

Early Intervention in Van Buren County

By Matt Motter, Early Intervention Caseworker

The Van Buren County Friend of the Court is now one year into its new Early Intervention Program. The program is inspired by Muskegon County's SEED program and Wayne County's "Reducing Paternity Defaults With E's" program. We hoped to create something similar, yet on a smaller scale.

We began by selecting some goals that were at the core of what our office was hoping to achieve. Those goals became:

- ◇ Improve the perception of the FOC.
- ◇ Create more father-involvement.
- ◇ Decrease the number of judgments of filiation entered by default.
- ◇ Improve amount and frequency of payments.
- ◇ Increase participation in genetic testing.

These goals are all closely related. Each hinges on the success of the others and all require one common variable: establishing communication with the noncustodial parent (NCP), usually the dad, as early as possible. We believed that the more time that elapsed between process of service and actual contact with someone in our office, the less likely we were to have a successful relationship with the individual.

With this in mind, we began by accompanying our warrant officer when he served papers to any defendant in a paternity action. This approach allowed our office contact at the very start. The process explained the options available to the alleged father and addressed any questions or concerns. At this initial contact, we could also ask the defendant for his current address and the best phone number to reach him, which is information that parents tend to be guarded about. Individuals have been much more apt to provide our office with accurate contact information once they realize that we have people in place to help them.

Meeting the defendants away from the looming shadow of our courthouse made it easier to create a dialogue to more accurately discern their feelings about their case, their child, and their perception of our office. This outreach has resulted in a high percentage of our alleged fathers requesting genetic testing. At this point in our program, over 88 percent of the alleged fathers have requested genetic testing services.

Our system for collecting DNA samples provided our first roadblock. We required parents to arrive at our office on a predetermined date that could be as distant as two months from the date testing was initially requested. Worse still, if the clients were unable to make it to that appointment they would have to reschedule to test eight weeks later. As our Early Intervention Specialist, I became certified to collect DNA samples, which eliminated that first roadblock. Additionally, this method allowed yet another opportunity to meet face-to-face with the alleged fathers.

Transportation was another issue that needed to be addressed. Van Buren County is predominately rural, with many living at or below the poverty line. Many parents are without their own means of transportation, relying on friends and relatives for transportation. This leaves them at the mercy of other's schedules and can put a strain on relationships.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

<i>Early Intervention in Van Buren County</i>	1
<i>Guideline Winner</i>	3
<i>Supervision</i>	4
<i>IV-D Card</i>	5
<i>UIFSA</i>	5
<i>Program Accomplishments</i>	6
<i>Legal Corner</i>	8

(continued on page 2)

Early Intervention in Van Buren County

(continued from page 1)

To address this issue, we decided to go mobile and meet them for testing at a time and place most convenient for them. While genetic testing can provide a level of embarrassment to our clients, several have expressed their gratitude at our willingness to meet them in the comfort of their own home. I am happy to say that those clients who wish to be tested are now able to do so within days of being served their papers.

Of the seventy-plus cases, only four of the defendants have defaulted. This is very effective for our office in that it keeps the case moving, but more importantly, it shows parents that we understand this is a difficult situation and are willing to go the extra mile to make it as painless as we can.

When we receive the test results, contact is made with the parent to discuss them. Questions are answered regarding support, parenting time and their rights. Once the new case is established, there are occasional check-ins with the parent to see how they are progressing. The frequency of the check-in call depends on the case. Calls are also made if there is any type of significant event in their case such as hearings and support reviews.

Developing these relationships has been rewarding for our office. Many of our parents' perceptions of the FOC have changed and they better understand what we do. By removing some of these roadblocks, several father-child relationships have had a chance to begin. For instance, one father began a GED program, and another entered a treatment program for substance abuse. Fathers are making a more concerted effort to play a role in their children's lives.

