

Technical Appendix for Demographic Statistics

by Yuval Elmelech and Younghwan Song

Introduction

The demographic statistics reported in *Map and Track: State Initiatives for Young Children and Families, 2000 Edition* are based on NCCP analysis of Current Population Survey (CPS) data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Current Population Survey is the source of official U.S. government statistics on employment and unemployment. It is a monthly survey of about 50,000 households, selected to be representative of the civilian non-institutional population of the United States. The CPS collects information on labor force participation and employment, as well as on age, sex, race, marital status, educational attainment, and family structure. In addition, supplemental information is collected each March on work experience, annual income, poverty status, noncash benefits, health insurance, and migration.

The data used for this publication were taken from the March CPS supplements—also known as the Annual Demographic Files—from 1995, 1997, and 1999, representing information from calendar years 1994, 1996, and 1998. NCCP averaged three years of data because of the small sample sizes in less populated states, and we selected three out of five years to avoid any duplication of cases, given that many respondents are interviewed two years in a row. The analyses focus on young children, defined as children under age six, who live with their families, defined as two or more persons residing together and related by birth, marriage, or adoption (children living in foster families and children living in institutions are not included¹). NCCP calculated these statistics using weights provided by the U.S. Census Bureau to yield results that are representative of the country's total population (weighted statistics take into account the different probabilities of the respondents to be included in the sample).² Unless otherwise noted below, the individual was the unit of analysis in *Map and Track* statistics, and figures were calculated using individual weights.

Number of young children

The number of children under age six (from birth through age five) residing in each state and in the District of Columbia was calculated using data from the March CPS, averaged across three years and weighted as described above.

Percent of young children who live in poverty and percent who are low-income

To calculate child poverty statistics, NCCP compared the income level of a child's family to the poverty thresholds issued by the U.S. Census Bureau. Poverty thresholds vary by family size and composition and are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U).³ Family income includes monetary income before taxes and does not include capital gains or noncash benefits (e.g., Medicaid, food stamps, public housing). Children are defined as "living in poverty" if they live in families whose income is below the poverty threshold. Children are defined as "low-income" if they live in families whose income is below 200 percent of the poverty threshold. Among the total number of young children, NCCP calculated the percentage that lived in poverty and the percentage that were low-income.

State median income for families with young children

The analysis of state median income was based on the income reported for families with at least one child under age six; unrelated "subfamilies" residing within the same household were treated as independent family units. The family was the unit of analysis, and figures were calculated using family weights.

Percent of young children with at least one parent working full-time who remain in poverty

A young child was considered to have at least one parent working full-time if a present parent—i.e., a parent who resides in the household with the child—worked full-year, full-time during the previous year (defined below). Among such children, NCCP calculated the percentage whose family income was below the poverty threshold.

Full-year work is defined as at least 50 weeks of work during the calendar year; part-year work is defined as less than 50 weeks of work. A person is classified as having worked full-time if the individual worked at least 35 hours per week during a majority of the weeks worked during the year. A person is classified as having worked part-time if the individual worked less than 35 hours per week during a majority of the weeks worked during the year. In this report, workers are defined as “full-time” if they worked full-year, full-time. Workers are defined as “part-time” if they worked: (1) full-year, part-time, (2) part-year, full-time, or (3) part-year, part-time.

Percent of low-income young children whose parents are employed full- or part-time

A young child was considered to have parents employed full- or part-time if all present parents—i.e., both parents in a two-parent household, one parent in a single-parent household—worked at least part-time (defined above) during the previous year. Among low-income young children, NCCP calculated the percentage whose parents were employed full- or part-time.

Percent of low-income young children who lack health insurance

The March CPS asks respondents whether their household members were covered by any of the following types of health insurance during the previous year: Medicare, Medicaid, military health care (including CHAMPUS, VA), employer/union paid health insurance, privately purchased health insurance, and health insurance of someone outside of the household. Respondents are not asked directly about whether they or their household members were uninsured throughout the previous year. In this analysis, a child was considered to lack health insurance if the child was not covered in any way by any of the insurance types listed above. NCCP calculated the percentage that lacked health insurance among low-income young children.

