An Updated Methodology for the KIDS COUNT® Index

JUNE 2026

THE ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION

An Updated Methodology for the KIDS COUNT Index

The Annie E. Casey Foundation thanks Alicia VanOrman, Nathan Porter and Nurfadila Khairunnisa at Population Reference Bureau (PRB) for their work on developing and revising the KIDS COUNT index methodology.

An Updated Methodology for the KIDS COUNT Index

Introduction

This report describes the motivations for revising the KIDS COUNT® index methodology, the Annie E. Casey Foundation's development of the new methodology and the opportunities it provides for understanding how children are faring across and within states over time.

The updated index provides new information for measuring progress or declines in child outcomes and identifies where targeted resources can make the biggest difference for kids. In addition to the traditional ranking of states, the *KIDS COUNT Data Book* will include scores for states overall and for each of the four domains: Economic Well-Being, Education, Health and Family and Community. In sum, the revised methodology will ensure KIDS COUNT is an even more useful data tool for public officials, funders, community leaders and others who make decisions to improve outcomes for children and youth.

Background on the KIDS COUNT Index

The Casey Foundation launched KIDS COUNT in 1990 to maintain unimpeachable data on how U.S. children and young people are faring and to inspire action to improve child well-being.

The Foundation achieves these goals through data-driven advocacy and clear communication about key trends in child well-being through the annual *KIDS COUNT Data Book*, the online KIDS COUNT Data Center and a nationwide network of KIDS COUNT grantees from each state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

For more than 35 years, the *Data Book* — the most visible KIDS COUNT product — has tracked child well-being at the state level and ranked states using an index that combines key indicators into an overall measure of child well-being.

Since 1990, the KIDS COUNT index has had only one major methodological change. In 2012, the original set of 10 indicators was overhauled. Some indicators were removed and several new indicators were added, increasing the total from 10 to 16.[1] In addition, the indicators were organized into four thematic domains: Economic Well-Being, Education, Health and Family and Community.

Incorporating a wider range of indicators and analyzing results by domain provided a more comprehensive picture of child well-being. The 2012 revision did not alter the underlying methodology for aggregating indicator data into composite scores, and it kept the analytic focus on state rankings (overall and by domain).

Since 2012, a few indicators have changed due to the availability of new data sources or changes in existing sources, but the core methods remained unchanged.

Throughout its history, the KIDS COUNT index has highlighted state and regional differences in child well-being, providing a basis for important policy discussions. Rankings are familiar, straightforward and effective for quick comparisons across states at a single point in time. The KIDS COUNT rankings show where states stand relative to one another in a single year, and they remain an important tool.

Because rankings are relative, however, year-to-year changes may reflect shifts in other states' outcomes rather than changes within a state itself. For example, a state could rise in the rankings with unchanged outcomes if outcomes decline in other states. Likewise, a state with stable or improving outcomes could fall in the rankings if other states improved more. Understanding why rankings change over time requires detailed analysis of the underlying data.

To help the index tell a fuller story, the Foundation partnered with Population Reference Bureau (PRB) to develop a new methodology for constructing the KIDS COUNT index. In addition to a rank, the updated approach provides a score overall and for each domain. Scores show gaps between states, opportunities for improvement and whether child outcomes are improving or declining. The scores provide states with tools to talk about the progress they have made as well as room for growth to ensure kids thrive. This new information can inform decision-making by public officials, funders, advocates and communities.

What Is Staying the Same and What Is Changing

Much of the KIDS COUNT index is staying the same. The index will continue to combine data from the same 16 indicators into an overall index and into four thematic domains. The underlying data will continue to be measured as percentages or rates for each indicator. Indicators will still contribute equally within domains, each domain will contribute equally to the overall index and rankings will still be available.

What is changing is the method for creating the aggregated data used for ranking states. In addition to rankings, the index now includes scores for each state, overall and by domain. Rankings provide a snapshot of how states compare to one another in a given year. Scores add essential context: They show the magnitude of differences between states, highlight which domains are driving results and allow states to track their progress or setbacks.

