

Table 1 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Adjusted Number of Families and Children Served (FFY 2008)		
States/Territories	Average Number of Families	Average Number of Children
Alabama	16,800	31,900
Alaska	2,100	3,500
American Samoa	-	-
Arizona	17,900	29,500
Arkansas	2,200	3,200
California	67,000	104,900
Colorado	10,900	18,900
Connecticut	6,100	9,400
Delaware	3,700	6,000
District of Columbia	1,100	1,600
Florida	67,100	101,000
Georgia	29,000	54,000
Guam	300	600
Hawaii	6,700	10,400
Idaho	4,300	7,900
Illinois	37,400	68,300
Indiana	19,000	36,100
Iowa	8,600	15,300
Kansas	11,400	21,500
Kentucky	17,500	31,200
Louisiana	28,100	45,300
Maine	2,100	3,100
Maryland	14,300	24,400
Massachusetts	16,900	23,100
Michigan	36,500	70,900
Minnesota	14,000	24,800
Mississippi	13,500	25,400
Missouri	21,100	35,900
Montana	2,800	4,500
Nebraska	6,200	11,200
Nevada	3,800	6,300
New Hampshire	5,300	7,700
New Jersey	24,600	35,800
New Mexico	11,200	18,700
New York	69,600	116,400
North Carolina	27,900	58,000
North Dakota	2,600	4,100
Northern Mariana Islands	200	400
Ohio	28,000	48,800
Oklahoma	14,500	24,700
Oregon	12,300	22,700
Pennsylvania	56,900	98,100
Puerto Rico	7,500	9,800
Rhode Island	3,600	6,000
South Carolina	12,100	21,300
South Dakota	3,200	5,100
Tennessee	22,300	42,700
Texas	65,200	120,500
Utah	6,500	12,500
Vermont	2,400	3,500
Virgin Islands	300	400
Virginia	14,900	23,900
Washington	29,000	48,400
West Virginia	5,100	8,300
Wisconsin	15,700	28,000
Wyoming	2,700	4,400
National Total	932,000	1,600,300

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.

2. All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. 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 was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.

4. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.

5. 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.

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 2008)				
State	Grants/Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %	Total
Alabama	0%	100%	0%	49,875
Alaska	0%	80%	20%	7,498
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	0%	100%	0%	52,560
Arkansas	--	--	--	--
California	38%	62%	0%	160,626
Colorado	1%	98%	0%	36,959
Connecticut	0%	100%	0%	14,683
Delaware	0%	100%	0%	10,256
District of Columbia	0%	100%	0%	1,953
Florida	58%	42%	0%	162,777
Georgia	0%	100%	0%	98,787
Guam	44%	56%	0%	2,160
Hawaii	39%	0%	61%	26,395
Idaho	--	--	--	--
Illinois	7%	93%	0%	121,440
Indiana	2%	98%	0%	55,935
Iowa	0%	100%	0%	27,948
Kansas	0%	100%	0%	36,216
Kentucky	0%	100%	0%	57,047
Louisiana	0%	100%	0%	97,118
Maine	45%	55%	0%	4,504
Maryland	0%	100%	0%	41,823
Massachusetts	41%	59%	0%	39,087
Michigan	0%	72%	28%	109,474
Minnesota	0%	100%	0%	37,733
Mississippi	5%	95%	0%	37,718
Missouri	0%	100%	0%	62,205
Montana	0%	97%	3%	9,024
Nebraska	0%	100%	0%	20,515
Nevada	19%	81%	0%	15,870
New Hampshire	6%	94%	0%	13,581
New Jersey	15%	85%	0%	70,659
New Mexico	0%	100%	0%	30,782
New York	19%	81%	0%	212,073
North Carolina	0%	100%	0%	78,850
North Dakota	0%	0%	100%	8,161
Northern Mariana Islands	--	--	--	--
Ohio	0%	100%	0%	87,815
Oklahoma	0%	100%	0%	44,676
Oregon	6%	94%	0%	41,546
Pennsylvania	0%	99%	1%	148,200
Puerto Rico	61%	39%	0%	15,168
Rhode Island	0%	100%	0%	9,699
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%	39,940
South Dakota	1%	99%	0%	9,896
Tennessee	0%	100%	0%	70,442
Texas	0%	100%	0%	222,055
Utah	0%	0%	100%	21,901
Vermont	1%	99%	0%	5,804
Virgin Islands	0%	100%	0%	765
Virginia	0%	100%	0%	51,227
Washington	0%	100%	0%	84,401
West Virginia	0%	100%	0%	14,565
Wisconsin	0%	100%	0%	43,591
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	7,978
National Total	10%	87%	3%	2,731,962

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 06-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2008. The ACF-800 is based on an annual unduplicated count of families and children; i.e., a family or child that receives one hour of service on one day is counted the same as a family or child that receives full-time care throughout the fiscal year.

2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. 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, Arkansas, Idaho, and Northern Mariana Islands had not reported any ACF-800 data for FFY 2008.

