

STATE CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE POLICIES 2010: NEW FEDERAL FUNDS HELP STATES WEATHER THE STORM

SEPTEMBER 2010

by

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

Child care helps children, families, and communities prosper. Children in child care have the opportunity to learn and develop skills they need to succeed in school and in life. Parents with dependable child care have the support and peace of mind they need to be productive at work. And child care helps our nation stay competitive, with a stronger workforce now and in the future. Reliable child care is particularly important in this difficult economy for parents who are trying to get and keep a job, and for children who need stability when their families may be experiencing financial or other types of instability. Yet many families, especially in the current economy, struggle to afford the high price of child care. The average fee for full-time care ranges from more than \$3,550 to more than \$18,750 annually, depending on where the family lives, the type of care, and the age of the child.¹ Child care assistance can help parents with these costs so that they can afford the care that they want for their children and that they need to remain employed.

Between February 2009 and February 2010, the majority of states did not have significant changes in the child care assistance policies covered in this report—income eligibility limits to qualify for child care assistance, waiting lists for child care assistance, copayments required of parents receiving child care assistance, and reimbursement rates for child care providers serving families receiving child care assistance. In those states in which changes occurred, some states moved forward on one or more policies, and others moved backward on one or more policies. Moreover, most states' policies were still the same as, or fell behind where they were, in 2001.²

Although most states did not progress in their child care assistance policies, given that many states made cuts to other programs between February 2009 and February 2010 in order to close budget gaps,³ it is noteworthy that most states' child care assistance policies at least held steady. In most instances, this is because of the infusion of federal funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) passed in February 2009, which included \$2 billion in additional funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) for FY 2009 and FY 2010⁴ to help states provide child care assistance to low-income families and support activities to improve the quality of care.⁵ As states exhaust these funds, however, some are beginning or planning to make cuts to their child care assistance programs.

Trends in states' policies between February 2009 and February 2010 are described in more detail below, but to summarize:

- ◆ Six states increased their income eligibility limits for child care assistance beyond what was necessary to adjust for inflation, and an additional thirty-two states increased their income limits sufficiently to keep pace with inflation.⁶



All but one of the remaining states kept their income limits the same. Still, in twenty-one states, the income limits in 2010 were lower as a percentage of the federal poverty level than in 2001.⁷

- ◆ The number of states with waiting lists for child care assistance in 2010—nineteen—was the same as the number of states with waiting lists in 2009. Among the fourteen states that had waiting lists and for which comparable data were available, the number of children on the waiting list decreased in eight states and increased in six between 2009 and 2010. The number of states with waiting lists in 2010 was still lower than the number of states with waiting lists—twenty-one—in 2001. Among the ten states that had waiting lists in both years and for which there were comparable data, the number of children on the waiting list decreased in four states and increased in six between 2001 and 2010.
- ◆ In about one-third of the states, families receiving child care assistance paid a lower percentage of their income in copayments in 2010 than in 2009, and in all but a few of the remaining states families paid the same percentage of their income in copayments. Yet, in one-third to nearly half of the states, depending on income, families receiving child care assistance paid a higher percentage of their income in copayments in 2010 than in 2001. In about one-third to over half of the states, depending on income, families receiving child care assistance paid a higher percentage of their income in copayments in 2010 than the nationwide average percentage of income that families who pay for child care spent on that care.
- ◆ Only six states had reimbursement rates for providers who serve families receiving child care assistance at the federally recommended level in 2010, lower than the number—nine—in 2009, and less than one-third the number—twenty-two—in 2001. Approximately three-fifths of the states had higher reimbursement rates for higher-quality providers in 2010, but in nearly two-thirds of these states, even the higher rates were below the federally recommended level.

LOOKING AHEAD: DEVELOPMENTS SINCE FEBRUARY 2010

While the ARRA funds helped most states at least maintain or in some cases improve their child care assistance policies, some states report that they plan to revert to previous policies or will no longer be able to hold off cuts if the ARRA funds expire and no additional child care funds are provided. Several states have restricted access to child care assistance or made other cuts to their programs since February 2010.

- ◆ Two states that used ARRA funds to increase their income eligibility limits for child care assistance between 2009 and 2010 have reduced or plan to reduce their income limits, although these states' new income limits will still be higher than their 2009 income limits as a dollar amount.
 - Connecticut increased its income limit from 50 percent of the 2009 state median income (\$39,405 for a family of three) in February 2009 to 75 percent of the 2010 state median income (\$61,556 for a family in three) in February 2010, but expects to reduce its income limit back to 50 percent of the 2010 state median income (\$41,037 for a family of three) in the coming year.
 - Wyoming increased its income limit from 185 percent of poverty⁸ in February 2009 to 250 percent of poverty⁹ in February 2010, but reduced its income limit to 225 percent of poverty¹⁰ as of July 1, 2010.
- ◆ Eleven states had or expected to have increases in their waiting lists for child care assistance (Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania), or expected to start waiting lists (Mississippi and Oregon), or to close intake

(Connecticut) due to continuing difficult economic and financial conditions, state budget cuts, and/or the expiration of ARRA funding. For example:

- Arkansas's waiting list grew from 2,727 children as of February 2010, to approximately 15,000 children as of August 2010.
 - New Hampshire's waiting list grew from 1,845 children as of April 19, 2010, to 2,359 children as of July 15, 2010, with approximately twelve children being added to the list every business day.
 - New Mexico expects its waiting list to continue to grow because it has been placing all families with incomes between 100 percent of poverty (\$18,310 for a family of three) and the state's income eligibility limit of 200 percent of poverty (\$36,620 for a family of three) who apply for child care assistance on the waiting list since January 1, 2010.¹¹
 - Oregon, which was providing child care assistance to families with incomes up to 185 percent of poverty (\$33,874 for a family of three) and had no waiting list as of February 2010, will only allow families who received Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) for at least one month in the prior twenty-four months to qualify for child care assistance as of October 1, 2010. Families enrolled in the child care assistance program prior to October 1, 2010 who have not received TANF for at least one month in the prior twenty-four months will lose their child care assistance as of December 31, 2010. In June 2010, the state reported that over 4,600 families would lose their child care assistance as a result of this change. The state will start a waiting list for families who apply for child care assistance but who do not qualify under the new rule.
 - Pennsylvania, which had 5,022 children on its waiting list as of February 2010, had cleared its waiting list as of May 7, 2010. However, the state's waiting list began growing again and had 10,461 children on it as of September 2010.
- ◆ Nine states that used ARRA funds to expand access to child care assistance for parents searching for a job—by allowing parents searching for a job to continue and/or begin receiving child care assistance or by allowing parents searching for a job to receive child care assistance for a longer period of time—have reverted to their previous policies or plan to do so once ARRA funds expire.
- Colorado is using ARRA funds to increase the amount of time parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job from thirty days to 180 days (in a twelve-month period). The expanded policy went into effect as of April 2009. The state will revert to the previous policy when ARRA expires.
 - Georgia is using ARRA funds for a secondary child care assistance program that allows parents to continue receiving child care assistance while searching for a job. The program went into effect as of January 2010 and will end in its entirety on September 30, 2010. The primary child care assistance program does not allow parents to receive child care assistance while searching for a job.
 - Illinois is using ARRA funds to increase the amount of time parents receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job from thirty days to ninety days. The expanded period for job search went into effect as of November 1, 2009 and will continue until September 2011, or as long as funds are available, at which point the state will revert to its previous policy.
 - Louisiana used ARRA funds from July 1, 2009, to December 31, 2009, to maintain a policy that allowed parents to receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to four

months. This policy ended as of January 2010 and parents are no longer able to receive child care assistance while searching for a job.

- Missouri is using ARRA funds to allow parents to begin or continue receiving child care assistance for up to eight weeks while searching for a job. This policy went into effect May 1, 2010 and will continue while ARRA funding is available or until September 30, 2011, whichever occurs first. At that point, the state will revert to its previous policy, which allows parents receiving child care assistance to continue receiving it while searching for a job for up to only four weeks, and does not allow parents to qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.
- North Carolina used ARRA funds to expand the length of time parents receiving child care assistance could receive it while searching for a job from sixty days under the state's previous policy to six months under a temporary policy that became effective July 1, 2009. Under the temporary policy, the state also began allowing families not receiving child care assistance to qualify for assistance while searching for a job and receive it for up to six months. ARRA funds were used to support the temporary job search policy through May 31, 2010. Other funding was used to maintain the temporary policy until June 30, 2010. Any families applying for child care assistance after that date are subject to the previous policy (the temporary policy still applies to families who were receiving assistance as of that date).
- South Dakota is using ARRA funds to allow parents to begin or continue receiving child care assistance for up to two months while searching for a job. Once ARRA funds are exhausted, the state will revert to its previous policy, which allows parents receiving child care assistance to continue to receive it while searching for a job for up to only thirty days, and does not allow parents to qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.
- Utah is using ARRA funds for a separate child care assistance program that allows parents to receive child care assistance for up to 100 hours while searching for a job. The state's primary child care program does not provide child care assistance while a parent searches for a job. The separate program was implemented as of June 2009 and will end when ARRA expires.
- Wyoming is using ARRA funds to allow parents to qualify for or continue receiving child care assistance for up to sixty days while searching for a job. This policy went into effect as of June 2009. The state will stop providing child care assistance to parents searching for a job when ARRA funds are expended.

METHODOLOGY

The data in this report were collected by the National Women's Law Center from state child care administrators in the fifty states and the District of Columbia (counted as a state in this report). The state child care administrators were sent a survey in the spring of 2010 requesting data on policies as of February 2010 in four key areas—income eligibility limits, waiting lists, parent copayments, and reimbursement rates. States were also asked to report any policy changes in each of the four areas, as well as any other major policy changes, they anticipated within the coming year. In addition to these questions, which were largely the same as in the previous year's survey, states were asked about their policies for providing child care assistance to parents searching for a job. States were asked to identify their state's most promising quality initiative and their most promising infant/toddler initiative as well; the information they provided about these initiatives will be included in a report that the Center will publish separately. The state administrators were contacted by Center staff for follow-up information as necessary.

The 2009 data used in this report for comparison purposes were collected by the Center through a similar process and published in the Center's September 2009 report, *State Child Care Assistance Policies 2009: Most States Hold the Line, but Some Lose Ground in Hard Times*. The 2001 data used in this report were collected by the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) and published in CDF's report, *State Developments in Child Care, Early Education and School-Age Care 2001*. CDF staff collected the data through surveys and interviews with state child care advocates and verified the data with state child care administrators. The CDF data reflect policies in effect as of June 1, 2001, unless otherwise indicated. The Center uses 2001 as a basis for comparison because it was, until this year, the year between the peak year for TANF funding for child care, FY 2000, and the peak year for CCDBG funding, FY 2002 (see the section below on funding for child care assistance).

The Center chose to examine the policy areas covered in this report because they are critical in determining whether low-income families can receive child care assistance and the extent of assistance they can receive. Income eligibility limits reveal how generous a state is in determining families who qualify for child care assistance,¹² and waiting lists help reveal whether families who qualify for assistance actually receive it. Parent copayment levels reveal whether low-income parents receiving child care assistance are left with significant out-of-pocket costs for care. Reimbursement rates reveal the extent to which families receiving assistance may be limited in both their choice of child care providers and the quality of care those providers offer. Eligibility policies for parents searching for work reveal whether parents can receive child care assistance while seeking employment without disrupting their child's child care arrangement.

FUNDING FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The primary source of funding for child care assistance is the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) program. CCDBG funding was \$5.044 billion in FY 2010.¹³ In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), passed in February 2009, provided an additional \$2 billion in CCDBG funding for states to obligate in FY 2009 and FY 2010. Assuming \$1 billion of these funds each year for FY 2009 and FY 2010, total CCDBG funding in FY 2010 was \$6.044 billion. This amount was higher, in real terms, than the previous peak for CCDBG funding (\$4.817 billion¹⁴ before adjusting for inflation, or \$5.899 billion in FY 2010 dollars¹⁵), which occurred in FY 2002.

Another important source of child care funding is the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. States may transfer up to 30 percent of their TANF block grant funds to CCDBG, or use TANF funds directly for child care without first transferring the money. States' use of TANF dollars for child care (including both transfers and direct funding) was \$3.514 billion in FY 2009 (the most recent year for which data are available).¹⁶ Even without adjusting for inflation, the amount of TANF funds used for child care in FY 2009 was below its high of \$3.966 billion in FY 2000¹⁷ (\$5.150 billion in FY 2010 dollars¹⁸).

As a result, total federal child care funding from CCDBG, ARRA, and TANF in FY 2010—\$9.558 billion, assuming TANF funding for child care in FY 2010, a figure not yet available, was the same as in FY 2009—remained below total federal child care funding in FY 2001 (just after the peak in TANF funding and just before the last peak in CCDBG funding) after adjusting for inflation—\$10.178 billion in FY 2010 dollars.¹⁹

INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS

A family's ability to obtain child care assistance depends on a state's income eligibility limit. In analyzing this policy area, it is important to consider not only a state's limit in a given year, but also whether the state adjusts the limit for inflation each year so that a family does not become ineligible for assistance because its income simply keeps pace with inflation.

Between 2009 and 2010, approximately three-quarters of the states increased their income eligibility limits as a dollar amount, while only one state decreased its income limit.²⁰ Between 2001 and 2010, approximately nine-tenths of the states increased their income limits as a dollar amount. However, not all of these states increased their income limits sufficiently to keep pace with or surpass inflation. Even with the increases in income limits over the past year, over two-thirds of the states had income limits at or below 200 percent of poverty in 2010.