All index methods require normalizing the underlying data in some way. Indices need to normalize indicator data so that measures with different units or scales (such as percentages, or rates per 1,000 or 100,000) can be compared and combined. Without normalization, indicators with larger numerical ranges would dominate the index even if they are not more important. By normalizing or standardizing the indicators, each measure starts with equal weight in the index.

To date, the basic methodology to construct the KIDS COUNT index has been:

- Each indicator was converted into a standardized score, known as a z-score.
- For each indicator, a state's z-score was calculated by:
    - starting with the state's value (percentage, rate, etc.);
    - subtracting the average value across states; and
    - dividing by the standard deviation across states.
- Z-scores were then summed across indicators within each domain to create domain-specific index scores.
- Domain scores were summed to create an overall index score (equivalent to summing all 16 indicators).
- States were ranked from highest/best (1) to lowest/worst (50) based on their overall index scores.

Z-scores are not intuitive or easy to interpret, and they do not have a set scale that starts and ends at specified points. This method also "resets" each year, as z-scores are based on a specific year's distribution of state values. To develop an interpretable score that could be compared across time, a different approach was needed to normalize the underlying indicator values.

The new method continues to combine data from 16 indicators of child well-being, measured as percentages or rates, into domain and overall index scores. But now, indicators are normalized using a min-max transformation and the overall index and domain scores are put on a scale ranging from 0 to 1,000. The scale ranges from 0 to 1,000, instead of 0 to 100, to ensure that audiences do not misinterpret the index values as percentages or percentiles. Lower values represent worse outcomes for children, while higher values represent better child outcomes. The overall and domain scores show where each state falls along a continuum from the worst to the best outcomes among all states. States are then ranked from best (1) to worst (50) based on these scores.

The new method anchors the scale to the worst (0) and best (1,000) performance among states in 2019. Using 2019 as the baseline year provides the last complete snapshot of child well-being before the significant impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. It also allows states to evaluate multiple years of progress encompassing both the consequences and recovery from the pandemic.

Selecting the Updated Approach

PRB gathered and synthesized information and feedback from multiple sources, including:

- reviewing recent national and international research on composite index construction, use and interpretation;[ii]
- reviewing input from members of the KIDS COUNT Network; and
- interviewing a broad range of child well-being experts, Foundation staff and young adult researchers.

PRB then worked with the Foundation to develop a new methodology for the KIDS COUNT index with the following goals:

- Preserve the usefulness and clarity of rankings, while also providing a meaningful measure of state performance and differences between states.
- Adopt a familiar and easy-to-interpret methodology.
- Show that all states have room for improvement.
- Provide a clear measure of improvement and change over time.

PRB began with the methodology used in the KIDS COUNT *Race for Results*® index, which places each state between a range of chosen reference points of best and worst performance.[iii] Because the *Race for Results* methodology was developed to provide a snapshot at a single point in time, PRB tested several modifications to adapt the approach to measure trends over time.

A key challenge in developing an index that tracks change over time is setting fixed baseline or comparison points. Within the approach used for *Race for Results,* this means setting specific minimum and maximum values for each indicator that represent best and worst for that indicator. Setting these values too high or too low can result in a scale that is too aspirational, meaning no state could ever reach best, or a scale that is highly compressed, meaning that only part of the scale is used and differences between states are falsely reduced.

PRB tested 12 variations of the methodology, ranging from setting the minimum and maximum indicator values at the limits of the data (i.e., at 0 and 100 for percentages) to fixing the values at observed levels in 2019 (i.e., the lowest and highest state values on each indicator). These variations were also compared to a modified standardization approach (i.e., transforming summed z-scores into a common scale).

Each variation was assessed on four criteria:

- **Distributional behavior**, including mean, standard deviation, interquartile range and minimum and maximum scores, to ensure that all or most of the full scale was used and that differences among states were not overly compressed.
- **Rank stability** to confirm that the index and domain ranking results remained consistent across reasonable scaling choices. Spearman correlation analysis was used to examine the stability of top- and bottom-ranked states and to assess the magnitude and frequency of rank changes across all states.
- **Temporal sensitivity** to confirm that all changes in child outcomes relative to the 2019 baseline were captured. Examining the indicator values for each state across time identified any state-indicator combinations that exceeded the fixed 2019 minimums and maximums.
- **Interpretability and communication clarity** to evaluate the ease (or complexity) of explaining the chosen methodology and how to use and interpret the scores.

