



Add It Up

Teen Parents and Welfare...
Undercounted,
Oversanctioned,
Underserved

Janellen Duffy and Jodie Levin-Epstein

CLASP
CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY



Add It Up

Teen Parents and Welfare...
Undercounted,
Oversanctioned,
Underserved

CLASP

CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY

Acknowledgments

The design of this study was undertaken in conjunction with Paul Offner of Georgetown University Institute for Health Care Research and Policy. Rutledge Hutson of the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) was instrumental in creating the project and crafting the survey instrument, as well as the design of each step of the process. Others at CLASP, particularly Christine Grisham, Susanna Montezemolo, and Naomi Seiler, offered important analytic insights; John Hutchins and Myra Batchelder provided helpful editing suggestions; Soleste Lupu formatted the report. Staff in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services helped provide clarification regarding federal data systems. We also thank teen parent service providers and researchers, particularly Jody Raphael, Charlene Clemens, and Liz Link.

Most importantly, this study could not have been developed without the time and attention of agency staff in the responding states. In 33 states, individuals took the time to offer their opinions and, in 11 of those states, provided available data. This only hints at the role state officials played in making this report possible. A number of state officials in Florida and Kentucky “field tested” the survey before it was sent out to other states. Another group of states responded to requests for follow-up details—and did so graciously and expeditiously. We are indebted to these state officials.

CLASP thanks the funders of its teen pregnancy work for enabling this survey and analysis to be undertaken and these findings to be distributed: Ford Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the George Gund Foundation, the Moriah Fund, the Open Society Institute, and the Public Welfare Foundation.

© Copyright April 2002 by the Center for Law and Social Policy.
All Rights Reserved.

Center for Law and Social Policy
1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 906-8000 voice
(202) 842-2885 fax
www.clasp.org

Designed by *amp& sand graphic design, inc.*
Washington, DC

Contents

- 1 Executive Summary**
- 4 TANF Minor Parents: The Rules and Research**
- 6 Teen Parent Participation in TANF**
- 10 The School/Training Requirement**
- 18 The Living Arrangement Requirement**
- 21 Conclusion**
- 22 Endnotes**
- 25 Appendix A: Study Design**
- 27 Appendix B: Evaluations of Teen Parent Education Intervention Programs**
- 31 Appendix C: 1996 TANF Teen Parent Rules**
- 33 Appendix D: Comparison of Emergency and Final Data Reporting Requirements**
- 35 Appendix E: Time-Limit Clocks for TANF Teen Parents**
- 36 Appendix F: State Exemptions from School/Training Requirements for TANF Teen Parents**

Executive Summary

Teen parents were of particular interest in the 1996 welfare debate. Research showed that almost one-half of all welfare recipients were single women who had first been teen mothers. While not all teen mothers immediately became welfare recipients, about one-half did so within five years of becoming parents; most received aid for two years, with many remaining on the welfare caseloads longer.¹ Such findings led to stricter welfare eligibility requirements for teen parents as part of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, the new welfare program created in 1996. Under TANF, minor parents are required to adhere to rules related to schooling and living arrangements in order to receive federal assistance.² Specifically, unless a minor mother is participating in school/training and living in an approved arrangement, she is ineligible for TANF.

Add It Up examines how states and teen parents have fared during implementation of the 1996 requirements. Few national data have been available to answer basic facts, such as how many teen parents have been subject to the rules and how they have been treated under the rules. Consequently, in July 2000, the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) undertook a survey to collect state data on teen parents who received TANF assistance.³ In addition to quantitative data, the survey sought insight and opinions from administrators of TANF teen parent programs about implementation.

The CLASP survey found that while most responding states support the goals of the teen parent TANF rules, teen parents in TANF appear undercounted, untracked, oversanctioned, and underserved:

- **Undercounted:** The number of teen parents in TANF may be significantly higher than the 108,000 officially reported by the federal government. This discrepancy appears to be caused by problems with state data reporting and with fed-

eral estimation methods. While newly adopted rules may help improve the count, problems will likely prevail. An accurate count of participants is important to adequately observe trends and to effectively design program interventions.

- **Untracked:** Responding states often were unable to produce answers to basic questions related to the status of participating teen parents — such as how the living arrangement requirement has been met and the types of placements that resulted from the school and training requirements. Some states may have collected the data but did not have the resources to cull it for this study; other states may not yet have the basic data available at the state level. Tracking the status of teen parents in TANF is important if the goal is to ensure that these very young families are provided needed services to get a healthy start.
- **Oversanctioned:** It appears that teen parents may be disproportionately sanctioned compared to the TANF population overall, according to the handful of states that were able to provide such data. For example, in Illinois, 10.5 percent of TANF teen parents received a sanction in a month, compared to 5.3 percent of TANF families generally, according to a rough comparison (1999 CLASP survey data on teens compared to 1998 GAO data on families).⁴ Sanctions are important not only because of the loss of immediate income but also because the instability it creates appears to be particularly difficult for families;⁵ very young families may be particularly vulnerable to the ill effects of instability.
- **Underserved:** Nearly all responding states identified at least one unmet service need of teen parents who are mandated to meet the school and living arrangement requirements, and 16 states identified more than one. These unmet needs include alternative placements, for both education and appropriate living arrangements for teen parents, as well as better or more case management, substance abuse treatment, mental health services, child care services, and, in particular, learning disability services.

Eleven states — which account for nearly 50 percent of the nation’s teen births — provided quantitative data for this study about teen parents participating in their TANF caseload. Unless otherwise noted, data are from March 1999. The eleven “data-reporting” states were Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Mississippi, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin; hereafter referred to as “data-reporting states.”⁶ In addition to the quantitative data, the 11 data-reporting states and 22 other states also answered a set of opinion questions and offered recommendations related to teen parent policies. While the federal rules are directed at minor parents (generally, those who are age 17 and below), states have the flexibility to expand the rules to older parents; as a result, CLASP collected survey data from states about both minor and older teen parents up to age 20. Included in this study are both quantitative and qualitative data. This study synthesizes the data that could be provided by the survey respondents and makes recommendations based on this data; it does not purport to evaluate the design or the impact of state TANF teen parent programs (see Appendix A: Study Design).

To facilitate an informed discussion of the welfare law and teen parents, *Add It Up*:

- briefly reviews the few state studies that look at the implementation and effects of teen parent school/training requirements and the research that touches on teen parent living arrangements;
- offers the findings of the CLASP survey regarding both teen parent participation and agency concerns and recommendations; and
- makes recommendations that should be considered during reauthorization and beyond.

The majority of the responding states typically indicated that the school/training participation requirement have had “some” or “important” positive results, and most supported the aims of the living arrangement rule, while also identifying important implementation challenges. Yet given the data limitations that most of the responding states are

experiencing, it is difficult to assess the extent to which this shared TANF vision translates into implementation.

The quantitative data that are available, as well as the qualitative data and anecdotes we have heard from the state respondents, indicate that there are varying degrees to which the states have devoted resources and program strategies to meet the school/training requirement. Some states have created comprehensive programs to address the needs of teen parents — for instance, California and Ohio, two states that already had specialized teen parent programs before the TANF rules came into effect. Evaluations that have been conducted of these programs suggest that there have been some limited, positive impacts resulting from large-scale and comparatively intensive programs (see Appendix B: Evaluations of Teen Parent Education Intervention Programs). The qualitative data presented in this study suggest that at least six states are attempting to move in the direction of these programs by offering more specialized case management services to teen parents. Fourteen additional states indicated that the school/training requirement has given their TANF agencies a valuable opportunity to promote educational achievement. While these 14 states welcome the requirement as a tool for reinforcing the value of education, these states do not seem to have allocated the resources, in most cases, for the full range of specialized services or administrative organizational tools that have been used in implementing the Ohio and California school requirements.

Five years after enactment of TANF, almost one-half of the state respondents report that they are grappling with implementation issues surrounding the school/training requirement, such as the need for better computer interface between the schools and TANF agencies, better assessments for teen parents, and, most commonly mentioned, alternative education placements for teen parents. It appears that there are even larger obstacles for the states in meeting the living arrangement requirement.

In terms of the living arrangement requirement, the states could provide very little data about teen place-

ments; at least 13 states raised concerns about a lack of alternative housing options for teen parents or difficulties in assessing the safety of teen parents' current living arrangement.

In the 2002 welfare reauthorization debate, some may make the mistake of viewing teen parents with disinterest. Because the teen birth rate has fallen by 22 percent since 1991 to a record low,⁷ and because the stricter requirements are now in place nationally, some policymakers may be under the impression that “teen parents are taken care of.” Others have gone so far as to argue that a focus on teen pregnancy is a “red herring”⁸ that deflects attention from more central concerns for reauthorization, such as marriage promotion.

Rather than ignoring teen parents, attention to their needs should remain a priority. A focus on teen parents makes sense in addressing non-marital births: nearly 80 percent of teen births are non-marital, and 20 percent of teen births are a second birth (or more).⁹ Nearly 60 percent of non-marital births are to teen mothers or to women 20 or older who started parenting as teen mothers.¹⁰ Further, while TANF recipients who are currently teen parents

comprise a small percent of the caseload, women who started parenting as teenagers historically make up a significant percent of the caseload — from 40 to 50 percent.¹¹ In addition, there are no new data suggesting that teen parents today have any less need for welfare than they have in the past.

The teen birth rate in the United States, while at a record low, is the highest among developed countries.¹² While the hope is that the TANF teen parent requirements will improve long-term outcomes for both teen parents and children, there is little evidence to date that we have identified the policy and program answers regarding how to best improve well-being for these vulnerable young families.

For the 2002 reauthorization debate, this study suggests that while progress has been made concerning the implementation of the 1996 TANF teen parent regulations, there is still work to be done to identify how many teen parent families are affected by these provisions, how many teens are benefiting from successful and innovative teen parent programs, and how many teen parents still face substantial barriers to meeting the 1996 requirements.

TANF Minor Parents: The Rules and Research

The 1996 TANF law includes two explicit requirements for unmarried, minor parents to receive federal assistance. TANF requires that these teen parents who have not graduated from high school must participate in educational/training activities. In addition, with few exceptions, minor parents must reside with their parents or adult relatives or in another adult-supervised living arrangement (see Appendix C: 1996 TANF Teen Parent Rules).

While Congress mandated these federal eligibility criteria, states maintain quite a bit of discretion over how the rules are defined and enforced. For example, nothing precludes a state from using state funds for those minor parents who do not meet the federal eligibility rules; alternatively, a state can extend a rule to other TANF youth, and many have done so.¹³ States decide issues ranging from the definition of school “participation” to whether bonuses should be offered to whether a “second chance” home or some other living arrangement exemption should be provided when a minor parent is without a safe place to live.

