

Bob Taft
Governor



Tom Hayes
Director

30 East Broad Street • Columbus, Ohio 43215
www.state.oh.us/odjfs

OWF/PRC GUIDANCE LETTER NO. 49

To: Directors, County Departments of Job and Family Services
Directors, County Public Children Services Agencies
Directors, Child Support Enforcement Agencies

From: Tom Hayes, Director

Date: October 29, 2002

Subject: **Wellness Program**

The purpose of this letter is to provide guidance for the Wellness Program currently operating with federal TANF funds. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 lists as one of the four purposes of TANF:

“to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies”.

Therefore, TANF is an appropriate program to support teenage pregnancy prevention and reduction efforts in Ohio and is done so through Am. Sub. H.B. No. 299.

If you have any questions regarding the Wellness Program, please contact Tracey Bennett at (614) 466-4815.

cc: County Commissioners Association
OJFSDA
PCSAO
Lynne Bratka, Ohio Family and Children First Program Director
Family and Children First Regional Coordinators
Family and Children First Council Coordinators
ODJFS Assistant Directors
ODJFS Deputy Directors
ODJFS/OFS Bureau Chiefs

WELLNESS PROGRAM

Governance of the Wellness Program

Am. Sub. H.B. No. 299 requires each County Department of Job and Family Services (CDJFS) to enter into a contract with the local Family and Children First (FCF) Council to administer the county's Wellness Program. FCF Councils are responsible for determining local programmatic and fiscal operations for the Wellness Program. FCF Councils must coordinate with CDJFS' to ensure compliance with all state and federal TANF rules and regulations. Responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- * coordinating with CDJFS' to ensure that all local, state, and federal requirements are met for competitive bidding with service providers
- * ensuring that the Wellness Program is clearly identified in the county PRC Plan
- * ensuring that a system is in place to determine both accountability and effectiveness through fiscal and programmatic monitoring of service providers

Purpose of the Wellness Program

The purpose of the Wellness Program is to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy in Ohio. Youths age 10-19 are the primary target population to which FCF Councils must direct their services. The secondary target population includes parents/caregivers and youths under age 10.

Program Administration

Eligibility-These funds are being targeted to accomplish TANF goal #3, therefore; Wellness services can be available to families with children as well as to childless individuals and can be available without regard to economic need. Please consult OWF/PRC Guidance Letter #13 and ORC 5108.07 for further details concerning eligibility.

Application Process-The application process to determine eligibility for the Wellness Program must be established in the CDJFS' PRC Plan. OWF/PRC Guidance Letter #13 and ORC 5108.07 should be consulted for details concerning applications, especially options concerning classes of students.

Funding-Ohio's appropriation for the Wellness Program is subject to the availability of funds. Each county's allocation is based on its percentage of Ohio's child population according to the 1990 U.S. Census.

Wellness

Page 2

Administrative Costs-The FCF Council may not use more than 10% of their Wellness Program expenditures for administrative costs related to the program.

Allowable Expenditures-Allowable expenditures under the Wellness Program are those services that directly lead (or can be reasonably expected to lead) to the prevention and reduction in the incidence of teenage pregnancy and are excluded from the definition of “assistance” under 45 CFR 260.31(b). Allowable expenditures may include:

- * curriculum-based programs
- * individual or group educational sessions on pregnancy avoidance, the responsibility of child-rearing, or the economic consequences of parenthood
- * home visits that focus on the prevention of subsequent pregnancies
- * pre-pregnancy family planning services
- * activities that seek to promote communication between parents and their children about responsible sexuality and parenthood
- * after-school programs, youth conferences, workshops, service-learning, mentoring and other programs that promote the development of youth assets that can be reasonably expected to lead to prevention and reduction of teen pregnancy
- * public awareness activities and materials such as billboards, public service announcements, brochures, and informational or educational presentations to large groups
- * other activities/services where documented evidence/research can be connected to teen pregnancy prevention and reduction

Counties are strongly encouraged to utilize evidence-based research in selecting programs for their communities. Douglas Kirby, Ph.D. has designed and tested effective teenage pregnancy prevention and reduction programs. More information concerning Dr. Kirby's work can be found at: http://www.teenpregnancy.org/resources/data/report_summaries/emerging_answers/default.asp

*Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 from Dr. Kirby's work are attached to this guidance letter to assist in planning for local Wellness Programs (Kirby, D. (2001). *Emerging Answers: Research Findings on Programs to Reduce Teen Pregnancy (Summary)*. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy).*

Local Family and Children First Councils should give consideration to LEAP clients as a target population for Wellness programming.

