

ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**

# **Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)**

Report to Congress  
FY 2014 – 2015



**CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND (CCDF)  
REPORT TO CONGRESS  
FY 2014 – 2015**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Overview of the CCDF Program.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Highlights of the CCDF Program Activities.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Child Care Caseload.....	3
Child Care Providers.....	4
<b>CCDF Quality Spending.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Technical Assistance .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Child Care Research.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Looking Toward the Future.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Additional Information .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Appendix A: FY 2014 Administrative Data .....	11
Appendix B: Summaries of Child Care Research Projects.....	47
Appendix C: Summary of Statutory Changes in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG) of 2014.....	59

## **BACKGROUND**

This Report to Congress is required by Section 658L of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act as amended. The report provides information about the role of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), which is authorized under the CCDBG Act, in improving access to high-quality child care in states, territories, and tribes.<sup>1</sup> This report covers fiscal years 2014 and 2015. While the program's authorizing statute was reauthorized during this period, the law had not yet been implemented in many states. The data and analysis contained in this report are from a variety of sources, including administrative data about children and families receiving CCDF services. Some data was not yet available at the time this report was drafted in accordance with the statutory submission deadline, but that data will be posted online. This report includes highlights of CCDF program activities, information on activities states and territories are doing to improve the quality of child care across the country, and an overview of the Administration for Children and Families' Technical Assistance and Research projects. The report closes with a look to the future.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE CCDF PROGRAM**

CCDF is a dual purpose program with a two generational impact, uniquely positioned to support both child development and family economic success. CCDF provides access to child care for low-income parents in order for them to work and gain economic independence, and it supports the long-term development of their children by making investments to improve the quality of child care. Quality early childhood and afterschool programs support children's learning and development, and can mitigate the disadvantages these children face and better prepare them to succeed in school and life.

### **Child Care and Development Fund Grantees**

- 50 states
- District of Columbia
- 5 territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands)
- Approximately 260 tribes and tribal consortia, encompassing over 500 federally-recognized tribes

CCDF is administered at the federal level by the Office of Child Care (OCC) in the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). CCDF enables states, territories, and tribes to provide child care subsidies through vouchers, grants, and contracts to low-income working families with children under age

---

<sup>1</sup> The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-193) consolidated funding for child care under section 418 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. § 618) and made such funding subject to the requirements of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act of 1990, as amended. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) subsequently designated the combined mandatory and discretionary funding streams as the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program.

13. States, territories, and tribes have discretion in implementing the block grant funds and in determining how funds are used to achieve the overall goals of CCDF.

On November 19, 2014, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act of 2014 was enacted into law, reauthorizing and making expansive changes to the CCDF program. The changes focus on: protecting the health and safety of children in child care; helping parents make informed consumer choices and access information to support child development; providing equal access to stable, high quality child care; and enhancing the quality of child care and the early childhood workforce. States began planning for implementation of the reauthorized law in fiscal year (FY) 2015 although compliance was not required until the end of FY 2016 or later depending on the specific statutory provision.

Within the federal rules, states, territories, and tribes decide how to administer their subsidy systems. They determine payment rates for child care providers, copayment amounts for families, specific eligibility requirements, and how CCDF services will be prioritized. By law, all states give priority to very low-income children and children with special needs, as defined by the State. States may establish other priorities for services. For the FY 2014-15 biennium, all States had approved Plans demonstrating compliance with the required priorities.<sup>2</sup>

Providers serving children funded by CCDF must meet health and safety requirements set by states, territories, and tribes. Parents may select any child care provider that meets state and local requirements, including child care centers, family child care homes, after-school programs, faith-based programs, and relatives. The CCDBG Act of 2014 significantly strengthens CCDF health and safety provisions by requiring states to implement: health and safety standards in specific areas (e.g., prevention of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS), first-aid, and CPR); pre-service/orientation and ongoing training; criminal background checks; and annual monitoring inspections. Other significant changes will occur as well as implementation continues.

States, territories, and larger tribes<sup>3</sup> are required to spend a portion of CCDF funds on quality improvement. Quality activities may include provider training, grants and loans to providers, health and safety improvements, monitoring of licensing requirements, and improving salaries and other compensation for program staff. The CCDBG Act of 2014 will increase the amount that must be spent for quality, and will establish a new spending requirement specifically for improving the quality of infant and toddler care.

---

<sup>2</sup> The CCDBG Act of 2014 requires ACF to prepare a report by September 30, 2016 (and annually thereafter) that contains a determination about whether each State uses CCDF funds in accordance with the law's priority for service provisions. States submitted FY2016-2018 CCDF Plans in March 2016, and those Plans are currently under review by ACF.

<sup>3</sup> Only tribal grantees who receive an allocation equal to or greater than \$500,000 are required to spend CCDF funds on quality improvement activities. Tribes who receive less than \$500,000 are exempt from this requirement.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE CCDF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Highlights of CCDF activities described in this report draw primarily from preliminary FY 2014 administrative data (prior to enactment of reauthorization).<sup>4</sup> This section of the report discusses the CCDF child care caseload and key characteristics of CCDF child care providers. It also includes an assessment of and recommendation for the Congress concerning efforts that should be undertaken to improve access of the public to quality and affordable child care, as required by Section 658L of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act.


### Child Care Caseload

Currently, federal and state funding for child care assistance falls well short of the need, and millions of low-income families struggle to find quality child care they can afford in their communities. As detailed in this section of the report, access to CCDF-funded child care assistance fell to an all-time low in FY 2014 due to these funding constraints, with an average of only 1.4 million children served each month, and only approximately 15 percent of eligible children receive subsidies. CCDF funding levels have not kept pace with the rising cost of child care and the value of the child care subsidy has decreased in real dollars by about 20 percent since 2003. Moreover, high-quality child care is extremely hard to find and expensive, particularly for low-income families with young children. States also face costs in implementing provisions of the 2014 reauthorization law. These challenges present an opportunity for Congress to undertake action to improve access of the public to quality and affordable child care, by funding the budget request for increased investment in the Child Care and Development Fund. The FY 17 budget includes \$82 billion in additional mandatory funding over ten years to ensure that all low- and moderate-income working families (under 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level) with children age three and below have access to child care assistance that can help them afford high-quality care. By 2026, this investment will provide access to high-quality child care to 1.15 million additional children under the age of four, increasing the total CCDF caseload to a historic high of over 2.6 million children, and will maintain access for 1.4 million children as states implement the changes required by CCDBG reauthorization. The FY 2017 budget request for CCDF also calls for \$200 million in additional discretionary funding to help states implement policies required by the reauthorization law.

- **The number of children served (caseload) in FY 2014 was 1.406 million per month.** In FY 2014, the average monthly number of children was 1,406,300, and the average monthly number of families was 852,900. Graph 1 illustrates the caseload over time, from FY 2005 to FY 2014.

---

<sup>4</sup> Please see Appendix A to view the data tables for FY 2014. The FY 2014 administrative data is preliminary, but a final version of the data will be released on the OCC website. In addition, FY 2015 administrative data is not yet available due to the quality assurance and review process to ensure data accuracy, but will also be posted on the OCC site. Preliminary FY 2015 and final FY 2014 data are expected to be published by the fall of 2016.




- **CCDF is mainly provided through certificates and vouchers.** In FY 2014, the percentage of children receiving certificates was 89 percent, compared to 9 percent of children with a grant or contract payment method. The number served with cash was approximately 2 percent.

### Child Care Providers


- **In FY 2014, there were over 369,600 CCDF participating providers.** In FY 2014, the number of providers was 369,606, with the majority of providers being family child care providers. There were 193,495 family care providers; 86,574 center-based providers; 60,931 providers in the child’s home, and 28,606 group home providers.
- **Since FY 2006, the percentage of CCDF children served in licensed care has increased.** The average monthly percentages of children served in regulated settings increased to 86 percent in FY 2014, following the trend from earlier years. Graph 2 shows the increase in CCDF children served by licensed care between FY 2005 and FY 2014.

**Graph 2. Percent of CCDF Children Served in Licensed Care and Percent of CCDF Licensed Providers**



- The majority of CCDF children are served in center-based care.** In FY 2014, 72 percent of children were served in center-based care, and 18 percent of children were served in family child care homes. The percentage of children served in child home settings was 3 percent, 6 percent of children were served in group home settings, and 1 percent were not reported or invalid. [See Graph 3.]

**Graph 3. Percent of CCDF Children Served Monthly by Type of Provider in FY 2014**



- **The majority of CCDF children served in unlicensed care are cared for by relatives.** Of the children served in settings legally operating but without regulation, 62 percent were in relative care, and 38 percent were served by non-relatives.
- **The average monthly subsidy paid to providers was \$402 (\$4,824 annually) in FY 2014.** Group homes accounted for the highest monthly subsidy amount, \$514 (\$6,168 annually); followed by center care, \$413 (\$4,956 annually); followed by family home care, \$345 (\$4,140); and finally, care in the child’s home, \$276 (\$3,312 annually). The average subsidy amount also differed by age group. Infants and toddlers accounted for the highest monthly subsidy amount, \$485 (\$5,820 annually), while school age children accounted for the lowest monthly subsidy amount, \$310 (\$3,720 annually).

## CCDF QUALITY SPENDING

Every two years, states and territories submitted an application for CCDF funds using the biennial CCDF Plan to indicate the activities they expected to implement over the next two years (beginning in FY 2016, states and territories move to a triennial Plan reporting cycle due to a change in the CCDBG Act of 2014). Since the Quality Performance Report (QPR) was established in FY 2012, states and territories have been able to report annual data to show how they actually implemented the planned activities to support high quality care and how many programs benefitted from these efforts.

In FY 2014 and FY 2015, OCC continued to collect detailed data on child care tied to CCDF quality funds using the QPR (FY 2015 data is not yet available). Since FY 2012, there have been upward trends in the areas of QRIS participation and support for professional development (see below for more details).

### **Key highlights from FY 2014 show that states and territories are investing in:**

- **Financial Incentives to Enhance Quality**
  - Forty-one states and territories reported that over 23,000 child care programs (over 9,400 centers and approximately 13,600 homes) received financial incentives such as grants, awards or bonuses to achieve and sustain quality.
    - Forty-four states and territories reported that over 22,000 centers received on-going or periodic quality stipends.
    - Forty-two states and territories reported that over 13,000 family child care homes received on-going or periodic quality stipends.
- **Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) Participation**
  - Forty-four states and territories reported having approximately 38,000 **centers** participate in QRIS in FY 2014.
  - Forty states and territories reported having just over 30,300 **family child care homes** participate in QRIS in FY 2014.
  - *There has been an increase of over 6,000 centers and 7,300 family child care homes participating in QRIS from FY 2012 to FY 2014.*



- **Professional Development and Technical Assistance**
  - Forty-nine states and territories reported providing scholarships to approximately 64,500 professionals to access education and training opportunities to meet and maintain standards and qualifications. *There has been an increase in over 7,500 professionals receiving scholarships to access professional development opportunities from FY 2012 to FY 2014.*
  - Fifty-five states and territories reported that they provide some type of technical assistance to practitioners working in at least one program setting (e.g. coaching, mentoring or consultation for individual teachers, caregivers, and other professional staff).

While there are many current efforts to improve quality, Congress could take action to further increase access to high-quality care by supporting the budget request noted above, as this would provide \$9 billion in new quality improvement funding over 10 years that would enable state work to improve the skills and competencies of the child care workforce, enhance training for providers, build networks of family child care providers, and support new classrooms with the equipment and materials they need to support children’s healthy development.

