

The Status of Women Leaders in Government – Utah Cities and Towns

Setting the Stage

Research shows that communities and organizations increasingly thrive when men and women work together in leadership roles.¹ Gender inclusivity benefits not only businesses, churches, schools, and state legislatures, but also state and local governments. American democracy is grounded in the idea of representation.² “Representative bureaucracy” is the term for government entities employing a workforce that shares the demographic characteristics of the communities they serve,³ and the combined experiences and perspectives of that workforce represent and benefit all residents within its purview.⁴ This includes the thousands of government professionals who run the daily functions of municipalities within the State of Utah.

Many decisions that have the greatest impact on the everyday lives of Utah residents do not happen in Washington DC or even in Utah’s State Capitol. They occur in the chambers of city councils and town meeting halls, where community members have much more access to their local elected government leaders than those at the state and national levels. And, Gallup recently found that 72% of Americans have a “great deal or a fair amount of trust in their local government,”⁵ which is strikingly different from trust in state and national governments. Yet, for local governments to run efficiently, the oversight of day-to-day operations is most often delegated to administrative professionals.

Through the years, Utah Women & Leadership Project (UWLP) researchers have collected data on the representation of women in many different settings (e.g., business, politics, nonprofit, schools and colleges, and boards and commissions). Yet, until 2020, there has been no understanding of the status of women leaders in government at the state and local levels in Utah. This brief is the third in a series that quantifies women leaders who work in Utah’s public sector. Previous briefs in this series documented women in leadership positions in the State of Utah government and within Utah’s 29 counties.

Study Background

To determine how reflective Utah’s local government organizations are of the communities they serve, UWLP researchers took on the task of reaching out to Utah’s 247 cities and towns to gather information on individuals who serve in leadership capacities. The goal was to document a baseline of the number and percentage of women in leadership that can be used in the future to learn where progress has been made.

We were able to gather information (in some cases only partial data) on all of Utah’s 247 cities and towns. Data for this

research were initially collected by contacting city recorders, town clerks, and human resource managers for the requested information. As needed, researchers submitted formal information (GRAMA) requests through the Open Records Portal website⁶ and partnered with the Utah League of Cities and Towns in the data collection process. Additionally, data was collected from municipal websites. The information requested from each municipality included a list of leadership positions; the gender of the person currently in each position; whether the position was considered to be elected, appointed, merit, or time-limited/part-time; and the total overall number of workers employed.

Researchers supplemented this information by analyzing each leadership position title and categorizing it based on the level of leadership. In addition, the data were analyzed by municipality size (city populations categorized by “class”), urban vs. rural designation, number of city or town employees, county grouping, and multi-county districts. The results of these additional analyses provided valuable insights into the status of women leaders in Utah’s cities and towns.

In total, there are over 25,850 municipal employees working for Utah’s 247 cities and towns. The analysis in this study reflects the information we received (or found through city websites) on the 4,544 leadership positions for which gender representation was available.

Findings Overview

Women hold 29.1% of supervisory, managerial, and executive leadership positions within city and town governments in Utah, which is considerably lower than the percentage of women leaders found within county leadership⁷ (42.5%) or for the State of Utah⁸ (39.3%). Although the size and structure of each city or town are certainly different, this statistic underscores how women are generally represented at a much lower rate in municipalities throughout Utah. In attempting to locate comparable national statistics, we found that this is one of the first statewide studies of its kind and therefore groundbreaking. In fact, the only comparable data we could find was national data from 2009 that reported women were represented in 30% of township administrations and 28% of city administrations.⁹ Of course, these data are outdated and represent only top administrators or executives, while our research included those positions as well as supervisory and managerial positions.

A complete listing of the overall percentage of women leaders in each of the 247 cities and towns is provided in the Appendix. The cities with the highest percentage of women leaders include Marysville Town at 83.3%, followed by Castle Valley,

Overall, women hold only 29.1% of supervisory, managerial, and executive leadership positions in Utah’s municipal governments.

