

Table 1 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Adjusted Number of Families and Children Served (FFY 2005)		
States/Territories	Average Number of Families	Average Number of Children
Alabama	14,900	27,100
Alaska	2,900	4,700
American Samoa	-	-
Arizona	18,400	31,100
Arkansas	6,200	10,300
California	106,900	162,600
Colorado	10,400	19,100
Connecticut	5,700	9,600
Delaware	4,200	6,900
District of Columbia	2,700	3,800
Florida	69,600	116,300
Georgia	33,400	60,600
Guam	-	-
Hawaii	5,700	8,900
Idaho	5,900	10,600
Illinois	44,800	84,000
Indiana	16,800	32,200
Iowa	10,400	17,900
Kansas	10,200	18,800
Kentucky	20,400	36,500
Louisiana	30,700	51,800
Maine	3,200	4,600
Maryland	11,700	20,500
Massachusetts	23,800	34,800
Michigan	40,300	79,300
Minnesota	14,300	25,500
Mississippi	16,400	33,300
Missouri	21,100	36,300
Montana	3,200	5,200
Nebraska	7,600	13,400
Nevada	2,800	4,600
New Hampshire	4,900	7,100
New Jersey	25,600	37,800
New Mexico	13,400	23,100
New York	77,500	127,600
North Carolina	50,600	104,200
North Dakota	2,300	3,700
Northern Mariana Islands	200	400
Ohio	29,000	51,600
Oklahoma	12,000	19,700
Oregon	10,700	21,300
Pennsylvania	41,400	72,600
Puerto Rico	3,400	4,400
Rhode Island	3,300	5,200
South Carolina	11,200	19,500
South Dakota	3,000	4,700
Tennessee	22,600	43,200
Texas	66,700	123,400
Utah	6,000	11,100
Vermont	2,800	4,100
Virgin Islands	300	500
Virginia	18,200	29,300
Washington	32,900	53,900
West Virginia	5,900	10,000
Wisconsin	16,400	28,700
Wyoming	2,900	4,600
National Total	1,027,800	1,782,000

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.

2. All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).

4. At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.

5. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

6. 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 (FFY 2005)				
State	Grants / Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %	Total
Alabama	0%	100%	0%	43,243
Alaska	0%	91%	9%	10,049
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0%	100%	0%	56,221
Arkansas	0%	100%	0%	32,293
California	39%	61%	0%	305,929
Colorado	1%	96%	3%	37,949
Connecticut	44%	56%	0%	27,902
Delaware	0%	100%	0%	11,806
District of Columbia	3%	97%	0%	5,807
Florida	42%	57%	0%	192,247
Georgia	0%	100%	0%	115,400
Guam	49%	51%	0%	2,053
Hawaii	36%	0%	64%	27,558
Idaho	0%	100%	0%	18,856
Illinois	8%	92%	0%	147,580
Indiana	4%	96%	0%	53,616
Iowa	0%	100%	0%	36,368
Kansas	0%	94%	6%	35,823
Kentucky	-	-	-	-
Louisiana	0%	100%	0%	113,508
Maine	31%	67%	2%	7,200
Maryland	0%	100%	0%	34,540
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-
Michigan	0%	70%	30%	120,540
Minnesota	0%	100%	0%	54,915
Mississippi	4%	96%	0%	32,238
Missouri	0%	100%	0%	68,275
Montana	0%	98%	2%	10,404
Nebraska	0%	100%	0%	25,785
Nevada	18%	82%	0%	13,361
New Hampshire	0%	100%	0%	12,270
New Jersey	18%	82%	0%	71,820
New Mexico	0%	100%	0%	39,813
New York	22%	78%	0%	249,500
North Carolina	0%	100%	0%	107,511
North Dakota	0%	100%	0%	7,265
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	901
Ohio	0%	100%	0%	100,010
Oklahoma	-	-	-	-
Oregon	4%	96%	0%	46,740
Pennsylvania	0%	79%	21%	125,602
Puerto Rico	70%	30%	0%	7,625
Rhode Island	0%	100%	0%	7,821
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%	35,429
South Dakota	2%	98%	0%	9,349
Tennessee	0%	100%	0%	72,051
Texas	0%	100%	0%	238,906
Utah	0%	0%	100%	21,122
Vermont	8%	92%	0%	9,847
Virgin Islands	0%	0%	100%	1,120
Virginia	0%	100%	0%	58,318
Washington	0%	82%	18%	96,624
West Virginia	0%	100%	0%	17,492
Wisconsin	0%	100%	0%	46,784
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	8,587
National Total	11%	85%	4%	3,033,974

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 18-JUL-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2005. 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.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and Oklahoma had not yet reported FFY 2005 ACF-800 data.