- ◆ Thirty-eight states increased their income eligibility limits as a dollar amount between 2009 and 2010 (*see Table 1a*). Six of these states increased their income limits beyond the amount needed to adjust for inflation and thirty-two of these states increased their income limits sufficiently to keep pace with inflation.²¹
- ◆ Twelve states left their income eligibility limits at the same level as a dollar amount between 2009 and 2010, thereby keeping pace with inflation.
- ◆ One state decreased its income eligibility limit as a dollar amount between 2009 and 2010.
- ◆ Forty-six states increased their the income eligibility limits as a dollar amount between 2001 and 2010 (*see Table 1b*). In nineteen of these states, the increase was great enough that the income limit was higher as a percentage of the federal poverty level in 2010 than in 2001. In eleven of these states, the increase was great enough that the income limit stayed the same, or nearly the same, as a percentage of the federal poverty level.²² However, in sixteen of these states, the increase was not sufficient to keep pace with the federal poverty level, so the income limit was lower as a percentage of the federal poverty level in 2010 than in 2001.
- ◆ In four states, the income eligibility limit was lower as a dollar amount in 2010 than in 2001. In one state, the income limit stayed the same as a dollar amount. In all of these states, the income limit decreased as a percentage of the federal poverty level, bringing to twenty-one the total number of states in which the income limit failed to keep pace with the increase in the federal poverty level between 2001 and 2010.
- ◆ The income eligibility limit was above 100 percent of the federal poverty level (\$18,310 a year for a family of three in 2010) in all states in 2010. However, a family with an income slightly above 150 percent of poverty (\$27,465 a year for a family of three in 2010) could not qualify for child care assistance in thirteen states. A family with an income above 200 percent of poverty (\$36,620 a year for a family of three in 2010) could not qualify for assistance in thirty-five states. Yet, in the majority of communities across the country, a family needs an income equal to at least 200 percent of poverty to meet its basic needs, including housing, food, child care, transportation, health care, and other necessities, based on a study by the Economic Policy Institute.²³

WAITING LISTS

Even families who are eligible for child care assistance may not necessarily receive it. Instead, a state may place eligible families on a waiting list or may freeze intake (turn away families without adding their names to a waiting list). For some families, the wait for child care assistance may be months or longer, and some families may remain stuck on the waiting list without ever receiving assistance. Families on the waiting list are often left with few good options, as shown in several studies.²⁴ Many of these families strain their limited budgets to afford the cost of stable, good-quality child care on their own while struggling to pay for other basic expenses, or use low-cost—and frequently low-quality—care because they cannot afford the care they would prefer for their children, or are left without reliable child care and as a result parents find it difficult to hold onto their jobs.

In 2010, over three-fifths of the states were able to serve eligible families who applied for child care assistance without placing any on waiting lists or freezing intake. Yet nearly two-fifths of the states had waiting lists or frozen intake for at least some families applying for assistance. The number of states with waiting lists or frozen intake in 2010 was unchanged from 2009, although more states' waiting lists decreased than increased between 2009 and 2010. In addition, the number of states with waiting lists in 2010 was lower than the number of states with waiting lists in 2001.²⁵

- ◆ Nineteen states had waiting lists or frozen intake in 2010, the same number of states as in 2009, and fewer than the number of states—twenty-one—that had waiting lists or frozen intake in 2001 (*see Table 2*).²⁶
- ◆ Eight states had shorter waiting lists in 2010 than in 2009, while six states had longer waiting lists. In the remaining two states with waiting lists in both 2009 and 2010, it was not possible to compare the length of waiting lists based on the available data.
- ◆ Four states had shorter waiting lists in 2010 than in 2001, while six states had longer waiting lists. In the remaining five states with waiting lists in both 2001 and 2010, it was not possible to compare the length of waiting lists based on the available data.

COPAYMENTS

Most states require families receiving child care assistance to contribute toward their child care costs based on a sliding fee scale that is designed to charge progressively higher copayments to families at progressively higher income levels. Some states also take into account the cost of care used by a family in determining the amount of the family's copayment. If states set copayments at levels that are unmanageable for the low-income families receiving child care assistance, families may strain to afford their copayments, may fail to cover their copayments and leave their child care providers to absorb the lost income, or may be discouraged from participating in the child care assistance program altogether.

This study compares state copayment policies by considering two hypothetical families: a family of three with an income at 100 percent of the federal poverty level and a family of three with an income at 150 percent of the federal poverty level.²⁷ In about one-third of the states, families paid a lower percentage of their income in copayments in 2010 than in 2009, and in most of the remaining states, copayments remained the same in 2010 as in 2009. However, copayments were still higher as a percentage of family income in 2010 than in 2001 in one-third to nearly half of the states, depending on income.

Although most states lowered or held steady their copayments between 2009 and 2010, many states still had relatively high copayments in 2010. In about one-third to over half of the states, depending on income, a family was required to pay more in copayments than the nationwide average amount that families who pay for child care (including those who receive child care assistance and those who do not) spent on child care—7.0 percent of income.²⁸

- ◆ In sixteen states, copayments for a family of three at 150 percent of poverty²⁹ decreased as a percentage of income between 2009 and 2010 (*see Table 3a*). In twenty-five states, copayments remained the same as a percentage of income. In only two states, copayments increased as a percentage of income. In three states, a family at 150 percent of poverty was eligible for child care assistance in 2010 but not 2009, and in five states, a family at 150 percent of poverty was not eligible in either 2009 or 2010.³⁰
- ◆ In nineteen states, copayments for a family of three at 150 percent of poverty³¹ decreased as a percentage of income between 2001 and 2010. In ten states, copayments remained the same as a percentage of income. However, in seventeen states, copayments increased as a percentage of income. In two states, a family at 150 percent of poverty was eligible for child care assistance in 2001 but not in 2010, and in three states, a family at 150 percent of poverty was not eligible in either 2001 or 2010.
- ◆ In eighteen states, copayments for a family of three at 100 percent of poverty decreased as a percentage of income between 2009 and 2010 (*see Table 3b*). In thirty states, copayments remained the same as a percentage of income. In only three states, copayments increased as a percentage of income.
- ◆ In nine states, copayments for a family of three at 100 percent of poverty decreased as a percentage of income between 2001 and 2010. In nineteen states, copayments remained the same as a percentage of income. However, in twenty-three states, copayments increased as a percentage of income.
- ◆ In twenty-eight states, the copayment for a family of three at 150 percent of poverty was above \$160 per month (7.0 percent of income) in 2010. In an additional five states, a family at this income level was not eligible for child care assistance.
- ◆ In sixteen states, the copayment for a family of three at 100 percent of poverty was above \$107 per month (7.0 percent of income) in 2010.

REIMBURSEMENT RATES

States determine reimbursement rates for child care providers who care for children receiving child care assistance. States set a maximum level up to which they will reimburse providers, and a provider must charge private-paying parents a fee that is equal to or greater than this level to receive the maximum rate. Reimbursement rates may vary by geographic region, age of the child, type of care, and other factors. Reimbursement rates affect the resources child care providers have to maintain their businesses, pay salaries to attract and retain staff, keep their child-staff ratios low, and support facilities, materials, and supplies for activities that promote children's learning. When reimbursement rates are low, child care providers lack the resources they need to offer high-quality care and high-quality providers may be discouraged from serving families who receive child care assistance.

States are required to conduct surveys of child care providers' market rates every two years, but are not required to set their rates at any particular level or update their rates regularly. Federal regulations recommend, but do not mandate, that rates be set at the 75th percentile of current market rates,³² a rate that is designed to allow families access to 75 percent of the providers in their communities. In 2010, only about one-eighth of the states set their reimbursement rates at the 75th percentile of current market rates, lower than in 2009, and substantially lower than in 2001, when over two-fifths of the states set their reimbursement rates at this recommended level.³³ In 2010, many states' reimbursement rates were significantly below the 75th percentile of current market rates.

When the state reimbursement rate falls short of the fee a child care provider charges private-paying parents, over three-quarters of the states allow child care providers to ask parents receiving child care assistance to cover the difference (beyond any required copayment). This approach may be intended to help child care providers avoid losing income, but it places a financial burden on low-income families whose very eligibility for child care assistance demonstrates that they cannot afford this additional charge.

- ◆ Only six states set their reimbursement rates at the 75th percentile of current market rates (rates from 2008 or 2009) in 2010 (*see Table 4a*). This was lower than the number of states—nine—that set their reimbursement rates at this level in 2009 (*see Table 4b*). In addition, it was less than one-third the number of states—twenty-two—that set their reimbursement rates at this level in 2001.
- ◆ Twenty-seven states updated their reimbursement rates in 2008 or more recently.³⁴ Only one state had not updated its reimbursement rates since 2001.
- ◆ In twenty-one states, reimbursement rates for center-based care for a four-year-old in 2010 were at least 20 percent below the 75th percentile of market rates (based on the state's most recent market survey) for this type of care (*see Table 4c*).³⁵
- ◆ In twenty-one states, reimbursement rates for center-based care for a one-year-old in 2010 were at least 20 percent below the 75th percentile of market rates (based on the state's most recent market survey) for this type of care.³⁶
- ◆ Thirty-nine states allowed child care providers to charge parents receiving child care assistance the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the fee that the provider charged private-paying parents if the state reimbursement rate was lower in 2010—the same number of states as in 2009.³⁷

Approximately three-fifths of the states reimbursed child care providers that met higher-quality standards at higher reimbursement rates (tiered rates) in 2010.³⁸ Some states had a single higher reimbursement rate; other states had progressively higher reimbursement rates for progressively higher levels of quality. Tiered reimbursement rates can offer child care providers encouragement and resources to improve the quality of their care. However, a small rate differential may not be sufficient to cover the additional costs entailed in meeting the criteria required to qualify for a higher rate, such as costs for increasing the number of staff in order to reduce child-staff ratios, recruiting and retaining staff with advanced education in early childhood development, training staff, upgrading facilities, and/or purchasing new equipment and materials. Yet, in nearly two-thirds of states with tiered rates, the highest rate fell below the 75th percentile of current market rates. In the majority of states with tiered rates, the highest reimbursement rate was also less than 20 percent above the basic rate.

- ◆ Thirty-one states paid higher reimbursement rates for higher-quality care in 2010 (*see Table 4d*).³⁹

- ◆ Fourteen of the thirty-one states with tiered rates in 2010 had two rate levels (including the base level),⁴⁰ four states had three levels, six states had four levels, five states had five levels, and two states had six levels.
- ◆ In approximately two-thirds of the thirty-one states with tiered rates in 2010, the reimbursement rate for center-based care for a four-year-old at the highest quality level was still below the 75th percentile of current market rates (which includes providers at all levels of quality).
 - In twenty of the thirty-one states, the reimbursement rate at the highest quality level was below the 75th percentile of current market rates.⁴¹ This includes eight states in which the reimbursement rate at the highest quality level was more than 20 percent lower than the 75th percentile.
 - In one of the thirty-one states, the reimbursement rate at the highest quality level was the same as the 75th percentile of current market rates.
 - In ten of the thirty-one states, the reimbursement rate at the highest quality level was higher than the 75th percentile of current market rates. This includes five states in which the reimbursement rate at the highest quality level was at least 10 percent above the 75th percentile.
- ◆ The difference between the states' lowest and highest reimbursement rates for center-based care for a four-year-old ranged from 5 percent to 67 percent in 2010. There was no consistent relationship between the percentage difference and whether the highest rate was below or above the 75th percentile of current market rates.
 - In six of the thirty-one states, the highest rate was less than 10 percent greater than the lowest rate. In four of these six states, the highest rate was below the 75th percentile of current market rates.
 - In twelve of the thirty-one states, the highest rate was 10 percent to 19 percent greater than the lowest rate. In six of these twelve states, the highest rate was below the 75th percentile of current market rates.
 - In six of the thirty-one states, the highest rate was 20 percent to 29 percent greater than the lowest rate. In all six of these states, the highest rate was below the 75th percentile of current market rates.
 - In seven of the thirty-one states, the highest rate was at least 30 percent greater than the lowest rate. In four of these seven states, the highest rate was below the 75th percentile of current market rates.

ELIGIBILITY FOR PARENTS SEARCHING FOR A JOB

Child care assistance provided to parents searching for work can help parents who lose a job hold onto their child care until they find a new job. Parents looking for work often need child care so that they have time and availability for job interviews and other activities related to searching for a new job. Parents may also want to retain their child care while they are searching for work so it is available as soon as they find a new job, and so that their children have continuity in their care. Child care assistance for parents searching for a job is particularly important in today's challenging economy.

All but four of the states allow families receiving child care assistance to continue receiving it while a parent searches for a job for at least some amount of time. Yet less than two-fifths of the states (eighteen) allow families to qualify for and begin receiving child care assistance while a parent is searching for work.⁴² Among

states setting a limit by the number of days, weeks, or months, the amount of time parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job ranges from two weeks to six months.

- ◆ Forty-seven states allow families receiving child care assistance to continue receiving it while a parent searches for a job (*see Table 5*).
 - Two states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance until the end of the month in which the parent lost his or her job, so the amount of time a parent has to search for a new job depends on when during the month s/he lost a job.
 - Three states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to a certain number of hours, including one state with a limit of 80 hours, one state with a limit of 100 hours, and one state with a limit of 240 hours.
 - One state allows families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to two weeks.
 - One state allows families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to twenty-one days.
 - Eighteen states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either thirty days, four weeks, or one month.
 - Four states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either forty days, forty-five days, fifty-six days, or six weeks.
 - Ten states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either sixty days, eight weeks, or two months.
 - Six states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either ninety days, twelve weeks, thirteen weeks, or three months.
 - Two states allow families to continue receiving child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either 180 days or six months.
- ◆ Four states do not allow families receiving child care assistance to continue receiving it while a parent searches for a job.
- ◆ Eighteen states allow families not receiving child care assistance to qualify for assistance while a parent searches for a job.
 - Three states allow families to receive child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to a certain number of hours, including one state with a limit of 80 hours, one state with a limit of 100 hours, and one state with a limit of 240 hours.
 - One state allows families to receive child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to two weeks.
 - Three states allow families to receive child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either thirty days, four weeks, or one month.
 - Three states allow families to receive child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either forty days, forty-five days, or six weeks.
 - Six states allow families to receive child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either sixty days, eight weeks, or two months.
 - Two states allow families to receive child care assistance while a parent searches for a job for up to either 180 days or six months.