PRB found that all methods produced highly stable rankings. Although actual scores varied across methodological choices, the relative rankings of states remained largely the same. Also, nearly all methods captured meaningful changes since 2019. Together, these results suggested that overall and domain rankings as well as time-trend interpretations were not sensitive to the specific minimums and maximums set. The focus then shifted to distributional behavior and clarity of interpretation to choose the final approach.

The chosen approach produces scores that use the entire scale while also fully capturing progress or decline. The minimum and maximum reference values for each indicator are set to the observed minimum and maximum state values in 2019. In subsequent years, indicator scores are measured relative to these reference values from 2019, meaning that indicator scores could fall below 0 or surpass 1,000 to account for performance beyond the 2019 benchmarks. Indicator scores are not capped, so indicator scores lower than 0 and higher than 1,000 contribute fully to a state's overall and domain scores and capture a state's complete progress or decline (since if the scale were capped at 2019 minimums and maximums, improvements or declines beyond those limits would be flattened).

At the same time, the overall index and domain scores are intended to be easy to understand. If an overall score or domain score falls below 0 or above 1,000, the score is adjusted to 0 or 1,000 for presentation in the *Data Book*. This was decided to simplify presentation and interpretation. For example, if a state has indicator scores of 1,000, 1,000, 1,100 and 1,200 in a single domain, it will have a raw domain score of 1,075, but in the *Data Book*, the score will be presented as 1,000.

Calculating New Index Score

This section describes the procedure for calculating the index scores and rankings. KIDS COUNT index indicators are oriented so that higher percentages or rates correspond to lower levels of well-being (see Appendix A for a full list of indicators and data sources). However, for interpreting the scores, the scale is oriented so that higher scores correspond to better outcomes for kids.

The **first step** is to fix the reference range using 2019 baseline data (see Appendix B).

For each indicator *i*:

- Min_{i2019} represents the best state value across all states on indicator *i* in 2019.
- Max_{i2019} represents the worst state value across all states on indicator *i* in 2019.

These reference points remain fixed for future years, which allows changes over time to be interpreted consistently. Scores reflect a state's position relative to best and worst state performance in 2019.

The **second step** is to make the data comparable across indicators by rescaling or normalizing the indicator values. Each indicator is transformed using linear rescaling that converts the indicator data to a scale ranging from 0 to 1,000.

- Transform the percentage or rate data for indicator *i*, state *s* and year *y* (i_{sy}) using a min-max transformation that is anchored to the 2019 reference values:

$$f_{isy} = \frac{(i_{sy} - Min_{i2019})}{(Max_{i2019} - Min_{i2019})}$$

  In this formula, *f* represents the normalized score for a given indicator (i), state (s) and year (y). Min_{i2019} and Max_{i2019} represent the smallest (and best) and largest (and worst) values across all states for that indicator from 2019 as derived in the first step.

- Next, convert the values to a 0-to-1,000 scale, with higher values indicating better outcomes:

$$S_{isy} = 1000 - (f_{isy} * 1000)$$

For each indicator, every state receives a final indicator score (S_{isy}) that is on a scale where 0 represents the worst-performing state in 2019 and 1,000 represents the best-performing state in 2019. In later years, a state's indicator score will fall below 0 if it drops below the worst state score in 2019 or rise above 1,000 if it exceeds the best state score in 2019.

The **third step** is to aggregate the rescaled data by averaging the indicator scores into domain scores and an overall score. Each indicator contributes equally to its domain and to the overall score. An equal weighting strategy is the simplest and most transparent method and is consistent with the method used to construct the 1990 and 2012 versions of the KIDS COUNT index.

At the 2019 baseline, all domain and overall scores will be above 0 and below 1,000. This is because no single state has the best or worst performance across all indicators in a domain or across the full index. In subsequent years, states can register domain and overall scores of 0 or 1,000 if their performance improves or declines to levels at or beyond the best or worst observed in 2019. All domain and overall index scores that fall below 0 or exceed 1,000 will be rounded to 0 and 1,000 to keep the published reporting scale consistent and easy to interpret.

