

**Table 1  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Average Monthly Adjusted Number of Families and Children Served (FFY 2007)**

States/Territories	Average Number of Families	Average Number of Children
Alabama	16,800	31,700
Alaska	2,300	3,800
American Samoa	-	-
Arizona	18,000	29,800
Arkansas	4,000	5,800
California	93,500	147,100
Colorado	9,200	16,500
Connecticut	6,200	9,700
Delaware	4,200	7,000
District of Columbia	2,700	3,900
Florida	71,800	108,900
Georgia	28,300	53,600
Guam	-	-
Hawaii	6,400	10,000
Idaho	4,600	8,700
Illinois	41,300	76,200
Indiana	18,400	35,200
Iowa	10,900	19,200
Kansas	12,000	22,500
Kentucky	16,400	29,400
Louisiana	27,300	44,800
Maine	3,900	5,800
Maryland	13,900	23,900
Massachusetts	20,700	28,600
Michigan	38,700	75,500
Minnesota	14,000	25,600
Mississippi	16,600	30,600
Missouri	19,300	31,400
Montana	2,900	4,800
Nebraska	8,400	14,900
Nevada	3,600	6,100
New Hampshire	5,200	7,600
New Jersey	24,300	35,100
New Mexico	12,600	21,300
New York	69,400	115,500
North Carolina	30,700	64,200
North Dakota	2,300	3,800
Northern Mariana Islands	200	500
Ohio	31,200	54,600
Oklahoma	13,300	22,600
Oregon	10,500	19,600
Pennsylvania	53,400	94,900
Puerto Rico	7,400	9,100
Rhode Island	4,700	7,700
South Carolina	11,700	20,500
South Dakota	3,200	5,100
Tennessee	21,100	40,400
Texas	71,300	132,000
Utah	6,700	12,600
Vermont	4,200	6,100
Virgin Islands	300	500
Virginia	15,000	24,400
Washington	34,700	56,700
West Virginia	5,500	9,300
Wisconsin	14,500	25,700
Wyoming	2,700	4,400
<b>National Total</b>	<b>992,400</b>	<b>1,705,200</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- 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 2007)**

State	Grants/Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %	Total
Alabama	0%	100%	0%	52,836
Alaska	0%	84%	16%	10,729
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	0%	100%	0%	82,323
Arkansas	43%	57%	0%	51,486
California	37%	63%	0%	371,153
Colorado	1%	98%	1%	36,114
Connecticut	31%	69%	0%	44,771
Delaware	0%	100%	0%	21,582
District of Columbia	0%	100%	0%	11,721
Florida	53%	47%	0%	248,877
Georgia	0%	100%	0%	101,155
Guam	43%	57%	0%	2,042
Hawaii	42%	0%	58%	26,183
Idaho	0%	100%	0%	16,032
Illinois	8%	92%	0%	289,350
Indiana	2%	98%	0%	56,566
Iowa	0%	100%	0%	38,314
Kansas	0%	100%	0%	39,027
Kentucky	0%	100%	0%	71,557
Louisiana	0%	100%	0%	95,464
Maine	29%	70%	1%	8,881
Maryland	0%	100%	0%	39,854
Massachusetts	44%	56%	0%	93,976
Michigan	0%	71%	29%	183,315
Minnesota	0%	100%	0%	59,873
Mississippi	3%	97%	0%	48,932
Missouri	0%	100%	0%	75,137
Montana	0%	97%	3%	10,874
Nebraska	0%	100%	0%	32,292
Nevada	19%	81%	0%	18,002
New Hampshire	0%	100%	0%	12,838
New Jersey	19%	81%	0%	72,134
New Mexico	0%	100%	0%	36,497
New York	20%	80%	0%	214,307
North Carolina	0%	100%	0%	145,630
North Dakota	0%	100%	0%	8,243
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	100%	516
Ohio	0%	100%	0%	175,279
Oklahoma	0%	100%	0%	59,537
Oregon	3%	97%	0%	39,011
Pennsylvania	0%	82%	18%	196,802
Puerto Rico	66%	34%	0%	14,577
Rhode Island	0%	100%	0%	17,663
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%	37,964
South Dakota	1%	99%	0%	9,997
Tennessee	0%	100%	0%	74,924
Texas	0%	100%	0%	243,068
Utah	0%	0%	100%	25,372
Vermont	1%	99%	0%	12,779
Virgin Islands	0%	100%	0%	973
Virginia	0%	100%	0%	52,401
Washington	0%	100%	0%	113,266
West Virginia	0%	100%	0%	24,943
Wisconsin	0%	100%	0%	93,649
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	8,207
<b>National Total</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3,928,995</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 11-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2007. 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 had not reported any ACF-800 data for FFY 2007.