Much of the Congressional impetus for the mandates may have been intuitive — it makes sense for minor parents to complete school and to live with adult supervision. However, the imposition of the mandates may keep particularly vulnerable teen parents and their children away from needed assistance with schooling and living arrangements.

Congress passed the two TANF rules regarding minor parents with limited information about their efficacy. Few programs that sought to address teen parent education and employability had been evaluated before 1996. Among the programs studied were the Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD) and the

New Chance Demonstration, which were operated at various sites around the country. Both showed some initial improvements in school/training participation, but neither had lasting impacts on earnings, employment, or welfare receipt (see Appendix B: Evaluations).

Evaluations of the impact of school participation requirements in more recent demonstration programs provide insights into the challenge of school completion by teen parents. Evaluation results from school/training programs that were begun before TANF in Wisconsin, Ohio, and California vary significantly, as do their approaches. The Learnfare program in Wisconsin failed to demonstrate that its rule resulted in improved school attendance. Ohio’s Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program generally improved enrollment and attendance, and increased the likelihood that in-school participants would earn a GED or high school diploma. LEAP, however, did not show these effects on those who had dropped out of school, and, at the four-year follow-up, no significant employment or earnings impacts were evident for the overall group of participants. Under California’s program, Cal-Learn, in contrast to the Ohio program, the positive impact of the program was greatest among those teen parents who had dropped out of school (and had not been held back a grade). Even though participants graduated at a significantly higher rate than non-participants in California, about half of the participants failed to graduate. None of these evaluations have found impacts on subsequent childbearing.

Even less impact evaluation research is available regarding the living arrangement rule. Prior to the 1996 law, for example, one study assessed voluntary co-residence with parents as a positive influence on teen parents if that co-residence was for a short time (two years or less). Teen parents who lived with their parents were found to have been more likely to stay in school while pregnant and following child-birth. However, teen parents who co-resided with their parents for more than two of the first five years after the birth of their child were shown to be less likely to achieve economic security.¹⁴ A statistical

review from Cornell University came up with a surprising finding: an association between minor parent living arrangement policies and an increase in non-marital childbearing. Specifically, the research found

that states with pre-TANF living arrangement rules showed an increase in subsequent non-marital births by both black and white teen mothers.¹⁵

Teen Parent Participation in TANF

Whether a teen parent is a participant in TANF depends on her ability to get into and stay in the program. Whether we know the number of teen parents actually participating in TANF depends on accurate data reporting. This study sought information on these basic questions and reports on participation data, application denials and diversion, closed cases, and TANF time limits.

Participation Numbers

How many teen parents participate in TANF? This question is not as easy to answer as it may seem. At the state level, the difficulty is caused, in part, by the fact that younger teen parents who live “embedded” within a household that receives TANF are not as easy to count as older teen parents who have established their own households. Most of the state respondents in the study reported difficulty with identifying embedded teen parents.¹⁶ At the federal level, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) takes the state data and uses statistical methods to provide an annual estimate of teen parent participation in TANF. The quality of the federal data is, therefore, dependent on two things: the quality of the state data received by the federal government and the estimation methodology DHHS uses. It appears that the methodology that DHHS employs to estimate participation results in a significant underestimation of teen parent participation.

The CLASP survey revealed notable differences between counts provided by states on their survey responses and the numbers estimated and issued by DHHS in its *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*. Ten states provided numbers of TANF teen parent participants in their state. A comparison of the reported state numbers with the federal estimates shows striking discrepancies. For five states

(Arizona, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas), the federal estimate totals 30 percent less than the states’ own numbers (13,000 compared to 18,500). This raises the real possibility that the federal number of teen parents in TANF — 108,000 — significantly “low-balls” actual participation (see Table 1 on the next page).

The DHHS number is questionable because:

- *Some state numbers in the CLASP survey are higher than the DHHS numbers.* In half the states (5 of 10) able to report a teen parent participation number, the state count is higher than the number reported by the federal government (Arizona, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas).
- *State numbers in the CLASP survey are monthly and should be lower, not higher, than the DHHS annual number.* Over the course of the year, individuals leave and others enter the TANF system. Thus, one would expect that an annual participation number (DHHS) would be higher than data that captures only one month (CLASP survey); for example, the DHHS annual number is substantially higher than the monthly data reported to CLASP for Wisconsin. Thus, this makes the apparent discrepancy in numbers for the five states above even more dramatic.
- *Two states in the CLASP survey were also able to report yearly counts; both are higher than the DHHS yearly number.* Annual data produced by Florida and Arizona for this study do not resemble the annual DHHS estimates available from the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*. In response to the CLASP survey, Arizona reported 15,148 and Florida reported 15,729 TANF teen parents for FY 1999 (not shown in Table 1). The numbers in the federal *Third Annual Report to Congress*, which covers the same time period, were considerably lower: 158 for Arizona and 5,777 for Florida.¹⁷

There are a number of reasons why federal estimates may inadequately count teen parents, including:

- *Unknown status.* The federal government classifies a recipient with an “unknown” status when

Table 1

TANF Teen Parents: Comparison of Federal and State Caseload Data

State	<i>Third Annual Report to Congress Total Number of Teen Parents FY 1999*</i>	<i>CLASP Survey State-Reported Teen Parent Total for March 1999</i>
Alabama	184	N/A
Arizona**	158	1,748
California	25,764	14,367
Florida	5,77	5,208
Illinois**	5,278	6,786
Louisiana**	524	2,601
Mississippi**	744	763
New Jersey	2,577	1,015***
Ohio	6,348	5,326
Texas**	6,274	6,610
Wisconsin	860	487

Notes:

* This figure is a sum of the number of “adult” and “child” TANF recipients with teen parent status (Tables 10-16 and 10-27 in the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*).

** The monthly total for March 1999 (Illinois data from June 1999) exceeds annual figure from the *Third Annual Report*. For two of these states, Mississippi and Texas, the population of TANF recipients for which teen parent status is “unknown” may account for the discrepancy between monthly and annual data reporting.

***New Jersey’s state-reported total number of teen parents in March 1999 is estimated.

the recipient’s teen-parent status is not coded by the state. It is possible that a state knows that a recipient is a teen parent, but because that information does not get properly coded these teen parents lose their status in the federal reports. The number of recipients whose status is unknown — and who might be teen parents — is large; in FY 1999, nearly 290,000 TANF recipients (10,000 adults and 280,000 children) were classified with an “unknown” teen parent status. In the eleven states reporting data in the CLASP survey, the number with “unknown” status totals about 43,000.¹⁸ Indeed, if every federally classified “unknown” person were a teen parent in Mississippi and Texas, for example, it could explain why the states’ monthly numbers are higher than the DHHS annual numbers.

- *Data sampling.* The federal methodology used to calculate the number of teen parents from submitted state data may underestimate the actual count. Twenty-two states and territories provide statistical samples of their total caseload from which teen parent participation numbers are estimated. The 32 other states and territories provide data on each TANF recipient (“universe data”) from which DHHS draws a sample¹⁹ to determine participation numbers. While the sample sizes drawn by the states and DHHS are statistically sufficient for the TANF population as a whole, TANF teen parents are such a small percentage of a state’s overall TANF caseload that the sample methodology currently in use may not be large enough to generate an accurate estimate of teen parent participation.²⁰

New federal reporting requirements will address some of the problems in counting participants. Reporting requirements that went into effect October, 1999, will eventually provide more information about why teen parents have been sanctioned and why their cases have been closed (see Appendix D: Comparison of Emergency and Final Data-Reporting Requirements).²¹ The new data reporting requirements might also help identify “embedded” teen parents and diminish the “unknown” status problem, but this is less clear.

If the new requirements improve the participation data submitted by the states, the “good news” is tempered by two key concerns. First, given the difficulties many states had in providing numbers for this survey, it may take some years for data management systems in the states to make the necessary changes and provide accurate reports. Even if states immediately provide improved data, it will only cover one year (FY 2000), and, therefore, it will not be possible to show trends for the reauthorization debate. Without reliable counts that indicate the number of TANF teen parents nationally from FY 1997 to FY 2001, it is difficult to assess what has been happening to this group. Second, the larger question is whether and how the federal government will improve its estimation methods based on state-reported data. Unless this question is revisited, better quality data from the states may not result in improved federal estimations of teen parent participation in TANF.

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Teen Parent Participation Data

- DHHS should revisit its estimation methodology for teen parent participation in TANF.
- DHHS should explain the limitations of its estimations in its annual report to Congress.
- DHHS should focus technical assistance to states on these new reporting requirements.
- States should train local welfare office staff on the reasons for accurate coding methods and should sample case records to ensure case records reflect the presence of embedded teen parents.

Applications Denied

Sometimes teen parents are not provided applications or are otherwise dissuaded from submitting applications. Data are not kept at the federal level on such “diversion” from application. However, one study in Los Angeles County conducted by the National Center for Youth Law documented examples of inappropriate diversion of teen parents as early as July 1999.²²

In an attempt to assess diversion, the CLASP survey asked how many teen parents were denied applications for failure to meet the school/training requirement. In the four states that had data to answer this question (Arizona, Illinois, Ohio, and Texas), no teen parents were reported to have been denied applications in March of 1999 for this reason. Over the course of the full fiscal year, Illinois reported that three teen parents were denied applications for this reason. The limited number of states that could report data suggests that diversion by the local welfare office is not systematically tracked at the state level. In fact, a new study by the Center for Impact Research (CIR) finds diversion occurring among a selected sample of teen parents trying to access TANF in parts of Chicago. As a result of this study, the state agency has begun developing policies and training to address diversion.²³

To the extent that diversion is happening, it may be that the special teen parent rules are signaling to local welfare offices the message to “get tough” with this population. Even where state policy allows local flexibility, training may have not emphasized these local options and the basic “get tough” message may turn teen parents away at the welfare door.

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Avoid Inappropriate Diversion

- Congress should collect studies and anecdotal information to try to establish the prevalence of inappropriate diversion.
- Congress should establish a period of up to 180 days for minor parents who at application are not in school or in an approved living arrangement or meeting other program requirements as the state may determine. This compliance period is intended to provide for time and services in order to bring the teen parent into compliance with the requirements.
- States should train TANF staff welfare workers on policies designed to avoid inappropriate diversion.

Closed Cases

There are a number of reasons why a teen parent's case might be closed, including an increase in income that disqualifies the teen for continued assistance, the exhaustion of all months of assistance permitted under the TANF time limit, and failure to meet the school/training or living arrangement requirement. At this stage, we have only limited data from the states on the number of teen parent cases that are closed in a given month, let alone the reasons for case closure.

