

**Table 1  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Average Monthly Adjusted Number of Families and Children Served (FFY 2011)**

<b>States/Territories</b>	<b>Average Number of Families</b>	<b>Average Number of Children</b>
Alabama	14,500	27,100
Alaska	2,600	4,200
American Samoa	-	-
Arizona	16,300	26,000
Arkansas	5,600	9,000
California	77,700	114,400
Colorado	9,900	16,900
Connecticut	6,600	9,500
Delaware	3,900	6,300
District of Columbia	1,000	1,300
Florida	63,400	92,800
Georgia	34,000	61,100
Guam	500	800
Hawaii	5,300	8,700
Idaho	3,900	7,000
Illinois	35,900	63,000
Indiana	16,900	32,400
Iowa	9,000	16,000
Kansas	11,000	20,200
Kentucky	16,300	29,300
Louisiana	24,100	36,000
Maine	1,800	2,600
Maryland	14,700	24,400
Massachusetts	21,600	28,600
Michigan	28,400	52,900
Minnesota	17,400	31,200
Mississippi	12,900	23,800
Missouri	26,500	41,300
Montana	2,800	4,500
Nebraska	6,900	12,300
Nevada	4,400	7,300
New Hampshire	3,500	4,800
New Jersey	25,200	36,300
New Mexico	12,200	20,500
New York	78,600	130,800
North Carolina	36,100	74,200
North Dakota	2,300	3,700
Northern Mariana Islands	100	200
Ohio	26,700	46,500
Oklahoma	17,000	28,000
Oregon	10,400	18,700
Pennsylvania	59,800	101,100
Puerto Rico	11,000	16,300
Rhode Island	3,400	5,500
South Carolina	10,900	18,000
South Dakota	3,600	5,800
Tennessee	24,600	46,100
Texas	74,000	130,300
Utah	6,400	11,900
Vermont	3,100	4,500
Virgin Islands	500	700
Virginia	14,900	23,300
Washington	26,000	44,800
West Virginia	4,300	7,100
Wisconsin	15,500	26,400
Wyoming	3,200	5,100
<b>National Total</b>	<b>969,100</b>	<b>1,621,500</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for states that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children was obtained from the monthly numbers in the FFY, as reported on the ACF-801 summary (header) record.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa had not submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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 2011)**

State	Grants/Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %	Total
Alabama	0%	100%	0%	45,555
Alaska	0%	91%	9%	5,003
American Samoa	0%	0%	100%	1,321
Arizona	0%	100%	0%	43,823
Arkansas	0%	100%	0%	18,867
California	42%	58%	0%	194,197
Colorado	1%	99%	0%	32,916
Connecticut	0%	100%	0%	15,059
Delaware	0%	99%	1%	11,570
District of Columbia	0%	100%	0%	1,949
Florida	0%	100%	0%	148,992
Georgia	0%	100%	0%	99,907
Guam	6%	94%	0%	1,325
Hawaii	34%	0%	66%	22,625
Idaho	0%	100%	0%	13,540
Illinois	6%	94%	0%	107,238
Indiana	2%	99%	0%	46,730
Iowa	0%	100%	0%	28,802
Kansas	0%	100%	0%	34,282
Kentucky	0%	100%	0%	49,096
Louisiana	0%	100%	0%	56,208
Maine	31%	69%	0%	4,156
Maryland	0%	100%	0%	40,024
Massachusetts	38%	62%	0%	58,138
Michigan	0%	93%	7%	78,034
Minnesota	0%	100%	0%	51,055
Mississippi	4%	96%	0%	38,863
Missouri	0%	100%	0%	68,228
Montana	0%	97%	3%	8,828
Nebraska	0%	100%	0%	22,103
Nevada	17%	83%	0%	15,092
New Hampshire	0%	100%	0%	8,255
New Jersey	15%	85%	0%	68,420
New Mexico	0%	100%	0%	33,153
New York	35%	65%	0%	226,170
North Carolina	0%	100%	0%	94,114
North Dakota	0%	100%	0%	7,120
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	448
Ohio	0%	100%	0%	93,847
Oklahoma	0%	100%	0%	51,908
Oregon	6%	94%	0%	35,149
Pennsylvania	0%	99%	1%	153,552
Puerto Rico	40%	60%	0%	29,837
Rhode Island	0%	100%	0%	8,859
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%	33,527
South Dakota	2%	98%	0%	11,266
Tennessee	0%	100%	0%	72,586
Texas	0%	100%	0%	233,965
Utah	0%	0%	100%	20,160
Vermont	0%	100%	0%	7,088
Virgin Islands	0%	100%	0%	1,220
Virginia	0%	100%	0%	52,634
Washington	0%	100%	0%	81,437
West Virginia	0%	100%	0%	12,355
Wisconsin	0%	100%	0%	44,384
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	9,066
<b>National Total</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2,754,045</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2011. The ACF-800 is based on an annual unduplicated count of families and children; i.e., a family or child that receives one hour of service on one day is counted the same as a family or child that receives full-time care throughout the fiscal year.

2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.

