

APPENDIX D-3: BEST PRACTICES DETAIL

APPENDIX D-3: BEST PRACTICES DETAIL

D.1 STRUCTURE

D.1.1 State Best Practices

D.1.1.1 Alabama¹ (AL 01)

Alabama's child support program is county-operated in 67 counties. The umbrella agency locally is the public welfare agency, with responsibility for child welfare, Food Stamps and TANF in addition to child support. The state IV-D office has 10 regional liaisons located around the state. The liaisons act as "consultants" to the county offices, as they do not have direct authority over how a county performs its functions. State and federal funding support the program. The counties do not contribute to the funding. The state pays for District Attorneys to represent the IV-D agencies in court.

D.1.1.2 California² (CA 01)

A few years ago California changed from a county-controlled child support program under the District Attorneys to a state-controlled program, in which counties hire staff using state and federal money. Each county has a stand-alone child support services department (except for three regional local offices), known collectively as the Local Child Support Agencies (LCSAs). The state works closely with the LCSAs, according to Mr. Lola. California recently implemented its SDU and is still implementing its statewide system. California has received millions of dollars in penalties because of its system certification delay.

California hired Regional Administrators (RAs) who are the liaisons between the state and the LCSAs. Each RA oversees the performance of several LCSAs. The 11 lowest-performing LCSAs have corrective action plans. Five of the six largest LCSAs are part of the 11 lowest-performing LCSAs.

D.1.1.3 Illinois³ (IL 01)

Illinois' Division of Child Support Enforcement has eight regional offices. DCSE works with the Circuit Courts, Illinois Attorney General, State's Attorneys, Circuit Court Clerks, Sheriffs, the Comptroller and the Illinois Supreme Court. Illinois won the NCSEA 2006 most improved program award.

D.1.1.4 Michigan⁴ (MI 01)

Background – Structure – Michigan has the longest running child support program in the country, going back over 80 years. The program uses County Prosecutors, County Friends of the Court and state staff to operate the program. The prosecutors do the establishment of the order. Friends of the Court enforce the order.

Representatives from the three entities and the state IT department form the PLG – the Program Leadership Group.⁵ Michigan is a universal state with a top-five national caseload of about one million. Wayne County (Detroit) has 39% of the caseload.

D.1.1.5 New Jersey⁶ (NJ 01)

The New Jersey state IV-D program has three regional offices and a self-assessment unit overseeing a bifurcated program. The county Boards of Social Services handle locate, and paternity and order establishment. The state Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) through the county Probation Divisions conducts the enforcement aspects of the case. Cases are heard in the county Family Courts. IV-D attorneys contract with the local Boards of Social Services or are independent. Ms. Griffin said she believes the program could be more efficacious if the program's bifurcation were removed and a single agency ran the program. The current system is burdensome, and co-location of full-service child support offices with TANF offices would improve efficiency. Central office staff should be in one office to oversee policy, systems, training and operations for better coordination.

The Self-assessment Unit conducts regular compliance audits. Currently, the Unit is looking into the paternity establishment rate in TANF cases to determine why the increases are not as dramatic as in the non-TANF caseload. Also the smaller counties are doing better than the large counties and that is being reviewed. The Unit samples cases and analyzes trends. The Unit reviews proper coding on the system to ensure accurate record-keeping and case status. The Unit is reviewing enforcement of cases with credits and very large arrearages and taking a closer look at them. The analysis provides the county offices with data to review performance and take steps to improve it. Currently, the data cannot be drilled down to the case manager level, but it will be part of the new system currently being built. It is important to look at the data analysis for the county office not as a "gotcha" tool but as a supportive management tool to fine-tune the local program based on better outcomes.

D.1.1.6 North Dakota – Regional Offices⁷ (ND 01)

The State of North Dakota, like many other states, is challenged by the need to cover a large geographic area with a fairly low population density in many areas. To respond to this challenge, the Child Support Program is operated through eight (8) regional offices, each of which serves from three (3) to eleven (11) counties. The Regional Offices are operated by a host county with other counties supporting the program financially through property taxes. This structure provides better returns for the state, because numerous two- and three-person offices don't need to be supported, and provides continuity of service for clients, because larger staff size reduces the loss felt when a case manager is on vacation or out sick.

The Regional Offices have been involved with the state office in determining the direction of the program. All offices participate in annual or bi-annual strategic planning sessions, which are held for three or four days at the end of September. Inviting Regional Office Administrators to participate in the strategic planning process provides for increased buy-in from staff, and ensures that regional offices are represented on task forces that result from the planning sessions.

In addition to encouraging participation from Regional Offices in the State strategic planning sessions, the State Central Office also asks each region to develop a plan for performance improvement (usually to increase by 2% in each area) for the year. The

State Strategic Plan provides the overall benchmark for the state as a whole, and the regional plans outline goals and programs that the regions intend to undertake to meet their own benchmarks. In addition to providing the regional office with their individual performance measure percentages each year, the State Central Office also provides monthly Paternity Establishment Percentages to each Regional Office. By distributing these performance measures, the State gives each Regional Office Administrator an opportunity to see how they performed against the previous year's plan, allowing for adjustments if goals were not met as anticipated.

One challenge that is currently facing North Dakota is the number of entities involved in the Child Support Program, making it difficult to manage and retain accountability. Each host county can determine through which agency it wants to operate the Child Support program; currently, three Regional Offices are operated by County Securities offices and five Regional Offices are operated by County Social Service Boards. To address this challenge, the State of North Dakota's Child Support Program created a task force to examine various options in operating and administering the program. The task force meets on a monthly basis and discusses a variety of options, including a state administered program. While the outcome of this task force is still unknown, it has provided an opportunity for North Dakota Child Support stakeholders to discuss the challenges the program is facing and options to address those challenges.

The web site for the task force, which includes presentations and meeting minutes, can be found at

<http://www.nd.gov/humanservices/services/childsupport/taskforce.html>

D.1.1.7 Ohio⁸ (OH 01)

Ohio is county-operated, with 88 counties running the program as a stand-alone Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA), part of a child support agency combined with child welfare and TANF services, part of a prosecutor's office or under a local court. The state has regional managers who oversee the performance of contiguous counties. Ohio is a universal state with very few non-IV-D cases. The caseload is about one million cases. Ohio has 4,200 workers at the state and county level.

The advantages to a state-operated IV-D program are that direction would be uniformly carried out; rules wouldn't have to go through the county filter; and there would be more flexibility to take action if the local office isn't on board with a policy or procedure. The disadvantage is the loss of processing fees generated going to the counties.

More functions could be centralized, said Mr. Pilat, if the counties contributed to the payment of the centralized function. Centralized enforcement for the Financial Institution Data Match (FIDM) could result in state-issued income withholding or freeze and seize notices.

D.1.1.8 Pennsylvania⁹ (PA 01)

Background – Structure – Pennsylvania operates its local program through its Domestic Relations Offices (DROs), which conduct all child support casework in Pennsylvania. The District Attorneys did not fight strenuously to retain the program at the time of the creation of the DROs. Each county has its own DRO. Most orders

are established administratively, but are issued with a judge's signature. Pennsylvania has a universal caseload, with few cases outside of the IV-D program. This means PA has a lower percentage of current TANF cases than many other states. (TANF cases are traditionally harder to work.)

D.1.1.9 South Dakota¹⁰ (SD 01)

South Dakota is state-operated with eight regional field offices. South Dakota relies on administrative process. South Dakota is considered one of the best states statistically, ranked third nationally in paternity establishment of the states using the IV-D caseload standard, first in order establishment (96%), third in current support collected (69%), fourth in cases with arrears in paying status (69%), and third in cost effectiveness (7.76). It is the only state to rank in the top five in cost effectiveness as well as the four other categories.

D.1.1.10 Vermont¹¹ (VT 01)

Vermont is a state-administered program. The state has five regional offices. Mr. Cohen believes a state-operated program is more responsive than a county-operated program. Attorneys are staff attorneys, although attorneys are not needed in all cases as Vermont uses administrative process in many cases. Vermont has a 98% paternity establishment rate and 88% order establishment rate.

D.1.1.11 Virginia¹² (VA 01)

Virginia is state operated with over 600 staff, divided into regional offices. While the program is state-run, there is some decentralization in the regional offices, where the managers have some autonomy in the management of the region. Two offices are privatized.

Privatization – Virginia outsourced some full-service offices and some functions, such as the call center, new hire reporting and paternity registration and outreach. This leaves state staff time to work core-function aspects of the cases.

D.1.1.12 Washington¹³ (WA 01)

Washington's child support program is state-operated, using administrative process for most cases. Washington has 10 field offices located throughout the state. Long considered an innovative state (e.g., new-hire reporting was piloted in Washington as was in-hospital paternity establishment), Washington has been considered a child support leader among the states for over 20 years. Washington has 50-60 attorneys who work inside the program as IV-D attorneys through "interlocal agreements." The Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys contracts with the state to review the program for uniformity and provide appeals analysis.

D.1.1.13 Wisconsin¹⁴ (WI 01)

Wisconsin is county-operated. Wisconsin's prosecuting attorneys left the child support program in the mid-1980s. Now the legal work is conducted by private or county attorneys. Prosecutors had not treated child support as a high priority. The bifurcated system with the counties operating the program locally through child support agencies is inefficient. Ms. Pfeiffer said she would prefer to have it be state-

operated. Smaller counties operate their child support agency in conjunction with the local social services agency, while larger counties have stand-alone child support agencies. Cases are heard by Family Court Commissioners, who are quasi-judicial officials. Wisconsin has had a history of very high performance, including over 100% in paternity establishment, 83% of cases needing orders with orders, and \$5.41 in cost effectiveness. Wisconsin has 344,000 cases; Milwaukee County has 133,000 cases.

D.1.2 County Best Practices

D.1.2.1 Milwaukee County, WI¹⁵ (MC 01)

Background – Structure – Milwaukee is the largest county in Wisconsin. The caseload is handled by specialists. The county has a customer service call center that it shares with Racine County.

Attorneys – In Milwaukee, attorneys handle 80 cases per week. That appears to be a fair caseload, and they do much of the preparation work themselves.

D.1.2.2 Los Angeles County, California¹⁶ (LA 01)

Background – Structure – Los Angeles County Child Support Services Department (CSSD) or Local Child Support Agency (LA LCSA) by itself has a caseload that is bigger than all but eight states. The LA LCSA has five divisions, contiguous with the borders of the districts of the five Supervisors who serve on the Board of Supervisors. Each district has about two million Angelenos, but the five offices have caseloads that range from 25,000 to 100,000, for a total of about 350,000 cases.

D.1.2.3 Orange County, California¹⁷ (OC 01)

Background – Structure – Orange County (OC) has almost 100,000 cases. There are 28 birthing hospitals in OC.

Child Support Office Location – Child support is always going to be secondary in a District Attorney's Office, said Mr. Sturla. A District Attorney may feel compelled to do child support, rather than wanting to do child support. D.A.s work in a punitive, adversarial environment, which makes people act defensively, said Mr. Sturla.

Changes in State/Local Configuration – Under the D.A. system the D.A.s were independent and any contest with the state was won by the D.A.s. The goal was to collect money. Under the new configuration, the state central office was more assertive, which it needed to be to get the new model off the ground, according to Mr. Sturla. The state needs to maintain that energy and drive that occurred at the start of the reconfiguration of the program. LCSAs tend to be stable, more so than at the central office management level. With a new leader, several top managers left, taking a lot of institutional knowledge with them. A strong, state-controlled agency needs management and leadership continuity and technical knowledge.

D.2 MANAGEMENT

D.2.1 State Best Practices

D.2.1.1 Alabama¹⁸ (AL 02)

County Plans – Each county is required to submit a management plan for the next fiscal year. Each plan must show incremental performance improvement and the steps to be taken to improve performance.

D.2.1.2 Arizona – Child Support Committee¹⁹ (AZ 01)

In 2002, the Arizona State Legislature passed legislation creating the Child Support Committee. (Prior to 2002, the Child Support Committee had been a part of the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Reforms Committee.) The Committee is comprised of 22 members representing the legislature, legal community, parents, judiciary, and state child support agency. Leadership for the Committee is shared by a member of the State Senate and a member of the State House, and the Administrative Office of the Courts provides staff support.

The Committee serves to develop and coordinate policies and initiatives to improve Child Support within the state, often recommending legislative or administrative changes regarding the Child Support Enforcement program.

