

## **SECTION 9. CHILD CARE**

### **CONTENTS**

- Introduction**
- Employment and Marital Status of Mothers**
- Child Care Arrangements Used by Working Mothers**
- Child Care Costs**
- Supply and Characteristics of Child Care Providers**
  - Supply of Providers**
  - Wages of Child Care Center Staff**
  - Staff Turnover**
  - Employing Welfare Recipients as Child Care Workers**
- Child Care Standards and Quality**
  - Regulation and Licensing**
  - Research on Child Care Quality**
- The Federal Role**
  - Background and Overview**
  - Major Day Care Programs**
  - Child Care and Development Block Grant**
- Child Care Tables**
  - Child Care and Development Fund**
  - Families and Children Served, Type of Care, and Payment Type**
  - State Income Eligibility Limits**
  - Trends in Child Care Expenditures**
  - State CCDF Allocations**
- References**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Child care is an issue of significant public interest for several reasons. The dramatic increase in the labor force participation of mothers is the most important factor affecting the demand for child care in the last quarter century. Currently, in a majority of American families with children—even those with very young children—the mother is in the paid labor force. Similarly, an increasingly significant trend affecting the demand for child care is the proportion of mothers who are the sole or primary financial supporters of their children, either because of divorce or because they never married. In addition, child care has been a significant issue in recent debates over how to move welfare recipients toward employment and self-sufficiency; mothers on welfare may have difficulty entering the labor force because of child care problems. Finally, the impact of child care on the children themselves is an issue of considerable interest, with ongoing discussion of whether low-income children benefit from participation in programs with an early childhood development focus.

Concerns that child care may be in short supply, not of good enough quality, or too expensive for many families escalated during the late 1980s into a national debate over the nature and extent of the Nation's child care problems and what, if any, Federal interventions would be appropriate. The debate culminated in the enactment of legislation in 1990 that expanded Federal support for child care by establishing two new State child care grant programs. The programs—the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) and the At-Risk Child Care Program—were enacted as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508). These programs were preceded by enactment of a major welfare reform initiative, the Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–485), which authorized expanded child care assistance for welfare families and families leaving welfare. In 1996, as part of welfare reform legislation (the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, Public Law 104–193), these programs were consolidated into an expanded Child Care and Development Block Grant (sometimes referred to as the Child Care and Development Fund), which provides increased Federal funding and serves both low-income working families and families attempting to transition off welfare through work.

This chapter provides background information on the major indicators of the demand for and supply of child care, the role of standards and quality in child care, a summary description of the major Federal programs that fund child care services, and reported data from the largest of those sources of funding, the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF).

### **EMPLOYMENT AND MARITAL STATUS OF MOTHERS**

The dramatic increase in the labor force participation of mothers is commonly regarded as the most significant factor fueling the increased demand for child care services. A person is defined as participating in the labor force if she is working or seeking work. As shown in table 9–1, in 1947, just following World War II, slightly over one-fourth of all mothers with children between the ages of 6 and 17 were in the labor force. By contrast, in 1999 over three-quarters of such mothers were labor force participants. The increased labor force participation of mothers with younger children has also been dramatic. In 1947, it was unusual to find mothers with a preschool-age child in the labor force—only about 12 percent of mothers with children under the age of 6 were in the labor force. But in 1999, over 64 percent of mothers with preschool-age children were in the labor force, a rate more than 5 times higher than in 1947. Women with infant children have become increasingly engaged in the labor market as well. Today, 60 percent of all mothers whose youngest child is under age 2 are in the labor market, while in 1975 less than one-third of all such mothers were labor force participants.

The rise in the number of female-headed families has also contributed to increased demand for child care services. Single mothers maintain a greater share of all families with children today than in the past. Census data show that in 1970, 11 percent of families with children were headed by a single mother, compared with 26 percent of families with children in 1998. While the num-

ber of two-parent families with children did not fluctuate much between 1970 and 1998 (25.8 and 25.7 million respectively), the number of female-headed families with children almost tripled, increasing from 3.4 million families in 1970 to 9.8 million in 1998. These families headed by mothers were a major source of growth in the demand for child care.

TABLE 9-1.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF WOMEN, BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD, SELECTED YEARS, 1947-99

	No chil- dren under 18	With children under age 18				
		Total	Age 6- 17 only	Under age 6		
				Total	Under 3	Under 2
April 1947 .....	29.8	18.6	27.3	12.0	NA	NA
April 1950 .....	31.4	21.6	32.8	13.6	NA	NA
April 1955 .....	33.9	27.0	38.4	18.2	NA	NA
March 1960 .....	35.0	30.4	42.5	20.2	NA	NA
March 1965 .....	36.5	35.0	45.7	25.3	21.4	NA
March 1970 .....	42.8	42.4	51.6	32.2	27.3	NA
March 1975 .....	45.1	47.3	54.8	38.8	34.1	31.5
March 1980 .....	48.1	56.6	64.3	46.8	41.9	39.2
March 1985 .....	50.4	62.1	69.9	53.5	49.5	48.0
March 1986 .....	50.5	62.8	70.4	54.4	50.8	49.2
March 1987 .....	50.5	64.7	72.0	56.7	52.9	51.9
March 1988 .....	51.2	65.0	73.3	56.1	52.5	50.8
March 1989 .....	51.9	65.7	74.2	56.7	52.4	51.7
March 1990 .....	52.3	66.7	74.7	58.2	53.6	52.1
March 1991 .....	52.0	66.6	74.4	58.4	54.5	53.8
March 1992 .....	52.3	67.2	75.9	58.0	54.5	54.3
March 1993 .....	52.1	66.9	75.4	57.9	53.9	54.2
March 1994 .....	53.1	68.4	76.0	60.3	57.1	<sup>1</sup> 56.7
March 1995 .....	52.9	69.7	76.4	62.3	58.7	<sup>1</sup> 57.9
March 1996 .....	53.0	70.2	77.2	62.3	59.0	57.9
March 1997 .....	53.6	72.1	78.1	65.0	61.8	59.9
March 1998 .....	54.1	72.3	78.4	65.2	62.2	62.1
March 1999 .....	54.3	72.1	78.5	64.4	60.7	60.6

<sup>1</sup> Includes mothers in the Armed Forces.

NA—Not available.

Note.—Data for 1994 and beyond are not directly comparable with data for 1993 and earlier years because of introduction of a major redesign in the Current Population Survey (household survey) questionnaire and collection methodology and the introduction of 1990 census-based population controls, adjusted for the estimated undercount (Polivka & Rothgeb, 1993).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mothers' attachment to the labor force differs depending on the age of their youngest child and marital status, as tables 9-2 and 9-3 show. Table 9-2 exhibits the labor force participation rates of various demographic groups of mothers with youngest child over or under age 6. The table provides graphic evidence of the exploding rate of working mothers, especially working mothers with preschool children.

TABLE 9-2.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BY MARITAL STATUS AND AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD, SELECTED YEARS, 1970-99

	1970	1980	1987	1988	1990	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Percent increase, 1980-99
<b>Married women:</b>														
Youngest under 6 .....	30.3	45.0	56.8	57.1	58.9	59.9	59.6	61.7	63.5	62.7	63.3	63.7	61.8	37.3
Youngest 6 or older .....	49.2	61.8	70.6	72.5	73.6	75.4	74.9	76.0	76.2	76.7	77.6	76.8	77.1	24.8
<b>Separated women:</b>														
Youngest under 6 .....	45.4	52.2	55.1	53.0	59.3	55.7	52.1	59.2	59.3	63.1	70.2	70.7	75.7	45.0
Youngest 6 or older .....	60.6	66.6	72.6	69.3	75.0	71.6	71.6	70.7	71.5	73.3	76.1	79.6	78.5	17.9
<b>Divorced women:</b>														
Youngest under 6 .....	63.3	68.3	70.5	70.1	69.8	65.9	68.1	67.5	73.3	76.5	78.7	74.7	80.5	17.9
Youngest 6 or older .....	82.4	82.3	84.5	83.9	85.9	85.9	83.6	84.9	85.2	85.5	85.1	85.5	85.0	3.3
<b>Never-married women:</b>														
Youngest under 6 .....	NA	44.1	49.9	44.7	48.7	45.8	47.4	52.2	53.0	55.1	65.1	66.3	68.1	54.4
Youngest 6 or older .....	NA	67.6	64.1	67.1	69.7	67.2	70.2	67.5	67.0	71.8	74.0	81.2	82.7	22.3
All women .....	<sup>1</sup> 52.9	56.6	64.7	65.0	66.7	67.2	66.9	68.4	69.7	70.2	72.1	72.3	72.1	27.4

<sup>1</sup>Excludes never-married women.

NA—Not available.

Note.—Data for 1994 and beyond are not directly comparable with data for 1993 and earlier years because of introduction of a major redesign in the Current Population Survey (household survey) questionnaire and collection methodology and the introduction of 1990 census-based population controls, adjusted for the estimated undercount (Polivka & Rothgeb, 1993).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 9-3.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF WOMEN WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18, BY MARITAL STATUS AND AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD, MARCH 1999

Marital status	Age of youngest child						
	Under 3	Under 6	Under 18	3-5	6-13	6-17	14-17
Married, spouse present .....	59.2	61.8	70.1	63.5	76.4	77.1	78.7
Divorced .....	81.5	80.5	84.0	80.5	86.3	85.0	82.2
Separated .....	69.3	75.7	77.3	80.4	77.8	78.5	80.6
Widowed .....	48.1	50.4	63.1	51.8	67.2	65.5	62.5
Never married .....	62.3	68.1	73.4	77.5	84.0	82.7	76.0
All women with children under 18 .....	60.7	64.4	72.1	69.5	78.3	78.5	78.9

Note.—Labor force participation rates include nonworking mothers who are actively looking for work.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 9-3 provides a detailed breakdown of the labor force participation of women for March 1999 by marital status and the age of the youngest child. Among those with children under 18, divorced women have the highest labor force participation rate (84.0 percent), followed by separated women (77.3 percent). The labor force participation rate for never-married mothers with children under 18 grew to over 73 percent in 1999, a 21 percent increase over the 1996 rate. In 1996, never-married mothers trailed all other marital status groups (with children under 18) in labor force participation, but by 1999, the participation rate for never-married mothers surpassed married women (70 percent) and widowed mothers (63 percent).

As table 9-3 illustrates, labor force participation rates tend to increase regardless of the marital status of the mother as the age of the youngest child increases. Among all women with children under 18, 61 percent of those with a child under 3 participate, 70 percent of those whose youngest child is between 3 and 5 participate, and 79 percent of those whose youngest child is between 14 and 17 participate.

While there has been a substantial increase in the proportion of mothers in the labor force, the data can be misleading without examining employment status. Although 72 percent of mothers participated in the labor force in 1999, table 9-4 shows 50 percent worked full time and 18 percent worked part time (less than 35 hours per week). Therefore, in 1999, about 30 percent of mothers were actively looking for work, but not employed. Forty-one percent of mothers with children under age 6 worked full time, and 19 percent worked part time.

Table 9-4 reveals that how much mothers' work differs according to their marital status and the age of their children. It also indicates that changes have occurred between 1996 and 1999. The 1996 welfare reform law's new emphasis on work is likely to have affected the employment status of the never-married mother subgroup most significantly, and that is reflected in the table. Overall, the percent of all mothers (with children under 18) employed full

time grew from slightly over 47 percent in 1996 to just over 50 percent in 1999. Within the subgroup of never-married mothers, the 3 year period was accompanied by a larger increase in full-time employment. In 1996, about 35 percent of never-married mothers with children under 18 were employed full time. By 1999, the figure had increased to over 48 percent. The percent of never-married mothers working full time with children under age 6 had grown comparably, increasing from almost 29 percent in 1996 to over 41 percent in 1999. Within the divorced mothers subgroup, there were increases between the years, but the differences are not nearly as large as within the never-married subgroup. In 1999, the percent of all divorced mothers employed full time with children under 18 had reached almost 69 percent, a 2 percentage point increase since 1996. For those with children under 6, over 60 percent worked full time in 1999. The employment status of married mothers is shown to have changed little or not at all since 1996, depending on full- or part-time status, and age of children.

TABLE 9-4.—PERCENT OF MOTHERS BY FULL- OR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT STATUS, MARCH 1996<sup>1</sup> and 1999

Marital status	With children under 18		With children under 6	
	1996	1999	1996	1999
Married, spouse present:				
Employed full time .....	46.3	48.0	39.4	39.4
Employed part time .....	21.3	20.0	20.9	20.2
Divorced:				
Employed full time .....	66.2	68.5	56.5	60.6
Employed part time .....	12.6	11.9	12.9	13.3
Never married:				
Employed full time .....	35.5	48.6	28.8	41.4
Employed part time .....	13.8	16.1	15.1	17.5
All mothers:				
Employed full time .....	47.5	50.4	39.0	41.1
Employed part time .....	19.0	18.4	19.1	19.3

<sup>1</sup> Full-time workers work 35 hours or more per week.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

### CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS USED BY WORKING MOTHERS

Data are collected periodically by the U.S. Census Bureau on the types of child care arrangements used by families with working mothers. The most recent U.S. Census Bureau statistics available on child care arrangements are based on data collected by the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) for the fall of 1995 (although the Census Bureau has not published a report with these data, the data are available on their Website at [www.census.gov/DES/www/welcome.htm](http://www.census.gov/DES/www/welcome.htm)). Because the interview questions obtain information about both paid and unpaid substitute care used while the mother works, it provides information on categories of care that

generally are not considered child care, such as care provided by the father, or care by a sibling.

The 1995 data indicate that the types of child care arrangements used by families while the mother works vary depending on the age of the child, as well as the mother's work schedule (full- or part-time), marital status, and family income. Table 9-5 shows the distribution of primary child care arrangements provided for preschoolers (children under age 5), by marital status and mother's work schedule. In the 1995 SIPP survey, parents were asked to estimate the number of hours a child spends in any of several care arrangements during a week, rather than to identify the child's "primary" care arrangement while the mother worked. In tables 9-5 and 9-6, the primary child care arrangement is based on the arrangement in which a child spends the most hours in a typical week. In the case of a child who spends equal time between arrangements, the child would have more than one primary arrangement.

