

state trends in child well-being



**KIDS  
COUNT**  
data book



2012



state trends in child well-being



**KIDS  
COUNT**  
data book



2012

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Annie E. Casey Foundation's *KIDS COUNT Data Book* could not be produced and distributed without the help of numerous people. The publication was assembled and produced under the general direction of Laura Speer. Other Casey staff who contributed to this report include Dennis Campa, Sue Lin Chong, Arin Gencer, Florencia Gutierrez, Lisa Hamilton, John Hodgins, Jann Jackson, Michael Laracy and Norris West. Nancy Cauthen provided writing and research support.

The Population Reference Bureau was instrumental in the development of the new KIDS COUNT index and in the collection and organization of data presented in this book. We are especially grateful to Jean D'Amico, Genevieve Dupuis, Linda Jacobsen, Mark Mather and Kelvin Pollard.

Special thanks are also due the staff at KINETIK Communication Graphics, Inc., for design and production services; the staff at Hager Sharp, for helping to promote and disseminate the *Data Book*; Connie Dykstra of The Hatcher Group, for managing production; and Jayson Hait of eye4detail, for proofreading and copyediting.

Finally, we would like to thank the state KIDS COUNT projects (see page 53), for making the *Data Book* available to national, state and local leaders across the country.

Permission to copy, disseminate or otherwise use information from this *Data Book* is granted as long as appropriate acknowledgment is given.

The 2012 *KIDS COUNT Data Book* can be viewed, downloaded or ordered on the Internet at [www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org).

## Outreach Partners

The Annie E. Casey Foundation wishes to thank our Outreach Partners for their support and assistance in promoting and disseminating the 2012 *KIDS COUNT Data Book*. With the help of our partners, data on the status and well-being of kids and families are shared with policymakers, advocates, practitioners and citizens to help enrich local, state and national discussions on ways to improve outcomes for America's most vulnerable children.

To learn more about the Annie E. Casey Foundation's 2012 KIDS COUNT Outreach Partners, please visit [datacenter.kidscount.org/DataBook/2012/OutreachPartners.aspx](http://datacenter.kidscount.org/DataBook/2012/OutreachPartners.aspx).

# CONTENTS

4	<b>FOREWORD</b>
10	<b>INDEX</b>
16	<b>TRENDS</b>
20	Overall Child Well-Being
22	Economic Well-Being
28	Education
32	Health
36	Family and Community
40	<b>CONCLUSION</b>
43	<b>KIDS COUNT DATA CENTER</b>
44	<b>APPENDICES</b>
50	Definitions and Data Sources
53	Primary Contacts for State KIDS COUNT Projects
56	About the Annie E. Casey Foundation and KIDS COUNT



# FOREWORD



# 2012 KIDS COUNT DATA BOOK

Each year, the Annie E. Casey Foundation publishes the *KIDS COUNT Data Book*, which tracks the well-being of our nation's children, state by state. As we release this year's *Data Book*, our 23rd, America's children and families face a crossroad. After the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, our economy has begun to slowly recover. Unemployment has declined and state revenues are trending upward. But the recovery is fragile. Many families are still coping with hardship caused by a long and deep recession, and states and localities still face serious fiscal challenges.

While we continue to manage the fallout from the downturn, as conditions improve, we should refocus our attention on strengthening our economy, communities and families for the future.

Before turning to the current state of child well-being in the United States, I encourage you to take a particularly close look at this year's *Data Book* because we've made some important changes. To take advantage of the tremendous growth in research and data about child development, we developed a more comprehensive index to measure child well-being and rank states. The new KIDS COUNT index includes

child-level indicators across four domains: (1) Economic Well-Being, (2) Education, (3) Health and (4) Family and Community. Domain-specific data allow for more fine-grained analysis of child well-being in each state, especially in cases where a state excels in one or two areas but lags behind in others. This more sophisticated, domain-based approach is the most significant change to the *KIDS COUNT Data Book* since we began tracking child well-being more than two decades ago. We hope you'll find it provides you with a more useful picture of the status of children in each of the states and our nation as a whole.

**Unlike the domains of Education and Health, where children are benefiting from long-term progress overall, the Economic Well-Being of children and families has plummeted because of the recession.**

### A Mixed Picture for Children in the United States

As our findings and other data reveal, many aspects of child well-being have improved considerably over time, while advances in other areas have eroded. In some domains, such as Education, wide inequities among children tempered progress for all. Despite perennial hand-wringing about a “crisis in education,” high school graduation rates and national math and reading scores for students of all races and income levels are higher than ever.<sup>1</sup> Although there’s plenty of room for improvement, the overall trend is positive. However, we continue to see deep disparities in educational achievement by race and especially by income.

A recent Stanford study found that the gap in standardized test scores between affluent and low-income students has grown by about 40 percent since the 1960s and is now double the testing gap between African Americans and non-Hispanic whites, which declined over the same period.<sup>2</sup> Comprehensive early childhood programs and high-quality preschool can help improve school readiness among low-income children, and access to such programs has increased. But only a small percentage of poor children participate in programs of sufficient quality and intensity to overcome the developmental deficits associated with chronic economic hardship and low levels of parental education.


Over the past couple of decades, many child health and safety outcomes have significantly improved. Mortality rates

have fallen for children of all ages as a result of medical advances and increased vigilance about safety, such as more widespread seat belt and car seat use. The rate of health insurance coverage among children has improved slightly despite declines in employer-sponsored coverage; public health insurance has more than filled the gap. On the flip side, obesity poses a growing health threat, especially to low-income and minority children. The prevalence of childhood obesity has tripled during the past 30 years. Obesity increases the risk of high blood pressure and cholesterol, which, if left untreated, raise the risk of cardiovascular disease in adulthood.<sup>3</sup>

Unlike the domains of Education and Health, where children are benefiting from long-term progress overall, the Economic Well-Being of children and families has plummeted because of the recession. After declining significantly in the late 1990s, child poverty began to rise even before the economic crisis. In 2000, the official child poverty rate, which is a conservative measure of economic hardship, was 17 percent. From 2000 to 2010, the number of children living in poverty jumped from 12.2 million to 15.7 million, an increase of nearly 30 percent. The additional 3.5 million children living in poverty is nearly equivalent to the entire population of the city of Los Angeles.

Stubbornly high unemployment and pervasive underemployment continue to threaten the financial status of middle-class families while creating deeper hardship for low-income families and communities. The foreclosure crisis, which has already created residential instability for an estimated





5 million to 6 million children, is far from over. African-American and Latino communities have sustained the greatest losses, widening the already enormous racial and ethnic gap in homeownership.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the most devastating economic effect of the recession and foreclosure crisis for families has been the massive loss of home equity, savings and other assets that parents work so hard to accumulate in the hopes of building a better future for their children.

Nonetheless, there are reasons to be cautiously optimistic about the prospects for improving outcomes for children. Now that the recovery is underway, we can begin to shift gears. As we move forward, we must continue to protect the most vulnerable and those hardest hit by the recession. And, we must also ensure that vulnerable children and their families have access to pragmatic, evidence-based services and supports to get families back on a path toward economic success and to improve the health and well-being of our nation's children.

### The Economic and Political Landscape for Improving Child Well-Being

Economic and job growth have been uneven in 2012. At the end of April, the unemployment rate was at its lowest level since January 2009. However, in May, there was a slight uptick in the jobless rate. Whatever the short-term fluctuations, economists caution that it will take several more years before the unemployment rate in the United States returns to prerecession levels.


The economic crisis caused the largest decline in state revenues on record. After

bottoming out in 2010, revenues have begun to grow again; but at the end of 2011, state revenues were still 7 percent below prerecession levels.<sup>5</sup> After multiple years of budget shortfalls, states have fewer options for closing current gaps. Most states have already made deep cuts in services and exhausted any reserves. Emergency federal aid largely expired a year ago, and looming federal cuts will likely exacerbate states' already precarious fiscal condition. As policymakers seek to restore fiscal health to their states, we urge them to refrain from making further cuts to health care, education and programs that assist vulnerable children and families.

Beyond the constraints posed by a nascent but fragile economic recovery and tight state budgets, the persistent paralysis of our current political culture is another potential obstacle to improving policies for children and families. It is critical that we find ways to come together on common ground. We need to make smart investments to restore what has been lost and to move forward to help children and families. These should be goals on which political partisans can agree, and we hope that our elected officials at the state and federal levels will rise to the occasion.

### The Challenge Ahead

In a recent study of 31 developed countries, the United States ranked 27th in measures of equal opportunity, which predict whether children will have the life chances necessary for them to thrive and mature into contributors to a future



**We must come together and commit ourselves to investing in today's young families to improve the future for children, the next generation and our nation.**

that sustains the American Dream. The study examined several areas, including poverty, unemployment, income inequality, education, health and social mobility.<sup>6</sup> The investments that we make in children greatly affect most of these measures.

We know what it takes for children to thrive and to become successful adults. We have reams of research and data identifying the best predictors of success: getting a healthy start at birth and maintaining healthy development in the early years; being raised by two married parents; having adequate family income; doing well in school, graduating high school and completing postsecondary education or training; avoiding teen pregnancy and substance abuse; staying out of trouble; and becoming connected to work and opportunity.

At the Annie E. Casey Foundation, we focus on three factors that can positively or negatively influence child well-being. First, we know that family economic opportunity and security are critical to child well-being. Growing up in poverty is strongly associated with bad outcomes for children. On almost every measure, children who experience chronic or deep poverty, especially when they are young, face tougher developmental and social barriers to success. Even brief experiences of poverty in early childhood can have lasting effects on health, education, employment and earning power. The most effective way to ensure that every child has opportunities to succeed is through a “two-generation” strategy that simultaneously strengthens parents’ work attachment, income and assets while

investing in their children’s healthy development and educational success.

Second, we know that a strong, nurturing two-parent family can protect children from economic hardship and other risks. Children who have a permanent sense of connection to their families fare much better on average, even if they experience poverty, when compared to children who are removed from their families because of abuse, neglect or criminal behavior or who grow up disconnected from one or both parents. We need proven, evidence-based innovations within public systems to keep children connected to their families or other caring adults, especially when families encounter a crisis and when youth get into trouble with the law.

Third, where a child grows up can make a huge difference. A low-income child living in a flourishing community—with good schools, safe streets, strong civic institutions, positive role models and connections to opportunities—is more likely to thrive and succeed. That same child living in a community of concentrated poverty—with high crime, poor schools and environmental hazards—is far more likely to get off track in school, become involved with gangs or other negative peer influences and fail to transition to successful employment. Community investments that focus on the social and economic well-being of neighborhoods can provide a foundation for children’s futures.

Finally, we must acknowledge and confront the enormous racial and ethnic disparities that impact children’s chances of success. African-American children are

nine times as likely as non-Hispanic white children to live in high-poverty census tracts. For Latino children, the risk is more than six times that of white children.<sup>7</sup> African-American and Latino children are far more likely than white children to live in poor families, regardless of whether they live in high-poverty neighborhoods. In 2010, the poverty rate for African-American children (38 percent) was nearly three times the rate for their white peers (13 percent); the child poverty rate for Latinos (32 percent) was two and a half times that for white children (see Figure 1).<sup>8</sup>


As the data in the pages ahead will show, millions of American children are growing up with risk factors that predict that they will not succeed in the world they will inherit. And, if they don't succeed, this country will become increasingly less able to compete and thrive in the global economy, thereby affecting the standard of living and the strength of our nation for all of us.