Two of the 11 data-reporting states were able to report on the number of teen parents whose cases were closed for failure to comply with the school/training requirement. Arizona closed 289 teen parent cases for this reason in March of 1999, which was 19 percent of those subject to the school/training requirement in that month. Illinois closed five cases for this reason in March 1999, which was 0.2 percent of those subject to the school/training requirement in October of 1999. Over fiscal year 1999, Illinois closed 24 teen parent cases (0.3 percent of the 1999 teen parent caseload) for failure to comply with the school/training requirement. The remaining states could not provide data for these categories.

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Closed Cases

- Congress should examine the reasons for case closings; the *Fourth Annual Report to Congress* may include some data on this topic. While any case closure data will only cover FY 2000 (and thereby does not allow for a review of trends), it could identify the predominant reasons why teen parent cases are closed. This could suggest the need to better understand policies and programs that may be contributing to the closures.²⁴

- States should analyze the data they submit on case closures and see if it suggests any operational improvements.

Time-Limit Clocks

How are TANF time limits affecting teen parents? The 1996 law prohibits TANF assistance to families in which an adult has received assistance for 60 months; states have the option to shorten this time limit. The term "adult" includes all 19-year-old teen parents and any 18-year-old teen parents who are not full-time students in a secondary school or equivalent training program. In addition, time clocks tick for minor parents who are heads-of-household or who are married to heads-of-household.²⁵

Most teen parents have ticking time clocks, according to reporting states; this trend, however, is largely driven by the fact that most teen parents are 18- or 19-years-old and are therefore typically considered "adults" (see Appendix E: Time-Limit Clocks for TANF Teen Parents).

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Time-Limit Clocks

- Congress should not start the federal time-limit clock on teen parent families (usually headed by 18- and 19-year-olds but sometimes by minors) when the parent is engaged in education/training. In order for these young mothers to be able to compete in the job market, they need to be able to participate in education without their schooling viewed as a "trade off" against the family's ability to receive assistance when needed in the future.

The School/ Training Requirement

While the 1996 law mandates the school/training requirement for minor parents, states can expand the requirement to older teen parents, and the term “participation” is left to the states to define. This study sought to pull together available data on how many teen parents were subject to state rules, as well as program administrators’ opinions on the implementation of state rules. The quantitative and qualitative data from state administrators help tell states’ “stories” about TANF teen parents, but they do not address the impact of state policies on teen parents.

State Data

Tracking

Only six of the 11 data-reporting states were able to provide the number of teen parents (of any age) required to meet their state’s school/training provision. In these six states, nearly 29,000 teen parents²⁶ were required to meet the school/training provision.²⁷ Most teen parents met the requirement by attending high school or middle school or participating in a GED program; others did so by participating in job training, individually designed activities, and other activities, according to the four states that could specify the number of teen parents in different types of placements.²⁸

Four states were able to disaggregate the number of minor parents subject to the rule; nearly 90 percent of these minor TANF teen parents were subject to the federal requirement, and the remaining were exempt for such reasons as lack of child care.²⁹

Exemptions

The federal law does not require that teen parents with infants younger than 12 weeks of age meet the school/training requirement. States have the flexibility to develop and implement additional exemptions or to be more stringent than federal law requires.

State exemption policies are varied. The most common exemption policy among the data-reporting states is based on the age of the teen parent’s child — usually children 12 weeks old or younger. Wisconsin and Ohio exempt teen parents until their children are about six weeks old,³⁰ and Louisiana exempts teen parents through their children’s first year.³¹ Some of these states have additional exemption policies (see Appendix F: State Exemptions from School/Training Requirements for TANF Teen Parents).

The number of teen parents that are exempt in each state also varies. Only a handful of the 11 states (AZ, CA, OH, TX, WI; see Appendix F) could report how many teen parents had been exempted from the school/training requirement. Wisconsin did not exempt any teen parents from the school/training requirement in March of 1999. California exempted only 0.33 percent of its teen parent caseload, while Ohio and Arizona exempted more moderate percentages, 9 percent and 14.4 percent respectively. (Texas exempted a much greater proportion of their teen parent caseload, 51.7 percent; however, in Texas, pursuit of a GED is counted as an exemption to the school/training requirement, while, in other states, participation in a GED is counted as meeting the school/training requirement.)³²

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Tracking and Exemptions

- DHHS should provide technical assistance and serve as a clearinghouse on state “best practices” related to tracking teen parents’ status — for instance, where they live and what type of educational programs they participate in.
- DHHS should provide technical assistance specifically geared to helping states share experiences

with different kinds of exemptions (e.g., how do states deal with domestic violence issues among teen parents?), so that a state can learn how other states inform clients about exemptions and assess the efficacy of the exemption, for example.

Sanctions

The CLASP survey found that nearly 2,500 teen parents in five responding states were sanctioned in *one month* for failure to comply with the school/training requirement.³³ Fluctuations in income, such as those resulting from sanctions, can create turbulence in families, which may lead to negative academic, emotional, and behavioral effects on children.³⁴

Among the five data-reporting states, there is variation in the percentage of teen parents sanctioned in a month. Of the total number of teen parents subject to each state's school/training requirement, California sanctioned 5.6 percent;³⁵ Arizona sanctioned 6.4 percent; Ohio, 9.9 percent; Illinois, 10.5 percent; and Texas, 22.7 percent.³⁶

Teen parent sanction rates are best understood when compared to each state's overall sanction rate. A rough comparison (using different years and different survey instruments, however) suggests the possibility that sanctions are disproportionately experienced by teen parents relative to the full TANF population. In each of the five states, the teen parent sanction rate appears higher than that of the state's overall population (see Table 2).³⁷

In this study, the two states that could delineate between first and subsequent sanctions reported that the majority of sanctions for teen parents were first sanctions: Arizona reported that 68 percent of their total sanctions for failure to meet the school/training requirement were first sanctions, and Texas reported 53 percent. However, this means that between one-third and one-half of sanctions of teen parents in these two states were second or higher sanctions. While these two states cannot depict a national trend, such significant percentages should flag a concern about the well-being of sanctioned teen parents and their children.

Table 2

Comparison of Sanction Rates for Teen Parents and All TANF Recipients

State	Monthly Sanction Rate for Teen Parents, March 1999		Partial Sanction Rate for All TANF Recipients, Avg. Month 1998	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Arizona	6.4	95	4.1	1,553
California	5.6	799	0.9	6,527
Illinois	10.5	338	5.3	8,553
Ohio	9.9	529	0.0	0
Texas	22.7	724	15.6	23,748

“I’m glad we are operating our LEAP program for the duration of the LEAP waiver because I feel that the TANF provisions relating to teen parents are more harsh and do not contain tools that assist the state in positively reinforcing compliant behavior.”

Social Program Developer,
Ohio Department of Job and Family Services

Bonuses

As of October of 1999, at least seven states (Arkansas, California, Delaware, North Dakota, Ohio, Utah, and Vermont) were providing some type of monetary bonus as an incentive for teen parents to attend school, progress to the next grade, and/or graduate.³⁸ Two of these states, Ohio and California, were among the data-reporting states in this study. Both California’s Cal-Learn and Ohio’s LEAP have comparatively well-established and well-evaluated teen parent programs that utilize pre-TANF case-management systems designed to enhance school completion by teen parents. In both states, bonuses, as well as sanctions, have been incorporated into the program design.

In each state, the bonus can be structured to reward different measures. California has designed its bonus system to reward academic progress; bonuses are awarded to teen parents for graduation (a one-time bonus of \$500) and for “satisfactory progress” at school (\$100 bonus per report card for a 2.0 in a 4.0 GPA scale). In March of 1999, Cal-Learn awarded bonuses to 8.8 percent of participating teen parents.³⁹

While Ohio also offers bonuses for graduation, their bonuses are centered on attendance and enrollment, in comparison to California’s academic progress model. In January, 2000, Ohio awarded bonuses to 20 percent of the LEAP teen parents: a one-time bonus for school enrollment (\$62), a monthly bonus for school attendance (\$62), a bonus for each grade completed (\$62), and a bonus for GED completion or graduation (\$200).⁴⁰

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Sanctions and Bonuses

- Congress should examine teen parent sanction rates, the reasons that teen parents are sanctioned, and the impact of sanctions on these families.
- Congress should establish sanction protection procedures that help teen parents understand, avoid, and/or end sanctions.
- States should examine data to see if teen parents are sanctioned at different rates in different parts of the state and explore why that might occur.
- DHHS could provide states with a synthesis of the evaluations that assess the impact of bonuses.

The View from State Administrators

All of the survey respondents were invited to provide their opinions about a range of issues related to the implementation of the school/training requirement. A set of questions sought attitudes about the law’s goals and the implementation challenges for their agencies, including coordination with other agencies.

School/Training Requirement Goal Generally Viewed Positively

Most state administrators (23 of 30) believed that the school/training provision had “some” or “important” positive results in their states. The school/training requirement was viewed in a positive light for its ability to promote the importance of education and high school completion, which many respondents considered essential components for a productive work-force, as well as for long-run self-sufficiency for teen parents. Specialized case management has been established or enhanced due to this requirement in at least six of the surveyed states. Even three of the five states that reported that the school/training requirement had “very lit

tle” positive effects also reported positive aspects about the requirement, such as the school/training requirement’s emphasis on the importance of basic education and its ability to enable TANF agencies to promote educational achievement.

Notwithstanding this positive view of the school/training requirement, the respondents did have several recommendations for how the rule could be improved — in particular, they called for additional services and alternative school placements for teen parents.

Implementation Challenges Viewed Differently

Most respondents (19 of 33) believed that their state did not face significant challenges when implementing the school/training requirement. At the same time, at least 12 state administrators believed that the requirement posed significant challenges in their states, including a lack of electronic interface between the TANF and the school system, lack of child care and transportation, and the lack of assessments for teen parents.

A majority of respondents (24 of 27) believed that the local and state administrative costs associated with implementing and regulating the requirement were well-spent. These respondents believed that expenses of the school/training requirement enabled their school districts to focus on the needs of teen parents and covered the appropriate tasks required, such as attendance tracking and reporting. As one state respondent noted, the administrative funds allocated for implementing the requirement prevent teen parents from “getting lost in the system.”

