

A PRB/KIDS COUNT Special Report

# CHILDREN AT RISK

STATE TRENDS 1990-2000

A FIRST LOOK AT CENSUS 2000  
SUPPLEMENTARY SURVEY DATA

## **KIDS COUNT**

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.

## **POPULATION REFERENCE BUREAU**

Founded in 1929, the Population Reference Bureau (PRB) is the leader in providing timely, objective information on U.S. and international population trends and their implications. PRB informs policymakers, educators, the media, and concerned citizens working in the public interest around the world through a broad range of activities, including publications, information services, seminars and workshops, and technical support. PRB is a nonprofit, nonadvocacy organization whose efforts are supported by government contracts, foundation grants, individual and corporate contributions, and proceeds from the sale of publications.



# CHILDREN AT RISK

STATE TRENDS 1990-2000

A FIRST LOOK AT CENSUS 2000  
SUPPLEMENTARY SURVEY DATA

*Children at Risk: State Trends 1990-2000* can be viewed in a downloadable PDF version or ordered at [www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org). This report is also available as a PDF on the Population Reference Bureau's website at [www.prb.org](http://www.prb.org).

This *PRB/KIDS COUNT Special Report* could not have been produced without the help of numerous people. Staff at the Population Reference Bureau (PRB), including Mark Mather, Kerri Rivers, and Kelvin Pollard, were instrumental in determining what measures to include in the report, obtaining the required data, and checking the figures at every step in the process. We owe a special debt of gratitude to Kerri Rivers at the Population Reference Bureau who worked tirelessly assembling, organizing, checking, and rechecking the figures seen here. We also want to recognize Yvette Collymore at PRB for her skillful editing of the text for this publication. Staff in the KIDS COUNT program at the Annie E. Casey Foundation, including William O'Hare and Megan Reynolds, also contributed at every stage of the process.

Assembling this publication required many decisions regarding which measures to include and how those measures should be labeled. We are indebted to the PRB/KIDS COUNT Census Advisory Committee

for their help with these issues. The members include Laura Beavers, Joan Benso, Brett Brown, Mike Crawford, Roderick Harrison, Don Hernandez, Ken Hodges, Rich Huddleston, Laura Lippman, Tom McDonald, Louisa Miller, Martin O'Connell, Kelly O'Donnell, Terry Schooley, and Matthew Snipp.

A special thanks goes to the U.S. Census Bureau for providing us with access to the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey data files.

Special thanks are also due Sam Shelton, Scott Rier, Mike Joosse, M. Jenny Harrington, and Beverley Hunter of KINETIK Communication Graphics, Inc., who were responsible for the design of the book; Jayson Hait at eye4detail for proofreading and copyediting; and staff at Communications Consortium Media Center, especially Phil Sparks, for assisting in the promotion and dissemination of this publication.

Finally, we would like to thank the state KIDS COUNT projects listed on page 108 for distributing this report to state and local leaders across the country.

To obtain additional copies of this publication, visit [www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org), call 410.223.2890, or write to the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Attn: *KIDS COUNT Special Reports*, 701 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, MD 21202.

© 2002 Annie E. Casey Foundation

Permission to copy, disseminate, or otherwise use information from this *PRB/KIDS COUNT Special Report* is granted as long as appropriate acknowledgment is given.

Designed by KINETIK Communication Graphics, Inc.  
Data compiled by the Population Reference Bureau

Printed and bound in the United States of America on recycled paper using soy-based inks.

<b>4</b>	<b>Introduction</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Summary and Findings</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>National Profile</b>
<b>23</b>	National Indicator Map
<b>24</b>	United States Profile
<b>25</b>	<b>State Profiles</b>
<b>77</b>	<b>Appendices</b>
<b>78</b>	Appendix 1: Number of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000
<b>86</b>	Appendix 2: Percentage of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000
<b>94</b>	Appendix 3: States Ranked by Percent Change, 1990-2000
<b>98</b>	Appendix 4: States Ranked by Percentage in 2000
<b>102</b>	<b>Definitions and Data Sources</b>
<b>108</b>	<b>Primary Contacts for State KIDS COUNT Projects</b>

# **INTRODUCTION**

We prepared this *PRB/KIDS COUNT Special Report* to increase public awareness and understanding of recent changes in the welfare of children in this country. Too often, decisions that affect children are made without good statistical information. And when data are lacking, decisions are likely to be based on anecdotes, ideology, or conjecture. Although national figures can provide some guidance for decision-makers, increasingly, state (and local) data are needed to inform policy decisions. This report, based on reliable state data from a trusted source, provides a first look at state trends over the past decade.

This report, with its focus on states, is particularly timely, given the recent shift in power from national to state government. The so-called “devolution revolution” has given state policymakers more discretion in setting policies and program rules regarding initiatives affecting children.

An assessment of changes in child well-being is timely because many of the social, economic, policy, and demographic changes that took place in the United States during the 1990s had important implications for children and families throughout the country. The following are a few examples:

- **Welfare reform ended “welfare as we know it” and ushered in a new relationship between the government and poor families.**
- **Increased immigration produced a national population where one-fifth of all children are now immigrants or children of foreign-born parents.**
- **The percentage of mothers in the labor force reached an all-time high.**
- **The number of children in the United States grew by more than 8 million—the largest increase since the 1950s.**

Data released by the U.S. Census Bureau in November 2001 provide the measures needed for a state-by-state examination of trends in the well-being of

children and families. In this publication, we assessed changes over the past decade by comparing figures from the 1990 Decennial Census with similar figures from a special U.S. Census Bureau survey called the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS). The C2SS was fielded during 2000 to test the methodology for the U.S. Census Bureau’s new American Community Survey (ACS) and to benchmark data from the ACS against the decennial census. (See page 20 for more details about the C2SS.)

While the data collected in the C2SS are similar to data collected in the 2000 Decennial Census, the C2SS data are available about a year earlier than comparable 2000 Census data. Moreover, several of the measures used here are not available in standard tables from the U.S. Census Bureau. We obtained these data through a special arrangement with the U.S. Census Bureau.

This publication looks at changes in 11 key measures of child well-being between 1990 and 2000. Changes are provided on a state-by-state basis, and national figures are presented with state figures to help readers quickly ascertain whether a state has improved more than average over the 1990s and which dimensions of children’s lives have changed the most over the past decade.

The page layout is designed to focus readers’ attention on comparative changes between 1990 and 2000. It is important to recognize that the perspective reflected in this publication, highlighting state changes in child well-being that occurred between 1990 and 2000, is distinctly different from comparisons of child well-being at a single point in time, say, 2000. For example, the child poverty rate in Mississippi fell by

21 percent between 1990 and 2000. However, despite the decrease, Mississippi still had one of the highest child poverty rates in the country in 2000. Thus, while some states improved dramatically during the 1990s, they may still be below average compared with other states in 2000. In fact, states that were doing relatively poorly in 1990 may find it easier to improve than those that were doing well in 1990. Similarly, a state may show little or no improvement over the decade, but may still be among the top states based on 2000 data. To use a sports analogy, this is like the distinction between the most improved player and the most valuable player in the league. Both dimensions are important, but they are quite distinct.

While the focus of this publication is on change over time, data showing how states rank based solely on 2000 data are in Appendix 4. The 2000 data underscore the enormous disparities among the states. For example, the child poverty rates in Louisiana and West Virginia (28 percent each) are four times the rate in New Hampshire (7 percent). Other measures show similar disparities, indicating that states are starting from very different places in their attempts to assist needy children.

This report, with its focus on states, is particularly timely, given the recent shift in power from national to state government. The so-called “devolution revolution” has given state policymakers more discretion in setting policies and program rules regarding initiatives affecting children.

During the first half of the 1990s, many state governments modified or eliminated programs through direct legislation. Michigan, for example, eliminated the

General Assistance program that had provided help primarily to low-income, single adults. Many states obtained waivers from the federal government to modify federally funded welfare programs. In 1992, Bill Clinton was elected president, promising to “end welfare as we know it.” By 1996, a Republican-controlled Congress had passed major welfare reform legislation, which replaced the 60-year-old Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) program with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and gave states more control over their programs. More public-policy decisions that affect children’s lives are now being made in state capitals rather than in Washington.

The shift from federal to state decision-making also has created a demand for better state-level data on children and families. It has become clear that states’ opportunities, constraints, and outcomes are closely linked to the social and economic forces operating in states and local areas. This publication illustrates some of the important state-level indicators that will be available from the ACS on a regular basis, assuming that it is fully funded in 2003.

# **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS**

The broad array of data presented in this *PRB/KIDS COUNT Special Report* is intended to illuminate state-by-state trends in the well-being of America's children from 1990 to 2000. States can also use these data to compare the status of their children with children in other states across several specific dimensions of child well-being.

Although the 11 measures used here can hardly capture the full range of conditions shaping children's lives, we believe these indicators reflect a wide range of factors affecting child welfare. Moreover, they permit legitimate comparisons because they are consistent across states and over time.

Despite the enormous wealth in the United States, our child poverty rate is among the highest in the developed world.

The measures shown here are a combination of “outcomes” and “risk factors.” Although conceptually there are distinctions to be made between outcomes and risk factors, all of the measures used to rank states in this report are closely associated with problems for kids—either directly or indirectly.

The 11 key indicators of child well-being used here are from the 1990 Census and the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) and reflect the best available state-level data for each indicator. However, it is important to recognize that no data are perfect. Therefore, we urge readers to focus on relatively large differences—both across states and over time within a state. Small differences may reflect random fluctuations rather than real changes in the well-being of children. In light of the sampling error in these estimates, the figures presented here are rounded to whole numbers to avoid giving readers a false sense of precision. In addition to standard errors, there are many other sources of error in any survey data. For more information, visit the U.S.

Census Bureau’s website at [www.census.gov/c2ss/www/methodology/Accuracy.htm](http://www.census.gov/c2ss/www/methodology/Accuracy.htm). For more information about the standard errors associated with the sample data used in this report, contact Kerri Rivers at the Population Reference Bureau in Washington, DC, at 202.483.1100.

We include data for the District of Columbia in this publication, but we do not include DC in our rankings. The District is so different from any state that the comparisons are not meaningful. It is more useful to look at changes in the District of Columbia over the 1990s or to compare the District with other large cities.<sup>1</sup>

We did not create a composite index based on all 11 indicators because some key domains of child well-being, such as health status, are not reflected here.

Table 1 shows national changes from 1990 to 2000 in the 11 measures used in this report. Eight of the 11 measures improved between 1990 and 2000, although several decreased by only 1 percentage point. While these figures paint a relatively positive picture of changes in child well-being during the 1990s, the picture varies from state to state.

In the remainder of this section, each of the 11 indicators is discussed separately. This section offers some background about each indicator, how it is linked to child well-being, citations to related studies, and a discussion of the range of state changes.

With regard to the state pages that follow, it is important to keep in mind that a negative change (that is, a number preceded by a minus sign) is generally a sign of improvement because it indicates

that a problem is diminishing. We point this out because negative signs often are associated with negative trends, but that is not the case here.

It is also important to recognize that the trends shown here are based on two data points: 1990 and 2000. In some cases there is reason to believe that recent trends—at the end of the 1990s—are different from trends that occurred earlier in the decade. These year-to-year fluctuations are not reflected in data from two points in time.

Finally, some of the 1990 Census figures in this report differ from 1990 figures presented in the *KIDS COUNT Data Books*, which are based on annual data from the Current Population Survey and other sources.

**Percent of children living in poverty**

The percentage of children living 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.<sup>2</sup>

The data shown here are based on the official poverty measure as determined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. However, readers should note that a number of researchers are critical of the official measure,<sup>3</sup> and public opinion polls suggest that the current poverty line (\$17,463 for a family of two adults and two children in 2000) is unrealistically low.<sup>4</sup> The U.S. Census Bureau has recently started publishing a set of experimental poverty measures that incorporate many of the changes called for in a study by the National Academy of Sciences.<sup>5</sup>

**Table 1: National Changes in Child Well-Being, 1990-2000**

	1990	2000	Percent Change 1990-2000
Percent of children living in poverty	18%	17%	-6%
Percent of children living in single-parent families	24%	30%	25%
Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	29%	28%	-3%
Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	22%	19%	-14%
Percent of children living in low-income working families	19%	22%	16%
Percent of children living in households without a telephone	8%	4%	-50%
Percent of children living in households without a vehicle	9%	7%	-22%
Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	5%	6%	20%
Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	12%	11%	-8%
Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	10%	9%	-10%
Percent of children living in "high-risk" families	13%	12%	-8%

SOURCE: Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Despite the enormous wealth in the United States, our child poverty rate is among the highest in the developed world. One study that examined child poverty rates in 17 developed countries indicated that the child poverty rate in the United States was the highest among these countries (50 percent higher than the next highest country).<sup>6</sup> This finding was reinforced by a recent United Nations study of industrialized nations.<sup>7</sup> While 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, the enormous differences in governmental efforts to alleviate child poverty greatly accentuate the disparities.

Nationally, the child poverty rate declined by 6 percent during the 1990s, with the rate falling from 18 percent in 1990 to 17 percent in 2000. However, the decline in poverty was not uniform across all states. Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of children in poverty decreased in 29 states, increased in 16 states and the District of Columbia, and remained about the same in 5 states. Alaska had the largest increase in child poverty (30 percent), but still had a relatively low child poverty rate in 2000 (13 percent). States with the largest decreases in child poverty rates during the 1990s were Colorado and South Dakota (33 percent each) and Minnesota (31 percent).

In 2000, there were 12.4 million children living in poverty in the United States. Louisiana and West Virginia had the highest child poverty rates (28 percent each), and New Hampshire had the lowest rate at 7 percent.

### Percent of children living in single-parent families

The percentage of children living in single-parent families has risen steadily over the past few decades and is a growing concern among policymakers and the public. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that the number of children living with a single parent rose by more than 200 percent from 1960 to 2000.<sup>8</sup> Reducing the number of single-parent families, particularly those resulting from births to unmarried women, is a prominent focus of federal and state welfare reform legislation.

Much of the public interest is linked to the fact that children growing up in single-parent households typically do not have access to the same economic or human resources as children growing up in two-parent families. For example, 40 percent of children in female-headed families were poor in 2000.<sup>9</sup> Most single-parent families are headed by women, and the absence of fathers may have implications beyond economics. One recent study found that youths raised in fatherless families were much more likely to be incarcerated even after other factors, such as poverty, were taken into account.<sup>10</sup>

The long-term rise in divorce and single parenting has led some public officials to propose or enact policy interventions. For example, Louisiana has introduced a “covenant marriage” option, which makes it more difficult for couples to obtain a divorce. Several other state-level initiatives have focused on lowering the divorce rate. Oklahoma’s governor has announced a \$10 million initiative to reduce his state’s divorce rate by one-third. Utah has created a Commission on

Marriage to promote marriage preparation classes for high school students, and several states have passed or are contemplating legislation that would reduce the cost of a marriage license for couples who take a marriage preparation course.<sup>11</sup> Even the federal government has become involved; the 1996 welfare reform law has a provision that rewards states for lowering out-of-wedlock births.

