Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

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

Updated December 14, 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

December 14, 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 (Puerto Rico, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands), 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. Adjusted for inflation, in FY2021, the TANF basic block grant was 40% below what its value 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 FY2020, expenditures on basic assistance totaled $7.1 billion—22% 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 pre-kindergarten programs toward the MOE requirement.

The TANF Assistance Caseload

A total of 1.0 million families, composed of 2.6 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded assistance in November 2020. The bulk of the "recipients" were children—1.9 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 2019, the maximum monthly benefit for a family of three ranged from $1,066 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 FY2020, states achieved, on average, an all-family participation rate of 39.6% and a two-parent rate of 46.9%. In FY2020, all jurisdictions met the all-family participation standard, but six jurisdictions (California, Guam, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Wyoming) did not meet the two-parent standard.

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? 4
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? 9
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? 10

Figures

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Funds by Spending Category, FY2020 3
Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Assistance, June 1959 to November 2020 6
Figure 3. Composition of the AFDC/TANF Assistance Caseload by Family Type: Selected Years, 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 2019 8
Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2020 10

Tables

Table 1. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Nominal and Constant Dollars 2
Table 2. Families and Recipients of TANF Assistance, November 2020 5

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 FY2020 TANF and MOE Funds by Category 15
Table B-2. Uses of FY2020 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 FY2020 21
Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Assistance by Jurisdiction, November 2020 22
Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Assistance by Jurisdiction, November of Selected Years 24
Table B-6. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction for All Families: FY2020 26
Table B-7. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction, for Two-Parent Families: FY2020 28

Appendixes

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

Contacts

Author Information 29

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 Further Extending Government Funding Act (P.L. 117-70), enacted December 3, 2021, funds TANF through February 18, 2022.

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 FY2021. In real (inflation-adjusted) terms, the FY2021 block grant was 40% below its value in FY1997.

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

($ in billions)

Fiscal Year	State Family Assistance Grant: 50 States, DC, Tribes, and Territories	State Family Assistance Grant Constant 1997 dollars	Cumulative Percentage Change, Constant 1997 dollars
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
2021	16.512	9.893	-40.3

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance; 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 FY2020, a total of $31.6 billion of both federal TANF and state MOE expenditures were either expended or transferred to other block grant programs. (This total excludes expenditures in tribal

TANF programs or those operated in the territories.) Basic assistance—ongoing benefits to families to meet basic needs—represented 22% ($7.1 billion) of total FY2020 TANF and MOE dollars.

TANF is a major contributor of child care funding. In FY2020, $5.2 billion (17% 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 $3.0 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 FY2020 totaled $2.8 billion, or 9% of total TANF and MOE spending.

TANF and MOE funds also help fund state pre-kindergarten (pre-K) programs, with total FY2020 expenditures for that category at $2.7 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 FY2020.

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Funds by Spending Category, FY2020

($ in billions)



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance.

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 FY2020 (September 30, 2020), a total of $6.0 billion of federal TANF funding remained neither transferred nor spent. However, some of these unspent funds represent monies that states had already committed to spend later. Of this amount, states had made such commitments to spend—that is, had obligated—a total of $0.9 billion. At the end of FY2020, states had $5.2 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 1.0 million families, composed of 2.6 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded assistance in November 2020.[2] The bulk of the "recipients" were children—1.9 million in that month. For state-by-state assistance caseloads, see **Table B-4**.

[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.

[2] The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has posted data on families and recipients of TANF assistance through December 2020. However, the data reported for Oregon are erroneous. Therefore, this report will show TANF assistance family and recipient data for November 2020, as the most recent data available for all states as of the update of this report.

Table 2. Families and Recipients of TANF Assistance, November 2020

Families	1,002,327
Recipients	2,598,799
Children	1,912,820
Adults	685,979

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

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

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 November 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.

During 2020, a year when the economy was affected by the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, there was a brief uptick in the number of families receiving assistance. The number of families receiving assistance increased in the April through June 2020 period. However, after June 2020, the number of families receiving TANF assistance again began to decline.[3] In November 2020, the number of families receiving assistance was reported at 1.0 million families, down 6.4% from its level in November 2019.