Table 3 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care (FFY 2005)						
State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	5%	4%	80%	11%	100%
Alaska	7%	35%	6%	52%	1%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	3%	18%	7%	72%	0%	100%
Arkansas	1%	19%	0%	80%	0%	100%
California	6%	33%	9%	52%	1%	100%
Colorado	6%	33%	0%	60%	1%	100%
Connecticut	30%	30%	0%	35%	4%	100%
Delaware	3%	37%	3%	57%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	5%	0%	93%	2%	100%
Florida	2%	11%	0%	86%	1%	100%
Georgia	1%	13%	2%	84%	0%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	12%	57%	0%	31%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	37%	13%	48%	0%	100%
Illinois	25%	43%	1%	31%	0%	100%
Indiana	1%	43%	0%	56%	0%	100%
Iowa	1%	56%	7%	36%	1%	100%
Kansas	6%	20%	40%	32%	2%	100%
Kentucky	0%	22%	2%	77%	0%	100%
Louisiana	17%	11%	0%	72%	0%	100%
Maine	3%	44%	0%	52%	1%	100%
Maryland	13%	46%	0%	40%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	4%	8%	17%	68%	3%	100%
Michigan	28%	43%	9%	14%	6%	100%
Minnesota	10%	47%	0%	36%	7%	100%
Mississippi	4%	24%	1%	71%	0%	100%
Missouri	2%	39%	2%	50%	7%	100%
Montana	3%	23%	35%	39%	0%	100%
Nebraska	0%	39%	8%	53%	1%	100%
Nevada	9%	6%	1%	84%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	7%	29%	0%	56%	8%	100%
New Jersey	2%	20%	0%	74%	4%	100%
New Mexico	2%	43%	6%	48%	0%	100%
New York	18%	38%	9%	32%	3%	100%
North Carolina	0%	18%	0%	81%	0%	100%
North Dakota	0%	44%	31%	25%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	12%	54%	2%	32%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	33%	1%	54%	12%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	1%	0%	98%	0%	100%
Oregon	0%	78%	3%	19%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	14%	31%	5%	48%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	2%	37%	1%	60%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	1%	31%	0%	67%	0%	100%
South Carolina	7%	14%	3%	76%	0%	100%
South Dakota	1%	48%	0%	52%	0%	100%
Tennessee	2%	15%	5%	78%	0%	100%
Texas	9%	12%	3%	76%	0%	100%
Utah	10%	45%	6%	37%	2%	100%
Vermont	2%	53%	1%	43%	1%	100%
Virgin Islands	9%	1%	6%	85%	0%	100%
Virginia	4%	38%	0%	58%	0%	100%
Washington	15%	29%	0%	41%	15%	100%
West Virginia	0%	40%	4%	56%	1%	100%
Wisconsin	0%	35%	0%	59%	6%	100%
Wyoming	7%	29%	7%	16%	41%	100%
National Total	8%	28%	4%	58%	2%	100%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. In prior years this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB recently decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages. National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
- For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.

Table 4 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in Regulated Settings vs. Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation (FFY 2005)				
State	Licensed / Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	76%	14%	11%	100%
Alaska	78%	22%	1%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	88%	12%	0%	100%
Arkansas	99%	1%	0%	100%
California	67%	32%	1%	100%
Colorado	79%	20%	1%	100%
Connecticut	44%	52%	4%	100%
Delaware	90%	10%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	97%	1%	2%	100%
Florida	90%	9%	1%	100%
Georgia	95%	5%	0%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	35%	65%	0%	100%
Idaho	61%	39%	0%	100%
Illinois	46%	54%	0%	100%
Indiana	65%	35%	0%	100%
Iowa	79%	20%	1%	100%
Kansas	80%	18%	2%	100%
Kentucky	86%	14%	0%	100%
Louisiana	69%	31%	0%	100%
Maine	85%	14%	1%	100%
Maryland	77%	22%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	90%	7%	3%	100%
Michigan	31%	64%	6%	100%
Minnesota	67%	26%	7%	100%
Mississippi	72%	28%	0%	100%
Missouri	58%	36%	7%	100%
Montana	87%	12%	0%	100%
Nebraska	82%	17%	1%	100%
Nevada	79%	21%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	64%	28%	8%	100%
New Jersey	85%	11%	4%	100%
New Mexico	56%	44%	0%	100%
New York	49%	48%	3%	100%
North Carolina	98%	2%	0%	100%
North Dakota	65%	35%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	99%	1%	0%	100%
Ohio	88%	0%	12%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	41%	59%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	60%	38%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	51%	49%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	96%	4%	0%	100%
South Carolina	82%	18%	0%	100%
South Dakota	88%	12%	0%	100%
Tennessee	88%	12%	0%	100%
Texas	82%	18%	0%	100%
Utah	56%	42%	2%	100%
Vermont	93%	6%	1%	100%
Virgin Islands	98%	2%	0%	100%
Virginia	82%	18%	0%	100%
Washington	66%	19%	15%	100%
West Virginia	96%	3%	1%	100%
Wisconsin	94%	0%	6%	100%
Wyoming	31%	28%	41%	100%
National Total	73%	25%	2%	100%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. In prior years this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB recently decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.

2. These percentages were based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors 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 Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.

