



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

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

Gene Falk

Specialist in Social Policy

March 18, 2016

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL32760

Summary

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant funds a wide range of benefits and services for low-income families with children. TANF was created in the 1996 welfare reform law (P.L. 104-193). This report responds to some frequently asked questions about TANF; it does not describe TANF rules (see, instead, CRS In Focus IF10036, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant*, by Gene Falk).

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

Federal and State TANF Expenditures. Though TANF is best known for funding cash assistance payments for needy families with children, the block grant and MOE funds are used for a wide variety of benefits and activities. In FY2014, expenditures on basic assistance (cash assistance) totaled \$8.4 billion—26% of total federal TANF and MOE dollars. TANF also contributes funds for child care and services for children who have been, or are at risk of being, abused and neglected. Some states also count expenditures in the pre-Kindergarten programs toward the MOE requirement.

Cash Assistance Caseload. A total of 1.6 million families, composed of 4.1 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded cash in March 2015. The bulk of the “recipients” were children—2.9 million in that month. The cash assistance caseload is heterogeneous. The type of family historically thought of as the “typical” cash assistance family—one with an unemployed adult recipient—accounted for less than half (45%) of all families on the rolls in FY2013. Additionally, 17% of cash assistance families had an employed adult, while 38% of all TANF families were “child-only” and had no adult recipient. Child-only families include those with disabled adults receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), adults who are nonparents (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) caring for children, and families consisting of citizen children and ineligible noncitizen parents.

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

Cash Assistance Work Requirements. TANF requires states to engage 50% of all families and 90% of two-parent families in work activities. However, these standards are reduced by the amount of a state’s caseload reduction from FY2005. Further, states may get an extra credit against these standards by spending more than required under the TANF MOE. Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% or 90% targets, and vary by state. In FY2013 states achieved, on average, an all-family participation rate of 33.5% and a two-parent rate of 32.9%. That year, 11 jurisdictions failed the all-family standard, and 18 jurisdictions failed the two-parent standard. States that fail to meet work standards are *at risk* of being penalized by a reduction in their block grant.

Contents

Introduction	1
Current Topics	1
What Is TANF’s Current Funding Status?.....	1
What Is TANF’s Funding Level?	1
May States Require Drug Testing of TANF Cash Assistance Recipients?.....	2
What Are TANF’s Rules for Drug Felons?	2
What Are TANF’s Rules for Substance Abuse Treatment?.....	2
What Is the Administration’s “Waiver” Initiative?.....	3
Has Any State Formally Applied for a “Waiver” of TANF Work Participation Standards?	3
Are there Restrictions on a Family’s Use of TANF Benefits?	3
Funding and Expenditures.....	3
How Much Has the TANF Grant Declined in Value Because of Inflation?.....	3
How May States Use Federal TANF Funds?	4
What Expenditures May a State Count Toward its Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Requirement?	5
How Have States Used TANF Funds?	5
How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?	6
The Caseload	7
How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services?.....	7
How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Cash Assistance?.....	7
How Does the Current Cash Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels?	7
What Are the Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families?	9
TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month?.....	10
TANF Work Participation Standards	11
What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?	11
Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law?	12
What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?.....	12
How Many Jurisdictions Have Failed the All-Families Standard From FY2002 Through FY2013?.....	13
Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?.....	15

Figures

Figure 1. Uses of TANF and MOE Funds, FY2014.....	6
Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance, July 1959-March 2015	8
Figure 3. Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families, Selected Years FY1988 to FY2013.....	9
Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single Parent Family with Two Children, July 2013	11
Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002- FY2013.....	13

Tables

Table 1. Federal Funding for TANF Grants: FY2008 Through FY2015.....	1
Table 2. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Constant Dollars	4
Table 3. TANF Cash Assistance Caseload: March 2015	7
Table 4. States Failing TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard: FY2002-FY2013.....	14
Table 5. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2002-FY2013	16
Table A-1. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2003-FY2006.....	19
Table A-2. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2011-FY2015	19
Table A-3. Uses of Federal TANF and State Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Dollars, FY2014.....	21
Table A-4. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961 to 2014.....	21
Table A-5. Families Receiving AFDC/TANF Cash Assistance by Family Category, Selected Years, FY1988 to FY2013	23
Table B-1. Use of FY2014 TANF and MOE Funds by Category.....	24
Table B-2. Use of FY2014 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percent of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding.....	26
Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2014.....	29
Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Cash Assistance by State, March 2015	30
Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Cash Assistance by State, March of Selected Years.....	32
Table B-6. TANF Families by Number of Parents by State: March 2015.....	34
Table B-7. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and Work Participation Rates by State, All Families, FY2013	36
Table B-8. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and Work Participation Rates by State, Two-Parent Families, FY2013.....	38

Appendixes

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables	19
Appendix B. State Tables	24

Contacts

Author Contact Information	40
----------------------------------	----

Introduction

This report provides responses to frequently asked questions about the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It is intended to serve as a quick reference to provide easy access to information and data. This report does not provide information on TANF program rules. For a non-technical overview of TANF, see CRS In Focus IF10036, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant*, by Gene Falk.

Current Topics

What Is TANF’s Current Funding Status?

P.L. 114-113 (The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016) extends TANF funding through September 30, 2016.¹ Funding for TANF is provided at the same level, and on the same terms, as in FY2015.

What Is TANF’s Funding Level?

Table 1 shows TANF funding for FY2008 through FY2016. The bulk of TANF funding is in a basic block grant (the state family assistance grant), which provides annual funding totaling \$16.5 billion for the 50 states and District of Columbia. This grant amount was established in the 1996 welfare reform law and has not been changed since then.

FY2016 funding for TANF grants is the same as in FY2015. As was the case in the prior year, a total of \$583 million is available for FY2016 contingency fund grants to states, compared with \$610 million in FY2014.

Table 1. Federal Funding for TANF Grants: FY2008 Through FY2015
(Dollars in millions)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
State family assistance grant	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489
Supplemental grants	319	319	319	211	0	0	0	0	0
Healthy marriage/responsible fatherhood grants	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150
Grants to the territories	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78
Grants for tribal work programs	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Contingency fund	428	1,107	212	334	612	610 ^a	610 ^a	583 ^b	583 ^c
Emergency contingency fund		617	4,383						
Totals	17,472	18,768	21,639	17,270	17,337	17,335	17,335	17,308	17,308

¹ The extension of program authority and funding for TANF is contained in Section 230 of Division H of the public law.

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

- a. P.L. 112-275 appropriated \$612 million to the TANF contingency fund for FY2013 and FY2014, and reserved \$2 million in each year of these funds for a commission on child abuse and neglect fatalities. Thus, \$610 million was available for FY2013 and FY2014 TANF contingency fund grants to states.
- b. P.L. 113-235 appropriated \$608 million to the TANF contingency fund for FY2015 and FY2016, but sets aside from those funds \$15 million for HHS welfare research activities and \$10 million for U.S. Census Bureau activities related to welfare research.
- c. P.L. 114-113 appropriated \$160 million to the TANF contingency fund for FY2016 and FY2017. It set aside from those funds \$15 million for HHS welfare research activities and \$10 million for U.S. Census Bureau activities related to welfare research. (The FY2016 appropriation to the contingency fund made by P.L. 114-113 replaced the FY2016 appropriation previously made by P.L. 113-235.)