[3] In 2020 and 2021, Congress enacted expansions to other programs – in particular, unemployment insurance—that might have lessened the need for need-tested cash from TANF. See CRS Report R46687, *Current Status of Unemployment Insurance (UI) Benefits: Permanent-Law Programs and COVID-19 Pandemic Response*. For estimates of the impact of the poverty interventions in response to COVID-19's economic downturn, see Laura Wheaton, Linda Giannarelli, and Ilham Dehry, *2021 Poverty Projections: Assessing the Impact of Benefits and Stimulus Measures*, Urban Institute, July 2021.

Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Assistance, June 1959 to November 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 the last month shown, 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.

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 Years, FY1988 to FY2019



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

Note: 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 2019.[4] For a family of three, the maximum TANF benefit paid in July 2019 varied from $170 per month in Mississippi to $1,066 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.

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 2019



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.

[4] 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). 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.

What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?

The TANF statute requires states to have 50% of their caseload meet standards of participation in work or activities—that is, a family member must be in specified activities for a minimum number of hours.[5] There is a separate participation standard that applies to the two-parent portion of a state's caseload, requiring 90% of the state's two-parent caseload to meet participation standards.

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.

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

What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?

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

Figure 5 shows the national average all-families work participation rate for FY2002 through FY2020. 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] The national average TANF work participation rate for all families declined in 2018 and 2019 from its 2017 high of 53.0%. In FY2020, a year affected by the COVID-19 virus and its economic fallout, the national average all-families rate fell by 7.5 percentage points. However, in FY2020 all states met their all-families TANF work participation standards despite this decline (in FY2019, only Montana did not meet its standard).

Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2020



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

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

In FY2020, 5 states (California, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Wyoming) as well as Guam failed the separate, higher two-parent standard. **Table B-6** provides information for each jurisdiction on the TANF work standard, caseload reduction credit, and work participation rate for all families for FY2020. **Table B-7** provides that information for two-parent families. The table shows that 26 jurisdiction did not have two-parent families receiving assistance funded by TANF or MOE funds (denoted with an "NA" in the table).

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, under the Administration of President Donald Trump, 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] HHS has not revised this statement under the current, Biden Administration.

[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 https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/private/pdf/116161/FINAL%20Fourteenth%20Report%20-%20FINAL%209%2022%2015.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 FY2020 TANF and MOE Funds by Category

($ in millions)

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Educa-tion, and Training	Refundable Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Alabama	$16.378	$24.228	$6.875	$0.000	$10.660	$40.010	$24.372	$46.281	$35.511	$204.316
Alaska	45.590	13.968	12.085	0.000	0.000	0.000	6.905	0.326	12.898	91.771
Arizona	45.033	0.000	0.565	0.000	0.000	238.209	18.940	9.179	43.640	355.567
Arkansas	4.257	7.798	12.439	0.000	26.742	0.913	14.984	5.902	11.093	84.129
California	2,598.201	762.874	1,574.497	0.000	0.101	0.062	549.893	261.704	955.710	6,703.043
Colorado	80.602	15.238	8.473	72.077	91.198	53.148	51.730	21.549	57.943	451.957
Connecticut	36.207	62.591	10.506	58.091	70.878	68.389	42.288	18.565	138.266	505.781
Delaware	11.544	82.878	6.475	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.367	2.433	17.632	126.329
District of Columbia	185.408	37.433	39.216	23.842	0.000	0.000	11.578	11.552	7.327	316.355
Florida	133.883	341.154	50.224	0.000	0.000	244.252	97.793	0.877	81.413	949.598
Georgia	109.858	22.183	8.286	0.000	0.000	228.090	22.445	5.799	87.628	484.290
Hawaii	38.679	9.974	41.531	0.000	0.000	1.417	15.754	7.929	105.609	220.893
Idaho	7.915	10.965	2.946	0.000	1.487	1.726	6.480	11.798	0.415	43.731
Illinois	50.912	560.158	17.587	86.933	104.551	239.565	0.000	0.879	96.901	1,157.486
Indiana	16.013	114.016	5.707	24.845	0.000	2.759	28.415	0.290	141.256	333.302
Iowa	30.373	52.604	8.490	25.390	0.000	46.660	6.518	0.347	20.756	191.137
Kansas	13.061	6.673	0.641	38.493	18.375	42.921	9.903	0.000	47.006	177.072