Dutch John, Helper, Rockville and Trenton Town each at 66.7%. The next highest group, with 62.5% of leadership positions being held by women, includes Boulder Town, Goshen, Hanksville, Moab, and Scofield Town. The cities with the lowest percentage of women in leadership included Naples (6.7%), Roosevelt City (9.5%), Cedar City (10.6%), Woodruff (12.5%), St. George (13.0%), and Vernal City (13.6%). There were several cities that had a 14.3% share of women in leadership that included Loa Town, Plain City, Toquerville, and Virgin Town.

The Appendix also includes the percentage of women elected officials for each municipality. The cities with the highest percentage of women in elected office include Helper and Santa Clara (both at 83.3%), followed by Marysvale Town (80.0%), Sandy City and South Salt Lake (both at 75%), and Fruit Heights City, Moab, and West Haven (each at 66.7%). There were 43 cities and towns reporting that 0% of their elected offices were held by women. The next lowest percentage of women in elected office included Hooper City (8.3%), followed by Clearfield, Cornish Town, Kamas City, Orem, Washington City, and West Valley City all at 14.3% (see the following report for more details about women in Utah politics: [The Status of Women in Utah Politics: A 2017 Update](#)).

Leadership Level & Position Classification

National and global researchers have discussed the leaky leadership “pipeline,” where comparable numbers of men and women start as front-line employees, yet as they progress through the leadership ranks, there are fewer and fewer women.¹⁰ The problem is not simply the overall numbers of women in the public sector workforce; it is how those numbers are spread across the different levels of leadership. Hence, to quantify the levels of leadership held by women, researchers categorized each leadership position based on its title into one of four levels: Top (C-suite level including elected officials, city managers, police chiefs, fire chiefs, and judges), Executive (includes directors), Senior (middle management, including assistant directors, supervisors, and managers), or Front-line (such as coordinators and analysts). Table 1 lists the percentage of women leaders in cities, grouped according to their level of leadership.

Table 1: Percentage of Women Leaders in Utah’s City Governments by Leadership Level

Leadership Level	Female	Male	% Female
Top	397	1308	23.3%
Executive	408	596	40.6%
Senior	326	698	31.8%
Front-line	193	618	23.8%
Total	1324	3220	29.1%

Overall, the results show that Utah’s cities and towns do not follow the “leaky leadership pipeline” concept. In fact, almost

the opposite is true. Currently, women comprise only 23.8% of front-line leadership in Utah’s municipalities, yet hold 31.8% of senior level leadership positions. Women make up 40.6% of positions considered an executive level, while holding 23.3% of the top leadership positions in Utah’s cities. Interestingly, outside of the top level of leadership, there are more women leaders the higher one goes in the organization, at least in the way we categorized them by title. A more thorough analysis of the cultural dynamics within municipalities could provide additional insight.

Leadership level was used as one method to analyze the data to understand how Utah is doing in terms of women and leadership in local governments. Unfortunately, we could not find recent national or state data that would provide an accurate comparison to these findings. The few older reports we did find used categories that did not align with these data.¹¹ While using this approach, we were cognizant that leadership titles, roles, and responsibilities in small cities and towns can be very different from those in larger municipalities.

In municipal governments, one of the highest appointed administrative positions is that of city manager. This position has responsibility for a city or town’s administrative operations and includes developing, recommending, and implementing policies; program planning; fiscal management; administration and operations. Importantly, this position often sets the tone for the initiatives and strategies a city or town may utilize related to diversity, equity, and inclusivity in all areas. Although not all of Utah’s 247 cities and towns have a city manager, of the approximately 96 that do, only five women (5.2%) currently serve as city manager or administrator. In terms of a national comparison, in the early 1970s, women accounted for 1% of the total number of city managers in the US.¹² By 2012 (more than 40 years later), the International City/County Manager’s Association reported that number had increased to 19.8%.¹³ Without more current data, we can only surmise that the national percentage has continued to increase in recent years. The fact remains that Utah is well below the national average in terms of women in city manager roles.

