CALIFORNIA'S ACCESS TO VISITATION GRANT PROGRAM

2016 Access to Visitation Forum Meeting: Summary Report to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

November 7, 2016
San Francisco, California

FEDERAL CHILD ACCESS AND VISITATION PROGRAM

Authorized as part of the 1996 welfare reform legislation (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act)

Statutory Goal: "to support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation of their children"

<u>Funding</u>: Approximately <u>\$10 million</u> is appropriated annually for the Access and Visitation (AV) Program, which provides funding to all 50 states and three territories

Since FFY 1997, an estimated \$190 million has been made available to states and (3) territories for the provision of AV services and

Over 1.2 million NCPs and their families have been served to date

Judicial Council Of California

CA ACCESS TO VISITATION PROGRAM

Judicial Council shall (FC section 3204):

- Administer and distribute AV grant funds
- Determine funding allocation awards to courts
- Submit a state application to federal OCSE to fund child custody and visitation programs
- Submit report to the state Legislature, evennumbered year regarding the grant program



FEDERAL FUNDING ALLOCATION TO STATE

Formula grant based on number of single-parent households

CA receives maximum amount —less than a million

CA allocation represents less than 10% of total national funding

States required to provide 10% match (non-federal source)

Match can be cash or in-kind

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OECALIFORNIA

ELIGIBLE GRANT RECIPIENTS

Low-income

Separated, separating, divorced, or never married parents

Involved in custody and visitation proceedings under the Family Code

Funds cannot be used for Tribal, dependency, home visitation, off-site visitation, or therapeutic / facilitated visitation services

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

GRANT SERVICE AREAS

• FC section 3204(b)(1) funds shall be used for:

Supervised visitation and exchange services

Parent education

Group counseling

FC section 3201 defines parent education

FC section 3202 defines "eligible provider" for the three service activities



Family courts eligible to apply Family law divisions required to administer the program Applicants "strongly encouraged" to involve multiple courts and countles; must designate one court as administering court Community-based agencies must apply as part of the courts application; court required to follow separate procurement process Subcontractor agency must be nonprofit agency

Supervised visitation services must be on-site facility, center-based Contract agreements are made only with designated court; courts subsequently enter into MOU agreement with subcontractor service provider.

AV grant contract agreement mentions Family Law Facilitators

OF CALIFORNIA

GRANT FUNDING AMOUNTS

 Funding cap and funding amounts divided into three categories:

Maximum of \$45,000

Maximum of \$60,000

Maximum of \$100,000

Demographic factors determine which category applies to a given court: (1) the number of single-parent households in the county; and (2) number of individuals with income below the poverty level in the county



FUNDING RESPONSIBILITIES

 Ensure funds expended to support program goal..."to establish programs to support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children"

States permitted to contract with courts and nonprofit entities

Monitor all programs funded

Evaluate the programs funded

Ensure safeguards are in place for clients served

Ensure domestic violence protocols established / in place



PROGRAM MONITORING

Required to monitor program services: (1) authorized by the statute; (2) ensure being conducted in an effective and efficient manner; (3) complies with federal evaluation and reporting requirements; and (4) contain safeguards that ensure safety of parents and children

Annual data reporting requirement through the "State Child Access Program Survey"

Collect Outcome data (i.e., number of NCP whose parenting time with children increased as a result of services)



PURPOSE OF 2016 FORUM MEETING

August 2016 State AV Coordinators/Managers Meeting

New Sense of Congress Legislation

State efforts to respond Sense of Congress: Goal was to bring together court leadership, child support, grant recipients, key stakeholders, and community-just partners to dialogue and exchange information regarding coordination and collaboration of services and how to integrate the states AV grant program to increase NCP parenting time – how can we create 'on ramps' through the AV funded services that will reach a greater number of NCP parents

Respond to State Grant Application Plan for FY's 2017-2019

Respond to funder directive that: (1) states should explore how to support parenting time arrangements that increase NCP access to and visitation with their children: (2) develop creative, innovative collaborations with state child support: (3) consider AV funded service delivery linkages and connections; and (4) greater federal emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness of program services and family safety



MEETING SUMMARY

Approximately 42 attendees; 27 counties statewide

Representatives included the co-chairs from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, judiciary, grant recipient courts, child support, community justice partners, Family Court Services Directors/Managers, Family Law Facilitators, Self-Help Center staff, and other key stakeholders

Meeting facilitated by outside expert

Several Roundtable group discussions AND presentation by San Diego representatives PTOC grant recipient

Six centralized themes emerged from Roundtable groups

Attendees completed evaluation form including suggestions for next steps, and ideas for if another meeting is convened





SIX PRIMARY THEMES EMERGED

Costs (affordability and accessible services)

Fear (e.g., of system, pf parent, court process, etc.) Compliance (e.g., court order/ visitation order)

Lack of information, knowledge, and education about the various processes (i.e., the court system, child support, and the AV funded services)

Safety concerns (DV, child abuse)

Increased collaboration with community

Availability of resources statewide

ATTENDEES FEEDBACK COMMENTS

Overwhelmingly positive (excellent, well planned and executed)

Learned and gained a lot of information about the AV program, grant requirements, and various ways grant has been implemented

Learned about other county programs and potential resources

Continue collaboration and outreach efforts

Cross participation b/t AV, child support and the courts (e.g., conferences, meetings, trainings)

Hearing innovative ideas; interaction / networking with other agencies and attendees

The discussion opened up possibilities

Additional funding needed (AV, court, and child support)

Additional resources that have statewide benefit for all courts, child support agencies



NEXT STEPS	
Comments Forum meeting Seeking Committee feedback and guidance next steps	
Forum Facilitator report completed 11/4/2016 2017 AV Grant Program RFP grant application for next three years of AV funding anticipated to be released in June 2016 – targeted to seek funding allocation approval at the council's Nov 2017 meeting	
Ideas, suggestions regarding 2017 RFP grant application	
HUBIOTAT COUNCIL OR CALIFORNIA	