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## ESSAY



> Helping Our Most Vulnerable Families Overcome Barriers to Work and Achieve Financial Success

Every year, the Annie E. Casey Foundation reports on the well-being of America's children. And every year, our KIDS COUNT data underscore the fact that kids from poor families too often lack the opportunities and assets that will enable them to become successful adults. Compared to their more affluent peers, kids from low-income families are more likely to suffer from preventable illnesses, fail in school, become teenage parents, and become involved with the justice system. As a result, these young people frequently reach adulthood without the necessary tools, experiences, and connections to succeed. At Casey, we've long believed that the most powerful approach to altering the future of our nation's most disadvantaged kids is to enhance the financial security of their parents in the present. The most basic and best way to do this is to help parents connect to and succeed in the workforce.

Over the past decade, states have made significant strides on this front-partly due to changes in our nation's social welfare policies that placed time limits on the receipt of welfare benefits and allowed states more flexibility to set new work standards. These changes also helped channel more effective federal and state spending to support lowincome working families. Coupled with the robust economy of the late 1990s, these new policies caused welfare rolls to decline significantly and increased the employment rate of single parents substantially.

Although progress has been made toward helping struggling parents become employed, far too many have not successfully connected to the workforce, despite the best intentions of states. This sizeable and growing population of poor families remains entirely disconnected from employment. In 2004, almost 4 million American children lived in low-income families where neither their parent(s) nor any other adult in the household worked at all in the past year. U.S. Census Bureau data show that during the late 1990s, as new welfare work rules took effect and the economy surged, the number of children living in non-working, low-income families dropped considerably. But since then, largely unacknowledged by policymakers or the media, the figure has been rising. Between 2000 and 2004, the number of children in low-income households where no adult worked grew from 2.9 million to 3.9 million. One million of these children live in the suburbs, and 600,000 live in rural America. ${ }^{1}$

Many of the obstacles that impede parents from steady employment have been well researched and well documented in Casey publications and in various policy research venues. These barriers include an inability to secure affordable and accessible child care; low literacy levels; limited transportation options that make it difficult for parents to commute to available jobs; and disincentives that strip government benefits from families when they become employed and earn wages. In addition, a significant number of parents face debilitating physical and mental health barriers to employment. For example, an estimated 40 percent of children in non-working households live in homes where the head of the household suffers from serious physical or mental health problems. ${ }^{2}$

This essay examines four employment barriers that policymakers and others consider among
the most difficult to overcome: substance abuse, domestic violence, a history of incarceration, and depression. These burdens can diminish a person's motivation and ability to find work. Furthermore, they can make it particularly difficult to demonstrate the workplace skills (for example, attendance, punctuality, collegiality, ability to take direction) that employers view as a foundation for success-even for entry-level jobs. Far too often, particularly for the formerly incarcerated, they can also negatively influence potential employers' hiring decisions.

In the pages that follow, we examine each of these issues in more detail and highlight a number of state and local initiatives across the country that are successfully addressing them. Because many people face more than one of these barriers simultaneously, we believe that it is critical for policymakers to champion interventions that are integrated, flexible, and comprehensive in their scope.

## A Closer Look at America's Most Persistently Unemployed Parents

 What lies behind the inability of more than 2 million parents to enter the world of work? The answer is both clear and compelling: In study after study, the cumulative impact of multiple barriers severely limits workforce success.Thus, while none of the four factors that we highlight necessarily precludes employment for low-income parents, each one makes it that much harder for parents to connect successfully to the workforce and provide the economic stability that kids need. Depression makes it difficult, but not impossible, for a single mother to find a job. If that mother also has an abusive partner or suffers from substance abuse, then she's highly unlikely to get a job. Should she have a history of incarceration, her chances are slimmer still.

In 1997, the Urban Institute compared a nationwide sample of current welfare recipients with parents who had recently exited the welfare rolls. Of those still on the welfare rolls, 44 percent had two or more obstacles, compared with 24 percent of those who had left welfare. ${ }^{3}$ The welfare "leavers" were almost twice as likely as welfare "stayers" to report no work barriers. Among current welfare recipients in 2002, the Urban Institute found that 51 percent of those with none of six key work impediments had jobs, compared with 30 percent of welfare recipients with one barrier and only 14 percent of those with two or more barriers. ${ }^{4}$

Despite this, programs and services typically address these barriers in isolation, in large part because that is how federal, state, and local funding streams (and the agencies that administer them) are usually organized. However, the following discussion about the prevalence and impact of the four key workforce barriers-substance abuse, domestic violence, prior incarceration, and depression-reveals that many of the hardest to employ need integrated, multi-dimensional supports.

Substance Abuse
The National Survey on Drug Use and Health estimated that in 2003, there were 19.4 million adults who abused or were dependent on alcohol or illicit drugs. ${ }^{5}$ Although overall rates of alcohol and illicit drug use are down from peak levels in the late 1970s and early 1980s, substance abuse still affects millions of families from all walks of life. ${ }^{6}$ While the majority of substance abusers were employed ( 77 percent had either a full- or part-time job), heavy use of alcohol and illicit drugs clearly makes it harder to find and keep a job.7 This is especially true among low-income populations.

Parental substance abuse can also have devastating effects on the well-being of children. In 2001, an estimated 6 million children lived with at least one parent who abused or was dependent on drugs or alcohol. ${ }^{8}$ One study of families receiving aid under the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF) found that children, especially adolescents, whose parents abused drugs or alcohol experienced significantly more behavioral, emotional, and physical problems and were more likely to engage in risky behaviors than children whose parents did not suffer from addiction. ${ }^{9}$ The unemployment and poverty that can result from substance abuse frequently compound the risk of child abuse or neglect. ${ }^{10}$ Furthermore, while substance abuse affects families of all economic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, its impact is even more profound if the family has limited access to adequate health care, child care, housing, and jobs that would provide economic stability.

Substance-abusing parents are also more likely to have other problems that impede their ability to gain employment and provide for their children. Substance abuse and dependence rates are more prevalent among those with low education levels, serious mental illness, and/or a history of incarceration. ${ }^{11}$ One recent study of women on welfare found that substance abusers were far more likely to need mental health services (46 percent vs. 15 percent) and to have ever been arrested ( 56 percent vs. 15 percent) or incarcerated ( 25 percent vs. 5 percent) than non-abusers. ${ }^{12}$

Among welfare recipients, the precise incidence of substance abuse is difficult to measure. Since the data are self-reported, estimates vary widely. Even so, in 2000, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services estimated that as many as 460,000 families on welfare were affected by substance abuse. ${ }^{13}$ Moreover, both un-
employment and substance-abuse rates are particularly high among individuals who have been arrested. The 2003 Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program, a survey that measures the extent of drug and alcohol use among people who were in city and county detention facilities, found that 74 percent of males tested positive for drugs or alcohol at the time of arrest. One in three of those arrested was found at risk for alcohol dependence, and 39 percent were at risk for drug dependence. Of all males arrested in 2003, 41 percent were unemployed at the time of arrest. ${ }^{14}$

## Impact of Substance Abuse on Employment

 Serious addiction to drugs and alcohol is one of the most significant barriers to finding and keeping a job. Substance abuse sets up a vicious cycle: The addiction can trigger unemployment, and unemployment can trigger or exacerbate the addictive behavior. ${ }^{15}$ The typical substance abuser is more likely to have additional barriers to employment. Research has shown that a welfare recipient who suffers from substance dependence combined with one or two other barriers to employment is highly unlikely to be able to meet work requirements. ${ }^{16}$ The New Jersey Substance Abuse Research Demonstration Project found that 49 percent of the TANF recipients who had substance-abuse problems also suffered from severe or moderate depression; that 44 percent had chronic health problems; and that 32 percent were victims of sexual abuse. ${ }^{17}$In addition, job opportunities are limited for those who cannot pass a drug screening test or who have prior convictions related to substance abuse, such as driving under the influence or drug possession. Many positions that would normally be available to people who lack advanced education, such as machine operators and commercial vehicle drivers, are no longer practical options because
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applicants must undergo routine drug testing. Likewise, service-sector jobs in child care, education, and health care are often not accessible to people with a history of alcohol- and drug-related arrests, since employers usually restrict those with criminal records from becoming licensed. ${ }^{18}$

In addition to the impact that substance abuse has on the earning potential of vulnerable families, the overall economic costs of substance abuse to the country are staggering. The Office of National Drug Control Policy in the Executive Office of the President estimated that in 2000 alone, the cost of substance abuse was more than $\$ 160$ billion. Nearly three-quarters of this cost resulted from productivity losses associated with absenteeism, drug-abuse-related illness and hospitalization, incarceration, and premature death. ${ }^{19}$

## Domestic Violence

Every year, an estimated 1.5 million women are victims of domestic violence. ${ }^{20}$ Although domestic abuse occurs across all classes and races, data show that the poorest women endure the most violence. In the National Family Violence Survey, rates of "abusive violence" against women with annual incomes below $\$ 10,000$ were more than 3.5 times those found among households with incomes above $\$ 40,000 .{ }^{21}$ While domestic violence is not confined to women, women are about 6 times more likely to experience serious aggression in an intimate relationship than are men. ${ }^{22}$ The effects of domestic violence vary according to how recent the experience of abuse has been, the duration of time over which the victim has suffered abuse, and the severity of the abuse.

Domestic violence has multiple and longranging effects on every member of the family. Its victims experience a variety of physical, psychological, and economic hardships. Children, in particular, suffer profoundly. It is esti-
mated that between 3.3 million and 10 million children witness domestic violence annually, ${ }^{23}$ and research shows that just being exposed to violence can have serious detrimental effects on child development. For example, children who witness assaults against a parent have a greater likelihood of exhibiting aggressive and antisocial behavior (especially among boys) and experiencing depression and anxiety, traumatic stress disorders, and slower cognitive development. ${ }^{24}$ Children of abused mothers are themselves more likely to suffer maltreatment. In a survey of more than 6,000 American families, researchers found that 50 percent of the men who frequently abuse their wives also assault their children. ${ }^{25}$

## Impact of Domestic Violence on Employment

 Many studies show that abusive male partners often oppose their female partners' efforts to go to work and stay employed. A Massachusetts study found that abused women were 10 times more likely to have a current or former partner who objected to their going to school or work, compared to women who had a non-abusive partner. ${ }^{26}$ There is a consensus in the literature that abusers not only oppose the idea of work, but often actively undermine employment in both direct and indirect ways. According to a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study, up to 50 percent of female employees who have experienced domestic violence have lost a job in part because of partner intrusions. Direct interference in partners' employment is documented in a range of studies: Between 35 percent and 56 percent of employed battered women were harassed at work in person by their abusive partners. In a Wisconsin study, 63 percent of women surveyed reported that they had been fired or had to quit a job because their partner threatened them; half of these women reported incurring absences at work due to severe beatings. ${ }^{27}$In Colorado, an assessment of 1,082 new applicants for public assistance found that 44 percent of those who reported being victims of domestic violence claimed that their abusive ex-partners had prevented them from working. ${ }^{28}$ In a Utah survey of women receiving long-term welfare benefits, 42 percent reported having been harassed at work by abusive partners, and 36 percent reported having to stay home from work due to domestic violence at some point in their lives. Among these Utah women, 29 percent said that their partner's objections were a barrier to employment; almost all of these women ( 80 percent) said that this abuse prevented them from working; and the rest said that it adversely affected their work. ${ }^{29}$

Abusers also use less direct and violent tactics to undermine their partners' success in the workplace. One common tactic is phone harassment. An Ohio study found that about 25 percent of women seeking services in domestic violence shelters said that their current partner had made harassing calls to the workplace or job training site. In a Wisconsin study of women on welfare, the rate was even higher, with 42 percent saying that they had received harassing phone calls at work. The same study found other kinds of abusive interference outside the workplace, including the abusive partner's failure to provide child care as promised during working hours ( 50 percent) or to provide needed transportation to working women (33 percent) to or from their workplace. ${ }^{30}$

Domestic abuse undermines the ability of women to work in other ways, as well. For example, there is a clear connection between abuse and mental health. In a Utah study, domestic violence survivors reported much higher rates of depression, post-traumatic stress, and substance abuse than individuals not subjected to violence. ${ }^{31}$ Similarly, abused women in a Michigan study were twice as likely to report a physical limitation
or rate their health as "poor" compared to those who had never been abused. Michigan researchers also found that women who had experienced severe physical violence in the past 12 months were significantly more likely to be alcohol dependent (8 percent) than those who had never experienced severe physical violence ( 1 percent). ${ }^{32}$ In addition, active drug and alcohol problems were reported by 18 percent of currently abused women in a New Jersey study, compared to 10 percent of the entire sample. ${ }^{33}$ Homelessness-which poses a huge obstacle to employment-is another all-too-frequent consequence of domestic violence, particularly among those who flee their home to escape an abusive partner. ${ }^{34}$

The impact of these abuses on women's employment is dramatically evident in the welfare statistics. Surveys of current and former welfare recipients reveal alarming levels of sexual abuse and other domestic violence. Fifty percent to 60 percent of women on welfare say that they have been abused in their lifetimes, compared to 22 percent of the general population. Numerous studies confirm that a majority of women receiving welfare have been subjected to domestic violence as adults, with as many as 30 percent reporting being subjected to abuse within the past year. This is substantiated by studies of women on welfare in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Utah. A New Jersey study indicated that a majority of shelter residents use welfare as a way to gain some measure of economic independence as they attempt to end reliance on an abusive household member. ${ }^{35}$

## Prior Incarceration

Another crippling employment obstacle confronting many low-income parents is a criminal record. Finding a job can be immensely difficult, particularly for the ever-growing number of parents returning to their communities from prison each year.

Between 1980 and 2003, the number of adults incarcerated in the United States quadrupled, from 504,000 to 2.1 million. ${ }^{36}$ It is estimated that by the end of 2001 approximately 5.6 million U.S. adults had served time in prison at some point in their lives. This included one of every six black men nationwide. ${ }^{37}$

The incarceration rate in recent years has grown even faster among women than men. The number of women confined in federal prisons, state prisons, and local jails nationwide climbed from 12,300 in 1980 to 182,271 in $2002 .{ }^{38}$ Although women still make up a small share of the total prison population, their incarceration has a much bigger impact on children than does the incarceration of men: More often than not, women are their children's primary caregivers. In both state and federal prisons, women inmates are much more likely than men to have lived with their minor children at the time of arrest, and they are many times more likely to have had sole custody. In 1999, more than 1.5 million children nationwide had a parent in prison, up from less than 1 million children in 1991. ${ }^{39}$ Including parents who have recently been released from jail or prison, and those on parole, the number of children experiencing the effects of parental incarceration rises to 3.2 million. ${ }^{40}$

Parental incarceration takes an obvious toll on children, which typically reveals itself in lower self-esteem, depression, emotional withdrawal, and disruptive and delinquent behavior. ${ }^{41}$ It also has a significant impact on their economic well-being. This is especially true when the imprisoned parent is a primary caregiver, and even more so when the inmate is a single parent. In 2000, an estimated 344, 100 households with children were missing a resident parent who was being held in a state or federal prison. ${ }^{42}$ Nearly 650,000 inmates, including 400,000 parents, were released from U.S.
prisons in 2004—almost 4 times the number released in $1980^{43}$ —and many of these parents will remain jobless well after their release. A 1997 study found that only 21 percent of California parolees had full-time jobs, while 9 percent had "casual jobs," and 70 percent were unemployed. ${ }^{44}$

## Impact of Prior Incarceration <br> on Employment

While parents who are released from prison face many of the same barriers to employment that stymie other persistently jobless parents, they often face even steeper odds, as they have even more limited or sporadic work histories.

Parents returning to society from prison also face a number of specific job and income obstacles directly related to their incarceration. State and federal laws often prohibit parents with criminal records from accessing welfare benefits, Food Stamps, subsidized housing, or tuition assistance that can help them temporarily stabilize their lives while looking for work. Furthermore, many states have laws barring those with criminal records from entering a variety of occupations, such as child care, health care, finance, and security. Even when formerly incarcerated adults are legally eligible to work, employers may be reluctant to hire them. One survey found that only 40 percent of employers would consider hiring someone who has been incarcerated, whereas 90 percent were willing to consider welfare recipients for similar positions. ${ }^{45}$

Issues of race make it even harder for persons of color who have been incarcerated to get a job. A 2002 survey of 200 Milwaukee employers found that among job applicants with identical education and employment backgrounds, just 5 percent of formerly incarcerated African Americans were offered jobs, compared with 14 percent of formerly incarcerated Caucasians. ${ }^{46}$

Despite the severe barriers facing ex-offenders upon their return to society, and the proven link between unemployment and recidivism, people who have been incarcerated typically receive little help in preparing for employment, either while they are in prison or in the crucial period immediately after their release.

For example, U.S. Bureau of Justice research shows that only 27 percent of soon-to-be-released prisoners took part in vocational programs in 1997, and 35 percent took part in educational programs-down from 31 percent and 41 percent, respectively, in 1991. Just 10 percent of prison inmates received professional substance-abuse treatment services in 1997, down from 25 percent in 1991. ${ }^{47}$ Likewise, as they leave prison, inmates commonly receive little help in finding jobs. "Most prisoners are released with little more than a bus ticket and a nominal amount of spending money," concluded one prominent study on prison inmates' re-entry to society. The study also found that "prisoners are often returned home without the important pieces of identification necessary to obtain jobs, get access to substance-abuse treatment, or apply for public assistance." ${ }^{48}$ Most prisoners return home without a driver's license, and some states even prohibit ex-offenders from obtaining licenses.

## Depression Among

Low-Income Mothers
Each year, between 4 percent and 10 percent of American adults suffer from major depression. Many more suffer depressive symptoms that do not meet the clinical criteria for a diagnosis of major depression. Women are 1.5 to 3 times as likely as men to report depression. Mental health researchers also consistently find that depression is significantly correlated to income:

Those in poor homes are roughly twice as likely to suffer depression as those in more affluent households. ${ }^{49}$

A nationwide survey of women in the early 1990 s found that 12.9 percent reported bouts of depression in the previous 12 months (compared with 7.7 percent of men). Among poor single women, the rate was 18.4 percent. ${ }^{50}$ Other research finds that depression is especially prevalent among low-income mothers, particularly welfare recipients. In a national evaluation of the Early Head Start Program, 48 percent of low-income women who were pregnant or had infant children were depressed, and one-third of mothers with 1 -year-old children and 3-year-old children were depressed. ${ }^{51}$

In Michigan, a detailed study of current and former welfare recipients found that 25.4 percent suffered a major depression in the prior 12 months. ${ }^{52}$ Analyses of welfare recipients in Kern and Stanislaus counties in California found depression rates of 22 percent and 36 percent, respectively. ${ }^{53}$ Among long-term welfare recipients in Utah, 42 percent met diagnostic criteria for major depression, and 57 percent suffered symptoms of depression. ${ }^{54}$ In the New Chance welfare-to-work demonstration project for young mothers, 53 percent of participants were found to be at high risk for clinical depression. ${ }^{55}$

In 2003 and 2004, the Annie E. Casey Foundation sponsored several focus groups nationwide to better understand the dynamics and impact of depression on low-income minority mothers, particularly immigrant mothers. Although the meetings were held in several different languages and involved women from a wide variety of cultures, all groups indicated that symptoms of depression were commonplace in their communities. Moreover, mothers from all immigrant groups reported that the special pres-


Though the connection between depression and employment has not been studied extensively, available evidence suggests that although many depressed women do work, they are less successful in the labor force than non-depressed women.

sures of finding jobs, resolving immigration status, learning English, and finding transportation and housing-often without support from their children's fathers-created serious emotional distress. This distress was often compounded by substance abuse and/or domestic violence.

## Impact of Depression on Employment

Though the connection between depression and employment has not been studied extensively, available evidence suggests that although many depressed women do work, they are less successful in the labor force than non-depressed women. In Michigan, for instance, current and former welfare recipients who suffered from depression were significantly less likely than those without depression to work more than 20 hours per week ( 48 percent vs. 61 percent). ${ }^{56}$ A national evaluation of welfare-to-work programs in 2001 showed that welfare recipients who did not suffer from depression (based on screenings) had higher earnings than recipients who did. ${ }^{57}$

As with other barriers described here, studies suggest that mild depressive symptoms can measurably diminish employment when they are compounded by additional barriers, such as substance abuse, domestic violence, or limited education. Unfortunately, all of these barriers are disproportionately higher in low-income families than among more economically stable households. Low-income single mothers with any mental health disorder (of which depression is the most common) are 25 percent less likely to work and 38 percent more likely to receive welfare than adults with no disorders. ${ }^{58}$

As with substance abuse, there can be a symbiotic relationship between depression and employment. Mental health scholars find that joblessness can trigger depression and other mental health problems. And besides jeopardizing eco-
nomic stability, parental depression can put children at heightened risk of developing behavioral problems, school difficulties, and physical health problems, as well as depression and a variety of other psychiatric illnesses.

Addressing the Needs of America's Most Persistently Jobless Families Looking at the range of employment barriers facing America's most persistently unemployed families, it is easy to become discouraged. Clearly, some of the hardships confronting them-substance abuse, domestic violence, prior incarceration, and depression-represent daunting challenges that are difficult to address. However, not focusing time, attention, and resources on these issues will, in the long run, be far more costly to society. Ignoring them will help to perpetuate a new generational cycle of poverty, compromised outcomes, and unmet potential for some 4 million children and, ultimately, their children. Not addressing these issues will also bring into question our nation's ability to fulfill the promise of welfare reform policies: Employment is the path out of poverty.

There is good news, however. A number of efforts in states and communities across the country are successfully taking on these challenges to employment and self-sufficiency. All of the promising programs noted here help people overcome individual or multiple barriers, while preparing them for and connecting them to the workforce. Several of these efforts are described in the following pages.

## Breaking the Chains of

 Substance AbusePrograms that effectively help people with substance abuse connect to the workforce tend to require that participants focus on recovering from
their addiction while improving their employment skills. ${ }^{59}$ New Jersey's Intensive Case Management program used this approach to increase the chances of successful abstinence over the long term and bolster the probability that participants would successfully remain in the workforce.

Participants were assigned a team of case managers who helped them overcome barriers to entering and staying in treatment, such as securing child care, transportation, and housing assistance. Case managers made home visits, contacted family members when necessary, and continued to be connected to participants, helping them coordinate services throughout the treatment period. Findings from a group of 155 female TANF recipients show that intensive case management interventions are more effective in increasing rates of abstinence and promoting employment than more typical approaches that primarily offer only treatment referral. ${ }^{60}$

CASAWORKS for Families is a national demonstration program that provides families receiving TANF with integrated services, including drug and alcohol treatment; literacy, job, parenting, and social skills training; family violence prevention; and health care. Funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the City of New York, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the mission of CASAWORKS for Families is "to help poor women achieve recovery, employment, family stability and safety, and strong parenting skills." The pilot program began in 10 cities and is currently operating in two sites in New York City.

Referrals into the CASAWORKS for Families program come from welfare offices, other state agencies, and community organizations. After the client is assessed, the client and case manager jointly develop goals and a plan for economic selfsufficiency. A typical plan includes substance-abuse
treatment, literacy, job training, and other services, depending on the individual's needs. Periodic evaluations occur throughout the 1-year program. Early results have shown that after 12 months, the proportion of enrolled women who abstained from using alcohol increased by 60 percent; the proportion who abstained from marijuana use grew by more than 20 percent; and the proportion who stopped using cocaine rose by 34 percent. During the same time period, enrollees more than doubled their rates of employment. ${ }^{61}$

Pioneer Human Services (PHS) is a human services organization in Seattle, Washington, that offers transitional employment and training opportunities to high-risk populations, including people who have been incarcerated or who abused drugs or alcohol. Through a "social enterprise" model, PHS helps people operate self-supporting businesses, while providing an array of client services, including substance-abuse treatment, employment training, and housing services. PHS is funded almost entirely by income from goods and services that are sold through contractual relationships with such companies as Boeing, Microsoft, and Nintendo. A study of participants in the Pioneer program found that they were far less likely to be re-incarcerated, earned more money, and worked more hours than people in a comparison group. ${ }^{62}$

Delancey Street Foundation is a San Fran-cisco-based residential education center that helps people who have been incarcerated or had substance-abuse issues move toward self-sufficiency. The program currently works with about 1,000 residents across the nation. Participants are required to stay involved in the program for 2 years, although the average stay is closer to 4 . The program is based on the concept that participants learn from each other; graduates hand down skills to new participants so that they can advance, as well.