## **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

Through the OCC's Child Care Technical Assistance Network (CCTAN) and federal leadership, the OCC provided training and technical assistance to states, territories, and tribes in fiscal years 2014 and 2015. This involved assessing Child Care and Development Fund grantees' needs, identifying innovations in child care administration, and promoting the dissemination and replication of solutions to the challenges that grantees and local child care programs face. The TA helped states, territories, tribes and local communities build integrated child care systems that enable parents to work and promote the health and development of children.

The technical assistance used multiple approaches, including TA that was widely available through issue briefs and websites. Other TA was either targeted (i.e., provided to specific states, territories and tribes through webinars or conference calls) or intensive (i.e., one-on-one and typically involving an on-site component). For example, in fiscal years 2014 and 2015:

- Eight states received intensive TA and 48 states and territories received targeted TA on licensing administration including posting monitoring reports online, reporting serious deaths and injuries in child care, monitoring license-exempt care and other monitoring approaches; supporting consumer education and the importance of choosing quality; quality improvement strategies including quality rating and improvement system design, financial incentives and projecting the cost of quality.
- Five states and territories received intensive TA and seven states received targeted TA on key subsidy topics that will directly support the implementation of the new reauthorization requirements, such as eligibility criteria and policies, and provider payment and family copay policies.

## **CHILD CARE RESEARCH**

CCDF-funded research initiatives provide states with the data and evidence needed to improve child care services and systems. In fiscal years 2014 and 2015, Congress appropriated approximately \$10 million annually in CCDF funds for research, demonstration, and evaluation. As a result of this funding, ACF has made investments in child care research to increase understanding about state child care policy decisions, the implications of these decisions for the availability and quality of child care, the choices families make, and the outcomes for children and families. These research projects are administered by ACF's Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE).

For a complete list and descriptions of child care research projects funded by ACF, please see Appendix B: Summaries of Child Care Research Projects.

## **LOOKING TOWARD THE FUTURE**

### **Implementing Child Care Reauthorization**

In December 2015, OCC published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to update Child Care and Development Fund regulations to reflect reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG). The proposed rule provided detail and clarification based on the law. The proposal was available for a 60-day public comment period that closed February 22. OCC is reviewing public comments and developing a final rule that is expected to be published in 2016.

OCC also released a revised CCDF Plan Preprint document for FY 2016 through 2018 reflecting the requirements of the reauthorization law. States and territories were required to complete and submit these Plan documents by March 2016. OCC expects to complete its review and approval of the Plans in the summer of 2016. States are required to comply with a reasonable interpretation of the statute pending issuance of final regulations. Under the law, states may apply for extension waivers. OCC will track and report on state compliance with the reauthorization requirements as implementation continues.

### **Launching a New, Cross-Sector Federal Training and Technical Assistance System**

In the fall of 2015, ACF announced a new [Early Childhood Training and Technical Assistance \(T/TA\) system](#) that offers CCDF administrators information, tools, training, and other supports. The system brings together resources from child care, Head Start, and our health partners, and focuses on ensuring that all early childhood systems and programs have access to the highest quality materials. By working with the states, tribes, and territories, ACF is creating more efficient and effective ways to provide program leaders and teaching staff with consistent, high quality resources based on the latest evidence-based practices. The TA providers are also assisting CCDF agencies with implementation of the reauthorization requirements under the CCDBG Act of 2014.

As of October 2015, the projects supporting child care technical assistance include:

- Child Care & Early Education Research Connections
- Child Care Communications Management Center
- Child Care State Capacity Building Center
- National Center on Afterschool and Summer Enrichment
- National Center on Child Care Data and Technology
- National Center on Early Childhood Development, Teaching, and Learning\*
- National Center on Early Childhood Health and Wellness\*
- National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance\*
- National Center on Parent, Family and Community Engagement\*
- National Center on Child Care Subsidy Innovation and Accountability
- National Center on Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships\*
- National Center on Tribal Child Care Implementation and Innovation

*\*Center is jointly administered by the Office of Head Start*

For more information, see: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ece/interagency-projects/ece-technical-assistance>

### **Strengthening Administrative Data Reporting Requirements**

In early 2016, the OCC announced revised CCDF administrative data reporting requirements (ACF-800 annual aggregate report and ACF-801 monthly case-level report). The revisions implement statutory changes made by the CCDBG Act of 2014 as well as other changes to strengthen administrative data. These new data elements, some of which will be phased-in over time, will provide additional information about children and families receiving CCDF services. This information will be included in future Reports to Congress.

These new elements include:

- the number of fatalities occurring among children while in the care and facility of child care providers
- whether a child is homeless
- whether a child has a disability
- the primary language spoken in the child's home
- the family's military status
- the zip code of the family and of the child care provider
- increased information about the quality of child care providers
- the date of child care provider's most recent fire, health and safety inspection

### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

More details about the information contained in this report may be found in the following documents:

- **The CCDF Administrative Data Tables:** The administrative data tables for FY 2014 are included as an appendix to this report. The tables, among other information, provide data on the number of children and families served through CCDF, average monthly percentages of children served by types of care, average monthly percentage of children served by ethnicity, average monthly payment to child care providers, monthly percentages of children in care by age group and average annual gross income of families served through CCDF programs.

As updated administrative data tables become available, they will be posted on the OCC website at: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ/resource/ccdf-statistics>

- **The Expenditure Reports (ACF-696):** The CCDF expenditure report provides details on expenditures for the three funding streams that comprise the Child Care and Development Fund - the Mandatory Fund, the Matching Fund, and the Discretionary Fund<sup>5</sup> as well as funds transferred from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program to CCDF. Reported expenditures are for administration, direct and non-direct services, and quality improvement activities including Congressionally-mandated targeted funds for: (1) Child Care and Quality Improvement Activities; (2) Infant and Toddler Quality Improvement; and (3) Child Care Resource and Referral and School Age Care. The expenditure reports are located on the OCC website at: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ/resource/ccdf-expenditure-data-all-years>
- **The CCDF Plan:** The CCDF Plan serves as the lead agency's application for CCDF funds by providing a description of the child care program and services available to eligible families. The Plan includes certain assurances and certifications required by the CCDBG statute and provides information about the overall management of CCDF services, including income eligibility guidelines, provider payment rates, parental rights and responsibilities, program integrity and accountability, and the lead agency's goals for administration of the subsidy program and quality improvement activities that include assurances of health and safety and continuous improvement strategies for child care programs and career pathways for child care providers and staff. The CCDF Plan also presents an opportunity for states, territories, and tribes to demonstrate the activities and services they are providing to meet the needs of low-income children and families. Prior to the CCDBG Act of 2014, the Plan is biennial. With reauthorization, the Plan will now be submitted every three years. The Plan is located on the OCC website at:

**FY 2014-2015 Plan Preprint:** <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ/resource/ccdf-acf-pi-2013-02>

**FY 2016-2018 Plan Preprint:** <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ/resource/pi-2015-09>

---

<sup>5</sup> CCDF consists of three funding streams. These components include Discretionary funds under the CCDBG Act, as well as Mandatory and Matching funds under Section 418 of the Social Security Act. To access the Matching funds, States must provide a share of the Matching funds and spend their required Maintenance of Effort (MOE) level.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Office of Child Care and Administration for Children and Families appreciates the interest and support of Congress in CCDF and looks forward to continued work together to implement the reauthorized law. Future reports will show the impact of these changes for our grantees (states, territories, and tribes) and for children and families.

**APPENDIX A: FY 2014 ADMINISTRATIVE DATA**

**Table 1  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates**

**Average Monthly Adjusted Number of Families and Children Served (FY 2014)**

<b>States/Territories</b>	<b>Average Number of Families</b>	<b>Average Number of Children</b>
Alabama	12,900	24,200
Alaska	2,400	3,700
American Samoa	500	500
Arizona	14,400	21,000
Arkansas	5,300	7,800
California	78,100	111,400
Colorado	9,900	16,700
Connecticut	6,100	8,800
Delaware	4,600	7,400
District of Columbia	900	1,200
Florida	62,700	90,000
Georgia	35,200	61,800
Guam	300	400
Hawaii	4,600	7,900
Idaho	3,600	6,200
Illinois	31,600	54,200
Indiana	21,600	40,200
Iowa	9,800	17,400
Kansas	8,500	15,700
Kentucky	4,900	9,500
Louisiana	12,800	19,100
Maine	1,600	2,600
Maryland	10,900	18,300
Massachusetts	21,300	28,300
Michigan	21,400	37,800
Minnesota	13,100	25,000
Mississippi	10,100	17,800
Missouri	22,600	34,500
Montana	2,200	3,400
Nebraska	6,200	11,400
Nevada	2,400	4,100
New Hampshire	3,800	5,200
New Jersey	30,500	44,800
New Mexico	10,100	16,600
New York	54,500	92,200
North Carolina	31,900	65,600
North Dakota	2,100	3,200
Northern Mariana Islands	200	200
Ohio	25,600	45,600
Oklahoma	14,700	24,100
Oregon	8,700	15,600
Pennsylvania	53,800	91,400

States/Territories	Average Number of Families	Average Number of Children
Puerto Rico	5,500	7,100
Rhode Island	3,500	5,700
South Carolina	7,400	12,000
South Dakota	2,600	4,300
Tennessee	18,400	32,900
Texas	66,000	112,100
Utah	6,500	12,200
Vermont	3,000	4,200
Virgin Islands	300	400
Virginia	14,100	24,300
Washington	25,000	42,700
West Virginia	4,700	7,700
Wisconsin	15,200	24,300
Wyoming	2,300	3,600
<b>National Total</b>	<b>852,900</b>	<b>1,406,300</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2013. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
5. The reported results shown above have been rounded to the nearest 100. The National numbers are simply the sum of the state and territory numbers.

**Table 2**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Percent of Children Served by Payment Method (FY 2014)**

State	Grants/Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %
Alabama	0%	100%	0%
Alaska	0%	95%	5%
American Samoa	0%	100%	0%
Arizona	0%	100%	0%
Arkansas	0%	0%	0%
California	43%	57%	0%
Colorado	0%	100%	0%
Connecticut	0%	100%	0%
Delaware	100%	0%	0%
District of Columbia	23%	77%	0%
Florida	0%	100%	0%
Georgia	0%	100%	0%
Guam	0%	97%	3%
Hawaii	3%	0%	97%
Idaho	0%	100%	0%
Illinois	4%	96%	0%
Indiana	1%	99%	0%
Iowa	0%	100%	0%
Kansas	0%	100%	0%
Kentucky	0%	100%	0%
Louisiana	0%	100%	0%
Maine	0%	100%	0%
Maryland	0%	100%	0%
Massachusetts	45%	55%	0%
Michigan	0%	75%	25%
Minnesota	0%	100%	0%
Mississippi	5%	96%	0%
Missouri	0%	100%	0%
Montana	0%	99%	1%
Nebraska	0%	100%	0%
Nevada	25%	75%	0%
New Hampshire	0%	100%	0%
New Jersey	0%	100%	0%
New Mexico	0%	100%	0%
New York	27%	73%	0%
North Carolina	0%	100%	0%
North Dakota	0%	100%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%
Ohio	0%	100%	0%
Oklahoma	0%	100%	0%
Oregon	4%	96%	0%
Pennsylvania	0%	100%	0%
Puerto Rico	51%	49%	0%



State	Grants/Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %
Rhode Island	0%	100%	0%
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%
South Dakota	2%	98%	0%
Tennessee	0%	100%	0%
Texas	0%	100%	0%
Utah	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	0%	100%	0%
Virgin Islands	100%	0%	0%
Virginia	1%	99%	0%
Washington	0%	100%	0%
West Virginia	0%	100%	0%
Wisconsin	0%	100%	0%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>2%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FY 2014. The ACF-800 is based on an annual unduplicated count of families and children; i.e., a family or child that receives one hour of service on one day is counted the same as a family or child that receives full-time care throughout the fiscal year.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
4. At the time of publication, all states and territories had submitted their ACF-800 data for FY 2014.

