

4-1990

Nebraska Department of Social Services' Child Support Enforcement Unit Demonstration Project: Final Evaluation Report

Chris Marshall
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Vincent J. Webb
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives>

 Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Marshall, Chris and Webb, Vincent J., "Nebraska Department of Social Services' Child Support Enforcement Unit Demonstration Project: Final Evaluation Report" (1990). *Publications Archives, 1963-2000*. 336.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives/336>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Public Affairs Research at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications Archives, 1963-2000 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES'
CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT UNIT
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT:

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT


APRIL, 1990

Chris E. Marshall
Vincent J. Webb

with Tracy L. Anderson,
Kelly M. Green, and
Susanne M. Roach


PROJECT CODIRECTORS: Vincent J. Webb, Chris E. Marshall

CENTER FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS RESEARCH DIRECTOR: Russell L. Smith




Acknowledgments

This evaluation study was conducted by staff members at the Center for Public Affairs Research and faculty and staff members of the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. In preparation of this report, Tim Humberger and Joseph Baldassano assisted with data processing activities; Margaret McDonald Rasmussen edited several versions of the manuscript; and Joyce Carson and Sandra Jensen accomplished the word processing activities for the report.



Contents

	Page
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
The Demonstration Project	1
The Plan of the Report	2
CHAPTER II: UPDATE OF <u>INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT</u>	3
Data from CSE-70 Form	3
Data Related to ADC Cases	3
Data Related to ADC and Foster Care Cases	4
Data Related to Non-ADC Cases	6
Compiled Data from PDS100, PDS110, PDS111, CSE-35, CSE-36, and CSE-37 Forms	8
Working Assumptions and Decisions	8
Aggregate Data Analysis	9
Individual Data Analysis	12
CHAPTER III: STAFF INTERVIEWS	14
Hastings Regional Office	14
Office Structure and Background	14
Individual Worker Interviews--Highlights	16
Intake Interviewer	16
Parent Location Specialist	18
Skip Tracer/Location Worker	18
Phone Contactor/Collector	19
Establishment/Enforcement Worker	20
Supervisor	21
Attorney	22
Fremont Regional Office	22
Office Structure and Background	22
Individual Worker Interviews--Highlights	23
Worker Number One	23
Worker Number Two	24
Worker Number Three	24
Supervisor	25
CHAPTER IV: SUPPLEMENTARY DATA SETS	26
Client Survey	26
Description	26
Selected Highlights	26
Hastings Telephone Logs	28
Description	28
Selected Highlights	28
CHAPTER V: EVALUATION HYPOTHESES	30
Description of the Sample	30
Examination of the Hypotheses	31
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION	45
APPENDICES	48



CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

In July 1987, the Nebraska Department of Social Services successfully applied to the U.S. Family Support Administration's Office of Child Support Enforcement for funds to conduct a Demonstration Project. This Demonstration Project, "The Nebraska IV-D/IV-A Intake and Phone Collection Project," was designed to increase telephone activities and improve intake practice as part of the ongoing child support collection activities. It was expected that such improvements would result in an increased level of absent parent location and an increased level of child support payment.

As part of the requirements for funding of the Nebraska Demonstration Project, an evaluation component was included. To design the evaluation component, the Nebraska DSS contracted with MAXIMUS, a management consulting firm operating out of Falls Church, Virginia. MAXIMUS developed a general evaluation framework for the Nebraska Demonstration Project. A central, stated goal of the MAXIMUS design was the utilization of data that already existed within DSS data bases, thereby enabling the most rigorous evaluation possible for the least cost.

The authors of the present report submitted a proposal to carry out the actual evaluation of the Demonstration Project. In both the proposal and the implementation of the evaluation, we have attempted to follow the MAXIMUS design as closely as possible. Although there exist some differences between the MAXIMUS evaluation design and the actual evaluation, we consider them to be minor and to have no significant impact on the overall conclusions of the evaluation. The present document is the Final Report of the evaluation component of the Nebraska IV-D/IV-A Intake and Phone Collection Project.

The Demonstration Project

The Demonstration Project involved two main organizational changes in the DSS office chosen for the experiment: (1) the implementation of a special Child Support Enforcement (CSE) intake process, and (2) the implementation of a telephone contact/collection unit with personnel specially trained in soliciting child support payment and helping to expedite the process of establishing an order of support from the absent parent. It was expected that these two changes would help improve the experience of a local CSE office in terms of more and quicker locations of absent,

parents, establishment of paternity in cases of unknown parentage, and more regular payment histories of the payors among other things. The implementation of these activities was accomplished in the Department of Social Services' Hastings Regional Office. The Fremont Regional Office, because of its similarity to the Hastings Office on many qualities, was chosen as a comparison site for the Evaluation Component.

The Plan of the Report

The authors of the report intend that the many dimensions of the original evaluation framework laid out by MAXIMUS, Inc. be realized herein. The reader is supplied with a substantial, number of tables, charts, etc. Perhaps this report will provide, in addition to evaluation results pertaining directly to the Demonstration Project, useful information for other, related issues of interest to CSE office operations.

Chapter II updates the information provided in the earlier "Interim Progress Report." That earlier information only included data through April of 1989. With receipt of the DSS data from the last three months of the Demonstration Project--May, June, and July of 1989--we are now able to analyze data for the entire Demonstration Project.

One portion of the evaluation project has been the interview of staff personnel in the Hastings and Fremont Regional Offices. In Chapter III, a discussion of this aspect of the evaluation is provided.

Chapter IV sets forth a description of the client survey conducted in the summer of 1989 and provides some of the highlights of that survey.

Chapter V provides an analysis of the hypotheses from the original MAXIMUS report. These hypotheses are key to the conclusions regarding the success of the Demonstration Project.

Finally, in Chapter VI, we set forth our own conclusions regarding the Demonstration Project. Suggestions for future consideration are also tendered in this last chapter.

CHAPTER II: UPDATE OF INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT

In the Interim Progress Report we provided preliminary findings from the DSS data. In the present chapter, we update that report through the concluding month of the Demonstration Project, July 1989. We have used three main sets of data. The first main body of data was obtained from copies of original CSE-70 forms. The second body of data is composed of selected information from DSS PDS100, PDS110, and PDS111 forms. The third set of information was selected from the Department's CSE-35, CSE-36, and CSE-37 forms.

Data from CSE-70 Form

NOTE: Appendix A (Figure A.1 through Figure A.18) contains figures and tables that represent the following data.

In the data derived from the DSS CSE-70 form, case counts are provided for the Hastings and Fremont regional areas; there is, however, no breakdown by local offices within these regional areas. The baseline period for data included here extends from June 1987 through May 1988.

Data Related to ADC Cases

Figure A.1: Total Number of Open ADC Arrears Only Cases Continued from the Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989. The Hastings portion of Figure A.1 shows a distinct change over time. In September, the total arrears case load was 547; in October, it jumped to 1,066, an increase of 94.9 percent. In contrast, Fremont's values stay right at the baseline value with virtually no fluctuation. In the Interim Progress Report, it was thought that changes in the Hastings office might have influenced the level of arrears. However, the data from February through July 1989 indicate that this interpretation was premature. The period from February through July 1989 demonstrates that the arrears cases carried over from the previous month in the Hastings office fell back in line with the pre-October 1988 level. If the Demonstration Project had any effect at all, it was a short-lived one.

Figure A.2: Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Opened During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Many of the months displayed no newly opened ADC arrears cases at all. CSE-70 data supplemental to those present in Figure A.2 show that, in Hastings, the mean number of cases from the period January 1988 through May 1988 was 19; however, in June 1988 the number dropped all the way back to 0. In December 1988, a suddenly large number of ADC arrears only cases was opened. It is not clear what caused this sudden increase.

Figure A.3: Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. The Hastings offices operated under the baseline level during the entire focal time period. The Fremont office did have three months at a greater-than-baseline level, but then, in July 1989, returned to the baseline level. The increased activity of the attorney for the Fremont CSE office, reported in the staff interviews, may have helped in getting the ADC arrears cases closed.

Figure A.4: Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. In Hastings a large increase occurs from 543 cases in September 1988 to 1,064 cases in October 1988; an increase of 95.9 percent. In the Fremont office, the number of cases in the critical period runs right at the baseline level. This pattern is similar to that observed in Figure A.1, "Total Open ADC Arrears Cases from the Previous Month." It was thought in the Interim Progress Report that that occurrence may have indicated that the Hastings office staff may have become less likely to close cases than they were prior to the Demonstration Project. The data from January through July 1989 seem to lessen the likelihood of that earlier interpretation. There was, at least, no long-term effect on open ADC arrears cases.

Figure A.5: Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. In Hastings, locations increased starting in September 1988 but dropped back to the baseline level in January 1989. The locations remained at or near the baseline for the remainder of the Demonstration Project, indicating no long-lived effect of the Project. It is possible a special effort was made in the Hastings office to clean up remaining open location cases in the fall, which would lead to such a peak and sudden drop-off. In the majority of the months under study, locations in Fremont fall below the baseline standard.

Data Related to ADC and Foster Care Cases

Figure A.6: Total Number of Open ADC and Foster Care Cases Continued from the Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Figure A.6 demonstrates a large jump in the number of open ADC and foster care cases continued from the previous month in the Hastings office, while Fremont showed a very gradual, small increase in cases over the time periods examined. In the post-February 1989 data, though, the experiences of both offices returned to the baseline level, indicating little or no effect of the Demonstration Project on this factor.

Figure A.7: Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Opened During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. The Hastings part of Figure A.7 shows an increase similar to that in Figure A.6. The largest leap in the Hastings office occurred from 81 in October 1988 to 133 in November 1988--an increase of 64.2 percent. After December, the values declined from a high point of 142 to 113 (-20.4 percent), and remained at or near the baseline level. The Fremont office reported a fairly steady pattern of opened cases, with most months below the baseline and only two--April and May 1989--above the baseline.

Figure A.8: Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Closings occurred with a greater frequency in the Hastings office than in the Fremont office over virtually the entire focal time period. The Fremont office has consistently closed fewer cases than during the baseline period. Hastings, though also under the baseline level for the majority of months, rose well above that level in November and December, but then returned to the baseline level or below for the remainder of the Demonstration Project period.

Figure A.9: Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Once again, October in the Hastings office presented a big increase in cases over the September period. The change from 656 cases in September to 1,348 cases in October constituted a 105.5 percent increase. However, after January 1989, the level returned to near, but above, the baseline level. The Fremont office operated above the baseline level from June 1988 through July 1989. The experiences of the Hastings and Fremont offices seem to suggest that both offices were keeping more ADC and Foster Care cases open longer than during the baseline period, thereby making the Demonstration Project an unlikely influencing force.

Figure A.10: Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases in which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Figure A.10 gives vivid evidence that a change in absent parent locations has taken place in the Hastings office--an impact of the Demonstration Project. After a brief two months in which the locations stayed at the baseline level, an increase occurred beginning in August 1988. In October 1988 the case load increased by 65.6 percent (from 93 to 154 cases); it peaked in November at 170 locations; then it declined again in December and January, still remaining considerably above the baseline. However, in February 1989 and thereafter a decline in the total AP locations is notable and leads one to believe that, if there was a real effect of the Demonstration Project on this factor, it was a very short one.

In the Fremont office, little changed over the focal period. The baseline started 57.8 percent lower than at Hastings, and locations have remained at a relatively constant level.

Figure A.11: Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Children for Whom Paternity Was Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.

Figure A.11, although showing some rather radical fluctuations, must be examined with caution: the absolute number of children is 10 or fewer, so a change of even 1 child between adjacent time periods might look significant and a change of 3 might look quite large. Hastings in October 1988 shows an increase of eight children's paternity establishments over the previous month--an increase of 400 percent. Comparisons to the baseline reveal that, in the Hastings office, the number of children for whom paternity was established was at a greater-than-baseline level for all months except one. In Fremont, several months fell below the baseline.

Figure A.12: Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Support Obligations Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. October 1988 and January 1989 had particularly high support obligation establishments in Hastings. But once again, the increases might be exaggerated due to the small number of cases involved. These peaks seem to appear at three-month intervals, possibly indicating a cyclical attention to this type of case. Hastings remains above the baseline level for all but one month.

Data Related to Non-ADC Cases

Figure A.13: Total Number of Open Non-ADC Cases from Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989. October 1988 seemed to produce a significant increase in Hastings cases. Between September and October 1988, the number of cases increased from 912 to 1,829 (an increase of 100.5 percent). However, after January 1989, the number of open non-ADC cases fell below the baseline. This seems to suggest that no real lasting effect of the Demonstration Project took place. In Fremont, there was very little fluctuation about the baseline during the focal period.

Figure A.14: Total Number of Non-ADC Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. In Hastings the key period appears to be October through December 1988; the formal closings in this period are well above the baseline. However, following January 1989, the closings fall below the baseline and remain there. This may be a function of the practice of keeping cases open to allow more time for the improved location mechanisms of the Demonstration

Project to work. The variation from the baseline standard--either over or under--does not appear great enough to be of any real significance. The Fremont results also show little variation from the baseline.

Figure A.15: Total Number of Non-ADC Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Here, again, the October through January values in Hastings are considerably above the baseline. The increase from September to October is from 945 case to 1,833, or 94.0 percent. However, from February 1989 through the end of the Demonstration Project, the number of non-ADC cases open at the end of the month falls below the baseline level. Perhaps the practice of retaining cases on open status in the Hastings office had discontinued by this time. In the Fremont office, the values remain quite close to the baseline throughout the evaluation period.

Figure A.16: Total Number of Non-ADC Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. The Hastings office once again appears to show a major change for part of the Demonstration Project period, but post-January 1989 differences with the Fremont office are much smaller. Locations through January 1989 are consistently higher than the baseline. In the Interim Progress Report, a cautionary note was mentioned: in the three months preceding June 1988, the case counts were 6 (March 1988), 8 (April 1988), and 21 (May 1988). The above-baseline values notable on the Hastings portion of Figure A.16 may have been a part of a gradual increase or trend rather than the result of practices associated with the Demonstration Project. The post-January figures seem to bear out the interpretation that there has been no real, lasting change in the level of non-ADC case locations reported. The Fremont office remains, for the most part, at or slightly below the baseline.