5. For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.

6. For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.

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 (FFY 2005)				
State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %	Total Count
Alabama	4%	96%	100%	3722
Alaska	50%	50%	100%	1004
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	0%	100%	3,819
Arkansas	1%	99%	100%	84
California	61%	39%	100%	52,210
Colorado	71%	29%	100%	3,821
Connecticut	79%	21%	100%	4,973
Delaware	83%	17%	100%	710
District of Columbia	89%	11%	100%	35
Florida	4%	96%	100%	10,113
Georgia	79%	21%	100%	3,035
Guam	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	82%	18%	100%	5780
Idaho	35%	65%	100%	4112
Illinois	35%	65%	100%	45,098
Indiana	9%	91%	100%	11,150
Iowa	18%	82%	100%	3,600
Kansas	84%	16%	100%	3,368
Kentucky	60%	40%	100%	5,154
Louisiana	48%	52%	100%	16,060
Maine	51%	49%	100%	635
Maryland	87%	13%	100%	4,585
Massachusetts	80%	20%	100%	2,361
Michigan	100%	0%	100%	50,371
Minnesota	43%	57%	100%	6,536
Mississippi	55%	45%	100%	9,399
Missouri	31%	69%	100%	12,917
Montana	58%	42%	100%	647
Nebraska	3%	97%	100%	2,300
Nevada	15%	85%	100%	984
New Hampshire	30%	70%	100%	1,993
New Jersey	33%	67%	100%	3,988
New Mexico	75%	25%	100%	10,137
New York	42%	58%	100%	60,979
North Carolina	80%	20%	100%	1,996
North Dakota	37%	63%	100%	1314
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	100%	5
Ohio	-	-	-	0
Oklahoma	-	-	-	0
Oregon	29%	71%	100%	12,512
Pennsylvania	41%	59%	100%	27,720
Puerto Rico	63%	37%	100%	2,164
Rhode Island	42%	58%	100%	190
South Carolina	0%	100%	100%	3,557
South Dakota	60%	40%	100%	557
Tennessee	44%	56%	100%	5,023
Texas	100%	0%	100%	21,817
Utah	95%	5%	100%	4,694
Vermont	12%	88%	100%	252
Virgin Islands	50%	50%	100%	8
Virginia	53%	47%	100%	5,417
Washington	98%	2%	100%	10,200
West Virginia	42%	58%	100%	298
Wisconsin	-	-	-	0
Wyoming	60%	40%	100%	1275
National	56%	44%	100%	444,688

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. In prior years this table was based on the AC-F800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB recently decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. Percentages are based on these counts. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 some States there were no children served in unregulated settings and thus the percent is "-" since division by zero is undefined. Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin have no Providers Legally Operating Without Regulation.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
- For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.

Table 6
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in All Types of Care (FFY 2005)

State	Total % of Children	Licensed or Regulated Providers				Providers Legally Operating without Regulation							Invalid / Not Reported
		Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Child's Home		Family Home		Group Home		Center	
						Relative	Non-Relative	Relative	Non-Relative	Relative	Non-Relative		
Alabama	100%	0%	5%	4%	67%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	13%	11%
Alaska	100%	0%	21%	6%	52%	5%	2%	6%	9%	0%	0%	0%	1%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	1%	8%	7%	72%	3%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arkansas	100%	0%	19%	0%	80%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
California	100%	0%	11%	9%	47%	4%	2%	16%	6%	0%	0%	5%	1%
Colorado	100%	0%	19%	0%	60%	5%	1%	9%	5%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Connecticut	100%	0%	12%	0%	32%	23%	7%	18%	1%	0%	0%	3%	4%
Delaware	100%	0%	32%	3%	55%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
District of Columbia	100%	0%	4%	0%	93%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Florida	100%	0%	11%	0%	80%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	1%
Georgia	100%	0%	9%	2%	84%	1%	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	100%	0%	7%	0%	28%	11%	2%	42%	7%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	13%	48%	1%	1%	13%	24%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Illinois	100%	0%	18%	1%	28%	12%	13%	7%	19%	0%	0%	4%	0%
Indiana	100%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%	1%	3%	8%	0%	0%	23%	0%
Iowa	100%	0%	36%	7%	36%	0%	0%	4%	16%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Kansas	100%	0%	8%	40%	32%	3%	3%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Kentucky	100%	0%	8%	2%	77%	0%	0%	9%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Louisiana	100%	0%	0%	0%	69%	11%	6%	3%	7%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Maine	100%	0%	33%	0%	52%	1%	2%	6%	5%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Maryland	100%	0%	37%	0%	40%	10%	3%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	5%	17%	68%	3%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Michigan	100%	0%	7%	9%	14%	28%	0%	36%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
Minnesota	100%	0%	33%	0%	34%	6%	4%	5%	9%	0%	0%	2%	7%
Mississippi	100%	0%	0%	1%	71%	3%	1%	13%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Missouri	100%	0%	11%	2%	44%	1%	1%	10%	17%	0%	0%	6%	7%
Montana	100%	0%	13%	35%	39%	2%	1%	5%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nebraska	100%	0%	22%	8%	53%	0%	0%	1%	17%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Nevada	100%	0%	4%	1%	74%	3%	6%	0%	2%	0%	0%	10%	0%
New Hampshire	100%	0%	8%	0%	56%	3%	4%	5%	16%	0%	0%	0%	8%
New Jersey	100%	0%	12%	0%	74%	1%	1%	3%	6%	0%	0%	0%	4%
New Mexico	100%	0%	2%	6%	48%	2%	1%	31%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New York	100%	0%	10%	9%	30%	9%	9%	11%	17%	0%	0%	2%	3%
North Carolina	100%	0%	17%	0%	81%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
North Dakota	100%	0%	8%	31%	25%	0%	0%	13%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	12%	53%	2%	32%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Ohio	100%	0%	33%	1%	54%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	1%	0%	98%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Oregon	100%	0%	21%	2%	18%	0%	0%	17%	40%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Pennsylvania	100%	0%	7%	5%	48%	6%	8%	10%	15%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Puerto Rico	100%	1%	2%	1%	47%	1%	1%	31%	5%	0%	0%	13%	0%
Rhode Island	100%	0%	29%	0%	67%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Carolina	100%	0%	3%	3%	76%	0%	7%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Dakota	100%	0%	37%	0%	52%	0%	1%	7%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tennessee	100%	0%	6%	5%	78%	2%	0%	4%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Texas	100%	0%	3%	3%	76%	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utah	100%	0%	13%	6%	37%	9%	1%	31%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Vermont	100%	0%	49%	1%	43%	0%	2%	1%	4%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Virgin Islands	100%	8%	0%	6%	84%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Virginia	100%	1%	24%	0%	56%	2%	1%	8%	6%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Washington	100%	0%	25%	0%	41%	14%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%
West Virginia	100%	0%	38%	4%	55%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	35%	0%	59%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
Wyoming	100%	0%	8%	7%	16%	5%	2%	12%	9%	0%	0%	0%	41%
Percentage	100%	0%	13%	4%	56%	5%	3%	9%	6%	0%	0%	2%	2%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. In prior years this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB recently decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- These percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
- For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.