Table 3 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care (FFY 2008)						
State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	7%	4%	89%	1%	100%
Alaska	19%	27%	7%	46%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	2%	14%	8%	75%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	15%	0%	85%	0%	100%
California	2%	39%	11%	47%	0%	100%
Colorado	2%	24%	0%	74%	1%	100%
Connecticut	19%	31%	0%	48%	2%	100%
Delaware	2%	33%	3%	62%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	5%	0%	95%	0%	100%
Florida	1%	10%	0%	89%	0%	100%
Georgia	1%	11%	3%	85%	0%	100%
Guam	4%	4%	1%	90%	0%	100%
Hawaii	19%	49%	0%	31%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	30%	15%	54%	0%	100%
Illinois	18%	45%	1%	36%	0%	100%
Indiana	0%	42%	0%	58%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	54%	5%	40%	0%	100%
Kansas	5%	21%	40%	34%	0%	100%
Kentucky	0%	14%	1%	85%	0%	100%
Louisiana	7%	12%	0%	81%	0%	100%
Maine	1%	36%	0%	63%	0%	100%
Maryland	8%	47%	0%	45%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	1%	2%	26%	70%	0%	100%
Michigan	28%	43%	11%	18%	1%	100%
Minnesota	10%	47%	0%	42%	0%	100%
Mississippi	3%	22%	1%	75%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	50%	2%	48%	0%	100%
Montana	4%	21%	40%	36%	0%	100%
Nebraska	0%	36%	8%	56%	0%	100%
Nevada	8%	7%	1%	85%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	6%	32%	0%	62%	0%	100%
New Jersey	2%	17%	0%	77%	5%	100%
New Mexico	2%	26%	6%	64%	1%	100%
New York	16%	36%	13%	34%	0%	100%
North Carolina	0%	18%	0%	81%	1%	100%
North Dakota	0%	43%	32%	25%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	3%	23%	8%	67%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	28%	2%	60%	10%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	23%	0%	77%	0%	100%
Oregon	21%	54%	5%	19%	1%	100%
Pennsylvania	2%	38%	4%	55%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	31%	4%	64%	1%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	35%	0%	64%	0%	100%
South Carolina	4%	15%	3%	78%	0%	100%
South Dakota	1%	47%	0%	52%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	15%	6%	78%	0%	100%
Texas	1%	4%	2%	92%	0%	100%
Utah	11%	42%	7%	38%	2%	100%
Vermont	4%	45%	0%	49%	2%	100%
Virgin Islands	9%	0%	8%	82%	0%	100%
Virginia	5%	29%	1%	65%	0%	100%
Washington	14%	29%	0%	43%	14%	100%
West Virginia	0%	32%	5%	63%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	0%	31%	0%	65%	4%	100%
Wyoming	5%	24%	5%	13%	53%	100%
National Total	6%	27%	5%	61%	1%	100%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 06-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008. 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. 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. 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
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 4 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in Regulated Settings vs. Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation (FFY 2008)				
State	Licensed/ Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	72%	28%	1%	100%
Alaska	71%	29%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	90%	10%	0%	100%
Arkansas	99%	1%	0%	100%
California	70%	30%	0%	100%
Colorado	93%	6%	1%	100%
Connecticut	57%	41%	2%	100%
Delaware	91%	9%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	99%	1%	0%	100%
Florida	90%	10%	0%	100%
Georgia	97%	3%	0%	100%
Guam	93%	7%	0%	100%
Hawaii	37%	63%	0%	100%
Idaho	68%	32%	0%	100%
Illinois	54%	46%	0%	100%
Indiana	70%	30%	0%	100%
Iowa	82%	18%	0%	100%
Kansas	84%	16%	0%	100%
Kentucky	92%	8%	0%	100%
Louisiana	79%	21%	0%	100%
Maine	92%	8%	0%	100%
Maryland	81%	19%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	96%	4%	0%	100%
Michigan	35%	64%	1%	100%
Minnesota	75%	25%	0%	100%
Mississippi	75%	25%	0%	100%
Missouri	54%	46%	0%	100%
Montana	86%	14%	0%	100%
Nebraska	82%	17%	0%	100%
Nevada	72%	28%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	69%	30%	0%	100%
New Jersey	88%	8%	5%	100%
New Mexico	72%	26%	1%	100%
New York	57%	43%	0%	100%
North Carolina	98%	1%	1%	100%
North Dakota	65%	35%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	75%	25%	0%	100%
Ohio	90%	0%	10%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	42%	57%	1%	100%
Pennsylvania	66%	32%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	70%	29%	1%	100%
Rhode Island	98%	2%	0%	100%
South Carolina	86%	14%	0%	100%
South Dakota	85%	15%	0%	100%
Tennessee	90%	10%	0%	100%
Texas	97%	3%	0%	100%
Utah	56%	43%	2%	100%
Vermont	84%	14%	2%	100%
Virgin Islands	98%	2%	0%	100%
Virginia	84%	16%	0%	100%
Washington	68%	18%	14%	100%
West Virginia	97%	3%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	96%	0%	4%	100%
Wyoming	25%	22%	53%	100%
National Total	76%	22%	1%	100%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008. 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. 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. 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
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 2008)					
State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %	Total Count	
Alabama	98%	2%	100%	1,007	
Alaska	60%	40%	100%	1,028	
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	
Arizona	100%	0%	100%	2,814	
Arkansas	0%	100%	100%	27	
California	70%	30%	100%	28,116	
Colorado	75%	25%	100%	1,091	
Connecticut	81%	19%	100%	3,416	
Delaware	98%	2%	100%	397	
District of Columbia	100%	0%	100%	17	
Florida	37%	63%	100%	654	
Georgia	78%	22%	100%	1,809	
Guam	44%	56%	100%	18	
Hawaii	86%	14%	100%	6,283	
Idaho	33%	67%	100%	2,510	
Illinois	36%	64%	100%	28,984	
Indiana	30%	70%	100%	1,878	
Iowa	6%	94%	100%	2,731	
Kansas	86%	14%	100%	3,401	
Kentucky	25%	75%	100%	2,487	
Louisiana	47%	53%	100%	8,571	
Maine	53%	47%	100%	238	
Maryland	0%	100%	100%	4,654	
Massachusetts	80%	20%	100%	816	
Michigan	96%	4%	100%	45,644	
Minnesota	49%	51%	100%	5,321	
Mississippi	54%	46%	100%	6,223	
Missouri	24%	76%	100%	14,324	
Montana	60%	40%	100%	648	
Nebraska	3%	97%	100%	1,946	
Nevada	18%	82%	100%	632	
New Hampshire	30%	70%	100%	2,323	
New Jersey	40%	60%	100%	2,766	
New Mexico	69%	31%	100%	4,922	
New York	43%	57%	100%	48,026	
North Carolina	74%	26%	100%	838	
North Dakota	38%	62%	100%	1,458	
Northern Mariana Islands	96%	4%	100%	108	
Ohio	NA	NA	NA	0	
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	0	
Oregon	33%	67%	100%	12,745	
Pennsylvania	56%	44%	100%	31,761	
Puerto Rico	89%	11%	100%	2,796	
Rhode Island	67%	33%	100%	100	
South Carolina	0%	100%	100%	2,945	
South Dakota	61%	39%	100%	735	
Tennessee	38%	62%	100%	4,092	
Texas	100%	0%	100%	3,228	
Utah	96%	4%	100%	5,308	
Vermont	53%	47%	100%	499	
Virgin Islands	50%	50%	100%	6	
Virginia	46%	54%	100%	3,097	
Washington	91%	9%	100%	8,799	
West Virginia	65%	35%	100%	65	
Wisconsin	NA	NA	NA	0	
Wyoming	60%	40%	100%	958	
National Total	58%	42%	100%	315,258	

