Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

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

Updated January 25, 2021

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
RL32760

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

SUMMARY

RL32760

January 25, 2021

Gene Falk
Specialist in Social Policy

Patrick A. Landers
Analyst in Social Policy

For a copy of the full report, please call 7-5700 or visit www.crs.gov.

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

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

TANF Funding and Expenditures. TANF provides fixed funding for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the territories, and American Indian tribes. The basic block grant totals $16.5 billion per year. States are also required in total to contribute, from their own funds, at least $10.3 billion annually under a maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement. The basic block grant is not adjusted for changes in circumstances (e.g., inflation, population) over time. In FY2020, the TANF basic block grant was 38% below what its value (adjusting for inflation) was in FY1997.

Though TANF is best known for funding basic assistance payments for needy families with children, the block grant and MOE funds are used for a wide variety of benefits and activities. In FY2019, expenditures on basic assistance totaled $6.5 billion—21% of total federal TANF and MOE dollars. Basic assistance is often—but not exclusively—paid as cash and on an ongoing basis (monthly). In addition to funding basic assistance, TANF also contributes funds for child care, employment services (for both assistance recipients and others), state refundable tax credits for low income families, pre-Kindergarten and Head Start programs, and services for children who have been, or are at risk of being, abused and neglected. Some states also count expenditures in prekindergarten programs toward the MOE requirement.

The TANF Assistance Caseload. A total of 1.1 million families, composed of 2.9 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded assistance in June 2020. The bulk of the "recipients" were children—2.1 million in that month. The assistance caseload is heterogeneous. The type of family once thought of as the "typical" assistance family—one with an unemployed adult recipient—accounted for 32% of all families on the rolls in FY2019. Additionally, 26% of cash assistance families had an employed adult, while 42% of all TANF families were "child-only" and had no adult recipient. Child-only families include those with disabled adults receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), adults who are nonparents (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) caring for children, and families consisting of citizen children and ineligible noncitizen parents.

Assistance Benefits. TANF assistance benefit amounts are set by states. In July 2018, the maximum monthly benefit for a family of three ranged from $1,039 in New Hampshire to $170 in Mississippi. Only New Hampshire (at 60% of the federal poverty guidelines) had a maximum TANF assistance amount for this sized family in excess of 50% of poverty-level income.

Work Requirements. TANF's main federal work requirement is a performance measure that applies to the states. States determine the work rules that apply to individual recipients. TANF law requires states to engage 50% of all families and 90% of two-parent families with work-eligible individuals in work activities, though these standards can be reduced by "credits." Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% or 90% targets, and vary by state. In FY2019, states achieved, on average, an all-family participation rate of 47.1% and a two-parent rate of 54.8%. In FY2019, only Montana did not meet the all-family participation standard and five jurisdictions (California, Montana, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Wyoming) did not meet the two-parent standard.

The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is likely to affect states' ability to meet TANF work standards. These standards are in statute and cannot be waived other than through legislation. However, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) can waive financial penalties for states that do not meet standards. In policy guidance, HHS has said it would use its authority to provide relief from the penalty for not meeting work standards "to the maximum extent possible."

Contents

Introduction 1
Funding and Expenditures 1
What Is TANF's Funding Status? 1
How Are State TANF Programs Funded? 1
How Much Has the Value of the TANF Basic Block Grant Changed Over Time? 1
How Have States Used TANF Funds? 2
How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent? 3
The Caseload 4
How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services? 4
How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Assistance? 4
How Does the Current Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels? 5
What Are the Characteristics of Families Receiving TANF Assistance? 6
TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month? 7
TANF Work Participation Standards 8
What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet? 8
Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law? 9
What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved? 9
How Many Jurisdictions Did Not Meet TANF Work Standards in FY2019? 10
How Might the COVID-19 Pandemic Affect the Ability of States to Meet TANF Work Standards? 11

Figures

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Funds by Spending Category, FY2019 3
Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Assistance, July 1959 to June 2020 5
Figure 3. Composition of the AFDC/TANF Assistance Caseload by Family Type: Selected Year FY1988 to FY2019 7
Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single-Parent Family with Two Children, 50 States and the District of Columbia, July 2018 8
Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2019 10

Tables

Table 1. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Nominal and Constant Dollars 2
Table 2. The TANF Assistance Caseload, June 2020 4

Table A-1. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961-2019 12
Table A-2. Families Receiving AFDC/TANF Assistance by Family Category, Selected Years, FY1988-FY2019 14

Table B-1. Use of FY2019 TANF and MOE Funds by Category 15
Table B-2. Uses of FY2018 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percentage of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Spending 18
Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2019 21
Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Assistance by Jurisdiction, June 2020 22
Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Assistance by Jurisdiction, June of Selected Years 24
Table B-6. TANF Assistance Families by Number of Parents by Jurisdiction: June 2020 26
Table B-7. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction, for All Families: FY2019 28
Table B-8. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction, for Two-Parent Families: FY2019 29

Appendixes

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables 12
Appendix B. State Tables 15

Contacts

Author Information 31

Introduction

This report provides responses to frequently asked questions about the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It is intended to serve as a quick reference to provide easy access to information and data. **Appendix A** provides additional data on families receiving TANF assistance over time. **Appendix B** presents a series of tables with state-level data on TANF expenditures and families receiving assistance.

This report does not provide information on TANF program rules (for a discussion of TANF rules, see CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk).

Funding and Expenditures

What Is TANF's Funding Status?

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (P.L. 116-260) extends TANF funding through the end of FY2021 (September 30, 2021).

How Are State TANF Programs Funded?

TANF programs are funded through a combination of federal and state funds. In FY2018, TANF has two federal grants to states. The bulk of the TANF funding is in a basic block grant to the states, totaling $16.5 billion for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Indian tribes. There is also a contingency fund available that provides extra federal funds to states that meet certain conditions.

Additionally, states are required to expend a minimum amount of their own funds for TANF and TANF-related activities under what is known as the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. States are required to spend at least 75% of what they spent in FY1994 on TANF's predecessor programs. The minimum MOE amount, in total, is $10.3 billion per year for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

How Much Has the Value of the TANF Basic Block Grant Changed Over Time?

TANF was created by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA, P.L. 104-193). A TANF basic block grant amount—both nationally and for each state—was established in the 1996 law. That amount for the 50 states, District of Columbia, territories, and tribes was $16.6 billion in total. From FY1997 through FY2016, that amount remained the same. The basic block grant was not adjusted for changes that occur over time, such as inflation, the size of the TANF assistance caseload, or changes in the poverty population. During this period, the real (inflation-adjusted) value of the block grant declined by one-third (33.1%). Beginning with FY2017, the state family assistance grant was reduced by 0.33% from its historical levels to finance TANF-related research and technical assistance. The reduced block grant amount is $16.5 billion.

Table 1 shows the state family assistance grant, in both nominal (actual) and real (inflation-adjusted) dollars for each year, FY1997 through FY2020. In real (inflation-adjusted) terms, the FY2020 block grant was 38% below its value in FY1997.

