



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

Federal Publications

Key Workplace Documents

7-9-2015

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions

Gene Falk

Congressional Research Service

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Key Workplace Documents at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Federal Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact hlmdigital@cornell.edu.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions

Abstract

[Excerpt] This report provides responses to frequently asked questions about the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It is intended to serve as a quick reference to provide easy access to information and data. This report does not provide information on TANF program rules.

Keywords

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, unemployment, welfare

Comments

Suggested Citation

Falk, G. (2015). *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant: Responses to frequently asked questions*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

A more recent version of this report can be found here: http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/1475

A previous version of this report can be found here:
http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/1179/



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions

Gene Falk

Specialist in Social Policy

July 9, 2015

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL32760

Summary

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant funds a wide range of benefits and services for low-income families with children. TANF was created in the 1996 welfare reform law (P.L. 104-193). This report responds to some frequently asked questions about TANF; it does not describe TANF rules (see, instead, CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk).

TANF Funding. TANF provides fixed funding to states, the bulk of which is provided in a \$16.5 billion-per-year basic federal block grant. States are also required in total to contribute, from their own funds, at least \$10.4 billion under a maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement.

Federal and State TANF Expenditures. Though TANF is best known for funding cash assistance payments for needy families with children, the block grant and MOE funds are used for a wide variety of benefits and activities. In FY2013, expenditures on basic assistance (cash assistance) totaled \$8.7 billion—28% of total federal TANF and MOE dollars. TANF also contributes funds for child care and services for children who have been, or are at risk of being, abused and neglected.

Cash Assistance Caseload. A total of 1.7 million families, composed of 4.2 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded cash in December 2014. The bulk of the “recipients” were children—3.1 million in that month. The cash assistance caseload is heterogeneous. The type of family historically thought of as the “typical” cash assistance family—one with an unemployed adult recipient—accounted for less than half of all families on the rolls in FY2012. Additionally, 18% of cash assistance families had an employed adult, while 36% of all TANF families were “child-only” and had no adult recipient. Child-only families include those with disabled adults receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), adults who are nonparents (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) caring for children, and families consisting of citizen children and ineligible noncitizen parents.

Cash Assistance Benefits. TANF cash benefits are set by states. In July 2013, the maximum monthly benefit for a family of three ranged from \$923 in Alaska to \$170 in Mississippi. Benefits in all states represent a fraction of poverty-level income. In the median jurisdiction (the District of Columbia), the maximum monthly benefit of \$428 for a family of three represents 26% of poverty-level income.

Cash Assistance Work Requirements. TANF requires states to engage 50% of all families and 90% of two-parent families in work activities. However, these standards are reduced by the amount of a state’s caseload reduction from FY2005. Further, states may get an extra credit against these standards by spending more than required under the TANF MOE. Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% or 90% targets, and vary by state. In FY2012 states achieved an all-family participation rate of 34.4% and a two-parent rate of 33.9%. That year, 16 jurisdictions failed the all-family standard, and 20 jurisdictions failed the two-parent standard. States that fail to meet work standards are *at risk* of being penalized by a reduction in their block grant.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Current Topics.....	1
What Is TANF’s Current Funding Status?.....	1
What Is TANF’s Funding Level?.....	1
May States Require Drug Testing of TANF Cash Assistance Recipients?.....	2
What Are TANF’s Rules for Drug Felons?.....	2
What Are TANF’s Rules for Substance Abuse Treatment?.....	2
What Is the Administration’s “Waiver” Initiative?.....	3
Has Any State Formally Applied for a “Waiver” of TANF Work Participation Standards?.....	3
Are there Restrictions on a Family’s Use of TANF Benefits?.....	3
Funding and Expenditures.....	4
How Much Has the TANF Grant Declined in Value Because of Inflation?.....	4
How May States Use Federal TANF Funds?.....	5
What Expenditures May a State Count Toward its Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Requirement?.....	5
How Have States Used TANF Funds?.....	6
How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?.....	7
The Caseload.....	7
How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services?.....	7
How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Cash Assistance?.....	7
How Does the Current Cash Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels?.....	8
What Are the Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families?.....	9
TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month?.....	11
TANF Work Participation Standards.....	12
What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?.....	12
Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law?.....	13
What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?.....	13
How Many Jurisdictions Have Failed the All-Families Standard From FY2002 Through FY2012?.....	14
Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?.....	16

Figures

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Federal Grants and State MOE Funds: FY2013.....	6
Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance, July 1959-December 2014.....	9
Figure 3. Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families, Selected Years FY1988 to FY2012.....	10
Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single Parent Family with Two Children, July 2013.....	12

Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-
FY2012 14

Tables

Table 1. Federal Funding for TANF Grants: FY2007 Through FY2015 1

Table 2. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Constant Dollars..... 4

Table 3. TANF Cash Assistance Caseload: December 2014..... 8

Table 4. States Failing TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard: FY2002-FY2012 15

Table 5. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State:
FY2002-FY2012..... 17

Table A-1. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2003-FY2006 20

Table A-2. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2011-FY2015 21

Table A-3. Use of TANF and State Maintenance of Effort Funds: FY2013 22

Table A-4. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961 to 2014 22

Table B-1. Use of FY2013 TANF and MOE Funds by Category 25

Table B-2. Use of FY2013 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percent of Total
Federal TANF and State MOE Funding 28

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2013 31

Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Cash
Assistance by State, December 2014..... 32

Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Cash Assistance by State,
December of Selected Years 34

Table B-6. TANF Families by Number of Parents in Assisted Unit by State: December
2014 36

Table B-7. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and
Work Participation Rates by State, All Families, FY2012..... 38

Table B-8. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and
Work Participation Rates by State, Two-Parent Families, FY2012 40

Appendixes

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables 20

Appendix B. State Tables..... 25

Contacts

Author Contact Information..... 42

Introduction

This report provides responses to frequently asked questions about the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It is intended to serve as a quick reference to provide easy access to information and data. This report does not provide information on TANF program rules. For such information, see CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk. For a non-technical overview of TANF, see CRS Report R40946, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant: An Overview*, by Gene Falk.

Current Topics

What Is TANF's Current Funding Status?

P.L. 113-235, the omnibus appropriation act for FY2015, extends TANF funding through September 30, 2015.¹

What Is TANF's Funding Level?

Table 1 shows TANF funding for FY2007 through FY2015. The bulk of TANF funding is in a basic block grant (the state family assistance grant), which provides annual funding totaling \$16.5 billion for the 50 states and District of Columbia. This grant amount was established in the 1996 welfare reform law and has not been changed since then.

FY2015 funding for TANF grants is the same as in previous years, except for the TANF contingency fund. A total of \$583 million is available for FY2015 contingency fund grants to states, compared with \$610 million in FY2014. A total FY2015 contingency fund appropriation of \$608 million includes set-asides of \$15 million for HHS TANF research activities and \$10 million for Census Bureau research activities related to TANF, leaving \$583 million for contingency fund grants to states.

Table 1. Federal Funding for TANF Grants: FY2007 Through FY2015

(Dollars in millions)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State family assistance grant	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489
Supplemental grants	319	319	319	319	211	0	0	0	0
Healthy marriage/responsible fatherhood grants	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150
Grants to the territories	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78
Grants for tribal work programs	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

¹ See Section 228 of Division G of P.L. 113-235.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Contingency fund	59	428	1,107	212	334	612	610 ^a	610 ^a	583 ^b
Emergency contingency fund			617	4,383					
Totals	17,103	17,472	18,768	21,639	17,270	17,337	17,335	17,335	17,308

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from HHS.

- a. P.L. 112-275 appropriated \$612 million to the TANF contingency fund for FY2013 and FY2014, and reserved \$2 million in each year of these funds for a commission on child abuse and neglect fatalities. Thus, \$610 million was available for FY2013 and FY2014 TANF contingency fund grants to states.
- b. P.L. 113-235 appropriated \$608 million to the TANF contingency fund for FY2015 and FY2016, but sets aside from those funds \$15 million for HHS welfare research activities and \$10 million for U.S. Census Bureau activities related to welfare research.

In addition to federal TANF funds, states are required in total to contribute, from their own funds, at least \$10.4 billion per year for TANF-related activities for low-income families with children. This level of state funding, known as *maintenance-of-effort* (MOE) funding, was also established in the 1996 welfare law and has not been changed since then.

May States Require Drug Testing of TANF Cash Assistance Recipients?