The **fourth step** is to produce rankings from the scores. For each domain and overall, states are ranked from highest score (1=best) to lowest score (50=worst).

How to Use the New Results

The updated index methodology produces two complementary metrics — **a rank** and **a score** — for each domain and overall.

The rank provides a quick and straightforward assessment of where each state stands relative to other states in a single year. Rankings are especially useful for headlines, high-level summaries and quick comparisons. But they do not convey the magnitude of states' performance differences, nor should they be used to assess change over time.

The scores range from 0 to 1,000 to provide an intuitive scale for interpreting performance as benchmarked against the best and worst child well-being outcomes observed across states in 2019. The difference between 1,000 and a state's scores can be interpreted as the distance remaining to achieve the best levels of child well-being as observed in 2019. For example, a score of 550 suggests that a state is about halfway toward achieving the best outcomes as observed in 2019, indicating substantial room for improvement. As a reminder, 2019 serves as the benchmark because it is the last year of complete data prior to significant disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Child well-being outcomes have significant room to improve beyond the levels observed in 2019.

Scores also provide information on how far apart states are from each other and which domains may be pulling scores up or driving them down. Because the scale is anchored to 2019, scores also can be used to interpret overall trends. An increase in scores indicates that child well-being outcomes have improved since 2019, and a decrease in scores signals worse outcomes for kids.

KIDS COUNT DATA IN ACTION

For more than 35 years, leaders and advocates across the country have put KIDS COUNT data to work — using it to guide decisions and build stronger programs and policies that make a difference in children's daily lives. For example, although New Mexico ranks 49th overall, scores show that child well-being improved in New Mexico in 2024 compared to 2019, driven by progress on Economic Well-Being and Family and Community measures.

Advocates in New Mexico used KIDS COUNT data on persistent high child poverty and gaps in economic security to make the case for increasing the state Child Tax Credit. Lawmakers responded by expanding this state policy in 2023, helping families with children better cover essentials such as housing, food and child care.

Another example is Mississippi, which ranks 50th overall but 16th in education. Mississippi made noteworthy progress for children from 2019 to 2024, with scores improving overall and in three domains Family and Community, Economic Well-Being and Education. Several actions contributed to the state's higher ranking and progress in Education, including passing the Literacy-Based Promotion Act focused on reading proficiency by third grade and making consistent investments in public schools.

Note that the 0-to-1,000 scale is a reporting scale. Differences on the scale are best understood as movement along a standardized yardstick, not proportional real-world change. A score of 800 is better than 400, but it does not mean "twice as good." An index score of 1,000 serves as a benchmark of what may be possible based on observed data in 2019. All states can improve outcomes for kids beyond these observed levels.

The scores allow for direct comparisons across states — for example, comparing states in the same geographic region or states with similarly sized child populations.

More importantly, scores allow states to measure and track the progress they have made within their state, and over time. The benefits of the scoring methodology to track progress or decline over time within a state can equip and empower educators, child advocates and others with the tools to gauge progress and tell the full story of their work to improve child well-being.

State Results Using the Updated Method

Comparing state rankings developed with the new methodology to those with the previous (2012) methodology using data mostly from 2023 (see Appendix C), overall child well-being rankings remain largely the same. No state shifts more than two rank positions. New Hampshire remains in the first position and New Mexico in last. These results show that the sequential ordering of states' performance is not greatly impacted by the change in method.

The addition of scores provides more information about how children are faring across states. The overall scores in 2023 range from a low of 219 to a high of 833 (see Appendix D). The scores demonstrate substantial separation between states at the upper and lower ends of the distribution and the next closest states (292 and 772, respectively). In 37 states and the United States as a whole, kids fared worse in 2023 than in 2019. Much of this decline was driven by losses in the Education domain since the pandemic.

Limitations

The KIDS COUNT index measures how states perform on a defined set of indicators. It is an important tool used to compare states on child well-being outcomes, to identify what's working and to target areas that need improvement. However, aggregate state-level data can obscure regional differences within states and differences across subpopulations.

