

Child Support Specialty Courts Pilot Program

Process Evaluation



January 2011

Prepared by
The State Court Administrative Office
P.O. Box 30048
Lansing, MI 48909

Executive Summary

In April 2009, the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County, the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County, and the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County received funds through Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts (IOLTA) to operate child support specialty court pilot programs. Collectively, those programs accepted 249 and discharged 89 participants in the first 18 months of operation. One hundred sixty participants are still participating in the programs.

- The average gross monthly income for child support specialty court participants at admission was \$235.85. On average, participants owed \$200.94 in child support obligations per month and had an average of \$18,215.49 in arrearages.
- During their final month of participation in child support specialty court pilot programs, 49 percent of participants made a payment toward their child support obligations. This is a marked improvement over the 16 percent of participants making payments toward their child support obligations during the three months prior to participating in a child support specialty court program. When the analysis is limited to those participants who successfully completed their child support specialty court program, 74 percent had made a payment toward their child support obligations during their final month of the program.
- Although some participants did make a child support payment in full during their last month of participation, on average, the last month of participation payment was approximately 21 percent of the total owed. When the analysis is limited to participants who successfully completed the program, on average, the last month of participation payment was approximately 38 percent.
- Participants paid a total of \$45,558.47 while participating in child support specialty court pilot programs.
- Across all of the child support specialty court pilot programs, 20 percent of participants reported improvements in parenting time ordered or parenting time exercised during the program. When the analysis is limited to participants who successfully completed their child support specialty court program, 32 percent reported improvements in parenting time ordered or parenting time exercised while participating in the program.
- Overall, 27 percent of participants improved their employment status while participating in a child support specialty court program and 13 percent maintained a part-time or full-time job from admission to discharge.

Introduction

Specialty Courts, also known as Problem Solving Courts, identify and treat the underlying reasons why individuals become entangled with the legal system. A team of professionals addresses the specialty court participants' barriers in order to reduce the likelihood of their continued involvement with the legal system and to integrate the participants into community services that improve their quality of life. Hallmarks of specialty courts include intense judicial supervision, referral to treatment services, educational courses, assistance in obtaining or maintaining employment, and usually drug testing.

Specialty courts began with adult drug treatment courts in 1989. Adult drug treatment courts target offenders who have a substance abuse or dependence disorder and are involved in the legal system due to drug or alcohol-related offenses. By 1997, drug courts had become popular throughout the United States and the National Association of Drug Court Professionals led an effort to standardize best practices by identifying the Ten Key Components of drug courts. Extensive research has shown that adult drug treatment courts are effective in reducing recidivism. In addition, adult drug treatment court programs tend to be cost effective long-term, when compared to standard probationers, as a result of participants' lower recidivism levels. Due to this research, the therapeutic jurisprudence model employed by adult drug treatment courts has been applied to other areas of the judicial system in hopes of similar success.

Michigan began operating adult drug treatment courts in 1992. Adult drug treatment courts' success quickly led to their expansion to include sobriety courts, juvenile drug treatment courts, and family dependency treatment courts. As with the national trend, Michigan also extended the therapeutic jurisprudence model to circumstances beyond substance use disorders, resulting in the implementation of mental health courts, veterans' treatment courts, prostitution courts, and community courts, to name a few.

In 1999, Judge Kristin Ruth of the Tenth District Court in Wake County, North Carolina began utilizing specialty court techniques to improve child support payment compliance. In doing so, she is credited with operating the first child support specialty court in the United States. In 2005, Judge Ruth contracted with Dr. Rhonda Zingraff of Meredith College to evaluate the impact of the child support specialty court. Dr. Zingraff's evaluations are the first evaluations of a child support specialty court and serve as benchmarks in terms of methodology and expected program impact. Dr. Zingraff reported¹ that court sanctions of electronic house arrest and Work For Kids (a vocational services program) compared favorably to more coercive efforts such as incarceration. By sanctioning payers to these alternatives to jail, jail costs are reduced and payers may continue working or pursuing work opportunities. These sanctions had a greater impact on payment frequency than payment effectiveness (amount of the payment).

In her most recent evaluation, focusing on the effects of substance abuse treatment for addicted participants and its impact on child support payments, Dr. Zingraff concluded that the treatment interventions improved payment compliance. However, payments rose to only one-third of the payment owed and the court interventions or sanctions used to

¹ Zingraff, R. (2007). The effects of differential court sanctions on child support payment compliance.

obtain payment compliance may have cost more than the amount collected by those efforts². Due to the infancy of the child support specialty court and the limited number of participants, Dr. Zingraff notes that all analyses and conclusions are tentative.

In 2008, a Friend of the Court workgroup, collaborating with Justice Maura D. Corrigan, asked the Michigan State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) to assist in establishing a specialty court to address child support issues. In response, SCAO convened a Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee that began developing appropriate guidelines for the operation of these specialty courts in December 2008. The committee (see Appendix A), comprised of professionals with a wide variety of expertise and backgrounds, reviewed current child support court program documentation from North Carolina, North Dakota, and Tennessee and applied their findings to Michigan.

In April 2009, the Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee developed guidelines to implement a new specialty court pilot program focused on increasing child support collections and utilization of parenting time (see Appendix B). Using the Ten Key Components of adult drug treatment courts and the established specialty courts structure, the committee developed ten guidelines to implement a Child Support Specialty Court in Michigan.

The Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee's program guidelines were included with materials distributed to courts that requested an application for grant funding through the SCAO. Grant funds were made available from IOLTA. In addition to program guidelines, the committee developed an assessment form (see Appendix C) that child support specialty court pilot programs could use to identify participants' barriers to paying their child support or exercising parenting time and a participant data collection form (see Appendix D) that reflected the data that committee members felt was important to collect at a statewide level and that captured data comparable to Dr. Zingraff's evaluation data.

The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County, the Thirteenth Circuit Court which has jurisdiction in Antrim, Grand Traverse and Leelanau counties, and the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County applied to the SCAO for funding to operate a child support specialty court. The thirteenth Circuit Court applied for funds to operate the child support specialty court only in Grand Traverse County. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County implemented a child support specialty court that they named "Parents and Children Together" (PACT) in 2007. Therefore, the program utilized grant funding to continue their operations. As a result, the Seventh Circuit Court differs from the other two pilot programs in design. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County and the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County began planning their programs as a result of funding availability. Hence, these programs were able to utilize the materials developed by the Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee.