After participants "get clean," one of their first goals is to earn a high school equivalency degree. Then they work in one of the foundation's vocational training programs, which include a moving and trucking school, a restaurant and catering service, a print and copy shop, transportation services, Christmas tree sales, and an automotive center. More than 14,000 people have graduated from the program in its 30 -year-plus history. In addition, 10,000 participants have received GEDs, and the program has developed more than 20 enterprises run by Delancey graduates. ${ }^{63}$

Jobs for Oregon's Future reflects an innovative approach to integrating drug and alcohol programs into state and local welfare departments. In 1992, Oregon began requiring that local welfare offices become more accountable for providing effective services to clients with alcohol and drug problems. Although welfare applicants are required to seek employment immediately, the program places treatment professionals in every welfare office so that substance-involved clients can participate in treatment and work-related activities at the same time. Studies have found that people who participated in the program earned wages that were 65 percent higher than similarly affected clients who had not participated in the treatment component. ${ }^{64}$

## Coping With the Effects of <br> Domestic Violence

People working in the field of domestic violence have long promoted the idea that policies and programs that help bolster a mother's ability to provide for her family economically (for example, job training, job placement, child care, child support, and Food Stamps) must deliberately and creatively incorporate a response to domestic violence, as well.

Under the TANF program, the Family Violence Option allows states the flexibility to modify program requirements for individuals who are victims of abuse. This provision is optional, and the terms of implementation vary across the 48 states that have either selected the option or implemented equivalent policies independently. In the majority of those states, victims of abuse can receive exemptions from many of the requirements concerning time limits for benefits, work participation, and child support enforcement.

For example, in Alabama, a special program for victims of domestic violence provides financial assistance such as deposits for housing, moving expenses, and other services for up to 4 months for extremely low-income women with young children. That assistance does not count against a TANF recipient's time or financial assistance limits. Other states, such as California and New Mexico, in addition to providing time and participation waivers, also classify participation in domestic violence services as "work activity." This inclusion is a clear recognition of the level of time and effort it takes to deal with these issues. ${ }^{65}$

Just as important as a state's willingness to exercise TANF policy options around domestic violence is the ability of front-line workers to collaborate across agencies and disciplines to best serve victims of abuse. Because TANF programs represent only one aspect of the job training and readiness universe, it is critical that the field in general be "cross-trained" on this issue and ready to work with a more diverse set of service agencies.

The Kraft Domestic Violence Services Project, a 2-year national demonstration project, was created to investigate how domestic violence affects outcomes in the employment and training field and to explore what interventions are most effective in reducing those barriers. Demonstra-
tion sites in Chicago, Houston, and Seattle were created with the intent of integrating domestic violence programs within job training environments and build a model for future collaborative efforts between domestic violence and employment service providers. ${ }^{66}$

The Kraft project found that issues related to client confidentiality, privacy, and security were among the most critical challenges in effectively meshing domestic violence and employment training services. The project also highlighted the need for states to take advantage of flexible federal policy options by establishing additional supports and alternative requirements for clients who are not likely to succeed in regular programming. In addition, it recommended that front-line service providers expand their capacity to provide necessary services while maintaining the levels of confidentiality and security that are essential when domestic violence is a factor. ${ }^{67}$

Some states are actively putting in place efforts that reflect these principles. In Anne Arundel County, Maryland, for example, the Department of Social Services began linking domestic violence screening to other services as early as 1995. In conjunction with a local domestic violence agency, the county developed a training curriculum for its human services workers to ensure that clients had several opportunities to report domestic violence during the child support and TANF intake processes. Clients were then able to avail themselves quickly of domestic violence services, and caseworkers were able to factor those issues into decisions regarding child support and work requirements.

Using the Family Violence Option, the state human services agency in South Carolina works with a statewide domestic violence coalition to provide training to case managers. In exchange, the state provides training to domes-
tic violence advocates working in shelters on the basic TANF requirements. This cross-training has enabled staff from both systems to communicate better and to provide their clients with more accurate information about available services. It also has created policies that better respond to the needs of domestic violence survivors.

In Kansas, the Orientation, Assessment, Referral, and Safety (OARS) program addresses domestic violence issues within the TANF/ KansasWorks employment services structure. The KansasWorks caseworkers act as service brokers for clients with multiple needs. Under this model, case managers are trained to create multidisciplinary teams that can respond to whatever employment barriers are hindering their clients. The OARS work component is designed to help Kansas TANF participants who are victims of domestic violence or sexual assault develop an employment plan, which includes goals for resolving these issues. Other components of the program include on-site domestic violence counselors, strict confidentiality guidelines, and full training support on domestic violence issues for frontline welfare and child support workers.

## Moving From Incarceration to Economic Stability

Offering transitional support to prison inmatesmany of whom are parents-can substantially increase their chances of finding jobs and helping their families achieve self-sufficiency. Several types of programs are improving the prospects of former prisoners who are trying to find work and avoid recidivism. Programs that are achieving significant results include education, training, and treatment services prior to release, as well as postrelease programs offering job placement, treatment, and case management support.

According to a recent Urban Institute study, "The emerging research knowledge about effective prison programs suggests that [they] produce public safety benefits and increase social functioning overall." The study also concluded that, "ironically, the research consensus comes at a time when smaller shares of prisoners seem to be receiving treatment and training than in the past." ${ }^{68}$

A comprehensive study of quality in-prison education programs in Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio found that participating inmates were less likely to be arrested, convicted, or re-incarcerated upon release than those who did not take such classes. The education program participants also earned higher incomes. ${ }^{69}$ Similarly, a Virginia study spanning 15 years found that prisoners who completed education programs while incarcerated had 59 percent lower recidivism rates than inmates who did not. ${ }^{70}$

Given the prevalence of significant drug and alcohol abuse among those incarcerated, effective in-prison treatment is critical. However, research shows that in order to produce positive results, treatment programs must develop clearly defined goals, use comprehensive assessment tools, match participants to appropriate therapy programs that build in strong incentives and behavioral contracts, provide reliable drug testing, and offer a continuum of care at various levels of inten-
sity. Studies consistently show that programs that keep participants in treatment longer and achieve high completion rates produce the best longterm outcomes. ${ }^{71}$

One example is Delaware's Key-Crest sub-stance-abuse treatment program, which works with people before and after their release from prison. The multi-stage Key-Crest approach includes substance-abuse treatment inside the prison, a period of community-based work-release plus treatment, and after-care support. The pro-
gram substantially reduces recidivism rates and measurably increases employment rates after release. Inmates who completed both the in-prison and community treatment phases were less than half as likely as non-participants ( 23 percent vs. 54 percent) to be re-arrested in the 18 months after release, and they were 3 times more likely ( 47 percent vs. 16 percent) to be drug-free at 18 months. ${ }^{72}$

A number of promising programs offer job readiness training, work experience, and job placement assistance for people returning to society from prison. The Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) in New York City temporarily places ex-inmates on five- to seven-person work crews that provide maintenance, repair, and sanitation services for state and local government agencies. The CEO model has three key features: (1) immediate income for people returning home from incarceration; (2) intensive job placement assistance, aided by CEO job developers whose pay is based on the number of participants they place into jobs; and (3) ongoing support from employment specialists to help participants keep their jobs, once hired. The 1,500 to 1,800 ex-offenders whom CEO serves each year are required to complete a 1-week job readiness workshop before being placed on a work crew. CEO pays participants minimum wage for their work on the crews, and it helps them to prepare for and find better-paying jobs in the competitive labor market. Participants work on their crews 4 days each week. On the fifth day, they meet with a job counselor or interview for permanent jobs.

In the 2004 program year, 62 percent of men and 71 percent of women who entered the program and met with a job developer found jobs, usually within 2 or 3 months, earning an average wage of about $\$ 8.00$ per hour. With ongoing support from CEO staff, 75 percent

of participants remained employed for at least 1 month. Of those remaining employed for 30 days, two-thirds retained their jobs for at least 3 months, and half retained employment for at least 6 months. ${ }^{73}$

The Safer Foundation in Chicago works with more than 8,000 incarcerated or formerly incarcerated men and women each year, providing employment services both inside correctional facilities and in community settings. The Safer Foundation itself operates two Adult Transition Centers, locked facilities with a combined 500 beds, where inmates spend the last 30 days to 24 months of their sentences while participating in work-release programs.

Since January 2004, the Safer Foundation also has been working with inmates at the Sheridan Correctional Center, recently reopened by Illinois Governor Rod Blagojevich, to focus exclusively on drug treatment and re-entry preparation. Individuals released from Sheridan and other Illinois facilities take part in the Safer Foundation's community-based job preparedness and placement programs. The programs begin with a 5-day pre-employment training seminar, followed by a job search. Safer Foundation employment specialists reach out to employers and offer to pay for drug testing services when requested, as well as help in accessing available employer tax credits and incentives. Once placed into a job, each participant is assigned a "lifeguard"-a case manager who will work with the participant for a full year to help address any problems that arise and pursue opportunities for advancement.

In 2004, the Safer Foundation placed 1,700 former prisoners into jobs, and 54 percent were still employed after 30 days. A 2004 study found that just 21 percent of Safer participants placed into jobs returned to prison within 3 years of release, compared with the statewide re-incarceration
rate of 54 percent. ${ }^{74}$ In 2005, the Safer Foundation also began offering temporary jobs for up to 300 of its participants, emulating the model that has proven successful for CEO and other employment initiatives for hard-to-employ workers.

Faith-based institutions also have been very active in supporting efforts to move formerly incarcerated individuals into employment. For example, Bethel New Life is a nationally recognized faith-based organization that began with a focus on housing in Chicago's West Side. In 2002, Bethel New Life launched an initiative aimed at reducing recidivism, promoting the successful re-entry of former prisoners, and advocating policies to remove employment barriers for people formerly incarcerated.

To better serve the large numbers of exinmates involved in its programs, Bethel New Life's Welcome Home program formed a network with other faith-based institutions, businesses, and other organizations to provide needed services, as well as internships, full- and part-time employment, job references, and guidance about workplace conduct. To date, the program has provided 32 internships and 11 jobs to people who had been incarcerated. Even those not selected to participate in Welcome Home receive similar services, including life-skills training, job readiness, anger management, skill assessment, and referrals for job placement and supportive services.

Since 1985, Texas's Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders) has been providing employment support for former inmates. A partnership between the Texas Workforce Commission and the state's adult and juvenile corrections agencies, with an annual budget of $\$ 13$ million, Project RIO offers career exploration, job readiness, basic education, and job counseling support to young people and adults before they leave their facilities. After re-

## Faith-based institutions <br> also have been very active in supporting efforts to move formerly incarcerated individuals into employment.

lease, the project offers job search and placement assistance in partnership with the state's 270 workforce development centers.

Of nearly 73,000 inmates released from Texas prisons in 2003, almost 28,000 (more than one-third) participated in Project RIO while in prison, and more than 26,000 signed up with a local workforce development center. Of these job-seekers, nearly 19,000 (70 percent) found jobs. ${ }^{75}$ An independent evaluation in 1992 found that 69 percent of Project RIO participants found jobs, compared to 36 percent of a comparison group who did not participate. Furthermore, just 23 percent of Project RIO participants deemed at high risk of recidivism were re-incarcerated, compared with 38 percent of high-risk inmates who did not participate. The benefits of participation in Project RIO were especially salient for African Americans and Hispanic re-entrants. ${ }^{76}$

## Treating Depression in <br> Low-Income Mothers

Research clearly shows that a variety of mental health treatments can effectively address depression. These include various forms of psychotherapy, as well as two major types of medications. ${ }^{.7}$ Some recent studies have found that combining medication and psychotherapy produces better results than either form of treatment on its own. ${ }^{78}$ Despite these breakthroughs, depression often goes undiagnosed and untreated, particularly among low-income and minority populations. Moreover, even when diagnosed, getting appropriate treatment is often problematic. A 2001 study on treatment for depression and anxiety found that only 25 percent of depressed individuals nationwide received minimally adequate care (at least four counseling sessions, or 2 or more months of medication). ${ }^{79}$ Low-income patients are even less likely than
those with higher incomes to receive specialized mental health care services, and Medicaid recipients (all of whom have low incomes) are far more likely than those with private insurance to receive older types of anti-depressants that are less effective. Low-income individuals also are far less likely to receive psychotherapy services or continuing care for depression. Many studies find that most of these patients never complete the prescribed treatment. ${ }^{80}$

Lack of quality treatment for low-income individuals plagued with depression stems from cultural barriers (such as mistrust of providers, fear of stigma, and lack of familiarity with the language and culture of mental health) as well as serious shortcomings in the mental health care system (such as lack of screening and outreach, staffing problems, and large gaps between best practices and usual services). Studies of mental health treatment in the Medicaid program have also found that low-income minorities diagnosed with depression are less likely to receive anti-depressants than whites, and when they do, they are less likely to receive newer types of medication with fewer side effects. ${ }^{81}$

Compounding this issue is the fact that low-income and minority individuals are often hesitant to accept care from mental health specialists. Focus group data in minority communities indicate that individuals are more likely to seek support from "natural helpers" such as family members, friends, and clergy. Given this, the challenge of diagnosing and medically treating their depression is often left to primary care doctors in community health care clinics. Unfortunately, these general practitioners are far less likely than mental health specialists to identify depression accurately or to administer medications properly, once depression is diagnosed. ${ }^{82}$

## Effective Approaches to

## Combat Depression

For job-seeking parents suffering from depression, there is a crucial need for effective screening, followed by high-quality, culturally sensitive treatment. One promising strategy is the E-Smart Project, in Boston's Dorchester neighborhood, which uses pediatricians in two community health clinics to identify depressed young parents and help steer them into treatment. While many low-income parents lack a regular health care provider, the vast majority do take their children for required health checkups and immunizations. Most pediatricians recognize the importance of parents' mental health in the healthy development of children, but they often lack expertise in how to screen for mental illness and how to advise and refer parents who exhibit mental health problems. By training pediatricians on maternal depression, informing them about appropriate referrals, and developing a quick and easy-to-use depression screening tool, the E-Smart Project has begun routinely referring parents for depression treatment.

In Washington, DC, Mary's Center for Maternal and Child Care employs paraprofessional home visitors to conduct depression screening among high-risk mothers. Initially, home visitors could only refer parents found to be at risk for depression to existing mental health programsand despite their urging, few moms attended steadily and received a full course of treatment. Recognizing this, Mary's Center secured additional funding and added two mental health specialists to its staff-one African American and one Hispanic. Now, parents identified as at risk for depression (roughly 60 percent to 70 percent of parents in the program) are offered quality therapy without leaving home. Program evaluations show that women diagnosed with depres-
sion now see reductions in symptoms in just 6 months, compared with the previous time frame of 12 months to 24 months.

It is also important to help combat the social isolation felt by many depressed low-income mothers. One approach is to build on their willingness to lean on family, friends, and clergy for support. Informal neighborhood support groups, such as the Reaching Out About Depression project (ROAD), in Boston, are showing positive results. ROAD is a "supportive action" group by and for low-income women who are struggling with depression and related issues, such as trauma, addiction, and domestic violence. The project began with a core group of women who studied depression and wrote a 12 -week workshop curriculum based on the effect of the disease on their lives.

Women who participated in the ROAD project have achieved positive clinical outcomes: Through focus groups and individual interviews, an evaluation team has concluded that women who take part in the workshops feel much more hopeful and functional; have fewer symptoms of depression and fewer "struggles" with them; and feel increasingly integrated into their communities. Other efforts, such as Sisters of Color in Denver and Community Moms in Brooklyn, cite similar good outcomes through the provision of group support, affirmation, and social networks for women suffering from depression and other problems.

Some of the most promising strategies systematically integrate quality mental health services with employment assistance. For example, in the Seattle site of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative, local leaders developed a concerted strategy to ensure that participating adults were effectively screened for depression and that they received appropriate mental health services.

The Seattle Jobs Initiative routinely trains case managers to recognize depression and other mental health issues. The program's case managers do not administer formal assessments to diagnose depression or other specific problems, but they build relationships with program participants and determine whether they may need mental health services. During the training phase of the program, mental health counselors administer an assessment (dubbed a "stress test") to all participants. Then the counselors meet individually with participants to discuss the test results. Counselors also consult with case managers regularly to determine the need for referrals to treatment services. The Jobs Initiative also funds private agencies to offer onsite counseling for program participants with mental health problems.

Another promising approach is the Michigan Prevention Research Center's JOBS Project, a series of workshops designed to help unemployed adults improve their job-seeking skills and increase their confidence and self-esteem. Initially designed for the recently unemployed, rather than persistently jobless adults or welfare recipients, this series of five to eight half-day workshops helped participants secure significantly better and higher-paying jobs compared to a control group of jobless adults who did not participate in the workshops. In addition, workshop participants proved significantly less likely to suffer depression in the 2.5 years after completing the program. The effects were particularly strong for women and for less-educated and more-disadvantaged participants. Recently, the program has been adapted for use in welfare-to-work programs. An initial test in Baltimore County, Maryland, led to rapid reductions in welfare caseloads and high job placement rates since implementing the workshops. ${ }^{83}$

## Most pediatricians recognize the <br> importance of parents' mental health in the healthy develop- <br> ment of children, but they often <br> lack expertise in how to screen <br> for mental illness and how to advise and refer parents who <br> exhibit mental health problems.

Successful programs demonstrate that no matter what barrier(s) a poor, out-of-work parent is facing, the best solution is to build a system of comprehensive, flexible, work-based supports to help that person connect to the workforce.

Comprehensive and Integrated
Approaches to Workforce Connection Successful programs demonstrate that no matter what barrier(s) a poor, out-of-work parent is facing, the best solution is to build a system of comprehensive, flexible, work-based supports to help that person connect to the workforce.

Tennessee's Families First program provides TANF clients with screening, assessment, solu-tion-focused therapy, clinical case management, advocacy, and referral to long-term treatment. Families First is the state's TANF program and operates under their Department of Human Services. Families who receive Families First cash payments and who are transitioning from welfare to work may receive assessment, home visits, counseling, and intensive clinical case management services through the Family Services Counseling program (FSC). FSC screens for domestic violence, substance abuse, and mental health issues, including depression. ${ }^{84}$ Counselors are located in each of the 95 social services agencies across the state. The department considers these services a work component that Families First case managers can suggest as part of a work plan. On average, participants spend about 3 months in the program.

A recent study suggests that participation in the FSC program has a positive impact on employment outcomes. Whereas 14 percent of participants were employed prior to counseling, employment rates increased to 49 percent after completing the program. For participants who were employed when they began the program, 38 percent saw an increase in earnings as a result of their participation. ${ }^{85}$

Project Match works with long-term welfare recipients in Chicago's housing projects and low-income neighborhoods. This program has achieved notable success not only in placing
jobless parents, but also in helping them remain employed and become steady workers. Project Match offers participants continuing assis-tance-including job preparation, job search, re-employment, and job retention and advance-ment-over several years.

For the least job-ready, the program can begin with basic mental health or substance-abuse counseling. Gradually, participants pursue more work-centered activities, such as education and training, volunteering, subsidized jobs, and parttime jobs. Unlike most welfare-to-work initiatives, Project Match recognizes that for many, finding a first job is not the end of a journey toward self-sufficiency. Many inexperienced workers lose their initial jobs quickly and need to follow a multi-stage process to economic independence. Project Match routinely monitors and supports participants over several years.

An evaluation in the early 1990s found that the percentage of Project Match participants working year-round rose from 26 percent in the first year of participation to 54 percent after 5 years. Currently, Project Match is working with several welfare-to-work agencies nationally to integrate its case management system and philosophy into their programs.

Launched in 1999, the Georgia Goodworks! program offers temporary jobs and intensive support services to welfare recipients approaching Georgia's 48 -month limit for TANF eligibility. The voluntary statewide program, which has served 5,000 participants since 2000, targets TANF recipients who have received benefits for at least 30 months.

Program staff members visit the homes of potential participants and conduct an outreach interview. More than most transitional employment programs (and most other welfare-towork programs), Georgia Goodworks! conducts
intensive assessments to identify barriers faced by participants, including in-depth screening for mental health and substance abuse. Personal counselors are available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, to offer advice, encouragement, and life-skills instruction. They also help program participants identify work barriers and access services to address them.

Job coaches interact with participants regularly at the workplace and help address any problems that arise on the job. Temporary work assignments begin at 20 hours per week and increase to 30 hours over the course of 6 to 9 months. Participants earn $\$ 5.15$ per hour while retaining their TANF benefits (such as child care assistance and Medicaid).

Most Goodworks! sites hire job developers to help participants find permanent jobs, while other sites rely solely on one-stop employment centers. Once participants find work, Goodworks! provides ongoing job retention and advancement help until the 1-year anniversary of participants' entry into the program (or longer, in some cases). In a 2002 evaluation of the original Goodworks! site (Augusta), 70 percent of all program participants were placed in unsubsidized jobs, in spite of the fact that only one-fourth were high school graduates. ${ }^{86}$ Overall, the Georgia Department of Labor reports that through June 2004, 54 percent of all Goodworks! participants found unsubsidized employment, earning an average starting wage of $\$ 6.33$ per hour. ${ }^{87}$

Washington State's Community Jobs program, the first large-scale transitional employment program for welfare recipients, was launched in 1998. Initially piloted in five sites, the program expanded statewide in July 1999 and has served more than 14,500 participants since its inception. Program participants spend 20 hours per week at transitional jobs, earning
$\$ 7.35$ per hour, plus an additional 20 hours per week in job search, education, or training activities. Community Jobs is open only to TANF recipients who fail to find work during a 12 -week "structured jobs search" workshop. Most participants have low education levels, very limited work histories, and a variety of other employment barriers. Nonetheless, 64 percent of participants from July 2003 through May 2005 found employment after leaving the program, most within 3 months. ${ }^{88}$

A 2002 evaluation found that program graduates steadily increased their earnings during the first 2 years after leaving the program, with average quarterly incomes rising from $\$ 1,811$ in the first quarter after leaving Community Jobs to $\$ 2,891$ in the eighth quarter. ${ }^{89}$ A 2001 analysis concluded that Community Jobs participants were 33 percent more likely ( 47 percent vs. 14 percent) to find jobs than TANF recipients with similar characteristics who did not participate in Community Jobs. ${ }^{90}$

## Recommendations and Conclusions

 This year's KIDS COUNT Data Book essay has examined four important, but still widely unaddressed, obstacles facing parents who are disconnected from America's workforce: substance abuse, domestic violence, prior incarceration, and depression. These issues, individually and in combination, prevent too many parents from providing their kids with the economic stability they need to thrive and succeed.The strategies and programs reviewed in this essay can help these parents overcome obstacles and become productive workers and providers. These promising initiatives demonstrate that many people who are considered the most difficult to employ can indeed become successful, both as workers and parents.

Although these initiatives provide direction, they do not sufficiently address the needs of those persistently jobless Americans who can't connect to the workforce. Put simply, if we're really going to build on successful welfare reforms and make good on our national aspiration to make work the pathway to self-sufficiency, then we must address the needs of this population in a more systematic, comprehensive, and integrated way. We need to enable states to craft policies and programs that will help people overcome multiple barriers, while assisting them to secure jobs. We support the idea of offering states more flexibility, including the use of waivers, to combine welfare and workforce resources into a more robust, integrated support system for the most challenged job-seekers. In addition, we offer the following recommendations:

First, given the time limits (5 years or less) imposed on low-income families under the 1996 welfare reform law, states should screen and assess TANF recipients aggressively to uncover hidden barriers to employment. This screening should be conducted early enough so that an individual's time clock is not substantially exhausted-and it should be done by trained professionals using sophisticated methods, rather than by rank-and-file caseworkers with limited training, high caseloads, and competing incentives.

Second, states must do a better job of collecting and analyzing data on the number and characteristics of TANF recipients with serious employment barriers. A 2001 GAO study found that only two of nine states surveyed were able to provide GAO with any data on the number of adult TANF recipients with substance-abuse issues, exposure to domestic violence, other mental or psychological conditions, criminal histories, and other issues that may impair job success. ${ }^{91}$
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We can and must finish the work begun under welfare reform and make good on the promise of helping all of those who want to work-even those facing the most formidable bar-riers-connect to a job, become self-sufficient, and find a path out of poverty. Almost 4 million kids are depending on us.