The challenges of implementation have varied from state to state. Some states have made large-scale systems changes, while others have implemented the rule without any additional teen parent services, such as specialized case management. In Ohio, the implementation of the LEAP program (pre-TANF), with its case management, bonuses, and sanctions, was a major policy and implementation initiative that

encountered some operational problems at the outset, such as difficulties integrating welfare and school data with case management information to provide bonuses and sanctions in a timely manner. Evaluators from the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) noted, “Case managers are a crucial component in the LEAP program. Without ongoing case management, a program such as LEAP would be very difficult to implement.”⁴¹ Further, MDRC stated that:

LEAP’s early difficulties occurred in the absence of a suitable system, and its subsequent experience with a sophisticated system (e.g., the newer [computer] system . . . can identify eligible teens who are not AFDC [heads of household]) underscores that successful implementation of a program like this one, especially on a large scale, is strongly related to the ability to develop and maintain a well-designed information system.⁴²

The MDRC evaluation of LEAP shows that, for large-scale teen parent education programs, the implementation challenges can be significant. It is possible that the states that report they did not face implementation challenges have either surpassed the early challenges typical of implementation of the larger-scale programs, or they have not undertaken a program with the breadth of LEAP or some of its peer programs and, therefore, have encountered fewer operational difficulties.

Integration Practices

The respondents typically provided examples of *successful* integration of the school system into the policy decisions and implementation of the school/training requirement, as opposed to examples of poor integration. At least 26 respondents reported examples of successful integration, such as strong (in some cases daily) collaboration and communication between schools and social service agencies, as well as on-site services for teen parents at their high schools, including case management and child care services.

Eleven states provided examples of poor integration, including limited alternatives to traditional high school, the lack of shared information or computer databases, the lack of shared information or computer databases, the lack of “comprehensive strategic plans” for implementing this requirement, and the need for a more seamless referral process and understanding of different agency cultures.

Alternative Education Programs

One-half of the states (six of 12) cited the lack of alternative education programs as an implementation challenge. The lack of alternative education programs was raised again by these and additional states in responses to other survey questions⁴³ (see “Helping Teens Return to School,” below).

The need for greater alternative education programs echoes a central recommendation by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., as part of a summary of three teen parent demonstration programs, the Teen Parent Demonstration, LEAP, and New Chance:

The education opportunities currently available to teenage parents are often inadequate for addressing their educational needs... Imaginative programs that combine academics, work experience, and intensive personal attention and can spark teenage parents’ interests are needed. Regular schools and community Adult Basic Education (ABE) and GED programs often offer poor learning environments for young mothers...⁴⁴

Needed Services

Thirty (of 33) states indicated that they needed at least one service to help teen parents meet the school/training requirement, and 16 of these states identified more than one service need. Among the services requested by these states were learning disability services, mental health services, substance abuse treatment, better case management, and child care services.

- **Learning disability services** were requested by a majority of respondents (18 of 30) as a pro-

gram component that would help teen parents meet the school/training requirement. This reported need is consistent with the high rates of learning disabilities of the overall TANF population — studies have found 25-40 percent of TANF recipients have learning disabilities.⁴⁵ While this concern ranks high, states have little data on what is being done to assess the problem at the state level. For example, no data-reporting state tracked learning disability assessments for TANF teen parents at the state level. While these assessments may have been occurring at the local level, it would be useful to track them at the state level as well so that the need for these services can be quantified.

- **Mental health services** were selected by 14 respondents who believed that this service would help teen parents meet the school/training requirement in their states. As with learning disability services, no data-reporting state indicated that it tracked whether teen parents were being assessed for mental or physical health problems — an activity that would help states better quantify demand for this service.
- **Substance abuse treatment** was recommended for helping teen parents attend school or training by 12 respondents. Again, no data-reporting state indicated it was tracking assessment of teen parents for substance abuse problems.
- **Other important services** raised by respondents included parenting classes, domestic violence support services, transportation, better case management, other educational services, child care services, and safe, stable living arrangements.

Helping Teens Return to School

At least eight states had difficulty narrowing down one top priority for services to help teen parents who have left school return. Instead, these states selected multiple needs. Among the most common needs identified were:

- **More alternative education placements** were most often chosen by the states as their top priority for getting teen parents to return to school.
- **Better or more case management** was the second most common top priority need.
- **Heavier TANF sanctions** was selected by one state as a means for getting teen parents to return to school. This respondent selected several top other priorities for assisting teen parents in their return to school.
- **Other services**, such as enhanced outreach efforts, home visiting, domestic violence support services, support for two-parent families, and improved transportation assistance, anger and financial management skills training, and other education skills, such as English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) training, were also recommended by ten respondents to better equip teen parents for returning to school.

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Services and Alternatives for Education

- Congress should continue TANF funding above the current level. The need for services like learning disability services, as well as alternative education options, raised in this study demonstrates the need for continued TANF support. In addition, flexibility in using TANF funds will enable state administrators to direct resources to programs that will best address the needs of TANF teen parents.
- Congress should require that states undertake education-related needs assessments of teen parents and develop appropriate individualized service plans. Under TANF, an assessment of skills, work experience, and employability is required for older TANF recipients.⁴⁶ For teen parents, an effective assessment of “school readiness,” including learning disabilities or mental health problems, is particularly important. Such information may be available through other agencies, but it needs to be part of the welfare case plan. The assessment should identify related support needs

— for instance, if a teen parent with a disabled child needs specialized child care arrangements.

- Congress should require that state plans identify the extent of unmet service needs of TANF teen parents.
- Congress should identify mechanisms for rewarding states that create new alternative placements and improve teen parent school graduation rates. DHHS could serve as a clearinghouse so that “best practice” assessment instruments for teen parents can be shared among states.

“The single biggest challenge in implementing the [school/training] requirement is an educational system that doesn’t accommodate teenage dropouts. Often their school of origin will not re-admit them, stating that they are too old and/or have too few credits. Alternative schools cannot accommodate everyone.”

State program administrator

Promising Innovations Identified by State Administrators

Over one-half of the responding states (19 of 33) reported an innovation they think “seems to have promise and should be better known around the country.” For example, Washington state provides teen parents who fall short of meeting the requirements with support services to help remove barriers that keep them from being eligible. Oregon reported on its policy that sanctions teen parents who do not meet the school training requirement on a progressively escalating scale. Rather than receiving a full sanction immediately, teen parents are subject to a \$50 grant reduction for the first two months they do not comply. After two months, the family’s grant is calculated as though the teen is not a recipient. Agency administrators believe that “the progressive

sanction is more effective in encouraging participation in the school/training requirement than the immediate full sanction against the teen.”

The following policies/programs were cited by multiple states as innovations that seem to have promise:

Post-Secondary Engagement

Some states have collaborated with state universities or community colleges to design services for teen parents, such as specialized case management. In addition, some states allow teen parents to continue their education at post-secondary institutions or to receive special GED or other parenting classes at state universities or community colleges. Arizona reported it allows both: TANF teen parents may attend full-time post-secondary programs, and Department of Education GED programs are available through community colleges throughout the state. In Illinois, teen parents engaged in post-secondary education (PSE) are eligible for the benefits that TANF adults gain when they attend PSE. If teen parents attend PSE and maintain a 2.5 GPA, their TANF assistance clock is stopped for the duration of their school attendance (for a maximum of 36 months). The state also reports that in at least one location in Illinois, a city college, is offering special services for teen parents, including pre-GED preparatory classes and educational assistance for teen parents who are waiting for their GED classes to begin.

In Nevada and Iowa, universities and community colleges are working to help teen parents meet the school/training requirement. Nevada’s Supporting Teens Achieving Real Life Success (STARS) program is a collaboration of case managers from the school of social work at the University of Nevada at Reno and Las Vegas and TANF social workers that is designed to ensure that TANF teen parents are meeting the school/training requirement. In Iowa, local collaboration has developed among TANF agencies, high schools, and community colleges in an effort to meet the needs of TANF teen parents as they comply with the school/training requirement.

Public/Private Partnerships

Respondents from Minnesota and Oregon highlighted public/private partnerships as examples of innovation for dealing with the school/training requirement in their states. In Minneapolis, a program called New Vistas was created in around 1992 for teen parents at the international headquarters of the Honeywell Corporation. The program was based on a partnership between Hennepin County Economic Assistance, Minneapolis Public Schools, Minnesota’s Department of Human Services, and the Honeywell Corporation. New Vistas, an alternative school for 70-75 teen parents annually, offered internships that paid \$8-9 an hour and were operated under the guidance of a mentor. Because of an AFDC waiver in operation at the time of this program, the earnings of the teen parents who participated in these paid internships were disregarded when calculating and providing assistance levels. Instruction at the school was self-paced, and the students were assisted by teachers, social workers, nurses, and an on-site child care center.

Although this New Vistas program is no longer in operation, there may still be lessons learned from this public/private partnership. As Stephen Gies from the state’s TANF agency explained, the teen parents at New Vistas designed their own program to work toward the prevention of second or additional pregnancies. “The teens recommended monthly voluntary pregnancy tests and private meetings for each of them with the public health nurse, who determined if a pregnancy test was needed,” Gies explained. “For each month that none of the teens were pregnant, they wanted to have recognition, such as a pizza party, a gift certificate to a local discount store, or a trip to the local mall.” This program lasted for about 16 months, during which time none of the teens had repeat pregnancies. Gies also noted that “Something like this was able to work because of the public/private partnership. Honeywell had no trouble coming up with the \$100-200 per month for the pizza and pop, and I know that there would have been no way that Hennepin County or the state could have come up with that money, even though we would have probably paid \$2,000-3,000 for just

one pregnancy and delivery through Medical Assistance.”

On-Site Child Care and Other Co-Located Services

Besides the New Vistas program, which offered on-site child care services, co-location of services for teen parents is occurring in a number of states. Co-location of substance abuse and domestic violence counselors in the Chicago Department of Human Services, Teen Parent Services/TANF offices is designed to enable caseworkers to identify potential reasons why teen parents might not be complying with program requirements and has facilitated the matching of teens with needed services.

Under the School-Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP), on-site services at high schools for TANF teen parents in New Jersey are designed to provide

teenagers with a comprehensive set of services on a “one-stop shopping” basis. On-site services include health care, mental health and family counseling, job and employment training, substance abuse counseling, and referral services. Several of the SBYSP sites also provide transportation, child care, tutoring, and family planning.

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Innovative Teen Parent Programs

- DHHS should provide technical assistance and serve as a clearinghouse of research and best practices on strategies for meeting and assessing the teen parent education/training requirements.
- Congress should fund evaluations of promising approaches to addressing the education/training needs of teen parents.