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Educa-tion, and Training	Refundable Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Kentucky	179.973	32.666	29.722	0.000	0.000	0.000	12.107	0.000	9.214	263.682
Louisiana	15.122	12.653	35.222	19.933	51.151	26.963	16.848	6.898	29.031	213.821
Maine	37.473	19.990	11.593	7.579	0.507	9.802	6.317	5.177	29.047	127.485
Maryland	153.087	5.484	30.478	154.133	76.530	29.930	23.337	27.518	44.909	545.407
Massachusetts	240.784	265.421	203.514	220.172	0.000	6.559	33.135	103.344	78.870	1,151.798
Michigan	129.478	27.019	1.958	43.518	191.413	78.645	53.354	20.648	794.532	1,340.566
Minnesota	93.963	159.106	52.951	177.877	5.700	0.000	42.407	22.554	18.005	572.564
Mississippi	4.074	1.715	22.769	0.000	0.000	21.756	9.419	0.000	17.110	76.844
Missouri	31.551	27.504	62.874	0.000	0.000	112.570	9.297	73.252	54.188	371.236
Montana	17.448	10.621	2.664	0.000	0.000	1.927	4.709	2.038	9.057	48.464
Nebraska	28.344	18.375	12.299	32.472	0.000	6.100	2.977	0.090	3.238	103.896
Nevada	33.047	13.902	1.302	0.000	0.000	28.275	9.894	8.956	18.736	114.112
New Hampshire	34.201	4.582	7.225	0.000	0.000	4.544	11.407	2.373	16.217	80.549
New Jersey	82.639	218.423	73.767	361.436	614.997	0.000	50.883	16.103	72.455	1,490.702
New Mexico	68.684	34.278	20.737	74.691	70.361	1.019	6.133	6.369	22.966	305.238
New York	1,444.193	479.272	120.136	1,296.116	496.529	348.868	431.817	212.620	330.864	5,160.413
North Carolina	34.722	226.371	4.005	0.000	92.153	135.889	43.433	3.574	44.245	584.392
North Dakota	3.857	1.239	3.915	0.000	0.000	24.228	4.941	0.079	0.926	39.184
Ohio	247.480	423.168	82.829	0.000	0.158	18.212	99.060	76.521	248.456	1,195.884
Oklahoma	19.303	59.713	9.208	0.000	0.000	13.408	8.399	0.587	34.063	144.682
Oregon	83.504	11.102	18.507	3.381	11.599	14.496	36.467	23.731	42.954	245.739

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Educa-tion, and Training	Refundable Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Pennsylvania	130.776	482.527	86.953	0.000	219.345	0.000	62.785	9.851	142.789	1,135.026
Rhode Island	21.679	41.607	9.897	22.214	1.190	26.256	5.141	0.000	26.679	154.664
South Carolina	48.818	4.085	8.203	0.000	27.777	5.063	18.961	0.000	53.150	166.057
South Dakota	13.022	0.803	2.798	0.000	0.000	3.494	2.205	3.792	2.823	28.937
Tennessee	23.612	57.000	23.053	0.000	83.207	0.000	32.009	0.000	2.907	221.788
Texas	45.249	0.000	85.947	0.000	339.179	377.214	68.821	4.337	63.466	984.212
Utah	17.343	22.619	14.777	0.000	12.486	1.348	6.507	1.983	19.620	96.684
Vermont	13.144	33.365	0.734	19.246	0.000	8.364	5.114	0.674	14.094	94.735
Virginia	65.836	38.566	36.533	0.186	6.635	56.980	48.434	5.392	41.402	299.964
Washington	139.722	150.607	131.210	0.000	51.343	28.400	54.971	76.080	424.139	1,056.473
West Virginia	40.212	21.096	0.587	0.000	0.000	26.446	14.834	13.620	27.733	144.529
Wisconsin	73.364	195.758	28.987	69.700	0.000	7.317	28.730	32.356	129.978	566.190
Wyoming	11.461	1.554	5.192	0.000	1.709	0.000	3.517	3.220	2.841	29.494
Totals	7,051.079	5,226.926	3,049.091	2,832.324	2,677.958	2,632.197	2,181.733	1,169.148	4,731.712	31,552.168

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance.