**Table 3**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care (FFY 2007)**

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	14%	3%	82%	1%	100%
Alaska	16%	30%	7%	48%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	3%	15%	7%	75%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	17%	0%	83%	0%	100%
California	4%	38%	10%	45%	0%	100%
Colorado	3%	25%	0%	72%	3%	100%
Connecticut	22%	30%	0%	43%	3%	100%
Delaware	3%	34%	3%	58%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	5%	0%	95%	1%	100%
Florida	1%	10%	0%	80%	0%	100%
Georgia	1%	12%	2%	85%	0%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	17%	50%	0%	30%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	32%	15%	51%	0%	100%
Illinois	20%	44%	1%	31%	0%	100%
Indiana	1%	43%	0%	32%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	54%	6%	40%	0%	100%
Kansas	5%	21%	40%	34%	0%	100%
Kentucky	0%	16%	2%	82%	0%	100%
Louisiana	10%	11%	0%	77%	0%	100%
Maine	3%	43%	0%	54%	0%	100%
Maryland	11%	47%	0%	42%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	3%	1%	26%	70%	0%	100%
Michigan	28%	44%	10%	17%	1%	100%
Minnesota	13%	47%	0%	37%	0%	100%
Mississippi	3%	21%	1%	76%	0%	100%
Missouri	1%	39%	2%	51%	2%	100%
Montana	4%	20%	39%	38%	0%	100%
Nebraska	0%	38%	8%	54%	0%	100%
Nevada	8%	6%	1%	67%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	6%	32%	0%	62%	1%	100%
New Jersey	2%	18%	0%	81%	4%	100%
New Mexico	1%	32%	6%	61%	2%	100%
New York	16%	40%	11%	31%	0%	100%
North Carolina	0%	16%	0%	84%	1%	100%
North Dakota	0%	42%	33%	25%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	7%	37%	7%	49%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	30%	2%	68%	9%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	25%	0%	75%	0%	100%
Oregon	21%	56%	4%	17%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	3%	42%	4%	52%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	5%	26%	1%	61%	2%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	34%	0%	65%	0%	100%
South Carolina	5%	16%	3%	77%	0%	100%
South Dakota	1%	47%	0%	52%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	15%	5%	79%	0%	100%
Texas	5%	11%	2%	82%	0%	100%
Utah	11%	43%	7%	39%	2%	100%
Vermont	0%	50%	0%	50%	2%	100%
Virgin Islands	8%	0%	4%	87%	0%	100%
Virginia	6%	30%	1%	60%	0%	100%
Washington	11%	32%	0%	57%	14%	100%
West Virginia	0%	33%	5%	60%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	0%	32%	0%	68%	4%	100%
Wyoming	6%	26%	5%	63%	50%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007. In years prior to FFY 2005, this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 2007.
- 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).
- 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.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.

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 2007)				
State	Licensed/ Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	71%	28%	1%	100%
Alaska	73%	27%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	90%	10%	0%	100%
Arkansas	99%	1%	0%	100%
California	70%	30%	0%	100%
Colorado	88%	8%	3%	100%
Connecticut	53%	44%	3%	100%
Delaware	90%	10%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	98%	1%	1%	100%
Florida	90%	10%	0%	100%
Georgia	96%	4%	0%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	37%	63%	0%	100%
Idaho	66%	34%	0%	100%
Illinois	52%	48%	0%	100%
Indiana	68%	32%	0%	100%
Iowa	83%	17%	0%	100%
Kansas	84%	16%	0%	100%
Kentucky	90%	10%	0%	100%
Louisiana	77%	23%	0%	100%
Maine	86%	14%	0%	100%
Maryland	79%	21%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	96%	4%	0%	100%
Michigan	33%	66%	1%	100%
Minnesota	72%	28%	0%	100%
Mississippi	76%	24%	0%	100%
Missouri	62%	36%	2%	100%
Montana	86%	14%	0%	100%
Nebraska	81%	19%	0%	100%
Nevada	72%	28%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	69%	30%	1%	100%
New Jersey	87%	9%	4%	100%
New Mexico	67%	31%	2%	100%
New York	54%	46%	0%	100%
North Carolina	98%	1%	1%	100%
North Dakota	65%	35%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	56%	44%	0%	100%
Ohio	91%	0%	9%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	42%	58%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	61%	37%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	67%	31%	2%	100%
Rhode Island	98%	2%	0%	100%
South Carolina	84%	16%	0%	100%
South Dakota	87%	13%	0%	100%
Tennessee	90%	10%	0%	100%
Texas	87%	13%	0%	100%
Utah	55%	43%	2%	100%
Vermont	98%	0%	2%	100%
Virgin Islands	98%	2%	0%	100%
Virginia	81%	19%	0%	100%
Washington	68%	18%	14%	100%
West Virginia	97%	3%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	96%	0%	4%	100%
Wyoming	27%	23%	50%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007. In years prior to FFY 2005, this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. 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 Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
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 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.
7. The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.

