
The Barriers Project

Evaluation and Final Report

**Funded in part by a Grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,
Office of Child Support Enforcement**

**Division of Child Support Enforcement
Virginia Department of Social Services
February 2006**

Evaluation and Final Report:
The Barriers Project

Fredericksburg District Office
Division of Child Support Enforcement
Department of Social Services
Commonwealth of Virginia

February 2006

Donald W. Myers
Professor Emeritus
School of Business
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia

dwmyers@vcu.edu
941/360-0046

Acknowledgements

Judge J. Dean Lewis, former Judge, Spotsylvania Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court (J&DR) Court had the experience and creativity to envision the validity of providing vocational and related services to motivated noncustodial parents (NCPs) in lieu of their incarceration. Her idea became a reality in October 1999 as the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) funded the Division of Child Support Enforcement' (DCSE) request for a demonstration grant resulting in the Barriers Program (BP). Judge John H. Thomas, who succeeded Judge Lewis, enthusiastically supported the BP and referred to the BP' Case Managers those NCPs whom he determined were suitable candidates. Judge David F. Peterson in the Fredericksburg J&DR Court acquired an appreciation for the BP' existence in the Spotsylvania J&DR Court and requested the program be implemented in the Fredericksburg J&DR Court.

A number of local and state organizations provided free services to the BP. Among these service providers were the Virginia Employment Commission, the Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services, Goodwill Industries, Rappahannock Community Services Board, and the Thurman Brisbane Homeless Shelter.

Several DCSE employees were critical to the successful operation of the BP. Mr. Robert Rodenski, District Manager, the Fredericksburg Child Support Enforcement District Office, was the overall manager of the BP from its inception in 1999 until it was discontinued at the end of the grant on June 1, 2005. His understanding of the BP and his commitment and support were invaluable in its successful operation.

Mary Ellen Forehand, Special Counsel, Fredericksburg Child Support Enforcement District Office, represented the Fredericksburg District Office in both the Spotsylvania and Fredericksburg J&DR courts. She frequently interacted with the BP' Case Managers. Her role was critically important in dealing with judges, courts personnel, NCPs, district office staff, private attorneys and, most importantly, the Case Managers with whom she worked in tandem as the legal complement to their case management.

Ceil Dixon, Executive Assistant, Fredericksburg District Office, provided consistent administrative support throughout the project.

Carol Rice and AnnYoz Hamm were the BP' Case Managers from December 1, 2003 until the program terminated operations on June 1, 2005.¹ As a team, they provided the kind of support and firmness that the BP' NCPs needed and sought. Their skills and focus were complementary, and they applied them to the program' best advantage.

Vicky Mackenzie was employed as Database Administrator from August 1, 2002 until the program was terminated.² She performed an important role in establishing a database needed

¹Case Manager Rice resigned effective May 24, 2005 to accept a full time position as a Support Enforcement Specialist in the Fredericksburg District Office. Case Manager Hamm resigned shortly after the BP program ended.

²Database Administrator Mackenzie resigned on May 4, 2005.

for case monitoring and program evaluation. In addition she posted payment and arrears data that assisted the Case Managers. Also, for seven weeks in 2003 she served as the sole contact with NCPs and CPs when no Case Managers were employed due to unforeseen personnel issues.

Dr. Todd Areson was the Project Manager from October 1999 to October 2004. In tandem with District Manager Bob Rodenski, Dr. Areson formed the team of original DCSE representatives in meetings with Judge J. Dean Lewis when she articulated her vision of increasing child support payments and reducing arrearages by referring NCPs to a then-undefined assistance program as an effective alternative to incarceration. Bob Rodenski and Dr. Areson were instrumental in conceptualizing the structure required to make the program a reality. Dr. Areson prepared the initial proposal for OCSE funding and in coordination with Bob Rodenski, was fully involved in staffing the BP and resolving both initial and continuing procedural issues. To a large extent, the BP's success is attributed to their dedication and hard work. Bob Owen served as the Project Manager from October 2004 until its termination on June 1, 2005. His dedication to this role ensured a seamless transition.

Finally, Joseph Crane, Assistant Director, DCSE, was always supportive of this and other research projects, which operated under his management. His appreciation for the value of conducting research and demonstrations to increase operational knowledge, regardless of the outcomes, afforded the Division the opportunity to test out proposed practices, new ideas, and collegial suggestions such as this one by Judge J. Dean Lewis. Without this advocacy and support, the BP could not have demonstrated its productivity for collections of both current support and arrearages among a cross-section of court-ordered NCPs.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
<i>The Barriers Program: An Overview</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Participants in the Barriers Program.....</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Ability/Willingness to Pay Support.....</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Services the Case Managers Provide.....</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Case Manager' Turnover.....</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Evaluation Study.....</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Increase in Payments</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Reduction in Arrearage Balances</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Cost Avoidance/Opportunity Costs of Incarceration.....</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Cost-Effectiveness for the Continuation of the BP.....</i>	<i>xii</i>
<i>Opinion Survey.....</i>	<i>xii</i>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
“BARRIERS” DEFINED	2
<i>Barriers I</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Barriers II.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Income Problems.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Motivation/Ability to Pay</i>	<i>3</i>
BARRIERS I DESIGN AND RESULTS	4
<i>Experimental Group.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Control Group</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Treatments</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Experimental/Control Group Results</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Other Results</i>	<i>5</i>
CASE MANAGERS’ STAFFING & TASKS	6
<i>Barriers I</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Barriers II</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Barriers’ II Operation</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Court Actions</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Motion for Show Cause Summons or Capias</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Summons.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Interviewing NCPs</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Services Provided</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>NCPs Enrollment in the BP.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Self-Referred NCPs</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Judicially-Referred NCPs</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Reasons for NCP Release from the BP</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>CP Enrollments in the BP</i>	<i>15</i>

Table of Contents (cont.)

<i>Cases in the BP</i>	15
<i>Case Managers' Tasks</i>	16
<i>Examples of Case Managers' Tasks</i>	18
<i>Marketing the BP</i>	21
<i>Case Manager Turnover</i>	22
<i>Quality of Case Managers' Services</i>	22
RESULTS OF THE BP	24
<i>Payments Before/After Enrollment in the BP</i>	25
<i>The Pretest Period</i>	25
<i>The Posttest Period</i>	25
<i>Results of Before/After Payment Comparison</i>	26
<i>Exclusion of Payments</i>	28
<i>Longer Term Effects</i>	29
<i>Inflated Payments</i>	29
<i>Case Managers' Job Performance and Turnover</i>	29
<i>Analysis of Payments</i>	29
<i>Effect on Arrearage Balances</i>	31
<i>Avoidance of Incarceration</i>	33
<i>Payments Foregone</i>	33
<i>Work Release</i>	33
<i>Jail Crowding</i>	33
<i>Costs of Incarceration</i>	33
COST EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE CONTINUATION OF THE BP	34
OTHER EVALUATIONS	37
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
<i>NCP/CP Cases in the Barriers Program</i>	38
<i>Ability/Willingness to Pay Support</i>	39
<i>Services the Case Managers Provided</i>	39
<i>Case Manager' Turnover</i>	40
<i>Evaluation Study</i>	40
<i>Arrearage Balances</i>	41
<i>Opportunity Costs of Incarceration</i>	41
<i>Cost Effectiveness for the Continuation of the BP</i>	41
<i>Opinion Survey</i>	42
Appendix 1: COMMUNITY PARTNERS NETWORK	43
Appendix 2: POSITION DESCRIPTION – CASE MANAGER	48
Appendix 3: POSITION DESCRIPTION – DATABASE ADMINISTRATOR	52
Appendix 4: COURT-ORDERED JOB SEARCH RECORD	55

Table of Contents (cont.)

Appendix 5: INFORMATION SHEET56

Appendix 6: BARRIERS ASSESSMENT FORM57

Appendix 7: BARRIERS PROJECT – CONSENT TO SHARE INFORMATION58

Appendix 8: BARRIERS PROJECT – PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT.....59

Appendix 9: MONTHLY STATEMENT LETTER.....60

Appendix 10: COMMUNICATION RECAP SHEET61

Appendix 11: LETTER MARKETING PROGRAM TO LOCAL EMPLOYERS (Sample).....63

Appendix 12: LETTER MARKETING PROGRAM TO LOCAL ATTORNEYS (Sample)64

Appendix 13: EVALUATION FORM.....65

Table of Contents (cont.)

Exhibit

Exhibit 1: *Case Manager' Employment, 2000-2005*8

Index of Tables

Table 1: *NCP/CP Enrollment and Attrition in Barriers Program, March 1, 2000 – December 31, 2004*14

Table 2: *Cases of NCPs/CPs Entering/Exiting Barriers Program, March 1, 2000 – December 31, 2004*17

Table 3: *Number of Cases of Participants in the Barriers Program, 2000 – 2004*.....17

Table 4: *Services/Assistance Provided to a Random Sample of 18 NCPs in the BP*.....21

Table 5: *NCP' Payments Two Quarters Before/After Enrollment in the Barriers Program, March 1, 2000 – June 30, 2004*26

Table 6: *Frequency & Amount of NCP' Payments Prior to Court Appearance*28

Table 7: *Intervals in Which Large Payments Were Made Prior to Court Appearance*29

Table 8: *NCP' Payments Before/After Entering Barriers Program (BP), March 1, 2000 – June 30, 2003*30

Table 9: *Effects of Barriers Program on Arrearages, Sample of 121 Active Cases, May 2004 – March 2005*.....32

Table 10: *Continuation of BP Annual Benefits: Two Payments/Costs Scenarios*36

Executive Summary

The Barriers Program: An Overview

The Barriers Program (BP) was a multi-year federal- and state-financed study to provide special services to noncustodial parents (NCPs) facing incarceration, to assist them in overcoming barriers that prevent their payment of child support. There were two phases in the BP. The first phase (referred to as Barriers I), was conducted from March 1, 2000 to April 1, 2001.³ The extension, which was titled Barriers II, was conducted from April 1, 2001 to June 1, 2005.⁴

Juvenile and Domestic Relations (J&DR) District Courts judges in and around Fredericksburg, Virginia referred 294 NCPs representing 490 cases for case management services in lieu of their incarceration⁵. The following BP results were impressive, with additional highlights summarized to enable readers to review various targeted areas in more detail.

- Six months after enrollment in the BP, NCPs entering between March 2000 and June 2004 made payments that were 106 percent greater (representing \$211,869 additional dollars) than they made six months prior to enrollment. For all BP participants, this trend in additional payments – ranging between 16 and 70 percent greater – continued for 18 months after enrollment in the program. Arrearages for 29.7 percent of the NCPs declined an average of 20.2 percent.
- Significant costs were also avoided in terms of having an alternative to incarceration. For example, if 260 of the NCPs had been incarcerated for six months in lieu of being referred to the BP, incarceration costs to the Commonwealth would have been over \$2.3 million, and \$412,000 in payments for the support of their children would have been lost. The Rappahannock Regional Jail, the facility that most likely would have been impacted if these NCPs had been incarcerated, was built to house 592 inmates but had 930 inmates in July 2005.

³ The first Case Manager (later in this report referred to as Case Manager #1 – see Exhibit 1) officially started work on November 29, 1999. The tracking of support payments made by NCPs in the BP commenced March 1, 2000.

⁴ The decision to officially end the BP was made on June 1, 2005, however, the program was gradually being discontinued earlier. For example, the last referrals made to the BP were in January 2005, and these consisted of one CP and one NCP. After January 10, 2005, no further referrals were made. Furthermore, the Database Administrator resigned on May 4, 2005 and was not replaced. This was followed by the resignation of one of the Case Managers effective May 24, 2005 who was also not replaced. This Case Manager, faced with the prospect of the discontinuance of the BP, resigned to accept a full time position as a Child Support Enforcement Specialist in the Fredericksburg District Office. The remaining Case Manager resigned shortly after the program ended.

⁵ Later, a decision was made to also assist custodial parents. The nature of this assistance is discussed later in this report.

Participants in the Barriers Program

A total of 294 NCP's (representing 490 cases) and 23 custodial parents (CPs) were enrolled in the BP at some time during the operation of the program from March 1, 2000 to June 1, 2005. Of the 317 total participants, 214 were still enrolled when the project ended on June 1, 2005 (Tables 1 and 2). Of the 100 participants who left the program, about half were noncompliant with BP requirements.

Ability/Willingness to Pay Support

A random sample of 30 of the 294 NCPs in the BP was selected to measure the relative frequency among them of the four combinations of ability/inability to pay child support and willingness/unwillingness to pay child support. The Case Managers were asked to categorize the 30 NCPs in the combination that best described them. Their belief was that 26 or 86.6 percent of the NCPs were able to pay child support. Half of this group were considered to be willing to pay support and the other half unwilling. The Case Managers believed that only four or 13.3 percent of the NCPs were unable to pay support.

Services the Case Managers Provided

Services provided by Case Managers included employment services mainly through temporary employment agencies or the Virginia Employment Commission, monthly statements mailed to NCP participants, referrals to homeless shelters, providing bus tickets to report for job interviews, assistance in obtaining birth certificates for job-related reasons, and referring NCP participants to the Department of Motor Vehicles to obtain Commercial Driver's Licenses and handle other business. Of these, employment services and mailing monthly statements were used most frequently. The other services were utilized infrequently but were deemed necessary and effective by Case Managers (Table 4).

Case Manager Turnover

Due to high staff turnover, recruitment and training were ongoing issues, except during the last 18 months of the BP operation when the last two Case Managers were continuously employed from December 1, 2003 to the end of the project. Major causes for the turnover were the temporary status of the positions, the lack of employee benefits, and a tight labor market in the Fredericksburg region

Evaluation Study

Several evaluative components were used to determine the results of this project. A pretest/posttest evaluation was conducted consisting of a minimum of six months of payments made by NCPs prior to enrollment (pretest) in the BP and at least six months of payments after

enrollment (posttest) in the BP.⁶ A ten percent sample of active NCPs in the BP was selected to evaluate the types of services Case Managers provided. An opinion survey was conducted of selected DCSE personnel and judges in the Spotsylvania and Fredericksburg J&DR Courts. An analysis was conducted of changes in arrearages over an 11-month period for a sample of 121 NCPs in the BP. A cost-effectiveness analysis was prepared regarding the establishment of a permanent BP in the Fredericksburg District Office. Finally, an analysis was prepared of the opportunity costs of incarceration in lieu of referral to a BP-type of intervention. Results of the BP may be found on pages 24 through 42.

Increase in Payments

The percentage increases in payments six months after enrollment in the BP compared to comparable periods prior to enrollment grew in every year but one, as the various players in the program gained experience. In the final period of the program, there was an 823 percent improvement in payments constituting an additional \$96,262. After 18 months in the BP, NCPs were continuing to make payments that were from 16 to 70 percent greater than they were making prior to enrollment (Table 8).

Reduction in Arrearage Balances

Changes in arrears balances from May 2004 to March 2005 were analyzed for a sample of 121 NCPs selected from the 194 in the BP (Table 9). The arrearages of 81 (66.9 percent) NCPs increased only 13 percent, in spite of the fact that interest on child support arrearages (for missed or incomplete payments) was accruing at between 6 and 9 percent for the duration of the Barriers Project. By comparison with another DCSE study, changes in the mean arrearage balances of the 121 NCPs were 44 percent better than those of less seriously delinquent NCPs who did not receive case management services.

Cost Avoidance/Opportunity Costs of Incarceration

As an alternative to incarceration, the project potentially saved several million dollars and reduced already greatly overcrowded jail conditions. At a cost of \$50 per day, 260 inmates serving six-month jail terms would have cost taxpayers over \$2.3 million. In addition to the severe overcrowding of the regional jail, there was also no possibility of a BP participant being assigned to work release as no slots were available in that program. Thus, if room could have been found in the jail for a potential BP participant, no support would have been collected during the incarceration. Since none of the ongoing BP participants were incarcerated, they paid \$412,000 in child support while the project was operating (Table 5).

⁶ Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966): p. 8. The methodology used in this phase of the study prevented the typical internal and external sources of invalidation with this quasi-experimental research design, such as history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, and interactions.

