



**Real-time Poverty Estimates During the COVID-19 Pandemic  
through March 2021\***

[Jeehoon Han](#), Zhejiang University  
[Bruce D. Meyer](#), University of Chicago, NBER, AEI  
[James X. Sullivan](#), University of Notre Dame, [LEO](#)

April 14, 2021

\* We thank the National Science Foundation, the Menard Family Foundation, and the Wilson Sheehan Lab for Economic Opportunities ([LEO](#)) for their financial support.

## Poverty Holds Steady as Households Await New Round of Benefits

The coronavirus pandemic has taken a significant toll on the U.S. labor market. Since the start of the pandemic, more than 100 million claims for unemployment insurance have been filed. While new UI claims fell sharply from April through July of last year, weekly claims have remained high since then at more than 1 million claims each week, about 5 times the pre-pandemic rate. Currently, nearly 10 million individuals are officially unemployed and millions of other former workers are still without jobs. The government response to this depressed employment and slow growth has been sporadic. Early in the pandemic, the federal government offered a generous relief package that included large, one-time stimulus payments to households and greatly expanded unemployment insurance benefits. After many of these benefits expired, the federal government passed another relief package in December 2020 that provided additional, but smaller, stimulus payments and partially extended some of the other benefits. The most recent relief package, the American Rescue Plan, includes more generous stimulus payments and additional expansions to unemployment insurance benefits, as well as a significant increase in the child tax credit.

The effect of the pandemic on the economy and the government's response have had a noticeable impact on poverty rates over the past year. In a [recent study](#), published in the *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, we developed a new poverty measure that provides near-real-time poverty estimates using U.S. Census Bureau data. These estimates, which can be produced with a lag of only a few weeks, provide immediate information on how the pandemic is affecting individuals and families. As a result, the estimates should guide government policies and programs that help prevent people from slipping into poverty during sharp downturns in the economy. This report summarizes the results from the most recent update to our study, including poverty rates through March 2021. These monthly updates are also available through our Poverty Measurement Dashboard at <http://povertymeasurement.org/covid-19-poverty-dashboard/>. Our most recent estimates do not reflect the impact of many of the benefits provided by the American Rescue Plan, because these estimates are based on data collected during the third week of March, only days after the American Rescue Plan was signed into law.

Our initial study provided estimates through June 2020. In Table 1, we report these estimates as well as updated results through March 2021. Our initial results showed that poverty declined in the first few months after the start of the pandemic. The poverty rate fell by 1.3 percentage points from 10.7 percent in January 2020 to 9.4 percent in June 2020.<sup>1</sup> We also showed that poverty declined across a range of demographic groups and geographies, with some of the most noticeable declines evident for people with low levels of education and for those who fall into the “other race” (neither white nor Black) category.

In the last 6 months of 2020, however, poverty rose sharply, as some of the benefits that were part of the initial government relief package expired. Poverty rose by 2 percentage points from 9.4 percent in June to 11.4 percent in December, adding 6.7 million people to the ranks of the

---

<sup>1</sup> This decline is only marginally significant, and changes in poverty between consecutive months are not statistically significant. These imprecise estimates result from the moderate sized samples available to construct these estimates. These numbers differ slightly from previously published numbers because of an improvement to the imputation methods.

poor. Poverty rose each month between June and November even though the unemployment rate fell by 40 percent (from 11.1 percent to 6.7 percent) during this period. This disconnect between poverty and unemployment is not surprising given that many government benefits expired, unemployment insurance benefits are typically only about half of pre-job loss earnings, and nearly five million people have left the labor force since the start of the pandemic and therefore are not counted as unemployed.

The increase in poverty in the latter half of 2020 was more noticeable for Blacks, children, and those with a high school education or less. For Blacks, poverty rose by 2.9 percentage points between June and December. Poverty also rose noticeably for those with a high school education or less, from 16.7 percent in June to 21.7 percent in December.