**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 2007)**

State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %	Total Count
Alabama	99%	1%	100%	916
Alaska	85%	15%	100%	1,031
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	100%	0%	100%	2,897
Arkansas	2%	98%	100%	46
California	74%	26%	100%	39,717
Colorado	75%	25%	100%	1,381
Connecticut	77%	23%	100%	3,805
Delaware	99%	1%	100%	547
District of Columbia	100%	0%	100%	41
Florida	22%	78%	100%	936
Georgia	80%	20%	100%	2,173
Guam	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	87%	13%	100%	5,996
Idaho	34%	66%	100%	2,939
Illinois	36%	64%	100%	33,582
Indiana	30%	70%	100%	2,608
Iowa	14%	86%	100%	3,339
Kansas	84%	16%	100%	3,548
Kentucky	51%	49%	100%	2,983
Louisiana	51%	49%	100%	9,638
Maine	51%	49%	100%	805
Maryland	47%	53%	100%	5,073
Massachusetts	78%	22%	100%	1,140
Michigan	100%	0%	100%	49,624
Minnesota	49%	51%	100%	6,504
Mississippi	54%	46%	100%	7,242
Missouri	7%	93%	100%	8,919
Montana	59%	41%	100%	654
Nebraska	3%	97%	100%	2,754
Nevada	25%	75%	100%	550
New Hampshire	29%	71%	100%	2,292
New Jersey	37%	63%	100%	3,030
New Mexico	72%	28%	100%	6,677
New York	45%	55%	100%	50,328
North Carolina	73%	27%	100%	799
North Dakota	36%	64%	100%	1,318
Northern Mariana Islands	99%	2%	100%	200
Ohio	NA	NA	NA	0
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	0
Oregon	31%	69%	100%	11,173
Pennsylvania	55%	45%	100%	35,058
Puerto Rico	83%	17%	100%	2,210
Rhode Island	65%	35%	100%	162
South Carolina	0%	100%	100%	3,199
South Dakota	61%	39%	100%	683
Tennessee	39%	61%	100%	3,850
Texas	100%	0%	100%	17,230
Utah	95%	5%	100%	5,377
Vermont	NA	NA	NA	0
Virgin Islands	50%	50%	100%	10
Virginia	47%	53%	100%	3,885
Washington	99%	1%	100%	10,038
West Virginia	64%	36%	100%	96
Wisconsin	NA	NA	NA	0
Wyoming	61%	39%	100%	1,031
<b>National Total</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>360,039</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007. In years prior to FFY 2005, this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 this table, centers operating without regulation (data element 26 = 11) were considered Non-Relative.
- 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: Ohio, Oklahoma, Vermont and Wisconsin.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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).
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.

**Table 6  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates**

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%	11%	3%	57%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	25%	1%
Alaska	100%	0%	19%	7%	48%	15%	1%	8%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	100%	0%	7%	7%	75%	2%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arkansas	100%	0%	16%	0%	83%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
California	100%	0%	15%	10%	45%	3%	1%	17%	6%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Colorado	100%	0%	19%	0%	69%	2%	0%	4%	2%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Connecticut	100%	0%	13%	0%	40%	16%	6%	15%	3%	0%	0%	5%	3%
Delaware	100%	0%	29%	3%	58%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
District of Columbia	100%	0%	4%	0%	94%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Florida	100%	0%	10%	0%	80%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%
Georgia	100%	0%	9%	2%	85%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Guam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	100%	0%	7%	0%	30%	15%	2%	37%	6%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	15%	51%	1%	1%	11%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Illinois	100%	0%	20%	1%	31%	9%	11%	7%	18%	0%	0%	4%	0%
Indiana	100%	0%	36%	0%	32%	0%	0%	2%	5%	0%	0%	24%	0%
Iowa	100%	0%	37%	6%	40%	0%	0%	2%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kansas	100%	0%	10%	40%	34%	2%	2%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kentucky	100%	0%	6%	2%	82%	0%	0%	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Louisiana	100%	0%	0%	0%	77%	7%	3%	4%	8%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Maine	100%	0%	32%	0%	54%	1%	2%	6%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maryland	100%	0%	37%	0%	42%	5%	6%	5%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	0%	26%	70%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Michigan	100%	0%	7%	10%	17%	28%	0%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Minnesota	100%	0%	34%	0%	37%	8%	5%	5%	8%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Mississippi	100%	0%	0%	1%	76%	2%	1%	11%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Missouri	100%	0%	11%	2%	49%	0%	0%	2%	26%	0%	0%	8%	2%
Montana	100%	0%	10%	39%	38%	3%	1%	5%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nebraska	100%	0%	19%	8%	54%	0%	0%	1%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nevada	100%	0%	4%	1%	67%	2%	6%	0%	1%	0%	0%	19%	0%
New Hampshire	100%	0%	8%	0%	61%	3%	3%	6%	18%	0%	0%	0%	1%
New Jersey	100%	0%	11%	0%	76%	1%	1%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4%
New Mexico	100%	0%	2%	6%	59%	0%	0%	22%	8%	0%	0%	0%	2%
New York	100%	0%	12%	11%	31%	8%	7%	11%	17%	0%	0%	2%	0%
North Carolina	100%	0%	15%	0%	83%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
North Dakota	100%	0%	7%	33%	25%	0%	0%	13%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	0%	7%	49%	7%	0%	36%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Ohio	100%	0%	30%	2%	59%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Oregon	100%	0%	21%	3%	17%	10%	11%	8%	27%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Pennsylvania	100%	0%	7%	4%	50%	2%	1%	19%	15%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Puerto Rico	100%	4%	3%	1%	60%	1%	0%	19%	4%	0%	0%	7%	2%
Rhode Island	100%	0%	32%	0%	65%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Carolina	100%	0%	5%	3%	77%	0%	5%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Dakota	100%	0%	35%	0%	52%	0%	1%	8%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tennessee	100%	0%	6%	5%	79%	1%	0%	3%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Texas	100%	0%	3%	2%	82%	5%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utah	100%	0%	11%	7%	37%	11%	1%	30%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%
Vermont	100%	0%	50%	0%	48%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Virgin Islands	100%	7%	0%	4%	87%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Virginia	100%	2%	18%	0%	60%	2%	2%	5%	7%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Washington	100%	0%	25%	0%	43%	11%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
West Virginia	100%	0%	32%	5%	60%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	32%	0%	64%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Wyoming	100%	0%	8%	5%	14%	4%	2%	10%	7%	0%	0%	0%	50%
<b>National Percentage</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007. In years prior to FFY 2005 this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- These percentages were 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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).
- 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.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.