Guideline #1

The first planning committee guideline addressed the planning and administration of child support specialty courts. The committee acknowledged that community partnerships are an essential component of specialty courts. Therefore, the committee emphasized forming community partnerships and gave a list of partners that the pilot

² Zingraff, R. (2010). The promise and peril of advancing strategies for a problem-solving court.

program teams should consider. This list included but was not limited to, local law enforcement, the Department of Human Services, private treatment providers, housing shelters, employment agencies, and school preparation programs.

All three of the pilot programs documented a significant number of partnerships with local organizations that could provide services to participants with a wide range of barriers to paying child support or exercising parenting time.

Guideline #2

The second planning committee guideline encouraged pilot programs to carefully consider their target population. The committee suggested pilot programs consider what reasons for nonpayment their program will target (individuals who are unable to pay versus those who are able but do not pay child support), target arrearage levels, case age, types of offenses that qualify for their program, and criteria that would exclude potential participants from the program such as residency restrictions.

In accordance with this guideline, The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County chose a target population of any child support payer in Grand Traverse County with an ongoing current child support obligation who is two months or more in arrears. Additionally, the program targets young parents and parents with little workforce experience or education.

The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County chose to target participants with classifications of paternity, family support, or divorced individuals, where both parents reside in Kent County. The program focuses additionally on cases where the payer did not pay support in the last 45 days, support is charging, and there is a child support arrearage of \$2,000 or greater. All cases in this program have received prior enforcement measures with a minimum threshold of at least one contempt hearing held. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County would like to balance cases less than five years old with arrearages less than \$10,000 against cases more than five years old with arrearages greater than \$2,000.

The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County chose to target individuals who have experienced job loss and have a change in their financial circumstances. Individuals with an arrearage less than \$10,000, children under the age of 10, and child support obligations that have not been paid in the last three to six months are also targeted.

Guideline #3

The third planning committee guideline referred to judicial assignments. The committee recommended that the specialty court caseload be restricted to one judge's docket and that the judge be made aware that the specialty court cases would be an additional demand.

The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County assigned all child support specialty court cases to a single judicial referee. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County chose to spread child support specialty court judicial responsibilities across seven of their judges. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County assigned all child support specialty court cases to a single judge.

Guideline #4

The planning committee's fourth guideline encouraged prompt assessment of child support specialty court participants and quick admission into the program. The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County identifies potential participants through contempt hearings, child support reviews, and initial contact with the friend of the court. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County developed a list of potential participants based on the target population criteria for its program and invites potential participants to a program orientation. In the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County, all child support cases assigned to Judge Michael Theile are placed on the child support specialty court docket.

Guideline #5

The fifth guideline developed by the planning committee was with regard to participant assessment methodology. The committee recommended that pilot program teams utilize the assessment form provided in Attachment B. Additionally, the committee emphasized the importance of conducting an assessment on participants as early in their team's admission process as possible. Once the assessment is completed, the identified barriers and proposed solutions should be translated into an individualized program resolution plan that serves as a road map for participants to understand what milestones need to be completed in order to successfully complete the program based on their individual barriers and situation.

The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County utilizes the modified version of the committee's assessment form to identify barriers its participants face. Based on those barriers, the team makes referrals to community services that address the participants' unique barriers and needs. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County utilizes the screening section of the data collection form developed by the Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee in conjunction with Arbor Circle Counseling Services' assessments of participants referred to their agency. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County conducts interviews with participants to uncover their barriers to paying child support obligations and/or exercising parenting time.

Guideline #6

The sixth guideline developed by the Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee referenced the terms and conditions for program participation as well as the suggested structure of the pilot programs. The committee recommended that each participant be made aware of the voluntary nature of participation in specialty court programs. Upon admission, all participants should be alerted to the program requirements, told that participants' referrals and resolution plans for completing the program are developed on an individual basis, and informed that failure to comply with the program may result in sanctions. The committee recommended adhering to the specialty court model of implementing a program with phases that participants advance through over a minimum of one year. The program should include regular meetings between participants and case managers, frequent random drug tests (if applicable to the individual participants), requirements to obtain employment or attend educational programs, and participants' attendance at child support specialty court review sessions as ordered.

The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County has a voluntary child support specialty court pilot program. If individuals choose to participate, enforcement may be temporarily stayed while they participate in the program. Participants are alerted to the possibility of facing sanctions such as jail work crews or jail stays if participants do not adhere to the requirements of the program. However, participants are also informed of the incentives of participating such as suspension of enforcement and re-establishing parenting time.

The program is structured into six phases with participants' individual circumstances dictating which phase they enter into at the beginning of the program. Participants with substance use disorders will be started in Phase I and referred to community treatment agencies to address their substance use disorders. Participants are allowed six weeks in Phase I to demonstrate evidence of progress toward overcoming their drug abuse or addiction. Failure to make adequate progress results in discharge from the program. Participants with mental illness are started in Phase II. In this phase, participants receive mental health assessments and treatment recommendations. Again, if progress toward stabilizing the mental health issues is not made within six weeks, the participant is discharged from the program. Participants without substance use disorders or mental illnesses are started in Phase III. Phase III involves participating in the Michigan Works! Job Club and JET program, which lasts for four weeks. After completing Phase III, participants move to Phase IV, which involves four weeks of community service and job searching. If a job is not secured within Phase IV, participants enter Phase V, which is another four weeks of the Michigan Works! Job Club and JET program. If participants obtain employment by the end of Phase V or in a prior phase, they are promoted to Phase VI where the child support specialty court provides 90 days of follow-up and employment oversight with the participants. If participants are not employed at the end of Phase V, they are discharged from the program.

During the program, participants come to the court weekly and alternate meeting with their case manager to provide progress updates and coming before the referee for status review hearings. If participants become employed during their participation in the program, participants are no longer required to come to the court and may engage in weekly phone contact for 90 days. Graduation occurs when participants have completed all phases or have obtained employment.

