

Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Report on States' and Territories' Priorities for Child Care Services: Fiscal Year 2021

Updated September 2022



BACKGROUND

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) is the primary federal funding source for child care assistance to help eligible working families with low-incomes access child care and to improve the quality of child care for all children. CCDF gives funding to states, territories, and tribes to provide child care subsidies through vouchers or certificates to families with low incomes, or through grants and contracts with providers. CCDF provides access to child care services for working families with low incomes, so parents can work, attend school, or enroll in training. Additionally, CCDF promotes the healthy development of children by improving the quality of early learning and school-age experiences for both subsidized and unsubsidized children. Within the federal regulations, lead agencies administering CCDF decide how to administer the CCDF subsidy programs. Lead agencies determine payment rates for child care providers, copayment amounts for families, specific eligibility requirements, and how to prioritize CCDF services.

The most recent data from the Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) estimated 1.9 million children under the age of 13 received child care subsidies through CCDF or related government funding streams in an average month in fiscal year (FY) 2018. This is equivalent to 15 percent of all children eligible under federal rules and 23 percent of all children eligible under state rules.¹ Under federal eligibility rules, 12.8 million children were eligible for child care subsidies in an average month in FY 2018, which represents 24 percent of the total 52.9 million children under the age of 13. Of that number, 8.4 million children were also eligible for subsidies under state eligibility rules, which represents 16 percent of the total 52.9 million children in the age range served by CCDF and 66 percent of children eligible under federal rules.

CCDF administrative data, including monthly case-level data reported on the ACF-801, provides information about the characteristics (including income) of families receiving a child care subsidy. Preliminary FY 2020 ACF-801 CCDF administrative data (most recent year available) indicates that approximately 1.49 million children and 900,300 families per month received CCDF child care assistance, increasing slightly from FY 2019.² The CCDF subsidy program emphasizes parental choice; therefore, children are cared for in a wide variety of settings. Nationally, in FY 2020:³

- 72 percent of children receiving subsidies were cared for in center-based care.
- 22 percent of children receiving CCDF assistance were cared for in family child care homes.
- Two percent of children were cared for in the child's own home.
- The data were not reported or was invalid for four percent.

1. <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/2021-08/cy-2018-child-care-subsidy-eligibility.pdf>

2. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/data/fy-2020-preliminary-data-table-1>

3. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/data/fy-2020-preliminary-data-table-3>

The percentage of children receiving services in a family child care home slightly increased from FY 2019 to FY 2020, while the percentage of children receiving services in center-based care slightly decreased during this same time period.

It is worth noting that child care experienced significant changes during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the data used to support this report was partially collected during the pandemic. Lead agencies were instructed to report annual estimates of families, children and providers receiving subsidies due to COVID-19 circumstances, which included families and children funded with CARES Act dollars and children of essential workers receiving subsidies due to the COVID-19 crisis. The additional CARES Act funding and prioritization of essential worker families and children during the early days of the pandemic shaped the delivery of child care services during FY 2020.

DISCUSSION

Section 658E(c)(3)(B)(ii)(I) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act⁴ requires ACF to issue an annual report “that contains a determination about whether each state uses amounts provided for the FY under this subchapter in accordance with the priority for services.” The statutory priorities for service categories are: 1) children of families with very low incomes (taking into account family size), and 2) children with special needs. To reflect the focus on serving children experiencing homelessness included in Section 658E(c)(3)(B)(i) of the CCDBG Act,⁵ the CCDF final regulations added serving children experiencing homelessness as a third priority for services category at 45 CFR 98.46(a)(3).⁶ The Act requires ACF to impose a fiscal penalty of five percent of a lead agency’s CCDF discretionary award for any FY that the Secretary determines the lead agency has failed to fully comply with the priority of services provisions at 45 CFR 98.46.

This report includes analysis of ACF-801 CCDF administrative data and summary information from FY 2022-2024 CCDF State/Territory Plans.⁷

Prioritizing services for children of families with very low incomes

CCDF lead agencies must prioritize child care subsidies for families with very low incomes. Over the past decade, child care prices have risen faster than family incomes, making quality child care financially out of reach for most families. The cost of child care for one child is equivalent to 10 percent of household income for the median married-couple family, and equivalent to 36 percent of household income for the median single parent.⁸ These costs are particularly burdensome for low-income families, and well over the recommended benchmark of limiting co-payments to seven percent of family income.

⁴ 42 U.S.C. §9858c(c)(3)(B)(ii)(I)

⁵ 42 U.S.C. § 9858c(c)(3)(B)(i)

⁶ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/09/30/2016-22986/child-care-and-development-fund-ccdf-program>.

⁷ Links to approved FY 2022-2024 CCDF State Plans are available at <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/form/approved-ccdf-plans-fy-2022-2024>

⁸ Child Care Aware of America, “Parents and the High Cost of Child Care: 2017 Report” (2017), available at https://usa.childcareaware.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/2017_CCA_High_Cost_Report_FINAL.pdf.

Of the families served by CCDF in FY 2020, 40 percent were below the HHS Poverty Guideline (also known as the Federal Poverty Level, or FPL), or \$21,720 for a family of three; 27 percent had incomes between 100 percent and 150 percent of the FPL; and 19 percent had incomes above 150 percent of the FPL.⁹ The remaining families had invalid or unreported data (8 percent), or a child as only recipient (five percent). Additionally, among families receiving CCDF assistance with reported income in FY 2020, approximately 34 percent of the families with reported income had \$0 copay.¹⁰

Most states give first priority for child care assistance to families currently receiving, at-risk of receiving, or transitioning off of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). In FY 2020, approximately nine percent of families that received CCDF assistance reported income from TANF.¹¹ Families receiving CCDF assistance also reported income from Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (30 percent) and housing assistance (two percent).