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

May States Require Drug Testing of TANF Cash Assistance Recipients?

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

What Are TANF’s Rules for Drug Felons?

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

What Are TANF’s Rules for Substance Abuse Treatment?

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

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

Additionally, a state may engage recipients in substance abuse treatment and count that activity toward its work participation standard, though such an activity is counted only for a limited

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

period of time. Substance abuse treatment is considered a “job readiness” activity; a state may count job search and job readiness activities for a maximum of 12 weeks in a year toward its work participation standards.

What Is the Administration’s “Waiver” Initiative?

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

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

As of March 16, 2016, one state (Ohio) had requested a waiver of TANF work participation standards. As of that date, the Administration had made no decision on whether to approve the waiver request.

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

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

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

Funding and Expenditures

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

From FY1997 (the first full year of TANF funding) through FY2015 (ended September 30, 2015), the real value of the TANF block grant declined by 32.5%. **Table 2** shows the impact of inflation on the value of the TANF block grant for each year, FY1997 through FY2015. On average, the TANF basic block grant has lost 2.2% of its value each year over that period.

Table 2. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Constant Dollars

Fiscal Year	Value of the Basic TANF Block Grant in FY1997 Dollars (\$ in billions)	Cumulative Change in Value of the Basic Block Grant from FY1997 Levels
1997	\$16.5	
1998	16.2	-1.6%
1999	15.9	-3.5
2000	15.4	-6.4
2001	14.9	-9.4
2002	14.7	-10.7
2003	14.4	-12.7
2004	14.1	-14.7
2005	13.6	-17.4
2006	13.1	-20.4
2007	12.8	-22.2
2008	12.3	-25.5
2009	12.3	-25.3
2010	12.1	-26.5
2011	11.8	-28.4
2012	11.5	-30.1
2013	11.3	-31.2
2014	11.2	-32.3
2015	11.1	-32.5
Average Annual Rate of Change in the Value of the Block Grant		-2.2%

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

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

How May States Use Federal TANF Funds?

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

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

1. provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives;

2. end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage;
3. prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and
4. encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

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

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

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

The range of expenditures on activities that states may count toward the maintenance of effort requirement is—like the authority to spend federal funds—quite broad. The expenditures need not be in the “TANF program” itself, but in any program that provides benefits and services to TANF-eligible families in cash assistance, child care assistance, education and job training, administrative costs, or any other activity designed to meet TANF’s statutory goals. States may count expenditures made by local governments toward the MOE requirement.

Additionally, there is a general rule of federal grants management that permits states to count as a state expenditure “third-party” in-kind donations from non-governmental entities. These third-party donations may be counted toward the TANF MOE as long as they meet the requirements of providing benefits or services to TANF-eligible families and meet the requirements of the types of activities that states may count toward the MOE requirement.

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


How Have States Used TANF Funds?

Figure 1 shows the uses of federal TANF grants to states and state MOE funds in FY2014. In FY2014, a total of \$31.9 billion of both federal TANF and state MOE expenditures were either expended or transferred to other block grant programs. Basic assistance, the category that most closely reflects cash assistance, represented 26% (\$8.4 billion) of total FY2014 TANF and MOE dollars.

TANF is a major contributor of child care funding. In FY2014, 16% of all TANF funds used were either expended on child care or transferred to the child care block grant (the Child Care and

Development Fund, or CCDF). TANF is also a major contributor to the child welfare system, which provides foster care, adoption assistance, and services to families with children who either have experienced or are at risk of experiencing child abuse or neglect. However, TANF’s accounting system does not clearly capture expenditures associated with spending on the child welfare system. Most TANF funding for these programs is subsumed in the catch-all “other” expenditure category. Some states also count as MOE dollars their expenditures on pre-Kindergarten programs. These expenditures too are subsumed in the “other” expenditure category.

Figure 1. Uses of TANF and MOE Funds, FY2014
(Dollars in billions)



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

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

How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?

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

At the end of FY2014 (September 30, 2014, the latest data currently available), a total of \$3.4 billion of federal TANF funding remained neither transferred nor spent. However, some of these unspent funds represent monies that states had already committed to spend later. At the end of FY2014, states had made such commitments to spend—that is, had obligated—a total of \$1.7 billion. Generally, obligations are binding commitments to spend, and they come in the form of contracts and grants to provide benefits and services. However, the definition of “obligation” varies from program to program, and because TANF essentially consists of 54 different programs (one for each state, the District of Columbia, and the territories), what constitutes an obligation may vary.

At the end of FY2014, states had \$1.6 billion of “unobligated balances.” These funds are available to states to make *new* spending commitments. **Table B-3** shows unspent TANF funds by state.

The Caseload

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

This number is not known. Federal TANF reporting requirements focus on families receiving only ongoing *basic (i.e., cash) assistance*, with no complete reporting on families receiving other TANF benefits and services. As discussed in a previous section of this report, TANF basic assistance accounts for about 26% of all TANF expenditures. Therefore, the federal reporting requirements that pertain to families receiving “assistance” are likely to undercount the number of families receiving any TANF-funded benefit or service.

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

Table 3 provides cash assistance caseload information. A total of 1.6 million families, composed of 4.1 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded cash in March 2015. The bulk of the “recipients” were children—2.9 million in that month. For state-by-state cash assistance caseloads, see **Table B-4**.

Table 3. TANF Cash Assistance Caseload: March 2015

Total Families	1,618,151
Total Recipients	4,067,509
Total Adults	1,120,809
Total Children	2,946,700

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

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

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

Figure 2 provides a long-term historical perspective on the number of families receiving cash assistance, from July 1959 to March 2015. Before 1997, these are families that received cash assistance from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. From 1997 onward, these are families that received cash assistance from TANF.


The shaded areas of the figure represent months when the national economy was in recession. Though the health of the national economy affected the trend in the cash assistance caseload, the long-term trend in receipt of cash assistance does not follow a classic counter-cyclical pattern. Such a pattern would have the caseload rise during economic slumps, and then fall again during

periods of economic growth. Factors other than the health of the economy (demographic trends, policy changes) also influenced the caseload trend.

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

During the recent 2007-2009 recession and its aftermath, the caseload began to rise from 1.7 million families in August 2008, peaking in December 2010 at close to 2.0 million families. By March 2015, the cash assistance caseload had declined to a new post welfare reform low of 1.6 million families.

Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance, July 1959-March 2015



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

Notes: Shaded areas denote months when the national economy was in recession. Information represents families receiving cash assistance from Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and TANF. For October 1999 through March 2015, includes families receiving assistance from Separate State Programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. See **Table A-4** for average annual data on families, recipients, adult recipients, and child recipients of ADC, AFDC, and TANF cash assistance for 1961 to 2014.