Increased father involvement was the one goal that we felt (and continue to feel) the most passionate about. The effect of fatherless children is becoming an epidemic in our country and the statistics are staggering. The result of children without fathers is linked to:

- ◇ 63 percent of youth suicides [*US D.H.H.S., Bureau of the Census*].
- ◇ 71 percent of pregnant teenagers [*U.S. Department of Health and Human Services press release, Friday, March 26, 1999*].
- ◇ 85 percent of all youth who exhibit behavior disorders [*Center for Disease Control*].
- ◇ 71 percent of all high school dropouts [*National Principals Association Report on the State of High Schools*].
- ◇ 75 percent of all adolescents in chemical abuse centers [*Rainbows for all God's Children*].
- ◇ 85 percent of all youths sitting in prison [*Fulton County Georgia jail populations, Texas Department of Corrections, 1992*].

THE PUNDIT

Editors

Paul Gehm

Editorial Staff

Stacy Selleck

Leland Mack, Jr.

April Liwanag

Joy Etinfoh

Nicole Searle

Sean Soard

Trisha Cuellar

Friend of the Court Bureau Contacts

Steven Capps, Director
cappss@courts.mi.gov

Bill Bartels, Management Analyst
bartelsb@courts.mi.gov

Daniel Bauer, Management Analyst
bauerd@courts.mi.gov

Timothy Cole, Management Analyst
colet@courts.mi.gov

Suzy Crittenden, Management Analyst
crittendens@courts.mi.gov

Paul Gehm, Management Analyst
gehmp@courts.mi.gov

Elizabeth Stomski, Management Analyst
stomskie@courts.mi.gov

Trisha Cuellar, Administrative Assistant
cuellart@courts.mi.gov

Friend of the Court Bureau

State Court Administrative Office
Michigan Hall of Justice
PO Box 30048
925 North Ottawa
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: 517-373-5975
Fax: 517-373-8740

Early Intervention in Van Buren County (continued from page 2)

With these numbers in mind, we decided there was more we could do. That turned into a class for new dads in the establishment phase offered by our office free of charge. Working closely with Dr. David Potts, we came up with a curriculum that would most benefit dads in this position. The topics include:

- ◇ Communication with the mother of their child.
- ◇ The American epidemic of “fatherless” children.
- ◇ Understanding child support.
- ◇ Ins/outs/misconceptions of the Friend of the Court.

The class ran for six weeks and was well-attended. Even when dealing with emotional issues, by the end everyone seemed to understand that they were involved in a partnership to raise their children. They realized they could risk their child’s wellbeing if they were unable to find a way to get along with their partner.

The first class was a success and the Early Intervention Program shows improvements. It can be a challenge to get dads to see their way through the anger and frustration of the situation, because the fear of fatherhood can make ignoring the responsibility a feasible option. Fatherhood is an experience filled with pain, anger, disappointment, and regret; however, it also is an adventure filled with boundless joy, wonder, pride, and an indescribable love. This program helps dads to achieve this understanding, and is in the process of creating a better relationship between fathers and the FOC office.



Winner of the Name the New Guideline Calculator Application Contest

Congratulations to Lauren Fodor, a Casework Assistant at Kent Co. Friend of the Court Office, for submitting the winning entry to the New Guideline Calculator Application Contest. Anonymous judges from three different counties reviewed over 40 entries, and chose the winning name, *MiChildSupport Calculator*. Lauren received gift cards to several popular restaurants for submitting the winning entry.

The new MiCSES support calculation application will be released later this year with Lauren’s distinctive title. The Program Leadership Group sends their thanks to everyone who participated and offered entries, and to Bill Bartels for suggesting the contest.



Previous issues of The Pundit can be accessed online at
<http://courts.mi.gov/administration/scao/officesprograms/foc/pages/pundit.aspx>

Using Friend of the Court Supervision

By James Raber, Friend of the Court Director, Charlevoix County

Charlevoix County uses friend of the court (FOC) supervision as an alternative to incarceration through a contempt finding during enforcement proceedings. In order to avoid a cycle of show cause enforcement with no progress in the case that results in more show cause cases, our office began the supervision program late in 2014. To date, individuals on the supervision caseload have experienced an improved relationship.