It is important to understand that this report shows trends in single-parent families based on data for 1990 and 2000 only and does not necessarily reflect trends in the late 1990s. National-level data from other sources suggest that there was a rapid increase in the percentage of children living in single-parent families in the early 1990s followed by a slight decline late in the decade.<sup>12</sup>

The 1990 Census and the C2SS show that the percentage of children living in single-parent families increased from 24 percent in 1990 to 30 percent in 2000, a 25 percent increase. Of the 11 indicators examined in this publication, this is the only one that showed an increase in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. However, there was substantial variation in the magnitude of this increase, ranging from a low of 13 percent in New Jersey to a high of 60 percent in North Dakota.

In 2000, more than 21 million children lived in single-parent families. Mississippi had the highest percentage of children living in single-parent families (41 percent), followed by Louisiana (40 percent). The share of children in single-parent families was smallest in Utah (18 percent).

Most single-parent families are headed by women, and the absence of fathers may have implications beyond economics. One recent study found that youths raised in fatherless families were much more likely to be incarcerated even after other factors, such as poverty, were taken into account.

#### **Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment**

In 2000, more than 19 million children did not have a parent in the household who worked full-time, year-round. Although many of these children were poor, the problems associated with this situation went beyond the effects of poverty. According to a recent report by the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, “Secure parental employment may also enhance children’s psychological well-being and improve family functioning by reducing stress and other negative effects that unemployment and under-employment can have on parents.”<sup>13</sup> The belief that children are better off when their parents work was a key premise of the 1996 welfare reform act.

Because a working parent offers children a strong, positive role model, a child who grows up in a family without a regularly employed parent does not experience the positive effects that such a parental figure offers. Also, some scholars note that the routinization

Research has shown that more educated parents limit television watching and encourage reading, studying, and other behaviors that may lead to more positive academic outcomes for children.

of household schedules that typically accompanies full-time work is beneficial to children.

However, many parents who are unable to find regular employment end up working at temporary or part-time jobs that do not provide enough money to support a family, that are often at odd hours requiring unusual child-care arrangements, and that offer little overall stability.

Nationally, the percentage of children in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment declined slightly from 29 percent in 1990 to 28 percent in 2000. Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of children without a parent in the household who worked full-time, year-round increased in 13 states, decreased in 27 states and the District of Columbia, and stayed about the same in 10 states. Minnesota (17 percent decrease), Texas (16 percent decrease), and Louisiana (15 percent decrease) improved the most. North Dakota (21 percent increase), North Carolina (20 percent increase), and Hawaii (19 per-

cent increase) experienced the largest increases.

In 2000, there were 19.1 million children living in families where no parent had full-time, year-round employment. Alaska had the highest percentage of children without a parent who worked full-time, year-round in 2000 (43 percent), and New Hampshire had the lowest percentage (19 percent).

#### **Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout**

The human resources parents bring to a family have important implications for the socialization of their children. Parents without a high school diploma are less likely to provide their children with an environment that is educationally stimulating. Research has shown that more educated parents limit television watching and encourage reading, studying, and other behaviors that may lead to more positive academic outcomes for children.<sup>14</sup> Children with well-educated parents also score higher on standardized tests, are more likely to visit libraries, and are more likely to read books in their free time.<sup>15</sup>

While this measure does not provide a complete picture of the education levels of every adult in a household, the education of the household head is closely related to the general education level in a household. Also, this measure is useful because it can be applied to all children, regardless of their living arrangements.

Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout declined from 22 percent to 19 percent, reflecting a long-term, nationwide trend of improved

high school graduation rates. However, there were five states where the percentage of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout increased: Alaska (27 percent), Wyoming (10 percent), Colorado (7 percent), Oklahoma (5 percent), and New Mexico (4 percent). Among the states with the most improvement on this indicator were South Dakota (46 percent decrease), Vermont (43 percent decrease), and Hawaii (41 percent decrease).

Nationwide in 2000, there were 13.5 million children living in families where the household head was a high school dropout. In 2000, California, at 29 percent, had the highest percentage of children living in households where the household head was a high school dropout, followed by Texas, at 28 percent. South Dakota had the lowest rate at 7 percent.

#### **Percent of children living in low-income working families**

While parental work and income are widely viewed as beneficial to children, many low-income working families do not earn enough money to provide health care, child care, and other critical services that working families need.<sup>16</sup>

During the 1990s, the number of children in low-income working families (at least one parent worked 50 or more weeks a year, but family income was below 200 percent of the poverty threshold) increased from 10.8 million to 14.2 million. In 1990, 19 percent of all children were living in low-income working families; by 2000, the figure had risen to 22 percent.

This measure is more difficult to interpret than the other measures included in this report. If the number

of working-poor families is increasing because parents are moving from long-term welfare dependency to work, then an increase is probably a positive change for children. On the other hand, if an increase means more of the parents who are working full-time, year-round are not able to lift their families out of “poverty,” then this reflects a worsening situation for children.

Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of children who lived in low-income working families increased in 34 states and the District of Columbia, decreased in 11 states, and stayed about the same in 5 states. The 3 states with the largest decreases were Utah (23 percent), followed by Idaho and South Dakota (21 percent each). The states with the largest increases in the percentage of kids in low-income working families were California and Maryland (50 percent each), Connecticut (44 percent), and Nevada (42 percent). The District of Columbia also had a 50 percent increase in this measure over the decade.

Nationwide in 2000, there were 14.2 million children living in low-income working families. In 2000, New Mexico (33 percent) had a higher percentage of children living in low-income working families than any other state, and Alaska (11 percent) had the smallest share of children in low-income working families.

#### **Percent of children living in households without a telephone**

The direct impact on children of living without a telephone at home is difficult to assess. However, it is noteworthy that 18 percent of 16- to 19-year-olds who have dropped out of high school do not have a phone at home, compared with 4 percent of teens who have

not dropped out of school.<sup>17</sup> While the cause-and-effect relationship is unclear, this statistic underscores the disadvantages faced by children without a phone at home. Moreover, outreach programs that rely on telephone contact miss a significant segment of needy kids. For example, a recent court decision in Texas found that the high rate of “phonelessness” among low-income families confounded state efforts to provide medical assistance.<sup>18</sup>

Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of children living in households without a telephone decreased in every state and the District of Columbia. States that improved by 75 percent or more between 1990 and 2000 include Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, and Washington. Indiana showed the least improvement, with an 11 percent decrease. Most states reduced rates of phonelessness by at least 50 percent over the decade.

Nationally, about 2.6 million children (4 percent) lived in households without a telephone in 2000.<sup>19</sup> New Mexico stands out as the only state where more than 10 percent of children lived in households without a telephone in 2000. Maine had the lowest rate at less than 0.5 percent.

#### **Percent of children living in households without a vehicle**

While policymakers and economists increasingly extoll the need to think about regional, national, and global economies, many families living in our poorest neighborhoods find it extremely difficult to work or shop outside their immediate community because they have neither a car nor access to reliable public transporta-

tion. Although many moderate- and upper-income families have more than one vehicle, half of the children in low-income urban areas live in households that do not have a car.<sup>20</sup> In light of a welfare reform approach that requires most parents in low-income families to work, it is difficult to overstate the importance of having a dependable vehicle. C2SS data show that 88 percent of workers used private vehicles to get to work in 2000.<sup>21</sup>

While communication and transportation are among the most obvious types of connections that are missing for many families living in poor neighborhoods, they often reflect more serious levels of isolation. Such isolation leaves these families disconnected from economic opportunity, meaningful social support systems, and the services and institutions that help families succeed.

Nationally, the percentage of children living in households without a vehicle fell from 9 percent in 1990 to 7 percent in 2000. The percentage of children without access to vehicles decreased in 35 states and the District of Columbia, stayed about the same in 11 states, and increased in only 4 states—Indiana (33 percent), Hawaii (25 percent), Arizona (17 percent), and Rhode Island (17 percent). States with the most improvement include Colorado, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Vermont, each with at least a 50 percent decrease.

In 2000, there were about 5 million children living in households without a vehicle. The states with the smallest share of children without access to vehicles were Idaho, Maine, and South Dakota, with 1 percent each. In contrast, 23 percent of children in

New York lacked access to a vehicle in 2000. In New York and possibly a few other states, the relatively high percentage of children living in households without a vehicle reflects the high concentration of people in urban areas where reliable public transportation is easily available.

#### **Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)**

The wave of immigration to the United States between 1990 and 2000, especially from Mexico and other non-English-speaking countries, has resulted in an increase in the number of children who have difficulty speaking English. The Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics reports that “children who speak languages other than English at home and who also have difficulty speaking English may face greater challenges progressing in school and, once they become adults, in the labor market.”<sup>22</sup> Difficulty speaking English may be partially responsible for high dropout rates among immigrant children.<sup>23</sup>

In the C2SS, ability to speak English is determined for individuals who speak a language other than English at home. The measure is defined as the share of children ages 5 to 17 who do not speak English at home and speak English less than “very well.” This includes children who speak English “well,” “not well,” or “not at all.” Questionnaire responses on the ability to speak English represent either the person’s own perception of his or her English-language ability or, in the case of most children, the perception of another household member.

In light of a welfare reform approach that requires most parents in low-income families to work, it is difficult to overstate the importance of having a dependable vehicle. C2SS data show that 88 percent of workers used private vehicles to get to work in 2000.

Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of children who have difficulty speaking English increased in 18 states, decreased in 11 states and the District of Columbia, and stayed about the same in 21 states. Delaware, Kansas, Louisiana, and West Virginia showed the most improvement on this indicator, while Nebraska and Oklahoma showed the largest increases in children with difficulty speaking English. (We urge readers to use caution when interpreting these figures because some of the changes seen in this indicator may be due to small sample sizes and/or small base percentages.) Nationally, the percentage of children with difficulty speaking English increased slightly, from 5 percent to 6 percent, over the decade.

Nationwide in 2000, there were almost 3 million children ages 5 to 17 who had difficulty speaking English. California had the highest percentage of children with difficulty speaking English (14 percent), and West Virginia had the lowest rate (less than 0.5 percent).

The more risk factors that children have in their lives, the higher the odds that they will suffer one or more negative outcomes (such as dropping out of high school, getting arrested, or having a baby) before reaching adulthood.

#### Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)

Graduating from high school is critical for both going to college and finding a good job. In many school systems around the country, a high percentage of students stay in school and graduate on time. However, many students attend schools where graduating on time with a solid education is more the exception than the rule. In high-poverty neighborhoods in large cities (neighborhoods with poverty rates above 20 percent), for example, one-fifth of 16- to 19-year-olds were high school dropouts in 1999.<sup>24</sup>

Teens who drop out of high school find it difficult to achieve financial success. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation indicate that high school dropouts are about three times as likely to slip into poverty as those who have finished high school.<sup>25</sup> Also, as a report from the U.S. Department of Education concludes, "In terms of employment, earnings, and family formation,

dropouts from high school face difficulties in making the transition to the adult world."<sup>26</sup> As America moves further into the 21st century, when advanced skills and technical knowledge will be required for most well-paying jobs, the prospects for those who have not completed high school will be even more dismal.

Indeed, ongoing changes in the U.S. economy over the past quarter century have increased the financial costs of dropping out of high school. Between 1973 and 1999, for example, the average hourly wage (adjusted for inflation) of high school dropouts fell 24 percent.<sup>27</sup> The deterioration of wages among poorly educated workers has hit the youngest workers the hardest, and this factor often is implicated in the deterioration of family formation and family stability among young adults.<sup>28</sup>

Nationwide, the percentage of high school dropouts fell from 12 percent in 1990 to 11 percent in 2000. Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of teens who dropped out of high school fell in 27 states and the District of Columbia, stayed about the same in 7 states, and increased in 16 states. States with the most improvement include Hawaii, Maine, and North Dakota, each with a 40 percent or greater decrease in the percentage of high school dropouts. The percentage of high school dropouts increased most dramatically in New Mexico (31 percent), Arizona (27 percent), and Wyoming (25 percent).

In 2000, there were 1.6 million teenagers between the ages of 16 and 19 who were high school dropouts. Arizona had the highest high school dropout rate at 19 percent, and North Dakota had the lowest rate at 3 percent.

### Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)

During late adolescence, young people make critical choices that affect their transition to adulthood. The percentage of teens not attending school and not working (sometimes referred to as “idle teens” or “disconnected youth”) reflects the roughly 1.3 million 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. Those individuals who have dropped out of school are clearly vulnerable, but many others who have finished school but are not working also are marginalized. Work experience at this stage in life is critical, and people who spend a large share of their young adult years unemployed have a hard time finding and keeping a job later in life.

Nationwide, there was a decline in the percentage of 16- to 19-year-olds who were neither attending school nor working (from 10 percent in 1990 to 9 percent in 2000). The percentage of idle teens increased in 11 states, stayed about the same in 10 states, and decreased in 29 states and the District of Columbia. Maine and Minnesota, each with a 50 percent or greater decrease in the percentage of idle teens, showed the most improvement. The percentage of idle teens increased by at least 25 percent in 3 states: Hawaii, Idaho, and Utah.

In 2000, there were 1.3 million idle teens in the United States. At the state level, Louisiana had the highest percentage of idle teens in 2000 (15 percent), and Maine and Minnesota had the lowest rates (3 percent each).

### Percent of children living in “high-risk” families

The family risk index<sup>29</sup> is a composite of four risk factors:

- **Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line**
- **Child lives in a single-parent family**
- **Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment**
- **Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout**

The more risk factors that children have in their lives, the higher the odds that they will suffer one or more negative outcomes (such as dropping out of high school, getting arrested, or having a baby) before reaching adulthood. In our analysis, children living in families with three or more of these risk factors are categorized as “high risk.” This approach to measuring risk has been used by other researchers.<sup>30</sup>

Nationally, the percentage of high-risk children fell slightly, from 13 percent in 1990 to 12 percent in 2000. Nine states and the District of Columbia experienced an increase in the percentage of high-risk children, 13 states showed no change, and 28 showed a decrease. Minnesota showed the most improvement in the percentage of high-risk children (a 38 percent decrease), followed by South Dakota (a 36 percent decrease), Michigan (a 33 percent decrease), and Colorado (a 30 percent decrease). Alaska had the greatest increase in children at risk (57 percent), followed by Oregon (40 percent) and Rhode Island (23 percent).