Because rescaling and normalizing indicator data is sensitive to outliers or extreme values, the choice of minimums and maximums can affect the relative ranking of states. By using the actual observed data in 2019, the index captures the full range of possible performance across states without compression. However, states that perform well on many indicators (or perform poorly on many indicators) or have an extreme value on one or two indicators may have a score much higher (or much lower) than other states. The distribution of scores matched the distribution in the underlying indicator data — in some cases, states' performance on indicators differed substantially from that of other states — demonstrating that outliers were assessed accurately.

Capping specific indicators to eliminate the impact of extreme values would compress the scale and minimize differences between some states.

The rescaling method is also dependent on the baseline year. The choice of 2019 as the fixed reference point affects the scale. This is necessary for comparability but also means that 2019 shapes how the scale behaves over time. Significant changes in states' performance over time may require updating the reference year and scale.

The original method of ranking states was developed so that there would be no ties (states with the same ranking). Without introducing a false level of precision, the new method can lead to ties or near ties. When states have similar scores, small differences may not be meaningful. Indicator data are rounded to the nearest tenth (hundredth for babies born with a low birth weight) to reduce false precision. However, the scores are best used to show broad patterns and differences.

The score is designed to provide a quick starting point for understanding state-level patterns of child well-being, both overall and within each domain. Examining the underlying indicator data and context will continue to provide the best way to understand the drivers of child well-being within and across states.

Conclusion

The updated methodology for the KIDS COUNT index advances understanding of state-level differences in child well-being and changes within states over time. By incorporating a score along with a rank, the index better quantifies gaps between states, enables states to more easily track changes in overall well-being and across domains, and reveals whether children's lives are getting better. The methodological changes in the index will paint a more complete picture of child well-being and make it easier for child advocates to identify and target areas of concern and celebrate areas of progress. The expanded KIDS COUNT index is an important new tool to help states evaluate and strengthen their progress for children and youth.

Appendix

Appendix A: Indicators, Data Sources and Data Years

Indicator	Source	Baseline Year	Trend Comparison Year
ECONOMIC WELL-BEING			
Children in poverty	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
Children whose parents lack secure employment	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
Children living in households with a high housing cost burden	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
Teens not in school and not working	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
EDUCATION			
Young children (ages 3 and 4) not in school	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-year Estimates	2015–19	2019–23
Fourth graders not proficient in reading	U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)	2019	2024
Eighth graders not proficient in math	U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)	2019	2024
High school students not graduating on time	U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, EDFacts File 150, Data Group 695	2018–19	2021–22
HEALTH			
Low birth-weight babies	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Statistics	2019	2023
Children without health insurance	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
Child and teen deaths per 100,000	Death statistics: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Statistics. Population statistics: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates	2019	2023
Children and teens (ages 10 to 17) who are overweight or obese	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, National Survey of Children's Health	2018–19	2022–23
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY			
Children in single-parent families	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year Estimates	2019	2023
Children living in high-poverty areas	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-year Estimates	2015–19	2019–23
Teen births per 1,000	Birth statistics: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Statistics. Population statistics: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates	2019	2023

Appendix B: 2019 Indicator Minimums and Maximums

Indicator	Minimum value (Best)		Maximum value (Worst)	
ECONOMIC WELL-BEING				
Children in poverty	7.1%	New Hampshire	28.1%	Mississippi
Children whose parents lack secure employment	18.6%	Utah	34.2%	West Virginia
Children in households with a high housing cost burden	16.1%	North Dakota	40.6%	California
Teens not in school and not working	3.9%	Minnesota, Nebraska	12%	Alaska
EDUCATION				
Young children (ages 3 and 4) not in school	34.7%	New Jersey	67.6%	North Dakota
Fourth graders not proficient in reading	54.6%	Massachusetts	76.3%	New Mexico
Eighth graders not proficient in math	52.6%	Massachusetts	79.3%	New Mexico
High school students not graduating on time	8.3%	Alabama	24.9%	New Mexico
HEALTH				
Low birth-weight babies	6.31%	Alaska	12.32%	Mississippi
Children without health insurance	1.5%	Massachusetts	12.7%	Texas
Child and teen deaths per 100,000	14.5	Massachusetts	53.0	Alaska
Children and teens (ages 10 to 17) who are overweight or obese	21.5%	Utah	39.7%	West Virginia
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY				
Children in single-parent families	18.7%	Utah	46.6%	Louisiana
Children in families where the household head lacks a high school diploma	3.9%	New Hampshire	19.6%	California
Children living in high-poverty areas	0.3%	New Hampshire	22.2%	Mississippi
Teen births per 1,000	6.6	New Hampshire	30.0	Arkansas