The CPS added a set of more extensive health insurance questions to the annual March survey beginning in 1996, but in this analysis, NCCP relies on the original set of questions to allow averaging over the period from 1994 to 1998. Analysis based on the new set of questions leads to only a minor difference in the percentage of uninsured young children in 1996 and 1998.⁴

The CPS health insurance questions ask about coverage at any time during the previous year, so in theory, estimates of the percent of individuals who are uninsured should estimate those without coverage throughout the previous year. However in practice, CPS estimates of the uninsured are found to be closer to the point-in-time estimates from other surveys. For example, a study conducted by Bennefield in 1996 showed that CPS estimates of the uninsured in 1991, 1992, and 1993 (14.1 percent, 14.7 percent, and 15.3 percent, respectively) were closer to the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) point-in-time estimates for those years (14.8 percent, 14.6 percent, and 14.5 percent, respectively) than to the SIPP annual estimates (7.0 percent, 7.6 percent, and 7.7 percent, respectively).⁵ Therefore, the young child health insurance statistics presented in this report may reflect point-in-time estimates rather than lack of coverage during the prior year. Even with these limitations, the CPS is the best data source for timely estimations of uninsured children at the state level.

Endnotes

1. “Secondary Individuals” are excluded from the analyses in this report. These are people of any age who reside in a household, but are not related to the householder (except unrelated subfamily members). People who reside in group quarters are also secondary individuals. Examples of a secondary individual include: (1) a guest, partner, roommate, or resident employee; (2) a foster child; or (3) a person residing in a rooming house, a halfway house, staff quarters at a hospital, or other type of group quarters. (For more information on the definition of household members see <<http://www.census.gov/population/www/cps/cpsdef.html>>.)

2. For more information on the weighting procedure see, for example: <<http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/tp63.html>>.

3. The CPI reflects spending patterns for each of two population groups: All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) and Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W). The CPI-U represents about 87 percent of the total U.S. population and it is based on expenditures of almost all residents of urban or metropolitan areas, including professionals, the self-employed, the poor, the unemployed, retired persons, as well as urban wage earners and clerical workers. Not included in the CPI are the spending patterns of persons living in rural-nonmetropolitan areas, farm families, persons in the armed forces, and those in institutions, such as prisons and mental hospitals. (For more information on the CPI see <<http://www.bls.gov/cpihome.htm>>.)

4. Using the new health insurance variables reduces the percentage of uninsured U.S. children under age six living in families below 200 percent of poverty by 0.15 percent compared to the results based on pre-existing health insurance variables for 1996–1998. All of this increase is due to the increased reporting of military health care coverage.

5. The differences between the CPS estimates and the SIPP annual estimates are mostly due to differences in private insurance coverage. See Bennefield, R. L. (1996). *A comparative analysis of health insurance coverage estimates: Data from CPS and SIPP* (SIPP Working Paper No. 218; presented at the 1996 Joint Statistical Meetings of the American Statistical Association). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Additionally, a study published by Lewis, Ellwood, and Czajka in 1998 suggests that CPS data underreport Medicaid coverage compared to yearly “Medicaid eligibles” from Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) 2082 reports. According to their comparison, the CPS Medicaid underreport for people from birth to age 65 is approximately 20 percent in 1994 and 1995. However (and similarly to the SIPP results described above), when CPS Medicaid reporting is compared to the HCFA June point-in-time Medicaid population <<http://www.hcfa.gov/medicaid/trends98.htm>>, the CPS Medicaid underreport is less than 6 percent during the same years. The exact level of underestimation requires further analysis.

See Lewis, K.; Ellwood, M.; & Czajka, J. L. (1998). *Counting the uninsured: A review of the literature* (Occasional Paper No. 8). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration. HCFA 2082 tables for 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998.