Nationwide in 2000, there were 8.2 million high-risk children. Mississippi had the highest percentage of high-risk children (20 percent), and Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Utah had the lowest rates (5 percent each).

## About the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey and the American Community Survey

The Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) is a special nationwide survey of 700,000 households that the U.S. Census Bureau conducted during calendar year 2000, using the questionnaire and methodology from the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS, when fully implemented, is designed to provide social, economic, and housing data for states and communities annually. Such local-area data currently are collected once every 10 years in the long form of the decennial census.

The year 2000 presented a special opportunity for the ACS. Having data from the ACS and the census in the same year allowed the U.S. Census Bureau to benchmark the ACS data against the decennial census. The Bureau conducted the C2SS to compare results for states and selected communities with data from the long form of the 2000 Census. The C2SS also was undertaken to demonstrate the operational feasibility of conducting the ACS at the same time as the decennial census.

However, the C2SS provides an additional benefit: For each state and for communities

of at least 250,000 people, it provides the first detailed data on social, economic, and housing characteristics since the 1990 Census—a full year before the U.S. Census Bureau releases official results for all states from the 2000 Census long form.

Results from the C2SS can be compared with 1990 Census results on many characteristics, allowing users to track trends over the decade. However, there are some important differences between the C2SS data and results from the census long form. First, unlike Census 2000, which has a specific reference date (population defined as of April 1), C2SS results reflect annual averages of monthly data. Second, the C2SS uses a “de facto,” or “current,” residence rule; persons are counted at a temporary residence if they are staying there for more than 2 months. By contrast, the census counts people at their “usual residence” as of the reference date.

Other differences between the two surveys include data collection elements (such as the way interviewers are trained and the nature of follow-up for nonresponse),

the population figures that are used as control totals, population coverage, weighting, and even the wording and design of some questions.

Assuming that it receives government funding, the U.S. Census Bureau will begin nationwide implementation of the ACS in 2003 by surveying about 3 million households annually. Beginning in mid-2004, the public can expect to receive census-type data (annual social, economic, and housing characteristics) for every state and for communities of 65,000 or more. Later in the decade, the U.S. Census Bureau will provide estimates for smaller communities and population areas. These estimates also will be updated annually.

By 2010, when the ACS is scheduled to replace the census long form, demographic and socioeconomic information will be available yearly for every community in the nation. This increased availability of data for local communities will provide state and local decision-makers such as governors, mayors, and legislators with up-to-date information about their states and local areas. These data will be useful in guiding legislation and formulating social services and

other programs for constituents. The information also will be useful for policy analysts and scholars.

One of the purposes of this publication is to highlight the kinds of analyses that will be possible when the ACS becomes fully operational in 2003. The C2SS data used here show the kind of information that will be available every year, assuming that the ACS is fully implemented.

More information about the C2SS is available at [www.census.gov/c2ss/www/](http://www.census.gov/c2ss/www/). Details about the ACS are available at [www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/).

## Endnotes


1. In February 2001, the Annie E. Casey Foundation published *The Right Start: Conditions of Babies and Their Families in America's Largest Cities*, which provides information on birth outcomes in 55 large American cities. The 2002 *Right Start* report is available on the KIDS COUNT website. In February 1997, the Casey Foundation published the *CITY KIDS COUNT* report, which provides comparable data on child well-being for the 50 largest cities in the country. To obtain a free copy of these publications, call 410.223.2890 or visit the KIDS COUNT website at [www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org).
2. Mayer, Susan E., 1997, *What Money Can't Buy: Family Income and Children's Life Chances*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, Table 3.1; and Children's Defense Fund, 1994, *Wasting America's Future*, Washington, DC.
3. National Research Council, 1995, *Measuring Poverty: A New Approach*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
4. Kull, Steven, 1994, *Fighting Poverty in America: A Study of American Public Attitudes*, Center for Study of Public Attitudes, Washington, DC; and O'Hare, William P., Taynia Mann, Kathryn Porter, and Robert Greenstein, 1990, *Real Life Poverty in America: Where the American Public Would Set the Poverty Line*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, DC.
5. Short, Kathleen, 2001, "Experimental Poverty Measures: 1999," *Current Population Reports*, Series P60-216, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC; and Iceland, John, 2000, "Poverty Among Working Families: Findings From Experimental Poverty Measures, 1998," *Current Population Reports*, Series P23-203, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC; and Short, Kathleen, Thesia Garner, David Johnson, and Patricia Doyle, 1999, "Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1997," *Current Population Reports*, Series P60-205, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
6. Rainwater, Lee, and Timothy M. Smeeding, 1995, "Doing Poorly: The Real Income of American Children in a Comparative Perspective," Working Paper No. 127, Luxembourg Income Study, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.
7. UNICEF, *The State of the World's Children 2000*, UNICEF, New York, NY, p. 76.
8. U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, "Living Arrangements of Children Under 18 Years Old: 1960 to Present," available online at [www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-am/tabCH-1.txt](http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-am/tabCH-1.txt) (accessed October 29, 2001).
9. U.S. Census Bureau, 2001, "Age, Sex, Household Relationship, Race and Hispanic Origin—Poverty Status of People by Selected Characteristics in 2000," table available online at [ferret.bls.census.gov/macro/032001/pov/new01\\_006.htm](http://ferret.bls.census.gov/macro/032001/pov/new01_006.htm) (accessed October 31, 2001).
10. Harper, Cynthia C., and Sara S. McLanahan, 1998, "Father Absence and Youth Incarceration," paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA, August.
11. *The Washington Post*, 2001, "Help Before the Honeymoon," February 25, p. C1.
12. O'Hare, William, 2001, "The Rise—and Fall—of Single-Parent Families," *Population Today*, Vol. 29, No. 5, the Population Reference Bureau, Washington, DC.
13. Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2001, *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, p. 16.
14. Bianchi, Suzanne M., 1999, "Using the Results of the 2000 Census to Measure the Well-Being of Children," Background Paper, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Population Reference Bureau.
15. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, 2000, "Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children and Youth," available online at [aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/00trends/index.htm](http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/00trends/index.htm) (accessed October 29, 2001).
16. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, 1999, "Access to Child Care for Low-Income Working Families," available online at [www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ccb/research/ccreport/ccreport.htm](http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ccb/research/ccreport/ccreport.htm) (accessed December 12, 2001); and the Urban Institute, 2000, "Health Insurance, Access, and Use: United States," available online at [newfederalism.urban.org/pdf/discussion00-14.pdf](http://newfederalism.urban.org/pdf/discussion00-14.pdf) (accessed December 12, 2001).
17. O'Hare, William, 2001, "Disconnected Kids: Children Without a Phone at Home," *KIDS COUNT SNAPSHOT*, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD, September.
18. *Frew et al. v. Gilbert et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:93CA65, U.S. Federal Court, Eastern District of Texas, Memorandum Opinion issued August 14, 2000, p. 100.
19. Data from the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey indicate a smaller number of children without a telephone than a recent report based on data from the March Current Population Survey. (See O'Hare, William, 2001, "Disconnected Kids: Children Without a Phone at Home," *KIDS COUNT SNAPSHOT*, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD, September.) Results from different surveys are expected to vary somewhat based on the wording of questions, the sample size, and the type of interview.
20. Child Trends analysis of the 1997 National Survey of America's Families, conducted by the Urban Institute, Washington, DC.
21. U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, "Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000," table available online at [www.census.gov/c2ss/www/Products/Profiles/2000/index.htm](http://www.census.gov/c2ss/www/Products/Profiles/2000/index.htm) (accessed December 21, 2001).
22. Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2001, *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, p. 5.
23. Fix, Michael et al., 2001, "The Integration of Immigrant Families in the United States," the Urban Institute, available online at [www.urban.org/immig/immig\\_integration.html](http://www.urban.org/immig/immig_integration.html) (accessed October 29, 2001).
24. Special tabulation of the March 1998 Current Population Survey from the U.S. Census Bureau.
25. U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, unpublished tabulations from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, available online at [www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povdynam/pov93t5.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povdynam/pov93t5.html) (accessed March 5, 2000).
26. National Center for Education Statistics, 1996, *Dropout Rates in the United States: 1994*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, p. viii.
27. Mishel, Lawrence, Jared Bernstein, and John Schmitt, 2000, *The State of Working America 2000-01*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, p. 153.
28. Wilson, William Julius, 1997, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, NY, Chapter 4.
29. The family risk index employed here is slightly different from the one used in the 1999 *KIDS COUNT Data Book*. One of the risk elements included in the *Data Book* (health insurance) was not measured in the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey or the 1990 Decennial Census. In addition, the Annie E. Casey Foundation no longer uses welfare receipt as a risk factor.
30. U.S. Census Bureau, 1997, *America's Children at Risk*, CENBR/97-2, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

# **NATIONAL PROFILE**


### Percent change in the share of children living in high-risk families, 1990 to 2000

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-8	<b>26</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-6
<b>1</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-38	<b>26</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-6
<b>2</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-36	<b>26</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-6
<b>3</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-33	<b>29</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	-30	<b>29</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	0
<b>9</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-19	<b>29</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	0
<b>10</b>	<b>Montana</b>	-18	<b>29</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-17	<b>29</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Utah</b>	-17	<b>29</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	0
<b>13</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-14	<b>29</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	-13	<b>29</b>	<b>Washington</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	-13	<b>29</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-13	<b>42</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	7
<b>14</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-13	<b>42</b>	<b>New York</b>	7
<b>14</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-13	<b>44</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	9
<b>19</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	-10	<b>45</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	12
<b>19</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-10	<b>46</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	13
<b>21</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-8	<b>47</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	15
<b>21</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-8	<b>48</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	23
<b>23</b>	<b>California</b>	-7	<b>49</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	40
<b>23</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-7	<b>50</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	57
<b>23</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-7	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	4

N.R. = Not Ranked













On this map, a decrease in the share of high-risk children indicates an improvement for children in that state, while an increase indicates a worsening situation.













kids count



Key Indicators\*

	Trend Data	Percent Change 1990-2000
Percent of children living in poverty	1990  18	[ -6% ]
	2000  17	
Percent of children living in single-parent families	1990  24	[ 25% ]
	2000  30	
Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	1990  29	[ -3% ]
	2000  28	
Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	1990  22	[ -14% ]
	2000  19	
Percent of children living in low-income working families	1990  19	[ 16% ]
	2000  22	

Key Indicators\*

	Trend Data	Percent Change 1990-2000
Percent of children living in households without a telephone	1990  8	[ -50% ]
	2000  4	
Percent of children living in households without a vehicle	1990  9	[ -22% ]
	2000  7	
Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	1990  5	[ 20% ]
	2000  6	
Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	1990  12	[ -8% ]
	2000  11	
Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	1990  10	[ -10% ]
	2000  9	

Family Risk Index

	Trend Data	Percent Change 1990-2000
Percent of children living in "high-risk" families, based on definition at right	1990  13	[ -8% ]
	2000  12	

Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


# **STATE PROFILES**

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


### Key Indicators\*



### Key Indicators\*



### Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


### Key Indicators\*



### Key Indicators\*



### Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


### Key Indicators\*



### Key Indicators\*



### Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


### Key Indicators\*



### Key Indicators\*



### Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index



Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Legend: State Rate (solid bar), National Rate (hatched bar)

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


**Key Indicators\***



**Key Indicators\***



**Family Risk Index**




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

## kids count


### Key Indicators\*



### Key Indicators\*



### Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

■ State Rate    ▨ National Rate


### Key Indicators\*



### Key Indicators\*



### Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":


- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index




Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout


\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

kids count


Key Indicators\*



Key Indicators\*



Family Risk Index



Children living in families with three or more of the following characteristics are considered at "high risk":

- Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line
- Child lives in a single-parent family
- Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
- Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout

\*See Definitions and Data Sources, page 102.

# **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 provides national and state estimates of the number of children at risk for each of the 11 indicators for 1990 and 2000. Figures have been rounded to the nearest 1,000 to improve readability and to avoid giving readers a false sense of precision.

Indicators	United States		Alabama		Alaska		Arizona		Arkansas	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Number of children living in poverty	11,239,000	12,379,000	248,000	235,000	16,000	23,000	208,000	299,000	158,000	170,000
Number of children living in single-parent families	14,779,000	21,229,000	281,000	362,000	33,000	52,000	232,000	420,000	146,000	224,000
Number of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	17,632,000	19,101,000	297,000	298,000	64,000	80,000	291,000	398,000	181,000	182,000
Number of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	13,995,000	13,499,000	294,000	231,000	20,000	26,000	234,000	320,000	170,000	140,000
Number of children living in low-income working families	10,832,000	14,176,000	230,000	273,000	17,000	19,000	203,000	313,000	163,000	177,000
Number of children living in households without a telephone	4,917,000	2,595,000	138,000	71,000	12,000	5,000	134,000	69,000	105,000	64,000
Number of children living in households without a vehicle	5,479,000	5,001,000	92,000	61,000	19,000	13,000	61,000	90,000	45,000	45,000
Number of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	2,358,000	2,972,000	7,000	9,000	4,000	5,000	59,000	92,000	4,000	8,000
Number of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	1,520,000	1,597,000	31,000	32,000	3,000	3,000	30,000	54,000	16,000	17,000
Number of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	1,318,000	1,339,000	27,000	29,000	3,000	3,000	24,000	38,000	15,000	17,000
Number of children living in "high-risk" families	7,770,000	8,158,000	158,000	151,000	11,000	20,000	129,000	191,000	91,000	96,000

