forced ultrasounds	Unconstitutional limits on abortion	Number of mandatory waiting-period and counseling restrictions*	TRAP laws
New York	No	37%	None	24 months	None	No
North Carolina	Yes	27%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	20 months	6	Yes
North Dakota	No	44%	Requires provider to offer woman ultrasound	20 months	4	Yes
Ohio	Yes	22%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	5	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes	45%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	20 months	4	Yes
Oregon	No	52%	None	No	None	No
Pennsylvania	No	36%	None	24 months	4	Yes
Rhode Island	No	35%	None	24 months	None	Yes
South Carolina	No	36%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	3	Yes
South Dakota	No	46%	Requires provider to offer woman ultrasound	24 months	9	Yes
Tennessee	Yes	21%	None	No	None	Yes
Texas	Yes	26%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	No	7	Yes
Utah	No	28%	Requires provider to offer woman ultrasound and, if ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	8	Yes
Vermont	No	48%	None	No	None	No
Virginia	No	23%	Requires an ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	No	4	Yes
Washington	No	40%	None	No	None	No
West Virginia	No	43%	If ultrasound is given, requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	No	5	No
Wisconsin	Yes	34%	Requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	No	5	Yes
Wyoming	No	49%	None	No	None	No

* See the methodology section for a complete explanation of the scoring for this factor.
Source: Guttmacher Institute.

Implementation of Affordable Care Act protections

Women stand to benefit tremendously from the Affordable Care Act. Across the nation, about 21 million women currently lack health insurance.⁷¹ Under the Affordable Care Act, many of these women would be eligible for tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies to help them afford health care coverage. The health care law would also expand coverage for women by allowing states to expand Medicaid eligibility for individuals and families living up to 138 percent of the federal poverty level. If every state accepted the federal funds guaranteed under the law and expanded Medicaid, 17 million Americans, including at least 7 million women, would gain coverage.⁷² But as of mid-September 2013, conservative legislatures and governors in 22 states decided not to expand Medicaid coverage in their states, leaving many women without access to affordable health insurance.⁷³

The Affordable Care Act will also end discrimination by insurance companies against women. Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies could discriminate against women, denying them coverage or charging them more for preexisting conditions such as pregnancy or being a victim of domestic violence. The health care law will end this discriminatory practice of gender rating and ensure that women will no longer have to pay more than men for the same health care coverage.

Table 13 shows the number of uninsured women by state, including African American and Hispanic women. It also shows where each state stands on Medicaid expansion.

TABLE 13
Affordable Care Act protections

Percentage of women without insurance coverage,
and state policy decisions on Medicaid expansion

State	Percentage of nonelderly women that are uninsured	Percentage of nonelderly African American women that are uninsured	Percentage of nonelderly Hispanic women that are uninsured	Medicaid expansion
Alabama	15.5%	18.4%	36.6%	Not moving forward
Alaska	19.9%	21.4%	30.9%	Not moving forward
Arizona	17.7%	15.0%	27.1%	Moving forward
Arkansas	19.1%	20.6%	35.8%	Partnership exchange
California	18.4%	15.0%	27.9%	Moving forward
Colorado	15.2%	17.2%	28.9%	Moving forward
Connecticut	8.5%	10.9%	18.3%	Moving forward
Delaware	9.8%	9.9%	21.5%	Moving forward
Florida	23.0%	25.1%	35.3%	Not moving forward
Georgia	20.4%	22.0%	41.9%	Not moving forward
Hawaii	7.2%	7.9%	12.8%	Moving forward
Idaho	17.9%	19.4%	32.9%	Not moving forward
Illinois	13.1%	17.1%	25.3%	Moving forward
Indiana	15.6%	18.2%	27.3%	Debate ongoing
Iowa	9.5%	12.3%	22.4%	Partnership exchange
Kansas	13.4%	17.7%	29.3%	Not moving forward
Kentucky	16.2%	17.9%	33.9%	Moving forward
Louisiana	19.4%	23.3%	35.6%	Not moving forward
Maine	11.3%	11.1%	20.8%	Not moving forward
Maryland	10.4%	11.9%	28.9%	Moving forward
Massachusetts	4.0%	6.1%	8.3%	Moving forward
Michigan	12.1%	14.6%	21.3%	Moving forward
Minnesota	8.8%	14.0%	26.3%	Moving forward
Mississippi	19.4%	22.0%	39.3%	Not moving forward
Missouri	15.1%	18.9%	28.0%	Not moving forward
Montana	20.4%	23.2%	35.2%	Not moving forward
Nebraska	12.2%	15.0%	26.7%	Not moving forward
Nevada	22.1%	21.7%	34.0%	Moving forward
New Hampshire	11.7%	14.3%	26.4%	Debate ongoing
New Jersey	13.4%	13.8%	26.8%	Moving forward
New Mexico	21.3%	19.0%	24.6%	Moving forward