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

**Table 3**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care (FFY 2011)**

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	5%	3%	92%	1%	100%
Alaska	11%	27%	6%	56%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	2%	12%	7%	79%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	12%	0%	88%	0%	100%
California	1%	35%	12%	53%	0%	100%
Colorado	1%	15%	0%	58%	27%	100%
Connecticut	15%	32%	0%	53%	0%	100%
Delaware	1%	24%	4%	72%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	3%	0%	96%	0%	100%
Florida	0%	8%	0%	92%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	8%	3%	89%	0%	100%
Guam	3%	5%	1%	92%	0%	100%
Hawaii	35%	42%	0%	23%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	20%	16%	62%	0%	100%
Illinois	15%	43%	2%	40%	0%	100%
Indiana	0%	40%	0%	60%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	47%	6%	47%	0%	100%
Kansas	5%	15%	43%	37%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	8%	1%	89%	0%	100%
Louisiana	3%	10%	0%	87%	0%	100%
Maine	0%	29%	0%	70%	1%	100%
Maryland	8%	40%	0%	51%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	0%	28%	72%	0%	100%
Michigan	23%	34%	14%	30%	0%	100%
Minnesota	11%	39%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Mississippi	2%	19%	1%	78%	0%	100%
Missouri	3%	26%	2%	68%	0%	100%
Montana	6%	18%	40%	36%	0%	100%
Nebraska	0%	27%	7%	66%	0%	100%
Nevada	8%	13%	1%	78%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	3%	16%	0%	80%	1%	100%
New Jersey	2%	13%	0%	81%	5%	100%
New Mexico	3%	19%	6%	72%	0%	100%
New York	15%	26%	17%	41%	0%	100%
North Carolina	0%	15%	0%	84%	1%	100%
North Dakota	0%	41%	33%	26%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	1%	2%	80%	17%	100%
Ohio	0%	22%	3%	75%	1%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	17%	0%	83%	0%	100%
Oregon	20%	50%	9%	22%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	1%	27%	4%	67%	1%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	42%	0%	56%	2%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	29%	0%	70%	0%	100%
South Carolina	2%	14%	2%	82%	0%	100%
South Dakota	1%	45%	4%	51%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	16%	5%	79%	0%	100%
Texas	1%	3%	2%	95%	0%	100%
Utah	2%	21%	27%	49%	1%	100%
Vermont	3%	39%	0%	56%	1%	100%
Virgin Islands	7%	2%	21%	70%	0%	100%
Virginia	4%	25%	1%	71%	0%	100%
Washington	14%	33%	0%	53%	0%	100%
West Virginia	0%	30%	5%	65%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	0%	23%	0%	70%	7%	100%
Wyoming	3%	33%	15%	48%	0%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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 between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 4**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in Regulated Settings vs.**  
**Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation (FFY 2011)**

State	Licensed/ Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	64%	35%	1%	100%
Alaska	77%	23%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	92%	8%	0%	100%
Arkansas	99%	1%	0%	100%
California	74%	26%	0%	100%
Colorado	71%	2%	27%	100%
Connecticut	65%	35%	0%	100%
Delaware	91%	9%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	99%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	92%	8%	0%	100%
Georgia	98%	2%	0%	100%
Guam	93%	7%	0%	100%
Hawaii	29%	71%	0%	100%
Idaho	77%	22%	0%	100%
Illinois	58%	42%	0%	100%
Indiana	73%	27%	0%	100%
Iowa	86%	14%	0%	100%
Kansas	84%	16%	0%	100%
Kentucky	96%	4%	0%	100%
Louisiana	85%	15%	0%	100%
Maine	92%	7%	1%	100%
Maryland	84%	15%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	0%	100%
Michigan	52%	48%	0%	100%
Minnesota	75%	25%	0%	100%
Mississippi	79%	21%	0%	100%
Missouri	69%	30%	0%	100%
Montana	84%	15%	0%	100%
Nebraska	88%	12%	0%	100%
Nevada	70%	30%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	86%	13%	1%	100%
New Jersey	89%	6%	5%	100%
New Mexico	80%	20%	0%	100%
New York	63%	37%	0%	100%
North Carolina	98%	1%	1%	100%
North Dakota	66%	34%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	82%	1%	17%	100%
Ohio	99%	0%	1%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	49%	51%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	78%	21%	1%	100%
Puerto Rico	57%	41%	2%	100%
Rhode Island	98%	1%	0%	100%
South Carolina	86%	14%	0%	100%
South Dakota	86%	14%	0%	100%
Tennessee	90%	9%	0%	100%
Texas	99%	1%	0%	100%
Utah	68%	31%	1%	100%
Vermont	88%	11%	1%	100%
Virgin Islands	99%	1%	0%	100%
Virginia	85%	15%	0%	100%
Washington	80%	20%	0%	100%
West Virginia	97%	3%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	93%	0%	7%	100%
Wyoming	83%	17%	0%	100%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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 between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 5  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Of Children in Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation,  
Average Monthly Percent Served by Relatives vs. Non-Relatives (FFY 2011)**

State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %	Total Count
Alabama	99%	1%	100%	618
Alaska	58%	42%	100%	960
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	0%	100%	2,011
Arkansas	0%	100%	100%	47
California	70%	30%	100%	25,662
Colorado	77%	23%	100%	383
Connecticut	80%	20%	100%	2,925
Delaware	99%	1%	100%	247
District of Columbia	100%	0%	100%	6
Florida	33%	67%	100%	169
Georgia	77%	23%	100%	1,377
Guam	59%	41%	100%	54
Hawaii	87%	13%	100%	6,035
Idaho	38%	62%	100%	1,564
Illinois	64%	36%	100%	23,833
Indiana	35%	65%	100%	899
Iowa	0%	100%	100%	2,267
Kansas	84%	16%	100%	3,273
Kentucky	59%	41%	100%	1,311
Louisiana	37%	63%	100%	4,771
Maine	17%	83%	100%	170
Maryland	85%	15%	100%	3,576
Massachusetts	NA	NA	NA	0
Michigan	63%	37%	100%	25,529
Minnesota	56%	44%	100%	5,883
Mississippi	51%	49%	100%	5,005
Missouri	49%	51%	100%	8,562
Montana	52%	48%	100%	703
Nebraska	16%	84%	100%	1,429
Nevada	60%	40%	100%	1,168
New Hampshire	36%	64%	100%	555
New Jersey	42%	58%	100%	2,190
New Mexico	68%	32%	100%	4,118
New York	53%	47%	100%	38,894
North Carolina	83%	17%	100%	778
North Dakota	43%	57%	100%	1,255
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	100%	2
Ohio	NA	NA	NA	0
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	0
Oregon	40%	60%	100%	9,456
Pennsylvania	57%	43%	100%	21,397
Puerto Rico	67%	33%	100%	6,755
Rhode Island	56%	44%	100%	61
South Carolina	21%	79%	100%	1,953
South Dakota	64%	36%	100%	825
Tennessee	25%	75%	100%	4,247
Texas	100%	0%	100%	1,180
Utah	100%	0%	100%	3,640
Vermont	56%	44%	100%	498
Virgin Islands	71%	29%	100%	7
Virginia	49%	51%	100%	2,208
Washington	71%	29%	100%	8,895
West Virginia	52%	48%	100%	25
Wisconsin	NA	NA	NA	0
Wyoming	58%	42%	100%	835
<b>National Total</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>240,215</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding. In this table, centers operating without regulation (data element 26 = 11) were considered Non-Relative.
- In some states there were no children served in unregulated settings and thus the percent is "NA" since division by zero is undefined. States with no Providers Legally Operating Without Regulation include: Massachusetts, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin.
- At the time of publication, American Samoa had not submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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 between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 6**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in All Types of Care (FFY 2011)**

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%	3%	3%	59%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	1%
Alaska	100%	0%	15%	6%	56%	3%	8%	10%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	0%	6%	7%	79%	2%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arkansas	100%	0%	11%	0%	88%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
California	100%	0%	13%	12%	49%	0%	0%	15%	6%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%
Colorado	100%	0%	13%	0%	57%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	27%
Connecticut	100%	0%	16%	0%	48%	11%	4%	13%	2%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%
Delaware	100%	0%	20%	4%	67%	1%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%
District of Columbia	100%	0%	3%	0%	96%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Florida	100%	0%	8%	0%	84%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%
Georgia	100%	0%	6%	3%	89%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Guam	100%	0%	1%	1%	91%	2%	1%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hawaii	100%	0%	7%	0%	22%	31%	4%	30%	5%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	16%	62%	2%	0%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Illinois	100%	0%	20%	2%	36%	9%	6%	15%	8%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%
Indiana	100%	0%	37%	0%	36%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	24%	0%
Iowa	100%	0%	33%	6%	47%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kansas	100%	0%	4%	43%	37%	3%	3%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kentucky	100%	0%	5%	1%	89%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Louisiana	100%	0%	0%	0%	85%	2%	1%	3%	7%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Maine	100%	0%	23%	0%	69%	0%	0%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Maryland	100%	0%	33%	0%	51%	6%	2%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	0%	28%	72%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Michigan	100%	0%	9%	14%	29%	5%	18%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Minnesota	100%	0%	31%	0%	44%	5%	5%	5%	3%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%
Mississippi	100%	0%	0%	1%	78%	2%	1%	9%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Missouri	100%	0%	9%	2%	58%	2%	1%	8%	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%
Montana	100%	0%	8%	40%	36%	3%	3%	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nebraska	100%	0%	15%	7%	66%	0%	0%	2%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nevada	100%	0%	5%	1%	64%	4%	4%	5%	3%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%
New Hampshire	100%	0%	7%	0%	79%	1%	1%	3%	6%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
New Jersey	100%	0%	8%	0%	81%	1%	1%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
New Mexico	100%	0%	2%	6%	72%	2%	1%	11%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New York	100%	0%	12%	17%	34%	10%	5%	6%	9%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%
North Carolina	100%	0%	14%	0%	84%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
North Dakota	100%	0%	7%	33%	26%	0%	0%	15%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	0%	2%	80%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Ohio	100%	0%	22%	3%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	17%	0%	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Oregon	100%	0%	19%	8%	21%	12%	7%	8%	22%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Pennsylvania	100%	0%	7%	4%	67%	0%	0%	12%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	1%	0%	56%	0%	0%	28%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Rhode Island	100%	0%	28%	0%	70%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Carolina	100%	0%	5%	2%	79%	0%	2%	2%	7%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
South Dakota	100%	0%	31%	4%	51%	0%	1%	9%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tennessee	100%	0%	7%	5%	79%	1%	0%	2%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Texas	100%	0%	3%	2%	95%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utah	100%	2%	12%	5%	48%	0%	0%	9%	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Vermont	100%	0%	31%	0%	56%	1%	2%	5%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Virgin Islands	100%	7%	1%	21%	70%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Virginia	100%	1%	18%	0%	65%	1%	1%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%
Washington	100%	0%	27%	0%	53%	8%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
West Virginia	100%	0%	30%	5%	62%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	23%	0%	70%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Wyoming	100%	0%	20%	15%	48%	2%	1%	8%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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 between related reports involving setting data, children with invalid or missing data for care type, hours, or payment for any setting(s) are reported in the Invalid/Not Reported category.

**Table 7  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Number of Child Care Providers Receiving CCDF Funds (FFY 2011)**

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Alabama	8	784	214	1,657	2,663
Alaska	319	592	43	140	1,094
American Samoa	0	0	0	42	42
Arizona	460	2,143	331	1,325	4,259
Arkansas	0	348	0	926	1,274
California	1,814	54,008	5,981	4,916	66,719
Colorado	100	1,423	0	1,293	2,816
Connecticut	3,697	4,566	21	1,415	9,699
Delaware	56	1,047	60	402	1,565
District of Columbia	23	87	0	151	261
Florida	5	3,191	0	7,242	10,438
Georgia	267	2,611	209	3,058	6,145
Guam	23	10	0	60	93
Hawaii	3,655	3,876	7	434	7,972
Idaho	61	362	233	396	1,052
Illinois	25,502	48,778	438	3,322	78,040
Indiana	13	2,869	0	1,190	4,072
Iowa	197	4,892	314	815	6,218
Kansas	746	1,983	2,716	718	6,163
Kentucky	419	1,685	98	1,888	4,090
Louisiana	629	1,537	0	2,142	4,308
Maine	1	704	0	430	1,135
Maryland	1,804	5,240	0	1,686	8,730
Massachusetts	3,659	3,492	5,255	4,446	16,852
Michigan	6,213	9,139	2,772	3,856	21,980
Minnesota	3,020	7,709	0	1,556	12,285
Mississippi	2,109	2,210	1,384	361	6,064
Missouri	621	5,347	159	2,394	8,521
Montana	322	1,002	485	248	2,057
Nebraska	0	2,505	280	716	3,501
Nevada	544	931	11	522	2,008
New Hampshire	123	566	0	571	1,260
New Jersey	652	3,686	0	2,575	6,913
New Mexico	2	2,715	129	559	3,405
New York	20,356	34,836	6,822	4,903	66,917
North Carolina	56	2,730	0	4,104	6,890
North Dakota	0	1,356	584	148	2,088
Northern Mariana Islands	1	12	2	25	40
Ohio	17	7,664	321	4,838	12,840
Oklahoma	26	1,431	0	1,266	2,723
Oregon	3,219	7,877	430	710	12,236
Pennsylvania	473	22,651	782	4,285	28,191
Puerto Rico	150	6,574	0	1,315	8,039
Rhode Island	6	649	3	346	1,004
South Carolina	157	1,733	128	1,280	3,298
South Dakota	61	1,750	59	282	2,152
Tennessee	212	4,113	427	1,890	6,642
Texas	1,510	3,443	856	6,498	12,307
Utah	1,042	3,356	201	364	4,963
Vermont	247	1,525	0	524	2,296
Virgin Islands	20	6	20	81	127
Virginia	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	7,968	6,820	0	1,827	16,615
West Virginia	11	1,933	105	417	2,466
Wisconsin	74	4,136	0	2,375	6,585
Wyoming	157	909	172	199	1,437
<b>National Total</b>	<b>92,827</b>	<b>297,542</b>	<b>32,052</b>	<b>91,129</b>	<b>513,550</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2011, an unduplicated annual count.
- 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.
- 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.
- At the time of publication, all states and territories had submitted their ACF-800 data for FFY 2011.
- 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. The state is working towards an automated system in order to report the number of providers.
- Michigan rolled out a new data system in FFY 2010. FFY 2011 is the first year in which data were actually reported using this system.

**Table 8  
Child Care and Development Fund  
Preliminary Estimates  
Consumer Education Strategies Summary (FFY 2011)**

State	Content						Method			Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education	
	Grants/Contracts/Certificates Info	Provider List	Types/Quality of Care Materials	Health and Safety	Child Care Regulatory Info	Child Care Complaint Policy	Print Materials	Counseling from Resource and Referral Agencies	Mass Media		Electronic Media
Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	42,701
Alaska	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9,520
American Samoa	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	737
Arizona	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	74,781
Arkansas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	50,000
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2,373,973
Colorado	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	143,320
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	26,907
Delaware	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	20,517
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	29,052
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	330,317
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	163,682
Guam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11,000
Hawaii	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	9,697
Idaho	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	757
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	228,290
Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	24,790
Iowa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	45,298
Kansas	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	107,233
Kentucky	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	26,648
Louisiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	77,992
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4,010
Maryland	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	221,880
Massachusetts	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	87,136
Michigan	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	411,680
Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	816,239
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	20,252
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	53,375
Montana	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	743,071
Nebraska	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	41,208
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10,283
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5,841
New Jersey	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	124,872
New Mexico	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	19,525
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,092,795
North Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	250,493
North Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	12,231
Northern Mariana Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	50
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	129,843
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	319,935
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	81,521
Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	170,283
Puerto Rico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21,831
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	7,844
South Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	421,720
South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	278,047
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	38,605
Texas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	128,846
Utah	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	7,211
Vermont	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	9,280
Virgin Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	757
Virginia	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	35,848
Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15,200
West Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9,097
Wisconsin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	53,361
Wyoming	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7,769
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>9,449,151</b>

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2011, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because it is impossible to tell which families receiving consumer information also received CCDF funding.
3. NA=Not applicable, does not offer grants or contracts for subsidized child care slots.
4. A blank cell indicates that the state did not provide a response.
5. At the time of publication, all states and territories had fully reported their ACF-800 data for FFY 2011.

**Table 9**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children In Care By Age Group (FFY 2011)**

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%	14%	14%	13%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	6%	12%	14%	14%	14%	10%	29%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	5%	9%	12%	14%	14%	11%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	9%	15%	17%	16%	14%	10%	19%	0%	0%	100%
California	2%	6%	9%	17%	20%	12%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Colorado	6%	11%	14%	15%	14%	11%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	6%	11%	14%	16%	15%	9%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	6%	11%	14%	14%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	7%	18%	24%	20%	10%	5%	17%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	5%	11%	14%	16%	16%	12%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	5%	12%	14%	15%	13%	9%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Guam	3%	13%	17%	20%	17%	12%	18%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	6%	13%	15%	15%	16%	7%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	6%	10%	13%	14%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	5%	10%	11%	12%	12%	10%	40%	1%	0%	100%
Indiana	4%	9%	14%	14%	15%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	6%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	5%	10%	13%	13%	13%	10%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	7%	12%	14%	14%	13%	9%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	8%	16%	19%	18%	13%	7%	20%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	5%	10%	13%	16%	17%	11%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Maryland	4%	12%	15%	15%	13%	9%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	5%	9%	14%	17%	16%	10%	29%	1%	0%	100%
Michigan	5%	10%	12%	12%	11%	9%	40%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	5%	11%	13%	14%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	3%	10%	13%	14%	13%	10%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Missouri	7%	12%	14%	15%	14%	10%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Montana	7%	12%	14%	15%	15%	11%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	8%	12%	13%	14%	13%	9%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Nevada	6%	10%	13%	14%	15%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	4%	10%	15%	17%	18%	13%	23%	0%	0%	100%
New Jersey	3%	10%	15%	15%	12%	10%	34%	1%	0%	100%
New Mexico	6%	11%	14%	15%	14%	10%	31%	0%	0%	100%
New York	5%	9%	13%	15%	14%	9%	35%	0%	0%	100%
North Carolina	4%	9%	11%	12%	13%	11%	40%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	9%	13%	15%	15%	14%	9%	24%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	5%	9%	13%	13%	15%	12%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	6%	11%	13%	14%	14%	10%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	7%	13%	15%	15%	13%	10%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	5%	10%	12%	13%	12%	10%	37%	1%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	4%	10%	12%	13%	13%	10%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	3%	11%	15%	18%	15%	8%	26%	3%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	4%	9%	12%	13%	13%	11%	39%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	7%	15%	18%	17%	14%	9%	21%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	8%	12%	13%	14%	14%	11%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	6%	12%	14%	15%	13%	9%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	6%	12%	15%	15%	13%	10%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Utah	4%	9%	12%	13%	13%	11%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	10%	13%	15%	15%	10%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	4%	14%	19%	21%	17%	9%	16%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	4%	11%	15%	15%	15%	10%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	5%	11%	13%	14%	13%	11%	35%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	11%	13%	14%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	7%	11%	13%	14%	13%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	6%	12%	14%	15%	14%	11%	27%	0%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.

2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.

3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.

6. The Invalid/Not Reported category only includes children with an invalid year/month of birth or report date.

**Table 10**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Reasons for Receiving Care, Average Monthly Percentage of Families (FFY 2011)**

State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Employment & Training/Education	Protective Services	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	68%	17%	4%	10%	0%	100%
Alaska	76%	7%	7%	10%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	51%	0%	10%	39%	0%	100%
Arkansas	65%	17%	4%	14%	0%	100%
California	81%	13%	4%	1%	0%	100%
Colorado	61%	9%	25%	0%	6%	100%
Connecticut	93%	6%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	79%	9%	5%	8%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	62%	34%	3%	1%	0%	100%
Florida	62%	6%	8%	24%	0%	100%
Georgia	83%	8%	3%	6%	0%	100%
Guam	81%	8%	10%	1%	0%	100%
Hawaii	76%	9%	14%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	70%	14%	16%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	85%	13%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Indiana	74%	13%	13%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	91%	7%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Kansas	92%	1%	6%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	85%	4%	8%	3%	0%	100%
Louisiana	77%	7%	11%	5%	0%	100%
Maine	80%	7%	11%	2%	0%	100%
Maryland	69%	19%	9%	0%	2%	100%
Massachusetts	66%	12%	2%	20%	0%	100%
Michigan	70%	1%	27%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	81%	7%	12%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	72%	23%	3%	2%	0%	100%
Missouri	60%	18%	2%	20%	0%	100%
Montana	60%	15%	14%	11%	0%	100%
Nebraska	72%	8%	5%	15%	0%	100%
Nevada	83%	5%	5%	7%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	83%	9%	0%	7%	1%	100%
New Jersey	77%	12%	3%	7%	0%	100%
New Mexico	69%	20%	11%	0%	0%	100%
New York	83%	13%	3%	1%	0%	100%
North Carolina	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	80%	13%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	96%	3%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	81%	9%	10%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	78%	18%	3%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	77%	3%	20%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	73%	11%	13%	0%	2%	100%
Puerto Rico	74%	18%	1%	1%	5%	100%
Rhode Island	89%	10%	1%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	66%	24%	2%	8%	0%	100%
South Dakota	66%	10%	12%	13%	0%	100%
Tennessee	39%	32%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	78%	16%	4%	1%	0%	100%
Utah	82%	9%	0%	0%	9%	100%
Vermont	55%	21%	2%	22%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	65%	29%	0%	6%	0%	100%
Virginia	81%	10%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	73%	3%	24%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	77%	12%	10%	0%	1%	100%
Wisconsin	91%	1%	5%	0%	3%	100%
Wyoming	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- The Invalid/Not Reported only includes family records with an invalid or missing number for ACF-801 element 6, Reason for Receiving Subsidized Child Care.
- Several states only capture the primary reason for receiving services and therefore do not report any families in Both Employment and Training/Education categories. States reporting no families in this combination category of Both Employment and Training/Education are Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Wyoming.
- OCC has observed some issues with income reporting across most states to varying degrees. OCC is working with states to address and resolve internal inconsistencies between ACF-801 element 6 (reason for receiving a subsidy), element 9 (total income for determining eligibility), and elements 10 through 15 (sources of income).
- Beginning FFY 2011, states and territories were no longer allowed to report "Other" as a Reason for Care.

**Table 11**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Racial Group (FFY 2011)**

State	Native American / Alaska Native	Asian	Black/ African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific	White	Multi-Racial	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	0%	78%	0%	21%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	8%	5%	11%	6%	45%	20%	5%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	5%	0%	15%	1%	74%	4%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	0%	58%	0%	38%	1%	3%	100%
California	2%	5%	21%	1%	69%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	1%	1%	11%	0%	35%	4%	49%	100%
Connecticut	1%	1%	32%	0%	34%	7%	25%	100%
Delaware	0%	0%	65%	0%	33%	1%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	0%	85%	0%	12%	0%	2%	100%
Florida	0%	0%	49%	0%	47%	4%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	0%	80%	0%	16%	1%	2%	100%
Guam	0%	16%	0%	69%	1%	14%	0%	100%
Hawaii	0%	22%	1%	35%	12%	30%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	0%	2%	0%	97%	1%	0%	100%
Illinois	0%	1%	54%	0%	21%	3%	20%	100%
Indiana	0%	0%	51%	0%	40%	9%	0%	100%
Iowa	1%	1%	16%	0%	79%	4%	0%	100%
Kansas	1%	1%	27%	0%	63%	4%	5%	100%
Kentucky	0%	0%	31%	0%	54%	0%	14%	100%
Louisiana	0%	0%	74%	0%	24%	1%	0%	100%
Maine	1%	1%	3%	0%	93%	2%	0%	100%
Maryland	1%	1%	75%	0%	20%	3%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	2%	16%	0%	23%	2%	57%	100%
Michigan	0%	0%	52%	0%	43%	2%	2%	100%
Minnesota	3%	3%	34%	0%	52%	8%	0%	100%
Mississippi	0%	0%	90%	0%	8%	2%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	0%	56%	0%	40%	1%	2%	100%
Montana	13%	0%	2%	0%	79%	4%	1%	100%
Nebraska	3%	0%	25%	0%	54%	1%	16%	100%
Nevada	2%	2%	31%	1%	58%	2%	4%	100%
New Hampshire	0%	0%	4%	0%	93%	1%	1%	100%
New Jersey	0%	1%	52%	9%	33%	1%	3%	100%
New Mexico	6%	0%	4%	0%	85%	3%	1%	100%
New York	1%	2%	50%	3%	42%	3%	0%	100%
North Carolina	2%	0%	60%	0%	36%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	20%	0%	7%	0%	70%	3%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	96%	100%
Ohio	0%	0%	52%	0%	43%	4%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	6%	1%	29%	0%	60%	4%	0%	100%
Oregon	2%	1%	8%	1%	87%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	1%	46%	0%	36%	3%	14%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	0%	0%	0%	94%	0%	6%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	0%	6%	0%	12%	1%	80%	100%
South Carolina	0%	0%	29%	0%	14%	2%	54%	100%
South Dakota	18%	0%	4%	0%	68%	9%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	0%	73%	0%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	0%	29%	0%	51%	1%	18%	100%
Utah	3%	1%	7%	1%	87%	1%	1%	100%
Vermont	0%	1%	4%	0%	91%	4%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	4%	0%	96%	0%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	6%	1%	62%	0%	30%	2%	0%	100%
Washington	2%	2%	10%	17%	36%	0%	33%	100%
West Virginia	0%	0%	11%	0%	74%	13%	2%	100%
Wisconsin	1%	2%	35%	0%	36%	4%	23%	100%
Wyoming	3%	0%	4%	0%	80%	0%	13%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- The multi-racial category includes any child where more than one race was answered Yes (1). Several states do not capture and report more than one race per child and thus do not provide multi-racial data.
- The Invalid/Not Reported category includes children where one or more race fields had anything other than a No (0) or Yes (1), blank, null, or space.
- It appears that several states and territories are still reporting ethnicity (Latino/Hispanic) as a race rather than as an ethnicity in accordance with the Pre-FFY 2000 Technical Bulletin 3 standard. In many of these instances, if a child is designated as Latino, no race is designated.