Yes. The 1996 assistance reform law gave states the *option* of requiring drug tests for assistance recipients and penalizing those who fail such tests. (See Section 902 of P.L. 104-193.) However, specific state policies regarding drug testing raise constitutional issues. For a discussion of states that require drug testing in TANF and related programs, see CRS Report R42394, *Drug Testing and Crime-Related Restrictions in TANF, SNAP, and Housing Assistance*, by Maggie McCarty et al. See also CRS Report R42326, *Constitutional Analysis of Suspicionless Drug Testing Requirements for the Receipt of Governmental Benefits*, by David H. Carpenter.

What Are TANF’s Rules for Drug Felons?

The 1996 welfare reform law established a lifetime ban on eligibility for TANF and food stamps for those convicted of a drug-related felony. However, states may either opt out entirely or modify and limit this lifetime ban. (See Section 115 of P.L. 104-193.)²

What Are TANF’s Rules for Substance Abuse Treatment?

States may use TANF funds for substance abuse treatment. Federal TANF dollars cannot be used for “medical services,” but can be used for “non-medical” treatment such as counseling. State MOE dollars can be used for medical services connected with substance abuse treatment.

² TANF also bars aid to fleeing felons and people convicted of welfare fraud by misrepresenting their state of residence. For an overview of rules for TANF, as well as those for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and housing assistance programs related to drug testing and crime-related issues, see CRS Report R42394, *Drug Testing and Crime-Related Restrictions in TANF, SNAP, and Housing Assistance*, by Maggie McCarty et al.

TANF requires states to conduct an employability assessment of adult recipients, and allows states to establish Individual Responsibility Plans (IRPs) for their TANF families. The IRP may require participation in a substance abuse treatment program. A family may be sanctioned for failure to comply with its IRP.

Additionally, a state may engage recipients in substance abuse treatment and count that activity toward its work participation standard, though such an activity is counted only for a limited period of time. Substance abuse treatment is considered a “job readiness” activity; a state may count job search and job readiness activities for a maximum of 12 weeks in a year toward its work participation standards.

What Is the Administration’s “Waiver” Initiative?

On July 12, 2012, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announced that it would accept applications for “waivers” of the TANF work participation standards. In general, these are waivers of the way the performance of state welfare-to-work programs are assessed, the federal work participation standards. For a discussion, see CRS Report R42627, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): Welfare Waivers*, by Gene Falk.

Has Any State Formally Applied for a “Waiver” of TANF Work Participation Standards?

As of July 7, 2015, no state had formally applied for a waiver of TANF work participation standards under the Administration’s waiver initiative.

Are there Restrictions on a Family’s Use of TANF Benefits?

TANF funds a wide range of benefits and services, many of which are for specific purposes. However, TANF is best known for helping states finance their cash public assistance programs for needy families with children. The “cash” benefits are often paid on an Electronic Benefit Transaction (EBT) card that a recipient can take to an Automated Teller Machine (ATM) to draw cash or use to purchase goods and services at a point-of-sale device. As “cash,” there are no restrictions on the types of goods and services that can be purchased with a TANF benefit.

However, TANF law does restrict *where* a recipient might access benefits at an ATM. P.L. 112-96 prevents electronic benefit transaction access to TANF cash at liquor stores, casinos, and strip clubs. States are required to prohibit access to TANF cash at Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) at such establishments.

Funding and Expenditures

How Much Has the TANF Grant Declined in Value Because of Inflation?

From FY1997 (the first full year of TANF funding) through FY2014 (ended September 30, 2014), the real value of the TANF block grant declined by 32.3%. **Table 2** shows the impact of inflation on the value of the TANF block grant for each year, FY1997 through FY2014. On average, the TANF basic block grant has lost 2.3% of its value each year over that period.

Table 2. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Constant Dollars

Fiscal Year	Value of the Basic TANF Block Grant in FY1997 Dollars (\$ in billions)	Cumulative Change in Value of the Basic Block Grant from FY1997 Levels
1997	\$16.5	
1998	16.2	-1.6%
1999	15.9	-3.5
2000	15.4	-6.4
2001	14.9	-9.4
2002	14.7	-10.7
2003	14.4	-12.7
2004	14.1	-14.7
2005	13.6	-17.4
2006	13.1	-20.4
2007	12.8	-22.2
2008	12.3	-25.5
2009	12.3	-25.3
2010	12.1	-26.5
2011	11.8	-28.4
2012	11.5	-30.1
2013	11.3	-31.2
2014	11.2	-32.3
Average Annual Rate of Change in the Value of the Block Grant		-2.3%

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

Notes: Constant dollars were computed using the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers (CPI-U).

How May States Use Federal TANF Funds?

TANF is a broad-purpose block grant that gives states the flexibility to use its funds to address both the effects of, and the root causes of, childhood economic disadvantage. There are two sets of rules: those that relate to the use of federal TANF grants, and those for which state expenditures count toward meeting the TANF MOE state spending requirement.

States have broad discretion on how they expend federal TANF grants. States may use TANF funds “in any manner that is reasonably calculated” to accomplish the block grant’s statutory purpose. That purpose is to increase the flexibility of states in operating a program designed to

1. provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives;
2. end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage;
3. prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and
4. encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

In addition, states may also expend federal TANF grants on any activity financed by pre-TANF programs. These are known as “grandfathered” activities.” Examples of activities that do not meet a TANF goal but may be financed by TANF grants include foster care payments and funding for juvenile justice activities, if they were financed in the pre-TANF programs.

In addition to expending federal funds on allowable TANF activities, federal law permits a limited amount of the federal TANF basic block grant to be used for other programs. A maximum of 30% of the TANF block grant may be used for the following combined transfers or expenditures: (1) transfers to the Child Care and Development Block Grant; (2) transfers to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), with a maximum transfer to the SSBG set at 10% of the basic block grant; (3) as state match for “reverse commuter grants,” providing public transportation from inner cities to the suburbs.

What Expenditures May a State Count Toward its Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Requirement?

The range of expenditures on activities that states may count toward the maintenance of effort requirement is—like the authority to spend federal funds—quite broad. The expenditures need not be in the “TANF program” itself, but in any program that provides benefits and services to TANF-eligible families in cash assistance, child care assistance, education and job training, administrative costs, or any other activity designed to meet TANF’s statutory goals. States may count expenditures made by local governments toward the MOE requirement. Additionally, there is a general rule of federal grants management that permits states to count as a state expenditure “third-party” in-kind donations, as long as they meet the requirements of providing benefits or services to TANF-eligible families and meet the requirements of the types of activities that states may count toward the MOE requirement.


The MOE requirement sets a minimum amount that states must expend from their own funds. Under current law, there are incentives for states to expend funds beyond this minimum. States must spend more than the minimum MOE to access TANF contingency funds. Additionally, states can receive extra “credit” toward their work participation standards for spending more than the minimum required.

How Have States Used TANF Funds?

Figure 1 shows the uses of federal TANF grants to states and state MOE funds in FY2013. In FY2013, a total of \$31.6 billion of both federal TANF and state MOE expenditures were either expended or transferred to other block grant programs. Basic assistance, the category that most closely reflects cash assistance, represented 28% (\$8.7 billion) of total FY2013 TANF and MOE dollars.

TANF is a major contributor of child care funding. In FY2013, 16% of all TANF funds used were either expended on child care or transferred to the child care block grant (the Child Care and Development Fund, or CCDF). TANF is also a major contributor to the child welfare system, which provides foster care, adoption assistance, and services to families with children who either have experienced or are at risk of experiencing child abuse or neglect. However, TANF’s accounting system does a poor job of capturing expenditures associated with spending on the child welfare system. Most TANF funding for these programs is subsumed in the catch-all “other” expenditure category.

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Federal Grants and State MOE Funds: FY2013
(Total = \$31.6 Billion)



Source: : Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

See **Appendix A, Table A-3** for dollar amounts of total federal TANF and state MOE funds associated with each of these categories. For state-specific information on the use of TANF funds, see **Table B-1** and **Table B-2**.

How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?

TANF law permits states to “reserve” unused funds without time limit. This permits flexibility in timing of the use of TANF funds, including the ability to “save” funds for unexpected occurrences that might increase costs (such as recessions or natural disasters).

At the end of FY2013 (September 30, 2013, the latest data currently available), a total of \$3.0 billion of federal TANF funding remained neither transferred nor spent. However, some of these unspent funds represent monies that states had already committed to spend later. At the end of FY2013, states had made such commitments to spend—that is, had obligated—a total of \$1.5 billion. Generally, obligations are binding commitments to spend, and they come in the form of contracts and grants to provide benefits and services. However, the definition of “obligation” varies from program to program, and because TANF essentially consists of 54 different programs (one for each state, the District of Columbia, and the territories), what constitutes an obligation may vary.