State	Percentage of nonelderly women that are uninsured	Percentage of nonelderly African American women that are uninsured	Percentage of nonelderly Hispanic women that are uninsured	Medicaid expansion
New York	11.3%	12.5%	19.9%	Moving forward
North Carolina	17.5%	19.6%	38.0%	Not moving forward
North Dakota	10.3%	14.9%	23.4%	Moving forward
Ohio	12.5%	15.0%	23.5%	Debate ongoing
Oklahoma	20.7%	21.3%	34.5%	Not moving forward
Oregon	16.7%	18.3%	31.7%	Moving forward
Pennsylvania	10.8%	14.3%	19.6%	Debate ongoing
Rhode Island	11.2%	14.5%	24.2%	Moving forward
South Carolina	18.0%	21.2%	38.7%	Not moving forward
South Dakota	12.9%	16.3%	27.3%	Not moving forward
Tennessee	15.2%	15.9%	34.4%	Debate ongoing
Texas	24.7%	22.1%	37.1%	Not moving forward
Utah	15.2%	16.2%	33.8%	Not moving forward
Vermont	6.3%	8.9%	17.3%	Moving forward
Virginia	13.1%	16.6%	32.1%	Not moving forward
Washington	14.7%	15.5%	28.6%	Moving forward
West Virginia	17.4%	17.0%	27.2%	Moving forward
Wisconsin	8.9%	11.8%	22.3%	Not moving forward
Wyoming	16.0%	18.2%	29.0%	Not moving forward

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, "Model-based Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) for Counties and States"; Kaiser Family Foundation.

Ensuring healthy pregnancy and delivery

Many women in the United States do not have healthy pregnancies and deliveries. Although the United States spends more than any other country on health care, “women in the USA have a higher risk of dying of pregnancy-related complications than those in 49 other countries, including Kuwait, Bulgaria, and South Korea.”⁷⁴ The United States has the highest first-day death rate for infants in the industrialized world.⁷⁵ According to a report from Save the Children, “An estimated 11,300 newborn babies die each year in the United States on the day they are born.”⁷⁶

Table 14 details infant mortality rates, maternal mortality rates, and women’s access to OB-GYN doctors across the states.

TABLE 14
Healthy pregnancy and delivery

Rates of infant and maternal mortality and access to OB-GYN physicians

State	Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 infants under 1 year of age)	Maternal mortality rate (per 100,000 live births)	Number of women for every OB-GYN physician
Alabama	8.71	11.6	14,121
Alaska	3.75	3.2	
Arizona	5.97	7.5	10,232
Arkansas	7.32	16	4,200
California	4.74	12.5	6,242
Colorado	5.91	10.9	4,920
Connecticut	5.28	7.5	3,790
Delaware	7.66	10.3	3,780
Florida	6.54	14.8	11,824
Georgia	6.42	20.9	7,125
Hawaii	6.16	13.9	2,595
Idaho	4.83	15	10,100
Illinois	6.77	7.8	12,632
Indiana	7.62	2.9	6,047
Iowa	4.88	8.2	12,210
Kansas	6.22	7.1	7,000
Kentucky	6.79	8.1	4,095