Figure A.17: Total Number of Non-ADC Children for Whom Paternity Was Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. The Hastings section of Figure A.17 displays an increased level of paternity establishments from October 1988 through January 1989 and a large peak in February 1989; but the small real values preclude considering the leaps and falls as very significant or long term. Fremont established no paternities for non-ADC children during many months of the focal period.

Figure A.18: Total Number of Non-ADC Support Obligations Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989. Figure A.18 shows the Hastings office at the baseline value with a count of one case in only two months (September 1988 and July 1989); the remaining months were greater than the baseline value. The Fremont office had monthly counts greater

than the baseline for several months, however, the baseline was zero and the raw counts were small. At virtually all points in time, the gross case count of the Hastings office was greater than that of the Fremont office.

**Compiled Data from PDS100, PDS110, PDS111,
CSE-35, CSE-36, and CSE-37 Forms**

NOTE: Appendix B (Table B.1 through Table B.17) contains figures and tables that represent these data.

Working Assumptions and Decisions

Following the format recommended in the original Maximus report, the evaluators constructed tables in which a baseline set of information, derived from the pre-Demonstration Project period, June 1987 through May 1988, is followed by the three most recent time periods for which data are available. In the Interim Progress Report, the data were available through April 1989; the present report enables examination of data through July 1989, the final month of the Demonstration Project.

The original information from the PDS-series and CSE-series forms is a complete, gross record of the DSS overall case load. It includes each time a client requests ADC in addition to each time his/her case is reopened. Also, in foster care cases, several children may be recorded for one parent. The result is that the overall data often contain recurrent instances of the same person and/or that person's dependents over the course of the study period. For the first part of the analysis, the entire body of data, regardless of the previously described repetition, is used. This approach to the analysis is accomplished because it represents the total real expended effort on the part of office staff. Such accounting provides an office-wide barometer of the gross level of activity, regardless of the types of cases involved. In the present report, data approached in this manner are referred to as "aggregate data." The gross number of cases per month handled by both the Hastings and Fremont Regional Areas together has increased from 1,896 to 2,313 (22.0 percent); for the Hastings Regional Area alone, the increase for the same period was 959 to 1,146 (19.5 percent); and for the Fremont Regional Area alone, the increase for the same period was 937 to 1,167 (24.5 percent). This difference between the total and the individual Regional Area offices is very slight: Hastings is slightly above and Fremont is slightly below. Therefore, overall the gross caseloads are very close.

For some of the remaining information from the PDS-series and CSE-series forms, such as differences in time between important case events and net unearned income, the evaluators selected individual clients rather than the entire body of cases as the basis for analysis. In order to select the individuals, the entire body of data was ordered by social security number and by descending tape source date, thereby enabling the evaluators to select the most recent occurrence of the particular client on the DSS recordkeeping system. Data approached in this manner are referred to as "individual data."

Finally, it must be noted that the PDS- and CSE-series form data used herein comprise only cases that fall into one of the following five classifications:

- ADC Regular;
- ADC Unemployed;
- AABD Disabled;
- State Foster Care, Title IV-A; or
- State Foster Care, Title IV-B.

Aggregate Data Analysis

Table B.1: Type of Case Eligibility by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989.

Within the regional areas, and in particular categories of cases, a couple of differences are notable in Table B.1. First, an increase from 879 ADC cases (both regular and unemployed parent) per month during the baseline period to 1,017 in the last month of the Demonstration Project constituted an increase of 15.7 percent in the Hastings Regional Area. In the Fremont Regional Area, the change was greater--from 907 ADC cases per month to 1,116 in the last month of the Demonstration Project, an increase of 23.0 percent. Second, the pattern of the AABD/Disabled cases was: (1) the Hastings Regional Area increased from 26 cases of this type to 38 in July 1989, a 46.2 percent increase, and (2) the Fremont Regional Area increased from 30 cases of this type to 50, a 66.7 percent increase. In both patterns, the Fremont Regional Area office seems to be receiving a larger influx of these types of cases.

Table B.2: Aid to Aged, Blind, Disabled Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989.

Table B.2 indicates that 44 disabled cases were handled in the Hastings Regional Area during the baseline period and 65 cases were handled in July 1989, an increase of 47.7 percent. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 51 cases and the July 1989 figure was 82, representing a 60.8 percent increase. In the Tekamah local office, a large increase, 44.4 percent, occurred from June 1989 to July 1989.

However, this percentage is not reliable because it is based on a very small base year--9 cases. A more reliable percentage presents itself in the Fremont local office: an 8.7 percent increase from June to July 1989. In fact, in the Fremont local office, the increase from the baseline year's disabled cases (26) to the end of the Demonstration Project (50) represents a substantial 92.3 percent increase. Alternatively, the Hastings local office's number of disabled cases in the baseline period was 40 and July 1989's number was 56, an increase of 40.0 percent. In short, the rate of increase in disabled cases was greater in the Fremont Regional Area and the Fremont local office in particular.

Table B.3: Medicaid Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.3 indicates that 463 Medicaid cases were handled in the Hastings Regional Area during the baseline period, and this figure increased to 495 cases in July 1989, a small 6.9 percent increase. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline figure was 425 Medicaid cases and the July 1989 value was 493, representing a 16.0 percent increase. In the Hastings local office the baseline Medicaid case per month value was 389 and the July 1989 count was 424, which represents a 9.0 percent increase. The Fremont local office had 282 Medicaid cases per month during the baseline period and 333 cases in the last month of the Demonstration Project, an 18.1 percent increase.

Table B.4: Social Service Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.4 shows that the number of social service cases in the Hastings Regional Area stood at 423 cases per month during the baseline period and declined to 400 cases in the final month of the Demonstration Project: this was a decrease of 5.4 percent. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 394 social service cases per month, and by the end of the Demonstration Project the cases had increase to 402, a growth of 2.0 percent. In the Hastings local office, the social service cases per month baseline was 367 and the July 1989 count was 352, a drop of 4.1 percent. The Fremont local office had 281 social service cases per month during the baseline period and 299 cases in July 1989, a 6.4 percent increase.

Table B.5: Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.5 indicates that the number of SSI cash recipient cases in the Hastings Regional Area was 24 per month during the baseline period and increased to 39 cases (62.5 percent) by July 1989. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 34, and by the end of the Demonstration Project the number of SSI cases had increased to 50

(47.1 percent). In the Hastings local office, the SSI cases per month baseline was 23 and the July 1989 amount was 37, an increase of 60.9 percent. The Fremont local office had 17 SSI cases per month during the baseline period and 27 cases in the final month of the Demonstration Project, representing a 58.8 percent increase.

Table B.6: Food Stamp Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.6 demonstrates that the number of food stamp cases in the Hastings Regional Area stood at 124 cases per month during the baseline period and declined to 111 cases in the final month of the Demonstration Project, a decrease of 10.5 percent. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 129 social service cases per month, and by the end of the Demonstration Project the cases had decreased to 110, a decline of 14.7 percent. In the Hastings local office, the social service cases per month baseline was 105 and the July 1989 count was 93, a drop of 11.4 percent. The Fremont local office had 78 food stamp cases per month during the baseline period and 67 cases in July 1989, a 14.1 percent decrease. The Fremont local office also had a large 22.1 percent drop in the last two months of the Demonstration Project.

Table B.7: Active Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.7 indicates that the number of active cases in the Hastings Regional Area was 449 per month during the baseline period, decreasing to 445 cases (0.9 percent) by July 1989. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 405, and by the end of the Demonstration Project the number of SSI cases had increased to 434 (7.2 percent). In the Hastings local office, the baseline number of active cases per month was 376 and the July 1989 number was 377, a slight increase of 0.3 percent. The Fremont local office had 261 active cases per month during the baseline period and 285 cases in the final month of the Demonstration Project, representing a 9.2 percent increase.

Table B.8: Pending Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.8 shows that the number of pending cases in the Hastings Regional Area was six per month during the baseline period and remained at six cases in July 1989. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 13, and by the end of the Demonstration Project the number of SSI cases had increased to 20 (53.8 percent). Because the size of these case counts is so small, percentages based upon them are of questionable reliability. Even the regional area percentages are suspect in terms of reliability.

Table B.9: Rejection Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.9 demonstrates that the number of rejected cases in the Hastings Regional Area stood at 50 cases per month during the baseline period and increased to 74 cases in the final month of the Demonstration Project: this was a increase of 48.0 percent. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 74 rejected cases per month and by the end of the Demonstration Project the cases had increased to 99 (33.8 percent). In the Hastings local office, the baseline number of rejected cases per month was 46 and the July 1989 count was 63, a growth of 37.0 percent. The Fremont local office had 55 rejected cases per month during the baseline period and 61 cases in July 1989, a 10.9 percent increase.

Table B.10: Closed Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.10 indicates that the number of closed cases in the Hastings Regional Area was 446 per month during the baseline period and increased to 604 cases (35.4 percent) by July 1989. In the Fremont Regional Area, the baseline value was 435, and by the end of the Demonstration Project the number of closed cases had increased to 594 (36.6 percent). In the Hastings local office, the baseline number of closed cases per month was 364 and the July 1989 number was 498, an increase of 36.8 percent. The Fremont local office had 272 closed cases per month during the baseline period and 383 cases in the final month of the Demonstration Project, representing a 40.8 percent increase.

Individual Data Analysis

Table B.11: Average Number of Individuals in Case by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. In Table B.11, it is difficult to rely on the percentages since the bases for them are very small. Therefore, interpretations based upon the raw averages are more certain. Table B.11 represents virtually no difference on this factor either between the Fremont and Hastings Regional Areas or between the Fremont and Hastings local offices. This would be expected because the Demonstration Project had no mechanism to alter the number of individuals associated with a case.

Table B.12: Average Amount of Court Ordered Payments by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.12 indicates that the Hastings Regional Area's average amount of court ordered payments, at \$145.50, was about \$30 more than the \$115.20 amount for the Fremont Regional Area during the baseline period. Over the last three months of the Demonstration Project, the Hastings Regional Office witnessed a steady increase in the amounts, but

no month rose to the earlier baseline level. This pattern occurred for the Hastings local office also.

Table B.13: Average Net Unearned Income of Clients by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. The average net unearned income of the clients in the Hastings local office was greater than the baseline average during two of the last three Demonstration Project months. A 53.9 percent drop in the average occurred between the baseline period and April 1989 for the Hastings local office. In the Fremont local office, the increase between the baseline period and April 1989 was 31.2 percent.

Table B.14: Average Amount of Grant by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. In Table B.14, the average grant amount in the Hastings and Fremont Regional areas for all time periods does not differ much. This is as expected since DSS state guidelines mandate the size of grants available based on the need and circumstances of the recipients.

Table B.15: Average Age of Applicants/Recipients by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. In Table B.15, the average age of applicants/recipients in the Hastings Regional Area does not differ from that of the Fremont Regional Area. Since nothing of the Demonstration Project could be expected to have influenced this factor, this lack of change is reasonable.

Table B.16: Average Number of Days Between Signed Application and Approval/Rejection Decision by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. Table B.16 shows the trend in the Hastings Regional Area is toward longer delays, even though all of the delays are shorter than the comparable Fremont Regional Area values. However, the differences between the baseline and later months for the two regional areas seem insufficiently large to conclude that the Demonstration Project has had a definite impact.

Table B.17: Average Number of Days Between Approval/Rejection Decision and Payment Effective Date by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 through July 1989. The extreme values in Table B.17 demonstrate the existence of an inexplicable data irregularity. It would not be prudent to interpret either trends or magnitudes for this table.

CHAPTER III: STAFF INTERVIEWS

The Demonstration Project began in June 1988 and continued through July 1989. During this period, changes in the two regional offices have occurred. Changes are, of course, inevitable and necessary in the conduct of a real-world social service agency. They do, however, provide difficult consequences for the evaluation research team. Such changes serve to "contaminate," so to speak, the experimental and control groups. In order to make reliable comparisons between the Hastings Office and the Fremont Office over a specified period of time, it must be assumed that the two offices remain relatively unchanged or, at least, that change occurs in a parallel manner. Moreover, the rationale for selecting Fremont as the comparison office included the fact that, on many important dimensions, it was very similar to the Hastings office.

In the present chapter, we hope to accomplish two goals: (1) describe the Demonstration Project from the eyes of those who have been a part of it, and (2) provide some feel for the real changes--in personnel and procedure--that might conceivably influence the operations of the Hastings and Fremont offices. Personal interviews were conducted with Hastings and Fremont office staff regarding their experiences during the Demonstration Project. The Hastings staff was interviewed November 11 and December 1, 1989; the Fremont staff was interviewed on December 5, 1989.

Hastings Regional Office

Office Structure and Background

Prior to the start of the Demonstration Project, the Hastings office had three full-time staff: two CSW IIIs and one CSW I. The CSW I performed intake and location functions for all ADC cases. CSW IIIs handled intake and location for the non-ADC cases. The CSW IIIs also performed the enforcement and establishment functions for all the cases in the office. Only CSW IIIs were allowed to perform these duties because they require paralegal experience.

Implementation of the Demonstration Project dictated changes in both staffing and case processing procedure in the Hastings office. The staff was divided into ADC and non-ADC case teams. One CSW III and one CSW I made up the non-ADC team. In addition, four new staff members were hired to join the CSW III on the ADC team. The four new personnel included: (1) a new CSW II hired as the intake interviewer; (2) another person eventually hired as the parent location specialist; (3)

an employee of the Grand Island Credit Bureau contracted to perform the phone contactor/collector duties; and (4) a new CSW I hired as the skip tracer/location worker.