Each year, the Committee breaks into workgroups, depending on what challenges or anticipated changes the Child Support Enforcement program is facing.

In 2005, the Committee had five workgroups:

- Economic Study Workgroup
- Child Support Solutions Workgroup
- Automation Workgroup
- Public Outreach/Customer Service Workgroup
- Statue Review Workgroup

In the past, the Committee has also included "Guidelines" and "Strategic Planning" workgroups.

The Committee publishes an annual report each year, which is posted on their website, along with Committee member information and Meeting minutes and agendas. The Arizona Child Support Committee website can be found at: <http://www.supreme.state.az.us/courtserv/CSC/CSC.htm>

D.2.1.3 California²⁰ (CA 02)

Policy and Performance – Policy staff work closely with the counties to ensure policy is implemented accurately. The California Child Support Directors Association meets regularly with state staff. Several county directors or on a research team that looks at data warehousing/data mining issues and reports that may help LCSAs improve performance. The state reviews closely data spikes and anomalies in data to determine why there are abnormalities. The California Legislature receives and annual report from the state that the LCSAs review first. There are six California performance measurements in addition to the five federal measurements.

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) – Two LCSAs have federal grant money to pilot ADR for related issues.

Strategic Planning – The state works with the LCSAs on the state strategic plan. LCSAs have a local plan consistent with the statewide plan. The SDU and system implementations should have a positive impact on numbers, said Mr. Lola.

D.2.1.4 Colorado – IV-D Task Force²¹ (CO 01)

The Colorado Child Support Enforcement Program (CO CSEP) has an advisory group that is referred to as the IV-D Task Force. The Task Force is co-chaired by a state person and a county person, and includes several subcommittees that are also co-chaired by one state and one county person. The primary purpose of the Task Force is to establish the long term and short term strategic focus for the program, and recently rolled out a new 5 year plan for the CO CSEP (this is the 4th long term strategic plan). The Task Force monitors the progress of the CSE program and develops strategies to meet short and long term goals.

The Task Force has a strong influence on the Child Support Enforcement Program in Colorado. High-level support of the task force is necessary to make it work. When the Task Force was originally created, the Executive Director was supportive of the process which helped in the original development. Since that time, the Colorado IV-D Director has continued to place a high priority on the Task Force, which has led to its continued success and influential role in the program.

The composition of the Task Force is determined by the IV-D Director in collaboration with the Director of the Office of Self Sufficiency. The Task Force consists of county social services directors, deputy directors, IV-D Administrators, judicial staff and state staff. In determining the composition of the Task Force, CO CSEP tries to achieve state wideness and a balance of small/medium/large counties, and looks for participants who really want to contribute to the overall effectiveness of the CSE program.

D.2.1.5 Illinois²² (IL 02)

Improving an Under-performing Program – Ms. Compton suggested that the first step to improve a program is to admit that you have gone in the wrong direction. Explain to all partners, stakeholders and advocates about the need to change course. Do not rely on excuses any longer to explain away less-than-optimal performance.

The second step is to conduct Business Process Reengineering (BPR). The Lincoln Foundation is the Illinois version of the Malcolm Baldrige Foundation. Ensuring performance excellence is its charge. The Foundation looks at activity-based cost models to measure performance, crafted using an analysis approach known as a Rational Design.²³ The program spent a lot of time defining activities. Everyone in the program was surveyed. The program looked at how much time people spent on various activities. Then perceptions were tackled, where people were asked to talk about what they did and not what they did to meet someone else's expectation. After reviewing activities and time spent, a reallocation of resources followed. Eliminate time spent on activities that do not promote collections.

The back end of the child support process, dealing with complaints, took a temporary back seat, according to Ms. Compton. A relatively few customers made a disproportionate number of the calls that took up valuable case manager time. Seventy percent of the questions were routine, such as "Has my payment arrived?" Temporarily, customers were cut off from the case managers to save 25% of the case managers' time. The state bought an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system. The Department had an IVR that was being used for the "downstate" offices, and the new IVR began to service Cook County cases. The state measured wait times and busy signals to determine how implementation was proceeding. At first callers couldn't get through and then after adjustments more callers could and the average wait time was reduced.

The next step was BPR. Case managers spent a lot of time on intake. Intake was handled based on first-come, first served. Intake interviewing for every new customer was the norm, but many customers did not need to be interviewed as all the information needed to establish an order had been obtained already.

In the review stage, the cases were evaluated for data sufficiency. Those cases with the most data were processed first, and then the cases that needed some extra data were processed next, and the cases with virtually no helpful data to process the case to the next stage were processed last. In cases in which information was needed, questions were sent in writing rather than setting appointments for in-person interviews, which are more time-consuming.

The TANF agency did not like the changes as it was not in line with its policy. Child support worked with TANF and turned off the non-cooperation process for a while. The state accepted a negative finding from the Auditor General on this issue. Later, the potential non-cooperation cases were run through the system after the workable backlog was further along in the process. Ms. Compton is certain that the federal government would have approved a temporary waiver if it had been approached first. The next decision was administrative or judicial case-processing, and ensuring that the local office received appropriate performance credit regardless of the decision-making method. This credit regardless of the decision-making avenue allowed local offices to make the best decision possible for the case without risking performance numbers. Cook County is more balanced between administrative and judicial process. Downstate offices use administrative process more regularly than judicial process. The order establishment rates have been rising, from 37% in Cook to over 50%, and statewide closing in on 65%. One county has hit 100% of its cases needing orders with orders.

Performance Monitoring – Illinois does a lot of performance monitoring, tracking default orders, Automated Income Withholding (AIW) and National Medical Support Notices (NMSNs). AIW was not serving employers as well as it was supposed to, and was not getting the expected new hire matches to feed the data to generate new withholding notices. The state matched quarterly employment wage data with the new hire data to determine where the state was missing information. There was only a 30-35% match range. Large employers were reporting to another state's new hire reporting center but had not registered as a multi-state employer. The compliance

rate increased to 40-45% after filtering them out along with government and hospital employers. The analysis showed that 65% of the reporting employers complied fully and the rest of the reporting employers were partially compliant. A new-employee manual was sent to all employers in the state. The state scheduled meetings with the employer community. The Governor mentioned the initiative in his State of the State speech. Non-complying employers were sent a friendly letter the first time, without threats of penalties. The letter mentioned that many employees that the employer may have may be support recipients, and support helps stabilize the workforce. If there still is non-compliance, then a second letter is sent with stronger language regarding compliance with the law, but still not in a threatening manner. The state worked with "mom and pop" employers, who received a different message than the larger employers. The program worked closely with payroll associations and payroll processors as well.

Policy Adherence versus Performance Focus – Focusing on policy adherence instead of performance has one "focused on a zebra in a herd of horses," according to Ms. Compton. A program will "only go down if there is a focus on policy adherence." Performance suffers when one looks at a very small percentage of cases not adhering to policy, as it takes focus and resources away from performance. The key, according to Ms. Compton, is to focus initially on the 80% of the caseload and not the 20% of the caseload. For the 20% of the caseload, conduct "exceptions processing." Eventually, get to the point where you can support robust customer service.

D.2.1.6 Missouri – Staff Evaluation System²⁴ (MO 01)

In 2005, the Missouri Child Support Enforcement Program (MO CSEP) changed the way in which it evaluated staff members. Prior to the change, staff had been evaluated based on their adherence to policy and set processes. However, the state was not seeing the improvement in performance it was hoping for. It was decided that to improve program performance, it was necessary to evaluate staff based on the same criteria on which the program as a whole was being evaluated. MO CSEP developed performance-based evaluations, based on staff title and role, and the five federal incentives. Now, staff are given "credit" for completing a task once the outcome is reached, not when the process is performed.

Each staff member knows in advance what the expectation is, and how meeting that expectation will contribute to their overall evaluation. For example, for "Enforcement," staff are rated on percentage of paying cases compared to the average for their office:

Percentage of Paying Cases.

The percentage of paying cases on your individual caseload, as compared to the office average of paying cases, will be rated as follows:

- Outstanding (5) 4 % or more above
- Highly Successful (4) 3% above
- Successful (3) 2% above or below
- Improvement Expected (2) 3% below
- Unsatisfactory (1) 4% or more below

Staff also know the performance of their office as a whole, and the office benchmark for improvement.

The Missouri Child Support Enforcement Program has improved in each of the five federal performance areas, and credits the change in staff evaluation methods with contributing significantly to this improvement.

D.2.1.7 Missouri – Local Office Staff Councils²⁵ (MO 02)

The leadership of the Missouri Child Support Enforcement Program encourages the participation of staff in the program, and asks for and listens to feedback from staff on a number of areas.

To ensure that this type of communication between program management and staff continues throughout the year, each Missouri local office has a staff council, comprised of staff representatives from a number of areas from the office. The state IV-D Director meets with each office staff council on a regular basis throughout the year to collect input on upcoming changes or initiatives, and to hear suggestions and concerns from the staff on how the program is being operated in their local office. The IV-D Director then follows up with the appropriate management staff on the concerns and suggestions of the field office staff.

This process keeps local case managers involved in the operations of the IV-D program, and provides increased staff buy-in when policy changes or new initiatives take place.

D.2.1.8 Nebraska – Strategic Planning²⁶ (NE 01)

The State of Nebraska's Child Support Division (NE CSD) didn't want their Strategic Plan to just sit on a shelf; they wanted it to be a "living" document that guided the work of all of their local offices and provided staff with an outline of key areas the Division wanted to focus on.

To accomplish this, the NE CSD invited numerous representatives to participate in the development of their most recent strategic plan. Representatives from each local office were involved, as were representatives from the Central Office, and additional stakeholders.

As a result of this collaborative effort, staff working for NE CSD not only know about the strategic plan, they know the details of the goals and how the Division intends to reach them. Staff also refer to the strategic plan when questions about upcoming projects or initiatives arise.

Because Nebraska Child Support staff know and understand the mission and goals of the Agency, they work with the State office to reach the goals, and they can evaluate their own individual performances against the state-wide goals.

Including representation from a number of different areas for development the strategic plan takes mostly communication and time. The costs were minimal, as many meetings can be help via conference call or web conference. The biggest "cost" is the time staff must spend working on the strategic plan, but this time spent up front results in buy-in from all necessary parties.

D.2.1.9 New Jersey²⁷ (NJ 02)

When asked what makes a strong program, Ms. Griffin discussed three things: 1) leadership - Programs that do best have stability in the leadership. When the state commits to its program leadership over time, it can better deal with complex issues. The state executives above the program director need to be supportive in both resources and approach. Succession planning is a key element, and leadership at all levels needs to be aware of managers' strengths and weaknesses. 2) Support - It is important to build a strong team to support the program manager. They must be knowledgeable for credibility and to do their jobs well. It is important that "people skills not be overlooked." 3) Track performance and incentivize – a program needs to analyze performance at all levels and set benchmarks. The same solution in one office may not be what is needed in another and analysis should uncover it. There should be striving for a certain level of performance.

Ms. Griffin said that one cannot expect instant change overnight. Incremental positive change will move the program in the right direction. A question to ask is "What is a reasonable expectation for improvement?" Different strategies are needed for different offices.

Strategic Planning – It is crucial to focus on performance. Intake to set the plan and its goals and objectives is crucial. Start to assess what first needs to be done. It is important to ensure that strategic planning is a dynamic process and provides opportunities for all workers to express concerns.

Performance First – Ms. Griffin, former president of the National Child Support Enforcement Association (NCSEA) and current president of the National Council of Child Support Directors (NCCSD), said she believes that performance and customer service must come before policy adherence. According to Ms. Griffin, strict adherence to policy is not as crucial in IV-D as it is in IV-A, as policy is a means to an end in IV-D, while in IV-A it is the process that must be handled according to policy to ensure accurate assistance to TANF grant applicants. "Policy is there to support business rather than to drive business" in the IV-D program, Ms. Griffin said.

Newsletter – New Jersey issues a newsletter to disseminate best practices. The practices that are put into place as a result are reviewed a year later to determine if they were effective.

D.2.1.10 Ohio²⁸ (OH 02)

Executive Leadership Committee – Local CSEA directors meet monthly to review statutory and rule changes. The CSEA directors provide input and recommendations, but the final decision must be the state's, as it has ultimate responsibility for the program.