Third, more emphasis should be placed on helping those TANF recipients who suffer from severe and/or multiple barriers and do not succeed in standard job search programs. Specifically:

- TANF recipients should receive additional monitoring and case-management support from staff with specialized expertise and smaller than normal caseloads.
- TANF work rules and time limits should be applied more flexibly to suit the individual needs, capabilities, and circumstances of those plagued by employment barriers.
- Specialized and evidence-based services should be available to help recipients overcome their barriers and succeed in the workplace. In particular, services to address employment barriers (substance-abuse treatment, mental health counseling, etc.) should be combined with employment-focused activities. Moreover, these services should not have short and arbitrary (3-month, 6 -month) time limits.

Finally, for individuals transitioning from incarceration to society, states and localities must do more than provide work experience in prison to help them successfully connect to the workforce upon release. ${ }^{92}$ Specifically:

- Prisoners should receive job search assistance prior to their release. One idea would be to connect prisoners to online job banks. In addition, prisons should help soon-to-be-released prisoners write resumes and secure the credentials and identification required for job applications. They should also consider transitional work options, which have been
shown to be particularly effective for those transitioning from prison to society.
- Prisons should provide an entree to local community-based organizations and faithbased institutions that can serve as intermediaries and references to potential employers in sectors that are most likely to hire individuals with criminal records, such as construction, transportation, and food distribution.
- States and localities should also educate employers about incentives for hiring former prisoners. These include the Federal Bonding Program, which enables employers to request free fidelity bonds to cover individuals who, because of prison records, might not be able to secure insurance under traditional commercial business policies, as well as various federal and state tax credit programs.
- States should review, amend, and repeal employment laws that prohibit people with criminal records from working in certain jobs. (The exception should be those instances where doing so would prove a clear potential threat to public safety.)
- Community-based organizations, faith-based institutions, and local government agencies should be encouraged to actively sponsor former prisoners seeking employment. Research indicates that employers are more likely to hire former prisoners if they believe that these individuals have the support of local groups that can provide them with counseling and help in such areas as housing, transportation, and child care to improve the odds of successful employment. ${ }^{93}$

Clearly, the issues in this year's KIDS COUNT Data Book essay represent some of the most formidable barriers facing parents who are trying to connect to the workforce. Substance abuse, domestic violence, prior incarceration, and depression can potentially paralyze even the most eager and enterprising parents and jeopardize the economic security and future of their children. But we believeand the evidence affirms-that it is possible to help these particularly vulnerable parents address and overcome these obstacles. Taking these solutions to scale, however, will require a significant commitment on the part of federal, state, and local leaders. Policies need to be reconsidered, resources need to be redeployed, services need to be integrated, skills need to be bolstered, and new partnerships need to be forged. Although this is a significant challenge, it is also an absolute necessity.

Today, too many parents want to work their way out of poverty, but are unable to do so, and as a result, the futures of too many kids are severely compromised. As a nation, we can and must do better than this. We can and must finish the work begun under welfare reform and make good on the promise of helping all of those who want to work-even those facing the most formidable barriers-connect to a job, become self-sufficient, and find a path out of poverty. Almost 4 million kids are depending on us.

## Douglas W. Nelson, President The Annie E. Casey Foundation
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## SUMMARY \& FINDINGS



The broad array of data we present each year in the KIDS COUNT Data Book is intended to illuminate the status of America's children and to assess trends in their well-being. By updating the assessment every year, KIDS COUNT provides ongoing benchmarks that can be used to see how states have advanced or regressed over time. Readers can also use KIDS COUNT to compare the status of children in their state with those in other states across several dimensions of child well-being. Furthermore, the annual presentation of KIDS COUNT data allows us to make incremental improvements to the Data Book as new data become available and methods are refined.

Although the 10 measures used in KIDS COUNT to rank states can hardly capture the full range of conditions shaping kids' lives, we believe these indicators possess three important attributes: (1) They reflect a wide range of factors affecting the well-being of children (such as health, adequacy of income, and educational attainment). (2) They reflect experiences across a range of developmental stages-from birth through early adulthood. (3) They permit legitimate comparisons because they are consistent across states and over time. Research shows that the 10 KIDS COUNT indicators capture most of the yearly variation in child wellbeing reflected in other indices that utilize a much larger number of indicators. For more information about the criteria used to select KIDS COUNT indicators, see p. 180.

The 10 indicators used to rank states reflect a developmental perspective on childhood and underscore our goal to provide a world where pregnant women and newborns thrive; infants and young children receive the support they need to enter school prepared to learn; children succeed in school; adolescents choose healthy behaviors; and young people experience a successful transition into adulthood. In all of these stages of development, young people need the economic and social assistance provided by a strong family and a supportive community.

As the KIDS COUNT Data Book has developed over time, some of the indicators used to rank states have changed because we replaced weaker measures with stronger ones. Consequently, comparing rankings in the 2005 Data Book to rankings in past Data Books does not always provide a perfect assessment of change over time. We have made a large number of improvements to the 2005 Data Book that confound comparisons with previous Data Books. However, Appendix 3 shows how states would have ranked in past years if we had employed the same 10 measures used in the 2005 Data Book. The table in Appendix 3 is the best way to assess state changes over time in overall child well-being.

In this Summary and Findings section, the amount of text about each of the 10 key indicators we use to rank states has been reduced relative to past Data Books. But we provide more extensive information on each of the 10 indicators on the KIDS COUNT website (www.kidscount.org/2005).

We have made several changes to the 10 measures used to rank states. First, in this year's Data $B o o k$ we use statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau's new American Community Survey (ACS) for 5 of the 10 measures. The ACS provides the same type of data formerly available only from
the Decennial Census, but the ACS provides this type of data every year for states and large cities. Using the ACS provides state-level measures that are more precise and more timely than what was previously available. Each state has at least 2,100 children in the 2003 ACS sample.

We have also changed the way we measure a couple of key concepts. For teen births we now use the birth rate for teens ages 15 to 19 (formerly, we used the birth rate for teens ages 15 to 17). For the Teen Death Rate we now use deaths from all causes (formerly, we only examined deaths from accidents, homicides, and suicides). Finally, we now report the percent of children living in single-parent households (formerly, we reported the percent of families with children that were headed by a single parent).

## Race and Child Well-Being

Before examining child well-being state by state, we would like to look at child well-being among major race groups and Hispanics. Table 1 provides national statistics for each major group on each of the 10 measures of child well-being used to rank states. Similar tables for earlier years are available on the KIDS COUNT website at www.kidscount.org/2005. Reliable data for all race groups for all states are not available.

The differences shown in Table 1 are both large and predictable. The size of the gap between black and non-Hispanic white children varies by indicator, but the outcomes for black children are worse on every one of the 10 indicators. The same is true for American Indian and Alaskan Native children when compared to nonHispanic white children.

Comparing outcomes for Hispanic children with those for non-Hispanic white children poses a bit of a paradox. Although Hispanic families typically have lower socioeconomic status character-
istics, many birth and health outcomes are actually better for Hispanics than for non-Hispanic whites. The percent of Hispanic children born of low birthweight is lower than that of non-Hispanic white children, and the Infant Mortality Rate for Hispanics is lower than that for non-Hispanic whites as well. The Child Death Rate and the Teen Death Rate are virtually identical for Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites. On the other measures of child well-being, however, Hispanics trail nonHispanic whites.

On seven measures of child well-being, Asian and Pacific Islander children come out better than non-Hispanic white children. Asian and Pacific Islander children trail non-Hispanic white children in terms of low birthweight, parental employment, and child poverty. The high school dropout rate for Asian and Pacific Islander children is only half that of non-Hispanic white children.

## KIDS COUNT State Indicators

In the pages that follow, the most recent figures are compared with corresponding data from 2000 to assess the trends over time in each state. To provide a fuller picture of children's lives and a framework for better understanding the 10 indicators of child well-being used to rank states, several background measures are provided for each state, including measures that reflect children living in low-income families where no parent works.

The 10 key indicators of child well-being used here are all from federal government statistical agencies and reflect the best available state-level data for tracking yearly changes in each indicator. However, it is important to recognize many of the indicators used here are derived from samples, and like all sample data, they contain some random error. Other measures (the Infant Mortality Rate and the Child Death Rate, for example) are based on relatively small numbers of events in some
table 110 Key Indicators of Child Well-Being by Race and Hispanic Origin Status: 2002/2003
${ }^{*}$ For this measure, the data for non-Hispanic whites, Blacks/ African Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives are for persons who selected only one race.

| Indicators |  | TOTAL | NONHISPANIC WHITE | BLACK/ <br> AFRICAN <br> AMERICAN | ASIAN AND <br> PACIFIC <br> ISLANDER | AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKAN native | HISPANIC/ LATINO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent low-birthweight babies | 2002 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 13.3 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 6.5 |
| Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | 2002 | 7.0 | 5.8 | 13.8 | 4.8 | 8.6 | 5.6 |
| Child death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1-14) | 2002 | 21 | 19 | 31 | 16 | 28 | 20 |
| Teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | 2002 | 68 | 66 | 82 | 37 | 91 | 65 |
| Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | 2002 | 43 | 29 | 67 | 18 | 54 | 83 |
| Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)* | 2003 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 15 |
| Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)* | 2003 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 13 | 13 |
| Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment* | 2003 | 33 | 26 | 50 | 31 | 51 | 38 |
| Percent of children in poverty* | 2003 | 18 | 10 | 34 | 13 | 32 | 28 |
| Percent of children in single-parent households* | 2003 | 30 | 22 | 62 | 16 | 45 | 34 |

[^0]and Alaskan Natives include those who are also Hispanic/Latino.
states and may exhibit some random fluctuation from year to year. Therefore, we urge readers to focus on relatively large differences-both across states and over time within a state. Small differences may simply reflect random fluctuations rather than real changes in the well-being of children.

It is noteworthy that most measures in most states are statistically significantly different from the national value for each measure. In other words, the national value for a measure does not tell much about most states. Tables showing the statistical significance of differences among states and changes over time are provided on the KIDS COUNT website (www.kidscount.org/2005).

We include data for the District of Columbia in the Data Book, but we do not include the District in our state rankings because it is so different from any state that the comparisons are not meaningful. It is more useful to look at changes within the District of Columbia between 2000 and 2003, or to compare the District with other large cities, as we do in some of the KIDS COUNT publications available on the KIDS COUNT website. For some measures, data for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are available on the KIDS COUNT website.

The data on the following pages present a rich but complex picture of American children. Some dimensions of well-being improved, some worsened, and some showed little change. At the national level, only 3 of the 10 indicators of child well-being showed that conditions improved since 2000 , while child well-being worsened on 5 indicators, and conditions were unchanged on 2 indicators. It should be noted, however, that many of these changes were very small and may be nothing more than random fluctuations. For example, the national changes in the Infant Mortality Rate and the Teen Death Rate between 2000 and 2002 were not statistically significant. Naturally, the portrait
of child well-being varies among states, and statelevel measures often mask important differences within a state.

Table 2 provides a summary of results from this year's KIDS COUNT Data Book. Data in Table 2 confirm the enormous variation in child well-being among the states.

The KIDS COUNT Data Book utilizes rates and percentages because that is the best way to compare states to each other and to assess changes over time within a state. However, our focus on rates and percentages may mask the magnitude of some of the problems that are examined in this report. The number of events or number of children that are reflected in each of the national rates for the 10 key indicators used to rank states are provided on the corresponding indicator pages. These data underscore the fact that thousands of children die every year, and millions are at risk because of poverty, family structure, lack of parental employment, or risky behavior. Similar data showing the numbers behind the state rates are offered in Appendix 2.

In the following pages, the overall ranking of states based on all 10 indicators is reported, and each of the indicators used to rank states is discussed separately.
table 2 Highest and Lowest Ranking States

| Indicators |  | HIGHEST RANKING VALUE | HIGHEST RANKING STATE(S) | LOWEST RANKING Value | LOWEST RANKING STATE(S) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent low-birthweight babies | 2002 | 5.8 | Alaska Oregon | 11.2 | Mississippi |
| Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | 2002 | 4.4 | Maine Vermont | 10.3 | Louisiana Mississippi |
| Child death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1-14) | 2002 | 12 | New Hampshire | 37 | Mississippi |
| Teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | 2002 | 34 | New Hampshire | 103 | West Virginia |
| Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | 2002 | 20 | New Hampshire | 65 | Mississippi |
| Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19) | 2003 | 4 | New Jersey North Dakota Wisconsin | 12 | Arizona Louisiana |
| Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19) | 2003 | 4 | Minnesota <br> Vermont Wisconsin | 14 | Louisiana |
| Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment | 2003 | 23 | Nebraska | 41 | Mississippi |
| Percent of children in poverty | 2003 | 8 | New Hampshire | 30 | Louisiana |
| Percent of children in single-parent households | 2003 | 17 | Utah | 42 | Mississippi |

## Ranking States on Composite Index

Data from all 10 indicators are used to develop a composite index of overall child well-being for each state. The Overall Rank Table and Map show how states rank based on the 10 -item index. More precise differences among states based on all 10 indicators are shown in Appendix 1 . The state that ranks highest based on the composite index is New Hampshire, with Vermont ranked second and Minnesota ranked third. The three states at the bottom of the ranking are Mississippi, Lovisiana, and Alabama.

The Overall Rank Map also reflects a couple of regional overtones. The New England states and a group of states in the Northern Plains all rank relatively high. Except for Rhode Island, all of the New England states rank in the top 11. Minnesota, North Dakota, lowa, Wisconsin, and Nebraska are all ranked in the top 12.

At the other end of the spectrum, states in the South and Southwest dominate the lower part of the ranking. The bottom 14 states are all located in the South or Southwest.

## Overall Rank: 2005



| Rank | State | Rank | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Hampshire | 27 | Pennsylvania |
| 2 | Vermont | 28 | Illinois |
| 3 | Minnesota | 29 | Ohio |
| 4 | New Jersey | 30 | Indiana |
| 5 | North Dakota | 31 | Delaware |
| 6 | Massachusetts | 32 | Nevada |
| 7 | Maine | 33 | Missouri |
| 8 | lowa | 34 | Montana |
| 9 | Utah | 35 | Florida |
| 10 | Wisconsin | 36 | Alaska |
| 11 | Connecticut | 37 | Texas |
| 12 | Nebraska | 38 | Oklahoma |
| 13 | Virginia | 39 | Georgia |
| 14 | Washington | 40 | North Carolina |
| 15 | Kansas | 41 | Arizona |
| 16 | Idaho | 42 | Kentucky |
| 17 | California | 43 | Tennessee |
| 18 | Oregon | 44 | Arkansas |
| 19 | Maryland | 45 | South Carolina |
| 20 | New York | 46 | New Mexico |
| 21 | South Dakota | 47 | West Virginia |
| 22 | Rhode Island | 48 | Alabama |
| 23 | Wyoming | 49 | Louisiana |
| 24 | Hawaii | 50 | Mississippi |
| 25 | Michigan | N.R. | District of |
| 26 | Colorado |  | Columbia |

## Percent Low-Birthweight Babies

Babies weighing less than 2,500 grams (about 5.5 pounds) at birth have a high probability of experiencing developmental problems. Although low-birthweight babies were only 7.8 percent of all births in 2002 , they accounted for 67 percent of infant deaths that year. The risk of dying during the first year of life for low-birthweight babies ( 59.5 deaths per 1,000 births) is nearly 25 times that for babies of normal birthweight ( 2.4 deaths per 1,000 births). Therefore, the Percent Low-Birthweight Babies reflects a group of children who are likely to experience a higher than average rate of problems as they grow older.

## For more information on low-birthweight babies, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

Nationally, 314,077 babies were born weighing less than 2,500 grams in 2002. Low-birthweight babies were 7.8 percent of all births in 2002, compared to only 7.6 percent in 2000.

- This represents a 3 percent increase over the 2000 to 2002 period.
- Between 2000 and 2002, the percent of low-birthweight babies improved in 4 states and the District of Columbia. However, the incidence of low-birthweight babies worsened in 41 states and went unchanged in 5 others.
- Among the states, the incidence of low-birthweight babies in 2002 ranged from a low of 5.8 percent in Alaska and Oregon to a high of 11.2 percent in Mississippi.


## Percent Low-Birthweight Babies: 2002*

More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 6.3 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 6.4 to 7.9 )

Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 8.0 to 9.5 )
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 9.6 and higher)

* Babies weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds) at birth.

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alaska | 5.8 | 27 | Michigan | 8.0 |
| 1 | Oregon | 5.8 | 27 | Missouri | 8.0 |
| 3 | Washington | 5.9 | 27 | New Jersey | 8.0 |
| 4 | Idaho | 6.1 | 27 | New Mexico | 8.0 |
| 5 | Maine | 6.3 | 27 | Oklahoma | 8.0 |
| 5 | Minnesota | 6.3 | 32 | Illinois | 8.2 |
| 5 | New Hampshire | 6.3 | 32 | Pennsylvania | 8.2 |
| 5 | North Dakota | 6.3 | 34 | Hawaii | 8.3 |
| 9 | California | 6.4 | 34 | Ohio | 8.3 |
| 9 | Utah | 6.4 | 36 | Florida | 8.4 |
| 9 | Vermont | 6.4 | 36 | Wyoming | 8.4 |
| 12 | lowa | 6.6 | 38 | Arkansas | 8.6 |
| 12 | Wisconsin | 6.6 | 38 | Kentucky | 8.6 |
| 14 | Arizona | 6.8 | 40 | Colorado | 8.9 |
| 14 | Montana | 6.8 | 40 | Georgia | 8.9 |
| 16 | Kansas | 7.0 | 42 | Maryland | 9.0 |
| 17 | Nebraska | 7.2 | 42 | North Carolina | 9.0 |
| 17 | South Dakota | 7.2 | 42 | West Virginia | 9.0 |
| 19 | Massachusetts | 7.5 | 45 | Tennessee | 9.2 |
| 19 | Nevada | 7.5 | 46 | Alabama | 9.9 |
| 21 | Indiana | 7.6 | 46 | Delaware | 9.9 |
| 22 | Texas | 7.7 | 48 | South Carolina | 10.0 |
| 23 | Connecticut | 7.8 | 49 | Louisiana | 10.4 |
| 24 | New York | 7.9 | 50 | Mississippi | 11.2 |
| 24 | Rhode Island Virginia | 7.9 7.9 | N.R. | District of Columbia | 11.6 |

## Infant Mortality Rate

Since the first year of life is more precarious than later years of childhood, negative social conditions (such as poverty and an unhealthy physical environment) have a bigger impact on newborns. The number of children who die before their first birthday is reflected in the Infant Mortality Rate, defined as the number of deaths to persons less than 1 year old per 1,000 live births during the year.

The Infant Mortality Rate increased slightly between 2001 and 2002. Athough preliminary data from 2003 indicate that the Infant Mortality Rate returned to the same level seen in 2000 and 2001 , this means there has been no improvement in infant mortality since 2000, which is a stark change from the 40-plus years of non-stop improvement seen prior to 2000.

- During 2002, 28,034 infants under age 1 died in the United States, which amounts to almost 77 infant deaths each day.
- The U.S. Infant Mortality Rate increased from 6.9 deaths per 1,000 live births in 2000 to 7.0 deaths in 2002. This is the first increase in the Infant Mortality Rate since 1957-58.
- This deterioration was reflected in 21 states. However, infant mortality improved in 27 states and the District of Columbia and went unchanged in 2 others.
- In 2002, the Infant Mortality Rate ranged from a low of 4.4 in Maine and Vermont to a high of 10.3 in Louisiana and Mississippi.


## Infant Mortality Rate (deaths per 1,000 live births): 2002

More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 5.6 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 5.7 to 7.0 )
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median (7.1 to 8.4)
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 8.5 and higher)

## Child Death Rate

The Child Death Rate (number of deaths per 100,000 children ages $1-14$ ) has fallen steadily for the past several years, due in large part to advances in medical care. The general decrease in deaths from motor vehicle accidents, which accounted for nearly one-fifth of all child deaths in 2002, also has contributed to a declining Child Death Rate. Too many young children die in automobile accidents because they are not wearing a seat belt. One study found that nearly half of the young children who died in traffic crashes were not wearing a seatbelt or other restraint.

Child deaths are just the tip of the iceberg. One study found that for each child death due to injury, there were 160 children admitted to a hospital for an injury and about 2,000 children with emergency room visits related to injuries.

## For more information on child death, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

In 2002, 12,008 children between the ages of 1 and 14 died in the United States, which amounts to an average of 33 deaths per day.- The Child Death Rate fell from 22 out of every 100,000 children in this age range in 2000, to 21 deaths per 100,000 in 2002 .
- Between 2000 and 2002, the Child Death Rate decreased in 24 states and the District of Columbia, while increasing in 15 states. In 11 states, the rate was unchanged.
- Among the states, the Child Death Rate in 2002 ranged from a low of 12 in New Hampshire to a high of 37 in Mississippi.
More than $20 \%$ better than state median (18 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median (19 to 22)
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 23 to 26 )
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median (27 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Hampshire | 12 | 26 | Idaho | 23 |
| 2 | Connecticut | 13 | 26 | Minnesota | 23 |
| 3 | Rhode Island | 14 | 26 | Montana | 23 |
| 4 | Massachusetts | 15 | 26 | Nebraska | 23 |
| 4 | Vermont | 15 | 26 | North Carolina | 23 |
| 6 | Hawaii | 17 | 26 | Texas | 23 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 17 | 26 | Utah | 23 |
| 6 | New York | 17 | 34 | Arizona | 24 |
| 9 | California | 18 | 34 | New Mexico | 24 |
| 10 | Nevada | 19 | 34 | Oklahoma | 24 |
| 10 | Ohio | 19 | 34 | West Virginia | 24 |
| 10 | Washington | 19 | 38 | Kansas | 25 |
| 13 | Illinois | 20 | 38 | Kentucky | 25 |
| 13 | Maine | 20 | 38 | Missouri | 25 |
| 13 | Maryland | 20 | 38 | Tennessee | 25 |
| 13 | North Dakota | 20 | 42 | Delaware | 27 |
| 13 | Virginia | 20 | 42 | South Carolina | 27 |
| 13 | Wisconsin | 20 | 44 | Alabama | 29 |
| 19 | Colorado | 21 | 44 | Alaska | 29 |
| 19 | Iowa | 21 | 46 | Arkansas | 30 |
| 19 | Oregon | 21 | 47 | South Dakota | 31 |
| 19 | Pennsylvania | 21 | 48 | Wyoming | 34 |
| 23 | Florida | 22 | 49 | Lovisiana | 35 |
| 23 | Indiana | 22 | 50 | Mississippi | 37 |
| 23 | Michigan | 22 | N.R. | District of |  |
| 26 | Georgia | 23 |  | Columbia | 23 |

## Teen Death Rate

NOTE: In the 2005 KIDS COUNT
Data Book, the Teen Death Rate is calculated
differently from previous Data Books.

As people move into their middle and late teenage years, they encounter many new risks that can cost them their lives. The Teen Death Rate reflects deaths among 15 - to 19 -year-olds (deaths per 100,000 teens in this age group) from all causes. It is worth noting that deaths from accidents, homicides, and suicides accounted for 76 percent of all deaths in this age group in 2002.

Accidents continue to account for at least three times as many teen deaths as any other cause, including homicide. Most of the lethal accidents are automobile accidents. The Teen Death Rate increased slightly between 2000 and 2002, and the increase was due to an increase in accidental deaths. The number of teen deaths due to accidents increased from 6,755 in 2000 to 7,137 in 2002, which represents a 6 percent increase. The number of teen deaths due to homicide fell from 1,914 in 2000 to 1,892 in 2002, and the number due to suicide dropped from 1,621 to 1,513 during the same period.

> For more information on teen death, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.
$\square$ In 2002, 13,812 Americans ages 15 to 19 died This amounts to an average of 38 teen deaths each day.

