

DIOCESAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR

NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING

A Program of the NCCB Committee for Pro-Life Activities

DIOCESAN NFP PROGRAM - PROFILE
1999 SUMMARY



Copyright © 2013, Natural Family Planning Program of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. All rights reserved. Permission is granted to reproduce in whole or in part, in print and/or electronically, with the following statement: National Diocesan Profile Survey Report, Year, NFPP/US Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, DC. Used with permission.

DIOCESAN NFP PROGRAM - PROFILE 1999 SUMMARY

Diocesan NFP Program--National *Profile*

In the Fall of 1990, the Diocesan Development Program (DDP) initiated an annual national survey. Diocesan NFP coordinators or contact persons were asked to complete a *Profile* questionnaire that would:

1. Give the DDP a clear understanding of diocesan NFP efforts, by focusing on the unique needs of individual dioceses.
2. Enable the DDP to provide the bishops and NFP coordinators with a broad national picture of diocesan NFP program activity.

The following information is based on responses to the 1999 Diocesan NFP program *Profile* survey.*

OVERVIEW OF THE 1999 *PROFILE*

In November of 1999, **187 *Profile*** questionnaires were mailed to dioceses. **Ninety-two or nearly half (49%)** of the dioceses completed and returned questionnaires. The data indicates that certain concerns remain true about NFP programs around the nation with improvement in certain areas:

- A. Where the diocesan bishop/clergy publicly support NFP, programs are strong and effective, even with limited funding. Repeatedly, NFP coordinators and teachers state that they themselves need to be inspired and visibly supported for their hard work (ministry) and dedication by the clergy. Every year this is the greatest need identified by respondents. Sufficient funding to support, train and expand NFP services is the second greatest need.
- B. **Thirty-six percent (36%)** of dioceses specifically allocated less than a **\$1,000** for NFP efforts. **Sixty-three percent (63%)** of all NFP diocesan programs operate on less than **\$10,000** per year. A few dioceses (**13%**) allocate **\$30,000** to more than **\$70,000** for their NFP programs. A typical arrangement is for an NFP program to share the funding, material, and staff support of an umbrella department, e.g., Family Life Office, Catholic Charities, or the facilities/staff of a Catholic hospital.
- C. In practically every diocese throughout the country, there is now a person designated either officially or unofficially as the Diocesan NFP Coordinator. Often, the NFP “hat” is one of many worn by this person (**55%**). For example, the Office of Marriage and Family Life Director (**44%**) is most often tasked to coordinate diocesan NFP efforts.

- D. Most diocesan marriage preparation programs make at least some effort to provide rudimentary NFP information to engaged couples; e.g., booklets and fact sheets. The time allotted for NFP in **81%** of Pre-Cana programs is less than **45 minutes**. A more thorough and substantive inclusion of NFP in educational programs about human sexuality and conjugal love remains a distant goal, not only for marriage preparation, but on every level of instruction. Sometimes, NFP is barely mentioned in Pre-Cana programs; e.g., literature is simply given to couples without discussion. To its credit, one diocese strongly encourages couples to complete a full course of instruction in NFP as part of its comprehensive marriage preparation program.
- E. The Sympto-Thermal Method and Ovulation Method are the most preferred methods of NFP. Increasingly, NFP teachers are willing either to teach or suggest both OM and STM giving couples a methodological choice. A variety of NFP national, regional and local provider groups are used by dioceses.
- F. The majority of diocesan NFP teachers (**40%**) are deeply committed volunteers. A few dioceses provide stipends to volunteer teachers (**23%**) to cover personal costs; e.g., transportation, baby sitter, materials, etc.
- G. From the dioceses surveyed, there are over **1,000+** diocesan NFP advocate/witness speakers and over **1,022** diocesan NFP teachers across the nation. Training new teachers and keeping seasoned instructors is a constant challenge in practically every diocesan program. These NFP advocate/witness speakers and NFP teachers have contributed over **33,000 hours** in donated time and energy this past year toward NFP efforts across the nation, often at great personal sacrifice. They are a great resource for the teaching of human sexuality within a faith context, a resource not fully utilized.

NFP efforts in dioceses, when viewed as a whole, vary from meager to comprehensive. Some dioceses have very strong educational programs that integrate NFP into all educational efforts on human sexuality, marriage, and family life. Through hard work and dedication, some dioceses have made tremendous strides in improving the quality of their NFP programs in order to meet the *National Standards*. Sadly, one diocese dramatically improves its NFP program, while another diocese experiences a reduction in program size either through teacher loss, budget cuts, and/or diocesan restructuring.