**Table 7**  
**Child Care and Development Fund and Additional State Efforts**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Number of Child Care Providers Receiving CCDF Funds (FFY 2007)**

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Alabama	19	1,280	246	1,700	3,245
Alaska	455	813	94	202	1,564
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	734	3,597	350	1,353	6,034
Arkansas	0	603	0	991	1,594
California	9,825	61,958	6,176	5,369	83,328
Colorado	535	2,569	0	1,406	4,510
Connecticut	4,811	4,033	17	1,586	10,447
Delaware	0	726	43	310	1,079
District of Columbia	105	146	0	214	465
Florida	35	5,464	0	7,444	12,943
Georgia	413	4,177	212	3,583	8,385
Guam	27	1	1	46	75
Hawaii	1,529	5,060	5	212	6,806
Idaho	120	1,732	397	525	2,774
Illinois	28,644	47,553	304	3,496	79,997
Indiana	67	3,495	0	1,199	4,761
Iowa	176	6,814	286	589	7,865
Kansas	688	2,646	2,355	726	6,415
Kentucky	232	2,996	132	1,800	5,160
Louisiana	2,705	2,010	0	2,172	6,887
Maine	215	1,821	0	491	2,527
Maryland	2,375	5,738	0	1,616	9,729
Massachusetts	1,203	1,819	2,956	2,339	8,317
Michigan	26,804	36,159	2,666	2,438	68,067
Minnesota	3,214	13,433	0	1,989	18,636
Mississippi	760	5,699	24	1,404	7,887
Missouri	579	6,565	174	2,061	9,379
Montana	247	1,283	447	237	2,214
Nebraska	309	3,235	284	648	4,476
Nevada	100	659	11	564	1,334
New Hampshire	367	1,540	0	609	2,516
New Jersey	681	4,897	0	2,479	8,057
New Mexico	9	4,268	162	502	4,941
New York	19,276	43,118	4,371	4,490	71,255
North Carolina	95	3,917	0	4,316	8,328
North Dakota	1	1,706	637	140	2,484
Northern Mariana Islands	0	83	0	19	102
Ohio	9	10,373	227	3,846	14,455
Oklahoma	17	2,252	0	1,303	3,572
Oregon	4,250	10,710	240	722	15,922
Pennsylvania	3,710	46,146	734	3,748	54,338
Puerto Rico	61	2,697	0	759	3,517
Rhode Island	36	1,133	6	356	1,531
South Carolina	664	2,511	163	1,199	4,537
South Dakota	57	1,388	84	240	1,769
Tennessee	354	4,325	521	1,898	7,098
Texas	7,412	12,749	897	6,556	27,614
Utah	2,592	6,802	500	511	10,405
Vermont	361	1,990	0	508	2,859
Virgin Islands	0	3	28	71	102
Virginia	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	9,574	8,834	0	1,969	20,377
West Virginia	14	2,239	93	441	2,787
Wisconsin	105	5,993	0	2,340	8,438
Wyoming	213	1,107	146	159	1,625
<b>National Total</b>	<b>136,784</b>	<b>414,865</b>	<b>25,989</b>	<b>87,891</b>	<b>665,529</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 11-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2007, 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 provider 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, American Samoa had not yet reported FFY 2007 ACF-800 data.
5. Virginia is not able to report the number of providers because payments are made locally and information on providers is also kept at the local level. They are working towards an automated system in order to report the number of providers.