- The Teen Death Rate increased from 67 deaths per 100,000 teens in 2000 to 68 deaths per 100,000 in 2002, an increase of 1 percent.
$\square$ Between 2000 and 2002, the rate of teen deaths declined in 23 states, increased in 25 states and the District of Columbia, and remained unchanged in 2 .
In 2002, the Teen Death Rate ranged from a low of 34 in New Hampshire to a high of 103 in West Virginia.
More than $20 \%$ better than state median (56 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 57 to 70 )
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 71 to 84 )
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 85 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Hampshire | 34 | 27 | Nebraska | 72 |
| 2 | Hawaii | 42 | 28 | Indiana | 73 |
| 2 | Massachusetts | 42 | 28 | Maryland | 73 |
| 4 | New Jersey | 47 | 30 | Colorado | 74 |
| 5 | Connecticut | 48 | 30 | Idaho | 74 |
| 6 | New York | 49 | 30 | Texas | 74 |
| 7 | Rhode Island | 52 | 33 | North Carolina | 75 |
| 8 | lowa | 57 | 34 | Alaska | 76 |
| 8 | Minnesota | 57 | 35 | Nevada | 77 |
| 10 | California | 58 | 35 | Wyoming | 77 |
| 10 | Maine | 58 | 37 | Oklahoma | 80 |
| 10 | Washington | 58 | 38 | Missouri | 83 |
| 13 | Ohio | 59 | 39 | Kentucky | 85 |
| 14 | Vermont | 60 | 40 | Arizona | 86 |
| 15 | Oregon | 62 | 41 | South Carolina | 93 |
| 15 | Wisconsin | 62 | 42 | Arkansas | 94 |
| 17 | Michigan | 63 | 42 | New Mexico | 94 |
| 18 | Virginia | 64 | 42 | South Dakota | 94 |
| 19 | Delaware | 65 | 42 | Tennessee | 94 |
| 19 | Illinois | 65 | 46 | Alabama | 100 |
| 19 | Utah | 65 | 46 | Lovisiana | 100 |
| 22 | Pennsylvania | 67 | 46 | Mississippi | 100 |
| 23 | Florida | 68 | 46 | Montana | 100 |
| 24 | North Dakota | 69 | 50 | West Virginia | 103 |
| 25 | Georgia Kansas | 70 70 | N.R. | District of Columbia | 168 |

## Teen Birth Rate

NOTE: In the 2005 KIDS COUNT
Data Book, the Teen Birth Rate is calculated differently from previous Data Books.

Teenage childbearing is problematic because it often diminishes the opportunities of both the child and the young mother.

The consequence of starting out life as the child of a teen mother can be illustrated by the following stark comparison: The poverty rate for children born to teenage mothers who have never married and who did not graduate from high school is 78 percent. On the other hand, the poverty rate for children born to women over age 20 who are currently married and did graduate from high school is 9 percent.

Nationally, the Teen Birth Rate fell from 48 births per 1,000 females ages 15 to 19 in 2000 to 43 births per 1,000 teen females in this age range in 2002. This decline was reflected among every major racial and ethnic group. It is worth noting that teen pregnancy rates and teen abortion rates have been falling as well.

## For more information on teen birth, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

- In 2002, there were 425,493 babies born to females ages 15 to 19 , yielding a record-low rate of 43 births per 1,000 teens.
- Nonetheless, this means that there were 1,166 births to teens each day during 2002.
- The 2002 rate represents a drop of 10 percent from 2000, when the Teen Birth Rate was 48 births per 1,000 teens.The Teen Birth Rate decreased in 46 states, increased in 2 states and the District of Columbia, and was unchanged in 2 others.
- The Teen Birth Rate in 2002 ranged from a low of 20 births per 1,000 females ages 15 to 19 in New Hampshire to a high of 65 births per 1,000 in Mississippi.


## Teen Birth Rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19): 2002

More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 32 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 33 to 40 )
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 41 to 48 )
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median (49 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Hampshire | 20 | 25 | Wyoming | 40 |
| 2 | Massachusetts | 23 | 28 | California | 41 |
| 3 | Vermont | 24 | 29 | Illinois | 42 |
| 4 | Maine | 25 | 30 | Kansas | 43 |
| 5 | Connecticut | 26 | 31 | Florida | 44 |
| 6 | Minnesota | 27 | 31 | Missouri | 44 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 27 | 33 | Indiana | 45 |
| 6 | North Dakota | 27 | 34 | Delaware | 46 |
| 9 | New York | 29 | 34 | West Virginia | 46 |
| 10 | lowa | 32 | 36 | Colorado | 47 |
| 10 | Pennsylvania | 32 | 37 | Kentucky | 51 |
| 10 | Wisconsin | 32 | 38 | North Carolina | 52 |
| 13 | Washington | 33 | 39 | South Carolina | 53 |
| 14 | Maryland | 35 | 40 | Nevada | 54 |
| 14 | Michigan | 35 | 40 | Tennessee | 54 |
| 16 | Montana | 36 | 42 | Alabama | 55 |
| 16 | Rhode Island | 36 | 43 | Georgia | 56 |
| 18 | Nebraska | 37 | 44 | Lovisiana | 58 |
| 18 | Oregon | 37 | 44 | Oklahoma | 58 |
| 18 | Utah | 37 | 46 | Arkansas | 60 |
| 21 | Hawaii | 38 | 47 | Arizona | 61 |
| 21 | South Dakota | 38 | 48 | New Mexico | 62 |
| 21 | Virginia | 38 | 49 | Texas | 64 |
| 24 | Idaho | 39 | 50 | Mississippi | 65 |
| 25 | Alaska Ohio | 40 40 | N.R. | District of Columbia | 69 |

## Percent of Teens Who Are High School Dropouts

Graduating from high school is critical for obtaining postsecondary education and getting a good job.

Teens who drop out of high school will find it difficult to achieve financial success in life. As America moves further into the 21 st century, when advanced skills and technical knowledge will be required for most good-paying jobs, the job prospects for those who have not completed high school will be even more dismal. The measure we use is called a "status dropout rate," and it reflects the percent of 16 - to 19 -year-olds who are not enrolled in school and do not have a high school degree or a GED. The 27 percent decline in this dropout rate since 2000 is a significant departure from the 1990s, when this rate changed very liftle.
maw For more information on high school dropouts, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

Nationwide in 2003, there were more than 1.1 million teens between the ages of 16 and 19 who were not in school and had not graduated from high school.

- The dropout rate in 2003 (8 percent) was 27 percent lower than the 11 percent rate in 2000 .

The dropout rate fell in 38 states and the District of Columbia between 2000 and 2003, rose in 9 states, and was unchanged in 3 others.

- In 2003, the high school dropout rate ranged from a low of 4 percent in New Jersey, North Dakota, and Wisconsin, to a high of 12 percent in Arizona and Louisiana.


## Percent of Teens Who Are High School Dropouts (ages 16-19): 2003

More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 6 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median (7)
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median (8)
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median (9 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | New Jersey | 4 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Rhode Island | 7 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | North Dakota | 4 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | South Carolina | 7 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Wisconsin | 4 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | South Dakota | 7 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Hawaii | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Connecticut | 8 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Kansas | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Florida | 8 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Massachusetts | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Illinois | 8 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Vermont | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Missouri | 8 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Virginia | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Oregon | 8 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Wyoming | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Pennsylvania | 8 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Arkansas | 6 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Tennessee | 8 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Maryland | 6 | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | Kentucky | 9 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Michigan | 6 | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | Texas | 9 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Utah | 6 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | Alabama | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Washington | 6 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | Alaska | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | California | 7 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | Montana | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Colorado | 7 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | Nevada | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Delaware | 7 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | New Mexico | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Idaho | 7 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | West Virginia | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | lowa | 7 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | Georgia | 11 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Maine | 7 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | Indiana | 11 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Minnesota | 7 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | Mississippi | 11 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Nebraska | 7 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | North Carolina | 11 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | New Hampshire | 7 | $\mathbf{4 9}$ | Arizona | 12 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |  |  | N.R.=Not Ranked. |  |
| $\mathbf{4 9}$ | Louisiana | 12 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Percent of Teens Not Attending School and Not Working

During late adolescence, young people make some critical choices that affect their transition to adulthood. The Percent of Teens Not Attending School and Not Working (sometimes referred to as "Idle Teens" or "Disconnected Youth") reflects young people ages 16 to 19 who are not engaged in either of the core activities that usually occupy people during this crucial period in their lives. While those who have dropped out of school are clearly vulnerable, many young persons who have finished school but are not working also belong to a marginalized group.


For more information on teens not attending school and not working, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

In 2003, almost 1.3 million teens between the ages of 16 and 19 were neither enrolled in school nor working.

- Nationwide, there was no change between 2000 and 2003 in the share of 16 - to 19 -year-olds who were idle ( 9 percent).
- The share of idle teens fell in 23 states and the District of Columbia during this period, while increasing in 16 states and remaining unchanged in 11 others. It should be noted that many of these changes were quite small and probably not statistically significant.
- Among the states, the Percent of Teens Not Attending School and Not Working in 2003 ranged from a low of 4 percent in Minnesota, Vermont, and Wisconsin to a high of 14 percent in Louisiana.
More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 6 and lower)
Up to 20\% better than state median (7 and 8)
Up to 20\% worse than state median (9 and 10)
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median (11 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Minnesota | 4 | 16 | South Dakota | 8 |
| 1 | Vermont | 4 | 16 | Utah | 8 |
| 1 | Wisconsin | 4 | 29 | Arkansas | 9 |
| 4 | Maine | 5 | 29 | Colorado | 9 |
| 4 | New Jersey | 5 | 29 | New York | 9 |
| 6 | Delaware | 6 | 29 | Oregon | 9 |
| 6 | New Hampshire | 6 | 29 | Rhode Island | 9 |
| 6 | North Dakota | 6 | 34 | Montana | 10 |
| 6 | Virginia | 6 | 34 | New Mexico | 10 |
| 6 | Wyoming | 6 | 34 | North Carolina | 10 |
| 11 | Connecticut | 7 | 34 | Texas | 10 |
| 11 | Iowa | 7 | 34 | Washington | 10 |
| 11 | Michigan | 7 | 39 | Alabama | 11 |
| 11 | Nebraska | 7 | 39 | Arizona | 11 |
| 11 | Pennsylvania | 7 | 39 | Georgia | 11 |
| 16 | California | 8 | 39 | Nevada | 11 |
| 16 | Florida | 8 | 39 | Oklahoma | 11 |
| 16 | Idaho | 8 | 39 | Tennessee | 11 |
| 16 | Illinois | 8 | 39 | West Virginia | 11 |
| 16 | Indiana | 8 | 46 | Kentucky | 12 |
| 16 | Kansas | 8 | 46 | Mississippi | 12 |
| 16 | Maryland | 8 | 48 | Alaska | 13 |
| 16 | Massachusetts | 8 | 48 | Hawaii | 13 |
| 16 | Missouri | 8 | 50 | Louisiana | 14 |
| 16 16 | Ohio South Carolina | 8 8 | N.R. | District of Columbia | 10 |

## Percent of Children Living in Families Where No Parent Has Full-Time, Year-Round Employment

In 2003, nearly 24 million children had no parent in the household who worked full-time, year-round. This measure is sometimes referred to as "lack of secure parental employment." In addition to having higher poverty rates, these children are more likely to lack access to the health and family benefits that a stable job provides. We found that 18 percent of children living in families where no parent had a full-time, year-round job lacked health insurance, compared to 9 percent in other families.

## For more information on children

living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

- Nationally, the Percent of Children Living in Families Where No Parent Has Full-Time, Year-Round Employment increased from 32 percent in 2000 to 33 percent in 2003.
- During that period, this measure improved in 16 states, got worse in 27 others (plus the District of Columbia), and was unchanged in 7 states.

■ Among the states, the 2003 figures ranged from a low of 23 percent in Nebraska to a high of 41 percent in Mississippi.

## Percent of Children Living in Families Where No Parent Has Full-Time, Year-Round Employment: 2003

More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 26 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 27 to 32 )
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 33 to 38 )
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 39 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Nebraska | 23 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Ohio | 32 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | South Dakota | 24 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Florida | 33 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | North Dakota | 25 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Hawaii | 33 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | lowa | 26 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | New York | 33 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Minnesota | 26 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Oklahoma | 33 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Utah | 26 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Rhode Island | 33 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Kansas | 27 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Tennessee | 33 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Maryland | 27 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Texas | 33 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | New Hampshire | 27 | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | Michigan | 34 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | New Jersey | 27 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | Alabama | 35 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Vermont | 27 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | California | 35 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Virginia | 27 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | Idaho | 35 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | Connecticut | 28 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | Oregon | 35 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | Wyoming | 28 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | Washington | 35 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Delaware | 29 | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | Arizona | 36 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Missouri | 29 | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | North Carolina | 36 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Indiana | 30 | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | South Carolina | 36 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Nevada | 30 | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | Arkansas | 37 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Wisconsin | 30 | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | West Virginia | 37 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Colorado | 31 | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | Kentucky | 39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Georgia | 31 | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | New Mexico | 39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Maine | 31 | $\mathbf{4 8}$ | Alaska | 40 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Massachusetts | 31 | $\mathbf{4 8}$ | Louisiana | 40 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Pennsylvania | 31 | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | Mississippi | 41 |
|  | 32 | $\mathbf{N . R}$. | District of |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Columbia | 54 |
|  |  |  |  | 32 |  |

## Percent of Children in Poverty

The Percent of Children in Poverty is perhaps the most global and widely used indicator of child well-being. This is partly due to the fact that poverty is closely linked to a number of undesirable outcomes in areas such as health, education, emotional welfare, and delinquency.

The data shown here are based on the official poverty measure as determined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. The official poverty measure consists of a series of income thresholds based on family size and composition. The 2003 poverty line was $\$ 14,824$ for a family of one adult and two children.

Despite the enormous wealth in the United States, our child poverty rate is among the highest in the developed world. The gap in the child poverty rate between the United States and other developed countries is partly a product of differences in private-sector income, but differences in governmental efforts to alleviate child poverty greatly accentuate the disparities. The failure to adequately invest in our children will put us at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy of the 21 st century.

## For more information on children in poverty, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

In 2003, there were 12.7 million U.S. children living in poverty.
Nationwide, 18 percent of children were poor in 2003, up slightly from 17 percent in 2000.

- Between 2000 and 2003, child poverty increased in 25 states and the District of Columbia, decreased in 12 states, and remained unchanged in 13 states.
- Among the states, the child poverty rate for 2003 ranged from a low of 8 percent in New Hampshire to a high of 30 percent in Louisiana.


## Percent of Children in Poverty: 2003

More than $20 \%$ better than state median ( 13 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 14 to 16 )
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median (17 to 19)
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median (20 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New Hampshire | 8 | 25 | Missouri | 16 |
| 2 | Minnesota | 9 | 25 | Pennsylvania | 16 |
| 3 | Maryland | 10 | 29 | Rhode Island | 17 |
| 4 | Connecticut | 11 | 30 | Idaho | 18 |
| 5 | Delaware | 12 | 30 | Montana | 18 |
| 5 | lowa | 12 | 30 | Ohio | 18 |
| 5 | Massachusetts | 12 | 30 | Oregon | 18 |
| 5 | New Jersey | 12 | 34 | California | 19 |
| 5 | Utah | 12 | 34 | Florida | 19 |
| 5 | Vermont | 12 | 34 | Georgia | 19 |
| 5 | Virginia | 12 | 34 | New York | 19 |
| 5 | Wyoming | 12 | 34 | North Carolina | 19 |
| 13 | Colorado | 13 | 34 | South Carolina | 19 |
| 13 | Maine | 13 | 40 | Tennessee | 20 |
| 13 | Nebraska | 13 | 41 | Arizona | 21 |
| 16 | Alaska | 14 | 42 | Oklahoma | 22 |
| 16 | Indiana | 14 | 43 | Texas | 23 |
| 16 | Kansas | 14 | 44 | Alabama | 24 |
| 16 | North Dakota | 14 | 44 | Arkansas | 24 |
| 16 | South Dakota | 14 | 44 | Kentucky | 24 |
| 16 | Washington | 14 | 47 | West Virginia | 25 |
| 16 | Wisconsin | 14 | 48 | New Mexico | 26 |
| 23 | Hawaii | 15 | 49 | Mississippi | 29 |
| 23 | Nevada | 15 | 50 | Lovisiana | 30 |
| 25 | Illinois Michigan | 16 16 | N.R. | District of Columbia | 36 |

## Percent of Children in Single-Parent Households

NOTE: In the 2005 KIDS COUNT
Data Book, the Percent of Children in
Single-Parent Households is calculated
differently from previous Data Books.

Much of the public interest in family structure is linked to the fact that children growing up in single-parent households typically do not have the same economic or human resources available as those growing up in two-parent households. About 42 percent of children in female-headed families were poor in 2003, compared to 9 percent of children in married-couple families. Only about one-third of female-headed families reported receiving any child support payments in 2003. Beyond poverty, children in single-parent families are at increased risk for academic failures (repeated grades, low marks, low class standing); increased likelihood of dropping out of high school or becoming a teen parent; and increased levels of depression, stress, anxiety, and aggression. Interestingly, the number of children living with a single father has nearly doubled since 1990, and many states now have official initiatives to promote responsible fatherhood.

## For more information on children in singleparent households, visit the Indicator Briefs and Definitions sections at www.kidscount.org/2005.

More than 22 million children lived in singleparent households in 2003.Nationwide, the Percent of Children in SingleParent Households remained steady between 2000 and 2003 at 30 percent.- During this period, 17 states and the District of Columbia recorded a decrease in the percent of children living in single-parent households. Eight states reported no change in this measure, while the situation worsened in 25 states.In 2003, the Percent of Children in SingleParent Households ranged from a low of 17 percent in Utah to a high of 42 percent in Mississippi.


## Percent of Children in Single-Parent Households: 2003

More than $20 \%$ better than state median (23 and lower)
Up to $20 \%$ better than state median ( 24 to 29)
Up to $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 30 to 35 )
More than $20 \%$ worse than state median ( 36 and higher)

| Rank | State | Rate | Rank | State | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Utah | 17 | 24 | Missouri | 29 |
| 2 | Idaho | 20 | 24 | Oklahoma | 29 |
| 2 | Nebraska | 20 | 29 | Hawaii | 30 |
| 4 | South Dakota | 22 | 29 | Michigan | 30 |
| 5 | lowa | 23 | 29 | Nevada | 30 |
| 5 | Minnesota | 23 | 29 | West Virginia | 30 |
| 5 | North Dakota | 23 | 33 | Alaska | 31 |
| 8 | New Hampshire | 25 | 33 | Pennsylvania | 31 |
| 8 | Wyoming | 25 | 35 | Delaware | 32 |
| 10 | Colorado | 26 | 35 | Maryland | 32 |
| 10 | Kansas | 26 | 35 | Ohio | 32 |
| 10 | Wisconsin | 26 | 35 | Rhode Island | 32 |
| 13 | Maine | 27 | 39 | Arkansas | 33 |
| 13 | Montana | 27 | 39 | Georgia | 33 |
| 13 | New Jersey | 27 | 39 | North Carolina | 33 |
| 16 | Connecticut | 28 | 39 | Tennessee | 33 |
| 16 | Indiana | 28 | 43 | Arizona | 34 |
| 16 | Massachusetts | 28 | 43 | New York | 34 |
| 16 | Oregon | 28 | 45 | Alabama | 35 |
| 16 | Texas | 28 | 46 | Florida | 36 |
| 16 | Vermont | 28 | 46 | New Mexico | 36 |
| 16 | Virginia | 28 | 48 | South Carolina | 37 |
| 16 | Washington | 28 | 49 | Lovisiana | 41 |
| 24 | California | 29 | 50 | Mississippi | 42 |
| 24 | Illinois <br> Kentucky | 29 29 | N.R. | District of Columbia | 62 |



## PROFILES



| Background Information | Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |  | Children Living in Vulnerable Households |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 72,760,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | [ | \$50,000 | ] | Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003 |  |  |
|  | Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[50,130,000$ | 69\% $]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 | [ | 8\% | ] | United States | $17 \%$ |  |
|  | Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[18,444,000$ | 25\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ | 39\% | ] | Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003 |  |  |
|  | Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[4,186,000$ | 6\% $\quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ | 36\% | ] | United States | 12\% |  |
|  | Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ | 60\% | ] | Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003 |  |  |
|  | Children without health insurance: 2002 | [ |  | Children in low-income families that spend more than 30\% of their income on housing: 2003 | [ | 60\% | ] | United States | 5\% |  |
|  | 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ |  | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ | 67\% | ] | Children in Low-Income Households Where No Adult Works |  |  |
|  | Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 2,79 \end{array}\right.$ |  | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | [ | 8\% | 」 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number of children in low-income } \\ & \text { households where no adult worked } \\ & \text { in the past } 12 \text { months: } 2003 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Education |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 |  |  |
|  | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 |  |  | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ | $31 \%$ | ] |  |  |  |
| An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information. | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $30 \%$ |  | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ | 27\% | $]$ | United States | - 5\% |  |

United States

## Percent Change Over Time

Trend Data



## Alabama
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Arizona


[^3]Background Information

## An abbreviated Definitions

and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information


| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 28 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 26 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \%$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $27 \%$ | $30 \%$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ 19\% | 27\% |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Arkansas | $17 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-In Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-incon households where no adult work in the past 12 months: 2003 | 38,000 |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Arkansas


[^4]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 9,346,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 51,000 \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ $6,531,000$ | $70 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $7 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[2,227,000$ | $24 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[42 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[588,000$ | 6\% $\quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $29 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $54 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 14 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $69 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $81 \%$ | $82 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $56 \%$ | 67\% $\quad$ ] |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[304,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$. |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 21 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 25 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $22 \%$ | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $22 \%$ | 27\% $\quad$. |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did nof finish high school: 2003

| California |  | $26 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| California |  |  | $30 \%$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| United States | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disabilily: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


## California



[^5]
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## Colorado



[^6]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions
and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 832,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [593,000 | $71 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[200,000$ | $24 \%$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[39,000$ | $5 \%$ |
| Child Health |  |  |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 8 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $95 \%$ | 82\% $\quad$ ] |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[34,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ |

## Education



Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Connecticut | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Connecticut | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |
| United States | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comenetiut 4\% } \\ & \text { Unieded States } 5 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Inco Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-income households where no adult worke in the poss 12 months: 2003 | $[23,000$ |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


## Connecticut



[^7]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 198,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 60,000 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL <br> \$50,000 |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [133,000 | 67\% $]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | 8\% |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [50,000 | 25\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[30 \%$ | 39\% |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[15,000$ | 7\% $\quad$ ] | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $40 \%$ | 36\% |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $64 \%$ | 60\% |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 9 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $[58 \%$ | 60\% |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $80 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | $[73 \%$ | 67\% |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[9,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | 8\% |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL <br> $31 \%$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $[31 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $26 \%$ | 27\% |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Delaware | $14 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Delaware | $6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| United States | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work discbility: 2003

| Deluwrie <br> U\% <br> Unied States$\|$ |
| :--- |
| 5\% |$|$

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


## Delaware



[^8]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 107,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 35,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 41,000 | $38 \% \quad]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $23 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[63,000$ | 59\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[55 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [4,000 | 4\% $\quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $18 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $64 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 9 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \%$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 60 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $81 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $36 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[5,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 10 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 7 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $[10 \%$ | 30\% $]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households
Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Distrito f Coumbia | 27\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United Stutes | 17\% |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| District of Columbia | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline \text { Distitit of Columbia } \\ \text { Unied Stutes } & 6 \% \\ 5 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Income Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-in households where no adult in the past 12 months: 200 | 18,00 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


## District of Columbia



| Background Information | Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  | Children Living in Vulnerable Households |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 3,930,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 45,000 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000]$ | Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003 |  |
|  | Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[2,488,000$ | $63 \% \quad]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $\begin{array}{rr} \text { Florida } & 17 \% \\ \text { United States } & 17 \% \end{array}$ |  |
|  | Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [1,191,000 | $30 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $42 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003 |  |
|  | Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[251,000$ | $6 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $35 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ | $\begin{array}{r\|r} \hline \text { Florida } & 13 \% \\ \text { United States } & 12 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $64 \%$ | $60 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003 |  |
|  | Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 15 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $65 \%$ | 60\% $]$ | Florida 6\% <br> United States $5 \%$ |  |
|  | 2 -year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $84 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $66 \%$ | $67 \%$ | Children in Low-Incom Households Where No Adult Works |  |
|  | Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[180,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[9 \%$ | $8 \%$ | Number of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 | $168,000$ |
|  | Education |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 |  |
|  | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 32 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ | Florida $\quad 4 \%$ |  |
| An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176 , or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information. | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $27 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $23 \%$ | $27 \% \quad]$ | United States $5 \%$ |  |

## Florida



[^9]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 2,283,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 47,300 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [1,523,000 | 67\% $]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[644,000$ | 28\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[41 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [116,000 | $5 \%]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [37\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $60 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 14 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 61 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $77 \%$ | $82 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 69 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[105,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 27 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 27 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $26 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $22 \%$ | 27\% $\quad$. |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Georgia | $17 \%$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Georgia | $6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| United States | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| Gergia <br> Un <br> Unied States$\|$ |
| :--- |
| 5\% |$|$