Lead agencies determine the definition of “very low income” for the purposes of providing priority of child care services. Analysis of FY 2022-2024 CCDF Plans shows that the definition of families with very low incomes (considering family size) varies across states/territories.

- 12 states/territories defined families with very low family incomes as families who are eligible for or received assistance under the TANF program (down from 19 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).¹²
- 21 states/territories define families with very low incomes as family with incomes at or below 100 percent of the FPL (up from 17 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 11 states/territories use thresholds above the 100 percent of the FPL to define families with very low incomes (up from 8 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Eight states/territories use thresholds at or below 60 percent of their State Median Income (SMI) to define families with very low incomes (up from 6 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Four states/territories use other mechanisms to define families with very low incomes. For example, states may not have specific definitions in their CCDF Plans for families with very low family incomes but describe how they provide priority of services to children of families with very low incomes.

Nationally, 21 percent of children ages 0-12 in the general population were below the Census poverty threshold (\$20,591 for a family of three in 2020), compared to 50 percent of children¹³

⁹ <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/data/child-care-and-development-fund-statistics>

¹⁰ Excludes families with \$0 income; in protective services/headed by a child; invalid copay or income.

¹¹ <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/data/fy-2020-preliminary-data-table-16>

¹² Comparisons made to FY 2019-2021 CCDF Plan data as reported in the 2020 CCDF Priorities report https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/occ/priorities_report_fy_2020.pdf

¹³ Please note that this estimate (50 percent) is for the percent of **children** in poverty, while the estimate cited at the beginning of this section (40 percent) is for the percent of **families** in poverty. While the two estimates also use different definitions of poverty (HHS Poverty Guideline vs. Census poverty threshold), the difference resulting from the use of different poverty definitions is very small (approximately 1 percentage point).

ages 0-12 who received CCDF assistance.¹⁴ The proportion of children below poverty is higher among children receiving CCDF services compared to the general population. This pattern holds in every state, suggesting that all states are prioritizing CCDF services for children of families with very low incomes. See Appendix A for state-by-state data. Furthermore, this pattern holds for White, Black/African American (non-Hispanic), Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic), Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic), and Hispanic (any race) children. In other words, the proportion of children below poverty is higher among children receiving CCDF services compared to the general population within each race subgroup. The subgroups most likely to be poor in the general population are also the subgroups most likely to be poor in the CCDF program. In the general population, Black/African American (non-Hispanic) and Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic) children are the most likely to be living below poverty. Similarly, among children receiving CCDF, Black/African American (non-Hispanic) and Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic) children are also the most likely to be living below poverty.

Lead agencies use multiple strategies to prioritize services for children of families with very low incomes. According to the FY 2022-2024 CCDF State/Territory Plans:

- 30 states/territories prioritize enrollment for children of families with very low incomes (up from 25 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 30 states/territories including the District of Columbia serve children of families with very low incomes without placing them on wait lists (up from 27 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 35 states waive co-payments for children of families with very low incomes (up from 29 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Five states/territories provide a higher payment rate to providers caring for children of families with very low incomes (down from seven states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Five states/territories use grants or contracts to reserve slots for children of families with very low incomes (no change from the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).

Lead agencies also use multiple strategies to prioritize services for children of families for families receiving TANF, those attempting to transition off TANF, and those at risk of becoming dependent on TANF. Prioritizing services for these children and families supports and aligns with the priorities to provide assistance for child care services for children of families with very low incomes.

According to the FY 2022-2024 CCDF State/Territory Plans:

¹⁴ For a discussion of the difference between the HHS Poverty Guideline (i.e., the Federal Poverty Level) and the Census poverty threshold: <https://aspe.hhs.gov/topics/poverty-economic-mobility/poverty-guidelines/frequently-asked-questions-related-poverty-guidelines-poverty>. The Office of Child Care typically uses the Federal Poverty Level. However, in order to achieve comparability with Census estimates of poverty for the overall population of children ages 0 to 12, we used the Census poverty threshold for all poverty estimates in Appendix A.

- 34 states/territories prioritize enrollment for children of families receiving TANF, those attempting to transition off TANF, and those at risk of becoming dependent on TANF.
- 41 states/territories serve children and families receiving TANF, those attempting to transition off TANF, and those at risk of becoming dependent on TANF without placing them on waitlists.
- 30 states/territories waive co-payments for children of families receiving TANF, those attempting to transition off TANF, and those at risk of becoming dependent on TANF.
- Five states/territories provide a higher payment rate to providers caring for children of families receiving TANF, those attempting to transition off TANF, and those at risk of becoming dependent on TANF.
- Three states/territories use grants or contracts to reserve slots for children of families receiving TANF, those attempting to transition off TANF, and those at risk of becoming dependent on TANF.