We are all responsible for finding solutions to the challenges we face. The choice is ours. We can choose to watch the promise of the American Dream slip away. Or, we can choose to come together as a nation, in a spirit of shared responsibility and shared sacrifice, and commit ourselves to investing in today's young families to improve the future for children, the next generation and our nation.

**Patrick T. McCarthy**  
President and CEO  
The Annie E. Casey Foundation

FIGURE 1

### Children in Poverty by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010



**SOURCE** U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey.

**NOTE** Data for African Americans, American Indians and Asians and Pacific Islanders also include those who are Hispanic.

# INDEX





# A NEW KIDS COUNT INDEX

Since 1990, KIDS COUNT has ranked states annually on overall child well-being using an index of 10 indicators. Over time, we changed some of the indicators to replace weaker measures with stronger ones, but the overall scope of the list remained consistent. During the two decades that we have produced the *KIDS COUNT Data Book*, research on child development and well-being has proliferated.

In this year's *Data Book*, we've updated our index to take advantage of these advances in knowledge and the availability of new state-level data to create a more robust tool to better serve the needs of the field.

A recent review of the literature reveals that while there is no consensus on the best model to track child well-being, there is growing agreement that measurement of child well-being should do the following:

- ▶ Acknowledge that children's lives are affected by both positive/protective and negative/risk factors;
- ▶ Recognize that children are affected by the environment in which they live, including their family, peer relationships, communities, institutions and cultural influences;
- ▶ Capture both basic survival (such as mortality and basic health) and quality of life (such as life skills and children's happiness);

- ▶ Include multiple domains (such as health, education and material well-being) that have a significant influence on a child's life;
- ▶ Incorporate the developmental stages of childhood; and
- ▶ Include indicators of current child well-being as well as factors that affect future outcomes as children move into adulthood.<sup>9</sup>

Keeping these basic concepts in mind, we decided to revisit our index. We consulted with a wide range of content and statistical experts and conducted an extensive review of the latest research on child development. We reviewed the use of domains across similar studies worldwide as well as the implications of adding domains to the *Data Book* methodology. As we identified indicators most connected to long-term success, we then attempted to find comparably collected, state-level data to track them. After analyzing



**Organizing the index into domains allows for a more nuanced characterization of child well-being in each state that can inform policy solutions by helping policymakers and advocates better identify areas of strength and weakness.**

available data, we selected 16 indicators that reflect a wide range of factors affecting child well-being and that are collected for all states on at least a biannual basis. To avoid redundancy, indicators that were too closely related were replaced with indicators that tracked different critical areas of child well-being. (For a more thorough description of the KIDS COUNT index review and revision process, please visit [datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012](http://datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012).)

### Understanding the Revised Index

#### Four Key Domains of Child Well-Being

The most significant change to the index is the creation of four content domains that capture what children need most to thrive: (1) Economic Well-Being, (2) Education, (3) Health and (4) Family and Community. Four indicators compose each of the four domains for a total of 16. For a list of indicators by domain, see Figure 2, “New KIDS COUNT Index.”

Organizing the index into domains allows for a more nuanced characterization of child well-being in each state that can inform policy solutions by helping policymakers and advocates better identify areas of strength and weakness. For example, a state may rank well above average in overall child well-being while showing need for improvement in education. Domain-specific data will strengthen decision-making efforts by providing multiple data points relevant to specific policy areas.

The new index possesses a number of important attributes. It reflects child

health and education outcomes as well as risk and protective factors, such as economic well-being, family structure and community context. The index incorporates a developmental perspective on childhood and includes experiences across life stages, from birth through early adulthood. The indicators are consistently and regularly measured, which allows for legitimate comparisons across states and over time.

#### How the Index Is Calculated

The new KIDS COUNT index was constructed by first converting the raw data for each of the 16 indicators into standard scores. Standardization is necessary because the distributions vary across different measures. For example, the percentage of children without health insurance ranges from 2 percent in Massachusetts and Vermont to 17 percent in Nevada. The teen birth rate ranges from 16 births per 1,000 female teens in New Hampshire to 64 births per 1,000 female teens in Mississippi and New Mexico. By standardizing these measures, we make sure that each indicator is given equal weight in the index.

Once standardized, the scores for each indicator are summed to create a total standard score for each state. These totals are ordered from highest to lowest and then translated into rankings with 1 being the best on overall child well-being and 50 the worst. Each indicator is given equal weight in the individual domain indices, and each domain is given equal weight in the overall index. For a detailed description of the methodology used to calculate the index, visit [datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012](http://datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012).

FIGURE 2

## New KIDS COUNT Index



### ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

- ▶ Children in poverty
- ▶ Children living in households with a high housing cost burden
- ▶ Children whose parents lack secure employment
- ▶ Teens not in school and not working



### EDUCATION

- ▶ Children not attending preschool
- ▶ Eighth graders not proficient in math
- ▶ Fourth graders not proficient in reading
- ▶ High school students not graduating on time



### HEALTH

- ▶ Low-birthweight babies
- ▶ Child and teen deaths per 100,000
- ▶ Children without health insurance
- ▶ Teens who abuse alcohol or drugs



### FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

- ▶ Children in single-parent families
- ▶ Children living in high-poverty areas
- ▶ Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma
- ▶ Teen births per 1,000

**By expanding the index and dividing the indicators into four equally weighted domains, there is a greater emphasis on education and family and community factors. And, the health indicators focus more on health status and less on mortality.**

### About the Data

The 16 indicators of child well-being are derived from federal government statistical agencies and reflect the best available state and national data for tracking yearly changes. For a complete description of the definitions and the data sources for each indicator, see page 50. It is important to recognize that many of the indicators are derived from samples, and like all sample data, they contain some random error. Other measures (such as the child and teen death rate) are based on relatively small numbers of events in some states and may exhibit some random fluctuation from year to year.

We urge readers to focus on relatively large differences across states as small differences may simply reflect random fluctuations, rather than real changes in the well-being of children. Assessing trends by looking at changes over a longer period of time is more reliable. State-level data for past years are available at the KIDS COUNT Data Center ([datacenter.kidscount.org](http://datacenter.kidscount.org)).

The *KIDS COUNT Data Book* utilizes rates and percentages because that is the best way to compare states to one another and to assess changes over time within a state. However, our focus on rates and percentages may mask the magnitude of some of the problems examined in the report. Therefore, data on the actual number of children or events are provided in Appendix 2 and at the KIDS COUNT Data Center.

We include data for the District of Columbia and some data for Puerto Rico

in the *Data Book*, but not in our state rankings. Because they are significantly different from any state, the comparisons are not instructive. It is more useful to look at changes for these geographies over time or to compare the District with other large cities. Data for many child well-being indicators for the 50 largest cities (including the District of Columbia) are available at the KIDS COUNT Data Center. Additionally, the Data Center contains some data for children and families residing in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

### What's Excluded

We excluded a wide range of additional variables from our new child well-being index for a couple of reasons. First, we wanted to limit the number of indicators to keep the index manageable and easy to understand. We considered quite a few indicators that were ultimately discarded because they were highly correlated with other important variables we already had selected. For example, food insecurity is a common measure of economic well-being, but it is so strongly related to poverty that it would have added little to the Economic Well-Being domain. We determined that it was more useful to include other dimensions, such as having a high housing cost burden.

Second, our selection of indicators was limited by data availability. Although data collection has proliferated and improved, and this is reflected in some of the indicators we added, there are some variables that affect child well-being for which comparable, consistently collected state-level data don't exist. Arguably, the

indicator that is most glaring in its absence is some measure of childhood obesity. National estimates indicate that the percent of children who are overweight or obese has skyrocketed over the past 20 years, with negative consequences for child health. However, no consistent

state-level data are currently available. Additionally, reliable state-level measures of childhood mental health, juvenile justice involvement and child maltreatment are either not regularly collected or are not collected in a sufficiently comparable form for inclusion in the index.

## How Does the New Index Compare With Previous Years?

Six of the 10 indicators from last year's *KIDS COUNT Data Book* are included in the new index. Two others—the death rate among children ages 1 to 14 and the death rate for teens 15 to 19—have been combined into a single mortality rate for children and youth. One previous indicator, percent of teens not in school and not high school graduates, has been replaced with percent of high school

students not graduating on time. In addition, infant mortality was eliminated because it is closely related to the percent of babies born with a low birthweight, which remains in the new index.

By expanding the index and dividing the indicators into four equally weighted domains, there is a greater emphasis on education and family and community factors. And, the health indicators focus more on health status

and less on mortality. Therefore, a state like California, where children tend to have relatively good health outcomes but lag behind the rest of the country in areas such as education and economic well-being, dropped significantly in the overall rankings this year compared to previous *Data Book* rankings. But even with this year's changes, the correlation between the overall state rankings for

2012 (using the new index) and for 2011 (using the previous index) is quite high (0.9). In other words, despite changes in the index, most states ended up in roughly the same place in the rankings as they did last year.

Note that data for indicators included in the previous index but not in the new one are still available at the KIDS COUNT Data Center ([datacenter.kidscount.org](http://datacenter.kidscount.org)).

# TRENDS





# STATUS OF CHILDREN

The following pages present a detailed portrait of the well-being of America's children. At the national level, this year's *Data Book* presents the most recent trends, starting from roughly 2005 and ending with the most recent year available, depending on the data availability for each indicator. With these data, we are able to compare how the nation's children were faring mid-decade, prior to the economic crisis, with how they are doing in its aftermath. Rankings at the state level are focused on the most recent data.

## Profile Pages Online

---

National and state profiles providing current and trend data for all 16 indicators are available at [datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012/profiles](http://datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012/profiles).

National and state data are also available in Appendix 2 on page 46.

FIGURE 3

## National Trends in 16 Key Indicators of Child Well-Being by Domain

PERCENT CHANGE  
OVER TIME

GETTING  
BETTER

GETTING  
WORSE

NO  
CHANGE



### ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Key Indicators	National Trend		
Children in poverty	2010	22%	16%
	2005	19%	
Children whose parents lack secure employment	2010	33%	22%
	2008	27%	
Children living in households with a high housing cost burden	2010	41%	11%
	2005	37%	
Teens not in school and not working	2010	9%	13%
	2008	8%	



### EDUCATION

Key Indicators	National Trend		
Children not attending preschool	2008-10	53%	-5%
	2005-07	56%	
Fourth graders not proficient in reading	2011	68%	-3%
	2005	70%	
Eighth graders not proficient in math	2011	66%	-8%
	2005	72%	
High school students not graduating on time	2008/09	24%	-11%
	2005/06	27%	



### HEALTH

Key Indicators	National Trend		
Low-birthweight babies	2009	8.2%	0%
	2005	8.2%	
Children without health insurance	2010	8%	-20%
	2008	10%	
Child and teen deaths per 100,000	2009	27	-16%
	2005	32	
Teens who abuse alcohol or drugs	2008-09	7%	-13%
	2005-06	8%	



### FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

Key Indicators	National Trend		
Children in single-parent families	2010	34%	6%
	2005	32%	
Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma	2010	15%	-6%
	2005	16%	
Children living in high-poverty areas	2006-10	11%	22%
	2000	9%	
Teen births per 1,000	2009	39	-3%
	2005	40	

FIGURE 4

## National Key Indicators by Race and Hispanic Origin

## Overall Trends in Child Well-Being

Comparing the data from pre- and post-recession time frames reveals both positive and negative developments in child well-being nationally (see Figure 3). Broadly speaking, children experienced gains in the Education and Health domains but setbacks in the Economic Well-Being and Family and Community domains.