Wellness
Page 3

Unallowable Expenditures-Unallowable expenditures include:

- * meet local match requirements for other state or federal programs
- * construct, purchase or renovate buildings, facilities, or property
- * provide medical services other than pre-pregnancy family planning
- * child care expenses

Reporting

No annual report for SFY03 will need to be submitted to ODJFS. However, local FCF Councils are responsible for ensuring that a system is in place to determine both accountability and effectiveness through fiscal and programmatic monitoring of service providers. Therefore, local FCF Councils may require service providers to submit an annual report to the Council as part of the ongoing oversight of the Wellness Program. ODJFS will be focused on county outcomes related to the numerical goal detailed in the ODJFS TANF State Plan (see attached Teen Births charts for both Past Performance and Trends) while local Councils may choose to focus on more program-specific outcomes as identified in the local planning process.

Fiscal Reporting- An allocation is issued to the CDJFS' for the state fiscal year. CDJFS' request cash from ODJFS through a weekly draw process up to the allocation amount. The CDJFS and FCF Council are responsible for negotiating how the funding will flow at the local level. All ODJFS fiscal reporting requirements must be met. Counties are encouraged to roll all provider costs into a unit cost for the provision of direct services. TANF funds require payment to vendors to be on a reimbursement basis. Wellness Program funds may only be expended for services provided during the state fiscal year for which the funds are allocated. Unexpended funds cannot be rolled over into the next fiscal year. Contact the Regional ODJFS Fiscal Supervisor or the ODJFS Bureau of County Finance and Technical Assistance with any questions regarding reporting or unit cost development at (614) 752-9194.

Program Reporting-All ODJFS program reporting requirements must be met via the ODJFS TANF Web Reporting Tool under TANF Type "Wellness" and the Category of "Out-of-Wedlock Pregnancy Prevention" with the appropriate Subcategory based on services provided. The TANF Web Reporting Tool will provide reports indicating both numbers served and dollars spent statewide and for each county.

EXHIBIT 1

10 Characteristics of Effective Sex and HIV Education Programs

The curricula of the most effective sex and HIV education programs share ten common characteristics. These programs:

1. Focus on reducing one or more sexual behaviors that lead to unintended pregnancy or HIV/STD infection.
2. Are based on theoretical approaches that have been demonstrated to influence other health-related behavior and identify specific important sexual antecedents to be targeted.
3. Deliver and consistently reinforce a clear message about abstaining from sexual activity and/or using condoms or other forms of contraception. This appears to be one of the most important characteristics that distinguishes effective from ineffective programs.
4. Provide basic, accurate information about the risks of teen sexual activity and about ways to avoid intercourse or use methods of protection against pregnancy and STDs.
5. Include activities that address social pressures that influence sexual behavior.
6. Provide examples of and practice with communication, negotiation, and refusal skills.
7. Employ teaching methods designed to involve participants and have them personalize the information.
8. Incorporate behavioral goals, teaching methods, and materials that are appropriate to the age, sexual experience, and culture of the students.
9. Last a sufficient length of time (i.e., more than a few hours).
10. Select teachers or peer leaders who believe in the program and then provide them with adequate training.

Generally speaking, short-term curricula — whether abstinence-only or sexuality education programs — do not have measurable impact on the behavior of teens.