D.2.1.11 Oregon – Relationships with District Attorneys²⁹ (OR 01)

The Oregon Division of Child Support (OR DCS) is housed within the Oregon Department of Justice, and 28 county District Attorneys (DAs) operate their county programs for non-assistance cases.

To ensure an ongoing and open relationship with the County DAs, the OR DCS has in place a number of measures that encourage communication.

A District Attorney Oversight group, which includes representatives from 10 of the counties, meets monthly to discuss issues affecting the DAs. Additionally, there is a DCS District Attorney group that meets regularly to address operational issues facing the District Attorneys.

In addition to these standing workgroups, the state of Oregon has a staff member whose role is to liaise with the District Attorneys and address concerns on a one-on-one basis. The D.A. Liaison is a member of the State DCS leadership team, and can escalate issues raised by the DAs as needed.

These measures help to ensure that the District Attorneys who are operating Child Support programs in their counties are heard on a regular basis, and reinforces their roles as key members of the Child Support Community in Oregon.

D.2.1.12 Oregon – Advisory Councils and Workgroups³⁰ (OR 02)

The Oregon Department of Child Support has a number of standing groups that provide guidance to the program. Each of these groups involves key stakeholders in Child Support, providing for a broad perspective on issues and potential changes.

Program Policy Forum – this group, comprised of DCS staff and representation from the District Attorneys, meets monthly to discuss policy changes and initiatives.

Child Support Steering Committee – this committee, which includes leadership from Child Support, the Department of Human Services, TANF, Child Welfare, Medicaid, and the Judicial Department, meets regularly to discuss what is happening with the Child Support program in Oregon, recommends changes for improvement.

Statewide Family Law Advisory Committee – this committee was created by the legislature, and includes a standing Child Support sub-committee. The sub-committee meets every other month and focuses discussions on the relationship between the Child Support program and the courts

D.2.1.13 Pennsylvania³¹ (PA 02)

Relationships – Since the DROs are under the Judiciary and the state central office and responsibility for the program ultimately is vested in the executive branch, it is key that the two branches work together and that both respect the work of the other. The DRO staff traditionally have a strong work ethic. While the DROs are

supervised by the courts, the child support activities are mostly handled by administrative process. Under three percent of the cases go to trial court. Orders go out administratively with the Judge's signature. Establishment cases start with a conference officer working with the parents. About 25-33% of the cases are appealed to a hearing officer, and then only 3% of the cases have exceptions filed that are taken up by the court.

Mr. Richard said it is important to provide constant attention to the counties to maintain good relations with them. DROs, since they are part of the Judicial Branch, must be treated as members of a co-equal branch of government. At the same time, the IV-D office is responsible for the program and needs to make the final decisions about the program. In Pennsylvania, the DRO and the state IV-D office work on commonalities, Mr. Richard said. How can we help one another? How can we promote the judicial philosophy better? It is important to pick battles, if necessary, very carefully. Good will and trust are the cornerstones of the relationship. Once the relationship is established, with a mature program, you rise to the next level of focusing on getting the job done, said Mr. Richard.

Policy and Performance – It is important to reach the federal incentive maximum performance levels. Policy that is not federally-mandated and does not aid in that effort is policy that is unproductive and should not be part of one's focus, according to Mr. Richard. Allegheny (Pittsburgh) and Philadelphia Counties are close to 80% on current support, so skeptics of the ability of large urban jurisdictions unable to perform at high levels need to reconsider. The state is contemplating who will take care of counties' funding losses under the Federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2006 if the counties get to 80% performance levels.

Improving County-based Programs - Mr. Richards suggests engaging in more dialogue with the District Attorneys, and always looking for opportunities to consolidate operations, systems and functions. It is important to provide management reports to county directors every month that drill down to the worker level. Managers and supervisors can examine the reports of cases not in paying status and analyze why they are not paying and take appropriate action.

Individual Performance Evaluations – Pennsylvania has been doing outcomes-based individual performance evaluations in child support for eight years. It is an important component for continuous improvement.

D.2.1.14 South Dakota³² (SD 02)

South Dakota Work Ethic – The culture in South Dakota is to work hard, leading to an expectation that people will work to support their children.

Interaction with Field Offices – Twenty years ago Mr. Walter went to the field offices and asked them what he could do for them. He has continued that practice ever since. The central office/eight field offices structure works well. He said he eliminates an additional layer of bureaucracy by direct control over the eight offices.

Contracts for Attorneys and Process Servers - He contracts with prosecutors on an hourly basis, and their hours are regularly audited. He uses private process servers in

the two largest jurisdictions, Sioux Falls and Rapid City. The process servers are paid only for successful service.

D.2.1.15 Vermont³³ (VT 02)

Policy Adherence – Policy adherence is a "means to an end," said Mr. Cohen. Adherence to policy alone will not lead to high performance as there are "too many shades of gray." Policy is a tool to assist in the objective of collecting support for the families. One cannot be fixated on process as it conforms to policy as much as how it leads to collections.

Malcolm Baldrige and Metrics – External review of the program was conducted by Malcolm Baldrige surveyors, the Vermont Quality Council. The surveyors looked at organizational performance. Gaps in data collection were noted. Metrics were developed, and benchmarks established, as the program looked at the non-federal performance measurements of locate, review and adjustment, and medical support enforcement. It is important to develop a baseline and then continuously work to improve, taking "two-foot jumps" each time, said Mr. Cohen.

D.2.1.16 Washington³⁴ (WA 02)

Key to success – Caring about and focusing on staff is the most important element in the success of the program, according to Mr. Stillman. Case managers have college degrees and a financial collection background is considered a plus during recruiting. There is a low workforce turnover rate (Seattle has a higher turnover than the more rural offices though). A little turnover is a good thing as fresh insights are brought into the program, so the state may over-hire occasionally. The state attends Job Fairs to find good workers, and then trains them intensively. There is one year of probation for the workers. The workforce is motivated by the mission and accepts readily being in a "continuous learning mode," stated Mr. Stillman.

Ten Years from Now – In 2016, Mr. Stillman foresees a child support program with improved agility in which case action can be individualized within the general context of automated case-processing. He said he believes that parents will have more choices in the manner their cases are processed.

Creative Environment – Washington promotes risk taking and creativity. Case managers are told that it is safe to take a risk. The state looks for the best practical solution whether or not it exactly follows the federal statute or regulation.

Data Mining and Performance – Mr. Stillman indicated that having data about individual worker performance will really make a difference to overall performance. Washington, which had hit a plateau for a few years, has begun recently to improve its performance based on the drilled-to-worker data and an improved economy. An important element for performance review is to insist on uniformity of definitions, which will allow everyone to be measured equitably and help the state pass the federal audits. Policy is a tool and not an end. The outcome is a self-sufficient family, with which obedience to a policy may interfere, said Mr. Stillman. To improve performance, there had been a focus on lowering the "denominator" of the five performance measurements, which resulted in some violations of federal case-closure standards. Mr. Stillman suggests erring on the side of keeping the case open

because of the unintended consequences of pushing too hard to close cases and perhaps creating more problems than one is solving.

D.2.2 County Best Practices

D.2.2.1 Milwaukee County, WI³⁵ (MC 02)

Strategies When Facing Low Performance – An underperforming county should "cherry-pick" cases to bring the performance numbers up. Close cases that are unworkable and which meet case closure criteria. Work current support cases first and then arrears-only cases.

Performance Evaluations – Everybody in Milwaukee County CSA has a performance target, from mail room workers to attorneys. Corrective action plans are used when performance goals are not met. Every non-manager in Milwaukee CSA is part of the union and has union protection.

D.2.2.2 Los Angeles County, California³⁶ (LA 02)

Management and Policy – A few years ago, each Division Administrator ran his or her division office differently. California did not have a policy manual, and the LCSAs were given policy letters that were not categorized. In the last few years, there has been an increase in uniformity among the district offices, and the state has an online policy manual, KRIS. The manual includes training modules. Monthly meetings of senior LCSA staff leads to policy implementation discussions. Semi-monthly meetings convened by Mr. Browning's Deputy, Steven Golightly, spotlight issues that need quick policy resolution.

Employee Expectations - County hasn't allowed standards for employees. There is an online performance evaluation tool. The tool produces a set of expectations. The union is involved in setting the expectations and a consensus is reached about goals.

Division Performance Competition and Initiatives - Divisions have performance competitions. Each office has a goal to improve performance relative to where the division is currently performing. "What gets measured gets done," said Mr. Browning. Each office receives a printout of which cases need work and a strategic plan for the county is analyzed at the divisional level. Each division chooses two or so initiatives to pilot for the LCSA. An example is civil contempt. Each division now has a target based on past initiatives. Refinancing of the debt to avoid higher child support interest (for example, securing an equity loan to pay off the child support balance) is another initiative with positive results. Also three months ago the LCSA started autodialing outbound calls to remind parents of their obligation to pay their child support debt, of their genetic test appointments, or of their court hearing date and time.

Employee Recognition – Employees are invited to an annual Division Employee Recognition Ceremony. The LCSA recognizes employees' innovation and improvement.

Sacramento – Los Angeles – LA – Many state workers do not have local child support experience, and as a result, do not have a full understanding of the issues faced at the local level. Much of the advice from Sacramento and from the Regional

Administrators (RAs) does not add much to the discourse, according to Mr. Browning. Many policies were retracted when they proved impractical. It is important for the LCSA directors and the state IV-D director and RAs to have frank discussions about the program and ways to improve it.

State Management - The state DCSS style in the past was fairly dictatorial. It would be good to have a county director be the state director; however, pay differences and moving to Sacramento may limit the number of potential applicants, said Mr. Browning. Having state workers embedded with county workers makes sense, as they learn the nuances and issues of local case-processing. A state IT staff person was located in LA LCSA and became a big advocate for the county at the state level regarding common-sense approaches to system changes.

D.2.2.3 Orange County, California³⁷ (OC 02)

Strategic Plan and Business Plan – It is important to have a statewide strategic plan and for local entities to have a local business plan, especially in the area of paternity. It is important to keep paternity acknowledgment rates at a high level and to integrate in your plan methodologies to accomplish that. OC has been going through a formal planning process for 7-8 years, according to Mr. Sturla.

It is important to have a mission, vision and to establish values. What is the purpose of the office? Are they performing well? In some cases, people do not know why or that they are doing or how it fits into the bigger scheme of things. No one has told them if they are doing well. The planning process must keep the mission, vision and values as the focus. Activities to improve performance, measure it, and determine whether it is worth it. How do you get everyone on the same page?

Accountability - Managers should measure performance down to the case manager level, using the measurements as a management tool for continuous improvement. Data mining is conducted by a three-person research department. They run ad hoc reports and extract other data. They promulgate monthly reports and statistics. "The last people I would get rid of are my research staff," said Mr. Sturla. All reports are accessible by intranet. If someone is underperforming, have an informal discussion with the worker and assign a mentor.

Performance and Policy – Compliance is a necessary evil, but it is not a direct way to increase performance, said Mr. Sturla. A child support agency cannot get to high performance through policy adherence, he stated.

Local Performance Incentives – LCSAs need to work toward a performance incentive reward system. Underperforming LCSAs could be placed under corrective action plans. A Program Improvement Fund can assist counties improve performance. If a county cannot improve performance significantly, the state may appoint an expert to manage the improvements. Currently the state has a weak level of child support expertise at the Regional Administrator level. To give good advice to the LCSAs requires a strong background in child support and an understanding of how the program works at the local level.

D.2.3 Nevada Best Practices (NV 11)

"I review cases, prepare a grid which indicates over performance for the month and cumulative. I prepare a monthly production summary and meet with the worker to go over the summary and to discuss reviews and their performance accuracy per statistics."

"Let case managers provide me with office proactive suggestions."

"Monthly meetings and weekly unit meetings with them are helpful."

"One on ones for input & suggestions."

"Positive gestures and comments, positive reinforcement."

"I seek out training on behalf of my case managers."

"Regular feedback."

"We work very closely with other partners and I meet regularly with partner office reps to identify & look at solutions to our issues - always talking about communication improvement, patience towards & understanding of each other's challenges."

D.3 CASE PROCESSING

D.3.1 State Best Practices

D.3.1.1 Alabama³⁸ (AL 03)

Data Reliability – Data Reliability has been a major focus for the past few years, according to Ms. McCampbell. The performance numbers are tracked statewide on a monthly basis. Field staff review county performance at the case level through a quality assurance process. Local office supervisors are being trained to do internal QA. The state QA staff has traditionally pulled reports and done spot checks to ensure data integrity.