All four Economic Well-Being indicators got substantially worse, which is not surprising, given the depth and severity of the economic crisis and continued high rates of unemployment. Conversely, all four Education indicators—which cover pre-school to high school graduation—showed some improvement over the five-year period. Child health continued to improve, with gains in children’s health insurance coverage and reductions in child and teen mortality and teen substance abuse. The percent of low-birthweight babies, however, remained unchanged.

Trends in the Family and Community domain were mixed. There were small declines in both the percent of children living with parents without a high school diploma and in the teen birth rate. But the percent of children living in single-parent families increased, and more children are living in high-poverty areas.

Overall, developments in child well-being over the past several years suggest that progress has been made in some areas but that a lot of work remains to be done to improve the prospects for the next generation.

Perhaps the most striking finding is that despite tremendous gains over recent decades for children of all races and income levels, inequities among children remain deep and stubbornly persistent (see Figure 4). The recession exacerbated some socioeconomic inequities that were already on the rise with potential negative consequences for the future.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING	National Average	African American	American Indian	Asian and Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic White
Children in poverty: 2010	22%	38%	35%	14%	32%	13%
Children whose parents lack secure employment: 2010	33%	49%	49%	23%	40%	25%
Children living in households with a high housing cost burden: 2010	41%	53%	36%	42%	52%	32%
Teens not in school and not working: 2010	9%	13%	16%	5%	11%	7%
EDUCATION						
Children not attending preschool: 2008–10	53%	50%	59%	48%	63%	50%
Fourth graders not proficient in reading: 2011	68%	84%*	81%*	51%*	82%	58%
Eighth graders not proficient in math: 2011	66%	87%*	83%*	45%*	80%	57%
High school students not graduating on time: 2008/09	24%	37%*	35%*	8%*	34%	18%
HEALTH						
Low-birthweight babies: 2009	8.2%	13.3%	7.3%	8.3%	6.9%	7.2%
Children without health insurance: 2010	8%	7%	18%	8%	14%	6%
Child and teen deaths per 100,000: 2009	27	39	41	16	25	25
Teens who abuse alcohol or drugs: 2009 <sup>^</sup>	7%	4%*	14%*	4%**	9%	7%
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY						
Children in single-parent families: 2010	34%	66%	52%	16%	41%	24%
Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma: 2010	15%	15%	20%	12%	37%	7%
Children living in high-poverty areas: 2006–10	11%	27%	24%	6%	19%	3%
Teen births per 1,000: 2009	39	59	55	15	70	25

\* Data for African Americans, American Indians and Asians and Pacific Islanders are for non-Hispanics in each respective group. All other rates for these racial groups include both Hispanics and non-Hispanics.

<sup>^</sup> These are single-year race data for 2009. Data in index are 2008–09 multiyear data.

+ Data results do not include Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders.

## Overall Rank

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

# OVERALL CHILD WELL-BEING

National data mask a great deal of state-by-state and regional variations in child well-being. A state-level examination of the data reveals a hard truth: A child's chances of thriving depend not just on individual, familial and community characteristics but also on the state in which she is born and raised. States vary considerably in the amount of wealth and other resources they possess. State policy choices also strongly influence children's chances for success.

We derive a composite index of overall child well-being for each state by combining data across the four domains: (1) Economic Well-Being, (2) Education, (3) Health and (4) Family and Community. These composite scores are then translated into a single state ranking for child well-being. The three highest ranked states are New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Vermont; the three lowest ranked states are Nevada, New Mexico and Mississippi (see box, "Overall Rank").

As is apparent in Figure 5, distinct regional patterns emerge from the state rankings. All of the northeastern states rank in the top 15 in

terms of overall child well-being except for Rhode Island and New York, both of which fall in the middle. States in the industrial Midwest rank in the middle on overall child well-being, while some of the states farther west—Minnesota, North Dakota, Iowa and Nebraska—are in the top 10.



States in the Southeast, Southwest and Appalachia—where the poorest states are located—populate the bottom of the overall rankings. In fact, with the exception of California, the 17 lowest ranked states in terms of child well-being are located in these regions.

However, as is obvious in Figure 5, overall state rankings obscure some important within-state variations. The graphic highlights states ranking best overall and in each domain (represented by concentric circles) in darker colors and those ranking worse in lighter colors. Although more than half the states (26) ranked either in the top 25 or bottom 25 across all four domains, the remaining states were somewhat mixed. For all states, the index illuminates bright spots and room for improvement.

FIGURE 5

### Overall Child Well-Being by State

We derive a composite index of overall child well-being for each state by combining data across the four domains: (1) Economic Well-Being, (2) Education, (3) Health and (4) Family and Community. To see how each state ranked overall and by domain, see Appendix I.



View an interactive version on the Data Center at: [datacenter/kidscount.org/databook/2012/](http://datacenter/kidscount.org/databook/2012/)



## Economic Well-Being Domain Rank

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

# ECONOMIC WELL-BEING



To help children grow into successful, productive adults, their parents need good jobs with good incomes, access to affordable housing and services and enough assets to build a better future. When parents are unemployed or their incomes are low, they may struggle to meet their children's most basic needs for food, safe housing, medical care and quality child care. They may be unable to provide books, toys and activities that are developmentally enriching. Inadequate family income and economic uncertainty also increase parental stress, which, in turn, can cause depression and anxiety and increase the risk of substance abuse and domestic violence—all of which can compromise parenting.<sup>10</sup> While the negative effects of poverty on children are troubling in their own right, they also increase the chances of poor outcomes for youth and young adults, such as teen pregnancy, not graduating from high school, poor health and lack of secure employment.<sup>11</sup>

## KEY FINDINGS IN ECONOMIC WELL-BEING



**+ 2.4** MILLION CHILDREN

The child poverty rate increased from 19 to 22 percent between 2005 and 2010, representing an increase of 2.4 million children.



**1** OUT OF **3** CHILDREN

One out of three children lives in a family without securely employed parents.



**41%** OF CHILDREN

Four out of 10 children in the United States live in households with high housing cost burdens.




**1** IN **11** TEENS

Nationally, about 1.6 million teens between the ages of 16 and 19 (9 percent) were neither in school nor working in 2010, up from 1.4 million in 2008.



On average, families need an income of roughly twice the official poverty level to meet their basic needs, including housing, food, transportation, health care and child care.



SOURCE U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Children in poverty

Growing up in poverty is one of the greatest threats to healthy child development. Poverty and financial stress can impede children's cognitive development and their ability to learn. It can contribute to behavioral, social and emotional problems and poor health. The risks posed by economic hardship are greatest among children who experience poverty when they are young and among children who experience persistent and deep poverty.<sup>12</sup> Already high compared with other developed nations, the child poverty rate in the United States increased dramatically as a result of the economic crisis. The official poverty line in 2010 was \$22,113 for a family of two adults and two children.

- Nationally, 22 percent of children (15.7 million) lived in poor families in 2010, up from 20 percent in 2009 (14.7 million). This means that the number of poor children increased by roughly 1 million in a single year, after the recession was officially over. From 2005 to 2010, the child poverty rate increased from 19 to 22 percent, representing an increase of 2.4 million children.
- The rate of child poverty for 2010 ranged from a low of 10 percent in New Hampshire to a high of 33 percent in Mississippi.
- The child poverty rate among African Americans (38 percent) was nearly three times the rate for non-Hispanic whites (13 percent) in 2010.

## A Better Measure of Poverty and the Role of the Social Safety Net

The revamped *KIDS COUNT Data Book* continues to use the official federal poverty measure for state-level child poverty rates. However, this statistic measures only the *cash* income available to families, without accounting for many safety net supports that a family might receive, such as federal tax credits, child care and housing vouchers, and food aid through the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly Food Stamps). The official measure also fails to adequately reflect the ways in which costs—like housing and child care—vary from region to region and have changed dramatically over the past half-century.

In fact, researchers have quantified basic living expenses in specific localities and found that on average, families need an income of roughly twice the federal poverty level to cover basic expenses for housing, food, transportation, health care and child care.<sup>13</sup> In 2010, 44 percent (32.2 million) of U.S. children lived in families with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level (\$44,226 for a family of four).

To better understand how families are faring, the U.S. Census Bureau recently created a Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM), which measures the impact of social programs and accounts for rising costs, among other changes. While the Census Bureau does not yet have sufficient data

(or funding) to calculate the SPM at the state level, this new national measure is an important advancement in understanding child poverty and the effects of safety net programs and tax policies on family economic well-being.

Revised poverty measures show that in 2010, our existing social safety net lifted many Americans out of poverty. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, when key safety net programs were included in a poverty measure, some 40 million people in 2010 rose above the poverty line. In fact, the significant, but temporary, policy changes enacted as part of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) kept 6.9 million people out of poverty, including 2.5 million children, making this one of the most effective pieces of anti-poverty legislation in our nation's history.<sup>14</sup>

While these efforts clearly did not go far enough in preventing all children from experiencing poverty during this economic crisis, using a more inclusive measure of poverty shows that our nation's social safety net can and does succeed in helping families in times of need. Though the SPM will continue to be refined over time, it is an important step in better understanding the economic well-being of the nation's children and families.


**To better understand how families are faring, the U.S. Census Bureau recently created a Supplemental Poverty Measure, which measures the impact of social programs and accounts for rising costs.**



## Children whose parents lack secure employment

Among Asian and Pacific Islander families, 23 percent of children had no parent with full-time, year-round employment in 2010, compared to more than twice that, 49 percent, for African-American and American Indian children.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS LACK SECURE EMPLOYMENT BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN: 2010



**SOURCE** U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey.

**NOTE** Data for African Americans, American Indians and Asians and Pacific Islanders also include those who are Hispanic.

Children living in families that lack secure parental employment, defined as those families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment, are particularly vulnerable. Without at least one parent employed full time, children are more likely to fall into poverty. Yet too many parents who want full-time work are forced to piece together part-time or temporary jobs that do not provide sufficient or stable income; some lack the education and skills needed to secure a good job. The recession exacerbated both unemployment and underemployment. Even a full-time job at low wages does not necessarily lift a family out of poverty. Without access to benefits and tax credits, one adult in a two-parent family with two children would need to earn \$11.06 an hour—\$3.81 above the federal minimum wage—working 40 hours a week for 50 weeks a year just to reach the poverty line.

■ In 2010, a third of all children in the U.S. (24.2 million) lived in families where no parent had full-time, year-round employment. Since 2008, the number of such children climbed by 4 million, from 27 to 33 percent.

■ At the state level, North Dakota had the lowest percentage of children in families without secure parental employment in 2010 (22 percent), followed closely by South Dakota and Wyoming at 23 percent. Mississippi had the highest rate at 39 percent.

## ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

## Children living in households with a high housing cost burden

Family income is only one part of financial security; the cost of basic expenses also matters. Housing is typically one of the largest expenses that families face. This measure identifies the proportion of children living in households that spend more than 30 percent of their pretax income on housing, whether they are renters or homeowners. Low-income families, in particular, are unlikely to be able to meet all of their basic needs if housing consumes nearly a third or more of their income.

- Across the nation, 41 percent of children lived in households with a high housing cost burden in 2010, compared to 37 percent in 2005, an 11 percent increase. That represents an increase from 27.4 million children to 30.1 million over five years.
- In 2010, California had the highest percentage of children—a startling 54 percent—living in households spending more than 30 percent of income for housing, whereas North Dakota had the lowest, 19 percent. Even in North Dakota, nearly one in five children lived in a family burdened by housing expenses.
- In 36 states and the District of Columbia, the percentage of children living in households with a high housing cost burden was 33 percent or more.