Appendix C: Overall Child Well-Being Rankings for 2023 Using Previous (2012) and New (2026) Method

State	Previous (2012) Method	New (2026) Method	Change in Rank
Alabama	43	43	0
Alaska	40	40	0
Arizona	42	41	1
Arkansas	45	45	0
California	32	33	-1
Colorado	12	13	-1
Connecticut	8	8	0
Delaware	30	30	0
Florida	35	35	0
Georgia	39	38	1
Hawaii	24	24	0
Idaho	15	15	0
Illinois	18	18	0
Indiana	25	25	0
Iowa	9	9	0
Kansas	14	14	0
Kentucky	36	36	0
Louisiana	49	49	0
Maine	17	16	1
Maryland	21	19	2
Massachusetts	3	4	-1
Michigan	33	34	-1
Minnesota	5	5	0
Mississippi	48	48	0
Missouri	27	27	0
Montana	22	22	0
Nebraska	10	10	0
Nevada	47	47	0
New Hampshire	1	1	0
New Jersey	7	7	0
New Mexico	50	50	0
New York	29	29	0
North Carolina	34	32	2
North Dakota	6	6	0
Ohio	31	31	0
Oklahoma	46	46	0
Oregon	28	28	0
Pennsylvania	20	19	1
Rhode Island	19	21	-2
South Carolina	38	39	-1
South Dakota	26	26	0
Tennessee	37	37	0
Texas	44	44	0
Utah	4	3	1
Vermont	2	2	0
Virginia	13	12	1
Washington	16	16	0
West Virginia	41	42	-1
Wisconsin	11	11	0
Wyoming	23	23	0

Appendix D: 2023 Overall and Domain Scores and Change From 2019

LOCATION	OVERALL CHILD WELL-BEING		ECONOMIC WELL-BEING		EDUCATION		HEALTH		FAMILY AND COMMUNITY	
	Score	Change in Score	Score	Change in Score	Score	Change in Score	Score	Change in Score	Score	Change in Score
United States	538	-15	555	4	410	-108	591	-33	596	78
Alabama	421	4	494	24	304	-89	413	-34	473	113
Alaska	443	17	458	85	74	-136	539	43	701	74
Arizona	432	-1	547	54	137	-138	510	-96	535	175
Arkansas	389	-66	421	-80	319	-149	354	-126	463	93
California	520	-11	416	-29	371	-71	734	-37	561	95
Colorado	648	-15	682	-31	484	-81	631	-21	793	71
Connecticut	691	-36	624	24	667	-145	767	-13	705	-12
Delaware	543	-9	670	101	312	-219	605	19	586	62
Florida	513	-17	449	0	422	-162	569	-5	611	96
Georgia	459	-5	494	2	356	-80	480	-5	505	62
Hawaii	593	-1	510	68	384	-68	738	-47	740	41
Idaho	632	-24	676	-83	287	-128	717	17	849	101
Illinois	617	-10	668	40	512	-81	629	-67	657	67
Indiana	586	37	716	76	467	-89	564	67	600	98
Iowa	681	-33	850	57	427	-171	689	-39	759	21
Kansas	640	-5	853	85	409	-119	621	-47	677	61
Kentucky	489	24	516	71	396	-113	546	14	500	127
Louisiana	292	15	250	11	339	73	322	-103	257	80
Maine	618	-83	662	-36	289	-247	675	-89	846	41
Maryland	610	1	731	107	424	-130	601	-21	685	50
Massachusetts	752	-64	623	-71	749	-151	877	-35	757	0
Michigan	517	-38	585	-26	219	-178	629	-34	636	88
Minnesota	729	-61	875	-6	427	-200	781	-97	831	57
Mississippi	305	51	398	182	445	14	115	-120	261	126
Missouri	562	11	693	88	365	-181	527	30	663	104
Montana	607	-10	662	85	392	-140	605	-50	769	63
Nebraska	679	-53	880	-29	419	-168	684	-43	734	30
Nevada	363	-60	378	-71	169	-136	426	-129	480	95
New Hampshire	833	22	891	88	591	-100	901	66	950	33
New Jersey	704	-35	642	11	694	-218	764	48	718	23
New Mexico	219	-40	269	5	0	-125	394	-89	239	47
New York	550	-23	409	-27	509	-50	747	-45	537	32
North Carolina	521	-9	575	47	406	-136	526	-40	578	93
North Dakota	722	24	1000	99	254	-223	735	93	884	127
Ohio	538	-7	590	-18	452	-52	540	-34	569	75
Oklahoma	380	-43	486	-30	99	-230	434	-23	501	112
Oregon	554	-51	528	-8	224	-170	741	-62	722	35
Pennsylvania	610	-22	657	22	474	-162	655	-26	654	76
Rhode Island	608	-14	622	-54	386	-73	682	-95	741	163
South Carolina	457	27	493	6	348	-13	438	10	550	104
South Dakota	574	-48	689	-88	298	-208	662	82	646	22
Tennessee	482	-9	513	-24	457	-51	463	-24	495	63
Texas	410	-12	477	-14	372	-94	366	-52	427	112
Utah	753	-8	799	-15	556	-57	724	-1	935	43
Vermont	772	5	828	57	470	-184	852	27	940	124
Virginia	649	-21	707	-7	469	-171	691	53	732	43
Washington	618	-45	570	-67	389	-105	742	-73	772	63
West Virginia	430	10	490	85	201	-171	453	0	577	128
Wisconsin	672	-33	809	19	532	-111	616	-86	733	47
Wyoming	599	-50	668	-181	396	-129	528	80	806	34