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

Table B-2. Uses of FY2020 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	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Alabama	8.0%	11.9%	3.4%	0.0%	5.2%	19.6%	11.9%	22.7%	17.4%	100.0%
Alaska	49.7	15.2	13.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.4	14.1	100.0
Arizona	12.7	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	67.0	5.3	2.6	12.3	100.0
Arkansas	5.1	9.3	14.8	0.0	31.8	1.1	17.8	7.0	13.2	100.0
California	38.8	11.4	23.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	3.9	14.3	100.0
Colorado	17.8	3.4	1.9	15.9	20.2	11.8	11.4	4.8	12.8	100.0
Connecticut	7.2	12.4	2.1	11.5	14.0	13.5	8.4	3.7	27.3	100.0
Delaware	9.1	65.6	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	1.9	14.0	100.0
District of Columbia	58.6	11.8	12.4	7.5	0.0	0.0	3.7	3.7	2.3	100.0
Florida	14.1	35.9	5.3	0.0	0.0	25.7	10.3	0.1	8.6	100.0
Georgia	22.7	4.6	1.7	0.0	0.0	47.1	4.6	1.2	18.1	100.0
Hawaii	17.5	4.5	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.6	7.1	3.6	47.8	100.0
Idaho	18.1	25.1	6.7	0.0	3.4	3.9	14.8	27.0	0.9	100.0
Illinois	4.4	48.4	1.5	7.5	9.0	20.7	0.0	0.1	8.4	100.0
Indiana	4.8	34.2	1.7	7.5	0.0	0.8	8.5	0.1	42.4	100.0
Iowa	15.9	27.5	4.4	13.3	0.0	24.4	3.4	0.2	10.9	100.0
Kansas	7.4	3.8	0.4	21.7	10.4	24.2	5.6	0.0	26.5	100.0
Kentucky	68.3	12.4	11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	3.5	100.0
Louisiana	7.1	5.9	16.5	9.3	23.9	12.6	7.9	3.2	13.6	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Education, and Training	Refund-able Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
Maine	29.4	15.7	9.1	5.9	0.4	7.7	5.0	4.1	22.8	100.0
Maryland	28.1	1.0	5.6	28.3	14.0	5.5	4.3	5.0	8.2	100.0
Massachusetts	20.9	23.0	17.7	19.1	0.0	0.6	2.9	9.0	6.8	100.0
Michigan	9.7	2.0	0.1	3.2	14.3	5.9	4.0	1.5	59.3	100.0
Minnesota	16.4	27.8	9.2	31.1	1.0	0.0	7.4	3.9	3.1	100.0
Mississippi	5.3	2.2	29.6	0.0	0.0	28.3	12.3	0.0	22.3	100.0
Missouri	8.5	7.4	16.9	0.0	0.0	30.3	2.5	19.7	14.6	100.0
Montana	36.0	21.9	5.5	0.0	0.0	4.0	9.7	4.2	18.7	100.0
Nebraska	27.3	17.7	11.8	31.3	0.0	5.9	2.9	0.1	3.1	100.0
Nevada	29.0	12.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	24.8	8.7	7.8	16.4	100.0
New Hampshire	42.5	5.7	9.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	14.2	2.9	20.1	100.0
New Jersey	5.5	14.7	4.9	24.2	41.3	0.0	3.4	1.1	4.9	100.0
New Mexico	22.5	11.2	6.8	24.5	23.1	0.3	2.0	2.1	7.5	100.0
New York	28.0	9.3	2.3	25.1	9.6	6.8	8.4	4.1	6.4	100.0
North Carolina	5.9	38.7	0.7	0.0	15.8	23.3	7.4	0.6	7.6	100.0
North Dakota	9.8	3.2	10.0	0.0	0.0	61.8	12.6	0.2	2.4	100.0
Ohio	20.7	35.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	8.3	6.4	20.8	100.0
Oklahoma	13.3	41.3	6.4	0.0	0.0	9.3	5.8	0.4	23.5	100.0
Oregon	34.0	4.5	7.5	1.4	4.7	5.9	14.8	9.7	17.5	100.0
Pennsylvania	11.5	42.5	7.7	0.0	19.3	0.0	5.5	0.9	12.6	100.0
Rhode Island	14.0	26.9	6.4	14.4	0.8	17.0	3.3	0.0	17.2	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Child Care	Work, Education, and Training	Refund-able Tax Credits	Pre-K/Head Start	Child Welfare	Adminis-tration	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Other Benefits and Services	Total Spending
South Carolina	29.4	2.5	4.9	0.0	16.7	3.0	11.4	0.0	32.0	100.0
South Dakota	45.0	2.8	9.7	0.0	0.0	12.1	7.6	13.1	9.8	100.0
Tennessee	10.6	25.7	10.4	0.0	37.5	0.0	14.4	0.0	1.3	100.0
Texas	4.6	0.0	8.7	0.0	34.5	38.3	7.0	0.4	6.4	100.0
Utah	17.9	23.4	15.3	0.0	12.9	1.4	6.7	2.1	20.3	100.0
Vermont	13.9	35.2	0.8	20.3	0.0	8.8	5.4	0.7	14.9	100.0
Virginia	21.9	12.9	12.2	0.1	2.2	19.0	16.1	1.8	13.8	100.0
Washington	13.2	14.3	12.4	0.0	4.9	2.7	5.2	7.2	40.1	100.0
West Virginia	27.8	14.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	18.3	10.3	9.4	19.2	100.0
Wisconsin	13.0	34.6	5.1	12.3	0.0	1.3	5.1	5.7	23.0	100.0
Wyoming	38.9	5.3	17.6	0.0	5.8	0.0	11.9	10.9	9.6	100.0
Totals	22.3	16.6	9.7	9.0	8.5	8.3	6.9	3.7	15.0	100.0