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


## Georgia



[^10]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 295,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 58,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[206,000$ | $70 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 | $[7 \%$ | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [ 72,000 | $24 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[36 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[17,000$ | 6\% $\quad$ ] | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $31 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $66 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 8 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $54 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $83 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $52 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | [9,000 | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 13 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 21 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 23 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $22 \%$ | $30 \%$ ] | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $17 \%$ | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Hawaii | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Hawaii | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disabilily: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Hawaii


[^11]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 370,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [291,000 | $79 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [ 64,000 | $17 \%$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [14,000 | 4\% $\quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 13 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $83 \%$ | 82\% $\quad]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | [ 11,000 | 2,791,000 $]$ |


| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 30 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $[32 \%$ | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $28 \%$ | 27\% |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households
Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Idaho | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Idaho | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Idaho } 4 \% \\ \text { Unied Stutes } \\ 5 \% \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Inco Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 | 10,000 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003



[^12]| Background Information | Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  | Children Living in Vulnerable Households |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 3,232,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 55,000 \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ | Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003 |  |  |
|  | Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[2,271,000$ | $70 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 | [ $8 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ | United States | $\begin{gathered} 15 \% \\ \hline 17 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[777,000$ | $24 \%$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | [36\% | $39 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003 |  |  |
|  | Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[184,000$ | $6 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $30 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ | Illinois | $\begin{gathered} 13 \% \\ \hline 12 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $60 \%$ | $60 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003 |  |  |
|  | Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 11 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than 30\% of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $62 \%$ | 60\% $]$ | United States |  |  |
|  | 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $85 \%$ | 82\% $]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $68 \%$ | $67 \% \quad]$ | Children in Low-Income Households Where No Adult Works |  |  |
|  | Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[109,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[7 \%$ | 8\% $]$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number of children in low-income } \\ & \text { households where no adult worked } \\ & \text { in the past } 12 \text { months: } 2003 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Education |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 |  |  |
|  | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 32 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |  |  |  |
| An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176 , or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information. | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $35 \%$ | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $29 \%$ | $27 \% \quad]$ | United States | 5\% |  |



[^13]Background Information

## An abbreviated Definitions

and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,602,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{cc} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[1,146,000$ | $71 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [357,000 | $22 \%]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [ 99,000 | 6\% $\quad$. |
| Child Health |  |  |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ {[10 \%} \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $82 \%$ | 82\% $\quad]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | [ 58,000 | 2,791,000 $]$ |


| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 35 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL <br> $31 \%$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ 33\% | $30 \%$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $31 \%$ | 27\% |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Indiana | $15 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003



[^14]Background Information

## An abbreviated Definitions

and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visi www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 690,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 51,000 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL <br> \$50,000 |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [524,000 | $76 \% \quad]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [126,000 | 18\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[34 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [41,000 | $6 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $50 \%$ | 36\% |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $70 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 6 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $39 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $85 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $78 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[21,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r}\text { STATE } \\ 35 \%\end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r}\text { STATE } \\ 36 \%\end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL <br> $31 \%$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $36 \%$ | $30 \%$ ] | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [33\% | 27\% |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| lowa | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Children in Low-Income
Households Where
No Adult Works

## Number of children in low-income houssholds where no oadult worked in 18,000

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003



[^15]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 685,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 50,500 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[505,000$ | $74 \% \quad]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $7 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[151,000$ | $22 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[37 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[29,000$ | 4\% $]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ 48\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $68 \%$ | $60 \%]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 7 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $50 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $78 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $72 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[29,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[5 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 41 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [35\% | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $34 \%$ | 27\% $\quad]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Kansas | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Kansas


[^16]

## Kentucky

## Percent Change Over Time



## National Rank

National Rank is based on nost recent available data

28
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39

[^17]

Louisiana


[^18]| Background Information | Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  | Children Living in Vulnerable Households |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 285,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{cc} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 47,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ | Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003 |  |
|  | Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[203,000$ | $71 \%$ ] | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | $8 \%$ |  |  |
|  | Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[57,000$ | $20 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $36 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003 |  |
|  | Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [ 24,000 | $9 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $48 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ | $\begin{array}{r\|r\|} \hline \text { Maine } & 1 \% \\ \text { United States } & \\ \hline 12 \% \end{array}$ |  |
|  | Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $62 \%$ | $60 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003 |  |
|  | Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 7 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \%$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $47 \%$ | 60\% $]$ | $\begin{array}{r\|r\|} \hline \text { Maine } & 8 \% \\ \hline \text { United States } & 5 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $84 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $74 \%$ | $67 \%$ | Children in Low-Income Households Where No Adult Works |  |
|  | Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[13,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | [ $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number of children in low-income } \\ & \text { households where no adult worked } \\ & \text { in the past } 12 \text { months: } 2003 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Education |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 |  |
|  | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 36 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 34 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ | Maine $\quad 3 \%$ |  |
| An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176 , or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information. | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $37 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $29 \%$ | $27 \% \quad]$ | United States $\quad 5 \%$ |  |



[^19]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,374,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 65,100 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[920,000$ | $67 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[370,000$ | $27 \%$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[24 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [84,000 | $6 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $31 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $67 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 9 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than 30\% of their income on housing: 2003 | $[66 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $85 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $72 \%$ | 67\% $\quad$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[64,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 32 \% \end{array}\right.$ | National $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $[31 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [30\% | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Maryland | $12 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Marlend } \\ \text { United Stutes } \\ \hline 5 \% \\ 5 \% \\ 5 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Inco Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-income households where no adult worke in the past 12 months: 2003 | 45,000 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Maryland


[^20]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,490,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 66,500 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [1,063,000 | $71 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[6 \%$ | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [370,000 | $25 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 26 \% \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[58,000$ | 4\% $\quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $34 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $60 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ {\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { ST } \end{array}\right.} \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 69 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2 -year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $93 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $72 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[64,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 40 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 41 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $43 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [38\% | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not tinish high school: 2003

| Massachusetts | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Massachusetts | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Massalusustst } 5 \% \\ & \text { United States } \\ & \hline 5 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low Households Wh No Adulł Work |  |
| Number of children in low households where no adul in the past 12 months: 20 | $[86,000$ |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003



## Massachusetts



[^21]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 2,527,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 53,000 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000 \quad]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[1,743,000$ | 69\% $]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [ 636,000 | 25\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[36 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[147,000$ | 6\% $\quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [37\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $60 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 7 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \%$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $59 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $83 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $78 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[85,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 32 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 34 \% \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $32 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $28 \%$ | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003


Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Michigan


[^22]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions
and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,242,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 61,400 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 954,000 | $77 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [227,000 | 18\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[24 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[62,000$ | $5 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $43 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $68 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ {\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { ST } \end{array}\right.} \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 60 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2 -year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $85 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $83 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[43,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[5 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$. |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 37 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 42 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [37\% | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ 44\% | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Minnesota | $7 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003

| Minnesota $5 \%$   <br>     <br> United States  $12 \%$  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Children in households where the household head has a work disabilily: 2003

| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Minesosta } & 3 \% \\ \text { Unied Sutes } & \text { 3\% } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in LowHouseholds Whe No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-in households where no adult in the past 12 months: 2003 | $d[21,000$ |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003



## Minnesota



[^23]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 755,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 35,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [436,000 | $58 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $13 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [282,000 | $37 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[56 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[37,000$ | $5 \%]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [33\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $67 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 11 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \%$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $52 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $84 \%$ | $82 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $65 \%$ | 67\% $\quad$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[34,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 10 \% \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | 8\% $\quad$. |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 18 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 17 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $21 \%$ | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $12 \%$ | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in houssholds where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Mississippi | $22 \%$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| Misisisipi $10 \%$ <br> United Sutes  <br> $5 \%$  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Inc Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-income households where no adult worke in the past 12 months: 2003 | 63,000 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


## Mississippi



[^24]Background Information

## An abbreviated Definitions

 and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,401,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 46,200 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 979,000 | $70 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[6 \%$ | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [346,000 | $25 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[39 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[76,000$ | $5 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $42 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $63 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ {\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { ST } \end{array}\right.} \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $[57 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2 -year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $85 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $72 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[60,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[7 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$. |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 34 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r}\text { STATE } \\ 30 \%\end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [34\% | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $28 \%$ | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the houshold head did not tinish high school: 2003

| Missouri | $13 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Missouri


[^25]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 215,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 41,700 \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NATIONAL } \\ & \$ 50,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [155,000 | $72 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $7 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [46,000 | $21 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[45 \%$ | 39\% $\quad$. |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [14,000 | $7 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $43 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $68 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 15 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $[45 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $85 \%$ | $82 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 66 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 67\% |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[7,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 35 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { NATIONAL } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [37\% | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [35\% | 27\% $\quad]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Montana | $7 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| Montona 4\% |
| :--- |
| Unied Stutes $5 \%$ |
| 5\% |$|$

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Montana


[^26]

## Nebraska



[^27]


[^28]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 304,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 63,700 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[223,000$ | $74 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $4 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [ 58,000 | 19\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[22 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[22,000$ | 7\% $\quad$ ] | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $57 \%$ | 36\% |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | $[61 \%$ | 60\% |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 6 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $[67 \%$ | 60\% |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $89 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $78 \%$ | 67\% |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[13,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | 8\% |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 40 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 43 \% \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { NATIONAL } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $40 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $35 \%$ | $27 \% \quad]$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the houshold head did not tinish high school: 2003

| New Hampshire | $7 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003

$\square$

New Hampshire


[^29]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { NUMBER } \\ 2,124,000\end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 1,541,000 | $73 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [473,000 | $22 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[110,000$ | $5 \%$ |
| Child Health |  |  |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 11 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ 77\% | 82\% $\quad]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | [82,000 | 2,791,000 $]$ |

$\left.\begin{array}{lc|c}\text { Economic Conditions of Families } \\ \hline \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Median income of families } \\ \text { with children: } 2003\end{array} & \text { STATE } & \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 69,100 & \$ 50,000\end{array}\right]$
Children in extreme poverty (income
below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 $\quad\left[\begin{array}{ll|l} & 6 \% & 8 \%\end{array}\right]$
Children in low-income
families (income below 200\%
of poverty level): 2003 $\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l} & 27 \%\end{array}\right.$
Female-headed families
receiving child support: 2003 $\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l}31 \% & 36 \%\end{array}\right]$
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\begin{array}{l}\text { Children under age } 6 \text { with all } \\ \text { parents in the labor force: } 2003\end{array}\end{array} \quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l}57 \%\end{array}\right] 60 \%\right]$

| Children in low-income families <br> that spend more than $30 \%$ <br> of their income on housing: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} & \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Children in households } \\ \text { where the household head } \\ \text { owns the housing unit: } 2003\end{array} & {[69 \%}\end{array}\right]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Children in households |
| :--- |
| where someone receives |
| Social Security income: 2003 | \(\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l} \& 7 \% <br>

\& <br>
\hline\end{array}\right.\)

## Education

| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 39 \% \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ 30 \% \end{array}\right]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 39 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL 31\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $37 \%$ | 30\% | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $[33 \%$ | 27\% |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| New Jersey | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| New evesey | 15\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Unieded Stues | 12\% |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { New Jesey } \\ & \text { United Sules } \\ & \text { 4\% } \\ & \hline 5 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low Households Wh No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in lowhouseholds where no adult in the past 12 months: 200 | $[63,000$ |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


New Jersey


[^30]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 498,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [313,000 | 63\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [ 146,000 | $29 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [39,000 | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ {[14 \%} \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ 78\% | 82\% $\quad]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[19,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ |


| Economic Conditions of FamiliesMedian income of families <br> with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{ccc}\text { STATE } & \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 35,300 & \$ 50,000\end{array}\right]$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Children in extreme poverty (income <br> below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{lll}14 \% & 8 \%\end{array}\right]$ |


| Children in low-income <br> families (income below 200\% <br> of poverty level): 2003 |
| :--- |

Female-headed families
receiving child support: 2003 $\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l}24 \% & 36 \%\end{array}\right]$
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\begin{array}{l}\text { Children under age } 6 \text { with all } \\ \text { parents in the labor force: } 2003\end{array}\end{array} \quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l}65 \%\end{array}\right] 60 \%\right]$

| Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ | 47\% | 60\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 |  | 70\% | 67\% |


| Children in households |
| :--- |
| where someone receives |
| Social Security income: 2003 | \(\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l} \& 7 \% <br>

\& <br>
\hline\end{array}\right.\)

## Education



Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| New Mexico |  |  | $25 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| New Mexico | $14 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Nee Mexico } & 5 \% \\ \text { United States } \\ 5 \% \\ 5 \% \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Inco Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of d tildren in low-income households where no adult worke in the past 12 months: 2003 | 25,000 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the pass 12 months: 2003

$\square$

New Mexico


[^31]


[^32]


[^33]


[^34]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 2,818,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[1,904,000$ | $68 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [729,000 | $26 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[37 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[186,000$ | 7\% $]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $43 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $63 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 8 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 61 \% \end{array}\right.$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $84 \%$ | $82 \% \quad]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $70 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[110,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[7 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 34 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r}\text { STATE } \\ 36 \%\end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [34\% | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [30\% | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Ohio | $12 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Ohio


[^35]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 878,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 39,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[621,000$ | $71 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $10 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[212,000$ | $24 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[50 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[45,000$ | $5 \%]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ 36\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | $[52 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r}\text { STATE } \\ 15 \%\end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ 47\% | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ 74\% | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | $[67 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[40,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 26 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 23 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $30 \%$ | $30 \% \quad]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $20 \%$ | 27\% $\quad]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Oklahoma | $15 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Oklahoma | $5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| United States |  | $12 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003

$\square$

Oklahoma


[^36]


[^37]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 2,817,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[1,937,000$ | $69 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 | [ $8 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[693,000$ | $25 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[37 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [187,000 | $7 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $42 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $62 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 9 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $56 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $88 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $73 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[102,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 36 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $32 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [30\% | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Pennsylvania | $12 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pemenslumania } \\ & \text { United Sutes } \\ & \text { Un } \\ & 5 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in LowHouseholds Whe No Adult Works | me |
| Number of children in lowhouseholds where no adult in the past 12 months: 2003 | $[147,000$ |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003

$\square$

## Percent Change Over Time



## National Rank

National Rank is based on nost recent available data

[^38]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 243,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 57,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[163,000$ | 67\% $]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $7 \%$ | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[63,000$ | $26 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[31 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[16,000$ | $7 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $40 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $67 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 5 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $[69 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $89 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | $[64 \%$ | $67 \% \quad]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 9,000 \end{array}\right.$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 29 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 28 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $30 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $[24 \%$ | $27 \%]$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not tinish high school: 2003

| Rhode Island | $18 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disabilily: 2003

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in LowHouseholds Whe No Adulł Works |  |
| Number of dildren in low-in households where no adult in the past 12 months: 2003 | L 20,000 |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Rhode Island


[^39]Background Information

## An abbreviated Definitions

and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { NUMBER } \\ 1,016,000\end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[635,000$ | 63\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [331,000 | $33 \%$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[50,000$ | $5 \%$ |
| Child Health |  |  |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 9 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $86 \%$ | 82\% $\quad]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | [44,000 | 2,791,000 $]$ |


| Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 41,300 \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[9 \%$ | 8\% |


| Children in low-income <br> families (income below 200\% <br> of poverty level): 2003 |
| :--- |


| Female-headed families <br> receiving child support: 2003 |
| :--- |


| Children under age 6 with all |
| :--- |
| parents in the labor force: 2003 | $\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l}64 \% & 60 \%\end{array}\right]$


| Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ | 55\% | 60\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 |  | 69\% | 67\% |


| Children in households |
| :--- |
| where someone receives |
| Social Security income: 2003 | \(\quad\left[\begin{array}{l|l} \& <br>

\hline\end{array}\right.\)

| Education |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 26 \% \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NATIONAL } \\ & 30 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $24 \%$ | 30\% |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| South Carolina | $15 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


South Carolina


[^40]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 193,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 45,000 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 149,000 | $77 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $7 \%$ | 8\% |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [35,000 | 18\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[37 \%$ | 39\% |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[9,000$ | $5 \%]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $41 \%$ | 36\% |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | $[72 \%$ | 60\% |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 8 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \%$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than 30\% of their income on housing: 2003 | $[47 \%$ | 60\% |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $83 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | $[74 \%$ | 67\% |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[6,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[4 \%$ | 8\% |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 34 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL <br> 31\% |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $39 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $35 \%$ | 27\% |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not tinish high school: 2003

| South Dakota | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| United States |  | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disabilily: 2003

| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Sout Dokota } & 3 \% \\ \text { Unied S Sutes } & \text { 5\% }\end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in LowHouseholds Whe No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-in households where no adult in the poss 12 months: 2003 | 8,000 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


South Dakota


[^41]

Tennessee


[^42]

Texas


[^43]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 738,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 51,500 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[611,000$ | $83 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[103,000$ | $14 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | [36\% | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[24,000$ | $3 \% \quad]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $42 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ 49\% | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 10 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $65 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [80\% | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ 79\% | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[20,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$. |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 32 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 31 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $32 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $31 \%$ | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Utah | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has limited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work discbility: 2003


Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003



[^44]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 136,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 51,400 \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 96,000 | $71 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 | [ $4 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[25,000$ | $19 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[33 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [15,000 | $11 \%]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $45 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $70 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 4 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $58 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $90 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ 77\% | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[7,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 37 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 42 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $39 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [35\% | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Vermont | $6 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| United States |  | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in houssholds where the houshold head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{array}{c\|c} \text { Vermont } & 5 \% \\ \hline \text { United States } & 5 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Incon Households Where No Adult Works |  |
| Number of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003 | 2,000 |

Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Vermont


[^45]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,790,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 57,200 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NATIONAL } \\ & \$ 50,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[1,281,000$ | $72 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [426,000 | $24 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[30 \%$ | 39\% $\quad$ ] |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [83,000 | $5 \%]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [35\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $62 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c}\text { STATE } \\ 10 \%\end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | $[59 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2 -year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $86 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $70 \%$ | 67\% $\quad$. |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[79,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[8 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$. |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 35 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 36 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $36 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $[31 \%$ | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Virginia | $12 \%$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


Virginia


[^46]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,487,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 51,400 \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $\$ 50,000 \quad]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[1,047,000$ | $70 \% \quad]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[6 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [332,000 | $22 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[35 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[108,000$ | 7\% $\quad$ ] | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $40 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $59 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 10 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \%$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $68 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $81 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $67 \%$ | 67\% $\quad$. |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[58,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[5 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 36 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [33\% | $30 \%$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $32 \%$ | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Washington | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003

| Washington | $8 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wastington 4\% } \\ & \text { United Suteses } 5 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low Households Wh No Adulł Work | come |
| Number of children in low households where no adul in the past 12 months: 20 | $d[49,000$ |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003

$\square$

## Percent Change Over Time



## National Rank

National Rank is based on nost recent available data

Solid bars indicate state change.

Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information.

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 389,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 36,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[272,000$ | $70 \%$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[11 \%$ | 8\% $]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[92,000$ | $24 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[49 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [ 25,000 | 6\% $\quad$ ] | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $40 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $56 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 9 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $43 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2 -year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ 79\% | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $73 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 19,000 \end{array}\right.$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 10 \% \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 29 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \%$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 24 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $25 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $20 \%$ | $27 \%$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not tinish high school: 2003

| West Virginia | $15 \%$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work discbility: 2003

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Children in Low-Inc Households Where No Adulf Works |  |
| Number of children in low-incom households where no adult work in the past 12 months: 2003 | 30,000 |

Percent of children in low-income housholds where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003

West Virginia

## Percent Change Over Time
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Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { NUMBER } \\ 1,323,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 53,800 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | $[959,000$ | $72 \%]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below $50 \%$ of poverty level): 2003 | $[6 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | $[269,000$ | $20 \%]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[33 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | [95,000 | 7\% $]$ | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ 44\% | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $68 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ \mathbf{6 \%} \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $64 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ $84 \%$ | $82 \%]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $73 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[44,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[6 \%$ | $8 \% \quad]$ |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 33 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 35 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | [ $37 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [35\% | 27\% $]$ |

Children Living in Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Wisconsin | $11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| United States | $17 \%$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003

$\square$

Wisconsin


[^47]Background Information

An abbreviated Definitions and Data Sources can be found on page 176, or visit www.kidscount.org/2005 for detailed information

| Demographic Data |  |  | Economic Conditions of Families |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total children in households: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { NUMBER } \\ 120,000 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENT } \\ 100 \% \end{array}\right]$ | Median income of families with children: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ \$ 49,600 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { NATIONAL } \\ \$ 50,000 \end{array}\right]$ |
| Children in marriedcouple households: 2003 | [ 89,000 | $74 \% \quad]$ | Children in extreme poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 | [ $5 \%$ | 8\% $\quad]$ |
| Children in single-parent households with no spouse/partner: 2003 | [ 23,000 | 20\% $]$ | Children in low-income families (income below 200\% of poverty level): 2003 | $[36 \%$ | $39 \% \quad]$ |
| Children in cohabitingcouple households: 2003 | $[7,000$ | 6\% $\quad$ ] | Female-headed families receiving child support: 2003 | [ $50 \%$ | $36 \% \quad]$ |
| Child Health |  |  | Children under age 6 with all parents in the labor force: 2003 | [ $64 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| Children without health insurance: 2002 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \text { STATE } \\ 13 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $12 \% \quad]$ | Children in low-income families that spend more than $30 \%$ of their income on housing: 2003 | [ $43 \%$ | 60\% $]$ |
| 2-year-olds who were immunized: 2003 | [ 77\% | 82\% $]$ | Children in households where the household head owns the housing unit: 2003 | [ $73 \%$ | 67\% $]$ |
| Number of children with special health care needs that limit employment of a family member: 2001 | $[4,000$ | 2,791,000 $]$ | Children in households where someone receives Social Security income: 2003 | $[7 \%$ | 8\% $\quad$ ] |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 34 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $30 \% \quad]$ | 4th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { STATE } \\ 39 \% \end{array}\right.$ | NATIONAL $31 \% \quad]$ |
| 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient reading level: 2003 | $[34 \%$ | $30 \%]$ | 8th grade students who scored at or above proficient math level: 2003 | [ $32 \%$ | $27 \% \quad]$ |

Children Living in
Vulnerable Households

Children in households where the household head did not finish high school: 2003

| Wyoming | $9 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| United States |  | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ |  |  |  |

Children in households where the household head has linited English proficiency: 2003


Children in households where the household head has a work disability: 2003


Percent of children in low-income households where no adult worked in the past 12 months: 2003


NH Vt mn nJ nd ma me ia ut wi ct ne va wa ks id ca or md ny sd ri wy hi mi co pa il oh in de nv mo mt fl ak tx ok ga nc az ky tn ar sc nm wv al la ms
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## APPENDICES




Overall Rank
This chart assists readers in comparing states' performance based on the 10 KIDS COUNT measures of child well-being used to rank states. In addition to showing whether a state ranks higher or lower overall than another state, this chart shows the differences among states based on the sum of their standard scores. If a state had the exact state mean on each indicator, then the sum of the standard scores for that state would be zero. We have inverted the vertical axis in this graph to reflect the fact that negative scores indicate better conditions for children. States are highly clustered near the middle of the distribution, as evidenced by the large number of states in the shaded area.

This Appendix provides the rate for each of the 10 KIDS COUNT Indicators used to rank states for each year since 2000. Data are available for 2003 for some measures but only through 2002 for others. The raw data behind the most recent rate is also provided. In addition, this table provides the state's rank by indicator for each year. Raw data based on estimates from the American Community Survey (ACS) are rounded to the nearest 1,000 .