EXHIBIT 2

Programs with Strong Evidence of Success

I. Programs that Focus Primarily on Sexual Antecedents

Sex education programs covering both pregnancy and STDs/HIV¹

- ▣ *Reducing the Risk*
- ▣ *Safer Choices*

HIV education programs¹

- ▣ *Becoming a Responsible Teen: An HIV Risk Reduction Intervention for African-American Adolescents*
- ▣ *Making a Difference: An Abstinence Approach to STD, Teen Pregnancy, and HIV/AIDS Prevention*
- ▣ *Making a Difference: A Safer Sex Approach to STD, Teen Pregnancy, and HIV/AIDS Prevention*

II. Programs that Focus Primarily on Non-Sexual Antecedents

Service learning²

- ▣ *Teen Outreach Program (TOP)*
- ▣ *Reach for Health Community Youth Service Learning*

III. Programs that Focus Upon Both Sexual and Non-Sexual Antecedents

Multi-component programs with intensive sexuality and youth development component

- ▣ *Children's Aid Society-Carrera Program*³

- 1 While the sex and HIV education programs identified in this table demonstrated a positive impact upon sexual behavior and condom and contraceptive use, some other sex and HIV education programs did not have a positive effects. Studies indicated that the sex and HIV education programs in this table reduced sexual risk-taking, but they did not provide evidence they reduced teen pregnancy.
- 2 All the service learning programs that have been evaluated, including the *Learn and Serve* programs, have found results suggesting a positive impact upon either sexual behavior or pregnancy. The *Learn and Serve* study is not included on this list because it did not meet the criteria for being on this list, but it did confirm the efficacy of service learning. According to the analysis of TOP, the particular curriculum used in the small group component did not appear to be critical to the success of service learning.
- 3 This program has provided the strongest evidence for a three-year impact upon pregnancy.

TEEN BIRTHS: PAST PERFORMANCE

County	Goal 2000 (set in 1995)		Actual 2000		Percent of Goal Actual	
	Births 2000	Rate of Births 2000	Births 2000	Rate of Births 2000	Births	Rate of Births
Ohio	19,939	26.1	18,761	23.3	106.28%	112.02%
Adams	74	35.4	71	29.4	104.23%	120.41%
Allen	268	33.0	243	30.6	110.29%	107.84%
Ashland	71	19.2	74	18.1	95.95%	106.08%
Ashtabula	200	26.2	188	23.8	106.38%	110.08%
Athens	102	17.7	107	17.5	95.33%	101.14%
Auglaize	69	21.3	59	17.0	116.95%	125.29%
Belmont	79	16.5	77	16.4	102.60%	100.61%
Brown	91	34.0	85	25.6	107.06%	132.81%
Butler	544	24.6	528	20.8	103.03%	118.27%
Carroll	40	20.2	40	18.0	100.00%	112.22%
Champaign	73	27.7	71	24.9	102.82%	111.25%
Clark	316	29.2	334	31.7	94.61%	92.11%
Clermont	299	26.0	278	19.8	107.55%	131.31%
Clinton	77	28.8	85	26.8	90.59%	107.46%
Columbiana	177	22.4	145	17.7	122.07%	126.55%
Coshocton	60	23.9	69	26.9	86.96%	88.85%
Crawford	104	30.2	94	28.1	110.64%	107.47%
Cuyahoga	2471	28.0	2329	26.5	106.10%	105.66%
Darke	104	25.5	65	15.8	160.00%	161.39%
Defiance	80	25.6	75	23.9	106.67%	107.11%
Delaware	82	16.1	82	10.6	100.00%	151.89%
Erie	152	27.9	132	24.2	115.15%	115.29%
Fairfield	192	25.5	175	18.7	109.71%	136.36%
Fayette	60	28.9	58	26.7	103.45%	108.24%
Franklin	1956	30.8	1943	27.7	100.67%	111.19%
Fulton	68	23.0	53	15.9	128.30%	144.65%
Gallia	65	28.0	69	28.0	94.20%	100.00%
Geauga	45	7.5	38	6.0	118.42%	125.00%