Next, researchers tried to determine whether the position classification had any connection to gender. Position classification was defined as being either elected, appointed, merit, or time-limited/part-time indefinitely. In government agencies, appointed positions are assigned by a high government official and often convey the heft of trust or authority. Merit positions are based on a competitive process that determines one’s ability to perform a job, rather than on political connections. Finally, time-limited/part-time indefinitely positions are linked to specific parameters regarding the position, either by tenure or hours worked. See Table 2 for the percentage of women leaders in Utah’s city and town governments by these position classifications.

Table 2: Percentage of Women Leaders in Utah’s City and Town Governments by Position Classification

Position Classification	Female	Male	% Female
Elected	374	1031	26.6%
Appointed	433	645	40.2%
Merit	452	1419	24.2%
Time-limited/part-time indefinitely	30	67	30.9%
Total	1289	3162	29.0%

For the positions for which we had data, we found that the largest percentage of Utah women leaders were classified as appointed, at 40.2%. Appointed positions are roles of authority and trust and give women opportunities to provide executive-level assistance to city managers and elected officials. Admittedly, each city is different and appointed positions within a city could include a city manager, city attorney, city recorder, finance director, police chief, fire chief, public works director, planning director, economic development director, or parks and recreation director. Yet, the number of women in appointed positions at the city level echoes what was found in county leadership, with 40.4% of appointed positions held by women. At the state level, women held 42.3% of appointed leadership positions. The similarity between the three levels of government regarding the ratio of women leaders is intriguing and warrants additional exploration. Conversely, women who are merit employees hold the lowest percentage of leadership positions (24.2%) within Utah’s cities and towns.

Population and Number of Employees

Another approach to analyze the data was to explore the number of women leaders in municipalities based on the number of residents who live within a city or town (see Table 3). To do this, populations were provided by the Utah League of Cities and Towns. Using the population as a guide, there were four cities considered 1st Class, seven ranked as 2nd Class, 23 identified as 3rd Class, 28 listed in the 4th class, 27 were sorted in the 5th Class-A category, 58 were in the 5th Class-B category, and 100 municipalities identified as towns.

Table 3: Percentage of Women Leaders in Utah City and Town Governments by Population Size

Classification	Female	Male	% Female
1st Class (100,000 +)	181	534	25.3%
2nd Class (65,000–99,999)	92	420	18.0%
3rd Class (30,000–64,999)	183	555	24.8%
4th Class (10,000–29,999)	179	366	32.8%
5th Class-A (5,000–9,999)	159	348	31.4%
5th Class-B (1,000–4,999)	226	467	32.6%

Towns (999 or less)	304	530	36.5%
Total	1324	3220	29.1%

Analyzing the data this way showed that Towns (municipalities having a population of 999 or less) were more likely to have women leaders (36.5%). This was closely followed by 4th Class cities (32.8%) and 5th Class-B cities (32.6%). In comparison, women who worked in 2nd Class cities are considerably less likely to hold a leadership role (18.0%).

These data align with the analysis of whether the counties are generally urban or rural areas of the state, based on the percentage of the county population living in rural areas as of the 2010 Census. We mirrored the county designations used by the Census,¹⁴ where counties with less than 50% of the population living in rural areas are identified as mostly urban. In the future, designating each city or town as rural or urban would most likely be more accurate. See Table 4 for the final percentage of women leaders in Utah city and town governments by either urban or rural counties.

Table 4: Percentage of Women Leaders in Utah City and Town Governments – Urban vs. Rural Counties

	Female	Male	% Female
Urban	845	2275	27.1%
Rural	479	945	33.6%
Total	1324	3220	29.1%

Researchers found that, in Utah, it was more likely to find women leaders in cities or towns within less populated counties (33.6%) than in those with larger populations (27.1%).

National research suggests women are more likely to be leaders over smaller organizations, have fewer people to supervise, and have less financial responsibility.¹⁵ To determine whether that applied to city and town governments in Utah, we analyzed the number of women leaders in municipal governments based on the number of overall workers employed by the city or town (see Table 5).