Table 1. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Nominal and Constant Dollars

(In Billions of $)

Fiscal Year	State Family Assistance Grant: 50 States, DC, Tribes, and Territories	State Family Assistance Grant Constant 1997 dollars	Cumulative Percentage Change
1997	$16.567	$16.567	
1998	16.567	16.306	-1.6%
1999	16.567	15.991	-3.5
2000	16.567	15.498	-6.5
2001	16.567	15.020	-9.3
2002	16.567	14.792	-10.7
2003	16.567	14.456	-12.7
2004	16.567	14.124	-14.7
2005	16.567	13.680	-17.4
2006	16.567	13.190	-20.4
2007	16.567	12.893	-22.2
2008	16.567	12.345	-25.5
2009	16.567	12.382	-25.3
2010	16.567	12.182	-26.5
2011	16.567	11.859	-28.4
2012	16.567	11.585	-30.1
2013	16.567	11.394	-31.2
2014	16.567	11.217	-32.3
2015	16.567	11.179	-32.5
2016	16.567	11.082	-33.1
2017	16.512	10.820	-34.7
2018	16.512	10.564	-36.2
2019	16.512	10.372	-37.4
2020	16.512	10.224	-38.3

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

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

How Have States Used TANF Funds?

In FY2019, a total of $30.9 billion of both federal TANF and state MOE expenditures were either expended or transferred to other block grant programs. Basic assistance—ongoing benefits to families to meet basic needs—represented 21% ($6.5 billion) of total FY2019 TANF and MOE dollars.

TANF is a major contributor of child care funding. In FY2019, $5.0 billion (16% of all TANF and MOE funds) were either expended on child care or transferred to the child care block grant (the Child Care and Development Fund, or CCDF). TANF work-related activities (including education and training) were the third-largest TANF and MOE spending category at $3.2 billion, or 10% of total TANF and MOE funds. TANF also helps low-wage parents by helping to finance state refundable tax credits, such as state add-ons to the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). TANF and MOE expenditures on refundable tax credits in FY2019 totaled $2.8 billion, or 9% of total TANF and MOE spending.

TANF and MOE funds also help fund state prekindergarten (pre-K) programs, with total FY2019 expenditures for that category at $2.6 billion. TANF is also a major contributor to the child welfare system, which provides foster care, adoption assistance, and services to families with children who either have experienced or are at risk of experiencing child abuse or neglect, spending about $2.6 billion on such activities. TANF and MOE funds are also used for short-term and emergency benefits and a wide range of other social services. **Figure 1** shows the uses of federal TANF grants to states and state MOE funds in FY2019.

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Funds by Spending Category, FY2019

(Dollars in Billions)



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

Notes: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding. Excludes TANF funds used in the territories and in tribal TANF programs.

For state-specific information on the use of TANF funds, see **Table B-1** and **Table B-2**.

How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?

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

At the end of FY2019 (September 30, 2019, the most recent data currently available), a total of $5.8 billion of federal TANF funding remained neither transferred nor spent. However, some of these unspent funds represent monies that states had already committed to spend later. At the end of FY2019, states had made such commitments to spend—that is, had obligated—a total of $1.4 billion. At the end of FY2019, states had $4.5 billion of "unobligated balances." These funds are

available to states to make *new* spending commitments. **Table B-3** shows unspent TANF funds by state.

The Caseload

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

This number is not known. Federal TANF reporting requirements focus on families receiving only ongoing assistance. There is no complete reporting on families receiving other TANF benefits and services.

"Assistance" is defined as benefits provided to families to meet ongoing, basic needs.[1] It is most often paid in cash. However, some states use TANF or MOE funds to provide an "earnings supplement" to working parents added to monthly Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) allotments. These earnings supplements are paid separately from the regular TANF cash assistance program. Additionally, TANF MOE dollars are used to fund food assistance for immigrants barred from regular SNAP benefits in certain states. These forms of nutrition aid meet an ongoing need, and thus are considered TANF assistance.

As discussed in a previous section of this report, TANF basic assistance accounts for about 21% of all TANF expenditures. Therefore, the federal reporting requirements that pertain to families receiving assistance are likely to undercount the number of families receiving any TANF-funded benefit or service.

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

Table 2 provides assistance caseload information. A total of 1.1 million families, composed of 2.9 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded assistance in June 2020. The bulk of the "recipients" were children—2.1 million in that month. For state-by-state assistance caseloads, see **Table B-4**.

Table 2. The TANF Assistance Caseload, June 2020

Families	1,120,319
Recipients	2,930,544
Adults	2,132,800
Children	797,744

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

Notes: TANF assistance caseload data exclude South Dakota. Data for South Dakota were not reported. TANF assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

[1] The definition of TANF assistance is not in statute. However, because the statutory language has most TANF requirements triggered by a family receiving "assistance," the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations define assistance at 45 C.F.R. §260.31.

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

Figure 2 provides a long-term historical perspective on the number of families receiving assistance from TANF or its predecessor program, from July 1959 to June 2020. The shaded areas of the figure represent months when the national economy was in recession. Though the health of the national economy has affected the trend in the cash assistance caseload, the long-term trend in receipt of cash assistance does not follow a classic countercyclical pattern. Such a pattern would have the caseload rise during economic slumps, and then fall again during periods of economic growth. Factors other than the health of the economy (demographic trends, policy changes) also have influenced the caseload trend.

The figure shows two periods of sustained caseload increases: the period from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s and a second period from 1988 to 1994. The number of families receiving assistance peaked in March 1994 at 5.1 million families. The assistance caseload fell rapidly in the late 1990s, after PRWORA, before leveling off in 2001. In 2004, the caseload began another decline, albeit at a slower pace than in the late 1990s. During the 2007-2009 recession and its aftermath, the caseload began to rise from 1.7 million families in August 2008, peaking in December 2010 at close to 2.0 million families. The number of families receiving assistance declined by almost half (to a little over 1 million families) during the long economic expansion of 2010 through 2019.

In June 2020, the number of families receiving assistance was reported at 1.1 million families, about 4% up from its level in December 2019.

Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Assistance, July 1959 to June 2020



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

Notes: Shaded areas denote months when the national economy was in recession. Information represents families receiving cash assistance from Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and TANF. For October 1999 through September 2019, includes families receiving assistance from Separate State Programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. See **Table A-1** for average annual data on families, recipients, adult recipients, and child recipients of ADC, AFDC, and TANF cash assistance for 1961 to 2019. Note that data for January-March 2020 exclude Virginia; data for April-June 2020 exclude South Dakota.

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

What Are the Characteristics of Families Receiving TANF Assistance?

Before PRWORA, the "typical" family receiving assistance had been headed by a single parent (usually the mother) with one or two children. That single parent had also typically been unemployed. However, since 1996, the assistance caseload decline has occurred together with a major shift in the composition of the rolls.

Figure 3 shows the change in the size and composition of the assistance caseload under both AFDC (1988 and 1994) and TANF. In FY1988, an estimated 84% of AFDC families were headed by an unemployed adult recipient. In FY2019, families with an unemployed adult recipient represented 32% of all cash assistance families. This decline occurred, in large part, as the number of families headed by unemployed adult recipients declined more rapidly than other components of the assistance caseload. In FY1994, a monthly average of 3.8 million families per month who received AFDC cash assistance had adult recipients who were not working. In FY2019, a monthly average of 359,000 families per month had adult recipients or work-eligible individuals, with no adult recipient or work-eligible individual working.