State	Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 infants under 1 year of age)	Maternal mortality rate (per 100,000 live births)	Number of women for every OB-GYN physician
Louisiana	7.6	17.9	13,136
Maine	5.4	1.2	5,082
Maryland	6.75	18.7	7,797
Massachusetts	4.43	4.8	5,245
Michigan	7.13	21	10,905
Minnesota	4.49	5	6,259
Mississippi	9.67	19	5,975
Missouri	6.61	12.7	4,418
Montana	5.89	10.1	5,700
Nebraska	5.25	9	6,564
Nevada	5.59	10	2,868
New Hampshire	3.96	9.2	3,627
New Jersey	4.81	16.5	4,067
New Mexico	5.64	16.5	13,700
New York	5.09	18.9	
North Carolina	7.01	10.9	5,493
North Dakota	6.81	10.3	5,400
Ohio	7.71	7.2	3,983
Oklahoma	7.59	20.1	18,713
Oregon	4.94	6.5	2,829
Pennsylvania	7.25	10.1	19,656
Rhode Island	7.07	5.2	7,383
South Carolina	7.37	12	7,408
South Dakota	6.94	9	8,000
Tennessee	7.93	11	8,471
Texas	6.13	10.5	4,617
Utah	4.86	9.9	7,869
Vermont	4.18	2.6	4,367
Virginia	6.8	8.3	5,062
Washington	4.5	9	5,168
West Virginia	7.28	10.4	15,340
Wisconsin	5.84	10.9	9,156
Wyoming	6.75	17	4,380

Note: Blanks indicate that the sample size was too small to make a confident calculation for that subgroup.
Sources: National Center for Health Statistics, National Women's Law Center, and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Conclusion

While women have come a long way over the past century, this report serves as a stark reminder that much remains to be done in order to achieve greater freedom, fairness, and equality for all. As we continue on the path to reaching this goal, we must keep in mind that we are not just improving the lives of women, but we are also improving the lives of their families and their children. Women and their families deserve a fair shot so that they can get ahead and not just get by.

Methodology

Selecting the factors

The factors were selected based on the unique challenges facing women across three broad categories of life: economic security, leadership, and health. The factors were chosen based on their ability to cover different facets of each of these categories. Therefore, the economic security portion incorporates not only state rankings on wage gaps and poverty rates but also evaluates states based on education, health, and labor policies that would have a positive impact on women's economic security. The section on women's leadership includes factors that assess both the public and private sectors. The health section ranges from looking at overall access to health care to reproductive health outcomes to abortion protections specifically. We aimed to include data on women of color where possible to provide a more complete picture of the progress made and challenges remaining for all women.

It should be noted, generally speaking, that it was not feasible to canvas every data source and include every piece of data pertaining to the three categories in this report. What's more, data are not available for all issues of interest in each category. Therefore, it should also be noted that the rankings and grades assigned to the states in the report are based solely on the factors examined in the report and the grading system described in greater detail below.

Ranking the states

The methodology for ranking the states consisted of awarding points based on how each state fared according to the 34 factors considered in the report. For each factor, the best-performing states received 1 point, and the worst-performing states received up to 10 points. States were then ranked within each category by calculating the average point values for the number of factors for which they were evaluated. In several instances, data were not available for certain states, such as in the case of Medicaid expansion, which some states are still debating, or for poverty rates among racial subgroups, for which the sample size was too small to determine a value accurately. The overall state rankings were then determined by averaging the rankings for each of the three categories. This way, no single category counted more than any other.

The table below details the process for awarding points to states for each of the 36 factors considered in the report. It is separated into the three categories of economic security, leadership, and health.

TABLE 15
Methodology for awarding points

Economic security factors

Policy and description	Points
Wage gap	30
1. Overall wage gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the amount a woman makes for every dollar a white man makes (Hereafter referred to as “decile system”)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among states ranked 1 to 5 Among states ranked 6 to 10 Among states ranked 11 to 15 Among states ranked 16 to 20 Among states ranked 21 to 25 Among states ranked 26 to 30 Among states ranked 31 to 35 Among states ranked 36 to 40 Among states ranked 41 to 45 Among states ranked 46 to 50
2. African American wage gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the amount an African American woman makes for every dollar a white man makes	Decile system of 1 to 10 points
3. Hispanic wage gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the amount a Hispanic woman makes for every dollar a white man makes	Decile system of 1 to 10 points