Service of Process – Alabama uses contracted process servers and sheriffs. If the sheriffs cannot serve, some counties then go to contracted process servers. Process may be served by certified mail as well.

Paternity – Cases are handled concurrently when there is more than one alleged father in a case. A case is unique for children with the same father and mother.

Bankruptcy – There are four federal District Court (trial level) districts in Alabama, and the state has one attorney assigned to work bankruptcy cases for each of the districts.

D.3.1.2 Arizona – Paternity Fair³⁹ (AZ 02)

In 2004, the Arizona Division of Child Support Enforcement (AZ DCSE) held a paternity fair in an effort to establish paternity in as many cases as possible. Over 25,000 letters were sent out with the goal of bringing as many people in as possible.

After the paternity fair, the AZ DCSE took advantage of the new data to do a paternity "scrub," including auditing all paternity cases and making sure that data in the system was correct. The AZ DCSE also worked to close cases when possible.

The paternity fair and the following paternity "scrub" resulted in a decrease in both paternity and establishment cases, resulting in improved performance numbers.

D.3.1.3 California⁴⁰ (CA 04)

POP – California has a Paternity Outreach Program (POP) that has made California among the leaders in the nation in statewide paternity establishment. The POP specialists work with vital statistics and birth clerks to review how paper birth records can be converted to electronic records. A vendor maintains a separate POP database. There is a website for POP and persons interested or involved in paternity issues. Having paperless records is a goal. In one of the phases of the implementation of the statewide system, there will be an imaging campaign. Outreach actions to birth clerks, hospitals and medical records specialists should lead to a concerted effort towards imaging.

Medical Support – Legwork underway with MediCal and Healthy Families to determine how cross-matching data would work. California wants to ensure that children are covered by health insurance regardless of source.

Data Reliability – California has one person dedicated to mimicking the federal auditor's audit techniques to ensure that when the actual audit takes place that all reliability issues have been dealt with and resolved.

D.3.1.4 Colorado – Collections⁴¹ (CO 02)

Colorado Child Support Enforcement Program (CO CSEP) has been challenged is in the areas of current support and arrears collections. To focus on improvement in these areas, CO CSEP has made some changes, including one that has been philosophical in nature: CO has become more neutral with regard to obligors and obliges; more father-oriented (encouraging visitation, work programs); and more payor-oriented (establishing orders that are within ability to pay).

In recent years CO CSEP has focused on arrears management, which has had a direct impact on collection of current support as well. Some specific examples of arrears management efforts include the emphasis on establishing reasonable orders using the best information possible; reducing the number of default orders established; limiting the amount of debt/retroactive support established; early intervention; and establishing fair and reasonable payments on arrears.

To limit the amount of dept established, CO CSEP changed the rule and gave county CSE units more flexibility and guidance on establishing debt, and established policies and procedures to ensure more realistic and fair orders are determined based upon actual income. This effort has required less emphasis on establishing the maximum amount of debt and retroactive support, and more emphasis on realistic support that can be fulfilled by the payor.

The successes that Colorado has seen could not have happened without the buy-in from the county CSE units, and the strong partnership developed between all stakeholders to the program.

D.3.1.5 Illinois⁴² (IL 03)

Review and Adjustment – The state worked on improving downward modifications and arrearage compromises during the adjustment period. Setting awards more accurately based on the current income of the obligor will result in higher compliance if there is a fairer relationship between the amount ordered and the ability to pay. Cook County has outsourced the review and adjustment process so that the staff can focus on core functions.

Medical Support – Illinois is a full-insurance state, providing insurance for every child either through private or public means. Medical support enforcement has been outsourced so staff can remain focused on core functions – establishing paternity and support orders and enforcing them.

D.3.1.6 Michigan⁴³ (MI 02)

Paternity – Michigan has 102 birthing hospitals. The state conducts a lot of outreach to the hospitals to ensure that as many acknowledgments are completed as could be expected. A state initiative resulted in eight hospitals offering free genetic testing. The initiative was very popular. Many times an alleged father will not sign if he is unsure about his status. If he agrees to a genetic test on the condition that if the results come back with a high probability of paternity he will sign an acknowledgment, the case can be resolved without a court hearing, as acknowledgments ripen into determinations of paternity by operation of law.

Reducing the Number of Attorneys – Ms. Stephen, a former child support attorney in Jackson County, MI, believes that the program uses too many lawyers and that more activities need to be administrative. This measure not only will cut costs but will speed up the process while ensuring that parents are treated fairly and have a right to appeal to a court if they choose.

Intake – All case intake is conducted by phone, with calls feeding two intake centers staffed by 75 people. IV-A does not collect NCP data.

D.3.1.7 New Jersey⁴⁴ (NJ 04)

Performance First – Ms. Griffin, former president of the National Child Support Enforcement Association (NCSEA) and current president of the National Council of Child Support Directors (NCCSD), said she believes that performance and customer service must come before policy adherence. According to Ms. Griffin, strict adherence to policy is not as crucial in IV-D as it is in IV-A, as policy is a means to an end in IV-D, while in IV-A it is the process that must be handled according to policy to ensure accurate assistance to TANF grant applicants. "Policy is there to support business rather than to drive business" in the IV-D program, Ms. Griffin said.

Child Support Compliance as a Condition of Other Programs' Eligibility – Ms. Griffin discussed cooperating with the child support agency as a condition of eligibility for some of the other means-tested programs, such as child care and TANF, before the benefit is granted.

Universal Caseload – New Jersey is close to universalizing its caseload, as almost all cases go through the IV-D system. Private cases go through family court and at the

hearings, the clients are encouraged to sign up for IV-D services. An application and informational packet is given to them.

Lien Registry – The New Jersey Supreme Court has a judgment index for child support liens. Data of child support obligors with at least one-month's delinquency are filed and placed on the index. Title searchers must check the index to see if a property owner/obligor is transferring property. If he or she is the child support debt for the lien amount is satisfied from the proceeds if there is equity left over after other priority liens are paid off, such as mortgages and tax liens. To clear title, an obligor goes to the local county office to get a warrant of satisfaction. While the registry works, not having an electronic interface with child support makes the arrears balances sometimes inaccurate, so that the satisfaction amount must be calculated individually at the time of the transfer and the application for the lien discharge.

Data Match with Insurers – New Jersey is a member of the Child Support Lien Network (CSLN). This network is made up of 23 states that match insurance data with insurers, leading to liens on potential personal injury and workers compensation settlements. Ms. Griffin said she was pleased with CSLN and the returns to the state.

License Suspension – New Jersey suspends an obligor's driver's license if there has been six months or more of non payment. Cases are reviewed individually and a notice of intent to suspend can be issued. A bench warrant issued for noncompliance may lead to automatic suspension, as the suspension is generated by the system.

Administrative Letter – New Jersey plans to use an administrative letter that tells parents that they are behind in doing something required by the court order. Ms. Griffin said 80% will respond and 20% will not. For the 20%, additional steps must be taken.

D.3.1.8 North Carolina – "Journey 2 Excellence"⁴⁵ (NC 01)

The state of North Carolina, in an effort to improve in all performance areas, initiated a "Journey to Excellence (J2E)" project in 2004. The goal of this five-year initiative was to provide a "roadmap" for all North Carolina Child Support offices, including 5 year goals and means to achieve them. A J2E committee, comprising Department of Social Services Directors, CSE Central Office and CSE Local Office staff, was formed along with seven subcommittees. Each subcommittee focused on one particular area:

- Paternity Establishment
- Percentage of Cases Under Order
- Percentage of Current Support Collected
- Percentage of Arrearage Collected
- Cost Effectiveness
- Health Insurance Coverage

Excellence in quality and performance (based on the "Malcolm Baldrige Award")

Each subcommittee developed a report that included five-year goals for their subject area, a list of recommendations to reach those goals, and examples of "Best Practices"

from around the state. A final report, including reports from each subcommittee, was compiled and sent to each CSE office.

Each subcommittee was also tasked with brainstorming ways to make each recommendation feasible, whether it be presenting new policy or working with Legislators to draft new legislation. For areas that required changes such as drafting legislation or making the Customer Service call center available in all counties, the subcommittees were charged with making the necessary steps to ensure the feasibility of recommendations.

Examples of recommendations from each committee include:

Percentage of Current Support Collected

- Compel confiscation of monetary awards in Civil Suits for payment of past due child support

Percentage of Cases Under Order

- Provide tools so CSE Agents can effectively use "worklists" to manage caseloads
- Utilize Data Warehouse and Self Assessment Reports to improve the metrics in yielding positive results, to increase the percent of cases under order
- Collaborate with Fatherhood Initiative Groups, Faith-Based Organizations, and Community-Based Organizations to assist in NCP outreach activities

Percentage of Arrears Collections

- Liquidation of Public Assistance debt on uncollectible cases
- Check county tax office websites for real estate owned by delinquent NCPs

Paternity Establishment

- Train every employee in each office to be a "DNA Agent" and take DNA samples in offices or courtrooms
- Annual campaign with all hospitals and birthing centers to encourage paternity acknowledgement

Cost Effectiveness

- Affidavit of Paternity in lieu of Civil Process
- Pay bonuses for exceptional performance
- Training of local supervisors to maximize efforts of staff performance

Health Insurance Coverage

- Provide legislation specifying that "reasonable costs" for health insurance be defined by District Court Judges Conference – just as child support payment amounts are calculated
- Offer the option of affordable Private Health Insurance to IVD Children, through group Medical Insurance plan

Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award

- Implement Malcolm Baldrige Process and Core Values (visionary leadership, customer-driven excellence, and valuing employees) in the Child Support offices

D.3.1.9 Ohio⁴⁶ (OH 04)

Courts and Administrative Process – Parents always have the option to go to court instead of using the administrative process. In many counties, magistrates are the decision-makers. Mr. Pilat does not think that one process is necessarily better than another.

Policy and Procedure Manual – The state policy manual is electronically available. Each county is to have a procedure manual that reflects state policy. Top four ways to improve state and county communication are: 1) monthly mailings; 2) policy input; 3) letters to the counties (130-140/year); and 4) the help desk.

D.3.1.10 Pennsylvania⁴⁷ (PA 03)

Case Management – Mr. Richard uses a multi-pronged approach to case management. He uses the CSPIA performance-measurement categories as his primary management tool. His team reviews data for anomalies and focuses on them, looking for explanations. This in turn launches a new wave of performance awareness when patterns are discovered that improve or hurt performance based on a certain set of common case or case manager characteristics

Ability to Pay and Modifications – Pennsylvania proactively modifies orders when an obligor's income has dropped, after notice to the parents. Orders should be based on the present income of the obligor and not what he or she was making at the time of the order or what he or she was presumed to be making, according to Mr. Richard. Pennsylvania routinely modifies cases when there is an inability to pay to a zero order. The cases are reviewed quarterly, using employment security information and other sources, such as percent of payment received, to trigger a review of obligor's current income level. Some detractors feel that this policy may leave some obligors off the hook, but if there are no identifiable assets or income, posits Mr. Richard, what is the point of investing in pursuing uncollectible support?

D.3.1.11 South Dakota⁴⁸ (SD 03)

Performance – Mr. Walter said the bottom line is that a child support program has to measure performance by worker, by office and by state. It is good to have competition between the field offices to promote performance improvement.

Automatic Withdrawal from Bank Accounts – South Dakota has an automatic withdrawal from bank accounts at the option of the obligor. The money is withdrawn the third day of each month. This is done as a benefit to employers. Otherwise, income withholding is used.

License Suspension - If an obligor is \$1,000 or more in arrears, a letter is sent. If the obligor enters into a repayment agreement for current support and arrears, it becomes part of the court order. If payments are missed, action on the license can then be taken administratively or by contempt action.

Liens on Motorcycles – Filed with the register of deeds, the liens prove productive.

Broad Definition of Income – South Dakota uses a broad definition of income to allow for the use of income withholding against most liquid assets.

Administrative and Judicial Process – Cases are administratively handled except for cases referred to the court. Court-appointed referees hear establishment cases and modification of court orders. A notice of support debt is issued to the obligor based on collected financial data. If there is no objection within 30 days, the referee enters the recommended order, and then the circuit court judge signs it if no one objects within 10 days. Mr. Walter meets with the state bar association and with the court on a regular basis to ensure good communication.