**Table 3**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care (FY 2014)**

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	4%	2%	94%	0%	100%
Alaska	7%	26%	7%	59%	1%	100%
American Samoa	0%	0%	1%	6%	93%	100%
Arizona	2%	9%	5%	84%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	9%	0%	91%	0%	100%
California	0%	32%	12%	56%	0%	100%
Colorado	0%	14%	0%	76%	10%	100%
Connecticut	16%	31%	0%	52%	0%	100%
Delaware	0%	19%	3%	77%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	3%	0%	95%	2%	100%
Florida	0%	7%	0%	93%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	6%	3%	92%	0%	100%
Guam	3%	1%	1%	95%	0%	100%
Hawaii	54%	26%	0%	20%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	14%	16%	68%	0%	100%
Illinois	14%	40%	3%	43%	1%	100%
Indiana	0%	40%	0%	60%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	41%	7%	50%	1%	100%
Kansas	5%	8%	45%	42%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	7%	1%	91%	0%	100%
Louisiana	1%	8%	0%	91%	0%	100%
Maine	0%	34%	0%	65%	1%	100%
Maryland	7%	37%	0%	56%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	2%	24%	74%	0%	100%
Michigan	15%	25%	16%	44%	0%	100%
Minnesota	0%	29%	0%	68%	3%	100%
Mississippi	2%	7%	1%	90%	1%	100%
Missouri	2%	23%	2%	72%	0%	100%
Montana	2%	13%	39%	47%	0%	100%
Nebraska	0%	24%	8%	68%	0%	100%
Nevada	8%	12%	0%	80%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	2%	11%	0%	86%	1%	100%
New Jersey	1%	10%	0%	89%	0%	100%
New Mexico	4%	13%	6%	77%	0%	100%
New York	13%	17%	27%	43%	0%	100%
North Carolina	0%	11%	0%	87%	1%	100%
North Dakota	0%	27%	36%	37%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	4%	0%	42%	55%	100%
Ohio	0%	16%	3%	80%	1%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	14%	0%	86%	0%	100%

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Oregon	15%	46%	12%	25%	2%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	19%	4%	75%	1%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	44%	0%	55%	1%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	26%	0%	73%	0%	100%
South Carolina	1%	10%	2%	83%	5%	100%
South Dakota	1%	41%	3%	55%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	13%	4%	82%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	3%	2%	95%	0%	100%
Utah	20%	21%	0%	56%	3%	100%
Vermont	2%	33%	0%	63%	1%	100%
Virgin Islands	1%	2%	2%	92%	3%	100%
Virginia	0%	21%	0%	79%	0%	100%
Washington	13%	29%	0%	57%	1%	100%
West Virginia	0%	28%	6%	65%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	0%	17%	0%	83%	0%	100%
Wyoming	3%	27%	14%	56%	0%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
5. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. Children in more than one setting category within the same month were counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example, if the child spent 70 hours in a center and 30 hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).
6. For consistency between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 4**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in Regulated Settings vs.**  
**Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation (FY 2014)**

State	Licensed/ Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	60%	40%	0%	100%
Alaska	80%	19%	1%	100%
American Samoa	7%	0%	93%	100%
Arizona	94%	6%	0%	100%
Arkansas	100%	0%	0%	100%
California	81%	19%	0%	100%
Colorado	89%	1%	10%	100%
Connecticut	63%	37%	0%	100%
Delaware	93%	7%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	98%	0%	2%	100%
Florida	92%	8%	0%	100%
Georgia	99%	1%	0%	100%
Guam	98%	2%	0%	100%
Hawaii	26%	74%	0%	100%
Idaho	84%	15%	0%	100%
Illinois	63%	36%	1%	100%
Indiana	75%	25%	0%	100%
Iowa	89%	10%	1%	100%
Kansas	87%	13%	0%	100%
Kentucky	97%	3%	0%	100%
Louisiana	90%	10%	0%	100%
Maine	85%	14%	1%	100%
Maryland	89%	11%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	0%	100%
Michigan	70%	30%	0%	100%
Minnesota	86%	11%	3%	100%
Mississippi	92%	7%	1%	100%
Missouri	71%	29%	0%	100%
Montana	92%	7%	0%	100%
Nebraska	89%	10%	0%	100%
Nevada	62%	38%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	90%	9%	1%	100%
New Jersey	96%	3%	0%	100%
New Mexico	85%	15%	0%	100%
New York	69%	31%	0%	100%
North Carolina	99%	0%	1%	100%
North Dakota	80%	20%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	42%	4%	55%	100%

State	Licensed/ Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Ohio	99%	0%	1%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	56%	43%	2%	100%
Pennsylvania	85%	13%	1%	100%
Puerto Rico	57%	43%	1%	100%
Rhode Island	99%	1%	0%	100%
South Carolina	86%	10%	5%	100%
South Dakota	85%	15%	0%	100%
Tennessee	92%	8%	0%	100%
Texas	99%	1%	0%	100%
Utah	97%	0%	3%	100%
Vermont	90%	8%	1%	100%
Virgin Islands	95%	2%	3%	100%
Virginia	97%	3%	0%	100%
Washington	82%	18%	1%	100%
West Virginia	100%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	87%	13%	0%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
5. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. Children in more than one setting category within the same month were counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example, if the child spent 70 hours in a center and 30 hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).
6. For consistency between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 5**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Of Children in Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation,**  
**Average Monthly Percent Served by Relatives vs. Non-Relatives (FY 2014)**

State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %
Alabama	98%	2%	100%
Alaska	64%	36%	100%
American Samoa	NA	NA	NA
Arizona	100%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	100%	100%
California	70%	30%	100%
Colorado	73%	27%	100%
Connecticut	84%	16%	100%
Delaware	100%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	50%	50%	100%
Florida	6%	94%	100%
Georgia	73%	27%	100%
Guam	0%	100%	100%
Hawaii	85%	15%	100%
Idaho	29%	71%	100%
Illinois	72%	28%	100%
Indiana	25%	75%	100%
Iowa	1%	99%	100%
Kansas	81%	19%	100%
Kentucky	58%	42%	100%
Louisiana	30%	70%	100%
Maine	6%	94%	100%
Maryland	83%	17%	100%
Massachusetts	45%	55%	100%
Michigan	71%	29%	100%
Minnesota	50%	50%	100%
Mississippi	39%	61%	100%
Missouri	46%	54%	100%
Montana	53%	47%	100%
Nebraska	20%	80%	100%
Nevada	58%	42%	100%
New Hampshire	49%	51%	100%
New Jersey	42%	58%	100%
New Mexico	60%	40%	100%
New York	56%	44%	100%
North Carolina	NA	NA	NA
North Dakota	51%	49%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	86%	14%	100%
Ohio	NA	NA	NA
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	41%	59%	100%

State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %
Pennsylvania	56%	44%	100%
Puerto Rico	77%	23%	100%
Rhode Island	64%	36%	100%
South Carolina	33%	67%	100%
South Dakota	65%	35%	100%
Tennessee	16%	84%	100%
Texas	100%	0%	100%
Utah	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	56%	44%	100%
Virgin Islands	100%	0%	100%
Virginia	47%	53%	100%
Washington	70%	30%	100%
West Virginia	47%	53%	100%
Wisconsin	NA	NA	NA
Wyoming	46%	54%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding. In this table, centers operating without regulation (data element 26 = 11) were considered Non-Relative.
4. In some states there were no children served in unregulated settings and thus the percent is "NA" since division by zero is undefined. States with no Providers Legally Operating Without Regulation include: American Samoa, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, and Wisconsin.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
6. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. Children in more than one setting category within the same month were counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example, if the child spent 70 hours in a center and 30 hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).
7. For consistency between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 6**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in All Types of Care (FY 2014)**

State	Total % of Children	Child's Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Family Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Group Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Center (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Child's Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Child's Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Family Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Family Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Group Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Group Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Center (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Invalid/ Not Reported
Alabama	100%	0%	2%	2%	55%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	39%	0%
Alaska	100%	0%	14%	7%	59%	1%	6%	11%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
American Samoa	100%	0%	0%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	93%
Arizona	100%	0%	5%	5%	84%	2%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arkansas	100%	0%	9%	0%	91%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
California	100%	0%	16%	12%	52%	0%	0%	11%	5%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Colorado	100%	0%	13%	0%	76%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%
Connecticut	100%	0%	16%	0%	47%	12%	4%	14%	1%	0%	0%	5%	0%
Delaware	100%	0%	16%	3%	74%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%
District of Columbia	100%	0%	3%	0%	95%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Florida	100%	0%	7%	0%	85%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%
Georgia	100%	0%	5%	3%	92%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Guam	100%	1%	1%	1%	95%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hawaii	100%	0%	7%	0%	19%	47%	7%	15%	4%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	16%	68%	1%	0%	4%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Illinois	100%	0%	21%	3%	39%	10%	4%	14%	5%	0%	0%	4%	1%
Indiana	100%	0%	38%	0%	37%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	23%	0%
Iowa	100%	0%	32%	7%	50%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Kansas	100%	0%	0%	45%	42%	2%	2%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kentucky	100%	0%	5%	1%	91%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Louisiana	100%	0%	0%	0%	90%	1%	0%	2%	6%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Maine	100%	0%	21%	0%	64%	0%	0%	1%	12%	0%	0%	0%	1%



State	Total % of Children	Child's Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Family Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Group Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Center (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Child's Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Child's Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Family Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Family Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Group Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Group Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Center (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Invalid/ Not Reported
Maryland	100%	0%	33%	0%	56%	5%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	2%	24%	74%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Michigan	100%	0%	10%	16%	43%	6%	9%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Minnesota	100%	0%	24%	0%	62%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	7%	3%
Mississippi	100%	0%	1%	1%	90%	0%	1%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Missouri	100%	0%	7%	2%	62%	2%	1%	7%	10%	0%	0%	10%	0%
Montana	100%	0%	7%	39%	47%	1%	1%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nebraska	100%	0%	14%	8%	68%	0%	0%	2%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nevada	100%	0%	3%	0%	58%	4%	4%	6%	3%	0%	0%	21%	0%
New Hampshire	100%	0%	5%	0%	85%	1%	1%	2%	3%	0%	0%	1%	1%
New Jersey	100%	0%	7%	0%	89%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New Mexico	100%	0%	2%	6%	77%	2%	2%	7%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New York	100%	0%	6%	27%	36%	8%	5%	5%	5%	0%	0%	7%	0%
North Carolina	100%	0%	11%	0%	87%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
North Dakota	100%	0%	7%	36%	37%	0%	0%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	1%	0%	42%	0%	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	55%
Ohio	100%	0%	16%	3%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	14%	0%	86%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Oregon	100%	0%	20%	11%	24%	10%	6%	8%	18%	0%	1%	1%	2%
Pennsylvania	100%	0%	6%	4%	75%	0%	0%	7%	6%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	2%	0%	55%	0%	0%	33%	10%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Rhode Island	100%	0%	26%	0%	73%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Carolina	100%	0%	4%	2%	79%	0%	0%	2%	4%	0%	0%	3%	5%
South Dakota	100%	0%	27%	3%	55%	0%	1%	10%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tennessee	100%	0%	6%	4%	82%	0%	0%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%