TABLE 9-5.—PRIMARY CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 WITH AN EMPLOYED MOTHER, BY MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE MOTHER, FALL 1995

[In percent]

Type of arrangement	Mothers with children under 5 years		
	Total	Employed full time	Employed part time
All marital statuses			
Care in child's home:			
By grandparent .....	5.9	5.4	6.5
By sibling age 15 or older .....	0.7	0.5	1.1
By sibling under age 15 .....	0.3	0.3	0.3
By other relative .....	1.5	2.3	3.1
By nonrelative .....	5.0	4.6	5.4
Total .....	13.5	13.1	16.4
Care in another home:			
By grandparent .....	10.0	9.1	11.1
By other relative .....	2.9	3.0	2.4
By family day care provider <sup>1</sup> .....	15.7	18.9	9.6
By nonrelative .....	7.9	9.0	5.8
Total .....	36.5	40.1	29.0
Organized child care facility:			
Day/group care center .....	17.8	20.2	13.1
Nursery school/preschool .....	5.9	6.3	5.2
Kindergarten/grade school .....	0.7	0.6	0.7
Head Start Program .....	1.5	1.4	1.6
Total .....	25.8	28.5	20.8
Parental care:			
By father .....	16.6	12.8	22.7

TABLE 9-5.—PRIMARY CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 WITH AN EMPLOYED MOTHER, BY MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE MOTHER, FALL 1995—Continued

[In percent]

Type of arrangement	Mothers with children under 5 years		
	Total	Employed full time	Employed part time
By mother at work <sup>2</sup> .....	5.4	3.6	8.3
Child cares for self .....	0.1	0.1	0.0
Total .....	22.1	16.6	31.0
Total children of employed mothers (in thousands) .....	10,022	6,336	3,601
	Married, husband present		
Care in child's home:			
By grandparent .....	5.0	5.1	4.6
By sibling age 15 or older .....	0.7	0.6	0.9
By sibling under age 15 .....	0.3	0.3	0.4
By other relative .....	1.0	0.8	1.4
By nonrelative .....	5.9	5.3	6.9
Total .....	13.0	12.1	14.2
Care in another home:			
By grandparent .....	9.3	8.5	10.6
By other relative .....	2.8	2.8	2.6
By family day care provider .....	16.3	20.6	9.3
By nonrelative <sup>1</sup> .....	7.2	8.1	5.7
Total .....	35.6	40.1	28.2
Organized child care facility:			
Day/group care center .....	16.7	19.6	11.9
Nursery school/preschool .....	5.9	6.4	5.1
Kindergarten/grade school .....	0.5	0.4	0.6
Head Start Program .....	0.7	0.5	1.0
Total .....	23.7	26.9	18.7
Parental care:			
By father .....	18.8	14.7	25.5
By mother at work <sup>2</sup> .....	6.3	4.2	9.9
Child cares for self .....	0.1	0.1	0.0
Total .....	25.2	19.0	35.4
Total children of employed mothers (in thousands) .....	7,582	4,702	2,809
	All other marital statuses <sup>3</sup>		
Care in child's home:			
By grandparent .....	8.4	6.2	12.9



TABLE 9-5.—PRIMARY CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 WITH AN EMPLOYED MOTHER, BY MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE MOTHER, FALL 1995—Continued

[In percent]

Type of arrangement	Mothers with children under 5 years		
	Total	Employed full time	Employed part time
By sibling age 15 or older .....	0.8	0.3	1.8
By sibling under age 15 .....	0.3	0.5	0.0
By other relative .....	3.0	3.1	2.9
By nonrelative .....	2.2	2.8	1.1
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>18.7</b>
Care in another home:			
By grandparent .....	12.0	11.1	13.3
By other relative .....	3.1	3.6	2.1
By family day care provider <sup>1</sup> .....	14.0	15.0	11.4
By nonrelative .....	9.9	11.7	6.5
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>33.2</b>
Organized child care facility:			
Day/group care center .....	20.9	22.5	17.9
Nursery school/preschool .....	6.1	6.2	5.9
Kindergarten/grade school .....	1.2	1.1	1.3
Head Start Program .....	3.9	4.0	3.7
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>28.8</b>
Parental care:			
By father .....	10.3	8.1	14.9
By mother at work <sup>2</sup> .....	2.8	2.3	3.7
Child cares for self .....	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>18.6</b>
<b>Total children of employed mothers (in thousands) .....</b>	<b>2,368</b>	<b>1,627</b>	<b>741</b>

<sup>1</sup> Family day care providers provide care outside the home for more than one child.<sup>2</sup> Includes women working at home or away from home.<sup>3</sup> Includes married, husband absent (including separated), widowed, divorced, and never-married women.

Source: Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 9-5 shows that over 36 percent of families of preschoolers with working mothers in 1995 primarily relied on care in another home by a relative, family day care provider, or other nonrelative, compared to almost 26 percent of families whose primary arrangement was an organized child care facility. These data mark a change from the fall 1994 survey results, which revealed that over 30 percent of families used organized child care as their primary arrangement. However, some of the decline in the use of organized child care facilities and increase in care out of another's home may

reflect a change in the 1995 survey, which more clearly defined care types, by asking specifically about family day care providers (providers caring for more than one child outside the child's home), as distinct from organized group day care. Relative care, either in the child's home or the relative's home, was used by 21 percent of families of preschool children with employed mothers. Over one-fifth of families with young children did not rely on others for help with child care arrangements while the mother worked, but instead used parental care (22 percent), especially care by fathers (almost 17 percent). Only 5 percent of families relied on care provided in the child's home by a nonrelative.

Preschool children of part-time employed mothers were much more likely to be cared for by a parent (31 percent), than by an organized child care facility (21 percent), and also more likely to be cared for by a relative, family provider, or nonrelative in another home (29 percent). Mothers employed full time were more likely to use family day care providers (19 percent) and organized day care centers (20 percent) than any other form of care. Care by grandparents, either in or out of the child's home, was the next most utilized category for full-time (14 percent), and part-time employed mothers (18 percent).

Table 9-6 shows the types of afterschool arrangements used in 1995 for school-age children by working mothers, as well as cases in which there were no arrangements used at all. The 1995 survey asked more questions about arrangements than in earlier years (for instance, it specifically asked about care by a sibling), and this may account for some of the increase in the "care in child's home" category. In 1993, 11 percent of children age 5-14 were being cared for afterschool in the child's home, whereas in 1995 this figure had increased to almost 20 percent. Of those children age 5-14 with employed mothers in 1995, over 10 percent were cared for by a sibling (over 3 percent by a sibling under age 15). Afterschool care by fathers also increased substantially from 1993 to 1995. In 1993, just over 11 percent of children were primarily cared for by fathers during afterschool time, compared to 21 percent in 1995. A total of 2.5 million school-age children (11.6 percent of children age 5-14) were reported to be in self-care or to be unsupervised by an adult for some time while their mothers were working. It is not known if the children in the "no care mentioned" category were unsupervised, or if other factors may account for their not being reported in a child care arrangement, such as travel time from school. Regardless, the 1995 survey instrument appears to have been more effective in identifying types of child care arrangements, since only 1.6 percent of children reportedly fall in the "no care mentioned" category, a sharp decline from 46 percent in the 1993 survey.

Table 9-7 shows the types of child care arrangements used in 1995 for children under 5 by the economic well-being of the family. The 9.2 percent of poor children being cared for in the child's home by a relative or nonrelative in 1995 represents a marked decrease from over 18 percent reported in 1994. The percent of nonpoor children in this category remained unchanged at 14 percent. Nonpoor children in 1995 were more likely than poor children to be cared for in another home by either a relative, family day care provider, or other nonrelative. Poor families were more likely than nonpoor

families to not mention any regular arrangement (10 percent versus 1 percent).

TABLE 9-6.—AFTERSCHOOL CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS USED BY EMPLOYED MOTHERS FOR CHILDREN 5-14, FALL 1995

Type of arrangement	Number (in thousands)	Percent
Care in child's home:		
By grandparent .....	795	3.7
By sibling age 15 or older .....	1,452	6.8
By sibling under age 15 .....	750	3.5
By other relative .....	426	2.0
By nonrelative .....	733	3.4
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>4,157</b>	<b>19.4</b>
Care in another home:		
By grandparent .....	1,469	6.8
By other relative .....	515	2.4
By family day care provider <sup>1</sup> .....	1,239	5.8
By nonrelative .....	890	4.1
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>4,113</b>	<b>19.2</b>
Organized child care facility:		
Day/group care center .....	405	1.9
Nursery school/preschool .....	200	0.9
After/before school program .....	1,065	5.0
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,669</b>	<b>7.8</b>
Parental care:		
By father .....	4,515	21.0
By mother at work <sup>2</sup> .....	981	4.6
Child cares for self .....	2,496	11.6
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>7,992</b>	<b>37.2</b>
No care mentioned .....	349	1.6
<b>Total children .....</b>	<b>19,506</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>1</sup>Family day care providers provide care outside the child's home for more than one child.

<sup>2</sup>Includes women working at home or away from home.

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service based on data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 9-8 shows the primary arrangements used by working mothers for their preschool-aged children from June 1977 through

TABLE 9-7.—PRIMARY CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS USED BY EMPLOYED MOTHERS FOR CHILDREN UNDER 5, BY POVERTY STATUS OF THE MOTHER, FALL 1995

[In percent]

Type of arrangement	Total <sup>1</sup>	Poor <sup>2</sup>	Not poor
<b>Care in child's home:</b>			
By grandparent .....	5.9	4.7	6.1
By sibling age 15 or older .....	0.7	2.4	0.5
By sibling under age 15 .....	0.3	0.0	0.4
By other relative .....	1.5	0.8	1.6
By nonrelative .....	5.0	1.3	5.4
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>13.5</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>14.0</b>
<b>Care in another home:</b>			
By grandparent .....	10.0	11.5	9.7
By other relative .....	2.9	2.6	2.9
By family day care provider <sup>3</sup> .....	15.7	10.0	16.3
By nonrelative .....	7.9	5.3	8.2
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>36.5</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>37.2</b>
<b>Organized child care facility:</b>			
Day/group care center .....	17.8	16.5	18.0
Nursery school/preschool .....	5.9	6.8	5.8
Kindergarten/grade school .....	0.7	2.1	0.5
Head Start Program .....	1.5	2.8	1.3
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>25.8</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>25.6</b>
<b>Parental care:</b>			
By father .....	16.6	17.9	16.5
By mother at work <sup>4</sup> .....	5.4	5.0	5.4
Child cares for self .....	0.1	0.0	0.1
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>22.1</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>22.0</b>
No regular arrangement mentioned .....	2.2	10.3	1.2
<b>Total children of employed mothers (in thousands)</b> .....	<b>10,022</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>9,034</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes children for which no poverty estimates were available.

<sup>2</sup> Below the poverty threshold, which was \$15,569 annually or \$1,297 monthly in 1995 for a family of four.

<sup>3</sup> Family day care providers provide care outside the child's home for more than one child.

<sup>4</sup> Includes women working at home or away from home.

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service based on data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 9-8.—PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 IN SELECTED CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS, SELECTED YEARS 1977-95

Family status and date of survey	Percent of children cared for by				
	Father	Mother <sup>1</sup>	Grandparent	Family day care <sup>2</sup>	Day care center/nursery school
<b>All families:</b>					
Fall 1995 .....	16.6	5.4	15.9	<sup>3</sup> 23.6	23.7
Fall 1994 .....	18.4	5.5	16.3	15.4	29.4
Fall 1993 .....	15.9	6.2	16.5	16.6	29.9
Fall 1991 .....	20.0	8.7	15.8	17.9	23.0
Fall 1990 .....	16.5	6.4	14.3	20.1	27.5
Fall 1988 .....	15.1	7.6	13.9	23.6	25.8
Fall 1987 .....	15.3	8.9	13.8	22.3	24.4
Fall 1986 .....	14.5	7.4	15.7	24.0	22.4
Winter 1985 ...	15.7	8.1	15.9	22.3	23.1
June 1977 .....	14.4	11.4	NA	22.4	13.0
<b>Married couples:</b>					
Fall 1995 .....	18.8	6.3	14.3	23.5	22.6
Fall 1994 .....	22.3	6.3	13.5	15.7	29.0
Fall 1993 .....	19.3	6.9	14.4	16.4	30.0
Fall 1991 .....	22.9	9.8	13.7	17.1	22.7
Fall 1990 .....	19.8	7.8	13.0	19.7	26.8
Fall 1988 .....	17.9	8.7	11.8	23.7	25.4
Fall 1987 .....	18.2	10.1	12.2	22.2	23.4
Fall 1986 .....	17.9	8.3	14.1	24.4	20.3
Winter 1985 ...	18.8	9.2	13.9	21.8	22.3
June 1977 .....	17.1	12.9	NA	22.6	11.6
<b>Single mothers:</b>					
Fall 1995 .....	10.3	2.8	20.4	23.9	27.0
Fall 1994 .....	5.4	2.5	25.4	14.6	30.5
Fall 1993 .....	3.4	3.5	24.6	17.3	29.5
Fall 1991 .....	7.0	3.7	24.8	21.3	24.5
Fall 1990 .....	3.2	0.7	20.0	27.8	30.4
Fall 1988 .....	1.5	2.4	23.9	22.8	27.8
Fall 1987 .....	2.3	3.4	20.8	22.3	28.3
Fall 1986 .....	1.4	3.8	20.3	22.4	30.2
Winter 1985 ...	2.2	3.5	24.5	24.4	26.7
June 1977 .....	0.8	4.4	NA	21.8	19.1

<sup>1</sup> Includes mothers working at home or away from home.

<sup>2</sup> Children cared for in another home by nonrelatives.

<sup>3</sup> The 1995 survey asked specifically about "family day care providers," caring for more than one child. This figure includes these providers as well as nonrelatives caring for one child outside the child's home.

NA—Not available.

Note.—Data are the principal arrangement used by mothers during most of their hours at work. Single mothers include women never married, widowed, divorced, and separated.

Source: Survey of Income and Program Participation and the June 1977 Current Population Survey and Casper et al. (1994).

the fall of 1995. In general, the table does not show dramatic changes in the arrangements used during this time period, except with regard to day care centers and nursery schools. As mentioned above, the increase in family day care in 1995 (to 23.6 percent) may be due in part to a change in the survey instrument, clarifying use of the term “family day care.”

The U.S. Census Bureau data discussed above reflect child care arrangements in the fall of 1995. More recently, data from the 1997 National Survey of America’s Families (NSAF), collected by the Urban Institute, can be used to examine primary child care arrangements used by children under 5 with employed mothers nationally, and across 12 individual States. Table 9–9 shows that nationwide, 41 percent of preschool children with employed mothers are in care for 35 or more hours per week (Capizzano & Adams, 2000a). One-quarter are in care for 15–34 hours per week, 16 percent for 1–14 hours per week, and 18 percent spend no hours in nonparental child care. For preschool children with mothers employed full time, the number of children in full-time care (35 or more hours) increases to 52 percent. Children that are 3 and 4 years old are slightly more likely to be in full-time care than younger preschoolers (44 percent versus 39 percent). Children in high-income families are almost equally as likely to spend 35 or more hours a week in child care as low-income children (42 percent versus 40 percent), although high-income children are more likely than low-income children to be in part-time care (42 percent versus 37 percent). Twenty-three percent of low-income children are reported to spend no hours in nonparental care, compared to 16 percent of high-income children.

TABLE 9–9.—PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE WITH EMPLOYED MOTHERS IN DIFFERENT HOURS OF NONPARENTAL CARE, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

	Hours in care			
	None	1–14	15–34	35+
All children .....	18	16	25	41
Mothers working full time .....	17	12	18	52
Child’s age:				
Under 3 years .....	21	17	23	39
3–4 years .....	13	14	28	44
Family income:				
200 percent of poverty and below .....	23	16	21	40
Above 200 percent of poverty .....	16	15	27	42

Source: Urban Institute calculations from the 1997 National Survey of America’s Families.

According to the 1997 NSAF (table 9–10), 32 percent of preschool children use center-based child care as their primary arrangement, while about half that number (16 percent) are in family child care (Capizzano, Adams, & Sonenstein, 2000). About 6 percent are primarily cared for in the child’s home by a babysitter or nanny. Twenty-three percent of children under 5 are cared for primarily by a relative, either inside or outside the child’s home, while almost a quarter (24 percent) of children are in the care of a parent. The

analysis of individual States revealed that there is considerable State variation in the use of specific primary child care arrangements.

TABLE 9-10.—PRIMARY CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN UNDER FIVE WITH EMPLOYED MOTHERS, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

[In percent]

	Center-based care	Family child care	Relative care	Parent care <sup>1</sup>	Nanny/babysitter
All children .....	32	16	23	24	6
Child's age:					
Under 3 years .....	22	17	27	27	7
3-4 years .....	45	14	17	18	6
Family income:					
200 percent of poverty and below ....	26	14	28	28	4
Above 200 percent of poverty .....	35	17	20	21	7

<sup>1</sup>The NSAF's questions focused on nonparental arrangements and did not include questions about care provided by another parent, care for the child while the parent was at work, or care for the child at home by a self-employed parent. Those respondents not reporting a child care arrangement are assumed to be in one of these forms of care and are coded into the parent care category.

Source: Urban Institute calculations from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families.

The Urban Institute's analysis also examined how child care arrangements vary according to both age of child and family income. The survey data indicate that nationally, infants and toddlers are more likely to be cared for by relatives (27 percent) and parents (27 percent) than to be in center-based care (22 percent) or family child care (17 percent). As preschoolers grow older (age 3 and 4), use of relative and parent care decreases (17 and 18 percent respectively), and center-based care becomes the most commonly used primary arrangement (45 percent). Use of family child care remains relatively steady at 14 percent for 3- and 4-year-olds.

At the national level, children under age 5 in families below 200 percent of poverty are less likely than high-income children to use center-based care as a primary arrangement (26 percent versus 35 percent). Relative care and parent care are used equally by low-income families (28 percent each), and more often than by high-income families, of which 20 percent use relative care and 21 percent parent care. Low- and high-income children are almost equally likely to use family child care as their primary arrangement (14 and 17 percent respectively).

In addition to looking at the primary child care arrangements for children under 5, Urban Institute researchers used the 1997 NSAF to examine the number of arrangements used to care for a child, and the hours that are spent in each type of arrangement. As shown in table 9-11, nationally, 38 percent of children under 5 combine more than one child care arrangement each week (Capizzano & Adams, 2000b). Of those, 8 percent combine three or more arrangements. The remaining 62 percent have only one child care arrangement. Children under age 3 are less likely to have multiple child care arrangements than 3- and 4-year-olds (34 per-

cent versus 44 percent). Children aged 3 and 4 are three times as likely to be in three or more care arrangements. Of the children in multiple arrangements, most use a combination of formal and informal care, regardless of age or income. Children from low- and high-income families are almost equally likely to be in multiple child care arrangements (37 and 40 percent respectively). As seen with primary arrangements, there is considerable State variation in the use of multiple arrangements.