The Living Arrangement Requirement

The TANF living arrangement requirement mandates that minor parents reside with their parents or adult relatives or in another adult-supervised living arrangement in order to be eligible for assistance. The state agency can also approve a teen parent to live “independently.” While the TANF statute mandates that states implement the policy, it does not provide funds for “second chance” homes for those situations in which a teen parent has no appropriate supervised living arrangement. Second chance homes are adult-supervised, alternative living arrangements for teen parents and their children that often offer access to services such as counseling, child care, and parenting and life skills.

State Data

Although the living arrangement requirement has been in place since 1996, this study found that most responding states had difficulty producing data on teen parents subject to the rule. Arizona reported it had 126 teen parents in March 1999 who were required to live with their parents or in an agency-approved setting.⁴⁷ Of these minor parents, 45 (36 percent) lived with parents or other relatives; none lived in “second chance” homes; and 81 (64 percent) were approved to live independently. Although Illinois did not indicate how many teen parents were subject to the living arrangement requirement in total or how many teen parents were approved to live independently, the state was able to report that 1,545 of all teen parents (23 percent of the entire teen parent caseload, including minor and adult teen parents) lived with their parents or other relatives in June 1999.

The inability of the remaining data-reporting states to indicate the number of teen parents required to

meet the living arrangement is both curious and problematic. Not only would such data be helpful for the states to estimate minor parents’ living arrangement needs, but this data would also be beneficial to the reauthorization discussion of this 1996 provision.

In addition, there was also a dearth of data from the 11 data-reporting states on the status of teen parents if the living arrangement requirement was not met. New Jersey and Illinois both reported that no teen parents were determined to be ineligible for “assistance” because they failed to comply with the living arrangement requirement.

An earlier CLASP survey also found that few states are able to report the number of teen parents who are ineligible for TANF due to the living arrangement rule. In that national survey, only 9 of 50 states reported a number; the available data suggested that ineligibility due to the requirement ranged from 0 percent of the total teen parent caseload to as high as 7 percent in one state.⁴⁸

Data on placements in second chance homes suggest this alternative living arrangement is often not available to TANF teen parents. Of the 11 data-reporting states, only New Jersey reported that some teen parents were meeting the living arrangement requirement by living in second chance homes. New Jersey estimated that six teen parents had this type of living arrangement in March of 1999. Illinois and Arizona reported that no teens were living in second chance homes. (In addition to the data-reporting states, other states have undertaken small-scale second chance home projects. See page 19.) New Jersey estimated that six teen parents had this type of living arrangement in March of 1999.

View from State Administrators

In the absence of quantitative data regarding living arrangements, much of what was learned in this study about the living arrangement provision is based on the opinions of the state administrators.

Living Arrangement Requirement Viewed Positively

This requirement was commonly considered by state administrators to be a positive measure, although concern was expressed about its implementation:

- “A great goal with few implementation impediments” was the most common description, which was selected by 12 respondents.
- Six states indicated that the living arrangement requirement is “a great goal, but insufficient funding means some teen parents still will live in undesirable places.”
- Five respondents believed that the living arrangement requirement “is a great goal, but implementation of the rule creates unnecessary hoops as most teen parents who leave their family do so for good reason.”
- Five states consider the living arrangement requirement in “other” terms, including “an ongoing challenge due to a range of welfare reform implementation programs,” successful when “applied with flexibility at the local level,” and in need of “added provisions for transitional independent living arrangements for teens who reach 18, but still are not ready to live completely on their own.”

Challenges Regarding Living Arrangements

Respondents were less likely to describe an innovation in their state related to the living arrangement requirement than detail the challenges in implementing it. Among the implementation challenges identified by 20 state respondents, two main categories emerged: (1) a lack of alternative housing for teen parents (identified by at least eight states) and (2) the need for additional options for teens who need more supervision. The recent Congressional approval of \$30 million to support supervised living arrangements for teen parents is a vital first step in meeting the demand for such housing.

Another group of responses focused on the difficulty in determining whether a teen parent’s parents (the child’s grandparents) could provide an “appropriate” living arrangement. Respondents mentioned the challenges entailed in ensuring careful screening of grandparents and ensuring that children in abusive situations are protected. As one respondent explained, the determination of an “appropriate” parent or living arrangement requires an expertise that may be lacking in some TANF offices.

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Alternatives and Services

- Congress should include a state plan requirement so that states report on the extent of the need for supervised living arrangements.
- DHHS should provide technical assistance and serve as a clearinghouse regarding “best practices” for assessing the appropriateness of various living arrangements — which state agency should handle this, what kind of training should the welfare worker receive, and so forth.

Promising Innovations Identified by State Administrators

At least 13 respondents described what they considered innovations in their states that pertain to the living arrangement requirement.

Second Chance Homes

One way for teen parents to comply with the living arrangement requirement when they are unable to live at home is by living in second chance homes. Most second chance homes are community-based, but at least five states — Massachusetts, Nevada, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and Texas — operate state-level second chance home networks in collaboration with local non-profits.⁴⁹ Respondents from Maryland, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Texas generally described small-scale or pilot projects undertaken in their states.

Collaboration with Foster Care

In Vermont, teen parents are able to access foster homes as appropriate living arrangements. Under a partnership between the welfare agency and the child welfare agency, a reciprocal agreement has been reached that both enables the welfare agency to use foster care homes as supervised living arrangements for teen parents and allows the child welfare agency to utilize the work/welfare case management services offered by the welfare agency for these teen parents. The TANF agency funds the teen parents' placements in specialized foster care by providing a flat grant for both the minor parent and her child. These payments, which are funded by both the minor's TANF grant and any TANF funds that have not been obligated or liquidated for other purposes, have ended up being less expensive than state placement of the minor parent in a residential care facility.⁵⁰

Changes in Grandparent Income Deeming

Each state determines how much, if any, of a teen's parental income it will "deem" available to the teen, which is factored into a teen parent's benefit level. At least one surveyed state, Nebraska, enables more teen parents to receive TANF when they live at home by disregarding a higher percent of the grandparents' income when determining the TANF payment level for the teen parent and her child.⁵¹ For a minor parent who lives with at least one parent, the

grandparent's income (earned and unearned) is only considered for the teen parent's benefits eligibility when the family's income exceeds 300 percent of the federal poverty guidelines (in addition, the minor parent's income and the child's income are considered when determining eligibility).⁵²

Continued Support Services

Washington state helps teen parents access support services that help remove the barriers preventing them from being eligible for assistance. These support services, which include transportation costs, payment for books and tuition, and diapers for children, are provided to teen parents who are "actively working with a social worker to remove the barriers that are preventing the minor from living in a department-approved living arrangement and/or meeting school requirements."

Considerations for Reauthorization and Beyond: Living Arrangement Innovations

- DHHS should provide technical assistance and serve as a clearinghouse of new strategies (e.g., Vermont's coordination with its child welfare agency) in meeting the teen parent living arrangement requirements and should collect available evaluations.
- States should revisit their grandparent deeming policies.

Conclusion

While progress has been made in implementing the 1996 teen parent requirements in the TANF program, this study indicates there is much work to be done. The state officials' suggestions provided in this paper, as well as the research findings, should be carefully considered during TANF reauthorization. In addition, since states have considerable flexibility within TANF, some of the concerns and suggestions offered in this study may instead be addressed within states, independent of federal legislative revision.

As Congress considers reauthorization of the 1996 TANF law, key teen parent issues to address include:

- Better data reporting by states and better estimation methods by the federal government.
- State assessments of why eligible teen parents are not participating in TANF. Are they inappropriately diverted from applying? Are they being sanctioned disproportionately?
- Improved access to needed support services, which can help teens meet the education/training and living arrangement requirements.
- Increased availability of alternative education services and second chance homes for those

without appropriate placements, and more funds to create and run such programs.

- Continued examination and evaluations of different approaches to the education/training and living arrangement requirements to identify which policies and programs provide better outcomes.

A renewed focus on teen parents within the TANF caseload is appropriate. Historically, teen parents often became long-term welfare recipients. They also are a source of many non-marital births. Helping these teen parents avoid unintended subsequent births could prove vital in efforts to reach economic self-sufficiency.

It is important to ensure that we have a complete picture of teen parent participation in TANF; we need an accurate count of the population and we need information on the status of participants. This is essential not only for the assessment of policy but also in the selection and design of needed services.

To be effective, it is important that the teen parent requirements under TANF be more than paper mandates that potentially impact these young families' access to the program's services; we need to adequately fund the teen parent services that support the TANF teen parent goals. Policymakers must begin to make the numbers and services "add up" for teen parents.