Table 7
Child Care and Development Fund and Additional State Efforts
Preliminary Estimates
Number of Child Care Providers Receiving CCDF Funds (FFY 2005)

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Alabama	16	1,249	288	1,610	3,163
Alaska	884	1,566	87	199	2,736
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	891	4,156	353	1,278	6,678
Arkansas	0	1,310	0	2,086	3,396
California	12,471	62,528	8,010	6,724	89,733
Colorado	1,458	6,428	0	2,744	10,630
Connecticut	5,376	3,673	20	1,575	10,644
Delaware	606	1,436	48	399	2,489
District of Columbia	7	180	0	221	408
Florida	127	7,198	0	8,053	15,378
Georgia	438	3,087	156	3,342	7,023
Guam	76	2	1	59	138
Hawaii	1,075	5,807	8	757	7,647
Idaho	158	2,488	433	526	3,605
Illinois	34,700	50,081	279	3,477	88,537
Indiana	83	3,826	0	1,245	5,154
Iowa	251	7,479	465	767	8,962
Kansas	897	2,423	2,387	743	6,450
Kentucky	-	-	-	-	-
Louisiana	6,226	2,306	0	2,297	10,829
Maine	147	1,753	0	475	2,375
Maryland	2,600	5,519	0	1,505	9,624
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	30,517	41,352	2,891	2,504	77,264
Minnesota	3,328	14,830	0	2,127	20,285
Mississippi	860	5,217	38	1,270	7,385
Missouri	1,023	9,578	198	2,052	12,851
Montana	254	1,452	454	251	2,411
Nebraska	549	3,715	331	625	5,220
Nevada	84	566	8	551	1,209
New Hampshire	539	2,158	0	609	3,306
New Jersey	924	6,497	0	2,527	9,948
New Mexico	9	8,579	187	497	9,272
New York	24,635	56,616	4,365	4,779	90,395
North Carolina	116	4,547	0	4,356	9,019
North Dakota	0	1,903	672	139	2,714
Islands	0	199	0	19	218
Ohio	17	12,171	137	3,672	15,997
Oklahoma	-	-	-	-	-
Oregon	4	12,874	148	800	13,826
Pennsylvania	8,566	28,849	669	3,564	41,648
Puerto Rico	48	3,086	0	734	3,868
Rhode Island	192	1,132	7	334	1,665
South Carolina	1,053	2,163	177	1,144	4,537
South Dakota	63	1,441	84	226	1,814
Tennessee	568	1,702	403	1,742	4,415
Texas	11,690	14,711	975	6,389	33,765
Utah	2,448	6,569	326	506	9,849
Vermont	553	3,027	0	738	4,318
Virgin Islands	0	14	38	93	145
Virginia	-	-	-	-	-
Washington	10,376	8,884	0	2,005	21,265
West Virginia	8	2,865	88	409	3,370
Wisconsin	110	6,573	0	2,267	8,950
Wyoming	719	2,834	264	218	4,035
National Total	167,740	440,599	24,995	87,229	720,563

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 18-JUL-2006

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2005, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because ACF-800 Data Element 6a it 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 one child is counted the same as a provider serving 200 children per day.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and Oklahoma had not yet reported FFY 2005 ACF-800 d
5. Virginia did not report the number of providers.

**Table 8
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Consumer Education Strategies Summary (FFY 2005)**

State	Grants / Contracts / Certificates Info	Resource and Referral	Provider List	Types/ Quality of Care Materials	Health and Safety	Child Care Regulatory Info	Child Care Complaint Policy	Mass Media	Other	Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education
Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	34,921
Alaska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,381
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	158,855
Arkansas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	22,356
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	2,054,455
Colorado	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	121,188
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	65,655
Delaware	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	18,806
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21,000
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	95,324
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	79,894
Guam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,057
Hawaii	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	20,744
Idaho	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	10,453
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	217,390
Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	24,446
Iowa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	30,174
Kansas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	127,009
Kentucky	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Louisiana	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	6,027
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7,438
Maryland	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	225,000
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,165,432
Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,859,277
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	17,993
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	44,215
Montana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,278,937
Nebraska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	449,933
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,339
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	9,848
New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	150,619
New Mexico	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	24,299
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	800,925
North Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	253,816
North Dakota	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,350
Northern Mariana Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	454
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	110,330
Oklahoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	31,776
Pennsylvania	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	187,012
Puerto Rico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11,473
Rhode Island	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	9,200
South Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	20,197
South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	249,165
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	36,754
Texas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	123,402
Utah	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,193
Vermont	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,756
Virgin Islands	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	637
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	40,000
Washington	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	23,127
West Virginia	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8,448
Wisconsin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	50,562
Wyoming	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11,390
Total Yes	32	52	49	52	50	48	48	47	8	10,354,432

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 18-JUL-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2005, an unduplicated annual count.
- 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.
- NA=Not applicable, does not offer grants or contracts for subsidized child care slots.
- A blank cell indicates that the State did not provide a response.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and Oklahoma had not yet reported FFY 2005 ACF-800 data.