In the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County, participation in the child support specialty court pilot program is voluntary. Participants are told that the benefits of participating may include ceasing surcharge assessments, reducing state owed arrearages through payment plans, involving the custodial parent in arrearage modification plans, immediately rescinding license suspension orders of driver, occupational, or recreational licenses, and recalling any felony nonsupport referrals. All participants are warned that failure to adhere to program requirements may result in sanctions including unfavorable case manager reports to the judge about the participant's progress, formal or informal hearings, contempt hearings, bench warrants, and/or incarceration. However, if participants do well in the program, the team may award incentives such as certificates for phase completion.

The program is structured into three phases. Phase I lasts one to three months. During this time, participants experience an initial court review hearing and a follow-up

review hearing six weeks later. Participants must keep all referral appointments, make efforts to obtain employment, make child support payments, and meet with their case manager biweekly. Phase II lasts between three and six months. During Phase II, participants have one status review hearing, must attend all referral appointments, make child support payments, meet with case managers biweekly, and make efforts to obtain or maintain employment. In Phase III, which lasts three to six months, participants appear in court upon demand, must attend all referral appointments, meet with case managers monthly, make efforts to obtain or maintain employment, and make child support payments.

Participants graduate from the program when they have completed all three phases at acceptable levels, as indicated by having paid 75 percent of their current child support cycle as long as they are employed or have assets to remit from, having kept 90 percent of their appointments in Phase I, and having kept 80 percent of their appointments in Phase II.

The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County places all child support cases assigned to Judge Michael Theile and meeting program target population guidelines in the child support specialty court pilot program. Although participants are not formally given the option to refuse the program, the benefits of participation include linkages to community services and resources chosen by professionals to address individuals' unique situations. Participants are made aware that possible sanctions for noncompliance with program guidelines consist of in-house treatment, work detail, or tether. If participants are doing well in the program, they may receive applause in the courtroom to recognize their progress.

This program does not have a phased structure. Instead, participants speak with their case manager by telephone biweekly or as needed and come before the judge for a status review hearing every 30 days, on average. During these meetings, progress toward resolving barriers is discussed, referrals to community partners are made, and disputes between parents regarding parenting time are mediated by an attorney. The Seventh Circuit Court's pilot program focuses more heavily on parenting time than the other two pilot programs and requires custodial parents' attendance at court review hearings.

Participants graduate from the program when they have obtained employment, have a parenting time order in place, and are making payments toward their child support obligations. The program can be completed in nine to 12 months.

Guideline #7

The Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee's seventh guideline recognized the importance of identifying community treatment agencies and ancillary services that could assist participants in overcoming the barriers they face in paying child support or exercising parenting time. The committee suggested identifying agencies that provide substance abuse and mental health treatment, employment services, medical assistance, transportation and housing services, mediation services, educational classes, parenting skills classes, and batterer intervention classes.

All three pilot programs created partnerships or linkages to community services that are capable of addressing the needs of the participants that the child support specialty court pilot programs serve. In addition, the pilot programs made an effort to identify resources

that are unique to their communities and included local programs in their list of possible referrals.

Guideline #8

The Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee's eighth guideline addressed the confidential nature of some of the participants' case information. The committee suggested that the pilot programs develop policies that address the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and Title IV-D of the Social Security Act. Additionally, the committee recommended that the pilot programs develop waivers for participants to sign that would allow treatment providers to disclose treatment information to court representatives. Each pilot program was encouraged to create a policy regarding where child support specialty court case files would be maintained and how that location would be secured.

All of the child support specialty court pilot programs have developed waivers and release of information forms necessary for their programs. The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County maintains participants' case files in the specialty court coordinator's locked office. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County ensures that case files are only accessible by team members. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County maintains data collectively for all participants rather than in separate case files. All participant information is secured in the program coordinator's office.

Guideline #9

The Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee's ninth guideline emphasized that specialty courts are composed of a team of professionals, often working outside of their traditional roles. In recognition of the different roles team members may assume, additional training may be necessary to fulfill their duties in the pilot program. At a minimum, the committee suggested that child support specialty court teams include a judge, a case manager, and community or ancillary service providers.

The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County has a child support specialty court team consisting of a Family Division Referee, a Program Coordinator, a Project Director, a Case Manager, Michigan Works!, and a Family Division Judge. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County has a child support specialty court team consisting of seven judges, case managers, case manager assistants, case manager supervisors, treatment providers, and an office staff attorney. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County has a child support specialty court team that consists of a judge and a program coordinator.

Guideline #10

The final guideline that the Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee suggested was that all pilot programs submit a standard set of data to the SCAO for evaluation purposes. The committee developed the standard set of data and it was distributed to the pilot programs during a kick-off event for the child support specialty court pilot program at the SCAO. During the kick-off event, pilot program staff was trained on how to complete the data collection form and was asked for suggestions on revising it to suit the needs of their individual pilot programs. After suggestions and

revisions were concluded, submitting the data to the SCAO on a quarterly basis became a contractual obligation.

All three child support specialty court pilot programs have submitted data for each quarter of their program's operation. The data is submitted in paper form and then keyed into a Microsoft Access database that houses the data from all three programs. The remainder of this document focuses on the data submitted by the programs and compiled by the SCAO.

Process Evaluation

Screening and Admission

Two hundred fifty seven individuals were screened for admission to one of the three child support specialty court pilot programs between April 1, 2009 and September 30, 2010. Eight screened individuals were not accepted into the programs³. The 249 accepted participants were distributed across the pilots as follows. The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County had 40 admissions. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County had 126 admissions. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County had 83 admissions.

Admission Statistics

The participants admitted into child support specialty courts throughout the state were predominately male (94%). Most participants did not have a history of substance abuse (72%) or a history of mental illness (88%). This was contrary to the expectations of the Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee members. Hence, child support specialty court teams needed to identify barriers beyond substance use disorders or mental illness that hindered participants in meeting their child support obligations.

Fifty four percent of admitted participants identified as African American. Thirty four percent of admitted participants identified as Caucasian. Hispanic (5%), multi-racial (1%), Native American (< 1%), Asian (< 1%), Arabic (<1%), and participants choosing not to identify their race or ethnicity (2%) were the remainder of the admitted participants (see Table 1).

Table 1

Race or Ethnicity of Admitted Participants

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
African American	1	90	49	140
Caucasian	37	18	29	84
Hispanic/Latino	0	11	2	13
No Response	1	2	2	5
Multi-racial	0	3	0	3
Native American	1	1	0	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	1	0	1
Arabic	0	0	1	1
Total Participants	40	126	83	249

Most participants indicated that they did not have housing (70%), while 25 percent indicated that they rented their housing, and 5 percent owned their housing (see Table 2).