Prioritizing children with special needs

The CCDBG Act states CCDF lead agencies must prioritize child care services for children with special needs. According to the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) household survey, approximately 1.2 million, or five percent, of the 23 million children under age 6 in the United States had a condition that affected the way the children were cared for, including physical, emotional, developmental, or behavioral conditions.¹⁵ The 2016 Early Childhood Program Participation Survey data show that 34 percent of parents with disabled children experience difficulty finding care, as compared to 25 percent of parents with nondisabled children. Additionally, the survey data showed that parents of children with special needs experience barriers to finding child care, such as lack of available slots and concerns about quality.¹⁶

The term “child with special needs” is not defined in the CCDBG Act or CCDF regulations. Therefore, lead agencies have the flexibility to define “child with special needs”. State and territory lead agencies are required to report their definition of this term in their CCDF Plans for the purposes of determining eligibility. Thirty states/territories explicitly include “child with a disability” in their definition of “child with special needs,” although other states/territories have definitions that may encompass children with disabilities, such as children diagnosed by a medical professional (see further discussion below).

An analysis of FY 2022-2024 CCDF Plan information shows that the definition of children with special needs for purposes of prioritizing services varies across states and territories.

- 21 states/territories define children with special needs as children diagnosed by a physician or other licensed medical professionals (up from 14 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).

¹⁵

<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/opre/Who%20provides%20ECE%20for%20children%20with%20special%20needs%20508.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/child-care-crisis-disproportionately-affects-children-disabilities/>

- 18 states and one territory use parts of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) definitions to define children with special needs (up from 14 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Five states use supplemental security income (SSI) definitions of children with disability to define children with special needs (up from 3 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 20 states/territories use their own state definition of children with special needs to include children unable to care for themselves or needing increased supervision or requiring special attention (up from 16 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Eight states and one territory define children with special needs as children at risk of or receiving protective services or foster care services or children under court supervision.

Lead agencies are not required to report if a child has special needs as part of the ACF-801 administrative data, but the state/territory must report if a child has a disability as defined in the Act. The Act states that “child with a disability” means a child with a disability, as defined in section 602 of IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1401); a child who is eligible for early intervention services under part C of IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.); a child who is less than 13 years of age and who is eligible for services under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794); and a child with a disability, as defined by the State involved. Appendix B provides ACF-801 administrative data on the state-by-state percent of children served that have a disability.

In FY 2020, across all states plus the District of Columbia (DC) and three territories, an average of two percent of children receiving CCDF were reported to have a disability, which is low compared to several data points. The 2012 NSECE household survey reported that five percent of children under age 6 had a condition that affected the way children were cared for, including physical, emotional, developmental, or behavioral conditions.¹⁷ The Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs has two measures of the number of children with disabilities, IDEA Part B (ages 6 through 21) and IDEA Part C (ages birth through 2). The percentage of the population served under IDEA Part B (ages 6 through 21) is 9.86 percent.¹⁸ The percentage of the population receiving early intervention services served under IDEA, Part C (ages birth through 2) is 3.48 percent.¹⁹ All of these measures are higher than the percent of children with special needs receiving CCDF.

Forty states plus DC and three territories reported children with disabilities receiving CCDF assistance, but of these, 22 reported less than one percent receiving CCDF assistance were children with disabilities, with the remaining 24 reporting one percent or more. Of these 24 lead agencies, 22 states, DC, and one territory reported that between one and eleven percent of children receiving CCDF assistance were children with disabilities with an average of three percent. Five states reported that a proportion of their data were invalid or not reported. Two states (California and Minnesota) reported that between 98 and 99 percent of their data were invalid or not reported. These invalid data and low reported rates of children with disabilities

¹⁷ Findings from the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/opre/Who%20provides%20ECE%20for%20children%20with%20special%20needs%20508.pdf>

¹⁸ [OSEP Fast Facts: School aged children 5-21 served under IDEA Part B](#)

¹⁹ [2020 Infographic: "OSEP Fast Facts: Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities" \(ed.gov\)](#)

receiving child care assistance may result from difficulty reaching and serving families with disabilities or difficulty with reporting.

States and territories use a variety of approaches to prioritize services for children with special needs.

- 31 states/territories do not waitlist children with special needs (up from 24 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 29 states/territories provide higher payment rates for access to higher quality care to providers that care for children with special needs (up from 26 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 28 states/territories prioritize enrollment in child care services for children with special needs (no change from prior report).
- Eight states waive co-payments (on a case-by-case basis) for parents of children with special needs (up from six states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Four states/territories use grants or contracts to reserve slots for children with special needs (up from three states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).

Prioritizing children experiencing homelessness

As stated above, children experiencing homelessness were added in the final regulation to the list of categories of the most vulnerable families for which states must prioritize for CCDF assistance and services. Lead agencies must use the definition of “homeless” applicable to Head Start and school programs from section 725 of Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Act,²⁰ which is inclusive of children living in emergency shelters, motels, hotels, trailer parks, cars, parks, public spaces, or abandoned buildings, and those sharing the housing of others due to a loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason.²¹

During the 2018-2019 school year, an estimated 1.30 million children under age 6 in the United States, or one in 20 children, experienced homelessness.²² That same year, public K-12 schools identified 1.28 million students who experienced homelessness, representing 2.5 percent of all students enrolled in public schools. Students experiencing homelessness were disproportionately students of color.²³ Rates of young children and school-age experiencing homelessness varied across states.²⁴ Gathering data on and measuring homelessness is challenging, as housing status changes are frequent and conditions such as doubling up or sharing housing may not be obvious to child care or school administrators. These measurement challenges are problematic for ensuring that children receive the screenings and services they need, and for child care providers,

²⁰ 42 U.S.C. §11434a.

²¹ For more information about the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act’s definition of “Homeless,” see https://childcareta.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/public/understanding-federal-definitions-3-12-18_508_0.pdf.

²² Yamashiro, A., & McLaughlin, J. (2021). *Early Childhood Homelessness State Profiles: Data Collected in 2018-19*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/homeless/early-childhood-homelessness-state-profiles-2021.pdf>

²³ NCES, 2021. [Common Core of Data \(CCD\) - CCD Data Files \(ed.gov\)](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/data/common-core-of-data/ccd/)

²⁴ See [Student Homelessness in America for MSO Review 8.20.21 \(ed.gov\)](https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/homeless/early-childhood-homelessness-state-profiles-2021.pdf). Yamashiro, A., & McLaughlin, J. (2021). *Early Childhood Homelessness State Profiles: Data Collected in 2018-19*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/homeless/early-childhood-homelessness-state-profiles-2021.pdf>

schools, program administrators, and researchers seeking to understand the scope and number of children experiencing homelessness.²⁵

The experience of homelessness during early childhood is associated with poor early development, early academic achievement, and engagement in elementary school and beyond.²⁶ Despite research suggesting that the benefits of attending high-quality child care accrue most to children and their families facing disadvantage, research finds that children facing adversities like homelessness are less likely to attend child care, and when they do, are likely to attend poorer quality child care and school programs staffed by teachers who are themselves faced with and stressed by low-incomes and other challenging circumstances.²⁷ Families with children experiencing homelessness face particular challenges in finding and affording child care, including a lack of access to transportation or the application and other barriers.²⁸

Children experiencing homelessness are categorically eligible for Head Start/Early Head Start and McKinney-Vento programs. In FY 2018-2019, 126,665²⁹ children under age 6 experiencing homelessness (about 10 percent of those estimated to be experiencing homelessness) were enrolled in federally-funded early childhood programs including Early Head Start, Head Start, and other programs funded with McKinney-Vento grants (not including CCDF-funded child care assistance), an increase from 100,874 children (about eight percent of those experiencing homelessness) in 2014-2015.³⁰ Rates of participation in federally funded early childhood programs among children experiencing homelessness varies across states, from an estimated three percent in Alabama to 57 percent in South Dakota.³¹

In the CCDF program, states have flexibility on how they provide priority for children experiencing homelessness in their service areas, such as waiving copayment fees or prioritizing enrollment for children experiencing homelessness. The 2014 reauthorization of CCDBG included a requirement that states report whether children receiving assistance are children experiencing homelessness.

²⁵ [Navigating the Intersections of the McKinney-Vento Act and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Coordination to Help Homeless Children and Youth with Disabilities](#)

²⁶ Fantuzzo, J., LeBoeuf, W., Chien, C.-C., Rouse, H., & Culhane, D. (2012). The unique and combined effects of school mobility on the educational outcomes of young children. *Educational Researcher*, 41(9), 393-402.
Herbers, J., Cutuli, J., Supkoff, L., Heistad, D., Chan, C.-K., Hinz, E., & Masten, A. (2012). Early reading skills and academic trajectories of students facing poverty, homelessness, and high residential mobility. *Educational Researcher*, 41(9), 366-374.

Yamashiro, A., & McLaughlin, J. (2021). *Early Childhood Homelessness State Profiles: Data Collected in 2018-19*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/homeless/early-childhood-homelessness-state-profiles-2021.pdf>

²⁷ Thompson, R., & Haskins, R. (2014). Early stress gets under the skin: Promising initiatives to help children facing chronic adversity. *The Future of Children*, 24(1), 1-8.

²⁸ Yamashiro, A., & McLaughlin, J. (2021). *Early Childhood Homelessness State Profiles: Data Collected in 2018-19*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/homeless/early-childhood-homelessness-state-profiles-2021.pdf>

²⁹ The number of children enrolled in federal programs does not include those receiving child care assistance under CCDF and may be inflated due to a small number of children participating in both Head Start/Early Head Start and McKinney-Vento programming.

³⁰ Administration for Children and Families. (June 2017). [Early Childhood Homelessness in the United States: 50-State Profile \(hhs.gov\)](#) U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

³¹ <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/homeless/early-childhood-homelessness-state-profiles-2021.pdf>

States report whether a family receiving CCDF assistance is experiencing homelessness on the ACF-801 administrative data report (Appendix C). In FY 2020, across all states plus DC and Puerto Rico, an average of two percent of children receiving CCDF were reported to be experiencing homelessness. Forty-nine states plus DC and Puerto Rico reported homelessness status for all families receiving CCDF assistance, but of these, seventeen reported 0.5 percent or fewer children receiving CCDF assistance were experiencing homelessness, with the remaining 32 reporting one percent or more. Of these 32 states, states reported that between one and 11 percent of children receiving CCDF assistance were experiencing homelessness, with an average of three percent. Eight states reported that a proportion of their data were invalid or not reported. Four states (Alaska, Arizona, California, and Nevada) reported that between 19 and 100 percent of their data were invalid or not reported. These invalid data and low reported rates of children experiencing homelessness receiving child care assistance may result from difficulty reaching and serving families experiencing homelessness, measuring or collecting data on homelessness, or both.

In addition to reporting on the ACF-801 administrative data, states must demonstrate how they plan to offer priority in their CCDF plans. An analysis of the FY 2022-2024 CCDF plans shows states are continuing to make progress in select areas for meeting this new priority of services requirement.

- 41 states have policies in place to prioritize enrollment for children experiencing homelessness (up from 32 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 34 states do not place children experiencing homelessness on a waitlist (up from 29 states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- 28 states have policies in place to waive copayments for children experiencing homelessness.
- Five states pay higher rates to providers that care for children experiencing homelessness (down from six states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).
- Three states use grants or contracts reserve child care slots for children experiencing homelessness (down from six states in the FY2019-2021 CCDF plan).

Other strategies that states have reported using to prioritize children experiencing homelessness include:

- Providing families experiencing homelessness a minimum 60-day stabilization period where no verifications are required (Colorado).
- Partnering with community agencies that support the families of children experiencing homelessness (Georgia).
- Automatically enrolling children with special needs, those experiencing homelessness, and children in the foster care system (Idaho).
- Providing priority for children residing in a homeless or domestic violence shelter, halfway house, or in a public place (Indiana).
- Providing homeless households up to three months from the application date to provide verification documentation (Kentucky).

- Children experiencing homelessness receive a 90-day grace period for providing eligibility documentation and are referred to a homeless liaison (Louisiana).
- Prioritizing access through contacts with families in shelters; allowing for all children meeting the definition to use homelessness as a service need, in lieu of employment, education, or training (Massachusetts).
- Waiving the activity requirements for three months and processing applications within five days for families experiencing homelessness and allowing children experiencing homelessness to be considered a child with a special need with higher reimbursement rates (Minnesota).
- Defining homelessness as a valid need for child care, requiring participation in a community-based program to address homelessness (e.g., shelters, Head Start programs; Missouri).
- Expediting child care services (within 7 days of the application, final eligibility decision within 30 days; New Hampshire.)
- Allowing homeless families to receive homeless child care assistance, which does not include the employment work requirements, when referred by a homeless agency (Utah).
- Allowing families experiencing homelessness to be determined eligible and receive services prior to completing the address verification.
- In the event of limited funding and the creation of a waitlist, prioritizing children from very low-income families, children with special needs, and then children experiencing homelessness (District of Columbia, Montana, Virginia).

States continue to establish or expand their data collection procedures to collect accurate data on the percent of families they serve who are experiencing homelessness. Homeless status is self-reported by the family at the time of application in most cases. Parents or guardians answering questions may not know the state's definition, or if the state does not provide meaningful and specific prompts at the time of application, parents may not correctly report the information. This may also be compounded by a reluctance to report because of stigma. Since families are eligible for at least 12 months of child care assistance, they are not required to report short-term changes in their living situations, if it does not affect their eligibility (for example, over 85 percent of state median income). If families report their homeless status only once, instead of whenever their homeless status changes, this may mean that the true incidence of homelessness is under-reported.

CONCLUSION

The CCDBG Act requires OCC to report on state compliance with the provisions related to priorities of services to children in families with very low incomes and children with special needs. OCC is pleased to report that all states and territories are prioritizing CCDF assistance to families with very low incomes, children with special needs, and children experiencing homelessness as reported in the FY 2022-2024 CCDF Plans. Analysis of the CCDF Plan data shows that states and territories have implemented policies to support these groups. However, the ACF-801 data does not necessarily reflect this prioritization for many lead agencies. This is particularly true for children with special needs. As stated above, the 2012 NSECE household survey, approximately 1.2 million, or five percent, of the 23 million children under age 6 in the United States had a condition that affected the way the children were cared for, including

physical, emotional, developmental, or behavioral condition, but only two percent of children receiving CCDF were reported to have a disability. Additionally, the percentage of children receiving IDEA Part B and IDEA Part C services is also higher than the percent of children with special needs receiving CCDF funding. Data collection and reporting on these priority categories have been challenging for some states and territories, and they may be reporting the information inaccurately or not at all with outdated technology systems. To help address these challenges, states and territories have been encouraged to invest in data systems to support equitable access to child care with American Rescue Plan Act supplemental CCDF funds.³²

Technology upgrades and data governance improvements can increase accuracy in reporting and allow states and territories to analyze prioritization policies to ensure they are equitable. OCC also provides technical assistance to states and territories to improve data quality and reporting methods.

In addition to data quality and reporting concerns, lead agencies may only report one reason to receive care for eligible children and families, and the most prevalent reason is “employment”. Families receiving care for this reason may also be experiencing homelessness or have a child with special needs but not presenting as such to the state or territory during eligibility determination, which would lead to underreported count in both categories. This is problematic when it comes to lead agencies identifying and meeting the needs of children and families who may be experiencing homelessness or with special needs. While the analysis of CCDF State/Territory Plan responses shows that states and territories are implementing policies to prioritize these categories of children and families, families of children with special needs often experience challenges finding care at a higher percentage than families of children who do not have special needs.³³ Lead agencies must improve data collection for these populations to shape policies and priorities to address the needs of these children.

Reported ACF-801 data and State/Territory Plan analysis both show that states and territories are prioritizing children and families with very low incomes. Data also support that state and territories are prioritizing children living with very low incomes across racial/ethnic groups. The proportion of children below poverty is higher among children receiving CCDF compared to children in the general population, and this is also true for White, Black/African American (non-Hispanic), Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic), Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic), and Hispanic (any race) children.

OCC will continue to track state and territory priorities data and provide technical assistance to provide more complete data reporting and analysis in the next annual report on priorities for CCDF services.

³² <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/occ/CCDF-ACF-IM-2021-03.pdf>

³³ <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/child-care-crisis-disproportionately-affects-children-disabilities/>

Appendix A

Percent of Children (Birth through 12) Below Poverty in Each State: A Comparison of the Child Care and Development Fund Caseload (FY 2020) and the General Population

State/Territory	Receiving CCDF (Total)	In General Population (Total)	Receiving CCDF (White (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (White (non-Hispanic))
Alabama	73%	27%	73%	17%
Alaska	25%	16%	25%	11%
American Samoa ^a	--	--	--	--
Arizona	46%	24%	43%	13%
Arkansas	62%	27%	63%	21%
California	41%	20%	45%	10%
Colorado	49%	14%	38%	9%
Connecticut	30%	15%	25%	6%
Delaware	53%	20%	47%	13%
District of Columbia	52%	25%	--*	1%
Florida	49%	22%	43%	15%
Georgia ^b	--	24%	--	14%
Guam ^a	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	57%	14%	63%	10%
Idaho	65%	17%	65%	14%
Illinois	47%	19%	38%	11%
Indiana	53%	22%	55%	17%
Iowa	62%	16%	60%	12%
Kansas	59%	18%	55%	13%
Kentucky	64%	27%	62%	24%
Louisiana	62%	30%	64%	17%
Maine	34%	19%	33%	17%
Maryland	39%	14%	33%	8%
Massachusetts	41%	15%	40%	8%
Michigan	63%	23%	57%	16%
Minnesota	42%	14%	29%	8%
Mississippi	57%	31%	50%	18%
Missouri	64%	21%	57%	18%
Montana	62%	18%	60%	15%
Nebraska	65%	16%	60%	11%
Nevada	51%	21%	43%	12%
New Hampshire	45%	12%	45%	11%

State/Territory	Receiving CCDF (Total)	In General Population (Total)	Receiving CCDF (White (non- Hispanci))	In General Population (White (non-Hispanic))
New Jersey	31%	15%	28%	8%
New Mexico	50%	30%	48%	18%
New York	45%	22%	45%	15%
North Carolina	60%	24%	63%	14%
North Dakota	39%	12%	33%	8%
Northern Mariana Islands ^a	--	--	--	--
Ohio	63%	23%	57%	17%
Oklahoma	67%	24%	62%	18%
Oregon	49%	19%	48%	15%
Pennsylvania	42%	20%	36%	13%
Puerto Rico ^a	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island	55%	19%	50%	10%
South Carolina	60%	24%	51%	14%
South Dakota	46%	19%	38%	10%
Tennessee	67%	25%	78%	19%
Texas	54%	23%	47%	11%
Utah	41%	13%	35%	9%
Vermont	38%	13%	37%	13%
Virgin Islands ^a	--	--	--	--
Virginia	62%	16%	59%	11%
Washington	36%	16%	36%	11%
West Virginia	57%	27%	57%	26%
Wisconsin	48%	17%	34%	11%
Wyoming	38%	14%	38%	12%
National	50%	21%	50%	13%

Appendix A

Percent of Children (Birth through 12) Below Poverty in Each State: A Comparison of the Child Care and Development Fund Caseload (FY 2020) and the General Population

State/Territory	Receiving CCDF (Black/African American (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (Black/African American (non-Hispanic))	Receiving CCDF (Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic))
Alabama	73%	43%	79%	18%
Alaska	36%	11%	16%	31%
American Samoa ^a	--	--	--	--
Arizona	51%	28%	49%	47%
Arkansas	61%	43%	53%	26%
California	42%	28%	29%	29%
Colorado	50%	23%	41%	28%
Connecticut	28%	26%	36%	25%
Delaware	56%	27%	--*	0%
District of Columbia	54%	39%	--*	--*
Florida	54%	33%	49%	26%
Georgia ^b	--	34%	--	36%
Guam ^a	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	40%	13%	--*	58%
Idaho	68%	19%	--*	24%
Illinois	50%	38%	48%	14%
Indiana	52%	42%	66%	31%
Iowa	66%	44%	70%	34%
Kansas	64%	38%	57%	33%
Kentucky	68%	41%	--*	35%
Louisiana	62%	48%	55%	28%
Maine	47%	43%	46%	40%
Maryland	41%	20%	35%	17%
Massachusetts	42%	25%	38%	20%
Michigan	67%	44%	65%	27%
Minnesota	51%	36%	47%	43%
Mississippi	58%	47%	63%	49%
Missouri	68%	35%	46%	33%
Montana	58%	18%	75%	42%
Nebraska	71%	30%	75%	43%
Nevada	57%	33%	36%	35%
New Hampshire	48%	21%	53%	0%

State/Territory	Receiving CCDF (Black/African American (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (Black/African American (non-Hispanic))	Receiving CCDF (Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (Native American/Alaska Native (non-Hispanic))
New Jersey	32%	26%	32%	23%
New Mexico	53%	26%	53%	42%
New York	44%	30%	14%	31%
North Carolina	60%	36%	71%	37%
North Dakota	48%	18%	56%	40%
Northern Mariana Islands ^a	--	--	--	--
Ohio	66%	45%	68%	29%
Oklahoma	72%	42%	77%	28%
Oregon	53%	31%	55%	31%
Pennsylvania	47%	35%	29%	42%
Puerto Rico ^a	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island	57%	27%	72%	70%
South Carolina	64%	38%	68%	29%
South Dakota	43%	18%	73%	61%
Tennessee	56%	40%	72%	37%
Texas	53%	29%	44%	16%
Utah	58%	29%	47%	44%
Vermont	56%	14%	--*	--*
Virgin Islands ^a	--	--	--	--
Virginia	64%	28%	72%	3%
Washington	40%	26%	42%	29%
West Virginia	56%	42%	36%	36%
Wisconsin	54%	42%	42%	45%
Wyoming	39%	19%	33%	32%
National	54%	35%	54%	37%

Appendix A

Percent of Children (Birth through 12) Below Poverty in Each State: A Comparison of the Child Care and Development Fund Caseload (FY 2020) and the General Population

State/Territory	Receiving CCDF (Asian/ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic))	Receiving CCDF (Hispanic (any race))	In General Population (Hispanic (any race))
Alabama	69%	10%	74%	42%
Alaska	30%	29%	21%	14%
American Samoa ^a	--	--	--	--
Arizona	45%	11%	47%	31%
Arkansas	70%	18%	69%	36%
California	35%	10%	40%	26%
Colorado	47%	11%	44%	22%
Connecticut	39%	9%	31%	30%
Delaware	64%	7%	50%	35%
District of Columbia	--*	2%	37%	17%
Florida	44%	12%	45%	26%
Georgia ^b	--	11%	--	34%
Guam ^a	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	54%	16%	59%	19%
Idaho	56%	16%	65%	30%
Illinois	41%	10%	44%	25%
Indiana	51%	19%	54%	31%
Iowa	60%	13%	62%	30%
Kansas	68%	14%	63%	27%
Kentucky	52%	19%	68%	39%
Louisiana	57%	17%	58%	33%
Maine	22%	13%	32%	29%
Maryland	43%	9%	30%	19%
Massachusetts	21%	10%	43%	33%
Michigan	70%	13%	62%	31%
Minnesota	30%	17%	36%	27%
Mississippi	31%	16%	51%	35%
Missouri	61%	11%	62%	29%
Montana	--*	13%	57%	23%
Nebraska	60%	22%	66%	30%
Nevada	44%	13%	48%	26%
New Hampshire	52%	6%	44%	17%

State/Territory	Receiving CCDF (Asian/ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic))	In General Population (Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic))	Receiving CCDF (Hispanic (any race))	In General Population (Hispanic (any race))
New Jersey	35%	5%	32%	25%
New Mexico	40%	11%	51%	33%
New York	42%	17%	45%	31%
North Carolina	50%	13%	50%	38%
North Dakota	--*	10%	--*	17%
Northern Mariana Islands ^a	--	--	--	--
Ohio	63%	12%	61%	37%
Oklahoma	64%	16%	69%	34%
Oregon	52%	13%	49%	30%
Pennsylvania	46%	13%	41%	38%
Puerto Rico ^a	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island	--*	11%	56%	35%
South Carolina	44%	13%	61%	38%
South Dakota	31%	16%	47%	29%
Tennessee	85%	10%	66%	37%
Texas	45%	10%	55%	31%
Utah	40%	19%	39%	23%
Vermont	31%	15%	48%	20%
Virgin Islands ^a	--	--	--	--
Virginia	58%	6%	51%	20%
Washington	37%	9%	34%	27%
West Virginia	68%	9%	55%	29%
Wisconsin	39%	15%	48%	29%
Wyoming	--*	0%	38%	23%
National	41%	11%	45%	29%

* Percents were not computed where there were fewer than 10 children in a race/ethnic group

^aThe American Community Survey did not cover US territories.

^bGeorgia did not submit ACF-801 data for FY 2020 due to ongoing issues with their reporting software.

"Receiving CCDF" estimates are from preliminary FY 2020 ACF-801 Data reported by the 50 States and District of Columbia (tabulation by the National Center on Child Care Data and Reporting staff). Official Census poverty thresholds are used.

"General Population" estimates are from the American Community Survey, 2015-2019 5-year estimates (IPUMS tabulation by ASPE staff). IPUMS-based data for 2016-2020 was not available at the time of analysis. The IPUMS race/ethnicity variable used for this analysis did not contain a "multiracial" category. Official Census poverty thresholds are used.

IPUMS USA sample data: Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Sophia Foster, Ronald Goeken, Jose Pacas, Megan Schouweiler and Matthew Sobek. IPUMS USA: Version 11.0. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2021.

<https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V11.0>

Appendix B
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Children with a Disability (FY 2020)

This table provides a snapshot of the progress States are making in reporting this data and should not be used to describe the national landscape of children with disabilities receiving child care services.

Child With a Disability Definition: Refer to footnote #7 for the definition

State/Territory	No Disability	Has Disability	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	100%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	100%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	100%	0%	0%	100%
California	0%	1%	99%	100%
Colorado	100%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	100%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	98%	2%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	95%	5%	0%	100%
Florida	100%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	-	-	-	-
Guam	100%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	100%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	98%	2%	0%	100%
Illinois	93%	1%	6%	100%
Indiana	99%	1%	0%	100%
Iowa	97%	3%	0%	100%
Kansas	100%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	98%	2%	0%	100%
Louisiana	98%	2%	0%	100%
Maine	99%	1%	0%	100%
Maryland	98%	2%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	99%	1%	0%	100%
Michigan	96%	4%	0%	100%
Minnesota	0%	2%	98%	100%
Mississippi	99%	1%	0%	100%
Missouri	96%	4%	0%	100%
Montana	95%	3%	2%	100%
Nebraska	96%	4%	0%	100%
Nevada	99%	1%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	99%	1%	0%	100%
New Jersey	99%	1%	0%	100%
New Mexico	100%	0%	0%	100%
New York	98%	1%	1%	100%
North Carolina	100%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	99%	1%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	-	-	-	-

State/Territory	No Disability	Has Disability	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Ohio	99%	1%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	98%	2%	0%	100%
Oregon	100%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	98%	2%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	89%	11%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	99%	1%	0%	100%
South Carolina	95%	5%	0%	100%
South Dakota	99%	1%	0%	100%
Tennessee	100%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	98%	2%	0%	100%
Utah	100%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	91%	9%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	100%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	99%	1%	0%	100%
Washington	100%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	100%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	100%	0%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this table

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2020.