Table 9
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Children In Care By Age Group (FFY 2005)

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	6%	9%	12%	14%	14%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	4%	8%	10%	13%	16%	14%	34%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	6%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	10%	15%	17%	16%	13%	9%	20%	0%	0%	100%
California	3%	5%	9%	14%	18%	12%	40%	0%	0%	100%
Colorado	7%	12%	13%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	5%	9%	11%	13%	13%	10%	39%	1%	0%	100%
Delaware	8%	12%	12%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	6%	13%	17%	18%	13%	8%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	6%	11%	13%	14%	15%	12%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	8%	13%	14%	14%	12%	9%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	5%	11%	13%	15%	19%	8%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	6%	9%	10%	11%	11%	9%	43%	1%	0%	100%
Indiana	4%	10%	12%	14%	13%	12%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	8%	12%	13%	13%	11%	9%	34%	1%	0%	100%
Kansas	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	8%	13%	15%	15%	11%	8%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	4%	8%	11%	15%	16%	12%	33%	1%	0%	100%
Maryland	4%	8%	11%	12%	13%	11%	41%	1%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	5%	10%	11%	13%	13%	10%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Michigan	6%	9%	10%	10%	10%	9%	45%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	6%	12%	13%	13%	12%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	5%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	35%	1%	0%	100%
Missouri	7%	11%	12%	13%	13%	10%	29%	0%	5%	100%
Montana	7%	12%	13%	14%	14%	11%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	9%	13%	13%	13%	12%	10%	30%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	7%	12%	14%	13%	14%	11%	30%	0%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	5%	10%	13%	14%	14%	12%	32%	0%	0%	100%
New Jersey	4%	10%	13%	13%	11%	10%	38%	2%	0%	100%
New Mexico	7%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
New York	4%	8%	10%	12%	13%	10%	43%	1%	0%	100%
North Carolina	5%	9%	11%	12%	13%	11%	40%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	10%	14%	13%	13%	12%	10%	28%	1%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	6%	12%	14%	14%	14%	11%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	7%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	9%	14%	15%	15%	12%	10%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	7%	11%	11%	11%	12%	11%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	5%	9%	11%	11%	12%	11%	41%	1%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	3%	7%	12%	19%	19%	10%	29%	2%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	4%	9%	11%	12%	12%	11%	40%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	7%	12%	14%	14%	13%	10%	31%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	9%	13%	14%	14%	14%	11%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	6%	12%	13%	13%	13%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	8%	12%	14%	13%	12%	9%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Utah	6%	10%	12%	12%	13%	11%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	10%	13%	14%	14%	11%	34%	1%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	2%	5%	11%	17%	18%	12%	33%	1%	0%	100%
Virginia	5%	11%	14%	14%	13%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	6%	12%	12%	12%	13%	11%	35%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	10%	12%	13%	13%	10%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	7%	11%	12%	13%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	7%	13%	14%	15%	14%	11%	27%	0%	0%	100%
National	6%	10%	12%	13%	13%	10%	36%	0%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.

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. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).

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 Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.

6. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

7. 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 (FFY 2005)

State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Emp & Training/Education	Protective Services	Other	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	78%	8%	4%	9%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	86%	3%	8%	0%	4%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	70%	1%	7%	20%	2%	0%	100%
Arkansas	75%	10%	1%	6%	8%	0%	100%
California	85%	6%	5%	2%	3%	0%	100%
Colorado	78%	15%	4%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Connecticut	92%	7%	1%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	86%	5%	2%	2%	5%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	56%	34%	3%	1%	7%	0%	100%
Florida	76%	4%	6%	12%	2%	0%	100%
Georgia	74%	14%	2%	7%	1%	1%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	82%	4%	11%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Idaho	72%	12%	17%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	89%	4%	2%	0%	5%	0%	100%
Indiana	72%	8%	8%	0%	12%	0%	100%
Iowa	80%	12%	1%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	91%	7%	2%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Kentucky	71%	9%	2%	10%	0%	8%	100%
Louisiana	79%	8%	10%	4%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	85%	5%	5%	2%	2%	0%	100%
Maryland	80%	13%	6%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	77%	10%	0%	7%	4%	3%	100%
Michigan	86%	9%	2%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	81%	6%	9%	0%	5%	0%	100%
Mississippi	75%	12%	8%	1%	4%	0%	100%
Missouri	64%	21%	1%	10%	1%	2%	100%
Montana	64%	12%	17%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	71%	14%	3%	12%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	84%	9%	3%	0%	5%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	81%	10%	0%	7%	1%	0%	100%
New Jersey	80%	3%	3%	5%	10%	0%	100%
New Mexico	61%	12%	11%	0%	16%	0%	100%
New York	72%	16%	2%	0%	9%	0%	100%
North Carolina	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	78%	13%	7%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	66%	27%	7%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	68%	18%	4%	0%	10%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	67%	9%	21%	3%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	74%	4%	20%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	49%	6%	2%	0%	0%	43%	100%
Puerto Rico	69%	21%	8%	1%	1%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	90%	8%	2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	63%	10%	12%	15%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	43%	37%	19%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Texas	72%	24%	2%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Utah	82%	3%	3%	0%	12%	0%	100%
Vermont	68%	13%	1%	13%	5%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	84%	10%	1%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	84%	6%	8%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Washington	83%	7%	1%	8%	1%	0%	100%
West Virginia	77%	14%	9%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	91%	1%	6%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Wyoming	89%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
National	76%	11%	5%	3%	3%	2%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- 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.
- Several States only capture the primary reason for receiving services and therefore do not report any families in the Both Employment and Training/Education category. States reporting no families in this combination category of Both Employment and Training Education" include New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Wyoming.
- Inconsistencies in income reporting appear in several States between ACF-801 element 6 (reason for receiving a subsidy, element 9 (total income for determining eligibility), and elements 10 through 15 (the sources of income). For example, element 6 may indicate that the reason is employment, element 10 may indicate employment as an income source, and element 9 may show a monthly income of \$0. All combinations of inconsistencies between these three types of data elements have been observed.
- Connecticut reports that they inadvertently did not code families in protective services as such.