County	Goal 2000 (set in 1995)		Actual 2000		Percent of Goal Actual	
	Births 2000	Rate of Births 2000	Births 2000	Rate of Births 2000	Births	Rate of Births
Greene	191	17.1	198	16.5	96.46%	103.64%
Guernsey	98	33.7	72	23.2	136.11%	145.26%
Hamilton	1711	29.6	1650	28.7	103.70%	103.14%
Hancock	119	24.9	106	20.7	112.26%	120.29%
Hardin	62	24.2	64	24.3	96.88%	99.59%
Harrison	25	20.1	17	13.9	147.06%	144.60%
Henry	41	18.7	33	14.8	124.24%	126.35%
Highland	111	41.4	85	26.8	130.59%	154.48%
Hocking	69	38.0	57	26.8	121.05%	141.79%
Holmes	49	16.7	50	14.1	98.00%	118.44%
Huron	122	27.4	113	23.2	107.96%	118.10%
Jackson	80	34.2	79	30.9	101.27%	110.68%
Jefferson	117	20.3	98	18.7	119.39%	108.56%
Knox	78	21.4	84	20.0	92.86%	107.00%
Lake	197	13.6	178	11.8	110.67%	115.25%
Lawrence	126	26.3	129	25.9	97.67%	101.54%
Licking	256	27.6	243	24.4	105.35%	113.11%
Logan	95	30.0	80	22.3	118.75%	134.53%
Lorain	599	28.6	507	23.2	118.15%	123.28%
Lucas	990	29.9	882	26.7	112.24%	111.99%
Madison	58	23.1	69	24.6	84.06%	93.90%
Mahoning	514	28.4	417	23.8	123.26%	119.33%
Marion	163	36.0	134	29.5	121.64%	122.03%
Medina	129	13.7	108	9.5	119.44%	144.21%
Meigs	33	19.0	53	28.4	62.26%	66.90%
Mercer	43	14.2	52	16.4	82.69%	86.59%
Miami	153	22.3	180	24.8	85.00%	89.92%
Monroe	21	18.1	18	15.7	116.67%	115.29%
Montgomery	1007	26.8	1072	28.7	93.94%	93.38%
Morgan	29	25.8	28	23.9	103.57%	107.95%
Morrow	60	26.5	56	21.1	107.14%	125.59%

County	Goal 2000 (set in 1995)		Actual 2000		Percent of Goal Actual	
	Births 2000	Rate of Births 2000	Births 2000	Rate of Births 2000	Births	Rate of Births
Muskingum	218	36.3	187	29.6	116.58%	122.64%
Noble	24	27.2	22	22.4	109.09%	121.43%
Ottawa	55	20.0	45	16.2	122.22%	123.46%
Paulding	40	24.2	37	22.5	108.11%	107.56%
Perry	90	36.7	86	31.3	104.65%	117.25%
Pickaway	98	30.5	90	25.6	108.89%	119.14%
Pike	78	41.2	74	32.6	105.41%	126.38%
Portage	176	14.8	155	12.8	113.55%	115.63%
Preble	63	20.5	51	15.4	123.53%	133.12%
Putnam	41	14.9	41	14.2	100.00%	104.93%
Richland	287	32.1	249	27.6	109.96%	109.93%
Ross	180	37.0	147	27.5	120.00%	119.74%
Sandusky	125	27.1	121	26.1	103.31%	103.83%
Scioto	204	33.3	216	34.2	94.44%	97.37%
Seneca	112	23.1	98	20.1	114.29%	114.93%
Shelby	84	24.3	104	28.1	80.77%	86.48%
Stark	636	25.2	563	21.7	112.97%	116.13%
Summit	838	24.8	748	20.8	112.03%	119.23%
Trumbull	379	24.1	361	23.5	104.99%	102.55%
Tuscarawas	160	26.8	138	21.7	115.94%	123.50%
Union	62	27.2	59	19.5	105.08%	139.49%
Van Wert	57	26.00	41	19.0	139.02%	136.84%
Vinton	36	39.5	26	24.8	138.46%	159.27%
Warren	153	19.7	155	14.7	98.71%	134.01%
Washington	98	21.2	90	19.2	108.89%	110.42%
Wayne	127	16.2	125	14.5	101.60%	111.72%
Williams	67	25.0	78	28.0	85.90%	89.29%
Wood	149	14.8	144	13.8	103.47%	107.25%
Wyandot	42	25.2	31	18.0	135.48%	140.00%