³ The eight individuals not accepted into a child support specialty court program were rejected due to the court receiving payments through an income withholding order, being on medical confinement and therefore not having a current billing, residing out of county, current participation in the Michigan Prisoner Reentry Initiative, being on disability, current involvement in an employment program, current pending charges, and not owing arrears.

Table 2

Race or Ethnicity of Admitted Participants' Housing

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
No Housing	9	98	67	174
Rent	27	25	10	62
Own	4	3	6	13
Total Participants	40	126	83	249

Many participants had not completed high school, with only five participants having graduated from a two or four year college (see Table 3).

Table 3

Admitted Participants' Education

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
Less than 11th Grade	14	44	27	85
High School Grade	9	32	28	69
GED	6	31	13	50
Some College	9	11	12	32
Some Trade School	1	3	2	6
2 Year College Grad	0	4	0	4
Trade School Grad	0	1	1	2
4 Year College Grad	1	0	0	1
Total Participants	40	126	83	249

The majority of the admitted participants did not have employment when accepted into the child support specialty court pilot programs (82%). Nine percent were working part-time, six percent were working full-time, and three percent were not in the labor force due to disability, homemaker status, being registered as a full-time student, or having retired (see Table 4).

Table 4**Admitted Participants' Employment Status**

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
Unemployed	29	112	62	203
Employed Part-Time	7	4	12	23
Employed Full-Time	3	4	8	15
Not in Labor Force	1	6	1	8
Total Participants	40	126	83	249

Most participants in child support specialty courts had only one child support specialty court case. Nevertheless, the child support specialty courts impacted 433 children across the state. The average gross monthly income for child support specialty court participants at admission was \$235.85. On average, participants owed \$200.94 in child support obligations per month and had an average of \$18,215.49 in arrearages.

Payments

In the three months prior to admission, only 37 of the 249 (15%) child support specialty court participants made a payment toward their child support obligations (see Table 5). Participants in the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County had a better history of payments when beginning the program (40 percent having made a payment in the previous three months) than participants in the other two pilot programs. In the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County, 13 percent of participants had made a payment in the previous three months, while in the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County only 5 percent of participants had made a payment in the previous three months.

Table 5**Number of Participants Making Payments Toward Child Support Obligations Three Months Prior to Admission by Percent of Obligation Paid and Court**

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
0% Paid	24	109	79	212
10% Paid	3	7	1	11
25% Paid	1	6	2	9
50% Paid	5	2	0	7
75% Paid	4	2	1	7
100% Paid	3	0	0	3
Total Participants	40	126	83	249

During their final month of participation in child support specialty court pilot programs, 49 percent of participants made a payment toward their child support obligations. This is a marked improvement over the 16 percent of participants making

payments toward their child support obligations during the three months prior to participating in a child support specialty court program. Additionally, this 49 percent includes participants who successfully completed their programs as well as those who did not successfully complete because they absconded, committed a crime, voluntarily withdrew, or were noncompliant with the program. When the analysis is limited to those participants who successfully completed their child support specialty court program, 74 percent had made a payment toward their child support obligations during their final month of the program.

It is important to note that this is preliminary data. By virtue of the analyses, data regarding participants' final month of the program can only be collected when those participants are discharged from the child support specialty court pilot programs. Eighty-nine participants have been discharged from child support specialty court pilot programs. Therefore, the above analyses include only 36 percent (89/249) of the participants accepted into child support specialty courts. However, this data replicates Dr. Zingraff's evaluation findings that child support specialty court techniques increase payment frequency.

Table 6 documents the number of participants making payments toward child support obligations during their final month of participation by court and percentage paid. The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County had the highest percentage of participants (62%) making payments toward their child support obligations during their final month of participation. However, this same court had the highest percentage of participants making payments toward their child support obligations the three months prior to admission as well. Thirty five percent of participants in the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County made a payment during their final month of the program. In the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County, 51 percent of participants made a payment during their final month of the program. In terms of improvement in payments toward child support obligations pre-program to program conclusion, participants in Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County made the largest improvement.

Table 6

Number of Participants Making Payments Toward Child Support Obligations During Final Month by Percent of Obligation Paid and Court

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
0% Paid	10	17	18	45
10% Paid	7	0	0	7
25% Paid	2	1	1	4
50% Paid	2	0	1	3
75% Paid	1	0	1	2
100% Paid	4	8	16	28
Total Participants	26	26	37	89

While participants in the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County showed the largest pre-program to program conclusion gains in payments toward child support

obligations, participants in the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County showed the largest percentage of successful participants making full payments during their final month of the program (see Table 7). Eighty-three percent of successful participants in the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County paid their full child support obligation during their final month of the program. In the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County, 65 percent of successful participants paid their full child support obligation during their final month of the program. In the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County, 29 percent of successful participants paid their full child support obligation during their final month of the program.

Table 7

Number of Participants Successful Participants Paying Child Support Obligations in Full During Final Month by Percent of Obligation Paid and Court

	13th Circuit Court	17th Circuit Court	7th Circuit Court	Total Participants
0% Paid	2	1	3	6
10% Paid	1	0	0	1
25% Paid	1	0	0	1
50% Paid	1	0	1	2
75% Paid	0	0	1	1
100% Paid	2	5	13	20
Total Participants	7	6	18	31

Although some participants did make a child support payment in full during their last month of participation, on average the last month of participation payment was approximately 21 percent of the total owed. When the analysis is limited to participants who successfully completed the program, on average, the last month of participation payment was approximately 38 percent. These relatively low collection figures are consistent with Dr. Zingraff's finding that regardless of the sanction or intervention utilized by the Wake County child support specialty court, the court had not succeeded at increasing collections beyond one-third of the amount owed.

Total Collections

In addition to reporting the percentage of child support obligations paid, child support specialty court pilot programs also reported the total amount of child support paid while individuals participated in child support specialty courts. Again, in order to record an accurate figure of total payments while participating, this figure must be collected when individuals' participation in the programs has concluded and they are discharged from the child support specialty court pilot programs. Eighty-nine participants have completed a child support specialty court program.