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

What Are the Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families?

Historically, the “typical” cash assistance family has been headed by a single parent (usually the mother) with one or two children. The single parent has also typically been unemployed. However, the cash assistance caseload decline has occurred together with a major shift in the composition of the rolls. **Figure 3** shows the change in the size and composition of the cash assistance caseload under both AFDC (1988 and 1994) and under TANF. In FY1988, 84% of AFDC families were headed by an unemployed adult recipient. In FY2013, families with an unemployed adult recipient represented 45% of all cash assistance families. This decline occurred, in large part, as the number of families headed by unemployed adult recipients declined more rapidly than other components of the cash assistance caseload.

With the decline in families headed by unemployed adults, the share of the caseload that represented families with employed adults and “child only” families has increased. In FY2013, families with employed adult recipients represented 17% of all cash assistance families. “Child-only” families are those where no adult recipient receives benefits in their own right; the family receives benefits on behalf of its children. The share of the caseload that was child-only in FY2013 was 38%. In FY2013, families with a non-recipient, non-parent relative (grandparents, aunts, uncles) represented 13% of all cash assistance families. Families with ineligible, noncitizen adults or adults who have not reported their citizenship status made up 11% of the cash assistance caseload in that year. Families where the parent received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and the children received TANF made up 9% of all cash assistance families in FY2013.

Figure 3. Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families, Selected Years FY1988 to FY2013



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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

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



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

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

TANF Work Participation Standards

What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?

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

However, the statutory work participation standards are reduced by a “caseload reduction credit.” The caseload reduction credit reduces the participation standard one percentage point for each

⁵ Some families are excluded from the participation rate calculation.

percentage point decline in a state's caseload. Additionally, under a regulatory provision, a state may get "extra" credit for caseload reduction if it spends more than required under the TANF MOE. Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% and 90% targets, and vary by state and by year.

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

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

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

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


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

What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?

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

Figure 5 shows the national average all-families work participation rate for FY2002 through FY2013. For the period FY2002 through FY2011, states achieved an average all-families work participation rate hovering around 30%. In FY2012, the average all-families work participation rate ticked up to 34.4%. In that year, states faced higher work participation standards because the "freeze" to the caseload reduction credit enacted in ARRA expired. The FY2013 average all-families work participation rate declined slightly to 33.5%.

Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2013



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

How Many Jurisdictions Have Failed the All-Families Standard From FY2002 Through FY2013?

Table 4 shows which states failed the TANF all-families work participation standards from FY2002 through FY2013. Before FY2007, only a few jurisdictions failed to meet TANF all-families work participation standards. However, in FY2007, 15 jurisdictions failed to meet the all-families standard. FY2007 was the first year in which policies under the DRA were effective. This number declined to 9 in FY2008 and 8 in FY2009.

In FY2012, despite the uptick in the national average work participation rate, 16 states failed to meet the all-family standard, the largest number of states that did not meet their participation standards in any one year since the enactment of TANF. FY2012 was the year that ARRA’s “freeze” of the caseload reduction credit expired, and states were generally required to meet higher standards than in previous years.

In FY2013, the number of jurisdictions that failed the all-family work participation standard declined to 11. The 11 jurisdictions are California, Colorado, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Puerto Rico, and Guam. California, Oregon, and Guam have failed their all-family work standards for all years, FY2007 through FY2013.

For state-by-state information on FY2013 caseload reduction credits, effective (after credit) standards, and work participation rates related to the “all families” standard, see **Table B-7**.

**Table 4. States Failing TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard:
FY2002-FY2013**

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

State	Pre-DRA					Post-DRA						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alabama												
Alaska											X	
Arizona												
Arkansas												
California						X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Colorado											X	X
Connecticut					X							
Delaware												
District of Columbia								X	X	X		
Florida												
Georgia												
Hawaii												
Idaho											X	
Illinois												
Indiana				X	X	X						
Iowa												
Kansas												
Kentucky						X						
Louisiana												
Maine						X	X	X	X	X	X	
Maryland												
Massachusetts												
Michigan						X	X		X	X		
Minnesota						X						
Mississippi												
Missouri							X	X		X	X	X
Montana												
Nebraska												
Nevada		X				X					X	X
New Hampshire												
New Jersey												
New Mexico						X						

State	Pre-DRA					Post-DRA						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
New York												
North Carolina												
North Dakota												
Ohio						X	X	X	X	X		
Oklahoma												
Oregon						X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pennsylvania												X
Puerto Rico						X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rhode Island											X	
South Carolina											X	
South Dakota												
Tennessee												
Texas												
Utah												
Vermont						X					X	X
Virginia											X	
Washington											X	X
West Virginia						X	X					
Wisconsin											X	X
Wyoming												
Guam	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Virgin Islands						X						
Totals	1	2	1	2	3	15	9	8	8	9	16	11

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

Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?

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

Table 5 shows whether each state met its two-parent work participation standard for FY2002 through FY2013. However, the display on the table is more complex than that for reporting whether a state failed its “all family” rate. A substantial number of states have reported *no* two-parent families subject to the work participation standard.⁶ These states are denoted on the table

⁶ Before the changes made by the DRA were effective, a number of states had their two-parent families in separate state (continued...)

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

In FY2013, 27 jurisdictions reported that no two-parent families were included in the TANF work participation standard calculation. Of the 27 jurisdictions that had two-parent families in their TANF work participation calculation, 9 met the standard and 18 did not. For state-by-state information on FY2013 caseload reduction credits, effective (after credit) standards, and work participation rates related to two-parent families, see **Table B-8**.

Table 5. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2002-FY2013

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

State	Pre- Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					Post-Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Alaska	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Arizona	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Arkansas	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Colorado	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Idaho	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Iowa	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Kansas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Kentucky	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Louisiana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

(...continued)

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

State	Pre- Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					Post-Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	NA	YES	YES
Michigan	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
New Hampshire	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
New York	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Oklahoma	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NA
Pennsylvania	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
South Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
West Virginia	NO	NO	NA	NA	NA	NO	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Wyoming	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Guam	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	Pre- Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)					Post-Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of Jurisdictions without Two-Parent Families	24	25	29	29	29	24	26	27	25	27	27	27
Number of Jurisdictions with Two-Parent Families	30	29	25	25	25	30	28	27	29	27	27	27
Number of Jurisdictions Meeting Two-Parent Standard	25	25	21	23	21	22	22	20	23	22	7	9
Number of Jurisdictions Failing Two-Parent Standard	5	4	4	2	3	7	6	7	6	5	20	18

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

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

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

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

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS).

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

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

Public Law	Time Period	Notes
P.L. 111-242	Oct. 1, 2010-Dec. 3, 2010	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 111-290	Dec. 4, 2010-Dec. 7, 2010	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 111-291	Dec. 8, 2010-Sept. 30, 2011 (except supplemental grants, Dec. 8, 2010-June 30, 2011)	Extension as part of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010. It funded supplemental grants only through the first three quarters of FY2011 and at a reduced rate.
P.L. 112-35	Oct. 1, 2011-Dec. 31, 2011	Free-standing bill to extend TANF for three months. No funding for TANF supplemental grants.