TEEN BIRTHS: TRENDS

County	Actual 1995		Actual 2000				Goal 2005		
	Births 1995	Rate of Births 1995	Births 2000	Percent Change from 1995	Rate of Births 2000	Percent Change from 1995	Projected Decline 10%	Births 2005	Rate of Births 2005
Ohio	20,988	27.5	18,761	-10.61%	23.3	-15.27%		16,885	21.0
Adams	78	37.3	71	-8.97%	29.4	-21.18%		64	26.5
Allen	282	34.8	243	-13.83%	30.6	-12.07%		219	27.5
Ashland	75	20.2	74	-1.33%	18.1	-10.40%		67	16.3
Ashtabula	210	28.0	188	-10.48%	23.8	-15.00%		169	21.4
Athens	107	18.6	107	0.00%	17.5	-5.91%		96	15.8
Auglaize	73	22.4	59	-19.18%	17.0	-24.11%		53	15.3
Belmont	83	17.4	77	-7.23%	16.4	-5.75%		69	14.8
Brown	96	35.8	85	-11.46%	25.6	-28.49%		77	23.0
Butler	573	25.9	528	-7.85%	20.8	-19.69%		475	18.7
Carroll	42	21.3	40	-4.76%	18.0	-15.49%		36	16.2
Champaign	77	29.2	71	-7.79%	24.9	-14.73%		64	22.4
Clark	333	30.8	334	0.30%	31.7	2.92%		301	28.5
Clermont	315	27.4	278	-11.75%	19.8	-27.74%		250	17.8
Clinton	81	30.3	85	4.94%	26.8	-11.55%		77	24.1
Columbiana	186	23.5	145	-22.04%	17.7	-24.68%		131	15.9
Coshocton	63	25.2	69	9.52%	26.9	6.75%		62	24.2
Crawford	109	31.8	94	-13.76%	28.1	-11.64%		85	25.3
Cuyahoga	2,601	29.4	2,329	-10.46%	26.5	-9.86%		2,096	23.9
Darke	109	26.8	65	-40.37%	15.8	-41.04%		59	14.2
Defiance	84	26.9	75	-10.71%	23.9	-11.15%		68	21.5
Delaware	86	16.9	82	-4.65%	10.6	-37.28%		74	9.5
Erie	160	29.3	132	-17.50%	24.2	-17.41%		119	21.8
Fairfield	202	26.8	175	-13.37%	18.7	-30.22%		158	16.8
Fayette	63	30.4	58	-7.94%	26.7	-12.17%		52	24.0
Franklin	2,059	32.5	1,943	-5.63%	27.7	-14.77%		1,749	24.9
Fulton	72	24.2	53	-26.39%	15.9	-34.30%		48	14.3
Gallia	68	29.4	69	1.47%	28.0	-4.76%		62	25.2
Geauga	47	7.9	38	-19.15%	6.0	-24.05%		34	5.4
Greene	201	18.0	198	-1.49%	16.5	-8.33%		178	14.9
Geurnsey	103	35.5	72	-30.10%	23.2	-34.65%		65	20.9
Hamilton	1,801	31.1	1,650	-8.38%	28.7	-7.72%		1,485	25.8
Hancock	125	26.2	106	-15.20%	20.7	-20.99%		95	18.6
Hardin	65	25.4	64	-1.54%	24.3	-4.33%		58	21.9
Harrison	26	21.1	17	-34.62%	13.9	-34.12%		15	12.5
Henry	43	19.7	33	-23.26%	14.8	-24.87%		30	13.3
Highland	117	43.6	85	-27.35%	26.8	-38.53%		77	24.1