- ◆ One state permits localities to allow families not receiving child care assistance to qualify for assistance while a parent searches for a job and receive assistance for up to six months (if funds are available).
- ◆ Thirty-two states do not allow families not receiving child care assistance to qualify for assistance while a parent searches for a job.

CONCLUSION

Most states were able to maintain their child care assistance policies on income eligibility limits, waiting lists, parent copayments, and reimbursement rates between February 2009 and February 2010, due to help from ARRA funds. Yet, most state child care assistance policies have not improved since 2001. As a result, most states continue to fall short in their policies, particularly on reimbursement rates, which are so essential to ensuring low-income children have access to good-quality care that promotes their healthy development. Moreover, as states exhaust their ARRA funds, some are beginning to make cuts, or are considering cuts, to their child care assistance programs. Additional child care investments are essential to prevent such cuts and allow states to improve their policies, so that low-income families have help affording the reliable child care that parents need to work and children need to grow and learn.

ENDNOTES

- 1 National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Parents and the High Cost of Child Care: 2010 Update (Washington, DC: NACCRRA, 2010), 1, *available at* http://www.naccrra.org/docs/Cost_Report_073010-final.pdf (last visited Aug. 4, 2010).
- 2 This report uses 2001 policies as the basis for comparison because, until this year, it was the year between the peak year for CCDBG funding, 2002, and the peak year for TANF funding used for child care, 2000. See section on funding for child care assistance.
- 3 Elizabeth McNichol, Phil Oliff, and Nicholas Johnson, Recession Continues to Batter State Budgets; State Responses Could Slow Recovery (Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2010), *available at* <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711> (last visited July 26, 2010); Nicholas Johnson, Phil Oliff, and Erica Williams, An Update on State Budget Cuts: At Least 45 States Have Imposed Cuts That Hurt Vulnerable Residents and the Economy (Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2010), *available at* <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=1214> (last visited July 26, 2010).
- 4 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Pub. L. No. 111–8, 123 Stat. 524 (2009).
- 5 Karen Schulman and Helen Blank, Supporting State Child Care Efforts with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds (Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center, 2010), *available at* <http://www.nwlc.org/pdf/supportingstatechildcareeffortswitharra.pdf> (last visited Aug. 3, 2010).
- 6 Inflation is measured here by reference to the federal poverty level in successive years. There was no difference between the federal poverty level in February 2009 and February 2010—it was \$18,310 for a family of three in both years. Compare U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, The 2009 HHS Poverty Guidelines, *available at* <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/09poverty.shtml> (last visited July 29, 2010) with Delayed Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines for the Remainder of 2010, 75 Fed. Reg. 45,628 (Aug. 3, 2010). The thirty-two states considered to have adjusted their income limits for inflation are those that had not adjusted for the 2009 federal poverty level as of February 2009 but did adjust for inflation between then and February 2010, effectively adjusting for both the 2009 and 2010 federal poverty level. The six states that are considered to have increased their income limits beyond what was necessary to adjust for inflation are those that increased their income limits by a greater amount than the increase needed to adjust for the 2009 and 2010 federal poverty level.
- 7 The federal poverty level for a family of three was \$14,630 in 2001. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, The 2001 HHS Poverty Guidelines, *available at* <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/01poverty.htm> (last visited July 29, 2010).
- 8 As of February 2009, Wyoming's income limit was 185 percent of the 2008 federal poverty level, or \$32,568 for a family of three. Taking into account that the state deducts \$200 per month from the gross income of each working parent in determining eligibility, the effective income limit for a family of three was \$34,968, which is the figure shown in Table 1a.
- 9 For a family of three, 250 percent of the 2010 federal poverty level is \$45,775. Taking into account that Wyoming deducts \$200 per month from the gross income of each working parent in determining eligibility, the effective income limit for a family of three was \$48,175, which is the figure shown in Table 1a.
- 10 For a family of three, 225 percent of the 2010 federal poverty level is \$41,198. Taking into account that Wyoming deducts \$200 per month from the gross income of each working parent in determining eligibility, the effective income limit for a family of three was \$43,598.
- 11 Families receiving child care assistance prior to January 1, 2010, including families with incomes between 100 and 200 percent of poverty, can continue to receive it as long as they remain eligible.
- 12 This study focuses on the income criteria used to determine a family's eligibility when it first applies for assistance, because this traditionally has been used as the measure of access to benefit programs and determines whether a family can enter the program. However, some states allow families to continue to receive assistance up to a higher income level than the initial eligibility cutoff. Information about states that have different entrance and exit eligibility criteria is provided in the notes to Tables 1a and 1b.
- 13 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Fiscal Year 2011 Budget in Brief (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010), 75, 79, *available at* <http://dhhs.gov/asfr/ob/docbudget/2011budgetinbrief.pdf> (last visited July 29, 2010). This amount includes \$2.127 billion in discretionary funding and \$2.917 billion in mandatory (entitlement) funding.
- 14 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> (last visited July 29, 2010). This amount includes \$2.1 billion in discretionary funding and \$2.717 billion in mandatory (entitlement) funding.
- 15 Email from Hannah Matthews, CLASP, to Karen Schulman, National Women's Law Center, July 29, 2010. Inflation adjustment by CLASP based on the Employment Cost Index (ECI) and Consumer Price Index (CPI) for FY 2003-2009 provided to CLASP by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), and on CBO economic projections for the ECI and CPI in FY 2010, Congressional Budget Office, The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2010 to 2020 (January 2010) (Washington, DC: Congressional Budget Office, 2010), 123.
- 16 National Women's Law Center analysis of data from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Fiscal Year 2009 TANF Financial Data, Table A. Combined Federal Funds Spent in FY 2009, *available at* http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/2009/tanf_2009.html (last visited July 29, 2010). Total includes \$1.727 billion transferred to CCDBG, \$343 million spent on child care categorized as "assistance," and \$1.444 billion spent on child care categorized as "non-assistance."
- 17 National Women's Law Center analysis of data from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Fiscal Year 2000 TANF Financial Data, Table A. Combined Federal Funds Spent in FY 2000 Through the Fourth Quarter, *available at* http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/tanf_2000.html (last visited Aug. 25, 2010). Total includes \$2.413 billion

- transferred to CCDBG, \$353 million spent on child care categorized as “assistance,” and \$1.200 billion spent on child care categorized as “non-assistance.”
- 18 Email from Hannah Matthews, CLASP, to Karen Schulman, National Women’s Law Center, Aug. 18, 2010. Inflation adjustment by CLASP based on the Employment Cost Index (ECI) and Consumer Price Index (CPI) for FY 2001-2009 provided to CLASP by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), and on CBO economic projections for the ECI and CPI in FY 2010, Congressional Budget Office, *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2010 to 2020* (January 2010) (Washington, DC: Congressional Budget Office, 2010), 123.
 - 19 In FY 2001, CCDBG funding was \$4.567 billion (\$5.733 billion in FY 2010 dollars) and TANF funding used for child care was \$3.541 billion (\$4.445 billion in FY 2010 dollars). The CCDBG funding amount includes \$2.0 billion in discretionary funding and \$2.567 billion in mandatory (entitlement) funding. 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://archive.hhs.gov/budget/pdf/hhs2002.pdf> (last visited Aug. 25, 2010). The TANF funding amount includes \$1.899 billion transferred to CCDBG, \$285 million spent on child care categorized as “assistance,” and \$1.357 billion spent on child care categorized as “non-assistance.” National Women’s Law Center analysis of data from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Fiscal Year 2001 TANF Financial Data, Table A. Combined Federal Funds Spent in FY 2001 Through the Fourth Quarter, *available at* http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/tanf_2001.html (last visited Aug. 25, 2010). CCDBG and TANF amounts in FY 2010 dollars provided in email from Hannah Matthews, CLASP, to Karen Schulman, National Women’s Law Center, Aug. 18, 2010. Inflation adjustment by CLASP based on the Employment Cost Index (ECI) and Consumer Price Index (CPI) for FY 2002-2009 provided to CLASP by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), and on CBO economic projections for the ECI and CPI in FY 2010, Congressional Budget Office, *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2010 to 2020* (January 2010) (Washington, DC: Congressional Budget Office, 2010), 123.
 - 20 In states that allow localities to set their income limits within a state-specified range, the maximum of that range was used for the analysis in this section.
 - 21 These thirty-two states include twenty-two that set their income limits based on the federal poverty level and adjusted their income limits for the 2009 federal poverty level between February 2009 and February 2010 and one that changed from setting its income limit as a percentage of the 2000 state median income to setting its income limit as a percentage of the 2009 federal poverty level. Because the federal poverty level did not increase between 2009 and 2010, these states effectively adjusted for the 2010 federal poverty level as well. The thirty-two states also include nine that set their income limits based on the state median income level and adjusted their income limits for the updated state median income estimate between February 2009 and February 2010.
 - 22 These eleven states include one state where the income limit decreased by just two percentage points, seven states where the income limit stayed the same, one state where the income limit increased by one percentage point, one state where the income limit increased by two percentage points, and one state where the income limit increased by three percentage points relative to the poverty level.
 - 23 National Women’s Law Center analysis of data from Economic Policy Institute, *Basic Family Budget Spreadsheets* (2007), *available at* http://www.epi.org/pages/budget_calculator_intro/ (last visited Aug. 3, 2010); and from James Lin and Jared Bernstein, *What We Need to Get By* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2008), *available at* <http://www.epi.org/publications/entry/bp224/> (last visited Aug. 3, 2010); Sylvia Allegretto, *Basic Family Budgets: Working Families’ Incomes Often Fail to Meet Living Expenses Around the U.S.* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2005), *available at* <http://www.epinet.org/briefingpapers/165/bp165.pdf> (last visited Aug. 3, 2010).
 - 24 See, e.g., Karen Schulman and Helen Blank, *In Their Own Voices: Parents and Providers Struggling with Child Care Cuts* (Washington, DC: National Women’s Law Center, 2005), 10; Children’s Action Alliance, *The Real Reality of Arizona’s Working Families—Child Care Survey Highlights* (Phoenix, AZ: Children’s Action Alliance, 2004); 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); 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); Jennifer Gulley and Ann Hilbig, *Waiting List Survey: Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area* (Houston, TX: Neighborhood Centers, Inc., 1999); 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); 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); 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); 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).
 - 25 Waiting lists are not a perfect measure of unmet need, however. For example, waiting lists may increase due to expanded outreach efforts that make more families aware of child care assistance programs, and may decrease due to a state’s adoption of more restrictive eligibility criteria.
 - 26 In previous years, it was reported that twenty-two states had waiting lists or frozen intake in 2001, because Connecticut was counted as having frozen intake. However, Connecticut did not freeze intake until August 2002.
 - 27 If a state determined its copayment based on the cost of care, this study assumes that the family had a four-year-old in a licensed, non-accredited center charging the state’s maximum reimbursement rate.

- 28 U.S. Census Bureau, *Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Summer 2006, Detailed Tables, Table 6 (2009)*, available at <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/child/table-2006/tab06.xls> (last visited Aug. 25, 2010).
- 29 For a family of three, 150 percent of the federal poverty level was equal to an income of \$27,465 in 2009 and 2010.
- 30 These eight states do not include states that had income eligibility limits to initially qualify for assistance below 150 percent of poverty but allowed families already receiving assistance to remain eligible with incomes above 150 percent of poverty.
- 31 For a family of three, 150 percent of the federal poverty level was equal to an income of \$21,945 in 2001.
- 32 Child Care and Development Fund (Preamble to Final Rule), 63 Fed. Reg. 142 (July 24, 1998), available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/law/finalrul/fr072498.pdf> (last visited Aug. 25, 2010).
- 33 For this analysis, a state's reimbursement rates in a given year are considered up-to-date if based on a market survey conducted no more than two years prior to that year. Also note that for this analysis, a state's reimbursement rates are not considered to be at the 75th percentile of market rates if only some of its rates—for example, for certain regions, age groups, or higher-quality care—are at the 75th percentile.
- 34 These twenty-seven states include Texas because it reported that a majority of its localities—which determine when to update rates—had updated at least some of their rates within the past two years. However, these twenty-seven states do not include Colorado because it did not report that any of its localities—which also determine when to update rates—had updated their rates within the past two years.
- 35 States were asked to report data from their most recent market rate survey, and most states reported data from 2008 or more recent surveys. However, five states—California, Idaho, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania—reported data from 2007 or earlier. These five states are not included in the twenty-one states because their reimbursement rates were less than 20 percent below the 75th percentile of market rates based on their outdated surveys, and thus it is not possible to calculate whether their reimbursement rates were 20 percent or more below the 75th percentile of current market rates. In addition, Arkansas provided data from its 2007 market rate survey, but indicated that its rates from more recent surveys have not changed significantly.
- 36 California, Idaho, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania are not included in the twenty-one states because their reimbursement rates were less than 20 percent below the 75th percentile of market rates based on their outdated surveys, and thus it is not possible to calculate whether their reimbursement rates were 20 percent or more below the 75th percentile of current market rates.
- 37 Comparable data were not collected for 2001. However, comparable data were collected for 2000 and 2005. In each of these years, thirty-seven states permitted child care providers to charge parents the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the provider's private fee. Karen Schulman and Helen Blank, *Child Care Assistance Policies 2005: States Fail to Make Up Lost Ground, Families Continue to Lack Critical Supports* (Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center, 2005), 5 and 18; Karen Schulman, Helen Blank, and Danielle Ewen, *A Fragile Foundation: State Child Care Assistance Policies* (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 2001), 103.
- 38 This analysis is based on tiered rates in each state's most populous city, county, or region. Within each state, the use and structure of tiered rates may vary across cities, counties, or regions.
- 39 In 2009, thirty-three states reported having tiered rates. Karen Schulman and Helen Blank, *State Child Care Assistance Policies 2009: Most States Hold the Line, but Some Lose Ground in Hard Times* (Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center, 2009), 10-11 and 28. The two states that reported having tiered rates in 2009 but not in 2010 are Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Massachusetts eliminated the tiered rates system it had in 2009 as it prepared to implement a new quality rating and improvement system with tiered rates; during the transition, all providers are paid at the highest rating tier that existed under the previous system. New Hampshire had bonus payments paid in an annual lump sum in 2009, and was counted then as having tiered rates, but no longer paid these bonuses in 2010. Comparable data on tiered rates were not collected for 2001.
- 40 These fourteen states include Nevada, which plans to have four tier levels, but so far has only implemented Tier 1 and Tier 4.
- 41 These twenty states include North Carolina, which determined a separate 75th percentile of current market rates for child care providers at each quality level. The reimbursement rate at the highest quality level was lower than even the 75th percentile for the lowest quality (and lowest-priced) level.
- 42 This analysis is based on policies for families not connected to the TANF program. Additional states allow families receiving or transitioning from TANF to qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.