At the end of FY2013, states also had \$1.5 billion of “unobligated balances.” These funds are available to states to make *new* spending commitments. **Table B-3** shows unspent TANF funds by state.

The Caseload

How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services?

This number is not known. Federal TANF reporting requirements focus on families receiving only ongoing cash *assistance*, with no complete reporting on families receiving other TANF benefits and services. As discussed in a previous section of this report, TANF basic assistance accounts for about 28% of all TANF expenditures. Therefore, the federal reporting requirements that pertain to families receiving “assistance” are likely to undercount the number of families receiving any TANF-funded benefit or service.

How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Cash Assistance?

Table 3 provides cash assistance caseload information. A total of 1.7 million families, composed of 4.2 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded cash in December 2014. The bulk of the “recipients” were children—3.1 million in that month. For state-by-state cash assistance caseloads, see **Table B-4**.

Table 3. TANF Cash Assistance Caseload: December 2014

Families	1,674,536
Total Recipients	4,216,251
Total Children	3,055,382
Total Adults	1,160,869

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


Notes: TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

How Does the Current Cash Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels?

Figure 2 provides a long-term historical perspective on the number of families receiving cash assistance, from July 1959 to December 2014. Before 1996, these are families that received cash assistance from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. From 1997 onward, these are families that received cash assistance from TANF. The shaded areas of the figure represent months when the national economy was in recession. Though the health of the national economy affected the trend in the cash assistance caseload, the long-term trend in receipt of cash assistance does not follow a classic counter-cyclical pattern. (Such a pattern would have the caseload rise during economic slumps, and then fall again during periods of economic growth.) Factors other than the health of the economy (demographic trends, policy changes) also influenced the caseload trend.

The figure shows two periods of sustained caseload increases: the period from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s and a second period from 1988 to 1994. The number of families receiving cash assistance peaked in March 1994 at 5.1 million families. The cash assistance caseload fell rapidly in the late 1990s (after the 1996 welfare reform law) before leveling off in 2001. In 2004, the caseload began another decline, albeit at a slower pace than in the late 1990s.

During the recent 2007-2009 recession and its aftermath, the caseload began to rise from its post-welfare reform low in August 2008 (1.7 million families), peaking in December 2010 at close to 2.0 million families. By December 2014, the cash assistance caseload had declined to approximately match its post-welfare reform low at about 1.7 million families.

Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance, July 1959-December 2014

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) with data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: Shaded areas denotes months when the national economy was in recession. Information represents families receiving cash assistance from Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and TANF. For October 1999 through December 2014, includes families receiving assistance from Separate State Programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. See **Table A-4** for average annual data on families, recipients, adult recipients, and child recipients of ADC,/AFDC and TANF cash assistance for 1961 to 2014.

Table B-5 shows recent trends in the number of cash assistance families by state.


What Are the Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families?

Historically, the “typical” cash assistance family has been headed by a single parent (usually the mother) with one or two children. The single parent has also typically been unemployed. However, the cash assistance caseload decline has occurred together with a major shift in the composition of the rolls. **Figure 3** shows the change in the size and composition of the cash assistance caseload under both AFDC (1988 and 1994) and under TANF. In FY1988, 84% of AFDC families were headed by an unemployed adult recipient. In FY2012, families with an unemployed adult recipients represented 45% of all cash assistance families. This decline occurred, in large part, as the number of families headed by unemployed adult recipients declined.

With the decline in families headed by unemployed adults, the share of the caseload that represented families with employed adults and “child only” families has increased. In FY2012, families with employed adult recipients represented 18% of all cash assistance families. “Child-only” families are those where no adult recipient receives benefits in their own right; the family receives benefits on behalf of its children. The share of the caseload that was child-only in

FY2012 was 36.5%. In FY2012, families with a non-recipient, non-parent relative (grandparents, aunts, uncles) represented 12% of all cash assistance families. Families with ineligible, noncitizen adults or adults who have not reported their citizenship status made up 11% of the cash assistance caseload in that year. Families where the parent received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and the children received TANF made up 9% of all cash assistance families in FY2012.

Figure 3. Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families, Selected Years FY1988 to FY2012



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulations of the TANF national data files.

Notes: TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

For more information on the characteristics and the changes in the composition of the cash assistance caseload, see CRS Report R43187, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): Size and Characteristics of the Cash Assistance Caseload*, by Gene Falk.

TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month?

There are *no* federal rules that help determine the amount of TANF cash benefits paid to a family. (There are also no federal rules that require states to use TANF to pay cash benefits, though all states do so.) Benefit amounts are determined solely by the states.


Most states base TANF cash benefit amounts on family size, paying larger cash benefits to larger families on the presumption that they have greater financial needs. The maximum monthly cash benefit is usually paid to a family that receives no other income (e.g., no earned or unearned income) and complies with program rules. Families with income other than TANF often are paid a reduced benefit. Moreover, some families are financially sanctioned for failure to meet a program requirement (e.g., a work requirement), and are also paid a lower benefit.

Figure 4 shows the maximum monthly TANF cash benefit by state for a single mother caring for two children (family of three) in July 2013.³ The benefit amounts shown are those for a single-parent family with two children. Some states vary their benefit amounts for other family types such as two-parent families or “child-only” cases. States also vary their benefits by other factors such as housing costs and sub-state geography. For a family of three, the maximum TANF benefit paid in July 2013 varied from \$170 per month in Mississippi to \$923 per month in Alaska. In all states, the maximum TANF cash assistance amount for this sized family was less than 50% of poverty-level income.⁴

³ States are not required to report to the federal government their cash assistance benefit amounts in either the TANF state plan (under Section 402 of the Social Security Act) or in annual program reports (under Section 411 of the Social Security Act). The benefit amounts shown are from the “Welfare Rules Database,” maintained by the Urban Institute and funded by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

⁴ In 2013, the HHS poverty guidelines for the contiguous 48 states and the District of Columbia for a family of 3 was \$1,628 per month. Higher poverty lines applied in Alaska (\$2,034 per month for a family of 3) and Hawaii (\$1,873 per month for a family of 3).

Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single Parent Family with Two Children, July 2013



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the Urban Institute’s *Welfare Rules Database*.

For additional information on TANF benefit amounts by state, see CRS Report R43634, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): Eligibility and Benefit Amounts in State TANF Cash Assistance Programs*, by Gene Falk.

TANF Work Participation Standards

What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?

The TANF statute requires states to have 50% of their caseload meet standards of participation in work or activities—that is, a family member must be in specified activities for a minimum number of hours.⁵ There is a separate participation standard that applies to the two-parent portion of a state’s caseload, requiring 90% of the state’s two-parent caseload to meet participation standards. States that fail the TANF work participation standards are at risk of being penalized by a reduction in their block grant amounts.

⁵ Some families are excluded from the participation rate calculation.

However, the statutory work participation standards are reduced by a “caseload reduction credit.” The caseload reduction credit reduces the participation standard one percentage point for each percentage point decline in a state’s caseload. Additionally, under a regulatory provision, a state may get “extra” credit for caseload reduction if it spends more than required under the TANF MOE. Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% and 90% targets, and vary by state and by year.

States that fail to meet the TANF work participation standard are at *risk* of being penalized through a reduction in their block grant. However, penalties can be forgiven if a state claims, and the Secretary of HHS finds, that it had “reasonable cause” for failing the standard. Penalties can also be forgiven for states that enter into “corrective compliance plans,” and subsequently meet the work standard.

Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law?

The 50% and 90% target standards that states face, as well as the caseload reduction credit, date back to the 1996 welfare reform law. However, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) made several changes to the work participation rules effective in FY2007:

- The caseload reduction credit was changed to measure caseload reduction from FY2005, rather than the original law’s FY1995.
- The work participation standards were broadened to include families receiving cash aid in “separate state programs.” Separate state programs are programs run with state funds, distinct from a state’s “TANF program,” but with expenditures countable toward the TANF MOE.
- HHS was instructed to provide definition to the allowable TANF work activities listed in law. HHS was also required to define what is meant by a “work-eligible” individual, expanding the number of families that are included in the work participation calculation.
- States were required to develop plans and procedures to verify work activities.


The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA, P.L. 111-5), a law enacted in response to the sharp economic downturn of 2007-2009, held states “harmless” for caseload increases affecting the work participation standards for FY2009 through FY2011. It did so by allowing states to “freeze” caseload reduction credits at pre-recession levels through the FY2011 standards.

What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?

HHS computes two work participation rates for each state that are then compared with the effective (after-credit) standard to determine if it has met the TANF work standard. An “all-families” work participation rate is computed and compared with the all-families effective standard (50% minus the state’s caseload reduction credit). HHS also computes a two-parent work participation rate that is compared with the two-parent effective standard (90% minus the state’s caseload reduction credit).