TABLE 9-11.—NUMBER OF NONPARENTAL CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS USED BY CHILDREN UNDER FIVE WITH EMPLOYED MOTHERS, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

[In percent]

	One arrangement	Two arrangements	Three or more arrangements
All children .....	62	30	8
Child's age:			
Under 3 years .....	65	30	4
3-4 years .....	56	31	13
Family income:			
200 percent of poverty and below .....	63	30	7
Above 200 percent of poverty .....	60	31	9

Source: Urban Institute calculations from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families.

### CHILD CARE COSTS

Research studies have found that the majority of families with working mothers and preschool children purchase child care services. The tendency to purchase care and the amount spent on care, both in absolute terms and as a percent of family income, generally varies by the type of child care used, family type (married or single mothers), and the family's economic status.

The most recent data on child care expenditures by families are from the Survey of Income and Program Participation for the fall of 1995. These data show that 64 percent of families with employed mothers paid for child care for their preschool-aged children. Nonpaid child care was most typically provided by relatives. Families with mothers employed full time were more likely to purchase care for their young children than those with mothers working part time. Among families with full-time working mothers, 73 percent paid for child care, compared to 50 percent of families with mothers employed part time. Likewise, as shown in table 9-12, families with higher incomes were more likely to purchase care than families with lower incomes, with the exception of families with monthly incomes between \$1,200 and \$3,000. For example, 71 percent of families with monthly incomes of \$4,500 or more purchased child care in the fall of 1995, while only 60 percent of families with monthly incomes of less than \$1,200 purchased care.

Average weekly costs per family for all preschool-aged children were \$83 in 1995 for those families that purchased care (table 9-12). Married-couple families devoted a smaller percentage of their



TABLE 9-12.—AVERAGE WEEKLY CHILD CARE EXPENDITURES FOR PRESCHOOLERS AND PERCENTAGE OF INCOME SPENT ON CARE, BY POVERTY STATUS AND FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1995

	Percent paying for care	Average weekly cost of care	Percent of family income spent on care
<b>All families:</b>			
Poverty status:			
Below poverty .....	54	\$59.22	35.7
Above poverty .....	66	84.75	10.3
Monthly family income:			
Less than \$1,200 .....	60	60.32	36.7
\$1,200–\$2,999 .....	57	69.25	15.2
\$3,000–\$4,499 .....	65	75.95	9.4
\$4,500 and over .....	71	101.09	6.8
Total .....	64	82.74	12.3
<b>Married-couple families:</b>			
Poverty status:			
Below poverty .....	32	72.72	26.9
Above poverty .....	66	87.08	8.8
Monthly family income:			
Less than \$1,200 .....	31	54.72	23.7
\$1,200–\$2,999 .....	53	66.02	13.1
\$3,000–\$4,499 .....	66	76.06	9.4
\$4,500 and over .....	72	103.04	6.9
Total .....	65	86.84	9.1
<b>Families with an absent father:</b>			
Poverty status:			
Below poverty .....	62	56.59	37.5
Above poverty .....	65	75.35	16.3
Monthly family income:			
Less than \$1,200 .....	66	60.91	38.1
\$1,200–\$2,999 .....	64	73.59	18.0
\$3,000–\$4,499 .....	55	75.00	9.0
\$4,500 and over .....	68	78.78	5.9
Total .....	64	70.41	21.7

Note.—Data are for all child care arrangements used by working mothers. Estimates are not consistent with prior year's Green Book data, which represented the principal arrangement used by mothers during most of their hours at work.

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service based on an analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, 1993 panel, wave 9.

income to child care (9 percent) than single-parent families (22 percent), but their child care expenditures were nonetheless greater (\$87 per week) than those of single-parent families (about \$70 per week).

Table 9–12 also shows that, while poor families spend fewer dollars for child care than higher income families, they spend a much greater percentage of their family income for child care. Thus, poor families spent only \$60 per week, but this amount represented 36 percent of their income. By contrast, nonpoor families spent \$85 per week on care, but this amount was only 10 percent of their income. A December 1997 survey of the cost of child care for a 4-year-old in urban child care centers across the country, conducted by the Children’s Defense Fund (Adams & Schulman, 1998) found that in every State, the average child care tuition exceeds \$3,000 per child, and is over \$5,000 per child in 17 States.

## **SUPPLY AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD CARE PROVIDERS**

### SUPPLY OF PROVIDERS

The variety of child care arrangements used by families has been discussed above, however, the studies of arrangements do not include estimates of the number of available providers. A comprehensive study of licensed centers, early education programs, center-based programs exempt from State or local licensing (such as programs sponsored by religious organizations or schools), and licensed family day care providers has not been conducted since the U.S. Department of Education’s Profile of Child Care Settings Study was released in 1991. That study reported that approximately 80,000 center-based early education and care programs were providing services in the United States at the beginning of 1990 (Kisker, Hofferth, Phillips, & Farquhar, 1991).

A less extensive, but more recent study, focusing only on regulated child care centers, was released by the Children’s Foundation in January 2000. The study reported that the number of regulated child care centers in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands totals 106,246 (Children’s Foundation, 2000). This is a 3.5 percent increase from the Foundation’s 1999 study’s total, and nearly a 19 percent increase from the total published by the Children’s Foundation’s first study of centers in 1991. The 2000 study notes that the definition of regulated child care center varies by State or territory. In 28 States, the number of regulated child care centers includes nursery schools, preschools, prekindergartens and religiously affiliated centers. In the remaining States and territories, the definition is less inclusive. For example, some States exclude nursery schools or religiously affiliated centers in their count.

The Children’s Foundation also conducts studies on family child care providers (as opposed to centers). Their 1999 report indicates that there are 290,667 regulated family child care homes, of which 249,622 are family day care homes (caring for up to 6 children) and 41,045 large group child care homes (in which providers generally care for 7–12 children). It is assumed by child care researchers that the number of unregulated family day care providers far exceeds the number of regulated family providers, though it is difficult to determine by how much. At the time of the aforementioned Profile of Child Care Settings Study of 1991, the number of regulated fam-

ily day care homes represented an estimated 10–18 percent of the total number of family day care providers.

The U.S. Census Bureau also collects data on the number of child care businesses in the United States. For a historical look at child care businesses in the early 1990s, a 1998 report used Census of Service Industries (CSI) data to provide information on the number and characteristics of child care businesses in 1992 (Casper & O'Connell, 1998). "Child care businesses" are defined as organized establishments engaged primarily in the care of infants or children, or providing prekindergarten education, where medical care or delinquency correction is not a major component. Not included in this definition are babysitting services or Head Start Programs that are coordinated with elementary schools. Based on the Census of Service Industries data, the number of incorporated child care centers doubled from 25,000 in 1977 to 51,000 in 1992.

#### WAGES OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF

No single data source provides comprehensive information on wages of child care workers. However, occupational data collected by the Department of Labor, when complemented by survey information gathered by organizations interested in child care issues, begin to paint a picture of the status of child care wages in the United States.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) collects wage data for 764 occupations, as surveyed by the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) Program. However, readers should be aware that the occupational categories create a misleading division in the child care work force. Center-based child care staff are described by the OES survey as either "preschoolteacher" or "child care worker," distinguishing the former as an individual who instructs children up to age 5 in developmental activities within a day care center, child development facility, or preschool, and the latter as a person who performs tasks such as dressing, feeding, bathing, and overseeing play of children. This division of tasks does not necessarily occur in actual child care settings, and therefore the survey's occupational group assignments, and wage distinctions made between those groups, should be interpreted with some caution. Nevertheless, the OES survey provides a general sense of wages within the child care field. Based on BLS data and OES survey results from 1997, the median hourly wage of a center-based "child care worker" was \$7.03, and a "preschoolteacher," \$9.09. Both these wages are considerably higher than the median hourly wage for family child providers, who, based on 1997 Current Population Survey data, earn an estimated median wage of \$4.69 per hour [based on a 55-hour week, which the Center for Child Care Workforce (1999) reports is the typical work week for U.S. family child care providers].

The National Child Care Staffing Study (NCCSS), originally launched in 1988, and most recently updated in 1997, provides additional information on child care center staff (Whitebook, Howes, & Phillips, 1998). Information on wages and characteristics of center staff was collected from 158 full-day, full-year, State licensed child care centers in five metropolitan areas around the country. Table 9–13 shows the study's findings on trends in hourly wages for center-based child care staff. Over the 10 year period of the

study, wages of child care center workers have remained relatively stagnant.

TABLE 9-13.—TRENDS IN HOURLY WAGES FOR CENTER-BASED CHILD CARE STAFF

Staff position	1988 Wage	1992 Wage	1997 Wage	Real change between 1992 and 1997	Real change between 1988 and 1997
Lowest-paid assist- ant .....	\$5.99	\$5.91	\$6.00	+1.5	+0.17 (+\$0.01 per hour)
Highest-paid assist- ant .....	6.96	7.03	7.00	-0.4	+0.57 (+\$0.04 per hour)
Lowest-paid teacher	7.38	7.55	7.50	-0.7	+1.6 (+\$0.12 per hour)
Highest-paid teacher	9.53	10.33	10.85	+5.0	+13.9 (+\$1.32 per hour)

Note.—All wages, and the 1988–97 trends, are in 1997 dollars. Each category reflects average wages for the position.

Source: Whitebook et al., 1998.

#### STAFF TURNOVER

Like many low-wage industries, turnover among the child care work force has been historically high. The NCCSS has tracked worker turnover and stability beginning with its initial study in 1988. In 1988, center directors in the sample reported a 41 percent average rate of annual turnover of teaching staff. In 1992, they reported average annual turnover of 26 percent for the year prior to the survey interview. By 1997, the rate had risen to 31 percent for all teaching staff, and one-fifth of centers reported losing half or more of their teaching staff in the previous year. The 10 percentage point decrease in turnover rates between 1988 and 1997 should be analyzed with caution, however, as the sample size of the NCCSS study dropped from 227 to 158. According to the study directors, a disproportionate number of the centers reporting the highest turnover in 1988 had closed by the time of the 1997 survey, leaving a sample of centers with potentially lower than average turnover rates for their areas. The issue of stability among centers themselves is not specifically addressed in the NCCSS study, however its authors do mention increasing reports of centers closing due to an insufficient supply of trained teachers. Better job opportunities and higher wages in other fields, due to a strong economy, have been identified as recent major causes of turnover. Ninety-three percent of directors reported taking more than 2 weeks to find replacements for departing teaching staff and over one-third (37 percent) reported taking over a month to do so. The effect of staff turnover on children is one of several topics that continues to receive attention during ever-growing discussions of how to measure child care quality.

### EMPLOYING WELFARE RECIPIENTS AS CHILD CARE WORKERS

Passage of welfare reform legislation in 1996, and its emphasis on moving recipients into work, created expectations of an increase in demand for child care, and recipients themselves were identified by some as a potential new source of child care workers. The 1997 NCCSS therefore gathered information from child care directors regarding the employment of welfare recipients (recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) as center staff. The study found that approximately one-third (35 percent) of the child care centers in the sample employ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) recipients, that those centers employing TANF recipients are more likely to pay lower wages across all positions, and that those centers experience higher teaching staff turnover. While the median wage reported for TANF workers is \$5.50 per hour (in 1997) compared to the \$6 per hour for all entry-level teaching assistants, 60 percent of centers pay TANF workers the same as their lowest-paid assistants, 23 percent pay them more, and 18 percent pay them less. Almost half (48 percent) of the centers employing TANF recipients report providing on-site training for TANF employees, 18 percent use community-based training programs, and 16 percent of the programs offer college credit-bearing training.

## CHILD CARE STANDARDS AND QUALITY

### REGULATION AND LICENSING

Regulation and licensing of child care providers is conducted primarily at the State and local levels, although the extent to which the Federal Government should play a role in this area has been a topic of debate for many years (see below). Licensing and regulation serves as a means of defining and enforcing minimum requirements for the legal operation of child care environments in which children will be safe from harm. There is no uniform way in which States and/or territories regulate child care centers, preschools, nursery schools, prekindergartens, and/or religiously affiliated child care centers. All States and territories do, however, require these center-based types of care (as opposed to family child care providers) to be regulated through licensing or registration. In the case of family day care providers, most States exempt certain providers—typically those serving smaller numbers of children from licensing or regulation. As mentioned in the earlier discussion of child care supply, the Children's Foundation survey found that there were 290,667 regulated family child care providers in the States and territories in 1999. If estimates from the 1990 child care settings study are applied, this number may represent only 10–18 percent of family child care, with the remaining facilities being unregulated. The count of centers that are regulated (meaning licensed or certified) totals 106,246 according to the Children's Foundation 2000 study.

Table 9–14 presents information on State licensing standards for child care centers, as collected by the Children's Foundation (2000). The table shows the number of States for which a select requirement or standard for child care centers applies, and in turn, how licensing standards vary across States. Note that all State vari-

ations in policy are not reflected in the table, and therefore totals by category will vary. Licensing standards are just one area that researchers continue to focus on when examining child care quality to determine whether higher licensing standards are associated with higher quality child care and better child outcomes.

TABLE 9–14.—NUMBER OF STATES WITH SELECTED CHILD CARE LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR REGULATED CHILD CARE CENTERS

Item	Number of States
Fee for licensing:	
No fee .....	23
Fixed fee .....	21
Assessed fee based on number of children cared for by provider .....	9
Frequency of required license renewal:	
Annually .....	23
Every 2 years .....	18
Every 3 years or nonexpiring .....	12
Required testing for asbestos, lead, radon, or other material:	
Yes .....	20
No .....	30
Inspection visits:	
All unannounced .....	9
Unannounced, annually (at minimum), and upon complaint .....	19
Unannounced, 2–4 per year .....	9
Unannounced upon complaint; other visits announced .....	7
All announced .....	1
Staff/child ratios:	
Infants, birth to 1 year:	
1:3 <sup>1</sup> .....	4
1:4 .....	31
Young toddlers, age 1–2:	
1:3 <sup>1</sup> .....	1
1:4 .....	15
Older toddlers, age 2–3:	
1:4–5 <sup>1</sup> .....	7
Preschoolers, age 3–5:	
1:6–7 <sup>1</sup> .....	1
Group size definitions:	
Yes .....	34
No .....	19
Regulation of “drop-in” child care .....	36
Smoking policy:	
Prohibited .....	35
Permitted in designated areas and with restrictions .....	17
Permitted .....	1
Required preservice training:	
CPR/first aid .....	23
Combined education and experience required:	
Head/lead teacher .....	41
Other teaching staff .....	29
None:	
Head/lead teacher .....	12

TABLE 9-14.—NUMBER OF STATES WITH SELECTED CHILD CARE LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR REGULATED CHILD CARE CENTERS—Continued

Item	Number of States
Other teaching staff .....	22
Inservice training requirements for all teaching staff:	
4-6 hours (annually) .....	6
7-13 hours (annually) .....	19
15-30 hours (annually) .....	16
None .....	5

<sup>1</sup> National Health and Safety Standard recommended ratios, developed by American Public Health Association and American Academy of Pediatrics.

Note.—All State variations in policy are not reflected in the table, and therefore totals by category will vary.

Source: The Children's Foundation, 2000 Child Care Center Licensing Study, Washington, DC, February, 2000.

#### RESEARCH ON CHILD CARE QUALITY

As women's labor force participation has grown over the past several decades, concerns about child care quality have increased. Highly publicized research on early brain development in infants and young children (under age 3) has drawn attention to what role child care may play in children's cognitive and social development. The relationship between quality of child care and outcomes for children is of increasing interest to parents, researchers, and policymakers. A growing body of research examines questions such as how to define the elements that correspond to quality child care, how to measure those elements, and ultimately, their effects on children both in the short- and long-term.