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008. 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. 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. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding. In this table, centers operating without regulation (data element 26 = 11) were considered Non-Relative.
4. In some States there were no children served in unregulated settings and thus the percent is "NA" since division by zero is undefined. States with no Providers Legally Operating Without Regulation include: Ohio, Oklahoma, Vermont and Wisconsin.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
6. Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. Children in more than one setting category within the same month were counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example, if the child spent 70 hours in a center and 30 hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).
7. 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 Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in All Types of Care (FFY 2008)														
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%	4%	4%	64%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	25%	1%	
Alaska	100%	0%	17%	7%	46%	10%	9%	8%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
American Samoa	100%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Arizona	100%	0%	7%	8%	75%	2%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Arkansas	100%	0%	14%	0%	85%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
California	100%	0%	14%	11%	44%	2%	0%	17%	8%	0%	0%	3%	0%	
Colorado	100%	0%	20%	0%	74%	1%	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	
Connecticut	100%	0%	14%	0%	43%	14%	5%	15%	2%	0%	0%	5%	2%	
Delaware	100%	0%	29%	3%	59%	2%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	
District of Columbia	100%	0%	4%	0%	95%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Florida	100%	0%	10%	0%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	
Georgia	100%	0%	9%	3%	85%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Guam	100%	2%	3%	1%	86%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	4%	0%	
Hawaii	100%	0%	8%	0%	29%	17%	2%	35%	6%	0%	0%	3%	0%	
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	15%	54%	1%	0%	9%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Illinois	100%	0%	20%	1%	32%	8%	10%	7%	17%	0%	0%	4%	0%	
Indiana	100%	0%	37%	0%	33%	0%	0%	1%	4%	0%	0%	25%	0%	
Iowa	100%	0%	37%	5%	40%	0%	0%	1%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Kansas	100%	0%	10%	40%	34%	2%	2%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Kentucky	100%	0%	6%	1%	85%	0%	0%	2%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Louisiana	100%	0%	0%	0%	79%	5%	2%	4%	8%	0%	0%	2%	0%	
Maine	100%	0%	29%	0%	62%	0%	1%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Maryland	100%	0%	36%	0%	45%	0%	8%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Massachusetts	100%	0%	0%	26%	70%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Michigan	100%	0%	6%	11%	18%	25%	2%	37%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	
Minnesota	100%	0%	36%	0%	39%	6%	4%	4%	7%	0%	0%	3%	0%	
Mississippi	100%	0%	0%	1%	75%	2%	1%	12%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Missouri	100%	0%	10%	2%	42%	0%	0%	9%	30%	0%	0%	6%	0%	
Montana	100%	0%	10%	40%	36%	3%	1%	6%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Nebraska	100%	0%	18%	8%	56%	0%	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Nevada	100%	0%	5%	1%	67%	2%	7%	0%	1%	0%	0%	18%	0%	
New Hampshire	100%	0%	8%	0%	62%	3%	3%	6%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
New Jersey	100%	0%	11%	0%	77%	1%	1%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	5%	
New Mexico	100%	0%	2%	6%	64%	1%	1%	17%	7%	0%	0%	0%	1%	
New York	100%	0%	11%	13%	33%	8%	8%	10%	16%	0%	0%	2%	0%	
North Carolina	100%	0%	17%	0%	81%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	
North Dakota	100%	0%	8%	32%	25%	0%	0%	13%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	0%	8%	67%	3%	0%	22%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Ohio	100%	0%	28%	2%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	
Oklahoma	100%	0%	23%	0%	77%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Oregon	100%	0%	20%	4%	18%	11%	11%	8%	26%	0%	1%	1%	1%	
Pennsylvania	100%	0%	7%	4%	55%	1%	1%	17%	13%	0%	0%	0%	2%	
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	3%	4%	64%	0%	0%	26%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%	
Rhode Island	100%	0%	34%	0%	64%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
South Carolina	100%	0%	5%	3%	78%	0%	4%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
South Dakota	100%	0%	33%	0%	52%	0%	1%	9%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Tennessee	100%	0%	7%	6%	78%	1%	0%	3%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Texas	100%	0%	3%	2%	92%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Utah	100%	0%	10%	7%	38%	10%	0%	30%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	
Vermont	100%	0%	35%	0%	49%	2%	2%	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	2%	
Virgin Islands	100%	8%	0%	8%	82%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Virginia	100%	2%	19%	1%	62%	1%	2%	5%	5%	0%	0%	3%	0%	
Washington	100%	0%	25%	0%	43%	12%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	
West Virginia	100%	0%	32%	5%	61%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	
Wisconsin	100%	0%	31%	0%	65%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	
Wyoming	100%	0%	7%	5%	13%	3%	2%	10%	7%	0%	0%	0%	53%	
National Percentage	100%	0%	13%	5%	58%	4%	2%	8%	6%	0%	0%	3%	1%	