One of the internal advantages is that our support investigators can turn over the supervision cases to the supervision officer. This essentially removes the case from the hundreds of cases each investigator handles for more active monitoring. In the past, a typical enforcement pattern has included a referee's hearing, followed by a recommendation that usually requires payment within 30 to 60 days, or an appearance in front of the judge for sentencing. During this show cause contempt waiting period, we often had little or no contact from the client. After the waiting period, a judge's hearing is held that often results in a bench warrant for nonappearance. This process could take as long as three months from start to finish. Utilizing FOC supervision with an order for immediate arrest for violation has shortened compliance/arrest time by approximately 30 days.

So far, the most common issue that has show cause cases in supervision is employment difficulties. We often utilize the supervision option in coordination with our employment specialist to enhance and increase the monitoring of our clients. The use of supervision, in connection with our employment specialist, has been the most common and effective tool within the supervision order. Our supervision order has allowed us to address case-specific issues, such as drug/alcohol problems and mental health concerns. We monitor these issues with court-ordered contact (by phone or in person) at a frequency that is appropriate to the individual.

One of our first supervision cases was subsequent to an arrest on a bench warrant. We'd had no contact with the client for several years. The client was placed on FOC supervision for 90 days and required to report once a week by phone. Additional requirements included a payment within seven days, proof of job seeking, and a mandatory appointment with our employment specialist. This resulted in verified employment within two weeks, which we monitored weekly for the remainder of the supervision to ensure continued compliance. We are now receiving payments on a regular basis.

Issues such as mental health, alcohol or drugs can be monitored through court-ordered counseling and in-person reporting requirements for a face-to-face assessment each week. The order may also provide for random or scheduled PBTs (breathalyzer test). Communication issues affecting parenting time can also be addressed through a parenting class, or parties can be ordered into our Coparenting Communication class.

Length of supervision can vary from 30 days to 90 days depending on the case needs. One client was placed on nonreporting supervision for 30 days with the requirement to pay his account in full. Another was placed on supervision for 90 days and ordered into outpatient treatment for his alcohol addiction. He was also ordered to sign releases so his progress could be monitored. When supervision is completed, the client will receive a letter from the supervision officer releasing the client from supervision, completing the enforcement chain.

Although a small sample size, the initial results appear to be favorable – only one supervision case had to go back before the court. FOC supervision created a more cooperative atmosphere for clients and most had a positive reaction to the supervision and the additional one-on-one contact to address their employment challenges.



The Pundit provides information on current issues to Michigan child support staff. The Pundit is not intended to provide legal advice and does not represent the opinions of the Michigan Supreme Court or the State Court Administrative Office.

Introducing the Child Support Information Card



We are pleased to introduce the new Child Support Information Card. The card was designed in response to IV-D program partner feedback, requests, and suggestions from the Customer Service themed Partner Forum. In addition, the card is in alignment with the Michigan Child Support Program Strategic Goal of Customer Service and the need for respectful education and timely communication to clients. The new Child Support Information Card will be replacing the old IVR and MiCase cards, and will provide additional information for clients regarding MiSDU.com, US Bank Relia-Card, OCS and SCAO. In a few weeks, each county will be receiving a small batch of these customized cards to see how they work and what can be improved or tailored to each county. The cost, including shipping, will be covered by OCS/MDHHS.

To order additional cards for your county, please contact Elizabeth Stomski at StomskiE@courts.mi.gov with your county contact information and the quantity requested. Cards are shipped in groups of 500.

Navigating the Transition to UIFSA 2008

Changes are in store for the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA). UIFSA applies in all cases where the parties reside in separate states or where one party resides in a different country.