With the decline in families headed by unemployed adults, the share of the caseload represented by families with employed adults and "child-only" families has increased. The first category includes families in "earnings supplement" programs separate from the regular TANF cash assistance program. In FY2019, families with an employed adult comprised 26% of all TANF families.

Child-only TANF families are those where no adult recipient receives benefits in their own right; the family receives benefits on behalf of its children. The share of the caseload that was child-only in FY2019 was 42%. In FY2019, families with a nonrecipient, nonparent relative (grandparents, aunts, uncles) represented 17% of all assistance families. Families with ineligible, noncitizen adults or adults who have not reported their citizenship status made up 10% of the assistance caseload in that year. Families where the parent received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and the children received TANF made up 9% of all assistance families in FY2019.

Figure 3. Composition of the AFDC/TANF Assistance Caseload by Family Type: Selected Year FY1988 to FY2019



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

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

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

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

Most states base TANF cash benefit amounts on family size, paying larger cash benefits to larger families on the presumption that they have greater financial needs. The maximum monthly cash benefit is usually paid to a family that receives no other income (e.g., no earned or unearned income) and complies with program rules. Families with income other than TANF often are paid a reduced benefit. Moreover, some families are financially sanctioned for not meeting a program requirement (e.g., a work requirement), and are also paid a lower benefit.

Figure 4 shows the maximum monthly TANF cash benefit by state for a single parent caring for two children (family of three) in July 2018.[2] The benefit amounts shown are those for a single-parent family with two children.[3] For a family of three, the maximum TANF benefit paid in July

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

[3] Some states vary their benefit amounts for other family types such as two-parent families or "child-only" cases. States also vary their benefits by other factors such as housing costs and substate geography.

2018 varied from $170 per month in Mississippi to $1,039 per month in New Hampshire. The map shows a regional pattern to the maximum monthly benefit paid, with lower benefit amounts in the South than in other regions. Only New Hampshire (at 60% of the federal poverty guidelines) had a maximum TANF cash assistance amount for this sized family in excess of 50% of poverty-level income.[4]

Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single-Parent Family with Two Children, 50 States and the District of Columbia, July 2018



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the Urban Institute's *Welfare Rules Database*. The welfare rules database has information for the 50 states and District of Columbia. It does not have information on TANF assistance programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands or tribal TANF programs.

TANF Work Participation Standards

TANF's main federal work requirement is actually a performance measure that applies to the states, rather than individual recipients. States determine the work rules that apply to individual recipients.

What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?

The TANF statute requires states to have 50% of their caseload meet standards of participation in work or activities—that is, a family member must be in specified activities for a minimum number of hours.[5] There is a separate participation standard that applies to the two-parent portion

[4] In 2018, the HHS poverty guidelines for the contiguous 48 states and the District of Columbia for a family of three was $1,732 per month. Higher poverty lines applied in Alaska ($2,165 per month for a family of three) and Hawaii ($1,992 per month for a family of three).

[5] Families without a work-eligible individual are excluded from the participation rate calculation. It excludes families

of a state's caseload, requiring 90% of the state's two-parent caseload to meet participation standards.

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

States that do not meet the TANF work participation standard are at *risk* of being penalized through a reduction in their block grant. However, penalties can be forgiven if a state claims, and the Secretary of HHS finds, that it had "reasonable cause" for not meeting the standard. Penalties can also be forgiven for states that enter into "corrective compliance plans," and subsequently meet the work standard.

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

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

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

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

What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?

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

where the parent is a nonrecipient (for example, disabled receiving Supplemental Security Income or an ineligible noncitizen) or the children in the family are being cared for by a nonparent relative (e.g., grandparent, aunt, uncle) who does not receive assistance on his or her behalf.

work participation rate that is compared with the two-parent effective standard (90% minus the state's caseload reduction credit).

Figure 5 shows the national average all-families work participation rate for FY2002 through FY2019. For the period FY2002 through FY2011, states achieved an average all-families work participation rate hovering around 30%. The work participation rate increased since then. In FY2016, it exceeded 50% for the first time since TANF was established. However, it is important to note that the increase in the work participation rate has not come from an increase in the number of recipients in regular TANF assistance programs who are either working or in job preparation activities. This increase stems mostly from states creating new "earnings supplement" programs that use TANF funds to aid working parents in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly food stamps) or who have left the regular TANF assistance programs for work.[6]

Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2019



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

How Many Jurisdictions Did Not Meet TANF Work Standards in FY2019?

In FY2019, Montana was the only jurisdiction that did not meet its TANF work participation standard for all families. Montana also did not meet its standard in FY2018. In terms of the higher two-parent standard, five jurisdictions did not meet it for FY2019: California, Montana, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. **Table B-7** provides information for each jurisdiction on the TANF work standard, caseload reduction credit, and work participation rate for all families for FY2019. **Table B-8** provides that information for two-parent families.

[6] See CRS In Focus IF10856, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families: Work Requirements*.

How Might the COVID-19 Pandemic Affect the Ability of States to Meet TANF Work Standards?

The COVID-19 pandemic is likely to affect states' ability to meet their work participation standards. Employment losses, disruptions in education, and the inability of states to engage recipients in group activities (e.g., job clubs) could all result in lower participation in work or job preparation activities. Additionally, if the economic dislocation results in higher assistance caseloads, a state's caseload reduction credit would be reduced, resulting in a higher effective (after-credit) participation standard for the state to meet.

The rules governing the TANF work participation standards cannot be waived, other than through new legislation. However, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has the ability to reduce or waive the penalty on states for failing to meet the TANF work participation standard. HHS has said that it would exercise its authority to provide states with relief from the penalty for not meeting participation standards "to the maximum extent possible."[7]

[7] U.S. Department of Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance, *Questions and answers about TANF and the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic*, TANF-ACF-Pi-2020-01, https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ofa/resource/tanf-acf-pi-2020-01.

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

Table A-1. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961-2019

					TANF Child Recipients	
Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	As a Percentage of All Children	As a Percentage of All Poor Children
1961	0.873	3.363	0.765	2.598	3.7%	14.3%
1962	0.939	3.704	0.860	2.844	4.0	15.7
1963	0.963	3.945	0.988	2.957	4.1	17.4
1964	1.010	4.195	1.050	3.145	4.3	18.6
1965	1.060	4.422	1.101	3.321	4.5	21.5
1966	1.096	4.546	1.112	3.434	4.7	26.5
1967	1.220	5.014	1.243	3.771	5.2	31.2
1968	1.410	5.702	1.429	4.274	5.9	37.8
1969	1.696	6.689	1.716	4.973	6.9	49.7
1970	2.207	8.462	2.250	6.212	8.6	57.7
1971	2.763	10.242	2.808	7.435	10.4	68.5
1972	3.048	10.944	3.039	7.905	11.1	74.9
1973	3.148	10.949	3.046	7.903	11.2	79.9
1974	3.219	10.847	3.041	7.805	11.2	75.0
1975	3.481	11.319	3.248	8.071	11.8	71.2
1976	3.565	11.284	3.302	7.982	11.8	76.2
1977	3.568	11.015	3.273	7.743	11.6	73.9
1978	3.517	10.551	3.188	7.363	11.2	72.8
1979	3.509	10.312	3.130	7.181	11.0	68.0
1980	3.712	10.774	3.355	7.419	11.5	63.2
1981	3.835	11.079	3.552	7.527	11.7	59.2
1982	3.542	10.358	3.455	6.903	10.8	49.6
1983	3.686	10.761	3.663	7.098	11.1	50.1
1984	3.714	10.831	3.687	7.144	11.2	52.3
1985	3.701	10.855	3.658	7.198	11.3	54.4
1986	3.763	11.038	3.704	7.334	11.5	56.0
1987	3.776	11.027	3.661	7.366	11.5	56.4
1988	3.749	10.915	3.586	7.329	11.4	57.8
1989	3.798	10.992	3.573	7.419	11.5	57.9
1990	4.057	11.695	3.784	7.911	12.1	57.9
1991	4.497	12.930	4.216	8.715	13.2	59.8

Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	TANF Child Recipients: As a Percentage of All Children	TANF Child Recipients: As a Percentage of All Poor Children
1992	4.829	13.773	4.470	9.303	13.9	59.9
1993	5.012	14.205	4.631	9.574	14.1	60.0
1994	5.033	14.161	4.593	9.568	13.9	61.7
1995	4.791	13.418	4.284	9.135	13.1	61.5
1996	4.434	12.321	3.928	8.600	12.3	58.7
1997	3.740	10.376	NA	NA	10.0	50.1
1998	3.050	8.347	NA	NA	8.1	42.9
1999	2.578	6.924	NA	NA	6.7	39.4
2000	2.303	6.143	1.655	4.479	6.1	38.1
2001	2.192	5.717	1.514	4.195	5.7	35.3
2002	2.187	5.609	1.479	4.119	5.6	33.6
2003	2.180	5.490	1.416	4.063	5.5	31.3
2004	2.153	5.342	1.362	3.969	5.4	30.2
2005	2.061	5.028	1.261	3.756	5.1	28.9
2006	1.906	4.582	1.120	3.453	4.6	26.7
2007	1.730	4.075	0.956	3.119	4.2	23.2
2008	1.701	4.005	0.946	3.059	4.1	21.6
2009	1.838	4.371	1.074	3.296	4.4	21.2
2010	1.919	4.598	1.163	3.435	4.6	20.9
2011	1.907	4.557	1.149	3.408	4.6	20.9
2012	1.852	4.402	1.104	3.298	4.4	20.3
2013	1.726	4.042	0.993	3.050	4.1	19.1
2014	1.650	3.957	1.007	2.950	4.0	18.9
2015	1.609	4.126	1.155	2.971	4.0	20.4
2016	1.479	3.780	1.037	2.743	3.7	20.7
2017	1.358	3.516	0.930	2.577	3.5	20.1
2018	1.196	3.150	0.833	2.317	3.2	19.5
2019	1.093	2.866	0.747	2.199	2.9	20.2

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

Notes: NA denotes not available. During transition reporting from AFDC to TANF, caseload statistics on adult and child recipients were not collected. For those years, TANF children as a percent of all children and percent of all poor children were estimated by HHS and published in *Welfare Indicators and Risk Factors, Annual Report to Congress*, Table TANF 2, p. A-7. See http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/14/indicators/rpt_indicators.pdf. For 2019, the ratio of TANF recipient children to all children in poverty might be overstated. This is because child poverty might have been underestimated, as responses to the survey used to estimate poverty were affected by the COVID-19

pandemic. See Jonathan Rothbaum and Adam Bee, *Coronavirus Infects Surveys, Too: Nonresponse Bias During the Pandemic in the CPS ASEC*, U.S. Census Bureau, SEHSD Working Paper no. 2020-10, September 15, 2020.

Table A-2. Families Receiving AFDC/TANF Assistance by Family Category, Selected Years, FY1988-FY2019

	1988	1994	2010	2019
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Not Working	3,136,566	3,798,997	879,922	358,761
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Working	243,573	378,620	287,146	286,373
Child-Only/SSI Parent	59,988	171,391	181,852	104,397
Child-Only/Noncitizen Parent	47,566	184,397	217,487	108,249
Child-Only/Other Ineligible Parent	51,764	146,227	4,968	3,391
Child-Only/Caretaker Relative	188,598	328,290	254,088	190,494
Child-Only/Unknown	19,897	38,341	84,378	68,743
Totals	3,747,952	5,046,263	1,909,841	1,120,407
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Not Working	83.7%	75.3%	46.1%	32.0%
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Working	6.5	7.5	15.0	25.6
Child-Only/SSI Parent	1.6	3.4	9.5	9.3
Child-Only/Noncitizen Parent	1.3	3.7	11.4	9.7
Child-Only/Other Ineligible Parent	1.4	2.9	0.3	0.3
Child-Only/Caretaker Relative	5.0	6.5	13.3	17.0
Child-Only/Unknown	0.5	0.8	4.4	6.1
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulations of the FY1988 and FY1994 AFDC Quality Control (QC) data files and the FY2010 and FY2019 TANF National Data Files.

Notes: FY2010 and FY2019 data include families receiving assistance from separate state programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Appendix B. State Tables

Table B-1. Use of FY2019 TANF and MOE Funds by Category

($ in Billions)

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Education, and Training	Refundable Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Administration	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Alabama	$17.263	$5.524	$7.500	$0.000	$22.005	$38.271	$12.855	$38.280	$35.228	$176.926
Alaska	37.176	14.782	10.152	0.000	0.000	0.000	6.239	0.367	16.192	84.908
Arizona	43.599	0.000	0.682	0.000	0.000	211.345	15.911	26.535	48.201	346.273
Arkansas	4.912	2.660	14.025	0.000	30.143	0.276	16.510	4.780	6.819	80.125
California	2,204.396	797.841	1,761.212	0.000	0.000	0.309	539.356	275.796	965.421	6,544.331
Colorado	75.424	12.422	11.619	76.440	59.323	50.090	18.451	18.121	60.979	382.870
Connecticut	41.886	41.485	11.267	59.300	82.701	70.619	38.627	20.945	134.497	501.326
Delaware	11.388	79.081	1.809	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.823	1.795	16.771	115.667
District of Columbia	164.956	59.117	34.563	23.681	0.000	0.000	9.725	69.144	7.068	368.253
Florida	145.677	290.578	46.106	0.000	0.000	250.139	88.941	0.950	81.598	903.989
Georgia	98.333	0.000	8.573	0.000	0.000	308.162	18.683	5.429	53.552	492.731
Hawaii	30.805	11.972	41.870	0.000	0.000	1.736	14.491	8.146	96.396	205.415
Idaho	8.299	13.293	3.250	0.000	1.505	1.998	6.840	12.540	0.724	48.450
Illinois	43.335	495.256	16.342	90.136	108.715	239.682	0.028	0.651	93.317	1,087.462
Indiana	12.749	123.164	6.365	25.177	0.000	9.169	30.519	0.191	144.564	351.898
Iowa	29.339	55.616	9.463	24.902	0.000	53.820	6.171	0.392	20.871	200.575
Kansas	11.901	6.673	0.737	40.117	17.990	34.534	10.418	0.000	47.000	169.371