A new round of stimulus payments of up to \$600 per person started going out in January and Pandemic Unemployment Compensation, which provides supplemental benefits to those collecting unemployment insurance, was revived at a lower amount (\$300 per week as compared to the \$600 per week supplement that expired in July). The American Rescue Plan, which was signed into law on March 11, 2021, provides additional stimulus payments of up to \$1,400 per person as well as an extension of the \$300 Pandemic Unemployment Compensation payments to September.

Although poverty estimates for January and February 2021 suggest that the trend of rising poverty during the latter half of 2020 was flattening out, poverty rose sharply in March, by 0.5 percentage points, although this change is not statistically significant. The groups that experienced the sharpest rise in poverty include children, whites, women, those with low education, and those in states that have historically paid unemployment insurance to a small share of the unemployed.

In our initial study, we also showed that the entire decline in poverty through June can be accounted for by the one-time stimulus checks the federal government issued, predominantly in April and May, and the expansion of unemployment insurance eligibility and benefits. In fact, in absence of these programs, poverty would have risen sharply. The one-time payments provided up to \$1,200 to individuals and \$2,400 to married couples without dependents, with the maximum amount going to individuals with income under \$75,000, and married couples with income under \$150,000. In addition, unemployment insurance benefits were initially increased by \$600 per week and eligibility for unemployment insurance was broadened to include the self-employed, those seeking part-time employment, and others who otherwise would not be eligible.

To calculate near-real-time estimates of poverty, we use data from the monthly Current Population Survey (CPS), a nationally representative survey of about 60,000 households each month — the same survey that is used to calculate official monthly unemployment statistics. This survey includes a question about family income that is asked of a quarter of the sample and provides the data necessary to estimate poverty. We show that, historically, the real-time poverty estimate from the monthly CPS has been a good predictor of changes in the official poverty rate. See our [study](#) for more details.