## ECONOMIC WELL-BEING


## Teens not in school and not working

Teens who leave school and do not become part of the workforce are at risk of experiencing negative outcomes as they transition to adulthood. The percent of teens not in school and not working (sometimes referred to as “disconnected youth” or “idle teens”) reflects young people ages 16 to 19 who are not engaged in school or the workforce. While those who have dropped out of school are clearly vulnerable, many young persons who have finished school but are not working are also at a disadvantage in achieving economic success in adulthood.

- Nationally, 9 percent of youth were disconnected from both work and school in 2010. About 1.6 million teens between the ages of 16 and 19 were neither enrolled in school nor working, up from 1.4 million in 2008.
- Nebraska and Vermont had the lowest rate of teens not in school and not working, 4 percent, while Nevada had the highest rate, 15 percent.
- American Indian, African-American and Latino teens were considerably more likely to be neither in school nor working than their white and Asian and Pacific Islander counterparts.

**Nebraska and Vermont had the lowest rate of teens not in school and not working, 4 percent, while Nevada had the highest rate, 15 percent.**

PERCENT OF TEENS NOT IN SCHOOL AND NOT WORKING: 2010



SOURCE U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey.



## Education Domain Rank

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

# EDUCATION



Establishing the conditions that promote successful educational achievement for children begins with quality prenatal care and continues into the early elementary school years. With a strong and healthy beginning, it is much easier to keep children on track to stay in school and graduate, pursue postsecondary education and training and successfully transition to adulthood. Yet, the United States continues to have significant gaps in educational achievement by race and income. Although the achievement gap between black and white students has narrowed considerably over the past four decades, the achievement gap by income has steadily increased.<sup>15</sup> Addressing this gap will be key to ensuring that our future workforce can compete on a global scale, given that most of the new jobs that will be created over the next decade will require some postsecondary education, training or certification.

## KEY FINDINGS IN EDUCATION




**53%** OF 3- AND 4-YEAR-OLDS

More than half (53 percent) of three- and four-year-olds were not enrolled in preschool in 2008–10.



**2 IN 3** 4TH GRADERS

More than two-thirds (68 percent) of fourth graders in public school were not reading proficiently in 2011, a slight improvement from 2005 when the figure was 70 percent.



**49–81%** OF 8TH GRADERS

The rate of eighth graders not proficient in math ranges from a low of 49 percent in Massachusetts to a high of 81 percent in Mississippi.




**1 IN 4** HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Although the rate is improving nationally, one out of four (24 percent) high school students did not graduate on time in 2008/09.



**Children who reach fourth grade without being able to read proficiently are more likely to drop out of high school, reducing their earning potential and chances for success.**

PERCENT OF FOURTH GRADERS NOT PROFICIENT IN READING BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN: 2011



**SOURCE** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress.

**NOTE** Data for African Americans, American Indians and Asians and Pacific Islanders do NOT include those who are Hispanic.

EDUCATION

**Children not attending preschool**

High-quality prekindergarten programs for three- and four-year-olds can improve school readiness, with the greatest gains accruing to the highest-risk children. Head Start and the expansion of state-funded programs since the 1990s have greatly increased access to preschool.<sup>16</sup> But many children, especially three-year-olds, continue to be left out, exacerbating socioeconomic differences in educational achievement. Because of small sample sizes in some states, we used data collected over a three-year period for this measure.

From 2008 to 2010, more than 4.2 million three- and four-year-olds were not enrolled in preschool, representing more than half (53 percent) of all children in that age group. This is a slight improvement over 2005–07, when nearly 4.7 million children (56 percent) did not participate in a pre-K program.

New Jersey and Connecticut, at 36 percent and 38 percent, respectively, had the lowest percentages of three- and four-year-olds not enrolled in preschool. The states with the highest percentages of children not enrolled in 2008–10 were Nevada (71 percent), Arizona (68 percent) and North Dakota (67 percent).

Half of African-American and white three- and four-year-olds were not in pre-K programs; the percentage was nearly the same for Asian and Pacific Islander children (48 percent). The rates were noticeably higher for Latinos (63 percent) and American Indians (59 percent).

EDUCATION

**Fourth graders not proficient in reading**

Proficiency in reading by the end of third grade is a crucial marker in a child’s educational development. In the early years, learning to read is a critical component of children’s education. But beginning in the fourth grade, children use reading to learn other subjects, and therefore, mastery of reading becomes a critical component in their ability to keep up academically. Children who reach fourth grade without being able to read proficiently are more likely to drop out of high school, reducing their earning potential and chances for success.<sup>17</sup>

A stunning 68 percent of fourth graders in public school were reading below proficient levels in 2011, a slight improvement from 2005, when the figure was 70 percent.

State differences in fourth grade reading levels among public school students are wide. In 2011, Massachusetts had the lowest percentage of public school fourth graders not proficient in reading, 50 percent, compared to a high of 79 percent in New Mexico.

More than 80 percent of African-American, American Indian and Latino fourth graders were not proficient in reading, compared to 58 percent of non-Hispanic whites.

EDUCATION

## Eighth graders not proficient in math

Competence in mathematics is essential for success in the workplace, which increasingly requires higher-level technical skills. The influence of high school students' math proficiency on later earnings has grown steadily over time. Students who take advanced math and science courses that require a strong mastery of math fundamentals are more likely to attend and to complete college.<sup>18</sup> But even for young people who do not attend college, basic math skills improve employability.

Among public school students, math proficiency levels in eighth grade and reading proficiency levels in fourth grade were quite similar in 2011, but there was greater improvement in eighth grade math achievement. Nationwide, two-thirds (66 percent) of public school eighth graders scored below proficient math levels in 2011, compared to 72 percent in 2005.

At 49 percent, Massachusetts had the lowest percentage of public school eighth graders not proficient in math in 2011. The state with the highest rate, 81 percent, was Mississippi.

Racial and ethnic disparities in math proficiencies are wide: 57 percent of non-Hispanic white eighth graders were below proficient, compared to 80 percent of Latinos, 83 percent of American Indians and 87 percent of African Americans.

EDUCATION

## High school students not graduating on time

Students who graduate from high school on time are more likely to continue to postsecondary education and training; they have higher earnings and are more employable than students who fail to graduate.<sup>19</sup> In 2010, median annual earnings for someone without a high school diploma (\$18,400) were 70 percent of those of a high school graduate (\$26,300) and 39 percent of the median earnings of someone with a bachelor's degree (\$47,400).<sup>20</sup> High school graduates have better health outcomes, make healthier choices and are less likely to engage in risky behavior.<sup>21</sup>


Nationally, for the 2008/09 school year, roughly 985,000 high school students (24 percent) did not graduate on time. However, this is an improvement of three percentage points from 2005/06 when 27 percent did not graduate in four years.

Among the states, the percentage of high school students not graduating from high school in four years ranged from a low of 9 percent in Wisconsin to a high of 44 percent in Nevada for 2008/09.

In 2008/09, 18 percent of non-Hispanic white students did not graduate from high school on time. The rate for African Americans was twice as high.

Students who don't take advanced math and science courses that require a strong mastery of math fundamentals are less likely to attend and to complete college.

PERCENT OF EIGHTH GRADERS NOT PROFICIENT IN MATH BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN: 2011



SOURCE U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress.

NOTE Data for African Americans, American Indians and Asians and Pacific Islanders do NOT include those who are Hispanic.

## Health Domain Rank

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

# HEALTH



Children’s health is the foundation of their overall development, and ensuring that they are born healthy is the first step toward increasing the life chances of disadvantaged children. Poverty, poor nutrition, lack of preventive health care, substance abuse, maternal depression and family violence put children’s health at risk. Poor health in childhood impacts other critical aspects of a child’s life, such as school readiness and attendance, and can have lasting consequences on their future health and well-being.

## KEY FINDINGS IN HEALTH



**8.2%** OF BIRTHS

After increasing for decades, the percent of low-birthweight babies has remained stable for the past several years at 8.2 percent of all live births.




**1 IN 12** CHILDREN

Across the nation, 5.9 million children (8 percent) lacked health insurance in 2010. That's a 20 percent improvement from 2008.



**27 PER 100,000** CHILDREN

Between 2005 and 2009, the child and teen death rate declined by 16 percent from 32 to 27 per 100,000 youth ages 1 to 19.



**MORE THAN 1 IN 14** TEENS

Nationally, 7 percent of teens ages 12 to 17 abused or were dependent on alcohol or drugs in 2008-09.





HEALTH


Low-birthweight babies

HEALTH

Children without health insurance

In 16 states, the percentage of children lacking health coverage was 5 percent or less in 2010. Massachusetts and Vermont had the lowest rate, 2 percent, compared to a high of 17 percent in Nevada.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITHOUT HEALTH INSURANCE: 2010



SOURCE U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey.

The birth of a baby reminds us of the potential that exists in every new generation. Yet, some newborns face stiffer odds than other babies to thrive. Babies who are born with a low birthweight (less than about 5.5 pounds) have a high probability of experiencing developmental problems and short- and long-term disabilities and are at greater risk of dying within the first year of life. Although recent increases in multiple births have strongly influenced the rise in rates of low-birthweight babies, rates have also been higher among singleton deliveries. Smoking, poor nutrition, poverty, stress, infections and violence can increase the risk of a baby being born with a low birthweight.<sup>22</sup>

- Nationally, low-birthweight babies represented 8.2 percent of all live births in 2009, unchanged from 2005. After gradually increasing over time, the percent of low-birthweight babies has remained relatively stable for the past several years, slightly below the three-decade high reached in 2006 of 8.3 percent.<sup>23</sup>
- South Dakota had the lowest percentage of low-birthweight babies in 2009, 5.8 percent of live births, while Mississippi had the highest, 12.2 percent.
- Among racial and ethnic groups, African-American babies are the most likely to be born with a low birthweight, at a rate of 13.3 percent of live births in 2009. Although this represents a slight decline from a high of 13.6 in 2007, it is still close to twice the low-birthweight rate for non-Hispanic whites.

Children without health insurance coverage are less likely than insured children to have a regular health care provider and to receive care when they need it. They are also more likely to receive treatment after their condition has worsened, putting them at greater risk for hospitalization. Having health insurance can protect families from financial devastation when their child experiences a serious or chronic illness. Although the provision of employer-sponsored health insurance is declining and most low-wage and part-time workers lack employer coverage, public health insurance has resulted in a modest increase in health coverage among children over the last decade.

- Across the nation, 8 percent of children (5.9 million) lacked health insurance in 2010. That's a 20 percent improvement from 2008 when 10 percent of children were uninsured.
- In 16 states, the percent of children lacking health coverage was 5 percent or less in 2010. Massachusetts and Vermont had the lowest rate, 2 percent, compared to a high of 17 percent in Nevada and 14 percent in Texas.
- American Indian (18 percent) and Latino children (14 percent) are far more likely to be uninsured than non-Hispanic white (6 percent), African-American (7 percent) and Asian and Pacific Islander (8 percent) children.

## HEALTH

## Child and teen deaths

The child and teen death rate (deaths per 100,000 children ages 1 to 19) reflects a broad array of factors: physical and mental health, access to health care, community factors (such as violence and environmental toxins), use of safety practices and, especially for younger children, the level of adult supervision. Accidents, primarily motor vehicle accidents, are the leading cause of death among children and youth, accounting for 31 percent of all deaths among children ages 1 to 14 and 42 percent of all deaths among teens ages 15 to 19 in 2009.<sup>24</sup> As children move into their middle and late teenage years, they encounter new risks that can be deadly. In 2009, accidents, homicides and suicides accounted for nearly 73 percent of deaths to teens ages 15 to 19. Death rates for children of all age groups have declined considerably in recent decades.