# Number of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

kids count

California		Colorado		Connecticut		Delaware		District of Columbia		Florida		Georgia		Hawaii		Idaho	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
1,361,000	1,793,000	125,000	105,000	78,000	95,000	19,000	22,000	29,000	35,000	518,000	694,000	332,000	393,000	31,000	35,000	44,000	47,000
1,814,000	2,639,000	181,000	264,000	164,000	227,000	38,000	64,000	64,000	71,000	758,000	1,266,000	473,000	754,000	53,000	72,000	47,000	72,000
2,561,000	2,754,000	215,000	271,000	175,000	205,000	33,000	39,000	39,000	41,000	779,000	1,002,000	446,000	545,000	65,000	82,000	82,000	100,000
2,300,000	2,649,000	118,000	160,000	126,000	114,000	30,000	26,000	41,000	35,000	698,000	668,000	463,000	491,000	47,000	28,000	42,000	43,000
1,068,000	1,938,000	155,000	168,000	59,000	101,000	24,000	32,000	15,000	24,000	558,000	762,000	321,000	460,000	42,000	46,000	83,000	75,000
349,000	226,000	43,000	15,000	35,000	9,000	8,000	4,000	9,000	5,000	244,000	157,000	211,000	112,000	8,000	6,000	20,000	9,000
549,000	558,000	34,000	27,000	67,000	54,000	11,000	11,000	45,000	43,000	210,000	196,000	168,000	160,000	12,000	15,000	4,000	3,000
793,000	916,000	18,000	44,000	25,000	27,000	2,000	2,000	4,000	3,000	113,000	138,000	19,000	46,000	11,000	8,000	5,000	10,000
220,000	186,000	16,000	25,000	15,000	16,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	3,000	85,000	89,000	53,000	70,000	5,000	3,000	6,000	9,000
170,000	157,000	14,000	14,000	12,000	13,000	3,000	4,000	4,000	3,000	63,000	67,000	41,000	58,000	4,000	6,000	5,000	10,000
1,030,000	1,180,000	81,000	73,000	69,000	76,000	14,000	15,000	24,000	28,000	356,000	445,000	234,000	275,000	19,000	18,000	23,000	22,000

Indicators	United States		Illinois		Indiana		Iowa		Kansas	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Number of children living in poverty	11,239,000	12,379,000	493,000	508,000	205,000	226,000	101,000	98,000	92,000	78,000
Number of children living in single-parent families	14,779,000	21,229,000	706,000	974,000	298,000	434,000	117,000	171,000	118,000	169,000
Number of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	17,632,000	19,101,000	777,000	803,000	335,000	390,000	152,000	153,000	142,000	143,000
Number of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	13,995,000	13,499,000	617,000	537,000	273,000	290,000	77,000	65,000	85,000	69,000
Number of children living in low-income working families	10,832,000	14,176,000	415,000	537,000	282,000	321,000	163,000	154,000	145,000	163,000
Number of children living in households without a telephone	4,917,000	2,595,000	217,000	168,000	126,000	119,000	31,000	17,000	37,000	26,000
Number of children living in households without a vehicle	5,479,000	5,001,000	327,000	259,000	87,000	121,000	20,000	15,000	23,000	11,000
Number of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	2,358,000	2,972,000	99,000	138,000	19,000	35,000	8,000	13,000	9,000	7,000
Number of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	1,520,000	1,597,000	66,000	61,000	37,000	45,000	11,000	9,000	11,000	17,000
Number of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	1,318,000	1,339,000	62,000	57,000	32,000	32,000	9,000	10,000	10,000	9,000
Number of children living in "high-risk" families	7,770,000	8,158,000	358,000	352,000	138,000	148,000	58,000	54,000	53,000	47,000

# Number of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

kids count

Kentucky		Louisiana		Maine		Maryland		Massachusetts		Michigan		Minnesota		Mississippi		Missouri	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
226,000	211,000	374,000	334,000	43,000	35,000	126,000	177,000	172,000	207,000	444,000	365,000	147,000	117,000	243,000	194,000	222,000	224,000
199,000	263,000	381,000	468,000	59,000	71,000	293,000	419,000	302,000	416,000	623,000	794,000	194,000	255,000	243,000	310,000	286,000	429,000
300,000	311,000	436,000	374,000	81,000	73,000	237,000	269,000	372,000	390,000	757,000	694,000	277,000	252,000	256,000	239,000	333,000	351,000
265,000	200,000	363,000	257,000	39,000	31,000	201,000	174,000	233,000	186,000	429,000	297,000	107,000	100,000	259,000	186,000	233,000	219,000
200,000	214,000	251,000	293,000	56,000	63,000	120,000	212,000	123,000	176,000	324,000	417,000	185,000	191,000	177,000	173,000	261,000	325,000
135,000	50,000	139,000	54,000	13,000	1,000	52,000	23,000	41,000	20,000	133,000	84,000	32,000	25,000	136,000	59,000	98,000	63,000
67,000	42,000	176,000	124,000	11,000	4,000	130,000	124,000	129,000	119,000	210,000	105,000	47,000	46,000	87,000	52,000	83,000	64,000
7,000	8,000	17,000	10,000	2,000	3,000	22,000	27,000	52,000	56,000	25,000	38,000	18,000	37,000	6,000	3,000	13,000	12,000
28,000	25,000	32,000	32,000	6,000	3,000	25,000	30,000	27,000	22,000	54,000	52,000	14,000	18,000	21,000	27,000	33,000	34,000
28,000	26,000	36,000	41,000	5,000	2,000	21,000	23,000	25,000	18,000	52,000	42,000	12,000	8,000	21,000	20,000	28,000	27,000
147,000	136,000	248,000	207,000	29,000	23,000	98,000	105,000	146,000	167,000	339,000	249,000	93,000	61,000	154,000	138,000	141,000	143,000

Indicators	United States		Montana		Nebraska		Nevada		New Hampshire	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Number of children living in poverty	11,239,000	12,379,000	45,000	43,000	58,000	50,000	39,000	62,000	21,000	21,000
Number of children living in single-parent families	14,779,000	21,229,000	42,000	55,000	72,000	103,000	71,000	159,000	44,000	68,000
Number of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	17,632,000	19,101,000	64,000	68,000	81,000	95,000	76,000	120,000	56,000	55,000
Number of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	13,995,000	13,499,000	24,000	22,000	41,000	38,000	58,000	102,000	34,000	35,000
Number of children living in low-income working families	10,832,000	14,176,000	58,000	54,000	111,000	98,000	49,000	122,000	32,000	39,000
Number of children living in households without a telephone	4,917,000	2,595,000	17,000	6,000	19,000	12,000	16,000	16,000	11,000	2,000
Number of children living in households without a vehicle	5,479,000	5,001,000	5,000	4,000	11,000	9,000	15,000	25,000	7,000	5,000
Number of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	2,358,000	2,972,000	2,000	2,000	3,000	10,000	9,000	36,000	2,000	3,000
Number of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	1,520,000	1,597,000	3,000	3,000	6,000	7,000	8,000	12,000	5,000	6,000
Number of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	1,318,000	1,339,000	3,000	3,000	5,000	6,000	7,000	12,000	4,000	4,000
Number of children living in "high-risk" families	7,770,000	8,158,000	22,000	19,000	32,000	33,000	28,000	35,000	15,000	13,000

# Number of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

New Jersey		New Mexico		New York		North Carolina		North Dakota		Ohio		Oklahoma		Oregon		Pennsylvania	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
198,000	219,000	120,000	126,000	775,000	895,000	268,000	365,000	30,000	24,000	481,000	448,000	179,000	167,000	106,000	146,000	427,000	441,000
400,000	525,000	110,000	162,000	1,168,000	1,553,000	401,000	627,000	26,000	38,000	638,000	837,000	179,000	257,000	151,000	252,000	596,000	824,000
424,000	488,000	153,000	157,000	1,267,000	1,385,000	376,000	551,000	42,000	47,000	771,000	741,000	238,000	237,000	213,000	283,000	704,000	711,000
339,000	309,000	110,000	127,000	968,000	924,000	407,000	420,000	18,000	13,000	517,000	355,000	159,000	174,000	102,000	119,000	478,000	407,000
161,000	233,000	107,000	144,000	570,000	819,000	326,000	396,000	48,000	38,000	436,000	541,000	196,000	203,000	129,000	160,000	454,000	535,000
92,000	54,000	82,000	54,000	321,000	119,000	167,000	91,000	8,000	3,000	187,000	83,000	112,000	52,000	39,000	21,000	109,000	74,000
182,000	194,000	23,000	12,000	1,002,000	1,069,000	120,000	114,000	3,000	3,000	213,000	144,000	40,000	43,000	25,000	26,000	299,000	297,000
78,000	90,000	33,000	30,000	242,000	257,000	21,000	46,000	1,000	1,000	35,000	37,000	9,000	17,000	12,000	22,000	47,000	50,000
35,000	35,000	11,000	18,000	92,000	77,000	49,000	65,000	2,000	1,000	55,000	58,000	19,000	28,000	16,000	20,000	60,000	45,000
32,000	28,000	10,000	13,000	90,000	83,000	36,000	37,000	2,000	2,000	56,000	45,000	18,000	21,000	13,000	19,000	57,000	42,000
163,000	156,000	74,000	83,000	597,000	668,000	189,000	271,000	14,000	15,000	352,000	313,000	104,000	107,000	68,000	109,000	294,000	304,000

Indicators	United States		Rhode Island		South Carolina		South Dakota		Tennessee	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Number of children living in poverty	11,239,000	12,379,000	31,000	43,000	188,000	199,000	41,000	28,000	253,000	277,000
Number of children living in single-parent families	14,779,000	21,229,000	52,000	79,000	256,000	341,000	35,000	43,000	300,000	435,000
Number of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	17,632,000	19,101,000	65,000	75,000	231,000	258,000	45,000	40,000	330,000	379,000
Number of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	13,995,000	13,499,000	50,000	50,000	265,000	200,000	26,000	14,000	325,000	252,000
Number of children living in low-income working families	10,832,000	14,176,000	28,000	33,000	197,000	226,000	62,000	49,000	246,000	287,000
Number of children living in households without a telephone	4,917,000	2,595,000	11,000	7,000	122,000	54,000	18,000	4,000	122,000	71,000
Number of children living in households without a vehicle	5,479,000	5,001,000	14,000	19,000	96,000	79,000	8,000	3,000	92,000	65,000
Number of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	2,358,000	2,972,000	9,000	9,000	8,000	13,000	2,000	3,000	9,000	9,000
Number of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	1,520,000	1,597,000	6,000	5,000	25,000	32,000	3,000	4,000	38,000	33,000
Number of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	1,318,000	1,339,000	5,000	4,000	21,000	28,000	3,000	3,000	32,000	32,000
Number of children living in "high-risk" families	7,770,000	8,158,000	28,000	38,000	125,000	139,000	20,000	14,000	171,000	189,000

# Number of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

kids count

Texas		Utah		Vermont		Virginia		Washington		West Virginia		Wisconsin		Wyoming	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
1,146,000	1,250,000	80,000	74,000	16,000	18,000	196,000	224,000	172,000	251,000	113,000	110,000	182,000	160,000	19,000	19,000
1,082,000	1,705,000	83,000	129,000	28,000	34,000	322,000	460,000	259,000	398,000	85,000	113,000	252,000	340,000	23,000	32,000
1,428,000	1,486,000	139,000	144,000	34,000	36,000	323,000	368,000	376,000	454,000	167,000	143,000	311,000	306,000	35,000	36,000
1,442,000	1,672,000	58,000	62,000	20,000	11,000	309,000	230,000	166,000	175,000	117,000	82,000	185,000	151,000	14,000	14,000
1,032,000	1,499,000	157,000	132,000	24,000	27,000	236,000	310,000	185,000	255,000	89,000	91,000	228,000	228,000	30,000	29,000
636,000	261,000	21,000	8,000	8,000	1,000	119,000	55,000	51,000	18,000	65,000	27,000	49,000	34,000	8,000	5,000
336,000	292,000	12,000	13,000	5,000	4,000	103,000	84,000	42,000	52,000	33,000	22,000	76,000	61,000	3,000	2,000
386,000	510,000	9,000	18,000	1,000	1,000	23,000	28,000	31,000	57,000	3,000	1,000	20,000	26,000	1,000	1,000
128,000	159,000	10,000	12,000	3,000	2,000	33,000	30,000	27,000	28,000	12,000	8,000	19,000	18,000	2,000	3,000
109,000	128,000	8,000	15,000	2,000	2,000	27,000	25,000	22,000	24,000	14,000	11,000	15,000	18,000	2,000	2,000
716,000	712,000	38,000	35,000	11,000	10,000	140,000	144,000	120,000	150,000	73,000	70,000	124,000	97,000	11,000	11,000

Appendix 2 provides national and state estimates of the percentage of children at risk for each of the 11 indicators. These percentages were used to calculate percent change from 1990 to 2000 shown in Appendix 3. The percentages were rounded to the nearest whole percent to improve readability and to avoid giving readers a false sense of precision.

Indicators	United States		Alabama		Alaska		Arizona		Arkansas	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Percent of children living in poverty	18	17	24	21	10	13	22	23	26	25
Percent of children living in single-parent families	24	30	27	33	20	29	24	32	24	33
Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	29	28	30	28	39	43	32	31	31	28
Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	22	19	28	21	11	14	24	24	28	20
Percent of children living in low-income working families	19	22	25	28	11	11	23	26	29	29
Percent of children living in households without a telephone	8	4	13	6	7	2	14	5	17	9
Percent of children living in households without a vehicle	9	7	9	5	11	7	6	7	7	7
Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	5	6	1	1	3	3	9	9	1	1
Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	12	11	13	14	10	8	15	19	12	11
Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	10	9	11	12	11	8	12	14	11	11
Percent of children living in "high-risk" families	13	12	16	15	7	11	14	15	16	15

# Percentage of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

kids count

California		Colorado		Connecticut		Delaware		District of Columbia		Florida		Georgia		Hawaii		Idaho	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
18	20	15	10	11	11	12	12	26	31	18	20	20	19	11	12	15	14
24	29	21	25	22	27	24	34	57	63	27	36	28	36	19	25	15	21
36	32	26	26	24	25	22	22	42	40	29	30	28	27	26	31	28	29
30	29	14	15	17	14	19	13	36	30	24	18	27	23	17	10	14	12
16	24	19	17	9	13	16	19	18	27	22	24	21	25	18	19	29	23
5	2	5	1	5	1	5	2	8	4	9	4	12	5	3	2	7	3
7	6	4	2	9	6	7	6	39	37	7	5	10	7	4	5	1	1
15	14	3	6	5	4	2	1	5	4	6	5	2	3	6	4	2	4
14	10	10	12	10	11	12	12	18	13	14	12	14	16	9	5	10	10
11	8	9	7	8	9	9	9	17	12	11	9	11	13	8	10	8	10
15	14	10	7	10	9	9	9	27	28	14	13	15	14	8	7	8	7

Indicators	United States		Illinois		Indiana		Iowa		Kansas	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Percent of children living in poverty	18	17	17	16	14	15	14	14	14	11
Percent of children living in single-parent families	24	30	24	31	21	28	17	24	18	24
Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	29	28	28	27	24	26	22	22	22	21
Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	22	19	21	17	19	19	11	9	13	10
Percent of children living in low-income working families	19	22	16	19	21	23	24	23	23	25
Percent of children living in households without a telephone	8	4	7	5	9	8	4	2	6	4
Percent of children living in households without a vehicle	9	7	11	8	6	8	3	2	4	2
Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	5	6	5	6	2	3	2	2	2	1
Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	12	11	11	9	12	14	8	6	9	10
Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	10	9	10	9	10	10	7	6	8	5
Percent of children living in "high-risk" families	13	12	13	12	10	10	8	8	8	7