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance.

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

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2020

(September 30, 2020; $ in millions)

State	Unliquidated Obligations	Unobligated Balance
Alabama	$5.000	$96.385
Alaska	3.823	17.833
Arizona	0.000	38.786
Arkansas	42.772	56.406
California	100.860	0.000
Colorado	0.000	87.486
Connecticut	0.000	0.000
Delaware	5.356	35.457
District of Columbia	0.000	15.236
Florida	50.819	0.000
Georgia	26.758	79.824
Hawaii	15.302	364.301
Idaho	0.000	8.269
Illinois	0.000	0.000
Indiana	13.406	18.647
Iowa	11.008	0.000
Kansas	3.567	57.065
Kentucky	0.000	38.810
Louisiana	0.000	65.375
Maine	22.300	93.075
Maryland	0.000	0.051
Massachusetts	0.000	0.000
Michigan	0.000	94.231
Minnesota	0.000	103.991
Mississippi	0.000	47.037
Missouri	0.000	0.000
Montana	0.000	19.455
Nebraska	39.053	52.068
Nevada	33.445	1.769
New Hampshire	0.000	44.926
New Jersey	27.786	25.000
New Mexico	1.195	60.053
New York	311.017	586.125
North Carolina	55.335	0.000

State	Unliquidated Obligations	Unobligated Balance
North Dakota	0.000	1.500
Ohio	0.000	582.599
Oklahoma	0.000	264.061
Oregon	0.000	45.203
Pennsylvania	88.075	410.985
Rhode Island	0.000	25.051
South Carolina	0.000	0.000
South Dakota	0.000	22.795
Tennessee	0.000	789.634
Texas	0.000	281.369
Utah	0.000	59.430
Vermont	0.000	0.000
Virginia	7.366	125.804
Washington	25.809	105.845
West Virginia	0.000	101.445
Wisconsin	0.000	204.997
Wyoming	0.000	27.231
Totals	890.054	5,155.608

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance.