UIFSA insures there is only one controlling order between each parent and child at a time. The first state to enter a valid support order is the issuing state of the controlling order, which controls any prospective current support. As long as an individual party or the child resides in the issuing state, that state retains the exclusive jurisdiction to modify. Another state can acquire continuing exclusive jurisdiction by properly modifying the order as laid out in UIFSA.

Michigan currently uses the 1996 version of UIFSA, but the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act of 2014 requires all states to adopt the 2008 version by January 1, 2016. These changes are intended to provide a uniform procedure for parents and guardians to establish child support orders throughout the United States and foreign countries.

The most noticeable change is the addition of sections pertaining solely to support orders in other countries. There is also language throughout the original articles indicating the applicability to foreign countries, as well. Another important change increases the time frame for support enforcement agencies to notify petitioners of communication from other tribunals from two days to five days. Each state was permitted to set its own time frame within certain federal limits, and Michigan's Child Support Program decided to extend the time frame three additional days to allow the friend of the court offices more time to process communications from other tribunals.

The Michigan Child Support Program has been working closely with the Legislature to get UIFSA 2008 introduced and passed by the federal deadline. Michigan Office of Child Support Policy and the Friend of the Court Bureau have been working with the Intergovernmental Work Improvement Team (WIT) to determine what policy changes will need to be made once the bill becomes an effective law in 2016.

For more information, the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement has the text of UIFSA 2008 and related information at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/css/resource/uniform-interstate-family-support-act-2008>. Questions regarding the upcoming changes can be directed to Elizabeth Stomski at stomskie@courts.mi.gov or Carly Saunders at saundersC5@michigan.gov.



Child Support Program Succeeds in Engaging Parents to Improve Children's Lives

The Child Support Program continues to flourish. In implementing the five-year strategic plan, the Program accomplished several important goals in the last year. The current year's goals are also set and prioritized. Of the seven strategic goals, the following four goals are high-priority areas: business process, support payment (improving collections), customer service, and technology. All of these accomplishments and upcoming goals are geared toward engaging parents to improve children's lives.

Friend of the Court Director Steve Capps adds, "I am very excited about the opportunities new legislation and pilot projects have provided to the child support program to tailor services to the family's conditions instead of approaching families with a 'one-size-fits-all' approach."

In 2014, the Program focused on the high-priority strategic goals to drive the Program forward. The following lists the accomplishments by strategic goal for 2014:

Customer Service

- ◇ Implemented a new Support Specialist Interactive Voice Response telephone system – the first of its kind in Michigan – resulting in a 54 percent reduction in total support-specialist call volume due to resolving the issue on the first-call.
- ◇ Upgraded MiChildSupport (formerly MiCase), which now encompasses all portal offerings and includes database consolidation, allowing real-time access to MiCSES data.
- ◇ Deployed the Child Support Verification Tool to assist agencies with child support verification.
- ◇ Reintroduced VISA as a credit card payment option for payers, for ease of payments.

Business Process

- ◇ Helped enact state legislation to address the following issues, among others.
- ◇ Pre-Assistance Cooperation. Allows the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to reject assistance applicants before receiving their first benefits if they fail to cooperate with child support.
- ◇ Consolidated Services. Allows prosecuting attorneys and DHHS to transfer responsibilities to the friend of the court (FOC), a county attorney, or a DHHS attorney.
- ◇ Genetic Parentage Act. Allows positive genetic testing as the basis for establishing the father with notice to Vital Records, and removes the need for an affidavit of parentage or court action.

Several county projects were also started, including the Acquiring DNA and Paternity Timely (ADAPT) project in Genesee County. The County works with Hurley Hospital to expedite establishment of legal paternity and parental responsibility for children born to unwed mothers.

Support Payment (improving collections)

- ◇ Completed a predictive modeling pilot in August of 2014 that will help identify cases for action and best use of Program resources.
- ◇ Increased overall collections by more than \$16 million from FY 2013.

Technology

- ◇ Enhanced the case intake procedure to automatically process child support applications (e1201) received through MiChildSupport.
- ◇ Completed four major MiCSES releases.