Table 5: Percentage of Women Leaders by Number of City or Town Employees

Number of Employees	Female	Male	% Female
0–19	411	778	34.6%
20–59	215	424	33.6%
60–199	197	444	30.7%
200–599	210	639	24.7%
600–999	112	390	22.3%
1,000–4,000	179	545	24.7%
Total	1324	3220	29.1%

Cities and towns with the fewest number of employees (0–19) have the highest percentage of women in leadership (34.6%), while those with 20–59 employees were close behind (33.6%). In comparison, cities or towns with 600–999 (22.3%), 200–599 (24.7%), and 1,000–4,000 employees (24.7%) were less likely to have women leaders.

Counties and Regions

In addition to the complete listing of the overall percentage of women leaders in each of Utah’s 247 cities and towns (see Appendix), researchers also analyzed the data by grouping the cities and towns by the county in which they are located. Table 6 shows the percentage of women leaders in municipalities by county.

Table 6: Percentage of Women Leaders in Utah’s Cities and Towns Grouped by County

County	Female	Male	% Female
Beaver	8	20	28.6%
Box Elder	54	116	31.8%
Cache	84	191	30.5%
Carbon	31	39	44.3%
Daggett	8	6	57.1%
Davis	92	261	26.1%
Duchesne	15	40	27.3%
Emery	33	51	39.3%
Garfield	30	42	41.7%
Grand	19	11	63.3%
Iron	31	100	23.7%
Juab	18	38	32.1%
Kane	17	30	36.2%
Millard	32	59	35.2%
Morgan	2	10	16.7%
Piute	11	13	45.8%
Rich	7	23	23.3%
Salt Lake	289	705	29.1%
San Juan	12	19	38.7%
Sanpete	41	99	29.3%
Sevier	38	80	32.2%
Summit	47	98	32.4%
Tooele	26	55	32.1%
Uintah	5	38	11.6%
Utah	157	441	26.3%
Wasatch	30	52	36.6%
Washington	68	255	21.1%
Wayne	13	23	36.1%
Weber	106	305	25.8%
Total	1324	3220	29.1%

In Utah, the county with the highest percentage of women municipal women leaders was Grand at 63.3%, followed by Daggett (57.1%), Piute (45.8%), Carbon (44.3%), and Garfield (41.7%). The counties with the lowest percentage of women in municipal leadership positions were Uintah (11.6%), Morgan (16.7%), Washington (21.1%), Rich (23.3%), and Iron (23.7%). There is a statistically significant difference in terms of the presence of women in municipal leadership roles when grouped by county.

Finally, researchers analyzed the data based on the clustering of cities into multi-county districts (MCDs). MCDs include

Bear River (Box Elder, Cache, and Rich counties), Central (Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne counties), Mountainland (Summit, Utah, and Wasatch counties), Southeastern (Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan counties) Southwestern (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington counties), Uintah Basin (Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah counties), and Wasatch Front (Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Tooele, and Weber counties). Table 7 lists the percentage of women leaders in these regions.

Table 7: Percentage of Women Leaders in Utah’s City and Town Governments by Region (MCDs)

Region	Female	Male	% Female
Bear River MCD	145	330	30.5%
Central MCD	153	312	32.9%
Mountainland MCD	234	591	28.4%
Southeastern MCD	95	120	44.2%
Southwestern MCD	154	447	25.6%
Uintah Basin MCD	28	84	25.0%
Wasatch Front MCD	515	1336	27.8%
Total	1324	3220	29.1%

When cities were grouped and analyzed by MCDs, the highest percentage of women in leadership (44.2%) was found in the Southeastern MCD (which includes Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan counties). This mirrors the findings of county leadership, where the Southeastern MCD had 52.2% of women in leadership. The lowest percentage of women in leadership (25.0%) was found in the Uintah Basin MCD (which includes Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah counties). In comparison, the county-level data found the lowest percentage of women in leadership (27.6%) in the Bear River MCD (which includes Box Elder, Cache, and Rich counties).