D.3.1.12 Vermont⁴⁹ (VT 03)

Parentage Reports – data reliability and increasing paternity establishment rates have led to the use of reports for the five regional offices to determine what can be done in specific cases, such as fixing improper coding, looking for cases that meet criteria for closing, examining caseloads with low paternity establishment percentages. Aggregately the reports can show trends but individually reviewing case data catches the unique problems, such as miscoding or typos.

Service of Process – The most common method to serve process is by certified mail with signature. Courts coordinate personal service if certified-mail delivery fails. Service by sheriffs has had mixed results.

Policy changes – Vermont has an online policy manual, with emails sent whenever changes are made to the manual.

D.3.1.13 Virginia⁵⁰ (VA 02)

Employer Database – Virginia is cleaning up the database to make the data more helpful. There is an automated interface with quarterly wage data that can be used by the case managers, with ad hoc reporting capability.

Cell Phone Subpoenas – Virginia won a 2006 federal award for innovation based on its project to collect support by subpoenaing phone companies for their cell phone records. Working with Cingular and Verizon, the two cell phone companies have volunteered to give information to the DCSE in lieu of receiving subpoenas for thousands of customer records. The cell phone information provides great locate information.

D.3.1.14 Washington⁵¹ (WA 04)

Data Mining and Performance – Mr. Stillman indicated that having data about individual worker performance will really make a difference to overall performance. Washington, which had hit a plateau for a few years, has begun recently to improve its performance based on the drilled-to-worker data and an improved economy. An important element for performance review is to insist on uniformity of definitions, which will allow everyone to be measured equitably and help the state pass the federal audits. Policy is a tool and not an end. The outcome is a self-sufficient family, with which obedience to a policy may interfere, said Mr. Stillman. To improve performance, there had been a focus on lowering the "denominator" of the five performance measurements, which resulted in some violations of federal case-closure standards. Mr. Stillman suggests erring on the side of keeping the case open

because of the unintended consequences of pushing too hard to close cases and perhaps creating more problems than one is solving.

GMAP – The Government Management Analysis and Performance (GMAP) measures performance in three categories: percentage of parents on current TANF or recently-former TANF, percentage of parents paying on their cases, and percentage of cases with orders. Ad hoc reports can be issued to anyone who has internal access to the state system. Additional measurements include the percentage of paternity acknowledgments of paternity determinations, tribal caseload, and the initiating and responding interstate caseload. An "e-model" similar to a Fair, Isaac scoring system for credit rating, indicates how well a case manager is performing in these categories. Unnecessary activities can hurt one's score (e.g., conducting confirmation of an address activity when employer is known). Coaches and performance analysts work with case managers to improve their performances.

Authorized Electronic Bank Withdrawal Payments – The Child Support Internet Payment Service allows obligors to go to the state website and pay child support by authorizing the state to withdraw funds from the obligors' bank accounts.

Direct Deposits and VISA Cards – The state gives the custodial parents a choice of direct deposit of a child support payment into a checking account or a credit on a VISA card. Mr. Stillman reported that the VISA card option is more popular.

FIDM – Data base matching yields bank matches, but the matches are provided to the case manager to review before authorizing a withholding of the account funds to ensure the case's fact patterns warrant seizure. The fact patterns differ case to case so that the state does not want to take automated freeze and seize action in the matched cases without the review process.

Imaging and Automated Liens and Levying – through imaging, orders are sent to be recorded as liens. A new generation of imaging equipment is scheduled for the State Disbursement Unit to support Check 21.

Policy and Procedure Manual – The Policy and Procedure Manual is online and is an important tool for communication with customers when they talk to the case manager. There are interactive links associated with it, connected to other resources.

D.3.1.15 Wisconsin⁵² (WI 03)

Modification Changes – In 2002, the state at the federal government's insistence changed the way many orders were set (based on a percentage of the obligor's income to a sum certain amount). This resulted in 66,000 orders updated that year. State showed it could handle a major case overhaul project well.

Specialization – Milwaukee is specialized but most other counties assign cases by alphabet; some have mixed functional status (establishment specialists and enforcement specialists, for example).

Policy and Procedure Manual – Policy and procedure manual is electronic. If a county has a question, state central office policy office will answer the question within two business days unless there is a legal issue involved.

D.3.2 County Best Practices

D.3.2.1 Milwaukee County, WI⁵³ (MC 03)

Paternity Cases – Wisconsin Works (W-2) Job Centers refer 45 to 50% of the Milwaukee paternity cases – these are self-referrals and not TANF cases. These parents are seeking assistance in establishing paternity in order to get a child support order to promote self-sufficiency. Hospital acknowledgments account for about 200 per month. Milwaukee out-stations paralegals in hospitals to obtain acknowledgments. Milwaukee has about 500-600 new paternity cases a month (and about 500 non-paternity new cases per month).

Settlements – People come in and resolve issues immediately, don't try to get both parties in there at the same time.

Pro Se Clinic – Run a pro se clinic to encourage parents to take charge of their cases. It also saves money for the county. The local bar association staffs it with a child support agency person there. Modification and contempt actions could be brought by the parents themselves and with some form-filling and evidence-gathering assistance, parents can proceed into court on their own. The modification form is one page. If there is a pro se contempt action that goes to the hearing stage, a child support agency attorney will be there.

Incarcerated NCPs – Milwaukee modified over 1500 orders to zero current support levels while the NCP is incarcerated (if the NCP has at least 6 months left on his or her prison term). No proof for the downward modification was needed unless the NCP was on work release. After so many days after release, the order automatically resumes to pre-incarceration levels.

Service of Process – Standard operating procedure is to use private process servers and to pay only for successful service (\$18/person served). Service occurs usually within one week after the summons is issued. The county child support agencies are putting together a database of process servers throughout the state.

TANF Cases – Applicants have to see child support staff before the TANF interview. The case then gets triaged – does the applicant know the father and his location? The agency gets paperwork going. Does the applicant know the father but does not know his location? Move the case to locate status.

Cases Without Income Information – State quarterly wage system is used, along with a letter to an employer, to provide income information. If wage history for the obligor is known, it is used.

Automated Enforcement – Milwaukee uses automated financial institution data match. The match is automated, but each match is reviewed to ensure a freeze and seize is appropriate. A letter regarding the freeze is sent to the NCP at the same time as the lien. Recreational hunting and fishing licenses are suspended through automated matches. Fifty percent of males in Wisconsin over 18 years old have them.

Liens – Liens on real property and vehicles sometimes result in big hits

Early Intervention – Early intervention is labor intensive but can keep cases in compliance or quickly returned to compliance status.

D.3.2.2 Los Angeles County, California⁵⁴ (LA 06)

Caseload Cleanup – Cases are reviewed to see if the awards are set too high for the income level of the obligors. The default rate is 70%, which is too high. All obligors with cases with orders without payments received new notices that they were entitled to a review and if appropriate, an adjustment of the ordered amount. About 40,000 cases have a new presumed amount that dropped the imputed income award levels from about \$400 per month to \$200 per month (minimum wage), removing about \$10 million from the current support due denominator. Current support is main focus today. A very high percentage of obligors receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI). These identified cases can be downwardly modified administratively.

D.3.2.3 Orange County, California⁵⁵ (OC 03)

Case-processing - Standardize business practices – analyze the steps - are the steps necessary to meet a goal or accomplish performance? Justify each step as it relates to achieving your performance goal.

D.3.3 Nevada Best Practices

D.3.3.1 Nevada County Tools (NV 03)

County	Nature of the Tool	Title
Elko DA	Desk Guide	Case File Set-Up
Elko DA	Desk Guide	Child Support Office Policy Manual Index
Elko DA	Cheat Sheet	Elko CS Best Practice/Setting Alerts
Elko DA	Checklist	Case manager Checklist
Elko DA	Performance	Child Support Case manager Weekly Progress Report
Humboldt DA	Desk Guide	"A-Z" Case Work
Humboldt DA	Desk Guide	Cash Handling Policies
Humboldt DA	Desk Guide	Procedures for Driver's License Suspensions
Douglas DA	Customer Service	Application Packet and Group Intake Calendar
Douglas DA	Desk Guide - Procedures	Case Set-Up/Case Closure
Douglas DA	Checklists	BOW Flag Manual Worksheet Closing a Case Group Intake License Suspension Tracking Modifying a Douglas County Order
Clark DA	Checklist – Worksheet	Worksheet for Court Prep III
Clark DA	Desk Guide – Procedures	Types of Cases that cannot be audited in NAWC
Lyon DA	Desk Guide - Procedures	Flow Chart for New Cases
Lyon DA	Customer Service – Procedures	How to Appeal the Court Master's Recommendations
Lyon DA	Checklist – Form	Courtmaster Hearing Case Presentation
Reno PAO	Desk Guide - Procedures	Accepting Referrals – aka PRFL
Reno PAO	Checklist - Form	Case Set-Up
Reno PAO	Cheat Sheet	Timeframes to Remember

County	Nature of the Tool	Title
Reno PAO	Cheat Sheet	Things to Remember When Working a Case
Reno PAO	Cheat Sheet	Locate Resources
Reno PAO	Desk Guides – Procedures	Court Desk Procedures
Elko PAO	Checklist – Form	Case Action Checklist
Elko PAO	Checklist – Form	Information for Notice
Elko PAO	Checklist – Form	Information for Default Order
Elko PAO	Log	Expedited Case Processing Log
Elko PAO	Report	EPAO Monthly Outcomes
Carson City DA	Cheat Sheet - Procedures	CCDA CSE House
Carson City DA	Customer Service	Group Interview Instructions
Churchill DA	Log	Action Log
Churchill DA	Checklist – Form	Court Prep Form
Washoe DA	Checklist – Form	Assistant Request
Washoe DA	Checklist – Form	File Closure Checklist and Request Form
Washoe DA	Checklist – Form	Paternity – Clerk Request Form
Washoe DA	Checklist	Incoming Fax Checklist
Washoe DA	Desk Guide – Procedures	Mail Room Procedures
Washoe DA	Desk Guide – Procedures	Printing Employer Letters and Wage Withholdings

D.3.3.2 Nevada Best Practice (NV 04)

DWSS currently has the start of what could be a very effective outreach tool to encourage in-hospital paternity acknowledgments. The person responsible for this outreach task is currently housed in the Las Vegas DWSS Desert Inn facility. She has several "eye-catching" informational items that enable the education and distribution of in-hospital paternity acknowledgment to both the hospitals and birthing centers, but also to the general public.

- Paternity – It's in the Bag" (PIB) small plastic bags containing an assortment of pamphlets about child support enforcement as well as an Affidavit of Paternity form that may be completed in the hospital,
- Nevada Hospital Paternity Program Hospital Training Manual, and Paternity: It's in the Bag Newsletter that is published quarterly.

D.3.3.3 Nevada Best Practice (NV 09)

The IV-D FTE housed in the Reno District Office is an excellent example of providing services to multiple stakeholders: the Reno PAO, the Washoe County FSD, the IV-A Support Specialists, and the child support customers. Since her placement in the DO, she has:

Taken on the responsibility of conducting QC on the Form 2906s received from the IV-A Support Specialists,

Attends Unit Meetings to provide feedback and education about the errors that are found in the completion of the Form 2906,

Contacts customers by telephone or correspondence when additional information or documentation is needed,

Created a IV-D Questionnaire Checklist that she uses for every 2906 received to make sure that all the required information is obtained before the Form 2906 is forwarded on to the PAO.

Created an EXCEL spreadsheet to track and monitor all Form 2906's that she's received, if good cause is claimed and if the Birth Certificate was received.

D.3.3.4 Nevada Best Practice (NV 07)

In Lyon County, minutes are taken at each office meeting and distributed to all staff to ensure that everyone is aware of what was discussed.

D.3.3.5 Nevada Best Practice – Clark County Employee Assistance Program (NV 08)

Nevada has a work related program in Clark County (Las Vegas) called the Employment Assistance Program (EAP) for clients that have Nevada Welfare related Child Support Orders. The program focuses on helping clients that have problems paying their child support. The program is designed to help participants improve their lives as well as be able to take care of their Child Support responsibilities. Program participants are normally referred into the program by the Child Support Court System. The program has a special court setting that is set up for the Court to monitor their participation in the program.