Cost-Effectiveness for the Continuation of the BP

By their own estimation, the caseload of the two Case Managers who were employed in the BP could have been doubled. Converting the BP to permanent status would have cost approximately \$98,240 annually which includes compensation for two Case Managers, database management and other costs for the program's operation (Table 10). If the caseload remained the same and 82 new NCPs were referred to the BP, the annual net benefit in additional payments would have been \$233,364. If the caseload had been doubled and 164 new NCPs were referred, the annual net benefit in additional payments would have been \$408,914. With no BP alternative, the additional rates of incarceration would result in significantly increased costs to taxpayers in the state and local area.

Opinion Survey

An Evaluation Form, accompanied by a preliminary copy of this report was mailed to the judges in the Spotsylvania and Fredericksburg District J&DR Courts who presided over child support enforcement cases. A comprehensive response was received from the judge who had the most experience in referring cases to the BP. This judge wrote, "The program is an effective weapon for DCSE to track and prod those responsible for supporting children. Unless this is done, they tend to fall back into not paying." He concluded, "I have been advised that the program in Spotsylvania may be terminated. I hope that does not happen. In fact, I hope it can be utilized throughout the Commonwealth, with or without Federal assistance."

Introduction

The Barriers Program (BP) was a federal- and state-financed study initiated by the Division of Child Support Enforcement (DCSE), Commonwealth of Virginia, to employ Case Managers to assist noncustodial parents (NCPs) in lieu of incarceration.⁷ The purpose of this research demonstration project was to measure the effectiveness of using Case Managers in the Fredericksburg District Child Support Enforcement Office, to assist NCPs in dealing with problems or “barriers” adversely impacting their ability to pay child support for which they were responsible. NCPs entered the BP through referrals from judges in Juvenile and Domestic Relations District (J&DR) Courts. There were two phases in the BP. The first phase (referred to as Barriers I), was conducted from March 1, 2000 to April 1, 2001.⁸ A report of Barriers I was published in December 2001.⁹ In response to Barriers’ I success in motivating NCPs to increase their support payments a decision was made to fund an extension of the program.¹⁰ This extension, which was titled Barriers II, was conducted from April 1, 2001 to June 1, 2005.¹¹

This report is a review of the operational characteristics of the BP, including an evaluation of it, with a primary focus on Barriers II. The report is composed of the following major parts:

- Definition of the term “Barriers”;
- Research design and a summary of the cost/benefit results of Barriers I;
- Staffing issues and tasks performed by the Case Managers;
- Barriers’ II operation;
- Case Managers’ turnover
- Results of the BP; and,
- Findings, conclusions and recommendations.

⁷ Later, a decision was made to also assist custodial parents. The nature of this assistance is discussed later in this report.

⁸ The first Case Manager (later in this report referred to as Case Manager #1 – see Exhibit 1) officially started work on November 29, 1999. The tracking of support payments made by NCPs in the BP commenced March 1, 2000.

⁹ Virginia Division of Child Support Enforcement, *Barriers to the Payment of Court-Ordered Child Support*, (December 2001).

¹⁰ See the report in Note 3 for a discussion of the net fiscal impact of the Barriers I pilot project.

¹¹ The decision to officially end the BP was made on June 1, 2005, however, the program was gradually being discontinued earlier. For example, the last referrals made to the BP were in January 2005 and these consisted of one CP and one NCP. After January 10, 2005, no further referrals were made. Furthermore, the Database Administrator resigned on May 4, 2005 and was not replaced. This was followed by the resignation of one of the Case Managers effective May 24, 2005 who also was not replaced. This Case Manager, faced with the prospect of the discontinuance of the BP, resigned to accept a full time position as a Child Support Enforcement Specialist in the Fredericksburg District Office. The remaining Case Manager resigned shortly after the program ended.

“Barriers” Defined

Barriers I

In the initial stage of Barriers I, the researchers conducted a literature review and interviewed NCPs, local attorneys, child support enforcement employees and personnel from local J&DR courts. From the interviews and literature review, the researchers concluded there were five issues facing NCPs, either singularly or in varying combinations, which either hindered or in some manner contributed to them not making their required child support payments.

These were the five issues or “barriers” that were identified:

- Visitation. This barrier was only cited by a relatively small number of NCPs who were interviewed, which was contrary to expectations based on information obtained from the literature review. Impeding NCPs in the process of visiting their children cause strife between NCPs and custodial parents (CPs). This strife, and the actual acts of preventing NCPs from visiting their child/ren, may contribute to their non-payment of support.¹² For example, researchers have found that NCPs are more likely to pay support when they are allowed regular visitation with their children.¹³
- Conflict. A majority of NCPs and a number of the attorneys the researchers interviewed during the study stated that conflict between the parents was a significant cause for NCPs’ failure to pay child support. The causes of this conflict include impeding NCP’ visitation of their children and NCP’ perception of the manner in which the child support payments were being spent by the CP. Many of these same individuals felt effective mediation between the parties could help prevent this conflict. Furthermore, a majority of those NCPs who were interviewed expressed an interest in entering into mediation with the other partner.
- Size of the Arrearage. Several issues interact to cause the occurrence of arrearages resulting from NCP’ failure to make payments as well as making payments that are less than the full amount. As noted above, NCPs who are denied the opportunity to visit their children are prone to skip support payments, thus incurring arrearages. As the arrearages increase, NCPs may view their debts as insurmountable and be even less likely to pay. Furthermore, strife between the parents may also cause NCPs to skip making payments as an ill-conceived method of reprisal. More conflict occurs resulting from CP’ animosity when they do not receive payments for the support of their children. This cycle of behavior tends to perpetuate itself resulting in ever-larger arrearages.
- Status as a Customer. Some NCPs who were interviewed by the researchers believed District Office Child Support Enforcement personnel treated them as “deadbeats” who

¹² For a fuller discussion of these barriers see Virginia Division of Child Support Enforcement, *Barriers to the Payment of Court-Ordered Child Support*, (December 2001), pp. 14-17.

¹³ Seltzer, Schaefer and Charng, “Family Ties After Divorce: The Relationship Between Visiting and Paying Child Support,” *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51 (4): pp. 1013-32, 1989.

will only support their children if they are forced. The researchers concluded that the NCP' perception of an adversarial relationship between them and District Offices contributed to NCP' recalcitrance to make support payments. The interviewees believed if NCPs were treated as DCSE' customers, in the same manner in which they perceive CPs are, they would more likely accept their responsibilities to pay support.

- Vocational Issues. A majority of the NCPs who were interviewed had a number of job issues that were negatively impacting their ability to consistently make child support payments. Loss of employment through layoffs and job discontinuances were a constant concern as well as a reality for NCPs in their efforts to pay support and simultaneously sustain themselves. Through the interviews, the NCPs also voiced problems with temporary, and in some cases, permanent disability. One-third of the NCPs had either current or prior disabilities affecting their ability to work, and most of them had the documentation to prove it. A number of the NCPs recognized that insufficient education, work experience and skills prevented them from obtaining steady employment in good jobs.

Barriers II

In Barriers II, the term “barrier” was defined to include any condition that a Case Manager could identify as inhibiting an NCP in making regular child support payments. In some cases, these conditions were other than the five named above, such as the inability to secure housing or periods of incarceration for illegal behavior other than for the non-payment of child support. For some conditions, most notably incarceration, Case Managers could give little, if any, assistance even if an NCP was enrolled in the BP. In these situations the most Case Managers were able to do was maintain contact with the NCPs, during the period of incarceration, and upon release from jail encourage them to find employment so they could resume making regular child support payments.

Income Problems

The Case Managers in Barriers II concluded early in the extension of the research demonstration that the inability to earn a sufficient income was a major “barrier” to NCPs making consistent child support payments. For this reason, the Barriers' II Case Managers focused a considerable portion of their efforts in assisting NCPs who had vocational issues. This assistance included making referrals to the Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) or to temporary employment agencies and continually encouraging unemployed NCPs to find employment.

Motivation/Ability to Pay

There are multiple reasons affecting both an NCP' motivation and ability to pay child support.¹⁴ The four combinations of these factors are willing/able to pay support, willing/unable

¹⁴ For a discussion of these reasons see *Child Support Arrearages: A Legal, Policy, Procedural, Demographic and Caseload Analysis*, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services (August 2004), pp. 4-7.

to pay, unwilling/able to pay, and unwilling/unable to pay. A random sample of 30 of the 294 NCPs in the BP was selected to measure the frequency of these four combinations among the group. The Case Managers were asked to categorize each of the 30 NCPs in the combination that best describes them. These were the results:

- 13 or 43.3 percent of the NCPs were categorized as willing/able to pay support.
- 1 of the NCPs was categorized as willing/unable to pay support.
- 13 or 43.3 percent of the NCPs were categorized as unwilling/able to pay support.
- 3 or 10 percent of the NCPs were categorized as unwilling/unable to pay support.

In short, the Case Managers believed that 26 or 86.6 percent of the NCPs were able to pay child support. Half of this group was willing to pay support and the other half was unwilling. The Case Managers believed that only four or 13.3 percent of the NCPs were unable to pay support.

Barriers I Design and Results

The goal of Barriers I was to develop, initiate and assess the effects on child support payments of the BP, to which delinquent NCPs were referred by judges, in lieu of being sent to jail. The study involved both experimental and control groups of NCPs.

Experimental Group

The experimental group consisted of 69 NCPs selected from a larger group who were ordered to appear in the Spotsylvania J&DR Court for failure to make court-ordered child support payments. Based upon the facts in each NCP' case, the judge determined if the BP might be effective in helping him/her pay support as required. These 69 NCPs were responsible for 113 child support cases,¹⁵ met the judges' criteria and were referred to the BP' Case Manager. The Case Manager interviewed the referred NCPs, assessed the type and extent of any barriers present and determined their needs for assistance based on her assessment of the "barrier" or "barriers" contributing to their failure to make child support payments. The Case Manager then made referrals to one or more service providers in a Community Partners Network, consisting of agencies in the Fredericksburg area that agreed to provide direct services to BP clients.¹⁶

Control Group

The control group consisted of a group of NCPs (who were responsible for 29 child support cases) who were ordered to appear in the Westmoreland J&DR Court for failure to make court-ordered child support payments. The NCPs in this control group were not referred to the BP but would have been eligible for referral if the BP had also operated in that court. Both courts (Spotsylvania and Westmoreland) enforce cases served by the Fredericksburg District Child Support Enforcement Office.

¹⁵Some of the 69 NCPs were responsible for multiple cases.

¹⁶For a discussion of this part of the research see *Barriers to the Payment of Court-Ordered Child Support*, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Commonwealth of Virginia, December 2001.

Treatments

The NCPs in the experimental group received these two treatments:

- An assessment and a minimum of 30 days of case management services; and,
- Referral for services through the Community Partners Network. Appendix 1 is a matrix of services provided by agencies in the Community Partners Network. Representatives of these agencies agreed to provide services to NCPs upon referral by the Case Manager.

All NCPs in the experimental group received the case management services intervention. In addition, 27 NCPs were referred for services from various agencies in the Community Partners Network but only 9 actually used them. Consequently, the case management component was the primary intervention received by all the NCPs in the experimental group.

The researchers conducting the Barriers I project made efforts to interview the NCPs in the experimental group to assess their opinions of the two interventions; only 9 were actually interviewed. The researcher's purpose for conducting interviews was to assess the NCP's perceived effectiveness of the two interventions. The nine NCPs who were interviewed opined that the assistance they received from the BP was a distinct change from their earlier experiences with the DCSE. They felt the main distinction was that the Case Manager was someone they could reach and talk to and who seemed interested in helping them rather than just 'pursuing' them to get money for support payments. Several of the NCPs felt the Case Manager's assistance provided them with the means to resume making child support payments and thereby stay out of jail.

Experimental/Control Group Results

Compared to the control group, the experimental group of NCPs achieved the following results:

- Made larger monthly payments for current support;
- Had higher rates of support payment (except for the first quarter when the rates were equal); and,
- Made significantly larger payments towards their arrearages.

Other Results

In addition to the experimental and control group comparisons, the following results were achieved by the NCPs in the experimental group:

- An analysis was made of the percentage of NCPs in the experimental group who made their child support payments for a full quarter. In the six-month period prior to enrollment in the BP, only 12 percent of the NCPs made their required support payments

for a full quarter. This percentage increased to 36 percent of the NCPs following their first quarter of enrollment in the BP. By the fourth quarter of participation in the BP, 65 percent of the experimental group of NCPs made their required child support payments for a full quarter.

- Also, during the period prior to receiving case management assistance, the overall rate of payment for the NCPs in the experimental group was 6 percent of monthly obligations plus arrears. This rate almost tripled to 17 percent while the NCPs were enrolled in the BP.
- Finally, due to the NCPs' progress in making support payments while in the BP, they served less than 1 percent of the number of days in jail that they were sentenced by the court, with the remainder suspended by the judge.

The researchers concluded that the BP was successful due to these and other positive results.¹⁷

Case Managers' Staffing & Tasks

Barriers I

In Barriers I, one Case Manager position was authorized in the Fredericksburg Child Support District Office to perform all the functions in the BP for the NCPs in the experimental group who were referred to the program by a judge. The position was filled with an applicant who had former experience in public sector social services.

This Case Manager attended court sessions, interviewed the NCPs who were referred by the judge, assessed the extent and type of their "barriers" and then arranged for services to address their "barrier(s)." As noted previously, the NCPs in the experimental group received two treatments: (1) an assessment and a minimum of 30 days of case management services and (2) referral for additional services through the Community Partners Network. As noted previously, only a small number of the NCPs actually received services through the Network, however, all the NCPs received case management services consisting of discussions with the Case Manager focusing on their problems or "barriers" adversely impacting them making regular support payments. The researchers concluded, based on the results outlined previously, that this personal one-on-one interaction helped change NCP' opinions about the child support enforcement process and was an important component in motivating them to make payments.

The Case Manager who was initially hired for the Barriers I study remained employed in the position for the entire year of the research. In addition to NCP' favorable comments about this Case Manager, District Office personnel were also impressed with the quality of her performance. The quality of her service and her tenure of employment throughout the project were considered major factors in Barriers' I success.

¹⁷ The results of this phase of the BP are documented in *Barriers to the Payment of Court-Ordered Child Support*, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Commonwealth of Virginia, December 2001.

Barriers II

Three positions were authorized in the Fredericksburg Child Support Enforcement District Office to conduct the work in Barriers II. Two of the three positions were Case Managers and the other one was a Database Administrator. The purpose of the latter position was to perform most of the administrative tasks in the BP and thus free the Case Managers to focus their efforts on client-related work. Case Manager and the Database Administrator job descriptions are Appendices 2 and 3, respectively.

Both of the Case Manager positions were designed to be full time because of the manner in which the work was planned to be accomplished. For example, both Case Managers were intended to be in court so that one could make an appointment with an NCP who was referred by the judge while the other Case Manager was available to meet other NCPs who might be similarly referred. Also, with two Case Managers, at least one was available most of the time for NCPs who came in the office or otherwise contacted the office regarding a BP issue.

A timeline in the employment of the Case Managers, including the transition from Barriers I to Barriers II, is shown on Exhibit 1.

Barriers I:

- One Case Manager (Case Manager #1) was hired November 29, 1999 but tracking of NCP' support payments did not start until March 1, 2000. She was employed until April 6, 2001, although Barriers I officially ended April 1.

Barriers II

- Barriers II began operation on April 1, 2001 but no Case Managers were employed from April 6 to June 21, 2001, when Case Manager #2 was hired.
- Case Manager #2 was the only person employed in the job from June 21, 2001 until April 1, 2002 when Case Manager #3 was hired.
- Case Manager #2 left the job on June 26, 2002. One month later (July 26, 2002), Case Manager #4 was hired although her tenure of employment was short-lived since she left September 11, 2002.
- Case Manager' #3 employment was also short since she left on September 20, 2002. Fortunately, Case Manager #5 was hired August 23, 2002 and operated the BP independently from September 20 until October 23 when Case Manager #6 was hired. Case Manager' #6 employment was temporary, to fill in for Case Manager #5 while she was on maternity leave, and she left February 3, 2003 when Case Manager #5 returned to work full-time.