Discharged participants paid a total of \$45,558.47 while participating in child support specialty court pilot programs. This figure includes \$11,896.69 collected from participants discharged from the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County, \$12,830.62 collected from participants discharged from the Seventeenth Circuit Court in

Kent County, and \$27,198.36 collected from participants discharged from the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County.

The Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County collected an average of \$457.57 per discharged participant. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County collected an average of \$493.49 per discharged participant. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County collected an average of \$735.09 per discharged participant.

When the data are limited to participants who successfully completed their child support specialty court pilot programs, the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County collected a total of \$4,080.62, which is \$582.95 per successful participant. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County collected a total of \$6,537.39, which is \$1089.57 per successful participant. The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County collected a total of \$16,618.76, which is \$923.26 per successful participant.

While \$45,558.47 is an impressive amount to collect, as with previous research conducted by Dr. Zingraff, the results are tempered by the reality of the costs involved in operating child support specialty court pilot programs. Dr. Zingraff's preliminary cost-benefit calculations identified that collections in the Wake County child support specialty court were smaller than the cost of every sanction or intervention the court ordered. For example, on average, \$643.53 was collected from participants sent to the Work For Kids vocational service program. However, on average, the Work For Kids program costs \$745.61 per participant. In some cases, such as ordering residential treatment for drug-addicted participants, the average \$379.51 collection from participants was dwarfed by the average \$4700.70 cost per participant for treatment. Dr. Zingraff correctly noted that the collection figures per participant are over a short three-month period. It is entirely possible that participants will continue making payments now that they are on the right path and will surpass the amount invested by the court to place them on that path in future payments. For Michigan's child support specialty court pilot programs, approximately \$22,542.37 in IOLTA grant funding was invested in the 89 discharged participants to produce the \$45,558.47 in collections while participants were in the programs. If grant funding covers all of the courts' expenses to operate a child support specialty court above and beyond the business-as-usual costs of facilities, staff, and supplies, then Michigan's child support specialty courts are producing a net benefit in collections. It is expected that collections will continue after participants are discharged from the programs. However, it is too early to conduct an analysis of post-program collections because few participants have been discharged from their child support specialty court pilot programs for more than three months.

Parenting Time

Across all of the child support specialty court pilot programs, 20 percent of participants reported improvements in parenting time ordered or parenting time exercised during the program. When the analysis is limited to participants who successfully completed their child support specialty court program, 32 percent reported improvements in parenting time ordered or parenting time exercised while participating in the program.

The Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County focused more heavily on parenting time ordered and parenting time exercised than the other two pilot programs, reporting improvements for 16 participants (43 percent of discharged participants). The Thirteenth

Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County reported improvements in parenting time ordered or exercised for two participants (8 percent of discharged participants) and a decrease in parenting time exercised for one participant⁴. The Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County did not report any changes in parenting time ordered or parenting time exercised.

Improvement in Employment or Education During Program

Overall, 27 percent of participants improved their employment status while participating in a child support specialty court program and 13 percent maintained a part-time or full-time job from program admission to discharge. Twenty three percent of participants discharged from the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County improved their employment status while participating in the program. The same was true of participants discharged from the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County. Thirty two percent of participants discharged from the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County improved their employment status while participating in the program.

When the analyses are limited to those participants who successfully completed the child support specialty court pilot programs, 83 percent improved their employment while participating in the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County. In the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County, 71 percent of successful participants improved their employment while participating in the program. In the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County, 33 percent improved their employment while participating in the child support specialty court program.

While not all participants were able to improve their employment, three participants (two in the Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County and one in the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County) were able to improve their educational status while participating in the child support specialty court pilot programs, which may enhance their employability.

Conclusion

Michigan is experiencing high unemployment and a weak economy currently, making the endeavor to facilitate the resolution of barriers to employment for those struggling to make child support payments a timely and daunting task for courts to undertake. Nevertheless, the Thirteenth Circuit Court in Grand Traverse County, Seventeenth Circuit Court in Kent County, and Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County accepted the challenge and successfully implemented child support specialty courts. The programs have increased compliance with child support payments and have shown preliminary results comparable to the accomplishments of the Wake County child support specialty court in North Carolina. Parenting time has been enhanced for some participants and their children. In addition, across all pilot programs, 27 percent of participants improved their employment status while participating in the child support pilot programs, even if they did not successfully complete the program. Even though there is room for improvement, it is certain that the participants experiencing these positive changes and the children that they support find child support specialty court pilot programs are moving in the right direction.

⁴ The parenting time exercised was decreased due to the child moving out of the state.

Appendix A

Child Support Specialty Court Planning Committee Members

- Gary Secor, Project Coordinator and Trial Court Planning Specialist representing the State Court Administrative Office
- Jessica Parks, Specialty Court Management Analyst representing the State Court Administrative Office
- Peter Stathakis, Michigan Judicial Institute Court Professional Program Manager representing the State Court Administrative Office
- Timothy Cole, Friend of the Court Bureau Management Analyst representing the State Court Administrative Office
- Connie Daiss, Program Assistant representing the State Court Administrative Office
- Judge Laura Frawley, representing the First Probate Court in Alcona County
- Judge Joan Young, representing the Michigan Judges Association and the Sixth Circuit Court in Oakland County
- Judge Michael Theile, representing the Seventh Circuit Court in Genesee County
- Zenell Brown, representing the Michigan Association of Circuit Court Administrators and the Wayne County Friend of the Court
- Chris Ward, Interim Director representing the Michigan Association of Community Mental Health Boards
- Pamela Sala, Vice President of the Michigan Family Support Council and representing the Sixth Circuit Court in Oakland County
- Sue Winter, Deputy Director of Programming representing the Northern Michigan Substance Abuse Services, Inc.
- Arthur Spears, President of the Referees Association of Michigan and representing the Sixth Circuit Court Friend of the Court in Oakland County
- Tracey Maroney, Quality Assurance Director representing the Capital Area Michigan Works
- Patricia Steele, representing the Michigan Association of Circuit Court Administrators and the Fourteenth Circuit Court in Muskegon County
- Ward Staffeld, representing the Michigan Family Support Council and Friend of the Court Association of the Twenty-Seventh Circuit Court in Oceana County
- Michael Adrian, Director of the Office of Child Support Program Development Division representing the Michigan Office of Child Support
- Jeffrey Sauter, Eaton County Prosecuting Attorney representing the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan
- Charlene Baker, Director of Friend of the Court representing the Twenty-Third Circuit Court in Alcona County

Appendix B

Child Support Specialty Court Guidelines

Guideline #1 Planning and Administration

Partnerships are an essential component of any specialty court model as they enhance credibility, bolster support, and broaden available resources. Because the specialty court model is built on and dependent upon a strong team approach, both within the court and beyond, the court should solicit the cooperation of other agencies, as well as community organizations to form partnership in support of the goals of the specialty court program.