Endnotes

- 1 U.S. General Accounting Office, *AFDC Women Who Gave Birth as Teenagers* (GAO/HHS 94-115), Washington, DC: General Accounting Office, May 31, 1994, quoted in Ellen Eliason Kisker, Rebecca Maynard, Anu Rangarajan, and Kimberly Boller, *Moving Teen Parents Into Self-Sufficiency: Lessons from Recent Demonstrations*, Mathematica Policy Research, September 1998. Available at: <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/isp/tpd/synthes/disack.htm>
- 2 P.L. 104-193, The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act; Title I, Sec. 408(a) (4) and (a) (5) (A). See also Jodie Levin-Epstein, *Teen Parent Provisions in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996*, Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), 1996.
- 3 In this study, “assistance” is defined as anything that falls within the definition of “assistance” found in the final TANF regulations (45 C.F.R. 260.31). In essence, we wanted to capture cash payments, vouchers, and other benefits designed to meet the on-going needs of teen parents and their children. We did not intend to capture nonrecurrent, short-term benefits that are designed to address a specific crisis or instance of need, unless those benefits are provided for more than four months. We did not intend to capture work subsidies paid to employers on behalf of teen parents, contributions to or withdrawals from Individual Development Accounts, refundable earned income tax credits, or services that do not provide basic income support. We intended to capture child care and transportation aid only when it is provided to families that are not employed.
- 4 The CLASP March 1999 survey data on teen parents is compared to state data on partial sanctions for families in an average month in 1998 as reported by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in *Welfare Reform: State Sanction Policies and Number of Families Affected*, Washington, DC: GAO, March 2000. (This GAO data was the only available comparison data).
- 5 Kristin Anderson Moore, Sharon Vandivere, and Jennifer Ehrle, *Turbulence and Child Well-Being*, New Federalism Series, No. B-16, Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, June 2000.
- 6 Teen parents in the data-reporting states comprise 49% of the number of the total births to teenagers nationally in FY 1997, including teen parents who received TANF assistance and those who did not. Calculation by CLASP using data from *Child Trends Facts-At-A-Glance*, Table 1: Births to Mothers under the Age 20 in 1997 By Age and Race/Ethnicity, Percent of Teen Births to Unmarried Mothers, Percent of Teens Who Are Sexually Active, and Percent of Teen Births That Are Repeat Births (Second or Higher Order Births), available at: www.childtrends.org/table1_99.asp. The teen parents participating in TANF that were reported by the data-reporting states in our survey account for 42% of the total population of TANF teen parents, using the teen parent participation total provided by *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF* (Tables 10:16 and 10:27).
- 7 Stephanie Ventura et al., “Births to Teenagers in the United States, 1940-2000,” *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol. 49, No. 10, September 25, 2001.
- 8 Robert Rector, “Welfare: Broadening the Reform,” in S. Butler and K. Holmes (eds.), *Issues 2000: The Candidate’s Briefing Book*, Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation, 1999, at p. 319.
- 9 Child Trends. *Facts at a Glance*, August 2001.
- 10 Child Trends, April 2001, unpublished calculation.
- 11 U.S. General Accounting Office, *AFDC Women Who Gave Birth as Teenagers*. See footnote 1.
- 12 High birthrates of 50 or more births per 1,000 adolescents women (age 15-19) exist in four eastern European countries: Armenia, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, and Ukraine. The U.S. birthrate to adolescents is among the highest in developed countries, at 54.4 births per 1,000 adolescents. See Susheela Singh and Jacqueline Darroch, “Adolescent Pregnancy and Childbearing: Levels and Trends in Developed Countries,” *Family Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 32, No. 1, Jan/Feb 2000.
- 13 For a state-by-state delineation of teen parent and TANF policy choices, see the State Policy Documentation Project at www.spdp.org, a joint project of CLASP and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
- 14 Frank Furstenberg, J. Brooks-Gunn, and S. Philip Morgan, *Adolescent Mothers in Later Life*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- 15 Ann Horvath and H. Elizabeth Peters, *Welfare Waivers and Non-Marital Childbearing*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, September 1999. Prepared for the “For Better and For Worse: State Welfare Reform and the Well-Being of Low-Income Families and Children” research conference sponsored by the Joint Center for Poverty Research, September 1999. Available at http://www.jcpr.org/wpfiles/Horvath_WP.PDF. This study, which uses state-level data from 1984 through 1996, found that the minor parent living arrangement waiver had a significant positive effect for all race groups. The size of this effect was about 12 percentage points for black teens, and almost 17 percentage points for white teens. The authors have hypothesized that perhaps the living arrangement waiver may make teen parents feel more secure, and thus teen parents subject to the rule are more likely to experience repeat pregnancies. This study also examined the impact of school attendance and performance requirement waivers on nonmarital childbearing, but this waiver was not found to have any significant effects on nonmarital childbearing for any race group, age group, or model specification, when all of the waivers were included in the regression analysis.
- 16 When asked about embedded teen parents, only four of the eleven data-reporting states could report data on this group (Arizona, Illinois, Mississippi, and Wisconsin). In these four

- states, a total of 16.6% of TANF teen parents were embedded. The small number of states that could answer this question suggests that the states either had difficulty identifying these teens or perhaps were confused about the definition of “embedded,” which was meant to describe those teen parents who are not heads-of-household and are provided for by another head-of-household’s TANF grant. The former explanation is consistent with earlier findings from Robert Wood and John Burghardt of Mathematica Policy Research who write: “Research on programs for teenage parents has consistently found that identifying young parents who receive cash assistance on someone else’s case is difficult” (Robert Wood and John Burghardt, *Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States*, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., October 1997).
- 17 The remainder of the data-reporting states could not provide unduplicated annual counts because TANF teen parent participation is tracked monthly, and special programming or additional management information resources is required to aggregate the monthly counts into annual, unduplicated data.
 - 18 In the 11 data-reporting states, the number of TANF recipients with an “unknown” teen parent status are as follows: AL: 38; AZ: 724; CA: 6907; FL: 1709; IL: 1559; LA: 209; MS: 232; NJ: 125; OH: 3367; TX: 1322; WI: 26,392. See the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*, Tables 10:16 and 10:27.
 - 19 The sample consists of 200 active cases and 400 closed cases, randomly sampled, for each month from 32 states and territories that provide universe data. The remaining 22 states and territories submitted sample data to DHHS for data reporting purposes.
 - 20 Adult recipients with a teen parent status and children recipients with a teen parent status comprise about 1.5% of the total TANF population (including all TANF adults and all TANF children). Of TANF adult recipients, teen parents account for 4.2%, and of TANF children recipients, teen parents account for 0.4%. See the *Third Annual Report to Congress*, Tables 10:16 and 10:17. Among teen recipients (all TANF adult and children recipients older than 12 and younger than 19), teen parents represent 7.5% of these recipients (108,132 TANF recipients with a teen parent status of about 1,431,304 teens who receive TANF). See the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*, Tables 10:11, 10:16, 10:22, and 10:27.
 - 21 At the time of this study, state data were reported according to TANF Emergency Data Reporting. (The data for the *Second* and *Third Annual Reports to Congress on TANF* were based on the Emergency Data Reporting.)
 - 22 This study provides a “snapshot” of inappropriate teen parent diversion based on one county in a specific time frame, February through April 1999. In this study, 55 instances were noted in which welfare offices refused to accept applications, discouraged or pressured applicants into withdrawing applications, or provided incorrect information about eligibility, and most of these instances involved teen parent applicants. See Martha Mathews and Shannon Shelley, “Turned Away, Misinformed, Denied: Teen Parents’ Experiences in Welfare Offices,” *Youth Law News*, July-August 1999.
 - 23 Center for Impact Research, *Knocking on the Door: Barriers to Welfare and Other Assistance for Teen Parents. A Three City Research Study*, Chicago, IL: Center for Impact Research, April 2002.
 - 24 For example, the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF* includes one table (10:31) that provides some information on the reasons for case closure for all TANF families. The most common reason reported in this table is employment (the reason for 23% of families with closed cases in FY 1999), the second most common reason is policy (16.5%), and the third most common reason is sanctions (6.2%).
 - 25 See Jodie Levin-Epstein, *Teen Parent Provisions in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996*, Washington, DC: CLASP, 1996.
 - 26 28,613
 - 27 The six states that reported the number of teens subject to the school/training requirement are the following: Arizona, California, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas. In California, 2,556 teen parents who were 19 in March of 1999 voluntarily participated in Cal-Learn. All teen parents who fail to meet the Cal-Learn school/training requirement do not lose assistance, but are rather served via a separate state program. It was difficult to determine the age demographics and marital status of the group of teen parents subject to the school/training requirement because only three states were able to provide this specific information.
 - 28 Four states (California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio) could describe the placement of the teen parents in their state subject to meet the school/training requirement. California: All of the teen parents in Cal-Learn met the requirement by being in enrolled in school or a GED class. Arizona: All teen parents subject to the school/training requirement were not captured in the following placement data: 201 teen parents were identified as enrolled in school, 7 teen parents were engaged in job/training, 2 teen parents were in individually designed activities, and 82 were in “other” activities. Illinois: 26% of the teen parents subject to the school/training requirement were enrolled in school, 32% were in GED programs, 4% were in job training, 1% were in individually designed activities, and 37% were in “other” activities. Ohio: All teen parents subject to the school/training requirement were not captured in the following placement data: 1,098 teen parents were enrolled in school in March of 1999, 994 teen parents participated in GED program, and 79 other teen parents were “assigned to a work activity.”
 - 29 If all 19-year-old teen parents are removed from a calculation of the number of teen parents who are subject to school/training in four states that could provide data for this estimate (Arizona, California, New Jersey, and Texas), the percentage of all teen parents under 19 subject to the school/training requirement is 87%. Using data from 6 states (AZ, CA, IL, NJ, OH, and TX), the percentage of all teen parents, including 19-year-olds, subject to the school/training requirement is 80% (Illinois data is an estimate). The first estimate based on data

- from four states may be a more accurate reflection of the number of teen parents subject to this requirement due to the varying status of 19-year-old TANF teen parents (as subject or exempt to the school/training requirement).
- 30 See the State Policy Demonstration Project at www.spdp.org.
- 31 Based on the author's conversation with this state respondent.
- 32 One component of Texas' exemption policy includes a provision that allows teen parents to become exempt from the school/training requirement if they attend GED programs. This policy may be fueling this large exemption figure for Texas, considering that most states include GED programs in their definition of participating in school/training and therefore do not need to exempt TANF teen parents from the school/training requirement when they wish to complete their high school education through a GED program.
- 33 2,485 teen parents in the five responding states were found to have been sanctioned. An earlier study by Mathematica on teen parents and TANF examined *annual* sanction rates and found rates ranging from 11% of teen parents in Virginia to 48% in the two study counties in California. See Robert Wood and John Burghardt, *Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States*, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., October 1997.
- 34 Kristin Anderson Moore and Sharon Vandivere, Child Trends, and Jennifer Ehrle, The Urban Institute, *Turbulence and Child Well-Being*, Assessing the New Federalism, Series B, No. B-16, June 2000.
- 35 All those participating in Cal-Learn in March 1999: 14,367, including 19-year-olds.
- 36 The total sanctioned in one month in the five states was 2,485. Illinois and Ohio's sanction rate is based on an alternative data reporting time frame. Illinois is based on October 1999 data. The Ohio sanction rate is an estimate based on the number of teen parents sanctioned in January 2000 for failure to meet the school/training requirement of the total number of teen parents subject to the school/training requirement in March 1999.
- 37 The survey data on teen parents is compared to state data on partial sanctions for families in an average month in 1998 as reported by the GAO in *Welfare Reform: State Sanction Policies and Number of Families Affected*, March 2000. (The GAO data was the only available comparison data.)
- 38 See State Policy Documentation Project (www.spdp.org), School/Training Requirements: Bonuses.
- 39 1,261 teen parents.
- 40 1,072 teen parents who accomplished one of the measures in March, 1999.
- 41 Johannes M. Bos and Veronica Fellerath, *LEAP: Final Report on Ohio's Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents; Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting Program*, New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, August 1997 (see pg. 122). See also Dan Bloom, Hilary Kopp, David Long, and Denise Polit, *LEAP: Implementing a Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents*, New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1991. See also Dan Bloom, Veronic Fellerath, David Long, and Robert Wood, *LEAP: Interim Findings on a Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents*, New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1993.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 19 states chose alternative education placements as their top priority need in getting teen parents who have dropped out of school to return. States also discussed limited alternatives to traditional high school when asked about examples of poor integration between the school system and the implementation of the TANF school/training requirement. Furthermore, states raised the issue of needed alternative education programs when asked an open-ended question about any aspect of the school/training requirement.
- 44 Ellen Eliason Kisker, Rebecca Maynard, Anu Rangarajan, and Kimberly Boller, *Moving Teen Parents Into Self-Sufficiency: Lessons from Recent Demonstrations*, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, September 1998.
- 45 D. Nightingale, R. Yudd, S. Anderson, and B. Barnow, *The Learning Disabled in Employment and Training Programs*, Research and Evaluation Report Series 91-E, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, 1991. See also Eileen Sweeney, *Recent Studies Indicate That Many Parents Who Are Current or Former Welfare Recipients Have Disabilities Or Other Medical Conditions*, Washington, DC: The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, February 2000.
- 46 P.L. 104-193, Title I, Section 408(b) (1). All those participating in Cal-Learn in March 1999: 14,367, including 19-year-olds.
- 47 For the full fiscal year, Arizona was the only data-reporting state that could report an unduplicated count. In FY 99, Arizona had 2,521 teen parents subject to the living arrangement requirement.
- 48 Jodie Levin-Epstein, *Seeking Supervision: State Policy Choices in Implementing the TANF Minor Parent Living Arrangement Rule*, Washington, DC: CLASP, March 1999. Available at www.clasp.org.
- 49 *Second Chance Homes Fact Sheet*, DHHS, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/2ndchancehomes00/brochure.htm>. See also the larger report, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/2ndchancehomes00/index.htm>, as well as www.spanonline.org.
- 50 Jodie Levin-Epstein. *Seeking Safe Haven: Two States' Approaches to the Minor Parent TANF Living Arrangement Rule*, Washington, DC: CLASP, March 1999. Available at www.clasp.org.
- 51 See www.spdp.org for a complete listing of state deeming choices.
- 52 *Nebraska Health and Human Services Manual*, Revised December 27, 1997. Manual Letter #60-97.