TABLE 1A: INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS FOR A FAMILY OF THREE 2009 AND 2010

State	Income limit in 2010			Income limit in 2009			Change in income limit 2009 to 2010		
	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$18,310 a year)	As percent of state median income	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$18,310 a year)	As percent of state median income	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty	As percent of state median income
Alabama*	\$23,808	130%	47%	\$22,320	122%	44%	\$1,488	8%	3%
Alaska*	\$46,248	253%	69%	\$46,248	253%	77%	\$0	0%	-8%
Arizona	\$30,216	165%	54%	\$29,052	159%	53%	\$1,164	6%	1%
Arkansas*	\$28,345	155%	62%	\$28,345	155%	65%	\$0	0%	-3%
California*	\$45,228	247%	70%	\$44,664	244%	71%	\$564	3%	-1%
Colorado*	\$23,803-\$54,108	130%-296%	37%-85%	\$22,880-\$39,600	125%-216%	36%-62%	\$923-\$14,508	5%-80%	1%-23%
Connecticut*	\$61,556	336%	75%	\$39,405	215%	50%	\$22,151	121%	25%
Delaware	\$36,624	200%	55%	\$35,208	192%	54%	\$1,416	8%	1%
District of Columbia*	\$45,775	250%	84%	\$40,225	220%	67%	\$5,550	30%	17%
Florida*	\$27,465	150%	49%	\$27,465	150%	50%	\$0	0%	-1%
Georgia	\$35,200	192%	61%	\$26,560	145%	47%	\$8,640	47%	14%
Hawaii*	\$47,124	257%	66%	\$47,124	257%	66%	\$0	0%	0%
Idaho	\$23,184	127%	46%	\$23,184	127%	48%	\$0	0%	-2%
Illinois*	\$36,624	200%	56%	\$35,208	192%	56%	\$1,416	8%	1%
Indiana*	\$23,256	127%	40%	\$22,356	122%	39%	\$900	5%	1%
Iowa*	\$26,556	145%	45%	\$25,524	139%	45%	\$1,032	6%	0%
Kansas	\$33,876	185%	58%	\$32,568	178%	57%	\$1,308	7%	1%
Kentucky*	\$27,468	150%	53%	\$26,400	144%	52%	\$1,068	6%	1%
Louisiana	\$37,896	207%	73%	\$35,244	192%	70%	\$2,652	14%	4%
Maine*	\$45,775	250%	81%	\$40,006	218%	75%	\$5,769	32%	6%
Maryland	\$29,990	164%	37%	\$29,990	164%	38%	\$0	0%	-1%
Massachusetts*	\$39,207	214%	50%	\$37,526	205%	50%	\$1,681	9%	0%
Michigan	\$23,880	130%	38%	\$23,880	130%	39%	\$0	0%	-1%
Minnesota*	\$32,944	180%	47%	\$32,167	176%	47%	\$777	4%	0%
Mississippi	\$34,999	191%	79%	\$34,999	191%	79%	\$0	0%	0%
Missouri*	\$23,520	128%	42%	\$22,620	124%	43%	\$900	5%	-1%
Montana	\$27,468	150%	52%	\$26,400	144%	52%	\$1,068	6%	1%
Nebraska*	\$21,972	120%	37%	\$21,120	115%	36%	\$852	5%	1%
Nevada	\$43,248	236%	75%	\$41,640	227%	75%	\$1,608	9%	0%
New Hampshire	\$45,775	250%	61%	\$44,000	240%	60%	\$1,775	10%	2%
New Jersey*	\$36,620	200%	45%	\$35,200	192%	44%	\$1,420	8%	0%
New Mexico	\$36,620	200%	82%	\$35,200	192%	81%	\$1,420	8%	2%
New York*	\$36,620	200%	56%	\$35,200	192%	55%	\$1,420	8%	0%
North Carolina	\$37,476	205%	69%	\$36,684	200%	71%	\$792	4%	-2%
North Dakota	\$29,556	161%	52%	\$29,556	161%	52%	\$0	0%	0%
Ohio*	\$27,468	150%	46%	\$35,208	192%	61%	-\$7,740	-42%	-15%
Oklahoma*	\$35,100	192%	73%	\$35,100	192%	76%	\$0	0%	-3%
Oregon	\$33,874	185%	60%	\$33,874	185%	62%	\$0	0%	-3%
Pennsylvania*	\$36,620	200%	58%	\$35,200	192%	57%	\$1,420	8%	1%
Rhode Island	\$32,958	180%	47%	\$31,680	173%	48%	\$1,278	7%	-1%
South Carolina*	\$27,465	150%	53%	\$26,400	144%	53%	\$1,065	6%	0%
South Dakota*	\$38,150	208%	70%	\$36,675	200%	69%	\$1,475	8%	1%
Tennessee*	\$31,044	170%	60%	\$30,312	166%	60%	\$732	4%	0%
Texas*	\$27,465-\$44,524	150%-243%	52%-85%	\$26,400-\$42,703	144%-233%	53%-85%	\$1,065-\$1,821	6%-10%	-1%-0%
Utah*	\$31,992	175%	58%	\$31,111	170%	58%	\$881	5%	0%
Vermont	\$36,600	200%	59%	\$35,484	194%	62%	\$1,116	6%	-3%
Virginia*	\$27,468-\$45,780	150%-250%	40%-67%	\$26,400-\$44,000	144%-240%	40%-67%	\$1,068-\$1,780	6%-10%	0%
Washington	\$36,624	200%	56%	\$35,208	192%	56%	\$1,416	8%	0%
West Virginia*	\$27,468	150%	58%	\$26,400	144%	56%	\$1,068	6%	2%
Wisconsin*	\$33,876	185%	54%	\$33,876	185%	56%	\$0	0%	-2%
Wyoming*	\$48,175	263%	79%	\$34,968	191%	58%	\$13,207	72%	21%

* indicates notes found on pages 18 and 19.

TABLE 1B: INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS FOR A FAMILY OF THREE 2001 AND 2010

State	Income limit in 2010			Income limit in 2001			Change in income limit 2001 to 2010		
	As annual dollar amount	As percent of poverty (\$18,310 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*	\$23,808	130%	47%	\$18,048	123%	41%	\$5,760	7%	6%
Alaska*	\$46,248	253%	69%	\$44,328	303%	75%	\$1,920	-50%	-6%
Arizona	\$30,216	165%	54%	\$23,364	160%	52%	\$6,852	5%	1%
Arkansas*	\$28,345	155%	62%	\$23,523	161%	60%	\$4,822	-6%	2%
California*	\$45,228	247%	70%	\$35,100	240%	66%	\$10,128	7%	4%
Colorado*	\$23,803-\$54,108	130%-296%	37%-85%	\$19,020-\$32,000	130%-219%	36%-61%	\$4,783-\$22,108	0%-77%	1%-24%
Connecticut*	\$61,556	336%	75%	\$47,586	325%	75%	\$13,970	11%	0%
Delaware	\$36,624	200%	55%	\$29,260	200%	53%	\$7,364	0%	2%
District of Columbia*	\$45,775	250%	84%	\$34,700	237%	66%	\$11,075	13%	18%
Florida*	\$27,465	150%	49%	\$20,820	142%	45%	\$6,645	8%	4%
Georgia	\$35,200	192%	61%	\$24,278	166%	50%	\$10,922	26%	11%
Hawaii*	\$47,124	257%	66%	\$46,035	315%	83%	\$1,089	-57%	-16%
Idaho	\$23,184	127%	46%	\$20,472	140%	51%	\$2,712	-13%	-6%
Illinois*	\$36,624	200%	56%	\$24,243	166%	43%	\$12,381	34%	13%
Indiana*	\$23,256	127%	40%	\$20,232	138%	41%	\$3,024	-11%	-1%
Iowa*	\$26,556	145%	45%	\$19,812	135%	41%	\$6,744	10%	4%
Kansas	\$33,876	185%	58%	\$27,060	185%	56%	\$6,816	0%	1%
Kentucky*	\$27,468	150%	53%	\$24,140	165%	55%	\$3,328	-15%	-2%
Louisiana*	\$37,896	207%	73%	\$29,040	205%	75%	\$8,856	2%	-2%
Maine*	\$45,775	250%	81%	\$36,452	249%	75%	\$9,323	1%	6%
Maryland	\$29,990	164%	37%	\$25,140	172%	40%	\$4,850	-8%	-3%
Massachusetts*	\$39,207	214%	50%	\$28,968	198%	48%	\$10,239	16%	2%
Michigan	\$23,880	130%	38%	\$26,064	178%	47%	-\$2,184	-48%	-10%
Minnesota*	\$32,944	180%	47%	\$42,304	289%	76%	-\$9,360	-109%	-29%
Mississippi	\$34,999	191%	79%	\$30,999	212%	77%	\$4,000	-21%	2%
Missouri*	\$23,520	128%	42%	\$17,784	122%	37%	\$5,736	7%	4%
Montana	\$27,468	150%	52%	\$21,948	150%	51%	\$5,520	0%	1%
Nebraska*	\$21,972	120%	37%	\$25,260	173%	54%	-\$3,288	-53%	-17%
Nevada	\$43,248	236%	75%	\$33,420	228%	67%	\$9,828	8%	8%
New Hampshire	\$45,775	250%	61%	\$27,797	190%	50%	\$17,978	60%	11%
New Jersey*	\$36,620	200%	45%	\$29,260	200%	46%	\$7,360	0%	-1%
New Mexico*	\$36,620	200%	82%	\$28,300	193%	75%	\$8,320	7%	7%
New York*	\$36,620	200%	56%	\$28,644	202%	61%	\$7,976	-2%	-5%
North Carolina	\$37,476	205%	69%	\$32,628	223%	69%	\$4,848	-18%	0%
North Dakota	\$29,556	161%	52%	\$29,556	202%	69%	\$0	-41%	-17%
Ohio*	\$27,468	150%	46%	\$27,066	185%	57%	\$402	-35%	-11%
Oklahoma*	\$35,100	192%	73%	\$29,040	198%	66%	\$6,060	-7%	7%
Oregon	\$33,874	185%	60%	\$27,060	185%	60%	\$6,814	0%	0%
Pennsylvania*	\$36,620	200%	58%	\$29,260	200%	58%	\$7,360	0%	0%
Rhode Island	\$32,958	180%	47%	\$32,918	225%	61%	\$40	-45%	-14%
South Carolina*	\$27,465	150%	53%	\$21,225	145%	45%	\$6,240	5%	8%
South Dakota*	\$38,150	208%	70%	\$22,826	156%	52%	\$15,324	52%	18%
Tennessee*	\$31,044	170%	60%	\$24,324	166%	56%	\$6,720	3%	4%
Texas*	\$27,465-\$44,524	150%-243%	52%-85%	\$21,228-\$36,516	145%-250%	47%-82%	\$6,237-\$8,008	-7%-5%	3%-5%
Utah*	\$31,992	175%	58%	\$27,048	185%	56%	\$4,944	-10%	2%
Vermont	\$36,600	200%	59%	\$31,032	212%	64%	\$5,568	-12%	-5%
Virginia*	\$27,468-\$45,780	150%-250%	40%-67%	\$21,948-\$27,060	150%-185%	41%-50%	\$5,520-\$18,720	0%-65%	-1%-17%
Washington	\$36,624	200%	56%	\$32,916	225%	63%	\$3,708	-25%	-6%
West Virginia*	\$27,468	150%	58%	\$28,296	193%	75%	-\$828	-43%	-17%
Wisconsin*	\$33,876	185%	54%	\$27,060	185%	51%	\$6,816	0%	3%
Wyoming*	\$48,175	263%	79%	\$21,948	150%	47%	\$26,227	113%	32%

* indicates notes found on pages 18 and 19.

NOTES FOR TABLES 1A AND 1B: INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS

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 limit. These higher exit eligibility limits are reported below for states that have them.