Exhibit 1
Case Manager' Employment, 2000 - 2005

Case Mgr	2000				2001				2002				2003				2004				2005		
	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul
#1	11/29/99 ¹	X	X	X	X	4/6 ²																	
#2							6/21 ³	X	X	X	6/26												
#3										4/1	X	9/20											
#4											7/26	9/11											
#5											8/23	X	X	X	10/7								
#6												10/23	2/3										
#7													12/3/02	X	X	10/7							
#8																12/1/03	X	X	X	X	X	5/24	
#9																12/1/03	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/1

¹Employment as Case Manager began November 29, 1999 and ended April 6, 2001. Data on the initial impact of the case management model, however, did not become available until March 1, 2000.

²Barriers I ended April 1, 2001.

³While Barriers II commenced operations on April 1, 2002, there was a gap of about 10 weeks before Case Manager #2 was hired to replace Case Manager #1.

-
- Case Manager #7 was hired December 3, 2002 and until October 7, 2003, there were two Case Managers in the BP. Due to some personnel issues Case Managers #5 and #7 were terminated on October 7.
 - No Case Managers were employed from October 7 to December 1, 2003 while an employment search and selection process was conducted to hire replacements for Case Managers #5 and #7.
 - Two Case Managers (#8 and #9) were hired and remained employed from December 1, 2003 to May 24, 2005 when Case Manager #8 accepted a full time position as Support Enforcement Specialist in the Fredericksburg District Child Support Office.
 - Case Manager #9 remained employed until the BP' operation was terminated June 1, 2005.

There was approximately a 10-week break between the end of Barriers I (April 1, 2001) and the employment of Case Manager #2 for the start-up of Barriers II (June 21, 2001). Barriers II operated with this one Case Manager for about 10 months before the second Case Manager (#3) was hired. The objective of maintaining the employment of two Case Managers was then met with the exception of the period June 26 to July 26, 2002 when only one Case Manager was employed, and from October 7 to December 1, 2003, when both Case Managers had been terminated due to personnel issues.

Court referrals to the BP were suspended during the October 7 to December 1, 2003 period until both positions could be filled, however, it was necessary to tend to pending business, including maintaining contact with those NCPs already in the program who either called or came in person to discuss personal issues. Fortunately, the Database Administrator had over one year of experience with the BP and knew virtually all of the clients in the program. Consequently, she was able to answer the telephone, discuss pending issues with NCPs and generally maintain the BP' momentum during the month. Both Case Manager positions were subsequently filled in December 2003 and those individuals remained employed during the remainder of the program.

Barriers' II Operation

The NCPs who received Case Manager' services in Barriers II included those who entered the BP under Barriers I since a number of them continued to receive services until the program ceased operation on June 1, 2005. Consequently, with the exception of the gap prior to the employment of Case Manager #2, there was a relatively seamless transition of services to NCPs that entered the BP prior to the commencement of Barriers II. At the start of Barriers II on April 1, 2001, only 5 cases were closed of the 113 cases of NCPs that entered the BP under Barriers I.¹⁸

Most of the NCPs in the BP had "old" as opposed to "new" cases and came to the program through a referral from a judge in the J&DR Court. Thus the BP did not have a problem

¹⁸ As noted previously, 69 NCPs were responsible for these 113 cases.

getting NCPs into the program since they were referred by a judge. A few NCPs were “ordered” into the BP by a judge and several other NCPs (fewer than five) were accepted through self-referrals but with these few exceptions almost all were “referred” by a judge.

Court Actions

Those NCPs referred to the BP were in court typically in response to one of these two actions:

- A “show cause” *Motion for Show Cause Summons or Capias* (issued because the NCP failed to pay child support) or
- A *Summons* issued in conjunction with a *Petition for Support (Civil)* which was issued for the establishment of an order for the NCP’ initial obligation to pay child support.

The District Office’ Court Specialist and the DCSE’ Special Counsel (who represented DCSE) were always in court to present cases (Special Counsel) or to provide information about the case (Court Specialist) to the judge. In addition, the Case Managers were also in court.

Motion for Show Cause Summons or Capias

In a “show cause” case, the Special Counsel briefed the judge on the NCP’ case history and explained the reason for the “show cause.” Typically this explanation involved disclosing the amount of arrearages, the date of the last payment and related information. The judge then would consider that information and whatever explanation the NCP offered. The judge would then decide whether to order the NCP to jail, pay a purge bond,¹⁹ or take some other action. In addition, for those NCPs the judge felt were candidates for the BP in lieu of incarceration, the judge would say something to the effect, “I want you to talk to these folks (the Case Managers were in the courtroom and the judge would gesture towards them) because they can help you if you will cooperate with them.”

Sometimes the judge also made unemployed NCPs return to court each week with the names of five or so employers they contacted for employment. The Case Managers gave guidance on employment searches to those NCPs who were referred to the BP. Appendix 5 is a form the Case Managers gave the NCPs to assist in this process. Contacting employers was an important condition because the judge could jail any NCP who did not bring back the list of employers who were contacted since this was an “order.”

Summons

In cases involving a summons for the establishment of an initial child support order amount, the Special Counsel presented any income information pertaining to the NCP that was available and/or if the NCP was present, the Special Counsel would address questions to the

¹⁹ A *purge bond* is a sum of money established by a judge that the NCP must pay towards arrearages to avoid being given a jail sentence or if the NCP is incarcerated for the failure to pay child support, a *purge bond* is the amount of money the NCP must pay to be released from jail.

individual concerning his/her income. Then the judge would set the support order amount. If the NCP was present in court and the judge felt the BP might benefit him/her, he said something to the effect, (using the same approach discussed above) “I want you to talk to these folks because they can help you if you will cooperate with them.”

Interviewing NCPs

Sometimes the Case Managers interviewed the NCPs in court but more typically, a time was set for them to be interviewed at the district office. When this occurred, the Case Managers would give the NCPs a copy of a brochure explaining they had been referred by the judge into the BP and the purpose of it (see Appendix 5). On some occasions when both Case Managers were present in court, one Case Manager used a court-provided room to conduct the interview. During the interview, the Case Managers would complete the *Barriers Assessment Form* (see Appendix 6) and obtain this information:

- job skills and competencies, including education and training;
- employment status;
- income;
- current/most recent employer’s name, address and telephone number;
- if unemployed, barriers to obtaining employment;
- other barriers to the payment of support and willingness to correct the barriers;
- willingness to undertake personal development to become employable;
- support order amount and number of cases with DCSE;
- any personal problems including drug abuse;
- conviction information, including current probation/parole; and,
- vehicle driver’s license and automobile ownership/transportation access.

The Case Managers would complete and explain the *Consent to Share Information* form (see Appendix 7) and request the NCP’s signature authorizing the Case Manager to exchange confidential information, such as financial and assessment information with various agencies, such as the Department of Social Services and the VEC.

Next, the Case Managers explained the *Barriers to Child Support Program Participation Agreement* (see Appendix 8) and have the NCPs sign it. The NCPs would be given a copy of the agreement so they could refer back to it as necessary to recall what they had agreed to do.

Finally, the Case Managers gave their business card to the NCPs and explained the importance of remaining in contact and meeting the terms of the *Participation Agreement*.

Services Provided

The Case Managers could not provide “paid” services because funds were not available for that purpose. The Case Managers used considerable creativity in developing plans utilizing free services. One of the main “services” the Case Managers provided was helping the NCPs talk-out their problems and other personal and child support payment issues. These conversations helped the Case Managers gain the NCPs’ confidence. NCPs needing

employment services were typically referred to the VEC. These services were not restricted to employment searches since the VEC also performs some job preparatory services such as resume preparation and interview skills building workshops. A few NCPs who had unique problems, such as physical or mental disabilities, were referred to state rehabilitative or local social service agencies. As needed, NCPs were referred to homeless shelters and temporary employment agencies. All NCPs (excluding those who were either homeless or incarcerated) received monthly statements showing their arrearage balances and related information (see Appendix 9).

Each month the Case Managers made an effort to contact each NCP in their active client base. In turn, some NCPs took the initiative of periodically contacting their respective Case Manager. As might be expected, some NCPs could not be contacted because they had moved or didn't have a telephone. Nevertheless, an effort was made to complete a personal contact with each NCP every month. All contacts were documented in the case files. In these contacts, as well as every other opportunity, the Case Managers stressed to the NCPs how important it was for them to make payments. "Try to pay something every month, even if it is not the full payment," is what they typically would say. The Case Managers also listened to the NCPs and were available at virtually all hours for them to call and explain whatever was on their minds. Probably personal communication with NCPs was one of the major tasks the Case Managers performed.

NCPs Enrollments in the BP

As noted previously, virtually all NCPs in the BP were referred by a J&DR Court judge. A few NCPs referred themselves to the BP.

Self-Referred NCPs

A few (fewer than five NCPs) volunteered to enter the program. Admitting NCPs to the BP through self-referrals was discussed at various points in the program's operation. The concept gained impetus when the Thurman Brisbane Homeless Shelter in Fredericksburg required any person, who had a child support order and was seeking shelter, to enroll in the BP on a volunteer basis. For this reason, and others, the concept of volunteering appeared to gain some favor and several NCPs who asked for admittance were admitted. Subsequently, a decision was made not to admit self-referred NCPs for several reasons, including the possibility that the caseload would become too large and prevent Case Managers from being fully engaged in assisting NCPs who were referred through judges in the J&DR Courts. Opponents to self-referrals felt the justification for funding the BP' extension was based on the premise that the only population to be served would be those NCPs referred by a judge.

Judicially-Referred NCPs

During the interval from March 1, 2000 through December 31, 2004, 294 NCPs were referred (virtually all were referred by a judge except for the several self-referrals discussed above) to the program. As stated previously, the official end date for the BP was June 1, 2005, however, one CP and one NCP were referred to the program in 2005 and both of those were in January 2005. The period from January 1 to June 1, 2005 was spent by the Case Managers in the

extensive process of terminating the BP grant. This process included contacting the NCPs in their respective caseloads and informing them of the program's termination, contacting representatives of various agencies who had interacted with the program and explaining the program's completion of the grant and performing other administrative details such as emptying file cabinets and preparing records for storage.

As shown in Table 1, 194 or about 65 percent of these NCPs were still enrolled on December 31, 2004. A few of these 194 NCPs were not actively involved in the BP and were earmarked for release for various reasons including noncompliance or moving to another jurisdiction.

Reasons for NCP Release From the BP

These were the reasons an NCP could be released from the BP:

- Child support case was closed and no arrears or fees in the case;
- Child support case was closed and arrears were paid for the full court-ordered amount through wage withholding for six consecutive months;
- All monies had been repaid to the state and child support payments had been made for six consecutive months;
- Written request from the NCP was received for release from the BP and the full court-ordered amount of child support had been paid through wage withholding for six consecutive months;
- NCP refused to comply with requests made by the Case Managers and there were three letters in the file supporting efforts made by them to obtain the NCP's cooperation;
- NCP was referred to the BP from a show cause motion and the individual had not complied with the Case Manager's requests within 90 days; and,
- Case transferred to another jurisdiction or the NCP moved from the BP's jurisdiction.

As shown in Table 1, 100 NCPs left the BP during the period March 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004. These are among the reasons for those NCPs leaving the BP:

- Eleven NCPs (11 percent) left because DCSE closed the case, so DCSE was no longer responsible for enforcing the support order. There were various reasons for case closures. Usually, the support order continued but the NCP was making payments directly to the CP. In some cases, the NCP and the CP jointly asked the judge to terminate the support order;

Table 1
NCP/CP Enrollment and Attrition in Barriers Program
March 1, 2000 – December 31, 2004

Date referred by court	NCPs (CPs) enrolled in BP	NCPs (CPs) enrolled at BP end	Reasons for leaving BP						
			DCSE closed case	Child adopted & no arrears	Moved to another jurisdiction	Non-compliant	Not the father	Deceased	Compliant and released ¹
2000 ²	52 (0)	23 (0)	3	1	4	9	0	2	10
2001	44 (1)	25 (1)	6	0	4	6	0	1	2
2002	66 (5)	46 (5)	1	0	1	15	1	0	2
2003 Jan.-June	41 (4)	26 (1)	0 (1)	0	1	9 (2)	0	0	5
2003 July-Dec.	13 (1)	8 (1)	0	0	0	3	0	0	2
2004 Jan.-June	44 (8)	33 (8)	0	0	1	4	0	0	6
2004 July-Dec.	34 (4)	33 (4)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	294 (23)	194 (20)	11 (1)	1	11	46 (2)	1	3	27

Notes:

¹The 27 NCPs in the “Compliant and released” Column are those who were released from the program because they met all requirements and were paying on a regular basis.

²March 1 through December 31.

- Eleven NCPs (11 percent) moved to other jurisdictions so the Case Managers were unable to continue providing assistance. Several of these NCPs moved to other states, but due to the strong relationships that had been established with the Case Managers, they periodically would communicate with them about the status of their cases;
- Noncompliance was the main reason NCPs left the BP. Forty-six NCPs (46 percent) were released from the BP for noncompliance. Noncompliant acts included the following: failing to remain in contact with the Case Managers; and, disregarding the Case Manager’ offers of assistance, such as failing to report for either job interviews or scheduled interviews with VEC’ vocational counselors. These noncompliant NCPs proved that the BP was not suitable for all NCPs despite the Case Manager’ best efforts. These were the procedures and/or outcomes involving noncompliant NCPs:
 - NCPs were given ample opportunity to remain in the program since procedures required that their BP’ file must contain at least three letters from Case Managers informing an NCP of the need to cooperate or face the prospect of being removed from the program. If these efforts were fruitless, procedures were commenced to remove the NCP from the program. In those situations, the Case Managers would

coordinate with the local DCSE Special Counsel in requesting a judge to remove the NCP.

- About six of the former BP clients, who were not cooperating with the Case Managers were ordered to jail by the judge. Most of these were eventually given work release, an arrangement in which they are incarcerated but work during the day and return to jail after work.
- Some NCPs were assigned to Home Electronic Monitoring, which is a process in which they were fitted with an ankle bracelet which allows their movements to be monitored from a central location. The NCPs were released from incarceration but had to remain at home during certain hours of the day except when working.
- Twenty-seven NCPs (27 percent) were released from the BP because they met all requirements and were making regular support payments.
- In one case (1 percent), the child was adopted and there were no arrears on the case so the NCP was released from the BP.
- Three NCPs (3 percent) died while enrolled in the BP.
- In one case (1 percent), the NCP was found not to be the father of the child and thus was released from the BP.

CP Enrollments in the BP

CPs are also responsible for the support of their children. Initially, CPs were not viewed as likely candidates for the BP but in 2001, this opinion changed. Consequently, as shown in Table 1, from 2001 to December 31, 2004, judges referred 23 CPs to the BP.

Typically, CPs were referred to the BP when they appeared in court for the establishment of the initial child support order amount. When this occurred, the judges preferred that the CPs were working so a reasonable support order amount could be established. The judges referred unemployed CPs to the BP because they believed the CPs should be contributing toward the financial support of their children. In these cases, the Case Manager' role was to assist the CPs in securing employment prior to the next court date. In addition to employment assistance, the Case Managers provided CPs with the same basic services provided to NCPs. Twenty or 87 percent of the CPs who entered the BP were still in the program on December 31, 2004. One CP left the BP because DCSE closed the case and the other two CPs left because they were noncompliant.

Cases in the BP

Table 2 contains the total number of cases for which the 294 NCPs were responsible by referral date. From the commencement of the BP until December 31, 2004, the total number of cases in the BP increased to 490. Table 3 contains the numbers of cases for which individual

NCPs were responsible. Most of the NCPs (177 or 60.2 percent) were responsible for a single case. However, a sizable portion of the 294 NCPs were responsible for support in multiple cases as follows:

- 65 NCPs (22.1 percent) were responsible for two cases;
- 33 NCPs (11.2 percent) had three cases;
- 13 NCPs (4.4 percent) had four cases and one of these NCPs was also a CP on another case;
- 4 NCPs (1.3 percent) had five cases; and,
- 2 NCPs (less than 1 percent) were responsible for six cases.

In summary, about 40 percent of the NCPs in the BP were responsible for two or more cases and 17 percent of the NCPs were responsible for three or more cases. As noted previously, 100 NCPs left the BP from March 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004. These 100 NCPs were responsible for 141 cases.

Case Manager' Tasks

The two Case Managers split the active BP caseload evenly with each one working with NCP and CP populations, of approximately 95 and 10 individuals, respectively, in December 2004. The Case Manager' job description in Appendix 2 defines most of the job tasks. In the opinion of the Case Managers one of the more important dimensions of their jobs was maintaining regular contact with each NCP in their client population.