Table 1. Poverty Rates, Monthly CPS, 2020-2021

| Month                       | Jan-20         | Feb-20         | Mar-20         | Apr-20         | May-20         | Jun-20         | Jul-20         | Aug-20         | Sep-20         | Oct-20         | Nov-20         | Dec-20         | Jan-21         | Feb-21         | Mar-21         | Jun-20<br>- Jan-20 | Mar-21<br>- Jun-20 | Mar-21<br>- Jan-20 |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Full Sample                 | 10.7%<br>(0.5) | 10.7%<br>(0.5) | 10.3%<br>(0.5) | 9.2%<br>(0.7)  | 9.1%<br>(0.6)  | 9.4%<br>(0.6)  | 10.2%<br>(0.6) | 10.4%<br>(0.6) | 10.6%<br>(0.5) | 11.3%<br>(0.5) | 11.6%<br>(0.5) | 11.4%<br>(0.6) | 11.1%<br>(0.5) | 11.2%<br>(0.5) | 11.7%<br>(0.6) | -1.3%<br>(0.8)     | 2.3%<br>(0.8)      | 1.0%<br>(0.7)      |
| Number of individuals       | 20,020         | 20,822         | 16,733         | 14,383         | 14,236         | 14,391         | 15,156         | 16,341         | 18,358         | 18,748         | 18,151         | 17,356         | 18,328         | 18,846         | 18,787         |                    |                    |                    |
| Age                         |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                    |                    |                    |
| Age 0-17                    | 15.1%<br>(1.0) | 14.9%<br>(1.0) | 16.5%<br>(1.2) | 14.0%<br>(1.4) | 12.7%<br>(1.4) | 13.4%<br>(1.3) | 15.5%<br>(1.3) | 15.6%<br>(1.3) | 16.0%<br>(1.2) | 16.6%<br>(1.1) | 15.8%<br>(1.0) | 15.9%<br>(1.2) | 16.0%<br>(1.1) | 16.1%<br>(1.1) | 17.4%<br>(1.2) | -1.7%<br>(1.7)     | 4.0%<br>(1.8)      | 2.4%<br>(1.5)      |
| Age 18-64                   | 9.8%<br>(0.5)  | 9.6%<br>(0.5)  | 8.6%<br>(0.5)  | 7.8%<br>(0.6)  | 8.3%<br>(0.6)  | 8.4%<br>(0.6)  | 9.2%<br>(0.6)  | 9.3%<br>(0.5)  | 9.1%<br>(0.5)  | 10.0%<br>(0.5) | 10.8%<br>(0.5) | 10.4%<br>(0.5) | 10.1%<br>(0.5) | 10.2%<br>(0.5) | 10.4%<br>(0.5) | -1.4%<br>(0.7)     | 2.0%<br>(0.8)      | 0.6%<br>(0.7)      |
| Age 65+                     | 7.6%<br>(0.6)  | 8.8%<br>(0.6)  | 7.3%<br>(0.6)  | 7.1%<br>(0.7)  | 6.6%<br>(0.6)  | 7.0%<br>(0.7)  | 5.9%<br>(0.6)  | 6.8%<br>(0.6)  | 8.0%<br>(0.6)  | 8.1%<br>(0.6)  | 8.5%<br>(0.7)  | 8.3%<br>(0.7)  | 7.1%<br>(0.6)  | 7.1%<br>(0.6)  | 7.8%<br>(0.6)  | -0.6%<br>(0.9)     | 0.8%<br>(0.9)      | 0.2%<br>(0.9)      |
| Race                        |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                    |                    |                    |
| White                       | 9.3%<br>(0.5)  | 8.9%<br>(0.5)  | 8.7%<br>(0.6)  | 7.7%<br>(0.7)  | 7.9%<br>(0.7)  | 7.9%<br>(0.6)  | 8.8%<br>(0.7)  | 8.0%<br>(0.6)  | 8.7%<br>(0.5)  | 9.5%<br>(0.5)  | 10.0%<br>(0.6) | 10.0%<br>(0.6) | 9.4%<br>(0.6)  | 9.1%<br>(0.5)  | 10.5%<br>(0.6) | -1.4%<br>(0.8)     | 2.6%<br>(0.9)      | 1.2%<br>(0.8)      |
| Black                       | 18.5%<br>(1.7) | 20.7%<br>(1.7) | 21.8%<br>(2.1) | 17.8%<br>(2.5) | 16.1%<br>(2.2) | 19.1%<br>(2.3) | 18.5%<br>(2.3) | 23.3%<br>(2.5) | 22.5%<br>(2.1) | 22.7%<br>(2.1) | 20.9%<br>(2.1) | 22.1%<br>(2.2) | 20.9%<br>(2.0) | 21.0%<br>(2.2) | 21.2%<br>(2.0) | 0.6%<br>(2.9)      | 2.1%<br>(3.1)      | 2.7%<br>(2.6)      |
| Other                       | 12.2%<br>(1.5) | 11.9%<br>(1.6) | 9.1%<br>(1.4)  | 9.3%<br>(2.0)  | 9.6%<br>(2.2)  | 8.3%<br>(1.7)  | 10.3%<br>(2.0) | 11.5%<br>(2.1) | 10.1%<br>(1.7) | 10.3%<br>(1.5) | 12.2%<br>(1.7) | 9.6%<br>(1.5)  | 12.1%<br>(1.7) | 13.2%<br>(1.8) | 9.3%<br>(1.3)  | -3.9%<br>(2.3)     | 1.0%<br>(2.2)      | -2.9%<br>(2.0)     |