Figure 5 shows the national average all-families work participation rate for FY2002 through FY2012. For the period FY2002 through FY2011, states have achieved an all-families work participation rate hovering around 30%. In FY2012, the all-families work participation rate ticked up to 34.4%. In that year, states faced higher work participation standards because the “freeze” to the caseload reduction credit enacted in ARRA expired.

Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2012



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

How Many Jurisdictions Have Failed the All-Families Standard From FY2002 Through FY2012?

Table 4 shows which states failed the TANF all-families work participation standards from FY2002 through FY2012. Before FY2007, only a few jurisdictions failed to meet TANF all-families work participation standards. However, in FY2007, 15 jurisdictions failed to meet the all-families standard. FY2007 was the first year policies under the DRA were effective. This number declined to nine in FY2008 and eight in FY2009.

In FY2012, despite the uptick in the national average work participation rate, 16 states failed to meet the all-family standard, the largest number of states that did not meet their participation standards in any one year since the enactment of TANF. FY2012 was the year that ARRA’s “freeze” of the caseload reduction credit expired, and states were generally required to meet higher standards than in previous years. For state-by-state information on FY2012 caseload reduction credits, effective (after credit) standards, and work participation rates related to the “all families” standard, see **Table B-7**.

**Table 4. States Failing TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard:
FY2002-FY2012**

(Changes to TANF Work Participation Standard Rules Under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA)
Effective in FY2007)

State	Pre-DRA					Post-DRA					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Alabama											
Alaska											X
Arizona											
Arkansas											
California						X	X	X	X	X	X
Colorado											X
Connecticut					X						
Delaware											
District of Columbia								X	X	X	
Florida											
Georgia											
Hawaii											
Idaho											X
Illinois											
Indiana				X	X	X					
Iowa											
Kansas											
Kentucky						X					
Louisiana											
Maine						X	X	X	X	X	X
Maryland											
Massachusetts											
Michigan						X	X		X	X	
Minnesota						X					
Mississippi											
Missouri							X	X		X	X
Montana											
Nebraska											
Nevada		X				X					X
New Hampshire											
New Jersey											
New Mexico						X					

State	Pre-DRA					Post-DRA					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
New York											
North Carolina											
North Dakota											
Ohio						X	X	X	X	X	
Oklahoma											
Oregon						X	X	X	X	X	X
Pennsylvania											
Puerto Rico						X	X	X	X	X	X
Rhode Island											X
South Carolina											X
South Dakota											
Tennessee											
Texas											
Utah											
Vermont						X					X
Virginia											X
Washington											X
West Virginia						X	X				
Wisconsin											X
Wyoming											
Guam	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Virgin Islands						X					
Totals	1	2	1	2	3	15	9	8	8	9	16

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?

In addition to meeting a work standard for all families, TANF also imposes a second, 90% standard for the two-parent portion of its cash assistance caseload. This standard too can be reduced for caseload reduction.

Table 5 shows whether each state met its two-parent work participation standard for FY2002 through FY2012. However, the display on the table is more complex than that for reporting whether a state failed its “all family” rate. A substantial number of states have reported *no two-*

parent families subject to the work participation standard.⁶ These states are denoted on the table with an “NA,” indicating that the two-parent standard was not applicable to the state in that year. For states with two-parent families in its caseload, the table reports “Yes” for states that met the two-parent standard, and “No” for states that failed the two-parent standard.

In FY2012, 27 jurisdictions reported that no two-parent families were included in the TANF work participation standard calculation. Of the 27 jurisdictions that had two-parent families in their TANF work participation calculation, 7 met the standard and 20 did not. For state-by-state information on FY2012 caseload reduction credits, effective (after credit) standards, and work participation rates related to two-parent families, see **Table B-8**.

Table 5. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2002-FY2012

(“Yes” indicates a state met the standard; “No” indicates the state failed to meet the standard; and “NA” means the standard was not applicable to the state in that year [no two-parent families in its caseload].)

State	Pre- Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					Post-Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Alaska	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	
Arizona	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Arkansas	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Colorado	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
District of Columbia	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Florida	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	
Idaho	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Indiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Iowa	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Kansas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Kentucky	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	
Louisiana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

⁶ Before the changes made by the DRA were effective, a number of states had their two-parent families in separate state programs that were not included in the work participation calculation. When DRA brought families receiving assistance in separate state programs into the work participation rate calculations, a number of states moved these families into solely-state-funded programs. These are state-funded programs with expenditures *not* countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, and hence are outside of TANF’s rules.

State	Pre- Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					Post-Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Maine	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	YES	YES	YES	YES	MA	NA	YES	YES	YES	NA	YES
Michigan	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
New Hampshire	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
New York	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Oklahoma	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Pennsylvania	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
South Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
West Virginia	NO	NO	NA	NA	NA	NO	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA
Wisconsin	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Wyoming	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Guam	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	Pre- Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					Post-Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Number of Jurisdictions without Two-Parent Families	24	25	29	29	29	24	26	27	25	27	27
Number of Jurisdictions with Two-Parent Families	30	29	25	25	25	30	28	27	29	27	27
Number of Jurisdictions Meeting Two-Parent Standard	25	25	21	23	21	22	22	20	23	22	7
Number of Jurisdictions Failing Two-Parent Standard	5	4	4	2	3	7	6	7	6	5	20

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

Table A-1. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2003-FY2006

Public Law	Time Period	Notes
P.L. 107-229	Oct. 1, 2002-Dec. 31, 2002	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 107-294	Jan. 1, 2003-Mar. 31, 2003	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 108-7	Apr. 1, 2003-June 30, 2003	Extension as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act.
P.L. 108-40	July 1, 2003-Sept. 30, 2003	Free-standing bill that amended the Social Security Act to extend TANF and related programs.
P.L. 108-89	Oct. 1, 2003-Mar. 31, 2004	Multipurpose bill that extended programs through the first half of FY2004.
P.L. 108-210	Apr. 1, 2004-June 30, 2004	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the program through June 30, 2004.
P.L. 108-262	July 1, 2004-Sept. 30, 2004	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the program through Sept. 30, 2004.
P.L. 108-308	Oct. 1, 2004- Mar. 31, 2005	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through Mar. 31, 2005.
P.L. 109-4	Apr. 1, 2005-June 30, 2005	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through June 30, 2005.
P.L. 109-19	July 1, 2005-Sept. 30, 2005	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through Sept. 30, 2005.
P.L. 109-68	Oct. 1, 2005-Dec. 31, 2005	Bill to provide extra funding to help states provide benefits to families affected by Hurricane Katrina, suspend certain requirements in states affected by the hurricane, and extend the funding authority for the programs through December 31, 2005.
P.L. 109-161	Jan. 1, 2006-Mar. 31, 2006	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through March 31, 2006. It reduced the bonus for reducing out-of-wedlock births for FY2006-FY2010 to offset the costs of the temporary extension.

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Note: Table shows extensions through 2006, when the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) extended TANF through FY2010. Temporary extensions after 2010 are shown in **Table A-2**.

Table A-2. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2011-FY2015

Public Law	Time Period	Notes
P.L. 111-242	Oct. 1, 2010-Dec. 3, 2010	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 111-290	Dec. 4, 2010-Dec. 7, 2010	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 111-291	Dec. 8, 2010-Sept. 30, 2011 (except supplemental grants, Dec. 8, 2010-June 30, 2011)	Extension as part of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010. It funded supplemental grants only through the first three quarters of FY2011 and at a reduced rate.
P.L. 112-35	Oct. 1, 2011-Dec. 31, 2011	Free-standing bill to extend TANF for three months. No funding for TANF supplemental grants.
P.L. 112-78	Jan 1, 2012-Feb. 21, 2012	Extension of TANF for two months, as part of a bill to provide a two-month extension for the 2011 payroll tax reduction, extended unemployment compensation, and other expiring provisions.
P.L. 112-96	Feb. 22, 2012-Sept. 30, 2012	Extension of TANF for the remainder of FY2012 included as part of a bill to extend the 2011 payroll tax reduction, unemployment compensation, and other expiring provisions.
P.L. 112-175	Oct. 1, 2011-March 27, 2013	Extension of TANF for the first six months of FY2013 as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-6	March 28, 2013-Sept. 30, 2013	Extension of TANF for the remainder of FY2013 as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-46	Oct. 17, 2013-Jan 15, 2014	Extension of TANF as a part of a continuing resolution. The resolution ended the “government shutdown,” and a TANF funding gap between Oct 1 and Oct 16, 2013
P.L. 113-73	Jan. 16, 2014-Jan. 18, 2014	Extension of TANF funding as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-76	Jan 19, 2014-Sept. 30, 2014	Extension of TANF funding for the remainder of FY2014 as part of an omnibus appropriation act.
P.L. 113-164	Oct. 1, 2014-Dec 11, 2014	Extension of TANF funding through Dec. 11, 2014, as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-202	Dec. 12, 2014-Dec 13, 2014	Extension of TANF funding through Dec. 13, 2014, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-203	Dec 14, 2014-Dec 17, 2014	Extension of TANF funding through Dec. 17, 2014, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-235	Dec. 18, 2014-Sept. 30, 2015	Extension of TANF funding for the remainder of FY2015 as part of an omnibus appropriations act.