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008. 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 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.
- 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 yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
- 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 2008)

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Alabama	12	1,153	228	1,719	3,112
Alaska	1,878	621	179	626	3,304
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	673	3,623	370	1,427	6,093
Arkansas	--	--	--	--	--
California	5,978	62,787	6,205	5,321	80,291
Colorado	283	1,975	0	1,412	3,670
Connecticut	5,025	4,494	20	1,239	10,778
Delaware	0	766	45	315	1,126
District of Columbia	96	142	0	211	449
Florida	58	4,718	0	7,328	12,104
Georgia	370	3,550	190	2,921	7,031
Guam	34	0	0	67	101
Hawaii	1,717	5,211	7	228	7,163
Idaho	--	--	--	--	--
Illinois	26,334	48,323	336	3,519	78,512
Indiana	42	3,348	0	1,219	4,609
Iowa	176	6,640	278	614	7,708
Kansas	683	2,697	2,364	727	6,471
Kentucky	600	2,828	110	1,878	5,416
Louisiana	1,941	2,127	0	2,264	6,332
Maine	43	895	0	406	1,344
Maryland	2,197	6,223	0	1,706	10,126
Massachusetts	1,379	1,848	2,823	2,176	8,226
Michigan	22,593	30,121	2,500	2,408	57,622
Minnesota	2,372	12,483	0	1,985	16,840
Mississippi	578	4,941	24	1,248	6,791
Missouri	562	5,876	175	2,137	8,750
Montana	174	1,082	455	243	1,954
Nebraska	0	3,156	207	668	4,031
Nevada	79	724	10	543	1,356
New Hampshire	390	1,505	0	644	2,539
New Jersey	648	4,783	0	2,601	8,032
New Mexico	4	3,592	135	513	4,244
New York	19,968	40,797	4,917	4,677	70,359
North Carolina	85	3,642	0	4,311	8,038
North Dakota	0	1,715	655	137	2,507
Northern Mariana Islands	--	--	--	--	--
Ohio	16	9,465	262	4,089	13,832
Oklahoma	25	1,943	0	1,273	3,241
Oregon	4,660	10,782	292	725	16,459
Pennsylvania	1,118	38,685	772	3,944	44,519
Puerto Rico	62	2,531	0	879	3,472
Rhode Island	16	982	4	361	1,363
South Carolina	594	2,250	157	1,177	4,178
South Dakota	65	1,501	78	255	1,899
Tennessee	395	3,911	480	1,868	6,654
Texas	2,324	7,582	840	6,622	17,368
Utah	2,208	5,824	291	390	8,713
Vermont	370	1,899	0	529	2,798
Virgin Islands	1	8	33	77	119
Virginia	--	--	--	--	--
Washington	11,640	5,801	0	1,766	19,207
West Virginia	8	2,050	88	445	2,591
Wisconsin	110	5,595	0	2,352	8,057
Wyoming	207	1,076	151	180	1,614
National Total	120,791	380,271	25,681	86,370	613,113