Appendix A

Study Design

In order to learn how the implementation of the school/training and living arrangement requirements fared across the states and to develop an understanding of how many teens were being affected by these requirements, the Center for Law and Social Policy undertook this review of the states' experiences. A questionnaire, which was distributed to the 50 states and the District of Columbia in June of 2000, was designed to capture the opinions of individuals who head state agencies that work with teen parents who receive TANF. The opinion questionnaire was answered by such individuals as TANF directors, teen parent program administrators, and TANF/economic stability policy directors.

In addition to requesting the opinions of these individuals, 22 states were also asked to provide data on the number of teen parents who were subject to these requirements in their states and on the ages of those teen parents, as well as other data, such as the number of teen parents who were sanctioned or had their cases closed for failure to meet the school/training or living arrangement requirement. Twenty states were selected because they were the ones with the largest number of births to mothers under 20 years old in 1997.¹ These states were Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. In addition to these 20 states, two others, Delaware and Wisconsin, were chosen because past data collection efforts indicated that these two states have a particularly strong ability to provide data specific to teen parents. These 22 states were asked both qualitative and quantitative data questions. The remaining states were only asked qualitative, "opinions" questions.

Among the 22 states asked both quantitative and qualitative questions, 11 states responded.² These 11 states account for 49 percent of the births to mothers under 20 in the U.S. in 1997; that is, these states represent about half of the population of births to mothers under 20, some of whom received TANF assistance and some of whom did not.

However, the teen parents discussed in this study are only those teen parents who received TANF from their respective states. For this study, "teen parents" was defined as "custodial parents under the age of 20." The number of teen parents who received TANF assistance in March of 1999 reported by these 11 states for this study account for 42 percent of the national teen parent caseload reported for FY 1999 in the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*.³ Among the 29 remaining states that were asked only qualitative questions, 21 responded.⁴

Once the responses from these states were collected, some of the data were clarified via conversations with the state respondents and/or research on state regulations and programs that were described in the responses. Data were also clarified and supplemented with information from the State Policy Documentation Project, a data source on state TANF policies jointly developed by the Center for Law and Social Policy and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Because the state respondents may not have been aware of every example of successful or unsuccessful implementation of the school/training or living arrangement requirement in their states, the qualitative data that resulted from this study is limited to the opinions and knowledge of the survey respondents.

In addition, it should also be noted that some states were reporting on teen parent programs and regulations that were established under welfare waivers, which were approved prior to the 1996 PRWORA and have been operating for some or nearly all of the past five years. The states' individual waiver requirements may slightly alter these states' teen parent provisions. For example, under Arizona's waiver, no TANF recipients were subject to the 60-month time limit on TANF assistance. Therefore, teen parents in Arizona did not have their assistance "time clocks" ticking in March of 1999. Other states may have had variations in their teen parent regulations due to the preexistence of their waiver policy.

Furthermore, some states had difficulty reporting demographic data on teen parents for March of 1999, the timeframe selected for this study. States that reported data from alternate time frames are noted where appropriate.

Appendix A Endnotes

- 1 Child Trends, Table 1: Births to Mothers Under the Age 20 in 1997 By Age and Race/Ethnicity, Percent of Teen Births to Unmarried Mothers, Percent of Teens Who Are Sexually Active, and Percent of Teen Births That Are Repeat Births (Second or Higher Order Births). Available at: www.childtrends.org/table1_99.asp.
- 2 These 11 states were Alabama, Arizona, California, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin.
- 3 As noted earlier, there are some discrepancies between the estimates on the number of teen parents who received TANF

in FY 1999, according to the *Third Annual Report to Congress on TANF*, and the data that was provided for this study. This measure of 42% is estimated by dividing the number of teen parents reported for this study by the *Third Annual Report's* number of the national TANF teen parent caseload.

- 4 Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Of these states, Iowa, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Vermont included some quantitative information about teen parents who receive TANF in their states. Also, Michigan provided some data regarding their TANF recipients with a teen parent status via a link to one of their websites.

Appendix B

Evaluations of Teen Parent Education Intervention Programs

Program	Description	Participant Target Group	Evaluations Conducted	Impact on Attendance and/or Enrollment	Impact on Graduation Rates	Impact on Employment and/or Earnings	Impact on Fertility
Teen Parent Demonstration Program (TPD)	Conducted in IL (Chicago) and NJ (Camden and Newark) in late 1980s and early 1990s. <i>Required</i> participants to attend skills training, job search, or education. Case management services provided. Relied on sanctions for teens who did not participate. ¹	Pregnant teens or teen parents who had had their first child and were receiving welfare for the first time. ²	Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (Kisker and Rangarajan, 1997; and Maynard, Nicholson, and Rangarajan, 1993)	N/A	N/A	No lasting impacts. Initial impacts (observed on young mothers) disappeared once the requirements and expectations of the program ceased. ³	During the 78-month follow-up period, no impact observed on percent of pregnancies, births, or miscarriages among participants. ⁴
New Chance Demonstration Project	Conducted in 16 sites around the country beginning in the late 1980s. <i>Voluntary</i> program, which provided comprehensive services including education, training, family planning, and child care.	AFDC mothers who had births as teens and had dropped out of school.	MDRC (Quint, Bos, and Polit, 1997; and Granger and Cytron, 1998)	N/A	Substantial impacts on GED receipt. ⁵	No lasting impacts on employment or earnings. Earnings and employment for participants initially declined as they enrolled in the program. ⁶	During the 42-month follow-up period, no impact observed on pregnancies or births. ⁷

Appendix B (continued)

Program	Description	Participant Target Group	Evaluations Conducted	Impact on Attendance and/or Enrollment	Impact on Graduation Rates	Impact on Employment and/or Earnings	Impact on Fertility
Cal-Learn ⁸	Conducted throughout California, beginning in 1994. Relies heavily on case management services, provides other support services, and issues sanctions and bonuses according to school progress.	Mandatory for all unmarried, custodial teen parents under 19-years-old who receive welfare and do not have a high school (HS) diploma or GED. Voluntary for 19-year-olds who have not yet attained a HS degree or GED.	University of California at Berkeley, UC Data. Evaluation in 4 counties.	Modest effects on school enrollment.	Graduation rates for participants significantly higher than non-participants. Impact on graduation rates concentrated largely on increased rates of GED attainment. Teens who already were attending school at program entry experienced smaller and non-significant program impacts. Teens who gained the most from Cal-Learn were 23% of sample that had never been held back and were out of school at program entry.	During the observation period, no impact observed on employment or earnings. Evaluation period “too brief” to estimate long-term impacts.	No effect on subsequent childbearing among participants.

Appendix B (continued)

Program	Description	Participant Target Group	Evaluations Conducted	Impact on Attendance and/or Enrollment	Impact on Graduation Rates	Impact on Employment and/or Earnings	Impact on Fertility
Learning, Earning and Parenting (LEAP)	Conducted in Ohio. <i>Requires</i> participants to attend school or GED program. Includes financial sanctions and bonuses for school attendance.	Pregnant women and custodial parents under the age of 20, who receive TANF and do not have a HS diploma or GED. ⁹	MDRC, 1997.	Increased HS enrollment from 28.7% to 36% and increased GED enrollment from 3.5% to 6.2% in the first year. Average number of months in HS increased by 0.6 months; 0.5 month increase in participation in GED programs. Impacts observed for those in school at entry to LEAP and those who had dropped out before LEAP. ¹⁰	After 3-year follow-up, increased completion rates for 9th, 10th, and 11th grade. ¹¹ After 3-year follow-up, no impact on HS graduation rates, but some increased likelihood of earning a GED. This impact on GEDs was only experienced by those teens in school when they entered LEAP (drop-outs did not encounter this impact). ¹²	After 4-year follow-up, no earnings impacts for the full sample, but 5% decrease in cash welfare receipt found. ¹³ For teens in school before beginning LEAP, employment held for significantly more quarters than those in control group. ¹⁴ For teens who had dropped out of school before LEAP, no increase in earnings or employment. ¹⁵	After 3-year follow-up, no impact on subsequent births. ¹⁶
Learnfare	Conducted in Wisconsin. <i>Requires</i> participants to attend school. Uses sanctions to impose fiscal penalty if participation is not met.	Minor parents and any child age 6 to 17 who receive public assistance under someone else's case.	Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau (study did not analyze separately impacts on in-school teens and drop-outs).	Three-semester impact study found no statistically significant difference in attendance for children age 13-19, but did find small but significant impacts for younger children. ¹⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A

Appendix B Endnotes

- 1 For brief descriptions, see the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, *FY 2000 Greenbook*. See also David Long and Johannes Bos, *Learnfare: How to Implement a Mandatory Stay-in-School Program for Teenage Parents on Welfare*. New York: MDRC, September 1998.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 See *2000 Greenbook*, 1444.
- 4 See *2000 Greenbook*, 1451.
- 5 Long and Bos, 13.
- 6 See *2000 Greenbook*. See also Long and Bos, 13.
- 7 See *2000 Greenbook*, 1450.
- 8 All data concerning this program derived from: Jane Mauldon, Jan Malvin, Jon Stiles, Nancy Nicosia, and Eva Seto, *Impact of California's Cal-Learn Demonstration Project, Final Report*. UC Data, University of California, June 2000.
- 9 Long and Bos, 5.
- 10 Long and Bos, 6.
- 11 See *2000 Greenbook*.
- 12 Long and Bos, 7.
- 13 See *2000 Greenbook*.
- 14 Long and Bos, 8-9.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 See *2000 Greenbook*.
- 17 State of Wisconsin, Legislative Audit Bureau, 1997.