The Program looks to build on its success in 2015. The following are the higher priorities within the strategic goals and Work Improvement Teams (WITs). Case management will focus on:

- ◇ Locating updates by identifying and using new federal, state, county, and private sources, as well as modifications, to allow the system to automatically upload data and take the next step.

Child Support Program Succeeds in Engaging Parents to Improve Children's Lives

(continued from page 6)

- ◇ Stratifying the caseload using predictive modeling to place cases into categories to identify where resources are best used, such as early intervention prior to order establishment or appropriate enforcement actions in the following categories:
 - 1) able and willing to pay;
 - 2) unable but willing to pay;
 - 3) able but unwilling to pay; and
 - 4) unable and unwilling to pay.

Enforcement priorities include:

- ◇ Review and modification to improve automation and efficiency. Pursue opportunities to gather income information and other federally-approved automated processes.
- ◇ Improve the interface between the Unemployment Insurance Agency (UIA) and MiCSES to address issues with unemployment income withholding and other related issues.
- ◇ Become a "one-stop" resource for sources of income by making it easier for employers (sources of income) to communicate with the FOCB staff.

Establishment work includes:

- ◇ Work to provide genetic testing at hospitals, as is being done at Hurley Hospital through Genesee County's ADAPT program. The high likelihood that both parents will be at the birth of a child provides unwed parents the opportunity to sign paternity affidavits or use genetic testing to establish the father.
- ◇ Focus on cutting delays by allowing prosecuting attorney and friend of the court offices to create a IV-D case.
- ◇ Improve the establishment workflow, particularly through case action referral (CAR) improvements and fixes, by addressing timeliness and efficiency issues, while giving appropriate abilities to prosecuting offices and friends of the court.

Financial efforts include:

- ◇ Monitor system reconciliation obligor account activities by creating an account-ledger methodology to help balance all activities against an obligor's account.
- ◇ Prorate the monthly support amount by automating the process to simplify work on staff from manually calculating a partial month obligation (order starts or emancipation occurs within a month).
- ◇ Distribute large allocations by having the system allocate to all of a payer's cases based on how much is owed at the payer/docket level before using the distribution hierarchy.

Other priorities:

- ◇ Modify obligations. Streamline and reduce the time-sensitive work of order entry.
- ◇ Identify the most effective enforcement remedy. Many friends of the court do not have the information they need to effectively enforce support orders and are left to rely on incarceration (or the threat of), which is not always the best result.
- ◇ Improve customer self-service. Help provide customers with all of the information they need and reduce costs of distributing that information.
- ◇ Implement UIFSA 2008. Federal law requires all states to adopt the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) 2008 to ensure a consistent mechanism for implementing and enforcing child support obligations with countries that are signatories of the Hague Treaty. See article on page 5.

**THE LEGAL CORNER**

A summary of recent Michigan Supreme Court and Michigan Court of Appeals decisions, and a summary of recent Michigan IV-D memoranda.

MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS DECISIONS

PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED SEE: <http://courts.mi.gov/courts/coa/opinions/pages/zipfiles.aspx>

Demski v. Petlick, published per curiam, released March 5, 2015. (Docket No. 322193). In an action to revoke paternity, the court is free, but is not required, to consider the best interest factors set forth in the child custody act, MCL 722.23, in its assessment under MCL 722.1443(4).

Kaeb v. Kaeb, published, released March 12, 2015. (Docket No. 319574). Where the requested relief is not a change in custody or change in parenting time, but rather a change in a condition of exercising parenting time that the movant claims is no longer necessary, the court should have applied a lesser, more flexible understanding of “proper cause” and heard the case based on the movant’s offer of proof attached to the motion.

Adler v. Dormio, published per curiam, released March 19, 2015. (Docket No. 319608). An affiliated father who obtains a judgment setting aside paternity under the Revocation of Paternity Act is not barred from seeking relief from arrearages on past-due child support under MCR 2.612(C)(1).