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Educa-tion, and Training	Refun-dable Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emer-gency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Kentucky	186.166	30.490	27.922	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.424	0.000	12.509	268.512
Louisiana	17.404	10.742	34.530	11.836	40.644	19.780	16.939	7.851	26.938	186.664
Maine	32.738	28.664	9.533	7.900	0.595	10.688	5.033	5.760	30.163	131.075
Maryland	117.921	6.468	29.644	156.514	70.018	16.909	30.668	38.835	43.987	510.963
Massachusetts	220.293	334.776	177.164	171.271	0.000	4.819	37.826	104.098	78.236	1,128.483
Michigan	74.149	27.829	4.039	40.146	188.527	75.330	58.542	17.654	748.702	1,234.920
Minnesota	78.515	166.913	58.409	142.862	5.700	0.000	44.752	23.846	25.246	546.243
Mississippi	5.543	1.715	25.349	0.000	0.000	27.088	11.422	0.000	29.945	101.062
Missouri	31.318	31.460	64.115	0.000	0.000	106.116	9.959	67.182	51.512	361.662
Montana	19.597	9.277	3.036	0.000	0.000	3.964	5.456	2.147	9.832	53.310
Nebraska	24.037	23.059	9.248	32.813	0.000	4.901	3.934	0.127	0.809	98.928
Nevada	33.727	21.966	4.783	0.000	3.006	26.899	10.333	6.975	16.189	123.879
New Hampshire	34.054	12.282	7.535	0.000	0.000	5.918	11.244	8.286	17.508	96.826
New Jersey	69.186	163.904	69.698	373.073	559.777	0.000	48.640	14.785	64.225	1,363.288
New Mexico	47.430	32.976	17.272	45.478	47.614	0.317	4.760	9.473	26.815	232.134
New York	1,473.353	467.812	162.000	1,324.586	492.403	339.964	424.079	266.100	334.652	5,284.951
North Carolina	32.930	198.883	5.566	0.000	90.203	131.687	47.863	5.117	52.186	564.436
North Dakota	3.896	1.117	3.714	0.000	0.000	18.430	3.680	0.015	1.151	32.002
Ohio	239.856	410.532	78.974	0.000	0.000	20.101	112.034	57.001	234.621	1,153.119
Oklahoma	17.988	32.714	11.092	0.000	9.059	19.263	8.418	0.629	29.307	128.471
Oregon	84.649	11.951	19.574	3.381	11.924	13.786	24.708	29.005	38.863	237.841

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Educa-tion, and Training	Refun-dable Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emer-gency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Pennsylvania	151.419	506.841	99.100	0.000	235.879	0.000	80.402	14.261	143.073	1,230.975
Rhode Island	23.911	45.352	12.079	22.715	0.000	33.194	5.022	27.702	12.662	182.638
South Carolina	52.507	4.085	9.840	0.000	27.193	6.693	21.205	0.000	43.959	165.482
South Dakota	13.246	0.803	3.261	0.000	0.000	3.125	1.823	2.264	2.847	27.369
Tennessee	57.657	0.000	19.316	0.000	82.092	0.000	26.804	0.000	2.427	188.297
Texas	39.782	0.000	83.597	0.000	349.682	324.487	118.891	5.686	70.626	992.751
Utah	22.529	22.922	19.109	0.000	10.122	1.567	7.981	1.835	18.884	104.949
Vermont	13.716	32.255	1.923	19.420	0.000	6.998	5.533	1.447	14.856	96.147
Virginia	62.525	38.527	37.792	0.524	4.009	55.156	49.769	4.556	34.619	287.476
Washington	141.868	144.488	99.704	0.000	50.235	4.152	87.620	63.991	416.008	1,008.066
West Virginia	25.140	10.021	0.344	0.000	0.000	31.140	12.543	14.229	23.623	117.041
Wisconsin	71.793	201.426	31.826	69.700	0.000	6.413	31.914	38.011	126.522	577.606
Wyoming	8.321	2.883	4.742	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.329	3.294	1.982	25.551
Totals	6,510.603	5,044.598	3,231.368	2,761.975	2,601.063	2,589.039	2,224.139	1,326.224	4,614.682	30,903.691

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

Notes: Excludes TANF funds used in the territories and in tribal TANF programs.

Table B-2. Uses of FY2018 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percentage of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Spending

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Education, and Training	Refund-able Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emer-gency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Alabama	9.8%	3.1%	4.2%	0.0%	12.4%	21.6%	7.3%	21.6%	19.9%	100.0%
Alaska	43.8	17.4	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	0.4	19.1	100.0
Arizona	12.6	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	61.0	4.6	7.7	13.9	100.0
Arkansas	6.1	3.3	17.5	0.0	37.6	0.3	20.6	6.0	8.5	100.0
California	33.7	12.2	26.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	4.2	14.8	100.0
Colorado	19.7	3.2	3.0	20.0	15.5	13.1	4.8	4.7	15.9	100.0
Connecticut	8.4	8.3	2.2	11.8	16.5	14.1	7.7	4.2	26.8	100.0
Delaware	9.8	68.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	1.6	14.5	100.0
District of Columbia	44.8	16.1	9.4	6.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	18.8	1.9	100.0
Florida	16.1	32.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	27.7	9.8	0.1	9.0	100.0
Georgia	20.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	62.5	3.8	1.1	10.9	100.0
Hawaii	15.0	5.8	20.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	7.1	4.0	46.9	100.0
Idaho	17.1	27.4	6.7	0.0	3.1	4.1	14.1	25.9	1.5	100.0
Illinois	4.0	45.5	1.5	8.3	10.0	22.0	0.0	0.1	8.6	100.0
Indiana	3.6	35.0	1.8	7.2	0.0	2.6	8.7	0.1	41.1	100.0
Iowa	14.6	27.7	4.7	12.4	0.0	26.8	3.1	0.2	10.4	100.0
Kansas	7.0	3.9	0.4	23.7	10.6	20.4	6.2	0.0	27.7	100.0
Kentucky	69.3	11.4	10.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.7	100.0
Louisiana	9.3	5.8	18.5	6.3	21.8	10.6	9.1	4.2	14.4	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Education, and Training	Refund-able Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emer-gency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Maine	25.0	21.9	7.3	6.0	0.5	8.2	3.8	4.4	23.0	100.0
Maryland	23.1	1.3	5.8	30.6	13.7	3.3	6.0	7.6	8.6	100.0
Massachusetts	19.5	29.7	15.7	15.2	0.0	0.4	3.4	9.2	6.9	100.0
Michigan	6.0	2.3	0.3	3.3	15.3	6.1	4.7	1.4	60.6	100.0
Minnesota	14.4	30.6	10.7	26.2	1.0	0.0	8.2	4.4	4.6	100.0
Mississippi	5.5	1.7	25.1	0.0	0.0	26.8	11.3	0.0	29.6	100.0
Missouri	8.7	8.7	17.7	0.0	0.0	29.3	2.8	18.6	14.2	100.0
Montana	36.8	17.4	5.7	0.0	0.0	7.4	10.2	4.0	18.4	100.0
Nebraska	24.3	23.3	9.3	33.2	0.0	5.0	4.0	0.1	0.8	100.0
Nevada	27.2	17.7	3.9	0.0	2.4	21.7	8.3	5.6	13.1	100.0
New Hampshire	35.2	12.7	7.8	0.0	0.0	6.1	11.6	8.6	18.1	100.0
New Jersey	5.1	12.0	5.1	27.4	41.1	0.0	3.6	1.1	4.7	100.0
New Mexico	20.4	14.2	7.4	19.6	20.5	0.1	2.1	4.1	11.6	100.0
New York	27.9	8.9	3.1	25.1	9.3	6.4	8.0	5.0	6.3	100.0
North Carolina	5.8	35.2	1.0	0.0	16.0	23.3	8.5	0.9	9.2	100.0
North Dakota	12.2	3.5	11.6	0.0	0.0	57.6	11.5	0.0	3.6	100.0
Ohio	20.8	35.6	6.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	9.7	4.9	20.3	100.0
Oklahoma	14.0	25.5	8.6	0.0	7.1	15.0	6.6	0.5	22.8	100.0
Oregon	35.6	5.0	8.2	1.4	5.0	5.8	10.4	12.2	16.3	100.0
Pennsylvania	12.3	41.2	8.1	0.0	19.2	0.0	6.5	1.2	11.6	100.0
Rhode Island	13.1	24.8	6.6	12.4	0.0	18.2	2.7	15.2	6.9	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Education, and Training	Refund-able Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emer-gency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
South Carolina	31.7	2.5	5.9	0.0	16.4	4.0	12.8	0.0	26.6	100.0
South Dakota	48.4	2.9	11.9	0.0	0.0	11.4	6.7	8.3	10.4	100.0
Tennessee	30.6	0.0	10.3	0.0	43.6	0.0	14.2	0.0	1.3	100.0
Texas	4.0	0.0	8.4	0.0	35.2	32.7	12.0	0.6	7.1	100.0
Utah	21.5	21.8	18.2	0.0	9.6	1.5	7.6	1.7	18.0	100.0
Vermont	14.3	33.5	2.0	20.2	0.0	7.3	5.8	1.5	15.5	100.0
Virginia	21.7	13.4	13.1	0.2	1.4	19.2	17.3	1.6	12.0	100.0
Washington	14.1	14.3	9.9	0.0	5.0	0.4	8.7	6.3	41.3	100.0
West Virginia	21.5	8.6	0.3	0.0	0.0	26.6	10.7	12.2	20.2	100.0
Wisconsin	12.4	34.9	5.5	12.1	0.0	1.1	5.5	6.6	21.9	100.0
Wyoming	32.6	11.3	18.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.9	12.9	7.8	100.0
Totals	21.1	16.3	10.5	8.9	8.4	8.4	7.2	4.3	14.9	100.0