State	Total % of Children	Child's Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Family Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Group Home (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Center (Licensed or Regulated Providers)	Child's Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Child's Home - Non - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Family Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Family Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Group Home - Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Group Home - Non-Relative (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Center (Providers Legally Operating without Regulation)	Invalid/ Not Reported
Texas	100%	0%	2%	2%	95%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utah	100%	20%	21%	0%	56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Vermont	100%	0%	27%	0%	63%	1%	1%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Virgin Islands	100%	1%	0%	2%	92%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Virginia	100%	0%	18%	0%	79%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Washington	100%	0%	25%	0%	57%	8%	5%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
West Virginia	100%	0%	28%	6%	65%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	17%	0%	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Wyoming	100%	0%	17%	14%	56%	2%	1%	4%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
5. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. Children in more than one setting category within the same month were counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example, if the child spent 70 hours in a center and 30 hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).
6. For consistency between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 7**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Number of Child Care Providers Receiving CCDF Funds (FY 2014)**

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center
Alabama	13	537	141	1,463
Alaska	165	618	71	200
American Samoa	0	0	6	31
Arizona	311	1,153	211	1,164
Arkansas	234	848	0	0
California	372	34,778	5,504	4,562
Colorado	83	953	0	1,270
Connecticut	3,446	4,176	21	1,422
Delaware	0	476	57	368
District of Columbia	17	82	0	153
Florida	0	2,241	0	7,080
Georgia	163	1,779	196	2,796
Guam	3	2	0	43
Hawaii	3,938	1,892	8	223
Idaho	19	262	231	404
Illinois	16,890	31,627	435	3,747
Indiana	7	2,634	0	1,185
Iowa	286	3,473	330	894
Kansas	449	951	2,035	702
Kentucky	106	634	65	1,619
Louisiana	126	607	0	1,658
Maine	5	588	0	370
Maryland	1,063	3,372	0	1,502
Massachusetts	1,795	2,102	6,297	4,648
Michigan	4,192	5,416	1,356	1,991
Minnesota	19	4,613	0	1,562
Mississippi	160	533	10	1,098
Missouri	257	3,787	126	2,234
Montana	63	187	390	244
Nebraska	0	1,910	294	639
Nevada	355	640	12	541
New Hampshire	83	398	0	660
New Jersey	360	3,047	0	2,386
New Mexico	0	1,699	91	564
New York	15,990	21,451	7,125	3,666
North Carolina	0	1,588	0	3,704
North Dakota	0	787	581	165
Northern Mariana Islands	0	13	0	18
Ohio	7	5,233	348	5,535
Oklahoma	27	1,015	0	1,117
Oregon	1,997	4,685	401	627
Pennsylvania	169	14,557	706	4,431

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center
Puerto Rico	11	3,184	0	617
Rhode Island	6	518	2	331
South Carolina	53	882	96	1,060
South Dakota	65	1,313	52	276
Tennessee	77	2,516	303	1,708
Texas	0	2,005	762	6,228
Utah	453	3,023	124	443
Vermont	213	1,230	0	534
Virgin Islands	0	9	5	64
Virginia	6	2,066	0	1,764
Washington	6,741	5,019	0	2,017
West Virginia	5	1,488	104	412
Wisconsin	40	2,432	0	2,247
Wyoming	91	466	110	187
<b>National Total</b>	<b>60,931</b>	<b>193,495</b>	<b>28,606</b>	<b>86,574</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY 2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FY 2014, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because ACF-800 Data Element 6a is reported as a count of providers receiving CCDF funding.
3. Note that this table reports the number of providers (not the number of children). A provider that serves only one child per day is counted the same as, for example, a provider serving 200 children per day.
4. At the time of publication, all states and territories had submitted their ACF-800 data for FY 2014.

**Table 8  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Consumer Education Strategies Summary (FY 2014)**

State	Grants/ Contracts/ Certificates Info (Content)	Provider List (Content)	Types/ Quality of Care Materials (Content)	Health and Safety (Content)	Child Care Regulatory Info (Content)	Child Care Complaint Policy (Content)	Print Materials (Method)	Counseling from Resource and Referral Agencies (Method)	Mass Media (Method)	Electronic Media (Method)	Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education
Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	57,240
Alaska	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	24,146
American Samoa	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	708
Arizona	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89,490
Arkansas	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	12,379
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,921,742
Colorado	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	178,187
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	13,438
Delaware	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	13,935
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	20,000
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	263,442
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	194,188
Guam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	83,000
Hawaii	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	7,766

State	Grants/ Contracts/ Certificates Info (Content)	Provider List (Content)	Types/ Quality of Care Materials (Content)	Health and Safety (Content)	Child Care Regulatory Info (Content)	Child Care Complaint Policy (Content)	Print Materials (Method)	Counseling from Resource and Referral Agencies (Method)	Mass Media (Method)	Electronic Media (Method)	Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education
Idaho	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	2,344
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	155,973
Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	31,622
Iowa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8,351
Kansas	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	32,674
Kentucky	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	46,048
Louisiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11,611
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	16,388
Maryland	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	219,392
Massachusetts	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	29,023
Michigan	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	349,650
Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	631,808
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	17,374
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	17,322
Montana	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	544,190
Nebraska	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15,173

State	Grants/ Contracts/ Certificates Info (Content)	Provider List (Content)	Types/ Quality of Care Materials (Content)	Health and Safety (Content)	Child Care Regulatory Info (Content)	Child Care Complaint Policy (Content)	Print Materials (Method)	Counseling from Resource and Referral Agencies (Method)	Mass Media (Method)	Electronic Media (Method)	Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6,593
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	6,342
New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	167,560
New Mexico	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	16,286
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	847,742
North Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	251,083
North Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5,399
Northern Mariana Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	189
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	121,630
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	200,000
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	36,877
Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	127,174
Puerto Rico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9,751
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	17,907
South Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	750,000
South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	247,988

State	Grants/ Contracts/ Certificates Info (Content)	Provider List (Content)	Types/ Quality of Care Materials (Content)	Health and Safety (Content)	Child Care Regulatory Info (Content)	Child Care Complaint Policy (Content)	Print Materials (Method)	Counseling from Resource and Referral Agencies (Method)	Mass Media (Method)	Electronic Media (Method)	Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education
Tennessee	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	28403
Texas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	102,960
Utah	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3,230
Vermont	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9,755
Virgin Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	671
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	27,238
Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	16,600
West Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8,004
Wisconsin	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	46,421
Wyoming	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15,000
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>8,079,407</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this table:

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FY 2014, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because it is impossible to tell which families receiving consumer information also received CCDF funding.
3. A blank cell indicates that the state did not provide a response.
4. At the time of publication, all states and territories had fully reported their ACF-800 data for FY 2014.
5. "-" indicates data not reported.



**Table 9**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children By Age Group (FY 2014)**

State	0 to < 1 yr	1 yr to < 2 yrs	2 yrs to < 3 yrs	3 yrs to < 4 yrs	4 yrs to < 5 yrs	5 yrs to < 6 yrs	6 yrs to < 13 yrs	13+ yrs	Invalid/not reported	Total
Alabama	5%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	6%	12%	13%	14%	14%	11%	30%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	4%	16%	22%	21%	18%	12%	6%	0%	0%	100%
Arizona	6%	10%	11%	12%	12%	11%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	9%	15%	16%	15%	15%	11%	18%	0%	0%	100%
California	2%	5%	10%	15%	20%	12%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Colorado	5%	10%	13%	14%	14%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	6%	11%	14%	15%	14%	9%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	5%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	36%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	7%	17%	24%	18%	10%	6%	19%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	5%	12%	15%	16%	15%	12%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	6%	12%	14%	14%	12%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Guam	7%	14%	18%	17%	18%	15%	10%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	6%	12%	14%	15%	14%	8%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	6%	11%	13%	14%	14%	12%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	5%	9%	11%	12%	12%	10%	40%	1%	1%	100%
Indiana	5%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	7%	11%	12%	12%	12%	10%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	5%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	5%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	8%	16%	18%	18%	12%	7%	20%	0%	0%	100%

State	0 to < 1 yr	1 yr to < 2 yrs	2 yrs to < 3 yrs	3 yrs to < 4 yrs	4 yrs to < 5 yrs	5 yrs to < 6 yrs	6 yrs to < 13 yrs	13+ yrs	Invalid/not reported	Total
Maine	5%	8%	12%	14%	14%	11%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Maryland	4%	11%	13%	14%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	4%	9%	11%	16%	16%	11%	34%	1%	0%	100%
Michigan	6%	10%	13%	13%	12%	9%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Minnesota	6%	10%	12%	12%	12%	11%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	4%	9%	12%	12%	12%	11%	40%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	6%	11%	13%	14%	14%	11%	31%	1%	0%	100%
Montana	7%	12%	14%	15%	14%	11%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	7%	11%	12%	12%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Nevada	6%	10%	11%	11%	12%	10%	39%	0%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	4%	11%	15%	17%	17%	13%	23%	0%	0%	100%
New Jersey	4%	11%	15%	14%	12%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
New Mexico	5%	10%	12%	14%	14%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
New York	4%	9%	13%	14%	14%	9%	37%	0%	0%	100%
North Carolina	4%	9%	11%	12%	12%	11%	42%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	10%	15%	15%	15%	15%	11%	19%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	3%	10%	12%	13%	14%	12%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	6%	11%	12%	13%	13%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	7%	12%	14%	14%	13%	10%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	5%	9%	10%	12%	12%	12%	40%	1%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	4%	10%	12%	12%	13%	11%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	2%	6%	10%	14%	18%	9%	35%	5%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	4%	8%	11%	12%	12%	11%	41%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	7%	15%	17%	15%	13%	9%	23%	0%	0%	100%

State	0 to < 1 yr	1 yr to < 2 yrs	2 yrs to < 3 yrs	3 yrs to < 4 yrs	4 yrs to < 5 yrs	5 yrs to < 6 yrs	6 yrs to < 13 yrs	13+ yrs	Invalid/not reported	Total
South Dakota	7%	11%	12%	13%	13%	11%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	7%	13%	15%	15%	13%	10%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	6%	11%	13%	14%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Utah	5%	9%	11%	12%	12%	12%	40%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	9%	12%	14%	15%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	3%	9%	10%	16%	22%	14%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	4%	10%	14%	14%	14%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	5%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	37%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	11%	12%	13%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	7%	11%	13%	14%	13%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	6%	11%	14%	14%	15%	11%	28%	0%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
6. The Invalid/Not Reported category only includes children with an invalid year/month of birth or report date.