Eickelberg v. Eickelberg, published per curiam, released January 27, 2015, approved for publication March 19, 2015. (Docket No. 318840). The focus of MCL 722.31(1) requiring court approval to move a child 100 miles from the child’s residence is the distance from the child’s legal residence at time of commencement of the action in which the order governing custody is issued, not the child’s legal residence immediately prior to the move.

Holmes v. Brabbs, unpublished per curiam, released January 13, 2015. (Docket No. 322096). A step-uncle has standing to file a custody action as person related by marriage within five degrees when the child’s custodial parent is deceased, the parents were never married, and the other parent did not have legal custody.

Shuryan v. Shuryan, unpublished per curiam, released January 15, 2015. (Docket No. 322491).

If the parties have failed to adhere to their original custody order, it is not error for the court to dissolve a temporary order for supervised parenting time based on unsubstantiated abuse allegations and reinstate the parenting time provisions of their order without holding an evidentiary hearing, without addressing the minor child’s established custodial environment, and without considering the best-interest factors regarding parenting time.

Andary v. Andary, unpublished per curiam, released February 10, 2015. (Docket No 319299). In a custody dispute, where the parents are uncooperative with each other but there is evidence that joint custody is in the best interests of the children, the court may properly award joint custody.

Evans v. Evans, unpublished per curiam, released February 10, 2015. (Docket No. 323126). The term “commencement of an action” in the statute preventing a parent from moving a child more than 100 miles from the child’s residence at the commencement of an action, means the original filing of the action in which the underlying custody order was entered, and not the residence at the time of subsequent motions.

Harger v. Murdock, unpublished per curiam, released February 10, 2015. (Docket No. 323438). If parties have joint legal custody, one parties’ incarceration, or extended incarceration, is not necessarily a material change and does not significantly affect the child’s well-being if the incarcerated parent is still able to make major life decisions regarding the child.

Anderson v. Anderson, unpublished per curiam, released February 24, 2015. (Docket No. 321880). The fact that a party may have mental disabilities or a criminal record does not prevent a court from imputing income where there is no showing that they impacted the party’s ability to obtain employment.

Durbin v. Monday, unpublished per curiam, released March 10, 2015. (Docket No. 322027). A court does not err when it determines that an established custodial environment does not exist with a parent when that parent has been in and out of the marital home throughout the child’s young life, and has not taken the lead in providing basic care for the child when the other parent was working or sleeping.

Akers v. Akers, unpublished per curiam, released March 17, 2015. (Docket No. 323806). In determining whether to grant a parent’s motion to change the child’s domicile, the court need not consider the MCL 722.31(4) factors if the parent has sole legal custody.

**THE LEGAL CORNER** (continued from page 8)

Pearce v. Valente, unpublished per curiam, released March 24, 2015. (Docket No. 318819). Even though parenting time is shared on a week-on/week-off basis, no custodial environment exists where the child does not look to the parent for essential care and emotional support.

Funk v. Funk, unpublished per curiam, released April 2, 2015. (Docket No. 319467). Although the Divorce Act states that a court in a county where either of the parties lives has jurisdiction to entertain the suit, MCL 600.1621 establishes venue in the county where the defendant resides.

Dollen v. Dollen, unpublished per curiam, released April 14, 2015. (Docket Nos. 316457, 318813). Trial court's mathematical error in attempting to divide an estate 50/50 is grounds for overturning distribution.

Freeman v. Baum, Jr., unpublished per curiam, released April 14, 2015. (Docket No. 323941). Trial court clearly erred by failing to make any relevant findings concerning an established custodial environment and by concluding that the child's split time between the two homes precluded an established custodial environment with either or both parties.

Helton v. Beaman, unpublished order, released April 17, 2015. (Docket No. 148927). An order revoking an acknowledgment of parentage is subject to a best interests analysis.