1. The program's main focus is providing clients with the following support services needed to gain employment:
 - Job placement assistance
 - Assistance with resumes and completing job applications
 - Transportation assistance – (bus pass/tokens or gas reimbursement for clients with private autos)
 - Assistance in obtaining ID, driver's license, work cards (Gaming, Sheriff, TAM, and Health), Background Checks and Finger Printing
 - Vouchers to purchase clothing for work and job search
 - Vouchers to purchase tools and equipment for employment
2. Clients also receive referrals to outside agencies for assistance with the following issues:
 - Family Mediation Services to help gain access to their child and visitation rights
 - Housing/Homeless Problems
 - Vocational Training Programs
 - Medical Treatment
 - Drug/Alcohol Treatment
 - Mental Health Treatment/Counseling
 - Assistance in seeking Social Security Disability Benefits
3. In addition, the EAP Program is a member of the Community Advisory Board for Nevada Department of Corrections, Going Home Prepared Re-Entry Program. This re-entry program is designed to assist violent offenders re-enter society upon their release from the Department of Corrections. The EAP Program provides all

of its services to Going Home Prepared Participants that have Welfare related Child Support Orders.

D.4 FUNDING

D.4.1 State Best Practices

D.4.1.1 California (CA 03)

County Pressures and Incentives – Flat funding has made it difficult at the local level, as many union contracts call for salary increases. The LCSAs are funded through reimbursement of their base costs (state share and FFP) and incentives, flowing down to the LCSAs based on the 11 performance indicators.

D.4.1.2 Michigan⁵⁶ (MI 03)

Incentives – Incentives are distributed based on federal performance measurements. Wayne County "floats the boat" when it comes to performance as two of five cases come from there. The incentives are triple-weighted to favor work on TANF cases (federal incentives count collections in TANF and former TANF cases double the never-TANF case collection rate when determining the potential state incentive pool).

DRA Cuts – Congress passed legislation that will cut \$8.4 billion in federal aid to the national child support program over 10 years, beginning in 2007.⁵⁷ Michigan will lose millions each year. The PLG and the state office are working on plans to make up the difference to Michigan of lost federal funds and to reduce costs at the same time. The PLG is working on a consensus approach that makes sense for the program, the taxpayers and children of Michigan. Instead of voting, consensus is sought and each participant should be able "to live with" the solution, particularly the IV-D director. Determining what to do with the impending budget cut led the PLG to form a committee of not more than 12 individuals representing the five PLG entities.

D.4.1.3 New Jersey⁵⁸ (NJ 03)

Funding – The program is projected to lose \$9 million per year in incentive dollars once the DRA goes into effect, eliminating the federal match on incentives. The incentives go to the counties to partially finance the local operations.

D.4.1.4 Ohio⁵⁹ (OH 03)

Incentives and Funding – Until four years ago, incentives distributed to counties were allocated based on collections. Now incentives are based on the first four federal incentive measurements. The counties use the IV-D PEP measurement for incentive distribution from the state to the counties, while the state uses the statewide PEP for federal incentive reimbursement.

Local program funding comes from incentives, fees and state allocation of about \$16-17 million. TANF state share retention is kept at the state level. Some counties have had to use county general funding to complete the 34% state/local share of the match with FFP.

D.4.1.5 Pennsylvania⁶⁰ (PA 04)

Funding – Counties appropriate what the federal government doesn't pay, or 34% of local IV-D agency costs. Incentives are distributed to counties based on counties general fund share of total statewide IV-D Program costs, which establishes the counties' base pool; then, among counties, incentives are distributed based on CSPIA.

D.4.1.6 Wisconsin⁶¹ (WI 02)

Incentives – The counties receive incentive money from the state, \$4 million or 80% of which is guaranteed based on caseload. The remaining \$1 million or 20% of the incentive fund is distributed based on performance and incremental improvement. Each measurement may have different weights." Allocation of incentives based on performance has turned the state around," stated Ms. Pfeiffer.

D.4.1.7 Washington⁶² (WA 03)

DRA FFP Match Loss Impact – Washington estimates it may lose 20% of its funds with the loss of the incentive FFP match. Mr. Stillman discussed the need to publicize the value brought to the customers of the program, particularly in the cost-avoidance area. Failure to invest in child support may have dire consequences to parents and to taxpayers.

D.5 CUSTOMER SERVICE

D.5.1 State Best Practices

D.5.1.1 California⁶³ (CA 05)

Customer Service – The Los Angeles CSSD call center has been shown to be very effective. The statewide SDU has a call center.

Outreach to Stakeholders – California reaches out to the California Chamber of Commerce and other state agencies to promote employer/IV-D program understanding and to address any issues that the employer community may have.

D.5.1.2 New Jersey⁶⁴ (NJ 05)

Pilot Call Center – Three counties are piloting a joint call center, jointly staffing the center. Since the AOC oversees the county work, the state IV-D agency cannot summarily set up the pilot. The state IV-D agency works with the AOC to plan for the program's future, using pilots such as the call center to determine if program changes should be rolled out statewide.

D.5.1.3 North Carolina – Relationship with the Military⁶⁵ (NC 02)

North Carolina is home to a number of military bases. To best serve this population, local offices have staff members at the bases each week. This outreach to military families is beneficial to both the Child Support Enforcement program and the families, and ensures ongoing communication between the program and the military.

D.5.1.4 Ohio⁶⁶ (OH 05)

Customer Service – Calls go to counties and then, if needed, they are bumped up to the state. Part of customer service can be done at the state level, including fielding

SDU calls. If a customer is unhappy, there is an independent hearing officer to review the actions taken or not taken.

D.5.1.5 Pennsylvania⁶⁷ (PA 05)

Customer Service – Pennsylvania has expanded the media through which contact can be made. Most customer service is conducted at the DRO level. Each has an IVR, although the state manages all the IVRs centrally. Each DRO records its own scripts for the IVR. There is a state hotline and a SDU number for calls regarding payments. The PA website allows secured log in by parents to show the last five payments. The site is refreshed every morning.

D.5.1.6 South Dakota⁶⁸ (SD 04)

Customer Service – South Dakota had a centralized customer service unit. The parents wanted to talk to the case managers, so they dissolved it.

Military – Rapid City office has strong contacts with Ellsworth Air Force Base to ensure service members concerns are met.

D.5.1.7 Vermont⁶⁹ (VT 04)

Customer Service – Centralized customer service is very helpful, said Mr. Cohen, and highly recommends it. It cannot be set up as a "glorified answering service" – the customer service representative must give out accurate information to the caller.

Imaging System – An important complement to the Customer Service Center is imaging, said Mr. Cohen. Imaging allows the customer service representatives to quickly view documents while answering questions for the callers.

D.5.1.8 Virginia⁷⁰ (VA 03)

Customer Service – Virginia is currently migrating all of its caseload to an outsourced, statewide call center in a rural part of the state. Three-quarters of the caseload had been migrated as of July 2006. Customer service representatives look up case information and answer questions at a fairly detailed level. The call center has the capability to do outbound dialing to call customers to remind them individually of events that affect them.

Website – Virginia gives customers the information they want, said Ms. White. Virginia posted information for the most frequently asked questions and provide access to individual case for unique case-specific information, such as payment history, last five actions noted in a case, and upcoming court dates.

D.5.1.9 Washington⁷¹ (WA 05)

The Customer Relationship – Washington stated that 16-18% of its customers have never received TANF and 15-16% of its customers currently are receiving TANF. That leaves the great majority as former TANF customers. The state has not spent a lot of time working on the customer relationship. There is no call center. Complaints are handled by a community relations unit of five people. They act as core staff to respond to legislators' inquiries and to field calls from inquiring parents. A conference board adjudicates disputes regarding policy application in specific cases, case manager treatment, and compromising arrearages. Washington does a lot of

outbound dialing for reminders and collections and returns incoming calls that are taken on voice mail within 24 hours.

Foreign Languages – Washington has Spanish-speaking personnel in all field offices, and in Seattle there are Russian and Vietnamese speakers. Administrative notices have been translated.

Military Liaison – Washington has a military liaison near Fort Lewis in Tacoma.

D.5.1.10 Wisconsin⁷² (WI 04)

Customer Service – Milwaukee has a call center for Milwaukee and Racine Counties. Other counties and the state disbursement unit answer questions directly.

D.5.1.11 Colorado⁷³ (CO 04)

Colorado provides customers with the ability to go online through their state website and access payment history online.

D.5.1.12 Colorado⁷⁴ (CO 05)

Colorado provides a display of payment and disbursement history. Colorado provides customers with the ability to go online through their state website and request case status and/or request an application for a debit card. In addition, the CST or NCP may display a complete payment record in pdf format to be printed

D.5.2 County Best Practices

D.5.2.1 Milwaukee County, WI⁷⁵ (MC 04)

Customer Service Call Center – Milwaukee has 15 slots. Hiring strategy was to look for persons with customer service skills first and then they were trained on child support. Interactive Voice Response Unit (IVRU) handles most of the calls. Case managers are left messages. Customers can leave messages on the web for case managers.

D.5.2.2 Los Angeles County, California⁷⁶ (LA 05)

Call Center – LA LCSA has 150 persons staffing the call center. An energized manager ensures that the customers' concerns are adequately addressed. All calls are taped so that complaints of treatment or accuracy of response can be checked later by supervisors. If there is a complaint, a union representative is brought in to protect the Customer Service Representative (CSR). A policy misapplication may result in a training alert. The supervisor reviews the answer and the correct policy with the CSR. A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is put into place. The LCSA has put into place targets for courteousness.

D.5.3 Nevada Best Practices

D.5.3.1 Nevada (NV 01)

Clark County has a blue card that can be folded into a business card size which contains the office phone number, fax number, hours, location, mailing address, address for mailing payments, room to add individual case numbers, etc. It requests changes in employment, address, or telephone number be reported and how. It is a good idea and customers can carry it with them easily in a purse or wallet. (This

would also be a good place to advertise email and Web site options, if those areas are enhanced.)

D.5.3.2 Nevada (NV 02)

An innovative approach was found in Clark County. A tutorial to the Application is available for in-person visitors. A computer with the on-line tutorial is in a room off of the Reception Area. Potential applicants who need assistance in completing an Application (English or Spanish) are shown to this room and the tutorial guides them through the Application. They can place the cursor on any field and there is an audible explanation as to what is required for that field. Clark County reported benefits include the fact that staff intervention and time is not needed to sit with the potential applicant and explain or assist with completing the application. (Future plans include the ability for potential applicants to complete the Applications on-line. As of now, however, there is not that capability.)

D.6 TRAINING

D.6.1 State Best Practices

D.6.1.1 New Jersey⁷⁷ (NJ 06)

Training Academy – New Jersey is building a training academy in conjunction with Rutgers University. The plan is to certify all workers eventually.

D.6.1.2 New York – Web Based Training⁷⁸ (NY 01)

The New York Division of Child Support Enforcement (NY DCSE) has started a state-wide web-based training project for the Child Support system that has improved the quality of training while keeping training costs down. When another Division in the Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance (which is where the NY DCSE is located) chose to purchase licenses for a web-based training project, the NY DCSE realized that they could save money by joining with the other agency on the license and developing web-based training materials.

Before the web-based license was purchased, the NY DCSE had contracted out training on their Child Support system, Assets. Training was done in classrooms using a Computer-Based Training system. The new web-based training (WBT) system allows NY DCSE trainers to conduct training from the State Central Office in numerous locations throughout the state. With this new system, the State Training office can offer two classes each day, and ten to twelve (10 – 12) courses each year.

The WBT system allows class participants to ask the trainer questions, or to post questions to the entire group. The trainers can monitor the work of the participants while they are taking quizzes, and can "step in" to assist when necessary. The anonymous nature of the classes makes many participants feel more comfortable speaking up with they have a question or don't understand a particular area, and the trainers have experienced more interaction in the WBT "classroom" than they did in the live classrooms.

In addition to offering two live classes each day on the WBT, the Training team also records each course so case managers can walk through the training at their own

convenience. While this option does not give participants the opportunity to take all of the quizzes or receive real-time feedback from trainers, it does give case managers a chance to re-visit areas they have questions about. These recorded sessions can also be used as a supervision tool; if a case manager is consistently being challenged by one area, their supervisor can recommend that they review the recorded class for that area.

The NY DCSE has experienced cost savings as a result of this training endeavor. Trainers and participants no longer need to travel, so travel costs and time are saved. Additionally, participants can take the class that is most convenient for them and the office they work in, so offices are not "losing" large numbers of staff due to a limited number of on-site classes. The central training team at the state office has six staff members, including one supervisor and five trainers, for 2000 child support workers.