Changes in income limits 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 income reached \$27,756. In 2009, the exit eligibility limit was \$25,752 and in 2010, it was \$27,468.
- Alaska: The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) payment, which the majority of families in the state receive, is not counted when determining eligibility.
- Arkansas: The income limits shown in the table take into account a \$100-per-month deduction (\$1,200 a year) that is allowed for an adult household member who works at least 30 hours per week. It is assumed there is one working parent. The stated income limits, in policy, were \$22,323 in 2001 and \$27,145 in 2009 and 2010.
- California: Under policies in effect in 2001, families who had been receiving assistance as of January 1, 1998 could continue doing so until their income reached \$46,800 since they were subject to higher income guidelines previously in effect. Also note that two pilot counties (San Mateo and San Francisco) allowed families already receiving assistance to continue to receive it up to an income of \$54,096 in 2009 and 2010.
- Colorado: Counties set their income limits within state guidelines. Also note that counties may allow families already receiving assistance to continue doing so after their income exceeds the county's initial income eligibility limit for up to six months, if their income remains below 85 percent of the state median income (\$50,484 in 2009 and \$54,108 in 2010).
- Connecticut: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$59,107. In 2010, the state did not have a separate exit eligibility limit.
- District of Columbia: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$41,640. In 2009, the exit eligibility limit was \$48,270, and in 2010, it was \$51,101.
- Florida: In 2009 and 2010, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$36,620.
- 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 limit, in policy, was \$36,828. The state no longer used the deduction in 2009 or 2010.
- Illinois: In 2001, the state allowed a 10 percent earned income deduction in determining eligibility, which is taken into account in the figure shown here. The stated income limit, in policy, was \$21,819. The state no longer used the deduction in 2009 or 2010.
- Indiana: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$29,916. In 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$31,128.
- Iowa: For special needs care, the income limit was \$35,200 in 2009 and \$36,620 in 2010. Also note that in some areas of the state a separate ARRA-funded scholarship program helps families with incomes between \$26,556 and \$33,874 pay for infant and toddler care offered by providers that are accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) or the National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC) or that have a rating of a level three or higher under the state's child care quality rating and improvement system. The scholarship program began in July 2009 and will end in June 2011 or earlier if the amount of funding available is expended.
- Kentucky: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$29,040. In 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$30,216.
- Louisiana: Data on the state's policies as of 2001 are not available, so data on policies as of March 15, 2000 are used instead.
- Maine: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$45,340. In 2010, there was no separate exit eligibility limit.
- Massachusetts: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$49,248. In 2009, the exit eligibility limit was \$63,794 and in 2010, it was \$64,103. Also note that, for special needs care, the income limit to qualify for assistance was \$63,794 in 2009 and \$64,103 in 2010, and the exit eligibility limit was \$75,052 in 2009 and \$78,415 in 2010.
- Minnesota: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$45,855. In 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$49,963.
- Missouri: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$24,756. In 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$25,740.
- Nebraska: For families transitioning from TANF, the income limit was \$32,568 in 2009 and \$33,876 in 2010.
- New Jersey: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$36,575. In 2009, the exit eligibility limit was \$44,000 and in 2010, it was \$45,776.
- New Mexico: For a period of time following August 1, 2001, the state lowered its income 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 income limit.

- New York: A few small demonstration projects set the income limit at \$44,880 in 2009 and \$46,691 in 2010. Also note that data on the state's policies as of 2001 are not available, so data on policies as of March 15, 2000 are used instead.
- Ohio: In 2010, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$36,624. The state did not have a separate exit eligibility limit in 2001 or 2009.
- Oklahoma: The income limit depends on how many children are in care. The income limits shown in the table assume that the family had two children in subsidized care. The income limit for a family of three with only one child in subsidized care was \$29,100 in 2009 and 2010.
- Pennsylvania: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$34,381. In 2009, the exit eligibility limit was \$41,360 and in 2010, it was \$43,029.
- South Carolina: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$24,763. In 2009, the exit eligibility limit was \$30,800 and in 2010, it was \$32,043.
- South Dakota: The income limits shown in the table take into account that the state disregards 4 percent of earned income in determining eligibility. The stated income limits, in policy, were \$21,913 in 2001, \$35,208 in 2009, and \$36,624 in 2010.
- Tennessee: The state has a separate ARRA-funded child care scholarship program that provides assistance to low-income, working parents who have incomes up to \$43,968, who are not receiving child care benefits through any other state program, and who are referred to the program by their child care provider. The scholarship program began April 1, 2009 and will end September 30, 2010; the state has not been accepting new children into the program since April 1, 2010.
- Texas: Local workforce development boards set their own income limits within state guidelines. Some local boards allow families an extended year of child care assistance up to a higher income than the initial eligibility limit; however, this exit eligibility limit cannot exceed 85 percent of state median income. As of October 2010, the maximum income at which local boards can set their eligibility limits will increase to \$46,658 to adjust for the 2011 state median income estimate.
- Utah: The income limits shown in the table take into account a monthly standard deduction of \$100 (\$1,200 a year) for each working parent, assuming there is one working parent in the family. The stated income limits, in policy, were \$25,848 in 2001, \$29,911 in 2009, and \$30,792 in 2010. The state allows a deduction of \$100 per month for the household for medical expenses as well. Also note that in 2009, families already receiving assistance could remain eligible up to a stated income limit of \$37,388. In 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$38,496. The income limit to qualify for special needs care was \$45,396 in 2009 and \$46,740 in 2010.
- Virginia: The state has different income limits for different regions of the state. In 2001, the state had three separate regional income limits, which for a family of three were: \$21,948, \$23,400, and \$27,060. In 2009, the state had four separate regional income limits: \$26,400, \$28,164, \$32,568, and \$44,000. In 2010, the state also had four separate regional income limits: \$27,468, \$29,304, \$33,876, and \$45,780.
- West Virginia: In 2009, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$32,556. In 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$33,876.
- Wisconsin: In 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$29,256. In 2009 and 2010, the exit eligibility limit was \$36,624.
- Wyoming: The income limits shown in the table for 2009 and 2010 take into account a standard deduction of \$200 per month (\$2,400 a year) for each working parent, assuming there is one working parent in the family. The stated income limits, in policy, were \$32,568 in 2009 and \$45,775 in 2010. Also note that, in 2001, families already receiving assistance could continue doing so until their income reached \$27,060. In 2009, the stated exit eligibility limit was \$35,200. The state did not have a separate exit eligibility limit in 2010. As of July 1, 2010, the stated income limit to qualify for assistance was decreased to \$41,198 (225 percent of poverty).

TABLE 2: WAITING LISTS FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

State	Number of children or families on waiting lists as of early 2010	Number of children or families on waiting lists as of early 2009	Number of children or families on waiting lists as of December 2001
Alabama*	6,682 children	9,682 children	5,089 children
Alaska	No waiting list	No waiting list	588 children
Arizona	11,391 children	178 children	No waiting list
Arkansas	2,727 children	3,001 children	8,000 children
California*	194,460 children	220,069 children	280,000 children (estimated)
Colorado*	1,455 children	No waiting list	Waiting lists at county level
Connecticut	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Delaware	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
District of Columbia*	No waiting list	No waiting list	9,124 children
Florida*	66,947 children	57,671 children	46,800 children
Georgia	No waiting list	2,992 children	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*	11,622 children	9,629 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	No waiting list	No waiting list
Louisiana	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Maine	No waiting list	867 children	2,000 children
Maryland	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Massachusetts	22,426 children	20,694 children	18,000 children
Michigan	No waiting list	No waiting list	No waiting list
Minnesota*	3,728 families	7,787 families	4,735 children
Mississippi	No waiting list	6,667 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*	2,545 children	3,035 children	No waiting list
New Hampshire*	1,845 children	No waiting list	No waiting list
New Jersey*	2,931 children	6,185 children	9,800 children
New Mexico	1,216 children	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	37,929 children	23,288 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	5,022 children	15,446 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	Frozen intake	9,388 children (and frozen intake)
Texas*	11,572 children	25,049 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*	9,670 children	8,157 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

* indicates notes found on page 21.

NOTES FOR TABLE 2: WAITING LISTS FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

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

California: The waiting list total for 2001 is an estimated figure. The waiting list total for 2009 reflects data as of September 30, 2008. The waiting list total for 2010 is from June 2009.

Colorado: Waiting lists are kept at the county level, rather than at the state level. Four counties had waiting lists in 2001, but data on the total number of children on waiting lists in counties that had them are not available. In addition, four counties had frozen intake in 2001. No counties had waiting lists February 2009. The waiting list total for 2010 is the total of reported county waiting lists.

District of Columbia: The waiting list total for 2001 may include some children living in the wider metropolitan area that encompasses parts of Maryland and Virginia.

Florida: The waiting list total for 2009 is from April of that year. The waiting list total for 2010 reflects data as of March 31, 2010.

Indiana: In addition to the waiting list, some counties froze intake in 2001.

Minnesota: The waiting list total for 2009 is from January of that year. The waiting list total for 2010 is from March of that year.

Nevada: The waiting list went into effect as of July 1, 2008.

New Hampshire: The waiting list total for 2010 reflects data as of April 19, 2010.

New Jersey: Data for 2001 are not available, so data from March 2002 are used instead. The waiting list total for 2010 reflects data as of April 22, 2010.

New York: Waiting lists are kept at the county level and statewide data are not available. Each county also has the authority to freeze intake and stop adding names to its waiting list.

Tennessee: When the state reported its data in 2001, the state had frozen intake for families not in the TANF or Transitional Child Care programs. The waiting list total for 2001 represents the number of children on the waiting list when intake was closed. The state did not provide a similar number for 2009 or 2010, when intake was also frozen. The state only provides child care assistance to families with a connection to the TANF program, teenage parents in school, and caretakers in TANF child-only cases who are employed full time.

Texas: Local workforce development boards maintain waiting lists. The totals in the table represent the aggregate number of children on waiting lists across all boards. The waiting list total for 2010 is from March of that year. In addition, some boards have frozen intake.

Virginia: Data for December 2001 are not available, so data from January of that year are used instead.

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

State	Monthly fee in 2010		Monthly fee in 2009		Monthly fee in 2001		Change 2009 to 2010		Change 2001 to 2010	
	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	\$197	9%	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$215	12%	N/A	N/A	-\$18	-3%
Alaska	\$67	3%	\$67	3%	\$71	4%	\$0	0%	-\$4	-1%
Arizona	\$152	7%	\$217	9%	\$217	12%	-\$65	-3%	-\$65	-5%
Arkansas	\$407	18%	\$407	18%	\$224	12%	\$0	0%	\$183	6%
California	\$87	4%	\$87	4%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$87	4%
Colorado	\$155	7%	\$253	11%	\$185	10%	-\$98	-4%	-\$30	-3%
Connecticut	\$137	6%	\$137	6%	\$110	6%	\$0	0%	\$27	0%
Delaware	\$208	9%	\$229	10%	\$159	9%	-\$21	-1%	\$49	0%
District of Columbia	\$88	4%	\$124	5%	\$91	5%	-\$36	-2%	-\$3	-1%
Florida*	\$173	8%	\$173	8%	\$104	6%	\$0	0%	\$69	2%
Georgia	\$190	8%	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$139	8%	N/A	N/A	\$51	1%
Hawaii	\$405	18%	\$68	3%	\$38	2%	\$338	15%	\$367	16%
Idaho	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Illinois	\$186	8%	\$186	8%	\$134	7%	\$0	0%	\$52	1%
Indiana*	\$170	7%	\$207	9%	\$154	8%	-\$37	-2%	\$16	-1%
Iowa*	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kansas	\$88	4%	\$207	9%	\$162	9%	-\$119	-5%	-\$74	-5%
Kentucky	\$242	11%	\$242	11%	\$177	10%	\$0	0%	\$65	1%
Louisiana*	\$154	7%	\$231	10%	\$114	6%	-\$77	-3%	\$40	0%
Maine	\$227	10%	\$228	10%	\$183	10%	-\$1	0%	\$44	0%
Maryland*	\$313	14%	\$313	14%	\$236	13%	\$0	0%	\$77	1%
Massachusetts	\$195	9%	\$195	9%	\$160	9%	\$0	0%	\$35	0%
Michigan	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$24	1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	\$74	3%	\$75	3%	\$53	3%	-\$1	0%	\$21	0%
Mississippi*	\$155	7%	\$155	7%	\$105	6%	\$0	0%	\$50	1%
Missouri	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Montana	\$227	10%	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$256	14%	N/A	N/A	-\$29	-4%
Nebraska*	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	\$129	7%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	\$149	7%	\$202	9%	\$281	15%	-\$53	-2%	-\$132	-9%
New Hampshire	\$309	13%	\$214	9%	\$2	<1%	\$95	4%	\$307	13%
New Jersey	\$51	2%	\$111	5%	\$133	7%	-\$60	-3%	-\$82	-5%
New Mexico	\$138	6%	\$144	6%	\$115	6%	-\$6	0%	\$23	0%
New York*	\$267	12%	\$288	13%	\$191	10%	-\$21	-1%	\$76	1%
North Carolina	\$229	10%	\$229	10%	\$159	9%	\$0	0%	\$70	1%
North Dakota	\$336	15%	\$336	15%	\$293	16%	\$0	0%	\$43	-1%
Ohio	\$200	9%	\$205	9%	\$88	5%	-\$5	0%	\$112	4%
Oklahoma	\$189	8%	\$189	8%	\$146	8%	\$0	0%	\$43	0%
Oregon	\$334	15%	\$334	15%	\$319	17%	\$0	0%	\$15	-3%
Pennsylvania	\$173	8%	\$173	8%	\$152	8%	\$0	0%	\$21	-1%
Rhode Island	\$113	5%	\$183	8%	\$19	1%	-\$71	-3%	\$94	4%
South Carolina	\$74	3%	\$87	4%	\$77	4%	-\$13	-1%	-\$3	-1%
South Dakota	\$172	7%	\$343	15%	\$365	20%	-\$172	-8%	-\$193	-12%
Tennessee	\$189	8%	\$186	8%	\$112	6%	\$3	0%	\$77	2%
Texas*	\$114-\$251	5%-11%	\$205-\$251	9%-11%	\$165-\$256	9%-14%	-\$91-\$0	-4%-0%	-\$51-\$5	-4%--3%
Utah	\$204	9%	\$216	9%	\$220	12%	-\$12	-1%	-\$16	-3%
Vermont	\$224	10%	\$272	12%	\$123	7%	-\$47	-2%	\$101	3%
Virginia	\$228	10%	\$228	10%	\$183	10%	\$0	0%	\$45	0%
Washington	\$134	6%	\$170	7%	\$87	5%	-\$36	-2%	\$47	1%
West Virginia	\$54	2%	\$54	2%	\$54	3%	\$0	0%	\$0	-1%
Wisconsin	\$204	9%	\$204	9%	\$160	9%	\$0	0%	\$44	0%
Wyoming	\$68	3%	\$68	3%	\$98	5%	\$0	0%	-\$30	-2%

* indicates notes found on page 24.