One comprehensive study of connections between child care and early childhood development is part of an ongoing project conducted by a team of researchers supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD, 1999), of the National Institutes of Health. The broad goal of the NICHD study, started in 1991, is to collect data on an ongoing basis from a sample of children and their families (located in 10 areas across the United States) to answer a range of questions about the relationship between child care characteristics and experiences, and children's developmental outcomes. The children and families in the study's sample vary in socioeconomic background, race, family structure, and type of child care used. The study design takes into account characteristics of the family and its environment to gain a more complete picture of the contribution that child care characteristics and experiences themselves make to children's development, above and beyond the contribution of the family environment. Even so, not all characteristics are observed, and the ability to completely disentangle all of the characteristics (both of the parents and the child) is difficult, if not impossible, in such a study. Children in the study are not randomly assigned to child care settings of varying degrees of quality, but are instead placed in settings of their parents' selection. The selection of care in and of itself may

reflect contributing variables—characteristics of the parents, children, and environment—that are not fully observed in the study. Likewise, a child's developmental outcomes in a particular setting may reflect the child's characteristics as much as the setting's quality. Although the NICHD study attempts to distinguish among some of these factors, the ability to interpret the results is somewhat constrained by selection bias.

The findings showed that in general, family characteristics and the quality of the mother's relationship with her child were stronger predictors of the child's development than were the characteristics of child care. The family characteristics such as income and mother's education were strong predictors of children's outcomes, for both children cared for solely by their mothers and children in extensive nonparental child care. The study did find a modest but consistent association between quality of nonparental child care over the first 3 years of life and children's cognitive and language development, regardless of family background. In this case, quality child care was defined as positive care giving and language stimulation; i.e., how often providers spoke to children, asked questions, and responded to children's questions.

The NICHD researchers also analyzed the more structural elements of child care in centers—elements that are generally regulated by the States (see table 9–14), but to varying degrees, such as child-staff ratio, group size, and teacher training and education. The researchers used recommended guidelines developed jointly by the American Public Health Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics to evaluate the degree to which standards were being met by centers used by families in the study. Twelve percent of the study's children were enrolled in child care centers at 6 months, and 38 percent at age 3. Findings indicate that the children in the centers that met some or all of the guidelines had better language comprehension and school readiness than the children who were in centers that did not meet the guidelines. There were also fewer behavioral problems for children age 2 and 3 in the centers that met the guidelines.

The researchers have continued to follow the children in the sample, and will release findings from the assessment of the children at 54 months of age, and again in first grade. Like other studies that examine the relationship between child care and developmental outcomes, the NICHD research aims to determine not just whether there are concurrent and short-term effects of child care on children's development, but long-term effects as well.

The study did not attempt to measure the quality of care offered by family child care providers or relatives according to the same set of guidelines used for center-based care. The most recent indepth observational study of family child care and relative care was published in 1994 by the Families and Work Institute. The study examined the care offered by 226 providers in 3 different communities in California, Texas, and North Carolina (Galinsky et al., 1994). Nonregulated family care providers may be nonregulated because they care for few enough children to be exempt from State regulation requirements, or, as the 1994 study found in their sample, 81 percent of the 54 nonregulated providers were illegally nonregulated, due to the fact that they were actually providing care for



a number of children over their State's limit. The quality of all types of family and relative care was determined according to measurements such as the setting's safety and the sensitivity and responsiveness of providers to the children. The study found that only 9 percent of the homes in the study sample were rated as good quality, while 56 percent were rated as adequate, and 35 percent inadequate. The researchers found that quality appeared to be higher when providers were trained and when they were caring for three to six children rather than one or two. As important, if not more so, in determining quality was whether the provider was committed to taking care of children, and had a sense that their work was important; participated in family child care training; thought ahead about the children's activities; was regulated; and followed standard business and safety practices. In the case of relative care, an important factor in the quality of the child's experience was whether the relative caring for the children did so out of desire, necessity, or both.

The Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes (1995, 1999) in Child Care Centers study conducted by researchers from four universities beginning in 1993, analyzes the influence of "typical" center-based child care on children's development during their preschool years and into elementary school. The "typical" centers were represented by a random sample of 401 full-day child care centers, half of them for-profit, half nonprofit, in regions of 4 States: California, Colorado, Connecticut, and North Carolina. Data on the quality and cost of services were collected, as well as data on the developmental progress of a sample of children in the selected centers.

Findings from the first phase of the study were released in 1995, and indicated that the quality of child care offered in over three-quarters of these "typical" centers in the United States did not meet "high standards" according to the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, which ranges from 1 ("low quality") to 7 ("high quality"). Eleven percent of centers in the sample scored below 3 ("minimally acceptable"). The researchers found that the quality of child care is primarily related to higher staff-to-child ratios, staff education, and administrators' previous experience. Teacher wages and education were also generally higher in higher quality centers. Like the NICHD study, the 1995 Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study also found that centers meeting higher licensing standards provided higher quality care.

In addition to examining the status of quality in the centers, the researchers wanted to determine what effects, if any, the quality of care had on children's development. The study's initial findings in 1995 indicated that children's cognitive and social development are positively related to the quality of their child care experience. This proved to be the case even after taking into account factors related to family background and associated with children's development (such as maternal education); the children in the low-quality care still scored lower on measures of cognitive and social development.

The findings from the second phase of the study, released in 1999, indicate that there are long-term effects of child care quality on children's development. Similar to the NICHD results, this study indicated that the impact of child care quality on children's

development was modest, but consistent, and applied even after taking into account child and family characteristics.

The extent to which the effects of quality child care and other early childhood program experiences “fade out” over time has long been an area of interest for researchers studying the connection between child care programs and children’s development. One of the longest-running research studies in this area is known as the Abecedarian Project, which began in the early 1970s. The project design consisted of a controlled study in which 57 infants, all from low-income families in North Carolina, were randomly assigned to an experimental group that would receive year-round, all-day educational child care/preschool emphasizing cognitive, language, and adaptive behavior skills (Burchinal et al., 1997; Campbell & Ramey, 1995). The control group of 54 infants received nutritional supplements and supportive social services (as did the experimental group), but did not receive the educational intervention emphasizing language, cognitive, and social development. The Abecedarian Project began in early infancy, and the children received the educational “treatment” for 5 years, a longer period than other programs. This study also differs from those discussed earlier in that it focuses solely on disadvantaged, low-income children.

Early findings of the project showed that from the age of 18 months through age 5 (the end of the program), children in the treatment group had higher scores on mental tests than children in the control group. In the primary grades through middle adolescence, children from the treatment group scored significantly higher on reading and math tests. Through age 15, the treatment group continued to score higher on mental tests, although the gap between the two groups had narrowed.

Most recently, the project’s researchers completed a followup study of the project’s participants (104 of the original 111) at age 21 (Campbell, 1999). Results showed that the 21-year-olds who had been in the treatment group had significantly higher mental test scores than those from the control group. Likewise, reading and math scores were higher for the treatment group, as had been the case since toddlerhood. Due to the longevity of the project, researchers were also able to look for differences in areas such as college enrollment and employment rates. The followup interviews revealed that about 35 percent of the young adults in the treatment group had either graduated from or were attending a 4 year college or university at the time of the assessment, compared to 14 percent of the control group.

A team of researchers from RAND evaluated the results of nine early childhood intervention programs, including the Abecedarian Project (Karoly et al., 1998). The RAND team determined that the nine early intervention programs evaluated in their study provided benefits for the participating disadvantaged children and their families. However, the Rand team pointed out that expanding model, resource-intensive programs like the Abecedarian Project to a larger scale may not necessarily result in the same developmental benefits.

## THE FEDERAL ROLE

### BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The Federal Government entered the child care business during the New Deal of the 1930s when federally funded nursery schools were established for poor children. The motivation for creating these nursery schools was not specifically to provide child care for working families. Rather, the schools were designed primarily to create jobs for unemployed teachers, nurses, and others, and also to provide a wholesome environment for children in poverty. However, when mothers began to enter the work force in large numbers during World War II, many of these nursery schools were continued and expanded. Federal funding for child care, and other community facilities, was available during the war years under the Lanham Act, which financed child care for an estimated 550,000–600,000 children before it was terminated in 1946.

The end of the war brought the expectation that mothers would return home to care for their children. However, many women chose to remain at work and the labor force participation of women has increased steadily ever since. The appropriate Federal role in supporting child care, including the extent to which the Federal Government should establish standards for federally funded child care, has been an ongoing topic of debate. In 1988 and 1990, four Federal child care programs were enacted providing child care for families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), families that formerly received AFDC, low-income working families at risk of becoming dependent on AFDC, and low-income working families generally.

The establishment of these programs was the culmination of a lengthy, and often contentious debate, about what role the Federal Government should play in child care. Lasting nearly 4 years, the debate centered on questions about the type of Federal subsidies that should be made available and for whom, whether the Federal Government should set national child care standards, conditions under which religious child care providers could receive Federal funds, and how best to assure optimal choice for parents in selecting child care arrangements for their children, including options that would allow a mother to stay home. Differences stemming from philosophical and partisan views, as well as jurisdictional concerns, were reflected throughout the debate.

Though the programs created in 1988 and 1990 represented a significant expansion of Federal support for child care, they joined a large number of existing Federal programs providing early childhood services, administered by numerous Federal agencies and overseen by several congressional committees. The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO; 1994) estimated that in fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993, more than 90 early childhood programs were funded by the Federal Government, administered through 11 Federal agencies and 20 offices. Of these programs, GAO identified 34 as having education or child care as key to their mission. The Congressional Research Service (CRS), in a memo to the House Committee on Ways and Means (Forman, 1994), identified 46 Federal programs related to child care operating in fiscal year 1994, administered by 10 different Federal agencies. However, CRS noted that

some of these programs were not primarily child care programs; rather, they were designed for some other major purpose but included some type of child care or related assistance. Moreover, a majority of the programs were small, with 32 of the 46 providing less than \$50 million in annual funding. A more recent GAO (1998a) report identified 22 key child care programs, of which 5 accounted for more than 80 percent of total child care spending in fiscal year 1997.

In 1996, the 104th Congress passed a major restructuring of Federal welfare programs, including a consolidation of major Federal child care programs into an expanded Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) (Public Law 104-103). The child care provisions in the new law were developed to achieve several purposes. As a component of welfare reform, the child care provisions are intended to support the overall goal of promoting self-sufficiency through work. However, separate from the context of welfare reform, the legislation attempts to address concerns about the effectiveness and efficiency of child care programs. The four separate child care programs that were enacted in 1988 and 1990 had different rules regarding eligibility, time limits on the receipt of assistance, and work requirements. Consistent with other block grant proposals considered in the 104th Congress, the child care provisions in Public Law 104-193 are intended to streamline the Federal role, reduce the number of Federal programs and conflicting rules, and increase the flexibility provided to States.

Under the new amendments, the CCDBG is now the primary child care subsidy program operated by the Federal Government, and replaces previous child care programs for welfare and working families (i.e., child care for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Transitional Child Care Assistance, and the At-Risk Child Care Program). The new law makes available to States almost \$20 billion over a 6-year period (1997-2002) in a combination of entitlement and discretionary funding for child care, which is approximately \$4 billion above the level that would have been available under the previous programs.

Despite this increase in Federal resources, concerns persist about the adequacy and quality of child care in the era of welfare reform. Although welfare caseloads have declined, freeing up potential funds from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant for use for child care, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) estimates that in an average month in 1998 only 15 percent of children eligible for Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) subsidies received them, raising questions of whether total child care funding is adequate (CCDF or otherwise). It should be noted, however, that eligibility figures do not necessarily reflect consumer demand for child care, leaving the issue of whether adequate child care funding exists open to debate. Nonetheless, child care spending has unarguably been increasing every year (as shown in detail in tables 9-26 through 9-29). In 1998, States drew down all available Federal mandatory CCDF funding and transferred \$652 million in Federal TANF dollars in that year to CCDF Programs. If, as many suspect, demand for child care increases alongside dropping welfare rolls and heightened work requirements

for welfare recipients, proposals for additional child care funding are likely to be made in the years ahead.

Increased demand and Federal resources for child care could cause growth in the supply of child care providers. In May 1997, the U.S. General Accounting Office reported that gaps existed between the demand for child care and the “known” supply (i.e., providers that are regulated by or otherwise known to the States), based on research at four sites. These gaps were larger in poor areas and for certain types of care, such as infant and school-aged care. However, since many parents rely on informal care givers, such as relatives and neighbors, who may not be known to State agencies, linking supply and demand for child care can be difficult. A later GAO study reviewed efforts in seven States to expand child care programs (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1998b). The seven States did not know whether their efforts to expand the supply of providers would be sufficient to meet the increased demand expected to result from welfare reform. States’ efforts included new provider recruitment; fiscal incentives for providers and businesses to establish or expand child care facilities; and initiatives to increase the use of early childhood development and education programs, such as Head Start and prekindergarten programs.

#### MAJOR DAY CARE PROGRAMS

Table 9–15 provides a brief description of the major Federal programs that currently support child care and related activities. One of the largest Federal sources of child care assistance is provided indirectly through the Tax Code, in the form of a nonrefundable tax credit for taxpayers who work or are seeking work. Other major sources of Federal child care assistance include the CCDBG, the Social Services Block Grant under title XX of the Social Security Act, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant, and the Child Care Food Program, which subsidizes meals for children in child care. Head Start, the early childhood development program targeted to poor preschool children, can also be characterized as a child care program. Although Head Start primarily operates on a part-day, part-year basis, programs increasingly are being linked to other all-day child care providers to better meet the needs of full-time working parents. Assuming that about \$1.9 billion will be spent from TANF either directly or by transfer to the CCDBG Block Grant, assuming that 13 percent of the title XX block grant is spent on child care, and counting the tax loss from the dependent care credit as spending, we can estimate that the Federal Government will spend over \$15 billion on child care and Head Start in 2000.

#### CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) was originally authorized as an amendment to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and in 1996 was reauthorized (through 2002) and amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (Public Law 104–193). The program provides funding for child care services for low-income families, as

TABLE 9–15.—OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS THAT SUPPORT CHILD CARE

	Program					
	Dependent Care Credit	Child Care and Development Block Grant	Child and Adult Care Food Program	Title XX Social Services Block Grant	Head Start	TANF
Budgetary classification.	Nonrefundable tax credit.	Discretionary authorization and authorized entitlement.	Authorized entitlement .....	Authorized entitlement.	Discretionary authorization.	Preappropriation (through 2002)
Statutory authority.	Internal Revenue Code.	Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.	Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.	Social Security Act.	Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996
Federal administration.	U.S. Department of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service.	DHHS, ACF <sup>1</sup> .....	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.	DHHS, ACF <sup>1</sup> ...	DHHS, ACF <sup>1</sup> .....	DHHS, ACF <sup>1</sup>
Federal funding support.	NA .....	Funding ceiling, 100 percent Federal funding for discretionary and part of entitlement funding; balance at Medicaid match rate.	Open-ended, 100 percent Federal funding.	Funding ceiling, 100 percent Federal funding.	Funding ceiling, 80 percent Federal funding.	TANF Block Grant, 100 percent Federal funding (with State MOE requirements)
Fiscal year 2000 funding (in millions) <sup>2</sup> .	\$2,200 <sup>3</sup> .....	\$1,183—discretionary, \$2,367—mandatory.	\$1,690 <sup>4</sup> .....	Total is \$1,775 <sup>5</sup> .	\$5,267 <sup>6</sup> .....	Total is \$16,500 <sup>7</sup>
Target population.	Taxpayers who need dependent care in order to accept or maintain employment.	Families with incomes at or below 85 percent of State median income, with parents engaged in work or education/training.	Children, particularly children from low-income families, in child care centers, day care homes, and afterschool programs.	State discretion.	Low-income children and families.	Needy families with minor children; needy pregnant women.

Eligible children.	Children under age 13 <sup>6</sup> .	Children under age 13 (unless incapable of self-care or under court supervision).	Children younger than 13 (through age 18 in the afterschool programs); migrant children younger than 16; disabled children.	State discretion.	Children from poor families who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance.	Needy children as determined by the State.
Provider requirements.	Centers only must meet applicable State and local standards.	Must meet applicable State and local standards (including relatives). With exception of relatives, must also meet certain health and safety standards.	Must meet Federal nutrition standards; must meet applicable State/local licensing approval standards (or, certain alternate approval standards if licensing/approval not required).	Must meet applicable State and local standards.	Must meet federally established standards with respect to health, education, parental involvement, nutrition, and social services.	NA (however, any transferred funds are subject to CCDBG rules).
Reimbursement rates to providers.	NA .....	No limit .....	Providers receive inflation-indexed per meal subsidies that are fixed by law and varied by children's family income; provider sponsors receive limited administrative payments for administrative costs.	No limit .....	No limit .....	NA (however, any transferred funds are subject to CCDBG rules).