Recommendations

By looking more closely at women’s representation in leadership positions within Utah’s city and town governments, we can see where local governments are doing well and where there are opportunities to improve the gender diversity of the workforce. Strategies implemented by some Utah municipalities have already led to greater diversity in the leadership ranks; however, there are also opportunities for improvement. In addition to the recommendations already published in the recent State of Utah and Utah Counties research and policy briefs, we offer the following recommendations specifically for municipal environments:

First, partner with colleges and universities, particularly Master of Public Administration (MPA) programs, to encourage women to pursue careers in local government. Also, work with K-12 public schools to have female employees engage in career exploration fairs, classroom presentations, and other types of events.

Second, strategically recruit more women, and particularly women of color, to apply for open positions, and ensure there is a diverse pool of applicants before interviewing begins. Minimize bias (conscious and unconscious) of those making hiring decisions by having a diverse hiring committee of individuals who have completed high-quality unconscious bias training.

Third, implement employee and family-friendly policies, such as paid parental leave, flexible working arrangements, daycare assistance, lactation support, student loan assistance, and tuition reimbursement.¹⁶ Become educated on the unique barriers that most women face in advancing to supervisor and department head positions within their city or town.

Fourth, recognize, reward, and encourage the work of women in private and public settings. Provide women career exploration, planning, and development opportunities, as well as equal access to leadership and professional development training geared to advance their leadership skills and abilities. Offer to mentor, coach, and sponsor as many women as men within the city or town government. Encourage women to apply for promotions, join networking groups, and hold active memberships in diverse professional leadership organizations.

Fifth, encourage associations and other types of organizations to educate public officials, city managers, and other city and town leaders about the value of diversity, equity, and inclusion in local government. Provide these leaders with strategies and tools to lead change. Help them find ways to promote and advocate for female leaders at all levels.

Finally, support and encourage qualified female candidates to run for mayor, city council, and other elected offices and donate to their campaigns early and often.

Conclusion

In summary, the percentage of women who hold supervisory, managerial, and executive leadership positions within city and town governments in Utah is considerably lower than the percentage of women leaders found within either Utah county or state leadership. We found higher percentages of women in leadership roles at the executive (director) level, in appointed positions, working in smaller municipalities with fewer employees, and in rural communities. While we expect Utah's numbers are lower than the national average, we did not locate current literature to support this claim. This study is now one of the few available of its kind in the United States.

The data shared in this report emphasize that more deliberate strategies are needed to achieve gender diversity in Utah's municipal governments. Research shows that communities and organizations will increasingly thrive when men and women work together in more equal numbers in leadership roles.¹⁷ And, in fact, a lack of gender diversity and women in front-line and senior administrative positions at the local level may hinder organizations from reaching peak performance and limit innovation.¹⁸ Although some progress has been

made to get more women into leadership positions in local governments, intentional effort is needed to address the ongoing and persistent challenges Utah women face in their efforts to advance and assume more active leadership roles in government organizations throughout our state.

¹ Madsen, S. R. (2015, January). Why do we need more women leaders in Utah? *UWLP*. Retrieved from <http://www.uvu.edu/uwlp/docs/uwlpbrief2015no5.pdf>

² Van Ryzin, G. G., Riccucci, N. M., & Li, H. (2016). Representative bureaucracy and its symbolic effect on citizens: A conceptual replication. *Public Management Review*, 19(9), 1365–1375. doi:10.1080/14719037.2016.1195009

³ Bradbury, M., & Kellough, J. E. (2011). Representative bureaucracy: Assessing the evidence on active representation. *American Review of Public Administration*, 41(2), 157–167. doi:10.1177/0275074010367823

⁴ Roman, A. (2015). The roles assumed by public administrators: The link between administrative discretion and representation. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 595–644.

⁵ McCarthy, J. (2018, October 8). Americans still more trusting of local than state government. *Gallup*. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/243563/americans-trusting-local-state-government.aspx>

⁶ <https://openrecords.utah.gov/>

⁷ Townsend, A., & Madsen, S. R. (2020). The status of women leaders in government – Utah counties. <https://www.usu.edu/uwlp/files/briefs/24-status-of-women-leaders-in-government-utah-counties.pdf>

⁸ Townsend, A., & Madsen, S. R. (2020). The status of women leaders in government – State of Utah. <https://www.usu.edu/uwlp/files/briefs/23-status-of-women-leaders-in-government-utah.pdf>

⁹ Alkadry, M. G., Bishu, S. G., & Bruns Ali, S. (2019). Beyond representation: Gender, authority, and city managers. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(2), 300–319.