Public Law	Time Period	Notes
P.L. 112-78	Jan 1, 2012-Feb. 21, 2012	Extension of TANF for two months, as part of a bill to provide a two-month extension for the 2011 payroll tax reduction, extended unemployment compensation, and other expiring provisions.
P.L. 112-96	Feb. 22, 2012-Sept. 30, 2012	Extension of TANF for the remainder of FY2012 included as part of a bill to extend the 2011 payroll tax reduction, unemployment compensation, and other expiring provisions.
P.L. 112-175	Oct. 1, 2011-March 27, 2013	Extension of TANF for the first six months of FY2013 as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-6	March 28, 2013-Sept. 30, 2013	Extension of TANF for the remainder of FY2013 as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-46	Oct. 17, 2013-Jan. 15, 2014	Extension of TANF as a part of a continuing resolution. The resolution ended the “government shutdown,” and a TANF funding gap between Oct 1 and Oct 16, 2013
P.L. 113-73	Jan. 16, 2014-Jan. 18, 2014	Extension of TANF funding as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-76	Jan. 19, 2014-Sept. 30, 2014	Extension of TANF funding for the remainder of FY2014 as part of an omnibus appropriation act.
P.L. 113-164	Oct. 1, 2014-Dec. 11, 2014	Extension of TANF funding through Dec. 11, 2014, as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-202	Dec. 12, 2014-Dec. 13, 2014	Extension of TANF funding through Dec. 13, 2014, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-203	Dec. 14, 2014-Dec. 17, 2014	Extension of TANF funding through Dec. 17, 2014, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-235	Dec. 18, 2014-Sept. 30, 2015	Extension of TANF funding for the remainder of FY2015 as part of an omnibus appropriations act.
P.L. 114-53	Oct. 1, 2015 – Dec. 11, 2015	Extension of TANF funding through December 11, 2015, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 114-96	Dec. 12, 2015-Dec. 16, 2015	Extension of TANF funding through December 16, 2015, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 114-100	Dec. 16, 2015-Dec. 17, 2015	Extension of TANF funding through December 22, 2015, as part of a short-term continuing resolution.
P.L. 114-113	Dec. 18, 2015- Sept. 30, 2016	Extension of TANF funding for the remainder of FY2016 as part of an omnibus appropriation act.

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Table A-3. Uses of Federal TANF and State Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Dollars, FY2014

	Billions of Dollars	Percent of Total Federal TANF and MOE Dollars
Basic Assistance	\$8.4	26.5%
Administration	2.3	7.1
Work Program	2.2	6.8
Child Care	5.1	16.1
Other Work Supports	3.0	9.5
Other	10.9	34.1
Totals	31.9	100.0

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

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

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

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

Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	TANF Child Recipients	
					As a Percent of All Children	As a Percent of All Poor Children
2012	1.852	4.402	1.104	3.298	4.4	20.3
2013	1.726	4.042	0.993	3.050	4.1	19.1
2014	1.650	3.957	1.007	2.949	4.0	18.8

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

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

Table A-5. Families Receiving AFDC/TANF Cash Assistance by Family Category, Selected Years, FY1988 to FY2013

	1988	1994	2001	2006	2013
Monthly Average Number of Families					
Total Families	3,747,952	5,046,263	2,202,356	1,957,402	1,749,424
Family with Adult(s)/Not Employed	3,136,566	3,798,997	992,445	825,490	781,473
Family with Adult(s)/Employed	243,573	378,620	420,794	259,001	302,079
Child-Only/SSI Parents(s)	59,988	171,391	171,951	176,670	156,215
Child-Only/Noncitizen Parent(s)	47,566	184,397	125,900	153,445	196,103
Child-Only/Caretaker Relative	188,598	328,290	255,984	261,944	234,499
Child-Only/Other	71,661	184,567	235,282	280,851	79,054
Percent of Total Cash Assistance Families					
Total Families	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Family with Adults/Not Employed	83.7	75.3	45.1	42.2	44.7
Family with Adults/Employed	6.5	7.5	19.1	13.2	17.3
Child-Only/SSI Parents(s)	1.6	3.4	7.8	9.0	8.9
Child-Only/Noncitizen Parent(s)	1.3	3.7	5.7	7.8	11.2
Child-Only/Caretaker Relative	5.0	6.5	11.6	13.4	13.4
Child-Only/Other	1.9	3.7	10.7	14.3	4.5

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulations of the FY1988 and FY1994 AFDC Quality Control (QC) data files and the FY2001, FY2006, and FY2013 TANF National Data Files.

Notes: FY2001 through FY2013 data include families receiving assistance from separate state programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. For FY2013, TANF families with an adult recipient include those families with “work-eligible” non-recipient parents. These include non-recipient parents who have been time-limited or sanctioned off the rolls, but the family continues to receive a reduced benefit. For FY2001 and FY2006, such families cannot be identified and are classified as “child-only” families.

Appendix B. State Tables

Table B-1. Use of FY2014 TANF and MOE Funds by Category
(Dollars in millions)

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Alabama	\$39.7	\$8.3	\$21.5	\$5.5	\$4.2	\$109.6	\$188.9
Alaska	39.8	4.7	12.5	24.8	1.2	3.4	86.4
Arizona	32.1	35.4	8.1	12.9	1.3	266.1	355.9
Arkansas	11.1	13.3	17.1	0.4	2.2	96.7	140.9
California	3,076.0	567.4	576.4	795.9	195.5	1,493.7	6,705.1
Colorado	79.3	20.5	2.2	0.9	7.2	206.0	316.1
Connecticut	83.4	38.1	17.7	39.4	5.1	313.2	497.0
Delaware	21.3	6.2	6.6	61.3	0.4	10.4	106.2
District of Columbia	60.3	8.6	34.6	55.7	21.0	84.2	264.5
Florida	165.5	41.3	50.7	337.8	0.9	403.0	999.3
Georgia	42.6	17.5	10.8	22.2	10.9	404.9	508.9
Hawaii	58.7	15.9	97.0	20.0	3.7	68.9	264.1
Idaho	6.7	5.1	5.7	11.8	0.2	16.7	46.3
Illinois	77.4	26.0	22.0	710.1	45.3	338.9	1,219.7
Indiana	23.4	18.8	15.0	77.7	32.5	100.0	267.4
Iowa	50.3	8.2	18.3	45.1	27.0	71.6	220.6
Kansas	22.8	10.2	0.5	19.7	50.9	54.8	159.0
Kentucky	132.1	11.3	33.9	31.4	19.5	30.3	258.5
Louisiana	20.3	19.6	5.3	10.2	18.8	144.8	219.0
Maine	45.3	3.0	10.7	5.7	12.2	8.7	85.5
Maryland	116.7	55.7	43.4	18.4	163.3	198.9	596.4
Massachusetts	292.7	34.6	6.4	323.6	114.3	328.3	1,099.9
Michigan	167.2	159.9	62.9	30.9	56.4	918.4	1,395.7
Minnesota	86.0	46.5	66.2	144.1	162.0	46.6	551.4
Mississippi	14.4	3.6	32.5	19.1	13.0	16.6	99.2
Missouri	83.8	4.7	23.6	41.0	0.0	242.0	395.2
Montana	15.8	6.2	11.0	10.5	0.0	9.2	52.7
Nebraska	23.4	3.8	18.1	23.5	37.4	10.1	116.3
Nevada	50.0	11.1	1.3	0.0	1.3	34.5	98.3
New Hampshire	21.6	11.6	6.6	8.0	1.2	12.6	61.6
New Jersey	218.5	67.2	96.5	114.0	202.4	594.7	1,293.4
New Mexico	47.2	7.6	13.0	36.2	47.6	63.2	214.8