County	Actual 1995		Actual 2000				Goal 2005		
	Births 1995	Rate of Births 1995	Births 2000	Percent Change from 1995	Rate of Births 2000	Percent Change from 1995	Projected Decline 10%	Births 2005	Rate of Births 2005
Hocking	73	40.0	57	-21.92%	26.8	-33.00%		51	24.1
Holmes	52	17.6	50	-3.85%	14.1	-19.89%		45	12.7
Huron	128	28.9	113	-11.72%	23.2	-19.72%		102	20.9
Jackson	84	36.0	79	-5.95%	30.9	-14.17%		71	27.8
Jefferson	123	21.4	98	-20.33%	18.7	-12.62%		88	16.8
Knox	82	22.5	84	2.44%	20.0	-11.11%		76	18.0
Lake	207	14.4	178	-14.01%	11.8	-18.06%		160	10.6
Lawrence	133	27.7	129	-3.01%	25.9	-6.50%		116	23.3
Licking	269	29.0	243	-9.67%	24.4	-15.86%		219	22.0
Logan	100	31.5	80	-20.00%	22.3	-29.21%		72	20.1
Lorain	631	30.1	507	-19.65%	23.2	-22.92%		456	20.9
Lucas	1,042	31.4	882	-15.36%	26.7	-14.97%		794	24.0
Madison	61	24.3	69	13.11%	24.6	1.23%		62	22.1
Mahoning	541	29.9	417	-22.92%	23.8	-20.40%		375	21.4
Marion	172	37.9	134	-22.09%	29.5	-22.16%		121	26.6
Medina	136	14.4	108	-20.59%	9.5	-34.03%		97	8.6
Meigs	35	20.0	53	51.43%	28.4	42.00%		48	25.6
Mercer	45	14.9	52	15.56%	16.4	10.07%		47	14.8
Miami	161	23.5	180	11.80%	24.8	5.53%		162	22.3
Monroe	22	19.1	18	-18.18%	15.7	-17.80%		16	14.1
Montgomery	1,060	28.2	1,072	1.13%	28.7	1.77%		965	25.8
Morgan	30	27.1	28	-6.67%	23.9	-11.81%		25	21.5
Morrow	63	27.9	56	-11.11%	21.1	-24.37%		50	19.0
Muskingum	229	38.2	187	-18.34%	29.6	-22.51%		168	26.6
Noble	25	28.6	22	-12.00%	22.4	-21.68%		20	20.2
Ottawa	58	21.0	45	-22.41%	16.2	-22.86%		41	14.6
Paulding	42	25.5	37	-11.90%	22.5	-11.76%		33	20.3
Perry	95	38.6	86	-9.47%	31.3	-18.91%		77	28.2
Pickaway	103	32.1	90	-12.62%	25.6	-20.25%		81	23.0
Pike	82	43.3	74	-9.76%	32.6	-24.71%		67	29.3
Portage	185	15.5	155	-16.22%	12.8	-17.42%		140	11.5
Preble	66	21.6	51	-22.73%	15.4	-28.70%		46	13.9
Putnam	43	15.7	41	-4.65%	14.2	-9.55%		37	12.8
Richland	302	33.8	249	-17.55%	27.6	-18.34%		224	24.8
Ross	189	39.0	147	-22.22%	27.5	-29.49%		132	24.8
Sandusky	132	28.5	121	-8.33%	26.1	-8.42%		109	23.5
Scioto	215	35.1	216	0.47%	34.2	-2.56%		194	30.8
Seneca	118	24.3	98	-16.95%	20.1	-17.28%		88	18.1

County	Actual 1995		Actual 2000				Goal 2005		
	Births 1995	Rate of Births 1995	Births 2000	Percent Change from 1995	Rate of Births 2000	Percent Change from 1995	Projected Decline 10%	Births 2005	Rate of Births 2005
Shelby	88	25.6	104	18.18%	28.1	9.77%		94	25.3
Stark	669	26.5	563	-15.84%	21.7	-18.11%		507	19.5
Summit	882	26.1	748	-15.19%	20.8	-20.31%		673	18.7
Trumbull	399	25.4	361	-9.52%	23.5	-7.48%		325	21.2
Tuscarawas	168	28.3	138	-17.86%	21.7	-23.32%		124	19.5
Union	65	28.7	59	-9.23%	19.5	-32.06%		53	17.6
Van Wert	60	27.4	41	-31.67%	19.0	-30.66%		37	17.1
Vinton	38	41.6	26	-31.58%	24.8	-40.38%		23	22.3
Warren	161	20.7	155	-3.73%	14.7	-28.99%		140	13.2
Washington	103	22.3	90	-12.62%	19.2	-13.90%		81	17.3
Wayne	134	17.1	125	-6.72%	14.5	-15.20%		113	13.1
Williams	71	26.4	78	9.86%	28.0	6.06%		70	25.2
Wood	157	15.6	144	-8.28%	13.8	-11.54%		130	12.4
Wyandot	44	26.6	31	-29.55%	18.0	-32.33%		28	16.2