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

State	Monthly fee in 2010		Monthly fee in 2009		Monthly fee in 2001		Change 2009 to 2010		Change 2001 to 2010	
	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	\$78	5%	\$78	5%	\$65	5%	\$0	0%	\$13	0%
Alaska	\$15	1%	\$15	1%	\$14	1%	\$0	0%	\$1	0%
Arizona	\$43	3%	\$65	4%	\$65	5%	-\$22	-1%	-\$22	-2%
Arkansas	\$102	7%	\$102	7%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$102	7%
California	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Colorado	\$253	17%	\$155	10%	\$113	9%	\$98	6%	\$140	7%
Connecticut	\$61	4%	\$61	4%	\$49	4%	\$0	0%	\$12	0%
Delaware	\$113	7%	\$100	7%	\$55	5%	\$13	1%	\$58	3%
District of Columbia	\$35	2%	\$49	3%	\$32	3%	-\$14	-1%	\$3	0%
Florida*	\$106	7%	\$106	7%	\$69	6%	\$0	0%	\$37	1%
Georgia	\$129	8%	\$130	9%	\$21	2%	-\$1	0%	\$108	7%
Hawaii	\$203	13%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$203	13%	\$203	13%
Idaho	\$153	10%	\$153	10%	\$65	5%	\$0	0%	\$88	5%
Illinois	\$87	6%	\$87	6%	\$65	5%	\$0	0%	\$22	0%
Indiana*	\$0	0%	\$77	5%	\$0	0%	-\$77	-5%	\$0	0%
Iowa*	\$9	1%	\$20	1%	\$22	2%	-\$11	-1%	-\$13	-1%
Kansas	\$0	0%	\$58	4%	\$22	2%	-\$58	-4%	-\$22	-2%
Kentucky	\$132	9%	\$132	9%	\$97	8%	\$0	0%	\$35	1%
Louisiana*	\$77	5%	\$154	10%	\$49	4%	-\$77	-5%	\$28	1%
Maine	\$121	8%	\$122	8%	\$97	8%	-\$1	0%	\$24	0%
Maryland*	\$200	13%	\$200	13%	\$90	7%	\$0	0%	\$110	6%
Massachusetts	\$119	8%	\$119	8%	\$40	3%	\$0	0%	\$79	5%
Michigan	\$23	1%	\$23	1%	\$24	2%	\$0	0%	-\$2	0%
Minnesota	\$42	3%	\$41	3%	\$5	<1%	\$1	0%	\$37	2%
Mississippi*	\$80	5%	\$80	5%	\$47	4%	\$0	0%	\$33	1%
Missouri	\$110	7%	\$110	7%	\$43	4%	\$0	0%	\$67	4%
Montana	\$42	3%	\$61	4%	\$49	4%	-\$19	-1%	-\$7	-1%
Nebraska	\$0	0%	\$58	4%	\$30	2%	-\$58	-4%	-\$30	-2%
Nevada	\$25	2%	\$51	3%	\$0	0%	-\$26	-2%	\$25	2%
New Hampshire	\$80	5%	\$139	9%	\$0	0%	-\$58	-4%	\$80	5%
New Jersey	\$0	0%	\$77	5%	\$71	6%	-\$77	-5%	-\$71	-6%
New Mexico	\$62	4%	\$64	4%	\$47	4%	-\$2	0%	\$15	0%
New York*	\$4	<1%	\$21	1%	\$4	<1%	-\$17	-1%	\$0	0%
North Carolina	\$153	10%	\$153	10%	\$106	9%	\$0	0%	\$47	1%
North Dakota	\$252	17%	\$252	17%	\$158	13%	\$0	0%	\$94	4%
Ohio	\$101	7%	\$108	7%	\$43	4%	-\$7	0%	\$58	3%
Oklahoma	\$120	8%	\$120	8%	\$54	4%	\$0	0%	\$66	3%
Oregon	\$125	8%	\$125	8%	\$90	7%	\$0	0%	\$35	1%
Pennsylvania	\$65	4%	\$87	6%	\$65	5%	-\$22	-1%	\$0	-1%
Rhode Island	\$0	0%	\$31	2%	\$0	0%	-\$31	-2%	\$0	0%
South Carolina	\$48	3%	\$61	4%	\$43	4%	-\$13	-1%	\$5	0%
South Dakota	\$0	0%	\$10	1%	\$0	0%	-\$10	-1%	\$0	0%
Tennessee	\$90	6%	\$87	6%	\$39	3%	\$4	0%	\$51	3%
Texas*	\$76-\$167	5%-11%	\$137-\$167	9%-11%	\$109-\$170	9%-14%	-\$61-\$0	-4%-0%	-\$33--\$3	-4%-- -3%
Utah	\$1	<1%	\$14	1%	\$36	3%	-\$13	-1%	-\$35	-3%
Vermont	\$0	0%	\$74	5%	\$0	0%	-\$74	-5%	\$0	0%
Virginia	\$152	10%	\$152	10%	\$122	10%	\$0	0%	\$30	0%
Washington	\$50	3%	\$50	3%	\$20	2%	\$0	0%	\$30	2%
West Virginia	\$38	2%	\$38	2%	\$27	2%	\$0	0%	\$11	0%
Wisconsin	\$78	5%	\$78	5%	\$61	5%	\$0	0%	\$17	0%
Wyoming	\$10	1%	\$10	1%	\$10	1%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

* indicates notes found on page 24.

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 and \$18,310 a year in 2009 and 2010.

For a family of three, an income at 150 percent of poverty was equal to \$21,945 a year in 2001 and \$27,465 a year in 2009 and 2010.

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 table reflect the maximum copayment levels allowed under state policy and used by a local coalition.

Indiana: Copayments vary depending on how long the family has been receiving child care assistance, with families paying a higher percentage of income the longer they receive assistance. The copayments shown in the table assume it is the first year the family is receiving assistance.

Iowa: A family with an income at 150 percent of poverty would be eligible for assistance if the family were using special needs care. For this family, the copayment in 2009 would have been \$185 per month and in 2010, it would have been \$174 per month. A family of three with an income at 100 percent of poverty that is using special needs care would have the same copayment as a family using basic care. Also note that no copayment is assessed for families with incomes under 100 percent of poverty.

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

Maryland: The state determines copayments based on maximum state reimbursement rates in the region where the family lives.

Mississippi: For children in foster care or protective services and children receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits, the copayment is \$10 per month.

Nebraska: A family with an income at 150 percent of poverty would be eligible if the family were transitioning from TANF. In 2009, this family's copayment would have been \$176 per month and in 2010, it would have been \$160 per month.

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

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

TABLE 4A: STATE REIMBURSEMENT RATES 2010

State	State reimbursement rates compared to market rates	Year when rates last updated	If state rate is lower than rate provider charges, is provider allowed to charge parents the difference?
Alabama	12th-51st percentile of 2009 rates	2009	Yes
Alaska*	50th/75th percentile of 2009 rates	2008	Yes
Arizona*	75th percentile of 2000 rates	2006	Yes
Arkansas*	75th percentile of 2007 rates	2006	Yes, for quality accredited
California	85th percentile of 2005 rates	2006	Yes
Colorado*	Locally determined	Varies by locality	No
Connecticut	60th percentile of 2001 rates	2002	Yes
Delaware*	57%-74% of the 75th percentile of 2007 rates	2006	Yes
District of Columbia	75th percentile of 2004 rates	2006	No
Florida*	Locally determined	2009	Yes
Georgia	50th percentile of 2005 rates	2007	Yes
Hawaii*	At or below the 75th percentile of 2009 rates	2008/2010	Yes
Idaho*	75th percentile of 2001 rates	2001	Yes
Illinois*	25th-100th percentile of 2008 rates	2010	Yes, unless contracted
Indiana	75th percentile of 2007 rates	2007	Yes
Iowa	2% above the 75th percentile of 2004 rates	2008	No
Kansas	65th percentile of 2000 rates	2002	Yes
Kentucky	68th percentile of 2005 rates	2006	Yes
Louisiana*	Below the 75th percentile of 2007 rates (except school-based)	2007	Yes
Maine	75th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	No
Maryland	51st percentile of 2005 rates	2010	Yes
Massachusetts*	20th-75th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	No
Michigan	50%-97% of the 75th percentile of 2009 rates	2009	Yes
Minnesota*	30th-42nd percentile of 2009 rates	2006	Yes
Mississippi*	36th-75th percentile of 2009 rates	2007	Yes
Missouri*	33rd percentile of 2008 rates	2008	Yes
Montana	75th percentile of 2009 rates	2009	Yes
Nebraska	60th percentile of 2009 rates	2009	No
Nevada	50th-65th percentile of 2004 rates	2004	Yes
New Hampshire	50th percentile of 2007 rates	2009	Yes
New Jersey*	30th-40th percentile of 2008 rates	2008	Yes, unless contracted
New Mexico	41%-97% of the 75th percentile of 2009 rates	2007	No
New York	75th percentile of 2009 rates	2009	Yes
North Carolina*	Below the 75th percentile of 2007 rates	2007	Yes
North Dakota	85% of the 75th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	Yes
Ohio	35th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	No
Oklahoma	38th-87th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	No
Oregon	75th percentile of 2006 rates	2007	Yes
Pennsylvania*	40th-72nd percentile of 2007 rates	2007	Yes
Rhode Island	75th percentile of 2002 rates	2002	No
South Carolina	40th to above the 85th percentile of 2009 rates	2007	Yes
South Dakota	75th percentile of 2009 rates	2009	Yes
Tennessee*	45th-60th percentile of 2006 rates	2008	Yes
Texas*	23rd-88th percentile 2009 rates	Varies by locality	Yes
Utah	Below the 75th percentile of 2009 rates	2007	Yes
Vermont	Below the 75th percentile of 2008 rates	2010	Yes
Virginia*	25th-40th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	Yes
Washington*	17th-86th percentile of 2008 rates	2008	No
West Virginia*	45th-85th percentile of 2008 rates	2009	No
Wisconsin	75th percentile of 2005 rates	2006	Yes
Wyoming	75th percentile of 2008 rates	2008	Yes

* indicates notes found on pages 29 and 30.

TABLE 4B: STATE REIMBURSEMENT RATES COMPARED TO THE 75TH PERCENTILE OF CURRENT MARKET RATES 2010, 2009, AND 2001

Rates equal to or above the 75th percentile of current market rates....

State	In 2010?	In 2009?	In 2001?
Alabama	No	No	Yes
Alaska*	No	No	No
Arizona	No	No	No
Arkansas*	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	No	No	Yes
Colorado*	No	No	Yes
Connecticut	No	No	No
Delaware	No	No	No
District of Columbia	No	No	No
Florida*	No	No	Yes
Georgia	No	No	No
Hawaii	No	Yes	No
Idaho	No	No	Yes
Illinois*	No	No	No
Indiana	No	Yes	Yes
Iowa	No	No	No
Kansas	No	No	No
Kentucky	No	No	Yes
Louisiana*	No	No	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	Yes	No
Nebraska	No	No	No
Nevada	No	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	No	No	Yes
Ohio	No	No	No
Oklahoma	No	No	No
Oregon	No	No	No
Pennsylvania*	No	No	No
Rhode Island	No	No	Yes
South Carolina	No	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	No	No	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	Yes

* indicates notes found on pages 29 and 30.

