

ERICSA

CELEBRATES **50** YEARS
OF SERVING FAMILIES: THE
MAGIC
IS STILL ALIVE



Large Jurisdiction Workshop

ERICSA Large Jurisdictions

Frances Pardus-abbadessa
Executive Deputy Commissioner,
Human Resources Administration
Office of Child Support Enforcement

May 22, 2013

AGENDA

- Brief Overview of the NYC Child Support Program
- Training and Procedures – challenges and solutions
- Locating NCPs – challenges and solutions

NYC Child Support Program

OCSE Program Statistics

	NYC			NYS		
	CY 2010	CY2011	CY2012	CY 2010	CY2011	CY2012
Average Caseload	403,606	403,925	408,221	937,619	947,994	956,758
Cases w/Orders	287,691	282,093	286,847	755,231	757,181	767,166
PEP	69.93%	71.48%	73.93%	82.12%	82.43%	83.44%
SEP	71.28%	69.84%	70.27%	80.55%	79.87%	80.18%
Collections on Current	71.24%	69.53%	70.51%	75.71%	75.28%	75.27%
Collections on Arrears	43.12%	42.64%	41.94%	47.43%	46.08%	45.26%
Cost Effectiveness	Unavailable	\$10.88	\$11.71	\$4.69	\$5.47	Unavailable

NYC Child Support Program

- 408,000 cases and 70 % or about 300,000 have a child support order in place
- In CY 2012, collected \$739 million, assisting 1/4 of a million NYC children
- Approximately 800 staff who are located in 11 offices throughout the City, including every Family court
- Organized by functional area – no case ownership

Training & Procedures: The Problem

With the exception of our intake division, there were few if any procedures & training in place to instruct staff on how to carry out their various tasks.

- Lack of uniformity in performing work
- Lack of conformance with policies
- Seemingly a lot of errors
- Work not aligned with best practices
- Difficult to hold staff accountable for errors
- Unclear expectations
- Diminished staff morale
- Lack of understanding as to why a particular task is performed

Training & Procedures: The Challenge

- Magnitude of the problem
- Complexity of the issue
- Creating procedures that are simple and easy to follow
- Getting seasoned staff to use procedures as a tool to perform their work
- Getting seasoned staff to break their old habits

Training & Procedures: The Benefits

- Improve services to the CPs & NCPs we serve
 - Better case maintenance/processing
 - Fewer financial & nonfinancial errors
- Improve overall performance
- Hold staff accountable
- Improve staff morale
- Consistency in day-to-day operational activities
- Allow staff to understand their roles and responsibilities
- Improve overall knowledge and understanding of the program

Training & Procedures: The Solution

- Partnered with NYC's City University of New York in 2008
 - Procedure development
 - Curriculum design and course development
 - Course delivery
 - Classroom
 - eLearning

Training & Procedures: The Setbacks

- Steep learning curve for CUNY staff with limited to no child support knowledge
- Poorly defined scope...too broad
- Significant time commitment of senior managers
- Policy issues arise when developing and reengineering processes
- Procedures are needed to develop curriculum for most courses
- Lengthy delays in developing procedures & delivering courses

Training & Procedures: Best Practices

- Clearly define scope
- Define a change control process so scope can expand only with approval
- Limit process re-engineering
- Clearly define course learning objectives upfront
- Create learning paths by worker title within division
- Define Level 2 Evaluation Questions during design stage
- Proper Sequencing of Events:

**Workflow
Analysis**

**Procedure
Development**

**Curriculum
Development**

Course Delivery

Training & Procedures: Evaluation

Apply Kirkpatrick Model – the first 3 steps of evaluation

STEP 1

Reaction – Elicit general feedback on the course..feel good

STEP 2

Learning – Administer pre and post test..knowledge gain during training

STEP 3

Behavior – Applied learning..several months later on the job

Training & Procedures: The Results

Concentrated efforts in Borough Offices, Fiscal Operations and Enforcement

- **14 procedures** published
 - Average procedure size: 185 pages
- **9 courses** developed
 - 1,273 OCSE staff trained
 - 123 training sessions facilitated
- Complete Level 2 Evaluation all course
 - Clear Knowledge gain
- Level 3 Evaluation Underway



Locating NCPs: The Problem

- NCP locate leads were received from multiple electronic sources & delivered through inter-office mail to four local offices in multiple paper reports
- Offices divided individual reports & distributed to staff to take action
- Process was inefficient & lengthy
- No way to control whether work was completed or completed timely
- No way to measure results

Locating NCPs: The Challenge

- The inefficiency of the process meant we were likely missing out on obtaining court orders
- This issue was core to improving our support establishment rate and increasing collections

Locating NCPs: The Solution

A Centralized Locate Unit



- All address leads are sent electronically to one central location
- A computer system was designed to track all leads & collect outcomes by worker
- All verified addresses electronically transmitted to 4 local offices for processing
- Local office activity tracked electronically

Locating NCPs: The Benefits

- Eliminated lost time in both delivery & distribution
- Created uniformity and allowed for the establishment of best practices in how staff reviewed quality of address
- Allowed work to be tracked by staff person
- Allowed outcomes to be tracked
- Ensured work was completed timely

Locating NCPs: The Setbacks

- It took time to create the system
- It took time for the local offices to buy-in
 - Resisted helping develop the system
 - Re-worked a case referred by centralized locate.
- Reports initially designed inefficiently.
- Prior leads that were determined poor kept being returned. (This has since been controlled for.)

Locating NCPs: The Results

Total cases processed in CY2012: 13,633

- Represents an increase of 240% since CY2009

Total cases referred to local offices in CY2012:
5,458 or 40%

- Major reasons why cases cannot be referred to the local offices:
 - Postal Clearance Sent
 - Case Previously Worked By CLU
 - NCP Incarcerated
 - Not Court Referable
 - CA/MA Closed

Locating NCPs: The Results

Total cases local offices refer to court CY2012:
4,830 or 91%

- Major reasons why cases referred to the local offices are not referred to court:
 - Case already in court
 - Intact family case
 - CA/MA Closed
- Total cases with court order & payment
 - Lack of court data prevents us from knowing the true effectiveness of this initiative

Questions