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Table A-3. Use of TANF and State Maintenance of Effort Funds: FY2013

(Dollars in Billions)

	Billions of Dollars	Percent of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Dollars
Basic Assistance	\$8.7	27.6%
Administration	2.3	7.2
Work Program Expenditures	2.0	6.4
Child Care	5.0	15.8
Other Work Supports	2.8	9.0
Other Expenditures	10.7	33.9
Totals	31.6	100.0

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

Table A-4. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961 to 2014

Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	TANF Child Recipients	
					As a Percent of All Children	As a Percent of All Poor Children
1961	0.873	3.363	0.765	2.598	3.7%	14.3%
1962	0.939	3.704	0.860	2.844	4.0	15.7
1963	0.963	3.945	0.988	2.957	4.1	17.4
1964	1.010	4.195	1.050	3.145	4.3	18.6
1965	1.060	4.422	1.101	3.321	4.5	21.5
1966	1.096	4.546	1.112	3.434	4.7	26.5
1967	1.220	5.014	1.243	3.771	5.2	31.2
1968	1.410	5.702	1.429	4.274	5.9	37.8
1969	1.696	6.689	1.716	4.973	6.9	49.7
1970	2.207	8.462	2.250	6.212	8.6	57.7
1971	2.763	10.242	2.808	7.435	10.4	68.5
1972	3.048	10.944	3.039	7.905	11.1	74.9
1973	3.148	10.949	3.046	7.903	11.2	79.9
1974	3.219	10.847	3.041	7.805	11.2	75.0
1975	3.481	11.319	3.248	8.071	11.8	71.2
1976	3.565	11.284	3.302	7.982	11.8	76.2
1977	3.568	11.015	3.273	7.743	11.6	73.9

Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	TANF Child Recipients	
					As a Percent of All Children	As a Percent of All Poor Children
1978	3.517	10.551	3.188	7.363	11.2	72.8
1979	3.509	10.312	3.130	7.181	11.0	68.0
1980	3.712	10.774	3.355	7.419	11.5	63.2
1981	3.835	11.079	3.552	7.527	11.7	59.2
1982	3.542	10.358	3.455	6.903	10.8	49.6
1983	3.686	10.761	3.663	7.098	11.1	50.1
1984	3.714	10.831	3.687	7.144	11.2	52.3
1985	3.701	10.855	3.658	7.198	11.3	54.4
1986	3.763	11.038	3.704	7.334	11.5	56.0
1987	3.776	11.027	3.661	7.366	11.5	56.4
1988	3.749	10.915	3.586	7.329	11.4	57.8
1989	3.798	10.992	3.573	7.419	11.5	57.9
1990	4.057	11.695	3.784	7.911	12.1	57.9
1991	4.497	12.930	4.216	8.715	13.2	59.8
1992	4.829	13.773	4.470	9.303	13.9	59.9
1993	5.012	14.205	4.631	9.574	14.1	60.0
1994	5.033	14.161	4.593	9.568	13.9	61.7
1995	4.791	13.418	4.284	9.135	13.1	61.5
1996	4.434	12.321	3.928	8.600	12.3	58.7
1997	3.740	10.376	NA	NA	10.0	50.1
1998	3.050	8.347	NA	NA	8.1	42.9
1999	2.578	6.924	NA	NA	6.7	39.4
2000	2.303	6.143	1.655	4.479	6.1	38.1
2001	2.192	5.717	1.514	4.195	5.7	35.3
2002	2.187	5.609	1.479	4.119	5.6	33.6
2003	2.180	5.490	1.416	4.063	5.5	31.3
2004	2.153	5.342	1.362	3.969	5.4	30.2
2005	2.061	5.028	1.261	3.756	5.1	28.9
2006	1.906	4.582	1.120	3.453	4.6	26.7
2007	1.730	4.075	0.956	3.119	4.2	23.2
2008	1.701	4.005	0.946	3.059	4.1	21.6
2009	1.838	4.371	1.074	3.296	4.4	21.2
2010	1.919	4.598	1.163	3.435	4.6	20.9
2011	1.907	4.557	1.149	3.408	4.6	20.9

Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	TANF Child Recipients	
					As a Percent of All Children	As a Percent of All Poor Children
2012	1.852	4.402	1.104	3.298	4.4	20.3
2013	1.726	4.042	0.993	3.050	4.1	20.6
2014	1.650	3.957	1.007	2.949	4.0	NA

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the U.S. Census Bureau.

Notes: NA denotes not available. During transition reporting from AFDC to TANF, caseload statistics on adult and child recipients were not collected. For those years, TANF children as a percent of all children and percent of all poor children were estimated by HHS and published in *Welfare Indicators and Risk Factors, Annual Report to Congress*, Table TANF 2, p. A-7. See http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/14/indicators/rpt_indicators.pdf. Child poverty data for 2014 will not be available until September 2015.

Appendix B. State Tables

Table B-1. Use of FY2013 TANF and MOE Funds by Category

(Dollars in millions)

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Alabama	\$45.9	\$24.4	\$21.0	\$5.5	\$3.8	\$70.3	\$170.9
Alaska	38.7	4.6	12.6	27.4	0.6	5.4	89.2
Arizona	-21.8	44.4	8.8	10.1	0.2	337.7	379.4
Arkansas	13.2	14.0	23.5	8.6	3.2	94.2	156.6
California	3,225.3	556.6	507.3	840.4	183.5	1,718.7	7,031.8
Colorado	70.7	20.7	2.1	1.2	8.3	212.7	315.7
Connecticut	81.3	29.3	16.1	35.5	4.9	318.1	485.2
Delaware	12.9	-0.2	1.4	57.2	0.0	11.9	83.2
District of Columbia	59.0	7.4	37.4	76.4	16.0	57.4	253.7
Florida	173.2	30.3	58.4	342.7	5.5	387.4	997.5
Georgia	47.5	15.7	-0.7	22.2	20.1	389.1	493.9
Hawaii	64.1	14.9	94.7	13.0	4.0	53.9	244.5
Idaho	6.5	5.6	6.2	10.8	0.3	16.8	46.3
Illinois	81.0	27.5	31.1	645.5	25.1	350.7	1,160.9
Indiana	28.9	18.0	16.0	77.7	33.9	104.9	279.3
Iowa	54.1	7.1	15.9	44.2	13.3	76.1	210.7
Kansas	27.5	13.5	0.4	22.5	54.2	55.5	173.6
Kentucky	102.1	11.9	34.1	74.4	21.7	33.5	277.7
Louisiana	25.7	20.4	6.4	5.2	19.0	145.1	221.7

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Maine	49.8	2.7	12.4	9.9	11.9	9.2	95.9
Maryland	139.2	61.2	36.3	24.2	147.6	175.9	584.2
Massachusetts	338.7	33.3	6.5	296.2	109.3	354.3	1,138.4
Michigan	206.6	180.5	81.0	19.5	51.6	890.4	1,429.6
Minnesota	94.1	46.3	54.7	53.7	134.7	53.4	437.0
Mississippi	16.7	3.2	33.0	19.1	16.8	17.6	106.4
Missouri	101.3	9.4	17.4	42.3	0.0	232.7	403.1
Montana	15.3	8.4	12.1	10.0	0.0	7.8	53.6
Nebraska	24.2	3.5	19.4	23.5	36.0	2.3	108.9
Nevada	43.5	8.1	1.8	0.0	1.1	35.5	90.1
New Hampshire	23.9	12.0	6.9	8.8	1.3	20.1	73.0
New Jersey	304.0	81.5	87.6	73.2	190.5	558.1	1,295.0
New Mexico	53.1	10.7	8.7	36.3	47.6	57.1	213.5
New York	1,606.0	333.9	124.4	536.9	1,432.6	1,576.8	5,610.7
North Carolina	59.1	47.8	42.6	172.3	60.8	240.4	623.0
North Dakota	5.1	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.3	18.5	33.9
Ohio	301.9	146.0	36.1	382.0	9.9	126.5	1,002.3
Oklahoma	19.8	23.9	0.0	70.0	25.7	59.6	199.0
Oregon	141.8	37.3	17.1	11.1	3.8	112.8	324.0
Pennsylvania	271.5	80.0	78.1	395.4	9.5	208.2	1,042.8
Rhode Island	42.4	16.2	9.4	24.4	13.6	80.4	186.4
South Carolina	34.8	19.1	20.1	4.1	1.9	150.3	230.2
South Dakota	12.6	2.8	4.2	0.8	0.1	7.1	27.6