**Table 10**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Reasons for Receiving Care, Average Monthly Percentage of Families (FY 2014)**

State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Employment & Training/Education	Protective Services	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	80%	10%	3%	8%	0%	100%
Alaska	78%	4%	7%	11%	0%	100%
American Samoa	93%	4%	3%	0%	0%	100%
Arizona	39%	0%	6%	55%	0%	100%
Arkansas	55%	11%	5%	19%	10%	100%
California	84%	10%	5%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	65%	8%	20%	0%	7%	100%
Connecticut	93%	5%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	88%	1%	0%	11%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	54%	36%	2%	1%	7%	100%
Florida	67%	5%	5%	24%	0%	100%
Georgia	85%	6%	2%	8%	0%	100%
Guam	81%	8%	10%	1%	0%	100%
Hawaii	79%	10%	11%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	76%	10%	15%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	88%	9%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Indiana	84%	8%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	94%	3%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Kansas	96%	1%	3%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	86%	5%	4%	5%	0%	100%
Louisiana	77%	4%	11%	8%	0%	100%
Maine	83%	4%	11%	0%	2%	100%
Maryland	77%	13%	10%	0%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	68%	9%	2%	20%	0%	100%
Michigan	79%	1%	19%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	84%	4%	13%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	22%	26%	46%	6%	1%	100%
Missouri	59%	10%	1%	29%	0%	100%
Montana	60%	10%	12%	18%	0%	100%
Nebraska	75%	6%	5%	14%	0%	100%
Nevada	84%	1%	1%	14%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	82%	13%	0%	5%	0%	100%
New Jersey	79%	8%	4%	10%	0%	100%
New Mexico	76%	14%	10%	0%	0%	100%
New York	82%	12%	3%	3%	0%	100%
North Carolina	91%	6%	3%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	85%	8%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	93%	5%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	77%	4%	20%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	84%	12%	3%	1%	0%	100%

State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Employment & Training/Education	Protective Services	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Oregon	88%	3%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	79%	9%	11%	0%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	86%	13%	1%	1%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	89%	10%	1%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	66%	24%	2%	9%	0%	100%
South Dakota	68%	8%	9%	15%	0%	100%
Tennessee	42%	24%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	70%	9%	5%	15%	0%	100%
Utah	93%	1%	1%	0%	4%	100%
Vermont	51%	23%	2%	24%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	77%	18%	0%	6%	0%	100%
Virginia	76%	11%	13%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	76%	3%	21%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	81%	8%	10%	0%	1%	100%
Wisconsin	90%	0%	2%	7%	1%	100%
Wyoming	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
6. The Invalid/Not Reported only includes family records with an invalid or missing number for ACF-801 element 6, Reason for Receiving Subsidized Child Care.
7. Several States only capture the primary reason for receiving services and therefore do not report any families in Both Employment and Training/Education categories. States reporting no families in this combination category of Both Employment and Training/Education are Iowa, New Hampshire, and Wyoming.
8. OCC has observed some issues with income reporting across most States to varying degrees. OCC is working with States to address and resolve internal inconsistencies between ACF-801 element 6 (reason for receiving a subsidy), element 9 (total income for determining eligibility), and elements 10 through 15 (sources of income).
9. Beginning FFY 2011, states and territories were no longer allowed to report "Other" as a Reason for Care.

**Table 11**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Racial Group (FY 2014)**

State	Native American / Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Multi- Racial	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	0%	80%	0%	19%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	8%	5%	11%	4%	44%	22%	5%	100%
American Samoa	0%	2%	0%	97%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Arizona	5%	0%	17%	0%	70%	7%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	0%	53%	0%	41%	2%	4%	100%
California	2%	5%	19%	0%	72%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	1%	0%	8%	0%	29%	4%	58%	100%
Connecticut	1%	1%	33%	0%	33%	8%	24%	100%
Delaware	0%	0%	64%	0%	34%	1%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	1%	0%	84%	1%	13%	0%	1%	100%
Florida	0%	0%	48%	0%	47%	4%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	0%	81%	0%	15%	3%	0%	100%
Guam	0%	8%	0%	91%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	0%	19%	1%	35%	12%	34%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	0%	3%	0%	95%	1%	0%	100%
Illinois	0%	1%	51%	0%	20%	3%	25%	100%
Indiana	0%	0%	52%	0%	39%	9%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	1%	17%	0%	75%	6%	0%	100%
Kansas	1%	1%	27%	0%	62%	6%	4%	100%
Kentucky	0%	0%	31%	0%	44%	0%	24%	100%
Louisiana	0%	0%	74%	0%	23%	2%	0%	100%
Maine	0%	0%	6%	0%	83%	2%	8%	100%
Maryland	0%	1%	80%	0%	15%	3%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	3%	19%	0%	21%	2%	55%	100%
Michigan	1%	0%	50%	0%	44%	2%	3%	100%
Minnesota	2%	2%	43%	0%	41%	8%	4%	100%
Mississippi	0%	0%	91%	0%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	0%	53%	0%	39%	1%	6%	100%
Montana	13%	0%	2%	0%	79%	3%	2%	100%
Nebraska	3%	0%	26%	0%	49%	6%	16%	100%
Nevada	1%	2%	36%	1%	51%	2%	6%	100%
New Hampshire	0%	1%	4%	0%	90%	2%	3%	100%
New Jersey	0%	1%	48%	15%	31%	1%	3%	100%
New Mexico	6%	0%	4%	0%	83%	3%	2%	100%
New York	1%	2%	46%	3%	37%	5%	6%	100%
North Carolina	2%	1%	62%	0%	35%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	15%	0%	10%	0%	70%	5%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	53%	0%	25%	0%	5%	18%	100%

State	Native American / Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Multi-Racial	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Ohio	0%	0%	53%	0%	37%	6%	4%	100%
Oklahoma	6%	1%	28%	0%	58%	7%	0%	100%
Oregon	2%	1%	9%	1%	67%	1%	18%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	1%	49%	0%	34%	3%	13%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	0%	0%	0%	99%	0%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	0%	5%	0%	8%	1%	86%	100%
South Carolina	0%	0%	44%	0%	18%	3%	34%	100%
South Dakota	20%	1%	5%	0%	64%	10%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	0%	70%	0%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	0%	27%	0%	47%	2%	24%	100%
Utah	2%	1%	5%	1%	45%	0%	46%	100%
Vermont	0%	1%	4%	0%	91%	3%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	2%	0%	97%	0%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	0%	1%	65%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	2%	2%	10%	16%	35%	0%	34%	100%
West Virginia	0%	0%	11%	0%	72%	14%	2%	100%
Wisconsin	1%	1%	33%	0%	33%	6%	26%	100%
Wyoming	3%	0%	5%	0%	78%	0%	14%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
6. The multi-racial category includes any child where more than one race was answered Yes (1). Several states do not capture and report more than one race per child and thus do not provide multi-racial data.
7. The Invalid/Not Reported category includes children where one or more race fields had anything other than a No (0) or Yes (1), blank, null, or space.
8. It appears that several states and territories are still reporting ethnicity (Latino/Hispanic) as a race rather than as an ethnicity in accordance with the Pre-FY 2000 Technical Bulletin 3 standard. In many of these instances, if a child is designated as Latino, no race is designated.

**Table 12**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Latino Ethnicity (FY 2014)**

State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	1%	99%	0%	100%
Alaska	10%	87%	3%	100%
American Samoa	0%	100%	0%	100%
Arizona	40%	60%	0%	100%
Arkansas	6%	94%	0%	100%
California	58%	42%	0%	100%
Colorado	22%	78%	0%	100%
Connecticut	41%	59%	0%	100%
Delaware	12%	88%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	15%	85%	0%	100%
Florida	26%	74%	0%	100%
Georgia	4%	96%	0%	100%
Guam	0%	100%	0%	100%
Hawaii	8%	92%	0%	100%
Idaho	18%	82%	0%	100%
Illinois	22%	72%	6%	100%
Indiana	10%	90%	0%	100%
Iowa	14%	86%	0%	100%
Kansas	16%	84%	0%	100%
Kentucky	5%	95%	0%	100%
Louisiana	2%	97%	0%	100%
Maine	3%	97%	0%	100%
Maryland	4%	96%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	34%	66%	0%	100%
Michigan	5%	95%	0%	100%
Minnesota	6%	94%	0%	100%
Mississippi	0%	100%	0%	100%
Missouri	4%	94%	2%	100%
Montana	5%	93%	2%	100%
Nebraska	13%	81%	5%	100%
Nevada	31%	66%	2%	100%
New Hampshire	8%	92%	0%	100%
New Jersey	38%	62%	0%	100%
New Mexico	77%	23%	0%	100%
New York	31%	69%	0%	100%
North Carolina	4%	96%	0%	100%
North Dakota	4%	96%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	6%	94%	0%	100%



State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Oklahoma	13%	87%	0%	100%
Oregon	18%	82%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	15%	83%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	13%	5%	82%	100%
South Carolina	2%	41%	57%	100%
South Dakota	4%	96%	0%	100%
Tennessee	2%	98%	0%	100%
Texas	44%	48%	9%	100%
Utah	16%	84%	0%	100%
Vermont	2%	98%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	13%	87%	0%	100%
Virginia	7%	93%	0%	100%
Washington	5%	81%	14%	100%
West Virginia	3%	97%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	12%	81%	6%	100%
Wyoming	14%	86%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY 2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
6. The Invalid/Not Reported category includes children where anything other than a No (0) or Yes (1) was in the Ethnicity field.

**Table 13**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Age Category and Care Type (FY 2014)**

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Infants (0 to <1 yr)	3%	21%	6%	70%	100%
Toddlers (1 yr to <3 yrs)	3%	17%	7%	73%	100%
Preschool (3 yrs to <6 yrs)	2%	14%	5%	78%	100%
School Age (6 yrs to <13 yrs)	5%	23%	6%	67%	100%
13 years and older	12%	50%	6%	32%	100%
<b>All Ages</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. Nationally, 0.7% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or payment.
3. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
4. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
5. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
6. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
7. The National values were determined by multiplying each state's percentage by the adjusted number of children served for each state, summing across the states and then dividing by the adjusted number of children served for the Nation. "Adjusted" means adjusted to represent CCDF funding only.
8. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. Children in more than one setting category within the same month were counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example, if the child spent 70 hours in a center and 30 hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).

**Table 14**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Hours for Children In Care By Age Group and Care Type (FY 2014)**

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	145	154	142	157	155
1 to < 2 yrs	149	159	149	164	162
2 to < 3 yrs	154	161	154	165	163
3 to < 4 yrs	154	161	154	163	162
4 to < 5 yrs	152	156	152	159	158
5 to < 6 yrs	141	140	127	137	137
6 to < 13 yrs	127	125	107	106	111
13+ yrs	140	119	94	97	113
<b>National</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>141</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. Nationally, 0.7% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or payment.
3. Average hours per month were based on sums of hours per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
4. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
5. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
6. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
7. For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the monthly hours with each provider divided by the monthly total hours of service. The average hours and payments for each state-month combination are based on the sum of hours in each category divided by the sum of proportional counts in each category. The state's annual results are determined by calculating a weighted average of the monthly results where the weight was the "adjusted" number of children served in each month. The National results shown above represent a weighted average of the State's fiscal annual results, where the weight for each state is the average monthly "adjusted" number of children served in each state for the fiscal year.
8. Some states have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized rather than the actual number of service hours provided.