**TABLE 4C: STATE REIMBURSEMENT RATE AMOUNT IN 2010
COMPARED TO MARKET RATE AMOUNT FOR CHILD CARE CENTERS**

State	City/county/region*	Center care for a four-year-old					Center care for a one-year-old				
		Monthly state reimbursement rate	75th percentile of market rate	Year of market rate	Difference between state rate and 75th percentile	Percentage difference between state rate and 75th percentile	Monthly state reimbursement rate	75th percentile of market rate	Year of market rate	Difference between state rate and 75th percentile	Percentage difference between state rate and 75th percentile
Alabama	Birmingham Region	\$442	\$559	2009	-\$117	-21%	\$481	\$615	2009	-\$135	-22%
Alaska*	Anchorage	\$645	\$690	2009	-\$45	-7%	\$790	\$850	2009	-\$60	-7%
Arizona	Maricopa County	\$515	\$780	2008	-\$265	-34%	\$576	\$901	2008	-\$325	-36%
Arkansas*	Little Rock/Pulaski County	\$457	\$457	2007	\$0	0%	\$552	\$552	2007	\$0	0%
California	Los Angeles County	\$744	\$787	2007	-\$44	-6%	\$1,029	\$1,228	2007	-\$199	-16%
Colorado	Denver	\$578	\$953	2009	-\$375	-39%	\$721	\$1,097	2009	-\$376	-34%
Connecticut	North Central Region	\$645	\$993	2009	-\$348	-35%	\$813	\$1,230	2009	-\$417	-34%
Delaware	New Castle County	\$478	\$782	2009	-\$304	-39%	\$539	\$1,018	2009	-\$478	-47%
District of Columbia	Citywide	\$632	\$1,340	2008	-\$708	-53%	\$862	\$1,430	2008	-\$568	-40%
Florida	Miami-Dade County	\$403	\$541	2009	-\$139	-26%	\$442	\$585	2009	-\$143	-24%
Georgia	Fulton County	\$493	\$584	2009	-\$91	-16%	\$558	\$649	2009	-\$91	-14%
Hawaii	Statewide	\$675	\$675	2009	\$0	0%	\$1,395	\$1,425	2009	-\$30	-2%
Idaho*	Boise Metro Area (Region IV)	\$492	\$602	2006	-\$110	-18%	\$594	\$667	2006	-\$73	-11%
Illinois*	Metropolitan Region (Group 1A)	\$727	\$922	2008	-\$195	-21%	\$1,033	\$1,199	2008	-\$166	-14%
Indiana	Marion County	\$693	\$736	2009	-\$43	-6%	\$814	\$866	2009	-\$52	-6%
Iowa*	Statewide	\$561	\$660	2008	-\$99	-15%	\$696	\$774	2008	-\$79	-10%
Kansas	Sedgwick County	\$444	\$567	2008	-\$123	-22%	\$661	\$777	2008	-\$117	-15%
Kentucky	Central Region	\$473	\$541	2008	-\$68	-13%	\$540	\$606	2008	-\$66	-11%
Louisiana	Statewide	\$385	\$476	2009	-\$91	-19%	\$407	\$520	2009	-\$113	-22%
Maine	Cumberland	\$805	\$805	2008	\$0	0%	\$996	\$996	2008	\$0	0%
Maryland*	Region W	\$532	\$758	2009	-\$226	-30%	\$844	\$1,101	2009	-\$257	-23%
Massachusetts	Greater Boston (Region 6)	\$795	\$1,150	2008	-\$355	-31%	\$1,181	\$2,032	2008	-\$851	-42%
Michigan	Statewide	\$487	\$974	2009	-\$487	-50%	\$731	\$1,136	2009	-\$405	-36%
Minnesota	Hennepin County	\$859	\$1,044	2009	-\$184	-18%	\$1,154	\$1,412	2009	-\$258	-18%
Mississippi	Statewide	\$312	\$380	2009	-\$68	-18%	\$339	\$436	2009	-\$97	-22%
Missouri	St. Louis Metropolitan Area	\$348	\$771	2008	-\$423	-55%	\$596	\$931	2008	-\$335	-36%
Montana	Billings Region	\$624	\$624	2009	\$0	0%	\$714	\$714	2009	\$0	0%
Nebraska	Urban Counties	\$671	\$736	2009	-\$65	-9%	\$812	\$866	2009	-\$54	-6%
Nevada	Clark County	\$498	\$1,083	2008	-\$585	-54%	\$606	\$844	2008	-\$238	-28%
New Hampshire	Statewide	\$680	\$767	2007	-\$88	-11%	\$810	\$953	2007	-\$143	-15%
New Jersey	Statewide	\$573	\$844	2008	-\$271	-32%	\$695	\$1,100	2008	-\$405	-37%
New Mexico	Metropolitan areas	\$440	\$728	2009	-\$288	-40%	\$521	\$786	2009	-\$264	-34%
New York	New York City	\$940	\$940	2009	\$0	0%	\$1,464	\$1,464	2009	\$0	0%
North Carolina*	Mecklenburg	\$702	\$853	2008-09	-\$151	-18%	\$737	\$988	2008-09	-\$251	-25%
North Dakota	Statewide	\$430	\$506	2007	-\$76	-15%	\$480	\$565	2007	-\$85	-15%
Ohio	Large Metro Counties (Group F)	\$669	\$890	2008	-\$221	-25%	\$883	\$1,031	2008	-\$148	-14%
Oklahoma*	Enhanced Area (Metro) Counties	\$438	\$476	2008	-\$38	-8%	\$601	\$606	2008	-\$5	-1%
Oregon*	Region A	\$705	\$800	2008	-\$95	-12%	\$894	\$987	2008	-\$93	-9%
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	\$714	\$736	2007	-\$22	-3%	\$888	\$888	2007	\$0	0%
Rhode Island	Statewide	\$680	\$862	2009	-\$182	-21%	\$814	\$989	2009	-\$175	-18%
South Carolina	Statewide Urban Counties	\$476	\$454	2009	\$22	5%	\$528	\$411	2009	\$117	28%
South Dakota	Minnehaha County/Sioux Falls	\$614	\$614	2009	\$0	0%	\$722	\$722	2009	\$0	0%
Tennessee*	Top 21 Counties	\$515	\$563	2008	-\$48	-8%	\$598	\$628	2008	-\$30	-5%
Texas	Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area	\$447	\$679	2009	-\$233	-34%	\$565	\$926	2009	-\$361	-39%
Utah	Statewide	\$450	\$516	2009	-\$66	-13%	\$564	\$710	2009	-\$146	-21%
Vermont	Statewide	\$561	\$730	2008	-\$169	-23%	\$594	\$772	2008	-\$178	-23%
Virginia	Fairfax City/Fairfax County/Falls Church	\$827	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,208	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	King County/Seattle Area	\$673	\$969	2008	-\$296	-31%	\$961	\$1,365	2008	-\$404	-30%
West Virginia	Statewide	\$498	\$498	2008	\$0	0%	\$606	\$644	2008	-\$38	-6%
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	\$779	\$870	2008	-\$91	-10%	\$1,005	\$1,121	2008	-\$117	-10%
Wyoming	Statewide	\$540	\$540	2008	\$0	0%	\$603	\$603	2008	\$0	0%

* indicates notes found on pages 29 and 30.

TABLE 4D: STATE TIERED REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR CENTER CARE FOR A FOUR-YEAR-OLD IN 2010

State	City/county/region*	Number of tier levels (including base rate)	Reimbursement rate for lowest tier	Reimbursement rate for highest tier	Reimbursement rates between highest and lowest tiers	Difference between highest and lowest tiers	Percentage difference between highest and lowest tiers	75th percentile of market rate	Difference between rate at highest tier and 75th percentile	Percentage difference between rate at highest tier and 75th percentile
Alabama										
Alaska										
Arizona	Maricopa County	2	\$515	\$567	N/A	\$52	10%	\$780	-\$214	-27%
Arkansas										
California										
Colorado*	Denver	6	\$578	\$773	\$619, \$643, \$706, \$740	\$196	34%	\$953	-\$179	-19%
Connecticut	North Central Region	2	\$645	\$677	N/A	\$32	5%	\$993	-\$316	-32%
Delaware										
District of Columbia	Citywide	3	\$632	\$909	\$771	\$277	44%	\$1,340	-\$431	-32%
Florida*	Miami-Dade County	2	\$403	\$483	N/A	\$81	20%	\$541	-\$58	-11%
Georgia										
Hawaii*	Statewide	2	\$675	\$710	N/A	\$35	5%	\$675	\$35	5%
Idaho										
Illinois*	Metropolitan Region (Group 1A)	5	\$632	\$759	\$664, \$696, \$727	\$126	20%	\$922	-\$163	-18%
Indiana	Marion County	2	\$693	\$762	N/A	\$69	10%	\$736	\$26	4%
Iowa										
Kansas										
Kentucky*	Central Region	4	\$462	\$523	See notes	\$61	13%	\$541	-\$18	-3%
Louisiana*	Statewide	5	\$385	\$462	\$397, \$416, \$437	\$77	20%	\$476	-\$14	-3%
Maine	Cumberland	4	\$805	\$886	\$821, \$846	\$81	10%	\$805	\$81	10%
Maryland*	Region W	4	\$532	\$671	\$585, \$633	\$139	26%	\$758	-\$87	-11%
Massachusetts										
Michigan										
Minnesota	Hennepin County	2	\$859	\$988	N/A	\$129	15%	\$1,044	-\$55	-5%
Mississippi	Statewide	2	\$312	\$339	N/A	\$27	9%	\$380	-\$41	-11%
Missouri	St. Louis Metropolitan Area	2	\$348	\$417	N/A	\$70	20%	\$771	-\$353	-46%
Montana	Billings Region	3	\$624	\$717	\$686	\$94	15%	\$624	\$94	15%
Nebraska	Urban Counties	2	\$671	\$736	N/A	\$65	10%	\$736	\$0	0%
Nevada*	Clark County	2	\$498	\$573	N/A	\$75	15%	\$1,083	-\$510	-47%
New Hampshire										
New Jersey	Statewide	2	\$573	\$604	N/A	\$31	5%	\$844	-\$240	-28%
New Mexico	Metropolitan areas	5	\$395	\$527	\$440, \$465, \$500	\$132	33%	\$728	-\$201	-28%
New York*	New York City	2	\$940	\$1,081	N/A	\$141	15%	\$940	\$141	15%
North Carolina*	Mecklenburg County	5	\$477	\$702	\$501, \$641, \$670	\$225	47%	\$853	-\$151	-18%
North Dakota										
Ohio	Large Metro Counties (Group F)	3	\$669	\$736	\$703	\$67	10%	\$890	-\$154	-17%
Oklahoma*	Enhanced Area (Metro) Counties	4	\$292	\$487	\$373, \$438	\$195	67%	\$476	\$11	2%
Oregon										
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	4	\$714	\$779	\$730, \$762	\$65	9%	\$736	\$43	6%
Rhode Island										
South Carolina	Statewide Urban Counties	5	\$390	\$624	\$455, \$476, \$580	\$234	60%	\$454	\$170	37%
South Dakota										
Tennessee*	Top 21 Counties	4	\$429	\$515	\$450, \$494	\$87	20%	\$563	-\$48	-8%
Texas	Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area	2	\$447	\$474	N/A	\$27	6%	\$679	-\$206	-30%
Utah										
Vermont	Statewide	6	\$561	\$786	\$589, \$617, \$673, \$730	\$224	40%	\$730	\$56	8%
Virginia										
Washington										
West Virginia	Statewide	3	\$498	\$585	\$541	\$87	17%	\$498	\$87	17%
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	2	\$779	\$857	N/A	\$78	10%	\$870	-\$13	-1%
Wyoming										

* indicates notes found on pages 29 and 30.

NOTES FOR TABLES 4A, 4B, 4C AND 4D: REIMBURSEMENT RATES

State reimbursement rates are compared to the 75th percentile of market rates (the rate that allows families 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 2010 are considered current if set at the 75th percentile of 2008 or more recent market rates).

States were asked to report reimbursement rates and the 75th percentile of market rates for their most populous city, county, or region. Monthly rates were calculated from hourly, daily, and weekly rates assuming the child was in care 9 hours a day, 5 days a week, 4.33 weeks a month. Differences between state reimbursement rates and the 75th percentile were calculated using raw data, rather than the rounded numbers shown in the table.

For states that pay higher rates for higher-quality care, the most common rate level (the level representing the greatest number of providers) for each state is used for the data analysis in Tables 4a, 4b, and 4c, unless otherwise indicated. The rates analyzed in the tables do not reflect other types of higher rates or rate enhancements, such as higher rates paid for care for children with special needs or care during non-traditional hours.

Alaska: Reimbursement rates are set at the 75th percentile of market rates for infant and toddler care and at the 50th percentile of market rates for all other categories of care. Also note that the state updated its reimbursement rates on March 1, 2010.

Arizona: Reimbursement rates were set at the 75th percentile of 2000 market rates in 2006. On July 1, 2007, the state implemented a 5 percent increase in rates. On April 1, 2009, the state reversed this 5 percent increase and rates reverted to the level at which they had been set in 2006.

Arkansas: Reimbursement rates have not changed since 2006; however, a market rate survey has been conducted each year and reimbursement rates still fall within the 75th percentile. Also note that only providers with state quality accreditation are allowed to charge parents the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the rate charged to private-paying parents.

Colorado: Each county determines its own reimbursement rates and whether to offer higher rates for higher-quality care.

Delaware: Providers are allowed to charge parents the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the private-pay rate under the Purchase of Care Plus option.

Florida: Reimbursement rates vary by local coalition; on average, reimbursement rates are 74 percent of the 75th percentile of market rates. In addition, counties may pay rates that are up to 20 percent higher than the basic rate for Gold Seal providers, a quality care designation authorized by the legislature tied to accreditation. Miami-Dade reimburses Gold Seal providers at a rate that is 20 percent higher than the basic rate.

Hawaii: Reimbursement rates were last updated for licensed care in 2008 and for license-exempt care in 2010. Also note that the state has higher reimbursement rates for accredited center-based care for children over age 24 months through the time the children are eligible to enroll in kindergarten or junior kindergarten (usually age five by the end of the calendar year, depending on the child's birth date). The state does not have accredited rates for care for infants and toddlers or for family child care.

Idaho: Compared to the most recent market rate survey, from January 2008, reimbursement rates are at the 52nd percentile of market rates for child care centers and family child care homes and at the 48th percentile for group child care. Also note that Region IV includes Ada, Boise, Elmore, and Valley Counties.

Illinois: Reimbursement rates are not based on a percentile of market rates. Rates vary by age of child, type of care, and region of the state. Rates generally range from below the 25th percentile to above the 50th percentile of market rates, and in some areas of the state, exceed the 100th percentile. Reimbursement rates are reported for the Metropolitan Region (referred to as Group 1A), which includes Cook, DeKalb, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, and McHenry Counties. Also note that a provider that has a contract with the state is not permitted to ask families to pay the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the rate charged to private-paying parents.

Iowa: The state calculates reimbursements based upon units of care. A unit is a 5-hour block of time. The rates shown in the table are calculated assuming that if a family is using 9 hours of care, 5 days per week, 4.33 weeks per month, this would translate into 2 units of care per day for 22 days per month, or 44 units per month.

Kentucky: The state has four star levels. The amount of the bonus at each star level—for four-year-olds, \$7 to \$11 per month for two-star providers, \$11 to \$15 per month for three-star providers, and \$14 to \$18 per month for four-star providers—depends on the percentage of children served by the provider who are receiving child care assistance. For all levels, a licensed or certified provider may receive, to the extent funds are available, \$2 per day beyond the maximum rate if the provider is accredited. The highest rate shown in Table 4d assumes that the provider receives the maximum allowable bonus at the four-star level and is accredited.

Louisiana: Reimbursement rates for care for infants, toddlers, and children ages three and over in centers, family child care, and in-home care are below the 75th percentile of market rates. Reimbursement rates for children ages three and over in school-based programs are above the 75th percentile. Rates were last updated as of January 2007, except for the addition of rates for military providers on October 30, 2009. Also note that bonuses for higher-quality care are paid quarterly.

Maryland: Region W includes Anne Arundel, Calvert, Carroll, Charles, and Prince George's Counties.

Massachusetts: Reimbursement rates are between the 20th and 75th percentile of market rates for center care and between the 35th and 55th percentile of market rates for family child care.