APPENDIX B

Demographic Statistics

Table 1: Number of Young Children and Poverty Statistics for Young Children, by State, 1994–1998

State	Total number of young children (0–6)	Low-income young children*		Young children in poverty	
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
<i>U.S.</i>	<i>23,790,958</i>	<i>10,948,183</i>	<i>46.0%</i>	<i>5,502,734</i>	<i>23.1%</i>
Alabama	360,291	185,255	51.4%	100,262	27.8%
Alaska	66,282	21,574	32.5%	9,097	13.7%
Arizona	487,198	284,752	58.4%	147,646	30.3%
Arkansas	208,778	122,981	58.9%	51,805	24.8%
California	3,288,388	1,715,948	52.2%	943,932	28.7%
Colorado	316,351	115,738	36.6%	47,475	15.0%
Connecticut	280,649	87,302	31.1%	48,446	17.3%
Delaware	58,616	27,763	47.4%	10,173	17.4%
District of Columbia	46,505	30,401	65.4%	20,877	44.9%
Florida	1,132,908	567,931	50.1%	290,916	25.7%
Georgia	641,830	290,082	45.2%	144,827	22.6%
Hawaii	100,451	41,763	41.6%	16,000	15.9%
Idaho	110,143	59,772	54.3%	26,501	24.1%
Illinois	1,117,291	456,360	40.8%	225,177	20.2%
Indiana	533,771	208,825	39.1%	92,008	17.2%
Iowa	248,804	108,413	43.6%	41,015	16.5%
Kansas	239,016	106,229	44.4%	44,463	18.6%
Kentucky	301,795	146,656	48.6%	73,513	24.4%
Louisiana	384,628	216,827	56.4%	139,243	36.2%
Maine	86,009	34,318	39.9%	16,142	18.8%
Maryland	467,056	145,736	31.2%	64,449	13.8%
Massachusetts	512,515	165,949	32.4%	79,843	15.6%
Michigan	900,173	376,070	41.8%	201,162	22.3%
Minnesota	423,632	149,346	35.3%	74,166	17.5%
Mississippi	245,888	148,863	60.5%	78,216	31.8%
Missouri	461,607	198,543	43.0%	88,115	19.1%
Montana	75,940	40,104	52.8%	18,600	24.5%
Nebraska	162,202	67,671	41.7%	31,689	19.5%
Nevada	145,284	57,384	39.5%	22,014	15.2%
New Hampshire	100,625	37,688	37.5%	14,046	14.0%
New Jersey	682,319	197,956	29.0%	85,265	12.5%
New Mexico	179,276	110,662	61.7%	61,095	34.1%
New York	1,601,942	772,189	48.2%	447,095	27.9%
North Carolina	588,322	262,341	44.6%	133,330	22.7%
North Dakota	52,437	23,376	44.6%	10,588	20.2%
Ohio	948,773	419,284	44.2%	220,864	23.3%
Oklahoma	250,605	133,684	53.3%	66,516	26.5%
Oregon	272,821	153,028	56.1%	58,346	21.4%
Pennsylvania	950,528	379,568	39.9%	173,436	18.2%
Rhode Island	68,517	27,908	40.7%	13,766	20.1%
South Carolina	293,833	147,876	50.3%	56,227	19.1%
South Dakota	60,830	27,253	44.8%	11,967	19.7%
Tennessee	459,835	253,990	55.2%	119,003	25.9%
Texas	1,974,924	1,075,155	54.4%	558,849	28.3%
Utah	234,230	99,890	42.6%	30,237	12.9%
Vermont	49,382	20,349	41.2%	7,052	14.3%
Virginia	551,644	193,932	35.2%	84,563	15.3%
Washington	493,105	194,289	39.4%	82,952	16.8%
West Virginia	110,974	71,686	64.6%	39,114	35.2%
Wisconsin	424,149	146,612	34.6%	72,850	17.2%
Wyoming	37,887	20,911	55.2%	7,801	20.6%

* Low-income young children are children under age 6 living in families with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level.

Source

NCCP analysis of March Current Population Surveys, U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data averaged across 1994, 1996, and 1998. (See Appendix A: *Technical Appendix for Demographic Statistics* for more information.)