Table 11 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Racial Group (FFY 2005)								
State	Native American / Alaskan	Asian	Black / African American	Native Hawaiian / Pacific	White	Multi-Racial	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	0%	76%	0%	23%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	7%	3%	11%	2%	49%	15%	13%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%
Arizona	5%	0%	14%	1%	78%	3%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	1%	64%	0%	35%	1%	0%	100%
California	2%	5%	21%	1%	46%	1%	24%	100%
Colorado	1%	1%	15%	0%	43%	2%	39%	100%
Connecticut	0%	0%	37%	0%	24%	5%	33%	100%
Delaware	0%	0%	66%	1%	33%	1%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	0%	93%	0%	5%	0%	2%	100%
Florida	0%	0%	51%	0%	47%	2%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	0%	78%	0%	19%	2%	1%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	0%	37%	1%	36%	12%	14%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	0%	1%	0%	95%	2%	1%	100%
Illinois	0%	1%	65%	1%	18%	1%	14%	100%
Indiana	1%	0%	51%	0%	41%	7%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	0%	20%	0%	79%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	1%	0%	28%	0%	64%	2%	5%	100%
Kentucky	0%	0%	32%	0%	60%	0%	8%	100%
Louisiana	0%	0%	80%	0%	19%	1%	0%	100%
Maine	1%	1%	3%	0%	85%	5%	5%	100%
Maryland	0%	0%	82%	0%	15%	1%	2%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	2%	17%	0%	28%	1%	53%	100%
Michigan	1%	0%	58%	0%	40%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	3%	3%	34%	0%	58%	2%	0%	100%
Mississippi	0%	0%	89%	0%	10%	1%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	0%	56%	0%	42%	1%	1%	100%
Montana	12%	0%	2%	0%	82%	4%	0%	100%
Nebraska	3%	1%	25%	0%	70%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	2%	1%	29%	1%	60%	8%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	0%	0%	1%	0%	22%	1%	76%	100%
New Jersey	0%	2%	57%	12%	21%	2%	6%	100%
New Mexico	6%	0%	4%	0%	86%	4%	0%	100%
New York	1%	1%	45%	1%	31%	1%	21%	100%
North Carolina	3%	1%	61%	0%	36%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	21%	0%	3%	0%	73%	3%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	0%	56%	0%	41%	1%	2%	100%
Oklahoma	9%	1%	30%	0%	61%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	2%	2%	10%	0%	85%	1%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	1%	33%	0%	63%	1%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	0%	0%	0%	58%	0%	42%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	1%	9%	0%	22%	0%	68%	100%
South Carolina	0%	0%	0%	0%	24%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	18%	1%	4%	1%	73%	4%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	0%	72%	0%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	0%	35%	0%	39%	1%	25%	100%
Utah	3%	2%	4%	0%	91%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	0%	1%	2%	0%	97%	1%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	4%	1%	95%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	9%	2%	63%	0%	25%	2%	0%	100%
Washington	2%	0%	1%	0%	42%	0%	45%	100%
West Virginia	0%	0%	13%	0%	76%	9%	2%	100%
Wisconsin	2%	2%	41%	0%	45%	3%	7%	100%
Wyoming	3%	0%	4%	0%	81%	0%	12%	100%
National	1%	1%	44%	1%	41%	1%	10%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- 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.
- 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.
- Several States including Washington are still reporting ethnicity (Latino/Hispanic) as a race rather than as an ethnicity in accordance with the Pre-FFY 2000 Technical Bulletin 3 standard. In many of these instances if a child is designated as Latino, no race is designated. In many states including Texas, Illinois, Louisiana, and Wisconsin self-reporting of race is optional and no race will be reported other than self reporting.
- National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.

Table 12
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Latino Ethnicity (FFY 2005)

State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	1%	99%	0%	100%
Alaska	9%	91%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	100%
Arizona	47%	54%	0%	100%
Arkansas	1%	99%	0%	100%
California	50%	48%	2%	100%
Colorado	35%	65%	0%	100%
Connecticut	36%	64%	0%	100%
Delaware	8%	92%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	7%	93%	0%	100%
Florida	23%	77%	0%	100%
Georgia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	4%	96%	0%	100%
Idaho	15%	85%	0%	100%
Illinois	12%	85%	3%	100%
Indiana	6%	94%	0%	100%
Iowa	7%	94%	0%	100%
Kansas	10%	90%	0%	100%
Kentucky	3%	92%	5%	100%
Louisiana	2%	98%	0%	100%
Maine	2%	98%	0%	100%
Maryland	2%	98%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	32%	68%	0%	100%
Michigan	4%	96%	0%	100%
Minnesota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Mississippi	1%	100%	0%	100%
Missouri	3%	97%	0%	100%
Montana	6%	94%	0%	100%
Nebraska	10%	90%	0%	100%
Nevada	26%	75%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	2%	0%	98%	100%
New Jersey	27%	73%	0%	100%
New Mexico	74%	26%	0%	100%
New York	19%	81%	0%	100%
North Carolina	5%	95%	0%	100%
North Dakota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	4%	96%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	7%	93%	0%	100%
Oregon	19%	81%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	7%	93%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	23%	77%	0%	100%
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%	100%
South Dakota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	99%	0%	100%
Texas	44%	56%	0%	100%
Utah	14%	86%	0%	100%
Vermont	1%	99%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	12%	88%	0%	100%
Virginia	12%	88%	0%	100%
Washington	15%	85%	0%	100%
West Virginia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	8%	93%	0%	100%
Wyoming	12%	88%	0%	100%
National	18%	81%	1%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The Invalid/Not Reported category includes children where anything other than a No (0) or Yes (1) was in the Ethnicity field.
- National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.

