

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care

Child Care Survey Results on Funding and Related Policies in the Southern States

Southern Institute on Children and Families
500 Taylor Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 779-2607
www.thesoutherninstitute.org

Prepared By

Nicole Ravenell, MPP
Policy and Research Director

Bob Amundson, MPA
Research Associate

April 2004

This report was made possible by a grant from
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

THE SOUTHERN INSTITUTE on Children and Families

The Southern Institute on Children and Families is an independent, non-profit organization that improves the well-being of children and families through knowledge, leadership and action. We educate through research of policies, systems and practices. We generate greater awareness and equip community and business leaders and policymakers with knowledge to make informed decisions. The Southern Institute on Children and Families is funded through grants and contributions. The southern states included in the work of the Southern Institute are:

Alabama
Arkansas
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maryland
Mississippi
Missouri
North Carolina
Oklahoma
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Virginia
West Virginia

While the primary focus of the Southern Institute on Children and Families is on the South, the Southern Institute directs national programs related to its mission.

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care

Alabama

Lee Anne Lynn
Supervisor of Day Treatment
East Alabama Mental Health

Arkansas

Janie Huddleston
Director, Division of Child Care and
Early Childhood Education
Arkansas Department of Human Services

Delaware

Betty Richardson
Director
Head Start Collaboration Office

District of Columbia

Carrie Thornhill
Vice President, Youth Investment &
Community Outreach
DC Agenda

Florida

Pat Cronon
Executive Director
Hand 'N Hand Child Care Center

Georgia

Marsha Moore
Assistant Director
Georgia Office of School Readiness

Kentucky

Kim Townley, PhD
Executive Director
Division of Early Childhood Development
Kentucky Department of Education

Louisiana

Ann Williamson
Secretary
Louisiana Department of Social Services

Maryland

Linda Zang
Director
Head Start Collaboration Office
Governor's Office for Children, Families and Youth

Mississippi

Carol Burnett
Executive Director
Mississippi Low Income Child Care Initiative

Missouri

Deborah Scott
Director Office of Early Childhood

North Carolina

Sheila Hoyle
Executive Director
Southwestern Child Development Commission

Oklahoma

Robert Harbison (Retired)
Child Advocate

South Carolina

Dennis Drew
Director of Education
Office of the Governor

Tennessee

Gina Lodge
Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Human Services

Texas

Diane D. Rath
Chair
Texas Workforce Commission

Virginia

Lisa Collis
First Lady of Virginia
Office of the Governor

West Virginia

Fred Boothe
Commissioner
Bureau for Children and Families
West Virginia Department of Health and
Human Resources

Southern Growth Policies Board Appointment

Tommy Deweese
Division Manager
Arkansas Southwestern Electric Power Company

Southern Institute on Children and Families

Appointments

Rebeca Maria Barrera

President

National Latino Children's Institute

Andy Downs

Executive Vice President

Kentucky Chamber of Commerce

James T. McLawhorn, Jr.

President and CEO

Columbia (SC) Urban League

Sandra L. Murman

Florida House of Representatives

Sarah C. Shuptrine

Chairman

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care

President and CEO

Southern Institute on Children and Families

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care Staff Work Group and Project Staff

Staff Work Group

Desiree Reddick-Head
Regional TA Specialist
National Child Care Information Center

Barbara Ferguson Kamara
Executive Director
Office of Early Childhood Development
DC Department of Human Services

Luis Hernandez
Director
Head Start Quality Improvement Center
DHHS Region IV

Susan D. Russell
Executive Director
Child Care Services Association

Linda Hoke
Senior Program Manager
Southern Growth Policies Board

Nancy vonBargen
Child Care Administrator
Oklahoma Department of Human Services

Lee Stevens
Legislative Director for Health and
Human Services
Southern Governors' Association

Robin Wade
Research Associate
Educational Policies
Southern Regional Education Board

Project Staff

Bob Amundson, MPA
Research Associate

Sarah C. Shuptrine
President and Chief Executive Officer,
Chairman, Southern Regional Task Force on
Child Care

Ann Marchetti, MS
Program Director

Jeanna M. Steele
Events Coordinator

Kerrie Newell
Program Assistant

Christi Stewart
Administrative Assistant
Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care

Nicole Ravenell, MPP
Policy and Research Director

Beth Shine, MMC
Communications Coordinator

Ashley S. Thomas
Communications and Development Director

Acknowledgements

The Southern Institute on Children and Families expresses great appreciation to The David and Lucile Packard Foundation for their support of the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care.

The Southern Institute acknowledges and thanks the members of the Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care and state child care administrators in the southern states and the District of Columbia for their cooperation and responses to the 2004 Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care Survey on Funding and Related Policies in the Southern States. Appreciation also is extended to Dottie C. Campbell for her assistance with the survey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care | iv |
| Staff Work Group and Project Staff | vi |
| Acknowledgements | vii |
| Table of Contents | ix |
| | |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| SURVEY METHODOLOGY..... | 2 |
| NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES RECEIVING CHILD CARE SUBSIDIES..... | 3 |
| Table 1: Changes in the Number of Children and Families Receiving Subsidized Child Care (All 16 States)..... | 4 |
| WAITING LISTS FOR CHILD CARE SUBSIDIES..... | 5 |
| Table 2: Changes in the Number of Children and Families on a Waiting List for Subsidized Child Care (10 States) | 7 |
| CHILD CARE FUNDING..... | 8 |
| Table 3: Projected Changes in the Number of Children and Families on a Waiting List for Subsidized Child Care in Federal Fiscal Year 2004 (11 States)..... | 10 |
| Table 4: Changes in Total Funding for Subsidized Child Care by State | 11 |
| STATE SUMMARIES..... | 12 |
| CONCLUSION | 14 |
| APPENDIX A: SOUTHERN INSTITUTE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CHILD CARE SURVEY (FEBRUARY 2004) | 15 |
| APPENDIX B: SOUTHERN INSTITUTE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CHILD CARE SURVEY SUPPLEMENT (FEBRUARY 2004)..... | 23 |
| APPENDIX C: SOUTHERN INSTITUTE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CHILD CARE SURVEY DATA | 27 |
| APPENDIX D: SOUTHERN INSTITUTE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CHILD CARE SURVEY CONTACTS..... | 51 |
| APPENDIX E: SOUTHERN REGIONAL INITIATIVE ON CHILD CARE PUBLICATIONS | 53 |

CHILD CARE SURVEY RESULTS ON FUNDING AND RELATED POLICIES IN THE SOUTHERN STATES

Introduction

The Southern Institute on Children and Families established the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care in January 2000 with support from The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. The Initiative is guided by a 24-member Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care composed of gubernatorial representatives from 17 southern states, a mayoral appointee representing the District of Columbia, a representative of the Southern Growth Policies Board and representatives appointed by the Southern Institute. States participating in the Initiative are Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia.

A Staff Work Group of child care experts and policy staff from southern regional organizations was assembled by the Southern Institute to complement the work of and provide expertise on issues addressed by the Task Force. The Southern Institute also commissioned consultants to conduct surveys and additional research needed to assist with the deliberations of the Task Force and explore issues identified during 13 state site visits conducted in 2001 and 2002.

The Task Force developed two action plans that serve as blueprints for southern states and tracked progress over several years. In January 2004 the Task Force held a meeting to review the Implementation Status Report of the *Southern Regional Action Plan to Improve the Quality of Early Care and Education* (October 2002) and the Implementation Status Report of the *Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South* (December 2000). During the meeting Task Force members discussed a variety of methods states were using to accommodate for funding shortages. These options included reducing the number of children or families receiving subsidized child care, starting waiting lists for child care, decreasing the amount of funds for quality enhancement efforts, reducing family eligibility income levels, not raising child care provider rates and increasing the co-payments families are required to pay to receive their child care subsidies.

In an effort to gain broader knowledge of the actions states in the region were taking or considering, the Task Force requested that the Southern Institute conduct a survey of the states participating in the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care. The survey was designed to collect information on child care funding in the southern region and identify state-initiated policy changes related to

funding shortages. Sixteen states responded to the survey (**Alabama, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia**). Delaware was not asked to complete the survey because at the time the survey was distributed, the Task Force position for Delaware was vacant. For the purpose of the survey results analysis, the District of Columbia is referred to as a state. This report reviews the findings from the survey. Data are presented in time periods and state summaries also are provided.

Survey Methodology

The Southern Institute developed a survey instrument (Appendix A) that was sent by e-mail to the child care administrators in states participating in the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care. The survey requested information for Federal Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003 and for Federal Fiscal Year 2004 information as of January 31, 2004. Child care administrators also were asked for projections for the current Federal Fiscal Year which ends September 30, 2004, and for Federal Fiscal Year 2005. A supplemental survey (Appendix B) focused on Federal Fiscal Year 2001 also was sent to each state. Survey questions related to the following topic areas:

- Number of Children and Families Receiving Child Care Subsidies
- Waiting Lists for Child Care Subsidies
- Child Care Funding

Where necessary, follow-up was conducted by phone or e-mail to clarify responses. Once the data were compiled, tables were created and sent to each state to review for accuracy. The complete survey tables are in Appendix C

Six survey questions requested narrative responses to obtain insight on each state's circumstance. The unedited state responses have been provided in Appendix C, but the responses are not discussed in this chapter. A full analysis was not possible because the project ends on April 30, 2004.

Question 13 requested information on the percentage of funds a state spent on quality, as defined in the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) regulations. Since CCDF funding was not constant during the time periods in the survey, the changes in the percentages do not equate to changes in the amounts of funds spent on quality enhancement activities. Thus, there is no discussion of Question 13 in this chapter.