Policy and description	Points
Minimum wage	10
4. Minimum wage impact: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of the total female population affected by raising the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
Women in poverty	50
5. Poverty rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of women living in poverty	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
6. African American poverty rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of African American women living in poverty	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
7. Hispanic poverty rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of Hispanic women living in poverty	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
8. Asian American poverty rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of Asian American women living in poverty	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
9. Native American poverty rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of Native American women living in poverty	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
Paid family and medical leave policies	30
10. Paid family leave: Laws establishing a program for paid family leave insurance, allowing workers to receive wage replacement after the birth or adoption of a new child or if they have to care for a seriously ill family member	State has passed and implemented a law 1 State has passed a law but has not implemented it due to budgetary constraints 5 State has not passed a law 10
11. Temporary disability insurance: Laws establishing a program for temporary disability insurance, providing wage replacement when workers are physically unable to work	State has passed and implemented a law 1 State has not passed a law 10
12. Paid sick leave: Laws that require employers to allow workers to earn paid sick leave for their own illness or to care for immediate family members	State has passed and implemented a law 1 State has one or more major municipalities that have passed a law, but state has not passed a law 5 State has not passed a law 10
Early childhood education	20
13. Access to early childhood education: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of 4-year-olds that have access to early childhood education including pre-K, Head Start, and special-education programs	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
14. Spending on early childhood education: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the spending per child in early childhood education programs	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
Total possible points in economic security	140

Leadership factors

Policy and description	Points
Women's leadership in public office	40
15. Congress: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of current members of Congress that are women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
16. Executive statewide offices: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of current statewide elected executive officeholders that are women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
17. State legislature: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of current officeholders in the state legislature that are women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
18. Minority women officeholders: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of officeholders in Congress, statewide elected executive offices, and the state legislature that are women of color	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
Women's leadership at work	50
19. Management gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of managerial positions held by women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
20. African American management gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of managerial positions among African Americans held by African American women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
21. Hispanic management gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of managerial positions among Hispanics held by Hispanic women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
22. Asian American management gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of managerial positions among Asian Americans held by Asian American women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
23. Native American management gap: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of managerial positions among Native Americans held by Native American women	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10
Total possible points in leadership	90

Health factors

Policy and description	Points	
Implementation of Affordable Care Act protections	40	
24. Overall uninsured: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of its female population that lacks health insurance coverage	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10	
25. African American uninsured: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of its African American female population that lacks health insurance coverage	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10	
26. Hispanic uninsured: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of its Hispanic female population that lacks health insurance coverage	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10	
27. Medicaid Expansion: Laws that provide for the state to expand Medicaid coverage as stipulated in the Affordable Care Act	State is moving forward with Medicaid expansion	1
	State has developed a partnership exchange with the federal government	5
	State is not moving forward with Medicaid expansion	10
Access to reproductive health services	62	
28. Defunding providers: Laws to strip funding or access to funding for Planned Parenthood and other health care providers	State has not acted to strip funding or access to funding for health care providers	1
	State has passed a law to strip funding or access to funding for health care providers	10
29. Contraceptive needs: Where a state ranks in the nation based on the percentage of the need for publicly funded contraceptive services that is met by publicly funded clinics	Decile system of 1 to 10 points 10	
30. Forced ultrasounds: Laws that require women to undergo ultrasounds as a part of their abortion treatment	State does not require ultrasounds or require that providers offer ultrasounds	1
	State requires provider to offer woman ultrasound	2.5
	If ultrasound is given, state requires provider to offer woman the opportunity to view image	5
	State requires ultrasound as part of woman's abortion treatment	10
31. Abortion bans: Laws that place an unconstitutional ban on abortions after a specific gestational age	State has not legislated an unconstitutional limit on abortion procedures	1
	State has legislated an unconstitutional limit on abortion procedures*	10