Demographic Statistics

Table 2: State Median Income for Families with Young Children, 1994–1998, and State Rank in Income Inequality, 1996–1998

State	State median income for families with young children (0–6)	State rank in income inequality*
	1	2
U.S.	\$36,910	
Alabama	\$33,784	12
Alaska	\$46,284	46
Arizona	\$29,000	3
Arkansas	\$29,200	29
California	\$34,300	6
Colorado	\$43,000	47
Connecticut	\$53,165	20
Delaware	\$34,340	38
District of Columbia	\$24,284	1
Florida	\$32,600	14
Georgia	\$35,700	13
Hawaii	\$40,275	21
Idaho	\$34,300	40
Illinois	\$42,240	24
Indiana	\$36,877	50
Iowa	\$36,620	49
Kansas	\$38,104	22
Kentucky	\$30,725	10
Louisiana	\$30,449	5
Maine	\$34,100	45
Maryland	\$55,550	31
Massachusetts	\$48,800	17
Michigan	\$41,400	30
Minnesota	\$48,004	36
Mississippi	\$27,020	16
Missouri	\$38,086	34
Montana	\$31,293	27
Nebraska	\$36,515	42
Nevada	\$40,000	39
New Hampshire	\$41,974	35
New Jersey	\$55,050	25
New Mexico	\$26,048	4
New York	\$35,200	2
North Carolina	\$37,780	18
North Dakota	\$34,778	48
Ohio	\$35,122	23
Oklahoma	\$33,500	19
Oregon	\$30,975	9
Pennsylvania	\$40,551	26
Rhode Island	\$38,104	7
South Carolina	\$36,584	37
South Dakota	\$35,500	33
Tennessee	\$30,000	28
Texas	\$31,260	8
Utah	\$40,001	51
Vermont	\$37,020	41
Virginia	\$43,100	11
Washington	\$39,268	32
West Virginia	\$22,100	15
Wisconsin	\$43,650	44
Wyoming	\$30,204	43

* State rank (out of 51, including the District of Columbia) based on the income gap between the average income of the poorest fifth of families and the average income of the richest fifth of families in the state (1 is the most unequal).

Sources, by column number

1. NCCP analysis of March Current Population Surveys, U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data averaged across 1994, 1996, and 1998. (See Appendix A: *Technical Appendix for Demographic Statistics* for more information.)

2. Bernstein, J.; McNichol, E. C.; Mishel, L.; & Zahradnik, R. (2000). *Pulling apart: A state-by-state analysis of income trends*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Data are from 1996–1998.

APPENDIX B

Demographic Statistics

Table 3: Parental Employment and Health Insurance Coverage for Low-Income Young Children* and Young Children in Poverty, by State, 1994–1998

State	Percent of young children with at least one parent working full-time who remain in poverty	Percent of young children with at least one parent working full-time who remain low-income	Percent of low-income young children whose parents are employed full- or part-time	Percent of low-income young children who lack health insurance
U.S.	7.7%	30.9%	51.5%	20.7%
Alabama	5.2%	34.0%	56.3%	22.2%
Alaska	5.0%	22.8%	54.6%	17.9%
Arizona	12.5%	44.5%	45.3%	32.7%
Arkansas	9.8%	48.4%	67.7%	23.9%
California	12.4%	36.2%	40.0%	22.7%
Colorado	4.0%	25.7%	56.0%	19.1%
Connecticut	2.9%	13.9%	57.4%	11.7%
Delaware	5.5%	33.0%	63.2%	28.9%
District of Columbia	11.4%	34.9%	43.8%	21.3%
Florida	8.5%	35.4%	52.9%	22.7%
Georgia	8.5%	32.6%	61.4%	21.9%
Hawaii	3.9%	30.8%	56.6%	10.2%
Idaho	11.8%	42.1%	54.8%	21.4%
Illinois	5.3%	24.7%	54.4%	16.2%
Indiana	4.6%	27.9%	61.8%	14.0%
Iowa	5.2%	31.7%	64.4%	11.4%
Kansas	6.4%	32.3%	63.6%	17.8%
Kentucky	8.5%	33.3%	58.6%	22.9%
Louisiana	11.2%	34.4%	46.6%	24.0%
Maine	1.1%	18.8%	74.6%	11.4%
Maryland	2.4%	17.1%	47.7%	16.9%
Massachusetts	1.8%	18.1%	44.3%	8.4%
Michigan	5.1%	24.7%	51.7%	11.7%
Minnesota	7.7%	25.8%	65.0%	22.2%
Mississippi	8.8%	42.0%	60.6%	23.0%
Missouri	4.6%	26.7%	71.5%	13.6%
Montana	9.5%	40.5%	63.2%	10.5%
Nebraska	9.5%	31.0%	67.7%	7.7%
Nevada	6.4%	31.1%	51.7%	32.5%
New Hampshire	5.4%	20.9%	62.9%	13.4%
New Jersey	3.2%	16.7%	43.0%	23.6%
New Mexico	16.6%	48.6%	49.5%	20.6%
New York	8.3%	28.0%	37.2%	18.2%
North Carolina	6.7%	29.6%	63.0%	18.0%
North Dakota	8.8%	32.5%	77.0%	17.0%
Ohio	5.0%	27.8%	49.9%	13.5%
Oklahoma	8.9%	38.2%	63.5%	31.6%
Oregon	7.2%	41.1%	58.9%	16.2%
Pennsylvania	5.2%	26.3%	50.4%	15.1%
Rhode Island	2.9%	22.7%	54.6%	5.3%
South Carolina	7.5%	40.4%	51.9%	32.5%
South Dakota	9.5%	35.0%	69.4%	8.6%
Tennessee	8.3%	40.0%	58.1%	26.0%
Texas	14.2%	41.9%	51.6%	31.1%
Utah	4.3%	32.4%	53.5%	16.2%
Vermont	6.5%	28.3%	65.3%	5.5%
Virginia	4.3%	23.8%	64.4%	23.3%
Washington	4.4%	25.3%	51.2%	17.5%
West Virginia	9.4%	45.4%	39.9%	8.0%
Wisconsin	4.0%	20.7%	64.3%	9.2%
Wyoming	8.1%	45.1%	64.1%	18.3%