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
New York	1,747.5	338.2	168.2	438.8	1,494.9	1,541.8	5,729.4
North Carolina	54.3	49.5	34.3	175.1	55.1	244.2	612.4
North Dakota	4.6	4.0	3.9	1.0	1.3	22.3	37.2
Ohio	282.6	161.0	73.8	399.4	11.6	196.8	1,125.3
Oklahoma	18.3	25.5	0.0	63.2	26.9	63.1	196.9
Oregon	140.2	47.4	18.6	13.7	2.1	119.3	341.2
Pennsylvania	256.2	72.5	85.8	411.4	9.2	223.8	1,058.8
Rhode Island	23.3	10.9	10.3	24.0	13.1	94.5	176.1
South Carolina	21.8	18.4	15.0	4.1	2.1	209.8	271.2
South Dakota	15.5	2.7	4.1	-3.5	0.1	6.4	25.4
Tennessee	81.3	32.5	38.4	44.3	0.0	70.2	266.7
Texas	64.4	56.2	89.3	26.7	4.6	646.9	888.1
Utah	24.6	5.7	28.0	13.5	0.0	22.1	93.9
Vermont	18.5	8.0	0.1	27.8	26.4	11.8	92.5
Virginia	99.4	21.4	52.1	39.1	8.1	69.0	289.1
Washington	180.9	65.7	164.1	158.2	3.7	401.0	973.7
West Virginia	30.6	28.7	1.6	11.9	31.4	36.8	141.0
Wisconsin	150.7	27.7	29.7	219.3	65.9	163.9	657.3
Wyoming	3.2	7.4	2.7	0.5	0.0	15.5	29.2
Totals	8,443.4	2,275.2	2,168.3	5,126.6	3,015.4	10,860.3	31,889.3

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

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

Table B-2. Use of FY2014 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percent of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding

	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Alabama	21.0%	4.4%	11.4%	2.9%	2.2%	58.0%	100.0%
Alaska	46.0	5.5	14.5	28.7	1.4	3.9	100.0
Arizona	9.0	9.9	2.3	3.6	0.4	74.8	100.0
Arkansas	7.9	9.5	12.1	0.3	1.6	68.7	100.0
California	45.9	8.5	8.6	11.9	2.9	22.3	100.0
Colorado	25.1	6.5	0.7	0.3	2.3	65.2	100.0
Connecticut	16.8	7.7	3.6	7.9	1.0	63.0	100.0
Delaware	20.1	5.9	6.2	57.7	0.4	9.8	100.0
District of Columbia	22.8	3.2	13.1	21.1	7.9	31.8	100.0
Florida	16.6	4.1	5.1	33.8	0.1	40.3	100.0
Georgia	8.4	3.4	2.1	4.4	2.1	79.6	100.0
Hawaii	22.2	6.0	36.7	7.6	1.4	26.1	100.0
Idaho	14.4	11.0	12.4	25.6	0.5	36.1	100.0
Illinois	6.3	2.1	1.8	58.2	3.7	27.8	100.0
Indiana	8.8	7.0	5.6	29.0	12.2	37.4	100.0
Iowa	22.8	3.7	8.3	20.5	12.2	32.5	100.0
Kansas	14.3	6.4	0.3	12.4	32.0	34.5	100.0
Kentucky	51.1	4.4	13.1	12.1	7.5	11.7	100.0
Louisiana	9.3	9.0	2.4	4.6	8.6	66.1	100.0
Maine	52.9	3.6	12.5	6.6	14.2	10.2	100.0
Maryland	19.6	9.3	7.3	3.1	27.4	33.3	100.0
Massachusetts	26.6	3.1	0.6	29.4	10.4	29.8	100.0

	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Michigan	12.0	11.5	4.5	2.2	4.0	65.8	100.0
Minnesota	15.6	8.4	12.0	26.1	29.4	8.4	100.0
Mississippi	14.5	3.6	32.8	19.2	13.1	16.7	100.0
Missouri	21.2	1.2	6.0	10.4	0.0	61.2	100.0
Montana	29.9	11.8	21.0	19.9	0.0	17.4	100.0
Nebraska	20.1	3.3	15.6	20.2	32.1	8.7	100.0
Nevada	50.9	11.3	1.3	0.0	1.4	35.1	100.0
New Hampshire	35.1	18.8	10.7	13.0	2.0	20.5	100.0
New Jersey	16.9	5.2	7.5	8.8	15.7	46.0	100.0
New Mexico	22.0	3.5	6.1	16.9	22.2	29.4	100.0
New York	30.5	5.9	2.9	7.7	26.1	26.9	100.0
North Carolina	8.9	8.1	5.6	28.6	9.0	39.9	100.0
North Dakota	12.5	10.7	10.5	2.7	3.6	60.1	100.0
Ohio	25.1	14.3	6.6	35.5	1.0	17.5	100.0
Oklahoma	9.3	12.9	0.0	32.1	13.7	32.0	100.0
Oregon	41.1	13.9	5.4	4.0	0.6	35.0	100.0
Pennsylvania	24.2	6.8	8.1	38.9	0.9	21.1	100.0
Rhode Island	13.2	6.2	5.8	13.6	7.4	53.7	100.0
South Carolina	8.1	6.8	5.5	1.5	0.8	77.4	100.0
South Dakota	61.2	10.7	16.2	-13.6	0.4	25.1	100.0
Tennessee	30.5	12.2	14.4	16.6	0.0	26.3	100.0
Texas	7.2	6.3	10.1	3.0	0.5	72.8	100.0
Utah	26.2	6.1	29.8	14.4	0.0	23.6	100.0

	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other Expenditures	Total
Vermont	20.0	8.6	0.1	30.0	28.5	12.8	100.0
Virginia	34.4	7.4	18.0	13.5	2.8	23.9	100.0
Washington	18.6	6.7	16.9	16.2	0.4	41.2	100.0
West Virginia	21.7	20.4	1.1	8.4	22.3	26.1	100.0
Wisconsin	22.9	4.2	4.5	33.4	10.0	24.9	100.0
Wyoming	10.8	25.2	9.2	1.8	0.0	53.0	100.0
Totals	26.5	7.1	6.8	16.1	9.5	34.1	100.0