- More than 21,600 children and youth ages 1 to 19 died in 2009 in the United States, which translates into a mortality rate of 27 per 100,000 children and teens. The rate declined from 2005, when it was 32 per 100,000, resulting in roughly 3,400 fewer child and teen deaths in 2009 compared to four years prior.
- Considerable variation in the child and teen mortality rate exists among the states. Massachusetts had the lowest rate, 17 deaths per 100,000 children and youth in 2009. Mississippi and Wyoming fell at the other end of the spectrum, with a child and teen death rate of 47 per 100,000.
- American Indian and African-American children and teens have mortality rates (41 and 39 per 100,000, respectively) that are far higher than the national average.

## HEALTH

## Teens who abuse alcohol or drugs

Teen alcohol and drug abuse are associated with a variety of potentially harmful behaviors, such as engaging in risky sexual activity, driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol, abusing multiple substances and committing crimes. Alcohol and drug abuse among adolescents can cause both short- and long-term physical and mental health problems and exacerbate existing conditions. Teen substance abuse is also associated with poor academic performance and increased risk for dropping out of school. The negative consequences of teen alcohol and drug abuse can carry into adulthood. Overall, alcohol and drug use by adolescents has declined over the past decade, although patterns vary by substance.

- In 2008–09, 7 percent of teens ages 12 to 17 had abused or were dependent on alcohol or drugs during the past year, declining from 8 percent in 2005–06.
- Rates of substance abuse among teens at the state level varied from a low of 5 percent in Tennessee in 2008–09 to 11 percent in Montana.
- Among racial and ethnic groups, African-American and Asian teens were least likely (4 percent) to abuse or be dependent on alcohol or drugs.

## INFANT MORTALITY, CHILD DEATHS AND TEEN DEATHS: 2009

6.4 PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS

Infant mortality rate

18 PER 100,000 CHILDREN

Death rate for children ages 1 to 14

53 PER 100,000 TEENS

Death rate for teens ages 15 to 19

SOURCE U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, 2009 Vital Statistics.

NOTE State-level data for these indicators are available at [datacenter.kidscount.org](http://datacenter.kidscount.org).

## Family and Community Domain Rank


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

# FAMILY AND COMMUNITY



When children are nurtured and well cared for, especially during their early years, they have better social-emotional, language and learning outcomes. These, in turn, lead to more positive behavior and academic achievement in later years. But single parents, especially those struggling with financial hardship, are more prone to stress, anxiety and depression, which can interfere with effective parenting. These findings underscore the importance of two-generation strategies that strengthen families by mitigating a family's underlying economic distress and addressing the well-being of both parents and children. Families exist in and are affected by neighborhoods and communities. When communities have strong social and cultural institutions; good role models for children; and the resources to provide safety, good schools and quality support services, families and their children are more likely to thrive.

## KEY FINDINGS IN FAMILY AND COMMUNITY




**19–46%** OF CHILDREN

The rate of children living in single-parent families varies dramatically across the states, from a low of 19 percent in Utah to a high of 46 percent in Mississippi.



**15%** OF CHILDREN

In 2010, 15 percent of children lived in households headed by an adult without a high school diploma, a decline since 2005.



**+1.6** MILLION CHILDREN

An estimated 11 percent of children lived in high-poverty areas nationwide during 2006–10. This represents an increase of 1.6 million children since 2000, when the rate was 9 percent.



**39** BIRTHS PER **1,000** TEENS

In 2009, the rate of births to teens reached a historic low of 39 births per 1,000 females ages 15 to 19.



FAMILY AND COMMUNITY


## Children in single-parent families

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

## Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma

Nationally, about 24.3 million children lived in single-parent families in 2010. Of these children, 4.8 million lived in cohabiting couple families.

CHILDREN BY HOUSEHOLD LIVING ARRANGEMENT: 2010



SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey.

Children growing up in single-parent families typically do not have the same economic or human resources available as those growing up in two-parent families. In 2010, 36 percent of single-parent families had incomes below the poverty line, compared to 8 percent of married-couple families with children. Only about 31 percent of female-headed families reported receiving any child support payments in 2009. Compared with children in married-couple families, children raised in female-headed households are more likely to drop out of school, to have or cause a teen pregnancy and to experience a divorce in adulthood.<sup>25</sup> The U.S. Census Bureau defines single-parent families as those families headed by an unmarried adult. A child living with cohabiting parents is counted as living in a single-parent family.

- The percentage of children living in single-parent families increased from 32 percent in 2005 to 34 percent in 2010, representing an increase of 2.6 million children.
- At the state level, the percentage of children living in single-parent families in 2010 ranged from a low of 19 percent in Utah to a high of 46 percent in Mississippi. This is one of the larger ranges in state variation among the indicators.
- Two-thirds (66 percent) of African-American children lived in single-parent families in 2010, compared to just over half of American Indian children (52 percent) and two out of five (41 percent) Latino children. By comparison, a fourth (24 percent) of non-Hispanic white and one-sixth (16 percent) of Asian and Pacific Islander children lived in single-parent households.

Higher levels of parental education are strongly associated with better outcomes for children. Children whose parents have not graduated from high school are at greater risk for being born with a low birthweight and having health problems, and they are more likely to smoke and binge drink when they are older. Their school readiness and educational achievement are also at risk.<sup>26</sup> More highly educated parents are better able to provide their children with economic stability and security, which, in turn, enhances child development. Over the past several decades, parental education levels have steadily increased.

- In 2010, 15 percent of children lived in households headed by an adult without a high school diploma. This represents 11.3 million children compared to 12 million in 2005, which is a 6 percent decline.
- In North Dakota and Vermont, only 4 percent of children lived in families not headed by a high school graduate in 2010, the lowest percentage in the country. At 26 percent, California had the highest rate of children living without a high-school-educated head of household.
- About 37 percent of Latino children lived in households headed by someone without a high school diploma. That's two and a half times the rate for African-American children (15 percent) and more than five times the rate for non-Hispanic white children (7 percent).

## FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

## Children living in high-poverty areas

Concentrated poverty puts whole neighborhoods and people living there at risk. High-poverty neighborhoods are much more likely than other neighborhoods to have high rates of crime and violence, physical and mental health problems, unemployment and other problems. Concentrated neighborhood poverty negatively affects poor children as well as those who are better off.<sup>27</sup> High-poverty areas are defined here as those census tracts where the poverty rates of the total population are 30 percent or more.

► During the period from 2006 to 2010, 11 percent of children lived in high-poverty areas nationwide, for a total of 7.9 million. This represents an increase of 1.6 million children since 2000, when the rate was 9 percent.

► Variation among the states is wide: Fewer than half of one percent of children in Wyoming lived in areas of concentrated poverty, whereas 23 percent of children lived in high-poverty areas in Mississippi. The rate was 20 percent in New Mexico.

► African-American, American Indian and Latino children were much more likely to live in high-poverty areas than children of other racial and ethnic groups. The rates were 27 percent, 24 percent and 19 percent, respectively.

## FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

## Teen births

Teenage childbearing can have long-term negative effects for both the mother and newborn. Babies born to teen mothers are at higher risk of being low-birthweight and preterm. They are also far more likely to be born into families with limited educational and economic resources, which function as barriers to future success.<sup>28</sup> In 2006, the United States saw the first increase in the teen birth rate in more than a decade, a rise that continued through 2007. But after the two-year increase, the teen birth rate declined in 2008 and 2009 to a historic low.


► In 2009, there were nearly 410,000 babies born to females ages 15 to 19. That translates into a birth rate of 39 births per 1,000 teens, which represents a slight decrease from 2005 when the rate was 40 births per 1,000 teens.

► Among the states, the teen birth rate for 2009 ranged from a low of 16 births per 1,000 teens ages 15 to 19 in New Hampshire to a high of 64 per 1,000 in Mississippi and New Mexico.

► At 70 births per 1,000 teenage girls, the teen birth rate for Latinos was the highest across major racial and ethnic groups. Although it remained high, the 2009 rate for births to Latino teens was the lowest rate on record.<sup>29</sup>

**African-American, American Indian and Latino children were much more likely to live in high-poverty areas than children of other racial and ethnic groups.**

### PERCENT OF CHILDREN LIVING IN HIGH-POVERTY AREAS BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN: 2006-10



SOURCE U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-10 American Community Survey.

NOTE Data for African Americans, American Indians and Asians and Pacific Islanders also include those who are Hispanic.





# CONCLUSION

Over the past few decades, we have made tremendous progress in some areas of child well-being and reduced some of the most egregious disparities associated with differences in income and wealth, and race and ethnicity. As the findings in this year's *KIDS COUNT Data Book* reveal, some aspects of child well-being, such as education and health, continued to show some improvement, despite the worst economic catastrophe since the Great Depression.

---

At the same time, some hard-won gains are slipping away. We are particularly concerned about the severe declines in economic well-being for families and their children caused by the recession. While the economy is slowly improving, change can't come soon enough for the children whose exposure to economic hardship has deepened or been prolonged. As we know, such conditions can have lasting consequences that reduce the chances of future success.

If we want to ensure that the next generation is prepared to effectively compete in a global economy that is increasingly technology driven and dependent on a well-educated workforce, then we must act.

With the right investments, we can provide all families and children with the opportunity to reach their full potential and, in the process, strengthen our economy and our nation.