| Gender                      |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                    |                    |                    |
| Male                        | 10.2%<br>(0.5) | 9.8%<br>(0.5)  | 8.9%<br>(0.6)  | 8.5%<br>(0.7)  | 8.4%<br>(0.7)  | 8.9%<br>(0.7)  | 8.9%<br>(0.7)  | 9.5%<br>(0.6)  | 9.9%<br>(0.6)  | 10.5%<br>(0.5) | 10.8%<br>(0.6) | 11.1%<br>(0.6) | 10.5%<br>(0.6) | 10.4%<br>(0.6) | 10.6%<br>(0.6) | -1.4%<br>(0.9)     | 1.7%<br>(0.9)      | 0.4%<br>(0.8)      |
| Female                      | 11.3%<br>(0.5) | 11.7%<br>(0.6) | 11.7%<br>(0.6) | 9.9%<br>(0.7)  | 9.8%<br>(0.8)  | 9.9%<br>(0.7)  | 11.4%<br>(0.7) | 11.3%<br>(0.7) | 11.3%<br>(0.6) | 12.0%<br>(0.6) | 12.4%<br>(0.6) | 11.7%<br>(0.6) | 11.6%<br>(0.6) | 11.9%<br>(0.6) | 12.8%<br>(0.6) | -1.3%<br>(0.9)     | 2.9%<br>(0.9)      | 1.5%<br>(0.8)      |
| Head Education              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                    |                    |                    |
| H.S. Degree or below        | 20.8%<br>(1.2) | 19.6%<br>(1.1) | 20.6%<br>(1.4) | 19.0%<br>(1.6) | 17.7%<br>(1.5) | 16.7%<br>(1.4) | 19.3%<br>(1.6) | 20.0%<br>(1.4) | 20.5%<br>(1.2) | 22.2%<br>(1.2) | 22.2%<br>(1.2) | 21.7%<br>(1.3) | 21.3%<br>(1.3) | 21.8%<br>(1.3) | 22.2%<br>(1.3) | -4.1%<br>(1.8)     | 5.5%<br>(1.9)      | 1.4%<br>(1.7)      |
| Some College or above       | 6.0%<br>(0.4)  | 6.3%<br>(0.5)  | 5.5%<br>(0.5)  | 4.6%<br>(0.5)  | 5.2%<br>(0.6)  | 6.1%<br>(0.6)  | 5.7%<br>(0.6)  | 5.8%<br>(0.5)  | 5.8%<br>(0.5)  | 6.0%<br>(0.5)  | 6.3%<br>(0.5)  | 6.5%<br>(0.5)  | 6.3%<br>(0.5)  | 5.7%<br>(0.5)  | 6.6%<br>(0.6)  | 0.1%<br>(0.8)      | 0.5%<br>(0.8)      | 0.6%<br>(0.7)      |
| UI Reciprocity Rate         |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                    |                    |                    |
| High Q1 Reciprocity (>=35%) | 9.3%<br>(0.6)  | 9.8%<br>(0.7)  | 8.5%<br>(0.7)  | 8.2%<br>(0.9)  | 8.4%<br>(0.9)  | 8.7%<br>(0.9)  | 10.0%<br>(0.9) | 10.0%<br>(0.8) | 8.5%<br>(0.7)  | 10.0%<br>(0.7) | 10.4%<br>(0.8) | 10.2%<br>(0.8) | 10.3%<br>(0.8) | 10.5%<br>(0.8) | 9.3%<br>(0.7)  | -0.6%<br>(1.1)     | 0.6%<br>(1.1)      | 0.0%<br>(0.9)      |
| Low Q1 Reciprocity (<35%)   | 12.1%<br>(0.7) | 11.6%<br>(0.7) | 12.1%<br>(0.9) | 10.1%<br>(0.9) | 9.9%<br>(0.9)  | 10.0%<br>(0.9) | 10.3%<br>(0.9) | 10.8%<br>(0.9) | 12.6%<br>(0.8) | 12.5%<br>(0.7) | 12.8%<br>(0.8) | 12.7%<br>(0.8) | 11.8%<br>(0.7) | 11.7%<br>(0.8) | 14.0%<br>(0.9) | -2.0%<br>(1.1)     | 3.9%<br>(1.2)      | 1.9%<br>(1.1)      |

Note: This table is an update of Table 1 of Han et al. 2020. We now multiply impute income within brackets for all months using five draws, while Han et al. used a single draw. Starting in February 2021 we also draw within bracket values from the 2020 ASEC instead of the 2019 ASEC and use 2020 Census poverty thresholds. See the paper for additional methods. The sample includes individuals who are included in the householders' families and who are in their 1st or 5th month in the survey. Individuals with imputed income are excluded from the sample. The statistics are weighted using fixed demographic weights since March 2020. Standard errors, reported in parentheses, are clustered at the household level.