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

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

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2014
(September 30, 2014, in millions of dollars)

State	Obligated but not Spent	Unobligated	Total Unspent Funds
Alabama	\$2.9	\$30.7	\$33.6
Alaska	0.0	63.4	63.4
Arizona	0.4	0.0	0.4
Arkansas	0.0	49.5	49.5
California	89.4	0.0	89.4
Colorado	14.0	7.7	21.7
Connecticut	0.2	6.3	6.4
Delaware	0.8	7.7	8.5
District of Columbia	2.0	80.7	82.7
Florida	34.3	0.0	34.3
Georgia	34.9	42.5	77.4
Hawaii	3.8	86.7	90.5
Idaho	30.3	0.0	30.3
Illinois	0.0	14.4	14.4
Indiana	301.1	2.6	303.7
Iowa	16.2	11.6	27.7
Kansas	10.7	42.1	52.8
Kentucky	0.0	4.4	4.4
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	0.0	58.8	58.8
Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	38.9	38.9
Minnesota	60.5	69.6	130.2
Mississippi	0.0	21.2	21.2
Missouri	9.7	0.0	9.7
Montana	41.8	0.0	41.8
Nebraska	0.2	56.1	56.3
Nevada	6.5	0.0	6.5
New Hampshire	0.0	29.3	29.3
New Jersey	29.5	13.9	43.5
New Mexico	75.2	0.0	75.2
New York	171.6	20.9	192.5
North Carolina	201.1	3.5	204.6

State	Obligated but not Spent	Unobligated	Total Unspent Funds
North Dakota	0.0	14.1	14.1
Ohio	197.6	79.6	277.2
Oklahoma	61.8	0.0	61.8
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	65.6	355.4	421.0
Rhode Island	12.1	0.0	12.1
South Carolina	0.0	35.5	35.5
South Dakota	0.0	19.4	19.4
Tennessee	0.0	153.1	153.1
Texas	188.7	0.0	188.7
Utah	0.0	116.0	116.0
Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	0.7	53.6	54.3
Washington	65.0	0.0	65.0
West Virginia	0.0	3.7	3.7
Wisconsin	0.0	5.0	5.0
Wyoming	1.9	23.9	25.7
Total	1,730.1	1,622.0	3,352.1

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

Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Cash Assistance by State, March 2015

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Alabama	13,419	31,205	24,162	7,043
Alaska	3,170	8,589	5,772	2,817
Arizona	11,073	23,939	18,017	5,922
Arkansas	4,768	10,606	7,792	2,814
California	616,628	1,728,256	1,216,670	511,586
Colorado	17,372	45,948	32,283	13,665
Connecticut	13,086	26,208	18,556	7,652
Delaware	4,525	12,717	7,739	4,978
District of Columbia	5,830	14,338	10,804	3,534

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Florida	48,376	83,013	68,935	14,078
Georgia	13,070	25,096	22,530	2,566
Guam	1,076	2,402	1,920	482
Hawaii	7,711	22,084	14,810	7,274
Idaho	1,838	2,684	2,615	69
Illinois	19,211	43,308	35,603	7,705
Indiana	9,193	18,350	16,568	1,782
Iowa	13,627	33,864	24,282	9,582
Kansas	6,095	14,312	10,699	3,613
Kentucky	25,347	49,986	40,881	9,105
Louisiana	5,102	11,287	9,967	1,320
Maine	19,388	40,335	22,678	17,657
Maryland	18,991	45,463	33,975	11,488
Massachusetts	58,491	137,738	93,942	43,796
Michigan	21,471	51,717	40,210	11,507
Minnesota	18,867	42,573	33,804	8,769
Mississippi	6,690	13,201	10,177	3,024
Missouri	28,024	67,963	47,110	20,853
Montana	2,820	6,687	5,115	1,572
Nebraska	5,604	13,307	10,984	2,323
Nevada	10,795	27,787	20,652	7,135
New Hampshire	5,512	13,280	9,131	4,149
New Jersey	24,580	57,343	42,161	15,182
New Mexico	11,841	29,535	22,034	7,501
New York	149,249	384,319	273,605	110,714
North Carolina	9,723	19,433	15,620	3,813
North Dakota	1,180	2,923	2,384	539
Ohio	59,611	112,481	96,852	15,629
Oklahoma	6,971	15,279	13,042	2,237
Oregon	57,392	172,571	108,524	64,047
Pennsylvania	63,978	158,450	114,916	43,534
Puerto Rico	10,758	29,499	18,298	11,201
Rhode Island	4,837	11,514	8,142	3,372
South Carolina	10,289	23,119	18,638	4,481
South Dakota	2,982	5,849	5,220	629
Tennessee	38,358	88,834	66,613	22,221
Texas	31,326	67,562	60,214	7,348

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Utah	3,710	9,084	6,658	2,426
Vermont	3,220	7,378	5,254	2,124
Virgin Islands	350	1,100	749	351
Virginia	24,981	54,279	40,160	14,119
Washington	33,977	76,125	54,034	22,091
West Virginia	7,597	15,809	12,306	3,503
Wisconsin	23,747	56,129	42,357	13,772
Wyoming	324	651	536	115
Totals	1,618,151	4,067,509	2,946,700	1,120,809

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

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

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

State	1994	2007	2010	2014	2015	Percentage Change to 2015 from:		
						1994	2010	2013
Alabama	51,217	18,005	20,740	17,232	13,419	-73.8%	-35.3%	-22.1%
Alaska	13,209	3,376	3,296	3,681	3,170	-76.0	-3.8	-13.9
Arizona	71,713	35,617	35,227	12,558	11,073	-84.6	-68.6	-11.8
Arkansas	26,355	8,600	8,492	5,963	4,768	-81.9	-43.9	-20.0
California	916,427	471,775	576,355	537,178	616,628	-32.7	7.0	14.8
Colorado	42,541	11,149	11,785	16,960	17,372	-59.2	47.4	2.4
Connecticut	59,351	20,890	17,261	14,421	13,086	-78.0	-24.2	-9.3
Delaware	11,592	4,027	5,089	4,627	4,525	-61.0	-11.1	-2.2
District of Columbia	27,047	5,748	9,786	6,336	5,830	-78.4	-40.4	-8.0
Florida	248,514	47,337	57,471	49,391	48,376	-80.5	-15.8	-2.1
Georgia	141,859	24,681	20,464	15,280	13,070	-90.8	-36.1	-14.5
Guam	1,863	931	1,245	1,254	1,076	-42.2	-13.6	-14.2
Hawaii	20,395	6,410	9,630	8,441	7,711	-62.2	-19.9	-8.6
Idaho	9,016	1,661	1,742	1,859	1,838	-79.6	5.5	-1.1
Illinois	241,817	31,397	21,973	20,206	19,211	-92.1	-12.6	-4.9
Indiana	74,843	41,226	35,915	10,614	9,193	-87.7	-74.4	-13.4
Iowa	40,676	20,082	21,345	15,784	13,627	-66.5	-36.2	-13.7