[^49]| Indicators |  | USA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Oi | - | - | -̀ |
| Percent low-birthweight babies | Rate | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | N.A. |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  | 2002 raw data | 314,077 births |  |  |  |
| Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | Rate | 6.9 | 6.8 | 7.0 | N.A. |
|  | Rank |  |  | N.R. | N.A. |
|  | 2002 raw data | 28,034 deaths |  |  |  |
| Child death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1-14) | Rute | 22 | 22 | 21 | N.A. |
|  | Rank |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  | 2002 raw data | 12,008 deaths |  |  |  |
| (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | Rate | 67 | 67 | 68 | N.A. |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  | 2002 raw data | 13,812 deaths |  |  |  |
| Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | Rate | 48 | 45 | 43 | N.A. |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  | 2002 raw data | 425,493 births |  |  |  |
| Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19) | Rate | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  | 2003 raw data | 1,131,000 teens |  |  |  |
| Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19) | Rate |  | 9 | 9 | 9 |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  | 2003 raw data | 1,266,000 teens |  |  |  |
| Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment | Rate | 32 | 31 | 33 | 33 |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  | 2003 raw data | 23,676,000 children |  |  |  |
| Percent of children in poverty | Rate | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  | 2003 raw data | 12,673,000 children |  |  |  |
| Percent of children in single-parent households | Rate | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  | 2003 raw data | 22,081,000 children |  |  |  |



|  | Indicators |  | USA |  |  |  | CT |  |  |  | DE |  |  |  | DC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ઠ્ઠ | No | \% | 合 | 항 | No ત̀ | ồ | Oi | 뭄 | Nṑ | ồ | Oi | 힝 | No | \% |
|  | Percent low-birthweight babies | Rate | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | N.A. | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.8 | N.A. | 8.6 | 9.3 | 9.9 | N.A. | 11.9 | 12.1 | 11.6 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 22 | 21 | 23 | N.A. | 41 | 46 | 46 | N.A. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 314,077 births |  |  |  | 3,258 births |  |  |  | 1,102 births |  |  |  | 866 births |  |  |  |
|  | Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | Rate | 6.9 | 6.8 | 7.0 | N.A. | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.5 | N.A. | 9.2 | 10.7 | 8.7 | N.A. | 12.0 | 10.6 | 11.3 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 19 | 16 | 21 | N.A. | 48 | 50 | 43 | N.A. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 28,034 deaths |  |  |  | 274 deaths |  |  |  | 96 deaths |  |  |  | 85 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Child death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1-14) | Rate |  | 22 | 21 | N.A. | 15 | 14 | 13 | N.A. | 27 | 22 | 27 | N.A. | 31 | 33 | 23 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 3 | 1 | 2 | N.A. | 39 | 21 | 42 | N.A. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 12,008 deaths |  |  |  | 90 deaths |  |  |  | 39 deaths |  |  |  | 20 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | Rate |  | 67 | 68 | N.A. | 47 | 54 | 48 | N.A. | 74 | 70 | 65 | N.A. | 108 | 149 | 168 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 3 | 9 | 5 | N.A. | 28 | 28 | 19 | N.A. |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 13,812 deaths |  |  |  | 110 deaths |  |  |  | 35 deaths |  |  |  | 46 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | Rate | 48 | 45 | 43 | N.A. | 31 | 28 | 26 | N.A. | 48 | 47 | 46 | N.A. | 53 | 64 | 69 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 7 | 6 | 5 | N.A. | 30 | 33 | 34 | N.A. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 425,493 births |  |  |  | 2,901 births |  |  |  | 1,209 births |  |  |  | 937 births |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19) | Rate |  | 10 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 6 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 30 | 7 | 5 | 30 | 37 | 41 | 33 | 15 |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,131,000 teens |  |  |  | 13,000 teens |  |  |  | 3,000 teens |  |  |  | 1,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19) | Rate |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 10 |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 20 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 26 | 29 | 10 | 6 |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,266,000 teens |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  | 2,000 teens |  |  |  | 1,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment | Rate | 32 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 25 | 26 | 30 | 29 | 44 | 49 | 49 | 54 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 8 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 15 | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 23,676,000 children |  |  |  | 232,000 children |  |  |  | 57,000 children |  |  |  | 58,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in poverty | Rate | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 30 | 32 | 28 | 36 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 5 | 5 | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 12,673,000 children |  |  |  | 91,000 children |  |  |  | 24,000 children |  |  |  | 38,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in single-parent households | Rate | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 25 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 33 | 32 | 34 | 32 | 66 | 66 | 62 | 62 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 8 | 18 | 13 | 16 | 39 | 37 | 43 | 35 |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. |
| N.A. $=$ Not Available. N $R$ = = ot Ranked. |  | 2003 raw data | 22,081,000 children |  |  |  | 236,000 children |  |  |  | 63,000 children |  |  |  | 66,000 children |  |  |  |


| FL |  |  |  | GA |  |  |  |  | HI |  |  |  |  | ID |  |  |  |  | IL |  |  |  | IN |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O. | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{8}$ | Õ미 | Ò | oì | 合 |  | તે તે | ồ | ষ융 | 訁્ત |  | ત્̀ | ò O | : | ઠ્તે |  | Nָ. | ồ | : | O. | ત̀ ત̀ | $\stackrel{0}{\mathbf{o}}$ | Oì | ت̈뭉 | Nò | ®ò |
| 8.0 | 8.2 | 8.4 | N.A. | 8.6 | 8.8 |  | 8.9 | N.A. | 7.5 | 8.1 |  | 8.3 | N.A. | 6.7 | 6.4 |  | 6.1 | N.A. | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.2 | N.A. | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.6 | N.A. |
| 35 | 36 | 36 | N.A. | 41 | 41 |  | 40 | N.A. | 25 | 35 |  | 34 | N.A. | 15 | 9 |  | 4 | N.A. | 31 | 32 | 32 | N.A. | 22 | 22 | 21 | N.A. |
| 17,320 births |  |  |  | 11,915 births |  |  |  |  | 1,450 births |  |  |  |  | 1,284 births |  |  |  |  | 14,725 births |  |  |  | 6,463 births |  |  |  |
| 7.0 | 7.3 | 7.5 | N.A. | 8.5 | 8.6 |  | 8.9 | N.A. | 8.1 | 6.2 |  | 7.3 | N.A. | 7.5 | 6.2 |  | 6.1 | N.A. | 8.5 | 7.7 | 7.4 | N.A. | 7.8 | 7.5 | 7.7 | N.A. |
| 27 | 29 | 32 | N.A. | 41 | 43 |  | 44 | N.A. | 37 | 18 |  | 29 | N.A. | 32 | 18 |  | 15 | N.A. | 41 | 36 | 30 | N.A. | 36 | 34 | 36 | N.A. |
| 1,548 deaths |  |  |  | 1,192 deaths |  |  |  |  | 127 deaths |  |  |  |  | 128 deaths |  |  |  |  | 1,339 deaths |  |  |  | 657 deaths |  |  |  |
| 24 | 23 | 22 | N.A. | 25 | 27 |  | 23 | N.A. | 15 | 16 |  | 17 | N.A. | 22 | 25 |  | 23 | N.A. | 20 | 22 | 20 | N.A. | 25 | 22 | 22 | N.A. |
| 30 | 29 | 23 | N.A. | 33 | 39 |  | 26 | N.A. | 3 | 5 |  | 6 | N.A. | 22 | 36 |  | 26 | N.A. | 12 | 21 | 13 | N.A. | 33 | 21 | 23 | N.A. |
| 656 deaths |  |  |  | 409 deaths |  |  |  |  | 38 deaths |  |  |  |  | 65 deaths |  |  |  |  | 498 deaths |  |  |  | 276 deaths |  |  |  |
| 73 | 68 | 68 | N.A. | 76 | 78 |  | 70 | N.a. | 41 | 50 |  | 42 | N.A. | 63 | 88 |  | 74 | N.A. | 68 | 68 | 65 | N.A. | 76 | 74 | 73 | N.A. |
| 26 | 25 | 23 | N.A. | 30 | 36 |  | 25 | N.A. | 2 | 4 | 2 |  | N.A. | 16 | 42 |  | 30 | N.A. | 23 | 25 | 19 | N.A. | 30 | 33 | 28 | N.A. |
| 734 deaths |  |  |  | 425 deaths |  |  |  |  | 36 deaths |  |  |  |  | 81 deaths |  |  |  |  | 576 deaths |  |  |  | 320 deaths |  |  |  |
| 51 | 48 | 44 | N.A. | 63 | 60 |  | 56 | N.A. | 46 | 42 |  | 38 | N.A. | 43 | 41 |  | 39 | N.A. | 48 | 46 | 42 | N.A. | 49 | 47 | 45 | N.A. |
| 35 | 36 | 31 | N.A. | 44 | 45 |  | 43 | N.A. | 25 | 26 |  | 21 | N.A. | 23 | 24 |  | 24 | N.A. | 30 | 30 | 29 | N.A. | 32 | 33 | 33 | N.A. |
| 23,181 births |  |  |  | 16,258 births |  |  |  |  | 1,538 births |  |  |  |  | 2,080 births |  |  |  |  | 18,217 births |  |  |  | 9,594 births |  |  |  |
| 12 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 16 | 14 |  | 13 | 11 | 5 | 8 |  | 8 | 5 | 10 | 10 |  | 9 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 11 |
| 37 | 37 | 30 | 30 | 46 | 45 |  | 47 | 45 | 2 | 14 |  | 18 | 4 | 22 | 30 |  | 30 | 15 | 17 | 30 | 18 | 30 | 40 | 45 | 47 | 45 |
| 61,000 tens |  |  |  | 46,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 3,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 6,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 49,000 teens |  |  |  | 34,000 teens |  |  |  |
| 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 |  | 12 | 13 | 11 | 10 |  | 10 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| 20 | 22 | 22 | 16 | 48 | 38 |  | 41 | 39 | 32 | 48 |  | 45 | 48 | 35 | 29 |  | 35 | 16 | 26 | 22 | 10 | 16 | 32 | 14 | 30 | 16 |
| 67,000 teens |  |  |  | 46,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 8,000 teens |  |  |  |  | $7,000 \text { teens }$ |  |  |  |  | $51,000 \text { teens }$ |  |  |  | $25,000 \text { teens }$ |  |  |  |
| 34 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 32 | 29 |  | 32 | 31 | 41 | 33 |  | 35 | 33 | 30 | 33 |  | 32 | 35 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 27 | 27 | 30 | 30 |
| 35 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 29 | 18 |  | 22 | 20 | 49 | 33 |  | 36 | 28 | 19 | 33 |  | 22 | 36 | 17 | 27 | 21 | 25 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 17 |
| 1,311,000 children |  |  |  | 717,000 children |  |  |  |  | 96,000 children |  |  |  |  | 128,000 children |  |  |  |  | 1,034,000 children |  |  |  | 473,000 children |  |  |  |
| 19 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 16 |  | 18 | 19 | 13 | 14 |  | 14 | 15 | 14 | 15 |  | 16 | 18 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 14 |
| 35 | 32 | 34 | 34 | 33 | 29 |  | 33 | 34 | 12 | 16 |  | 12 | 23 | 19 | 22 |  | 24 | 30 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 20 | 16 |
| 728,000 children |  |  |  | 420,000 children |  |  |  |  | 44,000 children |  |  |  |  | 65,000 children |  |  |  |  | 500,000 children |  |  |  | 213,000 children |  |  |  |
| 35 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 36 | 33 |  | 34 | 33 | 28 | 25 |  | 27 | 30 | 19 | 23 |  | 19 | 20 | 27 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 30 | 28 |
| 41 | 43 | 43 | 46 | 45 | 41 |  | 43 | 39 | 21 | 9 |  | 15 | 29 | 1 | 5 |  | 2 | 2 | 17 | 27 | 25 | 24 | 26 | 22 | 33 | 16 |
| 1,410,000 children |  |  |  | 747,000 children |  |  |  |  | 88,000 children |  |  |  |  | 76,000 children |  |  |  |  | 933,000 children |  |  |  | 445,000 children |  |  |  |


|  | Indicators |  | USA |  |  |  | 1A |  |  |  | KS |  |  |  | KY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { ì } \end{aligned}$ | Òì | 을 | - | Nṑ | ô | Oi | O | Nờ | Noì | 윤 | - | Ờ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { N }}$ |
|  | Percent low-birthweight babies | Rate | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | N.A. | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.6 | N.A. | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.0 | N.A. | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.6 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 5 | 9 | 12 | N.A. | 17 | 17 | 16 | N.A. | 37 | 37 | 38 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 314,077 births |  |  |  | 2,489 births |  |  |  | 2,757 births |  |  |  | 4,657 births |  |  |  |
|  | Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | Rate |  | 6.8 | 7.0 | N.A. | 6.5 | 5.6 | 5.3 | N.A. | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.1 | N.A. | 7.2 | 5.9 | 7.2 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 17 | 8 | 5 | N.A. | 24 | 31 | 27 | N.A. | 29 | 13 | 28 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 28,034 deaths |  |  |  | 199 deaths |  |  |  | 281 deaths |  |  |  | 392 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Child death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages $1-14$ ) | Rate | 22 | 22 | 21 | N.A. | 22 | 23 | 21 | N.A. | 25 | 24 | 25 | N.A. | 23 | 28 | 25 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.r. | N.R. | N.A. | 22 | 29 | 19 | N.A. | 33 | 33 | 38 | N.A. | 27 | 40 | 38 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 12,008 deaths |  |  |  | 112 deaths |  |  |  | 133 deaths |  |  |  | 176 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | Rate | 67 | 67 | 68 | N.A. | 77 | 59 | 57 | N.A. | 78 | 80 | 70 | N.A. | 82 | 73 | 85 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 33 | 14 | 8 | N.A. | 35 | 38 | 25 | N.A. | 39 | 31 | 39 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 13,812 deaths |  |  |  | 123 deaths |  |  |  | 144 deaths |  |  |  | 238 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | Rate |  | 45 | 43 | N.A. | 34 | 33 | 32 | N.A. | 46 | 44 | 43 | N.A. | 55 | 52 | 51 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 10 | 10 | 10 | N.A. | 25 | 28 | 30 | N.A. | 37 | 37 | 37 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 425,493 births |  |  |  | 3,392 births |  |  |  | 4,321 births |  |  |  | 6,899 births |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19) | Rate |  | 10 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 9 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 22 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 22 | 30 | 39 | 37 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,131,000 teens |  |  |  | 9,000 teens |  |  |  | 8,000 teens |  |  |  | 18,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19) | Rate | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 6 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 43 | 38 | 45 | 46 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,266,000 teens |  |  |  | 10,000 teens |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  | 24,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment | Rate |  | 31 | 33 | 33 | 23 | 24 | 28 | 26 | 22 | 23 | 29 | 27 | 34 | 33 | 35 | 39 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 35 | 33 | 36 | 46 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 23,676,000 children |  |  |  | 182,000 children |  |  |  | 182,000 children |  |  |  | 380,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in poverty | Rate | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 22 | 19 | 21 | 24 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 12 | 11 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 24 | 16 | 43 | 36 | 41 | 44 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 12,673,000 children |  |  |  | 82,000 children |  |  |  | 96,000 children |  |  |  | 234,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in single-parent households | Rate | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 26 | 29 | 29 |
|  |  | Rank |  |  | N.R. | N.R. | 4 |  | 9 | 5 | 8 |  | 9 | 10 | 290,000 children |  |  |  |
| N.A.=Not Available. <br> N.R.=Not Ranked. |  | 2003 raw data | 22,081,000 children |  |  |  | 160,000 children |  |  |  | 177,000 children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| NE |  |  |  | NV |  |  |  |  | NF |  |  |  | NJ |  |  |  |  | NM |  |  |  |  | NY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O. | öd | Nò | ò | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{O}}$ | Ö̀ |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{O}}$ | Oì | Ö̀i | No ત̀ | on | Oi | ત્ઠે |  | ત̀ | $\stackrel{\substack{\mathrm{N}}}{\text { Non }}$ | O | 合 |  | તે તે | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{O}}$ | Oi | ت訁 | Nò | \% |
| 6.8 | 6.6 | 7.2 | N.A. | 7.2 | 7.6 |  | 7.5 | N.A. | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.3 | N.A. | 7.7 | 7.9 |  | 8.0 | N.A. | 8.0 | 7.9 |  | 8.0 | N.A. | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.9 | N.A. |
| 16 | 14 | 17 | N.A. | 20 | 22 |  | 9 | N.A. | 11 | 13 | 5 | N.A. | 28 | 28 |  | 27 | N.A. | 35 | 28 |  | 27 | N.A. | 28 | 26 | 24 | N.A. |
| 1,817 births |  |  |  | 2,445 births |  |  |  |  | 914 births |  |  |  | 9,185 births |  |  |  |  | 2,225 births |  |  |  |  | 19,802 births |  |  |  |
| 7.3 | 6.8 | 7.0 | N.A. | 6.5 | 5.7 |  | 6.0 | N.A. | 5.7 | 3.8 | 5.0 | N.A. | 6.3 | 6.5 |  | 5.7 | N.A. | 6.6 | 6.4 |  | 6.3 | N.A. | 6.4 | 5.8 | 6.0 | N.A. |
| 31 | 23 | 25 | N.A. | 17 | 9 |  | 13 | N.A. | 9 | 1 | 4 | N.A. | 14 | 21 |  | 10 | N.A. | 19 | 20 |  | 17 | N.A. | 16 | 10 | 13 | N.A. |
| 178 deaths |  |  |  | 197 deaths |  |  |  |  | 72 deaths |  |  |  | 655 deaths |  |  |  |  | 174 deaths |  |  |  |  | 1,519 deaths |  |  |  |
| 22 | 23 | 23 | N.A. | 23 | 22 |  | 19 | N.A. | 14 | 20 | 12 | N.A. | 15 | 14 |  | 17 | N.A. | 20 | 25 |  | 24 | N.A. | 17 | 18 | 17 | N.A. |
| 22 | 29 | 26 | N.A. | 27 | 21 |  | 10 | N.A. | 2 | 16 | 1 | N.A. | 3 | 1 |  | 6 | N.A. | 12 | 36 |  | 34 | N.A. | 7 | 9 | 6 | N.A. |
| 79 deaths |  |  |  | 85 deaths |  |  |  |  | 28 deaths |  |  |  | 281 deaths |  |  |  |  | 93 deaths |  |  |  |  | 600 deaths |  |  |  |
| 73 | 68 | 72 | N.A. | 75 | 61 | 77 | 71 | N.A. | 55 | 59 | 34 | N.A. | 48 | 44 |  | 47 | N.A. | 99 | 74 |  | 94 | N.A. | 47 | 52 | 49 | N.A. |
| 26 | 25 | 27 | N.A. | 29 | 17 |  | 35 | N.A. | 10 | 14 | 1 | N.A. | 5 | 2 |  | 4 | N.A. | 48 | 33 |  | 42 | N.A. | 3 | 7 | 6 | N.A. |
| 95 deaths |  |  |  | 108 deaths |  |  |  |  | 31 deaths |  |  |  | 264 deaths |  |  |  |  | 139 deaths |  |  |  |  | 630 deaths |  |  |  |
| 38 | 37 | 37 | N.A. | 63 | 56 |  | 54 | N.A. | 23 | 21 | 20 | N.A. | 32 | 29 |  | 27 | N.A. | 66 | 63 |  | 62 | N.A. | 33 | 32 | 29 | N.A. |
| 15 | 16 | 18 | N.A. | 44 | 39 |  | 40 | N.A. | 1 | 1 | 1 | N.A. | 8 | 8 |  | 6 | N.A. | 46 | 47 |  | 48 | N.A. | 9 | 9 | 9 | N.A. |
| 2,394 births |  |  |  | 3,663 births |  |  |  |  | 881 births |  |  |  | 7,352 births |  |  |  |  | 4,513 births |  |  |  |  | 18,394 births |  |  |  |
| 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 10 |  | 2 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 5 |  | 4 | 4 | 16 | 9 |  | 15 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| 5 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 46 | 30 |  | 3 | 39 | 17 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 12 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 46 | 23 |  | 49 | 39 | 17 | 23 | 18 | 15 |
| 7,000 teens |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 4,000 teens |  |  |  | 15,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 10,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 65,000 teens |  |  |  |
| 5 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 13 |  | 1 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 |  | 7 | 5 | 11 | 11 |  | 12 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| 4 | 14 | 5 | 11 | 50 | 48 | 4 | 4 | 39 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 5 |  | 10 | 4 | 35 | 38 |  | 45 | 34 | 26 | 29 | 22 | 29 |
| 7,000 teens |  |  |  | 12,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 4,000 teens |  |  |  | 21,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 85,000 teens |  |  |  |
| 25 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 30 | 29 |  | 34 | 30 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 27 | 26 | 27 |  | 29 | 27 | 38 | 35 |  | 38 | 39 | 35 | 34 | 34 | 33 |
| 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 18 |  | 30 | 17 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 12 |  | 11 | 7 | 46 | 42 |  | 45 | 46 | 40 | 39 | 30 | 28 |
| 100,000 children |  |  |  | 174,000 children |  |  |  |  | 83,000 children |  |  |  | 573,000 children |  |  |  |  | 195,000 children |  |  |  |  | 1,506,000 children |  |  |  |
| 10 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 15 |  | 17 | 15 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 |  | 11 | 12 | 26 | 24 |  | 27 | 26 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| 3 | 16 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 22 |  | 29 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 47 | 48 |  | 48 | 48 | 35 | 36 | 34 | 34 |
| 54,000 children |  |  |  | 86,000 children |  |  |  |  | 25,000 children |  |  |  | 246,000 children |  |  |  |  | 125,000 children |  |  |  |  | 861,000 children |  |  |  |
| 25 | 23 | 25 | 20 | 31 | 28 |  | 30 | 30 | 26 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 26 |  | 26 | 27 | 31 | 34 |  | 38 | 36 | 33 | 35 | 34 | 34 |
| 8 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 31 | 22 | 3 | 3 | 29 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 13 |  | 13 | 13 | 31 | 43 |  | 48 | 46 | 39 | 45 | 43 | 43 |
| 85,000 children |  |  |  | 176,000 children |  |  |  |  | 76,000 children |  |  |  | 568,000 children |  |  |  |  | 181,000 children |  |  |  |  | 1,554,000 children |  |  |  |


|  | Indicators |  | USA |  |  |  | NC |  |  |  | ND |  |  |  | OH |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | - | No | Òì | 을 | Ö̀ | Nṑ | ô | 윤 | O | No ત̀ | $\stackrel{\substack{0}}{0}$ | 윤 | Ö̀ | 을 | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { N }}$ |
|  | Percent low-birthweight babies | Rate | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | N.A. | 8.8 | 8.9 | 9.0 | N.A. | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.3 | N.A. | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.3 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 45 | 43 | 42 | N.A. | 12 | 6 | 5 | N.A. | 31 | 32 | 34 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 314,077 births |  |  |  | 10,514 births |  |  |  | 486 births |  |  |  | 12,334 birrhs |  |  |  |
|  | Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | Rate | 6.9 | 6.8 | 7.0 | N.A. | 8.6 | 8.5 | 8.2 | N.A. | 8.1 | 8.8 | 6.3 | N.A. | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.9 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 44 | 42 | 40 | N.A. | 37 | 45 | 17 | N.A. | 33 | 36 | 37 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 28,034 deaths |  |  |  | 959 deaths |  |  |  | 49 deaths |  |  |  | 1,180 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Child death rate <br> (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1-14) | Rate | 22 | 22 | 21 | N.A. | 24 | 22 | 23 | N.A. | 19 | 17 | 20 | N.A. | 23 | 19 | 19 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 30 | 21 | 26 | N.A. | 10 | 7 | 13 | N.A. | 27 | 14 | 10 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 12,008 deaths |  |  |  | 368 deaths |  |  |  | 22 deaths |  |  |  | 421 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | Rate | 67 | 67 | 68 | N.A. | 71 | 79 | 75 | N.A. | 52 | 65 | 69 | N.A. | 58 | 58 | 59 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 24 | 37 | 33 | N.A. | 6 | 21 | 24 | N.A. | 11 | 11 | 13 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 13,812 deaths |  |  |  | 406 deaths |  |  |  | 34 deaths |  |  |  | 483 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | Rate | 48 | 45 | 43 | N.A. | 59 | 55 | 52 | N.A. | 27 | 27 | 27 | N.A. | 46 | 43 | 40 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 39 | 38 | 38 | N.A. | 4 | 4 | 6 | N.A. | 25 | 27 | 25 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 425,493 births |  |  |  | 13,756 births |  |  |  | 653 births |  |  |  | 15,698 births |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19) | Rate | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 46 | 45 | 33 | 45 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 14 | 9 | 15 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,131,000 teens |  |  |  | 44,000 teens |  |  |  | 1,000 teens |  |  |  | 39,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19) | Rate | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 35 | 38 | 30 | 34 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 16 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,266,000 teens |  |  |  | 39,000 teens |  |  |  | 2,000 teens |  |  |  | 48,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment | Rate | 32 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 35 | 33 | 35 | 36 | 29 | 25 | 26 | 25 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 32 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 40 | 33 | 36 | 41 | 17 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 22 | 25 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 23,676,000 children |  |  |  | 735,000 children |  |  |  | 37,000 children |  |  |  | 896,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in poverty | Rate | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 35 | 39 | 41 | 34 | 24 | 22 | 11 | 16 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 30 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 12,673,000 children |  |  |  | 382,000 children |  |  |  | 20,000 children |  |  |  | 495,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in single-parent households | Rate | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 35 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 26 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 28 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
|  |  | Rank |  |  | N.R. | N.R. | 41 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 37 | 38 | 35 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N.A. = =Not Available. } \\ & \text { N.R.=Not Ranked. } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2003 raw data | 22,081,000 children |  |  |  | 683,000 children |  |  |  | 33,000 children |  |  |  | 892,000 children |  |  |  |