Contact information for individuals who responded to the surveys is listed in Appendix D. The same individuals completed both surveys.

Number of Children and Families Receiving Child Care Subsidies

The following section describes the number of children and families receiving subsidized child care during the time periods covered in the survey. Information illustrating state responses appears in Table 1.

September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2002 (Number Served)

During this time period the total number of children served in the 16 states increased from 811,181 to 832,928, an increase of approximately three percent regionwide. The total number of families increased from 389,325 to 433,417, an increase of approximately 11 percent regionwide. Nine states (**Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Virginia**) reported increases in the number of children and families served. Three states that did not track the number of families in 2001 also reported increases in the number of children served (**Kentucky, Louisiana and South Carolina**). Five states reported decreases in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2002 (**District of Columbia, Mississippi, Missouri, Texas and West Virginia**).

September 30, 2002 to September 30, 2003 (Number Served)

During this time period the total number of children served in the 16 states increased from 832,928 to 839,100, an increase of less than one percent regionwide. The number of families decreased from 433,417 to 430,677, a decrease of less than one percent regionwide. During this same time period, five states increased the number of children and families served (**Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi and North Carolina**). One state (**Louisiana**), which did not track the number of families served, also reported an increase in the number of children served. Nine states (**Alabama, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia**) reported a decrease in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2002 to September 30, 2003. One state (**South Carolina**), which did not track the number of families, also reported a decrease in the number of children served.

September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003 (Number Served)

During the two-year time period there was an increase regionwide in the number of children and families receiving subsidized child care. The total number of children receiving subsidized child care increased from 811,181 to 839,100, an increase of approximately three percent regionwide. The total number of families receiving subsidized child care increased from 389,325 to 430,677, an increase

states reported increases in the number of children or families served and half reported decreases. Six states (**Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Virginia**) increased the number of children and families served. Seven states (**Alabama, District of Columbia, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Texas and West Virginia**) decreased the number of children and families served. Two states (**Louisiana and South Carolina**) increased the number of children served but did not track families. One state (**Kentucky**) decreased the number of children served but did not track families.

Table 1 below provides an illustration of information presented in this section.

| Table 1 Changes in the Number of Children and Families Receiving Subsidized Child Care (All 16 States) September 30, 2001 (FFY 2001) - September 30, 2003 (FFY 2003) | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| STATE ACTIONS | Number of States FFY 2001 - FFY 2002 | Number of States FFY 2002 - FFY 2003 | Number of States FFY 2001 - FFY 2003 |
| Increased the Number of Children Served | 12 States (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MO, NC, OK, SC, VA) | 6 States (AR, FL, GA, LA, MS, NC) | 8 States (AR, FL, GA, LA, NC, OK, SC, VA) |
| Decreased the Number of Children Served | 4 States (DC, MS, TX, WV) | 10 States (AL, DC, KY, MD, MO, OK, SC, TX, VA, WV) | 8 States (AL, DC, KY, MD, MS, MO, TX, WV) |
| Increased the Number of Families Served | 9 States (AL, AR, FL, GA, MD, NC, OK, VA, WV) | 5 States (AR, FL, GA, MS, NC) | 6 States (AR, FL, GA, NC, OK, VA) |
| Decreased the Number of Families Served | 4 States (DC, MS, MO, TX) | 9 States (AL, DC, KY, MD, MO, OK, TX, VA, WV) | 7 States (AL, DC, MD, MS, MO, TX, WV) |
| Did Not Track Families Served | 3 States (KY, LA, SC) | 2 States (LA, SC) | 3 States (KY, LA, SC) |

(Appendix C, Table 1)

Projections on Numbers Served for Federal Fiscal Year 2004

Projecting for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004, three states (**Arkansas, District of Columbia and Florida**) anticipate increasing the number of children and families served. Six states (**Alabama, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas and West Virginia**) projected a decrease in the number of children and families to be served. Seven states (**Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Virginia**) expect no change in the number of children and families to be served in 2004.

The narrative responses from survey Question 4, regarding state reasons for projecting the number of children and families on subsidized child care to increase, decrease or not change in FFY 2004, are in Appendix C.

Waiting Lists for Child Care Subsidies

The following section describes the number of children and families on waiting lists for subsidized child care during the time periods covered in the survey. It should be noted that there are several reasons why the number of children and families on waiting lists for subsidized child care (Table 4, Appendix C) are not entirely a measure of need for subsidized child care. The data presented, therefore, should simply be viewed as point-in-time numbers of children and families on waiting lists for subsidized child care.

At some point between FFY 2001 and FFY 2003, 10 states (**Alabama, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Texas and Virginia**) used waiting lists for children and/or families, and each of these states intends to continue to use waiting lists in FFY 2004. One state (**Mississippi**), which had not previously kept a waiting list, began keeping one in FFY 2004. Five states (**Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina and West Virginia**) do not maintain waiting lists. One state (**Missouri**) is unsure whether a waiting list will be needed in FFY 2004.

The narrative responses for survey Question 10, regarding states' reasons for expecting or not expecting to maintain waiting lists for subsidized child care in FFY 2004, are in Appendix C.

September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2002 (Waiting Lists)

During this time period, two states (**Georgia and Texas**) increased the number of children on a waiting list. Two states (**Alabama and Arkansas**) decreased the number of children on a waiting list. One state (**Florida**) reported no change in the number of children on a waiting list. Two states (**Kentucky and Virginia**) did

not maintain a waiting list for children. One state (**Georgia**) increased the number of families on a waiting list. Three states (**Alabama, Arkansas and Virginia**) decreased the number of families on a waiting list. Three states (**Florida, Kentucky and Texas**) did not maintain a waiting list for families.

Maryland had waiting lists for children and families but did not have any children or families on these waiting lists. The **District of Columbia** initiated waiting lists for children and families in June 2002. There are no data to compare for **Maryland** and **District of Columbia** during this time period. **North Carolina** had a waiting list for children and the number of children on the waiting list decreased during this time period. The State did not track the number of families on a waiting list during this time period.

September 30, 2002 to September 30, 2003 (Waiting Lists)

During this time period three states (**Alabama, Florida and Georgia**) increased the number of children on a waiting list. Two states (**Arkansas and Texas**) decreased the number of children on a waiting list. One state (**Virginia**) did not maintain a waiting list for children. Three states (**Alabama, Georgia and Virginia**) increased the number of families on a waiting list. One state (**Arkansas**) decreased the number of families on a waiting list. Two states (**Florida and Texas**) did not maintain waiting lists for families.

District of Columbia initiated waiting lists for children and families in June 2002, and the number of children and families on the waiting lists increased during this period. **Maryland** initiated waiting lists for children and families in January 2003 and **Kentucky** initiated waiting lists for children and families in May 2003. There are no data to compare for **Maryland** and **Kentucky** during this time period. **North Carolina** had a waiting list for children and the number of children on the waiting list decreased during this time period. The State did not track the number of families on a waiting list during this period.

September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003 (Waiting Lists)

During the two-year time period three states (**Alabama, Florida and Georgia**) increased the number of children on a waiting list. Two states (**Arkansas and Texas**) decreased the number of children on a waiting list. One state (**Virginia**) did not maintain a waiting list for children. Three states (**Alabama, Georgia and Virginia**) increased the number of families on a waiting list. One state (**Arkansas**) decreased the number of families on a waiting list. Two states (**Florida and Texas**) did not maintain a waiting list for families.

The **District of Columbia** initiated a waiting list for children and families in June 2002. **Maryland** initiated waiting lists for children and families in January 2003

and **Kentucky** initiated waiting lists for children and families in May 2003. There are no data to compare during this time period for these three states. **North Carolina** had a waiting list for children and the number of children on the waiting list decreased during this time period. The State did not track the number of families on a waiting list during this two-year time period.

Projections on Waiting Lists for Federal Fiscal Year 2004

During FFY 2004, eight states (**District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Texas and Virginia**) expect an increase, one state (**Arkansas**) expects no change and two states (**Alabama and Kentucky**) expect a decrease in the number of children on a waiting list. Eight states (**Alabama, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, Texas and Virginia**) expect an increase, one state (**Arkansas**) expects no change and one state (**Kentucky**) expects a decrease in the number of families on a waiting list. One state (**North Carolina**) does not track the number of families on a waiting list.

Table 2 below provides an illustration of information related to states' projections about waiting lists for FFY 2004.

| Table 2 Projected Changes in the Number of Children and Families on a Waiting List for Subsidized Child Care in Federal Fiscal Year 2004 (11 States)* | | |
|--|---|---|
| Projected State Actions | The Number of Children on Waiting List | The Number of Families on Waiting List** |
| Increase | 8 States (DC, FL, GA, MD, MS, NC, TX, VA) | 8 States (AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, MS, TX, VA) |
| No Change | 1 State (AR) | 1 State (AR) |
| Decrease | 2 States (AL, KY) | 1 State (KY) |

* Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina and West Virginia do not maintain waiting lists.

** North Carolina is not tracking families on a waiting list. (Appendix C, Table 5)

The narrative responses from survey Question 8 regarding state reasons for projecting the number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care to increase, decrease or not change in FFY 2004, are in Appendix C.

Child Care Funding

The following section describes subsidized child care funding during the time periods covered in the survey. Information illustrating states' responses appears in Tables 3 and 4. States reported information by the following funding sources:

- Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF);
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Funds transferred to CCDF;
- TANF funds spent directly on child care;
- Social Services Block Grant (SSBG);
- State Funding - Maintenance of Effort (required by federal law to prevent federal funds from supplanting state funds);
- State Funding – Match (required by federal law); and
- State Funding – Excess of State Match.