* Low-income young children are children under age 6 living in families with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level.

Source

NCCP analysis of March Current Population Surveys, U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data averaged across 1994, 1996, and 1998. (See Appendix A: *Technical Appendix for Demographic Statistics* for more information.)

State Efforts to Promote Family Economic Security

Table 1: State Income Tax Policies, 1999–2000

State	State income tax threshold is at or above the federal poverty level	Refundable earned income credit: Percent of federal credit	Refundable dependent care credit: Maximum credit for a family with 2 or more dependents
	1	2	3
Alabama			
Alaska	N/A		
Arizona	x		
Arkansas			\$288 [c]
California	x		
Colorado	x	10%	\$720
Connecticut	x		
Delaware			
District of Columbia	x	10%	
Florida	N/A		
Georgia			
Hawaii			\$1,200
Idaho	x		
Illinois			
Indiana			
Iowa	x		\$1,080
Kansas	x	10%	
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine	x		
Maryland	x	15%	
Massachusetts	x	10%	
Michigan			
Minnesota	x	34% [a]	\$1,440
Mississippi	x		
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska	x		\$1,440 [d]
Nevada	N/A		
New Hampshire	N/A		
New Jersey		10%	
New Mexico	x		\$960 [e]
New York	x	22.5%	\$1,440
North Carolina			
North Dakota	x		
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania	x		
Rhode Island	x		
South Carolina	x		
South Dakota	N/A		
Tennessee	N/A		
Texas	N/A		
Utah			
Vermont	x	32%	
Virginia			
Washington	N/A		
West Virginia			
Wisconsin	x	4%–43% [b]	
Wyoming	N/A		

N/A: State does not tax personal income.

[a] This is an average; the percent varies by earnings.

[b] Depends on the number of children (1 child: 4%; 2 children: 14%; 3 children: 43%).

[c] Only for care of children ages 3 to 5 in an accredited, developmentally appropriate early childhood education program.

[d] For taxpayers with a federal adjusted gross income of \$29,000 or less.

[e] \$960 for 2 dependents; \$1,200 for 3 or more dependents.

Sources, by column number

1. Johnson, N.; Zahradnik, R.; & McNichol, E. C. (2000). *State income tax burdens on low income families in 1999*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Data are from tax year 1999.

2. Johnson, N. (2000). *A hand up: How state earned income tax credits help working families escape poverty: 2000 edition*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Data are from November 2000.