**Table 15**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Subsidy Paid to Provider by Age Group and Care Type (FY 2014)**

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$305	\$390	\$563	\$521	\$489
1 to < 2 yrs	\$312	\$408	\$605	\$516	\$496
2 to < 3 yrs	\$306	\$394	\$589	\$488	\$475
3 to < 4 yrs	\$295	\$377	\$558	\$452	\$444
4 to < 5 yrs	\$293	\$365	\$529	\$448	\$438
5 to < 6 yrs	\$277	\$338	\$481	\$386	\$380
6 to < 13 yrs	\$257	\$300	\$424	\$308	\$310
13+ yrs	\$268	\$271	\$415	\$294	\$286
<b>National</b>	<b>\$276</b>	<b>\$345</b>	<b>\$514</b>	<b>\$413</b>	<b>\$402</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. Nationally, 0.7% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or subsidy.
3. Subsidy is the amount paid directly to the provider by the state or territory. It does not include the family copay.
4. Average subsidy per month is based on sums of subsidies per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
5. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
6. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
7. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
8. For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the monthly hours with each provider divided by the monthly total hours of service. The average hours and subsidies for each state-month combination are based on the sum of hours in each category divided by the sum of proportional counts in each category. The state's annual results are determined by calculating a weighted average of the monthly results where the weight was the "adjusted" number of children served in each month. The National results shown above represent a weighted average of the state's fiscal annual results, where the weight for each state is the average monthly "adjusted" number of children served in each state for the fiscal year.
9. Some states have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized and/or dollars authorized rather than the actual number provided.

**Table 16**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percent of Families Reporting Income from TANF (FY 2014)**

State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	20%	80%	0%	100%
Alaska	12%	88%	0%	100%
American Samoa	0%	100%	0%	100%
Arizona	17%	83%	0%	100%
Arkansas	10%	90%	0%	100%
California	13%	87%	0%	100%
Colorado	24%	76%	0%	100%
Connecticut	12%	88%	0%	100%
Delaware	16%	84%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	10%	90%	0%	100%
Florida	6%	93%	1%	100%
Georgia	3%	97%	0%	100%
Guam	3%	97%	0%	100%
Hawaii	25%	75%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	98%	0%	100%
Illinois	8%	92%	0%	100%
Indiana	3%	97%	0%	100%
Iowa	4%	96%	0%	100%
Kansas	4%	96%	0%	100%
Kentucky	3%	97%	0%	100%
Louisiana	5%	87%	8%	100%
Maine	4%	95%	0%	100%
Maryland	36%	64%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	18%	82%	0%	100%
Michigan	16%	84%	0%	100%
Minnesota	29%	71%	0%	100%
Mississippi	22%	78%	0%	100%
Missouri	8%	92%	0%	100%
Montana	11%	89%	0%	100%
Nebraska	17%	83%	0%	100%
Nevada	58%	42%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	19%	76%	5%	100%
New Jersey	12%	88%	0%	100%
New Mexico	12%	88%	0%	100%
New York	43%	57%	0%	100%
North Carolina	5%	95%	0%	100%
North Dakota	11%	89%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	24%	76%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	8%	92%	0%	100%

State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Oregon	18%	82%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	14%	86%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	100%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	14%	86%	0%	100%
South Carolina	11%	0%	89%	100%
South Dakota	6%	94%	0%	100%
Tennessee	63%	37%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	86%	14%	100%
Utah	8%	92%	0%	100%
Vermont	3%	97%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	3%	98%	0%	100%
Virginia	34%	66%	0%	100%
Washington	13%	87%	0%	100%
West Virginia	10%	90%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	10%	83%	7%	100%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.

**Table 17**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Mean Family Co-payment as a Percent of Family Income (FY 2014)**

State/Territories	Families with \$0 Income; Headed by a Child; In Protective Services; Invalid CoPay or Income (Category A) (Percent of Families)	Families with \$0 CoPay (and not in Category A) (Percent of Families)	Families with CoPay > \$0 (and not in Category A) (Percent of Families)	Total of All Families (Percent of Families)	Including Families with \$0 CoPay (Mean CoPay as a Percent of Income)	Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay (Mean CoPay as a Percent of Income)
Alabama	15%	12%	73%	100%	5%	6%
Alaska	28%	1%	71%	100%	6%	6%
American Samoa	4%	96%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Arizona	58%	8%	34%	100%	3%	4%
Arkansas	51%	37%	11%	100%	2%	6%
California	4%	63%	34%	100%	1%	4%
Colorado	25%	10%	65%	100%	10%	12%
Connecticut	5%	6%	90%	100%	4%	5%
Delaware	15%	31%	54%	100%	5%	7%
District of Columbia	38%	14%	49%	100%	3%	3%
Florida	27%	0%	73%	100%	6%	6%
Georgia	10%	5%	85%	100%	8%	9%
Guam	9%	27%	64%	100%	6%	9%
Hawaii	4%	12%	84%	100%	10%	12%
Idaho	11%	0%	89%	100%	9%	9%
Illinois	6%	4%	90%	100%	5%	5%
Indiana	4%	68%	27%	100%	2%	7%
Iowa	15%	44%	40%	100%	2%	5%
Kansas	13%	14%	73%	100%	4%	5%
Kentucky	8%	17%	75%	100%	6%	7%
Louisiana	9%	3%	88%	100%	9%	9%
Maine	10%	5%	85%	100%	7%	7%
Maryland	20%	24%	55%	100%	7%	10%
Massachusetts	31%	15%	54%	100%	7%	9%
Michigan	22%	15%	63%	100%	2%	3%
Minnesota	2%	30%	67%	100%	2%	3%
Mississippi	31%	3%	66%	100%	39%	41%
Missouri	32%	13%	55%	100%	5%	6%
Montana	22%	0%	78%	100%	4%	4%
Nebraska	29%	55%	16%	100%	2%	8%
Nevada	15%	33%	51%	100%	3%	4%
New Hampshire	9%	0%	91%	100%	7%	7%
New Jersey	12%	36%	52%	100%	3%	5%

State/Territories	Families with \$0 Income; Headed by a Child; In Protective Services; Invalid CoPay or Income (Category A) (Percent of Families)	Families with \$0 CoPay (and not in Category A) (Percent of Families)	Families with CoPay > \$0 (and not in Category A) (Percent of Families)	Total of All Families (Percent of Families)	Including Families with \$0 CoPay (Mean CoPay as a Percent of Income)	Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay (Mean CoPay as a Percent of Income)
New Mexico	4%	12%	84%	100%	4%	5%
New York	6%	40%	55%	100%	3%	6%
North Carolina	13%	4%	83%	100%	8%	8%
North Dakota	13%	0%	87%	100%	4%	4%
Northern Mariana Islands	10%	26%	64%	100%	3%	5%
Ohio	3%	3%	94%	100%	5%	5%
Oklahoma	30%	17%	53%	100%	6%	8%
Oregon	16%	5%	79%	100%	10%	10%
Pennsylvania	15%	0%	85%	100%	7%	7%
Puerto Rico	16%	61%	24%	100%	1%	4%
Rhode Island	10%	33%	56%	100%	3%	4%
South Carolina	14%	25%	61%	100%	4%	6%
South Dakota	24%	44%	32%	100%	5%	11%
Tennessee	2%	66%	32%	100%	3%	8%
Texas	22%	3%	75%	100%	8%	8%
Utah	6%	4%	90%	100%	5%	5%
Vermont	42%	28%	30%	100%	3%	6%
Virgin Islands	12%	78%	10%	100%	0%	1%
Virginia	42%	9%	50%	100%	8%	9%
Washington	11%	0%	89%	100%	5%	5%
West Virginia	8%	12%	80%	100%	4%	5%
Wisconsin	15%	1%	84%	100%	6%	6%
Wyoming	10%	5%	84%	100%	8%	8%
<b>National</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>7%</b>

Data as of: 26-MAY-2015

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2014.
2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.



5. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Mississippi had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data for FY 2014. All other states and territories had submitted the full 12 months of data.
6. The "Mean CoPay/Income" columns exclude families with zero income because dividing by zero is undefined.
7. The column labeled as "Category A" includes: families with zero income; families in Protective Services or families headed by a child; and families with invalid income or copay.
8. The "Families with \$0 Copay ..." category is the percentage of families that had a \$0 co-payment and were not in Category A, divided by the count of all families. The sum of these three categories is 100%.
9. The results shown under "Mean Copay/Income" feature two different statistics, "Including" and "Excluding" \$0 copay. The data analyzed for the "Including Families with \$0 CoPay" category includes all families except those families in the "Category A" data, i.e. the total minus the Category A data. The data analyzed for "Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay" includes only those families in the category "Families with CoPay >\$0 (and not in Category A)." Alternatively, the data used for "Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay" is all the family data minus those families in Category A and minus those families with \$0 CoPay.
10. The National weighted values were determined by multiplying each state's average co-payment/income percentage by the adjusted number of children in each state, summing across the states and then dividing by the adjusted number of children served for the Nation.

## Appendix B: Summaries of Child Care Research Projects

- **Assessing the Implementation and Cost of High Quality Early Care and Education (ECE-ICHQ), 2014-2019**

The goal of the project is to create a technically sound, feasible, and useful instrument that will provide consistent and systematic measures of the implementation and costs of quality to help fill the knowledge gap about the cost of providing and improving quality in early care and education. The first phase of the project will develop this instrument through: (1) a literature review and conceptual framework that specifies the contextual and implementation factors that may contribute to the association between features of high quality early care and education and the costs of operating programs of different quality, (2) consultations with a technical expert panel, and (3) a study of 72 centers conducted in three phases that will support development and iterative testing of implementation and cost measures. Stages two and three involve developing and testing the new measure and resources for training of administration of the measure.

- **Child Care Administrative Data Analysis Cooperative Agreements (2013-2016)**

Child Care Administrative Data Analysis Cooperative Agreements support CCDF Lead Agencies in conducting rigorous, policy-relevant research that primarily involves the analysis of administrative data. Grantees pursue research questions of national and state relevance and develop their methodology and research questions in partnership with local and state child care researchers and other stakeholders.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/child-care-administrative-data-analysis-cooperative-agreements>

- ***Project Title:* Facilitating Continuity in Subsidized Care within Maryland**

*Grantee:* Maryland State Department of Education, with partners Child Trends and Regional Economic Studies Institute (RESI) of Towson University.

*Abstract:* The project will accomplish three objectives: (1) describe longitudinal patterns in subsidy continuity within Maryland, (2) examine the association between continuity in subsidized care arrangements and the use of high quality care, and (3) analyze the association between new guidance regarding the administration of subsidy redetermination periods and subsidy spell length.

Specifically, this project will answer the following research questions: (1) What patterns emerge when examining the continuity of subsidy spells? Do these continuity patterns differ across child, family, and community characteristics? (2) Do children in accredited subsidized care arrangements remain in these providers' care longer than children in non-accredited subsidized arrangements? (3) Does the median length of subsidy spells differ before and after implementation of new guidance regarding 12 month redetermination administrative practices?

Research questions will be addressed through the analysis of linked child care subsidy administrative data and provider licensing/accreditation data from June 2007 through January 2016. These data will be analyzed using rigorous analytic techniques, including person-centered analyses, propensity score matching, and difference-in-differences analyses. Results will be disaggregated by subgroups that are of interest to state policymakers and child care subsidy administrators.

- ***Project Title: Development & Validation of the Oklahoma School Readiness Reach-by-Risk Index (SRR2I)***

*Grantee:* Oklahoma Department of Human Services

*Abstract:* Applying a selection of multivariate statistical methods and using administrative data from several state agencies and providers of early childhood education and support programs, this project aims to: (1) identify gaps in the availability of quality early childhood education and family service programs across Oklahoma, (2) determine the effect of Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) child care subsidies on school readiness, and (3) investigate changes in the profile of families who receive subsidies. The study is intended to inform policy decision-making and resource allocation by addressing several problems related to early childhood education and child care. These problems include: attempting to effectively distribute early childhood education resources statewide without the benefit of a comprehensive and complete picture of needs and services at the county level; limited knowledge of the effect of CCDF subsidized child care on school readiness and whether children with higher risk factors for school un-readiness benefit equally or more so than children with fewer risk factors; an incomplete understanding of who benefits the most from CCDF benefits compared to who is accessing benefits; and limited knowledge of the extent to which reductions in the CCDF program affected access by those most in need.