| OK |  |  |  | OR |  |  |  |  | PA |  |  |  |  | RI |  |  |  | Sc |  |  |  | S |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 。io | ö̀ | તัo | ồ | 芳 | ت訁 |  | Ờ | ò | 合 | 흘 |  | તે તે | ồ | O. | ઠ્ઠ | તัત | ò | O. | O. | Nờ | Ò ત̀ | ষ্ণী |  | Õ | \％ |
| 7.5 | 7.8 | 8.0 | N．A． | 5.6 | 5.5 |  | 5.8 | N．A． | 7.7 | 7.9 |  | 8.2 | N．A． | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.9 | N．A． | 9.7 | 9.6 | 10.0 | N．A． | 6.2 | 6.4 | 7.2 | N．A． |
| 25 | 27 | 27 | N．A． | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | N．A． | 28 | 28 |  | 32 | N．A． | 20 | 20 | 24 | N．A． | 47 | 47 | 48 | N．A． | 8 | 9 | 17 | N．A． |
| 4，019 births |  |  |  | 2，608 births |  |  |  |  | 11，685 births |  |  |  |  | 1，019 births |  |  |  | 5，455 births |  |  |  | 765 births |  |  |  |
| 8.5 | 7.3 | 8.1 | N．A． | 5.6 | 5.4 |  | 5.8 | N．A． | 7.1 | 7.2 |  | 7.6 | N．A． | 6.3 | 6.8 | 7.0 | N．A． | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.3 | N．A． | 5.5 | 7.4 | 6.5 | N．A． |
| 41 | 29 | 38 | N．A． | 7 | 5 |  | 11 | N．A． | 28 | 27 |  | 35 | N．A． | 14 | 23 | 25 | N．A． | 45 | 46 | 47 | N．A． | 6 | 31 | 21 | N．A． |
| 410 deaths |  |  |  | 260 deaths |  |  |  |  | 1，091 deaths |  |  |  |  | 90 deaths |  |  |  | 507 deaths |  |  |  | 70 deaths |  |  |  |
| 25 | 31 | 24 | N．A． | 21 | 18 |  | 1 | N．A． | 20 | 20 |  | 21 | N．A． | 17 | 15 | 14 | N．A． | 25 | 26 | 27 | N．A． | 35 | 33 | 31 | N．A． |
| 33 | 46 | 34 | N．A． | 19 | 9 |  | 19 | N．A． | 12 | 16 |  | 19 | N．A． | 7 | 3 | 3 | N．A． | 33 | 38 | 42 | N．A． | 49 | 47 | 47 | N．A． |
| 164 deaths |  |  |  | 139 deaths |  |  |  |  | 453 deaths |  |  |  |  | 26 deaths |  |  |  | 206 deaths |  |  |  | 46 deaths |  |  |  |
| 77 | 84 | 80 | N．A． | 66 | 53 |  | 62 | N．A． | 60 | 65 |  | 67 | N．A． | 52 | 48 | 52 | N．A． | 86 | 87 | 93 | N．A． | 78 | 66 | 94 | N．A． |
| 33 | 40 | 37 | N．A． | 19 | 8 |  | 15 | N．A． | 12 | 21 |  | 22 | N．A． | 6 | 3 | 7 | N．A． | 41 | 41 | 41 | N．A． | 35 | 24 | 42 | N．A． |
| 208 deaths |  |  |  | 153 deaths |  |  |  |  | 563 deaths |  |  |  |  | 36 deaths |  |  |  | 264 deaths |  |  |  | 58 deaths |  |  |  |
| 60 | 58 | 58 | N．A． | 43 | 40 |  | 37 | N．A． | 34 | 33 |  | 32 | N．a． | 34 | 36 | 36 | N．A． | 58 | 56 | 53 | N．A． | 38 | 38 | 38 | N．A． |
| 41 | 43 | 44 | N．A． | 23 | 22 |  | 18 | N．A． | 10 | 10 |  | 10 | N．A． | 10 | 13 | 16 | N．A． | 38 | 39 | 39 | N．A． | 15 | 17 | 21 | N．A． |
| 7，358 births |  |  |  | 4，411 births |  |  |  |  | 12，961 births |  |  |  |  | 1，197 births |  |  |  | 7，327 births |  |  |  | 1，138 births |  |  |  |
| 14 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 6 |  | 8 | 7 | 8 |  | 9 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| 42 | 44 | 39 | 15 | 30 | 14 | 5 |  | 30 | 9 | 14 |  | 30 | 30 | 22 | 23 | 9 | 15 | 42 | 23 | 39 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 18 | 15 |
| 13，000 teens |  |  |  | 14，000 teens |  |  |  |  | 44，000 teens |  |  |  |  | 3，000 teens |  |  |  | 15，000 teens |  |  |  | 3，000 teens |  |  |  |
| 11 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 7 |  | 9 | 7 | 8 |  | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| 35 | 44 | 10 | 39 | 32 | 29 |  | 10 | 29 | 13 | 14 |  | 22 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 5 | 29 | 43 | 22 | 30 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 22 | 16 |
| 20，000 teens |  |  |  | 15，000 teens |  |  |  |  | 41,000 teens |  |  |  |  | 4，000 teens |  |  |  | 17，000 teens |  |  |  | 4，000 teens |  |  |  |
| 33 | 30 | 33 | 33 | 36 | 37 |  | 34 | 35 | 28 | 29 |  | 32 | 31 | 34 | 32 | 35 | 33 | 31 | 33 | 36 | 36 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 |
| 32 | 23 | 26 | 28 | 44 | 45 |  | 30 | 36 | 14 | 18 |  | 22 | 20 | 35 | 30 | 36 | 28 | 23 | 33 | 42 | 41 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 287，000 children |  |  |  | 297，000 children |  |  |  |  | 869，000 children |  |  |  |  | 79，000 children |  |  |  | 365，000 children |  |  |  | 46，000 children |  |  |  |
| 19 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 18 | 18 |  | 17 | 18 | 15 | 15 |  | 15 | 16 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 35 | 39 | 43 | 42 | 33 | 33 |  | 29 | 30 | 24 | 22 |  | 20 | 25 | 28 | 33 | 20 | 29 | 35 | 39 | 37 | 34 | 19 | 16 | 12 | 16 |
| 193，000 children |  |  |  | 146，000 children |  |  |  |  | 435，000 children |  |  |  |  | 40，000 children |  |  |  | 188，000 children |  |  |  | 26，000 children |  |  |  |
| 31 | 31 | 30 | 29 | 32 | 27 |  | 28 | 28 | 29 | 29 |  | 29 | 31 | 35 | 35 | 32 | 32 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 37 | 22 | 22 | 24 | 22 |
| 31 | 34 | 33 | 24 | 36 | 18 |  | 19 | 16 | 26 | 27 |  | 25 | 33 | 41 | 45 | 38 | 35 | 41 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| 253,000 children |  |  |  | 235,000 children |  |  |  |  | 865,000 children |  |  |  |  | 77，000 children |  |  |  | 373，000 children |  |  |  | 43,000 children |  |  |  |


|  | Indicators |  | USA |  |  |  | TN |  |  |  | TX |  |  |  | UT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { ì } \end{aligned}$ | Òì | 응 | - | Nิ | ô | 윤 | - | No 문 | Noì | 윤 | Ö̀ | 을 | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { N }}$ |
|  | Percent low-birthweight babies | Rate | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | N.A. | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 | N.A. | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.7 | N.A. | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 46 | 45 | 45 | N.A. | 22 | 22 | 22 | N.A. | 14 | 9 | 9 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 314,077 births |  |  |  | 7,106 births |  |  |  | 28,646 births |  |  |  | 3,164 births |  |  |  |
|  | Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) | Rate |  | 6.8 | 7.0 | N.A. | 9.1 | 8.7 | 9.4 | N.A. | 5.7 | 5.9 | 6.4 | N.A. | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.6 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 47 | 44 | 48 | N.A. | 9 | 13 | 19 | N.A. | 3 | 2 | 9 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 28,034 deaths |  |  |  | 727 deaths |  |  |  | 2,368 deaths |  |  |  | 273 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Child death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages $1-14$ ) | Rate | 22 | 22 | 21 | N.A. | 28 | 23 | 25 | N.A. | 24 | 24 | 23 | N.A. | 20 | 20 | 23 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank |  | N.r. | N.R. | N.A. | 43 | 29 | 38 | N.A. | 30 | 33 | 26 | N.A. | 12 | 16 | 26 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 12,008 deaths |  |  |  | 272 deaths |  |  |  | 1,096 deaths |  |  |  | 129 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) | Rate | 67 | 67 | 68 | N.A. | 90 | 83 | 94 | N.A. | 76 | 70 | 74 | N.A. | 60 | 61 | 65 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 43 | 39 | 42 | N.A. | 30 | 28 | 30 | N.A. | 12 | 17 | 19 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 13,812 deaths |  |  |  | 366 deaths |  |  |  | 1,234 deaths |  |  |  | 130 deaths |  |  |  |
|  | Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) | Rate |  | 45 | 43 | N.A. | 59 | 57 | 54 | N.A. | 69 | 66 | 64 | N.A. | 38 | 38 | 37 | N.A. |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.A. | 39 | 42 | 40 | N.A. | 49 | 49 | 49 | N.A. | 15 | 17 | 18 | N.A. |
|  |  | 2002 raw data | 425,493 births |  |  |  | 10,300 births |  |  |  | 52,142 births |  |  |  | 3,574 births |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19) | Rate |  | 10 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 30 | 30 | 33 | 30 | 42 | 37 | 33 | 37 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,131,000 tens |  |  |  | 23,000 teens |  |  |  | 111,000 teens |  |  |  | 8,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19) | Rate | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 35 | 22 | 30 | 39 | 35 | 29 | 45 | 34 | 20 | 7 | 10 | 16 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 1,266,000 teens |  |  |  | 31,000 teens |  |  |  | 123,000 teens |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment | Rate | 32 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 32 | 34 | 34 | 33 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 26 | 30 | 26 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 29 | 39 | 30 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 26 | 28 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 4 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 23,676,000 children |  |  |  | 465,000 children |  |  |  | 2,078,000 children |  |  |  | 195,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in poverty | Rate | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 12 |
|  |  | Rank | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | N.R. | 40 | 43 | 37 | 40 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 5 |
|  |  | 2003 raw data | 12,673,000 children |  |  |  | 272,000 children |  |  |  | 1,406,000 children |  |  |  | 86,000 children |  |  |  |
|  | Percent of children in single-parent households | Rate | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 33 | 28 | 29 | 28 | 28 | 24 | 16 | 18 | 17 |
|  |  | Rank |  |  | N.R. | N.R. | 36 |  | 36 | 39 |  | 27 | 19 | 16 | 124,000 children |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N.A. = =Not Available. } \\ & \text { N.R.=Not Ranked. } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2003 raw data | 22,081,000 children |  |  |  | 453,000 children |  |  |  | 1,774,000 children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| V' |  | VA |  |  |  |  |  | WA |  |  |  | WV |  |  |  | WII |  |  |  | WY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O- | O- | Ň | ô | O- | تे | No | No | 을 | O- | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | O- | O- | No | No | 을 | O- | No | No | O. | O- | Ň | ¢ |
| 6.1 | 5.9 | 6.4 | N.A. | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 | N.A. | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | N.A. | 8.3 | 8.5 | 9.0 | N.A. | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.6 | N.A. | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.4 | N.A. |
| 5 | 4 | 9 | N.A. | 31 | 28 | 24 | N.A. | 1 | 3 | 3 | N.A. | 38 | 39 | 42 | N.A. | 13 | 14 | 12 | N.A. | 38 | 37 | 36 | N.A. |
| 409 births |  |  |  | 7,888 births |  |  |  | 4,604 births |  |  |  | 1,855 births |  |  |  | 4,538 births |  |  |  | 553 births |  |  |  |
| 6.0 | 5.5 | 4.4 | N.A. | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.4 | N.A. | 5.2 | 5.8 | 5.8 | N.A. | 7.6 | 7.2 | 9.1 | N.A. | 6.6 | 7.1 | 6.9 | N.A. | 6.7 | 5.9 | 6.7 | N.A. |
| 11 | 7 | 1 | N.A. | 26 | 35 | 30 | N.A. | 3 | 10 | 11 | N.A. | 33 | 27 | 45 | N.A. | 19 | 26 | 24 | N.A. | 22 | 13 | 23 | N.A. |
| 28 deaths |  |  |  | 741 deaths |  |  |  | 456 deaths |  |  |  | 188 deaths |  |  |  | 472 deaths |  |  |  | 44 deaths |  |  |  |
| 13 | 19 | 15 | N.A. | 20 | 18 | 20 | N.A. | 19 | 18 | 19 | N.A. | 30 | 21 | 24 | N.A. | 20 | 21 | 20 | N.A. | 27 | 29 | 34 | N.A. |
| 1 | 14 | 4 | N.A. | 12 | 9 | 13 | N.A. | 10 | 9 | 10 | N.A. | 44 | 19 | 34 | N.A. | 12 | 19 | 13 | N.A. | 39 | 42 | 48 | N.A. |
| 16 deaths |  |  |  | 272 deaths |  |  |  | 220 deaths |  |  |  | 72 deaths |  |  |  | 208 deaths |  |  |  | 31 deaths |  |  |  |
| 66 | 58 | 60 | N.A. | 67 | 60 | 64 | N.A. | 60 | 56 | 58 | N.A. | 88 | 75 | 103 | N.A. | 66 | 64 | 62 | N.A. | 81 | 89 | 77 | N.A. |
| 19 | 11 | 14 | N.A. | 22 | 16 | 18 | N.A. | 12 | 10 | 10 | N.A. | 42 | 35 | 50 | N.A. | 19 | 20 | 15 | N.A. | 38 | 44 | 35 | N.A. |
| 27 deaths |  |  |  | 318 deaths |  |  |  | 254 deaths |  |  |  | 123 deaths |  |  |  | 253 deaths |  |  |  | 32 deaths |  |  |  |
| 23 | 24 | 24 | N.A. | 41 | 40 | 38 | N.A. | 39 | 36 | 33 | N.A. | 47 | 46 | 46 | N.A. | 35 | 34 | 32 | N.A. | 42 | 39 | 40 | N.A. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | N.A. | 20 | 22 | 21 | N.A. | 18 | 13 | 13 | N.A. | 28 | 30 | 34 | N.A. | 13 | 12 | 10 | N.A. | 22 | 21 | 25 | N.A. |
| 533 births |  |  |  | 9,030 births |  |  |  | 7,035 births |  |  |  | 2,630 births |  |  |  | 6,436 births |  |  |  | 804 births |  |  |  |
| 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 5 |
| 5 | 14 | 18 | 4 | 17 | 7 | 18 | 4 | 17 | 23 | 18 | 10 | 12 | 23 | 18 | 39 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 22 | 37 | 9 | 4 |
| 2,000 teens |  |  |  | 20,000 teens |  |  |  | 20,000 teens |  |  |  | 9,000 teens |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  | 2,000 teens |  |  |  |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| 13 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 22 | 6 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 34 | 35 | 38 | 41 | 39 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 5 | 6 |
| 1,000 teens |  |  |  | 25,000 teens |  |  |  | 31,000 teens |  |  |  | 10,000 teens |  |  |  | 11,000 teens |  |  |  | 2,000 teens |  |  |  |
| 28 | 30 | 28 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 31 | 33 | 38 | 35 | 40 | 39 | 38 | 37 | 27 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 30 | 28 |
| 14 | 23 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 33 | 45 | 36 | 48 | 47 | 45 | 44 | 11 | 18 | 15 | 17 | 32 | 16 | 15 | 13 |
| 37,000 children |  |  |  | 488,000 children |  |  |  | 514,000 children |  |  |  | 145,000 children |  |  |  | 395,000 children |  |  |  | 34,000 children |  |  |  |
| 13 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 12 |
| 12 | 22 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 28 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 47 | 46 | 47 | 47 | 8 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 24 | 11 | 12 | 5 |
| 16,000 children |  |  |  | 205,000 children |  |  |  | 203,000 children |  |  |  | 98,000 children |  |  |  | 187,000 children |  |  |  | 14,000 children |  |  |  |
| 27 | 27 | 24 | 28 | 31 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 30 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 28 | 25 |
| 17 | 18 | 6 | 16 | 31 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 25 | 29 | 8 | 22 | 19 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 19 | 8 |
| 38,000 children |  |  |  | 497,000 children |  |  |  | 423,000 children |  |  |  | 115,000 children |  |  |  | 347,000 children |  |  |  | 30,000 children |  |  |  |

The 2005 KIDS COUNT Data Book is the 16th annual profile of child well-being produced by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. However, indicators used in the Data Books have changed over time, making year-to-year comparisons of state ranks problematic. This Appendix provides Overall Ranks for 2000 through 2003 for each state using a consistent set of indicators-namely, those used to derive the rank reported in the 2005 KIDS COUNT Data Book. This Appendix is the best source of information to see whether a particular state improved in ranking over the past few years.

Note that state ranks in 2003 are based on data from 2002 for five measures and data from 2003 for the other five measures. In other words, data for the Percent Low-Birthweight Babies, Infant Mortality Rate, Child Death Rate, Teen Death Rate, and Teen Birth Rate lag one year behind the other measures.


|  | FL | GA | HI | ID | IL | IN | 14 | KS | KY | LA | ME | MD | MA | MI | MN | MS | MO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 35 | 44 | 17 | 23 | 29 | 32 | 3 | 14 | 37 | 49 | 6 | 33 | 7 | 28 | 2 | 50 | 34 |
| 2001 | 33 | 42 | 20 | 23 | 29 | 30 | 6 | 15 | 36 | 49 | 8 | 21 | 3 | 27 | 2 | 50 | 34 |
| 2002 | 34 | 44 | 21 | 25 | 30 | 31 | 8 | 20 | 39 | 49 | 15 | 29 | 3 | 24 | 2 | 50 | 32 |
| 2003 | 35 | 39 | 24 | 16 | 28 | 30 | 8 | 15 | 42 | 49 | 7 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 3 | 50 | 33 |


|  | ND | OH | OK | OR | PA | RI | SC | SD | TN | TX | UT | VT | VA | WA | WV | WI | WY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 8 | 26 | 41 | 24 | 16 | 18 | 46 | 15 | 42 | 36 | 5 | 4 | 19 | 13 | 38 | 12 | 31 |
| 2001 | 9 | 28 | 40 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 44 | 11 | 47 | 35 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 12 | 41 | 14 | 24 |
| 2002 | 4 | 26 | 40 | 11 | 22 | 13 | 46 | 17 | 42 | 37 | 9 | 5 | 16 | 14 | 38 | 12 | 27 |
| 2003 | 5 | 29 | 38 | 18 | 27 | 22 | 45 | 21 | 43 | 37 | 9 | 2 | 13 | 14 | 47 | 10 | 23 |

2-Year-Olds Who Were Immunized: 2003 is derived from the National Immunization Survey, which provides state estimates of vaccination coverage levels among children ages 19 months to 35 months. The figures given here reflect the percentage of children who have "4:3:1 Series Coverage"; that is, four or more doses of diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and pertussis (DTP) vaccine, diphtheria and tetanus toxoids (DT) vaccine, and diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and acellular pertussis ( DTaP ) vaccine; three or more doses of poliovirus vaccine; and one or more doses of measles-containing vaccine. SOURCE: U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

4th Grade Students Who Scored At or Above Proficient Math Level: 2003 is the percentage of 4th grade public school students who reached either the Proficient or Advanced level in mathematics, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

4th Grade Students Who Scored At or Above Proficient Reading Level: 2003 is the percentage of 4th grade public school students who reached either the Proficient or Advanced level in reading, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

8th Grade Students Who Scored At or Above Proficient Math Level: 2003 is the percentage of 8th grade public school students who reached either the Proficient or Advanced level in mathematics, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education,
National Center for Education Statistics.

8th Grade Students Who Scored At or Above Proficient Reading Level: 2003 is the percentage of 8th grade public school students who reached either the Proficient or Advanced level in reading, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Child Death Rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1-14) is the number of deaths to children between ages 1 and 14 , from all causes, per 100,000 children in this age range. The data are reported by place of residence, not place of death.
SOURCE: U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.

Children in Cohabiting-Couple Households: 2003 reflects the number and percentage of children under age 18 who live in households headed by an unmarried couple (opposite sex or same sex), regardless of the relationship between the child and the household head (householder) SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Extreme Poverty (income below 50\% of poverty level): 2003 is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below 50 percent of the U.S. poverty threshold, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. In calendar year 2003, a family of two adults and two children fell in this category if their annual income fell below $\$ 9,330$. SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Households Where Someone
Receives Social Security Income: 2003 is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in households where someone received Social Security income (including railroad retirement insurance checks from the U.S. government) within 12 months prior to the survey. SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Households Where the Household Head Did Not Finish High School: 2003 is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in a household headed by an adult who is not a high school graduate. In this measure, persons who have a GED or equivalent are considered high school graduates.
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Households Where the Household Head Has a Work Disability: 2003 is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in a household headed by an adult who reported difficulty working at a job or business because of
a physical, mental, or emotional condition lasting more than 6 months.
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Households Where the Household
Head Has Limited English Proficiency: 2003
is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in a household headed by an adult who speaks a language other than English at home and who speak English less than "very well." This measure is based on self-reported perception of English proficiency.
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Households Where the Household Head Owns the Housing Unit: 2003 is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in households containing someone-usually the household head (householder) -who owns or coowns the housing unit where the child resides. SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Low-Income Families (income below $\mathbf{2 0 0 \%}$ of poverty level): 2003 is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below 200 percent of the U.S. poverty threshold, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. In calendar year 2003, a family of two adults and two children fell in this category if their annual income fell below $\$ 37,320$.
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Low-Income Families That Spend More Than 30\% of Their Income on Housing: 2003 is the share of children under age 18 in low-income families where the family spent more than 30 percent of their monthly income on rent, mortgage payments, taxes, insurance, and/or related expenses. Low-income families are those with incomes below 200 percent of the U.S. poverty threshold, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. In calendar year 2003, a family of two adults and two children fell in this category if their annual income fell below $\$ 37,320$. SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Low-Income Households Where No Adult Worked in the Past $\mathbf{1 2}$ Months: 2003 reflects the number and percentage of children under age 18 who live in low-income households where no adult worked (full- or part-time) in the 12 months prior to the survey. Low-income households are those with incomes less than 200 percent of the U.S. poverty line. In calendar year 2003, a family of two adults and two children fell in the low-income category if their annual income fell below $\$ 37,320$.
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Married-Couple Households: 2003 reflects the number and percentage of children under age 18 who live in households headed by a married couple, regardless of the relationship between the child and the household head (householder).
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children in Single-Parent Households With No Spouse/Partner: 2003 reflects the number and percentage of children under age 18 who live in households headed by a person (man or woman) without either a spouse or an unmarried partner present in the household, regardless of the relationship between the child and the household head (householder).
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children Under Age 6 With All Parents in the Labor Force: 2003 is the share of children under age 6 living with parents who are in the civilian labor force. For those children living with one parent, this means that the resident parent is in the civilian labor force. For those children living with two parents, this means that both resident parents are in the civilian labor force. The civilian labor force includes persons who are employed and those who are unemployed but looking for work. SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Children Without Health Insurance: 2002 is the percentage of children under age 18 who were not covered by health insurance at any point during the year. The figures shown here are 3 -year averages of data from 2001 through 2003. We label these as 2002 estimates because 2002 is the midpoint of the 3 -year period. sOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey.