**Table 8  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Consumer Education Strategies Summary (FFY 2007)**

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	N	50,286
Alaska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		10,709
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	224,944
Arkansas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	14,849
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2,069,910
Colorado	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1,645,831
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	74,126
Delaware	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	19,990
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	25,000
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	178,933
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	44,292
Guam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,103
Hawaii	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		8,883
Idaho	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	8,688
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	264,600
Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	28,388
Iowa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	44,998
Kansas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	124,277
Kentucky	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	43,736
Louisiana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	55,954
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	7,200
Maryland	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	251,548
Massachusetts	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		85,000
Michigan	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	918,235
Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,859,277
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	25,704
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	40,231
Montana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,251,465
Nebraska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	462,408
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		10,427
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8,256
New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	115,739
New Mexico	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21,316
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		986,274
North Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	274,735
North Dakota	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,879
Northern Mariana Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	639
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	120,696
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	200,380
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	157,339
Pennsylvania	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	193,117
Puerto Rico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11,299
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	8,000
South Carolina	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	23,671
South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		257,167
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	90
Texas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	125,420
Utah	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,703
Vermont	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,756
Virgin Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	664
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		37,335
Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	24,988
West Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8,457
Wisconsin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	52,801
Wyoming	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11,998
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12,519,711</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 11-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2007, 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. NA=Not applicable, does not offer grants or contracts for subsidized child care slots.
4. A blank cell indicates that the State did not provide a response.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported FFY 2007 ACF-800 data.

**Table 9**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children In Care By Age Group (FFY 2007)**

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	7%	12%	13%	13%	11%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	7%	12%	13%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	6%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	13%	20%	22%	20%	16%	8%	0%	0%	0%	100%
California	3%	7%	10%	14%	18%	11%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Colorado	7%	12%	13%	14%	13%	10%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	6%	11%	13%	14%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	7%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	6%	15%	20%	19%	12%	7%	21%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	6%	12%	14%	15%	14%	11%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	7%	12%	14%	13%	11%	9%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	6%	11%	13%	17%	19%	8%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	7%	11%	13%	13%	12%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	6%	10%	11%	11%	11%	9%	42%	1%	0%	100%
Indiana	6%	11%	12%	13%	13%	12%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	8%	12%	13%	13%	11%	9%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	7%	11%	13%	13%	12%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	8%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	9%	15%	17%	15%	11%	7%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	4%	9%	12%	14%	15%	11%	35%	1%	0%	100%
Maryland	6%	11%	13%	13%	12%	9%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	7%	10%	14%	13%	15%	8%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Michigan	6%	9%	10%	10%	9%	10%	45%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	9%	11%	12%	12%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	6%	11%	13%	13%	11%	9%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	5%	11%	12%	13%	12%	10%	28%	1%	9%	100%
Montana	8%	12%	14%	14%	13%	11%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	9%	13%	13%	13%	12%	9%	30%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	6%	11%	12%	13%	13%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	5%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
New Jersey	4%	11%	14%	14%	10%	9%	36%	1%	0%	100%
New Mexico	7%	12%	13%	14%	13%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
New York	5%	9%	11%	13%	13%	9%	41%	0%	0%	100%
North Carolina	6%	9%	11%	12%	12%	10%	40%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	11%	14%	14%	14%	11%	9%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	8%	9%	9%	10%	11%	11%	41%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	7%	12%	14%	12%	11%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	5%	13%	14%	14%	12%	10%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	8%	11%	11%	12%	11%	10%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	5%	10%	11%	12%	12%	10%	39%	1%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	3%	8%	12%	16%	19%	12%	29%	2%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	5%	9%	11%	12%	12%	10%	42%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	8%	13%	14%	14%	12%	9%	30%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	9%	12%	14%	15%	13%	11%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	7%	12%	13%	13%	12%	9%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	7%	12%	14%	13%	12%	9%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Utah	7%	10%	12%	12%	12%	11%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	10%	13%	13%	14%	11%	33%	1%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	3%	11%	14%	17%	18%	8%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	6%	11%	15%	15%	13%	10%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	7%	11%	12%	12%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	8%	11%	12%	12%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	7%	12%	14%	16%	14%	10%	27%	0%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.

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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. 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 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 FFY, 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 Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.