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 06-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2008, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because ACF-800 Data Element 6a is reported as a count of providers receiving CCDF funding.
3. Note that this table reports the number of providers (not the number of children). A provider that serves only one child per day is counted the same as, for example, a provider serving 200 children per day.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa, Arkansas, Idaho, and Northern Mariana Islands had not reported any ACF-800 data for FFY 2008.
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 2008)

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	25,016
Alaska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		9,800
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	228,873
Arkansas	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,900,492
Colorado	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		3,290,501
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		84,579
Delaware	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	19,240
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	25,000
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	245,356
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	25,744
Guam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,145
Hawaii	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,335
Idaho	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	262,880
Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	29,298
Iowa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	46,458
Kansas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	123,904
Kentucky	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		17,815
Louisiana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	65,940
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		7,000
Maryland	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	251,548
Massachusetts	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	81,994
Michigan	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	748,836
Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,859,277
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	20,215
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	44,999
Montana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	498,372
Nebraska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	37,209
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		10,365
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,147
New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	104,273
New Mexico	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	20,248
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1,077,737
North Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	274,737
North Dakota	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		10,707
Northern Mariana Islands	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	124,711
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	200,380
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	163,231
Pennsylvania	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	138,432
Puerto Rico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	12,501
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	500
South Carolina	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	25,227
South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	296,108
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	35005
Texas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	115,044
Utah	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,317
Vermont	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,735
Virgin Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	577
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		37,465
Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	22,461
West Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8,316
Wisconsin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	53,060
Wyoming	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	13,093
Total Yes	34	52	50	52	51	50	49	46	9	12,731,203

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 06-JUL-2009

- The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2008, 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, Arkansas, Idaho, and Northern Mariana Islands had not yet reported any ACF-800 data for FFY 2008.

Table 9
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Children In Care By Age Group (FFY 2008)

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%	9%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	7%	12%	14%	13%	13%	10%	31%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	12%	21%	22%	20%	17%	8%	0%	0%	0%	100%
California	3%	6%	9%	15%	16%	11%	39%	0%	0%	100%
Colorado	7%	12%	14%	14%	13%	11%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	6%	12%	13%	14%	14%	9%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	7%	12%	13%	13%	12%	9%	33%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	6%	17%	21%	20%	11%	6%	19%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	6%	12%	14%	15%	14%	11%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	8%	13%	14%	14%	11%	9%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Guam	11%	15%	16%	17%	12%	10%	18%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	6%	12%	13%	16%	19%	8%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	7%	12%	12%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	6%	10%	11%	11%	11%	9%	41%	1%	0%	100%
Indiana	6%	11%	13%	14%	13%	11%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	8%	13%	13%	13%	11%	9%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	8%	13%	13%	13%	12%	9%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	9%	16%	17%	15%	11%	7%	24%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	4%	8%	12%	15%	17%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Maryland	6%	12%	14%	13%	11%	9%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	6%	12%	12%	16%	12%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Michigan	6%	10%	10%	10%	10%	9%	44%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	7%	13%	13%	12%	12%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	5%	12%	13%	13%	12%	9%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	9%	13%	14%	14%	13%	9%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Montana	8%	13%	14%	15%	14%	11%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	9%	13%	13%	13%	12%	9%	31%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	7%	11%	12%	13%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	5%	11%	13%	13%	13%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
New Jersey	5%	12%	16%	14%	10%	8%	34%	1%	0%	100%
New Mexico	7%	12%	13%	14%	13%	10%	30%	0%	0%	100%
New York	5%	9%	11%	13%	12%	10%	39%	0%	0%	100%
North Carolina	6%	10%	11%	12%	11%	10%	40%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	10%	15%	15%	14%	12%	8%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	9%	13%	11%	13%	10%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	7%	13%	14%	12%	11%	9%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	8%	13%	14%	14%	12%	10%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	7%	12%	12%	12%	11%	10%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	5%	11%	12%	12%	12%	10%	38%	1%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	4%	10%	14%	18%	18%	7%	26%	2%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	5%	10%	12%	12%	12%	10%	40%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	9%	15%	15%	14%	12%	9%	27%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	9%	13%	14%	14%	14%	10%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	8%	13%	14%	13%	11%	9%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	7%	12%	14%	14%	12%	9%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Utah	6%	11%	11%	12%	12%	11%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	11%	12%	14%	14%	11%	33%	1%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	3%	8%	15%	17%	19%	9%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	6%	13%	14%	14%	13%	9%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	6%	12%	12%	13%	12%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	8%	12%	12%	12%	12%	9%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	7%	12%	14%	15%	15%	10%	27%	0%	0%	100%
National	6%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.
- 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 was 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
- 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 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 2008)							
State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Employment & Training/Education	Protective Services	Other	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	78%	7%	4%	9%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	85%	4%	9%	0%	3%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	69%	1%	6%	23%	2%	0%	100%
Arkansas	42%	8%	7%	7%	37%	0%	100%
California	86%	5%	4%	1%	3%	0%	100%
Colorado	80%	9%	5%	0%	1%	4%	100%
Connecticut	95%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	81%	7%	4%	2%	5%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	60%	29%	3%	1%	8%	0%	100%
Florida	65%	4%	4%	26%	1%	0%	100%
Georgia	81%	7%	3%	8%	0%	1%	100%
Guam	81%	9%	9%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	86%	4%	8%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Idaho	77%	9%	14%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	91%	3%	1%	0%	5%	0%	100%
Indiana	73%	9%	8%	0%	11%	0%	100%
Iowa	90%	4%	0%	4%	2%	0%	100%
Kansas	93%	4%	2%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Kentucky	76%	5%	6%	12%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	81%	5%	10%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	77%	6%	7%	5%	4%	0%	100%
Maryland	73%	15%	6%	0%	6%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	68%	8%	0%	19%	6%	0%	100%
Michigan	81%	15%	1%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	79%	4%	7%	0%	9%	0%	100%
Mississippi	77%	19%	3%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	43%	6%	42%	9%	0%	0%	100%
Montana	65%	10%	14%	10%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	77%	9%	3%	11%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	88%	8%	2%	0%	2%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	84%	7%	0%	8%	1%	0%	100%
New Jersey	80%	3%	3%	6%	8%	0%	100%
New Mexico	78%	11%	10%	0%	0%	0%	100%
New York	75%	15%	3%	1%	7%	0%	100%
North Carolina	93%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	81%	11%	6%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	81%	15%	5%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	69%	12%	7%	0%	12%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	83%	14%	0%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Oregon	76%	3%	21%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	74%	10%	14%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	76%	18%	5%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	86%	11%	2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	66%	9%	11%	14%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	46%	31%	20%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Texas	79%	15%	3%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Utah	85%	2%	3%	0%	10%	0%	100%
Vermont	60%	14%	2%	17%	6%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	77%	16%	0%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	87%	6%	5%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Washington	77%	12%	1%	9%	1%	0%	100%
West Virginia	79%	11%	8%	0%	0%	1%	100%
Wisconsin	93%	1%	5%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Wyoming	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
National	77%	9%	6%	5%	3%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.