Raymond v. Raymond, unpublished per curiam, released April 21, 2015. (Docket No. 318646). If alcohol use is controlled and does not impact the parent-child relationship, such use is generally not relevant in a best interests determination in a modification of parenting time; however, alcohol use that causes impairment and carries into parenting time may be subject to the court's restriction to serve the child's best interests.

DeLong v. DeLong, unpublished per curiam, released April 2015. (Docket No. 325381). A child's preference is grounds to revisit custody decision only if it has a significant effect on the child's well-being.

Rude v. Rude, unpublished per curiam, released May 5, 2015. (Docket No. 319291). It was not error for the court to award only temporary spousal support when the parties had spent alternate times working or as homemakers in their marriage and where the defendant's main cause for not being employed was a lack of motivation.

MICHIGAN IV-D MEMORANDUM (OFFICE OF CHILD SUPPORT)**2015-001 (January 26, 2015) IV-D Services in Domestic Relations Cases**

This IV-D Memorandum introduces a document that provides guidance to IV-D workers in situations involving IV-D case opening and domestic relations¹ cases. The document, which is presented in a question-and-answer format, discusses various situations related to the application for IV-D services² and case services.

2015-002 (February 18, 2015) Limiting the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES) Local Options Administrator (LOA) User Role, Introduction of the Functional Prototype Queries (FPRO) Worker and Transfer Worker User Roles, and Updates to Section 6.45, "Bench Warrants/LEIN," of the Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual

This IV-D Memorandum introduces policy on the MiCSES LOA user role, including: a description of the LOA role and its privileges; clean-up efforts to reduce the number of LOA users; a new process for IV-D staff to request the LOA role; and auditing of the LOA role. This memorandum also introduces two new MiCSES user roles: FPRO Worker and Transfer Worker. These roles provide privileges that will address the emerging business needs of MiCSES users and help reduce the need to assign the LOA role. Finally, this memorandum introduces a minor update to Section 6.45, "Bench Warrants/LEIN," of the Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual.

2015-003 (March 2, 2015) Proper Recording of IV-D Application Dates and IV-D Case Opening to Ensure Compliance With the Federally Mandated 20-Day Establishment Rule; Child Welfare Referral Updates

This IV-D Memorandum announces revisions to policy regarding the Michigan Child Support Program's federally required collection of application dates to meet the 20-day case opening benchmark for case establishment. In Michigan, IV-D application dates are recorded in the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES). Accurate recording of these dates is critical to meet performance benchmarks.

**THE LEGAL CORNER** (continued from page 9)**2015-004 (February 20, 2015) Introduction of the Data Warehouse Business Objects Income and Location Reports, and Updates to Section 3.45, “Review and Modification,” and Section 4.20, “Support Recommendations and Order Entry,” of the Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual**

This IV-D Memorandum introduces policy surrounding the Member Income and Location Report (MILR) (LC-001) and the Income and Location Report (ILR) (LC-002). These two new Business Objects reports will assist IV-D workers in locate efforts, order establishment, support determinations, review and modification, and enforcement.

This memorandum also obsoletes IV-D Memorandum 2014-033, Updates to the Child Support Recommendation (GUIDLINE Template), Determining End Dates for Child Support Obligations, and Recording Deviations from the Michigan Child Support Formula. Policy in that memorandum regarding the GUIDLINE template revisions has been transferred into this IV-D Memorandum. In addition, policy regarding determining end dates for child support obligations and recording deviations has been incorporated into Sections 3.45 and 4.20.

2015-005 (March 2, 2015) Implementation of the New IV-D Case Closure Process and Case Closure-Related Updates to IV-D Memorandum 2015-001, IV-D Services in Domestic Relations Cases

This IV-D Memorandum introduces the implementation of a new IV-D case closure process with the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES) 8.11 Release on March 6, 2015.