Each contact with an NCP was documented in the respective NCP' case file. These contacts included telephone calls, mailing letters and monthly statements and personal discussions. On some occasions an NCP would initiate a contact. More typically, the Case Managers took the initiative. Sometimes, a contact was simply to remind an NCP of a pending issue, such as a forthcoming job interview. Appendix 10 is a form the Case Managers used to record the various types of contacts, referrals and other information.

Some contacts were programmed on a regular basis. For example, each month, the Case Managers reviewed the payment records of the NCPs in their respective caseloads and determined the amount currently owed, including arrearages. Then as noted above, a monthly statement letter was prepared and mailed to all NCPs who had an address. The letter encouraged the NCPs to contact the office if they felt the amount was not correct. Appendix 9 is a copy of the monthly statement letter.

Table 2
Cases of NCPs/(CPs) Entering/Exiting Barriers Program
March 1, 2000 – December 31, 2004

Date referred by court	No. cases of NCPs (CPs) in BP entering BP	No. cases of NCPs (CPs) in BP at conclusion	Reasons for exiting BP						
			DCSE closed case	Child adopted & no arrears	Moved to another jurisdiction	Non-compliant	Not the father	Deceased	Compliant and released ¹
2000 ²	88 (0)	51 (0)	5	1	4	12	0	2	13
2001	68 (1)	41 (1)	6	0	5	13	0	1	2
2002	114 (5)	81 (5)	1	0	1	27	1	0	3
2003 Jan.-June	66 (7)	47 (4)	(1)	0	1	15 (2)	0	0	3
2003 July-Dec.	17 (2)	10 (2)	0	0	0	5	0	0	2
2004 Jan.-June	81 (14)	64 (14)	0	0	1	9	0	0	7
2004 July-Dec.	56 (6)	55 (6)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	490 (35)	349 (32)	13 (1)	1	12	81 (2)	1	3	30

Notes:

¹The 30 NCPs in the “Compliant and released” column are those who were released from the program because they met all requirements and were paying on a regular basis.

²March 1 through December 31.

Table 3
Number of Cases of NCPs/CPs in the Barriers Program, 2000-2004

Number Cases Per NCP	Noncustodial Parent		Custodial Parent	
	Number (%)	Total Cases	Number	Total Cases
1	177 (60.2%)	177	15 ¹	15
2	65 (22.1%)	130	5 ²	10
3	33 (11.2%)	99	2 ³	6
4	13 ⁴ (4.4 %)	52	1 ⁵	4
5	4 (1.3 %)	20	0	0
6	2 (⁶)	12	0	0
Totals	294 (100%)	490	23	35

Notes:

¹One CP is an NCP on another case

²One CP is an NCP on another case

³One CP is an NCP on another case

⁴One NCP is a CP on another case

⁵One CP is an NCP on another case

⁶Fewer than 1 percent

On occasion, the receipt of a monthly statement precipitated an NCP's telephone call, such as informing the Case Manager that a payment had been made after the statement was mailed. On occasion some of the NCPs were not mailed statements because they did not have a regular address throughout the period they were enrolled in the BP. For example, based on the results of a random sample of 18 of the 194 NCPs, enrolled in the BP in March 2005, perhaps as many as 22 percent of the NCPs were homeless at some period during their enrollment and 27 percent were incarcerated. Some individuals were homeless at some periods and incarcerated during others. In spite of these conditions, the Case Managers made efforts to send them statements, where possible.

Examples of Case Manager' Tasks

Services Provided to a Sample of 18 NCPs. In March 2005, the names of 20 NCPs were randomly selected from the approximately 194 NCPs in the active BP caseload. The sample was split between the two Case Managers. The Case Managers were asked to briefly outline the services/assistance they provided since they were hired in December 2003, to the NCPs in their respective samples. The Case Managers furnished information on 18 of the 20 NCPs. Following are brief vignettes of the services and documented contacts the two Case Managers made to these 18 clients during the designated period:

- NCP#1 entered Barriers 9/17/02. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agency listing and periodic other job postings. Verbal and written communications on regular basis. Sent monthly statements. NCP periodically incarcerated on other charges during this time.
- NCP#2 entered Barriers 10/22/04. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agencies and sent monthly statements. NCP had physical injuries when he entered the program.
- NCP#3 entered Barriers 8/27/04. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agencies, sent monthly statements, and given rooming information during period in which he was homeless. NCP employed when he entered the program so tabbed the case for monitoring due to high arrearages and past history.
- NCP#4 entered Barriers 1/4/02. Services: Appointment with the VEC and referral to temporary employment agencies. Given information on periodic job updates, as available. NCP periodically incarcerated on other charges during this time.
- NCP#5 entered Barriers 8/30/02. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agencies and sent monthly statements. NCP is on the run from the law in general; has many capiases out for his arrest.
- NCP#6 entered Barriers 6/15/04. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agencies, and sent monthly statements.

-
- NCP#7 entered Barriers 2/27/04. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agencies, and sent monthly statements. Written and oral communications. NCP incarcerated much of the time (14 year sentence). Out of jail for a short period but incarcerated again for 18 months on non-child support issues.
 - NCP#8 entered Barriers 8/26/02. Services: Appointment with the VEC, referral to temporary employment agencies, written and oral communications and sent monthly statements.
 - NCP#9 entered Barriers 9/20/04. Services: NCP already had a job doing construction work when he entered the BP but was laid off due to weather conditions. Referred to VEC and temporary employment agencies. Various written and verbal communications. Sent monthly statements.
 - NCP#10 entered Barriers 3/15/04. Services: Referred to VEC and several temporary employment agencies. Referred to homeless shelter. Written and verbal communications.
 - NCP#11 entered Barriers 5/12/03. Services: Referred to VEC and several temporary employment agencies. Various written and verbal communications. Sent monthly statements.
 - NCP#12 entered Barriers 3/10/03. Services: Referred to homeless shelter. Currently incarcerated.
 - NCP#13 entered Barriers 10/1/00. Services: Referred to Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles to obtain a Commercial Drivers' License. Referred to VEC for employment. Written and verbal communications. Sent monthly statements.
 - NCP#14 entered Barriers 8/2/04. Services: Paid for NCP' birth certificate. Referred to several temporary employment agencies. Also referred to homeless shelter.
 - NCP#15 entered Barriers 8/30/00. Services: Incarcerated until 9/04. Referred to several temporary employment agencies. Written and verbal communications. Sent monthly statements.
 - NCP#16 entered Barriers 11/18/01. Services: Written and verbal communications. Sent monthly statements.
 - NCP#17 entered Barriers 5/3/04. Services: Referred to VEC and several temporary employment agencies. Given bus fares for employment interviews.
 - NCP#18 entered Barriers 9/27/04. Services: Referred to VEC and several temporary employment agencies. Written and verbal communications. Sent monthly statements.

Table 4 contains a summary of the services/type of assistance the two Case Managers provided to the 18 NCPs in the sample:

- Employment. As noted previously, the Case Managers in Barriers II found that job-related issues were the major barrier to NCPs paying child support. Fourteen (78 percent) of the 18 NCPs were either referred or had appointments made for assistance from the VEC. In addition, 15 NCPs (83 percent) were referred for other employment opportunities, mainly to temporary employment agencies.
- Communication. The Case Managers made written and/or oral communication with 55 percent of the NCPs. This is probably understated since referrals were made to the VEC for most of the NCPs for which the Case Managers did not indicate they made oral or written communication. Also, for other NCPs the Case Managers gave services in which communication was required, for example, referrals to a homeless shelter were made for NCPs #3, #12, and #14, and bus tickets were given to NCP #17. Consequently, it appears the Case Managers communicated with all 18 NCPs even though they did not note it in the case summaries.
- Monthly Statements. Monthly statements were mailed to 72 percent of the NCPs. Apparently statements were not mailed to NCPs #12 and #14 because they were homeless and NCPs #1 and #4 were incarcerated so statements were not mailed to them.
- Other Services. One NCP (#14) was offered assistance in obtaining his birth certificate, one NCP (#13) was referred to the Department of Motor Vehicles to obtain a Commercial Drivers' License and one NCP (#17) was provided with bus tickets in conjunction with employment applications.

As shown in the summaries, one-third of the NCPs were incarcerated (five NCPs) or had outstanding capiases for his arrest (one NCP), at some time during the interval December 2003 to March 2005. The files indicate the major cause for these periods of incarceration were for other than the nonpayment of child support. This includes NCP#5 who was being sought by law enforcement officials for the purpose of serving him with several arrest warrants.

Services Provided to a Sample of Three CPs. These are some examples from case files of services given to a sample of three of the 23 CPs:

- CP#1: This CP had a disability that was preventing her from obtaining employment. A Case Manager worked with Counselors in the State Department of Rehabilitative Services to evaluate the CP's disability. Upon completion of this evaluation, the Case Manager assisted the CP in finding employment in a job that would accommodate the disability.

Table 4
Services/Assistance Provided to a Random Sample of 18 NCPs in the BP

NCP	Services/Referrals/Assistance								Other	
	VEC	Temp./ Other	Comm.	Shelter	State.	Birth Cert.	DMV	Bus	Incar./ Capias	Injured
#1	√	√	√						√	
#2	√	√			√					√
#3	√	√		√	√					
#4	√	√							√	
#5	√	√			√				√	
#6	√	√			√					
#7	√	√	√		√				√	
#8	√	√	√		√					
#9	√	√	√		√					
#10	√	√	√	√	√					
#11	√	√	√		√					
#12				√					√	
#13	√		√		√		√			
#14		√		√		√				
#15		√	√		√				√	
#16			√		√					
#17	√	√						√		
#18	√	√	√		√					
Totals	14	15	10	4	13	1	1	1	6	1

- CP#2: This CP had little employment experience so a Case Manager focused on helping the individual find a job to build some credible work experience. The initial job placement was working in a “fast food” establishment. Later, the CP used this job experience, demonstrating her reliability and work quality, to obtain a better position in retailing that provided her with more compensation and enhanced her self-esteem.
- CP#3: This CP did not have a high school degree so the Case Manager helped her complete the application process for the General Educational Development High School Equivalency Diploma Test. The Case Manager helped several other CPs, who similarly did not have high school degrees, with this application process.

Marketing the BP

The Case Managers used various means to communicate and market the BP to different constituencies. They contacted and explained the BP to local officials, such as the Mayor of the City of Fredericksburg. The Mayor wrote a letter in support of the continuation of the BP when the grant funding ended and he learned it would be discontinued.

The Case Managers also wrote various individuals to expand employment opportunities for NCPs. Appendix 11 is a sample of a letter used for this purpose.

Attorneys who represented NCPs in J&DR courts were other important players in the BP. The Case Managers made efforts to advise these attorneys of the BP' existence and encouraged them to refer their NCP-clients to the program. Appendix 12 is a sample of a letter used for this purpose.

Case Manager Turnover

As noted previously, the period of demonstration for Barriers I was March 1, 2000 to April 1, 2001 and the single Case Manager authorized for the research remained employed for that entire period. On the other hand, employment stability was more problematic in Barriers II. During the first three years and eight months of Barriers' II operation, six different individuals were employed in the position. The shortest and longest tenures in employment were six weeks and 18 months, respectively. Four individuals were employed less than one year. Due to this high turnover rate, recruitment and training were ongoing issues during Barriers II except during the last 18 months of the program' operation when the last two Case Managers were continuously employed from December 1, 2003 to June 1, 2005.²⁰

To some extent, a turnover problem was to be expected among the Case Managers, who were temporary employees (i.e., grant-funded) and did not receive employee benefits. During the period 1999 – 2002, the labor markets in the Fredericksburg region were extremely tight. The unemployment rates for the four years ranged from 1.8 percent to 2.8 percent. In comparison, for the same period, the unemployment rates for the entire state of Virginia ranged from 2.8 percent to 4.1 percent. By any standard, these are extremely low rates. As a result, the Case Managers had a number of employment options available to them.

Quality of Case Managers' Services

In addition to turnover problems, the quality of Case Managers' services varied considerably over the four-year period of Barriers' II operation. These were among the reasons for this variation:

- The selection process used in hiring the Case Managers. To a considerable extent the selection process depended upon the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the job description used by those individuals making the hiring recommendations and final hiring decision. Since the job was newly created for the project some of the job tasks, and the manner of accomplishing them, evolved during the life of the project. For some Case Managers, the job outgrew the incumbent, eventually resulting in either a resignation or termination. Consequently, upon initial employment, a newly hired Case Manager may have performed satisfactorily but the work quality diminished as the caseload increased and work methods changed.

²⁰ As noted previously, Case Manager Rice resigned May 24, 2005 to accept a full-time position as a Support Enforcement Specialist in the Fredericksburg District Office.

Also, procedures needed to be developed as issues facing the Case Managers became more complex. For example, Case Manager' initiative was necessary to formulate procedures for releasing NCPs from the BP. These procedures had to accommodate scenarios ranging from cases that were closed and all support was paid to NCP' refusal to comply with BP requirements, such as not appearing for employment interviews that were established by a Case Manager. Case Managers were also expected to become more efficient and enhance their interpersonal competencies in assisting and otherwise interacting with NCPs.

Individuals on Case Manager' selection panels could not have been expected to know how job tasks would transition as the program expanded. Much was learned in Barriers' II early years. Both the job description and the selection process used to hire the last two Case Managers were significant improvements from the past. In the opinion of most individuals who interacted with them, the last two Case Managers were well-qualified and performed in an excellent manner.

- The training given. To some extent this variable was related to several of the issues noted regarding the selection process. The Case Managers received basic District Office training, such as how to use APECS (DCSE' case management information system) and the roles of the various child support enforcement functions (such as locating NCPs, establishing paternity and support obligations, and enforcing orders).

Less comprehensive training was provided in performing important client-related tasks, such as how to conduct new client interviews (the format to follow, what information to collect, and what methods to use in motivating clients to give information), how to assess client needs, the procedures for developing providers of services, procedures for making referrals and how to monitor and document any progress. Most important, was training in how to build trust with NCPs who were referred to the BP. Another important training topic was the manner of communicating with District Office' enforcement personnel about particular NCPs without compromising the NCP' trust.

- Oversight and supervision given. Of necessity, the Case Managers were delegated extensive authority to accomplish their tasks. Virtually all of their tasks were performed in the absence of immediate onsite supervision. For example, the Case Managers received little supervision during periods in which they were performing the critical dimensions of their job, such as while they were in court, during the process of interviewing clients and making referrals, and when they were making follow-up contacts with clients regarding missed support payments and keeping appointments with service providers. Some Case Managers used this autonomy and flexibility to make improvements in BP procedures and in their personal work methods. A few Case Managers were less than successful in managing their own work and time. Consequently, it was necessary to terminate a few Case Managers since their skills were not compatible with job needs.

Because of the temporary nature of the job, these were some other factors important in recruiting and retaining well-qualified Case Managers:

- Absence of employee benefits. Since the positions were filled through a staffing agency, health insurance and other benefits were not provided. For a few Case Managers the absence of employee benefits, particularly health insurance, was a significant issue when they were initially hired or as time progressed. This was less of a problem for some Case Managers who had health insurance coverage under their spouses' place of employment. The absence of vacation time, holiday pay, retirement and other employee benefits were other issues but were not vocalized with any amount of frequency.
- Temporary position. As their tenure of employment increased, some Case Managers' expressed the need to obtain permanent full-time positions. The Case Managers knew the jobs were short-lived due to the experimental nature of the project. Consequently, some Case Managers had second jobs and some were conducting meaningful job searches during various periods of their employment. On the other hand, several Case Managers appeared to be unaffected by the temporary nature of their employment.
- Low pay. The low level of pay was an issue for several of the Case Managers. Initially, the pay for the position was \$12.44 per hour. This increased to \$15.40 per hour for the last two Case Managers who were employed from December 1, 2003 until the program was terminated on June 1, 2005. In addition, the vendor, who referred the Case Managers received from \$2.75 to \$3.24 per hour, depending upon the year in which the Case Managers were initially hired. Few Case Managers expressed concern about the pay but several of them did have additional jobs to supplement their family income.