Whom you should consider including:

Judge
Prosecutor
Local law enforcement
Local Bar Association
Friend of the Court staff
Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS)
Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC)
Community mental health treatment providers
Private treatment providers
Substance abuse treatment providers
Coordinating agency
Housing providers/shelters
Department of Labor - Michigan Works
Michigan rehab
Local employment agencies
Local transit
Council of government
SCAO regional offices
Head Start
Heating assistance
Local charitable organizations
Local advocacy agencies
Chamber of Commerce
SCAO resource (regional administration, specialty court analyst, Office of Dispute Resolution and/or FOCB staff)
Office of Child Support (OCS) local support specialist
Local school participation

Additional recommendations: Consider local funding units, media, the educational community, GED programs, local dispute resolution centers, father and mother advocacy groups, universities for evaluation purposes, and MSU extension offices.

Guideline #2 Target Population

The target population is based upon case type, payers, court established arrearage levels, court established case age, and the court's determination that traditional enforcement measures have not worked.

Population

Divorce, paternity cases, and family support cases.

Payers who want to pay can't pay.

Payers, who don't want to pay, can pay.

Payers who don't want to pay, can't pay.

Target Arrearage Levels

Each court should determine its own target arrearage amount and period of nonpayment. (For example: Under \$10,000 and/or at least six weeks in arrears.)

Case Age

Any length; must have a current child support cycle.

Type of Offenses

Nonpayment of child support.

Court determines that traditional enforcement measures have not worked.

Exclusions

Nonpayer with multiple cases in different counties. Noncounty residents (services may not be available to noncounty residents). Multicounty jurisdictions may make an exemption to this exclusion.

Guideline #3 Judicial Assignments

Assigned judge needs to be aware of additional caseload requirements. Specialty court cases would be restricted to that judge's caseload.

Guideline #4 Prompt Assessment and Program Entry

Identification of eligible participants and the associated custodial parents (if possible) should occur. Participants and custodial parents should be interviewed and participants should be placed promptly in the specialty court program.

Eligibility screening should be based on written criteria.

The FOC and/or the judge will be the Gatekeeper.

Specific specialty court team members should be designated to screen cases and identify potential specialty court participants.

Eligible participants for specialty court should be promptly advised about program requirements and the relative merits of participating.

The FOC and/or the judge will determine eligibility for acceptance into the program.

Guideline #5 Assessment Methodologies

An example of an assessment instrument is provided in the attachments to these guidelines.

Assessments should be conducted as soon as possible after entry of the program.

The assessment data should be translated into an individual program resolution plan.

Guideline #6 Terms and Conditions for Program Participation

This should be a voluntary judicially supervised program for individuals who are court ordered to pay child support. Individuals that are currently on probation may also participate. Once admitted into the program they must:

- willingly participate and follow all program guidelines. For example, participants may need employment assistance, substance abuse treatment, to attend parenting classes, or to attend other services and the court may need to arrange for the participant to obtain said services. Each particular service shall become part of the participants program and the participant must stay in compliance with the plan to successfully complete the program. Failure on the participant's part to comply with, or successfully complete, any service, or any other part of your program may result in sanctions, which may include more frequent court appearances, jail, a more restrictive treatment, or more restrictive programming setting.
- meet regularly with the case manager;
- take frequent/random drug test; (if required)
- obtain employment and/or attend educational programs; and
- attend specialty court sessions as ordered.

It is recommended that courts implement a phased program over a specific period of time (one-year minimum) that requires participants to substantially comply with court ordered support and meet the requirements of their individualized program resolution plan. (Each court needs to establish definition of substantial compliance).

Guideline #7 Treatment and Ancillary Services

Determining treatment modalities

- Substance abuse treatment services.
- Mental health treatment services (anger management).
- Employment services.
- Medical treatment services.
- Transportation and housing services.
- Mediation services (parenting time issue).
- Education services.
- Parenting skills.
- Batterer Intervention.

Guideline #8 Confidentiality

Insure HIPAA, 42 CFR, and IV-D safeguards.

Waivers and forms for treatment.

Case files maintained in secure area.

Case work files (The casework file for specialty court participants).

Guideline #9 Local Specialty Court Team

Identify those people who need to be part of the local specialty court team, and identify the type of training needed, when training should occur, and what members of the specialty court team should attend training.

The team should include;

Judge

Case manager

Other ancillary service providers as needed.

Guideline #10 Program Data

Established Minimum Data Standards are attached to the guidelines. These must be collected and the pilot courts will provide this information to SCAO.

Appendix C
**CHILD SUPPORT SPECIALTY COURT
INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT**

Participant Name _____ **Participant Case#** _____

EMPLOYMENT
1. Are you employed? If yes where?
2. What are your future employment goals?
3. Resources necessary to achieve these goals?
Employment: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:
EDUCATION
1. What is the highest grade you completed?
2. Any plans to continue your education?
3. Do you need any special assistance to continue your education?
Education (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:
TRANSPORTATION
1. What do you use for transportation and is it reliable?