Note: 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, November 2020

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Alabama	7,228	16,719	13,642	3,077
Alaska	2,013	5,376	3,692	1,684
Arizona	7,581	15,342	12,680	2,662
Arkansas	1,953	4,492	3,431	1,061
California	308,432	984,915	704,151	280,764
Colorado	12,359	30,023	22,338	7,685
Connecticut	6,320	13,403	9,791	3,612
Delaware	2,650	7,356	4,296	3,060
District of Columbia	7,465	21,847	16,103	5,744
Florida	41,491	75,073	59,340	15,733

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Georgia	8,060	15,222	13,889	1,333
Guam	437	1,078	834	244
Hawaii	6,881	21,265	13,595	7,670
Idaho	1,773	2,496	2,456	40
Illinois	10,735	21,098	18,996	2,102
Indiana	8,327	19,721	15,351	4,370
Iowa	7,504	17,947	13,759	4,188
Kansas	3,520	3,520	1,882	1,638
Kentucky	14,168	28,696	24,903	3,793
Louisiana	3,855	8,982	7,555	1,427
Maine	11,778	39,372	24,821	14,551
Maryland	23,055	56,580	39,938	16,642
Massachusetts	41,560	108,953	77,773	31,180
Michigan	10,762	26,774	21,444	5,330
Minnesota	19,680	47,585	35,101	12,484
Mississippi	1,877	3,158	2,888	270
Missouri	8,776	20,513	15,579	4,934
Montana	2,438	5,696	4,557	1,139
Nebraska	4,737	11,759	9,644	2,115
Nevada	6,658	17,198	12,826	4,372
New Hampshire	4,422	10,342	7,713	2,629
New Jersey	9,459	22,892	16,902	5,990
New Mexico	11,582	29,935	21,739	8,196
New York	113,201	289,625	198,575	91,050
North Carolina	13,775	25,289	22,273	3,016
North Dakota	1,078	2,820	2,244	576
Ohio	51,566	94,341	84,268	10,073
Oklahoma	5,592	12,901	10,932	1,969
Oregon	25,192	72,859	48,144	24,715
Pennsylvania	29,869	71,549	55,079	16,470
Puerto Rico	4,357	11,800	7,195	4,605
Rhode Island	2,577	6,094	4,622	1,472
South Carolina	8,133	18,749	15,127	3,622
South Dakota	2,716	5,495	5,051	444
Tennessee	15,578	32,436	26,923	5,513
Texas	21,404	44,545	37,455	7,090
Utah	2,657	6,195	4,621	1,574

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Vermont	2,052	4,305	3,233	1,072
Virgin Islands	69	225	156	69
Virginia	18,311	34,337	26,552	7,785
Washington	41,979	99,966	66,093	33,873
West Virginia	5,703	11,121	9,379	1,742
Wisconsin	16,495	37,683	30,420	7,263
Wyoming	487	1,136	869	267
Totals	1,002,327	2,598,799	1,912,820	685,979

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

Note: 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, November of Selected Years

					Percentage Change to 2020 from …	
	1994	2010	2019	2020	1994-2020	2019-2020
Alabama	48,142	23,954	7,456	7,228	-85.0%	-3.1%
Alaska	12,145	3,423	2,110	2,013	-83.4	-4.6
Arizona	72,171	19,406	7,108	7,581	-89.5	6.7
Arkansas	25,039	8,525	2,364	1,953	-92.2	-17.4
California	914,344	593,714	363,509	308,432	-66.3	-15.2
Colorado	39,171	11,998	13,671	12,359	-68.4	-9.6
Connecticut	60,846	16,922	7,659	6,320	-89.6	-17.5
Delaware	11,102	5,794	3,226	2,650	-76.1	-17.9
District of Columbia	27,390	9,963	7,243	7,465	-72.7	3.1
Florida	239,902	57,861	38,479	41,491	-82.7	7.8
Georgia	141,307	20,630	8,719	8,060	-94.3	-7.6
Guam	2,060	1,289	422	437	-78.8	3.6
Hawaii	21,415	10,019	4,022	6,881	-67.9	71.1
Idaho	8,608	1,809	2,014	1,773	-79.4	-12.0
Illinois	239,840	26,014	10,957	10,735	-95.5	-2.0
Indiana	70,161	33,553	5,410	8,327	-88.1	53.9
Iowa	37,941	21,478	8,787	7,504	-80.2	-14.6
Kansas	28,774	15,563	3,984	3,520	-87.8	-11.6