Results of the BP

Following are the areas, covering the most significant results of the BP, which are discussed more fully in the following sections:

- Payments before/after enrollment in the BP. An analysis was conducted of NCP' payments made six months prior to enrollment in the BP with payments after enrollment for quarterly intervals ranging from 3 months to 18 months.
- Effect on arrearage balances. An analysis was conducted of the changes in NCP' arrearage balances over a 10-month period for a sample of 121 NCPs.
- Avoidance of incarceration. In lieu of incarceration, judges referred NCPs to the BP. Generally incarcerated NCPs do not pay child support, unless they are assigned to either a work release unit within the jail or to Home Electronic Monitoring. In addition to the foregone support benefits, there are daily costs associated with incarceration. To estimate the benefits of judges making referrals to the BP, an analysis was conducted of the child support payments that would have been foregone due to incarceration and to cost avoidance of the daily operational cost per inmate for incarceration in the Rappahannock Regional Jail.

-
- Cost-effectiveness for BP continuation. An analysis was conducted of the estimated dollar cost/benefit return of the BP. This analysis assumes annual benefits of projected additional payments by NCPs for current support and arrearages contrasted with the operational expenses of total compensation and miscellaneous costs associated with the employment of two Case Managers.

Payments Before/After Enrollment in the BP

This phase of the evaluation involved using a pretest/posttest design of a minimum of six months of payments made by each NCP prior to enrollment (pretest) in the BP and at least six months of payments after enrollment (posttest) in the BP.²¹ The monthly payments consisted of the aggregation of monies received from the NCPs for current support, interest and arrears.

The Pretest Period

The NCP' six monthly payments prior to enrollment in the BP were collapsed into two three-month quarterly periods. For example, the second quarter prior to entering the BP consisted of payments made for months 4, 5 and 6 before entering the program and the first quarter prior to entering the BP consisted of payments made in months 1, 2, and 3 before entering the program. These quarterly payments were collected for all 490 cases of the 294 NCPs who entered the BP from its commencement (March 1, 2000) through December 2004, however, NCPs who entered the program after June 30, 2004 were not included, as discussed in the following section. The results are shown in Table 5.

The Posttest Period

The monthly payments in the posttest periods were those made by the NCPs following their enrollment in the BP. The months after enrollment in the BP were also aggregated into quarters. For example, the first quarter after enrollment in the BP was an aggregation of payments made in months 1, 2 and 3 after enrollment. An aggregation of payments in months 4, 5 and 6 after enrollment in the BP constituted the second quarter after enrollment and so on.

As noted previously, monthly payments were obtained for all 490 cases of the 294 NCPs who were enrolled in the BP for the period March 1, 2000 – December 31, 2004. However, NCPs who entered the program after June 30, 2004 were not included in the pre/post analysis because the posttest required a minimum of six months of payments after enrollment in the BP. (NCPs who entered the BP after July 1, 2004 did not make payments for six months prior to December 31, 2004). The posttest results shown in Table 5 include only those NCPs who entered the BP prior to July 1, 2004 because at least two quarters of payments could be collected by December 31, 2004.

²¹ Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966): p. 8. The methodology used in this phase of the study prevented the typical internal and external sources of invalidation with this quasi-experimental research design, such as history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, and interactions.

The payment data shown in Table 5 includes only 260 NCPs (294 minus the 34 NCPs who entered the BP during the period July – December 2004) who were responsible for 434 cases (490 minus 56 cases of the NCPs discussed above, who entered the BP after June 30, 2004). These quarterly payments were collected for all NCPs who entered the BP during the respective periods shown in Table 5.²²

Table 5
NCP' Payments Two Quarters Before/After Enrollment in the Barriers Program
March 1, 2000 – June 30, 2004

Date	Number		Payments Within Quarters				Total 1st & 2nd Quarterly Payments			
	NCPs enter. BP	Cases enter. BP	Prior to BP		After BP		Prior to BP	After BP	\$ Diff	% Diff (add'l)
			2nd	1 st	1 st	2nd				
2000 ⁴	52	88	21,795	32,519	36,535	35,893	54,314	72,428	18,114	33.3%
2001	44	68	16,995	27,982	24,119	27,579	44,977	51,698	6,721	14.9
2002	66	114	21,594	36,993	69,414	39,969	58,587	109,383	50,796	86.7
2003 Jan- June	41	66	11,901	12,848	25,360	25,783	24,749	51,143	26,394	106.6
2003 July- Dec. ²	13	17	3,719	1,841	4,871	14,271	5,560	19,142	13,582	244.2
2004 Jan.- June	44	81	6,479	5,208	69,830	38,119 ³	11,687	107,949	96,262	823.6
Total	260	434	82,483	117,391 ¹	230,129	181,614	199,874	411,743	211,869	106%

Notes:

¹The actual sum of this column is larger since deductions were made for atypical payments made by 28 NCPs in advance of their “show cause” appearance before a judge.

²During this period a smaller number of NCPs were admitted to the BP because of case monitoring issues which resulted in Case Manager terminations. Consequently, payments are smaller than they most likely would have been.

³This amount does not represent all the payments for a full quarter but is included for comparison purposes.

⁴March 1 through December 31.

Results of Before/After Payment Comparison

As shown in Table 5, a comparison of payments made for Quarters 1 and 2 before/after enrollment in the BP was made for these time periods:

- **2000 (March 1 to December 31, 2000, inclusive):** As shown in Table 5, the payments for Quarters 1 and 2 after enrollment in the BP was one-third greater than the payments from NCPs in Quarters 1 and 2 prior to enrollment;

²² These included payments made by NCPs who left the program, such as those who moved to another jurisdiction, were removed from the program due to noncompliance or were released from the program because they met all requirements and were paying on a regular basis.

-
- Calendar year 2001: Some momentum was lost in the transition from Barriers I to Barriers II due to the time gap between the resignation of Case Manager #1 and the employment of Case Manager #2 (see Exhibit 1). Consequently, the difference in the payments in the periods prior to and after enrollment in the BP, while positive at about 15 percent greater, was much less than in 2000;
 - Calendar year 2002: For the first time two Case Managers simultaneously (at different times in the year Case Managers #2, #3, #4, #5 and #6 were employed). As a result, judges made substantial increases in their referrals of NCPs (and their respective cases) to the BP. These developments are reflected in the \$50,796 increase in the dollar amount of payments in the post enrollment periods constituting an 86.7 percent increase over the periods prior to enrollment.
 - January – June 2003: This year is divided into six-month intervals because two Case Managers were terminated in the second half of the year. As shown in Table 5, compared to NCPs in prior years (particularly the year 2001), the NCPs who were referred to the BP during this period made substantially smaller payments in the two quarters before enrollment in the program. Conversely, their payments after enrollment were equivalent to those made by the NCPs in the earlier years. As a result, the percentage increase in payments after enrollment in the BP (106.6 percent) is skewed and appears substantially greater than that in earlier periods.
 - July – December 2003: As noted above, two Case Managers were terminated during this period. The terminations were in October 2003 and the positions remained vacant until December 1. Some deficiencies in these Case Managers' performance had been noted prior to their termination so a decision was made to suspend referrals to the BP until these issues were resolved. This explains the sharp decline in the number of referrals during the period. Most of the payments after enrollment in the BP were made during the period January – June 2004 which is during the tenure of the two Case Managers (#8 and #9) who were hired December 1, 2003. Thus, the large percentage increase in payments (244 percent) during the two quarters after enrollment in the BP is due to the competencies of these two Case Managers.
 - January – June 2004: Based on the opinions of the DCSE' Project Manager, Fredericksburg District Office personnel and others, Case Managers #8 and #9 quickly exhibited their skills and, as shown in Table 5, there was a resumption of referrals to the BP. The caliber of their work is also apparent in the dollar amount of payments made by NCPs after enrollment in the BP and the large percentage increase (823.6 percent) in payments compared to the before-enrollment quarters.
 - Total (March 1, 2000 – June 2004): In spite of Case Manager turnover, issues with some Case Manager' performance and other problems like the program's temporary status, the sum of NCP' payments (for March 1, 2000 to July 1, 2004) after enrollment in the BP was \$211, 869 more than comparable periods prior to enrollment, which constitutes a 106 percent increase.

Exclusion of Payments. In the J&DR District Courts in which the BP operated there was approximately a two to three month lag between the date the NCP received service of a show cause order and the court date. During this period, some NCPs, faced with the prospect of appearing in court and receiving a jail sentence, made payments they otherwise would not have made. The apparent motivation for making the payments was to impress the judge and thereby reduce the probability of receiving a jail sentence. All payments are good news to the children who need them for their support. The problem with payments made under these circumstances is that they skew the research results and prevent obtaining a clear picture of the BP' effects.

As a result, an analysis was conducted of the payment history of NCPs who made payments in advance of their court date. All the NCPs in the BP had poor payment histories so this analysis included determining which ones were making payments that were both uncharacteristic of them and were within three months of their court date. Twenty-eight NCPs met both criteria and the amount of the payments they made ranged from \$100 to \$5,464. A payment of \$100 is small but it is significant when it is made by someone who hasn't made a payment in six months or more. Table 6 is a frequency distribution of the payments made by these 28 NCPs.

Table 6
Frequency & Amount of NCP' Payments Prior to Court Appearance

Payment Amount	No. Making Payment
\$100 – 500	6
\$ 501 – 1,000	12
\$1,001 – 2,000	5
Over \$2,001	5
Total	28

Due to biasing effects of the payments in Table 6, they were deducted from the 1st Quarter payments before enrollment in the BP. As shown in Note 1 on Table 8, due to the deductions, the sum of the payments for the 1st Quarter prior to enrollment is smaller than actual. The amount that was deducted from the various periods totaled \$28,379.96 or 25.2 percent of the total. The respective time periods in which the deductions were made are shown in Table 7. In spite of these deductions, note in Table 8 that with, the exception of the data for July – December 2003 and January – June 2004, there remain significant increases in payments the NCPs made from the 2nd Quarter to the 1st Quarter prior to enrollment in BP. Thus, while the 28 NCPs in Table 7 represent the extreme, apparently a number of other NCPs were also motivated to increase their payments in the three-month period preceding their court date. Consequently, it is probable the results of the comparisons in the before/after BP enrollment payments are more positive than they appear in Table 5.

Table 7
Intervals in Which Large Payments Were Made Prior to Court Appearance

Time Period	Aggregate of Large Payments
March 1 – December 31, 2000	\$2,573.84
2001	\$11,499.47
2002	\$11,752.51
January – June 2003	\$1,457.98
July – December 2003	0.00
January – June 2004	\$1,096.16
Total	\$28,379.96

Longer Term Effects

One of the major concerns about a demonstration program like the BP is how enduring will be its effects on NCP' payments. Table 8 contains quarterly payments extending 18 months beyond enrollment in the BP. The 1st Quarter payments in the pre-BP enrollment period were inflated as discussed above. This inflation is a bigger issue in contrasting payments made a year or more after enrollment in the BP. Another issue impacting payments beyond six months after enrollment is Case Managers' turnover and the quality of the various Case Managers' services.

Inflated Payments. The NCP' payments in the 1st Quarter preceding enrollment in the BP were discussed previously, namely that a number of sizable payments were made by NCPs prior to their court date with the apparent intent to influence the judge's decision regarding their incarceration. Deductions were made for those payments by 28 NCPs and are reflected in the data in Table 8. Despite those corrections, the sum of the payments made in the 1st Quarter for all the periods prior to enrollment in the BP are 52.6 percent greater than the payments made in the 2nd Quarter prior to enrollment.

Case Manager' Job Performance and Turnover. The problems with Case Managers' turnover were discussed earlier. This turnover played an unknown but presumably significant role in providing services to NCPs and thus impacted the payments they made. Similarly, District Office management personnel, the Project Manager, and others considered some Case Managers clearly more qualified and better performers than others. Thus the continuity of Case Managers' employment and their qualifications and dedication in assisting NCPs in the BP were important determinants in NCP' payment practices.

Analysis of Payments. Considering the caveats noted above of inflated payments and Case Managers' longevity and performance, following are four time intervals in which payments were analyzed for two quarters prior to enrollment in the BP contrasted with six quarters after enrollment:

- **March 1 – December 31, 2000:** The payments in all six quarters after enrollment in the BP were much greater than the payments in the 2nd Quarter prior to enrollment. The results are not so dramatic comparing payments in the 1st Quarter prior to enrollment with those made in the six quarters after enrollment. Most of the payments made during the 1st

through the 3rd Quarters after enrollment were during the tenure of Case Manager #1 (for ease of analysis, the Case Managers are referred to by the sequenced number of the time period in which they were employed – see Exhibit 1). There was approximately a two and ½ month gap between the resignation of Case Manager #1 and the employment of Case Manager #2. Consequently, some momentum was lost and is reflected in the decline in the payments in Quarters 4 and 5. NCP’ payments increased in Quarter 6 as Case Manager #2 acquired job experience.

Table 8
NCP’ Payments Before/After Entering Barriers Program (BP)
March 1, 2000 – June 30, 2003

Date	Number		\$ payments within quarter							
	NCPs Enter. BP	Cases Enter. BP	Prior to BP		After admittance in BP					
			2 nd	1 st	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th
2000 ²	52	88	21,795	32,519	36,535	35,893	49,654	32,961	32,691	35,818
2001	44	68	16,995	27,982	24,119	27,579	34,073	22,373	33,526	19,358
2002	66	114	21,594	36,993	69,414	39,969	72,612	41,364	41,557	45,122
2003 Jan.- June	41	66	11,901	12,848	25,360	25,783	53,638	32,492	28,366	27,836
Total	203	336	72,285	¹ 110,342	155,428	129,224	209,977	129,190	136,140	128,134

Notes:

¹The actual sum of this column is larger since deductions were made for atypical payments made by 28 NCPs in advance of their “show cause” appearance before a judge.

²March 1 through December 31, 2000.

- 2001: The payments in Quarters 1 & 2 after enrollment were clearly adversely impacted by Case Manager’ #1 resignation and the two-month delay in employing her replacement. These are the only occasions in the four time periods shown (2000 through January – June 2003) in which the payments in Quarters 1 & 2 after enrollment are less than those in the 1st Quarter prior to enrollment. In April 2002, a second Case Manager (Case Manager #3) was employed which may account for the rise in Quarter 3 payments (in 2001). However, after several months, Case Manager #2 resigned and Case Manager #3 was handling the entire caseload, which had grown to an estimated 100. This development may account for the significant decline in Quarter 4 payments.

Two other issues occurred in 2002 that affected NCP’ payments in Quarters 5 & 6 (of 2001). First, for a short period a second Case Manager was employed (Case Manager #4) but she abruptly resigned about one and ½ months later. Case Manager #5 was hired about one month after the employment of Case Manager #4 so there remained some continuity in the BP’ operation. Nevertheless the inexperience and turmoil of these personnel changes undoubtedly contributed to the decline in payments in Quarter 6 (of 2001).

-
- 2002: The reason or reasons for the large increase in payments in Quarter 1 after enrollment in the BP compared to the 1st Quarter prior to enrollment and the similarly large increase in payments in Quarter 3 are not immediately clear. One reason may be that Case Manager #2 had about eight months of job experience, Case Manager #5 had several months of experience, and the earlier turnover problems had abated somewhat. Case Manager #5 requested maternity leave and took the leave in December 2002 and January 2003. Case Manager #6 was hired in October of 2002 to cover for the planned absence due to maternity leave for Case Manager #5. Case Manager #7 was hired in December of 2002. The consistency in the employment of two Case Managers may partially explain why the payments in Quarters 4, 5 and 6 (of 2002) remained high.
 - January – June 2003: The pre-enrollment payments for the 1st and 2nd Quarters are substantially lower than for comparable periods in 2000 – 2002. However the payments in Quarters 1 and 2, after enrollment are similar to 2001, which is a year in which comparable numbers of cases and NCPs entered the BP. The surge in payments in Quarter 3 of the post enrollment period can be attributed to the work of Case Managers #8 and #9 who were hired on December 1, 2003. Their work is also evident in the relatively steady level of payments in Quarters 4, 5, and 6.

Payments made in the two quarters prior to enrollment in the BP and the six quarters after enrollment were summed and are shown in Table 8. Compared to payments made in the 1st Quarter prior to enrolling in the BP, post-enrollment payments were larger for each quarter in the subsequent 18 months in which they were tracked. As shown in the column totals on Table 8, payments increased in Quarter 1 after enrollment, in Quarter 2 they declined somewhat from Quarter 1, peaked in Quarter 3 and then leveled out in Quarters 4, 5, and 6.