Table 13 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children in Child Care by Age Category and Care Type (FFY 2005)					
Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Infants (0 to <1 yr)	7%	34%	5%	54%	100%
Toddlers (1 yr to <3 yrs)	6%	29%	5%	60%	100%
Preschool (3 yrs to <6 yrs)	6%	23%	4%	67%	100%
School Age (6 yrs to <13 yrs)	12%	33%	4%	51%	100%
13 years and older	23%	47%	2%	28%	100%
All Ages	8%	29%	4%	59%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: **20-JUN-2006**

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.
2. All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
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 Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
6. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
7. Nationally 2.5% of the children were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one more setting elements of the child's setting record(s) were invalid or not reported.
8. 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.
9. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. If a child was in more than one of the above setting categories within the same month, the child was 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 setting 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 (FFY 2005)					
Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	161	159	153	161	160
1 to < 2 yrs	165	164	166	168	167
2 to < 3 yrs	168	165	161	169	168
3 to < 4 yrs	168	164	163	168	167
4 to < 5 yrs	164	162	160	163	163
5 to < 6 yrs	153	147	141	143	145
6 to < 13 yrs	139	131	118	112	122
13+ yrs	137	126	130	104	123
National	150	148	145	146	147

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.
- 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.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- Nationally 2.5% of the children were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one or more setting elements of a child's setting record was invalid or not reported. Wisconsin reports 0-hours (data element 26) with \$0 cost (data element 27) for some children authorized or previously authorized for care that do not receive any care which would be considered invalid.
- 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.
- Some States have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized rather than the actual number of hours service provided.

Table 15
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Expenditures for Children In Care By Age Group and Care Type (FFY 2005)

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$276	\$353	\$448	\$434	\$396
1 to < 2 yrs	\$303	\$365	\$471	\$444	\$411
2 to < 3 yrs	\$296	\$358	\$444	\$428	\$402
3 to < 4 yrs	\$285	\$343	\$441	\$416	\$394
4 to < 5 yrs	\$282	\$338	\$436	\$417	\$393
5 to < 6 yrs	\$266	\$311	\$391	\$369	\$349
6 to < 13 yrs	\$252	\$285	\$351	\$290	\$286
13+ yrs	\$260	\$277	\$320	\$282	\$276
National	\$267	\$320	\$410	\$376	\$353

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005.
- Average cost per month were based on sums of costs per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-80 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- Nationally 2.5% of the children were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one or more setting elements of a child's setting record was invalid or not reported. Wisconsin reports 0-hours (data element 26) with \$0 cost (data element 27) for some children authorized or previously authorized for care that do not receive any care which would be considered invalid.
- 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 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.
- The current Technical Bulletin 3 indicates that a payment over \$1000 per month is considered above the Out of Range Standard and therefore is considered invalid. However, the market survey data from the highest cost areas of some states shows that the 75-percentile full-time child care market rate cost is above \$1000 per month. In addition several States have indicated in their ACF-801 notes that they have valid costs over \$1000. States that fall in at least one of these categories include: Minnesota, Massachusetts, The District of Columbia, Wisconsin, California, Washington, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, New York and Oregon. Nationally approximately 1% of the reported cost data in FFY 2005 exceeded \$1000 and no state had more than 5% exceeding \$1,000. (Note that some of these data percentages with costs over \$1,000 were very large and thus clearly invalid.) The Child Care Bureau is currently planning on increasing this Out of Range Standard to \$2000 effective October 1, 2006.
- Some States have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized rather than the actual number of hours service provided.

Table 16 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percent of Families Receiving TANF (FFY 2005)				
State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	13%	87%	0%	100%
Alaska	11%	89%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	22%	78%	0%	100%
Arkansas	37%	63%	0%	100%
California	11%	88%	0%	100%
Colorado	18%	82%	0%	100%
Connecticut	71%	29%	0%	100%
Delaware	13%	87%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	20%	80%	0%	100%
Florida	10%	89%	1%	100%
Georgia	15%	85%	0%	100%
Guam	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	17%	83%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	98%	0%	100%
Illinois	7%	94%	0%	100%
Indiana	30%	70%	0%	100%
Iowa	38%	62%	0%	100%
Kansas	10%	90%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	99%	0%	100%
Louisiana	13%	84%	4%	100%
Maine	4%	96%	0%	100%
Maryland	18%	82%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	21%	79%	0%	100%
Michigan	45%	55%	0%	100%
Minnesota	36%	64%	0%	100%
Mississippi	22%	78%	0%	100%
Missouri	25%	75%	0%	100%
Montana	13%	87%	0%	100%
Nebraska	28%	72%	0%	100%
Nevada	28%	72%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	29%	66%	7%	100%
New Jersey	15%	85%	0%	100%
New Mexico	17%	83%	0%	100%
New York	39%	61%	0%	100%
North Carolina	7%	93%	0%	100%
North Dakota	20%	80%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	18%	82%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	15%	85%	0%	100%
Oregon	33%	67%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	9%	47%	43%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	100%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	9%	91%	0%	100%
South Carolina	46%	54%	0%	100%
South Dakota	7%	93%	0%	100%
Tennessee	62%	38%	0%	100%
Texas	2%	98%	0%	100%
Utah	11%	89%	0%	100%
Vermont	17%	83%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	2%	97%	0%	100%
Virginia	26%	74%	0%	100%
Washington	20%	80%	0%	100%
West Virginia	9%	91%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	7%	93%	0%	100%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	100%
National	19%	79%	2%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2005
- These percentages were based on the "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The percentage shown as "Yes" is the number reported as "Yes" divided by the families that answered "Yes" or "No" excluding families that were in protective services. The Invalid/Not Reported column includes families that did not indicate whether TANF was a source of income or not and the family was reported as being in protective services.