## ENDNOTES

1. Ravitch, D. (June 7, 2012). Do our public schools threaten national security? *New York Review of Books*. www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2012/jun/07/do-our-public-schools-threaten-national-security/?page=1#fn-\*
2. Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In R. Murnane & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality and the uncertain life chances of low-income children*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (June 2012). *Childhood obesity facts*. www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/obesity/facts.htm
4. Weller, C. E., Fields, J., & Agbede, F. (January 2011). *The state of communities of color in the U.S. economy: A snapshot as we enter 2011*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/01/pdf/comm\_of\_color.pdf
5. McNichol, E., Oliff, P., & Johnson, N. (May 24, 2012). *States continue to feel recession's impact*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711
6. Schraad-Tishcler, D. (2011). Social justice in the OECD: How do the member states compare? Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung. www.sgi-network.org/pdf/SGI11\_Social\_Justice\_OECD.pdf
7. Annie E. Casey Foundation. (February 2012). *Children living in high-poverty communities* (KIDS COUNT Data Snapshot). Baltimore, MD: Author. www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/Publications.aspx?pubguid={DF6A3A0E-9AA3-405E-9FB9-E1D9C80C5E5C}
8. Annie E. Casey Foundation, KIDS COUNT Data Center. http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/acrossstates/Rankings.aspx?ind=44
9. O'Hare, W., & Gutierrez, F. (2012). *Comprehensive assessment of child well-being indices: The state of the art*. Working paper, Annie E. Casey Foundation.
10. Yeung, W. J., Linver, M. R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for children's development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child Development*, 73(6), pp. 1861–1879.
11. For a summary of this literature, see Gershoff, E. T., Aber, J. L., & Raver, C. C. (2003). Child poverty in the U.S.: An evidence-based conceptual framework for programs and policies. In Lerner, R., Jacobs, F., & Wertlieb, D. (Eds.), *Promoting positive child, adolescent, and family development: A handbook of program and policy innovations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
12. Gershoff, E. T., Aber, J. L., & Raver, C. C. (2003). Child poverty in the U.S.: An evidence-based conceptual framework for programs and policies. In Lerner, R., Jacobs, F., & Wertlieb, D. (Eds.), *Promoting positive child, adolescent, and family development: A handbook of program and policy innovations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
13. Bernstein, J., Brocht, C., & Spade-Aguilar, M. (2000). *How much is enough? Basic family budgets for working families*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. www.epi.org/publications/entry/books\_howmuch/
14. Sherman, A. (November 2011). *Poverty and financial distress would have been substantially worse in 2010 without government action, new census data show*. Washington, DC: Center for Public Policy Priorities. www.cbpp.org/files/11-7-11pov.pdf
15. Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In R. Murnane & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality and the uncertain life chances of low-income children*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
16. Higgins, L. B., Stagman, S., & Smith, S. (2010). *Improving supports for parents of young children: State-level initiatives*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University. http://nccp.org/publications/pdf/text\_966.pdf.
17. Gormley, W., Jr., Gayer, T., Phillips, D., & Dawson, B. (2004). *The effects of Oklahoma's universal pre-kindergarten program on school readiness*. Washington, DC: Center for the Research on Children in the U.S., Georgetown University. www.crocus.georgetown.edu/reports/executive\_summary\_11\_04.pdf
18. Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2010). *Early warning! Why reading by the end of third grade matters* (KIDS COUNT Special Report). Baltimore, MD: Author. http://datacenter.kidscount.org/reports/readingmatters.aspx
19. Child Trends Data Bank. (January 2012). *Mathematics proficiency*. www.childtrendsdatabank.org/?q=node/256
20. Alliance for Excellent Education. (2011). *The high cost of high school dropouts: What the nation pays for inadequate high schools*. Washington, DC: Author. www.all4ed.org/files/HighCost.pdf
21. Population Reference Bureau's analysis of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey 1-year estimates, summary table S2001, data accessed at http://factfinder2.census.gov (June 11, 2012).
22. Alliance for Excellent Education. (2006). *Healthier and wealthier: Decreasing health care costs by increasing educational attainment*. Washington, DC: Author. www.all4ed.org/files/HandW.pdf
23. Shore, R., & Shore, B. (2009). *Preventing low birthweight* (KIDS COUNT Indicator Brief). Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/PublicationsSeries/KCIndicatorBriefs.aspx
24. Population Reference Bureau's analysis of data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. (2009). *Mortality Data File 2009*. http://webappa.cdc.gov/sasweb/ncipc/mortrate10\_us.html
25. Amato, P. R. (2005). The impact of family formation change on the cognitive, social, and emotional well-being of the next generation, *The Future of Children*, 15(2), pp. 75–96.
26. Child Trends Data Bank. (April 2012). *Parental education*. www.childtrendsdatabank.org/?q=node/183
27. Annie E. Casey Foundation. (February 2012). *Children living in high-poverty communities* (KIDS COUNT Data Snapshot). Baltimore, MD: Author. www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/Publications.aspx?pubguid={DF6A3A0E-9AA3-405E-9FB9-E1D9C80C5E5C}
28. Child Trends Data Bank. (March 2012). *Teen births*. www.childtrendsdatabank.org/?q=node/52
29. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Births: Final data for 2009. *National Vital Statistics Reports*, 60(1). Washington, DC. www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr60/nvsr60\_01.pdf

# KIDS COUNT DATA CENTER

The KIDS COUNT Data Center provides easy online access to hundreds of child well-being indicators in the areas of education, employment and income, health, poverty and youth risk factors. Data are available for the nation and for states, as well as for many cities, counties and school districts. The Data Center offers multiple tools to customize and share information. Ranking, mapping and graphing tools allow customization of data that can be shared and updated through social media and other web-based applications.


[datacenter.kidscount.org](http://datacenter.kidscount.org)

## Mobile Site

All indicators currently found on the KIDS COUNT Data Center can be accessed quickly and easily anytime, anywhere on your mobile device at: [mobile.kidscount.org](http://mobile.kidscount.org)

## Profile Pages Online

National and State profile pages previously available in the *Data Book* are now accessible online at: [datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012/profiles](http://datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2012/profiles)





# APPENDICES



## APPENDIX I

## Child Well-Being Rankings

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

N.R. Not Ranked.



## ECONOMIC WELL-BEING INDICATORS

State	Children in poverty: 2010		Children whose parents lack secure employment: 2010		Children living in households with a high housing cost burden: 2010		Teens not in school and not working: 2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
United States	15,749,000	22	24,159,000	33	30,107,000	41	1,580,000	9
Alabama	311,000	28	422,000	37	401,000	35	30,000	11
Alaska	24,000	13	65,000	35	58,000	31	5,000	11
Arizona	392,000	24	570,000	35	700,000	43	45,000	12
Arkansas	193,000	28	253,000	36	229,000	32	21,000	12
California	2,013,000	22	3,345,000	36	5,016,000	54	192,000	8
Colorado	211,000	17	356,000	29	481,000	39	20,000	7
Connecticut	103,000	13	228,000	28	348,000	43	11,000	5
Delaware	37,000	18	60,000	29	82,000	40	5,000	9
District of Columbia	31,000	30	44,000	44	43,000	42	3,000	9
Florida	924,000	23	1,377,000	34	1,961,000	49	103,000	10
Georgia	611,000	25	839,000	34	1,034,000	41	70,000	12
Hawaii	41,000	14	91,000	30	141,000	46	8,000	12
Idaho	80,000	19	134,000	31	153,000	36	10,000	11
Illinois	600,000	19	986,000	32	1,313,000	42	59,000	8
Indiana	342,000	22	536,000	33	513,000	32	31,000	8
Iowa	115,000	16	182,000	25	193,000	27	11,000	6
Kansas	131,000	18	199,000	27	217,000	30	10,000	6
Kentucky	263,000	26	375,000	37	327,000	32	27,000	11
Louisiana	300,000	27	404,000	36	358,000	32	37,000	14
Maine	48,000	18	92,000	34	91,000	33	5,000	7
Maryland	173,000	13	357,000	26	566,000	42	28,000	8
Massachusetts	201,000	14	424,000	30	556,000	39	20,000	5
Michigan	539,000	23	855,000	37	906,000	39	54,000	9
Minnesota	192,000	15	352,000	27	435,000	34	14,000	5
Mississippi	242,000	33	292,000	39	263,000	35	23,000	13
Missouri	291,000	21	436,000	31	463,000	33	30,000	9
Montana	44,000	20	70,000	31	67,000	30	5,000	9
Nebraska	82,000	18	112,000	24	127,000	28	4,000	4
Nevada	144,000	22	239,000	36	311,000	47	22,000	15
New Hampshire	28,000	10	70,000	25	111,000	39	4,000	6
New Jersey	295,000	14	567,000	27	994,000	48	36,000	8
New Mexico	154,000	30	190,000	37	170,000	33	15,000	12
New York	901,000	21	1,358,000	31	1,957,000	45	94,000	8
North Carolina	560,000	25	793,000	35	859,000	38	52,000	10
North Dakota	24,000	16	33,000	22	28,000	19	2,000	5
Ohio	624,000	23	918,000	34	969,000	36	53,000	8
Oklahoma	227,000	25	301,000	32	296,000	32	19,000	9
Oregon	184,000	22	315,000	36	393,000	45	20,000	10
Pennsylvania	522,000	19	854,000	31	981,000	35	53,000	7
Puerto Rico	500,000	56	487,000	54	288,000	32	42,000	18
Rhode Island	42,000	19	76,000	34	101,000	45	3,000	5
South Carolina	278,000	26	397,000	37	382,000	35	24,000	9
South Dakota	36,000	18	46,000	23	45,000	22	4,000	8
Tennessee	377,000	26	556,000	37	550,000	37	35,000	10
Texas	1,751,000	26	2,169,000	31	2,560,000	37	144,000	9
Utah	136,000	16	212,000	24	327,000	37	17,000	9
Vermont	21,000	17	41,000	31	50,000	39	1,000	4
Virginia	265,000	14	480,000	26	689,000	37	34,000	7
Washington	284,000	18	507,000	32	674,000	43	30,000	8
West Virginia	96,000	25	144,000	37	104,000	27	14,000	14
Wisconsin	250,000	19	402,000	30	478,000	36	21,000	7
Wyoming	19,000	14	32,000	23	34,000	25	3,000	9





## APPENDIX 2: DATA FOR 16 INDICATORS OF CHILD WELL-BEING

## EDUCATION INDICATORS

State	Children not attending preschool: 2008-10		Fourth graders not proficient in reading: 2011		Eighth graders not proficient in math: 2011		High school students not graduating on time: 2008/09	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
United States	4,234,000	53	N.A.	68	N.A.	66	985,330	24
Alabama	70,000	57	N.A.	69	N.A.	80	18,087	30
Alaska	12,000	63	N.A.	74	N.A.	65	3,026	27
Arizona	123,000	68	N.A.	74	N.A.	69	23,610	27
Arkansas	40,000	51	N.A.	70	N.A.	71	9,855	26
California	518,000	52	N.A.	75	N.A.	75	151,963	29
Colorado	71,000	52	N.A.	61	N.A.	57	13,703	22
Connecticut	32,000	38	N.A.	58	N.A.	62	11,406	25
Delaware	11,000	50	N.A.	64	N.A.	68	2,795	26
District of Columbia	4,000	34	N.A.	81	N.A.	83	2,118	38
Florida	217,000	51	N.A.	65	N.A.	72	69,117	31
Georgia	138,000	51	N.A.	68	N.A.	72	41,794	32
Hawaii	15,000	46	N.A.	73	N.A.	70	3,784	25
Idaho	30,000	63	N.A.	67	N.A.	63	4,043	19
Illinois	153,000	46	N.A.	67	N.A.	67	37,691	22
Indiana	107,000	61	N.A.	67	N.A.	66	20,986	25
Iowa	42,000	52	N.A.	67	N.A.	66	5,645	14
Kansas	42,000	53	N.A.	64	N.A.	59	7,479	20
Kentucky	64,000	56	N.A.	65	N.A.	69	12,058	22
Louisiana	57,000	47	N.A.	77	N.A.	78	17,332	33
Maine	17,000	58	N.A.	68	N.A.	61	3,242	20
Maryland	71,000	49	N.A.	57	N.A.	60	14,455	20
Massachusetts	59,000	41	N.A.	50	N.A.	49	13,128	17
Michigan	129,000	54	N.A.	69	N.A.	69	36,898	25
Minnesota	79,000	55	N.A.	65	N.A.	52	8,600	13
Mississippi	40,000	50	N.A.	78	N.A.	81	15,031	38
Missouri	90,000	57	N.A.	66	N.A.	68	12,832	17
Montana	14,000	59	N.A.	64	N.A.	54	2,214	18
Nebraska	27,000	53	N.A.	64	N.A.	67	4,021	17
Nevada	54,000	71	N.A.	75	N.A.	71	15,432	44
New Hampshire	15,000	49	N.A.	57	N.A.	56	2,753	16
New Jersey	78,000	36	N.A.	56	N.A.	53	16,326	15
New Mexico	34,000	62	N.A.	79	N.A.	76	9,744	35
New York	193,000	44	N.A.	65	N.A.	70	65,065	26
North Carolina	139,000	56	N.A.	66	N.A.	63	28,775	25
North Dakota	11,000	67	N.A.	64	N.A.	57	1,038	13
Ohio	160,000	54	N.A.	66	N.A.	61	31,325	20
Oklahoma	59,000	58	N.A.	73	N.A.	73	10,924	23
Oregon	54,000	58	N.A.	70	N.A.	67	10,806	24
Pennsylvania	147,000	51	N.A.	59	N.A.	61	31,585	19
Puerto Rico	43,000	48	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	14,308	33
Rhode Island	12,000	51	N.A.	65	N.A.	66	3,285	25
South Carolina	61,000	54	N.A.	72	N.A.	68	20,160	34
South Dakota	14,000	60	N.A.	69	N.A.	58	1,820	18
Tennessee	93,000	59	N.A.	74	N.A.	76	17,612	23
Texas	445,000	59	N.A.	72	N.A.	60	86,093	25
Utah	59,000	59	N.A.	67	N.A.	65	7,903	21
Vermont	7,000	52	N.A.	59	N.A.	54	839	10
Virginia	105,000	52	N.A.	61	N.A.	60	21,956	22
Washington	101,000	60	N.A.	66	N.A.	60	22,359	26
West Virginia	27,000	65	N.A.	73	N.A.	79	5,293	23
Wisconsin	80,000	59	N.A.	66	N.A.	59	6,679	9
Wyoming	10,000	60	N.A.	66	N.A.	63	1,814	25

N.A. Not Available.