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Tennessee	108.2	31.4	71.2	29.5	0.0	77.7	318.1
Texas	75.4	68.3	87.8	26.8	5.6	591.0	854.9
Utah	23.2	7.6	18.0	10.5	0.3	18.1	77.6
Vermont	20.0	7.1	0.1	28.9	24.9	11.4	92.5
Virginia	100.5	22.3	52.7	30.8	8.7	66.0	281.0
Washington	201.7	59.9	159.5	130.7	2.5	308.9	863.3
West Virginia	31.0	26.2	1.8	10.4	29.8	45.4	144.6
Wisconsin	134.2	23.0	34.2	200.0	47.8	164.7	603.9
Wyoming	2.5	7.4	1.8	3.7	0.0	17.5	32.8
Totals	8,737.9	2,290.9	2,033.7	5,006.5	2,844.8	10,735.3	31,649.2

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

Notes: Negative entries denote adjustments for prior year reporting changes.

Table B-2. Use of FY2013 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percent of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Alabama	26.9%	14.3%	12.3%	3.2%	2.2%	41.1%	100.0%
Alaska	43.3	5.2	14.1	30.7	0.6	6.0	100.0
Arizona	-5.8	11.7	2.3	2.7	0.1	89.0	100.0
Arkansas	8.4	8.9	15.0	5.5	2.0	60.2	100.0
California	45.9	7.9	7.2	12.0	2.6	24.4	100.0
Colorado	22.4	6.6	0.7	0.4	2.6	67.4	100.0
Connecticut	16.8	6.0	3.3	7.3	1.0	65.6	100.0
Delaware	15.5	-0.2	1.7	68.7	0.0	14.3	100.0
District of Columbia	23.3	2.9	14.8	30.1	6.3	22.6	100.0
Florida	17.4	3.0	5.8	34.4	0.6	38.8	100.0
Georgia	9.6	3.2	-0.1	4.5	4.1	78.8	100.0
Hawaii	26.2	6.1	38.7	5.3	1.6	22.0	100.0
Idaho	14.2	12.1	13.5	23.3	0.6	36.4	100.0
Illinois	7.0	2.4	2.7	55.6	2.2	30.2	100.0
Indiana	10.4	6.4	5.7	27.8	12.1	37.6	100.0
Iowa	25.7	3.4	7.5	21.0	6.3	36.1	100.0
Kansas	15.8	7.8	0.2	13.0	31.2	32.0	100.0
Kentucky	36.8	4.3	12.3	26.8	7.8	12.1	100.0
Louisiana	11.6	9.2	2.9	2.4	8.6	65.4	100.0
Maine	51.9	2.8	12.9	10.3	12.4	9.6	100.0
Maryland	23.8	10.5	6.2	4.1	25.3	30.1	100.0
Massachusetts	29.8	2.9	0.6	26.0	9.6	31.1	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Michigan	14.5	12.6	5.7	1.4	3.6	62.3	100.0
Minnesota	21.5	10.6	12.5	12.3	30.8	12.2	100.0
Mississippi	15.7	3.0	31.0	17.9	15.8	16.5	100.0
Missouri	25.1	2.3	4.3	10.5	0.0	57.7	100.0
Montana	28.6	15.7	22.6	18.6	0.0	14.5	100.0
Nebraska	22.3	3.2	17.8	21.6	33.0	2.1	100.0
Nevada	48.2	9.0	2.0	0.0	1.3	39.4	100.0
New Hampshire	32.7	16.4	9.5	12.0	1.8	27.5	100.0
New Jersey	23.5	6.3	6.8	5.7	14.7	43.1	100.0
New Mexico	24.9	5.0	4.1	17.0	22.3	26.8	100.0
New York	28.6	6.0	2.2	9.6	25.5	28.1	100.0
North Carolina	9.5	7.7	6.8	27.7	9.8	38.6	100.0
North Dakota	15.0	11.7	11.9	3.0	3.8	54.6	100.0
Ohio	30.1	14.6	3.6	38.1	1.0	12.6	100.0
Oklahoma	10.0	12.0	0.0	35.2	12.9	29.9	100.0
Oregon	43.8	11.5	5.3	3.4	1.2	34.8	100.0
Pennsylvania	26.0	7.7	7.5	37.9	0.9	20.0	100.0
Rhode Island	22.7	8.7	5.1	13.1	7.3	43.2	100.0
South Carolina	15.1	8.3	8.7	1.8	0.8	65.3	100.0
South Dakota	45.7	10.0	15.3	2.9	0.4	25.7	100.0
Tennessee	34.0	9.9	22.4	9.3	0.0	24.4	100.0
Texas	8.8	8.0	10.3	3.1	0.6	69.1	100.0
Utah	29.9	9.8	23.2	13.5	0.3	23.3	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Vermont	21.7	7.7	0.1	31.2	27.0	12.3	100.0
Virginia	35.8	7.9	18.8	11.0	3.1	23.5	100.0
Washington	23.4	6.9	18.5	15.1	0.3	35.8	100.0
West Virginia	21.4	18.1	1.3	7.2	20.6	31.4	100.0
Wisconsin	22.2	3.8	5.7	33.1	7.9	27.3	100.0
Wyoming	7.5	22.5	5.4	11.1	0.0	53.4	100.0
Totals	27.6	7.2	6.4	15.8	9.0	33.9	100.0

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

Notes: Negative entries denote adjustments for prior year reporting changes.

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2013
(September 30, 2013, in millions of dollars)

State	Obligated but not Spent	Unobligated	Total Unspent Funds
Alabama	\$3.7	\$10.6	\$14.3
Alaska	0.0	69.7	69.7
Arizona	2.7	0.0	2.7
Arkansas	18.3	16.0	34.3
California	8.4	0.0	8.4
Colorado	0.0	19.1	19.1
Connecticut	0.0	6.3	6.3
Delaware	9.6	10.4	20.0
District of Columbia	6.5	54.4	60.9
Florida	29.6	0.5	30.1
Georgia	21.2	60.9	82.1
Hawaii	5.8	59.5	65.2
Idaho	31.7	0.0	31.7
Illinois	0.0	16.0	16.0
Indiana	238.1	21.7	259.7
Iowa	14.1	3.0	17.1
Kansas	11.6	32.3	43.9
Kentucky	0.0	3.5	3.5
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	0.0	24.6	24.6
Maryland	4.9	0.0	4.9
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	42.4	42.4
Minnesota	0.0	161.4	161.4
Mississippi	4.0	7.9	11.9
Missouri	22.3	-0.2	22.1
Montana	0.4	42.7	43.1
Nebraska	0.0	59.6	59.6
Nevada	0.0	12.7	12.7
New Hampshire	0.0	13.2	13.2
New Jersey	32.4	37.5	69.9
New Mexico	50.2	0.0	50.2
New York	273.4	104.0	377.4

State	Obligated but not Spent	Unobligated	Total Unspent Funds
North Carolina	192.6	3.5	196.1
North Dakota	0.0	15.8	15.8
Ohio	201.3	34.0	235.4
Oklahoma	53.3	0.0	53.3
Oregon	0.0	17.9	17.9
Pennsylvania	52.1	300.1	352.2
Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	0.0	12.4	12.4
South Dakota	0.0	14.9	14.9
Tennessee	0.0	59.3	59.3
Texas	152.7	0.0	152.7
Utah	0.0	109.2	109.2
Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	5.1	33.9	39.0
Washington	69.5	0.0	69.6
West Virginia	0.0	0.1	0.1
Wisconsin	0.0	12.9	12.9
Wyoming	3.2	21.2	24.5
Totals	1,518.7	1,525.0	3,043.7

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Cash Assistance by State, December 2014

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Alabama	14,835	35,066	26,859	8,207
Alaska	3,066	8,277	5,618	2,659
Arizona	12,193	27,292	20,203	7,089
Arkansas	5,447	12,171	8,908	3,263
California	626,297	1,745,407	1,237,834	507,573
Colorado	17,680	46,925	33,119	13,806
Connecticut	13,711	27,512	19,350	8,162
Delaware	4,670	13,178	8,071	5,107
District of Columbia	5,027	12,637	9,230	3,407