The survey asked for the amount of TANF Bonus Funds each state spent on subsidized child care. The exact amounts of TANF Bonus Funds used for subsidized child care were not tracked by many states and are reported in other funding categories.

September 30, 2001 – September 30, 2002 (Child Care Funding)

The total for subsidized child care funding in the 16 southern states increased from approximately \$2.9 billion in FFY 2001 to approximately \$3.1 billion (an increase of approximately \$216 million) in FFY 2002. Ten of 16 states reported an increase in total funds (**Alabama, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Texas**). Six states reported a decrease in the total amount of funds for child care (**Florida, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia**).

Between FFY 2001 and 2002, CCDF, State Funding (Maintenance of Effort), State Funding (Match) and the Total of All Funding Sources increased. The totals by funding source show a decrease in TANF (Transfer Funds), TANF (Direct Funds), SSBG funds and State Funding (Excess of Match).

September 30, 2002 – September 30, 2003 (Child Care Funding)

Total subsidized child care funding increased from approximately \$3.1 billion in FFY 2002 to approximately \$3.2 billion (an increase of approximately \$46

million) in FFY 2003. Ten states reported increases in total funds (**Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma and South Carolina**). Six states reported decreases in the total amount of funds for child care (**District of Columbia, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia**).

Between FFY 2002 and 2003, there were increases in CCDF, TANF (Transfer Funds), TANF (Direct Funds), SSBG, State Funding (Maintenance of Effort), State Funding (Match) and the Total of All Funding Sources. Only State Funding (Excess of Match) decreased.

September 30, 2001 – September 30, 2003 (Child Care Funding)

During the two-year time period total subsidized child care funding across the southern region increased from approximately \$2.9 billion in FFY 2001 to approximately \$3.2 billion (an increase of approximately \$262 million) in FFY 2003. Twelve of the 16 states reported increases in total funds (**Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Texas**). Four states reported decreases in the total amount of funds for child care (**District of Columbia, Florida, Virginia and West Virginia**).

Between FFY 2001 and 2003, there were increases in CCDF, SSBG, State Funding (Maintenance of Effort), State Funding (Match) and the Total of All Funding Sources. TANF (Transfer Funds), TANF (Direct Funds) and State Funding (Excess of Match) decreased.

Tables 3 and 4 on the following pages provide an illustration of information presented in this section.

Table 3
Changes in Total Funding for Subsidized Child Care by State
September 30, 2001 (FFY 2001) - September 30, 2003 (FFY 2003)

| STATE | Change Between FFY 2001 - FFY 2002 | Change Between FFY 2002 - FFY 2003 | Change Between FFY 2001 - FFY 2003 |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| Alabama | +31,429,812 | +8,027,634 | +39,457,446 |
| Arkansas | +6,686,907 | +19,501,465 | +26,188,372 |
| District of Columbia | +4,843,612 | -10,641,538 | -5,797,926 |
| Florida | -14,119,210 | -23,364,152 | -37,483,362 |
| Georgia | +227,141 | +7,825,530 | +8,052,671 |
| Kentucky | +4,960,009 | +808,552 | +5,768,561 |
| Louisiana | +28,038,109 | -3,889,809 | +24,148,300 |
| Maryland | +27,524,360 | +29,500,575 | +57,024,935 |
| Mississippi | -266,970 | +729,473 | +462,503 |
| Missouri | -79,329 | +2,234,863 | +2,155,534 |
| North Carolina | -5,070,268 | +25,503,131 | +20,432,863 |
| Oklahoma | +15,375,288 | +15,586,709 | +30,961,997 |
| South Carolina | +7,621,681 | +1,278,462 | +8,900,143 |
| Texas | +112,846,558 | -15,400,372 | +97,446,186 |
| Virginia | -3,981,995 | -2,787,191 | -6,769,186 |
| West Virginia | -353,845 | -8,849,891 | -9,203,736 |
| Southern Region | +215,681,860 | +46,063,441 | +261,745,301 |

(Appendix C, Tables 7, 8 and 9)

| Table 4 Changes in Total Funding Sources for Subsidized Child Care by Funding Source (All 16 States) September 30, 2001 (FFY 2001) - September 30, 2003 (FFY 2003) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Funding Source | Change Between FFY 2001 - FFY 2002 | Change Between FFY 2002 - FFY 2003 | Change Between FFY 2001 - FFY 2003 |
| Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| TANF (Transfer Funds) | Decrease | Increase | Decrease |
| TANF (Direct Funds) | Decrease | Increase | Decrease |
| Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) | Decrease | Increase | Increase |
| State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| State Funding (Match) | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| State Funding (Excess of Match) | Decrease | Decrease | Decrease |

(Appendix C, Table 11)

Other Major Funding Sources

Other major funding sources for subsidized child care include a three percent excise beer tax (**Arkansas**), tobacco settlement funds (**Kentucky**) and First Steps State Funds (**South Carolina**). Both **Georgia** and **Virginia** used state pre-kindergarten funds. The **District of Columbia** Department of Employment Services provides Workforce Investment Dollars for TANF customers receiving job training. **Missouri** used funds from gaming revenue and **Texas** secured funds at the local level in the form of private or public donations, transfers or certifications.

State Summaries

Outlined below is a state-by-state summary of the number of children and families receiving child care subsidies, the number of children and families on waiting lists for child care subsidies and the amount of subsidized child care funding. State responses on the reasons why they expect or do not expect changes in the future are provided in Appendix C.

- **Alabama** reports a decrease in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects this to continue in FFY 2004. The State also has seen an increase in the number of children and families on a waiting list from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, but Alabama projects a decrease in the number of children and an increase in the number of families on a waiting list in FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Arkansas** increased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects this to continue in FFY 2004. The State decreased the number of children and families on waiting lists from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and projects no change in the number of children and families on a waiting list in FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- The **District of Columbia** reports a decrease in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, but expects to increase the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. An increase in the number of children and families on a waiting list in FFY 2004 is projected. The District of Columbia experienced a decrease in total funding for subsidized child care from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Florida** increased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects this to continue in FFY 2004. The State increased the number of children on a waiting list from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects the number of children and families on a waiting list to increase in FFY 2004. Florida experienced a decrease in total funding for subsidized child care from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Georgia** increased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and anticipates no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. The State also has seen an increase in the number of children and families on a waiting list from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects this to continue in FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.

- **Kentucky** reports decreases in the number of children served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, but projects no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. In FFY 2004 the State expects a decrease in the number of children and families on a waiting list. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Louisiana** increased the number of children served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Maryland** reports a decrease in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects this to continue in FFY 2004. In FFY 2004 the State expects an increase in the number of children and families on a waiting list. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Mississippi** reports a decrease in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects this to continue in FFY 2004. Mississippi began keeping a waiting list in FFY 2004 and expects an increase in the number of children and families on a waiting list during FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Missouri** reports decreases in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, but projects no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **North Carolina** increased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. Between September 30, 2001 and September 30, 2003, the State decreased the number of children on a waiting list but expects to increase the number of children on a waiting list during FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Oklahoma** increased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **South Carolina** increased the number of children served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, but projects a decrease in the number of children to be served in 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **Texas** reports a decrease in the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30 2003, and projects this to continue in 2004. Between September 30, 2001 and September 30, 2003, the number of children on a waiting list decreased but the State expects to

increase the number of children and families on a waiting list during FFY 2004. Total funding for subsidized child care increased from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.

- **Virginia** increased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and expects no change in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. The number of families on a waiting list increased from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003, and the state projects an increase of both children and families on a waiting list during FFY 2004. Virginia experienced a decrease in total funding for subsidized child care from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.
- **West Virginia** decreased the number of children and families served from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2003. The state projects a decrease in the number of children and families to be served in FFY 2004. West Virginia experienced a decrease in total funding for subsidized child care from FFY 2001 to FFY 2003.

Conclusion

After several years of most southern states reporting progress on the ***Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South*** (December 2000), many of the southern states responding to this survey are experiencing or anticipating reductions in their ability to provide child care subsidies for low-income families.

Additional information on the Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, all reports, both action plans and results of state surveys can be found by visiting the Southern Institute Web site at www.thesoutherninstitute.org.

APPENDIX A

**SOUTHERN INSTITUTE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
CHILD CARE SURVEY
February 2004**

The Southern Institute on Children and Families Child Care Survey
February 2004

1. Please provide the following information for the person completing the survey:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| State | <input type="text"/> |
| Name | <input type="text"/> |
| Title | <input type="text"/> |
| Organization | <input type="text"/> |
| Mailing Address | <input type="text"/> |
| Email | <input type="text"/> |
| Phone Number | <input type="text"/> |
| Fax Number | <input type="text"/> |

2. Please provide the total number of children and families receiving subsidized child care in the state. Please provide point in time data for one or both categories of the population receiving child care subsidies.

| Population Receiving Subsidies | September 30, 2002 | September 30, 2003 | January 31, 2004 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Number of Children | | | |
| Number of Families | | | |

3. Do you expect the number of children and families receiving subsidized child care in the state to increase, not change or decrease during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

FFY 2004

Increase

No Change

Decrease

4. State the reasons why you expect an increase, no change or decrease in the number of children and families receiving subsidized child care during FFY 2004.