3. Steinschneider, J.; Donahue, E. H.; Campbell, N. D.; & Williams, V. L. (1998). *Making care less taxing: Improving state child and dependent care tax provisions*. Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center, with updates from National Women's Law Center. (2000). Recent changes in state child and dependent care tax provisions: Tax year 2000 [unpublished table]. Data are from December 1999.

State Efforts to Promote Family Economic Security

Table 2: State Minimum Wage Levels and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Benefits, 2000

State	Minimum wage above federal level of \$5.15	TANF benefit—single-parent family of three with no earnings		
		Maximum annual benefit	Maximum annual benefit as a percent of state median income	Maximum annual benefit as a percent of federal poverty level
	1	2	3	4
Alabama		\$1,968	6%	14%
Alaska	\$5.65	\$11,076	24%	78%
Arizona		\$4,164	14%	29%
Arkansas		\$2,448	8%	17%
California	\$5.75	\$7,512	22%	53%
Colorado		\$4,272	10%	30%
Connecticut	\$6.15	\$6,516	12%	46%
Delaware	\$5.65	\$4,056	12%	29%
District of Columbia	\$6.15	\$4,548	19%	32%
Florida		\$3,636	11%	26%
Georgia		\$3,360	9%	24%
Hawaii	\$5.25	\$6,840	17%	48%
Idaho		\$3,516	10%	25%
Illinois		\$4,524	11%	32%
Indiana		\$3,456	9%	24%
Iowa		\$5,112	14%	36%
Kansas		\$4,836	13%	34%
Kentucky		\$3,144	10%	22%
Louisiana		\$2,280	7%	16%
Maine		\$5,532	16%	39%
Maryland		\$5,004	9%	35%
Massachusetts	\$6.00	\$6,780	14%	48%
Michigan		\$5,508	13%	39%
Minnesota		\$9,468 [a]	N/A [a]	N/A [a]
Mississippi		\$2,040	8%	14%
Missouri		\$3,504	9%	25%
Montana		\$5,616	18%	40%
Nebraska		\$4,368	12%	31%
Nevada		\$4,176	10%	30%
New Hampshire		\$7,200	17%	51%
New Jersey		\$5,088	9%	36%
New Mexico		\$5,268	20%	37%
New York		\$6,924	20%	49%
North Carolina		\$3,264	9%	23%
North Dakota		\$5,484	16%	39%
Ohio		\$4,476	13%	32%
Oklahoma		\$3,504	10%	25%
Oregon	\$6.50	\$5,520	18%	39%
Pennsylvania		\$4,836	12%	34%
Rhode Island	\$5.65	\$6,648	17%	47%
South Carolina		\$2,412	7%	17%
South Dakota		\$5,160	15%	36%
Tennessee		\$2,220	7%	16%
Texas		\$2,364	8%	17%
Utah		\$5,412	14%	38%
Vermont	\$5.75	\$7,464	20%	53%
Virginia		\$3,492	8%	25%
Washington	\$6.50	\$6,552	17%	46%
West Virginia		\$3,936	18%	28%
Wisconsin		\$8,076	19%	57%
Wyoming		\$4,080	14%	29%

[a] Minnesota provides a cash grant that combines TANF and food stamp benefits; \$9,468 is the total amount.

Sources, by column number

1. U.S. Department of Labor. (2000). Minimum wage laws in the states: Minimum Wage and Overtime Premium Pay Standards Applicable to Nonsupervisory NONFARM Private Sector Employment Under State and Federal Laws, August 1, 2000. <<http://www.dol.gov/dol/esa/public/minwage/america.htm>> Data are from August 2000.
2. State Policy Documentation Project. (2000). TANF cash assistance: Categorical and financial eligibility rules. <<http://www.spdp.org/tanf/cat-fin.htm>> Data are from June 2000.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*

State Efforts to Promote Family Economic Security

Table 3: Child Care Assistance through the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), 1999