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, Arkansas, Idaho, and Northern Mariana Islands had not reported any ACF-800 data for FFY 2008.

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 only includes family records with an invalid or missing number for ACF-801 element 6, Reason for Receiving Subsidized Child Care.

8. 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.

9. 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 2008)

State	Native American / Alaska Native	Asian	Black/ African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific	White	Multi-Racial	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	0%	77%	0%	22%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	9%	4%	10%	6%	45%	19%	6%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	5%	1%	14%	1%	77%	3%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	0%	59%	0%	38%	0%	1%	100%
California	2%	5%	21%	2%	69%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	1%	0%	15%	0%	34%	4%	45%	100%
Connecticut	1%	1%	34%	0%	29%	7%	28%	100%
Delaware	0%	0%	65%	0%	34%	1%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	1%	0%	87%	0%	10%	0%	2%	100%
Florida	0%	0%	50%	0%	47%	3%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	0%	79%	0%	18%	1%	2%	100%
Guam	0%	11%	1%	74%	0%	14%	0%	100%
Hawaii	0%	29%	1%	34%	11%	25%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	0%	1%	0%	96%	1%	0%	100%
Illinois	0%	0%	60%	1%	19%	2%	17%	100%
Indiana	0%	0%	50%	0%	41%	8%	0%	100%
Iowa	1%	0%	18%	0%	81%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	1%	1%	29%	0%	62%	3%	4%	100%
Kentucky	0%	0%	31%	0%	60%	0%	9%	100%
Louisiana	0%	0%	77%	0%	22%	1%	0%	100%
Maine	2%	1%	3%	0%	88%	5%	2%	100%
Maryland	1%	0%	77%	0%	19%	2%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	2%	15%	0%	24%	1%	57%	100%
Michigan	0%	0%	57%	0%	40%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	4%	4%	30%	1%	58%	3%	0%	100%
Mississippi	0%	0%	90%	0%	9%	1%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	0%	57%	0%	36%	1%	6%	100%
Montana	15%	0%	2%	0%	78%	4%	1%	100%
Nebraska	3%	0%	27%	0%	68%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	2%	1%	29%	1%	57%	10%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	0%	0%	5%	0%	93%	1%	1%	100%
New Jersey	0%	1%	55%	9%	26%	1%	7%	100%
New Mexico	6%	0%	4%	0%	85%	3%	0%	100%
New York	1%	1%	53%	2%	40%	2%	0%	100%
North Carolina	2%	1%	60%	0%	36%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	21%	0%	4%	0%	71%	3%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	0%	52%	0%	45%	2%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	8%	1%	33%	0%	58%	1%	0%	100%
Oregon	2%	1%	10%	1%	85%	1%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	1%	45%	0%	35%	2%	17%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	0%	25%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	0%	7%	0%	14%	1%	77%	100%
South Carolina	0%	0%	74%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	21%	0%	4%	0%	67%	7%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	0%	74%	0%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	0%	34%	0%	48%	1%	17%	100%
Utah	3%	2%	6%	1%	88%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	0%	1%	3%	0%	93%	3%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	6%	0%	94%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	5%	1%	65%	0%	28%	1%	0%	100%
Washington	2%	2%	10%	3%	44%	0%	39%	100%
West Virginia	0%	0%	11%	0%	75%	11%	2%	100%
Wisconsin	1%	1%	40%	0%	38%	3%	16%	100%
Wyoming	3%	0%	4%	0%	80%	0%	13%	100%
National	1%	1%	44%	1%	43%	2%	7%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.