D.6.1.3 Ohio⁷⁹ (OH 06)

Training Video-conferencing – Ohio offers video-conferencing for training to all counties. The state can conduct training in Columbus and have it shown throughout the state. This saves the counties a lot of travel money.

D.6.1.4 South Dakota⁸⁰ (SD 05)

Training for Establishment Specialists – Each field office has establishment specialists who are trained on the data reliability audit to ensure passage when the federal government audits the way data are collected and recorded.

D.6.1.5 Vermont⁸¹ (VT 05)

Training – New workers are trained for 10-12 days. The state has one trainer. Vermont has 130 FTEs, 65 of which are in central office and the others are in the regional offices.

D.6.1.6 Wisconsin⁸² (WI 05)

Training - Training conducted by the University of Wisconsin will likely face a budget cut due to the incentive match disallowance next year, going from 4 to 1.5 trainer FTEs.

D.6.1.7 Florida⁸³ (FL 01)

Training – With the implementation of the new Florida CAMS, the Department of Revenue (DOR) undertook a new, innovative approach to user training. DOR purchased training software, Learning Management System (LMS) from Pathlore. This training software allowed them to implement, manage, monitor and report on user system training throughout the state during implementation of the first phase of CAMS. Individualized training plans, outlining required courses dependent upon the type of functional areas the user would be performing tasks in (locate, enforcement, etc.), were established on LMS.

The users take a combination of web-based introductory prerequisite courses, distance learning (audio visual) classes and in-class courses. The web-based courses could be taken at any time, even after hours at home. At the end of each course, they were required to pass a test to show their efficiency in performing the tasks for the

particular class. There was also a great deal of flexibility allowed within LMS to work around the individual user's work schedule. Users were given a UserID to allow them access to CAMS only upon successful completion of all the classes in their training plan.

LMS allows both the trainers to see if a user had registered for courses, if they were a "no show" and if they either finished or mastered a class based on performance, as well as the supervisors to see how well the trainee did and what courses they completed. Evaluations were completed with allowance for a Level 3 evaluation which was done three months after the user had completed their training plan and was working on the new system.

LMS was purchased by DOR rather than by the Child Support Enforcement. The Department owned and maintained the system thus allowing other divisions within DOR to also use the training system.

LMS allows:

- Organization by jobs, roles and course catalogues,
- Tracks and maintains training records and student progress,
- Manages training resources, wait lists and facilities,
- Enables access to learning,
- Tracks and maintains assessments and test results, and
- Provides progress and status reporting on the system training program.

D.6.2 County Best Practices

D.6.2.1 Los Angeles County, California⁸⁴ (LA 04)

Mentoring Program – New supervisors explore new aspects of the program. They attend a Board of Supervisors' meeting, go to the call center, go to court, and learn from the IT group. A senior staff member is selected as a mentor for the supervisor and guides the person through the initial phases.

D.6.3 Nevada Best Practices

D.6.3.1 Best Practice – Nevada (NV 10)⁸⁵

The Reno PAO recently undertook a new approach to training. With the hiring of three new Support Enforcement Specialists, one of the more "seasoned" staff was charged with the responsibility of training the three new employees. He took an innovative approach and methodology to approach this task. A Training Plan was developed with a formal objective. The new employees were assigned to him for a six month period and were also assigned a caseload of 460 cases each to work. A Resource Book was put together for each of them by asking all of the case managers in the office for desk guides, handouts, charts, and other visual materials that they have created to help them in their job.

In addition to receiving training in all of the IV-D functional areas and case actions, the training that the three staff received also covered areas such as:

- How to organize their work
- Decision-making

- Brainstorming to come up with a written procedure
- Interviewing and telephone etiquette skills
- How to read, understand and use the CSE Manual, P&Ps, and Task Guides.

Each day was spent with a combination of lecture in the morning and "hands on" in the afternoon, using what they had learned on their actual cases. If they encountered a problem with a case, they set it aside. The following morning, time was set aside to discuss problems or questions that arose from those cases that they worked on the previous day and were set aside.

These three staff members received more complete, in depth training than most of the "seasoned" SESs in the office.

D.7 SYSTEMS

D.7.1 State Best Practices

D.7.1.1 Alabama⁸⁶ (AL 04)

Alerts – Alabama has a workgroup that prioritizes the alerts so that high-priority alerts are worked first.

D.7.1.2 Colorado – Reports⁸⁷ (CO 03)

The Colorado Child Support Enforcement Program's (CO CSEP) reports are high quality and fairly extensive. The statewide automated system produces numerous and detailed reports with statistics on every aspect of the program, including collections, establishment activities, enforcement activities, and financial activities. Most of these reports are produced at the county level, as well as team and individual levels. The system also produces working reports for county child support professionals that identify establishment, enforcement, and financial activities that need to occur, or actions needing to be taken. CO CSEP recently combined several working reports into two new super reports, one for enforcement and one for establishment, to eliminate duplicated information on various reports and to streamline the information needed by county child support professionals.

Some recent enhancements to reports include the addition of information to assist staff with early intervention: the establishment super report was changed from a monthly report to a weekly report, recognizing the need for more timely information as those case actions happen quicker and could be lost in a monthly reporting cycle.

Specific data from the reports produced by the statewide automated system is then compiled into several management reports. One of these reports, the Monthly Monitoring Report (MMR), is a 22-page monthly report by county. This report includes information on goals, and progress towards meeting those goals; collection information as well as data on specific activities, such as the number of paternities and orders established year-to-date. This report is distributed to county directors, CSE administrators, state staff, and field staff.

The number and quality of reports available to Colorado CSE staff assists them with case management, and allows supervisors and other management staff to see how the

Program as a whole, as well as individual offices, are performing and progressing toward their goals.

D.7.1.3 Michigan⁸⁸ (MI 04)

Alerts – Prioritize action alerts and ignore informational alerts, said Ms. Stephen.

D.7.1.4 New Jersey⁸⁹ (NJ 07)

Business Process Reengineering (BPR) – New Jersey is undergoing a BPR right now. BPR has uncovered how often the case managers are not using the system. There is a large problem with incorrect or different addresses for employers

Alerts/Tickers – It was a nightmare for the state but staff have learned how to manage and use the tickler system. The staff highlight good practices and then share them.

D.7.1.5 Ohio⁹⁰ (OH 07)

Alerts – Alerts can be divided between those that are critical and those that are informational. The informational ones are suppressed. This was part of a big release about 1 ½ years ago.

Data Mining – COGNOS is the Ohio data mining application. The state does the analysis and provides the data and reports to the counties. While counties could do the analysis themselves, they are not trained to the extent that dedicated state staff are to the analysis process.

D.7.1.6 Oregon – Alert Reduction Group⁹¹ (OR 03)

In response to a large number of complaints from workers about the numbers of alerts they received each day, the Oregon Division of Child Support created an "Alert Reduction Group." The group included case managers, branch managers, District Attorney staff, and representatives from the State Office Policy, Performance, Budget, Statistics, and IT staff. The Alert Reduction Group were able to significantly reduce the number of alerts by looking at the federal requirements for alerts and comparing that to their own list of alerts and the complaints of staff.

The Alert Reduction group continues to meet approximately every 6 months to discuss adding or removing alerts. In addition, every request to add or change an alert must go through the Alert Reduction group for review.

D.7.1.7 South Dakota⁹² (SD 06)

Self-Assessment - Mr. Walter spoke of ad hoc reporting capability, so managers can drill down to the worker level as well as the field office level to uncover trends and to find workers who may be falling behind. A daily report is made of each worker's performance. For quality control, 25% of each worker's cases are pulled and examined to see if policy and procedure were applied correctly.

Alerts – alerts are suppressed to block informational alerts so that the only alerts on the system that the worker sees are the ones that need to be worked. One person prioritizes field requests for systems modifications.

D.7.1.8 Vermont⁹³ (VT 06)

Case Management System – Vermont has a case management system that tracks compliance components and timeframes.

Alerts – It is the expectation that people will respond to alerts that arise. Good alerts management by each worker is part of the job.

D.7.1.9 Virginia⁹⁴ (VA 04)

Alerts – Alerts are for anything new such as a new automated FIDM match. Virginia stopped doing individual task alerts. Alerts are purged after one reminder if action is taken.

D.7.1.10 Washington⁹⁵ (WA 06)

Systems Improvements – Over 200 systems prioritized improvements were made in the past year based on input from field line staff, managers, systems managers.

Alerts – Critical alerts are prioritized. The e-model has helped with the prioritization. Built-in logic keeps unnecessary alerts from popping up.

D.7.1.11 Wisconsin⁹⁶ (WI 06)

Alerts – Some alerts were deleted so that they do not clog the workload for case managers.

D.7.2 County Best Practices

D.7.2.1 Los Angeles County, California⁹⁷ (LA 03)

Information Technology – LA LCSA IT staff went to the divisional offices to ask them what does and what doesn't work with the local system, known as ARS. (San Diego and Orange County have migrated onto ARS pending final migration to the new statewide system.) The IT staff had not heard from the divisions, so they had assumed everything was working smoothly. It turns out that the workers quit reporting the problems when they failed to see changes. The IT team, working with the Division Administrators, case managers and central office managers, prioritized requests and produced releases. Some were immediate to correct critical problems and others were less acute and were part of monthly releases.

D.7.3 Nevada Best Practices

D.7.3.1 Sample of Nevada Best Practices (NV 05)

Case managers in Lyon County devote 30 minutes each day working their alerts. Humboldt County case managers work the alerts for a case when they are in that case. Nye County office policy is to spend an hour every day working their alerts.

D.7.3.2 Nevada Best Practice (NV 06)

In addition to imaging the Form 2906, Clark County also has created an electronic Master's Recommendation Order/Judgment (MROJ) process to expedite the processing of court order entry.

This electronic process facilitates and expedites the movement of the MROJ from the DAFS office to the Hearing Master to the Court Clerk. It allows for an electronic

creation of the MROJ during the hearing as well as the ability to handle electronic signatures. This allows the Hearing Master recommendations to be entered into NOMADS as court orders with the Court Hearing Date without the delay of waiting the required 10 days should an objection to be filed. Due to the low number of objections actually filed by any party (13 objections filed between January 1, 2006 and May 15, 2006), the procedure of entering the Hearing Master Recommendations avoids the task of having to retroactively modify obligations in NOMADS.

¹ Based on an interview with Diana McCampbell, Director, Division of Child Support, Alabama Department of Human Resources, July 14, 2006.

² Based on an interview with George Lola, Chief of Data Performance Analysis Branch, California Department of Child Support Services, July 14, 2006.

³ Based on an interview with Pamela Compton, Administrator, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Illinois Healthcare and Family Services, July 10, 2006.

⁴ Based on an interview with Marilyn Stephen, Director, Mark Jasonowicz, Deputy Director, Michael Adrian, Policy and Procedure Manager, and Mike McCormick, Assistant Director, Office of Child Support, Michigan Department of Human Services, August 16, 2006.

⁵ The following is a summary of the PLG from the Michigan Office of Child Support's web site, http://www.michigan.gov/dhs/0,1607,7-124-5453_5528_41276---,00.html#plg. "The Department of Human Services' Office of Child Support (OCS) is the State agency that administers the federal Title IV-D child support program within Michigan. The OCS contracts with Friends of the Court and Prosecuting Attorneys in each county to deliver Michigan's Title IV-D support services. Each partner plays a critical role in the successful operation of the child support program. The recognition that more is accomplished through a cooperative partnership resulted in the formation of the Program Leadership Group (PLG). The PLG includes:

- The director of the Friend of the Court Bureau within the State Court Administrative Office,
- The president of the Friend of the Court Association of Michigan,
- A representative from the Prosecuting Attorneys Association,
- The director of the Office of Child Support,
- The MiCSES project manager from the Michigan Department of Information Technology.

The PLG is the decision making authority for the Title IV-D child support program. It operates in a spirit of trust and consensus, with the free flow of information and a goal of removing unnecessary barriers. It is this philosophy of teamwork that now guides the program."

⁶ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006

⁷ Mike Schwandt, North Dakota Child Support Enforcement Director, telephone interview with the author, 7 September 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

⁸ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.