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Administration for Children and Families.

<sup>2</sup> Amounts reflect appropriation levels except where noted otherwise.

<sup>3</sup> Estimated revenue loss, Joint Committee on Taxation.

<sup>4</sup> Estimated obligations.

<sup>5</sup> States used almost 13 percent of Social Services Block Grant funds for child day care in fiscal year 1997.

<sup>6</sup> Of the \$5.267 billion, \$3.867 billion is available for fiscal year 2000, and \$1.4 billion is available for fiscal year 2001.

<sup>7</sup> The 1996 welfare reform law allows States to use TANF funds for child care associated with the TANF Program, and also allows States to transfer a maximum of 30 percent of TANF funds to the CCDBG for use under the CCDBG's program rules. In fiscal year 1999 alone, States expended \$1.14 billion on child care from Federal TANF funds and funds countable toward the TANF maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement (excluding State expenditures that are made under CCDF). Through the first 3 years of Federal TANF grants (fiscal years 1997–99), States transferred \$3.6 billion (representing 8 percent of total TANF grants) to the CCDBG.

NA—Not applicable.

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service.

well as for activities intended to improve the overall quality and supply of child care for families in general.

### *Financing*

Under the original CCDBG Act, discretionary funds were authorized, subject to the annual appropriations process. As amended by the 1996 welfare reform law, the program is funded by a combination of discretionary and entitlement amounts. The combined total of funds is sometimes referred to as the Child Care and Development Fund. The discretionary funds are authorized at \$1 billion annually. However, appropriations surpassed the authorized level in both fiscal years 1999 and 2000, at \$1.183 billion. These funds are allocated among States according to the same formula contained in the original CCDBG Act, which is based on each State's share of children under age 5, the State's share of children receiving free or reduced-price lunches, and State per capita income. Half of 1 percent of appropriated funds is reserved for the territories, and between 1 and 2 percent is reserved for payments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations. States are not required to match these discretionary funds. Funds must be obligated in the year they are received or in the subsequent fiscal year, and the law authorizes the Secretary to reallocate unused funds.

The welfare reform law also provided entitlement funding to States for child care under the CCDBG. The annual amounts of entitlement funding were \$1.967 billion in fiscal year 1997; \$2.067 billion in fiscal year 1998; \$2.167 billion in fiscal year 1999; \$2.367 billion in fiscal year 2000; \$2.567 billion in fiscal year 2001; and \$2.717 billion in fiscal year 2002.

The Secretary must reserve between 1 and 2 percent of entitlement funds for payments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations. After this amount is reserved, remaining entitlement funds are allocated to States in two components. First, each State receives a fixed amount each year, equal to the funding received by the State under the three child care programs previously authorized under AFDC in fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995, or the average of fiscal years 1992–94, whichever is greater. This amount, totals approximately \$1.2 billion each year, is sometimes referred to as “mandatory” funds. No State match is required for these funds, which may remain available for expenditure by States with no fiscal year limitation. Although no State match is required, to receive their full TANF allotment, States must maintain at least 80 percent of their previous welfare expenditures (referred to as their “maintenance-of-effort” requirements), including previous expenditures for welfare-related child care, in fiscal year 1994.

After the guaranteed amount is distributed, remaining entitlement funds are distributed to States according to each State's share of children under age 13. States must meet maintenance-of-effort and matching requirements to receive these funds. Specifically, States must spend all of their “guaranteed” Federal entitlement funds for child care, plus 100 percent of the amount they spent of their own funds in fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995, whichever is higher, under the previous AFDC-related child care programs. Further, States must provide matching funds at the fiscal year 1995 Medicaid matching rate to receive these additional



entitlement funds for child care. If the Secretary determines that a State will not spend its entire allotment for a given fiscal year, then the unused amounts may be redistributed among other States according to those States' share of children under age 13.

In addition to amounts provided to States for child care, States may transfer up to 30 percent of their TANF Block Grant into their CCDBG or Social Services Block Grant Programs. Funds transferred into child care must be spent according to the CCDBG rules. However, States also may use TANF funds for child care without formally transferring them to the CCDBG.

#### *Eligibility and target population groups*

Children eligible for services under the revised CCDBG are those whose family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median. States may adopt income eligibility limits below those in Federal law. Because child care funding is not an entitlement for individuals, States are not required to aid families even if their incomes fall below the State-determined eligibility threshold. Federal law does require States to give priority to families defined in their plans as "very low income." Table 9-25 provides the CCDF income eligibility limits across the States and territories for families of three and four. To be eligible for CCDBG funds, children must be less than 13 years old and be living with parents who are working or enrolled in school or training, or be in need of protective services. States must use at least 70 percent of their total entitlement funds for child care services for families that are trying to become independent of TANF through work activities and families that are at risk of becoming dependent on public assistance. In their State plans, States must explain how they will meet the specific child care needs of these families. Of remaining child care funds (including discretionary amounts), States must ensure that a substantial portion is used for child care services to eligible families other than welfare recipients or families at risk of welfare dependency.

#### *Use of funds*

CCDBG funds may be used for child care services provided on a sliding fee scale basis; however, Federal regulations allow States to waive child care fees for families with incomes at or below the poverty line. Funds also may be used for activities to improve the quality or availability of child care. States are required to spend no less than 4 percent of their child care allotments (discretionary and entitlement) for activities to provide comprehensive consumer education to parents and the public, activities that increase parental choice, and activities designed to improve the quality and availability of child care (such as resource and referral services).

Child care providers receiving Federal assistance must meet all licensing or regulatory requirements applicable under State or local law. States must have in effect licensing requirements applicable to child care; however, Federal law does not dictate what these licensing requirements should be or what types of providers they should cover. States must establish minimum health and safety standards that cover prevention and control of infectious diseases (including immunizations); building and physical premises safety;

and health and safety training; and that apply to child care providers receiving block grant assistance (except relative providers).

Parents of children eligible to receive subsidized child care must be given maximum choice in selecting a child care provider. Parents must be offered the option to enroll their child with a provider that has a grant or contract with the State to provide such services, or parents may receive a certificate (also sometimes referred to as a voucher) that can be used to purchase child care from a provider of the parents' choice. Child care certificates can be used only to pay for child care services from eligible providers, which can include sectarian child care providers. Eligible providers also can include individuals, age 18 or older, who provide child care for their grandchildren, great grandchildren, nieces or nephews, or siblings (if the provider lives in a separate residence). Table 9-24 shows the percent of CCDF recipient children served by each form of payment type, by State, in fiscal year 1998. Certificates were overwhelmingly the form of payment most used, serving over 83 percent of CCDF children nationally. States must establish payment rates for child care services that are sufficient to ensure equal access for eligible children to comparable services provided to children whose parents are not eligible for subsidies.

The CCDBG contains specific requirements with regard to the use of funds for religious activities. Under the program, a provider that receives operating assistance through a direct grant or contract with a government agency may not use these funds for any sectarian purpose or activity, including religious worship and instruction. However, a sectarian provider that receives a child care certificate from an eligible parent is not so restricted in the use of funds.

#### *Administration and data collection*

At the Federal level, the CCDBG is administered by the Administration for Children and Families of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The Secretary is required to coordinate all child care activities within the agency and with similar activities in other Federal agencies. States are required to designate a lead agency to administer the CCDBG, and may use no more than 5 percent of their Federal child care allotment for administrative costs. States must submit disaggregated data on children and families receiving subsidized child care to DHHS every quarter, and aggregate data twice a year. The Secretary is required to submit a report to Congress once every 2 years. The most recent available data from DHHS as submitted by the States is from fiscal year 1998.

## **CHILD CARE TABLES**

### **CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND**

Tables 9-16 through 9-30 provide extensive information about the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) as reported by States to DHHS. Because the tables reflect funding from both the discretionary and mandatory portions of the child care funding pool, the term CCDF is used in the titles of the tables. The reader should note, however, that as mentioned in earlier parts of this

chapter, all discretionary and mandatory child care funding referenced here is subject to the rules of the CCDBG.

FAMILIES AND CHILDREN SERVED, TYPE OF CARE, AND PAYMENT TYPE

The average monthly number of families and children served by the CCDF in the last half of fiscal year 1998 is shown, by State, in table 9-16. Tables 9-17 and 9-18 reveal the percentage of children served nationwide by reason for care and by age of child respectively. The number of providers, by State and type, are displayed in table 9-19. The percentage of CCDF children served by each type of care, by State, follows in table 9-20. Tables 9-21 through 9-23 reveal State-by-State information on the breakdowns between type of care used by CCDF recipients, regulated and non-regulated care used, and relative and nonrelative care used. Table 9-24 shows the percentage of CCDF children served by each form of payment type.

TABLE 9-16.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—AVERAGE MONTHLY NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND CHILDREN SERVED, APRIL–SEPTEMBER 1998

State/territory	Number of families	Number of children
Alabama .....	11,914	20,526
Alaska <sup>1</sup> .....	2,862	5,083
American Samoa .....	82	234
Arizona .....	19,586	33,095
Arkansas .....	5,464	9,244
California <sup>1</sup> .....	70,673	99,922
Colorado .....	11,035	20,172
Connecticut .....	6,646	11,912
Delaware .....	3,527	6,138
District of Columbia <sup>1 2</sup> .....	2,707	4,245
Florida .....	26,825	44,867
Georgia .....	26,488	47,205
Guam .....	189	374
Hawaii <sup>1</sup> .....	4,292	6,673
Idaho .....	3,811	6,546
Illinois .....	46,186	88,333
Indiana <sup>3 4</sup> .....	7,153	12,673
Iowa <sup>1</sup> .....	7,367	11,805
Kansas .....	5,553	10,238
Kentucky .....	14,237	25,002
Louisiana <sup>1</sup> .....	19,986	35,194
Maine .....	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )
Maryland .....	13,720	21,383
Massachusetts <sup>1</sup> .....	30,813	46,009
Michigan .....	49,502	92,062
Minnesota <sup>1</sup> .....	15,168	25,525
Mississippi <sup>2 3 4</sup> .....	5,510	8,471
Missouri .....	35,174	43,445
Montana .....	3,135	5,528
Nebraska .....	5,349	9,348
Nevada <sup>2</sup> .....	2,986	5,084

TABLE 9-16.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—AVERAGE MONTHLY NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND CHILDREN SERVED, APRIL–SEPTEMBER 1998—Continued

State/territory	Number of families	Number of children
New Hampshire .....	4,238	6,394
New Jersey .....	22,132	32,496
New Mexico .....	8,782	14,983
New York <sup>1</sup> .....	98,667	158,605
North Carolina <sup>1</sup> .....	41,221	74,245
North Dakota .....	2,641	4,160
Northern Marianas .....	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )
Ohio <sup>2</sup> .....	33,165	59,357
Oklahoma <sup>2</sup> .....	21,882	36,029
Oregon .....	7,965	15,043
Pennsylvania <sup>1</sup> .....	39,985	72,683
Puerto Rico <sup>4</sup> .....	200	256
Rhode Island .....	3,998	6,326
South Carolina .....	12,779	21,733
South Dakota .....	2,042	3,529
Tennessee .....	29,765	55,419
Texas .....	46,017	78,955
Utah .....	6,703	12,552
Vermont .....	3,121	4,736
Virginia <sup>1</sup> .....	15,377	23,876
Virgin Islands .....	214	360
Washington <sup>1 4</sup> .....	25,243	36,883
West Virginia <sup>1</sup> .....	8,033	13,186
Wisconsin .....	13,361	23,867
Wyoming .....	1,870	3,088
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>907,351</b>	<b>1,515,107</b>

<sup>1</sup> Average monthly number of children served is extrapolated from sample data provided by the State based on the ratio of children to families in the sample.

<sup>2</sup> Number of children and families reported are based on less than 6 months of data.

<sup>3</sup> The reliability of the data provided is highly questionable due to serious information system problems during the reporting period.

<sup>4</sup> Reporting problems caused an underestimate of average children served monthly during fiscal year 1998.

<sup>5</sup> Unable to report any ACF-801 case-level data.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

TABLE 9-17.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED BY REASON FOR CARE, APRIL–SEPTEMBER, 1998

Reason for care	Percent of children served
Employment .....	73
Training/education .....	12
Both employment and training/education .....	6
Protective services .....	2
Other .....	7

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-18.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED BY AGE GROUP, APRIL–SEPTEMBER, 1998

Age group	Percent of children served
0–11 months .....	6
12–23 months .....	10
24–35 months .....	12
36–47 months .....	13
48–59 months .....	13
60–71 months .....	11
6–12 years .....	35
13+ years .....	0.4

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-19.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—NUMBER OF CHILD CARE PROVIDERS RECEIVING CCDF FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1998

State/territory	Child's home	Family home	Group home	Center
Alabama .....	32	3,247	287	1,601
Alaska .....	362	3,317	43	379
American Samoa .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	1	( <sup>1</sup> )	14
Arizona .....	538	4,976	326	1,910
Arkansas .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	538	( <sup>1</sup> )	856
California .....	4,538	13,911	3,455	7,689
Colorado .....	2,444	6,219	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,213
Connecticut .....	20,331	1,645	58	1,107
Delaware .....	384	1,360	22	278
District of Columbia .....	1	1	( <sup>1</sup> )	10
Florida .....	704	9,840	( <sup>1</sup> )	19,155
Georgia .....	1,683	8,102	314	4,643
Guam .....	73	164	30	45
Hawaii .....	208	5,462	( <sup>1</sup> )	774
Idaho .....	89	2,461	358	431
Illinois .....	46,723	40,852	465	4,767
Indiana .....	2,343	13,940	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,929
Iowa .....	422	9,296	826	905
Kansas .....	768	1,298	1,910	666
Kentucky .....	283	7,894	67	1,376
Louisiana .....	13,890	4,560	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,081
Maine .....	33	1,746	( <sup>1</sup> )	332
Maryland .....	7,091	8,237	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,371
Massachusetts .....	7,392	4,206	58	1,151
Michigan .....	33,824	39,293	2,647	2,304
Minnesota .....	1,584	15,258	( <sup>1</sup> )	6,294
Mississippi .....	1,951	2,388	21	1,138
Missouri .....	42	22,218	161	1,750
Montana .....	12	1,638	469	237
Nebraska .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,305	209	452
Nevada .....	131	436	10	400
New Hampshire .....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
New Jersey .....	640	7,474	( <sup>1</sup> )	2,061

TABLE 9-19.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—NUMBER OF CHILD CARE PROVIDERS RECEIVING CCDF FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

State/territory	Child's home	Family home	Group home	Center
New Mexico .....	49	7,204	153	448
New York .....	6,357	24,180	1,459	3,399
North Carolina .....	594	8,195	240	5,394
North Dakota .....	115	1,775	660	122
Northern Marianas .....	98	38	( <sup>1</sup> )	8
Ohio .....	8	9,059	71	2,594
Oklahoma .....	116	3,147	( <sup>1</sup> )	3,317
Oregon .....	3,145	14,361	98	760
Pennsylvania .....	19	3,196	502	3,633
Puerto Rico .....	79	747	898	486
Rhode Island .....	860	1,462	7	254
South Carolina .....	486	2,680	167	1,426
South Dakota .....	315	1,496	43	107
Tennessee .....	7,540	500	1,633	( <sup>1</sup> )
Texas .....	6,929	8,928	835	5,424
Utah .....	743	4,503	183	282
Vermont .....	355	1,110	( <sup>1</sup> )	333
Virginia .....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Virgin Islands .....	16	150	21	87
Washington .....	17,855	11,588	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,382
West Virginia .....	61	5,511	( <sup>1</sup> )	323
Wisconsin .....	80	5,247	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,490
Wyoming .....	157	679	( <sup>1</sup> )	88
<b>Total providers .....</b>	<b>194,493</b>	<b>359,039</b>	<b>18,706</b>	<b>99,676</b>

<sup>1</sup> Reported figure is 0 or not reported.<sup>2</sup> New Hampshire and Virginia did not report the number of providers by setting type.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

TABLE 9-20.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED BY TYPES OF CARE, FISCAL YEAR 1998