The increased payments after NCP' enrollment in the BP are considerable even 18 months later. As shown in Table 8, the sum of NCP' payments made in the 6th Quarter column is \$128,134. NCP' payments in the 2nd and 1st Quarters prior to BP enrollment are \$75,285 and \$110,342, respectively. The differences in NCP' payments made before and after enrollment range from \$17,792 to \$52,849. Consequently, after 18 months enrollment in the BP, NCPs made payments that were from 16 to 70 percent greater than they were in the 2nd and 1st Quarters prior to enrollment, respectively. The dollar and percentage differences are greater for Quarters 1 through 5 after enrollment in the BP. These data support the conclusion that the BP positively affected NCP' support payments at least one and ½ years beyond the date they were enrolled in the program.

Effect on Arrearage Balances

To measure the effects of the BP on NCP' arrearages, an analysis was conducted of a sample of 121 cases. The analysis focused on changes in arrearage balances between May 2004 and March 2005.²³ The results of this analysis which are shown in Table 9, include the following:

²³ These were all the cases in the caseload for the period May 2004 through March 2005 for one of the two Case Managers. Since all cases are included in the analysis, the sample is neither random nor a convenience sample but illustrative of feasible results.

Table 9
Effects of Barriers Program on Arrearages
Sample of 121 Active Cases, May 2004 – March 2005

Type Case	No. NCPs	\$ Amount of Arrearages		Difference (May 2004 – March 2005)	
		May 2004	March 2005	\$ Amounts	%
Arrears only or arrears & current support cases in which the arrearages declined	36	\$267,076	\$212,958	-\$54,118	-20.2%
Arrears only cases in which arrearages remained same/approx. same	3	\$35,421	\$35,541	\$120	0.3%
Arrears and arrears & current support case in which arrearages remained approx. same	1	\$30,067	\$30,116	\$49	0.16%
Arrears & current support cases in which the arrearages increased	81	\$933,995	\$1,055,579	\$121,584	13%
All cases	121	\$1,266,559 Mean = \$10,467	\$1,334,194 Mean = \$11,026	\$67,635 Mean = \$559	5.3%

:

- The arrearages declined for each of 36 NCPs who either only owed arrearages or owed arrearages and current support. As a group the decline was 20.2 percent.
- Four of the NCPs had arrearages that either remained the same or approximately the same.
- Eighty-one of the NCPs did not make sufficient payments for their arrearages to remain the same or decline. As a group, their arrearages increased 13 percent.
- Overall, for the group of 121 NCPs, the total arrearages increased 5.3 percent, which is less than the 6 percent rate of interest added by DCSE to overdue support effective July 2004. Prior to July 2004, the interest rate on overdue support was 9 percent.

The mean amount of arrearages owed by the 121 NCPs increased from \$10,467 to \$11,026. For comparison purposes to determine any effect of the BP on arrearage reductions, the

mean amount of increase of arrearages of the NCPs in another DCSE study was 19.9 percent. This increase occurred over a two-year period when the interest rate was 9 percent. Correcting for both time period and interest rate, the mean increase of arrearages for the BP group was 11.1 percent. Since both groups represent reasonable estimations of the populations involved, it can be concluded that NCPs assigned to a BP operating like the one in Fredericksburg would result in a reduction in arrearages of approximately 44 percent.

Avoidance of Incarceration

NCPs are responsible for paying child support to their children. Incarceration is among the alternatives for those who do not make required payments. Obviously, incarceration may be the only alternative for some NCPs, such as those who have the ability to pay support, are not motivated to do so and reject any attempts to help them.

Payments Foregone. Incarceration may not be an effective enforcement alternative for those NCPs who could be helped. Incarcerating this group is not effective because it denies the incarcerated NCP' children support payments that otherwise would be made in their behalf. For example, the 260 NCPs who entered the BP from March 2000 through June 2004, made total payments of approximately \$199,874 in the six months prior to entering the program. In contrast, this group of NCPs made approximately \$411,743 in payments in the six months after they entered the program. In short, their children would have been denied \$411,743 in payments if these NCPs had been incarcerated instead of being referred to the BP. Furthermore, due to the NCP' referral to the BP, their children received an additional \$211,869 in payments.

Work Release. An alternative to the BP for those NCPs who may otherwise require incarceration might be work release. The problem, however, was insufficient bed space in the Work Release Unit in the Rappahannock Regional Jail (Jail).²⁴

Jail Crowding. The lack of bed space in the Work Release Unit of the Rappahannock Regional Jail is symptomatic of other problems, such as overcrowding of the inmate population. According to one newspaper account, that jail was "bursting at the seams."²⁵ The facility, built to house 592 inmates, had approximately 930 as of June 2005.

Costs of Incarceration. Another problem is the cost to the Commonwealth of Virginia for those NCPs who would be viable candidates for the BP but instead are incarcerated. As of June 2005, the daily operational cost per inmate at the Rappahannock Regional Jail was \$49.53.²⁶ The incarceration for six months of only 50 of the 294 NCPs who were referred to the BP, would cost the Commonwealth of Virginia approximately \$450,000.

²⁴ Anecdotally, the evaluator was informed by a Rappahannock Regional Jail administrator that there were limited beds available for work release in the Rappahannock Regional Jail.

²⁵ Whitehurst, George, "Jail must expand rapidly," *The Fredericksburg Free Lance-Star* (May 5, 2005).

²⁶ Patrick Marshall, Rappahannock Regional Jail. The figure is for the 2004-2005 period

Cost Effectiveness for the Continuation of the BP

An estimation of the cost effectiveness of the BP is based on the assumption that the Case Managers would have full caseloads to calculate the payments portion of benefits attributed to the BP. Since the BP was a pilot project, none of the Case Managers, including the last two who were employed in the position, had a full caseload. According to the Project Manager, there was no intention to assign full caseloads to the Case Managers for several reasons, but primarily because it was a pilot project.²⁷ The main focus of the demonstration, of necessity, was on developing and implementing the organizational and procedural infrastructure required to implement Judge Lewis' concept. Other important reasons were to maintain the capacity to expand the program to a different court, to obtain additional clients, and the issue of eventually communicating the program's discontinuance upon completion of the grant.

As of June 1, 2005, when the BP was terminated, all the NCPs in the program were referred by judges in the Spotsylvania and Fredericksburg Courts. Although the Case Managers did not have full caseloads, there were valid reasons for employing two Case Managers. For example, the amount of time allotted for a case to be heard in court is minimal because of the volume of cases. As noted previously, two Case Managers were needed on court days so one person could be making arrangements with an NCP while the other one was available for another referral from the judge. In addition, having two Case Managers ensured that at least one person would be in the office most of the time to handle BP-related matters, such as calls from clients.

The caseload for the two Case Managers when the program was terminated was approximately 194 NCPs (responsible for 349 cases) and 20 CPs (responsible for 32 cases). The last two Case Managers employed in the position prior to completion of the grant believed they could effectively double the number of NCPs in the BP, provided the additional NCPs were gradually introduced into the program.²⁸ Payment/expense projections in Table 10 are based on two scenarios: maintaining the number of NCPs prior to the BP' completion and doubling the number as proposed by the Case Managers.

Converting the BP to permanent status then would have cost approximately \$98,240 annually which includes the compensation for two Case Managers and other costs for the program's operation (see Table 10). At the caseload existing when the BP ended, the NCPs would have made \$156,054 in annual payments beyond what they would have paid if not enrolled in the BP. If 82 new NCPs had been referred to the BP, they would have paid an additional \$175,550 in annual payments. If the number of referred NCPs were doubled, as suggested by the two Case Managers, the operating expenses would have remained at approximately \$98,240, and an additional \$351,100 in annual payments would have been paid beyond what would have been paid had the BP not existed. Under either scenario, the additional

²⁷ Interview with Todd Areson, Ph.D., former Project Manager, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Department of Social Services, Commonwealth of Virginia.

²⁸ This information is based on telephone interviews with the Case Managers who were employed when this evaluation was conducted. They stated case initiation requires time for client assessment and other tasks to start the client on a path of consistent payment. Case monitoring requires much less time per client once this initial period is completed.

monthly payments from the NCPs then enrolled in the BP would have been the same at \$156,054.

With the number of NCPs existing at the time the program ended, the annual cost effectiveness ratio would have been \$3.37 of additional payments for each \$1 of cost. Alternatively, the annual cost effectiveness ratio would have increased to \$5.16 of additional payments for each \$1 of cost if the program had been continued and the number of new NCPs were doubled. These benefits be significantly reduced if scenarios were considered that included additional rates of incarceration in lieu of assignment to the BP.

Table 10
Continuation of the BP
Annual Benefits: Two Scenarios

Payments/Costs	Annual Payments/Costs Scenarios	
	NCPs in BP in 2005	Doubling Number of NCPs ²
Additional annual payments ^a :		
82 new NCPs entering the program	\$175,550 ¹	\$351,100 ³
Existing NCPs in the program ⁴	<u>156,054⁵</u>	<u>156,054⁵</u>
Total additional annual payments	\$331,604	\$507,154
Annual costs:		
Compensation for two Case Managers:		
Salaries ⁶	\$ 73,000	\$ 73,000
Benefits ⁷	20,440	20,440
Other:		
Travel expenses ⁸	1,400	1,400
Mailing expenses ⁹	2,400	2,400
Miscellaneous expenses	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Total annual expenses	\$ 98,240	\$ 98,240
Net Annual benefit	\$233,364	\$408,914

Notes:

^aEstimates are total payments minus payments the NCPs would have made if not in the BP.

¹Based on before/after payment results, projected for 82 clients entering the program.

²Based on 164 new clients entering the program (which is twice the 82 clients). This assumes a gradual increase in the caseload during the year through expansion into other courts serving the Fredericksburg District Office, such as Stafford. Assumes the judge(s) would agree to cooperate with the program.

³\$351,100 from 164 new clients entering the program (which is twice the annual increase in payments from 82 clients).

⁴Number of NCPs in the BP when it ended.

⁵\$156,054 in additional annual payments from NCPs (estimate based on payments from the NCPs who were in the BP at its completion of the grant and actual additional benefits achieved for quarters 5 and 6 after enrollment). Calculated from data in Table 8.

⁶Based on estimated salary of Support Enforcement Specialist, Senior.

⁷Based on 28 percent of salary for benefits.

⁸Reimbursement for personal auto mileage traveling to court.

⁹Based on monthly statement mailings to 300 NCPs.

Other Evaluations

Various individuals who played differing roles with the BP were asked to complete an evaluation of their opinion of the program's effectiveness. See Appendix 13 for a copy of the Evaluation Form. Among these individuals were the three judges who referred NCPs to the BP. Only one judge, from all the individuals who were contacted, returned a completed Evaluation Form. This judge had the most experience in working with the program. Following are his responses to the three questions on the form:

1. Please indicate your overall opinion of the Barriers Program (in stating your opinion, please feel free to use any of the information contained in the attached report, *Evaluation of the Barriers Program*).

- The Barriers Program is very effective
 The Barriers Program is somewhat effective
 The Barriers Program is neither effective nor ineffective
 The Barriers Program is somewhat ineffective
 The Barriers Program is very ineffective
 I have no opinion about the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of the Barriers Program

Please explain the reason(s) for your response:

This program gives an effective weapon for DCSE to track and prod those responsible for supporting children. Unless this is done, they tend to fall back into not paying.

2. Please indicate your opinion regarding the continuance/discontinuance of the Barriers Program.

- The Barriers Program should be continued
 The Barriers Program should be discontinued
 The Barriers Program should be continued with modification
 I have no opinion about the continuance/discontinuance of the Barriers Program

Please explain the reason(s) for your response:

This program, as set forth in Dr. Myers Evaluation, is cost effective. Its benefits far outweigh its cost. Most importantly, it helps (noncustodial) parents to provide for their children.

3. Please give any other comment(s) you may have about the Barriers Program, such as any changes, (if necessary, use the other side of this form):

I have been advised that the program in Spotsylvania may be terminated. I hope that does not happen. In fact, I hope it can be utilized throughout the Commonwealth, with or without Federal assistance.

Please print your name and title /s/ Judge

Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations

The findings and conclusions drawn from this research demonstration are based on information obtained from a qualitative and quantitative analysis of cases that comprised the five-plus year BP. Information was obtained through personal interviews and telephone calls, meetings with BP staff and others, emails, and correspondence. These are among the sources of information:

- Personal interviews, telephone conversations and emails with Vicky Mackenzie, former Database Administrator in the BP (who created the BP database and input NCP' payments and arrearages);
- Several telephone interviews with Patrick Marshall of the Rappahannock Regional Jail (who supplied information on the Work Release Unit and the daily operational costs per incarcerated inmate);
- A telephone interview with George Whitehurst and other information obtained from the article he authored "Jail must expand rapidly," *The Fredericksburg Free Lance-Star* (May 5, 2005) that included interviews with enforcement personnel on jail crowding;
- A number of interviews, telephone calls, emails and meetings with the two Case Managers, particularly a series of emails and telephone conversations with Case Manager Carol Rice concerning various aspects of the BP including operational issues, forms used, and data collected;
- Interviews, telephone conversations and emails with various Fredericksburg District Office staff including District Manager Robert Rodenski, Executive Assistant Ceil Dixon, and Deborah Corder;
- Interviews, telephone conversations, and emails with various DCSE personnel including Special Counsel Mary Ellen Forward and Dr. Todd Areson, former Project Manager of the BP;
- Personal observations in the Spotsylvania District J&DR Court, the Honorable John H. Thomas, presiding; and,
- The report of Barriers I, *Barriers to the Payment of Court-Ordered Child Support*, Division of Child Support Enforcement, (December 2001).

Participants in the Barriers Program

- The BP functioned from March 1, 2000 to June 1, 2005.²⁹
- 294 noncustodial parents (NCPs) representing 490 cases and 23 custodial parents (CPs) were enrolled in the BP
- 194 of the 294 NCPs, representing 349 cases and 20 of the 23 CPs were still enrolled when the BP was discontinued due to the end of the grant on June 1, 2005 (see Tables 1 and 2).
- 100 NCPs (representing 141 cases) left the BP.

²⁹ The first Case Manager (referred to as Case Manager #1 – see Exhibit 1) officially started work on November 29, 1999. The tracking of support payments made by NCPs in the BP commenced March 1, 2000 and ended December 31, 2004. Except for two NCPs admitted early in January 2005, no NCPs were admitted to the BP after December 31, 2004.

-
- 46 percent of the NCPs left because they were noncompliant with BP requirements; 27 percent were compliant and released from the BP; DCSE closed the cases of 11 percent of the NCPs; 11 percent of the NCPs moved to another jurisdiction; 3 percent of the NCPs died; the child of 1 NCP was adopted; and, 1 NCP was found not to be the father of the child in the case.
 - 60.2 percent of the NCPs in the BP had only one case, 22.1 percent had two cases, 11.2 percent had three cases, 4.4 percent had four cases, and 2.1 percent had five or more cases (see Table 3). Sixty-five percent of the CPs had one case and the remaining 35 percent had from two to four cases.
 - Four of the CPs were NCPs on one other case. One NCP was a CP on another case.

Ability/Willingness to Pay Support

- A random sample of 30 of the 294 NCPs in the BP was selected to measure the frequency among them of the four combinations of ability/inability to pay child support and willingness/unwillingness to pay child support. The Case Managers were asked to categorize the 30 NCPs in the combination that best describes them.
 - Thirteen or 43.3 percent of the NCPs were considered willing and able to pay support.
 - One of the NCPs was considered willing and unable to pay support.
 - Thirteen or 43.3 percent of the NCPs were considered unwilling and able to pay support.
 - Three or 10 percent of the NCPs were considered unwilling and unable to pay support.
- In short, the Case Managers believed that 26 or 86.6 percent of the NCPs were able to pay child support. Half of this group was considered willing to pay support and the other half unwilling. The Case Managers believed that only four or 13.3 percent of the NCPs were unable to pay support.