Following the beginning of the Demonstration Project, many changes were made in the way case processing was accomplished in the Hastings office. The Project recommended that each staff member become responsible for a distinct stage in the processing of a case. However, as the Project progressed, it was not possible to maintain these strict separations, and some duplication of tasks occurred.

Furthermore, certain unexpected changes took place during the Demonstration Project:

- 1) Supervisor - Mr. Byron Van Patten served as Supervisor of the South Central District until January 1989. Mr. Van Patten was involved in planning the project and its initiation but left shortly thereafter. Ms. Peggy Borrell, one of the original CSW IIIs at the Hastings office, assumed duties as Acting Supervisor in February 1989. She continued in this role until August 1989. During this period, Ms. Borrell supervised the South Central District in addition to maintaining her caseload as a CSW III. In August 1989, Ms. Claire McKibben became Supervisor after the completion of the project, and she remains the current Supervisor of the South Central District.
- 2) Parent Location Specialist (Note: This position is also known as the "monitor" position in the Hastings office.) - Some minor problems occurred regarding this position. Since it is a key position in the Demonstration Project, these occurrences might have a bearing on the activities of the Project. The person first hired to do this job became unhappy with the position. Apparently, based upon staff interviews, the individual thought the position would involve more secretarial work; the person did not wish to do the required monitoring activities. Once this person left, the position was not filled for three months. During this period--January 1989 through March 1989--the other workers had to assume duties of the Parent Location Specialist. A replacement person was hired in April 1989.
- 3) Phone Contactor/Collector - Based upon the staff interviews in Hastings, this position appears to have been a troublesome aspect of the Project. The Phone Contactor/Collector was actually an employee of the Grand Island Credit Bureau whose services

were contracted for by the Department of Social Services. The Phone Contactor/Collector's hours were 3:30 - 8:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 9:30 - 11:30 a.m. on Saturdays. Other staff persons reported that, as the Project progressed, the person did not keep those hours, coming in late and leaving early. Since the Phone Contactor/Collector was not an employee of the DSS, the person's absenteeism was not easy to remedy.

Furthermore, while this person was trained in collection tactics, the individual had no background in child support enforcement practice or the related legal issues. Therefore, the worker could not answer questions posed by absent parents or clients. This resulted in upset and discouraged absent parents or clients, and these persons apparently turned that anger and discouragement toward the CSE office. During the course of the project, the Grand Island Credit Bureau decided that the Phone Contactor should no longer perform skip-tracing activities. The person was instructed to attempt to contact absent parents only. This change, in the view of Hastings staff, diminished the usefulness of the position.

A final complaint voiced by Hastings staff persons was that the Phone Contactor/Collector retained the files much longer than was allowed or necessary. The Project had set a time limit of 10 days for the Phone Contactor/Collector to attempt to contact the absent parent, but other workers reported that the person would often keep a file a month or more. As a result, the other workers began making phone contacts themselves rather than directing the files to her. Also, DSS began to provide flex time so one of the other workers could come in later in the morning and stay after 5:00 p.m. to attempt to make some additional after-hours contacts. It may be notable that many of the suggestions for improvement in the Project's practices provided by the Hastings staff focused upon the Phone Contactor/Collector position.

Individual Worker Interviews--Highlights

Intake Interviewer

The Intake Interviewer described the primary duties of the position as conducting intake interviews and handling a small establishment caseload. During a typical month of the Demonstration Project, the Intake Interviewer estimated that

80 percent of her time was occupied with intake duties; 10 percent was occupied with locations activities; and 10 percent was occupied with establishment activities.

The Intake Interviewer felt that the Demonstration Project had met one of its desired objectives very well: that is, getting information directly from the client led to much quicker results. The only difference in the way that ADC interviews were conducted during the Demonstration Project was that ADC staff no longer had to ask any CSE questions because the CSE office conducted its own interview. The Intake Interviewer felt that this system was a great improvement over that in operation before the Demonstration Project. She estimated that 95 percent of the clients were interviewed in person. The remaining 5 percent of the clients were interviewed by phone. One problem with the new intake interview approach was that ADC would not allow the CSE staff to interview the clients before the ADC interview (on Wednesdays). Therefore, CSE had to attempt to interview all CSE clients on Wednesdays between the scheduled ADC interviews. If there were simply too many people to interview, another CSE worker--usually the Skip Tracer/Location Worker--would help interview some of the clients. At one point during the Demonstration Project, CSE staff tried an alternative approach: the staff interviewed some of the clients a few days prior to the ADC interviews to eliminate some of the confusion. CSE office personnel thought this approach had worked very well; however, ADC refused to allow CSE to continue this practice. This decision by ADC resulted in returning to the CSE practice of attempting to accomplish all interviews in one day.

Regarding the effectiveness of case processing in the CSE office, the Intake Interviewer felt that the manner in which cases were processed worked fine through the location function; however, problems developed as the cases arrived at the establishment/enforcement function. The Intake Interviewer felt that the Establishment/Enforcement Worker had too many cases. Moreover, if the Establishment/Enforcement Worker was not able to get to the case right away, the absent parent (AP) would often move and the case would have to be directed back to a location worker. The Intake Interviewer felt that additional staff were needed to successfully accomplish the enforcement function.

Finally, the Intake Interviewer felt the idea of a Phone Contactor/Collector was fine, but that the individual who occupied the position did not meet expectations. The Intake Interviewer believed the Phone Contactor/Collector had too little training in the legal ramifications of child support and the operations of the CSE office to be useful. Moreover, the Intake Interviewer felt that these limitations resulted

in other staff members adjusting their schedules to work late and evenings or to do the phone work on their own cases to compensate for the limitations.

Parent Location Specialist

The Parent Location Specialist's main duties during the Demonstration Project included running computer checks on absent parents and monitoring child support payments. Additionally, this person occasionally checked with employers to make certain that the parent was still working in the same place and to possibly verify the AP's address. The Parent Location Specialist reported that 100 percent of her time was spent on monitoring, but this does include computer checks done for the intake function.

The Parent Location Specialist had been with the Hastings CSE office since approximately March 1989 and, consequently, was unable to note changes in the office occurring since the beginning of the Demonstration Project. The Parent Location Specialist did comment that the expected increased flow of information from the ADC application to the CSE Parent Location Specialist had not entirely succeeded but did not expand upon that point of view. She reported that the automated systems of the other state departments as well as that of DSS are very efficient and no problems have arisen in obtaining relevant information.

The Parent Location Specialist also mentioned the problems with the Phone Contactor/Collector and suggested that the delays at this function created problems for the other workers. In the view of the Parent Location Specialist, hiring the Phone Contactor/Collector through the DSS would allow more supervision over that position.

Skip Tracer/Location Worker

The Skip Tracer/Location Worker's main duties include Absent Parent location--approximately 95 percent of this person's time--and helping to back up the Intake Interviewer--approximately 5 percent of her time. The Skip Tracer/Location Worker commented that doing all the intake interviews on Wednesdays can be quite overwhelming. On those days, she is called upon to help the Intake Interviewer complete the interviews. Other than this problem, the Skip Tracer/Location Worker felt that the changes made in the intake stage of the process were very beneficial. Further, the face-to-face interviews made it easier to obtain important information and this, in turn, made the job of locating APs easier. The Skip Tracer/Location Worker reported that, because of the quantity and quality of information now obtained from the intake interviews, it is often possible to

locate an absent parent in the same day. If a postmaster letter is necessary, an address can usually still be verified in about two days. The Skip Tracer/Location Worker reported that an average location takes from 5 to 30 days, much shorter than that reported prior to the Demonstration Project. The Skip Tracer/Location Worker also estimated that 75 percent of the cases have verified locations within 60 days (the pre-Demonstration Project estimate was one-third).

The Skip Tracer/Location Worker stated that if the project were to continue as is, an additional Enforcement/Establishment Worker would be needed. However, the Skip Tracer/Location Worker's preference would be to work a case from start to finish, unlike the Demonstration Project approach, which involves a considerable division of labor on case activities.

Phone Contactor/Collector

The Phone Contactor/Collector's main duties include contacting absent parents to arrange for meetings with CSE workers and to arrange for collection of child support payments. The person in this position was not employed by DSS and had no child support background. Consequently, the Phone Contactor/Collector was not able to answer many of our questions concerning the project. This individual is an employee of the Grand Island Credit Bureau Services.

The person in the Phone Contactor/Collector position felt that the increased use of telephone contacts had been very beneficial to the DSS because more people did come in for appointments. This person suggested a few changes concerning the Phone Contactor/Collector job, for instance, that the Phone Contactor should be allowed to do skip-tracing. It is notable that, during the course of the Demonstration Project, the Grand Island Credit Bureau decided that the individual should no longer do skip-tracing, but should work solely on absent parent contacts. This represented to the Phone Contactor/Collector an underutilization of her skills.

Another change suggested by the Phone Contactor/Collector regarded preparation for the position. While this person reported that previous credit bureau training regarding collection techniques had been good, much of what had to be done with the CSE office required considerable trial and error. The Phone Contactor/Collector felt a need to be better informed about the CSE office's practices and about the legal aspects of child support cases; the Grand Island Credit Bureau had provided none of this.

The Phone Contactor/Collector reported attempting phone contacts outside normal working hours 20 to 50 hours per week;

this depended on how many cases she had to work with at the time. The person in the Phone Contactor/Collector position spent 16 hours a week making phone contacts outside normal working hours.

In general, the Phone Contactor/Collector felt that the Demonstration Project improved the degree of client cooperation because clients came to view the CSE office as working for them.

Establishment/Enforcement Worker

The Establishment/Enforcement Worker's main duties include establishment and enforcement on ADC and state debt cases. The worker began by saying that the changes in intake created by the Demonstration Project have been beneficial although time consuming. The Establishment/Enforcement Worker reported that 45 percent of her time was spent on establishment activities (the 1987 estimate was 20 percent). She estimated time spent on enforcement activities to be at 47 to 50 percent (the 1987 figure was 60 percent).

The Establishment/Enforcement Worker mentioned several problems that occurred during the Demonstration Project. For instance, the mechanics of intake were a problem in that all the clients were interviewed on the same day. Another problem identified was that four workers referred cases to the one Establishment/Enforcement Worker, creating an overwhelming caseload.

One more problem identified by the Establish/Enforcement Worker was the significant delay involved in obtaining information from the clerks of district courts and attorneys.

The Establish/Enforcement Worker identified problems with the Phone Contactor/Collector and suggested that this person should be an employee of the DSS. The Worker felt that a CSW I could handle the job. The Establish/Enforcement Worker felt that phone contacting, done correctly, should work fairly well for establishment, but not for enforcement. As it was done during the Demonstration Project, the Establish/Enforcement Worker thought the phone contacting was not consistent, thorough, or timely.

The Establishment/Enforcement Worker was the only one who did not feel that absent parents who know their cases are being monitored are more likely to pay. Further, she did not feel that the telephone contacts enhanced the image of the CSE unit as an active enforcement agent. She thought this due to the fact that the Phone Contactor/Collector was unreliable and unable to answer questions asked by the absent parents once they were contacted.

The Establish/Enforcement Worker was the only person to suggest a preference for some specialization in case processing rather than handling a case from start to finish. She described how an office might be set up: there would be one intake worker, a CSW I, to handle intake as part of the person's caseload. Then one half of the cases requiring location and one-half of the cases requiring monitoring would be handled by another worker. Finally, there would be one enforcement worker and one establishment worker.

The Establishment/Enforcement Worker felt that personnel changes would eliminate some of the problems with the Demonstration Project. Overall, this worker did not feel that the project had been supervised very well.

Supervisor

The Supervisor who was interviewed assumed the position in February 1989 and remained through the end of the Demonstration Project. During this period, she accomplished the duties of a District Supervisor in addition to handling the CSW III caseload.

The Supervisor estimated that 50 percent of the cases get verified absent parent locations within 60 days (in 1987 the estimate was 33 percent). The Supervisor credited this increase to: (1) the Intake Interviewer gathering more information for the Skip Tracer/Location Worker than was accomplished before the Demonstration Project, and (2) lack of a backlog of location cases. Therefore, the Skip Tracer/Location Worker is able to act on the information almost immediately after the intake interview.

Three main problems identified by the Supervisor included: (1) the breakdown of information between the ADC and CSE units; (2) problems of the CSE unit's image resulting from the activities of the Phone Contactor/Collector; and (3) an excessive caseload of the Establishment/Enforcement Worker.

The Supervisor reported that operating costs were not necessarily lowered by the Demonstration Project because of the addition of three additional workers and a legal secretary. (These added operating costs had been well anticipated.) Collections during the Demonstration Project did increase considerably. The Supervisor estimated that the Hastings CSE office collected \$80,000-\$90,000 a month during the Demonstration Project.

Attorney

The Attorney's main duties include finalizing all legal documents needed by the Hastings CSE office and handling all cases that go to court. This Attorney is responsible for all court cases in the South Central District except those in Nuckolls County.

The Attorney is employed by DSS but is supervised under the Legal Services Division of the Department. Therefore, the Attorney has no control over the child support staff workers and, conversely, they have no supervisory powers over the Attorney. The Attorney reported that this supervisory situation had created no problems and everyone worked quite well together.

Overall, the Attorney felt that the Demonstration Project went well. The Attorney did mention that passing a case from one worker to another was confusing for both the workers and the client.

The Attorney reported that the caseload requiring legal work had increased during the time the Attorney has been with the Department. He attributed this increase partially to the fact that the Demonstration Project hired additional workers and these persons, in turn, produced more cases in need of legal work.

Fremont Regional Office**Office Structure and Background**

The Fremont Regional CSE office has three full-time staff, all of whom are CSW III's. Each of the workers handles all functions needed by the cases from intake through establishment/enforcement. This is one major difference between the Hastings and Fremont offices. Each worker handles her own skip-tracing and phone contacts. The staff reported that they did not attempt any phone contacts outside normal working hours. Generally the Fremont staff did not feel that phone contacts outside normal working hours were necessary; the workers felt they were fairly successful getting in contact with people during the day.