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

Notes: Excludes TANF funds used in the territories and in tribal TANF programs.

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2019

(September 30, 2019; $ in Millions)

State	Unliquidated Obligations	Unobligated Balance
Alabama	$50.8	$59.6
Alaska	1.9	30.5
Arizona	0.0	41.8
Arkansas	40.9	49.2
California	259.3	0.0
Colorado	0.0	103.1
Connecticut	0.0	0.0
Delaware	3.1	29.7
District of Columbia	0.0	31.1
Florida	64.5	0.0
Georgia	39.7	48.1
Hawaii	23.7	328.1
Idaho	0.0	8.7
Illinois	0.0	0.0
Indiana	5.0	32.4
Iowa	0.0	0.9
Kansas	3.3	69.4
Kentucky	0.0	48.7
Louisiana	45.5	4.0
Maine	25.5	102.9
Maryland	0.0	29.5
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	99.2
Minnesota	0.0	64.4
Mississippi	0.0	15.7
Missouri	0.0	0.0
Montana	0.0	14.4
Nebraska	0.0	79.4
Nevada	0.0	28.9
New Hampshire	0.0	35.9
New Jersey	54.8	6.3
New Mexico	0.0	94.1
New York	17.4	649.1
North Carolina	64.6	0.0

State	Unliquidated Obligations	Unobligated Balance
North Dakota	0.0	5.3
Ohio	582.4	0.0
Oklahoma	0.8	212.6
Oregon	0.0	33.5
Pennsylvania	93.2	403.3
Rhode Island	0.0	12.6
South Carolina	0.0	0.0
South Dakota	0.0	22.0
Tennessee	0.0	731.9
Texas	0.0	330.3
Utah	0.0	55.9
Vermont	0.0	0.0
Virginia	6.7	133.6
Washington	0.0	111.9
West Virginia	0.0	101.8
Wisconsin	0.0	186.5
Wyoming	0.0	28.6
Totals	1,383.0	4,475.2

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

Notes: Excludes TANF funds used in the territories and in tribal TANF programs.

Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Assistance by Jurisdiction, June 2020

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Alabama	7,040	15,951	13,138	2,813
Alaska	2,359	6,438	4,362	2,076
Arizona	8,796	18,873	14,834	4,039
Arkansas	2,333	5,352	3,958	1,394
California	367,465	1,169,991	825,136	344,855
Colorado	14,320	35,177	25,584	9,593
Connecticut	7,421	15,603	11,282	4,321
Delaware	2,759	7,634	4,469	3,165
District of Columbia	9,145	26,560	19,055	7,505
Florida	46,369	84,876	66,261	18,615
Georgia	8,301	15,001	14,127	874

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Guam	490	1,157	908	249
Hawaii	6,110	18,240	11,862	6,378
Idaho	1,927	2,781	2,693	88
Illinois	10,609	20,945	19,004	1,941
Indiana	7,843	18,097	14,395	3,702
Iowa	8,031	19,086	14,688	4,398
Kansas	4,543	4,543	2,065	2,478
Kentucky	16,047	32,025	28,232	3,793
Louisiana	4,116	8,250	6,917	1,333
Maine	13,614	45,324	28,261	17,063
Maryland	27,705	70,483	48,793	21,690
Massachusetts	46,788	122,865	87,074	35,791
Michigan	19,518	49,836	36,241	13,595
Minnesota	15,243	35,463	27,618	7,845
Mississippi	2,439	4,334	3,748	586
Missouri	10,022	23,570	17,701	5,869
Montana	2,799	6,676	5,256	1,420
Nebraska	5,215	12,985	10,512	2,473
Nevada	8,198	21,681	15,850	5,831
New Hampshire	4,856	11,358	8,383	2,975
New Jersey	10,211	24,645	18,136	6,509
New Mexico	11,493	29,158	21,236	7,922
New York	120,192	309,525	212,013	97,512
North Carolina	13,702	24,439	21,829	2,610
North Dakota	998	2,531	2,039	492
Ohio	55,558	105,398	91,577	13,821
Oklahoma	5,738	13,100	11,137	1,963
Oregon	31,807	90,960	60,140	30,820
Pennsylvania	35,233	85,297	64,322	20,975
Puerto Rico	4,155	11,320	6,945	4,375
Rhode Island	3,438	8,425	6,180	2,245
South Carolina	7,776	17,237	14,422	2,815
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	16,448	34,286	28,113	6,173
Texas	21,306	47,069	39,417	7,652
Utah	2,872	6,382	4,733	1,649