# Percentage of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

kids count

Kentucky		Louisiana		Maine		Maryland		Massachusetts		Michigan		Minnesota		Mississippi		Missouri	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
24	22	31	28	14	12	11	13	13	14	18	14	13	9	33	26	17	16
21	27	32	40	20	24	26	32	23	28	26	32	17	20	33	41	22	31
33	33	39	33	27	25	22	21	29	27	32	28	24	20	38	33	27	26
28	20	30	21	13	10	17	13	17	12	18	11	9	8	35	24	18	15
23	24	23	28	19	22	12	18	10	13	14	18	17	16	28	26	22	25
14	5	11	4	4	less than 0.5	4	2	3	1	5	3	3	2	18	8	8	4
7	4	14	10	3	1	11	9	10	8	9	4	4	4	12	7	6	4
1	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	6	5	1	2	2	4	1	1	1	1
14	12	13	11	9	5	11	12	9	8	10	10	6	7	13	16	12	11
14	12	14	15	8	3	9	9	9	6	10	8	6	3	13	12	11	9
16	15	22	19	10	8	9	9	11	12	15	10	8	5	23	20	11	11

Indicators	United States		Montana		Nebraska		Nevada		New Hampshire	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Percent of children living in poverty	18	17	21	19	14	11	14	13	8	7
Percent of children living in single-parent families	24	30	19	25	17	24	25	32	16	23
Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	29	28	30	31	19	22	27	25	21	19
Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	22	19	11	10	10	9	20	20	12	11
Percent of children living in low-income working families	19	22	28	26	27	24	19	27	12	14
Percent of children living in households without a telephone	8	4	8	3	4	3	5	3	4	1
Percent of children living in households without a vehicle	9	7	2	2	3	2	5	5	2	2
Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	5	6	1	1	1	3	5	10	1	1
Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	12	11	7	7	8	7	15	13	9	9
Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	10	9	7	7	6	6	12	13	7	6
Percent of children living in "high-risk" families	13	12	11	9	8	8	10	8	6	5

# Percentage of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

kids count

New Jersey		New Mexico		New York		North Carolina		North Dakota		Ohio		Oklahoma		Oregon		Pennsylvania	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
11	11	27	26	19	20	17	19	17	15	17	16	22	19	15	18	16	15
23	26	25	33	28	34	25	33	15	24	23	30	22	30	21	31	22	29
25	25	37	33	32	32	25	30	24	29	29	27	30	29	31	35	27	25
19	15	25	26	23	20	25	21	10	8	19	12	19	20	14	14	17	14
10	12	27	33	15	20	23	23	28	25	17	21	26	26	19	21	18	20
5	3	19	11	8	3	10	5	4	2	7	3	13	6	5	2	4	3
10	9	5	2	24	23	8	6	2	2	8	5	5	5	4	3	11	10
6	6	10	8	8	8	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	3	2	4	2	2
9	9	13	17	10	8	14	17	5	3	9	10	11	13	12	11	10	7
8	7	12	12	10	9	10	10	5	4	10	8	11	10	10	11	10	7
10	8	18	18	15	16	13	15	8	9	13	12	13	13	10	14	11	11

Indicators	United States		Rhode Island		South Carolina		South Dakota		Tennessee	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Percent of children living in poverty	18	17	14	17	21	20	21	14	21	20
Percent of children living in single-parent families	24	30	23	32	28	34	18	22	25	32
Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment	29	28	30	31	28	27	23	20	29	29
Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout	22	19	22	20	29	20	13	7	27	18
Percent of children living in low-income working families	19	22	13	15	25	26	33	26	23	23
Percent of children living in households without a telephone	8	4	5	3	13	5	9	2	10	5
Percent of children living in households without a vehicle	9	7	6	7	10	8	4	1	8	5
Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)	5	6	6	5	1	2	1	2	1	1
Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)	12	11	13	10	13	14	9	8	14	11
Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)	10	9	10	7	10	12	7	6	12	11
Percent of children living in "high-risk" families	13	12	13	16	15	15	11	7	15	15

# Percentage of Children at Risk by Indicator, 1990 and 2000

Texas		Utah		Vermont		Virginia		Washington		West Virginia		Wisconsin		Wyoming	
1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
24	22	13	11	11	12	13	13	14	17	26	28	14	12	14	15
23	30	13	18	20	24	22	27	21	27	20	29	20	26	18	25
32	27	23	21	25	25	23	23	31	31	39	38	25	23	26	29
30	28	9	9	14	8	21	13	13	12	26	20	14	11	10	11
24	29	26	20	18	20	17	20	16	18	22	26	19	18	23	25
13	4	3	1	5	1	8	3	4	1	15	7	4	3	6	4
7	5	2	2	4	2	7	5	3	3	8	5	6	4	2	2
11	12	2	3	1	1	2	2	4	5	1	less than 0.5	2	3	1	1
13	13	9	7	9	6	11	9	11	9	12	9	8	6	8	10
11	11	7	9	8	7	9	7	9	7	14	12	6	6	8	6
16	13	6	5	8	7	10	9	10	10	17	19	10	8	9	9

Appendix 3 presents states ranked on the basis of percent change from 1990 to 2000 for 10 of the 11 measures used in the state pages. Data for the District of Columbia are shown here, but the District is not ranked.

Data are presented for each of the 11 indicators except “Children living in low-income working families.” States are not ranked on this measure because it is uncertain whether an increase over time is a positive or a negative trend. See page 15 for more discussion on this issue.

## Children living in poverty

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-6	<b>25</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	-5
<b>1</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	-33	<b>25</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	-5
<b>1</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-33	<b>28</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-4
<b>3</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-31	<b>28</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	-4
<b>4</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-22	<b>30</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-21	<b>30</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-21	<b>30</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	-21	<b>30</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	0
<b>8</b>	<b>Utah</b>	-15	<b>30</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	0
<b>9</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-14	<b>35</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	-14	<b>35</b>	<b>New York</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-14	<b>37</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	7
<b>12</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-13	<b>37</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	7
<b>12</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-13	<b>39</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	8
<b>14</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	-12	<b>39</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	8
<b>15</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-10	<b>41</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	9
<b>15</b>	<b>Montana</b>	-10	<b>41</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	9
<b>17</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-8	<b>43</b>	<b>California</b>	11
<b>17</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-8	<b>43</b>	<b>Florida</b>	11
<b>19</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	-7	<b>45</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	12
<b>19</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	-7	<b>46</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	18
<b>21</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-6	<b>47</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	20
<b>21</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-6	<b>48</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	21
<b>21</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-6	<b>48</b>	<b>Washington</b>	21
<b>21</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-6	<b>50</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	30
<b>25</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-5	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	19

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Children living in single-parent families

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	25	<b>24</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	30
<b>1</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	13	<b>27</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	32
<b>2</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	18	<b>27</b>	<b>Montana</b>	32
<b>3</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	19	<b>27</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	32
<b>4</b>	<b>Maine</b>	20	<b>27</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	32
<b>4</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	20	<b>27</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	32
<b>6</b>	<b>California</b>	21	<b>32</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	33
<b>6</b>	<b>New York</b>	21	<b>32</b>	<b>Florida</b>	33
<b>6</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	21	<b>32</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	33
<b>9</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	22	<b>32</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	33
<b>9</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	22	<b>36</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	36
<b>9</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	22	<b>37</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	38
<b>12</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	23	<b>37</b>	<b>Utah</b>	38
<b>12</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	23	<b>39</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	39
<b>12</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	23	<b>39</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	39
<b>12</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	23	<b>41</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	40
<b>16</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	24	<b>42</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	41
<b>17</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	25	<b>42</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	41
<b>18</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	28	<b>42</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	41
<b>18</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	28	<b>45</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	42
<b>20</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	29	<b>46</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	44
<b>20</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	29	<b>47</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	45
<b>20</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	29	<b>47</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	45
<b>20</b>	<b>Washington</b>	29	<b>49</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	48
<b>24</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	30	<b>50</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	60
<b>24</b>	<b>Texas</b>	30	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	11

N.R. = Not Ranked

### Children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-3	<b>25</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	-3
<b>1</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-17	<b>25</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-3
<b>2</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-16	<b>28</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	0
<b>3</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-15	<b>28</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-13	<b>28</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-13	<b>28</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	0
<b>4</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-13	<b>28</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>California</b>	-11	<b>28</b>	<b>New York</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	-11	<b>28</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	0
<b>9</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-10	<b>28</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	0
<b>9</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-10	<b>28</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Utah</b>	-9	<b>28</b>	<b>Washington</b>	0
<b>12</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-8	<b>38</b>	<b>Florida</b>	3
<b>13</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-7	<b>38</b>	<b>Montana</b>	3
<b>13</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-7	<b>38</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	3
<b>13</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-7	<b>41</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	4
<b>13</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	-7	<b>41</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	4
<b>13</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-7	<b>43</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	8
<b>13</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-7	<b>44</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	10
<b>19</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-5	<b>45</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	12
<b>19</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	-5	<b>46</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	13
<b>21</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-4	<b>47</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	16
<b>21</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-4	<b>48</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	19
<b>21</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-4	<b>49</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	20
<b>21</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	-4	<b>50</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	21
<b>25</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	-3	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-5

N.R. = Not Ranked

### Children living with a household head who is a high school dropout

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-14	<b>25</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	-18
<b>1</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-46	<b>25</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-18
<b>2</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-43	<b>28</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-17
<b>3</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	-41	<b>29</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	-16
<b>4</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-39	<b>30</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-15
<b>5</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-38	<b>31</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	-14
<b>6</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-37	<b>32</b>	<b>New York</b>	-13
<b>7</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	-33	<b>33</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-11
<b>8</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	-32	<b>34</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	-10
<b>9</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-31	<b>35</b>	<b>Montana</b>	-9
<b>9</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	-31	<b>35</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	-9
<b>11</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-30	<b>37</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-8
<b>12</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-29	<b>37</b>	<b>Washington</b>	-8
<b>12</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-29	<b>39</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-7
<b>12</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-29	<b>40</b>	<b>California</b>	-3
<b>15</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-25	<b>41</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	0
<b>15</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-25	<b>41</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	0
<b>17</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	-24	<b>41</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	0
<b>18</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-23	<b>41</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	0
<b>18</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-23	<b>41</b>	<b>Utah</b>	0
<b>18</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-23	<b>46</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	4
<b>21</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	-21	<b>47</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	5
<b>21</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-21	<b>48</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	7
<b>23</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	-20	<b>49</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	10
<b>24</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-19	<b>50</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	27
<b>25</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	-18	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-17

N.R. = Not Ranked

### Children living in households without a telephone

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-50	<b>25</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-56
<b>1</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-100	<b>27</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-54
<b>2</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	-80	<b>27</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	-54
<b>2</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	-80	<b>29</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-53
<b>2</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-80	<b>30</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	-50
<b>5</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-78	<b>30</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	-50
<b>6</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-75	<b>30</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-50
<b>6</b>	<b>Washington</b>	-75	<b>30</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	-50
<b>8</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	-71	<b>30</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	-50
<b>9</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-69	<b>30</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	-50
<b>10</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-67	<b>36</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-47
<b>10</b>	<b>Utah</b>	-67	<b>37</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	-42
<b>12</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	-64	<b>38</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-40
<b>12</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-64	<b>38</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	-40
<b>12</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-64	<b>38</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	-40
<b>15</b>	<b>Montana</b>	-63	<b>38</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	-40
<b>15</b>	<b>New York</b>	-63	<b>42</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	-33
<b>15</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-63	<b>42</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-33
<b>18</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	-62	<b>42</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-33
<b>19</b>	<b>California</b>	-60	<b>42</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	-33
<b>19</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	-60	<b>46</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-29
<b>19</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	-60	<b>47</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	-25
<b>22</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-58	<b>47</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-25
<b>23</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	-57	<b>47</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-25
<b>23</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-57	<b>50</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	-11
<b>25</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-56	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-50

N.R. = Not Ranked

Children living in households without a vehicle

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-22	<b>26</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	-25
<b>1</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-75	<b>26</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	-25
<b>2</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-67	<b>28</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-20
<b>3</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	-60	<b>28</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	-20
<b>4</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-56	<b>30</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	-18
<b>5</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	-50	<b>31</b>	<b>California</b>	-14
<b>5</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-50	<b>31</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	-14
<b>5</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-50	<b>33</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	-10
<b>8</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-44	<b>34</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-9
<b>9</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-43	<b>35</b>	<b>New York</b>	-4
<b>10</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-42	<b>36</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-38	<b>36</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	-38	<b>36</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-38	<b>36</b>	<b>Montana</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	-36	<b>36</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	0
<b>15</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	-33	<b>36</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	0
<b>15</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	-33	<b>36</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	0
<b>15</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-33	<b>36</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	0
<b>15</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	-33	<b>36</b>	<b>Utah</b>	0
<b>15</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-33	<b>36</b>	<b>Washington</b>	0
<b>20</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-30	<b>36</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	0
<b>21</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-29	<b>47</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	17
<b>21</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-29	<b>47</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	17
<b>21</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-29	<b>49</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	25
<b>21</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-29	<b>50</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	33
<b>25</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-27	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-5

N.R. = Not Ranked

Children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	20	<b>12</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	0
<b>1</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-100	<b>12</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	-50	<b>12</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-50	<b>12</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-50	<b>12</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	-33	<b>12</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	0
<b>6</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	-20	<b>12</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	0
<b>6</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	-20	<b>33</b>	<b>Texas</b>	9
<b>8</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-17	<b>34</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	20
<b>8</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-17	<b>35</b>	<b>Washington</b>	25
<b>8</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	-17	<b>36</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	50
<b>11</b>	<b>California</b>	-7	<b>36</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	50
<b>12</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	0	<b>36</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	50
<b>12</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	0	<b>36</b>	<b>Utah</b>	50
<b>12</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	0	<b>36</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	50
<b>12</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Maine</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>Montana</b>	0	<b>41</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	100
<b>12</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	0	<b>49</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	200
<b>12</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	0	<b>49</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	200
<b>12</b>	<b>New York</b>	0	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-20