Female-Headed Families Receiving Child Support: 2003 is the percentage of families headed by an unmarried woman (living with one or more of her own children under age 18) who reported receiving child support payments during the previous calendar year. The figures shown here represent 3-year averages of data from 2002 through 2004. We label these as 2003 estimates because 2003 is the midpoint of the 3 -year period.
SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey.

Infant Mortality Rate (deaths per 1,000 live births) is the number of deaths occurring to infants under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births. The data are reported by place of residence, not place of death.
SOURCE: U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.

Median Income of Families With Children: 2003 is the median annual income for families with related children under age 18 living in the household. "Related children" include the householder's (head of the household) children by birth, marriage, or adoption; as well as other persons under age 18 (such as nieces or nephews) who are related to the householder and living in the household. The median income is the dollar amount that divides the income distribution into two equal groups-half with income above the median, half with income below it.
SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Number of Children with Special Health Care Needs That Limit Employment of a Family Member: 2001 is the total number of children under age 18 who have a special health care need that forced at least one family member either to reduce the number of hours worked or to stop working altogether so that he or she could care for the child. The data are self-reported. SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey, National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, 2001.

Overall Rank for each state was obtained in the following manner. First, we converted the 2003 (or 2002, depending on the indicator) state numerical values for each of the 10 indicators into standard scores. We then summed those standard scores to create a total standard score for each of the 50 states. Finally, we ranked the states on the basis of their total standard score in sequential order from highest/best (1) to lowest/worst (50). Standard scores were derived by subtracting the mean score from the observed score and dividing the amount by the standard deviation for that distribution of scores. All measures were given the same weight in calculating the overall standard score.

Percent Change Over Time Analysis was computed by comparing the 2003 (or 2002, depending on the indicator) data for each of the 10 indicators with the data for 2000 . To calculate percent change, we subtracted the value for 2000 from the value for 2002/2003 and then divided that quantity by the value for 2000 . The results are multiplied by 100 for readability. The percent
change was calculated on rounded data, and the "percent change" figure has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Percent Low-Birthweight Babies is the share of live births weighing less than 2,500 grams ( 5.5 pounds). The data are reported by place of mother's residence, not place of birth.
SOURCE: U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.

Percent of Children in Poverty is the share of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below the U.S. poverty threshold, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. In 2003, the poverty threshold for a family of two adults and two children was \$18,660.
SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Percent of Children in Single-Parent Households is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in households headed by a person (man or woman) without a spouse present in the home. In this definition, single-parent households may include cohabiting couples.
SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Percent of Children Living in Families Where No Parent Has Full-Time, Year-Round Employment is the share of all children under age 18 living in families where no parent has regular, full-time employment. For children living in single-parent families, this means that the resident parent did not work at least 35 hours per week, at least

50 weeks in the 12 months prior to the survey. For children living in married-couple families, this means that neither parent worked at least 35 hours per week, at least 50 weeks in the 12 months prior to the survey. Children living with neither parent also were listed as not having secure parental employment because those children are likely to be economically vulnerable. SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Percent of Teens Not Attending School and Not Working (ages 16-19) is the percentage of teenagers between ages 16 and 19 who are not enrolled in school (full- or part-time) and not employed (full- or part-time). This measure is sometimes referred to as "Idle Teens" or "Disconnected Youth."
SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Percent of Teens Who Are High School Dropouts (ages 16-19) is the percentage of teenagers between ages 16 and 19 who are not enrolled in school and are not high school graduates. Those who have a GED or equivalent are included as high school graduates in this measure.
The measure used here is defined as a "status dropout" rate.
SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Teen Birth Rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15-19) is the number of births to teenagers between ages 15 and 19 per 1,000 females in this age group. Data reflect the mother's place of residence, rather than the place of the birth. SOURCES: Birth Statistics: Child Trends, Inc., Facts at a Glance (Washington, DC: 2005). Population Statistics: U.S. Census Bureau.

Teen Death Rate (deaths per 100,000 teens ages 15-19) is the number of deaths from all causes to teens between ages 15 and 19 , per 100,000 teens in this age group. The data are reported by place of residence, not the place where the death occurred.
SOURCES: Death Statistics: U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Population Statistics: U.S. Census Bureau.

Total Children in Households: 2003 reflects the total population of children under age 18 living in households. Children who live in group quarters (for example, institutions, dormitories, or group homes) are not included in this tabulation. SOURCE: Urban Studies Institute at the University of Louisville, analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey.

Over the past few years, we have
produced several KIDS COUNT
Working Papers focused on the KIDS
COUNT data and methodology.
These are available on the KIDS
COUNT website at www.kidscount.
org. For additional information on
characteristics of good indicators
of child well-being, see Indicators
of Children's' Well-Being, by Rober
M. Hauser, Brett V. Brown, and

William R. Posser (Eds.), Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY, 1997

Over the past several years, we have developed a set of criteria to select the statistical indicators published in the national KIDS COUNT Data Book for the purposes of measuring change over time and ranking the states. The criteria are designed to meet our twin goals of using only the highest quality data and communicating clearly and concisely. The criteria are described below.

1. The statistical indicator must be from o reliable source. All of the indicator data used in this book come from U.S. government agencies. Most of the data have already been published or released to the public in some other form before we use them. We work with a small circle of data experts to examine and re-examine the quality of the data used in the KIDS COUNT Data Book each year.
2. The statistical indicator must be available and consistent over time. Changes in methodologies, practice, or policies may affect year-to-year comparability. Program and administrative data are particularly vulnerable to changes in policies and/ or program administration, resulting in data that are not comparable across states or over time.
3. The statistical indicator must be available and consistent for all states. In practice, this means data collected by the federal government or some other national organization. Much of the data collected by states may be accurate and reliable and may be useful for assessing changes over time in a single state, but unless all of the states follow the same data collection and reporting procedures, the data are likely to be inconsistent across states. Without data for every state, we would not be able to construct an overall composite index of child well-being.
4. The statistical indicator should reflect a salient outcome or measure of well-being. We focus on outcome measures rather than programmatic or service data (such as dollars spent on education, or welfare costs), which are not always related to the actual well-being of children. This focus reflects our ultimate aim of improving child wellbeing, regardless of the policies or programs used to achieve this goal.
5. The statistical indicator must be easily understandable to the public. We are trying to reach an educated lay public, not academic scholars or researchers. Measures that are too complex or esoteric cannot be communicated effectively.
6. The statistical indicators we use must have a relatively unambiguous interpretation. If the value of an indicator changes over time, we want to be sure there is widespread agreement that this is a good thing (or a bad thing) for kids.
7. There should be a high probability that the measure will continue to be produced in the near future. We want to establish a series of indicators that can be produced year after year to track trends in the well-being of children in each state. Therefore, we are reluctant to use data from a one-time survey, even though it may provide good information about kids.

| Alabama | PO Box 4576 | Apreill Hartsfield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VOICES for Alabama's Children | Montgomery, AL 36103 | Director, Policy and Programs |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 334.213 .2410 \text { ext. } 101 \\ & 334.213 .2413 \text { (fax) } \end{aligned}$ | achartsfield@alavoices.org www.alavoices.org |
| Alaska | 3211 Providence Dr. | Virgene Hanna |
| KIDS COUNT Alaska | Anchorage, AK 99508 | Project Director |
| University of Alaska-Anchorage |  |  |
| Institute of Social and | 907.786.5431 | anvh@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Economic Research | 907.786.7739 (fax) | www.kidscount.alaska.edu |
| Arizona | 4001 N 3rd St. | Dana Naimark |
| Children's Action Alliance | Suite 160 | Director of Special Projects |
|  | Phoenix, AZ 85012 |  |
|  | 602.266.0707 | dnaimark@azchildren.org |
|  | 602.263.8792 (fax) | www.azchildren.org |
| Arkansas | 523 S Louisiana | Richard Huddleston |
| Arkansas Advocates | Suite 700 | Executive Director |
| for Children \& Families | Little Rock, AR 72201-4531 |  |
|  | 501.371.9678 ext. 114 | rich.huddleston@aradvocates.org |
|  | 501.371.9681 (fax) | www.aradvocates.org |
| California | 1212 Broadway | Elena Montoya |
| Children Now | 5th Floor | Senior Policy Associate |
|  | Oakland, CA 94612 |  |
|  | 510.763.2444 | emontoya@childrennow.org |
|  | 510.763.1974 (fax) | www.childrennow.org |
| Colorado | 1120 Lincoln St. | Kaye Boeke |
| Colorado Children's Campaign | Suite 125 | Director, KIDS COUNT |
|  | Denver, CO 80203-1604 |  |
|  | 303.839.1580 ext. 232 | kaye@coloradokids.org |
|  | 303.839.1354 (fax) | www.coloradokids.org |

## The KIDS COUNT State Network

The Annie E. Casey Foundation provides funding and technical assistance for a national network of KIDS COUNT projects in every state, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. These projects, listed on the following pages, measure and report on the status of children at the state and local levels. They use the data to inform public debates and encourage public action to improve the lives of children.

The state KIDS COUNT projects publish a range of data-driven materials-state data books, special reports, issue briefs, and fact sheets-that help policymakers and citizens identify the needs of children and families and develop appropriate responses to address these needs. Much of the local-level data collected by the state KIDS COUNT grantees is available at www.kidscount.org/cliks.

For more information about the network of state KIDS COUNT grantees, please visit www.kidscount.org/contacts.

| Connecticut | 110 Bartholomew Ave. | Judith Carroll |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Connecticut Association | Suite 4030 | Director, KIDS COUNT Project |
| for Human Services | Hartford, CT 06106 |  |
|  | 860.951 .2212 ext. 240 | jcarroll@cahs.org |
|  | 860.951 .6511 (fax) | www.cahs.org |
| Delaware | 298K Graham Hall | Terry Schooley |
| University of Delaware | Newark, DE 19716 | KIDS COUNT Project Director |
|  | 302.831.4966 | terrys@udel.edu |
|  | 302.831 .4987 (fax) | www.dekidscount.org |
| District of Columbia | 1616 P St. NW | Kinaya Sokoya |
| DC Children's Trust Fund | Suite 150 | Executive Director |
|  | Washington, DC 20036-4960 |  |
|  | 202.667.4940 | ksokoya@dcctf.org |
|  | 202.667.2477 (fax) | www.dckidscount.org |
| Florida | 13301 Bruce B. Downs Blvd. | Susan Weitzel |
| Center for the Study of Children's | Tampa, FL 33612 | Director |
| Futures-Louis de la Parte Florida |  |  |
| Mental Health Institute | 813.974 .7411 | weitzel@fmhi.usf.edu |
| University of South Florida | 813.974 .8534 (fax) | www.floridakidscount.org |
| Georgia | 235 Peachtree St. | Taifa Butler |
| Family Connection | Suite 1600, North Tower | Director, Public Affairs and Policy |
| Partnership, Inc. | Atlanta, GA 30303 |  |
|  | 404.527.7394 ext. 136 | taifa@gafcp.org |
|  | 404.527.7443 (fax) | www.georgiafamilyconnection.org |
| Hawaii | 2515 Campus Rd. | Marika Ripke |
| Center on the Family | Miller Hall 103 | KIDS COUNT Director |
| University of Hawaii-Manoa | Honolulu, HI 96822 |  |
|  | 808.956.6394 | marika@hawaii.edu |
|  | 808.956.4147 (fax) | www.uhfamily.hawaii.edu |


| Idaho | 1607 W Jefferson St. | Linda Jensen |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mountain States Group | Boise, ID 83702 | KIDS COUNT Director |
|  | 208.388 .1014 |  |
|  | 208.331 .0267 (fax) | ljensen@mtnstatesgroup.org |
| www.idahokidscount.org |  |  |


| Louisiana | PO Box 51837 | Shannon Johnson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agenda for Children | New Orleans, LA 70151 | KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
|  | 504.586.8509 ext. 28 | sjohnson@agendaforchildren.org |
|  | 504.586.8522 (fax) | www.agendaforchildren.org |
| Maine | $303 \text { State St. }$ | Elinor Goldberg |
| Maine Children's Alliance | Augusta, ME 04330 | President/CEO |
|  | 207.623.1868 ext. 203 | egoldberg@mekids.org |
|  | 207.626.3302 (fax) | www.mekids.org |
| Maryland | $8 \text { Market Pl. }$ | Jennean Everett-Reynolds |
| Advocates for Children | Suite 500, Bernstein Bldg. | KIDS COUNT Project Director |
| \& Youth | Baltimore, MD 21202 |  |
|  | 410.547 .9200 ext. 3014 | jenneanr@aol.com |
|  | 410.547 .8690 (fax) | www.acy.org |
| Massachusetts | 14 Beacon St. | Barry Hock |
| Massachusetts Citizens | Suite 706 | KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
| for Children | Boston, MA 02108 |  |
|  | 617.742.8555 ext. 5 | barry@masskids.org |
|  | $617.742 .7808 \text { (fax) }$ | www.masskids.org |
| Michigan | 1115 S Pennsylvania Ave. | Jane Zehnder-Merrell |
| Michigan League | Suite 202 | KIDS COUNT Project Director |
| for Human Services | Lansing, MI 48912-1658 |  |
|  | 517.487.5436 | janez@mlan.net |
|  | 517.371.4546 (fax) | www.milhs.org |
| Minnesota | 200 University Ave. W | Diane Benjamin |
| Children's Defense | Suite 210 | KIDS COUNT Director |
| Fund-Minnesota | St. Paul, MN 55103 |  |
|  | 651.855.1175 | benjamin@cdf-mn.org |
|  | 651.227 .2553 (fax) | www.cdf-mn.org |


| Mississippi | 737 N President St. | Jane Boykin <br> President and Project Director |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Missisippi Forum on <br> Children \& Families, Inc. | Jackson, MS 39202 | jane.boykin@mfcf.org |
|  | 601.355 .4911 | www.mfcf.org |


| New Jersey | 35 Halsey St. | Nancy Parello |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Association for Children of New Jersey | Newark, NJ 07102 | NJ KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
|  | 973.643.3876 | nparello@acnj.org |
|  | 973.643 .9153 (fax) | www.acnj.org |
| New Mexico | 2340 Alamo SE | Sara Beth Koplik |
| New Mexico Voices for Children | Suite 120 | KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
|  | Albuquerque, NM 87106 |  |
|  | 505.244 .9505 ext. 34 | skoplik@nmvoices.org |
|  | 505.244.9509 (fax) | www.nmvoices.org |
| New York | 5 Empire State Plaza | Deborah Benson |
| New York State Council | Suite 2810 | Director of Policy Planning |
| on Children \& Families | Albany, NY 12223-1533 | and Research |
|  | 518.473.3652 | debbie.benson@ccf.state.ny.us |
|  | 518.473.2570 (fax) | www.ccf.state.ny.us |
| North Carolina | 311 E Edenton St. | Elizabeth Hudgins |
| North Carolina Child | Raleigh, NC 27601-1017 | Senior Director of Policy and Research |
| Advocacy Institute |  |  |
|  | 919.834.6623 ext. 233 | elizabeth@ncchild.org |
|  | 919.829.7299 (fax) | www.ncchild.org |
| North Dakota | IACC 424 | Richard Rathge |
| North Dakota State University | PO Box 5636 | Executive Director |
| Department of Agribusiness \& | Fargo, ND 58105-5636 | North Dakota KIDS COUNT |
| Applied Economics | 701.231 .8621 | richard.rathge@ndsu.edu |
|  | 701.231 .9730 (fax) | www.ndkidscount.org |
| Ohio | 52 E Lynn St. | Barbara Turpin |
| Children's Defense Fund Ohio | Suite 400 | KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
|  | Columbus, OH 43215-3551 |  |
|  | 614.221.2244 | bturpin@cdfohio.org |
|  | 614.221 .2247 (fax) | www.cdfohio.org |


| Oklahoma | 420 NW 13th St. | Anne Roberts |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oklahoma Institute | Suite 101 |  |
| for Child Advocacy | Oklahoma City, OK 73103 <br> Executive Director |  |
|  | 405.236 .5437 ext. 110 |  |
|  | 405.236 .5439 (fax) | aroberts@oica.org |
| www.oica.org |  |  |


| South Dakota | 414 E Clark St. | Carole Cochran |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business Research Bureau | 132 Patterson Hall | Project Director |
| University of South Dakota | Vermillion, SD 57069-2390 | South Dakota KIDS COUNT |
|  | 605.677.5287 | kidscount@usd.edu |
|  | 605.677.5427 (fax) | www.sdkidscount.org |
| Tennessee | Andrew Johnson Tower, 9th Floor | Pam Brown |
| Tennessee Commission on Children \& Youth | 710 James Robertson Pkwy. | Director, KIDS COUNT Project |
|  | Nashville, TN 37243-0800 |  |
|  | 615.532.1571 | pam.k.brown@state.tn.us |
|  | 615.741 .5956 (fax) | www.tennessee.gov/tccy |
| Texas | 900 Lydia St. | Frances Deviney |
| Center for Public Policy Priorities | Austin, TX 78702 | Texas KIDS COUNT Director |
|  | 512.320 .0222 ext. 106 | deviney@cppp.org |
|  | 512.320.0227 (fax) | www.cppp.org/kidscount.php |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | PO Box 11790 | Dee Baecher-Brown |
| Community Foundation of the | St. Thomas, USVI 00801 | President |
| Virgin Islands |  |  |
|  | 340.774.6031 | dbrown@cfvi.net |
|  | 340.774.3852 (fax) | www.cfvi.net |
| Utah | 757 E South Temple St. | Terry Haven |
| Voices for Utah Children | Suite 250 | KIDS COUNT Director |
|  | Salt Lake City, UT 84102 |  |
|  | 801.364.1182 | terryh@utahchildren.org |
|  | 801.364 .1186 (fax) | www.utahchildren.org |
| Vermont | PO Box 261 | Beth Burgess |
| Vermont Children's Forum | Montpelier, VT 05601 | Research Coordinator |
|  | 802.229.6377 | bburgess@childrensforum.org |
|  | 802.229.4929 (fax) | www.childrensforum.org |


| Virginia | 701 E Franklin St. | Cindy Hetzel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voices for Virginia's Children | Suite 807 | Director of Data and Research |
|  | Richmond, VA 23219 |  |
|  | 804.649.0184 ext. 23 | cindy@vakids.org |
|  | 804.649 .0161 (fax) | www.vakids.org |
| Washington | 1107 NE 45th St., Suite 205 | Richard Brandon |
| Human Services Policy Center | Box 354804 | Director |
| Evans School of Public Affairs | Seattle, WA 98105-4804 |  |
| University of Washington | 206.543.8483 | brandon@u.washington.edu |
|  | 206.616.1553 (fax) | www.hspc.org |
| West Virginia | 1031 Quarrier St., Suite 313 | Margie Hale |
| West Virginia KIDS | Atlas Bldg. | Executive Director |
| COUNT Fund | Charleston, WV 25301 |  |
|  | 304.345 .2101 | margiehale@wvkidscountfund.org |
|  | 304.345 .2102 (fax) | www.wvkidscountfund.org |
| Wisconsin | 16 N Carroll St. | M. Martha Cranley |
| Wisconsin Council on | Suite 600 | KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
| Children \& Families | Madison, WI 53703 |  |
|  | 608.284.0580 ext. 321 | mcranley@wccf.org |
|  | 608.284 .0583 (fax) | www.wccf.org |
| Wyoming | 3116 Old Faithful Rd. | Mike Daharsh |
| Wyoming Children's | Suite 100 | KIDS COUNT Coordinator |
| Action Alliance | Cheyenne, WY 82001 |  |
|  | 307.635.2272 | mdaharsh@wykids.org |
|  | 307.635.2306 (fax) | www.wykids.com |

The Annie E. Casey Foundation wishes to thank the following organizations for their assistance in disseminating the KIDS COUNT Data Book.

Academy for Educational
Development
www.aed.org
ACCION USA, Inc.
www.accionusa.org
Advocates for Youth www.advocatesforyouth.org

Alliance for Children
and Families
www.alliance1.org
Alliance for Excellent
Education
www.all4ed.org
American Academy of Nursing-
Child \& Family Expert Panel
www.aannet.org

American Academy
of Pediatrics
www.aap.org
American Federation
of Teachers
www.aft.org
American Medical
Association
www.ama-assn.org/go/
adolescenthealth

American Public Human
Services Association
www.aphsa.org
American School Health
Association
www.ashaweb.org
American Youth
Policy Forum
www.aypf.org
ASPIRA Association
www.aspira.org
Association of Junior
Leagues International Inc.
www.ajli.org
Baltimore's Safe and
Sound Campaign
www.safeandsound.org
Big Brothers Big Sisters
of America
www.bigbrothersbigsisters.org

Boys and Girls Clubs
of America
www.bgca.org
Camp Fire USA
www.campfireusa.org
Casey Family Programs
www.casey.org

Center for Workforce
Preparation, U.S. Chamber
of Commerce
www.uschamber.com/cwp
Childspan
www.childspan.net
Coalition of Community
Foundations for Youth
www.ccfy.org
Coalition on Human Needs www.chn.org

Colorado Foundation for
Families and Children www.coloradofoundation.org

Congressional Coalition on
Adoption Institute
www.ccainstitute.org
Connect for Kids www.connectforkids.org

Corporate Voices for
Working Families
www.cvworkingfamilies.org
Council of Chief State
School Officers
www.ccsso.org
Council of Professional
Associations on
Federal Statistics www.copafs.org

| Darrell Green Youth | NAACP |
| :---: | :---: |
| Life Foundation www.dgylf.org | www.naacp.org |
| Foundation for the Mid South www.fndmidsouth.org | National Association <br> of Counties <br> www.naco.org |
| Fund for the City of New York www.fcny.org | National Association of Elementary School Principals www.naesp.org |
| Goodwill Industries <br> International www.goodwill.org | National Association of Manufacturers www.nam.org |
| Healthy Teen Network www.healthyteennetwork.org | National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University |
| Hogg Foundation for Mental Health | www.nccp.org |
| www.hogg.utexas.edu | National Child Care <br> Information Center |
| Institute for Educational Leadership | www.nccic.org |
| www.iel.org | National Conference of State Legislatures |
| Jim Casey Youth | www.ncsl.org |
| Opportunities Initiative www.jimcaseyyouth.org | National Council of Juvenile and Family |
| Jobs for the Future www.jff.org | Court Judges/Permanency Planning for Children Department |
| Marguerite Casey Foundation www.caseygrants.org | www.pppncjfcj.org |

National Education
Association
www.nea.org
National Human
Services Assembly
www.nassembly.org
National Lawyers Guild:
Maurice and Jane Sugar
Law Center for Economic
and Social Justice
www.sugarlaw.org
National Partnership
for Community Leadership
www.npcl.org
National PTA
www.pta.org
National School
Boards Association
www.nsba.org
New Mexico Forum for
Youth in Community
www.nmforumforyouth.org

## P-3 Community

Foundation
www.p3communityfoundation.org
Parkersburg Area
Community Foundation/
WVU Parkersburg
www.pacfwv.com

Southwest Key
www.swkey.org

Taos Community
Foundation
www.taoscf.org

UPS Foundation
www.community.ups.com
U.S. Census Bureau
www.census.gov
U.S. Conference of Mayors www.usmayors.org

VSA Arts of Hawaii-Pacific www.vsarts.hawaii.edu

Washington Grantmakers www.washingtongrantmakers.org

William Penn Foundation www.williampennfoundation.org

Workforce Strategy Center www.workforcestrategy.org

YouthBuild USA
www.youthbuild.org

Youth Law Center
www.ylc.org

The Annie E. Casey Foundation
701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
410.547 .6624 fax
www.aecf.org
www.kidscount.org

KIDS COUNT, a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is a national and state-by-state effort to track the status of children in the United States. By providing policymakers and citizens with benchmarks of child well-being, KIDS COUNT seeks to enrich local, state, and national discussions concerning ways to secure better futures for all children. At the national level, the principal activity of the initiative is the publication of the annual KIDS COUNT Data Book, which uses the best available data to measure the educational, social, economic, and physical well-being of children. The Foundation also funds a nationwide network of state-level KIDS COUNT projects that provide a more detailed, community-by-community picture of the condition of children.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of UPS, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public policies, human-service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities, and communities fashion more innovative, costeffective responses to these needs.
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[^0]:    NOTE: Data for Blacks/African Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders, and American Indians
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[^49]:    N.A. $=$ Not Available
    N.R. $=$ Not Ranked.