¹⁰ Cabrera, E. F. (2009). Fixing the leaky pipeline: Five ways to retain female talent. *People and Strategy*, 32(1), 40–46.

¹¹ Caceres-Rodriguez, R. (2013). The glass ceiling revisited: Moving beyond discrimination in the study of gender in public organizations. *Administration & Society*, 45(6), 674–709; ICMA. (2014). Final report on the status of women in the profession. *ICMA Task Force on Women in the Profession*. <https://icma.org/documents/final-report-status-women-profession>, p. 12.

¹² Alkadry et al. (2019).

¹³ *Ibid*, p. 301.

¹⁴ United States Census Bureau. (2010). Urban and rural. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/geography/guidance/geo-areas/urban-rural.html>

¹⁵ Alkadry, M. G., & Tower, L. E. (2014). *Women and public service: Barriers, challenges and opportunities*. M.E. Sharpe.

¹⁶ Houghteling, K. (2019, December 12). Meet new League board president Kelly Houghteling. *The League of Women in Government*. <https://www.leagueofwomentogovernment.org/2019/12/meet-new-league-board-president-kelly-houghteling/>

¹⁷ Madsen, S. R. (2015, January). Why do we need more women leaders in Utah? *UWLP*. Retrieved from <http://www.uvu.edu/uwlp/docs/uwlpbrief2015no5.pdf>

¹⁸ Antil, P. W., & Letourneau, T. S. (2015, November 13). Why we need more women running our local governments. *Governing*. <https://www.governing.com/gov-institute/voices/col-why-need-more-women-chief-administrative-officer-local-government.html>

Acknowledgements: This brief was made possible through the generous support of the Woodbury School of Business and the Division of Student Affairs at Utah Valley University. We are also thankful to the Utah League of Cities and Towns for their partnership on this study and to Erin Wells and the Utah City/County Management Association for assistance in communicating with their membership. We appreciate the cooperation of participating municipalities, especially with the limitations imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Copyright © 2020 Utah Women & Leadership Project