Policy and description	Points	
32. Counseling and waiting periods: Laws that require onerous or misleading counseling and waiting-period restrictions as a part of women’s abortion treatment (Note: states with no restrictions received one point. States with restrictions had points added according to each restriction listed to the right.)	State does not have any onerous or erroneous counseling materials, or waiting period	1
	State passed law requiring a waiting period prior to abortion procedure	1
	State passed law requiring in-person counseling that necessitates two trips to clinic	1
	State passed law requiring written materials on abortion procedures be offered	1
	State passed law requiring written counseling materials on abortion procedures be given	2
	State passed law requiring woman be informed that abortion cannot be coerced	1
	State passed law requiring counseling materials on the ability of a fetus to feel pain	1
	State passed law requiring counseling materials that state personhood begins at conception	1
	State passed law requiring counseling materials that inaccurately portray risk of future fertility	1
	State passed law requiring counseling materials that inaccurately portray risk of future fertility and passed law requiring description of specific procedure be given	1
	State passed law requiring counseling materials that inaccurately assert possible link to breast cancer	1
	State passed law requiring counseling materials that describe only negative emotional responses	1
33. TRAP laws: Laws that place specific regulatory burdens and undue hurdles on facilities that provide abortion services	State has not passed any TRAP laws	1
	State has passed TRAP laws	10
Ensuring healthy pregnancy and delivery	30	
32. Maternal mortality rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on maternal mortality rate	Decile system of 1 to 10 points	10
33. Infant mortality rate: Where a state ranks in the nation based on infant mortality rate	Decile system of 1 to 10 points	10
34. Rate of OB-GYNs: Where a state ranks based on the number of women for every obstetrician-gynecologist physician	Decile system of 1 to 10 points	10
Total possible points in health	132	
Total possible points overall	362	
Best possible average state score	1	
Worst possible average state score	10	

* North Dakota was given an additional 10 points in this category as a penalty for being the only state in the nation that has passed and implemented a “personhood” law that states life begins at conception.

Grading the states

States were assessed based on the average point values they received. This was done both within each category and overall. Overall grades were based on the overall rankings, or the average of the rankings within the three categories, as described above.

The table below details the point-value ranges that correspond with each grade.

Sources

State-level economic and health data were drawn exclusively from government sources. Policy evaluations and figures for leadership in public office were based on state-by-state analyses done by public policy organizations that provided comprehensive and trustworthy methodology and citations. Policy evaluations for state leave policies and reproductive rights were also compiled in part through consultation with experts at the Center for American Progress, for whose help we are extremely grateful.

TABLE 16
Methodology for
assessing state grades

State rank	Grade
1 to 5	A
6 to 10	A-
11 to 13	B+
14 to 17	B
18 to 20	B-
21 to 23	C+
24 to 27	C
28 to 30	C-
31 to 33	D+
34 to 37	D
38 to 40	D-
41 to 50	F

Author bios

Anna Chu is the Policy Director for the ThinkProgress War Room at the Center for American Progress Action Fund. She brings experience serving as the policy director for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee during the successful 2012 cycle that saw Democrats adding two seats to their majority in the Senate. As policy director, Anna oversaw and managed all policy issues for the committee and Democratic Senate candidates. Prior to working at the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, Anna served as the policy advisor for the House Democratic Caucus. She previously served as a federal law clerk and worked as an associate at Paul Hastings. Anna graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, and has a J.D. from the University of Southern California.

Charles Posner is the State Communications Assistant for the ThinkProgress War Room. Prior to joining American Progress, he worked at Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, specializing in U.S. political issues, and as a field organizer in Ohio on campaigns to overturn a voter suppression law and protect collective bargaining rights for public-sector unions. Posner graduated with a bachelor's degree in political science from Brown University, where he was captain of the men's tennis team in his senior year. He hails from Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Acknowledgements

Countless people gave their time, advice, and assistance on this report. We cannot begin to thank everyone, but we are particularly grateful to Jocelyn Frye, Sarah Jane Glynn, Heidi Williamson, Judith Warner, Melissa Boteach, Sarah Baron, Katie Wright, and Arkadi Gerney.