State	1994	2007	2010	2014	2015	Percentage Change to 2015 from:		
						1994	2010	2013
Kansas	30,591	14,550	14,202	7,027	6,095	-80.1	-57.1	-13.3
Kentucky	81,141	29,788	30,028	28,785	25,347	-68.8	-15.6	-11.9
Louisiana	88,059	10,730	10,273	5,604	5,102	-94.2	-50.3	-9.0
Maine	23,231	12,736	14,942	25,658	19,388	-16.5	29.8	-24.4
Maryland	81,253	19,077	24,052	20,369	18,991	-76.6	-21.0	-6.8
Massachusetts	112,803	44,579	49,062	69,408	58,491	-48.1	19.2	-15.7
Michigan	227,114	75,173	70,633	26,486	21,471	-90.5	-69.6	-18.9
Minnesota	64,055	26,513	24,048	21,920	18,867	-70.5	-21.5	-13.9
Mississippi	56,420	11,210	11,805	8,637	6,690	-88.1	-43.3	-22.5
Missouri	93,735	39,577	38,847	30,641	28,024	-70.1	-27.9	-8.5
Montana	12,278	3,184	3,742	2,996	2,820	-77.0	-24.6	-5.9
Nebraska	16,323	7,426	8,539	6,082	5,604	-65.7	-34.4	-7.9
Nevada	14,011	6,424	10,365	11,961	10,795	-23.0	4.1	-9.7
New Hampshire	11,574	5,183	6,247	5,876	5,512	-52.4	-11.8	-6.2
New Jersey	123,025	34,884	33,047	28,154	24,580	-80.0	-25.6	-12.7
New Mexico	33,847	14,017	19,342	12,693	11,841	-65.0	-38.8	-6.7
New York	457,660	159,447	156,188	151,233	149,249	-67.4	-4.4	-1.3
North Carolina	134,063	25,509	24,382	16,688	9,723	-92.7	-60.1	-41.7
North Dakota	6,079	2,016	2,037	1,280	1,180	-80.6	-42.1	-7.8
Ohio	254,021	77,624	103,012	62,519	59,611	-76.5	-42.1	-4.7
Oklahoma	47,428	9,283	9,315	6,987	6,971	-85.3	-25.2	-0.2
Oregon	43,617	18,872	30,199	45,233	57,392	31.6	90.0	26.9
Pennsylvania	211,771	63,637	51,085	68,008	63,978	-69.8	25.2	-5.9
Puerto Rico	58,869	13,809	13,581	12,079	10,758	-81.7	-20.8	-10.9
Rhode Island	22,872	8,296	7,505	5,523	4,837	-78.9	-35.5	-12.4
South Carolina	53,260	15,652	17,934	11,089	10,289	-80.7	-42.6	-7.2
South Dakota	7,129	2,825	3,209	3,117	2,982	-58.2	-7.1	-4.3
Tennessee	111,740	62,395	61,685	47,691	38,358	-65.7	-37.8	-19.6
Texas	286,613	61,566	49,871	35,950	31,326	-89.1	-37.2	-12.9
Utah	17,908	5,146	6,724	4,276	3,710	-79.3	-44.8	-13.2
Vermont	9,988	4,463	3,106	3,400	3,220	-67.8	3.7	-5.3
Virgin Islands	1,078	440	507	420	350	-67.5	-31.0	-16.7
Virginia	75,854	31,354	36,744	27,437	24,981	-67.1	-32.0	-9.0
Washington	104,326	52,292	69,637	42,521	33,977	-67.4	-51.2	-20.1
West Virginia	41,521	9,774	9,690	8,535	7,597	-81.7	-21.6	-11.0
Wisconsin	78,739	17,211	21,353	27,271	23,747	-69.8	11.2	-12.9

State	1994	2007	2010	2014	2015	Percentage Change to 2015 from:		
						1994	2010	2013
Wyoming	5,857	273	352	363	324	-94.5	-8.0	-10.7
Totals	5,098,288	1,749,847	1,905,106	1,635,702	1,618,151	-68.3	-15.1	-1.1

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

Notes: Caseload data for 2007 through 2015 include those families in Separate State Programs with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-6. TANF Families by Number of Parents by State: March 2015

State	Single Parent	Two Parents	No Parent	As a Percentage of Total Families		
				Single Parent	Two Parents	No Parent
Alabama	6,870	128	6,421	51.2%	1.0%	47.9%
Alaska	1,926	411	833	60.8	13.0	26.3
Arizona	5,177	292	5,604	46.8	2.6	50.6
Arkansas	2,649	105	2,014	55.6	2.2	42.2
California	335,363	111,031	170,234	54.4	18.0	27.6
Colorado	10,053	1,484	5,835	57.9	8.5	33.6
Connecticut	7,574	0	5,512	57.9	0.0	42.1
Delaware	1,369	16	3,140	30.3	0.4	69.4
District of Columbia	3,611	0	2,219	61.9	0.0	38.1
Florida	10,401	599	37,376	21.5	1.2	77.3
Georgia	2,478	0	10,592	19.0	0.0	81.0
Guam	344	98	634	32.0	9.1	58.9
Hawaii	4,383	1,794	1,534	56.8	23.3	19.9
Idaho	67	0	1,771	3.6	0.0	96.4
Illinois	6,729	0	12,482	35.0	0.0	65.0
Indiana	2,143	146	6,904	23.3	1.6	75.1
Iowa	7,732	850	5,045	56.7	6.2	37.0
Kansas	2,743	392	2,960	45.0	6.4	48.6
Kentucky	7,795	615	16,937	30.8	2.4	66.8
Louisiana	1,285	0	3,817	25.2	0.0	74.8
Maine	16,739	472	2,177	86.3	2.4	11.2
Maryland	11,538	0	7,453	60.8	0.0	39.2
Massachusetts	36,162	4,061	18,268	61.8	6.9	31.2
Michigan	10,532	0	10,939	49.1	0.0	50.9
Minnesota	8,879	0	9,988	47.1	0.0	52.9