Services the Case Managers Provided

- A random sample of 10 percent or 20 NCPs was selected from the active caseload of 194. The Case Managers listed a summary of services they provided to 18 of the NCPs (see Table 4).
- 83 percent of the NCPs were referred for employment opportunities, mainly temporary employment agencies.
- 77 percent of the NCPs were either referred to/had appointments made for them with the VEC.
- Monthly statements were mailed to 72 percent of the NCPs.
- On one or more occasions, 33 percent of the NCPs were either incarcerated (five NCPs) for reasons other than failure to pay child support or had capiases for their arrest (one NCP).
- Referrals to homeless shelters were made for 16 percent of the NCPs.
- One NCP received bus tickets to report for a job interview.
- One NCP was assisted in obtaining his birth certificate (apparently for job-related reasons).

-
- One NCP was referred to the Department of Motor vehicles to obtain a Commercial Drivers' License.

Case Manager Turnover

- There was no Case Manager turnover during the entire period of Barriers I (November 29, 1999 to April 1, 2001).
- During the first three years and eight months of Barriers' II operation, six different individuals were employed in the position. The shortest and longest tenures in employment were six weeks and 18 months, respectively. Four individuals were employed for periods of less than one year.
- Due to high turnover in Barriers II, recruitment and training were ongoing issues except during the last 18 months of the BP' operation when the final two Case Managers were continuously employed from December 1, 2003 to June 1, 2005.
- Major causes for the turnover were the temporary (i.e., grant-funded) status of the position and the lack of employee benefits.
- A contributing cause for the turnover was the tight labor market in the Fredericksburg region in which the unemployment rates, for the four most significant years in which the BP operated, ranged from 1.8 to 2.8 percent compared to 2.8 to 4.1 percent for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Due to the regional labor shortage there were a number of attractive full-time jobs available with benefits. These collective conditions made it difficult to recruit and retain persons with the personal competencies required for the Case Manager roles.

Evaluation Study

- Using a pretest/posttest design³⁰ NCPs who entered the BP from March 1, 2000 to June 30, 2004 made payments that were 106 percent greater in the six months after entering the program compared to the six months before entering it. This improvement represented an additional \$211,869 in payments (see Table 5).
- The percentage increases in payments six months after enrollment in the BP compared to comparable periods prior to enrollment grew in every year but one as the various players in the program gained experience.
- In the final period of the program, there was an 823 percent improvement in payments constituting an additional \$96,262.
- After 18 months in the BP, NCPs were continuing to make payments that were from 16 to 70 percent greater than they were making prior to enrollment (see Table 8).

³⁰ Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966): p. 8. The methodology used in this phase of the study prevented the typical internal and external sources of invalidation with this quasi-experimental research design, such as History, Maturation, Testing, Instrumentation, and Interactions.

Arrearage Balances

- Changes in arrears balances from May 2004 to March 2005 were analyzed for a sample of 121 NCPs selected from the 194 in the BP (see Table 9).
- Thirty-six (29.7 percent) of the 121 NCPs who owed arrearages only or arrearages and current support made sufficient payments so their arrearages declined 20.2 percent.
- Four NCPs made sufficient payments so their arrearages either remained the same or nearly the same.
- The arrearages of 81 (66.9 percent) NCPs increased 13 percent.
- Overall, the 121 NCPs made sufficient payments so their arrearages increased 5.3 percent during the 11-month period. For the period of the BP through July 1, 2004, the state's interest rate of 9 percent was added to the unpaid balances of NCPs' support. After this date it was lowered to 6 percent.
- For comparison purposes, the changes in the mean arrearages balances of the 121 NCPs were 44 percent better than those of the NCPs in another DCSE study who did not receive Case Manager services.

Cost Avoidance/Opportunity Costs of Incarceration

- If the 260 NCPs shown in Table 5 of this report were incarcerated for six months in lieu of referral to the BP, \$412,000 in payments for the support of their children would have been lost and incarceration costs to the Commonwealth of Virginia would have been over \$2.3 million.
- In July 2005, NCPs incarcerated for non-support had no opportunity to be assigned to a Work Release program where they could earn money for the payment of child support because the Work Release Unit at the Rappahannock Regional Jail had few available beds.
- The Rappahannock Regional Jail, which was built to house 592 inmates, had 930 inmates in July 2005.

Cost-Effectiveness for the Continuation of the BP

- At the end of the demonstration, the final two Case Managers estimated that their caseloads could have been doubled if the program were to become full-time.
- Converting the BP to permanent status would have cost approximately \$98,240 annually, an estimate that includes compensation for two Case Managers and other costs for the program's operation (see Table 10).
- If the caseload remained the same and 82 new NCPs were referred to the BP yearly, the annual net benefit in additional payments would have been \$233,364.
- If the caseload had been doubled and 164 new NCPs were referred yearly, the annual net benefit in additional payments would have been \$408,914.
- For each \$1 of cost if the program had been continued, the net annual benefit would have been \$3.37 of additional payments.
- For each \$1 of cost if the program had been continued and the caseload doubled, the net annual benefit would have been \$5.16 of additional payments.

-
- In lieu of assignment to the BP, if scenarios were considered that included additional rates of incarceration, the benefits in any cost effectiveness calculations would be reduced.

Opinion Survey

- An Evaluation Form, accompanied by a preliminary copy of this report, was sent via email to several DCSE employees to elicit their opinions about various aspects of the BP; none responded.
- The same Evaluation Form, accompanied by a preliminary copy of this report was mailed to the three judges in the Spotsylvania and Fredericksburg District J&DR Courts who presided over child support enforcement cases. A comprehensive response was received from the judge who had the most experience in referring cases to the BP. The other two judges did not respond and apparently believed they did not have sufficient knowledge of the program to complete an evaluation.
- The responding judge indicated that the BP was effective and should be continued. He wrote, “The program is an effective weapon for DCSE to track and prod those responsible for supporting children. Unless this is done, they tend to fall back into not paying.” In conclusion, he wrote, “I have been advised that the program in Spotsylvania may be terminated. I hope that does not happen. In fact, I hope it can be utilized throughout the Commonwealth, with or without Federal assistance.”

Appendix 1-Community Partners Network

	GOODWILL	DSS (SOCIAL SERVICES, STATE & LOCAL)	RAPP. AREA COMM. SVCS. BOARD (RACSB) [MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES, REGIONAL]	“HEALTHY FAMILIES” [PREVENTIVE SERVICES; RACSB]	SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY VOC. TECH.	REGIONAL ADULT EDUCATION	GAPS IN SERVICES
VISITATION				SUPERVISED HOME VISITATION, PARENT EDUCATION			TRANSPORTATION
VOCATIONAL	JOB READINESS JOB PLACEMENT, APPLICATION AND RESUME, COMMUNITY- BASED JOB ASSESSMENTS, WORK CLOTHING VOUCHERS <i>FEEES: AGENCIES PURCHASE THE SERVICES</i>	TANF BASED ON ELIGIBILITY			TECHNICAL TRAINING <i>E.G., WELDING FEE-BASED</i>	BASIC SKILLS EDUCATION GED ATTAINMENT ESL CLASSES CITIZENSHIP CLASSES <i>No charge for basic services; must be 18 or older</i>	TRANSPORTATION <i>Local shuttle, vehicle pool</i>
CONFLICT			MH / SA Counseling and Services <i>SLIDING SCALE; SUBSTANTIAL WAITING LIST</i>				

	GOODWILL	DSS (SOCIAL SERVICES, STATE & LOCAL)	RAPP. AREA COMM. SVCS. BOARD (RACSB) [MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES, REGIONAL]	“HEALTHY FAMILIES” [PREVENTIVE SERVICES; RACSB]	SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY VOC. TECH.	REGIONAL ADULT EDUCATION	GAPS IN SERVICES
ARREARAGES		TANF, OTHER SUPPORT BASED ON ELIGIBILITY					AFFORDABLE HOUSING
CUSTOMER SERVICE		WELFARE-TO- WORK TANF, FOOD STAMPS, OTHER SUPPORT <i>BASED ON ELIGIBILITY</i> CASE MANAGEMENT <i>SIMILAR TO DCSE CASE MANAGEMENT</i>					TRANSPORTATION

	COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE	RAPP. CDV [DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL]	DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER [RESOURCES & REFERRAL]	RAPP. COUNTY CAP [COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM]	MEDIATION CENTER	DRS [STATE REHABILITATION SERVICES]	VEC [STATE EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION]
VISITATION	<p>Parent Education <i>No specific requirements</i></p> <p>TRAINING OF PRISON/JAIL POPULATION -- MENTORS -- TRANSITION -- PARENT ED.</p> <p>PARENTING APART: <i>NCPS AND CPS</i></p>	<p>FRESH START <i>14-WEEK BATTERER INTERVENTION GROUP FOR MEN: \$250 UP-FRONT</i></p>		<p>PARENT HELP: <i>SUPPORT GROUP OPEN TO ANY PARENT; NO FEE</i></p>	<p>MEDIATION COURT-ORDERED MEDIATION <i>REFERRAL BY J&DR COURT</i></p>		
CONFLICT	<p>TRAINING OF PRISON/JAIL POPULATION -- MENTORS -- PARENT ED.</p>	<p>FRESH START</p>		<p>Parent Help: <i>SUPPORT GROUP OPEN TO ANY PARENT; NO FEE</i></p>	<p>MEDIATION COURT-ORDERED MEDIATION <i>REFERRAL BY J&DR COURT</i></p>		
ARREARAGES	<p>FINANCIAL COUNSELING NO SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS</p>				<p>MEDIATION COURT-ORDERED MEDIATION <i>REFERRAL BY J&DR COURT</i></p>		

	COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE	RAPP. CDV [DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL]	DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER [RESOURCES & REFERRAL]	RAPP. COUNTY CAP [COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM]	MEDIATION CENTER	DRS [STATE REHABILITATION SERVICES]	VEC [STATE EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION]
VOCATIONAL	<p>TRAINING OF PRISON/JAIL POPULATION -- JOB SKILL DEVELOPMENT -- MENTOR ASSIGNMENT -- TRANSITION</p> <p>MENTOR PROGRAMS</p> <p><i>NO</i> SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS</p> <p><i>NOTE: WILL DESIGN PROGRAMS FOR SMALL GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS, AS NEEDED</i></p>					<p>VOCATIONAL EVALUATION TRAINING</p> <p>RESTORATION: PHYSICAL AND MENTAL</p> <p>JOB PLACEMENT AND FOLLOW-UP CRITERIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>PHYSICAL OR MENTAL DISABILITY (INC. SUBSTANCE ABUSE) WHICH IS BARRIER TO EMPLOYMENT</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>EXPECTATION OF BENEFIT FROM SERVICES</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>FINANCIAL CRITERIA</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>UNEMPLOYED, UNDEREMPLOYED</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>SA CLIENTS MUST BE CLEAN FOR 90 DAYS</i> 	<p>JOB REFERRAL <i>NO ELIGIBILITY; MUST BE WORK-READY</i></p> <p>UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE <i>MUST MEET PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, INCL. INVOLUNTARY JOB LOSS, ACTIVELY JOB HUNTING, ETC.</i></p> <p>ASSESSMENT</p> <p>CAREER COUNSELING</p> <p>Training: Referral / Vouchers SEMINARS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> INTERVIEWING SKILLS <input type="checkbox"/> RESUME PREP. <input type="checkbox"/> CUSTOMER SERVICES SKILLS

	COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE	RAPP. CDV [DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL]	DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER [RESOURCES & REFERRAL]	RAPP. COUNTY CAP [COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM]	MEDIATION CENTER	DRS [STATE REHABILITATION SERVICES]	VEC [STATE EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION]
CUSTOMER SERVICE	<p>TRAINING OF PRISON/JAIL POPULATION -- MENTOR ASSIGNMENT -- TRANSITION</p> <p><i>NOTE: WILL DESIGN PROGRAMS FOR SMALL GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS, AS NEEDED</i></p>	FRESH START	<p>LONG-TERM SUPPORT: <i>FOR THOSE WITH QUALIFYING DISABILITIES</i></p>			<p>COUNSELING, SUPPORT, EDUCATION <i>CRITERIA AS ABOVE</i></p>	<p>‘ONE-STOP SHOP’ CASE MANAGEMENT</p> <p>LABOR MARKET INFORMATION</p> <p>OPEN TO ALL</p>

Position Description
<p>Title: Case Manager, Barriers Project</p>
<p>Basic Function: Conduct intake interviews of noncustodial parents (NCPs) who are deficient in making regular child support payments and who either are incarcerated and volunteer to enroll in the Barriers Project (BP) or are referred by a Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judge in lieu of incarceration; assess/diagnose NCP’s problem(s); refer them to appropriate agencies; monitor progress; and, make evaluations to form a basis for either recommending their continuance in or termination from the BP.</p>
<p>Tasks:</p> <p><u>Court</u></p> <p>Assemble files containing current status of NCPs who are in the BP (client-NCPs).</p> <p>Travel to Spotsylvania J&DR court.</p> <p>Pull files of client-NCPs who are either appearing before the judge or having their cases reviewed.</p> <p>Discuss the status of client-NCPs with the DCSE Attorney (see <u>Monitoring/Evaluation</u>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inform the DCSE Attorney of the client-NCP’s progress in the BP, including providing such information as whether the individual is cooperating with the Case Manager in keeping appointments when referred to agencies like the VEC, returning telephone calls and making support payments. - Advise DSCE Attorney if client has moved and not informed the Case Manager of the new address. - Recommend to the DCSE Attorney whether client-NCPs should be permitted to remain in the BP, citing specific reasons for the recommendation. <p><u>Intake</u></p> <p>Use court-provided interview room to interview potential client-NCPs who appear in court for either a “Show Cause” order and are referred to the BP by the judge or a new order is prepared and they are unemployed.</p> <p>Give client-NCPs a copy of the information sheet explaining they have been ordered into the BP and the purpose of it.</p> <p>Conduct intake interviews with client-NCPs who have been referred to the BP by the judge.</p> <p>Complete <i>Barriers Assessment Form</i> to obtain the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - job skills and competencies, including education and training;

- employment status;
- income;
- current/most recent employer's name, address and telephone number;
- if unemployed, barriers to obtaining employment;
- willingness to undertake personal development to become employable;
- support order amount and number of cases with DCSE;
- barriers to payment of support and willingness to correct the barriers;
- any personal problems including drug abuse;
- conviction information, including current probation/parole; and,
- driver's license and automobile ownership/transportation access.

Complete and explain the *Consent to Exchange Information Form* and request the client-NCP's signature authorizing the Case Manager to exchange confidential information, such as financial and assessment information with various agencies, such as the Department of Social Services and Virginia Employment Commission.

Explain the *Barriers to Child Support Program Participation Agreement* and have the client-NCPs sign it. Give a copy of the agreement to the client-NCPs so they know what they have agreed to do.

Give business card to client-NCP and explain the importance of remaining in contact and meeting the terms of the *Agreement*.

Problem Assessment/Diagnosis

Verify information furnished by client-NCPs during intake interviews.

Determine client-NCP's problem(s) in making regular support payments, utilizing the information supplied on the *Barriers Assessment Form* and the *Consent to Exchange Information Form*.

Referral

Make referral(s) to these agencies/entities based upon client-NCP's problem assessment/diagnosis and needs:

- VEC for either underemployed or unemployed client-NCPs or CPs;
- Moss Free Clinic for client-NCPs who have medical needs and cannot afford medical care;
- Salvation Army for client-NCPs who need job training;
- Spotsylvania Vocational Center for client-NCPs who need GED training;
- Job Corps for client-NCPs (ages 16 – 24) who are able to satisfy their support obligation during their absence for vocational (including GED) training;
- Healthy Families to teach parenting skills;
- Taskforce for temporary employment;
- Labor Finders for temporary employment;
- Randstad for temporary employment;
- Department of Social Services for various services, including food stamps; and,

-
- Thurman Brisbane Center for temporary sleeping accommodations for the homeless.

Monitoring/Evaluation

Contact representatives of referral agencies/entities to ensure client-NCPs kept appointments, and, where applicable:

- obtain information about client-NCP's progress;
- receive information about other assistance needed; and,
- receive BP's referral tracking form from agencies that use it.

Follow-up with client-NCPs either personally or via telephone to ensure they made contact with agencies/entities to whom they were referred.

- send letters to client-NCPs who cannot be contacted either in person or via the telephone;
- discuss with client-NCPs the progress being made to address problems identified in the problem assessment/diagnosis phase after intake; and,
- make contacts as frequently as necessary to ensure client-NCPs are meeting stipulations to remain enrolled in the BP.