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-8	<b>25</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-8
<b>1</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	-44	<b>25</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	-8
<b>1</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-44	<b>28</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	0
<b>3</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	-40	<b>28</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-33	<b>28</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-30	<b>28</b>	<b>Montana</b>	0
<b>6</b>	<b>California</b>	-29	<b>28</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	-25	<b>28</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-25	<b>28</b>	<b>Texas</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-25	<b>35</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	8
<b>10</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	-23	<b>35</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	8
<b>11</b>	<b>Utah</b>	-22	<b>37</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	9
<b>12</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	-21	<b>38</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	10
<b>13</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	-20	<b>39</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	11
<b>13</b>	<b>New York</b>	-20	<b>39</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	11
<b>15</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-18	<b>41</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	14
<b>15</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-18	<b>42</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	17
<b>15</b>	<b>Washington</b>	-18	<b>42</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	17
<b>18</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-15	<b>44</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	18
<b>19</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-14	<b>45</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	20
<b>19</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-14	<b>46</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	21
<b>21</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	-13	<b>47</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	23
<b>21</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	-13	<b>48</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	25
<b>23</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-11	<b>49</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	27
<b>23</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-11	<b>50</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	31
<b>25</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-8	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-28

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-10	<b>25</b>	<b>New York</b>	-10
<b>1</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-63	<b>27</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	-9
<b>2</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-50	<b>28</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-8
<b>3</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-38	<b>28</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	-8
<b>4</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	-33	<b>30</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	-30	<b>30</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	-30	<b>30</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	-27	<b>30</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	0
<b>7</b>	<b>California</b>	-27	<b>30</b>	<b>Montana</b>	0
<b>9</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	-25	<b>30</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	0
<b>10</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	-22	<b>30</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	0
<b>10</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-22	<b>30</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	0
<b>10</b>	<b>Washington</b>	-22	<b>30</b>	<b>Texas</b>	0
<b>13</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-20	<b>30</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	0
<b>13</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	-20	<b>40</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	7
<b>13</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-20	<b>41</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	8
<b>16</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-18	<b>42</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	9
<b>16</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	-18	<b>43</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	10
<b>18</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	-14	<b>44</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	13
<b>18</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-14	<b>45</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	17
<b>18</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-14	<b>46</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	18
<b>18</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-14	<b>47</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	20
<b>18</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	-14	<b>48</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	25
<b>23</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	-13	<b>48</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	25
<b>23</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-13	<b>50</b>	<b>Utah</b>	29
<b>25</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-10	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	-29

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Children living in "high risk" families

Rank	State	% Change	Rank	State	% Change
	<b>United States</b>	-8	<b>26</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	-6
<b>1</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	-38	<b>26</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	-6
<b>2</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	-36	<b>26</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	-6
<b>3</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	-33	<b>29</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	-30	<b>29</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Maine</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	-20	<b>29</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	0
<b>9</b>	<b>Texas</b>	-19	<b>29</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	0
<b>10</b>	<b>Montana</b>	-18	<b>29</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	-17	<b>29</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Utah</b>	-17	<b>29</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	0
<b>13</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	-14	<b>29</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	-13	<b>29</b>	<b>Washington</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	-13	<b>29</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	0
<b>14</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	-13	<b>42</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	7
<b>14</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	-13	<b>42</b>	<b>New York</b>	7
<b>14</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	-13	<b>44</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	9
<b>19</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	-10	<b>45</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	12
<b>19</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	-10	<b>46</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	13
<b>21</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	-8	<b>47</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	15
<b>21</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	-8	<b>48</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	23
<b>23</b>	<b>California</b>	-7	<b>49</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	40
<b>23</b>	<b>Florida</b>	-7	<b>50</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	57
<b>23</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	-7	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	4

N.R. = Not Ranked

Appendix 4 presents states ranked on the basis of the percentage of children at risk in 2000 for 10 of the 11 measures used in the state pages. Data for the District of Columbia are shown here, but the District is not ranked.

Data are presented for each of the 11 indicators except “Children living in low-income working families.” States are not ranked on this measure because it is uncertain whether a relatively high percentage is a positive or a negative outcome. See page 15 for more discussion on this issue.

## Children living in poverty

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	17	<b>23</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	15
<b>1</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	7	<b>27</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	16
<b>2</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	9	<b>27</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	16
<b>3</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	10	<b>27</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	16
<b>4</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	11	<b>30</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	11	<b>30</b>	<b>Washington</b>	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	11	<b>32</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	18
<b>4</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	11	<b>33</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	19
<b>4</b>	<b>Utah</b>	11	<b>33</b>	<b>Montana</b>	19
<b>9</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	12	<b>33</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	19
<b>9</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	12	<b>33</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	19
<b>9</b>	<b>Maine</b>	12	<b>37</b>	<b>California</b>	20
<b>9</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	12	<b>37</b>	<b>Florida</b>	20
<b>9</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	12	<b>37</b>	<b>New York</b>	20
<b>14</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	13	<b>37</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	20
<b>14</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	13	<b>37</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	20
<b>14</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	13	<b>42</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	21
<b>14</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	13	<b>43</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	22
<b>18</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	14	<b>43</b>	<b>Texas</b>	22
<b>18</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	14	<b>45</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	23
<b>18</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	14	<b>46</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	25
<b>18</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	14	<b>47</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	26
<b>18</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	14	<b>47</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	26
<b>23</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	15	<b>49</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	28
<b>23</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	15	<b>49</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	28
<b>23</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	15	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	31

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Children living in single-parent families

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	30	<b>24</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	29
<b>1</b>	<b>Utah</b>	18	<b>24</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	29
<b>2</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	20	<b>28</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	30
<b>3</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	21	<b>28</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	30
<b>4</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	22	<b>28</b>	<b>Texas</b>	30
<b>5</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	23	<b>31</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	31
<b>6</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	24	<b>31</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	31
<b>6</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	24	<b>31</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	31
<b>6</b>	<b>Maine</b>	24	<b>34</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	32
<b>6</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	24	<b>34</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	32
<b>6</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	24	<b>34</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	32
<b>6</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	24	<b>34</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	32
<b>12</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	25	<b>34</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	32
<b>12</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	25	<b>34</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	32
<b>12</b>	<b>Montana</b>	25	<b>40</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	33
<b>12</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	25	<b>40</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	33
<b>16</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	26	<b>40</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	33
<b>16</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	26	<b>40</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	33
<b>18</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	27	<b>44</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	34
<b>18</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	27	<b>44</b>	<b>New York</b>	34
<b>18</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	27	<b>44</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	34
<b>18</b>	<b>Washington</b>	27	<b>47</b>	<b>Florida</b>	36
<b>22</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	28	<b>47</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	36
<b>22</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	28	<b>49</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	40
<b>24</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	29	<b>50</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	41
<b>24</b>	<b>California</b>	29	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	63

N.R. = Not Ranked

# States Ranked by Percentage in 2000

## Children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	28	<b>21</b>	<b>Texas</b>	27
<b>1</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	19	<b>27</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	28
<b>2</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	20	<b>27</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	28
<b>2</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	20	<b>27</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	28
<b>4</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	21	<b>30</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	29
<b>4</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	21	<b>30</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	29
<b>4</b>	<b>Utah</b>	21	<b>30</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	29
<b>7</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	22	<b>30</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	29
<b>7</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	22	<b>30</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	29
<b>7</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	22	<b>35</b>	<b>Florida</b>	30
<b>10</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	23	<b>35</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	30
<b>10</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	23	<b>37</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	31
<b>12</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	25	<b>37</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	31
<b>12</b>	<b>Maine</b>	25	<b>37</b>	<b>Montana</b>	31
<b>12</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	25	<b>37</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	31
<b>12</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	25	<b>37</b>	<b>Washington</b>	31
<b>12</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	25	<b>42</b>	<b>California</b>	32
<b>12</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	25	<b>42</b>	<b>New York</b>	32
<b>18</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	26	<b>44</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	33
<b>18</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	26	<b>44</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	33
<b>18</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	26	<b>44</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	33
<b>21</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	27	<b>44</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	33
<b>21</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	27	<b>48</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	35
<b>21</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	27	<b>49</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	38
<b>21</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	27	<b>50</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	43
<b>21</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	27	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	40

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Children living with a household head who is a high school dropout

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	19	<b>23</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	14
<b>1</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	7	<b>27</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	15
<b>2</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	8	<b>27</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	15
<b>2</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	8	<b>27</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	15
<b>2</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	8	<b>30</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	9	<b>31</b>	<b>Florida</b>	18
<b>5</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	9	<b>31</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	18
<b>5</b>	<b>Utah</b>	9	<b>33</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	19
<b>8</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	10	<b>34</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	20
<b>8</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	10	<b>34</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	20
<b>8</b>	<b>Maine</b>	10	<b>34</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	20
<b>8</b>	<b>Montana</b>	10	<b>34</b>	<b>New York</b>	20
<b>12</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	11	<b>34</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	20
<b>12</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	11	<b>34</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	20
<b>12</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	11	<b>34</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	20
<b>12</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	11	<b>34</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	20
<b>16</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	12	<b>42</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	21
<b>16</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	12	<b>42</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	21
<b>16</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	12	<b>42</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	21
<b>16</b>	<b>Washington</b>	12	<b>45</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	23
<b>20</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	13	<b>46</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	24
<b>20</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	13	<b>46</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	24
<b>20</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	13	<b>48</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	26
<b>23</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	14	<b>49</b>	<b>Texas</b>	28
<b>23</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	14	<b>50</b>	<b>California</b>	29
<b>23</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	14	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	30

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Children living in households without a telephone

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	4	<b>19</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	3
<b>1</b>	<b>Maine</b>	less than 0.5	<b>19</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	1	<b>19</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	1	<b>19</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	1	<b>19</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	1	<b>31</b>	<b>Florida</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Utah</b>	1	<b>31</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	1	<b>31</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Washington</b>	1	<b>31</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	4
<b>9</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	2	<b>31</b>	<b>Texas</b>	4
<b>9</b>	<b>California</b>	2	<b>31</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	4
<b>9</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	2	<b>37</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	5
<b>9</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	2	<b>44</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	6
<b>19</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	3	<b>44</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	6
<b>19</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	3	<b>46</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	7
<b>19</b>	<b>Montana</b>	3	<b>47</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	8
<b>19</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	3	<b>47</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	8
<b>19</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	3	<b>49</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	9
<b>19</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	3	<b>50</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	11
<b>19</b>	<b>New York</b>	3	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	4

N.R. = Not Ranked

Children living in households without a vehicle

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	7	<b>22</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	5
<b>1</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	1	<b>22</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	5
<b>1</b>	<b>Maine</b>	1	<b>22</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	5
<b>1</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	1	<b>22</b>	<b>Texas</b>	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	2	<b>22</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	2	<b>22</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	2	<b>32</b>	<b>California</b>	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Montana</b>	2	<b>32</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	2	<b>32</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	6
<b>4</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	2	<b>32</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	6
<b>4</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	2	<b>36</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	7
<b>4</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	2	<b>36</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Utah</b>	2	<b>36</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	2	<b>36</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	2	<b>36</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	7
<b>15</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	3	<b>36</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	7
<b>15</b>	<b>Washington</b>	3	<b>42</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	8
<b>17</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	4	<b>42</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	8
<b>17</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	4	<b>42</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	8
<b>17</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	4	<b>42</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	8
<b>17</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	4	<b>46</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	9
<b>17</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	4	<b>46</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	9
<b>22</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	5	<b>48</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	10
<b>22</b>	<b>Florida</b>	5	<b>48</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	10
<b>22</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	5	<b>50</b>	<b>New York</b>	23
<b>22</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	5	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	37

N.R. = Not Ranked

Children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	6	<b>24</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	3
<b>1</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	less than 0.5	<b>24</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	1	<b>24</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	1	<b>24</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	1	<b>24</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	1	<b>24</b>	<b>Utah</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	1	<b>24</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	1	<b>33</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Maine</b>	1	<b>33</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	1	<b>33</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	1	<b>33</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Montana</b>	1	<b>33</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	1	<b>38</b>	<b>Florida</b>	5
<b>2</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	1	<b>38</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	1	<b>38</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	1	<b>38</b>	<b>Washington</b>	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	1	<b>42</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	6
<b>17</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	2	<b>42</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	6
<b>17</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	2	<b>42</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	6
<b>17</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	2	<b>45</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	8
<b>17</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	2	<b>45</b>	<b>New York</b>	8
<b>17</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	2	<b>47</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	9
<b>17</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	2	<b>48</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	10
<b>17</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	2	<b>49</b>	<b>Texas</b>	12
<b>24</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	3	<b>50</b>	<b>California</b>	14
<b>24</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	3	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	4

N.R. = Not Ranked

# States Ranked by Percentage in 2000

## Teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	11	<b>22</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	10
<b>1</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	3	<b>22</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	5	<b>22</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Maine</b>	5	<b>29</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	6	<b>29</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	6	<b>29</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	6	<b>29</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	11
<b>7</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	7	<b>29</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	11
<b>7</b>	<b>Montana</b>	7	<b>29</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	11
<b>7</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	7	<b>35</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	12
<b>7</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	7	<b>35</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	12
<b>7</b>	<b>Utah</b>	7	<b>35</b>	<b>Florida</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	8	<b>35</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	8	<b>35</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>New York</b>	8	<b>40</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	13
<b>12</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	8	<b>40</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	13
<b>16</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	9	<b>40</b>	<b>Texas</b>	13
<b>16</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	9	<b>43</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	14
<b>16</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	9	<b>43</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	14
<b>16</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	9	<b>43</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	14
<b>16</b>	<b>Washington</b>	9	<b>46</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	16
<b>16</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	9	<b>46</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	16
<b>22</b>	<b>California</b>	10	<b>48</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	17
<b>22</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	10	<b>48</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	17
<b>22</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	10	<b>50</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	19
<b>22</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	10	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	13

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	9	<b>24</b>	<b>Florida</b>	9
<b>1</b>	<b>Maine</b>	3	<b>24</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	9
<b>1</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	3	<b>24</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	9
<b>3</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	4	<b>24</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	5	<b>24</b>	<b>New York</b>	9
<b>5</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	6	<b>24</b>	<b>Utah</b>	9
<b>5</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	6	<b>32</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	6	<b>32</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	10
<b>5</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	6	<b>32</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	10
<b>5</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	6	<b>32</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	6	<b>32</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	6	<b>37</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	11
<b>12</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	7	<b>37</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	11
<b>12</b>	<b>Montana</b>	7	<b>37</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	11
<b>12</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	7	<b>37</b>	<b>Texas</b>	11
<b>12</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	7	<b>41</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	7	<b>41</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	7	<b>41</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	7	<b>41</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	12
<b>12</b>	<b>Washington</b>	7	<b>41</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	12
<b>20</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	8	<b>41</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	12
<b>20</b>	<b>California</b>	8	<b>47</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	13
<b>20</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	8	<b>47</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	13
<b>20</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	8	<b>49</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	14
<b>24</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	9	<b>50</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	15
<b>24</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	9	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	12