One difference between the Hastings and Fremont offices is that the Fremont workers do not conduct face-to-face intake interviews. Rather, the clients fill out an absent parent form when they go through the ADC interviews. If the CSE worker needs more information, the worker will send a letter to the client or phone him or her. Very few clients are

actually interviewed in person by the Fremont CSE workers. Up until about 1-1/2 years ago, the Fremont CSE office conducted its own intake interviews, but at that time a new system was initiated and the CSE staff no longer conducted personal interviews on a regular basis. Generally, the staff workers in Fremont did not see this lack of personal, face-to-face contact with the clients as a problem, whereas several of the workers in Hastings had reported this to be one of the more beneficial aspects of the Demonstration Project.

One notable change in the office structure occurred during the course of the Demonstration Project: a new attorney was hired by the Fremont CSE office. The workers reported that the new attorney was much more aggressive in taking cases to court. Therefore, the workers were more likely to follow through on borderline cases because they knew the attorney would not drop the case once she received it. The attorney's secretary also helped the CSE workers with some of their paperwork, which freed up some of the CSE staff time.

Another notable happening occurred during the course of the Demonstration Project: near the end of the Project, three of the workers were on six-week maternity leave. At one point when two workers were absent at the same time, the Department hired a temporary employee to help with some of the intake work and to verify locations in cases which needed no skip-tracing done. Although the staff reported this as a hectic time in the office, the temporary intake/location worker seemed to work out very well. All the workers mentioned hiring someone in this capacity as an improvement to implement in the Fremont office.

Individual Worker Interview--Highlights

Worker Number One

Worker Number One's main duties include intake, location, establishment, and enforcement. This person also handles all foster care cases for the Fremont CSE office.

During the period of the Demonstration Project in the Hastings office, Worker Number One expressed that there was occasionally a lack of information provided by the clients, and that clients who walk in during the day often cause slowdowns in the broader process.

Additional comments from Worker Number One appear to indicate that the Fremont office handles the location of absent parents slightly differently than does the Hastings office. That is, the Fremont office staff closes a case if an absent parent cannot be located within 30 days. After

about 90 days, the Fremont staff person reopens the case and attempts, once again, to make a location. Worker Number One estimated that 80 percent of the cases received have verified absent parent locations within 30 days. Worker Number One said this percentage is high because the CSE staff already know where many of the parents are for foster care cases. Worker Number One also reported that, on the average, it takes two weeks to get a location.

Worker Number One estimated that she accomplishes 75 percent of the initial interviews by mail, 18 percent by phone, and 7 percent in person. She spends 50 percent of her time on establishment activities, 30 percent on enforcement activities, and the remaining 20 percent answering client questions. Worker Number One reported that non-ADC clients tend to cooperate with the CSE unit while ADC and foster care clients do not.

Worker Number One identified that the most significant delays relating to her job involve waiting for court documents, lack of cooperation from absent parents and clients, and case overload. To help solve the latter problem, she suggested hiring an additional worker and/or hiring an intake/location worker. Worker Number One also thought that having a secretary would decrease the time spent on paperwork and therefore increase the amount of time available for more important child support activities.

Worker Number Two

Worker Number Two's main duties include all aspects of child support enforcement. Worker Number Two estimated that she conducts approximately 80 percent of her initial interviews by mail, 10 percent by phone, and 10 percent in person. Worker Number Two stated that she makes 60 percent of her locations within 30 days and that an average location takes about 2-1/2 to 3 weeks. Moreover, she estimated that she spends 10 percent of her time on establishment activities, 25 percent on enforcement activities, and 65 percent answering client questions.

Worker Number Two listed the lack of an intake worker as the main problem in the child support case processing. She listed the addition of more workers, including an intake/location worker, as the most needed change for the office.

Worker Number Three

Worker Number Three's main duties include all aspects of enforcement. Worker Number Three estimated that she conducts 95 percent of her initial interviews by the mail and

the other 5 percent over the phone. She reported that she verifies 75 percent of absent parent locations within 30 days and that an average location takes about 15 days. Worker Number Three also estimated that she spends 20 percent of her time on establishment activities, 40 percent on enforcement activities, and 20 percent answering client questions.

Worker Number Three listed the problems in the Fremont office as being the number of cases they are trying to handle--each worker has a caseload of about 750. She also felt that they did not get enough information from the ADC office and that they needed more clerical help. She also suggest hiring another worker to do intake/location.

Supervisor

The Supervisor's main duties include supervision of eight CSE workers in the Northeast District. The Supervisor felt that the biggest problem for the workers involved the large caseloads. When asked whether there had been any changes in the way telephone contacts were conducted, the Supervisor commented that about one year ago they had a change in policy wherein the workers were to use phone contacts instead of letters whenever possible. Therefore, there should have been an increase in the number of phone contacts made. However, none of the workers has reported this as having happened.

The Supervisor estimated that the Fremont office collected about \$220,000-\$230,000 a month during the Demonstration Project. This is about three times the amount reported by the Supervisor of the Hastings office.

CHAPTER IV: SUPPLEMENTARY DATA SETS

This chapter provides summaries of the additional data sets available for the evaluation task. The data sets were derived from a client survey conducted in mid-1989 and the telephone logs provided by the Hastings office.

Client Survey

Description

In June and July of 1989, the evaluators conducted a mail survey of a random sample of clients of the Child Support Enforcement offices in the Hastings and Fremont Regional Areas. The sample was drawn from an overall list of the heads of the households provided in the broader set of data analyzed in Chapter II of the present report. It is notable that this list included individuals who had contact with the CSE offices between June 1987 and April 1989. The mailing, in mid-1989, arrived up to two years after some of the clients had been in contact with the CSE offices, and perhaps these respondents felt little interest in answering the questionnaire. Also, based upon respondent comments on returned questionnaires, some of the sample members were not appropriate respondents; for example, one respondent was a support person for a mother who was on ADC. For these reasons among others, the response rate for the survey, 5.9 percent, was not good. As a result, the following analysis should be examined for its intuitive or sensitizing utility, rather than its generalizability or its statistical significance. In other words, a reliable extension of the survey results to the general population of CSE clients is impossible using these data.

With these cautionary comments in mind, we proceed to point out some of the highlights of the survey results. A complete series of graphical presentations of the data is provided in Appendix C. In the present chapter, a few of these data will be highlighted for discussion.

Selected Highlights

Figure C.1 enables us to roughly gauge the reason for first coming to the DSS offices. A larger percentage of persons came to the Fremont office (25 percent) than to the Hastings office (12 percent) to apply solely for child support enforcement services. However, when those who came to apply for both ADC and CSE are included with those arriving solely for CSE service, 53 percent came to the Hastings office as compared to 43 percent to the Fremont office. The

difference--10 percent--is too small to be a significant difference between the offices: it is more likely there is no real difference between the offices as to reasons for first coming to the office.

In the early part of the questionnaire, the evaluators tried to determine the degree of clarity the client encountered in the CSE offices. Figure C.2 demonstrates that it was equally clear to clients in both offices how long the interviewing process would last. It may be notable that about one quarter of the respondents in each office were not clear at all regarding the length of the process. Reducing this uncertainty would seemingly facilitate the CSE process and should be relatively easy to implement. Most respondents felt that the amount of time taken for the case handling was about right in both offices (Figure C.3). However, clients from the Fremont office seemed to represent more dissatisfaction with the length of the process, stating more often that it was either too short or too long.

In a subsequent series of questions, the evaluator sought to determine the interviewers' impressions of the help they received at the CSE offices. In many cases there was no difference between the Hastings and Fremont offices. Responses to one important statement, "The CS worker treats me with respect," indicated that a large majority in both offices agreed with this statement (Figure C.9). There did appear to be a possible difference between offices on the statement, "The child support worker clearly explained the child support enforcement service." Figure C.12 shows that about 74 percent of the Hastings respondents agreed with this statement while only 60 percent of the Fremont persons did. Perhaps the newly instituted intake activities in Hastings lent themselves to a focused explanation of the child support services. However, even though this difference existed, Fremont still contained a majority who felt the explanation was clear.

The next set of questions dealt with the client's general impressions of the CSE program. While few of these factors demonstrated any difference between the offices, the experience of both offices indicates the impressions of clients toward the program. For example, Figure C.19 shows that clients in both Fremont and Hastings realize the importance of providing as much information as possible to the CSE staff: 83 percent in Hastings and 80 percent in Fremont agreed with this statement. Similarly, Figure C.23 shows that a substantial proportion of clients in Fremont and Hastings found themselves more inclined to cooperate with CSE activities following the child support interview: 81 percent in Hastings and 82 percent in Fremont agreed with this statement.

Hastings Telephone Logs

Description

With the initiation of the Demonstration Project in the Hastings office, a form was created for recording the activities of the Phone Contactor/Collector. In Chapter V we describe some of this information in the sample drawn to study the evaluation hypotheses. However, we feel that the entire data set (N=311 cases) might have some results of use. Therefore, we now present some of those findings. The figures are located in Appendix D.

Selected Highlights

The Phone Contactor/Collector was asked to record the CSE case type on the log. As presented in Figure D.1, of the total 310 available cases, 64 (20.6 percent) were paternity cases, 46 (14.8 percent) were establishment cases, and 200 (64.5 percent) were absent parent cases.

Figure D.2 represents three call results occurring if an individual is personally contacted: a promise to pay, an appointment set, or an expression of non-cooperation. In the present analysis, we have focused only on the results of the first call; it should be kept in mind that the Phone Contactor/Collector frequently made repeated calls in an attempt to contact a person. The most likely result of a personal contact on the first call was setting an appointment; 10.6 percent of the calls had this result. A promise to pay and no cooperation had roughly the same likelihood: 7.1 percent of these calls resulted in a promise to pay and 6.8 percent of the first calls resulted in non-cooperation. In Figure D.3, first call results wherein personal contact was not made are summarized. Not surprisingly, the most likely results were the person not at home (28.1 percent) or no answer (27.3 percent). A very small percentage of first calls, 5.1 percent, resulted in a busy line.

Figure D.4 demonstrates the results of the first call in which the phone contactor/collector recorded written comments for future reference. There were 91 recorded comments of this kind. The most likely comment was to note either a message left (22.0 percent) or a wrong number dialed (22.0 percent). The least likely recorded comment (2.2 percent) was that the individual indicated he or she would not pay.

In Figure D.5 and several subsequent figures, a summary of the entire history of up to 20 separate calls per individual is provided. Figure D.5 demonstrates that in 48 cases (15.4 percent) a promise to pay child support was obtained. Figure D.6 indicates that in 66 cases (21.2 percent) an appointment was set. Figure D.7 expresses that in 48 cases (15.4 percent) the person refused to cooperate with the CSE program. And, finally, Figure D.8 shows that in 142 cases (45.7 percent) no one was home.

CHAPTER V: EVALUATION HYPOTHESES

In the original evaluation design, MAXIMUS provided several hypotheses which were to be evaluated in light of the new or existing data sources. These hypotheses were closely associated with the desired goals or outcomes of the Demonstration Project. In this chapter we study these hypotheses using the available data resources and reach conclusions as to whether these hypotheses were supported.

Description of the Sample

The final data set used to evaluate several of the hypotheses is a very complex one. The central difficulty is that the hypotheses embody variables which reside in various constituent data sets. For instance, one hypothesis would require information from the PDS100 form and information from the activity logs. The constituent data sets for the final set are: (1) the data set including information from the PDS100, PDS110, and PDS111; (2) the data set including information from the CSE-35, CSE-36, and CSE-37; (3) the data set from the Hastings office's telephone logs; and (4) the data set from the activity logs from both offices.

The activity logs were especially problematic. None of this information was available on computer, but much of it was essential for the hypotheses. Incompatibility between the Hastings and Fremont activity and intake information resulted from two sources: (1) due to a statewide change in DSS recordkeeping practice, the Fremont Office discontinued use of one activity form and replaced it with another during the course of the evaluation, and (2) Fremont has discontinued the use of the intake form in favor of using the activity log. Due to this incompatibility, we were unable to use the intake log information and made the decision to substitute other available information where possible.

As the evaluation progressed, it became clear that handling the entire mass of data was going to be impossible. Therefore, the decision was made to draw a sample. This was no mean task itself. The sample was drawn from names in the PDS-series data set. These names then had to be matched with the names on the activity logs. This was accomplished by creating a small data set--an "index" file--including names and identifying lines placed directly on the hardcopy activity logs by the evaluation team. This file was then put on the computer and a sort of the file by name for each office was accomplished. Then the evaluation team returned to the hardcopy activity logs and searched for the name and all the line numbers associated with that same name, thereby obtaining

the history of the sample individuals, many of whom had several recurrences on the logs. This information history was re-recorded by hand on a code sheet and subsequently entered on the computer.

This succeeded in placing the sample's activity log information on the computer. We were then able to match this information with the other computerized information so that, for example, information from Jane Smith's activity log might be linked with Jane Smith's information from the CSE-35 form. We used the last name as the common link between these data sets. This was a practical choice. We felt that the social security number would have been a more reliable link since deciphering the staff persons' longhand recording of the names was sometimes quite difficult; generally, it seemed numbers were more readable. But although the Social Security number would have been more precise, unfortunately it was not recorded on the constituent activity log data set.

One other difficulty occurred with regard to hypotheses related to differences in time. Within the PDS-series and CSE-series data sets discussed above, it was necessary to select from among many appearances of an individual in the set. The choice was made to select the last appearance of the person on the DSS records. In fact, the last appearance may be the fourth or fifth of a particular individual's case. As a result, differences between, for example, the application date for ADC and the date of the first obligation may be skewed.

The final, random sample included 588 cases to be analyzed: 143 were in the Hastings Pretest (pre-June 1988) Group; 148 in the Hastings Posttest Group; 125 in the Fremont Pretest Group; and 172 in the Fremont Posttest Group. For the purposes of the following analysis, the criterion for statistical significance for diagnostic statistics is $p < 0.05$. In a real sense, this is an arbitrary criterion, and fairly conservative. The probabilities for the diagnostics are supplied so that the utility of the criterion on any one hypothesis may be considered.