Once again, the single most compelling pastoral question is: “*Can couples who wish to be faithful to Church teaching on responsible parenthood get the NFP help they need from their diocese?*” The answer to this question will determine how best to plan program development for local diocesan NFP ministry.

Gratitude is extended to the following dioceses which provided data for the 1999 *Profile* survey:

Albany; Altoona-Johnstown; Arlington; Austin; Baltimore; Baton Rouge; Beaumont; Biloxi; Boston; Bridgeport; Brooklyn; Brownsville; Burlington; Camden; Cincinnati; Cleveland; Columbus; Corpus

Christi; Covington; Detroit; Dodge City; Dubuque; Duluth; El Paso; Erie; Fort Wayne; Forth Worth; Gary; Grand Rapids; Great Falls-Billings; Green Bay; Harrisburg; Hartford; Helena; Jackson; Jefferson City; Kalamazoo; Knoxville; La Crosse; Lafayette; Lake Charles; Lincoln; Los Angeles; Lubbock; Madison; Manchester; Marquette, MI; Memphis; Metuchen; Miami; Milwaukee; Monterey; Nashville; Newark; New Orleans; New Ulm; Ogdensburg; Omaha; Owensboro; Pensacola-Tallahassee; Peoria; Philadelphia; Phoenix; Pittsburg; Portland; Raleigh; Rockford; St. Augustine; St. Cloud; St. Louis; St. Paul and Minneapolis; St. Petersburg; Salina; San Angelo; San Antonio; Savannah; San Jose; Scranton; Sioux City; Spokane; Springfield, MA; Springfield Cape Girardeau; Superior; Toledo; Trenton; Tucson; Tulsa; Venice; Wichita; Winona; and Yakima.

*The bishops of NCCB Committee for Pro-Life Activities are very grateful to Rev. Robert R. Cannon, M.A., M.Th., J.C.L. of the Diocese of Venice for preparing the 1999 Profile Report.

I. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

1. The (arch)diocesan NFP program is: *(Check one.)?*
 - 71% Part of the office of Marriage and Family Life
 - 12% A service of one of our Catholic hospital(s)
 - 03% Part of Respect-Life Activities
 - 04% Part of Catholic Charities
 - 09% Other
 - 01% No Response

2. Does the (arch)diocese have an NFP Advisory Committee?
 - 37% Yes
 - 63% No

3. Who is responsible for coordinating NFP ministry, *(e.g. Family Life Director, NFP Coordinator, Respect Life Director, etc.)?*
 - 35% Diocesan NFP Coordinator
 - 45% Family Life Director
 - 03% Director Catholic Charities
 - 02% Coordinator Marriage Prep
 - 15% Other
 - 0% No Response

4. For this position, NFP work is: *(Check only one.)*
 - 55% One aspect of other responsibilities
 - 09% Full-time, paid
 - 01% Full-time, volunteer
 - 20% Part-time, paid
 - 10% Part-time, volunteer
 - 05% No Response

5. Is the NFP coordinator trained in NFP methodology? (*Check one.*)

77% Yes
19% No
04% No Response

6. If the answer to question (5) is “Yes,” for which of the following roles was the NFP coordinator trained? (*Check all that apply.*)

(*Frequency*)
46 Teacher
52 User
42 Promoter
22 No Response

7. If the answer to question (6) is “Yes,” the NFP coordinator is trained in: (*Check all that apply.*)

(*Frequency*)
54 STM
40 OM
19 No Response

8. If you answered question (5), please indicate which school(s) of NFP trained the coordinator: (*Check all that apply.*)

(*Frequency*)
21 Billings Ovulation Method Association (BOMA)
24 Couple to Couple League (CCL)
16 Creighton Model Ovulation Method Programs (now *Fertility Care*)
14 Diocesan NFP Teacher Training Program
08 Family of the Americas Foundation
12 Northwest Family Services
06 Other
17 No Response

9. How many trained NFP advocates/witness speakers are part of the (arch)diocesan program? (*Couples count as two.*)

Total: 1002

10. How many NFP teachers are part of the (arch)diocesan program? (*Count teaching couples as two.*)

Total: 1,022

11. Which statement best describes the NFP program policy regarding remuneration of its teachers? (*Check one.*)

23% Most of our NFP instructors are volunteers. We give them a stipend to cover expenses.