5. Does the state currently maintain a waiting list for the subsidized child care program? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

Yes

No (go to question 9)

6. Please provide the total number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care. Please provide point in time data for one or both categories of the population on a waiting list.

| Population on Waiting List | September 30, 2002 | September 30, 2003 | January 31, 2004 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Number of Children | | | |
| Number of Families | | | |

7. Do you expect an increase, no change or decrease in the number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care in FFY 2004? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

FFY 2004
(Children)

Increase

No Change

Decrease

FFY 2004 (Families)

Increase

No Change

Decrease

8. State the reasons why you expect an increase, no change or decrease in the number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care in FFY 2004.

9. Does the state plan to maintain a waiting list for the subsidized child care program sometime in FFY 2004? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

FFY 2004

Yes

No

10. State the reasons why you expect to maintain a waiting list or do not expect to maintain a waiting list for the subsidized child care program sometime in FFY 2004.

11. Please provide the following information regarding funding for the state subsidized child care program in the table below.

| Funding Source | For FFY 2002 | For FFY 2003 | For FFY 2004 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Child Care and Development Fund | | | |
| TANF <i>Transfer Funds</i> | | | |
| TANF <i>Bonus Funds</i> | | | |
| TANF <i>Direct Funds</i> | | | |
| Social Services Block Grant | | | |
| State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | | | |
| State Funding (Match) | | | |
| State Funding (Excess of Match) | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |

12. Please describe any other major funding sources used by the state for subsidized child care and provide amounts in the table below. (Do not include other early care and education funds, such as Head Start and pre-kindergarten, unless they are incorporated into the subsidized child care program budget administered by the state.)

| Other Funding | For FFY 2002 | For FFY 2003 | For FFY 2004 |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |

13. Please provide the percentage of funds spent on quality, as defined in the CCDF regulations, in the table below.

| | For FFY 2002 | For FFY 2003 | For FFY 2004 |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Percentage of CCDF Funding | | | |

14. Please provide income eligibility guidelines for families to receive subsidized child care for FFY 2002, FFY 2003 and FFY 2004. Please send the tables via e-mail to Bob Amundson at bob@kidsouth.org or fax to (803) 254-6301.

15. What changes, if any, do you anticipate regarding income eligibility guidelines for families to receive subsidized child care for FFY 2005?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

16. Please provide the subsidized child care program reimbursement rates to licensed child care providers for FFY 2002, FFY 2003 and FFY 2004. Please send the tables via e-mail to Bob Amundson at bob@kidsouth.org or fax to (803) 254-6301.

17. What changes, if any, do you anticipate regarding rates to licensed child care providers for FFY 2005?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

18. Please provide information regarding co-payments (per child) paid for subsidized child care for FFY 2002, FFY 2003 and FFY 2004. Please send the tables via e-mail to Bob Amundson at bob@kidsouth.org or fax to (803) 254 6301.

19. What changes, if any, do you anticipate regarding co-payments (per child) paid for subsidized child care for FFY 2005?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

APPENDIX B

Southern Institute on Children and Families Child Care Survey Supplement February 2004

**The Southern Institute on Children and Families Child Care Survey
Supplement
February 2004**

2. Please provide the total number of children and families receiving subsidized child care in the state. Please provide point in time data for one or both categories of the population receiving child care subsidies.

| Population Receiving Subsidies | September 30, 2001 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Number of Children | |
| Number of Families | |

6. Please provide the total number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care. Please provide point in time data for one or both categories of the population on a waiting list.

| Population on Waiting List | September 30, 2001 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Number of Children | |
| Number of Families | |

11. Please provide the following information regarding funding for the state subsidized child care program in the table below.

| Funding Source | For FFY 2001 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Child Care and Development Fund | |
| <i>TANF Transfer Funds</i> | |
| <i>TANF Bonus Funds</i> | |
| <i>TANF Direct Funds</i> | |
| Social Services Block Grant | |
| State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | |
| State Funding (Match) | |
| State Funding (Excess of Match) | |
| Total | |

12. Please describe any other major funding sources used by the state for subsidized child care and provide amounts in the table below. (Do not include other early care and education funds, such as Head Start and pre-kindergarten, unless they are incorporated into the subsidized child care program budget administered by the state.)

| Other Funding | For FFY 2001 |
|---------------|--------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Total | |

13. Please provide the percentage of funds spent on quality, as defined in the CCDF regulations, in the table below.

| | For FFY 2001 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Percentage of CCDF Funding | |

APPENDIX C

Southern Institute on Children and Families Child Care Survey Data Tables

| Table 1 | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Total Number of Children and Families Receiving Subsidized Child Care | | | | | | |
| September 30, 2001 - September 30, 2003 | | | | | | |
| State | Number of Children | | | Number of Families | | |
| | 30-Sep-01 | 30-Sep-02 | 30-Sep-03 | 30-Sep-01 | 30-Sep-02 | 30-Sep-03 |
| Alabama* | 34,421 | 40,301 | 32,203 | 21,513 | 28,433 | 20,959 |
| Arkansas | 11,008 | 13,289 | 14,935 | 6,415 | 7,773 | 8,634 |
| District of Columbia | 20,996 | 16,443 | 13,598 | 14,896 | 11,181 | 9,304 |
| Florida | 135,036 | 147,356 | 162,958 | 77,705 | 87,336 | 97,331 |
| Georgia | 51,532 | 51,882 | 62,220 | 28,484 | 30,044 | 34,030 |
| Kentucky | 44,699 | 47,680 | 40,588 | Not tracked | 31,787 | 27,059 |
| Louisiana | 37,283 | 46,406 | 47,652 | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked |
| Maryland | 28,205 | 30,841 | 26,272 | 20,979 | 23,301 | 19,736 |
| Mississippi | 52,330 | 37,302 | 37,579 | 28,735 | 20,965 | 21,175 |
| Missouri | 46,304 | 47,328 | 45,582 | 24,735 | 25,235 | 24,404 |
| North Carolina | 91,207 | 92,421 | 98,257 | 49,824 | 50,551 | 53,682 |
| Oklahoma | 47,452 | 50,937 | 49,295 | 25,996 | 27,905 | 27,006 |
| South Carolina | 43,428 | 45,417 | 45,207 | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked |
| Texas | 123,205 | 120,747 | 119,945 | 64,836 | 63,439 | 62,785 |
| Virginia | 25,017 | 27,466 | 26,846 | 13,782 | 15,278 | 15,000 |
| West Virginia | 19,058 | 17,112 | 15,963 | 11,425 | 10,189 | 9,572 |

Survey Question 2: Please provide the total number of children and families receiving subsidized child care in the state. Please provide point in time data for one or both categories of the population receiving child care subsidies.

* Number of Families is an estimate for September 30, 2001.

| Table 2 | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Expected Change in the Number of Children and Families Receiving Subsidized Child Care During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 | | | |
| State | Increase | No Change | Decrease |
| Alabama | | | X |
| Arkansas | X | | |
| District of Columbia | X | | |
| Florida | X | | |
| Georgia | | X | |
| Kentucky | | X | |
| Louisiana | | X | |
| Maryland | | | X |
| Mississippi | | | X |
| Missouri | | X | |
| North Carolina | | X | |
| Oklahoma | | X | |
| South Carolina | | | X |
| Texas | | | X |
| Virginia | | X | |
| West Virginia | | | X |

Survey Question 3: Do you expect the number of children and families receiving subsidized child care in the state to increase, not change or decrease during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

**Survey
Question 4**

State the reasons why you expect an increase, no change or decrease in the number of children and families receiving subsidized child care during FFY 2004.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Alabama | State implemented a freeze on new placements from the waiting list in April 2003. Anticipate this freeze will continue throughout FY2004. |
| Arkansas | We have TANF dollars that were transferred that are still available to spend. Also, in the Special Session of the 84th Legislature, \$40 million dollars was appropriated for Pre-K services to serve three and four year old children up to 200% of the FPL. |
| District of Columbia | The same amount of dollars is available in FY04 for child care subsidy as in FY03. This is a result of a TANF bonus the District of Columbia received. Without the bonus, fewer children would have received subsidies. |
| Florida | Increase in federal CCDF funding for FFY 2004. |
| Georgia | Georgia did not receive additional state funds and is expecting no increase in federal funds. The population we serve has changed this year and will continue to change. This past year we began serving children in Head Start through the subsidy process rather than through contracts, and will primarily serve foster children who need supplemental supervision when foster parents have to work. These funds will come from CCDF rather than from State and IV-E funds. |
| Kentucky | Due to budget constraints, no additional allocations are expected. KY will be monitoring expenditures to assure that the maximum number of eligible children and families are served within the funding available. |
| Louisiana | We do not expect a significant change in FFY 2004 because our child care caseload has been relatively stable over the last seven months. |
| Maryland | Current caseload trends show declining enrollment in Non-TCA due to the waiting list and growth occurring in TCA child care as a result of universal engagement efforts in the Family Investment Administration. We anticipate an overall decline. |
| Mississippi | We expect a decrease in TANF funds transferred into CCDF. |
| Missouri | The number of children receiving child care subsidy has remained relatively stable over the past 2-3 years. While we do not anticipate a dramatic increase, any sizeable fluctuation would require Missouri to institute a waiting list. |
| North Carolina | The state's subsidy program did not receive an increase in funding from the General Assembly for SFY 2003-2004 and we will not know about the amount of funds available for SFY 2004-2005 until the state legislature approves the budget. |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Oklahoma | Oklahoma is experiencing a significant budget deficit within the child care subsidy program. Current ongoing revenue can no longer fund the program unless additional funding sources are identified or services are reduced. In SFY-04, Oklahoma will utilize approximately \$42 million in TANF reserve funding to fund the \$139 million child care budget. With no changes, TANF reserve will become completely exhausted at the end of SFY-05. As of February 2004, OKDHS is defining strategies to balance the child care budget through various changes and assumed increases in funding. Although there may be significant decreases in the near future, we do not expect the changes to begin affecting families until the start of the new federal fiscal year. Until such time as additional appropriations are determined, many of the questions requesting anticipated data are unknown. |
| South Carolina | The funding for the ABC Program was not increased for FY'04, but the average cost of child care has increased. As a result, DHHS discontinued the Continuity of Care (COC) policy which allowed eligible children to continue to receive child care services until age 6. As services for these children end, they are being dropped from the ABC Program. |
| Texas | Texas has had a slight increase in CCDF funding; however, the trend in the first four months indicates that a higher percentage of the children receiving subsidies will be enrolled in Choices child care. "Choices" is the name of the TANF employment program in Texas, and children of parents participating in Choices services are a priority group for child care services. Parents who are participating in Choices services are exempt from co-payments for child care. Since they have no co-pay, the cost of Choices child care is higher for Choices child care, and the balance of the funds left to serve low-income, working families is correspondingly reduced. |
| Virginia | Funding for Virginia's child care subsidy program remains level. Also, the delay of TANF and CCDF reauthorization has delayed any possible federal increases for child care subsidies. |
| West Virginia | The state is considering new policy that would require families to work a minimum number of hours and to earn minimum wage. Also under consideration is policy that would require families to pursue child support. We anticipate some slight reduction in the number of families that would be eligible if these policy changes are implemented. |