2. If your transportation is unreliable, what would you need to make it reliable?
3. Does your access to transportation restrict your ability to do things (e.g., work, attend school, go to the doctor, attend church, recreation)?
Transportation: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:
FINANCIAL RESOURCES
1. Employment income:
2. Other Income:
3. Savings, Assets:
Financial Resources: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:
HOUSING AND CLOTHING
1. Do you own or rent? What are your monthly payments? Do you receive any subsidies to help you pay?
2. Does your housing meet your current need? (Size, security, condition, cost, proximity to school or work, cleaning supplies, smoke alarms, heating/cooling, door locks, working appliances)
3. Do you have a place to go to meet your needs for clothing and household goods? (Goodwill, church, friend, relatives)
4. How long do you plan to live in this housing?
Housing and Clothing: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:

PERSONAL HYGIENE

1. Do you have the facilities and items you need to bathe or shower, brush your teeth, shave regularly?

2. Do you have access to a washer and dryer and laundry detergent so you can wash and dry your clothes?

3. Do you believe you have any difficulties with hygiene that affect your ability to find and retain employment?

Personal Hygiene: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty

Possible referrals/resources:

HEALTH

1. Do you currently have medical insurance?

2. Do you and members of your family have regular health exams?

Medical:

Dental:

Other:

3. Do you have a family doctor or medical clinic you go to?

4. Do you or anyone in your family need medical attention now?

5. Do you or anyone in your family have a physical or psychological condition that makes it difficult to get around?

Health: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty

Possible referrals/resources:

LEGAL

1. Do you have any current or pending legal issues?

2. Have you ever been convicted of a crime?

3. Probation, Jail, Prison, Parole? If Yes explain.

4. Any instances of domestic violence?

5. Any instances of police being called to your house?

Legal: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty

Possible referrals/resources:
SUBSTANCE ABUSE
1. Do you use alcohol or drugs?
2. Are you concerned or has anyone ever expressed concern of your use of alcohol or drugs?
3. Have you ever experienced negative consequences due to substance abuse (employment, financial, legal, relationships)?
4. Have you ever been involved in any treatment programs for substance abuse? If yes explain.
5. Are you interested in receiving information on treatment programs?
Substance Abuse: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:
PARENTING
1. How often do you have contact with your children? Is your current parenting time schedule adequate?
2. How long has it been since you have spent some time with your children?
3. What things do you do with your children?
4. What do you do best as a parent?
5. What challenges you most as a parent?
Parenting: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:
RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PARENT
1. Describe your relationship with the custodial parent.
Very Good Good Neutral Poor Very Poor
2. Describe the way you and the custodial parent communicate.
Friendly Business-Like Argumentative Other

3. Major sources of disagreement if any?
Relationship with other Parent: (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
Possible referrals/resources:

CHILD SUPPORT SPECIALTY COURT INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Participant Name _____ Participant Case# _____

Cumulative Assessment

- Employment:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Education** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Transportation:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Financial Resources:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Housing:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Personal Hygiene:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Health:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Legal:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Substance Abuse:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Parenting:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty
- Relationship With Other Parent:** (1) Strength (2) Some difficulty (3) Serious difficulty

Recommendations:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Recommended Program Admission _____ Not Recommended for Admission _____

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Appendix D
Child Support Specialty Court Participant Data Collection Form
FY 2009-2010

Section A – Screening*

Section B – Accepted Participants’ Data for Each Phase

Section C – Criminal/Court Activity, Service Referrals, Incentives, and Sanctions

Section D – Discharge

***Section A must be completed for every screened potential participant, whether or not the screening information obtained results in the participant’s admission into child support specialty court.**

Section A – Screening

Referral Source _____
Court _____

Referral Date _____
Screening Date _____

Payer Information

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Custodial Parents’ Information

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Race: African-American
Alaskan Native
Asian/Pacific Islander
Caucasian
Hispanic/Latino
Multi-racial
Native American
Other: _____

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Gender : Male Female

Last Name _____

Date of Birth _____

First Name _____

U.S. Citizen: Yes No

Address _____

Payer Information continued...

Current Marital Status: Married
Separated
Divorced
Widowed
Single

Housing: Rent
Own
None

Driver's License Status: None
Revoked
Suspended
Valid

Driver's License Number _____
Pending Driver's License Changes: Yes
No

Case Number _____

Case Code _____

Saving Account: Yes No
Bank Name _____
Checking Account: Yes No
Bank Name _____

Health Insurance Type: Private
Medicare
Medicaid
None
Other

Insurer: _____
Number covered by Payer's health insurance including Payer _____

History of Substance Abuse: Yes No

History of Mental Illness: Yes No

Payer Information continued...

Highest Education Completed:
< or = 11th grade
GED
High School Graduate
Some Trade School
Trade School Graduate
Some College
College Graduate 2 year
College Graduate 4 year
Some Post Graduate
Advanced Degree

Employment: Unemployed
Part-Time ≤ 35 hr/wk
Full-Time > 35 hr/wk
Not in Labor Force

Primary Occupation: Agricultural
Industrial
Clerical/Sales
Machine Trade
Miscellaneous
Processing
Professional
Service
Construction
Other _____

Professional Licenses Held _____

Primary Support: Disability _____
Family
Retirement
Wages
Social Security
Veteran's Benefits
Welfare
Worker's Comp.
None
Other _____

Gross Monthly Income _____

Seasonal Variation in Income?: Yes No

Payer Information continued...

Pending Charges: Yes No
If yes, charge: _____

Bench Warrant: Yes No
If yes, reason: _____

Prior Convictions: Yes No
If yes, # misdemeanors _____
If yes, # felonies _____

Currently on Probation/Parole? Yes No
If yes, where? _____
For what? _____
Completion Date _____

PPO or Restraining Order?: Yes No

History of Domestic Violence?: Yes No

Child Protective Services History?: Yes
No

Total Child Support Obligation _____

Total Child Support Arrearage _____

Total Amount Being Paid _____

Formula Deviation?: Yes No

Recipient(s) of Support: _____

Private Collection Agency Involved? Yes
No

Date of Current Child Support Order(s)

Date(s) Last Modified _____

Default Order _____

Utilized ADR Services?: Yes No

Payer's Children

Child #1

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Age _____

Dependent of Payer? Yes No

Custody Status _____

Parenting Time _____

Increased Contact Desired? Yes No

Barriers to Contact _____

Child Support Obligation _____

Child Support Arrearage _____

Child #2

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Age _____

Dependent of Payer? Yes No

Custody Status _____

Parenting Time _____

Increased Contact Desired? Yes No

Barriers to Contact _____

Child Support Obligation _____

Child Support Arrearage _____

Payer's Children continued...

Child #3

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Age _____

Dependent of Payer? Yes No

Custody Status _____

Parenting Time _____

Increased Contact Desired? Yes No

Barriers to Contact _____

Child Support Obligation _____

Child Support Arrearage _____

Child #4

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Age _____

Dependent of Payer? Yes No

Custody Status _____

Parenting Time _____

Increased Contact Desired? Yes No

Barriers to contact _____

Child Support Obligation _____

Child Support Arrearage _____

Payer's Children continued...