KEY Red: Significant decrease | Green: Significant increase | Grey: Not a significant change or stable

Endnotes

[i] The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2012). *The new KIDS COUNT index*. https://www.aecf.org/resources/the-new-kids-count-index

[ii] Esri. (2024, May). *Creating composite indices using ArcGIS: Best practices* [Esri Technical Paper]. https://www.esri.com/content/dam/esrisites/en-us/media/technical-papers/creating-composite-indices-using-arcgis.pdf; Lafortune, G., Fuller, G., Moreno, J., Schmidt-Traub, G., & Kroll, C. (2018). SDG index and dashboards: Detailed methodological paper. https://github.com/sdsna/2018GlobalIndex/raw/master/2018GlobalIndexMethodology.pdf; Mazziotta, M., & Pareto, A. (2017). Synthesis of indicators: The composite indicators approach. In F. Maggino (Ed.), *Complexity in society: From indicators construction to their synthesis*, (pp. 159–191). Springer International, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60595-1_7; Mazziotta, M., & Pareto, A. (2021). Data normalization for aggregating time series: The constrained min-max method. Italian Journal of Economic, Demographic and Statistical Studies, *LXXV-4*, 101–108. https://www.rieds-journal.org/rieds/article/view/82; OECD/European Union/EC-JRC. (2008). *Handbook on constructing composite indicators: Methodology and user guide*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264043466-en; Rinner, C., & Pietropaolo, A. (2021). Tracking area-based composite indices over time: Change indicators vs. jointly rescaled indicators, *Geomatica*, 75(2), 51–64. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1195103624000740; Sachs, J. D., Lafortune, G., Fuller, G., & Iablonovski, G. (2025). *Sustainable development report 2025: Financing sustainable development to 2030 and mid-century*. Dublin University Press. https://doi.org/10.25546/111909; United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). (2019). *Guidelines on producing leading, composite and sentiment indicators*. United Nations.

[iii] The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014). *2014 Race for results*. https://www.aecf.org/resources/race-for-results; The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014). *KIDS COUNT Race for Results index methodology: Comparing children's success across and within states*. https://assets.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-RaceforResultsMethodology-2014.pdf

701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
www.aecf.org

THE ANNIE E. CASEY
FOUNDATION

www.aecf.org | Subscribe for updates at www.aecf.org/newsletter

annie-e.-casey-foundation @annieecaseyfdn