6. The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.

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 2007)**

State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Employment & Training/Education	Protective Services	Other	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	79%	7%	4%	9%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	86%	3%	8%	0%	2%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	70%	1%	5%	23%	2%	0%	100%
Arkansas	46%	9%	8%	5%	32%	0%	100%
California	86%	6%	5%	1%	3%	0%	100%
Colorado	81%	11%	5%	0%	2%	2%	100%
Connecticut	95%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	82%	6%	4%	2%	5%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	63%	26%	3%	1%	6%	0%	100%
Florida	67%	4%	3%	25%	1%	0%	100%
Georgia	81%	7%	2%	8%	0%	1%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	85%	3%	8%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Idaho	77%	9%	14%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	91%	3%	1%	0%	5%	0%	100%
Indiana	69%	10%	7%	0%	13%	0%	100%
Iowa	88%	6%	0%	6%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	93%	4%	2%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Kentucky	78%	7%	2%	13%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	76%	8%	10%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	86%	4%	6%	2%	2%	0%	100%
Maryland	79%	12%	6%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	72%	10%	0%	15%	3%	0%	100%
Michigan	84%	12%	1%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	78%	7%	7%	0%	8%	0%	100%
Mississippi	77%	17%	5%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	60%	16%	6%	8%	0%	10%	100%
Montana	67%	11%	15%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	75%	11%	2%	12%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	90%	6%	2%	0%	2%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	83%	8%	0%	8%	1%	0%	100%
New Jersey	81%	2%	3%	5%	8%	0%	100%
New Mexico	77%	12%	11%	0%	0%	0%	100%
New York	75%	14%	3%	0%	8%	0%	100%
North Carolina	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	78%	14%	6%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	70%	15%	5%	0%	11%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	81%	15%	3%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Oregon	75%	4%	20%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	78%	6%	13%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	71%	18%	9%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	90%	8%	2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	81%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	64%	10%	12%	14%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	42%	35%	21%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Texas	79%	16%	3%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Utah	84%	2%	3%	0%	10%	0%	100%
Vermont	63%	14%	2%	15%	6%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	79%	16%	1%	4%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	89%	4%	5%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Washington	82%	8%	0%	9%	1%	0%	100%
West Virginia	79%	13%	8%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	93%	1%	5%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Wyoming	92%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- 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 any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- 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 Both Employment and Training/Education categories. States reporting no families in this combination category of Both Employment and Training/Education are Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Wyoming.
- CCB has observed some issues with income reporting across most States to varying degrees. CCB 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).

**Table 11**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Racial Group (FFY 2007)**

State	Native American/ Alaska Native	Asian	Black/ African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Multi-Racial	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	0%	76%	0%	23%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	10%	5%	10%	6%	47%	16%	6%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	5%	1%	14%	1%	77%	3%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	0%	59%	0%	40%	0%	0%	100%
California	2%	5%	24%	1%	66%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	1%	0%	15%	0%	34%	3%	46%	100%
Connecticut	1%	0%	34%	0%	27%	6%	31%	100%
Delaware	0%	0%	65%	0%	34%	1%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	1%	0%	88%	0%	9%	0%	2%	100%
Florida	0%	0%	50%	0%	47%	3%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	0%	80%	0%	17%	1%	2%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	0%	31%	1%	35%	11%	21%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	0%	1%	0%	96%	1%	0%	100%
Illinois	0%	0%	62%	1%	19%	2%	16%	100%
Indiana	0%	0%	48%	0%	42%	9%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	1%	20%	0%	79%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	1%	1%	28%	0%	63%	2%	5%	100%
Kentucky	0%	0%	31%	0%	60%	0%	9%	100%
Louisiana	0%	0%	77%	0%	22%	1%	0%	100%
Maine	1%	1%	4%	0%	86%	5%	2%	100%
Maryland	0%	0%	78%	0%	18%	2%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	2%	17%	0%	25%	1%	54%	100%
Michigan	0%	0%	57%	0%	41%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	3%	8%	33%	0%	54%	2%	0%	100%
Mississippi	0%	0%	88%	0%	10%	2%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	0%	56%	0%	38%	1%	4%	100%
Montana	13%	0%	2%	0%	80%	4%	1%	100%
Nebraska	3%	0%	27%	0%	68%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	2%	1%	29%	1%	57%	9%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	0%	0%	3%	0%	75%	0%	21%	100%
New Jersey	0%	1%	56%	12%	25%	1%	5%	100%
New Mexico	6%	0%	4%	0%	85%	3%	0%	100%
New York	1%	1%	53%	2%	40%	3%	0%	100%
North Carolina	2%	0%	62%	0%	35%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	24%	0%	4%	0%	69%	4%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	0%	53%	0%	44%	2%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-
Oregon	2%	2%	10%	0%	85%	1%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	1%	44%	0%	53%	2%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	0%	7%	0%	17%	0%	75%	100%
South Carolina	0%	0%	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	20%	0%	4%	0%	69%	6%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	0%	73%	0%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	0%	35%	0%	46%	1%	18%	100%
Utah	3%	2%	5%	1%	89%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	0%	1%	3%	0%	93%	3%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	5%	0%	94%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	3%	1%	67%	0%	27%	1%	0%	100%
Washington	3%	2%	10%	0%	41%	0%	44%	100%
West Virginia	0%	0%	11%	0%	76%	11%	2%	100%
Wisconsin	2%	1%	40%	0%	40%	3%	13%	100%
Wyoming	3%	0%	4%	0%	80%	0%	13%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- 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 any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- 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.
- 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-FFY 2000 Technical Bulletin 3 standard. In many of these instances, if a child is designated as Latino, no race is designated.
- 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 2007)**