2015-006 (March 11, 2015) Processing the Emergency Release of Passport Denial Through the State Services Portal (SSP) and Updates to Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual Section 6.24, “Passport Denial/Restriction”

This IV-D Memorandum explains the expansion of the SSP’s Federal Collections and Enforcement application to allow electronic requests for the emergency release of passport denial. OCS has revised Section 6.24, “Passport Denial/Restriction,” of the Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual to reflect these changes.

2015-007 (April 13, 2015) Changes to the U.S. Bank ReliaCard Visa (Debit Card)

This IV-D Memorandum announces changes regarding the U.S. Bank ReliaCard Visa. This is the debit card that the Michigan child support program uses as a method for distributing child support payments to families.

2015-008 (March 19, 2015) Renaming of the MiCase Web Portal to the MiChildSupport Portal; Updates to the MiCase Website and Section 1.35, “MiCase,” of the Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual

This IV-D Memorandum introduces the following updates to the MiCase web portal and website that were effective as of October 31, 2014: changing the MiCase portal name to the MiChildSupport portal; and optimizing the MiCase website to be mobile-device responsive.

2015-009 (March 26, 2015) Enforcement Activities and Automated Case Closure

During the implementation of automated case closure, OCS and the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES) team identified impacts to certain enforcement activities. This IV-D Memorandum discusses these enforcement activities that may require a IV-D worker to manually take action either before or after MiCSES automatically closes a case.

2015-010 (April 29, 2015) Performance Factors, Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP), and Updates to the Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual

This IV-D Memorandum announces the following: the introduction of Section 1.30, “Performance Factors, Incentives, and the Data Reliability Audit” of the *Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual*; an update to *Michigan IV-D Child Support Manual*, Section 4.05, “Paternity Establishment”; and the upcoming revision of the Paternity page on mi-support.

2015-011 (May 5, 2015) Billing Coupons on MiCase and Reduction in Billing Coupon Mailings

This IV-D Memorandum announces changes to the process by which the Michigan IV-D program provides billing coupons to eligible non-custodial parents (NCPs). OCS is implementing a plan to make billing coupons available on the MiCase website and reduce the number of billing coupons mailed to NCPs.

**THE LEGAL CORNER** (continued from page 10)**2015-012 (June 5, 2015) Updates to the Cooperative Reimbursement Program (CRP) Combined Agreement (COM)**

This IV-D Memorandum announces updates to the procedures to enter into a CRP COM with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) OCS or terminate a CRP COM and enter into separate FOC and PA CRP agreements with MDHHS-OCS.

2015-013 (June 1, 2015) Updates to Order Establishment, Review and Modification, and Arrears Management Policy, and Introduction of the Court-Referred Support Investigation Process

This IV-D Memorandum explains changes in policy and procedures regarding the order establishment and review and modification processes and introduces the court-referred support investigation process. The Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES) 8.12 Release (June 5, 2015) will implement enhancements to the Review and Modification Processor (REVP) screen. The enhancements will improve the usability of the review and modification activity, create the support investigation activity, and automate certain steps within the activities.

2015-014 (June 2, 2015) Letter to Employers, Non-Custodial Parents (NCPs), and Custodial Parties (CPs) Regarding Notice of Rescission/Termination of Health Care Coverage (FEN308) Mailing Error

In March and April of 2015, the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES) sent several hundred FEN308s in error to employers, NCPs, and CPs. OCS will mail these recipients a letter on June 10, 2015, explaining the mailing error. This IV-D Memorandum discusses the FEN308 mailing error, the affected recipients, and OCS's response to the situation.

2015-015 (June 15, 2015) Updated Child Support Forms and Publications; Obsolete Amnesty Program Communications

This IV-D Memorandum announces revisions to several forms and publications maintained by the Michigan Office of Child Support (OCS) and used by the Michigan IV-D program. The changes affect forms that are maintained in the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES) as well as forms that are not maintained in MiCSES.

The forms have been updated to reflect the merger of the Department of Human Services (DHS) and the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), which occurred in April 2015. The revised forms include the new agency name, the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), and will be available on June 19, 2015 after 5 p.m.

≈