APPENDIX

Percentage of Women Leaders by City or Town

Municipality	% Women Leaders Overall	% Women Elected	Municipality	% Women Leaders	% Women Elected
Alpine City	18.2	16.7	Eagle Mountain	35.0	50.0
Alta Town	54.5	60.0	East Carbon	30.0	20.0
Altamont Town	33.3	20.0	Elk Ridge	20.0	16.7
Alton Town	50.0	40.0	Elmo Town	22.2	20.0
Amalga Town	16.7	0.0	Elsinore Town	33.3	20.0
American Fork	27.8	33.3	Elwood Town	30.0	25.0
Annabella Town	25.0	20.0	Emery	50.0	40.0
Antimony Town	33.3	20.0	Enoch	33.3	28.6
Apple Valley Town	22.2	20.0	Enterprise	20.0	0.0
Aurora City	41.7	33.3	Ephraim	23.1	16.7
Ballard City	16.7	0.0	Escalante	55.6	50.0
Bear River City	25.0	0.0	Eureka City	30.0	16.7
Beaver	22.2	16.7	Fairfield Town	28.6	20.0
Bicknell Town	28.6	20.0	Fairview	27.3	0.0
Big Water Town	38.5	20.0	Farmington	21.1	33.3
Blanding	42.9	33.3	Farr West City	25.0	0.0
Bluff Town	60.0	60.0	Fayette Town	50.0	40.0
Bluffdale	35.3	33.3	Ferron	55.6	50.0
Boulder Town	62.5	60.0	Fielding Town	41.7	40.0
Bountiful	23.8	50.0	Fillmore	44.4	20.0
Brian Head	27.3	40.0	Fountain Green City	23.1	0.0
Brigham City	30.4	16.7	Francis	45.5	40.0
Bryce Canyon City	25.0	16.7	Fruit Heights	42.9	66.7
Cannonville Town	50.0	40.0	Garden City	25.0	20.0
Castle Dale City	33.3	16.7	Garland	18.2	0.0
Castle Valley Town	66.7	60.0	Genola Town	33.3	20.0
Cedar City	10.6	33.3	Glendale Town	42.9	40.0
Cedar Fort Town	40.0	20.0	Glenwood Town	28.6	0.0
Cedar Hills	44.4	50.0	Goshen Town	62.5	60.0
Centerfield	33.3	16.7	Grantsville	38.5	33.3
Centerville City	40.0	50.0	Green River	28.6	16.7
Central Valley Town	37.5	20.0	Gunnison	30.0	20.0
Charleston Town	25.0	20.0	Hanksville	62.5	60.0
Circleville Town	33.3	20.0	Harrisville	27.8	20.0
Clarkston Town	50.0	25.0	Hatch Town	33.3	20.0
Clawson Town	42.9	20.0	Heber City	27.3	50.0
Clearfield	27.6	14.3	Helper	66.7	83.3
Cleveland Town	42.9	40.0	Henefer Town	30.8	20.0
Clinton City	35.7	50.0	Henrieville Town	40.0	25.0
Coalville	21.4	16.7	Herriman	20.0	20.0
Corinne City	27.3	14.3	Hideout Town	37.5	16.7
Cornish Town	50.0	50.0	Highland	41.7	33.3
Cottonwood Heights	44.4	33.3	Hildale	20.0	40.0
Daniel, Town of	55.6	40.0	Hinckley Town	18.2	0.0
Delta City	30.8	16.7	Holden	37.5	25.0
Deweyville Town	50.0	40.0	Holladay	50.0	33.3
Draper	27.3	33.3	Honeyville City	25.0	16.7
Duchesne	42.9	33.3	Hooper	23.5	8.3
Dutch John Town	66.7	60.0	Howell Town	28.6	0.0

Authors: Dr. April Townsend (Research Fellow, Utah Women & Leadership Project), Dr. Susan R. Madsen (Inaugural Karen Haight Huntsman Endowed Professor of Leadership in the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business at Utah State University), D. Candice Backus Pierucci (Research Fellow, Utah Women & Leadership Project), and Brooke Smith (Graduate Research Assistant, Utah Women & Leadership Project).

For questions, contact Dr. Madsen at uwlp@usu.edu. For additional information: www.utwomen.org