					Percentage Change to 2020 from …	
	1994	2010	2019	2020	1994-2020	2019-2020
Kentucky	77,403	31,175	16,234	14,168	-81.7	-12.7
Louisiana	84,031	11,062	4,478	3,855	-95.4	-13.9
Maine	21,782	15,397	14,586	11,778	-45.9	-19.3
Maryland	80,480	25,347	16,761	23,055	-71.4	37.6
Massachusetts	106,736	50,878	50,505	41,560	-61.1	-17.7
Michigan	211,259	68,790	11,119	10,762	-94.9	-3.2
Minnesota	61,352	24,759	15,087	19,680	-67.9	30.4
Mississippi	53,652	12,052	3,011	1,877	-96.5	-37.7
Missouri	91,205	39,737	9,687	8,776	-90.4	-9.4
Montana	11,464	3,650	3,266	2,438	-78.7	-25.4
Nebraska	15,543	8,381	4,346	4,737	-69.5	9.0
Nevada	15,330	10,778	7,821	6,658	-56.6	-14.9
New Hampshire	11,154	6,097	5,286	4,422	-60.4	-16.3
New Jersey	113,444	34,996	9,003	9,459	-91.7	5.1
New Mexico	34,906	21,447	9,901	11,582	-66.8	17.0
New York	462,309	157,247	112,549	113,201	-75.5	0.6
North Carolina	127,829	23,879	14,236	13,775	-89.2	-3.2
North Dakota	5,290	1,967	972	1,078	-79.6	10.9
Ohio	239,144	104,370	43,736	51,566	-78.4	17.9
Oklahoma	45,863	9,380	5,650	5,592	-87.8	-1.0
Oregon	39,763	32,548	36,514	25,192	-36.6	-31.0
Pennsylvania	209,875	59,090	39,133	29,869	-85.8	-23.7
Puerto Rico	56,378	13,953	4,410	4,357	-92.3	-1.2
Rhode Island	22,581	6,648	3,846	2,577	-88.6	-33.0
South Carolina	50,351	19,371	8,220	8,133	-83.8	-1.1
South Dakota	6,434	3,247	2,928	2,716	-57.8	-7.2
Tennessee	107,498	63,925	18,804	15,578	-85.5	-17.2
Texas	281,897	52,970	21,904	21,404	-92.4	-2.3
Utah	17,387	7,097	3,133	2,657	-84.7	-15.2
Vermont	9,691	3,264	2,665	2,052	-78.8	-23.0
Virgin Islands	1,222	526	101	69	-94.4	-31.7
Virginia	73,692	37,478	16,586	18,311	-75.2	10.4
Washington	102,718	67,762	35,846	41,979	-59.1	17.1
West Virginia	39,299	10,747	6,361	5,703	-85.5	-10.3
Wisconsin	73,730	25,056	14,839	16,495	-77.6	11.2

					Percentage Change to 2020 from …	
	1994	2010	2019	2020	1994-2020	2019-2020
Wyoming	5,457	302	482	487	-91.1	1.0
Totals	4,968,507	1,947,288	1,071,146	1,002,327	-79.8	-6.4

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

Note: 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 Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction for All Families: FY2020

State	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (after-credit) standard	Work Participation Rate	Met the Standard?
Alabama	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	44.3%	Yes
Alaska	50.0	42.4	7.6	38.2	Yes
Arizona	50.0	50.0	0.0	15.2	Yes
Arkansas	50.0	50.0	0.0	17.4	Yes
California	50.0	25.3	24.7	50.5	Yes
Colorado	50.0	35.0	15.0	39.9	Yes
Connecticut	50.0	50.0	0.0	11.3	Yes
Delaware	50.0	50.0	0.0	28.6	Yes
District of Col.	50.0	47.7	2.3	49.9	Yes
Florida	50.0	39.0	11.0	19.1	Yes
Georgia	50.0	50.0	0.0	16.1	Yes
Guam	50.0	50.0	0.0	9.6	Yes
Hawaii	50.0	50.0	0.0	18.2	Yes
Idaho	50.0	0.0	50.0	54.7	Yes
Illinois	50.0	46.1	3.9	66.5	Yes
Indiana	50.0	50.0	0.0	21.3	Yes
Iowa	50.0	50.0	0.0	20.0	Yes
Kansas	50.0	50.0	0.0	31.8	Yes
Kentucky	50.0	50.0	0.0	41.0	Yes
Louisiana	50.0	50.0	0.0	3.5	Yes
Maine	50.0	0.0	50.0	83.5	Yes
Maryland	50.0	50.0	0.0	14.3	Yes