State	CCDF subsidy coverage rate (US: 12%)	Follows recommended federal guidelines on:		Transfers TANF block grant funds to CCDF
		Subsidy purchasing power	Subsidy co-payment burden	
	1	2	3	4
Alabama	11%		N/A	x
Alaska	13%	x	x	x
Arizona	13%			x
Arkansas	6%	x	N/A	
California	13%	x [a]	x	x
Colorado	11%		x	
Connecticut	5%		x	
Delaware	12%			x
District of Columbia	3%		x	x
Florida	8%	x	x	x
Georgia	8%		x	x
Hawaii	9%		x	x
Idaho	11%	x	N/A	x
Illinois	14%	x [b]	x	x
Indiana	7%		x	x
Iowa	8%		N/A	x
Kansas	7%		x	x
Kentucky	15%		N/A	x
Louisiana	18%	x	x	x
Maine	15%	x	x	x
Maryland	8%	x	N/A	x
Massachusetts	13%		x	x
Michigan	19%		x	x
Minnesota	6%	x	x	x
Mississippi	10%		x	x
Missouri	19%		N/A	x
Montana	11%	x		x
Nebraska	11%	x	x	
Nevada	6%	x		
New Hampshire	9%		x	
New Jersey	10%		x	x
New Mexico	13%	x	x	x
New York	19%		[c]	x
North Carolina	16%		x	x
North Dakota	12%			
Ohio	10%	x	x	
Oklahoma	16%		x	x
Oregon	11%			
Pennsylvania	15%		x	x
Rhode Island	15%		x	x
South Carolina	8%	x	x	x
South Dakota	8%			
Tennessee	18%		x	x
Texas	8%	x	x	x
Utah	10%	x		x
Vermont	15%	x	x	x
Virginia	8%	x	x	x
Washington	15%		x	x
West Virginia	25%		N/A	x
Wisconsin	7%	x		x
Wyoming	11%		N/A	x

N/A: Family of three at 150% FPL is not eligible for CCDF subsidies.

[a] The state rate in California is set at 1.5 standard deviations above the average MRS from 1997.

[b] Illinois has three regional rates; given variation among counties, rates may be above, equal to, or below the 75th percentile in a particular county.

[c] Co-payment rates vary by county.

Sources, by column number

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2000). Child Care and Development Block Grant/Child Care and Development Fund: Children served in Fiscal Year 1999 (average monthly) [table]. <<http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/cctable.htm>> Data are from fiscal year 1999.

This table updates the information reported in U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (1999). *Access to child care for low-income working families*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.

2. Blank, H. & Poersch, N. O. (1999). *State developments in child care and early education, 1999*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund. Data are from June 1999.

3. *Ibid.*

4. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Financial Services. (2000). TANF program expenditures in FY 1999 through the 4th quarter. <<http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/q499/table-d.htm>> Data are from fiscal year 1999.

State Efforts to Promote Family Economic Security

Table 4: Health and Nutrition Assistance, 1998–2000

State	Medicaid/CHIP eligibility levels as a percent of the federal poverty level:			Food stamp coverage rate for children under age 5	State supplements WIC funding
	Infants (0–1)	Children (1–6)	Parents		
	1	2	3	4	5
Alabama	200%	200%	22%	65.3%	
Alaska	200%	200%	156%	62.9%	
Arizona	200%	200%	51%	35.4%	
Arkansas	200%	200%	56%	64.3%	
California	250%	250%	157%	52.2%	
Colorado	185%	185%	45%	53.2%	
Connecticut	300%	300%	100%	66.9%	
Delaware	200%	200%	108%	63.4%	
District of Columbia	200%	200%	200%	74.5%	x
Florida	200%	200%	71%	52.6%	
Georgia	200%	200%	45%	78.0%	
Hawaii	185%	133%	115%	111.5%	
Idaho	150%	150%	36%	37.6%	
Illinois	200%	185%	52%	61.7%	
Indiana	200%	200%	33%	54.4%	
Iowa	185%	185%	93%	47.4%	
Kansas	200%	200%	67%	38.1%	
Kentucky	200%	200%	54%	62.3%	
Louisiana	150%	150%	23%	67.8%	
Maine	200%	200%	108%	66.8%	
Maryland	200%	200%	46%	75.1%	x
Massachusetts	200%	200%	133%	66.1%	x
Michigan	200%	200%	48%	62.0%	
Minnesota	280% [a]	275%	275%	48.4%	x
Mississippi	200%	200%	40%	67.4%	
Missouri	300%	300%	100%	73.7%	
Montana	150%	150%	73%	52.0%	
Nebraska	185%	185%	43%	50.2%	x
Nevada	200%	200%	38%	45.0%	
New Hampshire	300%	300%	60%	35.0%	
New Jersey	350%	350%	47%	78.0%	
New Mexico	235%	235%	62%	44.7%	x
New York	230%	230%	94%	59.8%	x
North Carolina	200%	200%	56%	62.4%	x
North Dakota	140%	140%	55%	38.6%	
Ohio	150%	150%	85%	53.0%	
Oklahoma	185%	185%	37%	69.0%	
Oregon	170%	170%	100%	44.4%	
Pennsylvania	235%	235%	71%	69.9%	
Rhode Island	250%	250%	193%	88.6%	
South Carolina	185%	150%	59%	71.1%	
South Dakota	140%	140%	70%	59.9%	
Tennessee	400%	400%	67%	67.8%	
Texas	200%	200%	32%	55.7%	
Utah	200%	200%	58%	42.1%	
Vermont	300%	300%	158%	61.5%	
Virginia	185%	185%	33%	71.2%	
Washington	250%	250%	96%	60.9%	x
West Virginia	150%	150%	30%	86.3%	x
Wisconsin	185%	185%	65%	48.2%	x
Wyoming	133%	133%	69%	48.5%	