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Florida	50,288	87,711	72,331	15,380
Georgia	13,910	27,197	24,168	3,029
Guam	1,133	2,545	2,030	515
Hawaii	8,166	23,547	15,804	7,743
Idaho	1,903	2,830	2,708	122
Illinois	19,410	43,526	35,829	7,697
Indiana	9,753	19,736	17,745	1,991
Iowa	14,169	35,460	25,361	10,099
Kansas	6,478	15,424	11,453	3,971
Kentucky	26,486	53,071	42,998	10,073
Louisiana	5,619	12,686	11,006	1,680
Maine	23,345	48,172	26,662	21,510
Maryland	20,803	50,484	37,250	13,234
Massachusetts	63,094	149,391	101,532	47,859
Michigan	23,364	57,661	44,255	13,406
Minnesota	19,055	41,193	32,390	8,803
Mississippi	7,642	15,572	11,760	3,812
Missouri	28,870	70,128	48,501	21,627
Montana	3,068	7,457	5,595	1,862
Nebraska	5,803	14,029	11,455	2,574
Nevada	12,015	31,578	23,005	8,573
New Hampshire	5,816	14,185	9,698	4,487
New Jersey	26,397	61,824	44,981	16,843
New Mexico	11,522	34,081	26,864	7,217
New York	150,121	386,055	275,109	110,946
North Carolina	6,806	14,818	11,189	3,629
North Dakota	1,208	3,025	2,452	573
Ohio	61,872	118,421	100,551	17,870
Oklahoma	7,373	16,416	13,926	2,490
Oregon	57,659	174,750	109,621	65,129
Pennsylvania	68,231	170,018	122,507	47,511
Puerto Rico	11,818	32,495	20,228	12,267
Rhode Island	5,237	12,512	8,817	3,695
South Carolina	11,064	25,089	19,999	5,090
South Dakota	3,042	6,053	5,366	687
Tennessee	41,109	96,181	71,628	24,553
Texas	34,110	75,102	66,362	8,740

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Utah	4,004	9,894	7,204	2,690
Vermont	3,470	8,059	5,675	2,384
Virgin Islands	381	1,207	824	383
Virginia	26,293	57,457	42,359	15,098
Washington	36,004	81,972	57,822	24,150
West Virginia	8,130	17,407	13,342	4,065
Wisconsin	25,225	60,670	45,262	15,408
Wyoming	344	697	566	131
Totals	1,674,536	4,216,251	3,055,382	1,160,869

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Cash Assistance by State, December of Selected Years

State	1994	2007	2010	2013	2014	Percentage Change to 2014 from ...		
						1994	2007	2013
Alabama	47,903	18,584	24,212	18,394	14,835	-69.0%	-20.2%	-19.3%
Alaska	12,370	2,989	3,572	3,439	3,066	-75.2	2.6	-10.8
Arizona	72,158	37,122	19,366	14,036	12,193	-83.1	-67.2	-13.1
Arkansas	25,047	8,741	8,632	6,395	5,447	-78.3	-37.7	-14.8
California	923,358	477,465	601,286	533,081	626,297	-32.2	31.2	17.5
Colorado	40,244	9,094	8,064	17,270	17,680	-56.1	94.4	2.4
Connecticut	60,965	19,424	16,750	14,335	13,711	-77.5	-29.4	-4.4
Delaware	11,227	3,997	5,745	4,792	4,670	-58.4	16.8	-2.5
District of Columbia	27,420	5,237	9,410	6,021	5,027	-81.7	-4.0	-16.5
Florida	238,564	48,608	58,144	53,087	50,288	-78.9	3.5	-5.3
Georgia	141,154	22,740	20,686	16,481	13,910	-90.1	-38.8	-15.6
Guam	2,088	NA	1,260	1,342	1,133	-45.7	NA	-15.6
Hawaii	21,489	6,621	10,240	8,865	8,166	-62.0	23.3	-7.9
Idaho	8,953	1,527	1,848	1,838	1,903	-78.7	24.6	3.5
Illinois	241,091	20,562	27,177	20,354	19,410	-91.9	-5.6	-4.6
Indiana	69,933	31,103	31,461	11,195	9,753	-86.1	-68.6	-12.9
Iowa	38,022	19,762	21,037	16,126	14,169	-62.7	-28.3	-12.1

State	1994	2007	2010	2013	2014	Percentage Change to 2014 from ...		
						1994	2007	2013
Kansas	28,838	12,853	15,647	7,553	6,478	-77.5	-49.6	-14.2
Kentucky	76,824	29,323	31,336	29,488	26,486	-65.5	-9.7	-10.2
Louisiana	82,792	11,106	11,117	6,151	5,619	-93.2	-49.4	-8.6
Maine	22,025	12,235	15,435	26,604	23,345	6.0	90.8	-12.3
Maryland	80,890	20,466	26,160	21,310	20,803	-74.3	1.6	-2.4
Massachusetts	105,769	52,473	51,179	71,012	63,094	-40.3	20.2	-11.2
Michigan	209,695	69,327	67,596	29,782	23,364	-88.9	-66.3	-21.5
Minnesota	61,343	26,387	24,726	22,267	19,055	-68.9	-27.8	-14.4
Mississippi	53,221	11,631	12,078	9,260	7,642	-85.6	-34.3	-17.5
Missouri	91,802	39,054	39,617	32,172	28,870	-68.6	-26.1	-10.3
Montana	11,660	3,192	3,694	3,149	3,068	-73.7	-3.9	-2.6
Nebraska	15,427	7,515	8,406	6,379	5,803	-62.4	-22.8	-9.0
Nevada	15,559	7,410	11,066	11,914	12,015	-22.8	62.1	0.8
New Hampshire	11,078	4,497	6,168	6,080	5,816	-47.5	29.3	-4.3
New Jersey	113,293	34,175	35,153	28,658	26,397	-76.7	-22.8	-7.9
New Mexico	34,854	12,195	21,664	13,206	11,522	-66.9	-5.5	-12.8
New York	463,692	155,798	158,133	153,078	150,121	-67.6	-3.6	-1.9
North Carolina	128,848	24,544	23,639	18,575	6,806	-94.7	-72.3	-63.4
North Dakota	5,309	2,072	1,931	1,366	1,208	-77.2	-41.7	-11.6
Ohio	236,298	80,629	103,513	64,371	61,872	-73.8	-23.3	-3.9
Oklahoma	45,893	8,951	9,472	7,270	7,373	-83.9	-17.6	1.4
Oregon	39,967	19,299	33,123	45,270	57,659	44.3	198.8	27.4
Pennsylvania	208,949	55,389	59,034	69,667	68,231	-67.3	23.2	-2.1
Puerto Rico	56,132	12,356	14,621	12,818	11,818	-78.9	-4.4	-7.8
Rhode Island	22,599	8,349	6,778	5,815	5,237	-76.8	-37.3	-9.9
South Carolina	50,251	14,428	19,038	11,770	11,064	-78.0	-23.3	-6.0
South Dakota	6,521	2,904	3,290	3,204	3,042	-53.4	4.8	-5.1
Tennessee	105,616	55,161	63,150	50,850	41,109	-61.1	-25.5	-19.2
Texas	281,011	57,002	52,972	38,460	34,110	-87.9	-40.2	-11.3
Utah	17,240	5,140	6,811	4,382	4,004	-76.8	-22.1	-8.6
Vermont	9,707	4,242	3,335	3,638	3,470	-64.3	-18.2	-4.6
Virgin Islands	1,264	399	511	432	381	-69.9	-4.5	-11.8
Virginia	74,203	31,041	37,105	28,866	26,293	-64.6	-15.3	-8.9
Washington	102,603	52,013	69,805	42,747	36,004	-64.9	-30.8	-15.8
West Virginia	39,546	8,725	10,676	8,862	8,130	-79.4	-6.8	-8.3
Wisconsin	73,714	17,788	25,270	27,522	25,225	-65.8	41.8	-8.3

State	1994	2007	2010	2013	2014	Percentage Change to 2014 from ...		
						1994	2007	2013
Wyoming	5,400	265	312	380	344	-93.6	29.8	-9.5
Totals	4,971,819	1,703,910	1,952,451	1,671,379	1,674,536	-66.3	-1.8	0.2

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: Caseload data for 2007 through 2014 include those families in Separate State Programs with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-6. TANF Families by Number of Parents in Assisted Unit by State: December 2014