State	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (after-credit) standard	Work Participation Rate	Met the Standard?
Massachusetts	50.0	25.1	24.9	56.9	Yes
Michigan	50.0	50.0	0.0	32.2	Yes
Minnesota	50.0	44.6	5.4	22.3	Yes
Mississippi	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.3	Yes
Missouri	50.0	50.0	0.0	17.1	Yes
Montana	50.0	18.4	31.6	35.5	Yes
Nebraska	50.0	50.0	0.0	10.2	Yes
Nevada	50.0	39.2	10.8	27.0	Yes
New Hampshire	50.0	0.0	50.0	55.1	Yes
New Jersey	50.0	50.0	0.0	17.4	Yes
New Mexico	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.8	Yes
New York	50.0	48.9	1.1	17.8	Yes
North Carolina	50.0	47.7	2.3	10.0	Yes
North Dakota	50.0	50.0	0.0	35.2	Yes
Ohio	50.0	42.5	7.5	29.4	Yes
Oklahoma	50.0	50.0	0.0	20.1	Yes
Oregon	50.0	0.0	50.0	59.6	Yes
Pennsylvania	50.0	50.0	0.0	14.5	Yes
Puerto Rico	50.0	50.0	0.0	6.6	Yes
Rhode Island	50.0	50.0	0.0	6.8	Yes
South Carolina	50.0	50.0	0.0	20.4	Yes
South Dakota	50.0	0.0	50.0	52.7	Yes
Tennessee	50.0	50.0	0.0	33.6	Yes
Texas	50.0	50.0	0.0	11.3	Yes
Utah	50.0	50.0	0.0	13.0	Yes
Vermont	50.0	46.7	3.3	39.7	Yes
Virgin Islands	50.0	50.0	0.0	4.1	Yes
Virginia	50.0	45.5	4.5	29.3	Yes
Washington	50.0	50.0	0.0	41.8	Yes
West Virginia	50.0	48.6	1.4	24.8	Yes
Wisconsin	50.0	42.2	7.8	37.3	Yes
Wyoming	50.0	0.0	50.0	76.0	Yes

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

Table B-7. TANF Work Participation Standard and Rate, By Jurisdiction, for Two-Parent Families: FY2020

(NA Denotes that the Jurisdiction Did Not Have Two-Parent Families Receiving TANF or MOE-Funded Assistance)

State	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (after-credit standard)	Work Participation Rate	Met the Standard?
Alabama	90.0%	90.0%	0.0%	48.1%	Yes
Alaska	90.0	54.8	35.2	52.1	Yes
Arizona	90.0	76.0	14.0	27.1	Yes
Arkansas	90.0	75.8	14.2	16.8	Yes
California	90.0	30.5	59.5	27.5	No
Colorado	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Col.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	90.0	86.7	3.3	17.1	Yes
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Guam	90.0	52.9	37.1	9.5	No
Hawaii	90.0	77.9	12.1	26.4	Yes
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	90.0	83.2	6.8	29.3	Yes
Iowa	90.0	84.5	5.5	13.1	Yes
Kansas	90.0	77.1	12.9	33.8	Yes
Kentucky	90.0	56.0	34.0	43.0	Yes
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	90.0	0.0	90.0	94.0	Yes
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	90.0	25.1	64.9	86.0	Yes
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	90.0	54.8	35.2	41.8	Yes
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	90.0	39.2	50.8	38.3	No
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	90.0	82.9	7.1	94.2	Yes

State	Statutory Standard	Caseload Reduction Credit	Effective (after-credit standard)	Work Participation Rate	Met the Standard?
New Mexico	90.0	64.4	25.6	32.0	Yes
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	90.0	47.7	42.3	11.1	No
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	90.0	88.6	1.4	27.8	Yes
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	90.0	0.0	90.0	97.8	Yes
Pennsylvania	90.0	89.6	0.4	20.5	Yes
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	90.0	62.4	27.6	7.3	No
South Carolina	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	90.0	77.4	12.6	30.9	Yes
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	90.0	63.7	26.3	63.0	Yes
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	90.0	51.9	38.1	62.4	Yes
West Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	90.0	63.4	26.6	45.9	Yes
Wyoming	90.0	0.0	90.0	78.6	No

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

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.