State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	1%	99%	0%	100%
Alaska	10%	88%	2%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	48%	52%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	100%	0%	100%
California	52%	48%	0%	100%
Colorado	33%	67%	0%	100%
Connecticut	37%	63%	0%	100%
Delaware	10%	90%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	11%	89%	0%	100%
Florida	24%	76%	0%	100%
Georgia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	6%	94%	0%	100%
Idaho	16%	84%	0%	100%
Illinois	15%	83%	3%	100%
Indiana	7%	93%	0%	100%
Iowa	6%	94%	0%	100%
Kansas	12%	88%	0%	100%
Kentucky	4%	91%	5%	100%
Louisiana	2%	98%	0%	100%
Maine	3%	97%	0%	100%
Maryland	3%	97%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	33%	67%	0%	100%
Michigan	4%	96%	0%	100%
Minnesota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Mississippi	1%	99%	0%	100%
Missouri	3%	97%	0%	100%
Montana	7%	93%	0%	100%
Nebraska	10%	90%	0%	100%
Nevada	31%	69%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	5%	71%	24%	100%
New Jersey	29%	71%	0%	100%
New Mexico	75%	25%	0%	100%
New York	24%	76%	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	0%	100%	0%	-
Oregon	14%	86%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	11%	83%	5%	100%
Puerto Rico	99%	1%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	21%	79%	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	16%	84%	0%	100%
Vermont	2%	98%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	9%	91%	0%	100%
Virginia	6%	94%	0%	100%
Washington	13%	87%	0%	100%
West Virginia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	8%	92%	0%	100%
Wyoming	12%	88%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- 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 any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care. New Hampshire does not appear to properly report ethnicity for a significant proportion of the children served.
- 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 2007)**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Child's Home</b>	<b>Family Home</b>	<b>Group Home</b>	<b>Center</b>	<b>Total</b>
Infants (0 to <1 yr)	6%	33%	6%	55%	100%
Toddlers (1 yr to <3 yrs)	5%	28%	6%	62%	100%
Preschool (3 yrs to <6 yrs)	4%	23%	5%	68%	100%
School Age (6 yrs to <13 yrs)	10%	34%	4%	52%	100%
13 years and older	17%	51%	4%	28%	100%
<b>All Ages</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
2. Nationally, 1.5% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one or more setting elements of the child's setting record(s) were invalid or not reported.
3. 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. 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 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 FFY, 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 Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
7. The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
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. 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 (FFY 2007)**

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	155	159	159	162	161
1 to < 2 yrs	161	165	158	169	167
2 to < 3 yrs	162	166	162	171	168
3 to < 4 yrs	167	166	164	169	168
4 to < 5 yrs	161	163	159	164	164
5 to < 6 yrs	148	147	142	142	144
6 to < 13 yrs	139	130	120	112	121
13+ yrs	138	124	108	101	119
<b>National</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>148</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- Nationally, 1.5% of the children children served with CCDF funds 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.
- 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- 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 service hours provided.

Table 15 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Payment to Provider (Including Family CoPay) by Age Group and Care Type (FFY 2007)					
Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$299	\$381	\$518	\$482	\$439
1 to < 2 yrs	\$315	\$392	\$500	\$483	\$447
2 to < 3 yrs	\$291	\$384	\$516	\$464	\$438
3 to < 4 yrs	\$296	\$367	\$485	\$441	\$421
4 to < 5 yrs	\$286	\$362	\$470	\$441	\$418
5 to < 6 yrs	\$263	\$332	\$436	\$381	\$365
6 to < 13 yrs	\$255	\$295	\$401	\$298	\$297
13+ yrs	\$250	\$276	\$327	\$310	\$283
<b>National</b>	<b>\$272</b>	<b>\$339</b>	<b>\$460</b>	<b>\$401</b>	<b>\$377</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- Nationally, 1.5% of the children served with CCDF funds 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.
- Payment is defined as the total amount received by the provider. It is the sum of the State subsidy and the family copay.
- Average payment per month is based on sums of payments 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa and Guam had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- 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 and/or dollars authorized rather than the actual number provided.