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Vermont	2,100	4,386	3,320	1,066
Virgin Islands	73	242	168	74
Virginia	19,836	35,796	27,744	8,052
Washington	43,065	102,292	68,106	34,186
West Virginia	5,848	11,291	9,576	1,715
Wisconsin	15,544	34,448	28,350	6,098
Wyoming	505	1,162	890	272
Totals	1,120,319	2,930,544	2,132,800	797,744

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

Notes: NA denotes not available. June 2020 data for South Dakota were not reported. TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Assistance by Jurisdiction, June of Selected Years

					Percentage Change to 2020 from …	
State	1994	2010	2019	2020	1994	2019
Alabama	49,482	21,288	7,146	7,040	-85.8%	-1.5%
Alaska	12,977	3,475	2,441	2,359	-81.8	-3.4
Arizona	71,530	31,919	6,839	8,796	-87.7	28.6
Arkansas	25,892	8,268	2,333	2,333	-91.0	0.0
California	919,535	578,950	371,318	367,465	-60.0	-1.0
Colorado	41,378	11,675	14,072	14,320	-65.4	1.8
Connecticut	59,701	16,957	7,807	7,421	-87.6	-4.9
Delaware	11,239	5,322	3,366	2,759	-75.5	-18.0
District of Columbia	27,443	7,373	7,345	9,145	-66.7	24.5
Florida	239,232	56,706	38,894	46,369	-80.6	19.2
Georgia	139,566	20,134	9,069	8,301	-94.1	-8.5
Guam	1,973	1,296	445	490	-75.2	10.1
Hawaii	20,844	9,663	4,077	6,110	-70.7	49.9
Idaho	8,739	1,744	2,006	1,927	-77.9	-3.9
Illinois	242,740	22,087	10,640	10,609	-95.6	-0.3
Indiana	72,881	34,409	5,238	7,843	-89.2	49.7
Iowa	39,813	21,345	8,793	8,031	-79.8	-8.7
Kansas	30,020	14,183	3,745	4,543	-84.9	21.3

					Percentage Change to 2020 from …	
State	**1994**	**2010**	**2019**	**2020**	**1994**	**2019**
Kentucky	79,225	30,130	16,922	16,047	-79.7	-5.2
Louisiana	85,741	10,256	4,498	4,116	-95.2	-8.5
Maine	22,641	14,675	16,329	13,614	-39.9	-16.6
Maryland	79,706	24,153	16,051	27,705	-65.2	72.6
Massachusetts	110,108	48,975	49,107	46,788	-57.5	-4.7
Michigan	222,472	66,433	10,816	19,518	-91.2	80.5
Minnesota	63,043	24,146	15,731	15,243	-75.8	-3.1
Mississippi	55,183	11,931	3,262	2,439	-95.6	-25.2
Missouri	92,265	38,308	9,562	10,022	-89.1	4.8
Montana	12,004	3,665	3,258	2,799	-76.7	-14.1
Nebraska	15,649	8,486	4,290	5,215	-66.7	21.6
Nevada	14,207	10,499	8,018	8,198	-42.3	2.2
New Hampshire	11,591	6,202	5,221	4,856	-58.1	-7.0
New Jersey	122,536	33,540	8,814	10,211	-91.7	15.8
New Mexico	33,732	19,737	9,567	11,493	-65.9	20.1
New York	460,590	155,302	115,700	120,192	-73.9	3.9
North Carolina	131,065	23,384	13,305	13,702	-89.5	3.0
North Dakota	5,725	1,958	913	998	-82.6	9.3
Ohio	247,886	103,198	50,116	55,558	-77.6	10.9
Oklahoma	46,864	9,021	5,907	5,738	-87.8	-2.9
Oregon	41,982	30,811	37,609	31,807	-24.2	-15.4
Pennsylvania	211,431	51,683	40,140	35,233	-83.3	-12.2
Puerto Rico	58,484	13,257	4,558	4,155	-92.9	-8.8
Rhode Island	22,737	7,404	3,894	3,438	-84.9	-11.7
South Carolina	51,590	17,843	7,950	7,776	-84.9	-2.2
South Dakota	6,868	3,247	2,867	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	109,339	61,851	19,030	16,448	-85.0	-13.6
Texas	282,902	50,171	22,037	21,306	-92.5	-3.3
Utah	17,536	6,641	3,224	2,872	-83.6	-10.9
Vermont	10,006	3,131	2,713	2,100	-79.0	-22.6
Virgin Islands	1,106	513	108	73	-93.4	-32.4
Virginia	75,020	37,276	16,698	19,836	-73.6	18.8
Washington	104,243	70,099	36,206	43,065	-58.7	18.9
West Virginia	40,379	9,619	6,269	5,848	-85.5	-6.7
Wisconsin	76,458	23,435	15,127	15,544	-79.7	2.8

State	1994	2010	2019	2020	Percentage Change to 2020 from … 1994	2019
Wyoming	5,751	337	515	505	-91.2	-1.9
Totals	5,043,050	1,898,111	1,091,906	1,120,319	-77.8	2.9

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

Notes: NA denotes not available. June 2020 data for South Dakota were not reported. Percentage changes from 1994 and 2019 also exclude data from South Dakota for those years. TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-6. TANF Assistance Families by Number of Parents by Jurisdiction: June 2020

State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Total Families	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent
Alabama	2,695	31	4,314	7,040	38.3	0.4	61.3
Alaska	1,334	336	689	2,359	56.5	14.2	29.2
Arizona	3,167	404	5,225	8,796	36.0	4.6	59.4
Arkansas	1,226	80	1,027	2,333	52.6	3.4	44.0
California	217,819	28,112	121,534	367,465	59.3	7.7	33.1
Colorado	9,030	0	5,290	14,320	63.1	0.0	36.9
Connecticut	2,414	0	5,007	7,421	32.5	0.0	67.5
Delaware	353	13	2,393	2,759	12.8	0.5	86.7
District of Columbia	7,505	0	1,640	9,145	82.1	0.0	17.9
Florida	10,661	1,625	34,083	46,369	23.0	3.5	73.5
Georgia	881	0	7,420	8,301	10.6	0.0	89.4
Guam	120	60	310	490	24.5	12.2	63.3
Hawaii	3,492	1,625	993	6,110	57.2	26.6	16.3
Idaho	92	0	1,835	1,927	4.8	0.0	95.2
Illinois	1,763	0	8,846	10,609	16.6	0.0	83.4
Indiana	3,677	375	3,791	7,843	46.9	4.8	48.3
Iowa	3,668	333	4,030	8,031	45.7	4.1	50.2
Kansas	2,395	416	1,732	4,543	52.7	9.2	38.1
Kentucky	3,700	343	12,004	16,047	23.1	2.1	74.8
Louisiana	1,893	0	2,223	4,116	46.0	0.0	54.0
Maine	7,134	4,972	1,508	13,614	52.4	36.5	11.1
Maryland	20,245	1,004	6,456	27,705	73.1	3.6	23.3
Massachusetts	31,681	2,711	12,396	46,788	67.7	5.8	26.5
Michigan	12,984	0	6,534	19,518	66.5	0.0	33.5