N.R. = Not Ranked

## Children living in "high risk" families

Rank	State	Percent	Rank	State	Percent
	<b>United States</b>	12	<b>26</b>	<b>Alaska</b>	11
<b>1</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	5	<b>26</b>	<b>Missouri</b>	11
<b>1</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>	5	<b>26</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	11
<b>1</b>	<b>Utah</b>	5	<b>29</b>	<b>Illinois</b>	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	7	<b>29</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	7	<b>29</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	7	<b>32</b>	<b>Florida</b>	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	7	<b>32</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	13
<b>4</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>	7	<b>32</b>	<b>Texas</b>	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Vermont</b>	7	<b>35</b>	<b>California</b>	14
<b>10</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	8	<b>35</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	14
<b>10</b>	<b>Maine</b>	8	<b>35</b>	<b>Oregon</b>	14
<b>10</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	8	<b>38</b>	<b>Alabama</b>	15
<b>10</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	8	<b>38</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	15
<b>10</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	8	<b>38</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	15
<b>10</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	8	<b>38</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>	15
<b>16</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	9	<b>38</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	15
<b>16</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	9	<b>38</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	15
<b>16</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	9	<b>38</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	15
<b>16</b>	<b>Montana</b>	9	<b>45</b>	<b>New York</b>	16
<b>16</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	9	<b>45</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	16
<b>16</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	9	<b>47</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	18
<b>16</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>	9	<b>48</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	19
<b>23</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	10	<b>48</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	19
<b>23</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	10	<b>50</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	20
<b>23</b>	<b>Washington</b>	10	<b>N.R.</b>	<b>District of Columbia</b>	28

N.R. = Not Ranked

**Percent of children living 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. Poverty thresholds vary by family size and composition. In 2000, the poverty threshold for a family of two adults and two children was \$17,463. Poverty status is not determined for people in military barracks or institutional quarters, or for unrelated individuals under age 15 (such as foster children). The 1990 Census data on poverty are based on family income in 1989, while the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) data are based on income received in the 12 months prior to the survey.

The poverty thresholds are revised annually, using the Consumer Price Index to reflect changes in the cost of living. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country; that is, they are not adjusted for regional, state, or local variations in the cost of living. The poverty level is based on money income and does not include noncash benefits, such as food stamps. For a detailed discussion of the poverty definition, see U.S. Census Bureau, “Poverty in the United States: 2000,” *Current Population Reports*, Series P-60, No. 214.

Because C2SS data were collected only for people residing in households, the data presented here for both 1990 and 2000 exclude people living in group quarters. **SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990

Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living in single-parent families** is the percentage of related children under age 18 living in households headed by a person—male or female—without a spouse present in the home. “Related children” are children under 18 years old who are related to the household head by birth, marriage, or adoption. This includes relations such as nieces and nephews who are related to the household head. Related children of the household head also include married children under age 18 living in the same household. Foster children are not considered related children.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census, Summary Tape File 3, Table P126. **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment** is the share of children under age 18 living in families where no parent works at least 35 hours per week, 50 weeks per year. For children living in single-parent

families, this means the resident parent did not work at least 35 hours per week, at least 50 weeks in the previous year. For children living in married-couple families, this means neither parent worked at least 35 hours per week, at least 50 weeks in the previous year. Children living with neither parent also are included in this category. Children living in subfamilies are excluded from the tabulations for both years because we lack 2000 data on parental work status. (A subfamily is a married couple with or without children under 18 years old, or one parent with one or more children under 18 years old, living in a household where they are related to the household head.)

The 1990 Census data on work status are based on employment in the previous calendar year, while the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey data are based on employment in the 12 months prior to the survey.

This measure is very similar to the measure called “Secure Parental Employment,” used by the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family statistics in its publication *America’s Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being*.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living with a household head who is a high school dropout** is the share of children under age 18 living in households where the household head has not graduated from high school. High school dropouts are identified as those who did not receive a high school diploma or an equivalent (such as a GED).

We use the educational attainment of the household head because this measure is closely related to the general education level in a household. Also, the measure could be applied to all children, regardless of their living arrangements.

We use the term “household head” here, although the U.S. Census Bureau commonly uses the term “householder” to identify this individual. The household head, or householder, is usually the person in whose name the home is owned or rented. If there is no such person in the household, then any adult household member age 15 or older could be designated as the householder.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living in low-income working families** is the share of own children under age 18 living in families that met two criteria, one defined by family income and the other, by parental work effort. First, the family income was less than twice the federal poverty level. We use the “200 percent of poverty” threshold for this measure because it is a cutoff point commonly used to identify low-income families. For example, the U.S. Census Bureau uses 200 percent of poverty as a key threshold in their annual poverty reports, and the Urban Institute uses this level in many of their New Federalism reports. Furthermore, people with family incomes between 100 percent and 200 percent of poverty are eligible for many government means-tested assistance programs—for example, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), many of the new State Child Health Insurance Programs (SCHIPs), and food stamps.

Second, at least one parent worked 50 or more weeks during the previous year. Researchers have used a wide range of employment thresholds to identify low-income working families—from any work during the year to full-time, year-round employment. Some analysts actually have combined the hours worked by all adults in the household to determine work effort. The annual *KIDS COUNT Data Books* have used 50 weeks of work to identify low-income working families, a practice continued in this analysis. We should

note that the definition used here includes people who worked part-time as well as full-time. However, the vast majority of people who worked at least 50 weeks during the year worked full-time (35 or more hours a week). We also should note that relative to the thresholds used by other researchers to identify low-income working families, the work requirement used here is relatively stringent. Use of a less stringent work threshold would add many more low-income children to the figures shown here.

An “own child” is a never-married child under age 18 who is a son or daughter by birth, a stepchild, or an adopted child of the household head.

The 1990 Census data on work status and income are based on employment and family income in the previous calendar year, while the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey data are based on employment and income in the 12 months prior to the survey.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living in households without a telephone** is the share of children under age 18 living in households without a telephone in their home at

the time of the interview. In the 1990 Census, respondents were asked whether there was a telephone in the house or apartment. In the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS), respondents were asked whether there was a telephone in the house and, specifically, whether this telephone was in working order and with service allowing the respondent to both make and receive calls. These questions differ slightly, but the U.S. Census Bureau reports that C2SS data on telephone availability can be compared with 1990 Census data, provided that data users understand the differences in the questionnaires and use caution. For more information about comparability of 1990 and 2000 data, visit the U.S. Census Bureau's website at [www.census.gov/c2ss/www/Products/KnownDiff.htm](http://www.census.gov/c2ss/www/Products/KnownDiff.htm).

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living in households without a vehicle** is the share of children under age 18 living in households without a vehicle at the time of the interview. Vehicles include passenger cars, vans, and trucks kept at home and available for use by household members.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children who have difficulty speaking English (ages 5-17)** is the share of children ages 5 to 17 who speak a language other than English at home and speak English less than “very well.” This includes children who speak English “well,” “not well,” or “not at all.” Questionnaire responses on the ability to speak English represent either the person's own perception of his or her English-language ability or, in the case of most children, the perception of another household member.

This definition is used by the U.S. Census Bureau based on previous research that assessed the validity of the self-reported English-ability question. The U.S. Census Bureau conducted the English Language Proficiency Survey in 1982. Results of that survey showed a strong correlation between the responses on the English-ability question and the test scores from a more comprehensive exam. Those persons who spoke a language other than English at home and reported an English-speaking ability of “very well” passed at a rate similar to English-only persons. People who reported

less than “very well” (e.g., “well,” “not well,” or “not at all”) had significantly higher rates of failure. Therefore, the number of people who reported speaking English less than “very well” is considered a reasonably good measure of the number of persons of limited English proficiency. This measure also is used in the *America’s Children* report of the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. For more information on the *America’s Children* report, visit the National Center for Health Statistics at [nces.ed.gov/pubs/ce/c9704e01.html](http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/ce/c9704e01.html).

Because Census 2000 Supplementary Survey data were collected only for people residing in households, the data presented here for both 1990 and 2000 exclude people living in group quarters.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of teens who are high school dropouts (ages 16-19)** is the share of teens between ages 16 and 19 who are not enrolled in school and are not high school graduates. Those persons 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 by the National Center for Education

Statistics (NCES) as shown in their publication *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2000* (p. 2). For the measure presented here, we focus on teens ages 16 to 19 rather than young adults ages 16 to 24 (which is the focus of *Dropout Rates*), because a large share of 18- to 24-year-olds migrate across state lines each year, confounding the connection between state policies and programs and state dropout rates.

The 1990 Census and the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) used different time references in measuring school enrollment. The 1990 Census asked if the individual had attended regular school or college at any time since February 1, 1990 (that is, 2 months prior to the census reference date of April 1). The C2SS asked if the person had attended a school or college at any time during the 3 months prior to the survey. The 3-month reference period in the C2SS is expected to pick up spring enrollment for persons interviewed during the summer months.

Because C2SS data were collected only for people residing in households, the data presented here for both 1990 and 2000 exclude people living in group quarters.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of teens not attending school and not working (ages 16-19)** is the share of teens 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.”

The 1990 Census and the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) used different time references in measuring school enrollment. The 1990 Census asked if the individual had attended regular school or college at any time since February 1, 1990 (that is, 2 months prior to the census reference date of April 1). The C2SS asked if the person had attended a school or college at any time during the 3 months prior to the survey. The 3-month reference period in the C2SS is expected to pick up spring enrollment for persons interviewed during the summer months.

Because C2SS data were collected only for people residing in households, the data presented here for both 1990 and 2000 exclude people living in group quarters.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

**Percent of children living in “high-risk” families** is based on a family risk index, which reflects four separate measures of vulnerability. The index is constructed by noting which of four risk factors are present in a child’s life, then cumulating the total number of these factors for that child. Children living in families with three or more risk factors are categorized as “high risk.” The risk factors are as follows:

- **Child lives in a family with income below the poverty line**
- **Child lives in a single-parent family**
- **Child lives in a family where no parent has full-time, year-round employment**
- **Child lives with a household head who is a high school dropout**

Children living in subfamilies are excluded from the tabulations for both years because we lack 2000 data on parental work status. A subfamily is a married couple with or without children under 18 years old, or one parent with one or more children under 18 years old, living in a household and related to the household head.

**SOURCES: 1990 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census 5 Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS). **2000 data:** Population Reference Bureau, tabulations of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS).

The Annie E. Casey Foundation funds a nationwide network of KIDS COUNT projects that provide a more detailed, community-by-community picture of the condition of children.

---

**Alabama**
**Apreill Curtis***Coordinator of**Policy and Programs***VOICES for Alabama's Children**

PO Box 4576

Montgomery, AL 36103

**(334) 213-2410****(334) 213-2413 (fax)****acurtis@alavoices.org****www.alavoices.org**


---

**Arizona**
**Dana Naimark***Assistant Director***Children's Action Alliance**

4001 North 3rd St.

Suite 160

Phoenix, AZ 85012

**(602) 266-0707****(602) 263-8792 (fax)****dnaimark@azchildren.org****www.azchildren.org**


---

**Alaska**
**Virgene Hanna***Project Director***KIDS COUNT Alaska****University of Alaska—****Anchorage Institute of Social  
and Economic Research**

3211 Providence Dr.

Anchorage, AK 99508

**(907) 786-7706****(907) 786-7739 (fax)****afngd@uaa.alaska.edu****www.kidscount.alaska.edu**


---

**Arkansas**
**Amy Rossi***Executive Director***Arkansas Advocates for  
Children & Families**

523 S Louisiana

Suite 700

Little Rock, AR 72201-4531

**(501) 371-9678****(501) 371-9681 (fax)****amyrossi@swbell.net****www.aradvocates.org**

## California

**Amy Dominguez-Arms**

*Vice President*

## Children Now

1212 Broadway  
Suite 530  
Oakland, CA 94612  
**(510) 763-2444**  
**(510) 763-1974 (fax)**  
[ada@childrennow.org](mailto:ada@childrennow.org)  
[www.childrennow.org](http://www.childrennow.org)

## Delaware

**Teresa Schooley**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Project Director*

## University of Delaware

298K Graham Hall  
Newark, DE 19716  
**(302) 831-4966**  
**(302) 831-4987 (fax)**  
[terrys@udel.edu](mailto:terrys@udel.edu)  
[www.dekidscount.org](http://www.dekidscount.org)

## Colorado

**Kaye Boeke**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Coordinator*

## Colorado Children's Campaign

225 E 16th Ave.  
Suite B-300  
Denver, CO 80203  
**(303) 839-1580 ext. 232**  
**(303) 839-1354 (fax)**  
[kaye@coloradokids.org](mailto:kaye@coloradokids.org)  
[www.coloradokids.org](http://www.coloradokids.org)

## District of Columbia

**Sonali Patel**

*Director of*

*Public Policy*

## DC Children's Trust Fund

2021 L St. NW  
Suite 205  
Washington, DC 20036-4960  
**(202) 624-5555**  
**(202) 624-0396 (fax)**  
[spatel@dcctf.org](mailto:spatel@dcctf.org)  
[www.dcctf.org](http://www.dcctf.org)

## Connecticut

**Amy Sampson**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Coordinator*

## Connecticut Association for Human Services

110 Bartholomew Ave.  
Suite 4030  
Hartford, CT 06106  
**(860) 951-2212 ext. 239**  
**(860) 951-6511 (fax)**  
[amy.sampson@cahs.org](mailto:amy.sampson@cahs.org)  
[www.cahs.org](http://www.cahs.org)

## Florida

**Susan Weitzel**

*Director*

**Center for the Study of Children's Futures**  
**Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida**  
13301 Bruce B. Downs Blvd.  
Tampa, FL 33612  
**(813) 974-7411**  
**(813) 974-8534 (fax)**  
[weitzel@fmhi.usf.edu](mailto:weitzel@fmhi.usf.edu)  
[www.floridakidscount.org](http://www.floridakidscount.org)

**Georgia**

**Gustave Thomas**  
*Executive Director*

**Georgians For Children**

300 W Wieuca Rd. NW  
Suite 216  
Atlanta, GA 30342  
**(404) 843-0017**  
**(404) 843-0019 (fax)**  
**gustave@georgians.com**  
**www.georgians.com**

**Illinois**

**Julie Zasadny**  
*Director of  
Communications*

**Voices for Illinois Children**

208 S LaSalle St.  
Suite 1490  
Chicago, IL 60604  
**(312) 516-5551**  
**(312) 456-0088 (fax)**  
**jzasadny@voices4kids.org**  
**www.voices4kids.org**

**Hawaii**

**Marcia Hartsock**  
*KIDS COUNT  
Project Director*

**Center on the Family  
University of Hawaii—Manoa**

2515 Campus Rd.  
Miller Hall 103  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
**(808) 956-4136**  
**(808) 956-4147 (fax)**  
**marciah@hawaii.edu**  
**uhfamily.hawaii.edu**

**Indiana**

**Karen Ruprecht**  
*Director of  
Programs*

**Indiana Youth Institute**

603 E Washington St.  
Suite 800  
Indianapolis, IN 46208-4046  
**(800) 343-7060**  
**(317) 924-1314 (fax)**  
**ruprecht@iyi.org**  
**www.iyi.org**

**Idaho**

**Linda Jensen**  
*KIDS COUNT Director*

**Mountain States Group**

1607 W Jefferson St.  
Boise, ID 83702  
**(208) 388-1014**  
**(208) 331-0267 (fax)**  
**ljensen@mtnstatesgroup.org**  
**www.idahokids.org**

**Iowa**

**Michael Crawford**  
*KIDS COUNT  
Project Director*

**Child & Family Policy Center**

218 Sixth Ave.  
Suite 1021  
Des Moines, IA 50309  
**(515) 280-9027**  
**(515) 244-8997 (fax)**  
**mcrawford@cfpciowa.org**  
**www.cfpciowa.org**

## Kansas

### Gary Brunk

*Executive Director*

### Kansas Action for Children

PO Box 463

Topeka, KS 66601

**(785) 232-0550**

**(785) 232-0699 (fax)**

**brunk@kac.org**

**www.kac.org**

## Maine

### Lynn Davey

*KIDS COUNT*

*Director*

### Maine Children's Alliance

303 State St.

Augusta, ME 04330

**(207) 623-1868**

**(207) 626-3302 (fax)**

**ldavey@mekids.org**

**www.mekids.org**

## Kentucky

### Valerie Salley

*KIDS COUNT*

*Coordinator*

### Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc.