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 was 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.

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 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

Table 12 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Latino Ethnicity (FFY 2008)				
State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	1%	99%	0%	100%
Alaska	10%	87%	2%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	48%	52%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	100%	0%	100%
California	55%	45%	0%	100%
Colorado	35%	65%	0%	100%
Connecticut	37%	63%	0%	100%
Delaware	10%	90%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	12%	88%	0%	100%
Florida	24%	76%	0%	100%
Georgia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Guam	1%	99%	0%	100%
Hawaii	6%	94%	0%	100%
Idaho	16%	84%	0%	100%
Illinois	16%	81%	3%	100%
Indiana	8%	92%	0%	100%
Iowa	6%	94%	0%	100%
Kansas	13%	87%	0%	100%
Kentucky	4%	93%	3%	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%	92%	5%	100%
Montana	5%	95%	0%	100%
Nebraska	11%	89%	0%	100%
Nevada	32%	68%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	7%	93%	0%	100%
New Jersey	30%	70%	0%	100%
New Mexico	75%	25%	0%	100%
New York	24%	76%	0%	100%
North Carolina	7%	93%	0%	100%
North Dakota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	4%	96%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	10%	90%	0%	100%
Oregon	5%	95%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	12%	82%	6%	100%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	22%	78%	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	17%	83%	0%	100%
Vermont	2%	98%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	9%	91%	0%	100%
Virginia	9%	91%	0%	100%
Washington	11%	88%	1%	100%
West Virginia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	9%	91%	0%	100%
Wyoming	12%	88%	0%	100%
National	19%	81%	1%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.
- 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 was 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
- 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.

Table 13
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Children in Child Care by Age Category and Care Type (FFY 2008)

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Infants (0 to <1 yr)	5%	32%	6%	57%	100%
Toddlers (1 yr to <3 yrs)	4%	27%	6%	63%	100%
Preschool (3 yrs to <6 yrs)	4%	22%	5%	69%	100%
School Age (6 yrs to <13 yrs)	9%	32%	4%	54%	100%
13 years and older	17%	53%	5%	26%	100%
All Ages	6%	27%	5%	62%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.
2. Nationally, 1.4% 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 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.
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 was 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
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 2008)

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	151	156	150	161	159
1 to < 2 yrs	157	162	159	168	166
2 to < 3 yrs	160	165	160	171	168
3 to < 4 yrs	158	164	158	168	166
4 to < 5 yrs	158	160	158	164	163
5 to < 6 yrs	148	144	143	141	142
6 to < 13 yrs	135	127	114	111	118
13+ yrs	129	120	106	99	116
National	145	146	143	148	147

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.
2. Nationally, 1.4% 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.
3. Average hours per month were based on sums of hours per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
4. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. 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.
5. All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month 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.
6. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
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. 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.
9. 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 2008)					
Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$305	\$397	\$515	\$495	\$455
1 to < 2 yrs	\$316	\$411	\$548	\$502	\$470
2 to < 3 yrs	\$313	\$397	\$516	\$480	\$455
3 to < 4 yrs	\$297	\$384	\$502	\$456	\$437
4 to < 5 yrs	\$299	\$372	\$482	\$449	\$428
5 to < 6 yrs	\$289	\$345	\$454	\$395	\$380
6 to < 13 yrs	\$268	\$306	\$389	\$304	\$305
13+ yrs	\$258	\$299	\$424	\$315	\$302
National	\$285	\$354	\$471	\$414	\$392

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.
2. Nationally, 1.4% 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.
3. Payment is defined as the total amount received by the provider. It is the sum of the State subsidy and the family copay.
4. 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.
5. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. 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.
6. All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month 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.
7. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Some States have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized and/or dollars authorized rather than the actual number provided.