Examination of the Hypotheses

Expected Outcome 1.0: More and better information will be collected.

Hypothesis 1.1 The percentage of APs located before ADC determination is made will increase.

Hypothesis 1.1 required selecting from the greater sample (N=588) only those APs located (N=103). Figure E.1 demonstrates only a small percentage difference between the

locations. The Hastings Posttest Group had 20.3 percent locations compared to 16.8 percent for the Hastings Pretest. This difference, as well as the difference between the Fremont groups, was statistically insignificant (chi-square of 1.38, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.66$); in other words, differences no larger than these might occur just by accident of the draw of the sample. Therefore, the differences are not likely to be reflective of any real differences between the groups resulting from the Demonstration Project.

More to the thrust of Hypothesis 1.1, though, we examined the differences between the ADC application date and the time of location for located APs. The descriptive information for this difference is presented in Table V.1.

Table V.1. Number of days between ADC application date and the time of location by evaluation group.

Group	-----Number of Days-----				Valid Cases
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Fremont Pretest	-411	3,362	510.3	1,085.6	13
Fremont Posttest	-438	2,550	572.7	858.8	17
Hastings Pretest	-191	727	215.9	250.8	16
Hastings Posttest	-280	2,471	751.8	806.2	24
Total Sample	-438	3,362	540.9	804.2	70

Looking at the means, one would conclude that the Fremont Office demonstrated very little difference between the Pretest and Posttest Groups (510.3 compared to 572.7). Also, the Hastings Posttest Group is actually greater than the Hastings Pretest Group--opposite of what was expected. An examination of the statistical significance of the differences between these group means shows that there is no real difference between the four group means (F ratio of 1.47, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.23$).

Figure E.2 demonstrates that the percentage of cases located before the ADC determination was the same in the Hastings Pretest Group (12.5 percent) and the Hastings Posttest Group (12.5 percent). The only change that does occur seems to be a decline in the percentage located before the ADC, from 38.5 percent in the Fremont Pretest to 11.8 percent in the Fremont Posttest. However, this difference is not statistically significant (chi-square is 5.11, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.16$), but it is close enough that the Fremont decline may be worth looking at as a real decline.

Hypothesis 1.2 The percentage of cases referred directly to establishment/enforcement/phone collection will increase.

In Figure E.3 we note that there is virtually no difference between the Hastings test groups (21.0 percent for the Hastings Pretest; 16.0 percent for the Hastings Posttest); however, the Fremont Posttest group was about twice as likely to send the case directly to establishment/enforcement/phone collection--34.0 percent for the Fremont Posttest group compared to 16.0 percent for the Hastings Posttest group. It is possible that this occurrence is due to the differences in record keeping between the Fremont and Hastings offices. It was pointed out in the staff interviews that, in Fremont, the workers tend to handle a broader range of activities on the cases; perhaps some of the location work done early in a case is inadvertently masked in recording the activity log information in the Fremont office. It is notable that the differences in the percentages of the groups are statistically significant (chi-square is 20.9, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.0001$).

Hypothesis 1.3 The percentage of locations will increase.

Figure E.1, used in the interpretation of Hypothesis 1.1 above, allows us to evaluate the present hypothesis. From the greater sample of 588, APs were located in 103 cases, or in 17.5 percent of the cases. Figure E.1 demonstrates only a small percentage difference between the locations. The Hastings Posttest group had 20.3 percent locations compared to 16.8 percent for the Hastings Pretest. This difference was statistically insignificant (chi-square is 1.38, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.66$). Therefore, the differences are most likely not reflective of any real differences between the groups resulting from the Demonstration Project.

Hypothesis 1.4 The average amount of time each IV-A worker spends on IV-D related information during intake will decrease.

Staff interviews conducted with CSE personnel in the Hastings and Fremont offices supply some evidence to evaluate this hypothesis. The Hastings supervisor, for instance, felt that the average amount of time the ADC (IV-A) intake worker spent on CSE (IV-D) related information had lessened since the Demonstration Project. Three other staff persons felt that the time the worker spent on CSE matters had been reduced or at least remained the same. One CSE staff person pointed out that ADC no longer works with CSE forms, but rather the individual is referred directly to the CSE office.

Expected Outcome 2.0: Client cooperation will improve.

Hypothesis 2.1 The number of "good cause" claims will decrease.

Once again, staff interviews conducted with CSE personnel in the Hastings and Fremont offices provide some clue as to the level of "good cause" claims, in lieu of the hard data from the CSE-36 form. The Hastings Supervisor pointed out that the number of "good cause" claims has remained about the same since the Demonstration Project; she estimated the level at about two or three such claims per year. Other staff persons bore out this point of view: there are very few "good cause" claims and there has been no discernible change since the implementation of the Demonstration Project.

Hypothesis 2.2 Client understanding of the CSE program will improve.

Information from the previously discussed Client Survey (see Chapter IV) enables us to report some information that helps to rate the success of the two offices in helping with client understanding. We will focus on three of the statements in the Client Survey. The specific statements are: (1) the child support worker gave me clear instructions; (2) the child support worker willingly answered all of my questions; and (3) the child support worker explained the child support enforcement service. Unfortunately, comparisons between pretest and posttest results are not possible, but comparisons between Hastings and Fremont are.

In the first statement, represented in Figure C.10, the vast majority of surveyed clients agreed that the child support worker gave clear instructions. It appears that the clients in both offices are equally satisfied on this dimension: 86 percent in the Hastings office; 74 percent in the Fremont office. In the second statement, represented in Figure C.11, a very large majority, 89 percent, of the Hastings clients agreed that the child support worker willingly answered all of his or her questions. By comparison, 71 percent of the Fremont clients agreed with this statement. It was noted in the staff interviews that the Fremont staff has less personal contact with the client than the Hastings staff. The closer contact might improve the outlook of the Hastings' clients. However, a majority of the Fremont clients were satisfied. Finally, in the third statement, represented in Figure C.12, a larger majority of clients from the Hastings office (74 percent) than from the Fremont office (60 percent) agreed that the child support enforcement worker explained the child support enforcement service. This, too, might be an artifact of the closer contact with the Hastings clients. Overall, the Hastings Office rates higher on all three questions, giving some indication that this office is doing very well in terms of client understanding of the CSE program.

Hypothesis 2.3 The number of adverse actions issued for non-cooperation will increase.

The hard data for this hypothesis was limited. We did use the information from the IV-D Reason Code on the CSE-37 form. This information for the sample is displayed in Figure E.4. Although the values are quite small, the percentages are based upon large values, thereby making percentage comparisons more reliable. The percentage of non-cooperations in the Fremont office dropped from 2.4 percent to 0.6 percent, while this percentage decreased in the Hastings office, too: from 1.4 percent to 0.7 percent. In either case, the raw numbers are miniscule. The differences are not statistically significant either (chi-square is 2.48, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.48$).

Additional clues to this hypothesis include the impression of the Hastings Supervisor that client cooperation had improved since the implementation of the Demonstration Project. The supervisor felt that there existed improved cooperation throughout the CSE steps, from intake through enforcement.

Hypothesis 2.4 The number of unknown absent parents will decrease.

As mentioned earlier, the intake information available from Fremont is incomplete and it is not part of the random sample. Therefore, for this hypothesis we used all the intake information we did have, and we will analyze this as a stand-alone data set. There were a total of 770 cases available to us. As a point of departure, it was concluded that "unknown absent parents" referred to those cases which required that paternity be established. Figure E.5 displays the pertinent frequencies and percentages. Note that there was a sharp increase in cases demanding paternity in Fremont (13 percent in the Fremont Pretest Group and 45 percent in the Fremont Posttest Group). Hastings Office percentages are much closer to that of the overall sample: the Hastings Pretest Group was 28 percent and the Posttest Group was 32 percent. These are significant differences (chi-square is 55.6, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.0000$). However, this statistical significance is not reliable due to the non-random character of the data set. Therefore, the most we could say, based upon this information, is that there was a possible increase in Fremont from pretest to posttest and that there was probably no change to speak of in Hastings over the same period.

Expected Outcome 3.0: Establishment and enforcement of court orders will be expedited.

Hypothesis 3.1 The percentage of cases in which the AP voluntarily acknowledges paternity will increase.

With this hypothesis, we return to the sample for analysis. In Figure E.6 we see that, over the entire sample, about 3.0 percent of the cases had a voluntary acknowledgement. This is roughly comparable to the Fremont Pretest Group (2.4 percent) and the Hastings Pretest Group (2.8 percent). However, the posttest groups vary from the total in an unexpected way. That is, the Fremont Posttest had a substantial increase in the level of voluntary acknowledgements while the Hastings Posttest Group had a substantial decrease. These differences were not significant: chi-square is 7.45, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.06$. It simply does not appear that the activities of the Demonstration Project had the intended effect on this variable.

Hypothesis 3.2 The percentage of cases in which the AP agrees to voluntary blood testing will increase.

We did not have adequate information to directly evaluate this hypothesis. One staff person interviewed in the Hastings Office was generally positive, however, this person identified increased difficulty in obtaining blood tests--necessary to establish paternity--resulting from heavy caseloads of the staff as one thing lessening the advantages of the Demonstration Project.

Hypothesis 3.3 The percentage of cases in which the AP stipulates to pay support will increase.

Figure E.7 demonstrates that about 3.7 percent of those in the sample reached an agreement to pay as one of the activity log entries. The percentages are quite close for the Hastings Pretest and the Hastings Posttest--3.5 percent and 2.7 percent, respectively. However, the Fremont office shows a marked jump from the pretest to the posttest. The Fremont Pretest Group had 1.6 percent of the cases reach a stipulation to pay and the posttest group had 6.4 percent. Even though there is a large difference in the Fremont setting, we cannot say that it is a statistically significant one (chi-square is 5.42, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.14$). This indicates that the change in the AP stipulation to pay may have been merely an accident of the sample drawn and not an effect of the Demonstration Project's activities.

Hypothesis 3.4 The average amount of time from application for ADC to establishment of a court order will decrease.

This hypothesis, like Hypothesis 1.1, is a complex one. First, we selected only those of the total sample (N=588) for whom a court order was established. This resulted in 173 cases (29.4 percent of the total sample). Table V.2 displays the number of days from application for ADC to establishment of the first court order.

Table V.2. Number of days from application for ADC to establishment of the first court order by evaluation group.

-----Number of Days-----

Group	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Cases
Fremont Pretest	-5,368	1,393	-911.2	1,537.0	37
Fremont Posttest	-5,176	590	-1091.5	1,490.0	42
Hastings Pretest	-5,204	3,433	-641.7	1,579.8	41
Hastings Posttest	-3,886	1,581	-562.1	1,459.7	53
Total Sample	-5,368	3,433	-784.2	1,514.8	173

Looking at the means in Table V.2, one concludes that the Hastings Posttest Group had the shortest difference between the application for ADC and the first obligation. This would be a finding in line with the expectation of the Demonstration Project. An examination of the difference between the four group means (F ratio is 1.17, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.32$) indicates no significant difference.

Since the median is less influenced by extreme values than the mean, we have also examined the difference of evaluation group medians.

Figure E.8, though, does not provide much more confidence that a real difference exists among the groups. The Fremont groups are generally above the overall percentage of 50.3 percent and the Hastings groups are generally below that value. The chi-square for this test is 5.19, three degrees of freedom, which is significant at $p < 0.16$. Therefore, according to the criterion accepted here, $p < 0.05$, this is an insignificant relationship; that is, membership in one of these groups has no real influence on the time from ADC application to court order.

Hypothesis 3.5 The percentage of APs interviewed will increase.

There appeared to be no clear way to establish this percentage from the available data.

Hypothesis 3.6 The average amount of time from application for ADC to receipt of first child support payment will decrease.

This hypothesis, like the earlier ones dealing with differences of dates, is a complex one. First, we selected only those of the total sample (N=588) for whom a first child support payment has been received. This resulted in 375 cases (63.8 percent of the total sample). Moreover, we used the data from the PDS-series forms specifying the date of the first obligation as an indication of the date the first child support payment was received. Table V.3 displays the basic statistics for the groups.

Table V.3. Number of days from application for ADC to receipt of first child support payment.

-----Number of Days-----

Group	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Cases
Fremont Pretest	2	3,840	635.5	772.6	65
Fremont Posttest	-1	2,623	441.2	517.1	98
Hastings Pretest	-678	3,624	579.9	635.6	100
Hastings Posttest	-1,460	3,587	745.1	841.7	112
Total Sample	-1,460	3,840	-602.6	708.5	375

Curiously, we find the group means heading in unexpected directions in Table V.3. That is, the number of days for the Fremont Posttest group is less than the Fremont Pretest, and the Hastings Posttest is greater than the Hastings Pretest. An examination of the statistical significance of the differences between these group means shows that there is a real difference between the four group means (F ratio is 3.35, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.02$).

Figure E.9, examining group medians, does not provide much more confidence that a real difference exists for the groups. The Fremont groups are generally above the overall percentage of 50.1 percent and the Hastings groups are generally below that value. The chi-square for this test is

2.98, three degrees of freedom, which is significant at $p < 0.39$. Therefore, according to the criterion accepted here, this is an insignificant relationship; that is, membership in one of these groups has no real influence on the time from ADC application to receipt of first payment.

Hypothesis 3.7 The average amount of time from application for ADC to either a verified address or verified AP employment information will decrease.

We selected only those of the total sample (N=588) for whom a location of AP address or a location of AP employment was accomplished. This resulted in 200 cases (34.0 percent of the total sample). Table V.4 displays the basic statistics for the groups.

Table V.4. Number of days from application for ADC to location of address or location of employment by evaluation group.