State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent
Alabama	8,028	129	6,678	54.1	0.9	45.0
Alaska	1,874	362	830	61.1	11.8	27.1
Arizona	6,197	356	5,640	50.8	2.9	46.3
Arkansas	3,092	110	2,245	56.8	2.0	41.2
California	344,136	110,621	171,540	54.9	17.7	27.4
Colorado	10,355	1,380	5,945	58.6	7.8	33.6
Connecticut	8,087	0	5,624	59.0	0.0	41.0
Delaware	1,586	22	3,062	34.0	0.5	65.6
District of Columbia	3,561	0	1,466	70.8	0.0	29.2
Florida	11,677	693	37,918	23.2	1.4	75.4
Georgia	2,946	0	10,964	21.2	0.0	78.8
Guam	363	106	664	32.0	9.4	58.6
Hawaii	4,712	1,871	1,583	57.7	22.9	19.4
Idaho	121	0	1,782	6.4	0.0	93.6
Illinois	6,731	0	12,679	34.7	0.0	65.3
Indiana	2,491	133	7,129	25.5	1.4	73.1
Iowa	8,235	863	5,071	58.1	6.1	35.8
Kansas	3,018	419	3,041	46.6	6.5	46.9
Kentucky	8,674	657	17,155	32.7	2.5	64.8
Louisiana	1,645	0	3,974	29.3	0.0	70.7
Maine	20,645	436	2,264	88.4	1.9	9.7
Maryland	13,322	0	7,481	64.0	0.0	36.0
Massachusetts	41,362	4,418	17,314	65.6	7.0	27.4
Michigan	12,067	0	11,297	51.6	0.0	48.4
Minnesota	8,949	0	10,106	47.0	0.0	53.0

State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent
Mississippi	3,783	0	3,859	49.5	0.0	50.5
Missouri	22,082	0	6,788	76.5	0.0	23.5
Montana	1,605	291	1,172	52.3	9.5	38.2
Nebraska	2,692	0	3,111	46.4	0.0	53.6
Nevada	5,681	1,388	4,946	47.3	11.6	41.2
New Hampshire	4,341	48	1,427	74.6	0.8	24.5
New Jersey	18,427	0	7,970	69.8	0.0	30.2
New Mexico	5,573	822	5,127	48.4	7.1	44.5
New York	96,025	3,129	50,967	64.0	2.1	34.0
North Carolina	3,354	144	3,308	49.3	2.1	48.6
North Dakota	572	0	636	47.4	0.0	52.6
Ohio	14,333	1,520	46,019	23.2	2.5	74.4
Oklahoma	2,490	0	4,883	33.8	0.0	66.2
Oregon	49,333	2,918	5,408	85.6	5.1	9.4
Pennsylvania	49,875	1,450	16,906	73.1	2.1	24.8
Puerto Rico	10,816	712	290	91.5	6.0	2.5
Rhode Island	3,150	319	1,768	60.1	6.1	33.8
South Carolina	5,277	0	5,787	47.7	0.0	52.3
South Dakota	687	0	2,355	22.6	0.0	77.4
Tennessee	23,199	182	17,728	56.4	0.4	43.1
Texas	8,740	0	25,370	25.6	0.0	74.4
Utah	2,102	0	1,902	52.5	0.0	47.5
Vermont	1,662	352	1,456	47.9	10.1	42.0
Virgin Islands	338	0	43	88.7	0.0	11.3
Virginia	15,477	0	10,816	58.9	0.0	41.1
Washington	17,759	3,093	15,152	49.3	8.6	42.1
West Virginia	3,224	0	4,906	39.7	0.0	60.3
Wisconsin	12,845	862	11,518	50.9	3.4	45.7
Wyoming	125	3	216	36.3	0.9	62.8
Totals	919,441	139,809	615,286	54.9	8.3	36.7

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-7. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and Work Participation Rates by State, All Families, FY2012

State	Caseload Reduction Credit (Percentage Points)	Effective (After Caseload Reduction Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard?
United States			34.4%	
Alabama	7.7	42.3%	46.0	Yes
Alaska	9.8	40.2	36.7	No
Arizona	38.0	12.0	27.1	Yes
Arkansas	50.0	0.0	40.2	Yes
California	0.0	50.0	27.2	No
Colorado	14.9	35.1	23.8	No
Connecticut	24.2	25.8	52.7	Yes
Delaware	12.8	37.2	41.5	Yes
District of Col.	17.8	32.2	34.8	Yes
Florida	9.7	40.3	45.1	Yes
Georgia	50.0	0.0	64.5	Yes
Guam	0.0	50.0	29.0	No
Hawaii	50.0	0.0	50.6	Yes
Idaho	0.0	50.0	49.8	No
Illinois	17.5	32.5	38.6	Yes
Indiana	38.8	11.2	31.0	Yes
Iowa	17.3	32.7	38.4	Yes
Kansas	39.8	10.2	28.4	Yes
Kentucky	19.6	30.4	53.3	Yes
Louisiana	34.8	15.2	26.8	Yes
Maine	0.0	50.0	34.9	No
Maryland	5.1	44.9	46.1	Yes
Massachusetts	24.2	25.8	39.7	Yes
Michigan	12.5	37.5	43.1	Yes
Minnesota	8.8	41.2	45.3	Yes
Mississippi	26.8	23.2	67.6	Yes
Missouri	12.9	37.1	20.5	No
Montana	3.1	46.9	47.3	Yes
Nebraska	50.0	0.0	53.4	Yes
Nevada	2.9	47.1	35.1	No
New Hampshire	0.0	50.0	73.0	Yes

State	Caseload Reduction Credit (Percentage Points)	Effective (After Caseload Reduction Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard?
New Jersey	47.6	2.4	19.6	Yes
New Mexico	16.1	33.9	46.0	Yes
New York	31.4	18.6	31.6	Yes
North Carolina	29.4	20.6	47.3	Yes
North Dakota	36.0	14.0	71.1	Yes
Ohio	0.0	50.0	61.9	Yes
Oklahoma	25.8	24.2	24.7	Yes
Oregon	0.0	50.0	33.8	No
Pennsylvania	21.4	28.6	29.8	Yes
Puerto Rico	9.0	41.0	16.3	No
Rhode Island	0.0	50.0	10.0	No
South Carolina	0.0	50.0	36.8	No
South Dakota	0.0	50.0	55.0	Yes
Tennessee	28.5	21.5	30.5	Yes
Texas	43.4	6.6	29.1	Yes
Utah	24.8	25.2	41.4	Yes
Vermont	4.7	45.3	42.2	No
Virgin Islands	42.9	7.1	15.1	Yes
Virginia	7.0	43.0	42.6	No
Washington	32.7	17.3	11.1	No
West Virginia	11.9	38.1	38.7	Yes
Wisconsin	0.0	50.0	32.4	No
Wyoming	0.6	49.4	79.4	Yes

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Table B-8. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and Work Participation Rates by State, Two-Parent Families, FY2012

State	Caseload Reduction Credit (Percentage Points)	Effective (After Caseload Reduction Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard?
United States			33.9%	
Alabama	56.5	33.5%	40.0	Yes
Alaska	18.9	71.1	38.1	No
Arizona	38.0	52.0	66.1	Yes
Arkansas	53.7	36.3	27.4	No
California	0.0	90.0	30.8	No
Colorado	14.9	75.1	20.1	No
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Col.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	19.4	70.6	53.0	No
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Guam	0.0	90.0	62.3	No
Hawaii	55.6	34.4	58.7	Yes
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	38.8	51.2	24.0	No
Iowa	45.8	44.2	29.3	No
Kansas	39.8	50.2	30.8	No
Kentucky	19.6	70.4	51.8	No
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	0.0	90.0	19.0	No
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	24.2	65.8	83.9	Yes
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	34.1	55.9	56.6	Yes
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	2.9	87.1	41.6	No
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	Caseload Reduction Credit (Percentage Points)	Effective (After Caseload Reduction Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard?
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	16.1	73.9	53.5	No
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	29.4	60.6	63.6	Yes
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	0.0	90.0	60.1	No
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	0.0	90.0	8.7	No
Pennsylvania	72.7	17.3	54.0	Yes
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	0.0	90.0	6.3	No
South Carolina	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	4.7	85.3	52.2	No
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	32.7	57.3	11.8	No
West Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	0.0	90.0	16.9	No
Wyoming	0.6	89.4	77.4	No

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: NA denotes that the state does not have two-parent families in their TANF or MOE programs.

Author Contact Information

Gene Falk
Specialist in Social Policy
gfalk@crs.loc.gov, 7-7344