## HEALTH INDICATORS

State	Low-birthweight babies: 2009		Children without health insurance: 2010		Child and teen deaths per 100,000: 2009		Teens who abuse alcohol or drugs: 2008–09	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Rate	Number	Percent
United States	336,747	8.2	5,918,000	8	21,621	27	1,815,000	7
Alabama	6,454	10.3	67,000	6	447	37	26,000	7
Alaska	666	5.9	23,000	12	75	39	4,000	7
Arizona	6,575	7.1	208,000	13	536	30	43,000	8
Arkansas	3,546	8.9	46,000	7	280	37	18,000	8
California	35,802	6.8	833,000	9	2,386	24	257,000	8
Colorado	6,007	8.8	124,000	10	337	26	38,000	10
Connecticut	3,127	8.0	24,000	3	163	19	23,000	8
Delaware	994	8.6	11,000	5	65	29	5,000	8
District of Columbia	929	10.3	2,000	2	49	38	2,000	5
Florida	19,247	8.7	507,000	13	1,253	29	94,000	7
Georgia	13,190	9.4	244,000	10	723	27	48,000	6
Hawaii	1,592	8.4	11,000	4	82	27	8,000	8
Idaho	1,541	6.5	45,000	11	114	26	11,000	8
Illinois	14,316	8.4	140,000	4	896	27	75,000	7
Indiana	7,225	8.3	143,000	9	482	29	41,000	8
Iowa	2,671	6.7	29,000	4	189	25	20,000	8
Kansas	3,011	7.3	60,000	8	236	32	18,000	8
Kentucky	5,141	8.9	61,000	6	349	32	21,000	6
Louisiana	6,915	10.6	62,000	6	516	43	21,000	6
Maine	851	6.3	11,000	4	78	27	7,000	7
Maryland	6,836	9.1	64,000	5	366	25	27,000	6
Massachusetts	5,802	7.8	22,000	2	264	17	37,000	7
Michigan	9,799	8.4	95,000	4	728	29	65,000	8
Minnesota	4,604	6.5	84,000	7	294	22	32,000	8
Mississippi	5,249	12.2	64,000	8	380	47	15,000	6
Missouri	6,393	8.1	88,000	6	525	35	35,000	7
Montana	865	7.1	28,000	12	100	42	8,000	11
Nebraska	1,922	7.1	26,000	6	121	25	11,000	8
Nevada	3,046	8.1	115,000	17	204	29	19,000	9
New Hampshire	925	6.9	14,000	5	57	18	9,000	9
New Jersey	9,137	8.3	123,000	6	398	18	45,000	6
New Mexico	2,416	8.3	53,000	10	213	40	17,000	10
New York	20,341	8.2	208,000	5	1,032	22	121,000	8
North Carolina	11,454	9.0	177,000	8	717	30	44,000	6
North Dakota	572	6.4	10,000	6	58	37	4,000	8
Ohio	12,378	8.6	162,000	6	762	26	70,000	7
Oklahoma	4,558	8.4	93,000	10	404	42	22,000	8
Oregon	2,955	6.3	76,000	9	191	21	27,000	9
Pennsylvania	12,187	8.3	144,000	5	764	25	60,000	6
Puerto Rico	5,525	12.4	39,000	4	316	30	N.A.	N.A.
Rhode Island	913	8.0	12,000	6	59	23	7,000	8
South Carolina	6,047	10.0	102,000	9	407	35	22,000	6
South Dakota	696	5.8	17,000	8	98	46	6,000	9
Tennessee	7,539	9.2	79,000	5	511	32	26,000	5
Texas	34,137	8.5	996,000	14	2,093	29	153,000	7
Utah	3,766	7.0	95,000	11	226	25	15,000	6
Vermont	411	6.7	3,000	2	30	21	4,000	7
Virginia	8,779	8.4	121,000	7	421	21	44,000	7
Washington	5,580	6.3	102,000	6	386	23	38,000	7
West Virginia	1,952	9.2	18,000	5	145	35	9,000	7
Wisconsin	5,027	7.1	67,000	5	345	24	39,000	9
Wyoming	661	8.4	11,000	8	66	47	4,000	9

N.A. Not Available.



## APPENDIX 2: DATA FOR 16 INDICATORS OF CHILD WELL-BEING

## FAMILY AND COMMUNITY INDICATORS

State	Children in single-parent families: 2010		Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma: 2010		Children living in high-poverty areas: 2006-10		Teen births per 1,000: 2009	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Rate
United States	24,297,000	34	11,338,000	15	7,879,000	11	409,802	39
Alabama	429,000	40	182,000	16	151,000	13	8,205	51
Alaska	57,000	32	19,000	10	5,000	3	1,106	45
Arizona	569,000	37	310,000	19	253,000	16	10,874	51
Arkansas	254,000	39	111,000	16	98,000	14	5,753	59
California	2,945,000	33	2,374,000	26	1,049,000	11	47,831	37
Colorado	356,000	30	161,000	13	92,000	8	6,203	38
Connecticut	249,000	32	81,000	10	62,000	7	2,605	21
Delaware	73,000	37	24,000	12	9,000	4	1,081	35
District of Columbia	57,000	60	19,000	19	33,000	32	1,034	48
Florida	1,484,000	39	555,000	14	341,000	8	22,021	39
Georgia	888,000	38	371,000	15	264,000	11	16,345	48
Hawaii	85,000	30	25,000	8	12,000	4	1,547	41
Idaho	105,000	25	51,000	12	13,000	3	2,038	36
Illinois	989,000	33	426,000	14	304,000	10	16,196	36
Indiana	530,000	35	205,000	13	135,000	8	9,527	43
Iowa	200,000	29	63,000	9	27,000	4	3,421	32
Kansas	214,000	31	84,000	12	46,000	6	4,233	44
Kentucky	338,000	35	143,000	14	132,000	13	7,208	51
Louisiana	472,000	45	194,000	17	193,000	17	8,413	53
Maine	90,000	34	16,000	6	8,000	3	1,047	24
Maryland	457,000	36	137,000	10	43,000	3	6,140	31
Massachusetts	425,000	31	128,000	9	100,000	7	4,482	20
Michigan	763,000	34	234,000	10	341,000	14	11,709	33
Minnesota	345,000	28	100,000	8	68,000	5	4,384	24
Mississippi	326,000	46	125,000	17	177,000	23	6,945	64
Missouri	457,000	34	164,000	12	123,000	9	8,499	42
Montana	61,000	29	17,000	8	14,000	6	1,264	39
Nebraska	125,000	28	52,000	11	27,000	6	2,209	35
Nevada	229,000	36	145,000	22	41,000	6	3,879	47
New Hampshire	75,000	27	16,000	6	5,000	2	765	16
New Jersey	579,000	29	204,000	10	128,000	6	6,408	23
New Mexico	207,000	42	105,000	20	100,000	20	4,438	64
New York	1,446,000	35	673,000	16	674,000	15	16,306	24
North Carolina	792,000	37	324,000	14	212,000	9	14,093	45
North Dakota	37,000	25	7,000	4	11,000	7	663	28
Ohio	925,000	36	286,000	11	324,000	12	15,445	39
Oklahoma	307,000	35	129,000	14	98,000	11	7,451	60
Oregon	262,000	32	134,000	15	42,000	5	4,063	33
Pennsylvania	902,000	34	285,000	10	299,000	11	12,850	29
Puerto Rico	475,000	56	198,000	22	786,000	83	7,992	55
Rhode Island	80,000	37	31,000	14	22,000	10	1,051	27
South Carolina	423,000	42	154,000	14	133,000	12	7,651	49
South Dakota	57,000	29	16,000	8	22,000	11	1,092	38
Tennessee	524,000	37	191,000	13	197,000	13	10,378	51
Texas	2,337,000	36	1,595,000	23	1,120,000	17	52,656	61
Utah	164,000	19	78,000	9	27,000	3	3,349	31
Vermont	38,000	30	5,000	4	1,000	1	393	17
Virginia	574,000	32	202,000	11	76,000	4	8,228	31
Washington	444,000	29	197,000	12	87,000	6	6,866	32
West Virginia	117,000	33	47,000	12	33,000	8	2,845	50
Wisconsin	403,000	31	135,000	10	107,000	8	5,798	29
Wyoming	34,000	26	10,000	7	1,000	0	814	45

## Definitions and Data Sources

**Domain Rank** for each state was obtained in the following manner. First, we converted the state numerical values for the most recent year for each of the four key indicators within each domain into standard scores. We summed those standard scores in each domain to get a total standard score for each state. Finally, we ranked the states on the basis of their total standard score by domain in sequential order from highest/best (1) to lowest/worst (50). Standard scores were derived by subtracting the mean score from the observed score and dividing the amount by the standard deviation for that distribution of scores. All measures were given the same weight in calculating the domain standard score.

**Overall Rank** for each state was obtained in the following manner. First, we converted the state numerical values for the most recent year for each of the 16 key indicators into standard scores. We summed those standard scores within their domains to create a domain standard score for each of the 50 states. We then summed the four domain standard scores to get a total standard score for each state. Finally, we ranked the states on the basis of their total standard score in sequential order from highest/best (1) to lowest/worst (50). Standard scores were derived by subtracting the mean score from the observed score and dividing the amount by the standard deviation for that distribution of scores. All measures were given the same weight in calculating the total standard score.

**Percent Change Over Time Analysis** was computed by comparing the most recent year's data for 16 key indicators with the data for the base year. To calculate percent change, we subtracted the rate for the most recent year from the rate for the base

year and then divided that quantity by the rate for the base year. The results are multiplied by 100 for readability. The percent change was calculated on rounded data, and the "percent change" figure has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### Economic Well-Being Indicators

**Children in poverty** is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below 100 percent of the U.S. poverty threshold, as issued each year by the U.S. Census Bureau. The federal poverty definition consists of a series of thresholds based on family size and composition and is updated every year to account for inflation. In calendar year 2010, a family of two adults and two children fell in the "poverty" category if their annual income fell below \$22,113. Poverty status is not determined for people living in group quarters, such as military barracks, prisons and other institutional quarters, or for unrelated individuals under age 15 (such as foster children). The data are based on income received in the 12 months prior to the survey. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Children whose parents lack secure employment** is the share of all children under age 18 living in families where no parent has regular, full-time, year-round employment. For children living in single-parent families, this means that the resident parent did not work at least 35 hours per week, at least 50 weeks in the 12 months prior to the survey. For children living in married-couple families, this means that neither parent worked at least 35 hours per week, at least 50 weeks in the 12 months prior to the survey. Children living with neither parent are also listed as not having secure parental employment because those

children are likely to be economically vulnerable. The 2010 estimate for this measure should not be compared to estimates prior to 2008 because of substantial changes made to the 2008 American Community Survey questions on labor force participation and number of weeks worked. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Children living in households with a high housing cost burden** is the percent of children under age 18 who live in households where more than 30 percent of monthly household pretax income is spent on housing-related expenses, including rent, mortgage payments, taxes and insurance. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Teens not in school and not working** is the percentage of teenagers between ages 16 and 19 who are not enrolled in school (full or part time) and not employed (full or part time). This measure is sometimes referred to as “Idle Teens” or “Disconnected Youth.” The 2010 estimate for this measure should not be compared to estimates prior to 2008 because of substantial changes made to the 2008 American Community Survey questions on labor force participation and number of weeks worked. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

## Education Indicators

**Children not attending preschool** is the percentage of children ages three to four who were not enrolled in nursery school or preschool during the previous two months. Children enrolled in kindergarten are excluded from this analysis. Due to small sample size, the three-year

American Community Survey was used to increase accuracy of the estimates. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Fourth graders not proficient in reading** is the percentage of fourth grade public school students who did not reach the proficient level in reading as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Public schools include charter schools and exclude Bureau of Indian Education schools and Department of Defense Education Activity schools. **SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress.