| Table 3 | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| States Currently Maintaining a Waiting List for Subsidized Child Care | | |
| State | Yes | No |
| Alabama | X | |
| Arkansas | X | |
| District of Columbia | X | |
| Florida | X | |
| Georgia | X | |
| Kentucky | X | |
| Louisiana | | X |
| Maryland | X | |
| Mississippi | X | |
| Missouri | | X |
| North Carolina | X | |
| Oklahoma | | X |
| South Carolina | | X |
| Texas | X | |
| Virginia ⁽¹⁾ | X | |
| West Virginia | | X |

Survey Question 5: Does the state currently maintain a waiting list for the subsidized child care program? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

(1) Virginia has a state supervised, locally administered system. Waiting lists are maintained by individual localities.

| Table 4 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Total Number of Children and Families Placed on a Waiting List for Subsidized Child Care⁽¹⁾ | | | | | | |
| State | Number of Children | | | Number of Families | | |
| | 30-Sep-01 | 30-Sep-02 | 30-Sep-03 | 30-Sep-01 | 30-Sep-02 | 30-Sep-03 |
| Alabama ⁽²⁾ | 5,471 | 3,755 | 16,757 | 3,419 | 2,086 | 10,976 |
| Arkansas | 8,821 | 2,339 | 1,426 | 5,189 | 1,376 | 839 |
| District of Columbia ⁽²⁾ | No waiting list | 540 | 1,299 | No waiting list | 338 | 812 |
| Florida | 51,457 | 51,457 | 56,482 | No waiting list | No waiting list | No waiting list |
| Georgia ⁽³⁾ | 10,785 | 27,440 | 37,755 | 8,296 | 21,107 | 29,042 |
| Kentucky | No waiting list | No waiting list | 10,686 | No waiting list | No waiting list | 6,583 |
| Maryland ⁽⁴⁾ | No waiting list | No waiting list | 1,156 | No waiting list | No waiting list | 780 |
| North Carolina | 26,696 | 21,336 | 19,880 | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked |
| Texas | 38,660 | 41,277 | 30,450 | No waiting list | No waiting list | No waiting list |
| Virginia ^(5,6) | No waiting list | No waiting list | No waiting list | 4,255 | 3,704 | 4,428 |

Survey Question 6: Please provide the total number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care. Please provide point in time data for one or both categories of the population on a waiting list.

(1) Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina and West Virginia did not maintain waiting lists.

(2) Number of families is an estimate.

(3) Numbers of children for September 30, 2002 and September 30, 2003 are estimates.

(4) Waiting list was initiated January 2003.

(5) Currently working on a system that continuously tracks number of children and families. Waiting list should be completed this FFY (2004).

(6) Data for September 30, 2001 are actually point in time data for January 1, 2001. Data for September 30, 2002 are actually point in time data for July 1, 2002. Data for September 30, 2003 are actually point in time data for January 1, 2003.

| Table 5 | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Expected Change in the Number of Children and Families Placed on a Waiting List for Subsidized Child Care in FFY 2004 * | | | | | | |
| State | Children | | | Families | | |
| | Increase | No Change | Decrease | Increase | No Change | Decrease |
| Alabama | | | X | X | | |
| Arkansas | | X | | | X | |
| District of Columbia | X | | | X | | |
| Florida | X | | | X | | |
| Georgia | X | | | X | | |
| Kentucky | | | X | | | X |
| Maryland | X | | | X | | |
| Mississippi** | X | | | X | | |
| North Carolina | X | | | Number of families is not tracked | | |
| Texas | X | | | X | | |
| Virginia | X | | | X | | |

Survey Question 7: Do you expect an increase, no change or decrease in the number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care in FFY 2004? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

* Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina and West Virginia do not maintain waiting lists.

** Mississippi initiated a waiting list in 2004.

**Survey
Question 8**

State the reasons why you expect an increase, no change or decrease in the number of children and families placed on a waiting list for subsidized child care in FFY 2004.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alabama | Expect to experience a decrease in the waiting list as the number of families who apply for care decreases because no new families are being added from the waiting list. Also, those currently on the waiting are not responding to notices to determine if they still need care and/or still meet eligibility criteria. |
| Arkansas | We have just hired six new eligibility specialists in order to work the current applications we are receiving within our 30 day goal. |
| District of Columbia | We are continuing the waiting list throughout FY04. The District continues to add new children and families based on specific eligibility criteria. TANF families, disabled children, children in child protective services, and children in foster care continue to be enrolled. |
| Florida | Historical trends reveal the wait list has increased an average of 3,349 additional eligible children each fiscal year. These increases of children waiting for programs are partly due to dollars available to serve children, Florida's population size as well as the income of Florida's parents to name a few. Since there is no actual data to support the reason for the increase, it is believed that it is due to availability of additional funds and population growth in Florida. |
| Georgia | There has been a steady increase of our waiting list over the past months. There is an ongoing need for subsidized child care. (See attached chart). |
| Kentucky | Decreases are expected due to the implementation of lower initial eligibility criteria (from 165% to 150%) resulting in fewer families qualifying and as management of the expenditures result in additional children being served from the waiting list. |
| Louisiana* | |
| Maryland | Unless we close the waiting list, families should continue to apply. |
| Mississippi | We received a cut in TANF dollars. More qualified child care providers are receiving a higher reimbursement. |
| Missouri | In spite of Missouri's very low eligibility rates which have avoided a waiting list for the state, the system is at capacity and is being monitored carefully on a monthly basis. The need to institute a waiting list is anticipated should any substantial increased demand occur. |
| North Carolina | The need for child care assistance is greater than the availability of subsidy funds as evidenced by the waiting list and the subsidy allocation formula which allows the state to identify the number of children that would qualify for subsidy services. |
| Oklahoma | Oklahoma does not have a waiting list. |
| South Carolina* | |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Texas | The waiting list is comprised of low-income, working families because Choices families receive priority for services. If the current trend continues and the number of children in Choices child care increases, there may be less funding available to serve low-income, working families. |
| Virginia | Virginia has seen an increase in the number of TANF cases over the past year. If child care costs for TANF families increase, there could be an increase in the number of non-TANF families who are placed on waiting lists for subsidized child care. |
| West Virginia | West Virginia does not operate a waiting list. |

*Louisiana and South Carolina do not maintain waiting lists.

| Table 6 | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| States Planning to Maintain a Waiting List Sometime in FFY 2004 | | |
| State | Yes | No |
| Alabama | X | |
| Arkansas | X | |
| District of Columbia | X | |
| Florida* | X | |
| Georgia | X | |
| Kentucky | X | |
| Louisiana | | X |
| Maryland | X | |
| Mississippi | X | |
| Missouri | Unsure | Unsure |
| North Carolina | X | |
| Oklahoma | | X |
| South Carolina | | X |
| Texas | X | |
| Virginia | X | |
| West Virginia | | X |

Survey Question 9: Does the state plan to maintain a waiting list for the subsidized child care program sometime in FFY 2004? Please indicate the correct response with an "X".

* Waiting lists are maintained by the 50 local School Readiness Coalitions.