State/territory	Child's home	Family home	Group home	Center
Alabama .....	0.1	20.2	5.6	74.1
Alaska .....	5.2	57.1	3.2	34.5
American Samoa .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	0.9	( <sup>1</sup> )	99.1
Arizona .....	2.0	20.4	4.5	73.0
Arkansas .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	17.5	( <sup>1</sup> )	82.5
California .....	6.2	17.8	5.6	70.5
Colorado .....	9.4	33.3	( <sup>1</sup> )	57.3
Connecticut .....	56.6	6.4	0.4	36.6
Delaware .....	4.1	39.5	1.5	54.9
District of Columbia .....	0.5	5.3	( <sup>1</sup> )	94.1
Florida .....	1.0	14.2	( <sup>1</sup> )	84.8
Georgia .....	3.5	19.1	1.5	75.9
Guam .....	17.7	39.4	2.7	40.1
Hawaii .....	6.8	65.2	0.4	27.7

TABLE 9-20.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED BY TYPES OF CARE, FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

State/territory	Child's home	Family home	Group home	Center
Idaho .....	1.4	39.7	14.5	44.5
Illinois .....	31.6	36.9	0.6	30.9
Indiana .....	10.4	53.9	( <sup>1</sup> )	35.7
Iowa .....	1.6	54.7	10.4	33.4
Kansas .....	7.1	15.2	41.3	36.4
Kentucky .....	1.4	36.8	0.9	61.0
Louisiana .....	36.0	15.1	( <sup>1</sup> )	49.0
Maine .....	0.8	34.7	( <sup>1</sup> )	29.0
Maryland .....	22.7	42.4	( <sup>1</sup> )	34.9
Massachusetts .....	17.2	9.3	17.3	56.2
Michigan .....	30.7	41.8	8.8	18.7
Minnesota .....	6.8	66.0	( <sup>1</sup> )	27.2
Mississippi .....	12.0	17.7	1.2	69.0
Missouri .....	0.0	58.0	1.7	40.2
Montana .....	0.2	36.3	33.6	30.0
Nebraska .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	32.3	9.2	58.5
Nevada .....	3.9	12.3	2.2	81.6
New Hampshire .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
New Jersey .....	1.1	24.8	( <sup>1</sup> )	74.1
New Mexico .....	4.4	47.9	4.4	43.3
New York .....	10.1	42.3	7.0	40.6
North Carolina .....	0.8	17.0	1.4	80.8
North Dakota .....	3.0	44.2	26.6	26.3
Northern Marianas .....	58.2	30.8	( <sup>1</sup> )	11.0
Ohio .....	0.0	34.6	0.8	64.6
Oklahoma .....	0.3	18.9	( <sup>1</sup> )	80.9
Oregon .....	13.7	64.8	0.8	20.6
Pennsylvania .....	21.1	15.7	4.4	58.9
Puerto Rico .....	1.4	20.1	13.9	64.7
Rhode Island .....	9.9	25.4	0.2	64.5
South Carolina .....	3.5	18.2	2.9	75.5
South Dakota .....	6.0	61.0	6.2	26.9
Tennessee .....	0.8	21.8	4.8	72.6
Texas .....	7.4	10.3	3.3	79.0
Utah .....	4.4	26.1	5.0	64.6
Vermont .....	5.6	50.1	( <sup>1</sup> )	44.4
Virginia .....	1.9	44.1	( <sup>1</sup> )	54.0
Virgin Islands .....	3.0	23.6	6.1	67.3
Washington .....	24.7	34.0	( <sup>1</sup> )	41.2
West Virginia .....	0.4	59.9	( <sup>1</sup> )	39.8
Wisconsin .....	0.4	39.4	( <sup>1</sup> )	60.2
Wyoming .....	13.4	55.4	( <sup>1</sup> )	31.2
National average percent	10.8	29.7	3.6	55.4

<sup>1</sup> Reported figure is 0 or not reported.

Note.—Row total(s) and column total(s) do not add up for the following reason(s): Adjusted figures are rounded. Errors in reports submitted by Maine and New Hampshire.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

TABLE 9-21.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED IN REGULATED SETTINGS AND SETTINGS LEGALLY OPERATING WITHOUT REGULATION

State/territory	Licensed/reg- ulated	Legally oper- ating without regulation
Alabama .....	74	26
Alaska .....	54	46
American Samoa .....	100	(1)
Arizona .....	88	12
Arkansas .....	100	(1)
California .....	82	18
Colorado .....	76	24
Connecticut .....	43	57
Delaware .....	83	17
District of Columbia .....	98	2
Florida .....	87	13
Georgia .....	85	15
Guam .....	39	61
Hawaii .....	31	69
Idaho .....	59	41
Illinois .....	41	59
Indiana .....	46	54
Iowa .....	67	33
Kansas .....	86	14
Kentucky .....	67	33
Louisiana .....	49	51
Maine .....	57	7
Maryland .....	65	35
Massachusetts .....	80	20
Michigan .....	39	61
Minnesota .....	66	34
Mississippi .....	70	30
Missouri .....	54	46
Montana .....	85	15
Nebraska .....	100	(1)
Nevada .....	76	24
New Hampshire .....	(1)	(1)
New Jersey .....	85	15
New Mexico .....	52	48
New York .....	59	41
North Carolina .....	94	6
North Dakota .....	97	3
Northern Marianas .....	100	(1)
Ohio .....	100	(1)
Oklahoma .....	100	(1)
Oregon .....	38	62
Pennsylvania .....	71	29
Puerto Rico .....	65	35
Rhode Island .....	72	28
South Carolina .....	83	17
South Dakota .....	77	23
Tennessee .....	84	16
Texas .....	85	15



TABLE 9-21.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED IN REGULATED SETTINGS AND SETTINGS LEGALLY OPERATING WITHOUT REGULATION—Continued

State/territory	Licensed/reg- ulated	Legally oper- ating without regulation
Utah .....	79	21
Vermont .....	94	6
Virginia .....	80	20
Virgin Islands .....	68	32
Washington .....	64	36
West Virginia .....	89	11
Wisconsin .....	100	( <sup>1</sup> )
Wyoming .....	55	45
National average percent .....	72	28

<sup>1</sup> Reported figure is 0 or not reported.

Note.—Row total(s) and column total(s) do not add up for the following reason(s): Errors in reports submitted by Maine and New Hampshire. Adjusted figures are rounded.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

TABLE 9-22.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED IN SETTINGS LEGALLY OPERATING WITHOUT REGULATION, BY RELATIVES AND NON-RELATIVES, FISCAL YEAR 1998

State/territory	Relative	Nonrelative
Alabama .....	39	61
Alaska .....	27	73
American Samoa .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Arizona .....	100	( <sup>1</sup> )
Arkansas .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
California .....	62	38
Colorado .....	44	56
Connecticut .....	71	29
Delaware .....	54	46
District of Columbia .....	70	30
Florida .....	23	77
Georgia .....	29	71
Guam .....	91	9
Hawaii .....	69	31
Idaho .....	44	56
Illinois .....	56	44
Indiana .....	39	61
Iowa .....	31	69
Kansas .....	71	29
Kentucky .....	29	71
Louisiana .....	48	52
Maine .....	32	68
Maryland .....	78	22
Massachusetts .....	42	58

TABLE 9-22.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED IN SETTINGS LEGALLY OPERATING WITHOUT REGULATION, BY RELATIVES AND NON-RELATIVES, FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

State/territory	Relative	Nonrelative
Michigan .....	72	28
Minnesota .....	42	58
Mississippi .....	64	36
Missouri .....	46	54
Montana .....	10	90
Nebraska .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Nevada .....	16	84
New Hampshire .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
New Jersey .....	31	69
New Mexico .....	57	43
New York .....	40	60
North Carolina .....	81	19
North Dakota .....	100	( <sup>1</sup> )
Northern Marianas .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Ohio .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Oklahoma .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Oregon .....	29	71
Pennsylvania .....	22	78
Puerto Rico .....	54	46
Rhode Island .....	78	22
South Carolina .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	100
South Dakota .....	79	21
Tennessee .....	12	88
Texas .....	100	( <sup>1</sup> )
Utah .....	37	63
Vermont .....	1	99
Virginia .....	83	17
Virgin Islands .....	58	42
Washington .....	65	35
West Virginia .....	91	9
Wisconsin .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Wyoming .....	52	48
National average percent .....	53	47

<sup>1</sup> Reported figure is 0 or not reported.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

TABLE 9-23.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED IN ALL TYPES OF CARE, FISCAL YEAR 1998

State/territory	Licensed regulated providers				Providers legally operating without regulation						Center
	Child's home	Family home	Group home	Center	Child's home		Family home		Group home		
					Relative	Nonrel-ative	Relative	Nonrel-ative	Relative	Nonrel-ative	
Alabama .....	(1)	10	6	59	0.1	0.1	10	0.1	(1)	(1)	15
Alaska .....	0.01	16	3	35	2	3	11	30	(1)	(1)	(1)
American Samoa .....	(1)	1	(1)	99	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Arizona .....	0.5	10	4	73	2	(1)	10	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Arkansas .....	(1)	18	(1)	82	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
California .....	(1)	7	6	70	5	2	6	4	(1)	(1)	1
Colorado .....	(1)	19	(1)	57	2	7	8	6	(1)	(1)	0
Connecticut .....	(1)	6	(1)	36	41	16	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1
Delaware .....	(1)	34	1	48	4	(1)	5	(1)	(1)	(1)	7
District of Columbia .....	(1)	4	(1)	94	(1)	1	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Florida .....	(1)	8	(1)	80	1	(1)	2	4	(1)	(1)	5
Georgia .....	(1)	7	2	76	1	3	4	8	(1)	(1)	(1)
Guam .....	(1)	(1)	(1)	39	18	(1)	37	2	1	2	1
Hawaii .....	(1)	8	(1)	22	3	3	45	12	(1)	(1)	5
Idaho .....	(1)	(1)	14	44	(1)	1	17	22	(1)	(1)	(1)
Illinois .....	(1)	11	1	29	11	21	22	4	(1)	(1)	2
Indiana .....	2.2	14	(1)	30	5	3	16	23	(1)	(1)	6
Iowa .....	(1)	23	10	33	1	1	10	22	(1)	(1)	(1)
Kansas .....	(1)	9	41	36	3	4	6	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Kentucky .....	(1)	5	1	61	1	1	9	23	(1)	(1)	(1)
Louisiana .....	(1)	(1)	(1)	49	22	14	2	13	(1)	(1)	(1)
Maine .....	(1)	28	(1)	29	(1)	(1)	2	5	(1)	(1)	(1)

TABLE 9-23.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED IN ALL TYPES OF CARE, FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

State/territory	Licensed regulated providers				Providers legally operating without regulation						
	Child's home	Family home	Group home	Center	Child's home		Family home		Group home		Center
					Relative	Nonrel-ative	Relative	Nonrel-ative	Relative	Nonrel-ative	
Maryland .....	(1)	31	(1)	34	16	7	12	(1)	(1)	(1)	0
Massachusetts .....	(1)	6	17	56	5	12	3	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Michigan .....	(1)	11	9	19	14	17	30	(1)	(1)	(1)	0
Minnesota .....	(1)	42	(1)	24	4	3	10	14	(1)	(1)	3
Mississippi .....	(1)	(1)	1	69	9	3	10	8	(1)	(1)	(1)
Missouri .....	(1)	15	2	37	(1)	(1)	21	22	(1)	3	
Montana .....	0.02	21	34	30	(1)	(1)	1	14	(1)	(1)	(1)
Nebraska .....	(1)	32	9	58	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Nevada .....	(1)	3	2	70	2	2	2	7	(1)	(1)	11
New Hampshire .....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
New Jersey .....	(1)	10	(1)	74	1	(1)	4	10	(1)	(1)	(1)
New Mexico .....	(1)	5	4	43	2	2	25	18	(1)	(1)	(1)
New York .....	(1)	11	7	41	5	5	11	19	(1)	(1)	(1)
North Carolina .....	(1)	11	1	81	1	(1)	5	1	(1)	(1)	0.1
North Dakota .....	(1)	44	27	26	3	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Northern Marianas .....	58.2	31	(1)	11	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Ohio .....	0.01	35	1	65	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Oklahoma .....	0.26	19	(1)	81	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Oregon .....	0.22	21	1	16	5	9	14	30	(1)	0.1	5
Pennsylvania .....	(1)	7	4	59	5	16	1	7	(1)	(1)	(1)
Puerto Rico .....	(1)	(1)	(1)	65	1	(1)	12	8	6	8	(1)
Rhode Island .....	(1)	8	(1)	64	4	6	18	(1)	(1)	(1)	0.3

South Carolina .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	5	3	76	( <sup>1</sup> )	3	( <sup>1</sup> )	13	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
South Dakota .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	44	6	27	4	2	14	3	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Tennessee .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	7	5	73	1	( <sup>1</sup> )	1	14	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Texas .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	3	3	79	7	( <sup>1</sup> )	7	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Utah .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	9	5	65	2	2	6	11	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Vermont .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	50	( <sup>1</sup> )	44	0	6	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Virginia .....	0.20	26	( <sup>1</sup> )	54	2	( <sup>1</sup> )	15	3	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	0
Virgin Islands .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	6	62	3	( <sup>1</sup> )	16	8	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	5
Washington .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	23	( <sup>1</sup> )	41	12	12	11	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
West Virginia .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	50	( <sup>1</sup> )	39	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	10	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	1
Wisconsin .....	0.38	39	( <sup>1</sup> )	60	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Wyoming .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	24	( <sup>1</sup> )	31	8	6	16	16	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
National average percent ...	0.1	13	3	55	6	6	9	6	0.02	0.03	1

<sup>1</sup>Reported figure is 0 or not reported.

Note.—Select row total(s) and column total(s) do not add up for the following reason: Errors in reports submitted by Maine and New Hampshire.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

TABLE 9-24.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED, BY PAYMENT METHOD, FISCAL YEAR 1998

State/territory	Grants/ contracts	Certifi- cates	Cash to parents
Alabama .....	45.4	53.7	0.9
Alaska .....	(1)	99.3	0.7
American Samoa .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Arizona .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Arkansas .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
California .....	58.3	33.8	7.9
Colorado .....	0.4	99.5	0.1
Connecticut .....	24.0	76.0	(1)
Delaware .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
District of Columbia .....	59.6	40.4	(1)
Florida .....	72.6	20.1	7.3
Georgia .....	4.6	95.4	(1)
Guam .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Hawaii .....	(1)	(1)	100.0
Idaho .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Illinois .....	14.1	85.9	(1)
Indiana .....	1.0	99.0	(1)
Iowa .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Kansas .....	(1)	92.9	7.1
Kentucky .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Louisiana .....	(1)	65.3	34.7
Maine .....	23.5	75.9	0.6
Maryland .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Massachusetts .....	27.6	72.4	(1)
Michigan .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Minnesota .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Mississippi .....	27.1	72.9	(1)
Missouri .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Montana .....	(1)	96.4	3.6
Nebraska .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Nevada .....	6.1	93.9	(1)
New Hampshire .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
New Jersey .....	26.7	73.3	(1)
New Mexico .....	1.3	98.7	(1)
New York .....	23.1	76.9	(1)
North Carolina .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
North Dakota .....	4.0	96.0	(1)
Northern Marianas .....	(1)	(1)	100.0
Ohio .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Oklahoma .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Oregon .....	11.0	89.0	(1)
Pennsylvania .....	(1)	56.4	43.6
Puerto Rico .....	57.5	42.5	(1)
Rhode Island .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
South Carolina .....	12.0	88.0	(1)
South Dakota .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Tennessee .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Texas .....	(1)	83.1	16.9
Utah .....	(1)	(1)	100.0

TABLE 9-24.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—PERCENT OF CHILDREN SERVED, BY PAYMENT METHOD, FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

State/territory	Grants/ contracts	Certifi- cates	Cash to parents
Vermont .....	0.4	99.6	(1)
Virginia .....	1.1	100.0	(1)
Virgin Islands .....	2.4	97.6	(1)
Washington .....	(1)	64.4	35.6
West Virginia .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Wisconsin .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
Wyoming .....	(1)	100.0	(1)
National average percent .....	9.8	83.5	6.6

<sup>1</sup> Reported figure is 0 or not reported.

Note.—Row total(s) and column total(s) do not add up for the following reason(s): Errors in report submitted by Virginia. Adjusted figures are rounded.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Child Care Information System.

#### STATE INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS

States' income eligibility limits for families of three and four receiving Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) subsidies, as submitted in the latest available State CCDF plans, are displayed in table 9-25.