Child #5

Last Name _____

First Name _____

Address _____

Age _____

Dependent of Payer? Yes No

Custody Status _____

Parenting Time _____

Increased Contact Desired? Yes No

Barriers to Contact _____

Child Support Obligation _____

Child Support Arrearage _____

Other Child Support Information

Additional Child Support Cases? Yes No

Children with Special Needs? Yes No

If yes, what kind? _____

Notes:

Acceptance Date: _____

Rejection Date: _____

Rejection Reason: _____

Section B - Accepted Participant's Information

Payer's Name _____ Court _____ Phase # _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Attended: _____

Changes to Custody During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Parenting Time During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Child Support During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

If Payer Has a Substance Abuse Disorder

Number of Drug Tests Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Drug Tests Given: _____

Number of Positive Drug Tests (not including missed tests) _____

Drug of Choice _____

Treatment Modality: Outpatient Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Sub-Acute Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Intensive Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Early Intervention	start date _____	end date _____

If Payer Has a Mental Illness

DSM-IV Diagnosis _____

Treatment Modality:

Assertive Community Treatment	start date _____	end date _____
Case Management/Support Coordination	start date _____	end date _____
Co-Occurring Treatment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Community Based Services	start date _____	end date _____
Crisis Residential/Intensive Crisis Stabilization	start _____	end date _____
Doctor/Medication Review	start date _____	end date _____
Employment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Inpatient Hospitalization/Partial Day Hospitalization	start _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Therapy Services	start date _____	end date _____

Number of Incentives Given in this Phase _____

Number of Sanctions Given in this Phase _____ Jail Days in this Phase _____

Section B - Accepted Participant's Information

Payer's Name _____ Court _____ Phase # _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Attended: _____

Changes to Custody During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Parenting Time During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Child Support During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

If Payer Has a Substance Abuse Disorder

Number of Drug Tests Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Drug Tests Given: _____

Number of Positive Drug Tests (not including missed tests) _____

Drug of Choice _____

Treatment Modality: Outpatient Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Sub-Acute Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Intensive Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Early Intervention	start date _____	end date _____

If Payer Has a Mental Illness

DSM-IV Diagnosis _____

Treatment Modality:

Assertive Community Treatment	start date _____	end date _____
Case Management/Support Coordination	start date _____	end date _____
Co-Occurring Treatment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Community Based Services	start date _____	end date _____
Crisis Residential/Intensive Crisis Stabilization	start _____	end date _____
Doctor/Medication Review	start date _____	end date _____
Employment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Inpatient Hospitalization/Partial Day Hospitalization	start _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Therapy Services	start date _____	end date _____

Number of Incentives Given in this Phase _____

Number of Sanctions Given in this Phase _____ Jail Days in this Phase _____

Section B - Accepted Participant's Information

Payer's Name _____ Court _____ Phase # _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Attended: _____

Changes to Custody During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Parenting Time During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Child Support During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

If Payer Has a Substance Abuse Disorder

Number of Drug Tests Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Drug Tests Given: _____

Number of Positive Drug Tests (not including missed tests) _____

Drug of Choice _____

Treatment Modality: Outpatient Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Sub-Acute Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Intensive Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Early Intervention	start date _____	end date _____

If Payer Has a Mental Illness

DSM-IV Diagnosis _____

Treatment Modality:

Assertive Community Treatment	start date _____	end date _____
Case Management/Support Coordination	start date _____	end date _____
Co-Occurring Treatment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Community Based Services	start date _____	end date _____
Crisis Residential/Intensive Crisis Stabilization	start _____	end date _____
Doctor/Medication Review	start date _____	end date _____
Employment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Inpatient Hospitalization/Partial Day Hospitalization	start _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Therapy Services	start date _____	end date _____

Number of Incentives Given in this Phase _____

Number of Sanctions Given in this Phase _____ Jail Days in this Phase _____

Section B - Accepted Participant's Information

Payer's Name _____ Court _____ Phase # _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Court Review Hearings Attended: _____

Changes to Custody During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Parenting Time During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

Changes to Child Support During this Phase?: Yes No
If yes, what kind? _____

If Payer Has a Substance Abuse Disorder

Number of Drug Tests Scheduled: _____ per _____

Number of Drug Tests Given: _____

Number of Positive Drug Tests (not including missed tests) _____

Drug of Choice _____

Treatment Modality: Outpatient Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Sub-Acute Detox	start date _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Intensive Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Outpatient	start date _____	end date _____
Early Intervention	start date _____	end date _____

If Payer Has a Mental Illness

DSM-IV Diagnosis _____

Treatment Modality:

Assertive Community Treatment	start date _____	end date _____
Case Management/Support Coordination	start date _____	end date _____
Co-Occurring Treatment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Community Based Services	start date _____	end date _____
Crisis Residential/Intensive Crisis Stabilization	start _____	end date _____
Doctor/Medication Review	start date _____	end date _____
Employment Services	start date _____	end date _____
Inpatient Hospitalization/Partial Day Hospitalization	start _____	end date _____
Residential	start date _____	end date _____
Therapy Services	start date _____	end date _____

Number of Incentives Given in this Phase _____

Number of Sanctions Given in this Phase _____ Jail Days in this Phase _____

Section C: In-Program Criminal or Court Activity

Payer's Name _____ Court _____

Charged During Program Participation? Yes No

If yes, charge _____

Occurred during phase # _____

Arrest date _____

Charge type: Felony
Misdemeanor
Civil
Petition
Other _____

Convicted? Yes No
If yes, Date _____

Sentence, if applicable _____

Program Impact: Discharged
Sanctioned
None
Other: _____

Bench Warrant Issued While in Program?: Yes No
If yes, Date _____

Reason _____

Occurred in Phase # _____

Services Referred to During Program

Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____
Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____
Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____
Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____
Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____
Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____
Service _____	for _____	Start date _____	End Date _____

Incentives and Sanctions

Incentive Type _____
Incentive Type _____
Incentive Type _____
Incentive Type _____
Incentive Type _____

Given For _____
Given For _____
Given For _____
Given For _____
Given For _____

Sanction Type _____
Sanction Type _____
Sanction Type _____
Sanction Type _____
Sanction Type _____

Given For _____
Given For _____
Given For _____
Given For _____
Given For _____

*****Please attach documentation indicating the payer's current child support payments and arrearages from the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MICSES).**

Notes:
