

SEPTEMBER 2005

## CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE POLICIES 2005: STATES FAIL TO MAKE UP LOST GROUND, FAMILIES CONTINUE TO LACK CRITICAL SUPPORTS

by  
*Karen Schulman, Senior Policy Fellow*  
*Helen Blank, Director of Leadership and Public Policy*

Help paying for child care is crucial for low-income families given the high cost of care. Care for one child can easily cost \$4,000 to \$10,000 a year, more than the cost of public college tuition.<sup>1</sup> Low-income parents struggling to support their families need assistance so they can afford child care that enables them to work and ensures the safety and well-being of their children. Child care assistance can also give these families access to high-quality care that can nurture their children's learning and development so that they are prepared for school.

An increasing number of families need help in paying for child care. After declining through much of the 1990s, the number of children in low-income families (families earning under 200 percent of poverty, or \$32,180 a year for a family of three in 2005) has been rising once again.<sup>2</sup> The number of children under six in low-income families rose from 9.12 million (40.3 percent of all children under six) in 2000 to 9.37 million (41.3 percent) in 2001, and was at 9.80 million (42.1 percent) in 2004.<sup>3</sup> Despite this trend, many states have reduced access to child care help rather than expanding it.

A September 2004 report by National Women's Law Center's demonstrated that between 2001 and 2004 most states took steps backward on child care assistance.<sup>4</sup> Many states:

- Set more restrictive eligibility criteria for child care assistance;
- Left eligible families on long waiting lists for child care assistance;
- Increased the share of child care costs that parents receiving assistance were required to pay; and/or
- Failed to set adequate reimbursement rates for child care providers serving families receiving assistance.

The impacts of these cuts on parents, child care providers, and children are described in a separate report just released by the National Women's Law Center, *In Their Own Voices: Parents and Providers Struggling with Child Care Cuts*. The report includes stories collected in 2004 from parents who did not have the resources to choose good child care for their children and from providers who were straining to offer high-quality care and keep their programs in business in the face of state cuts.

### CONTENTS

2	METHODOLOGY
3	INCOME ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA
3	WAITING LISTS
4	COPAYMENTS
5	REIMBURSEMENT RATES
6	PARENTS IN SCHOOL
7	ENDNOTES
9, 10	TABLES 1A & 1B: INCOME ELIGIBILITY
13	TABLE 2: WAITING LISTS FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE
15, 16	TABLES 3A & 3B: PARENT COPAYMENTS
18, 19	TABLES 4A & 4B: REIMBURSEMENT RATES
21	TABLE 5: PARENTS IN SCHOOL AND ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

Yet little has been done to help these parents and providers. Data on state child care assistance policies as of February 2005 indicate that policies are largely unchanged since 2004. While there were positive developments in several states, a number of states put more restrictive policies in place. Most states failed to take any action to address continuing gaps in their child care assistance programs.

In addition to tracking policies on eligibility criteria, waiting lists, parent copayments, and provider reimbursement rates, this report also examines state policies regarding child care assistance for parents going to school. Many parents want to receive additional education or training in order to improve their chances of getting a stable, good-paying job, and child care assistance can be critical to enabling them to do this. While nearly all states provide some child care help to parents attending education or training programs, assistance is not consistently available to these parents.

The lack of progress on child care assistance is closely tied to a lack of sufficient funding. Over the past several years, federal funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) has failed to keep pace with inflation, and has actually decreased slightly in nominal dollars. After rising from \$4.567 billion in FY 2001<sup>5</sup> to a peak of \$4.817 billion in FY 2002,<sup>6</sup> funding started to decline, and in FY 2005 was down to \$4.800 billion.<sup>7</sup> The amount of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant funding states use for child care has declined as well. States may transfer up to 30 percent of their TANF block grant funds to the CCDBG or use TANF funds for child care directly within the TANF block grant. The total amount of TANF funds transferred to the CCDBG or used directly for child care reached a high of \$3.96 billion in FY 2000, then dipped to \$3.54 billion in FY 2001,<sup>8</sup> and was at \$3.28 billion in FY 2004 (the most recent year for which data are available).<sup>9</sup>

Reversing the recent decline in child care funding and increasing the federal and state investment in child care assistance would enable more families to have access to good child care. Additional child care funding would also bring positive returns to states, enabling more parents to be productive workers and more children to enter school ready to succeed.<sup>10</sup>

## METHODOLOGY

Data on child care assistance policies in the fifty states and the District of Columbia<sup>11</sup> as of February 2005 were collected by the National Women's Law Center from state child care administrators in spring and summer of 2005. The data were gathered through an e-mail survey, and follow-up e-mails and telephone calls were used for clarification when necessary. The 2004 data used in this report to examine trends were collected by the Center through a similar process in 2004, and reported in the Center's September 2004 publication, *Child Care Assistance Policies 2001-2004: Families Struggling to Move Forward, States Going Backward*. Data on policies as of 2001, which were also referred to in the September 2004 report and are used in this update, were originally reported in the Children's Defense Fund's 2002 publication, *State Developments in Child Care, Early Education and School-Age Care 2001*. The data reflect policies as of June 1, 2001 unless otherwise noted. The Children's Defense Fund collected its data through surveys and interviews with state child care administrators and advocates.

## INCOME ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Income eligibility criteria determine how much access low-income families have to child care assistance. States are permitted to set their income cutoffs for child care assistance at any level up to 85 percent of state median income,<sup>12</sup> yet most states set their income cutoffs significantly below this maximum. With few states expanding eligibility for child care assistance between 2004 and 2005, states failed to make up the ground lost between 2001 and 2004. States that adjusted their income cutoffs over the past year generally did so by only enough to reflect the annual update to the federal poverty level or state median income. As a result, many low-income families continue to be denied the help they need to afford child care.

- In about half of the states, the income cutoff to qualify for assistance<sup>13</sup> remained the same as a dollar amount between 2004 and 2005, while half of the states increased their income cutoffs as a dollar amount between 2004 and 2005 (see Table 1a). In most states that raised their income cutoffs, the increase in the cutoff for a family of three was less than \$1,000 a year. One exception was Mississippi, which increased its annual income cutoff for a family of three from \$30,999 to \$34,999.
- In twelve states, the income cutoff was lower as a dollar amount—even before adjusting for inflation—in 2005 than in 2001 (see Table 1b).
- In about three-fifths of the states, the income cutoff decreased as a percentage of the federal poverty level between 2004 and 2005.<sup>14</sup> The income cutoff increased as a percentage of poverty in only five states, and the remaining states had no change in their income cutoffs relative to the poverty level.<sup>15</sup> When income cutoffs fail to keep pace with annual adjustments in the poverty level—which reflect increases in the income required to cover basic needs as costs rise—it becomes more difficult for low-income families to qualify for assistance, even as they find it more challenging to make ends meet.
- In two-thirds of the states, the income cutoff was lower as a percentage of the federal poverty level in 2005 than in 2001.<sup>16</sup>
- In eleven states, the income cutoff decreased as a percentage of state median income between 2004 and 2005. In over half of the states, the income cutoff increased as a percentage of state median income, and in the remaining states it stayed the same.<sup>17</sup>
- In about half of the states, the income cutoff as a percentage of state median income in 2005 was lower than the income cutoff relative to state median income in 2001.
- In about one-third of the states, a family of three earning \$25,000 a year (155 percent of poverty) could not qualify for help in 2005.
- In three-quarters of the states, a family of three earning \$32,180 a year (200 percent of poverty) could not qualify for help in 2005.

## WAITING LISTS

Many families who meet the income criteria to qualify for child care help still do not receive it. Eligible families may be placed on long waiting lists and may have to wait months or years for assistance, or never receive help at all. Some states freeze intake, turning eligible families away without even taking their names. In 2005, a few states eliminated their waiting lists by providing assistance to families that had been waiting and that still qualified for help. Yet most states

that had waiting lists in 2004 continued to have them in 2005. Families trapped on the waiting list without help find it very challenging to stay employed, afford good child care, and pay their bills, according to several studies.<sup>18</sup>

- Twenty states had waiting lists or frozen intake in 2005, compared to twenty-four states in 2004 and twenty-two states in 2001 (see Table 2).
- In Maryland, there were 19,700 children on the waiting list in 2005, up from 14,400 in 2004. The state had no waiting list in 2001. Tennessee continued to freeze intake for families not receiving welfare, as it had since July 2004 when it stopped adding names to its very long waiting list. As of early 2004, 23,000 children were on the waiting list, compared to about 9,400 children in 2001.
- In several states, the number of children on the waiting list in 2005 was lower than in 2004 or 2001. In some cases, the decline may have occurred as a result of the state providing funds to serve more families that had been waiting. However, a decrease in the length of the waiting list does not always indicate that a state is making progress in meeting the need for child care assistance. Rather, a shorter waiting list may reflect that many families are too discouraged about their chances of ever receiving help to bother to sign up. A waiting list may also decrease if a state makes eligibility criteria stricter so that fewer families can qualify for assistance.
- Four states, Arizona, Connecticut, Kentucky, and Nevada, that had families on the waiting list in 2004 no longer had any families waiting in 2005. Three of these states (Arizona, Kentucky, and Nevada) had not had waiting lists in 2001.

## PARENT COPAYMENTS

Families that receive assistance typically must still pay something toward the cost of care. In most states, the amount of the copayment depends on a family's income level, with families at higher income levels required to contribute more. In some states, the copayment may also depend on the cost of care a family uses. Parent copayments in 2005 were largely unchanged from 2004 and in many states remained higher than in 2001. Many states continue to require low-income parents receiving assistance to pay a significant share of their child care costs, leaving them with a heavy financial burden. Nationwide, families who pay for child care (including both those who receive assistance and those who do not) devote an average of 7 percent of their income to child care.<sup>19</sup> A large number of states set copayments that require parents receiving child care assistance to contribute a greater share of their income than this.

- Copayments for a family of three at 150 percent of poverty remained constant as a percentage of income between 2004 and 2005 in half of the states, and decreased in six states (see Table 3a).<sup>20</sup> However, in nearly one-quarter of the states, the copayment increased as a percentage of income.<sup>21</sup> For example, Alabama's copayment increased from an already-high \$184 a month (9 percent of income) to \$215 a month (11 percent of income).
- In twenty-one states, copayments for a family of three at 150 percent of poverty were higher as a percentage of income in 2005 than in 2001.<sup>22</sup> In an additional four states, a family of three at 150 percent of poverty would have been eligible for help in 2001 but not 2005.
- In over half of the states, a family of three at 150 percent of poverty that was receiving assistance would have a copayment of more than \$150 a month (7 percent of income) in 2005. In an additional seven states,

a family at this income level would not even be eligible for assistance and would have to pay the full cost of care without help.<sup>23</sup>

- Copayments for a family of three at 100 percent of poverty were unchanged as a percentage of income between 2004 and 2005 in three-quarters of the states (see Table 3b). In nine states the copayment decreased as a percentage of income, and in five states the copayment increased as a percentage of income.
- In about half of the states, a family of three at 100 percent of poverty paid a higher percentage of its income in copayments in 2005 than a family of three at 100 percent of poverty in 2001.
- In twelve states, a family of three at 100 percent of poverty with one child in care had to pay more than \$100 a month (7 percent of income) in copayments in 2005.

## REIMBURSEMENT RATES

Families receiving assistance can have difficulty finding good child care options if state reimbursement rates for child care providers are inadequate. When state reimbursement rates fail to reflect current market prices, many providers are reluctant to serve families receiving assistance. Meanwhile, providers that try to make do with the low rates often find themselves without the resources they need to support high-quality care. Low rates make it even harder for child care programs, which already operate on tight budgets, to pay their staff decent wages, maintain safe facilities, or purchase new books or toys. Yet the large majority of states continue to pay outdated rates. In some states that have neglected to raise rates for many years, rates are falling further and further behind what providers charge private-paying parents.

- In 2005, about three-quarters (thirty-seven) of the states had rates that were based on outdated market rate surveys or below the level recommended in federal regulations (the 75th percentile of market rates, which is the rate that allows families access to 75 percent of the providers in their communities) (see Table 4a). This is the same as the number of states that had outdated or inadequate rates in 2004, and higher than the number in 2001 (twenty-nine states) (see Table 4b).
- In 2005, ten states reported that they had gone since 2000 or even longer without updating their rates. For example, Missouri had last updated its rates for infants in 1998, and had not updated its remaining rates since 1991. Michigan had not updated its rates since 1997.
- About one-third of the states reported that they had updated their rates in 2004 or early 2005. For example, Montana increased its rates from the 75th percentile of 2000 market rates to the 75th percentile of 2004 rates. However, several other states that made updates still had rates that fell below the 75th percentile of current market rates.
- When the state rate falls short of the provider's private rate, over two-thirds of the states allow providers to ask parents receiving assistance to pay the difference (on top of the parent's required copayment). By giving providers a way to address the gap between the state's rate and the provider's rate, this approach may make some providers more willing to serve families receiving assistance. However, the additional costs can create tremendous difficulties for many low-income parents already struggling to make ends meet who cannot afford to shoulder an even greater financial burden.<sup>24</sup>

## PARENTS IN SCHOOL AND ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

*In addition to tracking trends in state policies in four areas (eligibility, waiting lists, copayments, and reimbursement rates), the National Women's Law Center's annual update on state child care assistance policies each year will highlight a different policy issue affecting families' access to quality, affordable care. This year, information was collected on state policies regarding assistance for parents attending school.*

Child care assistance is essential not only for parents who are working, but also for parents who are going to school in order to improve their chances of getting a stable job with decent pay. Education clearly makes a difference to a woman's earning potential—in 2004, median earnings were just \$13,951 for women over twenty-five who did not graduate from high school, compared to \$20,928 for those who graduated high school but did not go on to college, \$24,586 for those with some college, and \$39,330 for those with four-year college degrees.<sup>25</sup> Recognizing this, all states allow at least some parents in school to receive child care assistance through the Child Care and Development Block Grant.<sup>26</sup> However, many states place restrictions on this assistance. For example, some states set time limits on how long a parent can receive child care assistance while in school or require parents to be working while attending school (see Table 5).

- About one-quarter of the states require some or all parents to work while in school in order to be eligible for child care assistance. Among these states, the most typical requirement is for twenty hours of work per week. Some states only require parents in school to work under certain circumstances. For example, Illinois, Mississippi, Montana, and Pennsylvania require students in postsecondary school to work but not those in high school, and New York only requires it for a four-year degree program.
- A few states do not require parents to work, but do require parents to have a certain total number of hours of activities a week, whether with school alone or a combination of school and work, to receive child care assistance. For example, South Dakota requires activities totaling eighty hours per month, Tennessee requires forty hours per week, and Louisiana requires twenty-five hours per week.
- The majority of states allow parents to receive child care assistance while working toward a four-year undergraduate degree. Yet, a number of states have more restrictive policies on how long parents can stay in school or on the degree they can pursue while receiving child care assistance. For example, Alabama, Iowa, North Carolina, Utah, and Wisconsin only allow parents to receive child care assistance while in school for a maximum of two years. Michigan typically limits the assistance to the final year of a training or education program. Georgia limits child care assistance to twelve months of vocational education, and Washington limits assistance to thirty-six months of vocational education.
- Some states set other restrictions on the type of education a parent can be receiving if they are to be eligible for child care assistance. For example, Texas and Utah indicated that they require that the training and education prepare the parent for a job in a field where there is a high demand for workers.
- A few states, such as Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, only provide child care assistance to parents in school if they are receiving welfare.
- Even if parents attending school are eligible for child care assistance, they may not receive it because the state places a low priority on serving them. For example, Oregon provides assistance to only a very limited number of parents in school.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Karen Schulman, *The High Cost of Child Care Puts Quality Care Out of Reach for Many Families* (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 2000), 1.
- <sup>2</sup> National Center for Children in Poverty, "Basic Facts about Low-Income Children: Birth to Age 6" (2005), available at [http://nccp.org/pub\\_ycp05.html](http://nccp.org/pub_ycp05.html), accessed August 25, 2005. Data only include children living with at least one parent (biological, adoptive, and/or step-parent) in the household.
- <sup>3</sup> E-mail communications from Ayana Douglas-Hall, Research Associate, National Center for Children in Poverty, August 25, 2005 and September 2, 2005, on file with the National Women's Law Center. Data for 2004 are the most recent available.
- <sup>4</sup> Karen Schulman and Helen Blank, *Child Care Assistance Policies 2001-2004: Families Struggling to Move Forward, States Going Backward* (Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center, 2004).
- <sup>5</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *FY 2002 President's Budget for HHS* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001), 89, 90 available at <http://www.hhs.gov/budget/pdf/hhs2002.pdf>, accessed August 31, 2004. This amount includes \$2 billion in discretionary funding and \$2.567 billion in mandatory (entitlement) funding.
- <sup>6</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *FY 2003 President's Budget for HHS* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2002), 83, 92, available at <http://www.hhs.gov/budget/pdf/hhs2003bib.pdf>, accessed June 28, 2004. This amount includes \$2.1 billion in discretionary funding and \$2.717 billion in mandatory (entitlement) funding.
- <sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *FY 2006 President's Budget for HHS* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2005), 88, 93, available at <http://www.hhs.gov/budget/06budget/FY2006BudgetinBrief.pdf>, accessed February 18, 2005. This amount includes \$2.083 billion in discretionary funding and \$2.717 billion in mandatory (entitlement) funding.
- <sup>8</sup> Jennifer Mezey and Brooke Richie, *Welfare Dollars No Longer an Increasing Source of Child Care Funding: Use of Funds in FY 2002 Unchanged from FY 2001, Down from FY 2000* (Washington, DC: CLASP, 2003), 5, available at [http://www.clasp.org/publications/2002\\_tanf\\_cc.htm](http://www.clasp.org/publications/2002_tanf_cc.htm), accessed August 30, 2005.
- <sup>9</sup> Analysis of data from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Fiscal Year 2004 TANF Financial Data, "Table A. Combined Federal Funds Spent in FY 2004 through the Fourth Quarter," available at [http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/tanf\\_2004.html](http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/tanf_2004.html), accessed August 30, 2005. Total includes \$1.86 billion transferred to the CCDBG, \$300 million spent on child care categorized as "assistance," and \$1.12 billion spent on child care categorized as "non-assistance."
- <sup>10</sup> For facts and resources on the importance of good, reliable child care for parents and children, see National Women's Law Center, "Child Care Quality: What It Is, Why It Matters, and How to Improve It" (2005), available at <http://nwlc.org/pdf/2004QualityFactSheet.pdf>, accessed August 25, 2005; and National Women's Law Center, "Low-Income Women and Their Families: How They Benefit from Affordable Quality Child Care and Struggle to Find It" (2005), available at <http://nwlc.org/pdf/LowIncomeFactSheet2004.pdf>, accessed August 25, 2005.
- <sup>11</sup> The District of Columbia is counted as a state in analyzing the data for this report.
- <sup>12</sup> Median income is the income below which half of families' incomes fall and which half of families' incomes exceed.
- <sup>13</sup> The analysis in this section was done based on the income eligibility criteria for families who are initially qualifying for assistance. Some states allow families already receiving assistance to continue to receive it up to an income level higher than the initial cutoff.
- <sup>14</sup> In 2005, the federal poverty level for a family of three was \$16,090 a year. In 2004, the federal poverty level for a family of three was \$15,670 a year.
- <sup>15</sup> Some states indicated that they planned to adjust their income cutoffs for the updated federal poverty level later in 2005.
- <sup>16</sup> In 2001, the federal poverty level for a family of three was \$14,630 a year.
- <sup>17</sup> Note that between 2004 and 2005 state median income actually *declined* in over half of the states. As a result, in some states where the income cutoff decreased as a dollar amount, it remained the same relative to state median income, and in some states where the income cutoff stayed at the same dollar amount, it increased relative to state median income.

<sup>18</sup> See, for example: Children's Action Alliance, *The Real Reality of Arizona's Working Families—Child Care Survey Highlights* (2004), available at [http://www.azchildren.org/caa/\\_mainpages/publications/\\_child\\_care\\_survey\\_brochure\\_.pdf](http://www.azchildren.org/caa/_mainpages/publications/_child_care_survey_brochure_.pdf); Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, *Valuing Families: The High Cost of Waiting for Child Care Sliding Fee Assistance* (Minneapolis, MN: Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, 1995); Deborah Schlick, Mary Daly, and Lee Bradford, *Faces on the Waiting List: Waiting for Child Care Assistance in Ramsey County* (Ramsey County, MN: Ramsey County Human Services, 1999). Survey conducted by the Minnesota Center for Survey Research at the University of Minnesota; Casey Coonerty and Tamsin Levy, *Waiting for Child Care: How Do Parents Adjust to Scarce Options in Santa Clara County?* (Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education, 1998); Philip Coltoff, Myrna Torres, and Natasha Lifton, *The Human Cost of Waiting for Child Care: A Study* (New York, NY: Children's Aid Society, 1999); Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth, et al., *Use of Subsidized Child Care by Philadelphia Families* (Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth, 1997); Jennifer Gulley and Ann Hilbig, *Waiting List Survey: Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area* (Houston, TX: Neighborhood Centers, Inc., 1999); and Jeffrey D. Lyons, Susan D. Russell, Christina Gilgor, and Amy H. Staples, *Child Care Subsidy: The Costs of Waiting* (Chapel Hill, NC: Day Care Services Association, 1998).

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, *Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Spring 1999* (Current Population Reports PPL-168), PPL Table 6: Average Weekly Child Care Expenditures by Employed Mothers of Children Under 14: Spring 1999 (2003), available at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/child/ppl-168.html>, accessed August 30, 2005.

<sup>20</sup> In 2005, 150 percent of the federal poverty level was equal to \$24,135 a year for a family of three. In 2004, 150 percent of the federal poverty level was equal to \$23,505 a year for a family of three.

<sup>21</sup> In the remaining states, families at this income level were not eligible for assistance.

<sup>22</sup> In 2001, 150 percent of the federal poverty level was equal to \$21,945 a year for a family of three.

<sup>23</sup> These seven states do not include states that set their income cutoffs to qualify for assistance below 150 percent of poverty but that allow families already receiving assistance to continue receiving help up to an income that exceeds 150 percent of poverty.

<sup>24</sup> The National Women's Law Center did not collect data on whether states permitted providers to charge parents the difference between state and private-pay rates in 2004. However, a comparison with data on policies as of 2000 indicates that nearly all states had the same policy in 2005 as in 2000; the only exceptions are Florida, which allowed providers to charge the difference in 2000, but not in 2005, and Texas, which did not allow it in 2000, but did in 2005. Data on policies in 2000 from Karen Schulman, Helen Blank, and Danielle Ewen, *A Fragile Foundation: State Child Care Assistance Policies* (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 2001), 103.

<sup>25</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2005 Annual Social and Economic Supplement, Detailed Income Tables, "PINC-03. Educational Attainment—People 25 Years Old and Over, by Total Money Earnings in 2004, Work Experience in 2004, Age, Race, Hispanic Origin, and Sex," available at [http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032005/perinc/new03\\_253.htm](http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032005/perinc/new03_253.htm), accessed August 30, 2005.

<sup>26</sup> In addition to the CCDBG, there are several other sources of funding for child care for students enrolled in college such as the Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS) program, but these do not offer significant support to students. The CCAMPIS program received \$16.1 million for FY 2005. (Data on funding level from the U.S. Department of Education, "Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program, Funding Status," available at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/campisp/funding.html>, accessed August 29, 2005.)



TABLE 1A: INCOME ELIGIBILITY CUTOFFS FOR A FAMILY OF THREE 2004 AND 2005

State	Income cutoff in 2005				Income cutoff in 2004				Change in income cutoff 2004 to 2005			
	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$16,090 a year)	As percent of state median income	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$15,670 a year)	As percent of state median income	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty	As percent of state median income	
Alabama*	\$19,836	123%	44%	\$19,836	127%	43%	\$0	-3%	\$0	-3%	1%	
Alaska*	\$46,248	287%	79%	\$46,248	295%	77%	\$0	-8%	\$0	-8%	2%	
Arizona	\$25,860	161%	57%	\$25,188	161%	53%	\$672	0%	\$672	0%	1%	
Arkansas*	\$25,311	157%	61%	\$25,311	162%	63%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	-2%	
California*	\$35,100	218%	64%	\$35,100	224%	66%	\$0	-6%	\$0	-6%	-2%	
Colorado*	\$20,376-\$35,256	127%-219%	36%-62%	\$19,838-\$34,344	127%-219%	35%-60%	\$538-\$912	0%	\$538-\$912	0%	1%	
Connecticut*	\$36,120	224%	53%	\$34,735	222%	50%	\$1,385	3%	\$1,385	3%	2%	
Delaware	\$31,344	195%	54%	\$30,528	195%	50%	\$816	0%	\$816	0%	4%	
District of Columbia*	\$4,700	216%	74%	\$4,700	221%	67%	\$0	-6%	\$0	-6%	7%	
Florida*	\$24,135	150%	50%	\$23,505	150%	49%	\$630	0%	\$630	0%	1%	
Georgia	\$24,416	152%	48%	\$24,416	156%	49%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	-1%	
Hawaii*	\$44,136	274%	78%	\$44,136	282%	80%	\$0	-7%	\$0	-7%	-2%	
Idaho	\$20,472	127%	45%	\$20,472	131%	48%	\$0	-3%	\$0	-3%	-3%	
Illinois*	\$29,052	181%	50%	\$27,936	178%	50%	\$1,116	2%	\$1,116	2%	0%	
Indiana	\$19,380	120%	37%	\$19,080	122%	36%	\$300	-1%	\$300	-1%	1%	
Iowa*	\$21,936	136%	43%	\$21,936	140%	42%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	0%	
Kansas	\$28,992	180%	56%	\$28,236	180%	54%	\$756	0%	\$756	0%	1%	
Kentucky*	\$23,505	146%	52%	\$22,890	146%	50%	\$615	0%	\$615	0%	2%	
Louisiana*	\$31,152	194%	71%	\$31,152	199%	72%	\$0	-5%	\$0	-5%	-1%	
Maine	\$41,985	261%	85%	\$41,715	266%	85%	\$270	-5%	\$270	-5%	0%	
Maryland	\$29,990	186%	46%	\$29,990	191%	43%	\$0	-5%	\$0	-5%	3%	
Massachusetts*	\$28,968	180%	44%	\$28,968	185%	43%	\$0	-5%	\$0	-5%	1%	
Michigan	\$23,880	148%	42%	\$23,880	152%	42%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	0%	
Minnesota*	\$27,423	170%	45%	\$26,705	170%	44%	\$718	0%	\$718	0%	1%	
Mississippi	\$34,999	218%	87%	\$30,999	198%	79%	\$4,000	20%	\$4,000	20%	8%	
Missouri	\$17,784	111%	35%	\$17,784	113%	35%	\$0	-3%	\$0	-3%	1%	
Montana	\$23,508	146%	54%	\$22,536	144%	56%	\$972	2%	\$972	2%	-2%	
Nebraska*	\$18,804	117%	37%	\$18,312	117%	36%	\$492	0%	\$492	0%	1%	
Nevada	\$37,536	233%	75%	\$37,344	238%	75%	\$192	-5%	\$192	-5%	0%	
New Hampshire	\$28,784	179%	47%	\$29,004	185%	48%	-\$220	-6%	-\$220	-6%	0%	
New Jersey*	\$31,340	195%	45%	\$30,520	195%	45%	\$820	0%	\$820	0%	0%	
New Mexico*	\$23,508	146%	58%	\$23,508	150%	60%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	-2%	
New York*	\$32,180	200%	59%	\$31,340	200%	56%	\$840	0%	\$840	0%	2%	
North Carolina	\$35,352	220%	72%	\$35,352	226%	74%	\$0	-6%	\$0	-6%	-2%	
North Dakota	\$29,556	184%	62%	\$29,556	189%	64%	\$0	-5%	\$0	-5%	-2%	
Ohio*	\$23,505	146%	44%	\$23,505	150%	44%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	0%	
Oklahoma*	\$29,100	181%	67%	\$35,655	228%	79%	-\$6,555	-47%	-\$6,555	-47%	-11%	
Oregon	\$24,132	150%	48%	\$23,505	150%	48%	\$627	0%	\$627	0%	0%	
Pennsylvania*	\$31,340	195%	58%	\$30,420	194%	55%	\$920	1%	\$920	1%	3%	
Rhode Island*	\$35,258	219%	62%	\$34,335	219%	58%	\$923	0%	\$923	0%	4%	
South Carolina*	\$23,505	146%	50%	\$22,890	146%	46%	\$615	0%	\$615	0%	4%	
South Dakota*	\$32,184	200%	69%	\$31,344	200%	62%	\$840	0%	\$840	0%	7%	
Tennessee	\$28,032	174%	60%	\$28,260	180%	60%	-\$228	-6%	-\$228	-6%	0%	
Texas*	\$23,505-\$40,182	146%-250%	50%-85%	\$22,896-\$40,416	146%-258%	48%-85%	-\$234-\$609	-8%-0%	-\$234-\$609	-8%-0%	0%-2%	
Utah	\$28,164	175%	56%	\$27,768	177%	56%	\$396	-2%	\$396	-2%	0%	
Vermont	\$31,032	193%	59%	\$31,032	198%	59%	\$0	-5%	\$0	-5%	1%	
Virginia*	\$23,508-\$39,175	146%-243%	42%-70%	\$22,896-\$38,160	146%-244%	39%-65%	\$612-\$1,015	0%	\$612-\$1,015	0%	3%-4%	
Washington*	\$31,344	195%	56%	\$30,528	195%	55%	\$816	0%	\$816	0%	1%	
West Virginia*	\$21,228	132%	53%	\$21,228	135%	51%	\$0	-4%	\$0	-4%	2%	
Wisconsin*	\$29,772	185%	53%	\$28,990	185%	53%	\$782	0%	\$782	0%	0%	
Wyoming*	\$29,004	180%	60%	\$29,004	185%	59%	\$0	-5%	\$0	-5%	1%	

**Bold numbers indicate lower cutoff**

\* notes on pages 11 and 12

TABLE 1B: INCOME ELIGIBILITY CUTOFFS FOR A FAMILY OF THREE 2001 AND 2005

State	Income cutoff in 2005			Income cutoff in 2001			Change in income cutoff 2001 to 2005		
	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$16,090 a year)	As percent of state median income	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$14,630 a year)	As percent of state median income	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty	As percent of state median income
Alabama*	\$19,836	123%	44%	\$18,048	123%	41%	\$1,788	0%	3%
Alaska*	\$46,248	287%	79%	\$44,328	303%	75%	\$1,920	-16%	4%
Arizona	\$25,860	161%	54%	\$23,364	160%	52%	\$2,496	1%	2%
Arkansas*	\$25,311	157%	61%	\$23,523	161%	60%	\$1,788	-3%	1%
California*	\$35,100	218%	64%	\$35,100	240%	66%	\$0	-22%	-3%
Colorado*	\$20,376-\$35,256	127%-219%	36%-62%	\$19,020-\$32,000	130%-219%	36%-61%	\$1,356-\$3,256	-3%-0%	0%-1%
Connecticut*	\$36,120	224%	53%	\$47,586	325%	75%	-\$11,466	-101%	-23%
Delaware	\$31,344	195%	54%	\$29,260	200%	53%	\$2,084	-5%	1%
District of Columbia*	\$34,700	216%	74%	\$34,700	237%	66%	\$0	-22%	8%
Florida*	\$24,135	150%	50%	\$20,820	142%	45%	\$3,315	8%	5%
Georgia	\$24,416	152%	48%	\$24,278	166%	50%	\$138	-14%	-2%
Hawaii*	\$44,136	274%	78%	\$46,035	315%	83%	-\$1,899	-40%	-5%
Idaho	\$20,472	127%	45%	\$20,472	140%	51%	\$0	-13%	-6%
Illinois*	\$29,052	181%	50%	\$24,243	166%	43%	\$4,809	15%	7%
Indiana	\$19,380	120%	37%	\$20,232	138%	41%	-\$852	-18%	-5%
Iowa*	\$21,936	136%	43%	\$19,812	135%	41%	\$2,124	1%	2%
Kansas	\$28,992	180%	56%	\$27,060	185%	56%	\$1,932	-5%	-1%
Kentucky*	\$23,505	146%	52%	\$24,140	165%	55%	-\$635	-19%	-3%
Louisiana*	\$31,152	194%	71%	\$29,040	205%	75%	\$2,112	-11%	-4%
Maine	\$41,985	261%	85%	\$36,452	249%	75%	\$5,533	12%	10%
Maryland	\$29,990	186%	46%	\$25,140	172%	40%	\$4,850	15%	6%
Massachusetts*	\$28,968	180%	44%	\$28,968	198%	48%	\$0	-18%	-4%
Michigan	\$23,880	148%	42%	\$26,064	178%	47%	-\$2,184	-30%	-6%
Minnesota*	\$27,423	170%	45%	\$42,304	289%	76%	-\$14,882	-119%	-30%
Mississippi	\$34,999	218%	87%	\$30,999	212%	77%	\$4,000	6%	10%
Missouri	\$17,784	111%	35%	\$17,784	122%	37%	\$0	-11%	-2%
Montana	\$23,508	146%	54%	\$21,948	150%	51%	\$1,560	-4%	3%
Nebraska*	\$18,804	117%	37%	\$25,260	173%	54%	-\$6,456	-56%	-17%
Nevada	\$37,536	233%	75%	\$33,420	228%	67%	\$4,116	5%	8%
New Hampshire	\$28,784	179%	47%	\$27,797	190%	50%	\$987	-11%	-3%
New Jersey*	\$31,340	195%	45%	\$29,260	200%	46%	\$2,080	-5%	-1%
New Mexico*	\$23,508	146%	58%	\$28,300	193%	75%	-\$4,792	-47%	-17%
New York*	\$32,180	200%	59%	\$28,644	202%	61%	\$3,536	-2%	-2%
North Carolina	\$35,352	220%	72%	\$32,628	223%	69%	\$2,724	-3%	3%
North Dakota	\$29,556	184%	62%	\$29,556	202%	69%	\$0	-18%	-7%
Ohio*	\$23,505	146%	44%	\$27,066	185%	57%	-\$3,561	-39%	-14%
Oklahoma*	\$29,100	181%	67%	\$29,040	198%	66%	\$60	-18%	1%
Oregon	\$24,132	150%	48%	\$27,060	185%	60%	-\$2,928	-35%	-12%
Pennsylvania*	\$31,340	195%	58%	\$29,260	200%	58%	\$2,080	-5%	0%
Rhode Island*	\$35,258	219%	62%	\$32,918	225%	61%	\$2,340	-6%	1%
South Carolina*	\$23,505	146%	50%	\$21,225	145%	45%	\$2,280	1%	5%
South Dakota*	\$32,184	200%	69%	\$22,826	156%	52%	\$9,358	44%	17%
Tennessee	\$28,032	174%	60%	\$24,324	166%	56%	\$3,708	8%	4%
Texas*	\$23,505-\$40,182	146%-250%	50%-85%	\$21,228-\$36,516	145%-250%	47%-82%	\$2,277-\$3,666	0%-1%	3%
Utah	\$28,164	175%	56%	\$25,848	177%	54%	\$2,316	-2%	2%
Vermont	\$31,032	193%	59%	\$31,032	212%	64%	\$0	-19%	-5%
Virginia*	\$23,508-\$39,175	146%-243%	42%-70%	\$21,948-\$27,060	150%-185%	41%-50%	\$1,560-\$12,115	-4%-58%	1%-20%
Washington*	\$31,344	195%	56%	\$32,916	225%	63%	-\$1,572	-30%	-6%
West Virginia*	\$21,228	132%	53%	\$28,296	193%	75%	-\$7,068	-61%	-21%
Wisconsin*	\$29,772	185%	53%	\$27,060	185%	51%	\$2,712	0%	2%
Wyoming*	\$29,004	180%	60%	\$21,948	150%	47%	\$7,056	30%	13%

**Bold numbers indicate lower cutoff**  
\* notes on following pages

### Notes for Tables 1a and 1b: Income Eligibility Cutoffs

*The income eligibility limits shown in the table represent the maximum income families can have when they apply for child care assistance. Some states allow families, once receiving assistance, to continue receiving assistance up to a higher income level than that initial cutoff. These higher exit eligibility cutoffs are reported below for states that have them.*

*Changes in income cutoffs were calculated using raw data, rather than the rounded numbers shown in the table.*

Alabama: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their annual income reached \$27,756. In 2004 and 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$30,516.

Alaska: The majority of families receive a taxable Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) payment, but this is not counted toward a family's income when determining their eligibility for child care assistance. In 2005, the PFD was \$920 per family member, or \$2,760 for a three-person family. Therefore, in 2005, a family of three with an income at the state eligibility cutoff level of \$46,248, would typically have a total income of \$49,008 with the PFD included.

Arkansas: The income cutoffs shown in the table take into account a \$100-per-month deduction (\$1,200 a year) that is allowed for each working parent. It is assumed there is one working parent. The stated income cutoffs, in policy, were \$22,323 in 2001 and \$24,111 in 2004 and 2005.

California: Families who were receiving assistance as of January 1, 1998 could continue doing so until their annual income reached \$46,800 since they were subject to higher income guidelines previously in effect.

Colorado: Counties set the income eligibility cutoff within state guidelines. In 2005, counties could allow families already receiving assistance to continue doing so until annual income reached \$39,092.

Connecticut: In 2004, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their annual income reached \$52,102. In 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$54,181.

District of Columbia: In 2001, 2004, and 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their annual income reached \$41,640.

Florida: In 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$32,180.

Hawaii: In 2001, the state allowed a 20 percent deduction of all countable income in determining eligibility, which is taken into account in the figure shown here. The stated income cutoff, in policy, was \$36,828. The state no longer used the deduction in 2004 or 2005.

Illinois: In 2001, the state allowed a 10 percent earned income deduction, which is taken into account in the figure shown here. The stated income cutoff was \$21,819. The state no longer used the deduction in 2004 or 2005.

Iowa: For special needs care, the income cutoff was \$27,420 for a family of three in 2005. Also note that the state updates its income cutoff for the current federal poverty level every July 1st.

Kentucky: In 2004, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$25,179. In 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$25,856. As of April 1, 2005, the income cutoff to qualify for assistance was scheduled to be updated to \$24,135, and the exit eligibility cutoff was to be updated to \$26,549.

Louisiana: Data on the state's policies as of 2001 were not available, so data on policies as of March 15, 2000 were used instead.

Massachusetts: In 2001, 2004, and 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$49,248.

Minnesota: In 2004, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$38,149. In 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$39,174.

*(notes continued on following page)*

*(notes continued from previous page)*

Nebraska: For a family of three transitioning from TANF, the income limit was \$28,236 a year in 2004 and \$28,992 in 2005.

New Jersey: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$36,575. In 2004, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$38,150 and in 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$39,175.

New Mexico: For a period of time following August 1, 2001, the state lowered its eligibility limit for non-TANF families to 100 percent of poverty. Parents whose child care cases were open prior to August 1, 2001 were not subject to this new eligibility limit. Also note that in 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$31,344.

New York: Data on the state's policies as of 2001 were not available, so data on policies as of March 15, 2000 were used instead.

Ohio: In 2004 and 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$25,860.

Oklahoma: In 2004, the income eligibility cutoff depended on how many children were in care. The income cutoff shown in the table assumes that the family had two children in care. In 2004, the state also allowed a 20 percent disregard of earned income in determining eligibility, which is taken into account in the figure shown here. The stated income cutoff, in policy, was \$28,524. The state no longer used this disregard in 2005. However, in 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$35,100.

Pennsylvania: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$34,381. In 2004, the exit eligibility limit was \$35,861 and in 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$36,825. Also note that the income cutoffs were expected to be updated to reflect the adjusted 2005 federal poverty level effective May 2, 2005.

Rhode Island: The income cutoff was scheduled to be updated to reflect the adjusted 2005 federal poverty level in April 2005.

South Carolina: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$24,763. In 2004, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$26,705 and in 2005, the exit eligibility cutoff was \$27,423.

South Dakota: The 2001 income cutoff shown here took into account a 4 percent earned income deduction. The stated income cutoff, in policy, was \$21,913.

Texas: Local boards set their own income cutoffs within state guidelines.

Virginia: The state has different income cutoffs for different regions of the state. In 2001, the state had three separate regional cutoffs, which for a family of three were: \$21,948, \$23,400, and \$27,060. In 2004, the state had four separate regional cutoffs: \$22,896, \$24,420, \$28,236, and \$38,160. In 2005, the state also had four regional cutoffs: \$23,508, \$25,080, \$28,992, and \$39,175.

Washington: The income cutoff was scheduled to be adjusted for the 2005 federal poverty level as of April 1, 2005, with the new income cutoff set at \$32,184 for a family of three.

West Virginia: In 2004 and 2005, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$26,172.

Wisconsin: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$29,256. In 2004, the exit eligibility limit was \$31,344 and in 2005, the exit eligibility limit was \$32,184.

Wyoming: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until annual income reached \$27,060. In 2004 and 2005, the exit eligibility limit was \$31,344.

TABLE 2: WAITING LISTS FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

State	Number of children or families on waiting lists as of early 2005	Number of children or families on waiting lists as of early 2004	Number of children or families on waiting lists as of December 2001
Alabama*	13,260 children	14,375 children	5,089 children
Alaska	No waiting list	No waiting list	588 children
Arizona	No waiting list	6,700 children	No waiting list
Arkansas	517 families	801 families	8,000 children
California*	280,000 children (estimated)	280,000 children (estimated)	280,000 children (estimated)
Colorado*	602 families	1,550 families	Waiting lists at county level
Connecticut*	No waiting list	4,500	Frozen intake
Delaware	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
District of Columbia*	1,483 children	1,460 children	9,124 children
Florida*	39,677 children	46,315 children	46,800 children
Georgia	17,600 families	35,743 families	16,099 children
Hawaii	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Idaho	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Illinois	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Indiana*	7,975 children	10,966 children	11,958 children
Iowa	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Kansas	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Kentucky	No waiting list	2,153 children	No waiting list
Louisiana	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Maine	2,025 children	2,188 children	2,000 children
Maryland*	19,674 children	14,412 children	No waiting list
Massachusetts	13,563 children	16,077 children	18,000 children
Michigan	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Minnesota	859 families	6,929 families	4,735 children
Mississippi	478 children	7,961 children	10,422 children
Missouri	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Montana	No waiting list	No waiting list	Varies by resource and referral district
Nebraska	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Nevada	No waiting list	1,700 children	No waiting list
New Hampshire	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
New Jersey*	6,994 children	14,668 children	9,800 children
New Mexico	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
New York*	Waiting lists at county level	Waiting lists at county level	Waiting lists at county level
North Carolina	15,871 children	24,576 children	25,363 children
North Dakota	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Ohio	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Oklahoma	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Oregon	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Pennsylvania	2,929 children	1,680 children	540 children
Rhode Island	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
South Carolina	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
South Dakota	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Tennessee*	Frozen intake	23,000 children	9,388 children
Texas	22,045 children	26,518 children	36,799 children
Utah	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Vermont	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Virginia*	4,819 children	6,908 children	4,255 children
Washington	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
West Virginia	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Wisconsin	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Wyoming	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list

\* notes on following page

**Notes for Table 2: Waiting Lists for Child Care Assistance**

Alabama: Data for December 2001 were not available so data from November of that year were used instead.

California: Counties maintain waiting lists, but there is no statewide total for the number of families and children on those lists. The figure reported here is an estimate provided by the state.

Colorado: Four counties had waiting lists in 2001, but data on the total number of children on waiting lists in counties that had them were not available. In addition, four counties had frozen intake in 2001. For 2004, the figure reported in the table is the total for the 12 counties that reported having waiting lists.

Connecticut: The state did not report whether the number for 2004 represented children or families.

District of Columbia: The waiting list may include some children living in the wider metropolitan area that encompasses parts of Maryland and Virginia.

Florida: The waiting list total reported for 2005 is the total as of April of that year.

Indiana: In addition to the waiting list, some counties ran out of funding and stopped accepting applications for assistance in 2001.

Maryland: The waiting list total reported for 2005 is the total as of March of that year.

New Jersey: Data for 2001 were not available, so data from March 2002 were used instead.

New York: Waiting lists are kept at the county level and statewide data are not available.

Tennessee: When the state reported its data in 2001 and again in 2004, the state had frozen intake for families not in the TANF or Transitional Child Care programs. The waiting list figures for each year represent the number of children on the waiting list when intake was closed. The state did not provide a similar number for 2005, when the waiting list was still frozen.

Virginia: Data for December 2001 were not available, so data from January of that year were used instead. The waiting list total reported for 2005 is the total as of March of that year.

TABLE 3A: PARENT COPAYMENTS  
 FAMILY OF THREE WITH AN INCOME AT 150 PERCENT OF POVERTY  
 AND ONE CHILD IN CARE

State	Monthly fee in 2005		Monthly fee in 2004		Monthly fee in 2001		Change 2004 to 2005		Change 2001 to 2005	
	As a dollar amount	As a percent of income	As a dollar amount	As a percent of income	As a dollar amount	As a percent of income	In dollar amount	In percent of income	In dollar amount	In percent of income
Alabama	\$215	11%	\$184	9%	\$215	12%	<b>\$31</b>	<b>1%</b>	\$0	-1%
Alaska	\$42	2%	\$42	2%	\$71	4%	\$0	0%	-\$29	-2%
Arizona	\$154	8%	\$152	8%	\$217	12%	<b>\$2</b>	0%	-\$63	-4%
Arkansas	\$390	19%	\$368	19%	\$224	12%	<b>\$22</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$166</b>	<b>7%</b>
California	\$42	2%	\$44	2%	\$0	0%	-\$2	0%	<b>\$42</b>	<b>2%</b>
Colorado	\$258	13%	\$231	12%	\$185	10%	<b>\$27</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$73</b>	<b>3%</b>
Connecticut	\$121	6%	\$114	6%	\$110	6%	<b>\$7</b>	0%	<b>\$11</b>	0%
Delaware	\$172	9%	\$179	9%	\$159	9%	-\$7	-1%	<b>\$13</b>	0%
District of Columbia	\$134	7%	\$118	6%	\$91	5%	<b>\$16</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$43</b>	<b>2%</b>
Florida*	\$201	10%	\$196	10%	\$104	6%	<b>\$5</b>	0%	<b>\$97</b>	<b>4%</b>
Georgia	\$135	7%	\$173	9%	\$139	8%	-\$38	-2%	-\$4	-1%
Hawaii	\$42	2%	\$43	2%	\$38	2%	-\$1	0%	<b>\$4</b>	0%
Idaho	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	\$134	7%	\$134	7%	\$134	7%	\$0	0%	\$0	-1%
Indiana	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$154	8%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Iowa*	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kansas	\$177	9%	\$177	9%	\$162	9%	\$0	0%	<b>\$15</b>	0%
Kentucky	\$210	10%	\$206	11%	\$177	10%	<b>\$4</b>	0%	<b>\$33</b>	<b>1%</b>
Louisiana*	\$236	12%	\$236	12%	\$114	6%	\$0	0%	<b>\$122</b>	<b>6%</b>
Maine	\$181	9%	\$196	10%	\$183	10%	-\$15	-1%	-\$2	-1%
Maryland	\$290	14%	\$272	14%	\$236	13%	<b>\$18</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$54</b>	<b>1%</b>
Massachusetts	\$180	9%	\$195	10%	\$160	9%	-\$15	-1%	<b>\$20</b>	0%
Michigan	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$146	7%	\$24	1%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	\$96	5%	\$90	5%	\$53	3%	<b>\$6</b>	0%	<b>\$43</b>	<b>2%</b>
Mississippi	\$130	6%	\$122	6%	\$105	6%	<b>\$8</b>	0%	<b>\$25</b>	<b>1%</b>
Missouri	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$256	14%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nebraska*	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$129	7%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	\$225	11%	\$238	12%	\$281	15%	-\$13	-1%	-\$56	-4%
New Hampshire	\$1	<1%	\$5	<1%	\$2	<1%	-\$4	0%	-\$1	0%
New Jersey	\$157	8%	\$133	7%	\$133	7%	<b>\$24</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$24</b>	<b>1%</b>
New Mexico	\$128	6%	\$121	6%	\$115	6%	<b>\$7</b>	0%	<b>\$13</b>	0%
New York*	\$235	12%	\$229	12%	\$191	10%	<b>\$6</b>	0%	<b>\$44</b>	<b>1%</b>
North Carolina	\$201	10%	\$196	10%	\$159	9%	<b>\$5</b>	0%	<b>\$42</b>	<b>1%</b>
North Dakota	\$280	14%	\$280	14%	\$293	16%	\$0	0%	-\$13	-2%
Ohio	\$211	10%	\$190	10%	\$88	5%	<b>\$21</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$123</b>	<b>6%</b>
Oklahoma	\$192	10%	\$154	8%	\$146	8%	<b>\$38</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>\$46</b>	<b>2%</b>
Oregon	\$463	23%	\$423	22%	\$319	17%	<b>\$40</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$144</b>	<b>6%</b>
Pennsylvania	\$120	6%	\$173	9%	\$152	8%	-\$53	-3%	-\$32	-2%
Rhode Island	\$120	6%	\$113	6%	\$19	1%	<b>\$7</b>	0%	<b>\$101</b>	<b>5%</b>
South Carolina	\$52	3%	\$48	2%	\$77	4%	<b>\$4</b>	0%	-\$25	-2%
South Dakota	\$302	15%	\$293	15%	\$365	20%	<b>\$9</b>	0%	-\$63	-5%
Tennessee	\$155	8%	\$143	7%	\$112	6%	<b>\$12</b>	0%	<b>\$43</b>	<b>2%</b>
Texas*	\$181-\$261	9%-13%	\$176-\$255	9%-13%	\$165-\$256	9%-14%	<b>\$5-\$6</b>	0%	<b>\$5-\$16</b>	-1%-0%
Utah	\$200	10%	\$200	10%	\$220	12%	\$0	0%	-\$20	-2%
Vermont	\$228	11%	\$205	10%	\$123	7%	<b>\$22</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$105</b>	<b>5%</b>
Virginia	\$201	10%	\$196	10%	\$183	10%	<b>\$5</b>	0%	<b>\$18</b>	0%
Washington	\$145	7%	\$142	7%	\$87	5%	<b>\$3</b>	0%	<b>\$58</b>	<b>2%</b>
West Virginia	\$114	6%	\$97	5%	\$54	3%	<b>\$16</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$60</b>	<b>3%</b>
Wisconsin	\$181	9%	\$178	9%	\$160	9%	<b>\$3</b>	0%	<b>\$21</b>	0%
Wyoming	\$75	4%	\$75	4%	\$98	5%	\$0	0%	-\$23	-2%

*Bold numbers indicate increased copayment*

\* notes on page 17

TABLE 3B: PARENT COPAYMENTS  
 FAMILY OF THREE WITH AN INCOME AT 100 PERCENT OF POVERTY  
 AND ONE CHILD IN CARE

State	Monthly fee in 2005		Monthly fee in 2004		Monthly fee in 2001		Change 2004 to 2005		Change 2001 to 2005	
	As a dollar amount	As a percent of income	As a dollar amount	As a percent of income	As a dollar amount	As a percent of income	In dollar amount	In percent of income	In dollar amount	In percent of income
Alabama	\$65	5%	\$76	6%	\$65	5%	<del>\$11</del>	-1%	<del>-\$1</del>	-1%
Alaska	\$13	1%	\$13	1%	\$14	1%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$1</del>	0%
Arizona	\$99	7%	\$65	5%	\$65	5%	<b>\$34</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>\$34</b>	<b>2%</b>
Arkansas	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
California	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Colorado	\$122	9%	\$122	9%	\$113	9%	\$0	0%	<b>\$9</b>	0%
Connecticut	\$54	4%	\$51	4%	\$49	4%	<b>\$3</b>	0%	<b>\$5</b>	0%
Delaware	\$60	4%	\$78	6%	\$55	5%	<del>-\$19</del>	-2%	<b>\$5</b>	0%
District of Columbia	\$53	4%	\$53	4%	\$32	3%	\$0	0%	<b>\$21</b>	<b>1%</b>
Florida*	\$134	10%	\$131	10%	\$69	6%	<b>\$3</b>	0%	<b>\$65</b>	<b>4%</b>
Georgia	\$75	6%	\$108	8%	\$21	2%	<del>-\$33</del>	-3%	<b>\$54</b>	<b>4%</b>
Hawaii	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Idaho	\$103	8%	\$65	5%	\$65	5%	<b>\$38</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>\$38</b>	<b>2%</b>
Illinois	\$65	5%	\$65	5%	\$134	11%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$69</del>	-6%
Indiana	\$0	0%	\$82	6%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$82</del>	-6%	\$0	0%
Iowa	\$22	2%	\$22	2%	\$22	2%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Kansas	\$22	2%	\$22	2%	\$22	2%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Kentucky	\$100	7%	\$108	8%	\$97	8%	<del>-\$8</del>	-1%	<b>\$3</b>	0%
Louisiana*	\$163	12%	\$163	13%	\$49	4%	\$0	0%	<b>\$114</b>	<b>8%</b>
Maine	\$80	6%	\$104	8%	\$97	8%	<del>-\$24</del>	-2%	<del>-\$17</del>	-2%
Maryland	\$115	9%	\$115	9%	\$90	7%	\$0	0%	<b>\$25</b>	<b>1%</b>
Massachusetts	\$60	4%	\$65	5%	\$40	3%	<del>-\$5</del>	0%	<b>\$20</b>	<b>1%</b>
Michigan	\$24	2%	\$24	2%	\$24	2%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Minnesota	\$53	4%	\$51	4%	\$5	<1%	<b>\$2</b>	0%	<b>\$48</b>	<b>4%</b>
Mississippi	\$63	5%	\$55	4%	\$47	4%	<b>\$8</b>	0%	<b>\$16</b>	<b>1%</b>
Missouri	\$66	5%	\$65	5%	\$43	4%	<b>\$1</b>	0%	<b>\$23</b>	<b>1%</b>
Montana	\$52	4%	\$52	4%	\$49	4%	\$0	0%	<b>\$3</b>	0%
Nebraska	\$52	4%	\$51	4%	\$30	2%	<b>\$1</b>	0%	<b>\$22</b>	<b>1%</b>
Nevada	\$28	2%	\$43	3%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$15</del>	-1%	<b>\$28</b>	<b>2%</b>
New Hampshire	\$1	<1%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	<b>\$1</b>	0%	<b>\$1</b>	0%
New Jersey	\$90	7%	\$71	5%	\$71	6%	<b>\$19</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$19</b>	<b>1%</b>
New Mexico	\$54	4%	\$54	4%	\$47	4%	\$0	0%	<b>\$7</b>	0%
New York*	\$0	0%	\$4	<1%	\$4	<1%	<del>-\$4</del>	0%	<del>-\$4</del>	0%
North Carolina	\$134	10%	\$131	10%	\$106	9%	<b>\$3</b>	0%	<b>\$28</b>	<b>1%</b>
North Dakota	\$180	13%	\$180	14%	\$158	13%	\$0	0%	<b>\$22</b>	0%
Ohio	\$137	10%	\$127	10%	\$43	4%	<b>\$10</b>	0%	<b>\$94</b>	<b>7%</b>
Oklahoma	\$107	8%	\$65	5%	\$54	4%	<b>\$42</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>\$53</b>	<b>4%</b>
Oregon	\$129	10%	\$119	9%	\$90	7%	<b>\$10</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$39</b>	<b>2%</b>
Pennsylvania	\$80	6%	\$87	7%	\$65	5%	<del>-\$7</del>	-1%	<b>\$15</b>	<b>1%</b>
Rhode Island	\$13	1%	\$13	1%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	<b>\$13</b>	<b>1%</b>
South Carolina	\$36	3%	\$39	3%	\$43	4%	<del>-\$3</del>	0%	<del>-\$7</del>	-1%
South Dakota	\$0	0%	\$10	1%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$10</del>	-1%	\$0	0%
Tennessee	\$73	5%	\$74	6%	\$39	3%	<del>-\$1</del>	0%	<b>\$34</b>	<b>2%</b>
Texas*	\$121-\$174	9%-13%	\$118-\$170	9%-13%	\$109-\$170	9%-14%	<b>\$3-\$4</b>	0%	<b>\$4-\$12</b>	-1%-0%
Utah	\$33	2%	\$33	3%	\$36	3%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$3</del>	0%
Vermont	\$18	1%	\$23	2%	\$0	0%	<del>-\$5</del>	0%	<b>\$18</b>	<b>1%</b>
Virginia	\$134	10%	\$131	10%	\$122	10%	<b>\$4</b>	0%	<b>\$12</b>	0%
Washington	\$50	4%	\$50	4%	\$20	2%	\$0	0%	<b>\$30</b>	<b>2%</b>
West Virginia	\$60	4%	\$60	5%	\$27	2%	\$0	0%	<b>\$33</b>	<b>2%</b>
Wisconsin	\$73	5%	\$69	5%	\$61	5%	<b>\$4</b>	0%	<b>\$12</b>	0%
Wyoming	\$11	1%	\$10	1%	\$10	1%	<b>\$1</b>	0%	<b>\$1</b>	0%

*Bold numbers indicate increased copayment*

*\* notes on following page*



### **Notes for Tables 3a and 3b: Parent Copayments**

*For a family of three, an income at 100 percent of poverty was equal to \$14,630 a year in 2001, \$15,670 a year in 2004, and \$16,090 a year in 2005.*

*For a family of three, an income at 150 percent of poverty was equal to \$21,945 a year in 2001, \$23,505 a year in 2004, and \$24,135 a year in 2005.*

*For states that calculate their fees as a percentage of the cost of care, it is assumed that the family was purchasing care at the state's maximum reimbursement rate for licensed, non-accredited center care for a four-year-old. Monthly fees were calculated from hourly, daily, and weekly fees assuming the child was in care 9 hours a day, 5 days a week, 4.33 weeks a month.*

*Changes in copayments were calculated using raw data, rather than the rounded numbers shown in the table.*

Florida: Local coalitions have flexibility in setting copayments; the copayments in the tables reflect the maximum amount permitted by the state.

Iowa: A family at 150 percent of poverty would be eligible for assistance if the family was using special needs care. For this family, the copayment in 2005 would be \$176 per month.

Louisiana: Data were not available for June 2001, so data from March 2000 were used instead.

Nebraska: A family at 150 of poverty would be eligible if the family was transitioning from welfare. For this family, the copayment in 2005 would be \$156 per month.

New York: Data were not available for June 2001, so data from March 2000 were used instead. The state allows districts the flexibility to set copayments within a state-specified range; the copayments in the tables reflect the maximum amount possible in that range.

Texas: Local workforce boards set their own copayments within state guidelines. Parents participating in the TANF work program (Choices) and the Food Stamp Employment and Training program are exempt from the parent copayment.

TABLE 4A: STATE REIMBURSEMENT RATES 2005

State	State reimbursement rates compared to market rates	Year when rates last updated	If the state rate is lower than the rate a provider charges, is the provider allowed to charge parents the difference?
Alabama*	45th percentile of 2003 rates	2001	Yes
Alaska	50th percentile of 2003 rates	2001	Yes
Arizona	75th percentile of 1998 rates	2001	Yes
Arkansas	75th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	No
California	85th percentile of 2002 rates	2002-2003	Yes
Colorado*	75th percentile of 2003 rates	Ongoing	No
Connecticut	60th percentile of 2001 rates	2002	Yes
Delaware	50th to 75th percentile of 2005 rates	2005	Yes
District of Columbia	75th percentile of 1998 rates	1999-2000	No
Florida	75th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	No
Georgia*	50th percentile of 2003 rates	2005	Yes
Hawaii	70th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	Yes
Idaho	75th percentile of 2001 rates	2001	Yes
Illinois*	21st to 80th percentile of 2002 rates	2000	Yes, unless contracted
Indiana	75th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	Yes
Iowa	75th percentile of 1998 rates	2000	No
Kansas*	65th percentile of 2000 rates	2002	Yes
Kentucky	Approximately 75th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	Yes
Louisiana*	70th to 73rd percentile of 2003 rates	2004	Yes
Maine	75th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	No
Maryland	75th percentile of 2001 rates	2002	Yes
Massachusetts*	25th to 75th percentile of 2003 rates	2004	No
Michigan	75th percentile of 1996 rates	1997	Yes
Minnesota	75th percentile of 2001 rates	2003	Yes
Mississippi	75th percentile of 1999 rates	1999	Yes
Missouri*	Based on 1991 prices (1996 for infants)	1998	Yes
Montana	75th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	Yes
Nebraska	60th to 75th percentile of 2001 rates	2001	No
Nevada*	73rd to 85th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	Yes
New Hampshire	48th percentile of 2001 rates	2000	Yes
New Jersey	Below the 75th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	Yes
New Mexico*	Below the 75th percentile of 2003 rates	2005	No
New York*	75th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	Yes, unless contracted
North Carolina*	75th percentile of 1997 rates	2003	Yes
North Dakota*	At or above the 75th percentile of 2003 rates	2000	Yes
Ohio	75th percentile of 2000 rates	2001	No
Oklahoma*	Below or above the 75th percentile of 2003 rates	2001	No
Oregon*	21st percentile of 2004 rates	1999	Yes
Pennsylvania*	10th to 100th percentile of 2003 rates	2004	Yes
Rhode Island	75th percentile of 2002 rates	2004	No
South Carolina	75th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	Yes
South Dakota	75th percentile of 2003 rates	2003	Yes
Tennessee*	Below the 75th percentile of 2002 rates	2002	Yes
Texas*	Varies by county	2002	Yes
Utah*	75th percentile of 2000 rates	2001	Yes
Vermont	50th to 65th percentile of 2003 rates	2004	Yes
Virginia*	75th percentile of 2002 rates	2004	Yes
Washington	38th percentile of 2002 rates	2002	No
West Virginia	Below the 50th to 95th percentile of 2003 rates	2000	No
Wisconsin	75th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	Yes
Wyoming*	75th percentile of 2002 rates	2003	Yes

\* notes on page 20

TABLE 4B: STATE REIMBURSEMENT RATES  
 COMPARED TO THE 75TH PERCENTILE OF  
 CURRENT MARKET RATES

State	Rates equal to or above the 75th percentile of current market rates....		
	In 2005?	In 2004?	In 2001?
Alabama*	No	No	Yes
Alaska	No	No	No
Arizona	No	No	No
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	Cannot be determined	Yes	Yes
Colorado*	Yes	No	Yes
Connecticut	No	No	No
Delaware	No	No	No
District of Columbia	No	No	No
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia*	No	No	No
Hawaii	No	No	No
Idaho	No	No	Yes
Illinois	No	No	No
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iowa	No	No	No
Kansas	No	No	No
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes
Louisiana*	No	Yes	Yes
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maryland	No	No	Yes
Massachusetts*	No	No	No
Michigan	No	No	No
Minnesota	No	No	Yes
Mississippi	No	No	Yes
Missouri*	No	No	No
Montana*	Yes	No	No
Nebraska	No	No	No
Nevada*	Yes	No	Yes
New Hampshire	No	No	No
New Jersey*	No	No	No
New Mexico*	No	No	No
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	No	No	No
North Dakota*	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ohio	No	No	No
Oklahoma*	No	No	No
Oregon*	No	No	No
Pennsylvania*	No	No	No
Rhode Island	No	Yes	Yes
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	No
South Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tennessee*	No	No	No
Texas*	No	No	Yes
Utah	No	No	No
Vermont	No	No	No
Virginia*	No	No	No
Washington	No	No	No
West Virginia*	No	No	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wyoming*	No	Yes	Yes

\* notes on following page

### **Notes for Tables 4a and 4b: Reimbursement Rates**

*State reimbursement rates are compared to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of market rates (the rate that allows parents access to 75 percent of providers in their community) because federal regulations recommend that rates be set at this level.*

*A state is considered to have rates that were based on current market prices if the market survey used to set its rates was conducted no more than two years earlier (so, for example, rates used in 2005 were considered current if set at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of 2003 or more recent market rates).*

*The data in these tables reflect states' basic rates. Some states may have higher rates for particular types of care such as higher quality care or care for children with special needs.*

Alabama: The percentile varies by region.

Colorado: Each county determines its own rates. The percentile at which rates are set varies by county when applied, but the state rate was an average of the 75th percentile in 2005.

Georgia: The percentile varies by type of care, age of child, and region.

Illinois: A provider on contract with the state is prohibited from charging families the difference between the state rate and what the provider charges private-paying families. A provider paid through the certificate program is discouraged from this practice but it is not prohibited.

Kansas: Rates for regulated providers were last updated February 1, 2002. New rates were implemented for in-home care (care provided in the child's own home) on October 1, 2004 and for out-of-home relative care on January 1, 2005.

Louisiana: The percentile for the rate varies—it was at the 73rd percentile for licensed centers, the 70th for registered family child care homes, and the 72nd for in-home care (care provided in the child's own home) in 2005.

Massachusetts: The percentile varies by type of care and region. In 2005, the rates ranged from approximately the 75th percentile for infant/toddler care in the Western Region to approximately the 25th percentile in the Greater Boston Suburbs.

Missouri: The reimbursement rates for preschool and school-age care were set in 1991 and not reflective of a particular percentile. The reimbursement rate for infants was at the 50th percentile of 1996 market rates. Provider rates were increased in 1998 for infant care and nontraditional care. In 1999, the state introduced provider rate enhancements for care for children with special needs, accredited providers, and disproportionate share providers who care for a higher number of children receiving subsidies.

Montana: Data on policies as of 2001 were not available, so policies as of March 2000 were used instead.

Nevada: The rates vary geographically but the average rate for infant care was at the 85th percentile, the rates for toddler and preschool care were each at the 74th percentile, and the rate for school-age care was at the 73rd percentile in 2005.

New Jersey: Data on policies as of 2001 were not available, so policies as of March 2000 were used instead for this analysis.

New Mexico: The state does not set its rates as a percentile of market rates. However, a comparison of the state's base rates in 2005 to the 75th percentile of 2003 market rates indicates that most state rates fall below that level, although some rates, such as those for licensed care in rural areas for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, are above the 75th percentile. In recent years, the state has raised rates for certain categories of providers or providers with higher quality levels, rather than raising rates for all providers. The state increased rates for accredited providers in rural areas in April 2003, added differential rate levels for higher quality providers in February 2004, and raised rates for licensed providers in rural areas in February 2005.

New York: Providers may only charge parents the difference between the state rate and provider rate if the provider does not have a contract with the county.

North Carolina: In 2003, the state used a 2000 market rate survey to adjust certain rates by 1 to 3 percent.

North Dakota: In 2004 and 2005, rates for centers were above the 75th percentile, but rates for some family child care providers were below the 70th percentile.

Oklahoma: The percentile varies by type of care, age of child, and region.

Oregon: The percentile varies by type of care, age of child, and region.

Pennsylvania: The percentile varies by type of care, age of child, and region. For full-time center-based care, the maximum provider reimbursement rates for 2005 were set at the 50th percentile of 2003 market rates. The state planned to update rates as of July 2005.

Tennessee: The percentile varies significantly by type of care, age of child, and region.

Texas: Localities have flexibility in determining maximum reimbursement rates. In most localities, the rates were below the 75th percentile as of 2004.

Utah: The state adjusted its infant rates in 2001. All other rates have not been adjusted in over five years.

Virginia: In 2005, rates for licensed and regulated care for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers were set at the 75th percentile of 2002 rates. Rates for unlicensed providers and for all school-age care were below the 75th percentile of 2002 rates.

West Virginia: Policies as of 2001 were not available, so policies as of March 2000 were used instead.

Wyoming: The state planned to update its rates as of April 1, 2005.

TABLE 5: PARENTS IN SCHOOL AND ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE 2005

State	Are parents in school eligible?	Must parents also be working?	Number of hours of work required per week	Maximum number of years of education or training and/or highest level of degree allowed
Alabama	Yes	No	NA	24 months, Bachelor's degree
Alaska	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
Arizona*	Yes	Yes	20 hours	No limits specified
Arkansas	Yes	No	NA	15 semesters or 5 years
California	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
Colorado*	Yes, depending on county	No	NA	48 months, Bachelor's degree (counties can set stricter limits)
Connecticut	Yes, but only if receiving TANF	No	NA	No limits specified
Delaware*	Yes, but only if receiving TANF or Food Stamps	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
District of Columbia*	Yes	No, if full-time student	(20 hours for work/school if part-time)	Bachelor's degree
Florida	Yes	Yes	20 hours	No limits specified
Georgia*	Yes	No	NA	12 months, technical or vocational program
Hawaii	Yes, but only if receiving TANF	No, but must be agreed on	NA	Parent expected to be pursuing goal
Idaho	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Illinois*	Yes	Yes, for postsecondary education	10 hours	Bachelor's degree
Indiana	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Iowa	Yes, if enrolled full time in approved program	No	NA	24 months (lifetime limit), Bachelor's degree
Kansas*	Yes	Yes	20 hours	Determined case by case
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	20 hours	3 years for Associate degree, 5 years for Bachelor's degree
Louisiana*	Yes	No, but activity requirement	(25 hours for work/school)	No limits specified
Maine	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
Maryland	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Massachusetts*	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Michigan*	Yes, in some circumstances	Yes	20 hours	Usually limited to final year of program
Minnesota*	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Mississippi*	Yes	Yes, for postsecondary education	25 hours	No limits specified
Missouri*	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Montana*	Yes	Yes, for postsecondary education	10 hours	Bachelor's degree
Nebraska	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Nevada	Yes	No	NA	10 semesters if not working; no limit if working
New Hampshire*	Yes	No	NA	2 or 3 years, Bachelor's degree (TANF), 2 years, Associate degree (non-TANF)
New Jersey	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
New Mexico*	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
New York*	Yes, depending on county	Yes, for 4-year degree program	17.5 hours	Bachelor's degree; 30 months for Associate degree
North Carolina*	Yes	No	NA	2 years for postsecondary school or skills training
North Dakota	Yes, for vocational education	No	NA	Vocational, professional, or technical education (not eligible for Bachelor's degree)
Ohio	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Oklahoma	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Oregon*	Yes, but only a very limited number served	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Pennsylvania*	Yes	Yes, for postsecondary education	25 hours	No limits specified
Rhode Island*	Yes, but only if receiving TANF	No, initially	NA	Limit depends on TANF requirements
South Carolina	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
South Dakota*	Yes	No, but activity requirement	(80 hours a month for work/school)	Bachelor's degree
Tennessee*	Yes	No, but activity requirement	(40 hours for work/school)	Bachelor's degree
Texas	Yes	No	NA	4 years, degree in high-demand occupation
Utah*	Yes	Yes	15 hours	2 years, degree or certificate in a marketable field
Vermont*	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree
Virginia*	Yes	No, except TANF recipients	8 hours for TANF work component	No limits specified
Washington	Yes	Yes	20 hours (16 hours for work-study)	36 months, vocational education
West Virginia	Yes	No	NA	No limits specified
Wisconsin*	Yes	Yes	Determined case by case	2 years
Wyoming	Yes	No	NA	Bachelor's degree

\* notes on following pages

**Notes for Table 5: Parents in School and Eligibility for  
Child Care Assistance**

Arizona: There is no limit on the number of years or the level of schooling for parents to receive child care assistance while in school. However, the course of study must be related to the parent's employment goal and satisfactory progress must be maintained.

Colorado: Counties determine whether to allow parents to be eligible for child care assistance while in school; as of February 2005, it was allowed in 47 out of 64 counties. Counties also determine the amount of time for which parents can receive assistance while in school. The state permits the county to provide assistance to parents in school for up to 48 months and up to a Bachelor's degree. Among counties that serve parents in school, the time limit ranges from 9 to 48 months, with most permitting 24 to 48 months.

Delaware: Parents are only eligible for child care assistance while in school if they are participating in a Food Stamp/TANF Employment and Training program.

District of Columbia: Full-time students do not have to be working to be eligible for child care assistance, but for part-time students, school and work activities must equal a minimum of 20 hours per week.

Georgia: Parents are eligible for assistance while in school if they are participating in a state-approved activity (i.e., a technical or vocational program leading to a specific job or career) for an average of 25 hours a week for single parents and 35 hours a week for two-parent families, or if a teen parent is pursuing a GED or high school diploma.

Illinois: Teen parents who need child care assistance to obtain their high school diploma or its equivalent do not have a work requirement. A parent receiving TANF who is attending school may or may not have a work requirement. Any work requirement is monitored by the TANF caseworker. A parent not receiving TANF who is attending a GED, ESL, ABE or vocational school program does not have a work requirement for the first 24 non-consecutive months. After that they must work 20 hours per week. A parent not receiving TANF who is attending a two- or four-year degree program is required to work an average of 10 hours per week.

Kansas: To receive child care assistance while in school, parents must receive approval and are required to work 20 hours per week, unless the training will be completed within 6 months.

Louisiana: Parents are not required to work while in school, but to be eligible for child care assistance, total time spent working and/or attending school or training must be an average of 25 hours per week.

Massachusetts: Parents are not required to be working, but if they take four college courses, they would only be eligible for half-time care (20 hours); to be eligible for full-time care, they would have to be working as well. (High school students are eligible for full-time care without having to work.)

Michigan: The work requirement for parents in school to receive child care assistance (20 hours a week) may vary depending on the circumstances. Parents are usually only eligible for child care assistance while in school during the final year of their education program, unless they are pursuing a high school degree.

Minnesota: The maximum length of time a student is eligible for child care assistance is no more than the time necessary to complete the credit requirements for their Associate or Bachelor's degree as determined by the educational institution, excluding basic or remedial education programs needed to prepare for postsecondary education or employment.

Mississippi: Parents in high school are not required to be working while in school.

Missouri: Parents are eligible for child care assistance while obtaining a GED/ABE for up to one year, although the time limit may be extended with a review on an individual basis; for junior high or elementary school education as needed to complete; for high school for up to four years, with the maximum based on actual semesters required to graduate; and for postsecondary education for up to four years, with the maximum based on actual semesters required to graduate. For postsecondary education, the parent's intent must be to receive a Bachelor's or Associate degree.

*(notes continued on following page)*

*(notes continued from previous page)*

Montana: To receive assistance, parents must work 10 hours per week if attending school full time.

New Hampshire: Parents receiving TANF are eligible for child care assistance while working toward their Bachelor's degree for up to two years of full-time study or three years of part-time study. Parents not receiving TANF are eligible for child care assistance while working toward their Associate degree for up to two years.

New Mexico: Parents not receiving TANF and attending school are not subject to any work requirements or limits on the years or level of schooling in order to qualify for child care assistance. However, parents receiving TANF and attending school may be subject to work requirements or other limitations.

New York: Counties set their own priorities for child care assistance and may, but are not required to, pay for child care for parents attending postsecondary education. Counties have the option to provide child care assistance to parents in community college if the course of study does not take more than 30 months and leads to an Associate degree or certificate of completion. Counties also have the option to pay for child care for parents in a four-year program leading to a Bachelor's degree, but the parent must be working at least 17½ hours per week.

North Carolina: There is a time limit on child care assistance while a parent is attending postsecondary school or a skills-training program, but there is no time limit for parents attending continuing elementary or high school education programs provided by the local school system, community college, or technical institutes, or engaging in Work First Employment Services training-related activities.

Oregon: Teen parents can receive child care assistance to attend high school if they are in the JOBS program. In addition, a small number of parents (about 200) can receive assistance to attend a two- or four-year college.

Pennsylvania: Parents who are under age 22 and in high school are exempt from any work requirements. Also note that the state planned to reduce the number of hours parents were required to work to only 10 hours a week if they were attending postsecondary school 10 hours a week, effective July 1, 2005.

Rhode Island: Parents in school initially do not have to be working to receive child care assistance, but at some point in their Family Independence Plan (TANF), they do have to work to receive assistance.

South Dakota: Parents are not required to work while in school to be eligible for child care assistance, but they must be participating in school and/or work activities for a total of 80 hours per month.

Tennessee: Parents must participate in school and/or work activities for a total of 40 hours per week to be eligible for assistance, although the state accepts 30 to 40 hours per week when the employer considers full-time employment to be less than 40 hours, or the economic conditions of the area make 40 hours per week unrealistic. Parents receive credit for one hour of study for each hour of class. Students participating in post-graduate education are not eligible for assistance unless they meet activity requirements through work hours exclusively.

Utah: If a parent is pursuing a four-year degree, the state will only provide child care assistance to cover the last two years of the program.

Vermont: Parents attending school can receive child care assistance in accordance with the plan they establish with the state. Parents are not necessarily required to be working in order to be eligible for assistance; they can be in school full time. The state will not pay for a Master's degree if a parent already has a Bachelor's degree.

Virginia: Parents may receive child care assistance while in school if it is an approved plan.

Wisconsin: Authorization for child care assistance while attending an institution of higher education is possible. The parent must be in an approved employment-related activity; the number of hours of employment-related activity is determined on a case-by-case basis.

*The National Women's Law Center is a non-profit organization that has been working since 1972 to advance and protect women's legal rights. The Center focuses on major policy areas of importance to women and their families, including employment, education, health and reproductive rights, and family economic security.*

*The Center is grateful for the tremendous assistance of the state child care administrators who provided the information that made this issue brief possible. The authors also thank Joan Entmacher, Vice-President for Family Economic Security, for her comments.*

*This issue brief would not have been possible without the generous support of the National Women's Law Center's child care and early education work provided by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Bernice R. and Joseph A. Coleman Foundation, The Ford Foundation, the George Gund Foundation, the A.L. Mailman Family Foundation, the Moriah Fund, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, The William Penn Foundation, the Rockefeller Family Fund, and an anonymous donor.*



11 Dupont Circle, NW Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.588.5180 • 202.588.5185  
[www.nwlc.org](http://www.nwlc.org)