Table 17 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Mean Family Co-payment as a Percent of Family Income (FFY 2005)						
State/Territories	Percent of Families				Mean CoPay/Income	
	Families with \$0 Income; Headed by a Child; In Protective Services; Invalid CoPay or Income (Category A)	Families with \$0 CoPay (and not in Category A)	Families with CoPay > \$0 (and not in Category A)	Total of All Families	Including Families with \$0 CoPay	Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay
Alabama	23%	8%	69%	100%	6%	7%
Alaska	7%	10%	83%	100%	4%	4%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	23%	11%	65%	100%	4%	5%
Arkansas	10%	71%	18%	100%	2%	9%
California	5%	69%	27%	100%	1%	3%
Colorado	30%	7%	64%	100%	8%	9%
Connecticut	11%	3%	86%	100%	5%	5%
Delaware	12%	40%	48%	100%	5%	9%
District of Columbia	43%	19%	37%	100%	3%	4%
Florida	17%	1%	83%	100%	6%	6%
Georgia	19%	15%	66%	100%	6%	8%
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	4%	46%	50%	100%	2%	3%
Idaho	11%	0%	89%	100%	10%	10%
Illinois	4%	1%	95%	100%	6%	6%
Indiana	1%	78%	21%	100%	1%	6%
Iowa	12%	57%	31%	100%	2%	6%
Kansas	21%	18%	61%	100%	5%	6%
Kentucky	21%	22%	57%	100%	5%	7%
Louisiana	5%	8%	87%	100%	13%	14%
Maine	7%	3%	90%	100%	8%	8%
Maryland	4%	26%	70%	100%	6%	8%
Massachusetts	17%	29%	54%	100%	6%	9%
Michigan	6%	23%	71%	100%	2%	3%
Minnesota	8%	24%	69%	100%	4%	5%
Mississippi	21%	7%	72%	100%	4%	4%
Missouri	28%	24%	48%	100%	4%	6%
Montana	9%	0%	91%	100%	4%	4%
Nebraska	40%	45%	15%	100%	2%	9%
Nevada	3%	24%	73%	100%	5%	7%
New Hampshire	17%	34%	50%	100%	0%	0%
New Jersey	12%	16%	72%	100%	6%	7%
New Mexico	7%	20%	73%	100%	4%	5%
New York	8%	34%	58%	100%	3%	5%
North Carolina	14%	6%	80%	100%	8%	8%
North Dakota	29%	0%	71%	100%	15%	15%
Northern Mariana Islands	22%	0%	79%	100%	8%	8%
Ohio	8%	6%	87%	100%	6%	7%
Oklahoma	20%	52%	27%	100%	0%	1%
Oregon	32%	7%	61%	100%	7%	8%
Pennsylvania	47%	7%	46%	100%	4%	4%
Puerto Rico	17%	36%	47%	100%	2%	4%
Rhode Island	5%	29%	67%	100%	3%	5%
South Carolina	7%	0%	93%	100%	4%	4%
South Dakota	21%	45%	34%	100%	5%	11%
Tennessee	1%	80%	20%	100%	0%	1%
Texas	28%	6%	66%	100%	9%	10%
Utah	3%	15%	83%	100%	4%	4%
Vermont	27%	20%	53%	100%	4%	5%
Virgin Islands	7%	72%	21%	100%	0%	0%
Virginia	4%	27%	69%	100%	7%	10%
Washington	21%	60%	19%	100%	2%	7%
West Virginia	6%	14%	80%	100%	4%	5%
Wisconsin	16%	3%	81%	100%	6%	6%
Wyoming	13%	2%	85%	100%	5%	5%
National	15%	25%	61%	100%	5%	6%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 20-JUN-2006

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2005.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. A few States have indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all these factors into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 were 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 were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- 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.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2005. One other Territory submitted less than 12 months of ACF-801 data; the Northern Mariana Islands submitted nine (9) months.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Wisconsin has been reporting some children that are authorized for care but do not receive care. Nebraska has been reporting child records for some children that do not receive a subsidy if other children in the same family are receiving a subsidy. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served by CCDF due to sampling difficulties the State is trying to resolve. Furthermore Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The "Mean CoPay/Income" columns exclude families with zero income because dividing by zero is undefined.
Columns labeled as "Category A" include: families with zero income; families in protective services or families headed by a child; families with invalid income or copay.
- 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% and equals the sum of families shown in Table 1.
- 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.
- 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.