- **Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Policies Database (2008-2018)**

The CCDF Policies Database is a source of information on the detailed policies used to operate child care subsidy programs under CCDF. Since 2008, the Urban Institute has collected, coded, and disseminated the CCDF policies in effect across the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and territories and outlying areas, using consistent methods across places and over time. The information in the CCDF Policies Database is based primarily on the documents that caseworkers use as they work with families and providers, as well as the biennial CCDF Plans and amendments submitted by states/territories to ACF, state law, and regulations used by the staff operating the program. The Database captures detailed information on eligibility, family payments, application procedures, and provider-related policies, including dates of enactment and some of the policy variations that exist within states/territories. The information collected by the project is being disseminated in different forms to meet the needs of different users – quantitative and qualitative researchers, policymakers, and administrators at all levels of government.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/child-care-and-development-fund-ccdf-policies-database-2008-2013>

- **Child Care and Early Education Policy and Research Analysis Project (CCEEPRA) (2005-2018)**

The Child Care and Early Education Policy and Research Analysis and Technical Expertise Project is a contract awarded by OPRE to Child Trends. The purpose of this contract is to support the provision of expert consultation, assessment and analysis in child care and early education policy and research to OPRE, including activities related to: (a) providing expert advice, assistance and consultation in support of the agency’s research priorities and goals, (b) conducting assessment, analyses and summaries of policies, practices and research of relevance to the agency’s mission; (c) conducting studies to inform policy and practice and the development of new research priorities, (d) identifying and refining measures and instruments to improve the collection of data related to program policies and practices, and to program outcomes for families and children, (e) identifying sources of data and conducting statistical analyses on national and other original data-sets to answer questions of relevance to the Agency on child care utilization, child care supply, and the effects of child care and other early childhood policies on parental and child outcomes, (f) providing technical assistance and expertise in the preparation of written materials, and (g) convening experts on early care and education research and policy issues of relevance to the administration of the CCDF and other early childhood programs in states, territories, and tribes. Products supported through this contract include literature reviews, measures compendia, meeting summaries, briefing papers, webinars, research briefs, and research-to-policy/research-to-practice briefs.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/child-care-and-early-education-policy-and-research-and-technical>

- **Child Care and Early Education RESEARCH CONNECTIONS, 1998-2018**

*Research Connections* is a web-based, interactive database of research documents and public use data sets for conducting secondary analyses on topics related to early care and education. *Research Connections* houses an increasingly comprehensive collection of research reports, syntheses, and other critical information related to child care and early education, and in particular, children in low-income families; provides researchers access to data from major child care, Head Start, and early education research and evaluation studies; provides technical assistance to researchers and policy makers; provides collaboration and outreach that can strengthen dissemination and use of research by both the research and the policy maker communities, and provides support to the Child Care Policy Research Consortium. Access the site at: <http://www.researchconnections.org>

- **Child Care Policy Research Partnerships**

The Child Care Research Partnership grants support research on child care policy issues conducted by state agencies, researchers and other organizations in partnership. Partnerships must include the state agency that administers the Child Care and Development Fund, and at least one member must be a research group.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/child-care-research-partnerships-1995-2013>

- **2010 Grantees (Project Period of 2010 through 2014):**

- **Determinants of Subsidy Stability and Continuity of Child Care in Illinois and New York**

*Grantee:* University of Chicago

*Partners:* The Urban Institute; Illinois Department of Human Services, Bureau of Child Care & Development; New York State Office of Children & Family Services; Illinois Action for Children; Monroe County, NY Department of Human Services; Nassau County, NY Department of Social Services.

*Project overview:* This partnership joins researchers at the University of Chicago and the Urban Institute with the CCDF administrators in the States of Illinois and New York to inform policy efforts in those States as well as in other state CCDF programs concerning the determinants of subsidy stability and child care continuity. By analyzing quantitative and qualitative information on parent perceptions together with administrative records, the partnership aimed to strengthen knowledge around the pathways that lead to stability for key sub-populations of families. The project addressed the following

research questions: (1) What are the different patterns of subsidy use and stability over time? (2) To what extent do subsidy program characteristics and parental work circumstance influence subsidy use and stability? (3) How stable are child care arrangements for subsidy-receiving families both during a subsidy spell and over time? (4) To what extent do subsidy program characteristics and parental work circumstance directly influence the stability of child care arrangements? (5) What challenges to subsidy stability and child care stability do parents perceive to be most difficult? and (6) What challenges to subsidy stability and child care stability are particularly salient for parents with non-traditional jobs and/or nonstandard work schedules, families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, immigrant families/non-English speaking parents, and families with multiple children? The study results will: (1) inform administrators and policymakers about how to design and administer subsidies in ways that will improve stability for families with different characteristics and in diverse circumstance, and (2) improve understanding of the linkages between subsidy stability and child care stability.

- **Early Care and Education Choices, Quality and Continuity, for Low-Income Families A Maryland-Minnesota Research Partnership**

*Grantee:* Child Trends

*Partners:* Maryland State Department of Education; Minnesota Department of Human Services University of Minnesota; Wilder Research; RESI of Towson University

*Project overview:* Child Trends conducted three sub-studies in Minnesota and Maryland to inform policy efforts in those States by examining critical issues in early care and education using research findings with an interdisciplinary team of researchers experienced in conducting studies on subsidy policy, quality improvement strategies, family experiences, and child outcomes. Child Trends, in partnership with the University of Minnesota, Towson University, and Wilder Research capitalized on existing research projects in the two States, and sought to facilitate cross-state application of learning using mixed methodologies and rigorous analytic techniques. The project addressed research questions in the following domains: (1) how families seek and process information about early care and education, (2) how families value and weigh different features of the quality of arrangements, (3) the dynamics of how families/children transition between arrangements, and (4) the effects of these processes/decisions

on family and child outcomes. The methodology allowed for the study of parent decisions over time and account for unobservable characteristics that may impact choices related to early care and education decisions. This methodology fills a void in the field which has not previously addressed these issues. The study used focus groups and cognitive interviews with low-income families in both states to learn more about developing measures that adequately captures the constructs being assessed. Results will inform policy related to: (1) the factors shaping early care and education decisions and outcomes, (2) the critical aspects of early care and education for supporting positive outcomes for families and children, and (3) the patterns of early care and education use, dynamics of child care subsidy use, and the ways in which subsidy receipt influences continuity in early care and education services.

- **2013 Grantees (Project Period of 2013 through 2017):**
  - **Stars Plus: Promoting Quality Improvement for Family Child Care Providers in QRIS using a Community of Practice Model**  
*Principal Investigator:* Rena Hallam, *University of Delaware*  
*Project overview:* This partnership will document the experiences of family child care providers (FCCP) in two different Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) in Delaware and Kentucky, evaluating a quality improvement framework adapted to meet the needs of FCCP. Specifically, the project will investigate the implementation of a community of practice model and coordinated curriculum- focused professional development and the effects on FCCP participation and quality improvement within QRIS.
  - **Determinants of Subsidy Stability and Child Care Continuity in Illinois and New York: Phase 2 – A Focus on the Subsidy-Quality Intersection**  
*Principal Investigator:* Julia R. Henly, *University of Chicago*  
*Project overview:* Researchers at the University of Chicago and the Urban Institute continue their partnership with Illinois and New York child care administrators and four local offices to develop an empirically-informed and practically-relevant knowledgebase regarding the determinants of subsidy stability and child care continuity. Phase 2 will focus on provider- and subsidy program-related factors that impede families’ access to high quality and stable subsidized arrangements and examine strategies to successfully integrate subsidized providers into quality improvement efforts.
  - **Evaluation of the Child Care Voucher Eligibility Reassessment Policy Change in Massachusetts**

*Principal Investigator:* Pamela Joshi, *Brandeis University*

*Project overview:* Researchers at Brandeis and Boston Universities partner with Massachusetts child care administrators to evaluate recently-implemented state policies designed to make accessing child care subsidies more family-friendly. The partnership will: (1) document the implementation of a new policy shifting responsibilities for redetermination of voucher eligibility from Child Care Resource and Referral centers to contracted child care providers, (2) evaluate the effects of the policy change, and (3) examine any differential effects on service populations, focusing specifically on under-participating groups such as Hispanic and immigrant families.

- **Child Care Collaboration and Quality**

*Principal Investigators:* Gary Resnick and Meghan Broadstone, *Education Development Center*

*Project overview:* This partnership will examine state and community-level collaborations designed to improve quality, access, and outcomes in infant/toddler care. Joining with child care administrators from Maryland and Vermont, researchers will conduct secondary analyses of existing datasets; analyze new data from all state child care administrators; and survey center- and family-based child care providers, teachers and parents at two time points in partner states. The project aims to identify models of collaboration that leverage quality initiatives leading to desired child and family outcomes.

- **Virgin Islands' Partners for Early Success**

*Principal Investigator:* Michal Rhymer-Charles, *Virgin Islands Department of Human Services*

*Project overview:* This research partnership will examine the validity of the Virgin Islands' Quality Rating and Improvement System by: (1) assessing the measurement strategies and psychometric properties of measures used to assess early care and education (ECE) quality, (2) examining the effects of introducing QRIS and new licensing regulations on the supply and quality of ECE, and (3) examining the developmental trajectories of children to identify predictors of early school success in the Virgin Islands context.

- **Are You In? A Systems-Level Mixed-Method Analysis of the Effects of Quality Improvement Initiatives on Participating and Non-Participating Providers**

*Principal Investigator:* Holli Tonyan, *The University Corporation (California State University, Northridge)*



*Project overview:* This partnership will examine quality improvement activities among family child care providers (FCCP) in the context of California's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge. Through a combination of survey and in-depth qualitative methods, the project will compare providers' experiences in two regions operating with different QRIS. Specifically, the study will explore the conditions under which FCCP adopt and sustain changes in their daily routine activities caring for children.

- **Child Care Research Scholars (2000-2016)**

Child Care Research Scholars grants support dissertation research on child care policy issues in partnership with State Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) lead agencies. On average, four grants are funded each year for approximately two years. Annual cohorts of grantees are described in the link below: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/child-care-research-scholars-0>

- **Enhancing Analytic Capacity of NSECE Data (2015-2018)**

The project to enhance analytic capacity of the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) Data involves tasks to construct new variables that can be disseminated as part of public-use and restricted-use data sets to conduct secondary analyses in order to answer policy-relevant questions. In addition, the contract is tasked to develop training and technical assistance products and activities to help analysts and researchers use the data, and to disseminate restricted use data that include personally identifiable information from study participants in a way that eliminates disclosure risk and appropriate reporting of findings. <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/topic/overview/child-care>

- **National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families (2013–2018)**

The National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families is a cooperative agreement with Child Trends in partnership with Abt Associates and several academic partners (i.e., New York University, University of Maryland, University of North Carolina- Greensboro) to conduct research and provide research-based information addressing three priority areas: (1) early care and education, (2) poverty reduction and self-sufficiency, and (3) healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood, in order to inform ACF programs and policies supporting Hispanic families and children. The Center has three primary goals across these priority areas: (1) advance a cutting-edge research agenda, (2) build research capacity, and (3) implement an innovative communication and dissemination approach.