#### TRENDS IN CHILD CARE EXPENDITURES

Tables 9-26 through 9-29 contain information about trends in child care expenditures under the CCDF and its predecessor programs (i.e., AFDC child care programs). All figures reflect expenditures made in the year indicated, as opposed to expenditures made from a given year's appropriation. Table 9-26 provides a summary of discretionary and mandatory expenditures on child care from fiscal years 1992 through 1998. Table 9-27 gives the mandatory fund expenditure trends from fiscal years 1992 through 1998, and the total expenditures (mandatory and discretionary) are shown by State in table 9-28. A detailed breakdown of CCDF expenditures made in fiscal year 1998 (the latest year available) by State is displayed in table 9-29.

#### STATE CCDF ALLOCATIONS

Table 9-30 shows actual State allotments for discretionary and entitlement (mandatory and matching) funding for fiscal year 1999.

TABLE 9–25.—CCDF INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS FOR FAMILIES OF THREE AND FOUR

[Monthly income]

State/territory	85 percent of State median income		CCDF income eligibility limit		Very low income limit (priority for child care)		CCDF income limit as a percent of State median income		Very low income limit as a percent of State median income	
	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four
Alabama .....	\$2,870	\$3,417	\$1,504	\$1,809	\$1,503	\$1,808	45	45	45	45
Alaska .....	3,694	4,397	3,694	4,397	1,423	1,714	85	85	33	33
American Samoa <sup>1</sup> .....	474	632	474	632	237	316	85	85	43	43
Arizona .....	2,804	3,339	1,905	2,217	1,157	1,392	58	56	35	35
Arkansas .....	2,172	5,586	1,533	1,825	1,022	1,217	60	28	40	19
California .....	3,197	3,552	2,821	3,134	1,881	2,090	75	75	50	50
Colorado .....	3,510	4,178	2,139	2,574	1,504	1,810	52	52	36	37
Connecticut <sup>1</sup> .....	3,698	4,403	3,264	3,885	1,088	1,295	75	75	25	25
Delaware .....	3,371	4,014	2,314	2,784	867	1,044	58	59	22	22
District of Columbia .....	3,169	3,772	2,326	2,576	1,585	1,886	62	58	43	42
Florida .....	2,667	3,175	1,706	2,056	2,104	2,536	54	55	67	68
Georgia .....	2,817	3,130	2,817	3,130	2,023	2,248	85	85	61	61
Guam .....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	2,463	2,963	1,331	1,601	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Hawaii .....	3,257	3,878	2,874	3,422	1,278	1,538	75	75	33	34
Idaho .....	2,684	2,982	1,706	2,056	1,705	2,055	54	59	54	59
Illinois .....	3,440	4,095	1,818	2,165	1,214	1,445	45	45	30	30
Indiana .....	3,149	3,795	2,161	2,605	1,628	1,962	58	58	44	44
Iowa .....	3,081	3,668	1,793	2,157	1,619	1,948	49	50	45	45
Kansas .....	3,114	3,747	3,114	3,747	1,832	2,204	85	85	50	50
Kentucky .....	2,739	3,261	1,851	2,227	1,851	2,227	57	58	57	58
Louisiana .....	2,742	3,265	2,420	2,880	1,157	1,392	75	75	36	36
Maine <sup>1</sup> .....	2,708	3,223	2,708	3,223	1,101	1,329	85	85	35	35



Maryland .....	3,957	4,711	1,870	2,226	767	913	40	40	16	16
Massachusetts <sup>1</sup> .....	3,522	4,193	2,771	3,299	1,931	2,299	67	67	47	47
Michigan .....	3,342	3,979	2,172	2,586	809	940	55	55	21	20
Minnesota .....	3,604	4,290	3,181	3,787	3,180	3,786	75	75	75	75
Mississippi .....	2,333	2,750	2,333	2,750	1,416	1,667	85	85	52	52
Missouri .....	2,772	3,696	1,482	1,764	674	802	45	41	21	18
Montana .....	2,592	3,085	1,735	2,088	469	564	57	58	15	16
Nebraska .....	2,707	3,323	2,105	2,535	1,121	1,350	66	65	35	35
Nevada .....	3,171	3,776	2,798	3,331	1,532	1,793	75	75	41	40
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup> .....	3,064	3,647	1,784	2,147	1,556	1,873	49	50	43	44
New Jersey .....	3,959	4,770	1,735	2,088	2,892	3,479	37	37	62	62
New Mexico <sup>1</sup> .....	2,212	2,633	1,951	2,323	1,465	1,742	75	75	56	56
New York .....	3,326	3,960	2,338	2,783	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	60	60	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )
North Carolina .....	3,082	3,668	2,719	3,237	2,719	3,237	75	75	75	75
North Dakota .....	2,445	2,910	2,445	2,910	288	342	85	85	10	10
Northern Marianas .....	1,273	1,498	1,157	1,392	1,157	1,392	77	79	77	79
Ohio .....	3,084	3,672	2,105	2,536	700	843	58	59	19	20
Oklahoma .....	2,635	3,137	1,936	1,936	1,933	1,934	62	52	62	52
Oregon .....	3,226	3,841	2,088	2,290	1,157	1,392	55	51	30	31
Pennsylvania .....	3,201	3,811	2,139	2,574	1,156	1,391	57	57	31	31
Puerto Rico .....	1,279	1,523	1,279	1,523	753	1,039	85	85	50	58
Rhode Island .....	3,067	3,407	2,602	3,131	1,278	1,438	72	78	35	36
South Carolina .....	2,954	3,518	1,446	1,740	1,157	1,392	42	42	33	34
South Dakota .....	2,786	3,317	2,140	2,575	1,157	1,392	65	66	35	36
Tennessee .....	2,871	3,418	2,027	2,413	1,478	1,528	60	60	44	38
Texas .....	2,856	3,400	1,735	2,088	1,157	1,392	52	52	34	35
Utah .....	2,724	3,242	1,794	2,136	1,138	1,371	56	56	36	36
Vermont .....	2,664	3,209	2,586	3,115	1,157	1,392	83	83	37	37
Virginia <sup>1</sup> .....	2,977	3,544	2,977	3,544	1,111	1,338	85	85	32	32
Virgin Islands <sup>1</sup> .....	1,364	1,557	1,364	1,557	1,111	1,338	85	85	69	73
Washington .....	3,194	3,803	2,024	2,435	856	1,030	54	54	23	23
West Virginia .....	2,457	2,925	1,735	2,087	463	557	60	61	16	16

TABLE 9-25.—CCDF INCOME ELIGIBILITY LIMITS FOR FAMILIES OF THREE AND FOUR—Continued

[Monthly income]

State/territory	85 percent of State median income		CCDF income eligibility limit		Very low income limit (priority for child care)		CCDF income limit as a percent of State median income		Very low income limit as a percent of State median income	
	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four	Family of three	Family of four
Wisconsin .....	( <sup>4</sup> )	3,586	1,909	2,297	NA	NA	NA	54	NA	NA
Wyoming .....	2,881	3,430	1,539	1,852	1,273	1,532	45	46	38	38

<sup>1</sup>Income eligibility limits for this State reflect figures submitted in its initial 1997 State plan.

<sup>2</sup>Guam is using 185 percent of the Federal poverty income guidelines for Hawaii to limit eligibility. There is no current median income established for Guam.

<sup>3</sup>Local social services districts define the income level, which constitutes "very low income" in their districts. It must be established at or below 200 percent of the State income standard. Currently, levels at which districts have established "very low income" range from 100–200 percent of the State income standard.

<sup>4</sup>In the Wisconsin State plan, 85 percent State median income figure is available only for a family of four.

NA—Not available.

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service based on information from CCDF State plans submitted by the States to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-26.—SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AND MANDATORY CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND AND PREDECESSOR PROGRAM EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS 1992-98

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Discretionary funds (Federal) <sup>1</sup>	Mandatory funds <sup>2</sup>		Total	Percent change in total expenditures from previous year
		Federal	State		
1992 .....	\$332,159	\$801,289	\$615,552	\$1,749,000	NA
1993 .....	675,229	889,592	662,184	2,227,005	27.3
1994 .....	835,014	1,054,893	797,745	2,687,652	20.7
1995 .....	832,009	1,235,233	949,821	3,017,063	12.3
1996 .....	850,122	1,280,212	994,275	3,124,608	3.6
1997 .....	1,010,068	1,518,905	1,357,515	3,886,488	24.4
1998 .....	1,403,230	2,078,421	1,713,933	5,195,584	33.7

<sup>1</sup>Discretionary funds are from appropriations and are authorized under the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) of 1990. For fiscal years 1997 and 1998, discretionary funds include those expenditures financed through transfers from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant.

<sup>2</sup>Mandatory funds are Federal funds provided under title IV-A of the Social Security Act and State funds required to obtain these Federal funds. For fiscal years 1992-96, mandatory child care funds were for individuals who received cash welfare (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), in transition from cash welfare, or "at risk" of cash welfare receipt. For fiscal years 1997 and 1998, mandatory funds were those provided under section 418 of the Social Security Act and transferred to the CCDF, as well as State funds expended either as the maintenance-of-effort (MOE) or State match for CCDF matching funds.

NA—Not applicable.

Note.—All figures reflect expenditures made in the year indicated, as opposed to expenditures made only from a given year's appropriation. The Federal share of fiscal year 1992-96 mandatory funds from the program for those "at risk" of welfare might be overstated, as it reflects expenditures reported by the States multiplied by the Medicaid matching rate. For some States, this computed Federal share might be greater than the cap on Federal funding for the State under the "at risk" program.

Source: Congressional Research Service based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-27.—FEDERAL MANDATORY CHILD CARE EXPENDITURES, BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 1992-98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage change	
								1992-98	1996-98
Alabama .....	\$12,100	\$15,147	\$17,480	\$17,626	\$17,734	\$27,539	\$28,847	138	63
Alaska .....	3,242	2,740	3,096	3,983	3,599	5,063	6,468	100	80
Arizona .....	15,730	13,876	16,591	20,998	24,993	31,034	32,258	105	29
Arkansas .....	2,073	3,668	3,867	5,300	4,009	3,938	17,326	736	332
California .....	98,097	47,592	111,360	90,347	97,454	101,077	212,855	117	118
Colorado .....	8,432	10,339	9,653	10,498	10,486	11,926	23,275	176	122
Connecticut .....	9,816	10,893	15,206	18,738	25,122	27,298	28,676	192	14
Delaware .....	2,811	3,620	4,226	5,292	5,217	6,718	6,807	142	30
District of Columbia .....	3,730	3,769	3,730	4,721	4,455	5,703	6,823	83	53
Florida .....	40,379	37,581	40,848	48,743	54,008	62,220	102,098	153	89
Georgia .....	26,000	31,520	37,081	39,088	49,040	40,876	65,599	152	34
Hawaii .....	1,097	1,309	3,211	5,221	4,562	8,406	8,924	714	96
Idaho .....	1,768	2,857	3,136	3,062	2,357	3,809	5,689	222	141
Illinois .....	18,689	29,156	35,860	60,275	78,690	92,635	95,625	412	22
Indiana .....	3,903	9,604	21,298	28,640	29,777	32,515	43,371	1011	46
Iowa .....	7,099	5,860	6,693	9,219	7,089	11,182	19,622	176	177
Kansas .....	12,113	9,265	11,497	10,044	11,632	15,598	18,007	49	55
Kentucky .....	13,153	16,101	17,293	17,230	17,490	22,112	32,584	148	86
Louisiana .....	6,912	9,705	11,492	14,539	13,895	15,058	29,498	327	112
Maine .....	980	2,725	3,137	3,036	3,456	6,015	6,897	604	100
Maryland .....	18,326	22,126	25,141	24,367	23,575	26,356	46,759	155	98

Massachusetts .....	29,688	34,745	39,730	46,798	52,211	60,350	62,620	111	20
Michigan .....	15,527	29,589	23,702	32,082	30,340	38,803	65,828	324	117
Minnesota .....	16,589	19,301	21,934	23,368	26,089	28,796	33,639	103	29
Mississippi .....	2,909	3,800	4,689	6,682	6,787	4,892	19,032	554	180
Missouri .....	15,491	19,764	21,560	25,390	26,805	37,505	42,753	176	59
Montana .....	2,109	2,023	2,972	3,191	3,451	2,968	8,476	302	146
Nebraska .....	9,863	10,402	11,653	10,072	8,786	15,878	15,822	60	80
Nevada .....	1,823	2,975	2,489	2,873	3,122	2,897	7,375	305	136
New Hampshire .....	3,828	3,961	4,407	5,139	4,387	7,900	8,383	119	91
New Jersey .....	25,997	26,331	31,253	40,031	49,494	51,121	39,311	51	-21
New Mexico .....	3,777	6,900	10,170	4,174	9,174	13,916	14,342	280	56
New York .....	67,010	76,568	65,787	108,871	71,877	69,409	173,957	160	142
North Carolina .....	28,838	48,070	62,072	71,708	63,320	84,934	95,048	230	50
North Dakota .....	1,941	2,665	2,506	2,188	1,895	1,531	5,288	173	179
Ohio .....	38,649	55,079	53,159	71,195	66,526	95,211	109,039	182	64
Oklahoma .....	22,068	20,869	22,132	25,638	26,638	33,905	35,324	60	33
Oregon .....	13,591	13,141	19,065	20,288	26,515	27,598	28,981	113	9
Pennsylvania .....	41,419	37,667	45,351	55,355	55,822	76,285	82,810	100	48
Rhode Island .....	4,273	4,707	5,773	6,695	6,856	8,884	9,794	129	43
South Carolina .....	6,543	8,195	5,893	9,967	12,457	16,796	22,509	244	81
South Dakota .....	1,318	1,607	1,713	1,753	1,742	3,125	4,781	263	174
Tennessee .....	14,207	21,135	33,972	39,566	43,192	51,259	53,621	277	24
Texas .....	50,258	62,222	59,880	63,995	72,750	64,857	121,168	141	67
Utah .....	8,928	12,467	12,998	13,019	14,450	19,428	20,605	131	43
Vermont .....	2,589	3,003	4,386	3,737	3,841	5,667	5,687	120	48
Virginia .....	16,032	17,272	17,002	21,364	18,716	34,148	30,333	89	62
Washington .....	25,180	29,219	36,459	41,948	43,218	52,091	63,917	154	48

TABLE 9-27.—FEDERAL MANDATORY CHILD CARE EXPENDITURES, BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 1992-98—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage change	
								1992-98	1996-98
West Virginia .....	3,233	6,807	8,904	8,834	9,837	12,973	13,561	319	38
Wisconsin .....	18,656	17,085	18,572	25,715	28,995	35,850	42,977	130	48
Wyoming .....	2,507	2,567	2,815	2,631	2,277	2,851	3,431	37	51
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>801,289</b>	<b>889,592</b>	<b>1,054,893</b>	<b>1,235,233</b>	<b>1,280,212</b>	<b>1,518,905</b>	<b>2,078,421</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>62</b>

Note.—All figures reflect expenditures made in the year indicated, as opposed to expenditures made only from a given year's appropriation. Mandatory funds are Federal funds provided under title IV-A of the Social Security Act and State funds required to obtain these Federal funds. For fiscal years 1992-96, mandatory child care funds are for individuals who received cash welfare (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), in transition from cash welfare, or "at risk" of cash welfare receipt. For fiscal years 1997 and 1998, mandatory funds are those provided under section 418 of the Social Security Act and transferred to the CCDF. The Federal share of fiscal year 1992-96, mandatory funds from the program for those "at risk" of welfare might be overstated, as it reflects expenditures reported by the States multiplied by the Medicaid matching rate. For some States, this computed Federal share might be greater than the cap on Federal funding for the State under the "at risk" program.