Survey Question 10 **State the reasons why you expect to maintain a waiting list or do not expect to maintain a waiting list for the subsidized child care program sometime in FFY 2004.**

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alabama | Waiting list will continue to be maintained as in previous years of children eligible for care but funding is not available. If additional funding becomes available to service children from the waiting list, children will be served according to date placed on waiting list. |
| Arkansas | We are currently receiving over 1,000 new applications monthly for subsidized services. Also, we may raise the eligibility to 200% to match the new pre-K money. That would make more families eligible. |
| District of Columbia | The budget for child care subsidies is approximately the same amount in FY04 as in FY03. This is entirely a result of a TANF bonus that the District of Columbia received. Without the bonus fewer dollars for subsidy would have been available in FY04. We expect fewer dollars for subsidy to be available in FY05 since the TANF bonuses will no longer be available. |
| Florida | The Florida Partnership for School Readiness, which is the state entity for subsidized child care funds in Florida, works with 50 local school readiness coalitions who are responsible for maintaining local waiting lists. |
| Georgia | There is an ongoing need for assistance with child care. Maintaining a waiting list allows the state to gather data to determine if the expressed need for assistance has increased or decreased. |
| Kentucky | Due to budget constraints, no additional allocations are expected. KY will be monitoring expenditures to assure that the maximum number of eligible children and families are served within the funding available, but it is anticipated that a waiting list will continue to be maintained. |
| Louisiana | We do not expect to maintain a waiting list in FFY 2004, as we have not had a waiting list since 2001. |
| Maryland | We do not anticipate that additional funds will be available. |
| Mississippi | A waiting list will be maintained in order to document the need for subsidized child care services. |
| Missouri | Unknown. As stated above, the system is at capacity. Substantial fluctuation would require instituting a waiting list. |
| North Carolina | The availability of subsidy funds is not sufficient to serve all the eligible families. |
| Oklahoma | Oklahoma does not have a waiting list nor does it have a statutory requirement to maintain eligibility at defined levels. Should Oklahoma face the need to limit the number of families and children participating within the child care subsidy program, we will opt to decrease eligibility and forego the need for a waiting list. |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| South Carolina | The ABC Program does not maintain a waiting list because it creates anticipation that services will be offered, and that is not always possible depending on services already being provided to targeted populations. In the past when children have needed to be added to the program, we have allowed potential clients to call the 1-800 number and get pre-screened for eligibility, and then applications have been mailed to those parents on the pre-screening list. |
| Texas | The amount of federal and state dollars available for subsidized child care is insufficient to provide child care services to the state's eligible low-income, working families. Waiting lists provide Boards a systematic method for enrolling children from low-income, working families when attrition occurs. |
| Virginia | Waiting lists are maintained by localities. Not all localities have a waiting list. Those localities that do have a waiting list do not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible families who apply for services. |
| West Virginia | West Virginia does not maintain a waiting list. The state's philosophy is to serve those individuals with the lowest incomes. Rather than place such individuals on a waiting list, we opted to reduce eligibility guidelines and increase co-payments in order to reduce the number of eligible families to a level that could be served based on available funding. All families with incomes within the guidelines are financially eligible to receive child care and none are wait listed. This means that there are a number of families who are potentially eligible under CCDF regulations that are not tracked because they would be over West Virginia's income guidelines. |

Table 7

Funding Sources for State Subsidized Child Care Programs Federal Fiscal Year 2001⁽¹⁾

| State | Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) | TANF (Transfer Funds) | TANF (Direct Funds) | Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) | State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | State Funding (Match) | State Funding (Excess of Match) | Total |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Alabama | 61,825,108 | 26,604,196 | 93,315 | 500,000 | 6,896,417 | 3,686,070 | 0 | 99,605,106 |
| Arkansas | 14,171,575 | 5,760,000 | 3,100,329 | 909,232 | 1,886,543 | 4,549,212 | 0 | 30,376,891 |
| District of Columbia | 12,470,066 | 11,916,885 | 19,763,165 | 0 | 4,566,974 | 1,940,843 | 15,276,183 | 65,934,116 |
| Florida | 212,419,658 | 114,531,007 | 158,758,055 | 2,110,274 | 77,736,865 | 946,052 | 115,682,515 | 682,184,426 |
| Georgia | 142,111,203 | 40,000,000 | 0 | 90 | 22,585,618 | 26,699,631 | 22,182,651 | 253,579,193 |
| Kentucky | 70,325,025 | 36,240,000 | 17,000,000 | 0 | 7,274,537 | 7,592,099 | 1,596,166 | 140,027,827 |
| Louisiana | 49,903,882 | 54,106,043 | 0 | 0 | 5,219,488 | 3,044,095 | 0 | 112,273,508 |
| Maryland | 74,856,782 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23,301,407 | 25,072,098 | 0 | 123,230,287 |
| Mississippi | 34,139,584 | 19,636,326 | 0 | 0 | 1,715,430 | 3,367,213 | 1,651,783 | 60,510,336 |
| Missouri | 87,566,009 | 22,442,506 | 0 | 189,013 | 16,548,756 | 16,639,457 | 46,568,794 | 189,954,535 |
| North Carolina ⁽²⁾ | 124,555,542 | 78,833,367 | 26,621,241 | 3,000,000 | 41,383,151 | 18,612,825 | 74,611,115 | 367,617,241 |
| Oklahoma | 11,726,988 | 29,522,359 | 47,864,372 | 0 | 10,630,233 | 0 | 0 | 99,743,952 |
| South Carolina | 63,950,398 | 1,354,617 | 0 | 5,348,498 | 4,085,269 | 7,583,029 | 0 | 82,321,811 |
| Texas ⁽³⁾ | 229,916,696 | 33,473,321 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 34,681,707 | 45,894,707 | 0 | 345,966,431 |
| Virginia ⁽³⁾ | 91,676,492 | 27,699,905 | 0 | 0 | 21,328,762 | 29,470,386 | 0 | 170,175,545 |
| West Virginia | 33,311,895 | 0 | 27,274,140 | 353,778 | 2,859,276 | 2,596,019 | 235,575 | 66,630,683 |

Survey Question 11: Please provide the following information regarding funding for the state subsidized child care program in the table below.

(1) Some states did receive TANF Bonus Funds and used these funds for subsidized child care. The exact amounts of TANF Bonus Funds were not tracked by many of these states and appear in other funding categories.

(2) Amounts are State Fiscal Year (SFY) expenditures.

(3) State Funding (Match) includes local funds needed to match Federal CCDF funds.

Table 8

Funding Sources for State Subsidized Child Care Programs Federal Fiscal Year 2002 ⁽¹⁾

| State | Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) | TANF (Transfer Funds) | TANF (Direct Funds) | Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) | State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | State Funding (Match) | State Funding (Excess of Match) | Total |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Alabama | 74,366,797 | 24,742,924 | 20,723,128 | 500,000 | 6,896,417 | 3,805,652 | 0 | 131,034,918 |
| Arkansas ⁽²⁾ | 22,560,117 | 6,000,000 | 453,502 | 987,661 | 1,886,543 | 5,175,975 | 0 | 37,063,798 |
| District of Columbia | 8,369,740 | 10,978,707 | 29,645,281 | 0 | 4,566,974 | 2,532,376 | 14,684,650 | 70,777,728 |
| Florida | 222,838,017 | 114,531,007 | 146,659,212 | 2,110,274 | 85,036,845 | 9,919,447 | 86,970,414 | 668,065,216 |
| Georgia | 153,467,615 | 23,200,000 | 0 | 90 | 22,317,327 | 32,638,651 | 22,182,651 | 253,806,334 |
| Kentucky | 75,284,836 | 36,240,000 | 17,000,000 | 0 | 7,274,537 | 8,759,642 | 428,821 | 144,987,836 |
| Louisiana | 89,930,047 | 40,362,082 | 0 | 0 | 5,219,488 | 4,800,000 | 0 | 140,311,617 |
| Maryland | 80,436,244 | 17,737,994 | 0 | 0 | 23,301,407 | 29,279,002 | 0 | 150,754,647 |
| Mississippi | 34,880,544 | 19,160,710 | 0 | 0 | 1,715,430 | 3,101,056 | 1,385,626 | 60,243,366 |
| Missouri | 93,810,237 | 6,275,223 | 0 | 189,013 | 16,548,755 | 19,287,670 | 53,764,308 | 189,875,206 |
| North Carolina ⁽³⁾ | 135,459,231 | 77,270,363 | 26,621,241 | 3,000,000 | 67,295,313 | 26,056,582 | 26,844,243 | 362,546,973 |
| Oklahoma | 33,753,589 | 62,771,602 | 7,963,816 | 0 | 10,630,233 | 0 | 0 | 115,119,240 |
| South Carolina | 69,843,998 | 1,500,000 | 0 | 4,957,248 | 4,085,269 | 9,556,977 | 0 | 89,943,492 |
| Texas ⁽⁴⁾ | 362,076,253 | 0 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 34,681,707 | 66,991,595 | 0 | 465,749,555 |
| Virginia ⁽⁴⁾ | 99,087,673 | 10,967,813 | 0 | 0 | 21,328,762 | 34,809,302 | 0 | 166,193,550 |
| West Virginia | 31,829,453 | 0 | 28,476,210 | 0 | 2,971,392 | 2,796,695 | 203,088 | 66,276,838 |

Survey Question 11: Please provide the following information regarding funding for the state subsidized child care program in the table below.

(1) Some states did receive TANF Bonus Funds and used these funds for subsidized child care. The exact amounts of TANF Bonus Funds were not tracked by many of these states and appear in other funding categories.

(2) \$870,000 reported as "other funding" in Table 12 could also be placed in State Funding.

(3) Amounts are State Fiscal Year (SFY) expenditures.

(4) State Funding (Match) includes local funds needed to match Federal CCDF funds.