-----Number of Days-----					
Group	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Cases
Fremont Pretest	-594	3,362	398.6	827.4	46
Fremont Posttest	-438	2,550	448.5	664.0	59
Hastings Pretest	-855	3,239	489.7	786.8	54
Hastings Posttest	-280	2,639	858.9	858.6	41
Total Sample	-855	3,362	532.3	790.6	200

Looking only at the means in Table V.4, both offices experienced increased delays from application to location, and the Hastings Office seemed to have the largest increase. An examination of the statistical significance of the differences between these group means shows that there is a real difference between the four group means (F ratio is 3.14, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.03$).

At first glance, Figure E.10, examining group medians, provides more evidence that a real difference between Hastings and Fremont exists. The two Fremont groups are above the 50.0 percent level for the overall sample while the Hastings groups are below that level. The chi-square for this test is 6.35, three degrees of freedom, which is significant at $p < 0.10$. According to the criterion accepted here, this is an

insignificant relationship; membership in one of these groups has no real influence on whether the case will be above or below the median time from ADC application to location of AP address or employment.

Hypothesis 3.8 The average amount of time from application for ADC to referral to IV-D will decrease.

We were unable to link the information from the DSS data bases and the intake logs such that this hypothesis might be evaluated. Further, the data from the intake logs for the reasons mentioned earlier does not seem to be consistent and reliable over all the groups.

Hypothesis 3.9 The average amount of time from application for ADC to IV-D intake will decrease.

This is similar to Hypothesis 3.8 (if not the same hypothesis) and we were unable to evaluate it for the same reasons.

Hypothesis 3.10 The average amount of time from application for ADC to first contact with AP will decrease.

We selected only those of the total sample (N=588) for whom a location of AP address or a location of AP employment or acknowledgement of paternity was accomplished. This resulted in 399 cases (67.9 percent of the total sample). Table V.5 displays the basic statistics for the groups.

Group	-----Number of Days-----				Standard Deviation	Valid Cases
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean			
Fremont Pretest	-148,559	760	-145,572.6	17,380.3	73	
Fremont Posttest	-148,568	1,348	-146,527.3	14,580.6	105	
Hastings Pretest	-148,553	3,629	-115,596.4	61,407.8	102	
Hastings Posttest	-148,527	2,447	-122,586.2	55,822.1	119	
Total Sample	-148,568	3,629	-131,305.2	46,641.7	399	

Looking only at the means in Table V.5, both offices experienced increased delays, and the Hastings Office seemed to have the largest increase. An examination of the

statistical significance of the differences between these group means shows that there is a real difference between the four group means (F ratio is 12.20, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.00$).

Figure E.11, examining group medians, suggests that the difference is the opposite of that expected when compared with the overall median for the time difference between ADC application and location of address or employment or the acknowledgement of paternity for all cases. The Fremont groups are generally above the overall 50.1 percent, while the Hastings groups are generally below that value. The chi-square for this test is 24.07, three degrees of freedom, which is significant at $p < 0.00$. Therefore, according to the criterion accepted here, this is a significant relationship; that is, membership in one of these groups has a real influence on whether the case will be above or below the median time from ADC application to a location of address or employment, or acknowledgement. More specifically, those in the Hastings Posttest group are more likely than those in the Fremont Posttest group to take longer to locate the AP.

Expected Outcome 4.0: Child support collections will increase and payment histories will improve.

Hypothesis 4.1 The total amount of collection for ADC/CSE cases will increase.

For Hypothesis 4.1, we used an indirect indicator of the level of collections by determining the cases in which obligation has been met in the sample. Figure E.12 shows that 7.5 percent of the cases in the sample met their obligation according to the indicator from the IV-D Status, Reason Code on the CSE-37 form. The Fremont Groups were both higher than this value and both the Hastings Groups were below. However, these differences were not statistically significant: chi-square was 4.60, three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.20$. Therefore, there was no difference in total collections among the groups.

Hypothesis 4.2 The amount of money saved by the project will be greater than its operating costs.

The staff interviews offer some clue to this hypothesis. The office supervisor in the Hastings office suggested that the operating costs covering three additional workers and a legal secretary, equipment, and a larger office increased the operating costs, but that these circumstance had been adequately anticipated. Moreover, she felt that the Demonstration Project period improved child support payments to about the \$80,000-\$90,000 level.

Expected Outcome 5.0: Worker efficiency will improve.

Hypothesis 5.1 The number of AP locations made per worker will increase.

The earlier discussion of Hypothesis 3.7 bears on this hypothesis. Table V.6, an adaptation of Table V.4, shows the valid cases per worker in the groups. Fremont had three workers throughout the study period; Hastings had three in the pretest period and seven in the posttest period.

Group	Cases	Worker	Cases/Worker
Fremont Pretest	46	3	15.3
Fremont Posttest	59	3	19.7
Hastings Pretest	54	3	18.0
Hastings Posttest	41	7	5.6

Table V.11 indicates that the number of cases in Hastings Posttest Group located was not sufficiently large enough to overcome the increase in the number of workers, at least in the present sample.

Hypothesis 5.2 The number of paternities established per worker will increase.

Once again, the discussion of Hypothesis 3.1 bears on this hypothesis. Table V.7 is an adaptation of Figure E.6.

Group	Cases	Worker	Cases/Worker
Fremont Pretest	3	3	1.0
Fremont Posttest	10	3	3.3
Hastings Pretest	4	3	1.3
Hastings Posttest	1	7	0.1

Table V.7 does not allow us to conclude that the number of paternities per worker has increased in the Hastings office, at least in the present sample.

Hypothesis 5.3 and Hypothesis 5.4 [Combined] The number and percentage of active cases (receiving some kind of attention) will increase.

Figure E.13 provides the information for both Hypotheses 5.3 and 5.4. Neither the absolute number of cases nor the percentage of cases appears to vary much from the overall sample or between the groups. However, the difference is statistically significant (chi-square is 13.67 at three degrees of freedom; $p < 0.003$). It seems that the Hastings office has experienced a drop in the active cases receiving attention. This may be due to the more thorough treatment of individual cases and possible reluctance to re-open cases until absolutely necessary.

Expected Outcome 6.0: Other possible effects.

Hypothesis 6.1 Clients may be less satisfied with one or more aspects of the project than they are with aspects of the present system.

Refer to Chapter IV for a discussion of the satisfaction of the clients as indicated by the Client Survey. A good portion of the entire questionnaire covered the degree of satisfaction with various aspects of the CSE offices. Unfortunately, for reasons already discussed, we have no pretest-posttest comparison, only a comparison of offices.

Hypothesis 6.2 ADC/CSE workers will spend more time on non-ADC cases due to denial rates.

This seemed an unclear hypothesis because there is apparently no way to know why ADC/CSE workers shift from one type of case to another. There was no immediately understandable way to evaluate this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6.3 Number of contacts made with AP after hours will be greater than those made during hours.

The information available seemed insufficient to evaluate this hypothesis. It is clear that a good part of the Phone Contactor/Collector's efforts occurred after normal hours. Perhaps the discussion of the telephone logs information in Chapter IV could provide useful information.

Hypothesis 6.4 Number of successful AP locations gathered from custodial parents in face-to-face interviews will be greater than those gathered in phone calls.

Information appropriate to evaluate this hypothesis was not available.

Hypothesis 6.5 ADC savings will result from decreased processing time.

Evaluation of the correct ADC cost figures was not possible.

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

As with many field experiments, the overall evaluation of the Nebraska IV-D/IV-A Intake and Phone Collections Project resulted in mixed findings. It appears that the Demonstration Project produced positive or desired outcomes in several areas, which are summarized below.

-The Demonstration Project generally increased the level of absent parent locations in the Hastings office.

-Paternity establishments were generally improved for both ADC and non-ADC cases throughout the life of the Demonstration Project.

-There was an increase in the establishment of support obligations in the Hastings office during the Demonstration Project.

Short-term changes in the desired direction were detected in several other areas, however, these trends were generally short lived and they fell back to the baseline levels. This cycle of substantial gains followed by a decline to the baseline generally occurred over a four-month period, October 1988 through January 1989. Although we are unable to explain this cyclical pattern we offer two possible explanations.

The apparent changes during this quarter may be an artifact resulting from increased reporting during the first quarter of the federal fiscal year. Although the dynamics of this are unclear, it may be that a new fiscal year imposes reporting requirements that are reflected only in the first quarter. The post-January decline may be a function of the cessation of reporting, and in reality, the true effect does not vary much from the baseline.

A second possible reason for the rapid increases followed by sharp declines may have to do with changes in the level of program efforts. It may be that the level of effort allocated by program staff to the Demonstration Project intensified during the first quarter and then fell back to baseline levels.

We are unable to determine which of these two possibilities is most plausible. However, our impression is that the short-term effects are probably the result of a reporting artifact and not a real program effect.

Other positive outcomes attributed to the Demonstration Project were identified by project staff during the interview phase of the evaluation. In general, nearly all of the staff at the Hastings demonstration site indicated that the Demonstration Project produced desired outcomes. As was reported in Chapter III, staff had several suggestions for improving the project, but nearly everyone was positive about the project's future potential.

Evidence of at least one additional benefit that resulted from the project was identified in the client survey. Hastings office clients, in comparison to Fremont office clients, tended to evaluate their treatment by social services staff more favorably. They also indicated that Hastings workers provided clearer explanations of child support enforcement services.

The Demonstration Project does not appear to have produced the desired outcomes on a multitude of other variables. In particular, evidence in support of the evaluation hypotheses is lacking for nearly all of the hypotheses. We are reluctant to conclude that the Demonstration Project was more of a failure than a success for several reasons.

-There is a good likelihood that Fremont was an inappropriate control, even though it may have been the best possible choice. It appears that Fremont had an influx of cases during the project life that made comparisons difficult.

-The Demonstration Project was implemented in a manner consistent with the Project's quasi-experimental design. However, personnel changes in both offices probably produced effects that are impossible to sort out.

-The performance of the telephone number contactor/collector was problematic and was out of compliance with the "treatment" component of the project design.

There are several other reasons why the evaluation may not have detected positive Project effects. These have to do with the evaluation design itself and with the data systems available for use in the evaluation.

-Some of the data collection instruments were seriously flawed in that it was next to impossible to link these instruments with other social services data systems. For some reason a common identifier, such as social security number, was not included on all of the data collection logs. Changes in data collection formats during the Project compounded this problem.


-The evaluation design relied too heavily on complex data systems that were not designed for, and were "unfriendly" to, program evaluation.

-The evaluation design was implemented several months into the project making it impossible for the evaluators to remedy problems with data collection instruments and with the design itself.

The evaluation design was probably unnecessarily complicated. Moreover, difficulty in implementing the design was likely exacerbated by having one party develop the design and another party carry out its implementation. Although the design may have represented the ideal, it turned out to be insensitive to real capabilities of current social services data systems, etc. The evaluation would have benefited by having the evaluators develop the design.

Future evaluations of demonstration projects such as this one would benefit from a team approach to the evaluation. The team might consist of outside evaluators, social services staffers assigned (on a part-time basis) to work on the evaluation with the evaluators, and a social services data specialist. This approach is more likely to result in a robust evaluation design that reflects the realities of social service programs and processes, and data systems.

In sum, it appears that several positive effects can be attributed to the Demonstration Project. There are several areas in which the Demonstration Project appears to have failed in bringing about desired effects. However, these failures may be a function of flaws in the implementation of the Project and with the evaluation design, rather than with Project design.



APPENDIX A: Figure A.1 Through Figure A.18, Data from CSE-70 FormA-1 to A-5

Data Related to ADC Cases:

- Figure A.1 - Total Number of Open ADC Arrears Only Cases Continued from the Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-1
- Figure A.2 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Opened During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-1
- Figure A.3 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-1
- Figure A.4 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-1
- Figure A.5 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-2

Data Related to ADC and Foster Care Cases:

- Figure A.6 - Total Number of Open ADC and Foster Care Cases Continued from the Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-2
- Figure A.7 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Opened During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-2
- Figure A.8 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-2
- Figure A.9 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-3
- Figure A.10 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-3
- Figure A.11 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Children for Whom Paternity Was Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-3
- Figure A.12 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Support Obligations Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989...A-3

Data Related to Non-ADC Cases:

- Figure A.13 - Total Number of Open Non-ADC Cases from Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....A-4




Figure A.14 - Total Number of Non-ADC Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....	A-4
Figure A.15 - Total Number of Non-ADC Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....	A-4
Figure A.16 - Total Number of Non-ADC Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....	A-4
Figure A.17 - Total Number of Non-ADC Children for Whom Paternity Was Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....	A-5
Figure A.18 - Total Number of Non-ADC Support Obligations Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.....	A-5

APPENDIX B: Table B.1 Through Table B.17, Data from PDS100, PDS110, PDS111, CSE-35, CSE-36, CSE-37 Forms.....B-1 to B-17

Aggregate Data Analysis:

Table B.1 - Type of Case Eligibility by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-1
Table B.2 - Aid to Aged, Blind, Disabled Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-2
Table B.3 - Medicaid Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-3
Table B.4 - Social Service Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-4
Table B.5 - Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-5
Table B.6 - Food Stamp Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-6
Table B.7 - Active Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-7
Table B.8 - Pending Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-8
Table B.9 - Rejection Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....	B-9




Table B.10 - Closed Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....B-10

Individual Data Analysis:

Table B.11 - Average Number of Individuals in Case by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....B-11
Table B.12 - Average Amount of Court Ordered Payments by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July1989.....B-12
Table B.13 - Average Net Unearned Income of Clients by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July1989.....B-13
Table B.14 - Average Amount of Grant by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989.....B-14
Table B.15 - Average Age of Applicants/ Recipients by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July1989.....B-15
Table B.16 - Average Number of Days Between Signed Application and Approval/Rejection Decision by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July1989.....B-16
Table B.17 - Average Number of Days Between Approval/Rejection Decision and Payment Effective Date by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July1989.....B-17

APPENDIX C: Figure C.1 Through Figure C.32, Data from Client Survey.....C-1 to C-16