2034 Frankfort Ave.

Louisville, KY 40206

**(502) 895-8167**

**(502) 895-8225 (fax)**

**vsalley@kyyouth.org**

**www.kyyouth.org**

## Maryland

### Jennean Everett-

**Reynolds**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Project Director*

### Advocates for Children & Youth

34 Market Pl.

5th Floor

Bernstein Building

Baltimore, MD 21202

**(410) 547-9200**

**(410) 547-8690 (fax)**

**jenneanr@aol.com**

**www.acy.org**

## Louisiana

### Shannon Johnson

*KIDS COUNT*

*Coordinator*

### Agenda for Children

PO Box 51837

New Orleans, LA 70151

**(504) 586-8509**

**(504) 586-8522 (fax)**

**sjohnson@agendaforchildren.org**

**www.agendaforchildren.org**

## Massachusetts

### Barry Hock

*KIDS COUNT*

*Coordinator*

### Massachusetts Citizens for Children

14 Beacon St.

Suite 706

Boston, MA 02108

**(617) 742-8555**

**(617) 742-7808 (fax)**

**barry@masskids.org**

**www.masskids.org**

---

**Michigan**

**Jane Zehnder-Merrell**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Project Director*

**Michigan League for Human Services**

1115 S Pennsylvania Ave.

Suite 202

Lansing, MI 48912-1658

**(517) 487-5436**

**(517) 371-4546 (fax)**

**janez@mlan.net**

**www.milhs.org**

---

**Missouri**

**Cande Iveson**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Project Director*

**Citizens for Missouri's Children**

621 E McCarty

Suite D

Jefferson City, MO 65101

**(573) 634-4324**

**(573) 634-7540 (fax)**

**civeson@mokids.org**

**www.mokids.org**

---

**Minnesota**

**Diane Benjamin**

*KIDS COUNT Director*

**Children's Defense Fund—Minnesota**

200 University Ave. W

Suite 210

St. Paul, MN 55103

**(651) 227-6121**

**(651) 227-2553 (fax)**

**benjamin@cdf-mn.org**

**www.cdf-mn.org**

---

**Montana**

**Steve Seninger**

*Director of*

*Economic Analysis*

**Bureau of Business and Economic Research  
University of Montana**

234 Gallagher Business Building

Missoula, MT 59812-6840

**(406) 243-2725**

**(406) 243-2086 (fax)**

**steve.seninger@business.umt.edu**

---

**Mississippi**

**K.C. Grist**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Project Coordinator*

**Mississippi Forum on Children and Families, Inc.**

737 N President St.

Jackson, MS 39202

**(601) 355-4911**

**(601) 355-4813 (fax)**

**kccald@meta3.net**

**www.mfcf.org**

---

**Nebraska**

**Janet Johnston**

*Research*

*Coordinator*

**Voices for Children in Nebraska**

7521 Main St.

Suite 103

Omaha, NE 68127

**(402) 597-3100**

**(402) 597-2705 (fax)**

**jjohnston@voicesforchildren.com**

---

**Nevada**  
**R. Keith Schwer**  
*Director*

**Center for Business and Economic Research**  
**University of Nevada, Las Vegas**  
 4505 S Maryland Pkwy.  
 Box 456002  
 Las Vegas, NV 89154  
**(702) 895-3191**  
**(702) 895-3606 (fax)**  
**schwer@nevada.edu**  
**www.kidscount.unlv.edu**

---

**New Mexico**  
**Kelly O'Donnell**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Coordinator*

**New Mexico Advocates for Children & Families**  
 8505 Rancho Diego Pl. NE  
 Albuquerque, NM 87113  
**(505) 259-9713**  
**(505) 244-9509 (fax)**  
**kodonnell@uswest.net**  
**www.nmadvocates.org**

---

**New Hampshire**  
**Candace Leonard**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Coordinator*

**Children's Alliance of New Hampshire**  
 2 Greenwood Ave.  
 Concord, NH 03301  
**(603) 225-2264**  
**(603) 225-8264 (fax)**  
**cleonard@childrennh.org**  
**www.childrennh.org**

---

**New York**  
**Deborah Benson**  
*Director of*  
*Policy Planning*  
*& Research*

**State of New York Council on Children and Families**  
 5 Empire State Plaza  
 Suite 2810  
 Albany, NY 12223-1533  
**(518) 474-6294**  
**(518) 473-2570 (fax)**  
**debbie.benson@ccf.state.ny.us**  
**www.capital.net/com/council**

---

**New Jersey**  
**Eloisa Hernandez**  
*KIDS COUNT Director*

**Association for Children of New Jersey**  
 35 Halsey St.  
 Newark, NJ 07102  
**(973) 643-3876**  
**(973) 643-9153 (fax)**  
**eloisa@acnj.org**  
**www.acnj.org**

---

**North Carolina**  
**Joann Haggerty**  
*Research & Data*  
*Director*

**North Carolina Child Advocacy Institute**  
 311 E Edenton St.  
 Raleigh, NC 27601-1017  
**(919) 834-6623 ext. 233**  
**(919) 829-7299 (fax)**  
**jhaggerty@intrex.net**  
**www.ncchild.org**

---

**North Dakota**  
**Ann Lochner**  
*Director*

**North Dakota KIDS COUNT**  
**North Dakota State University**  
 Department of Agribusiness and  
 Applied Economics  
 IACC 424  
 PO Box 5636  
 Fargo, ND 58105  
**(701) 231-7980**  
**(701) 231-7400 (fax)**  
[ann\\_lochner@mail.und.nodak.edu](mailto:ann_lochner@mail.und.nodak.edu)

---

**Oregon**  
**Liz Smith**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Coordinator*

**Children First for Oregon**  
 PO Box 14914  
 Portland, OR 97214  
**(503) 236-9754**  
**(503) 236-3048 (fax)**  
[liz@cffo.org](mailto:liz@cffo.org)  
[www.cffo.org](http://www.cffo.org)

---

**Ohio**  
**Mark Real**  
*Executive Director*

**Children's Defense Fund Ohio**  
 52 E Lynn St.  
 Suite 400  
 Columbus, OH 43215-3551  
**(614) 221-2244**  
**(614) 221-2247 (fax)**  
[mreal@cdfohio.org](mailto:mreal@cdfohio.org)  
[www.cdfohio.org](http://www.cdfohio.org)

---

**Pennsylvania**  
**Joan Benso**  
*Executive Director*

**Pennsylvania Partnerships  
 for Children**  
 20 N Market Sq.  
 Suite 300  
 Harrisburg, PA 17101  
**(717) 236-5680**  
**(717) 236-7745 (fax)**  
[jbenso@papartnerships.org](mailto:jbenso@papartnerships.org)  
[www.papartnerships.org](http://www.papartnerships.org)

---

**Oklahoma**  
**Ann Salazar**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Leadership*  
*Coordinator*

**Oklahoma Institute for  
 Child Advocacy**  
 420 NW 13th St.  
 Suite 101  
 Oklahoma City, OK 73103  
**(405) 236-5437**  
**(405) 236-5439 (fax)**  
[apsalazar@oica.org](mailto:apsalazar@oica.org)  
[www.oica.org](http://www.oica.org)

---

**Rhode Island**  
**Elizabeth Burke  
 Bryant**  
*Executive Director*

**Rhode Island KIDS COUNT**  
 1 Union Station  
 Providence, RI 02903  
**(401) 351-9400**  
**(401) 351-1758 (fax)**  
[ebb@rikidscount.org](mailto:ebb@rikidscount.org)  
[www.rikidscount.org](http://www.rikidscount.org)

**South Carolina**  
**Baron Holmes**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Project Director*

**South Carolina Budget & Control Board**  
 PO Box 12444  
 Columbia, SC 29211  
**(803) 734-2291**  
**(803) 734-1276 (fax)**  
**bholmes@ogc.state.sc.us**  
**www.ors.state.sc.us/kc.html**

**Texas**  
**Dianne Stewart**  
*Executive Director*

**Center for Public Policy Priorities**  
 900 Lydia St.  
 Austin, TX 78702  
**(512) 320-0222**  
**(512) 320-0227 (fax)**  
**www.cppp.org/kidscount**

**South Dakota**  
**Carole Cochran**  
*Project Director*

**Business Research Bureau**  
**University of South Dakota**  
 414 E Clark St.  
 Vermillion, SD 57069  
**(605) 677-5287**  
**(605) 677-5427 (fax)**  
**ccochran@usd.edu**  
**www.usd.edu/brbinfo/brb/kc**

**U.S. Virgin Islands**  
**Dee Baecher-Brown**  
*Executive Director*

**The Community Foundation of the Virgin Islands**  
 PO Box 11790  
 38A Dronningens Gade  
 Suite 103  
 St. Thomas  
 USVI 00801  
**(340) 774-6031**  
**(340) 774-3852 (fax)**  
**dbrowncfvi@attglobal.net**

**Tennessee**  
**Pam Brown**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Project Director*

**Tennessee Commission on Children & Youth**  
 Andrew Johnson Tower  
 9th Floor  
 710 James Robertson Pkwy.  
 Nashville, TN 37243-0800  
**(615) 532-1571**  
**(615) 741-5956 (fax)**  
**pbrown3@mail.state.tn.us**  
**www.state.tn.us/tccy**

**Utah**  
**Terry Haven**  
*KIDS COUNT*  
*Coordinator*

**Utah Children**  
 757 E South Temple St.  
 Suite 250  
 Salt Lake City, UT 84102  
**(801) 364-1182**  
**(801) 364-1186 (fax)**  
**terryh@utahchildren.net**  
**www.utahchildren.net**

**Vermont**

**Carlen Finn**

*Executive Director*

**Vermont Children's Forum**

PO Box 261  
 Montpelier, VT 05601  
**(802) 229-6377**  
**(802) 229-4929 (fax)**  
[vtcyf@together.net](mailto:vtcyf@together.net)

**West Virginia**

**Margie Hale**

*Executive Director*

**West Virginia KIDS COUNT Fund**

1031 Quarrier St.  
 Suite 313  
 Atlas Building  
 Charleston, WV 25301  
**(304) 345-2101**  
**(304) 345-2102 (fax)**  
[margiehale@wvkidscountfund.org](mailto:margiehale@wvkidscountfund.org)  
[www.wvkidscountfund.org](http://www.wvkidscountfund.org)

**Virginia**

**Cindy Dixon**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Project Director*

**Action Alliance for Virginia's  
 Children & Youth**

701 E Franklin St.  
 Suite 807  
 Richmond, VA 23219  
**(804) 649-0184**  
**(804) 649-0161 (fax)**  
[cindy@vakids.org](mailto:cindy@vakids.org)  
[www.vakids.org](http://www.vakids.org)

**Wisconsin**

**M. Martha Cranley**

*KIDS COUNT*

*Coordinator*

**Wisconsin Council on  
 Children & Families**

16 N Carroll St.  
 Suite 600  
 Madison, WI 53703  
**(608) 284-0580**  
**(608) 284-0583 (fax)**  
[mcranley@wccf.org](mailto:mcranley@wccf.org)  
[www.wccf.org](http://www.wccf.org)

**Washington**

**Richard Brandon**

*Executive Director*

**Human Services Policy Center  
 Evans School of Public Affairs  
 University of Washington**

303 Parrington  
 Box 353060  
 Seattle, WA 98195-3060  
**(206) 543-8483**  
**(206) 616-1553 (fax)**  
[brandon@u.washington.edu](mailto:brandon@u.washington.edu)  
[www.hspc.org](http://www.hspc.org)

**Wyoming**

**Kathy Emmons**

*Executive Director*

**Wyoming Children's Action  
 Alliance**

2712 Thomas Ave.  
 Cheyenne, WY 82001  
**(307) 635-2272**  
**(307) 635-4680 (fax)**  
[kemmons@trib.com](mailto:kemmons@trib.com)  
[www.wykids.com](http://www.wykids.com)



**The Annie E. Casey Foundation**  
701 St. Paul Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
410.547.6600  
410.547.6624 fax  
[www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org)

**Population Reference Bureau**  
1875 Connecticut Avenue NW  
Suite 520  
Washington, DC 20009-5738  
202.483.1100  
202.328.3937 fax  
[www.prb.org](http://www.prb.org)

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 United Parcel Service, 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, cost-effective responses to these needs.

**The Annie E. Casey Foundation**

**701 St. Paul Street**

**Baltimore, MD 21202**

**410.547.6600**

**410.547.6624 fax**

**[www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org)**