**Eighth graders not proficient in math** is the percentage of eighth grade public school students who did not reach the proficient level in math as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Public schools include charter schools and exclude Bureau of Indian Education schools and Department of Defense Education Activity schools. **SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress.

**High school students not graduating on time** is the estimated percentage of an entering freshman class not graduating in four years. The measure is derived from the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR), which uses aggregate student enrollment data to estimate the size of an incoming freshman class and aggregate counts of the number of regular diplomas awarded four years later. **SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD).

## Health Indicators

**Low-birthweight babies** is the percentage of live births weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds). The data reflect the mother's place of residence, not the place where the birth occurred. **SOURCE:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Statistics.

**Children without health insurance** is the percentage of children under age 18 not covered by any health insurance. The data are based on health insurance coverage at the time of the survey; interviews are conducted throughout the calendar year. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Child and teen deaths** is the number of deaths, from all causes, to children between ages 1 and 19 per 100,000 children in this age range. The data are reported by the place of residence, not the place where the death occurred. **SOURCES:** Death Statistics: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Statistics. **Population Statistics:** U.S. Census Bureau.

**Teens who abuse alcohol or drugs** is the percent of teens ages 12 to 17 reporting dependence on or abuse of either illicit drugs or alcohol in the past year. Illicit drugs include marijuana, cocaine, heroin, hallucinogens, inhalants or prescription drugs used nonmedically. Dependence or abuse is based on definitions found in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. These data are based on a two-year average of survey responses. **SOURCE:** Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Survey on Drug Use and Health.

## Family and Community Indicators

**Children in single-parent families** is the percentage of children under age 18 who live with their own unmarried parent, either in a family or sub-family. In this definition, single-parent families may include cohabiting couples. Children living with married stepparents are not considered to be in a single-parent family. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma** is the percentage of children under age 18 living in households where the household head does not have a high school diploma or equivalent. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Children living in high-poverty areas** is the percentage of children under age 18 who live in census tracts where the poverty rate of the total population is 30 percent or more. In calendar year 2010, a family of two adults and two children fell in the "poverty" category if their annual income fell below \$22,113. The data are based on income received in the 12 months prior to the survey. The census tract level data used in this analysis are only available in the five-year American Community Survey. The most recent year of data covers the time period 2006–10. **SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

**Teen births** is the number of births to teenagers between ages 15 and 19 per 1,000 females in this age group. Data reflect the mother's place of residence, rather than the place of the birth. **SOURCES:** Birth Statistics: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Statistics. **Population Statistics:** U.S. Census Bureau.

## Primary Contacts for State KIDS COUNT Projects

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

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

### Alabama

VOICES for Alabama's Children  
[www.alavoices.org](http://www.alavoices.org)  
 (334) 213-2410

### Alaska

KIDS COUNT Alaska  
[kidscount.alaska.edu](http://kidscount.alaska.edu)  
 (907) 786-5431

### Arizona

Children's Action Alliance  
[www.azchildren.org](http://www.azchildren.org)  
 (602) 266-0707

### Arkansas

Arkansas Advocates for Children & Families  
[www.aradvocates.org](http://www.aradvocates.org)  
 (501) 371-9678

### California

Children Now  
[www.childrennow.org](http://www.childrennow.org)  
 (510) 763-2444

### Colorado

Colorado Children's Campaign  
[www.coloradokids.org](http://www.coloradokids.org)  
 (303) 839-1580

### Connecticut

Connecticut Association for Human Services  
[www.caahs.org](http://www.caahs.org)  
 (860) 951-2212

### District of Columbia

DC Action for Children  
[www.dckids.org](http://www.dckids.org)  
 (202) 234-9404

### Delaware

University of Delaware  
[www.dekidscount.org](http://www.dekidscount.org)  
 (302) 831-3462

### Florida

University of South Florida  
 Florida KIDS COUNT  
[www.floridakidscount.org](http://www.floridakidscount.org)  
 (813) 974-7411

### Georgia

Georgia Family Connection Partnership, Inc.  
[www.gafcp.org](http://www.gafcp.org)  
 (404) 527-7394

### Hawaii

University of Hawaii Center on the Family  
[www.uhfamily.hawaii.edu](http://www.uhfamily.hawaii.edu)  
 (808) 956-3760

### Idaho

Mountain States Group  
[www.idahokidscount.org](http://www.idahokidscount.org)  
 (208) 388-1014

### Illinois

Voices for Illinois Children  
[www.voices4kids.org](http://www.voices4kids.org)  
 (312) 456-0600

## State Grantees

For more information about the network of state KIDS COUNT grantees, including mailing addresses, please visit [www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org).



### Indiana

Indiana Youth Institute  
www.iyi.org  
(317) 396-2700

### Iowa

Child & Family Policy Center  
www.cfpciowa.org  
(515) 280-9027

### Kansas

Kansas Action for Children  
www.kac.org  
(785) 232-0550

### Kentucky

Kentucky Youth  
Advocates, Inc.  
www.kyyouth.org  
(502) 895-8167

### Louisiana

Agenda for Children  
www.agendaforchildren.org  
(504) 586-8509

### Maine

Maine Children's Alliance  
www.mekids.org  
(207) 623-1868

### Maryland

Advocates for Children & Youth  
www.acy.org  
(410) 547-9200

### Massachusetts

Massachusetts Budget  
& Policy Center  
www.massbudget.org  
(617) 426-1228

### Michigan

Michigan League for  
Human Services  
www.milhs.org  
(517) 487-5436

### Minnesota

Children's Defense  
Fund—Minnesota  
www.cdf-mn.org  
(651) 227-6121

### Mississippi

Social Science  
Research Center  
www.ssrc.msstate.edu/  
mskidscount  
(662) 325-0851

### Missouri

Partnership for Children  
http://pfc.org  
(816) 531-9200

### Montana

Bureau of Business  
& Economic Research  
www.montanakidscount.org  
(406) 243-2780

### Nebraska

Voices for Children in Nebraska  
www.voicesforchildren.com  
(402) 597-3100

### Nevada

Center for Business  
and Economic Research  
http://business.unlv.edu/kids/  
(702) 895-3011

### New Hampshire

Children's Alliance  
of New Hampshire  
www.childrennh.org  
(603) 225-2264

### New Jersey

Advocates for Children  
of New Jersey  
www.acnj.org  
(973) 643-3876

### New Mexico

New Mexico Voices for Children  
www.nmvoices.org  
(505) 244-9505

### New York

New York State Council  
on Children & Families  
www.ccf.ny.gov  
(518) 473-3652

### North Carolina

Action for Children  
North Carolina  
www.ncchild.org  
(919) 834-6623

**North Dakota**

North Dakota State University  
[www.ndkidscount.org](http://www.ndkidscount.org)  
 (701) 231-5931

**Ohio**

Children's Defense Fund Ohio  
[www.cdfohio.org](http://www.cdfohio.org)  
 (614) 221-2244

**Oklahoma**

Oklahoma Institute for  
 Child Advocacy  
[www.oica.org](http://www.oica.org)  
 (405) 236-5437

**Oregon**

Children First for Oregon  
[www.cffo.org](http://www.cffo.org)  
 (503) 236-9754

**Pennsylvania**

Pennsylvania Partnerships  
 for Children  
[www.papartnerships.org](http://www.papartnerships.org)  
 (717) 236-5680

**Puerto Rico**

National Council of La Raza  
[www.nclr.org](http://www.nclr.org)  
 (787) 963-0156

**Rhode Island**

Rhode Island KIDS COUNT  
[www.rikidscount.org](http://www.rikidscount.org)  
 (401) 351-9400

**South Carolina**

The Children's Trust of  
 South Carolina  
[www.scchildren.org](http://www.scchildren.org)  
 (803) 733-5430

**South Dakota**

SD KIDS COUNT Project  
[www.sdkidscount.org](http://www.sdkidscount.org)  
 (605) 677-6432

**Tennessee**

Tennessee Commission  
 on Children & Youth  
[www.tn.gov/tccy/index.shtml](http://www.tn.gov/tccy/index.shtml)  
 (615) 741-2633

**Texas**

Center for Public Policy Priorities  
[www.cppp.org/kidscount.php](http://www.cppp.org/kidscount.php)  
 (512) 320-0222

**US Virgin Islands**

CFVI, Inc.  
[www.cfvi.net](http://www.cfvi.net)  
 (340) 774-6031

**Utah**

Voices for Utah Children  
[www.utahchildren.org](http://www.utahchildren.org)  
 (801) 364-1182

**Vermont**

Voices for Vermont's Children  
[www.voicesforvtkids.org](http://www.voicesforvtkids.org)  
 (802) 229-6377

**Virginia**

Voices for Virginia's Children  
[www.vakids.org](http://www.vakids.org)  
 (804) 649-0184

**Washington**

Children's Alliance  
<http://childrensalliance.org>  
 (206) 324-0340

**West Virginia**

West Virginia KIDS COUNT Fund  
[www.wvkidscountfund.org](http://www.wvkidscountfund.org)  
 (304) 345-2101

**Wisconsin**

Wisconsin Council  
 on Children & Families  
[www.wccf.org](http://www.wccf.org)  
 (608) 284-0580

**Wyoming**

Wyoming Children's  
 Action Alliance  
[www.wykids.com](http://www.wykids.com)  
 (307) 635-2306

## ABOUT THE ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION AND KIDS COUNT

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of UPS, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public policies, human-service reforms and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities and communities fashion more innovative, cost-effective responses to these needs.

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 initiative develops and distributes reports on key areas of well-being, including the annual *KIDS COUNT Data Book*.

The initiative also maintains the KIDS COUNT Data Center, which uses the best available data to measure the educational, social, economic and physical well-being of children.

Additionally, the Foundation funds a nationwide network of state-level KIDS COUNT projects that provide a more detailed, community-by-community picture of the condition of children.



© 2012 Annie E. Casey Foundation  
701 St. Paul Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
[www.aecf.org](http://www.aecf.org)

KIDS COUNT® is a registered trademark  
of the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Permission to copy, disseminate or  
otherwise use information from this  
*Data Book* is granted as long as  
appropriate acknowledgment is given.

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

ISSN 1060-9814

Designed by KINETIK  
[www.kinetikcom.com](http://www.kinetikcom.com)

Photography © Susie Fitzhugh, Jason  
Miczek and Cynthia Sambro-Rier

Data compiled by  
Population Reference Bureau  
[www.prb.org](http://www.prb.org)

The Annie E. Casey Foundation



701 St. Paul Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
410.547.6600  
[www.aecf.org](http://www.aecf.org)