**Table 12**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Latino Ethnicity (FFY 2011)**

State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	1%	99%	0%	100%
Alaska	11%	87%	2%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	45%	55%	0%	100%
Arkansas	4%	96%	0%	100%
California	57%	43%	0%	100%
Colorado	29%	71%	0%	100%
Connecticut	38%	62%	0%	100%
Delaware	11%	89%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	15%	85%	0%	100%
Florida	26%	74%	0%	100%
Georgia	3%	97%	0%	100%
Guam	1%	99%	0%	100%
Hawaii	8%	92%	0%	100%
Idaho	14%	86%	0%	100%
Illinois	20%	77%	3%	100%
Indiana	9%	91%	0%	100%
Iowa	11%	89%	0%	100%
Kansas	15%	85%	0%	100%
Kentucky	5%	95%	0%	100%
Louisiana	2%	98%	0%	100%
Maine	2%	98%	0%	100%
Maryland	4%	96%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	30%	70%	0%	100%
Michigan	4%	96%	0%	100%
Minnesota	7%	93%	0%	100%
Mississippi	1%	99%	0%	100%
Missouri	4%	96%	1%	100%
Montana	6%	94%	0%	100%
Nebraska	10%	86%	4%	100%
Nevada	34%	65%	1%	100%
New Hampshire	7%	93%	0%	100%
New Jersey	34%	66%	0%	100%
New Mexico	77%	23%	0%	100%
New York	29%	71%	0%	100%
North Carolina	4%	96%	0%	100%
North Dakota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	4%	96%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	12%	88%	0%	100%
Oregon	5%	95%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	13%	83%	3%	100%
Puerto Rico	41%	59%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	17%	83%	0%	100%
South Carolina	1%	1%	98%	100%
South Dakota	4%	96%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	99%	0%	100%
Texas	46%	54%	0%	100%
Utah	18%	82%	0%	100%
Vermont	2%	98%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	11%	89%	0%	100%
Virginia	11%	89%	0%	100%
Washington	6%	66%	28%	100%
West Virginia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	11%	81%	8%	100%
Wyoming	13%	87%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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 2011)**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Child's Home</b>	<b>Family Home</b>	<b>Group Home</b>	<b>Center</b>	<b>Total</b>
Infants (0 to <1 yr)	5%	25%	6%	64%	100%
Toddlers (1 yr to <3 yrs)	3%	22%	7%	68%	100%
Preschool (3 yrs to <6 yrs)	3%	18%	5%	74%	100%
School Age (6 yrs to <13 yrs)	7%	27%	5%	61%	100%
13 years and older	14%	48%	5%	33%	100%
<b>All Ages</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- Nationally, 3.9% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or payment.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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.
- 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 2011)**

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	144	152	144	153	152
1 to < 2 yrs	151	158	146	161	159
2 to < 3 yrs	155	160	150	162	161
3 to < 4 yrs	153	161	149	161	160
4 to < 5 yrs	150	157	147	158	157
5 to < 6 yrs	140	141	128	136	137
6 to < 13 yrs	125	125	106	104	111
13+ yrs	137	117	106	96	112
<b>National</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>141</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
2. Nationally, 3.9% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or payment.
3. Average hours per month were based on sums of hours per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
4. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
5. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
7. For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the monthly hours with each provider divided by the monthly total hours of service. The average hours and payments for each state-month combination are based on the sum of hours in each category divided by the sum of proportional counts in each category. The state's annual results are determined by calculating a weighted average of the monthly results where the weight was the "adjusted" number of children served in each month. The national results shown above represent a weighted average of the state's fiscal annual results, where the weight for each state is the average monthly "adjusted" number of children served in each state for the fiscal year.
8. Some states have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized rather than the actual number of service hours provided.

<b>Table 15</b> <b>Child Care and Development Fund</b> <b>Preliminary Estimates</b> <b>Average Monthly Payment to Provider (Including Family CoPay) by Age Group and Care Type (FFY 2011)</b>					
Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$349	\$414	\$571	\$536	\$499
1 to < 2 yrs	\$351	\$439	\$602	\$541	\$514
2 to < 3 yrs	\$333	\$424	\$572	\$522	\$500
3 to < 4 yrs	\$320	\$413	\$562	\$503	\$485
4 to < 5 yrs	\$322	\$403	\$537	\$504	\$484
5 to < 6 yrs	\$310	\$363	\$486	\$433	\$417
6 to < 13 yrs	\$277	\$318	\$408	\$339	\$333
13+ yrs	\$273	\$288	\$449	\$346	\$314
<b>National</b>	<b>\$302</b>	<b>\$373</b>	<b>\$511</b>	<b>\$455</b>	<b>\$433</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
2. Nationally, 3.9% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or payment.
3. 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. 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
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 and/or dollars authorized rather than the actual number provided.

**Table 15**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Subsidy Paid to Provider by Age Group and Care Type (FFY 2011)**

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$321	\$382	\$545	\$499	\$464
1 to < 2 yrs	\$320	\$402	\$565	\$495	\$471
2 to < 3 yrs	\$304	\$382	\$537	\$471	\$452
3 to < 4 yrs	\$293	\$371	\$522	\$449	\$435
4 to < 5 yrs	\$293	\$364	\$495	\$450	\$433
5 to < 6 yrs	\$284	\$328	\$452	\$383	\$372
6 to < 13 yrs	\$253	\$287	\$375	\$296	\$294
13+ yrs	\$243	\$263	\$416	\$305	\$282
<b>National</b>	<b>\$276</b>	<b>\$338</b>	<b>\$475</b>	<b>\$407</b>	<b>\$390</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
2. Nationally, 3.9% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was missing or invalid or their setting information was invalid, due to out-of-range or missing care type, hours, or subsidy.
3. Subsidy is the amount paid directly to the provider by the state or territory. It does not include the family copay.
4. Average subsidy per month is based on sums of subsidies per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
5. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
6. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
8. For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the monthly hours with each provider divided by the monthly total hours of service. The average hours and subsidies for each state-month combination are based on the sum of hours in each category divided by the sum of proportional counts in each category. The state's annual results are determined by calculating a weighted average of the monthly results where the weight was the "adjusted" number of children served in each month. The national results shown above represent a weighted average of the state's fiscal annual results, where the weight for each state is the average monthly "adjusted" number of children served in each state for the fiscal year.
9. Some states have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized and/or dollars authorized rather than the actual number provided.