[a] Children below age 2 are covered up to 280% of the federal poverty level.

Sources, by column number

- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2000). State income eligibility guidelines for children's Medicaid and separate child health insurance programs [table]. <<http://www.cbpp.org/shsh/elig.htm>> Data are from April 2000.
- Ibid.*
- Guyer, J. & Mann, C. (1999). *Employed but not insured: A state-by-state analysis of the number of low-income working parents who lack health insurance*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Data are from February 1999.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2000). *Characteristics of food stamp households: Fiscal year 1998*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture. Data are from fiscal year 1998.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Supplemental Food Programs Division. (2000). WIC program: State appropriations—fiscal year 2000 [unpublished table]. Data are from fiscal year 2000.

State Efforts to Promote Family Economic Security

Table 5: Strategies to Increase Enrollment for Medicaid and Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), 2000

State	Presumptive eligibility		12-month continuous eligibility		No assets test		Self-declaration of income	
	Medicaid*	CHIP**	Medicaid*	CHIP**	Medicaid*	CHIP**	Medicaid*	CHIP**
Alabama	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Alaska	N		N		Y		N	
Arizona	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Arkansas	N		N		N		N	
California	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Colorado	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Delaware	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
District of Columbia	N		N		Y		N	
Florida	N	N	Y[a]	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgia	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hawaii	N		N		Y		N	
Idaho	N		Y		N		Y	
Illinois	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Indiana	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Iowa	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Kansas	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Kentucky	N	N	N	N[b]	Y	Y	N	N
Louisiana	N		Y		Y		N	
Maine	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Maryland	N		N		Y		Y	
Massachusetts	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Michigan	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Minnesota	N		N		Y		N	
Mississippi	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Missouri	N		N		N		N	
Montana	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Nebraska	Y		Y		Y		N	
Nevada	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
New Hampshire	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
New Jersey	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
New Mexico	Y		Y		Y		N	
New York	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
North Carolina	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
North Dakota	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Ohio	N		N		Y		N	
Oklahoma	N		N		Y		Y	
Oregon	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pennsylvania	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Rhode Island	N		N		Y		N	
South Carolina	N		Y		Y		N	
South Dakota	N		N		Y		N	
Tennessee	N		N		Y		N	
Texas	N	N	N	N[b]	N	Y	N	N
Utah	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Vermont	N		N		Y		Y	
Virginia	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Washington	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Wisconsin	N		N		Y		N	
Wyoming	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

* Includes expanded Medicaid programs funded through CHIP.
 ** Separate CHIP-funded programs (i.e., does not include expanded Medicaid).
 [a] 12-month continuous eligibility for children under age 5 only.
 [b] In development.

Source
 Cox, L. & Ross, D. C. (2000). *Medicaid for children and CHIP income eligibility guidelines and enrollment procedures: Findings from a 50-state survey, preliminary report*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Data are from March 2000.