State	Single Parent	Two Parents	No Parent	As a Percentage of Total Families		
				Single Parent	Two Parents	No Parent
Mississippi	2,994	0	3,696	44.8	0.0	55.2
Missouri	21,317	0	6,707	76.1	0.0	23.9
Montana	1,384	266	1,170	49.1	9.4	41.5
Nebraska	2,438	0	3,166	43.5	0.0	56.5
Nevada	4,776	1,100	4,919	44.2	10.2	45.6
New Hampshire	4,038	40	1,434	73.3	0.7	26.0
New Jersey	16,731	0	7,849	68.1	0.0	31.9
New Mexico	5,647	957	5,237	47.7	8.1	44.2
New York	95,376	3,161	50,712	63.9	2.1	34.0
North Carolina	3,538	146	6,039	36.4	1.5	62.1
North Dakota	539	0	641	45.7	0.0	54.3
Ohio	12,368	1,390	45,853	20.7	2.3	76.9
Oklahoma	2,237	0	4,734	32.1	0.0	67.9
Oregon	47,466	3,193	6,733	82.7	5.6	11.7
Pennsylvania	50,154	1,353	12,471	78.4	2.1	19.5
Puerto Rico	9,800	685	273	91.1	6.4	2.5
Rhode Island	2,793	317	1,727	57.7	6.6	35.7
South Carolina	4,692	0	5,597	45.6	0.0	54.4
South Dakota	629	0	2,353	21.1	0.0	78.9
Tennessee	20,964	149	17,245	54.7	0.4	45.0
Texas	7,348	0	23,978	23.5	0.0	76.5
Utah	1,639	0	2,071	44.2	0.0	55.8
Vermont	1,446	331	1,443	44.9	10.3	44.8
Virgin Islands	307	0	43	87.7	0.0	12.3
Virginia	14,422	0	10,559	57.7	0.0	42.3
Washington	16,153	2,862	14,962	47.5	8.4	44.0
West Virginia	2,737	0	4,860	36.0	0.0	64.0
Wisconsin	11,389	801	11,557	48.0	3.4	48.7
Wyoming	109	3	212	33.6	0.9	65.4
Totals	869,973	139,248	608,930	53.8	8.6	37.6

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

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

Table B-7. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and Work Participation Rates by State, All Families, FY2013

State	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Adjusted Standard (Statutory Standard Minus Caseload Reduction Credit)	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard? (WPR Equals or Exceeds Adjusted Standard)
Alabama	50.0%	19.6%	30.4%	48.8%	Yes
Alaska	50.0	7.8	42.2	42.8	Yes
Arizona	50.0	37.9	12.1	20.8	Yes
Arkansas	50.0	50.0	0.0	39.5	Yes
California	50.0	0.0	50.0	25.1	No
Colorado	50.0	9.7	40.3	24.2	No
Connecticut	50.0	27.2	22.8	47.8	Yes
Delaware	50.0	30.7	19.3	39.3	Yes
District of Col.	50.0	6.7	43.3	44.3	Yes
Florida	50.0	16.6	33.4	44.6	Yes
Georgia	50.0	50.0	0.0	61.9	Yes
Guam	50.0	0.0	50.0	35.5	No
Hawaii	50.0	50.0	0.0	46.8	Yes
Idaho	50.0	0.0	50.0	51.1	Yes
Illinois	50.0	0.0	50.0	69.0	Yes
Indiana	50.0	25.5	24.5	32.8	Yes
Iowa	50.0	30.3	19.7	36.4	Yes
Kansas	50.0	43.5	6.5	32.5	Yes
Kentucky	50.0	19.4	30.6	54.7	Yes
Louisiana	50.0	47.2	2.8	23.6	Yes
Maine	50.0	0.0	50.0	76.6	Yes
Maryland	50.0	19.5	30.5	50.4	Yes
Massachusetts	50.0	5.5	44.5	47.4	Yes
Michigan	50.0	0.0	50.0	53.3	Yes
Minnesota	50.0	11.6	38.4	45.1	Yes
Mississippi	50.0	0.0	50.0	63.0	Yes
Missouri	50.0	26.9	23.1	22.4	No
Montana	50.0	10.8	39.2	40.2	Yes
Nebraska	50.0	50.0	0.0	51.3	Yes
Nevada	50.0	0.0	50.0	36.4	No
New Hampshire	50.0	0.0	50.0	76.3	Yes

State	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Adjusted Standard (Statutory Standard Minus Caseload Reduction Credit)	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard? (WPR Equals or Exceeds Adjusted Standard)
New Jersey	50.0	44.6	5.4	21.8	Yes
New Mexico	50.0	29.4	20.6	51.7	Yes
New York	50.0	31.4	18.6	32.5	Yes
North Carolina	50.0	30.2	19.8	43.8	Yes
North Dakota	50.0	42.2	7.8	74.1	Yes
Ohio	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.9	Yes
Oklahoma	50.0	29.2	20.8	27.1	Yes
Oregon	50.0	0.0	50.0	46.5	No
Pennsylvania	50.0	19.4	30.6	25.8	No
Puerto Rico	50.0	4.7	45.3	21.5	No
Rhode Island	50.0	43.9	6.1	11.6	Yes
South Carolina	50.0	20.8	29.2	31.9	Yes
South Dakota	50.0	0.0	50.0	57.3	Yes
Tennessee	50.0	29.4	20.6	28.6	Yes
Texas	50.0	47.8	2.2	20.2	Yes
Utah	50.0	38.1	11.9	29.9	Yes
Vermont	50.0	8.5	41.5	39.3	No
Virgin Islands	50.0	50.0	0.0	16.0	Yes
Virginia	50.0	15.4	34.6	43.1	Yes
Washington	50.0	28.9	21.1	13.3	No
West Virginia	50.0	20.9	29.1	36.5	Yes
Wisconsin	50.0	0.0	50.0	33.8	No
Wyoming	50.0	1.6	48.4	78.6	Yes
Met Standard					43
Failed Standard					11

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

Table B-8. TANF Caseload Reduction Credits, Effective (After Credit) Standards, and Work Participation Rates by State, Two-Parent Families, FY2013

	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Adjusted Standard (Statutory Standard Minus Caseload Reduction Credit)	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard? (WPR Equals or Exceeds Adjusted Standard)
Alabama	90.0%	49.1%	40.9%	44.6%	Yes
Alaska	90.0	18.5	71.5	46.8	No
Arizona	90.0	37.9	52.1	54.5	Yes
Arkansas	90.0	50.2	39.8	22.0	No
California	90.0	0.0	90.0	30.9	No
Colorado	90.0	9.7	80.3	17.8	No
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Col.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	90.0	46.5	43.5	51.2	Yes
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Guam	90.0	0.0	90.0	59.3	No
Hawaii	90.0	52.1	37.9	57.0	Yes
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	90.0	67.9	22.1	22.6	Yes
Iowa	90.0	56.2	33.8	28.7	No
Kansas	90.0	43.5	46.5	35.2	No
Kentucky	90.0	28.6	61.4	52.4	No
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	90.0	0.0	90.0	12.6	No
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	90.0	5.5	84.5	95.8	Yes
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	90.0	10.8	79.2	37.5	No
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	90.0	0.0	90.0	40.3	No
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Adjusted Standard (Statutory Standard Minus Caseload Reduction Credit)	Work Participation Rate	Met Standard? (WPR Equals or Exceeds Adjusted Standard)
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	90.0	29.4	60.6	61.6	Yes
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	90.0	30.2	59.8	61.5	Yes
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	90.0	0.0	90.0	57.0	No
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	90.0	52.2	37.8	48.2	Yes
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	90.0	43.9	46.1	7.4	No
South Carolina	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	90.0	29.4	60.6	6.8	No
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	90.0	8.5	81.5	49.8	No
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	90.0	28.9	61.1	12.6	No
West Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	90.0	0.0	90.0	26.1	No
Wyoming	90.0	1.6	88.4	80.2	No
Met Standard					9
Failed Standard					18
Not Applicable (No Two-Parent Families)					27

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

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

Author Contact Information

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