**Table 16**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Percent of Families Reporting Income from TANF (FFY 2011)**

State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	26%	74%	0%	100%
Alaska	11%	89%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	21%	79%	0%	100%
Arkansas	17%	83%	0%	100%
California	13%	87%	0%	100%
Colorado	25%	75%	0%	100%
Connecticut	12%	88%	0%	100%
Delaware	21%	79%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	16%	84%	0%	100%
Florida	8%	90%	2%	100%
Georgia	5%	95%	0%	100%
Guam	0%	99%	0%	100%
Hawaii	22%	78%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	98%	0%	100%
Illinois	7%	93%	0%	100%
Indiana	19%	81%	0%	100%
Iowa	10%	90%	0%	100%
Kansas	9%	91%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	99%	0%	100%
Louisiana	8%	88%	5%	100%
Maine	6%	94%	0%	100%
Maryland	24%	76%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	23%	77%	0%	100%
Michigan	27%	73%	0%	100%
Minnesota	33%	67%	0%	100%
Mississippi	22%	78%	0%	100%
Missouri	14%	86%	0%	100%
Montana	16%	84%	0%	100%
Nebraska	24%	76%	0%	100%
Nevada	46%	54%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	32%	61%	7%	100%
New Jersey	17%	83%	0%	100%
New Mexico	20%	80%	0%	100%
New York	39%	60%	1%	100%
North Carolina	4%	96%	0%	100%
North Dakota	19%	81%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	15%	85%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	10%	90%	0%	100%
Oregon	31%	69%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	18%	82%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	100%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	14%	86%	0%	100%
South Carolina	73%	0%	27%	100%
South Dakota	8%	92%	0%	100%
Tennessee	72%	28%	0%	100%
Texas	1%	99%	0%	100%
Utah	15%	85%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	95%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	3%	97%	0%	100%
Virginia	31%	69%	0%	100%
Washington	21%	79%	0%	100%
West Virginia	11%	89%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	11%	89%	0%	100%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	100%
<b>National</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.

2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.

3. All states provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For states reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.

**Table 17**  
**Child Care and Development Fund**  
**Preliminary Estimates**  
**Average Monthly Mean Family Co-payment as a Percent of Family Income (FFY 2011)**

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	19%	15%	66%	100%	6%	7%
Alaska	33%	1%	66%	100%	5%	5%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	43%	12%	45%	100%	4%	4%
Arkansas	58%	38%	4%	100%	1%	9%
California	4%	64%	32%	100%	1%	4%
Colorado	43%	12%	45%	100%	9%	11%
Connecticut	14%	5%	81%	100%	4%	5%
Delaware	14%	34%	52%	100%	5%	8%
District of Columbia	39%	13%	48%	100%	3%	3%
Florida	28%	0%	72%	100%	6%	6%
Georgia	17%	9%	74%	100%	8%	9%
Guam	18%	44%	38%	100%	4%	9%
Hawaii	35%	13%	52%	100%	8%	10%
Idaho	13%	0%	87%	100%	11%	11%
Illinois	5%	1%	94%	100%	4%	4%
Indiana	1%	77%	22%	100%	2%	7%
Iowa	11%	51%	38%	100%	2%	4%
Kansas	21%	16%	63%	100%	4%	5%
Kentucky	6%	18%	75%	100%	6%	7%
Louisiana	19%	5%	76%	100%	8%	9%
Maine	15%	7%	78%	100%	7%	7%
Maryland	16%	21%	63%	100%	8%	10%
Massachusetts	29%	22%	48%	100%	6%	9%
Michigan	27%	19%	55%	100%	2%	3%
Minnesota	2%	34%	64%	100%	2%	3%
Mississippi	24%	3%	74%	100%	5%	5%
Missouri	26%	23%	51%	100%	4%	6%
Montana	14%	0%	86%	100%	4%	4%
Nebraska	39%	49%	12%	100%	2%	8%
Nevada	14%	18%	68%	100%	4%	4%
New Hampshire	22%	0%	77%	100%	6%	6%
New Jersey	14%	40%	46%	100%	3%	5%
New Mexico	8%	16%	75%	100%	4%	5%
New York	6%	34%	59%	100%	3%	5%
North Carolina	17%	3%	80%	100%	8%	8%
North Dakota	26%	74%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	28%	72%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Ohio	24%	3%	73%	100%	5%	5%
Oklahoma	34%	19%	47%	100%	5%	7%
Oregon	30%	6%	64%	100%	7%	8%
Pennsylvania	18%	0%	82%	100%	5%	5%
Puerto Rico	37%	45%	18%	100%	1%	5%
Rhode Island	12%	32%	56%	100%	3%	4%
South Carolina	12%	28%	59%	100%	5%	7%
South Dakota	23%	43%	34%	100%	5%	10%
Tennessee	2%	74%	24%	100%	2%	7%
Texas	23%	3%	74%	100%	9%	9%
Utah	19%	47%	34%	100%	1%	1%
Vermont	46%	30%	23%	100%	2%	5%
Virgin Islands	16%	53%	32%	100%	0%	0%
Virginia	6%	31%	63%	100%	6%	10%
Washington	13%	0%	87%	100%	5%	5%
West Virginia	7%	13%	80%	100%	2%	2%
Wisconsin	21%	3%	76%	100%	6%	6%
Wyoming	20%	13%	67%	100%	6%	7%
<b>National</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>6%</b>

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 3-JAN-2013

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2011.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children, unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only (which includes Federal Discretionary, Mandatory, and Matching Funds; TANF transfers to CCDF; and State Matching and Maintenance of Effort Funds). The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the state multiplied by its pooling factor, as reported on the ACF-800. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- 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 submitted any months and Oregon had submitted 11 months of ACF-801 data for FFY 2011.
- 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.