Appendix C

1996 TANF Teen Parent Rules

I. The School/Training Requirement:

Prohibitions; Requirements

P.L. 104-193

Title I, Sec. 408 (a) (4)

“(a) IN GENERAL-

“(4) NO ASSISTANCE FOR TEENAGE PARENTS WHO DO NOT ATTEND HIGH SCHOOL OR OTHER EQUIVALENT TRAINING PROGRAM. A State to which a grant is made under section 403 shall not use any part of the grant to provide assistance to an individual who has not attained 18 years of age, is not married, has a minor child at least 12 weeks of age in his or her care, and has not successfully completed a high-school education (or its equivalent), if the individual does not participate in –

“(A) educational activities directed toward the attainment of a high school diploma or its equivalent; or

“(B) an alternative educational or training program that has been approved by the State.”

II. The Living Arrangement Requirement:

Living Arrangement Requirement

P.L. 104-193

Title I, Sec. 408 (a) (5) (A)

“(i) REQUIREMENT. Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a State to which a grant is made under section 403 shall not use any part of the grant to provide assistance to an individual described in clause (ii) of this sub-paragraph if the individual and the minor child referred to in clause (ii) (II) do not reside in a place of residence maintained by a parent, legal guardian, or other adult relative of the individual as such parent’s, guardian’s, or adult relative’s own home.

“(ii) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED. For purposes of clause (i), an individual described in this clause is an individual who-

“(I) has not attained 18 years of age; and

“(II) is not married, and has a minor child in his or her care.

“(B) EXCEPTION.

“(i) PROVISION OF, OR ASSISTANCE IN LOCATING, ADULT SUPERVISED LIVING ARRANGEMENT. In the case of an individual who is described in clause (ii), the State agency referred to in section 402(a) (4) shall provide, or assist the individual in locating, a second chance home, maternity home, or other appropriate adult supervised supportive living arrangement, taking into consideration the needs and concerns of the individual, unless the State agency determines that the individual’s current living arrangement is appropriate, and thereafter shall require that the individual and the minor child referred to in subparagraph (A) (ii) (II) reside in such living arrangement as a condition of the continued receipt of assistance under the State program funded under this part attributable to funds provided by the Federal Government (or in an alternative appropriate arrangement, should circumstances change and the current arrangement cease to be appropriate).

“(ii) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED. For purposes of clause (i), an individual is described in this clause if the individual is described in subparagraph (A) (ii), and

“(I) the individual has no parent, legal guardian or other appropriate adult relative described in subclause (II) of his or her own who is living or whose whereabouts are known;

“(II) no living parent, legal guardian, or other appropriate adult relative, who would otherwise meet applicable State criteria to act as the individual’s legal guardian, of such individual allows the individual to live in the home of such parent, guardian, or relative;

Appendix C (continued)

“(III) the State agency determines that

“(aa) the individual or the minor child referred to in subparagraph (A) (ii) (II) is being or has been subjected to serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse, or exploitation in the residence of the individual’s own parent or legal guardian; or

“(bb) substantial evidence exists of an act or failure to act that presents an imminent or serious harm if the individual and the minor child lived in the same residence with the individual’s own parent or legal guardian; or

“(IV) the State agency otherwise determines that it is in the best interest of the minor child to waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) with respect to the individual or the minor child.

“(iii) SECOND CHANCE HOME. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘second chance home’ means an entity that provides individuals described in clause (ii) with a supportive and supervised living arrangement in which such individuals are required to learn parenting skills, including child development, family budgeting, health and nutrition, and other skills to promote their long term economic independence and the well being of their children.”

Appendix D

Comparison of Emergency and Final Data Reporting Requirements

The TANF Emergency Data Reporting: What States Reported for FY 1999 and FY 1998 Regarding TANF Teen Parents

The Final TANF Regulations Data Reporting Requirements: What States Report Starting FY 2000 Regarding TANF Teen Parents

What do states report about TANF teen parents with an adult status?

The state indicates whether adult TANF recipients have a “teen parent status.” For this purpose, the Emergency Data Reporting defines a teen parent as “a person who is under 20 years of age and that person’s child is also a member of the TANF family.”

For adult TANF recipients with a “teen parent” status, the states report such characteristics as:

- Date of Birth, Marital Status, Race/Ethnicity
- Relationship to the Head-of-Household (in this case, the teen parent is the Head-of-Household)
- Education Level: Highest level of education attained and highest degree attained.
- Employment Status
- Work Participation Status: Teen parents can be classified as “Deemed engaged in work, single teen head-of-household or married teen who maintains satisfactory school attendance or participating in education directly related to employment for an average of 20 hours per week during the reporting period.”

Adult Work Participation Activities: Among these activities, teen parents may be engaged in “education directly related to employment for individuals with no high school diploma or certificate of high school equivalency” or “Satisfactory school attendance for individuals with no high school diploma or certificate of high school equivalency.”

In the new data reporting, this question has been changed from a question about “teen parent status” to “Parent with Minor Child in the Family.” If the individual is a parent with a minor child in the family, then the state must indicate whether they are included in the two-parent participation rate.

All of the information that was required of adult TANF recipients with a “teen parent” status under the Emergency Data Reporting is required in the new data reporting.



Appendix D (continued)

<p>The TANF Emergency Data Reporting: What States Reported for FY 1999 and FY 1998 Regarding TANF Teen Parents</p>	<p>The Final TANF Regulations Data Reporting Requirements: What States Report Starting FY 2000 Regarding TANF Teen Parents</p>
<p>What do the states report for TANF teen parents with a “child” status, i.e., “embedded” teen parents who are not heads-of-household?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Date of Birth ● Relationship to Head-of-Household (daughter, grandchild, etc.) ● Education Level: Highest level of education attained degree attained. 	<p>Same as under the Emergency Data reporting, except for the code “Parent with a Minor Child in The Family” (see above).</p>
<p>Do the states report on sanctions for teen parents?</p>	
<p>Not specifically.</p> <p>When reporting family-level data, the states report if a reduction in the amount of assistance was due to sanctions. However, the state need not specify what the sanction was for.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>When reporting family-level data, there are specific options under “reasons for sanctions.” States will now have to specify the following types of sanctions that may pertain to teens, such as “Sanction for Teen Parent Not Attending School” or “Failure to Comply with Individual Responsibility Plan.” The states will not have to specifically code if a teen parent is sanctioned for failure to meet the living arrangement requirement.</p>
<p>What references are there regarding teen parents and case closure?</p>	
<p>When reporting on families who no longer receive assistance under the TANF program, the states indicate the “Reason for Closure.” Possibilities for such reasons include: Employment, Marriage, Five-Year Time Limit, Sanction, State (Tribal) Policy, Other. States need not specify what sanctions were for.</p>	<p>For reporting family-level data on reasons for case closure, states have been given more specifics. Now included in reasons why families may no longer be receiving assistance are: “teen parent failing to meet school attendance requirement” or “teen parent failing to live in an adult setting.” However, if both reasons are occurring, the states will only code for “teen parent failing to meet school attendance requirement.”</p>
<p>Explanatory Note: Minor children who are head-of-households are to be coded as “adults.”</p>	<p>Explanatory Note: Minor children who are either heads-of-household or married to the head-of-household are to be coded as “adults” and are referred to in the final TANF regulations as “minor child head-of-household.”</p>

Appendix E

Time-Limit Clocks for TANF Teen Parents

State	Number of Teen Parents That Had Their Own Clock Ticking (March 1999)	Percent of March 1999 Teen Parent Caseload with Own Clock Ticking	Policy Notes
Arizona	N/A	N/A	Under Arizona's general TANF waiver, there is no lifetime limit for TANF receipt. Therefore, no TANF recipients have their assistance time clocks ticking.*
Illinois	3372	50.0%	The number of teens with a clock ticking matches the number of 19-year-olds on IL's March 1999 caseload. In IL, a teen parent who attends post-secondary education full time and maintains a 2.5 GPA has her assistance clock stopped. In addition, minor parent heads-of-household do not have a clock ticking.
Mississippi	763	100%	N/A
Texas	5752	87%	N/A
Wisconsin	482	99%	N/A

*According to AZ's State TANF Plan (10/1/99 through 9/30/01), the AZ TANF waiver was approved for seven years beginning with date of implementation. The waiver expires on 9/30/02.

Appendix F

State Exemptions from School/Training Requirements for TANF Teen Parents

State	Number of Teens Exempt from School/ Training Requirement	Percent of March 1999 Caseload Exempt from the School/Training Requirement	State's Exemption Policy: Teen parents can be exempt from the school/training requirement under one of the following circumstances:
Arizona	251	14.4%	The teen parent is employed full-time. The teen parent is caring for a child under the age of 12 weeks. Other policy: If a teen parent is not attending high school or its equivalent, she becomes JOBS-mandatory and is subject to JOBS regulation, including "good cause exemption" for non-participation. Some additional exemptions qualify for temporary deference or as "good cause exemptions."
California	48	0.33%	The teen parent has been expelled from school. Child care/transportation is unavailable. Deferral is allowed for postpartum period prescribed by physician and when special need cannot be addressed.
Ohio	480	9%	The teen parent is caring for a child under the age of six weeks. The teen parent has been expelled from school. The teen parent needs an alternative program. Child care/transportation is unavailable. The teen parent or her child has an illness.
Texas	3420	51.7%*	The teen parent is eligible to participate in a school district's special education program. The teen parent has a physical or mental condition of a temporary and remediable nature that makes it unfeasible to attend school. The teen parent is 16 or older and attending a course to prepare for the high school equivalency exam. The teen parent is enrolled in the Texas Academy of Mathematics and Science of Leadership in Humanities. The teen parent is specifically exempted under another law.

* Texas's exemption rate may be skewed since it includes pursuing a GED as an exemption policy for the school/training requirement.

CLASP

CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY

1015 15th Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 906-8000 voice
(202) 842-2885 fax
www.clasp.org