Municipality	% Women Leaders	% Women Elected	Municipality	% Women Leaders	% Women Elected
Huntington	44.4	33.3	Myton City	37.5	33.3
Huntsville Town	44.4	20.0	Naples	6.7	0.0
Hurricane	15.0	16.7	Nephi	16.7	0.0
Hyde Park	53.8	33.3	New Harmony Town	16.7	0.0
Hyrum	31.3	28.6	Newton Town	42.9	20.0
Independence	50.0	33.3	Nibley	23.1	33.3
Interlaken Town	27.3	25.0	North Logan	17.6	0.0
Ivins	32.1	50.0	North Ogden	33.3	25.0
Joseph Town	28.6	0.0	North Salt Lake	25.9	33.3
Junction Town	33.3	20.0	Oak City	33.3	20.0
Kamas	35.7	14.3	Oakley	37.5	0.0
Kanab	18.2	16.7	Ogden	17.5	28.6
Kanarrville Town	25.0	16.7	Orangeville City	41.7	33.3
Kanosh Town	28.6	0.0	Orderville Town	40.0	40.0
Kaysville	20.0	50.0	Orem	17.9	14.3
Kingston Town	33.3	20.0	Panguitch	38.5	16.7
Koosharem Town	33.3	20.0	Paradise Town	25.0	20.0
La Verkin	20.0	16.7	Paragonah	36.4	40.0
Laketown Town	33.3	20.0	Park City	31.8	33.3
Layton	20.0	33.3	Parowan	50.0	16.7
Leamington Town	28.6	0.0	Payson	33.3	33.3
Leeds Town	50.0	40.0	Perry	25.0	16.7
Lehi	23.3	33.3	Plain City	14.3	0.0
Levan	45.5	20.0	Pleasant Grove	41.9	28.6
Lewiston	50.0	33.3	Pleasant View	53.8	28.6
Lindon City	29.4	16.7	Plymouth Town	33.3	20.0
Loa Town	14.3	0.0	Portage Town	60.0	50.0
Logan	16.4	50.0	Price	35.7	33.3
Lyman Town	33.3	20.0	Providence	55.6	60.0
Lynndyl Town	60.0	60.0	Provo	19.4	25.0
Manila Town	50.0	40.0	Randolph Town	25.0	20.0
Manti City	27.8	16.7	Redmond Town	37.5	40.0
Mantua Town	25.0	0.0	Richfield	44.4	33.3
Mapleton	30.8	33.3	Richmond	50.0	50.0
Marriott-Slaterville	38.5	16.7	River Heights	40.0	33.3
Marysvalle Town	83.3	80.0	Riverdale	20.0	0.0
Mayfield Town	25.0	0.0	Riverton	24.4	33.3
Meadow Town	33.3	20.0	Rockville Town	66.7	60.0
Mendon City	36.4	0.0	Rocky Ridge Town	37.5	20.0
Midvale	20.0	16.7	Roosevelt City Corp.	9.5	0.0
Midway City	40.0	33.3	Roy	30.0	50.0
Milford	25.0	0.0	Rush Valley Town	37.5	20.0
Millcreek City	44.4	60.0	Salem	18.2	16.7
Millville City	21.1	16.7	Salina	18.8	0.0
Minersville Town	36.4	20.0	Salt Lake City	32.2	42.9
Moab	62.5	66.7	Sandy	25.4	75.0
Mona	33.3	16.7	Santa Clara	50.0	83.3
Monroe	28.6	16.7	Santaquin	45.5	33.3
Monticello	25.0	33.3	Saratoga Springs	25.0	0.0
Morgan	16.7	0.0	Scipio Town	37.5	20.0
Moroni	27.3	16.7	Scotfield Town	62.5	40.0
Mt. Pleasant	35.7	0.0	Sigurd Town	20.0	0.0
Murray City Corp.	32.5	50.0	Smithfield	27.3	0.0

Municipality	% Women Leaders	% Women Elected
Snowville Town	33.3	20.0
South Jordan	15.8	33.3
South Ogden	31.3	50.0
South Salt Lake	45.1	75.0
South Weber	37.5	50.0
Spanish Fork	17.4	16.7
Spring City	25.0	0.0
Springdale	24.1	25.0
Springville	27.3	16.7
St. George	13.0	33.3
Sterling Town	42.9	40.0
Stockton Town	30.8	33.3
Sunset	33.3	33.3
Syracuse	21.4	33.3
Tabiona Town	33.3	20.0
Taylorville	20.0	33.3
Tooele City Corp.	31.0	33.3
Toquerville	14.3	0.0
Torrey Town	37.5	20.0
Tremonton	35.3	16.7
Trenton Town	66.7	60.0
Tropic Town	37.5	40.0
Uintah City	40.0	60.0
Vernal	13.6	0.0
Vernon Town	16.7	0.0
Vineyard	33.3	40.0
Virgin Town	14.3	0.0
Wales Town	25.0	0.0
Wallsburg Town	50.0	40.0
Washington City	19.0	14.3
Washington Terrace	25.0	0.0
Wellington	41.7	50.0
Wellsville	41.7	33.3
Wendover	33.3	33.3
West Bountiful	16.7	0.0
West Haven	50.0	66.7
West Jordan	15.4	25.0
West Point	28.6	16.7
West Valley City	24.8	14.3
Willard	18.2	0.0
Woodland Hills	33.3	33.3
Woodruff Town	12.5	0.0
Woods Cross	42.9	33.3
Total	29.1%	26.6%