Endnotes

- 1 Judith Warner, "Lessons Learned" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2013), available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/report/2013/04/26/61538/lessons-learned/>.
- 2 Jane Farrell, "Infographic: Where Are U.S. Women in 2013?", Center for American Progress, March 8, 2013, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/news/2013/03/08/55678/infographic-where-are-u-s-women-in-2013/>.
- 3 Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, *2012 American Community Survey* (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2013).
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Farrell, "Infographic: Where Are U.S. Women in 2013?"
- 6 Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, *2012 American Community Survey*.
- 7 Kaiser Family Foundation, "Health Insurance Coverage of Nonelderly Women 0-64," available at <http://kff.org/other/state-indicator/nonelderly-women/> (last accessed August 2013).
- 8 U.S. Census Bureau, *Women in the Workforce* (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2010), available at http://www.census.gov/newsroom/pdf/women_workforce_slides.pdf.
- 9 Heather Boushey, Ann O'Leary, and Sarah Jane Glynn, "Our Working Nation" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2013), available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/report/2013/02/05/51720/our-working-nation-in-2013/>.
- 10 Wendy Wang, Kim Parker, and Paul Taylor, "Breadwinner Moms" (Washington: Pew Research Center, 2013), available at <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/05/29/breadwinner-moms/>.
- 11 Wage-gap calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, *2012 American Community Survey*.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Wang, Parker, and Taylor, "Breadwinner Moms."
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Calculations based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, *2012 American Community Survey*.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 David Madland and Karla Walter, "Top 6 Policies to Help the Middle Class that Won't Cost Taxpayers a Penny," Center for American Progress, April 24, 2013, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/news/2013/04/24/61295/top-6-policies-to-help-the-middle-class-that-wont-cost-taxpayers-a-penny/>.
- 24 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "CPI Inflation Calculator," available at http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm (last accessed August 2013).
- 25 Madland and Walter, "Top 6 Policies to Help the Middle Class that Won't Cost Taxpayers a Penny."
- 26 National Women's Law Center, "60 Percent of Women's Job Gains in the Recovery Are in the 10 Largest Low-Wage Jobs" (2013), available at <http://www.nwlc.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/60percentfactsheet.pdf>.
- 27 Economic Policy Institute, "Characteristics of workers who would be affected by increasing the federal minimum wage to \$10.10 by July 1, 2015" (2013), available at <http://www.epi.org/files/2013/EPI-federal-minimum-wage-state-impact.pdf>.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Kai Filion, "Fact Sheet for 2009 minimum wage increase—Minimum Wage Issue Guide" (Washington: Economic Policy Institute, 2009), available at http://www.epi.org/publication/mwig_fact_sheet/.
- 30 Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, "Income Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2012" (Washington: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013), available at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p60-245.pdf>.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 U.S. Census Bureau, *2012 American Community Survey*.
- 33 Catherine Rampell, "In Most Rich Countries, Women Work More Than Men," *The New York Times*, December 19, 2012, available at http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/19/in-most-rich-countries-women-work-more-than-men/?_r=0.
- 34 Heather Boushey and Jane Farrell, "A Women's Agenda for the 21st Century" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2013), available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/report/2013/05/23/64276/a-womans-agenda-for-the-21st-century/>.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 HighScope, "HighScope Perry Preschool Study" (2005), available at <http://www.highscope.org/Content.asp?ContentId=219>.
- 37 Boushey and Farrell, "A Women's Agenda for the 21st Century."
- 38 Rob Grunewald and Arthur J. Rolnick, "Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return," *fedgazette*, March 2003, available at http://www.minneapolisfed.org/publications_papers/pub_display.cfm?id=3832.
- 39 Farrell, "Infographic: Where Are U.S. Women in 2013?"
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Ibid. The figure for state legislators comes from a Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the Center for American Women and Politics. See Center for American Women and Politics, "Women in Elective Office," available at <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/> (last accessed September 2013).