⁹ Based on an interview with Daniel Richard, Director, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, August, 2006

¹⁰ Based on an interview with Terry Walter, Administrator, Office of Child Support Enforcement, South Dakota Department of Social Services, July 3, 2006.

¹¹ Based on an interview with Jeff Cohen, Director, Sean Brown, Assistant, and Cindy Griffiths, Assistant, Vermont Office of Child Support, July 5, 2006.

¹² Based on an interview with Nathaniel Young, Director, and Connie White, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, July 14, 2006.

¹³ Based on an interview with David Stillman, Director and David Johnson, Executive Assistant, Division of Child Support, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, July 3, 2006.

¹⁴ Based on an interview with Susan Pfeiffer, Director, Bureau of Child Support, Wisconsin Division of Economic Support, July 5, 2006.

¹⁵ Based on an interview with John Hayes, Director, and Lisa Marks, Assistant Director, Milwaukee County Child Support Agency, August, 2006.

¹⁶ Based on an interview with Phillip Browning, Director of the Los Angeles Child Support Services Department, County of Los Angeles, August 16, 2006.

¹⁷ Based on an interview with Jan Sturla, Director of the Orange County Child Support Services Department, County of Orange, August 17, 2006.

¹⁸ Based on an interview with Diana McCampbell, Director, Division of Child Support, Alabama Department of Human Resources, July 14, 2006.

¹⁹ Veronica Romero, Assistant to the Arizona IV-D Director, telephone interview with the author, 12 July 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

²⁰ Based on an interview with George Lola, Chief of Data Performance Analysis Branch, California Department of Child Support Services, July 14, 2006.

²¹ Pauline Burton, Colorado IV-D Director, Questionnaire submitted to the author.

²² Based on an interview with Pamela Compton, Administrator, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Illinois Healthcare and Family Services, July 10, 2006.

²³ The following is a description of The Rational Process, as published on computernano website: <http://www.computernano.com/background/whatisratdes.html>

You start with the problem you want to solve — a more efficient reaction, a rubber that gives car tires better grip in the wet or a material that can pop back into shape after an impact for example You develop an understanding of the problem at a fundamental level. Why is that reaction not running faster? What gives rubber tires grip, and what decreases that grip on wet roads? What happens when a material deforms during an impact? Is it reversible?

The investigation and understanding phase might involve the use of modeling and simulation software to perform virtual experiments or look at materials structures on the molecular level With your new understanding of the issues, you can begin to perform targeted research and development. This is where rationality comes in — first spend a little time and effort gaining understanding and then look for a tailor-made solution to that problem. This should leave you with a compact, targeted list of potential solutions that can then go into a 'real life' experimental phase Once you have validated your research and chosen a final candidate, you can proceed to manufacture. This might in itself involve some research into new methods and processes.

The Advantages of Rational Design

You gain understanding of a particular problem or system. This understanding, at such a fundamental level, may enable future problems to be solved faster and more efficiently You reduce the amount of costly, labor-intensive laboratory experimentation or fieldwork that needs to be done to solve a specific issue. You already know the direction you need to head in, and so can dismiss a proportion of potential solutions straight away. Virtual experiments (in silico experimentation), computer modeling and simulation all help to travel towards an answer before having to spend time, money, resources and people on solving the problem

More virtual and less laboratory experimentation often means fewer chemicals and reagents are used, which saves money and can be better for the environment ('green chemistry')

The end results are generally 'better out of the box,' being designed from scratch to be more effective at solving the original problem.

²⁴ Jim Carney, Missouri Child Support Field Office Director, telephone interview with the author, 12 July 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Darryl Wusk, Nebraska IV-D Director, and Deb Steidley, Nebraska IV-D Operations Administrator, telephone interview with the author, 8 August 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

²⁷ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006

²⁸ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.

²⁹ William Caster, Oregon IV-D Director, telephone interview with the author, 20 July 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Based on an interview with Daniel Richard, Director, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, August, 2006

³² Based on an interview with Terry Walter, Administrator, Office of Child Support Enforcement, South Dakota Department of Social Services, July 3, 2006.

³³ Based on an interview with Jeff Cohen, Director, Sean Brown, Assistant, and Cindy Griffiths, Assistant, Vermont Office of Child Support, July 5, 2006.

³⁴ Based on an interview with David Stillman, Director and David Johnson, Executive Assistant, Division of Child Support, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, July 3, 2006.

³⁵ Based on an interview with John Hayes, Director, and Lisa Marks, Assistant Director, Milwaukee County Child Support Agency, August, 2006.

³⁶ Based on an interview with Phillip Browning, Director of the Los Angeles Child Support Services Department, County of Los Angeles, August 16, 2006.

³⁷ Based on an interview with Jan Sturla, Director of the Orange County Child Support Services Department, County of Orange, August 17, 2006.

³⁸ Based on an interview with Diana McCampbell, Director, Division of Child Support, Alabama Department of Human Resources, July 14, 2006.

³⁹ Mary Clayton, Arizona DCSE Legal Services Deputy Administrator, telephone interview with the author, 4 August 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

⁴⁰ Based on an interview with George Lola, Chief of Data Performance Analysis Branch, California Department of Child Support Services, July 14, 2006.

⁴¹ Pauline Burton, Colorado IV-D Director, Questionnaire submitted to the author.

⁴² Based on an interview with Pamela Compton, Administrator, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Illinois Healthcare and Family Services, July 10, 2006.

⁴³ Based on an interview with Marilyn Stephen, Director, Mark Jasonowicz, Deputy Director, Michael Adrian, Policy and Procedure Manager, and Mike McCormick, Assistant Director, Office of Child Support, Michigan Department of Human Services, August 16, 2006

⁴⁴ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006

⁴⁵ Barry Burger, North Carolina Child Support Enforcement Assistant Chief of Program Operations, telephone interview with the author, 3 August 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA and 2005 Journey to Excellence Book and Program Review, North Carolina Child Support Enforcement

⁴⁶ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.

⁴⁷ Based on an interview with Daniel Richard, Director, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, August, 2006

⁴⁸ Based on an interview with Terry Walter, Administrator, Office of Child Support Enforcement, South Dakota Department of Social Services, July 3, 2006.

⁴⁹ Based on an interview with Jeff Cohen, Director, Sean Brown, Assistant, and Cindy Griffiths, Assistant, Vermont Office of Child Support, July 5, 2006.

⁵⁰ Based on an interview with Nathaniel Young, Director, and Connie White, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, July 14, 2006.

⁵¹ Based on an interview with David Stillman, Director and David Johnson, Executive Assistant, Division of Child Support, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, July 3, 2006.

⁵² Based on an interview with Susan Pfeiffer, Director, Bureau of Child Support, Wisconsin Division of Economic Support, July 5, 2006.

-
- ⁵³ Based on an interview with John Hayes, Director, and Lisa Marks, Assistant Director, Milwaukee County Child Support Agency, August, 2006.
- ⁵⁴ Based on an interview with Phillip Browning, Director of the Los Angeles Child Support Services Department, County of Los Angeles, August 16, 2006.
- ⁵⁵ Based on an interview with Jan Sturla, Director of the Orange County Child Support Services Department, County of Orange, August 17, 2006.
- ⁵⁶ Based on an interview with Marilyn Stephen, Director, Mark Jasonowicz, Deputy Director, Michael Adrian, Policy and Procedure Manager, and Mike McCormick, Assistant Director, Office of Child Support, Michigan Department of Human Services, August 16, 2006
- ⁵⁷ Estimate from the Center for Law and Social Policy
- ⁵⁸ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006
- ⁵⁹ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.
- ⁶⁰ Based on an interview with Daniel Richard, Director, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, August, 2006
- ⁶¹ Based on an interview with Susan Pfeiffer, Director, Bureau of Child Support, Wisconsin Division of Economic Support, July 5, 2006.
- ⁶² Based on an interview with David Stillman, Director and David Johnson, Executive Assistant, Division of Child Support, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, July 3, 2006.
- ⁶³ Based on an interview with George Lola, Chief of Data Performance Analysis Branch, California Department of Child Support Services, July 14, 2006.
- ⁶⁴ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006
- ⁶⁵ Barry Miller, North Carolina Child Support Enforcement Chief, telephone interview with the author, 11 July 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA
- ⁶⁶ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.
- ⁶⁷ Based on an interview with Daniel Richard, Director, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, August, 2006
- ⁶⁸ Based on an interview with Terry Walter, Administrator, Office of Child Support Enforcement, South Dakota Department of Social Services, July 3, 2006.
- ⁶⁹ Based on an interview with Jeff Cohen, Director, Sean Brown, Assistant, and Cindy Griffiths, Assistant, Vermont Office of Child Support, July 5, 2006.
- ⁷⁰ Based on an interview with Nathaniel Young, Director, and Connie White, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, July 14, 2006.
- ⁷¹ Based on an interview with David Stillman, Director and David Johnson, Executive Assistant, Division of Child Support, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, July 3, 2006.
- ⁷² Based on an interview with Susan Pfeiffer, Director, Bureau of Child Support, Wisconsin Division of Economic Support, July 5, 2006.
- ⁷³ Customer Service Survey sent to state IV-D Directors, John Burnhart, IV-D Director, State of Colorado, 11/2/06.
- ⁷⁴ Customer Service Survey sent to state IV-D Directors, John Burnhart, IV-D Director, State of Colorado, 11/2/06.
- ⁷⁵ Based on an interview with John Hayes, Director, and Lisa Marks, Assistant Director, Milwaukee County Child Support Agency, August, 2006.
- ⁷⁶ Based on an interview with Phillip Browning, Director of the Los Angeles Child Support Services Department, County of Los Angeles, August 16, 2006.
- ⁷⁷ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006.
- ⁷⁸ Monique Rabideau, New York Division of Child Support Trainer Director, telephone interview with the author, 4 August 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

⁷⁹ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.

⁸⁰ Based on an interview with Terry Walter, Administrator, Office of Child Support Enforcement, South Dakota Department of Social Services, July 3, 2006.

⁸¹ Based on an interview with Jeff Cohen, Director, Sean Brown, Assistant, and Cindy Griffiths, Assistant, Vermont Office of Child Support, July 5, 2006.

⁸² Based on an interview with Susan Pfeiffer, Director, Bureau of Child Support, Wisconsin Division of Economic Support, July 5, 2006.

⁸³ Based on an interview by Ruth Hara with Beverly Bonasorte, Workforce Transition Administrator, Florida Department of Revenue, September 21, 2006

⁸⁴ Based on an interview with Phillip Browning, Director of the Los Angeles Child Support Services Department, County of Los Angeles, August 16, 2006.

⁸⁵ Interview conducted by Ruth Hara of Trainer at the Reno PAO

⁸⁶ Based on an interview with Diana McCampbell, Director, Division of Child Support, Alabama Department of Human Resources, July 14, 2006.

⁸⁷ Pauline Burton, Colorado IV-D Director, Questionnaire submitted to the author.

⁸⁸ Based on an interview with Marilyn Stephen, Director, Mark Jasonowicz, Deputy Director, Michael Adrian, Policy and Procedure Manager, and Mike McCormick, Assistant Director, Office of Child Support, Michigan Department of Human Services, August 16, 2006

⁸⁹ Based on two interviews with Alisha Griffin, IV-D Assistant Director (lead IV-D designee), Office of Child Support and Paternity, New Jersey Division of Family Development, July 3 and July 30, 2006.

⁹⁰ Based on an interview with Joe Pilat, Deputy Director, Office of Child Support, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, July 13, 2006.

⁹¹ William Caster, Oregon IV-D Director, telephone interview with the author, 20 July 2006, MAXIMUS, Inc., Reston, VA

⁹² Based on an interview with Terry Walter, Administrator, Office of Child Support Enforcement, South Dakota Department of Social Services, July 3, 2006.

⁹³ Based on an interview with Jeff Cohen, Director, Sean Brown, Assistant, and Cindy Griffiths, Assistant, Vermont Office of Child Support, July 5, 2006.

⁹⁴ Based on an interview with Nathaniel Young, Director, and Connie White, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, July 14, 2006.

⁹⁵ Based on an interview with David Stillman, Director and David Johnson, Executive Assistant, Division of Child Support, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, July 3, 2006.

⁹⁶ Based on an interview with Susan Pfeiffer, Director, Bureau of Child Support, Wisconsin Division of Economic Support, July 5, 2006.

⁹⁷ Based on an interview with Phillip Browning, Director of the Los Angeles Child Support Services Department, County of Los Angeles, August 16, 2006.