Figure C.1 - Reason for visiting DSS office...C-1
Figure C.2 - Clarity of length of process.....C-1
Figure C.3 - Amount of time taken for case....C-2
Figure C.4 - Receive handouts, pamphlets?.....C-2
Figure C.5 - Handouts helpful?.....C-3
Figure C.6 - Privacy of interview setting.....C-3
Figure C.7 - Effect of lack of privacy.....C-4
Figure C.8 - CSE worker knowledgeable?.....C-4
Figure C.9 - Treated with respect?.....C-5
Figure C.10 - Clear instructions?.....C-5
Figure C.11 - All questions answered?.....C-6
Figure C.12 - Clear explanations?.....C-6
Figure C.13 - Individual interview helped.....C-7
Figure C.14 - Too many questions asked.....C-7





Figure C.15 - CSE worker listened well.....	C-8
Figure C.16 - My case handled well.....	C-8
Figure C.17 - Informed about case progress.....	C-9
Figure C.18 - Treatment of absent parent.....	C-9
Figure C.19 - I want to help CSE staff.....	C-10
Figure C.20 - Group interview informative.....	C-10
Figure C.21 - Cooperate with CSE, then ADC?....	C-11
Figure C.22 - Want to establish paternity?....	C-11
Figure C.23 - Cooperate for my children.....	C-12
Figure C.24 - Children benefit most.....	C-12
Figure C.25 - Would not have applied for ADC...C-13	C-13
Figure C.26 - Now receiving PA in Nebraska?....	C-13
Figure C.27 - Receiving ADC?.....	C-14
Figure C.28 - Receiving Medical Assistance?....	C-14
Figure C.29 - Applied for ADC in last 2 years?..C-15	C-15
Figure C.30 - Status of ADC application?.....	C-15
Figure C.31 - Applied in Nebraska before?.....	C-16
Figure C.32 - Past participation in CSE.....	C-16


APPENDIX D: Figure D.1 Through Figure D.10, Data from
Hastings Telephone Logs.....D-1 to D-5

Figure D.1 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: CSE Case Type.....	D-1
Figure D.2 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: First Call Results--Contact Made.....	D-1
Figure D.3 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: First Call Results--Contact Not Made.....	D-2
Figure D.4 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: First Call Results--Recorded Comments.....	D-2
Figure D.5 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Promise to Pay Obtained.....	D-3
Figure D.6 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Appointment Obtained.....	D-3
Figure D.7 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Noncooperating Person.....	D-4
Figure D.8 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Telephone Busy.....	D-4
Figure D.9 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: No One Home.....	D-5
Figure D.10 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: No One Answered Phone.....	D-5




APPENDIX E: Figure E.1 Through Figure E.13, Data
Related to Evaluation Hypotheses...E-1 to E-7

Figure E.1 - Total Absent Parent Locations by Evaluation Group.....	E-1
Figure E.2 - Total Absent Parent Locations Occurring Before ADC Determination by Evaluation Group.....	E-1
Figure E.3 - Total Cases Referred Directly to Establishment or Enforcement or Phone Contact/Collection by Evaluation Group.....	E-2
Figure E.4 - Total Noncooperation Cases Reported on CSE-37 Form by Evaluation Group.....	E-2
Figure E.5 - Total Cases Needing Paternity Establishment by Evaluation Group.....	E-3
Figure E.6 - Total Voluntary Acknowledgments of Paternity by Evaluation Group.....	E-3
Figure E.7 - Total Absent Parents Who Stipulate to Pay Support by Evaluation Group.....	E-4
Figure E.8 - Total Cases Less than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and Establishment of Court Order by Evaluation Group.....	E-4
Figure E.9 - Total Cases Less than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and First Court Obligation by Evaluation Group.....	E-5
Figure E.10 - Total Cases Less than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and Address Location or Employment Location by Evaluation Group...	E-5
Figure E.11 - Total Cases Less than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and Address Location, Employment Location, or Paternity Acknowledgment by Evaluation Group.....	E-6
Figure E.12 - Total Cases With Obligation Met as Reported on CSE-37 Form by Evaluation Group.....	E-6
Figure E.13 - Total Active Cases Receiving Some Kind of Attention by Evaluation Group.....	E-7



Appendices



Appendix A
Figure A.1 Through Figure A.18,
Data from CSE-70 Form




Figure A.1 - Total Number of Open ADC Arrears Only Cases Continued from the Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989




Figure A.2 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Opened During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989




Figure A.3 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989





Figure A.4 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989






Figure A.5 - Total Number of ADC Arrears Only Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During Month, June 1987 - July 1989




Figure A.6 - Total Number of Open ADC and Foster Care Cases Continued From Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989




Figure A.7 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Opened During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989





Figure A.8 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.






Figure A.9 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.




Figure A.10 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.




Figure A.11 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Children for Whom Paternity Was Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.





Figure A.12 - Total Number of ADC and Foster Care Support Obligations Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989.






Figure A.13 - Total Number of Open Non-ADC Cases from Previous Month, June 1987 - July 1989




Figure A.14 - Total Number of Non-ADC Cases Formally Closed During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989




Figure A.15 - Total Number of Non-ADC Cases Open on the Last Day of the Month, June 1987 - July 1989





Figure A.16 - Total Number of Non-ADC Cases in Which an Absent Parent Location Was Made During the Month June 1987 - July 1989






Figure A.17 - Total Number of Non-ADC Children for Whom Paternity Was Established the During Month, June 1987 - July 1989






Figure A.18 - Total Number of Non-ADC Support Obligations Established During the Month, June 1987 - July 1989





Appendix B

**Table B.1 Through Table B.17,
Data from PDS100, PDS110, PDS111, CSE-35,
CSE-36, CSE-37 Forms**




Table B.1 - Type of Case Eligibility by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
AABD/disabled	24	32	33	33	0	0.0
ADC/regular	621	724	715	725	10	1.4
ADC/unemployed parent	97	107	108	108	0	0.0
State foster care, IV-A	43	43	42	40	-2	-4.8
State foster care, IV-B	11	49	47	51	4	8.5
Office Summary	796	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
AABD/disabled	2	5	5	5	0	0.0
ADC/regular	134	157	161	157	-4	-2.5
ADC/unemployed parent	27	30	29	27	-2	-6.9
State foster care, IV-A	0	0	0	0	0	NA
State foster care, IV-B	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
AABD/disabled	5	4	5	8	3	60.0
ADC/regular	146	193	191	194	3	1.6
ADC/unemployed parent	20	28	28	28	0	0.0
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
ADC/regular	13	8	5	5	0	0.0
ADC/unemployed parent	1	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
AABD/disabled	15	28	29	30	1	3.4
ADC/regular	510	610	615	617	2	0.3
ADC/unemployed parent	77	96	99	101	2	2.0
State foster care, IV-A	0	0	0	0	0	NA
State foster care, IV-B	0	0	1	1	0	0.0
Office Summary	602	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
AABD/disabled	10	13	12	12	0	0.0
ADC/regular	130	151	155	153	-2	-1.3
ADC/unemployed parent	10	17	15	18	3	20.0
Office Summary	150	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8




Table B.2 - Aid to Aged, Blind, Disabled Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
No AABD	755	898	886	898	12	1.4
Aged	1	0	0	0	0	NA
Blind	1	2	2	2	0	0.0
Disabled	40	54	56	56	0	0.0
State disability program	0	1	1	1	0	0.0
Office Summary	797	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
No AABD	159	183	186	180	-6	-3.2
Disabled	4	9	9	9	0	0.0
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	960	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
No AABD	161	216	213	215	2	0.9
Aged	2	2	2	2	0	0.0
Blind	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Disabled	9	7	9	13	4	44.4
Office Summary	172	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
No AABD	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
No AABD	575	686	695	696	1	0.1
Aged	1	2	2	2	0	0.0
Blind	1	1	1	1	0	0.0
Disabled	26	45	46	50	4	8.7
Office Summary	603	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
No AABD	133	159	162	163	1	0.6
Disabled	16	21	19	19	0	0.0
State disability program	0	1	1	1	0	0.0
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	938	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,898	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8

NA = Calculation not applicable because it would require division by 0.




Table B.3 - Medicaid Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
No Medicaid status-closed	379	518	524	515	-9	-1.7
Regular	389	420	398	424	26	6.5
Excess income spenddown	28	17	23	18	-5	-21.7
State only medical/Nebraska disabled program	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	796	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
No Medicaid status-closed	78	111	112	112	0	0.0
Regular	74	76	77	71	-6	-7.8
Excess income spenddown	11	5	6	6	0	0.0
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
No Medicaid status-closed	85	130	133	132	-1	-0.8
Regular	78	94	91	98	7	7.7
Excess income spenddown	8	1	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
No Medicaid status-closed	13	8	5	5	0	0.0
Regular	1	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
No Medicaid status-closed	313	396	402	410	8	2.0
Regular	282	330	336	333	-3	-0.9
Excess income spenddown	7	8	6	6	0	0.0
Office Summary	603	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
No Medicaid status-closed	83	123	122	117	-5	-4.1
Regular	64	52	56	62	6	10.7
Excess income spenddown	2	4	2	2	0	0.0
Excess income nursing home	0	2	2	2	0	0.0
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8

NA = This calculation not applicable because it would require division by 0.




Table B.4 - Social Service Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
No social services	429	599	595	605	10	1.7
Social services	367	356	350	352	2	0.6
Office Summary	796	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
No social services	107	144	145	141	-4	-2.8
Social services	56	48	50	48	-2	-4.0
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
No social services	105	159	157	160	3	1.9
Social services	66	66	67	70	3	4.5
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
No social services	9	8	5	5	0	0.0
Social services	5	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
No social services	321	442	439	450	11	2.5
Social services	281	292	305	299	-6	-2.0
Office Summary	602	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
No social services	108	148	149	150	1	0.7
Social services	42	33	33	33	0	0.0
Office Summary	150	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8

NA = Calculation not applicable because it would require division by 0.




Table B.5 - Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
Not applicable to case	753	891	881	893	12	1.4
SSI cash recipient	23	35	37	37	0	0.0
SSI/not financially eligible	18	25	23	23	0	0.0
Rejected SSI-other than financial reason	2	2	2	2	0	0.0
SSI determination pending	0	2	2	2	0	0.0
Office Summary	796	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
Not applicable to case	158	183	186	180	-6	-3.2
SSI cash recipient	1	2	2	2	0	0.0
SSI/not financially eligible	4	7	7	7	0	0.0
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
Not applicable to case	161	214	211	213	2	0.9
SSI cash recipient	8	8	10	12	2	20.0
SSI/not financially eligible	2	3	3	5	2	66.7
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
Not applicable to case	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
Not applicable to case	574	684	693	699	6	0.9
SSI cash recipient	17	27	28	27	-1	-3.6
SSI/not financially eligible	9	20	20	20	0	0.0
Income over limit	3	3	3	3	0	0.0
Office Summary	603	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
Not applicable to case	135	161	164	165	1	0.6
SSI cash recipient	9	11	11	11	0	0.0
SSI/not financially eligible	5	9	7	7	0	0.0
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8




Table B.6 - Food Stamp Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
No food stamps	691	854	846	864	18	2.1
Food stamps (PA)	105	101	99	93	-6	-6.1
Food stamps (non-PA)	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	796	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
No food stamps	143	171	173	171	-2	-1.2
Food stamps (PA)	19	21	22	18	-4	-18.2
Office Summary	162	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	958	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
No food stamps	140	190	191	200	9	4.7
Food stamps (PA)	31	35	33	30	-3	-9.1
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
No food stamps	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
No food stamps	525	641	658	682	24	3.6
Food stamps (PA)	78	93	86	67	-19	-22.1
Office Summary	603	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
No food stamps	129	164	170	170	0	0.0
Food stamps (PA)	20	17	12	13	1	8.3
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,895	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8

NA = Calculation not applicable because it would require division by 0.




Table B.7 - Active Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
Not active	421	574	580	580	0	0.0
Active	376	381	365	377	12	3.3
Office Summary	797	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
Not active	90	124	123	121	-2	-1.6
Active	73	68	72	68	-4	-5.6
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	960	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
Not active	90	137	138	139	1	0.7
Active	81	88	86	91	5	5.8
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
Not active	13	8	5	5	0	0.0
Active	1	0	0	0	0	NA
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
Not active	341	446	454	464	10	2.2
Active	261	288	290	285	-5	-1.7
Office Summary	602	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
Not active	87	126	127	125	-2	-1.6
Active	62	55	55	58	3	5.5
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	936	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8

NA = Calculation not applicable because it would require division by 0.