Table 9

Funding Sources for State Subsidized Child Care Programs Federal Fiscal Year 2003 ⁽¹⁾

| State | Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) | TANF (Transfer Funds) | TANF (Direct Funds) | Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) | State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | State Funding (Match) | State Funding (Excess of Match) | Total |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Alabama | 70,855,749 | 20,545,839 | 35,021,686 | 500,000 | 6,896,417 | 5,242,861 | 0 | 139,062,552 |
| Arkansas | 43,920,377 | 6,000,000 | 52 | 0 | 1,886,543 | 4,758,291 | 0 | 56,565,263 |
| District of Columbia | 9,860,475 | 11,693,000 | 16,500,000 | 298,715 | 4,566,974 | 2,469,809 | 14,747,217 | 60,136,190 |
| Florida | 228,617,642 | 122,549,158 | 112,665,224 | 1,707,706 | 106,936,783 | 27,949,187 | 44,275,364 | 644,701,064 |
| Georgia | 153,590,589 | 32,200,000 | 0 | 90 | 22,599,673 | 31,058,861 | 22,182,651 | 261,631,864 |
| Kentucky | 73,322,188 | 36,240,000 | 19,771,200 | 0 | 7,274,537 | 8,968,658 | 219,805 | 145,796,388 |
| Louisiana | 87,371,840 | 39,030,550 | 0 | 0 | 5,219,418 | 4,800,000 | 0 | 136,421,808 |
| Maryland | 79,628,207 | 48,884,560 | 0 | 0 | 23,301,407 | 28,441,048 | 0 | 180,255,222 |
| Mississippi | 33,831,691 | 19,323,838 | 0 | 0 | 1,715,430 | 3,908,655 | 2,193,225 | 60,972,839 |
| Missouri | 93,551,805 | 28,959,156 | 0 | 189,012 | 16,548,755 | 18,681,005 | 34,180,336 | 192,110,069 |
| North Carolina ⁽²⁾ | 147,744,722 | 72,812,189 | 26,621,241 | 3,000,000 | 73,224,494 | 27,405,915 | 37,241,543 | 388,050,104 |
| Oklahoma | 35,234,240 | 29,518,565 | 55,322,911 | 0 | 10,630,233 | 0 | 0 | 130,705,949 |
| South Carolina | 67,939,562 | 1,300,000 | 0 | 8,771,296 | 4,085,269 | 9,125,827 | 0 | 91,221,954 |
| Texas ⁽³⁾ | 353,672,089 | 0 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 34,681,707 | 59,995,387 | 0 | 450,349,183 |
| Virginia | 97,180,099 | 10,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 21,328,762 | 34,897,498 | 0 | 163,406,359 |
| West Virginia | 30,892,483 | 0 | 20,733,002 | 0 | 2,971,392 | 2,725,617 | 104,453 | 57,426,947 |

Survey Question 11: Please provide the following information regarding funding for the state subsidized child care program in the table below.

(1) Some states did receive TANF Bonus Funds and used these funds for subsidized child care. The exact amounts of TANF Bonus Funds were not tracked by many of these states and appear in other funding categories.

(2) Amounts are State Fiscal Year (SFY) expenditures.

(3) State Funding (Match) includes local funds needed to match Federal CCDF funds.

Table 10

Total Funding for Subsidized Child Care*
Federal Fiscal Year 2001 to Federal Fiscal Year 2003

| Funding Source | FFY 2001 | FFY 2002 | FFY 2003 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) | 1,314,926,903 | 1,587,994,391 | 1,607,213,758 |
| TANF (Transfer Funds) | 502,120,532 | 451,738,425 | 479,056,855 |
| TANF (Direct Funds) | 300,474,617 | 277,542,390 | 286,635,316 |
| Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) | 14,410,885 | 13,744,286 | 16,466,819 |
| State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | 282,700,433 | 315,756,399 | 343,867,794 |
| State Funding (Match) | 197,693,736 | 259,510,622 | 270,428,619 |
| State Funding (Excess of Match) | 277,804,782 | 206,463,801 | 155,144,594 |
| Total | 2,890,131,888 | 3,112,750,314 | 3,158,813,755 |

Compiled using Tables 7, 8 and 9.

* Some states did receive TANF Bonus Funds and used these funds for subsidized child care. The exact amounts of TANF Bonus Funds were not tracked by many of these states and appear in other funding categories.

| Table 11 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Changes in Funding for Subsidized Child Care* | | | |
| Federal Fiscal Year 2001 to Federal Fiscal Year 2003 | | | |
| Funding Source | Change Between FFY 2001 and FFY 2002 (%) | Change Between FFY 2002 and FFY 2003 (%) | Change Between FFY 2001 and FFY 2003 (%) |
| Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) | 273,067,488 (21%) | 19,219,367 (1%) | 292,286,855 (22%) |
| TANF (Transfer Funds) | -50,382,107 (-10%) | 27,318,430 (6%) | -23,063,677 (-5%) |
| TANF (Direct Funds) | -22,932,227 (-8%) | 9,092,926 (3%) | -13,839,301 (-5%) |
| Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) | -666,599 (-5%) | 2,722,533 (20%) | 2,055,934 (14%) |
| State Funding (Maintenance of Effort) | 33,055,966 (12%) | 28,111,395 (9%) | 61,167,361 (22%) |
| State Funding (Match) | 61,816,886 (31%) | 10,917,997 (4%) | 72,734,883 (37%) |
| State Funding (Excess of Match) | -71,340,981 (-26%) | -51,319,207 (-25%) | -122,660,188 (-44%) |
| Total | 222,618,426 (8%) | 46,063,441 (2%) | 268,681,867 (9%) |

Compiled from information in Table 10.

* Some states did receive TANF Bonus Funds and used these funds for subsidized child care. The exact amounts of TANF Bonus Funds were not tracked by many of these states and appear in other funding categories.

Table 12

**Other Major Funding Sources for Subsidized Child Care ⁽¹⁾
Federal Fiscal Years 2001, 2002 and 2003**

| State | FFY 2001 | | FFY 2002 | | FFY 2003 | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| | Source | Amount | Source | Amount | Source | Amount |
| Arkansas | | | 3% excise beer tax | 870,000 | | |
| District of Columbia ⁽²⁾ | | | | | Dept. of Emp. Services | 388,000 |
| Georgia | Pre-Kindergarten Care | 1,480,104 | Pre-Kindergarten Care | 2,084,495 | Pre-Kindergarten Care | 2,161,248 |
| Kentucky | Tobacco | 3,000,000 | Tobacco | 3,000,000 | Tobacco | 3,000,000 |
| Missouri | | | Gaming Revenue | 1,359,591 | Gaming Revenue | 1,359,591 |
| South Carolina | | | First Steps State Funds | 1,724,863 | First Steps State Funds | 1,419,910 |
| Texas ⁽³⁾ | Portion of state funds ⁽⁴⁾ | 11,988,136 | Portion of state funds ⁽⁴⁾ | 23,285,375 | Portion of state funds ⁽⁴⁾ | 13,789,166 |
| Virginia ⁽⁵⁾ | State Pre-K funding | 2,132,876 | State Pre-K funding | 7,265,752 | State Pre-K funding | 7,265,752 |

Survey Question 12: Please describe any other major funding sources used by the state for subsidized child care and provide amounts in the table below. (Do not include other early care and education funds, such as Head Start and pre-kindergarten, unless they are incorporated into the subsidized child care program budget administered by the state.)

(1) Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma and West Virginia did not have other sources of funding.

(2) DC Department of Employment Services provides Workforce Investment Dollars for TANF customers receiving job training.

(3) These figures are included in State Funding (Match) in Tables 7, 8 and 9.

(4) A portion of the State Matching Funds identified in Table 9 were secured at the local level in the form of private or public donations, transfers or certifications.

(5) 20% of Virginia's state pre-kindergarten funding is used as a match for CCDF. These figures are included in "State Funding (Match)" in Tables 7, 8 and 9.

Table 13**Percentage of CCDF Set Aside for Activities to Improve Quality
Federal Fiscal Years 2001, 2002 and 2003**

| State | FFY 2001 | FFY 2002 | FFY 2003 |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Alabama | 8.9% | 5.4% | 8.4% |
| Arkansas | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% |
| District of Columbia | 12.0% | 13.0% | 13.0% |
| Florida | 5.0% | 13.0% | 22.0% |
| Georgia | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% |
| Kentucky | 4.0% | 7.0% | 8.0% |
| Louisiana | 7.5% | 10.0% | 10.0% |
| Maryland | 7.0% | 12.0% | 7.0% |
| Mississippi | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% |
| Missouri | 8.0% | 8.0% | 8.0% |
| North Carolina | 7.3% | 7.2% | 7.3% |
| Oklahoma | 9.8% | 10.2% | 12.6% |
| South Carolina | 7.0% | 11.0% | 10.0% |
| Texas | 4.1% | 8.5% | 12.3% |
| Virginia | 10.4% | 9.3% | 9.1% |
| West Virginia | 9.9% | 16.6% | 14.1% |

Survey Question 13: Please provide the percentage of funds spent on quality, as defined in the CCDF regulations, in the table below.

Survey Question 15 What changes, if any, do you anticipate regarding income eligibility guidelines for families to receive subsidized child care for FFY 2005?