Source: Congressional Research Service based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-28.—TOTAL CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND AND PREDECESSOR PROGRAM EXPENDITURES, BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 1992-98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage change	
								1992-98	1996-98
Alabama .....	\$29,490	\$37,892	\$39,133	\$45,166	\$46,612	\$52,411	\$60,689	106	30
Alaska .....	5,161	6,851	6,624	9,183	6,525	13,123	16,660	223	155
Arizona .....	27,055	33,404	38,600	44,690	51,305	61,200	81,923	203	60
Arkansas .....	7,918	13,441	12,888	12,720	16,436	16,370	23,333	195	42
California .....	134,248	131,165	265,531	250,940	286,913	368,789	586,143	337	104
Colorado .....	13,518	22,480	29,810	29,043	23,342	32,909	45,449	236	95
Connecticut .....	19,683	24,041	26,068	46,096	55,540	58,668	71,601	264	29
Delaware .....	5,957	7,914	9,505	11,570	11,396	17,487	24,409	310	114
District of Columbia .....	7,940	8,479	8,852	10,204	10,021	13,604	20,154	154	101
Florida .....	82,247	92,867	97,543	118,142	136,035	157,347	222,576	171	64
Georgia .....	53,234	70,596	82,240	88,069	101,717	131,264	162,139	205	59
Hawaii .....	1,311	5,016	7,768	11,540	10,399	20,335	30,770	2247	196
Idaho .....	3,976	6,631	11,780	5,552	5,535	9,127	16,022	303	189
Illinois .....	40,401	73,846	91,971	148,557	178,373	236,029	300,808	645	69
Indiana .....	6,071	26,100	47,329	60,247	63,782	78,288	96,576	1491	51
Iowa .....	14,645	15,797	14,794	20,845	19,830	20,130	49,489	238	150
Kansas .....	23,632	21,006	25,763	23,022	25,370	35,108	45,693	93	80
Kentucky .....	21,417	40,950	38,150	39,877	41,912	51,609	83,939	292	100
Louisiana .....	13,035	31,726	33,840	38,756	40,111	47,367	62,341	378	55
Maine .....	2,928	8,179	6,856	4,925	11,444	15,436	10,847	270	-5
Maryland .....	37,864	47,157	55,672	54,799	53,032	58,365	104,766	177	98
Massachusetts .....	63,113	74,331	85,598	87,370	110,469	243,113	216,503	243	96
Michigan .....	48,892	69,409	54,593	78,554	56,481	122,046	295,723	505	424
Minnesota .....	30,959	40,306	46,784	52,321	57,896	69,637	87,929	184	52
Mississippi .....	7,699	5,597	36,326	11,062	17,399	48,388	32,494	322	87

TABLE 9-28.—TOTAL CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND AND PREDECESSOR PROGRAM EXPENDITURES, BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 1992-98—  
Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage change	
								1992-98	1996-98
Missouri .....	32,786	44,233	48,520	55,428	58,917	79,879	89,283	172	52
Montana .....	4,670	5,570	6,982	6,794	7,952	8,272	14,114	202	77
Nebraska .....	17,485	15,861	27,212	20,324	18,014	27,170	40,892	134	127
Nevada .....	4,018	6,386	5,874	8,055	7,273	13,020	18,020	348	148
New Hampshire .....	7,725	8,481	7,553	12,335	9,787	16,177	17,988	133	84
New Jersey .....	46,865	41,713	63,979	97,526	98,877	105,672	93,805	100	-5
New Mexico .....	8,529	17,394	22,219	13,956	20,709	29,483	38,875	356	88
New York .....	117,129	174,006	167,235	236,714	180,514	236,240	393,261	236	118
North Carolina .....	40,988	88,657	137,160	132,261	95,981	169,501	224,494	448	134
North Dakota .....	4,267	5,932	5,502	5,014	3,753	5,130	9,040	112	141
Ohio .....	72,069	108,544	115,799	132,215	136,752	191,298	198,768	176	45
Oklahoma .....	38,415	41,169	44,756	48,920	51,198	57,553	71,542	86	40
Oregon .....	18,814	32,011	37,885	39,559	49,598	53,278	56,280	199	13
Pennsylvania .....	59,809	85,238	101,849	123,618	128,740	183,408	179,692	200	40
Rhode Island .....	8,724	10,374	12,545	13,761	14,368	18,713	25,788	196	79
South Carolina .....	9,843	18,060	17,733	29,603	37,000	28,466	66,987	581	81
South Dakota .....	2,925	4,458	5,408	5,647	2,512	6,327	10,676	265	325
Tennessee .....	26,030	45,040	66,777	76,320	80,708	107,875	136,666	425	69
Texas .....	116,364	158,555	159,691	181,988	182,971	217,999	274,659	136	50
Utah .....	17,307	16,858	29,960	24,758	28,700	28,414	39,635	129	38
Vermont .....	5,046	5,918	8,396	10,052	10,040	15,508	17,484	246	74
Virginia .....	29,825	48,681	36,430	48,874	50,583	85,645	87,823	194	74
Washington .....	49,744	61,173	76,153	89,337	94,775	116,631	172,423	247	82
West Virginia .....	7,678	14,614	17,351	17,088	15,176	24,062	35,704	365	135



Wisconsin .....	29,996	42,683	40,341	52,990	59,441	76,883	124,609	315	110
Wyoming .....	3,874	5,067	5,178	5,853	5,627	5,735	8,102	109	44
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,483,319</b>	<b>2,021,857</b>	<b>2,442,504</b>	<b>2,792,241</b>	<b>2,887,844</b>	<b>3,886,488</b>	<b>5,195,584</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>80</b>

Note.—All figures reflect expenditures made in the year indicated, as opposed to expenditures made only from a given year's appropriation. Discretionary funds are from appropriations and are authorized under the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990. For fiscal years 1997 and 1998, discretionary funds include those expenditures financed through transfers from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant. Mandatory funds are Federal funds provided under title IV-A of the Social Security Act and State funds required to obtain these Federal funds. For 1992–96, mandatory child care funds are for individuals who received cash welfare (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), in transition from cash welfare, or “at risk” of cash welfare receipt. For 1997 and 1998 mandatory funds are those provided under section 418 of the Social Security Act and transferred to the CCDF, as well as State funds expended either as the maintenance-of-effort or State match for CCDF matching funds. The Federal share of fiscal year 1992–96 mandatory funds from the program for those “at risk” of welfare might be overstated, as it reflects expenditures reported by the States multiplied by the Medicaid matching rate. For some States, this computed Federal share might be greater than the cap on Federal funding for the State under the “at risk” program.

Source: Congressional Research Service based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-29.—FISCAL YEAR 1998 CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND EXPENDITURES

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Discretionary	Mandatory block grant	Federal share of matching fund	State share of matching fund	Maintenance of effort (MOE)	Total
Alabama .....	\$19,455	\$16,442	\$12,405	\$5,490	\$6,896	\$60,689
Alaska .....	4,613	3,545	2,924	2,034	3,545	16,660
Arizona .....	33,075	19,827	12,431	6,557	10,033	81,923
Arkansas .....	0	6,091	11,234	4,077	1,931	23,333
California .....	174,693	95,050	117,805	113,001	85,593	586,143
Colorado .....	346	9,295	13,980	12,842	8,986	45,449
Connecticut .....	6,739	18,738	9,937	9,937	26,249	71,601
Delaware .....	1,671	4,642	2,166	2,166	13,765	24,409
District of Columbia .....	7,687	4,609	2,213	1,077	4,567	20,154
Florida .....	40,323	43,027	59,071	46,739	33,416	222,576
Georgia .....	55,988	41,765	23,835	15,341	25,210	162,139
Hawaii .....	13,060	5,110	3,814	3,814	4,972	30,770
Idaho .....	7,925	2,868	2,821	1,233	1,176	16,022
Illinois .....	37,777	56,874	38,752	38,752	128,655	300,808
Indiana .....	26,587	25,451	17,920	11,261	15,357	96,576
Iowa .....	8,048	8,508	11,114	6,461	15,357	49,489
Kansas .....	15,341	9,708	8,299	5,600	6,745	45,693
Kentucky .....	37,613	17,370	15,214	6,467	7,275	83,939
Louisiana .....	21,526	13,865	15,634	6,097	5,219	62,341
Maine .....	189	3,019	3,878	2,011	1,750	10,847
Maryland .....	11,248	23,301	23,457	23,457	23,301	104,766
Massachusetts .....	91,263	44,973	17,647	17,647	44,973	216,503
Michigan .....	178,334	32,082	33,746	27,150	24,411	295,723
Minnesota .....	21,482	19,398	14,241	13,118	19,690	87,929

Mississippi .....	8,183	7,220	11,813	3,409	1,870	32,494
Missouri .....	18,230	24,669	18,084	11,751	16,549	89,283
Montana .....	2,999	5,296	3,180	1,324	1,314	14,114
Nebraska .....	11,045	10,595	5,227	3,318	10,707	40,892
Nevada .....	3,269	2,580	4,795	4,795	2,580	18,020
New Hampshire .....	1,222	4,582	3,801	3,801	4,582	17,988
New Jersey .....	15,184	26,374	12,937	12,937	26,374	93,805
New Mexico .....	19,362	8,308	6,035	2,276	2,895	38,875
New York .....	26,398	83,035	90,922	90,922	101,984	393,261
North Carolina .....	50,816	72,571	22,477	13,150	65,480	224,494
North Dakota .....	1,758	2,988	2,299	977	1,017	9,040
Ohio .....	19,758	74,918	34,122	24,567	45,404	198,768
Oklahoma .....	21,233	24,910	10,414	4,355	10,630	71,542
Oregon .....	9,519	19,309	9,672	6,065	11,715	56,280
Pennsylvania .....	26,125	55,173	27,637	24,128	46,629	179,692
Rhode Island .....	2,240	6,909	2,885	2,541	11,212	25,788
South Carolina .....	35,063	9,867	12,641	5,331	4,085	66,987
South Dakota .....	3,635	1,711	3,070	1,457	803	10,676
Tennessee .....	54,863	37,702	15,919	9,206	18,976	136,666
Texas .....	92,050	76,595	44,573	26,759	34,681	274,659
Utah .....	11,527	12,592	8,014	3,027	4,475	39,635
Vermont .....	8,070	3,945	1,743	1,060	2,666	17,484
Virginia .....	27,433	21,329	9,004	8,728	21,329	87,823
Washington .....	44,768	41,883	22,034	20,248	43,490	172,423
West Virginia .....	17,444	8,727	4,834	1,728	2,971	35,704
Wisconsin .....	53,713	26,579	16,398	11,471	16,449	124,609
Wyoming .....	2,340	2,108	1,323	777	1,554	8,102
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,403,230</b>	<b>1,198,031</b>	<b>880,391</b>	<b>682,439</b>	<b>1,031,494</b>	<b>5,195,584</b>

Note.—All figures reflect expenditures made in fiscal year 1998, as opposed to expenditures made only from the fiscal year 1998 appropriation.

Source: Congressional Research Service based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 9-30.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—STATE ALLOCATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1999

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Child care entitlement		CCDBG dis- cretionary
	Mandatory	Matching	
Alabama .....	\$16,442	\$14,250	\$20,585
Alaska .....	3,545	2,548	2,103
Arizona .....	19,827	17,599	20,529
Arkansas .....	5,300	8,748	12,073
California .....	85,593	125,636	121,446
Colorado .....	10,174	13,578	10,761
Connecticut .....	18,738	10,909	7,192
Delaware .....	5,179	2,415	1,960
District of Columbia .....	4,567	1,552	1,888
Florida .....	43,027	47,400	51,390
Georgia .....	36,548	26,963	32,685
Hawaii .....	4,972	4,171	3,940
Idaho .....	2,868	4,548	5,263
Illinois .....	56,874	43,250	37,520
Indiana .....	26,182	19,900	18,189
Iowa .....	8,508	9,386	9,248
Kansas .....	9,812	9,042	8,916
Kentucky .....	16,702	12,630	17,830
Louisiana .....	13,865	15,605	25,619
Maine .....	3,019	3,860	3,870
Maryland .....	23,301	17,397	13,201
Massachusetts .....	44,973	19,988	13,674
Michigan .....	32,082	33,425	28,187
Minnesota .....	23,368	16,446	13,348
Mississippi .....	6,293	9,888	16,954
Missouri .....	24,669	18,624	18,448
Montana .....	3,191	2,925	3,156
Nebraska .....	10,595	5,811	5,659
Nevada .....	2,580	6,136	4,741
New Hampshire .....	4,582	3,962	2,478
New Jersey .....	26,374	27,404	18,739
New Mexico .....	8,308	6,647	9,410
New York .....	101,984	63,144	56,936
North Carolina .....	69,639	25,539	28,290
North Dakota .....	2,506	2,115	2,302
Ohio .....	70,125	37,712	33,633
Oklahoma .....	24,910	11,485	15,151
Oregon .....	19,409	10,700	10,088
Pennsylvania .....	55,337	38,181	32,313
Rhode Island .....	6,634	3,172	2,601
South Carolina .....	9,867	12,796	17,999
South Dakota .....	1,711	2,544	3,162
Tennessee .....	37,702	17,738	20,442
Texas .....	59,844	75,736	94,329
Utah .....	12,592	9,082	9,767
Vermont .....	3,945	1,902	1,684

TABLE 9-30.—CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND—STATE ALLOCATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1999—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Child care entitlement		CCDBG discretionary
	Mandatory	Matching	
Virginia .....	21,329	22,317	19,414
Washington .....	41,883	19,418	16,431
West Virginia .....	8,727	5,264	7,618
Wisconsin .....	24,511	17,577	14,810
Wyoming .....	2,815	1,652	1,667
Subtotal .....	1,177,525	940,718	949,640
Tribes .....	43,340	NA	19,995
Total States/territories/tribes .....	1,220,865	NA	997,501
Technical assistance .....	5,355	NA	2,473
Total resources .....	1,226,220	940,718	999,974

NA—Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, G., & Schulman, K. (1998). *Child care challenges*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.
- Burchinal, M.R., Campbell, F.A., Bryant, D.M., Wasik, B.H., & Ramey, C.T. (1997). Early intervention and mediating processes in cognitive performance of children of low-income African-American families. *Child Development*, 68, 935-54.
- Campbell, F.A. (1999, April 16). *Long-term outcomes from the Abecedarian study*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.
- Campbell, F.A., & Ramey, C.T. (1995). Cognitive and school outcomes for high-risk African-American students at middle adolescence: Positive effects of early intervention. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 743-72.
- Capizzano, J., & Adams, G. (2000a). *The hours that children under five spend in child care: Variation across States* (No. B-8). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Capizzano, J., & Adams, G. (2000b). *The number of child care arrangements used by children under five: Variation across States* (No. B-12). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Capizzano, J., Adams, G., & Sonenstein, F. (2000). *Child care arrangements for children under five: Variation across States* (No. B-7). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Casper, L.M., Hawkins, M., & O'Connell, M. (1994). Who's minding the kids? *Current Population Reports* (Series P70-36). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

- Casper, L., & O'Connell, M. (1998). *State estimates of organized child care facilities* (Population Division Working Paper No. 21). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Center for the Child Care Workforce. (1999, March). *Current data on child care salaries and benefits in the United States*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Children's Foundation. (1999). *The 1999 family child care licensing study*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Children's Foundation. (2000). *2000 Child care center licensing study*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study Team. (1995). *Cost, quality, and child outcomes in child care centers, Public Report*. Denver: Economics Department, University of Colorado-Denver.
- Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study Team. (1999). *The children of the cost, quality, and outcomes study go to school—executive summary*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center.
- Forman, M.R. (1994, October 20). *Federal funding for child care* (Memorandum to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Galinsky, E., Howes, C., Kontos, S., & Shirr, M. (1994). *The study of children in family child care and relative care*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.
- Karoly, L.A., Greenwood, P.W., Everingham, S.S., Hoube, J., Kilburn, M.R., Rydell, C.P., Sanders, M., & Chiesa, J. (1998). *Investing in our children: What we know and don't know about the costs and benefits of early childhood interventions*. Washington, DC: RAND.
- Kisker, E.E., Hofferth, S.L., Phillips, D.A., & Farquhar, E. (1991). *A profile of child care settings: Early education and care in 1990*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Early Child Care Research Network. (1999, July). Child outcomes: When child care center classes meet recommended standards of quality. *American Journal of Public Health, 89*(7), 1072–77.
- Polivka, A.E., & Rothgeb, J.M. (1993). Redesigning the CPS questionnaire. *Monthly Labor Review, 116*(9), 10–28.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1994). *Early childhood programs: Multiple programs and overlapping target groups* (HEHS-95-4FS). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1997). *Welfare reform: Implications of increased work participation for child care* (HEHS-97-75). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1998a). *Child care: Federal funding for fiscal year 1997* (HEHS-98-70R). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1998b). *Welfare reform: States' efforts to expand child care programs* (HEHS-98-27). Washington, DC: Author.
- Whitebook, M., Howes, C., & Phillips, D. (1998). *Worthy work, unlivable wages: The national child care staffing study, 1988–97*. Washington, DC: Center for the Child Care Workforce.