Table 16 Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates Average Monthly Percent of Families Reporting Income from TANF (FFY 2008)				
State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	13%	87%	0%	100%
Alaska	15%	85%	0%	100%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--
Arizona	18%	82%	0%	100%
Arkansas	6%	94%	0%	100%
California	9%	91%	0%	100%
Colorado	4%	96%	0%	100%
Connecticut	12%	88%	0%	100%
Delaware	16%	84%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	6%	94%	0%	100%
Florida	5%	93%	2%	100%
Georgia	5%	95%	0%	100%
Guam	0%	100%	0%	100%
Hawaii	12%	88%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	99%	0%	100%
Illinois	4%	96%	0%	100%
Indiana	17%	83%	0%	100%
Iowa	22%	78%	0%	100%
Kansas	6%	94%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	99%	0%	100%
Louisiana	9%	87%	5%	100%
Maine	5%	95%	0%	100%
Maryland	14%	86%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	20%	80%	0%	100%
Michigan	57%	43%	0%	100%
Minnesota	36%	64%	0%	100%
Mississippi	15%	85%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	100%	0%	100%
Montana	11%	89%	0%	100%
Nebraska	21%	79%	0%	100%
Nevada	31%	69%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	25%	67%	8%	100%
New Jersey	15%	85%	0%	100%
New Mexico	15%	85%	0%	100%
New York	44%	55%	0%	100%
North Carolina	5%	95%	0%	100%
North Dakota	18%	82%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	14%	86%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	9%	91%	0%	100%
Oregon	33%	67%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	15%	85%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	100%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	9%	91%	0%	100%
South Carolina	33%	67%	0%	100%
South Dakota	6%	94%	0%	100%
Tennessee	54%	46%	0%	100%
Texas	1%	99%	0%	100%
Utah	12%	88%	0%	100%
Vermont	20%	80%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	8%	92%	0%	100%
Virginia	29%	71%	0%	100%
Washington	18%	81%	0%	100%
West Virginia	7%	93%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	4%	96%	0%	100%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	100%
National	16%	83%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2008.

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 was 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.

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 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 2008)

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%	4%	5%
Alaska	9%	8%	84%	100%	4%	4%
American Samoa	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	27%	8%	65%	100%	4%	4%
Arkansas	14%	76%	10%	100%	1%	6%
California	4%	61%	35%	100%	1%	4%
Colorado	21%	11%	68%	100%	7%	8%
Connecticut	5%	5%	90%	100%	5%	5%
Delaware	9%	32%	59%	100%	6%	9%
District of Columbia	37%	14%	49%	100%	3%	4%
Florida	29%	0%	70%	100%	6%	6%
Georgia	15%	12%	73%	100%	7%	8%
Guam	3%	47%	50%	100%	4%	8%
Hawaii	3%	40%	57%	100%	2%	3%
Idaho	11%	0%	89%	100%	10%	10%
Illinois	3%	2%	95%	100%	7%	7%
Indiana	2%	72%	26%	100%	2%	6%
Iowa	8%	46%	46%	100%	3%	7%
Kansas	16%	17%	67%	100%	5%	6%
Kentucky	14%	21%	66%	100%	3%	4%
Louisiana	9%	4%	87%	100%	11%	12%
Maine	9%	5%	87%	100%	7%	7%
Maryland	11%	12%	76%	100%	9%	10%
Massachusetts	26%	23%	51%	100%	6%	9%
Michigan	9%	25%	66%	100%	2%	3%
Minnesota	2%	28%	70%	100%	3%	4%
Mississippi	19%	2%	79%	100%	4%	4%
Missouri	27%	21%	53%	100%	5%	7%
Montana	13%	0%	87%	100%	4%	4%
Nebraska	37%	48%	15%	100%	2%	9%
Nevada	3%	23%	74%	100%	6%	7%
New Hampshire	12%	33%	56%	100%	2%	3%
New Jersey	12%	33%	56%	100%	4%	6%
New Mexico	6%	15%	79%	100%	4%	5%
New York	2%	38%	60%	100%	3%	4%
North Carolina	13%	5%	82%	100%	8%	8%
North Dakota	26%	0%	74%	100%	18%	18%
Northern Mariana Islands	14%	0%	86%	100%	3%	3%
Ohio	8%	3%	88%	100%	6%	6%
Oklahoma	26%	21%	53%	100%	5%	8%
Oregon	24%	6%	69%	100%	7%	7%
Pennsylvania	30%	0%	70%	100%	6%	6%
Puerto Rico	37%	32%	31%	100%	2%	4%
Rhode Island	9%	32%	59%	100%	3%	4%
South Carolina	9%	0%	91%	100%	4%	4%
South Dakota	22%	43%	35%	100%	5%	11%
Tennessee	2%	90%	8%	100%	0%	1%
Texas	20%	4%	76%	100%	9%	10%
Utah	3%	15%	83%	100%	4%	5%
Vermont	33%	7%	60%	100%	5%	5%
Virgin Islands	11%	51%	38%	100%	0%	0%
Virginia	3%	30%	66%	100%	7%	11%
Washington	22%	49%	29%	100%	2%	7%
West Virginia	6%	13%	81%	100%	4%	4%
Wisconsin	14%	3%	83%	100%	6%	6%
Wyoming	16%	2%	83%	100%	5%	5%
National	14%	21%	64%	100%	5%	6%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 07-JUL-2009

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2008.
- 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 was 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 had not yet reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2008, Guam had reported ten months, Northern Mariana Islands had reported four months, and Puerto Rico had reported nine months.
- 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.