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; CARES Act, and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages. Based on ACF-800 data, 14 states (DE, ID, IL, IA, KS, ME, MN, NV, ND, OK, PA, TX, VA, WY) reported including families, children and providers served with CARES Act funding in the ACF-800 and ACF-801 data.

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 FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.

4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

5. At the time of publication, American Samoa, Georgia, and Northern Mariana Islands had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2020. Alaska had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data. Mississippi had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data. North Carolina had submitted 8 months of ACF-801 data. Ohio had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data. Virgin Islands had submitted 3 months of ACF-801 data.

6. The Invalid/Not Reported column only includes child records with an invalid or missing number for ACF-801 element 25a, Child Disability.

7. Child with a disability is defined to include:

- A. a child with a disability, as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401) (i.e., a child receiving special education services based on an Individualized Education Program (IEP) under Part B of IDEA);
- B. a child who is eligible for early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) (i.e., an infant or toddler eligible to receive early intervention services based on an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) under Part C of IDEA);
- C. a child who is eligible for services under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) (i.e., a child eligible to receive services under a 504 Plan); and
- D. a child with a disability, as defined by the State involved (States have flexibility regarding part D of the definition.)

8. "-" indicates data not reported.

Appendix C
Child Care and Development Fund
Preliminary Estimates
Average Monthly Percentages of Families by Homeless Status (FY 2020)

This table provides a snapshot of the progress States are making in reporting this data and should not be used to describe the national landscape of CCDF families experiencing homelessness.

Family Homeless Status Definition: Agencies must use the term homeless as defined in section 725 of subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Act. See footnote #7 for the detailed description of "homeless children".

State/Territory	Not Experiencing Homelessness	Experiencing Homelessness	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	100%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	76%	1%	23%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	62%	2%	36%	100%
Arkansas	100%	0%	0%	100%
California	0%	0%	100%	100%
Colorado	98%	2%	0%	100%
Connecticut	100%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	99%	1%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	95%	5%	0%	100%
Florida	99%	1%	0%	100%
Georgia	-	-	-	-
Guam	100%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	100%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	99%	1%	0%	100%
Indiana	91%	9%	0%	100%
Iowa	100%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	100%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	100%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	90%	2%	8%	100%
Maine	99%	1%	0%	100%
Maryland	98%	2%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	97%	3%	0%	100%
Michigan	99%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	81%	11%	8%	100%
Mississippi	100%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	99%	1%	0%	100%
Montana	95%	2%	2%	100%
Nebraska	97%	3%	0%	100%
Nevada	78%	3%	19%	100%
New Hampshire	89%	11%	0%	100%

State/Territory	Not Experiencing Homelessness	Experiencing Homelessness	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
New Jersey	98%	2%	0%	100%
New Mexico	100%	0%	0%	100%
New York	100%	0%	0%	100%
North Carolina	100%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	100%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	-	-	-	-
Ohio	99%	1%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	100%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	91%	1%	8%	100%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	99%	1%	0%	100%
South Carolina	96%	4%	0%	100%
South Dakota	97%	3%	0%	100%
Tennessee	100%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	97%	3%	0%	100%
Utah	94%	6%	0%	100%
Vermont	98%	2%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	100%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	98%	2%	0%	100%
Washington	93%	7%	0%	100%
West Virginia	100%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	97%	3%	0%	100%
Wyoming	99%	1%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2020.

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; CARES Act, and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages. Based on ACF-800 data, 14 states (DE, ID, IL, IA, KS, ME, MN, NV, ND, OK, PA, TX, VA, WY) reported including families, children and providers served with CARES Act funding in the ACF-800 and ACF-801 data.

3. All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month was directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.

4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

5. At the time of publication, American Samoa, Georgia, and Northern Mariana Islands had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2020. Alaska had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data. Mississippi had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data. North Carolina had submitted 8 months of ACF-801 data. Ohio had submitted 10 months of ACF-801 data. Virgin Islands had submitted 3 months of ACF-801 data.

6. The Invalid/Not Reported column only includes family records with an invalid or missing number for ACF-801 element 16a, Family Homeless Status.

7. Agencies must use the term homeless as defined in section 725 of subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Act. The term "homeless children and youths" refers to individuals who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence and includes the following four categories:

1. Children and youth who:
 - a) share the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason;
 - b) are living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to the lack of alternative accommodations;
 - c) are living in emergency or transitional shelters; or
 - d) are abandoned in hospitals.
2. Children and youth who have a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.
3. Children and youth who are living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations, or similar settings.
4. Children of migrant or seasonal workers who qualify as homeless because they are living in circumstances described in the first three categories.

8. "-" indicates data not reported.