- Minnesota: Reimbursement rates for licensed centers are at approximately the 33rd percentile of market rates statewide (30th percentile in rural counties and 34th percentile in urban counties). Reimbursement rates for licensed family child care are at approximately the 40th percentile of market rates statewide (42nd percentile in rural counties and 37th percentile in urban counties).
- Mississippi: Reimbursement rates for licensed centers are at the 51st percentile for infants, 49th percentile for toddlers, 56th percentile for preschoolers, 62nd percentile for school-age care during the summer, and 75th percentile for special needs care. Reimbursement rates for family child care are at the 36th percentile for infants, 65th percentile for toddlers, 64th percentile for preschoolers, 75th percentile for school-age care during the summer, and 42nd percentile for special needs care.
- Missouri: The state does not allow parents involved in the protective services system to be asked to pay the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the rate providers charge private-paying parents.
- Montana: Data on policies as of 2001 are not available, so policies as of March 2000 are used instead.
- Nevada: The state has established four levels in its tiered reimbursement system, but only two are currently in effect. The first level is for all licensed centers and family child care homes. The fourth level is for all accredited centers and family child care homes, which receive a reimbursement rate that is 15 percent above the rate for licensed care. The second and third levels, which will pay 5 percent and 10 percent, respectively, above the rate for licensed care, have not been implemented yet.
- New Jersey: The percentile of the market rate at which reimbursement rates are set depends on the age of the child and category of care. Also note that centers that have direct contracts with the state are not permitted to ask families receiving child care assistance to pay the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the rate charged to private-paying parents. Data on policies as of 2001 are not available, so policies as of March 2000 are used instead.
- New York: Social services districts may set reimbursement rates for accredited programs that are up to 15 percent higher than basic reimbursement rates.
- North Carolina: The state's market rate survey differentiates between quality levels and the 75th percentile of market rates is obtained for providers at each quality level. Reimbursement rates were increased on October 1, 2007, for three-, four-, and five-star licensed facilities if the market rate survey data supported a change, but were not brought up to the 75th percentile of 2007 market rates. Rates for one- and two-star licensed facilities are based on 2003 market rate survey data. In Table 4c, the reimbursement rate for the most common rate level is compared to the 75th percentile for that same quality level. In Table 4d, the reimbursement rate for the highest quality level is compared to the 75th percentile for that quality level.
- Oklahoma: Enhanced Area Rates apply to 19 out of 77 counties in the state (Caddo, Canadian, Cherokee, Cleveland, Comanche, Creek, Garfield, Kay, Logan, McCurtain, Oklahoma, Ottawa, Payne, Pittsburg, Pottawatomie, Tulsa, Wagoner, Washington, and Woods).
- Oregon: Region A includes the Ashland, Bend, Corvallis, Eugene, Monmouth, and Portland areas.
- Pennsylvania: Reimbursement rates for center care for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers are set at least at the 62nd percentile of market rates for full-time care and the 58th percentile for part-time care. Rates for center care in counties with a concentration of young children in poverty are set at least at the 72nd percentile for full-time care and the 60th percentile for part-time care. Rates for group or family child care for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers are set at least at the 55th percentile for full-time care and the 50th percentile for part-time care. Rates for center, group, or family child care for school-age children are set at least at the 40th percentile.
- Tennessee: Reimbursement rates are at the 60th percentile of market rates for infants, 50th percentile for toddlers, and 45th percentile and above for all others. The rates shown in the table apply to the 21 counties that meet the criteria for being paid the higher reimbursement rate (counties that were among the top 15 in average population in 2004 and/or among the top 15 in per capita income in 2002-2004). There is a separate set of reimbursement rates that apply to the remaining counties.
- Texas: Local workforce development boards determine and update reimbursement rates at their own discretion. The average maximum rates across board areas range from the 23rd to the 88th percentile of market rates. Twenty-two of the 28 boards have updated reimbursement rates in at least one category of care within the last two years. Also note that providers are allowed to ask parents to pay the difference between the state reimbursement rate and the private-pay rate, unless specifically prohibited by the local board or when the parent is exempt from having to pay a copayment or the parent's copayment is calculated to be zero.
- Virginia: Reimbursement rates, depending on age group, are between the 35th and 40th percentile of market rates for center care and between the 25th and 40th percentile for family child care.
- Washington: Reimbursement rates for center care range from the 17th percentile of market rates for infants in Region 4 to the 60th percentile for school-age children in Region 3. Rates for family child care range from the 25th percentile for school-age children in Region 3 to the 86th percentile for infants in Region 2.
- West Virginia: The percentile of the market rate for reimbursement rates varies by the type of care, age of child, and quality tier. Also note that policies as of 2001 are not available, so policies as of March 2000 are used instead.

TABLE 5: ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE WHILE PARENTS SEARCH FOR A JOB 2010

State	<i>Parents receiving child care assistance when they lose a job</i>		<i>Parents applying for child care assistance while searching for a job</i>	
	Can they continue receiving assistance?	For how much time?	Can they qualify for assistance?	For how much time?
Alabama	No	N/A	No	N/A
Alaska*	Yes	80 hours	Yes	80 hours
Arizona*	Yes	60 days	No	N/A
Arkansas*	Yes	45 days	Yes	45 days
California	Yes	6 weeks	Yes	6 weeks
Colorado*	Yes	180 days	Yes	180 days
Connecticut*	Yes	2 months	No	N/A
Delaware	Yes	3 months	No	N/A
District of Columbia*	Yes	3 months	No	N/A
Florida*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Georgia*	Yes	12 weeks	No	N/A
Hawaii	Yes	30 days	Yes	30 days
Idaho*	Yes	Until end of month	No	N/A
Illinois*	Yes	90 days	No	N/A
Indiana	Yes	13 weeks	No	N/A
Iowa	Yes	30 days	Yes	30 days
Kansas*	Yes	Until end of month	No	N/A
Kentucky	Yes	4 weeks	No	N/A
Louisiana*	No	N/A	No	N/A
Maine*	Yes	8 weeks	No	N/A
Maryland*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Massachusetts*	Yes	8 weeks	Yes	8 weeks
Michigan	No	N/A	No	N/A
Minnesota*	Yes	240 hours	Yes	240 hours
Mississippi*	Yes	60 days	Yes	60 days
Missouri*	Yes	4 weeks	No	N/A
Montana*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Nebraska*	Yes	2 months	Yes	2 months
Nevada	Yes	2 weeks	Yes	2 weeks
New Hampshire*	Yes	40 days	Yes	40 days
New Jersey*	Yes	90 days	No	N/A
New Mexico*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
New York*	Yes	4 weeks	Locally determined	See notes
North Carolina*	Yes	6 months	Yes	6 months
North Dakota*	Yes	8 weeks	Yes	8 weeks
Ohio*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Oklahoma*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Oregon*	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Pennsylvania*	Yes	60 days	No	N/A
Rhode Island*	Yes	21 days	No	N/A
South Carolina	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
South Dakota*	Yes	2 months	Yes	2 months
Tennessee	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Texas*	Yes	4 weeks	No	N/A
Utah*	Yes	100 hours	Yes	100 hours
Vermont*	Yes	30 days	Yes	30 days
Virginia	No	N/A	No	N/A
Washington*	Yes	56 days	No	N/A
West Virginia	Yes	30 days	No	N/A
Wisconsin*	Yes	4 weeks	No	N/A
Wyoming*	Yes	60 days	Yes	60 days

* indicates notes found on pages 32 and 33.

NOTES FOR TABLE 5: ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE WHILE PARENTS SEARCH FOR A JOB

The table reflects policies that apply to families not receiving TANF; policies may differ for families receiving TANF.

Alaska: Parents may receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 80 hours in a 12-month period.

Arizona: Each parent in a family receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job for up to two 30-day periods or one 60-day period in each 12-month period. Only certain TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.

Arkansas: In addition to the 45 days a parent may receive child care assistance while searching for a job, a one-time extension of 15 consecutive calendar days may be granted if needed to secure employment. A handwritten statement listing job contacts or documentation of the job search must be provided in order to receive the extension.

Colorado: The amount of time parents could receive child care assistance while searching for a job was extended from 30 days to 180 days (in a 12-month period) as of April 2009 using ARRA funds. The state will revert to the previous policy when ARRA expires.

Connecticut: Payment eligibility can start up to 10 days prior to the start of employment.

District of Columbia: If a parent quits a job or terminates for cause, child care assistance is ended, but if a parent loses employment due to no fault of his/her own, child care assistance will be continued for up to 3 months from the effective date of termination from employment. Only parents in a structured job search program through TANF can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.

Florida: Local early learning coalitions, which administer the child care assistance program, may seek a waiver to the 30-day time limit and allow parents to continue to receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 60 or 90 days. Parents who qualify for unemployment compensation may continue to receive child care assistance for up to 6 months. Only TANF recipients can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job; they are limited to 24 months of services.

Georgia: Parents can continue to receive child care assistance while searching for a job under an ARRA-funded secondary child care program. The program in its entirety will end September 30, 2010. Only TANF applicants/recipients can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.

Idaho: Parents searching for a new job can continue to receive child care assistance only during the month in which they lost their previous job.

Illinois: The state is using ARRA funds to increase the amount of time parents can continue to receive child care assistance while searching for a job from 30 days to 90 days. This policy went into effect November 1, 2009, and will continue until September 2011, or as long as funds are available. When ARRA expires, the state will revert to the previous policy of limiting the time parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job to 30 days.

Kansas: A parent receiving child care assistance must report the loss of a job within 10 days, and the caseworker must provide 10 days notice that the case will be closed. Cases always close the last day of the month. Only TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job and it must be part of the parent's work program plan.

Louisiana: The state's previous policy, in effect until January 2010, allowed parents to receive child care assistance for up to 4 months while searching for a job.

Maine: Parents can continue to receive child care assistance for 20 hours per week for 8 weeks while searching for a job.

Maryland: Only TANF recipients can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.

Massachusetts: Parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job for an additional 4 weeks (on top of the initial 8 weeks allowed) if they were laid off or there are other extraordinary circumstances.

Minnesota: Parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 240 hours per calendar year. TANF recipients can receive child care assistance while searching for a job for additional time if it is identified in the parent's employment plan.

Mississippi: Families can qualify for child care assistance for up to 60 days from the last day of the parent's employment.

Missouri: As of May 1, 2010, parents applying for or receiving child care assistance can receive assistance for up to 8 weeks while searching for a job. This policy will be in effect while ARRA funding is available or until September 30, 2011, whichever occurs first.

Montana: Parents receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job if the child care agency has been notified of the job loss.

Nebraska: Parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 2 calendar months, with a possible extension.

New Hampshire: Parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 40 days in a 6-month period.

New Jersey: Only TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job; they can receive child care assistance for up to 4 weeks of job search activities.

New Mexico: Only TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job; they can receive child care assistance for up to 6 weeks.

- New York: For TANF participants, child care assistance must be maintained while a parent searches for a job for up to 2 weeks, or 4 weeks if child care arrangements would be lost if child care assistance was not continued. For families who are not participating in TANF, child care assistance may be maintained while a parent searches for a job for up to 2 weeks, or 4 weeks if child care arrangements would be lost if child care assistance was not continued. In addition, each local social services district may choose to provide child care assistance to parents searching for a job for up to 6 months (including those receiving and applying for child care assistance) as funds are available.
- North Carolina: From July 1, 2009 until June 30, 2010, parents applying for or receiving child care assistance could receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 6 months. As of July 1, 2010, this policy ended for all new applicants and the state reverted to its previous policy, which limits the amount of time parents receiving child care can continue to receive it while searching for a job to 60 days and does not allow parents to qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.
- North Dakota: Parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job for up to 8 weeks in a calendar year.
- Ohio: Parents receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job for up to 30 days if they are scheduled to return to work, school, or training within that timeframe.
- Oklahoma: Parents receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job if they have been receiving assistance for at least 30 days and will continue to use the same child care provider. Only TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job and it must be part of their employability plan; they can receive child care assistance for up to 4 consecutive weeks.
- Oregon: Only TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.
- Pennsylvania: Parents who lose a job voluntarily can continue to receive child care assistance during a 13-day notification period. A parent who loses a job involuntarily can continue to receive child care assistance for up to 60 days, in addition to the 13-day notification period.
- Rhode Island: Parents receiving child care assistance may continue to receive it for up to 21 consecutive days from the beginning of a period of temporary unemployment resulting from a job loss or transition between jobs. Rhode Island Works Program participants can receive child care assistance while engaged in activities required to comply with their approved employment plan.
- South Dakota: The state's standard policy allows parents receiving child care assistance to continue to receive it while searching for a job for up to 30 days. The state is using ARRA funds to also allow parents applying for or receiving child care assistance to receive it while searching for a job for up to 2 months; this policy went into effect as of June 2009.
- Texas: Parents receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job for up to 4 weeks in a federal fiscal year.
- Utah: The state's standard child care assistance program, Employment Support Child Care, does not provide child care assistance while a parent searches for a job. However, the Kids-In-Care Program, which is funded through ARRA, allows parents to receive child care assistance for up to 100 hours while searching for a job. Kids-In-Care began in June 2009 and will end when ARRA expires. TANF participants, who had previously been allowed to receive child care assistance while searching for a job, will still be able to do so.
- Vermont: The amount of time parents can receive child care assistance while searching for a job can be extended.
- Washington: Parents receiving child care assistance can continue to receive it while searching for a job for up to a 28-day period twice per year or a total of 56 days once per year. Only TANF participants can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job, and it must be part of the family's plan.
- Wisconsin: If a parent loses a job, the family has 10 days before the authorization for child care assistance is ended. In addition, if the parent is laid off, but will be returning to work within 4 weeks, up to 4 weeks of child care assistance can be authorized. Only parents participating in Wisconsin Works or FoodShare Employment and Training can qualify for child care assistance while searching for a job.
- Wyoming: The state is using ARRA funds to allow parents to receive child care assistance while searching for a job. This policy went into effect as of June 2009. The state will stop providing child care assistance to parents searching for a job when ARRA funds are expended.

The National Women's Law Center is a nonprofit 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 continued assistance of the state child care administrators who provided the information included in this issue brief. The authors also thank Nancy Duff Campbell, Co-President, and Joan Entmacher, Vice President for Family Economic Security, for their comments.

This issue brief would not have been possible without the generous support for the Center's child care and early education work provided by the Birth to Five Policy Alliance, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Early Care and Education Consortium, Ford Foundation, George Gund Foundation, Hagedorn Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, A.L. Mailman Foundation, McKnight Foundation, Moriah Fund, Ms. Foundation for Women, New Prospect Foundation, William Penn Foundation, Scherman Foundation, Service Employees International Union, and an anonymous donor.

The findings and conclusions of this report are those of the authors alone, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of these funders.



11 Dupont Circle, NW Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
202.588.5180 ■ 202.588.5185
www.nwlc.org