40% Most of our NFP instructors are volunteers. We do not give them a stipend.

15% We pay our NFP instructors (part and/or full time).

11% Salaries/stipends for instructors are provided by other sources (e.g., Catholic Hospital, Knights of Columbus, etc.).

11% No Response

12. Which organization trains the (arch)diocesan teachers? (*Check all that apply.*)

(*Frequency*)

10 Billings Ovulation Method Association (BOMA)

39 Couple to Couple League (CCL)

30 Creighton Model Ovulation Method Programs (now *Fertility Care*)

17 Diocesan Teacher Training program

03 Family of the Americas Foundation

12 Northwest Family Services

08 Other: Various local sponsored settings

02 No Response

II. PROGRAM BUDGET

13. How much money was spent on (arch)diocesan NFP programing last year? (*Estimate should include salaries, stipends, postage, materials, etc.*)

06% \$0

21% \$1-999

24% \$1,000 - 4,999

13% \$5 - 9,999

11% \$10 - 29,999

04% \$30 - 49,999

05% \$50 - 69,999

11% \$70,000+

05% No Response

14. How much (arch)diocesan money was allocated for NFP programing last year?

14% \$0

22% \$1-999

24% \$1,000 - 4,999
 10% \$5 - 9,999
 12% \$10 - 29,999
 04% \$30 - 49,999
 05% \$50 - 69,999
 04% \$70,000+
 05% No Response

15. Is there a fee for an introductory session? (*Check one.*)

Prices range from a low of **\$5.00** to a high of **\$55.00** depending on materials and length of introductory session(s).

16. How much is charged to clients/couples for a course in NFP? (*If amounts vary, give average.*)

The average cost for a course in NFP is **\$70.00**. Costs vary from a low of **\$12.00** to a high of **\$235.00**. Cost determinants are materials, length of course and the number of follow-up services required by clients.

17. Please estimate the total number of hours donated by volunteers to the NFP program (*Please give your best estimate.*)

Total: 32,607*

*This number is a broad estimate since most NFP coordinators do not intentionally track volunteer hours given in support of NFP.

III. PROGRAM SERVICE

18. Which NFP method(s) is currently taught in the (arch)diocesan program? (*Check all that apply.*)

(*Frequency*)

56 OM

67 STM

07 No Response

19. Does the (arch)diocese have guidelines for marriage preparation?

91% Yes

5% No

4% No Response

20. If the answer to question (19) was “yes,” is NFP included in the guidelines for marriage preparation?
- 77% Yes
15% No
8% No Response
21. Does the (arch)diocese require an *introduction (overview)* to NFP for the engaged? (*Check one.*)
- 55% Yes
41% No
4% No Response
22. Does the (arch)diocese require a NFP a *course* for engaged couples? (*Check one.*)
- 1% Yes
96% No
3% No Response
23. On average how much time is allowed for NFP education in marriage preparation programs? (*Give your best estimate.*)
- 33% 5 minutes - 15 minutes
33% 20 minutes - 30 minutes
15% 35 minutes - 45 minutes
16% 1 hour - 2 hours+
3% No Response
24. Does the (arch)diocese have guidelines on human sexuality? (*Check one.*)
- 60% Yes
27% No
13% No Response
25. Continuing and out-reach education in NFP was provided in the (arch)diocese, during the last 12 months, for: (*Check all that apply.*)
- (*Frequency*)
- 58 NFP teachers
49 NFP clients
30 Deacons
33 Priests
13 (Arch)diocesan directors of religious education
25 Health care professionals
20 Other

26. Please describe the greatest obstacles that hinder the growth/establishment of NFP services in the (arch)diocese.

(Top five contributing factors in order of greatest frequency.)

- 1 Support of bishop for NFP efforts in the diocese
- 2 Solid relationship with Catholic hospital
- 3 Integration into marriage preparation programs
- 4 Dedication of teaching couples
- 5 Continuous educational efforts throughout the diocese

27. Please describe the greatest obstacles that hinder the growth/establishment of NFP services in the (arch)diocese.

(Top five obstacles in order of greatest frequency)

- 1 Lack of public support by bishop and priests
- 2 Insufficient funds
- 3 Lack of teachers
- 4 An uninformed medical community
- 5 An uninformed laity (i.e., confusion with rhythm method)