Table B.8 - Pending Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
Not pending	793	949	941	953	12	1.3
Pending	4	6	4	4	0	0.0
Office Summary	797	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
Not pending	160	187	191	187	-4	-2.1
Pending	2	5	4	2	-2	-50.0
Office Summary	162	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
Not pending	170	223	219	226	7	3.2
Pending	1	2	5	4	-1	-20.0
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
Not pending	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
Not pending	593	730	740	740	0	0.0
Pending	10	4	4	9	5	125.0
Office Summary	603	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
Not pending	147	180	174	176	2	1.1
Pending	2	1	8	7	-1	-12.5
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8




Table B.9 - Rejection Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
Not rejected	750	893	881	894	13	1.5
Rejected	46	62	64	63	-1	-1.6
Office Summary	796	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
Not rejected	159	182	184	178	-6	-3.3
Rejected	4	10	11	11	0	0.0
Office Summary	163	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
Not rejected	164	208	208	212	4	1.9
Rejected	7	17	16	18	2	12.5
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
Not rejected	13	7	4	4	0	0.0
Rejected	1	1	1	1	0	0.0
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
Not rejected	548	665	679	688	9	1.3
Rejected	55	69	65	61	-4	-6.2
Office Summary	603	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
Not rejected	138	161	164	164	0	0.0
Rejected	11	20	18	19	1	5.6
Office Summary	149	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8




Table B.10 - Closed Status of Cases by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month:				Amount Change: June '89 to July '89	Percent Change: June '89 to July '89
	6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989		
HASTINGS REGION						
Hastings Office:						
Not closed	433	459	448	459	11	2.5
Closed case (up to 2 years)	364	496	497	498	1	0.2
Office Summary	797	955	945	957	12	1.3
Clay Center Office:						
Not closed	80	84	89	83	-6	-6.7
Closed case (up to 2 years)	82	108	106	106	0	0.0
Office Summary	162	192	195	189	-6	-3.1
Regional Summary	959	1,147	1,140	1,146	6	0.5
FREMONT REGION						
Tekamah Office:						
Not closed	92	109	111	116	5	4.5
Closed case (up to 2 years)	79	116	113	114	1	0.9
Office Summary	171	225	224	230	6	2.7
West Point Office:						
Not closed	2	1	1	1	0	0.0
Closed case (up to 2 years)	12	7	4	4	0	0.0
Office Summary	14	8	5	5	0	0.0
Fremont Office:						
Not closed	330	370	369	366	-3	-0.8
Closed case (up to 2 years)	272	364	375	383	8	2.1
Office Summary	602	734	744	749	5	0.7
Blair Office:						
Not closed	78	82	87	90	3	3.4
Closed case (up to 2 years)	72	99	95	93	-2	-2.1
Office Summary	150	181	182	183	1	0.5
Regional Summary	937	1,148	1,155	1,167	12	1.0
Total	1,896	2,295	2,295	2,313	18	0.8




Table B.11 - Average Number of Individuals in Case by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	2.6	2.4	3.0	2.5	-16.7
Clay Center Office	3.0	2.3	2.0	2.7	35.0
Regional Summary	2.7	2.4	2.9	2.6	-10.3
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	2.2	2.0	1.0	2.8	180.0
West Point Office	3.0	m	m	2.3	NA
Fremont Office	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7	3.8
Blair Office	2.6	2.0	3.4	2.7	20.5
Regional Summary	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.7	0.0
Total	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.6	-7.1

m = Missing data

Data include individuals who applied for benefits prior to June 1987.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.




Table B.12 - Average Amount of Court Ordered Payments by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	148.9	68.3	125.2	143.4	14.5
Clay Center Office	137.9	25.0	m	100.8	NA
Regional Summary	145.5	53.9	125.2	137.1	9.5
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	96.2	100.0	150.0	155.6	3.7
West Point Office	40.0	m	m	200.0	NA
Fremont Office	137.6	200.0	30.9	133.4	331.7
Blair Office	35.4	1.0	150.5	171.6	14.0
Regional Summary	115.2	100.3	90.6	143.4	58.3
Total	131.2	77.1	106.3	140.4	32.0

m = Missing data

Data include individuals who applied for benefits prior to June 1987.

Data represent first obligation only.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.




Table B.13 - Average Net Unearned Income of Clients by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month:				Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
	6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	191.2	149.3	416.5	192.1	-53.9
Clay Center Office	164.6	m	m	209.2	NA
Regional Summary	186.8	149.3	416.5	194.2	-53.4
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	134.5	175.0	m	230.5	NA
West Point Office	390.8	m	m	100.0	NA
Fremont Office	234.5	m	175.0	229.6	31.2
Blair Office	175.0	m	m	260.9	NA
Regional Summary	234.2	175.0	175.0	234.5	34.0
Total	199.9	153.6	368.2	209.8	43.0

m = Missing data

Data include individuals who applied for benefits prior to June 1987.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.




Table B.14 - Average Amount of Grant by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	298.0	364.0	293.0	301.8	3.0
Clay Center Office	319.9	293.0	m	303.4	NA
Regional Summary	303.3	340.3	293.0	302.0	3.1
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	327.0	m	205.3	284.1	38.4
West Point Office	m	m	m	m	NA
Fremont Office	318.5	293.0	293.0	315.1	7.5
Blair Office	280.0	m	m	330.1	NA
Regional Summary	316.8	293.0	249.1	311.0	24.8
Total	310.2	328.5	263.8	306.9	16.3

m: Missing data

Data include individuals who applied for benefits prior to June, 1987.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.




Table B.15 - Average Age of Applicants/Recipients by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	30.6	27.1	27.3	28.9	5.9
Clay Center Office	29.4	22.1	17.0	29.3	72.3
Regional Summary	30.4	26.8	26.3	28.9	9.9
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	25.8	32.0	41.3	29.4	-28.8
West Point Office	29.1	m	m	27.4	NA
Fremont Office	29.5	32.0	23.0	29.1	26.5
Blair Office	35.0	37.4	37.5	28.5	-24.0
Regional Summary	29.7	33.6	27.8	29.0	4.3
Total	30.0	29.0	27.1	29.0	7.0

m = Missing data

Data include individuals who applied for benefits prior to June 1987.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.




Table B.16 - Average Number of Days Between Signed Application and Approval/Rejection Decision by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	14.7	20.6	25.7	28.1	9.3
Clay Center Office	19.1	15.5	23.0	22.9	0.43
Regional Summary	15.8	19.9	25.5	27.3	7.1
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	38.3	21.0	m	32.9	NA
West Point Office	30.0	m	m	33.3	NA
Fremont Office	25.4	27.6	33.8	27.5	-18.6
Blair Office	25.6	67.0	21.4	33.1	54.7
Regional Summary	27.1	40.0	29.7	29.5	0.67
Total	21.6	27.5	27.9	28.4	1.8

m = Missing data

Data include individuals who applied prior to June 1987.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.





Table B.17 - Average Number of Days Between Approval/Rejection and Decision Payment Effective Date by DSS Office and Region: Selected Data from June 1987 Through July 1989

	Baseline				Percent Change in Mean: June '89 to July '89
	Cases Per Month: 6/87 to 5/88	May 1989	June 1989	July 1989	
HASTINGS REGION					
Hastings Office	43.1	361.9	395.0	631.8	59.9
Clay Center Office	41.9	1629.3	8.0	695.9	86.0
Regional Summary	42.9	585.5	359.8	642.1	78.5
FREMONT REGION					
Tekamah Office	43.2	-131.0	30.0	634.1	20.1
West Point Office	60.8	m	m	293.7	NA
Fremont Office	34.6	402.2	445.6	574.5	-28.9
Blair Office	41.9	128.7	667.2	479.9	28.0
Regional Summary	37.8	251.8	488.9	570.6	16.7
Total	40.3	470.0	436.3	606.1	39.9

m = Missing data

Data include individuals who applied for benefits prior to June 1987.

NA = Calculation not possible because of missing data.



Appendix C
Figure C.1 Through Figure C.32,
Data from Client Survey






Figure C.1 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Why did you first come to the Child Support office?"



Note: 60 Hastings Responses; 58 Fremont Responses; and 27 Missing Cases

Figure C.2 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Was it made clear to you how long the ADC and the Child Support intake/interviewing process would take?"



Note: 73 Hastings Responses; 69 Fremont Responses; and 3 Missing Cases






Figure C.3 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Do you think that the amount of time taken to handle your case on the first day at the Department of Social Services' Child Support office was":



Note: 75 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 0 Missing Cases

Figure C.4 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Did you receive any handouts, pamphlets, or other printed information describing the Child Support Enforcement Services?"



Note: 75 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 0 Missing Cases






Figure C.5 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "If yes [to the previous question], was this information helpful?"



Note: 29 Hastings Responses; 36 Fremont Responses; and 80 Missing Cases

Figure C.6 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Considering the area or room where you were interviewed in the Child Support office, did you feel that others nearby could overhear your responses to the Child Support worker?"



Note: 70 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 5 Missing Cases






Figure C.7 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "If yes [to the previous question], do you feel that the fact the others could overhear your responses affected what you said during the interview?"



Note: 37 Hastings Responses; 28 Fremont Responses; and 80 Missing Cases

Figure C.8 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker was knowledgeable."



Note: 75 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 0 Missing Cases






Figure C.9 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker treated me with respect."



Note: 75 Hastings Responses; 69 Fremont Responses; and 1 Missing Case

Figure C.10 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker gave me clear instructions."



Note: 74 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 1 Missing Case






Figure C.11 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker willingly answered all of my questions."



Note: 74 Hastings Responses; 69 Fremont Responses; and 2 Missing Cases

Figure C.12 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker clearly explained the Child Support enforcement service."



Note: 72 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 3 Missing Cases






Figure C.13 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement "My individual interview with the Child Support worker helped me to understand the Child Support services available."



Note: 72 Hastings Responses; 69 Fremont Responses; and 4 Missing Cases

Figure C.14 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker asked too many questions."



Note: 71 Hastings Responses; 69 Fremont Responses; and 6 Missing Cases






Figure C.15 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support worker listened carefully to what I said."



Note: 74 Hastings Responses; 69 Fremont Responses; and 2 Missing Cases

Figure C.16 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "My Child Support case has been handled well."



Note: 69 Hastings Responses; 67 Fremont Responses; and 9 Missing Cases






Figure C.17 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "I have been kept well informed of the progress of my child support enforcement case."



Note: 71 Hastings Responses; 65 Fremont Responses; and 9 Missing Cases

Figure C.18 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The Child Support staff treated the absent father (or mother) in my case fairly."



Note: 63 Hastings Responses; 60 Fremont Responses; and 22 Missing Cases






Figure C.19 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The more information that I am able to provide to the Child Support staff the better off my family will be."



Note: 71 Hastings Responses; 67 Fremont Responses; and 7 Missing Cases

Figure C.20 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "The first group interview explaining child support enforcement services was informative."



Note: 83 Hastings Responses; 81 Fremont Responses; and 21 Missing Cases






Figure C.21 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "If I had known that I had to cooperate with Child Support, I would not have applied for ADC."



Note: 69 Hastings Responses; 65 Fremont Responses; and 11 Missing Cases

Figure C.22 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "After the Child Support interview, I was more interested in establishing the paternity of my child."



Note: 54 Hastings Responses; 57 Fremont Responses; and 34 Missing Cases






Figure C.23 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "After the Child Support interview, I was more interested in cooperating with the effort to collect my child support for my child(ren)."



Note: 66 Hastings Responses; 65 Fremont Responses; and 14 Missing Cases

Figure C.24 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "Children are the ones who benefit most from the Child Support program."



Note: 70 Hastings Responses; 67 Fremont Responses; and 8 Missing Cases






Figure C.25 - Percentage of Responses to the Statement: "If I had known I could help obtain child support, I would not have applied for ADC."



Note: 57 Hastings Responses; 63 Fremont Responses; and 25 Missing Cases

Figure C.26 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Are you now receiving public assistance/welfare from Nebraska?"



Note: 74 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 1 Missing Cases






Figure C.27 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Are you receiving Aid to Dependent Children (ADC)?"



Note: 47 Hastings Responses; 44 Fremont Responses; and 54 Missing Cases

Figure C.28 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Are you receiving medical assistance?"



Note: 49 Hastings Responses; 44 Fremont Responses; and 52 Missing Cases






Figure C.29 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Have you applied for Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) within the last 2 years?"



Note: 72 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 3 Missing Cases

Figure C.30 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "What is the present status of your application?"



Note: 44 Hastings Responses; 44 Fremont Responses; and 57 Missing Cases






Figure C.31 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "Before your request for ADC benefits referred to above in 5A, had you ever applied for ADC benefits in Nebraska?"




Note: 43 Hastings Responses; 45 Fremont Responses; and 57 Missing Cases

Figure C.32 - Percentage of Responses to the Question: "At any time in the past, have you participated in the Nebraska Child Support Enforcement Program?"



Note: 71 Hastings Responses; 70 Fremont Responses; and 4 Missing Cases



Appendix D

**Figure D.1 Through Figure D.10,
Data from Hastings Telephone Logs**






Figure D.1 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: CSE Case Type



Note: 310 Total Cases; 1 Missing Case

Figure D.2 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: First Call Results--Contact Made








Figure D.3 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: First Call Results--Contact Not Made



Note: 1 Case Missing in 2nd Result Data

Figure D.4 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: First Call Results--Recorded Comments



Note: 207 Cases Missing/Not Codeable






Figure D.5 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Promise to Pay Obtained?



Note: Up to 20 Calls per Person

Figure D.6 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Appointment Obtained?



Note: Up to 20 Calls per Person






Figure D.7 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Noncooperating Person?



Note: Up to 20 Calls per Person

Figure D.8 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: Telephone Busy?



Note: Up to 20 Calls per Person






Figure D.9 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: No One Home?




Note: Up to 20 Calls per Person

Figure D.10 - Hastings Telephone Log Data: No One Answers Phone?



Note: Up to 20 Calls per Person



Appendix E

Figure E.1 Through Figure E.13, Data Related to Evaluation Hypotheses




Figure E.1 - Total Absent Parent Locations by Evaluation Group





Figure E.2 - Total Absent Parent Locations Occurring Before ADC Determination by Evaluation Group






Figure E.3 - Total Cases Referred Directly to Establishment or Enforcement or Phone Contact/Collection by Evaluation Group





Figure E.4 - Total Noncooperation Cases Reported on CSE-37 Form by Evaluation Group






Figure E.5 - Total Cases Needing Paternity Establishment by Evaluation Group





Figure E.6 - Total Voluntary Acknowledgments of Paternity by Evaluation Group






Figure E.7 - Total Absent Parents Who Stipulate to Pay Support by Evaluation Group





Figure E.8 - Total Cases Less Than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and Establishment of Court Order by Evaluation Group






Figure E.9 - Total Cases Less Than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and First Court Obligation by Evaluation Group





Figure E.10 - Total Cases Less Than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and Address Location or Employment Location by Evaluation Group






Figure E.11 - Total Cases Less Than the Total Sample's Median Number of Days Between ADC Application and Address Location, Employment Location, or Paternity Acknowledgment by Evaluation Group




Figure E.12 - Total Cases With Obligation Met as Reported on CSE-37 Form by Evaluation Group