Document all contacts with client-NCPs, including meetings, telephone or correspondence.

Conduct monthly reviews of each client-NCP.

Notify DCSE when client-NCP's change addresses and/or employers.

Check status and frequency of client-NCP's support payments.

Identify client-NCPs who are not making regular payments;

- discuss with client-NCPs the reason(s) for non-payment and explain the ramifications of not meeting obligations;
- determine what assistance is needed and if it can be provided;
- make suggestions for addressing any identified problems; and,
- make judgment about the efficacy of client-NCPs remaining in the BP.

Schedule more frequent follow-ups with client-NCPs who are not meeting required targets to remain in the BP.

Periodically review listing of client-NCPs to determine who should be released from the BP.

Meet with the DCSE attorney concerning legal issues.

Advise DCSE attorney of client-NCPs who:

- are meeting the requirements of the BP and should remain in it;
- are not fully meeting the requirements of the BP but should be allowed additional

-
- time to meet requirements;
 - are not fulfilling their responsibilities under the BP and should be released; and,
 - either no longer need the services of the BP or request to be released from it.

Outreach

Create presentations and brochures, as needed.

Give presentations explaining the BP to incarcerated NCPs in the Rappahannock Regional Jail:

- explain the process involved, such as intake, problem assessment, referral, monitoring and evaluation;
- give examples of agencies/entities who give assistance;
- discuss ways client-NCPs can be helped, such as with assistance in mediating purge amounts; and,
- answer questions about the BP.

Meet with representatives of community organizations to explain the BP, explore potential liaisons and learn names of contact personnel.

Position Description

Title: Database Administrator, Barriers Project

Basic Function: Prepares and maintains files on noncustodial parents (NCPs) who are referred to the Barriers Project (BP) by a Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Judge. Checks payment history of NCPs accepted into the BP (client-NCPs) and sends them monthly statements of payments and arrearages. Posts information in APECS on contacts with NCPs. Updates NCP's files on status of referrals, prepares summaries of progress and, makes evaluations to form a basis for either recommending their continuance in or termination from the BP.

Tasks:

Court

Prepare client files for NCPs who are referred to the BP by the judge, when Case Managers return from court.

Obtain docket for next court date and make copies for Case Manager and incumbent and return original to DCSE Court Specialist.

Use docket to research files of clients who are in the BP (client-NCPs) and who are going to court. Prepare Summary Sheet of information involving these clients, such as:

- Date ordered into BP.
- Appointments made and kept (or missed) for referrals to VEC and other agencies.
- Any payments made and whether or not for the full amount.
- Record of contacts made with BP staff.
- Whether the client-NCPs are cooperating with the Case Manager including returning telephone calls.
- Whether the client-NCPs have moved and not informed the Case Manager of the new address.
- Recommend whether client-NCPs should be released from/remain in the BP, citing specific reasons for the recommendation.

Pull files of client-NCPs who are either appearing before the judge or having their cases reviewed.

Intake

Give client-NCPs a copy of the information sheet explaining they have been ordered into the BP and the purpose of it.

Referral

Make referral(s), as needed in the absence of Case Managers, to these agencies/entities based upon client-NCP's problem assessment/diagnosis and needs:

- VEC for either underemployed or unemployed client-NCPs or CPs;
- Moss Free Clinic for client-NCPs who have medical needs and cannot afford medical care;
- Salvation Army for client-NCPs who need job training;
- Spotsylvania Vocational Center for client-NCPs who need GED training;
- Job Corps for client-NCPs (ages 16 – 24) who are able to satisfy their support obligation during their absence for vocational (including GED) training;
- Healthy Families to teach parenting skills;
- Taskforce for temporary employment;
- Labor Finders for temporary employment;
- Randstad for temporary employment;
- Department of Social Services for various services, including food stamps; and,
- Thurman Brisbane Center for temporary sleeping accommodations for the homeless.

Monitoring/Evaluation

Send letters to client-NCPs to remind them of their obligation to keep in contact with BP.

Check amounts client-NCPs owe each month.

Send client-NCPs letters transmitting the *DCSE Case Account Statement* showing the payments received and the amount of arrearages.

Receive BP's Referral Tracking Form which is faxed from VEC (the only partner agency sending verification of whether client-NCPs met appointments).

Follow-up with client-NCPs either personally or via telephone to ensure they made contact with agencies/entities to whom they were referred.

- send letters to client-NCPs who cannot be contacted either in person or via the telephone;
- discuss with client-NCPs the progress being made to address problems identified in the problem assessment/diagnosis phase after intake; and,
- make contacts as frequently as necessary to ensure client-NCPs are meeting stipulations to remain enrolled in the BP.

Document all contacts with client-NCPs, including meetings, telephone or correspondence.

Conduct monthly reviews of client-NCPs.

Notify DCSE when client-NCPs change addresses and/or employers.

Check status and frequency of client-NCP's support payments.

Identify client-NCPs who are not making regular payments;

- discuss with client-NCPs the reason(s) for non-payment and explain the

ramifications of not meeting obligations;

- determine what assistance is needed and if it can be provided;
- make suggestions for addressing any identified problems; and,
- make judgment about the efficacy of client-NCPs remaining in the BP.

Periodically review listing of client-NCPs to determine who should be released from the BP.

Check telephone messages and return calls to client-NCPs.

Update in APECS the results of telephone contacts and places information in client-NCP's files.

Update in APECS the outcome from client-NCP's court appearances.

Update into Access information on client-NCPs.

Perform other miscellaneous tasks including ordering supplies and making copies of BP forms.

Appendix 4

COURT ORDERED JOB SEARCH RECORD

DATE: _____

Name: _____

Case #: _____

	Date	Company Name & Address	Supervisor	Phone Number
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

OR ~~ PROVIDE WRITTEN CONFIRMATION FROM

Employed @ _____
Address: _____
Phone #: _____ Supervisor: _____
Hourly Rate: _____ # Hours Per Week: _____ If salaried annual \$: _____

Insurance available thru employer for child(ren) only @ _\$_____ per week.

RETURN TO JUDGE THOMAS WEEKLY UNTIL EMPLOYED.

Things to remember

You can be referred into the Barriers Project by a judge

Barriers services are currently available through the Fredericksburg & Spotsylvania courts.

Incarcerated? Yes you MUST continue to make your child support payments.

**Assistance with
Job searches
Education (GED)
Training
Counseling
Rehabilitation**

Did you know

Paying **SOMETHING** is **better** than doing **NOTHING**.

Income withholding may be up to 65% of your income.

We cannot pay your support for you.

You must be willing to make a commitment to **Yourself** and your child for Barriers to assist you.

Barriers Project

2342 Plank Road

Fredericksburg, VA 22401

For more information contact:

AnnYoz Hamm ~~~~ 540-899-4166

Carol Rice ~~~~~~ 540-899-4328

Vicky Mackenzie ~~~ 540-899-4986

Barriers Project



**FREE
Assistance
to remove the
BARRIERS
to the payment of
Child Support.**

Appendix 6

MPI # _____

Removing the Barriers to Payment of Child Support

Date: _____

Assessment Form

Group: Barriers

Client Name: _____

Case #'s: _____

Home Address: _____

Home Phone: _____ Cell Phone: _____ Pager: _____

Social Security #: _____ Sex: M F Date of Birth: _____

Emergency Contact: _____ Phone: _____

Relationship: _____

Race: _____ Employed: YES NO How Long? _____

Employer Name: _____ Phone #: _____

Employer Address: _____

Hourly rate: _____ Hrs P/WK: _____ Monthly Income: _____

Occupation: _____ Job skills: _____

Title: _____
Education: 7 8 9 10 11 12 GED College

Client Assessment

Self Employed? #Years _____

Currently receiving Public Assistance?

Currently working w/another agency?

Do you have a valid driver's license?

Revoked by Child Support?

Other: DMV

Are you interested in getting a GED?

Drug abuse?

Alcohol abuse?

Substance abuse treatment?

Do you have a criminal history?

Are you currently on probation?

Are you currently on parole?

YES	NO	W/A	W/UA	UW/A	UW/UA
		Agency: _____			
		Restricted: Yes No			
		Officer: _____			
		Officer: _____			

Comments: _____

Assessment Completed By: _____, Case Manager

Court & Judge: _____

revised 10/2004

Barriers Project

CONSENT TO SHARE INFORMATION **CHILD SUPPORT “BARRIERS” PROJECT**

NECESSITY In order for the Case Managers to work my Barriers case, in the attempt to reduce obstacles that hinder regular payment of my Child Support obligation, it may be necessary for them to share case-specific, confidential information with appropriate collaborating agencies in the Spotsylvania-Fredericksburg area.

Types of Information The types of case-specific, confidential information to be shared may include:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Assessment of barriers | Military history |
| Services/benefits requested | Financial information |
| Employment history | Health/mental health information |
| Educational history | Criminal information (e.g., incarceration) |
| Other _____ | |

(Specify)

Collaborating Agencies Spotsylvania-Fredericksburg area agencies with which the Barriers Project is collaborating include:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court | Virginia Employment Commission |
| Department of Social Services, state and local | County extension offices |
| Regional adult education programs | Rappahannock Com. Svs. Board |
| Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services. | Spotsylvania Vo-Tech |
| Rappahannock Area Community Action Program | Disability Resource Center |
| Rappahannock Council on Domestic Violence | |
| Other: _____ | |

(Specify)

CONSENT I consent to the release of case-specific, confidential information to enable the Barriers Case Managers to work my case, which was assigned to the Barriers Project by the _____ Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court on _____.

Signatures Barriers Client _____ Date _____

(Barriers Case Manager)

(Date)

(Tel. Number)

(rev. 5-03)

Barriers Project

Removing the barriers to payment of child support.

BARRIERS TO CHILD SUPPORT PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

1. I understand that as a requirement of the Barriers to Child Support Program, I must contact my case manager on a monthly basis. All information requested would be included in a follow-up report to the court. This information is kept confidential and will be used only for reports to the court and Virginia Department of Social Services.
2. I will advise my case manager within five (5) days of any changes that take place in residence, employment, phone numbers, and the related.
3. I understand that as a Barriers to Child Support Program participant, I must comply with the referral from the Court, make child support payments and be actively involved in work, a work training, education and/or counseling activity.
4. I understand that failure to advise my case manager of any changes may result in termination from the Barriers to Child Support Program and will be reported to the court.

I have read the above or had the above read to me, and I agree to abide by these provisions while enrolled in the Barriers to Child Support Program. I realize that it is my responsibility to obtain employment and make the court ordered child support payments for my child(ren). If I do not complete an activity or activities being ordered by the Court or am in non-compliance with the four (4) conditions outlined above or by my case manager, I may be dropped from the program and not eligible to re-enroll.

Signature of Program Participant

Date

Signature of Case Manager

Date

Barriers Project

Removing the barriers to payment of child support

2342 Plank Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Date

Mr./Mrs. NCP
Street/Road
City, VA 22553

Case #: xxxxxxxx

Dear NCP,

Your court referral into Barriers requires that you:

1. Be actively employed
2. Make your child support payments on a regular monthly basis
3. Contact your BARRIERS Case Manager monthly
4. Advise your BARRIERS Case Manager within five (5) days of any changes to your residence, employment, phone number, and related information.

Your BARRIERS team is required to:

1. Assist you with job searches, education (GED), training, counseling, rehabilitation.
2. Provide a monthly statement of **arrears** (to include interest and fees)
3. To advise the court if you are not meeting your requirements as stated above.

A recap of your monthly arrears is shown below:

<u>May 2004</u>	<u>June 2004</u>	<u>July 2004</u>	<u>Aug 2004</u>	<u>Sept2004</u>	<u>Oct 2004</u>
\$761.51	\$1,143.14	\$1,399.59	\$1,330.76	\$1,242.65	\$1,267.39
<u>Nov2004</u>	<u>Dec2004</u>				
\$1,386.27	\$1,392.86				

Contact me if you have any questions about the above information.

Sincerely,

Carol Rice
Barriers

Carol Rice
Case Manager
(540) 899-4328

AnnYoz Hamm
Case Manager
(540) 899-4166

Vicky MacKenzie
Database Manager

BARRIERS PROJECT

Name: Jess Anybody
Address: No Name Street, Fredericksburg, VA 22407
 xxx/xxx-xxxx home phone xxx/xxx-xxxx cell phone
 MPI# XXXXXXX

	Action	Date	Date	Date	Date	Date	Date
Forms:	Intake						

Referrals to:	CS ~ DCSE						
	DRS or DSS						
	Housing or Soc Sec						
	Legal Aide or Medical						
	Organizations						
	Temp Agencies						
	VEC						
	Other~Specify						

Written Correspondence	Court Follow Up						
	Financials						
	Incoming Correspondance						
	Miscellaneous Correspondance						
	Non Contact						
	Reminder post cards						
	Turned over to DCSE						

Verbal Communication	Incoming Phone Calls						
	Outgoing to NCP						

Incarcerated	IN	OUT	IN	OUT	IN	OUT
Rappahannock Reg. Jail						
Purge Amount						

Other

--	--	--	--	--	--

Place of Employment _____

Comments _____

filename: communication recap sheet

Barriers Project

Removing the barriers to payment of child support

2342 Plank Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Date

Bragg Hill Family Life Center
400 Bragg Hill Drive
Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Dear Reverend Henderson:

We enjoyed your presentation at the Greater Fredericksburg Workforce Network meeting today. We are with a program called BARRIERS and want to take just a minute of your time to introduce our program.

This program was created to help eligible non-custodial parents to overcome the barriers (obstacles) they face in meeting their child support obligations.

Examples of common barriers are: lack of or seasonal employment, the lack of skills to obtain and keep a good paying job, disabilities, substance abuse, difficulty in managing finances, conflicts with the custodial parent and not understanding the requirements of the child support system.

We are specifically seeking employers that are willing and able to hire persons with a felony background, poor credit ratings and are COURT ordered to find employment.

If you can assist Barriers with employment of such individuals please contact us at the numbers listed below.

We appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

Carol
Carol Rice
Case Manager
(540) 899-4328

AnnYoz
AnnYoz Hamm
Case Manager
(540) 899-4166

Vicky
Vicky MacKenzie
Database Manager
(540) 899-4986

Barriers Project

Removing the barriers to payment of child support

2342 Plank Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Date

Mr./Ms. Attorney, Esquire
Law Offices of xxxx & xxxx
P.O. Box xxxx
Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Dear So & So:

Please allow us to take just a minute of your time to reintroduce the staff of the Barriers Project.

This program was created to help eligible non-custodial parents to overcome the barriers (obstacles) they face in meeting their child support obligations.

Examples of common barriers are: lack of or seasonal employment, the lack of skills to obtain and keep a good paying job, disabilities, substance abuse, difficulty in managing finances, conflicts with the custodial parent and not understanding the requirements of the child support system.

Clients can be referred to Barriers by legal counsel or a Judge. Clients referred by legal counsel can be assisted by Barriers staff prior to going to court and then being referred by the judge.

If you are representing someone that is in need of our assistance please do not hesitate to have them contact us.

Sincerely,

Carol Rice
Case Manager
(540) 899-4328

AnnYoz Hamm
Case Manager
(540) 899-4166

Vicky MacKenzie
Database Manager
(540) 899-4986

Appendix 13

Evaluation Form

1. Please indicate your overall opinion of the Barriers Program (in stating your opinion, please feel free to use any of the information contained in the attached report, *Evaluation of the Barriers Program*).

_____ The Barriers Program is very effective

_____ The Barriers Program is somewhat effective

_____ The Barriers Program is neither effective nor ineffective

_____ The Barriers Program is somewhat ineffective

_____ The Barriers Program is very ineffective

_____ I have no opinion about the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of the Barriers Program

Please explain the reason(s) for your response:

2. Please indicate your opinion regarding the continuance/discontinuance of the Barriers Program.

_____ The Barriers Program should be continued

_____ The Barriers Program should be discontinued

_____ The Barriers Program should be continued with modification

_____ I have no opinion about the continuance/discontinuance of the Barriers Program

Please explain the reason(s) for your response:

3. Please give any other comment(s) you may have about the Barriers Program, such as any changes, (if necessary, use the other side of this form):

Please print your name and title _____

Please return the form via email to dwmyers@vcu.edu. Thank you,