The National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families has many research activities underway to improve understanding of the experiences, needs, and assets of low-income Hispanic children nationally. Some of these projects are focused on ECE

experiences of Hispanic children and families, and other projects are addressing topics with great relevance to ECE needs and utilization, such as family structure and family formation, housing complexity, income stability.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/center-for-research-on-hispanic-children-families>

- **National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) (2010-2015)**

The National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) documented the nation's current utilization and availability of early care and education (including school-age care), in order to deepen the understanding of the extent to which families' needs and preferences coordinate well with provider's offerings and constraints. The experiences of low-income families are of special interest as they are the focus of a significant component of early care and education/school-age (ECE/SA) public policy. The NSECE collected data on nationally-representative samples including interviews in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The NSECE design included five survey components and four related questionnaires.

- A **Household Survey** conducted with a parent or guardian of a child or children under age 13. Eligible respondents were identified through the **Household Screener**. The NSECE data includes approximately 12,000 interviews with adults in households with children under age 13.
- A **Home-based Provider Survey** conducted with two types of respondents. The first type is Formal Home-Based Providers who were identified on state-level administrative lists of ECE/SA providers as providing regulated or registered home-based care, with an estimated total of 4,000 interviews. The second type is Informal Home-Based Providers identified through the Household Screener as caring for children under age 13 who are not their own in a home-based setting (and who do not appear on a state-level administrative list), with an estimated total of 2,000 interviews.
- The **Center-based Provider Survey** conducted with directors of ECE/SA programs who were identified from state-level administrative lists such as state licensing lists, Head Start program records, or pre-K rolls. Eligible respondents were identified through the Center-based Provider Screener. The estimated total of Center-based Provider interviews is 8,200.
- The **Workforce Provider Survey** conducted with classroom-assigned staff members of Center-based providers completing the Center-based Provider interview. After each Center-based Provider interview was completed, one staff member from that organization was sampled and administered the workforce interview. Approximately 5,600 workforce members were

interviewed. In addition, the Home-Based Provider questionnaire collected workforce information on those working in home-based settings.

The NSECE will produce a series of reports and papers as well as public-use data sets that examine the current state of ECE/SA usage and availability at the local and national levels. The products of this study will offer an initial summary of findings, fundamental information about ECE/SA availability and utilization for the government, public, and researchers.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/national-survey-of-early-care-and-education-nsece-2010-2014>

- **Quality Features, Dosages and Thresholds and Child Outcomes: Study Design (Q-Dot), 2009-2014**

This project examined associations between the quality of early care and education settings and child outcomes, asking whether certain thresholds of quality or dosage need to be met or particular aspects of quality need to be present before linkages are apparent. Interrelationships of these factors and relevance for different age groups of children between the ages of birth and age five participating in center-based care settings were considered. A special focus of the project was children from low-income families, including those with risk factors affecting their potential school readiness.

The project was funded to provide guidance to ACF, other federal agencies and other stakeholders in order to guide new research on the quality of early care and education; support quality improvement initiatives and practice; and, inform policy decision-making at the state and national levels. The final product of this project is the design of a study to test the relationship between thresholds, dosages, and features of early childhood program quality and children's outcomes in multiple developmental domains.

To address the study questions, the project team conducted several activities, including: literature review, secondary analyses of data, conceptual framework and logic model, and development of a design, methodology, analyses plans and resources estimates for a new study to test the associations identified in the logic model. The final stage of the project involved conducting a feasibility study of the design and methodology for a new study implementation, and piloting of measures to be used to assess the relationship between quality and child outcomes. The project was conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. and its subcontractors: Child Trends, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Virginia.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/quality-features-dosages-and-thresholds-and-child-outcomes-study-design-q>

- **Secondary Analysis of Data on Child Care and Early Education 2015-2017**

The eighteen projects funded under the grant program for Secondary Analyses of Data on Child Care and Early Education are conducting analyses of existing data sets to answer critical research questions that will inform both policymakers and future research. Topics include associations between subsidy receipt and long-term child achievement, access to early care and education for low-income families, and links between subsidy rates and child care quality. The total funding for these grants is \$2,619,112.00.

- The changing landscape of publicly-funded center-based child care: 1990 and 2012. Deborah Phillips, Georgetown University
- Subsidy Utilization and Impact on Early Care and Education of Low-income Children with Special Needs. Amanda Sullivan; Amy Susman-Stillman, Regents of the University of Minnesota
- Peer Effects on Children and Teachers in Preschool Classrooms. Rebekah Levine Coley, Trustees of Boston College
- Promoting Social Competence in ECE: Predicting the development of prosocial behavior from early experiences in child care and families. Celia Brownell; Jesse Drummond, University of Pittsburgh
- The market for quality child care: Supply, demand, and quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS). Erin Bumgarner, Abt Associates, Inc.
- The Impact of Early Care and Education in Child Nutrition, Sedentary Behavior and Obesity by Kindergarten. Margaret Weden; Lynn Karoly, RAND Corporation
- How Parental Preferences and Subsidy Receipt Shape Immigrant Families' Child Care Choices. Heather Sandstrom; Julia Gelatt, The Urban Institute
- Inside the classroom door. Anna Johnson, Georgetown University
- Supporting low-income families: State variations in child care subsidies and TANF policies and children's developmental ecologies. Kathryn Maguire Jack, Kelly Purtell, The Ohio State University
- What Shape is the Relationship between Child Outcomes and Classroom Assessment Scoring System? Alan Cobo-Lewis, University of Maine System Acting Through the University of Maine
- Mitigating Susceptibility with the Child Care Development Fund: Using four large data sets to classify risk profiles and risk transmission by modifiable factors. Sarah Enos Watamura; Julia Dmitrieva, Colorado Seminary which owns & operates the University of Denver
- Child Care Accessibility Index: Leveraging SC Child Care Administrative Data to Inform State CCDBG Subsidy Policies. Herman Knopf, University of South Carolina
- Are Higher Subsidy Payment Rates and Provider-Friendly Payment Policies Associated with Child Care Quality? Teresa Derrick-Mills; Julia Isaacs ; Erica Greenberg , The Urban Institute
- Child Care Factors that Influence Parental Engagement: Understanding Longitudinal Pathways to Children's School Readiness. Melissa Barnett; Christina Cutshaw; Ann Mastergeorge, Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona
- Constellations of Support: Teacher Professional Development in Head Start and Child Outcomes. Megan Pratt, Michelle Taylor, Manuela Jimenez H., AZ Board of Regents on Behalf of Arizona State University

- Child Care Subsidies and the Long Term Achievement of Low-Income Children. Wladimir Zanoni, Chapin Hall Center for Children
- Levels of Quality and Children's Development. Greg Welch, Board of Regents, University of Nebraska, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Access to Early Care and Education (ECE) for Disadvantaged Families. Rebecca Madill, Child Trends Incorporated

## **Appendix C: Summary of Statutory Changes in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG) of 2014**

### **Health and Safety Requirements for Child Care Providers**

- Requires states to establish health and safety requirements in 10 different topic areas (e.g., prevention of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS), first-aid, and CPR).
- Child care providers serving children receiving assistance through the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program must receive pre-service and ongoing training on such topics.
- Requires states to conduct criminal background checks for all child care staff members, including staff members who do not care directly for children but have unsupervised access to children, and specifies disqualifying crimes.
- Requires states to certify child care providers will comply with child abuse reporting requirements.
- Requires states to conduct pre-licensure and annual unannounced inspections of licensed CCDF providers and annual inspections of license-exempt CCDF providers.
- Requires states to establish qualifications and training for licensing inspectors and appropriate inspector-to-provider ratios.
- Requires states to have standards for CCDF providers regarding group size limits and appropriate child-to-provider ratios based on the age of children in child care.
- Requires states to conduct emergency preparedness planning and have statewide disaster plans for child care.

### **Transparent Consumer and Provider Education Information**

- Requires states to make available by electronic means, easily accessible provider-specific information showing results of monitoring and inspection reports, as well as the number of deaths, serious injuries, and instances of substantiated child abuse that occur in child care settings each year.
- Requires states to have a website describing processes for licensing and monitoring child care providers, processes for conducting criminal background checks, and offenses that prevent individuals from being child care providers.
- Funds a national website to disseminate consumer education information that allows search by zip code and referral to local child care providers, as well as a national hotline for reporting child abuse and neglect.

### **Family-Friendly Eligibility Policies**

- Establishes a 12-month eligibility re-determination period for CCDF families, regardless of temporary changes in income (as long as income does not exceed the federal threshold of 85 percent of state median income) or temporary changes in participation in work, job training, or educational activities.
- Allows states the option to terminate assistance prior to re-determination if a parent loses employment. However, assistance must be continued for at least three months to allow for job search activities.
- Eligibility re-determination should not require parents to unduly disrupt their employment.
- Provides for a graduated phase-out of assistance for families whose income has increased at the time of re-determination, but remains below the federal threshold.
- Requires procedures for enrollment of homeless children pending completion of documentation, and training and outreach to promote access to services for homeless families.

### Activities to Improve the Quality of Child Care

- Phases-in increases in minimum quality set-aside from four percent to nine percent over a five-year period. In addition, requires states to spend minimum of three percent to improve the quality of care for infants and toddlers.
- Requires states to spend quality funds on at least 1 of 10 specified quality activities, which include developing tiered quality rating systems and supporting statewide resource and referral services.
- Requires establishment of professional development and training requirements with ongoing annual training and progression to improve knowledge and skills of CCDF providers.
- Requires states to implement Early Learning and Development Guidelines describing what children should know and be able to do, appropriate from birth to kindergarten entry.
- Includes provisions on social-emotional health of children, including providing consumer and provider education about policies regarding expulsions of children from early care and education programs and developmental screenings for children at risk of cognitive or developmental delays.

### Tribes

- Tribal set-aside: Establishes a discretionary set-aside of not less than two percent (current law says up to two percent) for tribes.
- The law does not indicate the extent to which many of the new provisions apply to tribes.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The Office of Child Care will issue policy guidance on how provisions apply to Tribes after consultation with Tribal Leaders and administrators. A proposed regulation was published in December 2015 and a final regulation is anticipated in 2016.

### Other Provisions

- *Equal Access:* Requires states to conduct a market rate survey, or use an alternative methodology, such as a cost estimation model, and describe how payment rates will be established based on results of the survey or alternative methodology, taking into account cost of providing higher quality services.
- *Supply-building:* States must develop strategies for increasing supply and quality of services for children in underserved areas, infants and toddlers, children with disabilities, and children in non-traditional hour care—which may include use of grants/contracts and alternative reimbursement.
- *Provider payment practices:* States must establish policies that reflect generally accepted payment practices for child care providers, including (to the extent practicable) paying for absence days, and timely reimbursement for child care services.
- *Technical assistance set-aside:* Establishes a set-aside of up to half of one percent for technical assistance to CCDF Lead Agencies on administering the program.
- *Research set-aside:* Establishes a set-aside of up to half of one percent to conduct research and demonstration activities, as well as periodic, external, independent evaluations of the CCDF program.
- *Plan period:* Changes CCDF Plan period from a two to a three-year cycle.
- *Waiver authority:* Allows HHS to waive provisions or penalties in the statute for up to three years (with the option of a one year extension) based on a request from a state identifying duplicative requirements preventing effective delivery of child care services, extraordinary circumstances, or an extended period of time for a state legislature to enact legislation to implement the statute.