- 42 Catalyst, "Women in Government" (2012), available at <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-government>.
- 43 Farrell, "Infographic: Where Are U.S. Women in 2013?"
- 44 U.S. Census Bureau, "American FactFinder," available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=EEO_10_5YR_EEOALL1R&prodType=table (last accessed August 2013).
- 45 Dan Mangan, "Medical Bills Are The Biggest Cause of US Bankruptcies," CNBC News, June 25, 2013, available at <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100840148>.
- 46 NBC News, "Biggest cause of personal bankruptcy: Medical bills," June 25, 2013, available at <http://www.nbcnews.com/business/biggest-cause-personal-bankruptcy-medical-bills-6C10442408>.
- 47 U.S. Census Bureau, "Model-based Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) for Counties and States," available at <http://www.census.gov/did/www/sahie/> (last accessed September 2013).
- 48 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Occupational Employment Statistics, Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2012," available at <http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes291064.htm> (last accessed September 2013).
- 49 Amnesty International, "Maternal Health in the U.S." (2011), available at <http://www.amnestyusa.org/our-work/campaigns/demand-dignity/maternal-health-is-a-human-right/maternal-health-in-the-us>.
- 50 National Women's Law Center, "The Affordable Care Act and Covering More Women and Families in Medicaid" (2013), available at http://www.nwlc.org/sites/default/files/north_carolina.pdf.
- 51 Tara Culp-Ressler, "Texas Advances Sweeping Anti-Choice Bill That Will Force Most Abortion Clinics to Close," ThinkProgress, June 19, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/health/2013/06/19/2180571/texas-advances-trap-special-session/>.
- 52 Laura Bassett, "North Carolina Abortion Bill Passes Senate Despite GOP Governor's Rebuke," HuffPost Politics, July 3, 2013, available at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/03/north-carolina-abortion_n_3541251.html.
- 53 Planned Parenthood, "Planned Parenthood at a Glance," available at <http://www.plannedparenthood.org/about-us/who-we-are/planned-parenthood-glance-5552.htm> (last accessed August 2013).
- 54 Emilie Openchowski, "Abortion Is the Battle, but Women's Health Is the War," Center for American Progress, August 23, 2012, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2012/08/23/33841/abortion-is-the-battle-but-womens-health-is-the-war/>.
- 55 Guttmacher Institute, "Laws Affecting Reproductive Health and Rights: State Trends at Midyear, 2013," available at <http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/updates/2013/statetrends2013.html> (last accessed September 2013).
- 56 Rita Rubin, "The pill: 50 years of birth control changed women's lives," *USA Today*, May 8, 2010, available at http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/health/2010-05-07-1Apill07_CV_N.htm.
- 57 Jennifer J. Frost, Mia R. Zolna, and Lori Frohwirth, "Contraceptive Needs and Services, 2010" (New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2013), available at <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/win/contraceptive-needs-2010.pdf>.
- 58 Guttmacher Institute, "Facts on Publicly Funded Contraceptive Services in the United States" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/fb_contraceptive_serv.html.
- 59 Guttmacher Institute, "Requirements for Ultrasound" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_RFU.pdf.
- 60 Dahlia Lithwick, "Virginia's Proposed Ultrasound Law Is an Abomination," Slate, February 16, 2012, available at http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2012/02/virginia_ultrasound_law_women_who_want_an_abortion_will_be_forcibly_penetrated_for_no_medical_reason.html.
- 61 Erik Eckholm and Kim Severson, "Virginia Senate Passes Ultrasound Bill as Other States Take Notice," *The New York Times*, February 28, 2012, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/29/us/virginia-senate-passes-revised-ultrasound-bill.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Guttmacher Institute, "Requirements for Ultrasound"
- 64 Guttmacher Institute, "State Policies on Later Abortions" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_PLTA.pdf.
- 65 Tara Culp-Ressler, "North Dakota Votes To Ban All Abortions By Defining Life At Conception," ThinkProgress, March 22, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/health/2013/03/22/1764141/north-dakota-passes-personhood/>.
- 66 Guttmacher Institute, "Counseling and Waiting Periods for Abortion" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_MWPA.pdf.
- 67 Guttmacher Institute, "Targeted Regulation of Abortion Providers" (2013), available at http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_TRAP.pdf.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Culp-Ressler, "Texas Advances Sweeping Anti-Choice Bill That Will Force Most Abortion Clinics to Close."
- 70 Guttmacher Institute, "Targeted Regulation of Abortion Providers."
- 71 U.S. Census Bureau, "Model-based Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) for Counties and States."
- 72 Boushey and Farrell, "A Women's Agenda for the 21st Century."
- 73 Kaiser Family Foundation, "Status of State Action on the Medicaid Expansion Decision, as of September 3, 2013," available at <http://kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/state-activity-around-expanding-medicare-under-the-affordable-care-act/> (last accessed September 2013).
- 74 Amnesty International, "Maternal Health in the U.S."
- 75 Save the Children, "State of the World's Mothers" (2013), available at <http://www.savethechildrenweb.org/SOWM-2013/#/10/>.
- 76 Ibid.

The Center for American Progress is a nonpartisan research and educational institute dedicated to promoting a strong, just, and free America that ensures opportunity for all. We believe that Americans are bound together by a common commitment to these values and we aspire to ensure that our national policies reflect these values. We work to find progressive and pragmatic solutions to significant domestic and international problems and develop policy proposals that foster a government that is “of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

Center for American Progress