State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Total Families	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent
Minnesota	7,910	0	7,333	15,243	51.9	0.0	48.1
Mississippi	580	0	1,859	2,439	23.8	0.0	76.2
Missouri	6,409	0	3,613	10,022	63.9	0.0	36.1
Montana	1,251	183	1,365	2,799	44.7	6.5	48.8
Nebraska	2,487	0	2,728	5,215	47.7	0.0	52.3
Nevada	3,691	951	3,556	8,198	45.0	11.6	43.4
New Hampshire	2,771	28	2,057	4,856	57.1	0.6	42.4
New Jersey	6,441	34	3,736	10,211	63.1	0.3	36.6
New Mexico	5,960	981	4,552	11,493	51.9	8.5	39.6
New York	78,717	2,857	38,618	120,192	65.5	2.4	32.1
North Carolina	2,206	41	11,455	13,702	16.1	0.3	83.6
North Dakota	575	0	423	998	57.6	0.0	42.4
Ohio	11,082	1,026	43,450	55,558	19.9	1.8	78.2
Oklahoma	1,963	0	3,775	5,738	34.2	0.0	65.8
Oregon	22,569	4,098	5,140	31,807	71.0	12.9	16.2
Pennsylvania	20,813	216	14,204	35,233	59.1	0.6	40.3
Puerto Rico	3,692	258	205	4,155	88.9	6.2	4.9
Rhode Island	2,414	103	921	3,438	70.2	3.0	26.8
South Carolina	2,815	0	4,961	7,776	36.2	0.0	63.8
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	5,350	184	10,914	16,448	32.5	1.1	66.4
Texas	7,652	0	13,654	21,306	35.9	0.0	64.1
Utah	1,198	0	1,674	2,872	41.7	0.0	58.3
Vermont	721	164	1,215	2,100	34.3	7.8	57.9
Virgin Islands	54	0	19	73	74.0	0.0	26.0
Virginia	11,018	0	8,818	19,836	55.5	0.0	44.5
Washington	21,688	8,483	12,894	43,065	50.4	19.7	29.9
West Virginia	1,368	0	4,480	5,848	23.4	0.0	76.6
Wisconsin	5,558	255	9,731	15,544	35.8	1.6	62.6
Wyoming	231	19	255	505	45.7	3.8	50.5
Totals	589,113	62,321	468,885	1,120,319	52.6	5.6	41.9

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

Notes: NA denotes not available. June 2020 data for South Dakota were not reported. TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-7. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction, for All Families: FY2019

State	Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (After Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate
Alabama	50.0	50.0	0.0	54.8
Alaska	50.0	31.0	19.0	48.5
Arizona	50.0	50.0	0.0	21.6
Arkansas	50.0	50.0	0.0	26.4
California	50.0	16.2	33.8	55.3
Colorado	50.0	38.3	11.7	34.7
Connecticut	50.0	50.0	0.0	26.7
Delaware	50.0	50.0	0.0	23.1
District of Col.	50.0	48.0	2.0	50.0
Florida	50.0	31.6	18.4	41.5
Georgia	50.0	50.0	0.0	26.6
Guam	50.0	47.5	2.5	24.1
Hawaii	50.0	50.0	0.0	29.3
Idaho	50.0	0.0	50.0	59.6
Illinois	50.0	43.0	7.0	61.5
Indiana	50.0	50.0	0.0	30.5
Iowa	50.0	50.0	0.0	27.2
Kansas	50.0	50.0	0.0	32.4
Kentucky	50.0	45.5	4.5	55.6
Louisiana	50.0	50.0	0.0	5.8
Maine	50.0	0.0	50.0	87.7
Maryland	50.0	44.3	5.7	26.6
Massachusetts	50.0	20.5	29.5	66.4
Michigan	50.0	50.0	0.0	60.5
Minnesota	50.0	40.4	9.6	35.7
Mississippi	50.0	50.0	0.0	49.1
Missouri	50.0	50.0	0.0	24.3
Montana[a]	50.0	10.9	39.1	37.2
Nebraska	50.0	50.0	0.0	43.9
Nevada	50.0	22.0	28.0	38.1
New Hampshire	50.0	0.0	50.0	62.9
New Jersey	50.0	50.0	0.0	29.8
New Mexico	50.0	50.0	0.0	42.5

State	Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (After Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate
New York	50.0	44.4	5.6	21.7
North Carolina	50.0	44.6	5.4	26.4
North Dakota	50.0	50.0	0.0	54.1
Ohio	50.0	42.8	7.2	34.8
Oklahoma	50.0	46.9	3.1	31.5
Oregon	50.0	0.0	50.0	65.9
Pennsylvania	50.0	50.0	0.0	22.2
Puerto Rico	50.0	50.0	0.0	19.1
Rhode Island	50.0	50.0	0.0	8.9
South Carolina	50.0	50.0	0.0	29.9
South Dakota	50.0	0.0	50.0	57.7
Tennessee	50.0	50.0	0.0	33.2
Texas	50.0	50.0	0.0	21.8
Utah	50.0	50.0	0.0	11.8
Vermont	50.0	42.6	7.4	46.2
Virgin Islands	50.0	50.0	0.0	6.2
Virginia	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.5
Washington	50.0	46.8	3.2	50.5
West Virginia	50.0	45.6	4.4	34.7
Wisconsin	50.0	41.2	8.8	51.8
Wyoming	50.0	0.0	50.0	72.5

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

a. State did not meet its work participation standard.

Table B-8. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction, for Two-Parent Families: FY2019

State	Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (After Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate
Alabama	90.0	89.5	0.5	52.9
Alaska	90.0	39.5	50.5	64.2
Arizona	90.0	74.0	16.0	55.9
Arkansas	90.0	84.2	5.8	27.0
California[a]	90.0	25.6	64.4	31.1
Colorado	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (After Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Col.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	90.0	80.8	9.2	44.3
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Guam	90.0	47.5	42.5	54.6
Hawaii	90.0	75.3	14.7	46.4
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	90.0	77.2	12.8	29.8
Iowa	90.0	80.2	9.8	22.3
Kansas	90.0	75.6	14.4	39.6
Kentucky	90.0	45.5	44.5	57.9
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	90.0	0.0	90.0	97.3
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	90.0	20.5	69.5	84.8
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana[a]	90.0	41.0	49.0	40.2
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada[a]	90.0	22.0	68.0	50.3
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	90.0	77.3	12.7	92.8
New Mexico	90.0	62.5	27.5	52.7
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	90.0	44.6	45.4	46.7
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	90.0	84.1	5.9	37.7
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	90.0	0.0	90.0	98.6
Pennsylvania	90.0	89.4	0.6	37.8
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (After Credit) Standard	Work Participation Rate
Rhode Island[a]	90.0	58.8	31.2	11.8
South Carolina	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	90.0	69.4	20.6	32.8
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	90.0	61.2	28.8	58.0
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	90.0	46.8	43.2	69.6
West Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	90.0	68.3	21.7	66.5
Wyoming[a]	90.0	0.0	90.0	77.6

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

Note: NA = jurisdiction does not serve two-parent families in its TANF assistance program.

a. State did not meet its two-parent family work participation standard.

Author Information

Gene Falk
Specialist in Social Policy

Patrick A. Landers
Analyst in Social Policy

Acknowledgments

Amber Wilhelm and Calvin DeSouza produced this report's data visualizations.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.