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alabama | No changes anticipated |
| Arkansas | Possibly raising the income eligibility to 200% to match that of the pre-I program. |
| District of Columbia | Changes are unclear at this point in time. Proposed rules have been published to reduce the income eligibility level from 250% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) for new families and 300% of FPL for those already enrolled to 200% of FPL for all families. These proposed rules have not been finalized and it is unclear if and when they will be. Reducing the income eligibility limit to 200% of FPL would result in approximately 500 children no longer being eligible for subsidy. |
| Florida | None |
| Georgia | For FFY '04, Georgia implemented new maximum allowable income guidelines. Families earning up to 160% of the federal poverty level may receive subsidized child care if the family is otherwise eligible and funds are available. |
| Kentucky | Income eligibility guidelines are updated when Federal Poverty Guidelines are released. |
| Louisiana | None |
| Maryland | We do not anticipate changes to income eligibility guidelines. |
| Mississippi | None |
| Missouri | As a result of the state's budget crisis, Missouri is unable to increase eligibility guidelines for FY05. |
| North Carolina | North Carolina adjusts income eligibility biennially to correspond to 75% of state median income, according to family size. The guidelines were revised in SFY 2003 and became effective October 1, 2003 and will be adjusted again in SFY 2005. The current guidelines allow a family of four to earn up to \$42,084. |
| Oklahoma | These changes are unknown at this time. |
| South Carolina | Income guidelines are revised prior to each federal fiscal year based on federal poverty levels. |
| Texas | None |
| Virginia | Income eligibility guidelines are based on the federal poverty level, so they change annually. |
| West Virginia | No changes are anticipated. |

Survey Question 17 What changes, if any, do you anticipate regarding rates to licensed child care providers for FFY 2005?

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alabama | No changes anticipated. |
| Arkansas | None |
| District of Columbia | No changes anticipated. |
| Florida | Florida voters passed our Voluntary Universal Pre-Kindergarten for the 2004-2005 school year which would require reduced staff to child ratios and require higher credentials for teachers. |
| Georgia | Administration has determined that provider rates will remain the same until CCDF is reauthorized. |
| Kentucky | KY does not anticipate any rate changes for FFY 2005. |
| Louisiana | We are planning to implement a rate increase effective June 2004 or July 2004 and continuing thereafter. For licensed "Class A" centers, the regular daily rate will increase from \$15/day to \$16.50/day and the special needs care incentive rate will increase from \$18.75/day to \$20.65/day. We also plan to implement a new category of rates for "infants and toddlers" (age 0 to 2). For regular "infants and toddlers", the rate will be \$17.50/day, and for special needs "infants and toddlers" the rate will be \$21.65/day. |
| Maryland | We do not anticipate rate changes. |
| Mississippi | None |
| Missouri | None |
| North Carolina | Decisions about rate changes have not yet been made. |
| Oklahoma | These changes are unknown at this time. |
| South Carolina | Provider rates may change for FY'05 depending on the market rate survey that will be conducted during the summer of 2004. At this time we do not know what those changes may be. |
| Texas | Reimbursement rates are established by the local workforce development Boards based on local market trends and other information. |
| Virginia | Virginia plans to set the Maximum Reimbursement Rate at 75% of the market rate for licensed providers only. |
| West Virginia | No changes are anticipated. |

Survey Question 19 What changes, if any, do you anticipate regarding co-payments (per child) paid for subsidized child care for FFY 2005?

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alabama | No changes anticipated. |
| Arkansas | None |
| District of Columbia | No changes expected. |
| Florida | The State of Florida has 50 local School Readiness Coalitions. Each coalition establishes their own co-payment schedule in accordance with their local needs. |
| Georgia | In the CCDF plan for 2004-2005, provisions were made to increase co-payments from 10% of a family's gross weekly income to 15%. January 2004, co-payments increased to 10%. Other increases have not yet occurred. |
| Kentucky | KY does not anticipate any co-payment changes for FFY 2005. |
| Louisiana | Effective June 2004 or July 2004, we plan to increase our agency percentage of payments from 70/50/30 to 75/55/35, thus reducing the co-payment percentages for clients. |
| Maryland | We do not anticipate co-payment changes. |
| Mississippi | None |
| Missouri | None |
| North Carolina | The co-payments for subsidized child care were increased from 7, 8, and 9% of a family's gross countable income and based on family size to 8, 9, and 10% and became effective October 1, 2001. Additional changes are not being made at this time. |
| Oklahoma | These changes are unknown at this time. |
| South Carolina | The fee scale for the ABC Program is based on the income guidelines, and adjusted prior to the federal fiscal year based on federal poverty levels. |
| Texas | Local workforce development Boards are responsible for setting the sliding scale for co-payments; it is possible that some Boards may increase co-payments to help offset the rising costs of care and to avoid reducing the number of children served. |
| Virginia | No change to co-payments is anticipated for FFY05. |
| West Virginia | No changes are anticipated. |

APPENDIX D

Southern Institute on Children and Families Child Care Survey Respondents Contact Information

APPENDIX D

Child Care Survey Respondents

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Alabama Jeanetta E. Green Director Office of Child Care Subsidy Phone: (334) 242-1427 Email: jgreen@dhr.state.al.us</p> | <p>Arkansas Janie Huddleston Director Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education Phone: (501) 682-4891 Email: janie.huddleston@mail.state.ar.us</p> |
| <p>District of Columbia Barbara Ferguson Kamara Executive Director Department of Human Services Phone: (202) 727-1839 Email: barbara.kamara@dc.gov</p> | <p>Florida Gladys W. Wilson Interim Executive Director Florida Partnership for School Readiness Phone: (850) 922-4200 Email: gladys.wilson@schoolreadiness.org</p> |
| <p>Georgia Carol Hartman Program Consultant DHS Division of Family and Children Services Phone: (404) 657-3464 Email: ckhartman@dhr.state.ga.us</p> | <p>Kentucky Michael Cheek Director Commonwealth of KY/Division of Child Care Phone: (502) 564-2524 Email: michael.cheek@ky.gov</p> |
| <p>Louisiana Sammy Guillory Family Support Services Manager Office of Family Support Phone: (225) 342-2530 Email: sguillory@dss.state.la.us</p> | <p>Maryland Patricia Jennings Acting Executive Director Maryland Child Care Administration Phone: (410) 767-7798 Email: pjennings@dhr.state.md.us</p> |
| <p>Mississippi Julia M. Todd Director Office for Children and Youth Phone: (601) 359-4555 Email: jatodd@mdhs.state.ms.us</p> | <p>Missouri Deborah Scott Director Office of Early Childhood/MO Dept. of Social Services Phone: (573) 751-6793 Email: deborah.e.scott@dss.mo.gov</p> |
| <p>North Carolina Nancy Guy Chief, Subsidy Services Section North Carolina Division of Child Development Phone: (919) 662-4561 ext. 300 Email: nancy.guy@ncmail.net</p> | <p>Oklahoma Mark Lewis Comptroller Oklahoma Department of Human Services Phone: (405) 521-3561 Email: mark.lewis@okdhs.org</p> |
| <p>South Carolina Libby Chapman Program Coordinator South Carolina Department of Social Services Phone: (803) 898-2570 Email: chapman@dhhs.state.sc.us</p> | <p>Texas Donna Garrett Deputy Director, Policy and Development Texas Workforce Commission Phone: (512) 936-0474 Email: donna.garrett@twc.state.tx.us</p> |
| <p>Virginia Mary Ward Program Consultant Virginia Department of Social Services Phone: (804) 726-7638 Email: mary.ward@dss.virginia.gov</p> | <p>West Virginia Judy Curry Child Care Program Coordinator WV Department of Health and Human Services Phone: (304) 558-0938 Email: jcurry@wvdhhr.org</p> |

APPENDIX E

Southern Institute on Children and Families Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care Publications

APPENDIX E

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care Publications

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, *Southern Regional Action Plan to Improve the Quality of Early Care and Education: Survey Results on the Status of State Implementation Efforts 2003* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, January 2004).

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, *Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South: Survey Results on the Status of State Implementation Efforts 2001-2003* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, January 2004).

Campbell, Dottie, *Collaboration in Southern Regional Early Care and Education Systems* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2003).

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, *Southern Regional Forum on Collaboration and Coordination Across Early Care and Education Programs* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2003).

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, *Moving Forward: Southern States Take Action to Improve Access to Quality, Affordable Child Care* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, May 2003).

Schumacher, Rachel, Jennifer Mezey, and Mark Greenberg, *Analysis of Potential Barriers to Creating Coordinated Absence Policies for Collaborations Between Head Start and CCDF and TANF-Funded Programs* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2002).

Campbell, Dottie, *Collaboration Among Child Care, Head Start, and Pre-Kindergarten: A Telephone Survey of Selected Southern State* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2002).

Schumacher, Rachel, Jennifer Mezey, Mark Greenberg, Center for Law and Social Policy, *Analysis of Potential Barriers to Creating Coordinated Absence Policies for Collaborations Between Head Start and CCDF and TANF-Funded Programs* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2002).

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, *Southern Regional Action Plan to Improve the Quality of Early Care and Education* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, October 2002).

Southern Institute on Children and Families, *Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South: Survey Results on the Status of State Implementation Efforts in 2001 and 2002* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2002).

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, *Southern Regional Action Plan to Improve the Quality of Early Care and Education* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, October 2002).

Southern Institute on Children and Families, *Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South: Survey Results on the Status of State Implementation Efforts* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, February 2002).

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care, *Building Momentum — Taking Action: Southern States Collaborate on Child Care Financial Aid and Quality Initiatives* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, February 2002).

Greenberg, Mark, Rachel Schumacher and Jennifer Mezey, Center for Law and Social Policy, *The Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South: An Analysis of the Legal Issues* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, August 2001).

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, *Action Plan to Improve Access to Child Care Assistance for Low-Income Families in the South* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2000).

Southern Regional Task Force on Child Care, *Sound Investments: Financial Support for Child Care Builds Workforce Capacity and Promotes School Readiness* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2000).

Stoney, Louise, *Child Care in the Southern States: Expanding Access to Affordable Care for Low-Income Families and Fostering Economic Development* (Columbia, SC: Southern Institute on Children and Families, April 2000).