**Table 16**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percent of Families Receiving TANF (FFY 2007)**

State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	13%	87%	0%	100%
Alaska	14%	86%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	19%	81%	0%	100%
Arkansas	5%	95%	0%	100%
California	11%	89%	0%	100%
Colorado	7%	93%	0%	100%
Connecticut	13%	87%	0%	100%
Delaware	9%	91%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	9%	91%	0%	100%
Florida	5%	93%	2%	100%
Georgia	6%	94%	0%	100%
Guam	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	13%	87%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	99%	0%	100%
Illinois	5%	95%	0%	100%
Indiana	21%	79%	0%	100%
Iowa	27%	73%	0%	100%
Kansas	7%	93%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	99%	0%	100%
Louisiana	10%	85%	5%	100%
Maine	3%	97%	0%	100%
Maryland	13%	87%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	22%	78%	0%	100%
Michigan	57%	43%	0%	100%
Minnesota	36%	64%	0%	100%
Mississippi	11%	89%	0%	100%
Missouri	17%	83%	0%	100%
Montana	11%	89%	0%	100%
Nebraska	24%	76%	0%	100%
Nevada	17%	83%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	27%	65%	8%	100%
New Jersey	13%	87%	0%	100%
New Mexico	15%	85%	0%	100%
New York	46%	54%	0%	100%
North Carolina	4%	96%	0%	100%
North Dakota	20%	80%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	15%	85%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	10%	90%	0%	100%
Oregon	32%	68%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	12%	88%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	100%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	8%	92%	0%	100%
South Carolina	26%	74%	0%	100%
South Dakota	6%	94%	0%	100%
Tennessee	60%	40%	0%	100%
Texas	1%	99%	0%	100%
Utah	12%	88%	0%	100%
Vermont	19%	81%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	5%	95%	0%	100%
Virginia	31%	69%	0%	100%
Washington	20%	80%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	94%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	4%	96%	0%	100%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- 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 (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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- 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 any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- 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 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 2007)**

State/Territories	Percent of Families				Mean CoPay as a Percent of 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	16%	7%	76%	100%	5%	5%
Alaska	9%	8%	84%	100%	4%	4%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	27%	7%	66%	100%	4%	4%
Arkansas	12%	78%	10%	100%	1%	6%
California	3%	65%	32%	100%	1%	3%
Colorado	23%	8%	68%	100%	9%	11%
Connecticut	8%	5%	88%	100%	5%	5%
Delaware	9%	38%	53%	100%	5%	9%
District of Columbia	36%	17%	47%	100%	3%	4%
Florida	28%	0%	72%	100%	7%	7%
Georgia	15%	12%	73%	100%	6%	7%
Guam	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	3%	46%	50%	100%	1%	2%
Idaho	12%	0%	88%	100%	10%	10%
Illinois	3%	1%	95%	100%	6%	6%
Indiana	2%	75%	22%	100%	1%	6%
Iowa	9%	55%	35%	100%	2%	6%
Kansas	17%	18%	66%	100%	5%	6%
Kentucky	14%	21%	65%	100%	6%	8%
Louisiana	9%	5%	86%	100%	12%	12%
Maine	5%	3%	92%	100%	7%	8%
Maryland	5%	15%	80%	100%	8%	9%
Massachusetts	20%	26%	53%	100%	6%	8%
Michigan	4%	26%	70%	100%	2%	3%
Minnesota	2%	28%	70%	100%	3%	4%
Mississippi	16%	1%	83%	100%	4%	4%
Missouri	47%	16%	37%	100%	4%	6%
Montana	9%	0%	91%	100%	4%	4%
Nebraska	38%	47%	15%	100%	2%	9%
Nevada	2%	18%	80%	100%	6%	7%
New Hampshire	11%	37%	52%	100%	0%	0%
New Jersey	12%	14%	74%	100%	6%	7%
New Mexico	7%	16%	77%	100%	4%	5%
New York	2%	37%	62%	100%	3%	5%
North Carolina	14%	5%	80%	100%	8%	8%
North Dakota	29%	0%	71%	100%	17%	17%
Northern Mariana Islands	17%	0%	83%	100%	4%	4%
Ohio	8%	4%	88%	100%	6%	6%
Oklahoma	33%	22%	44%	100%	6%	9%
Oregon	26%	7%	67%	100%	8%	9%
Pennsylvania	13%	3%	85%	100%	5%	5%
Puerto Rico	28%	35%	37%	100%	2%	4%
Rhode Island	6%	26%	69%	100%	4%	5%
South Carolina	8%	0%	92%	100%	3%	3%
South Dakota	22%	44%	34%	100%	5%	11%
Tennessee	1%	88%	11%	100%	0%	1%
Texas	21%	4%	75%	100%	9%	10%
Utah	3%	14%	84%	100%	4%	4%
Vermont	30%	7%	63%	100%	5%	5%
Virgin Islands	9%	60%	31%	100%	0%	0%
Virginia	2%	33%	64%	100%	7%	10%
Washington	25%	59%	16%	100%	2%	7%
West Virginia	6%	13%	80%	100%	3%	4%
Wisconsin	13%	3%	84%	100%	6%	6%
Wyoming	14%	1%	84%	100%	6%	6%
<b>National</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>6%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 09-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2007.
- 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. The District of Columbia has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor 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 FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- 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 any ACF-801 data for FFY 2007.
- The current Wyoming processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. Wyoming is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006; however, they are still resolving the difficulty of capturing information on children in Protective Services and Foster Care.
- The "Mean CoPay/Income" columns exclude families with zero income because dividing by zero is undefined.
- 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.
- 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%.
- 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.