



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No. 24-078

For business meeting on March 15, 2024

Title

Report to the Legislature: California's
Access to Visitation Grant Program
(Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24)

Agenda Item Type

Information Only

Date of Report

February 15, 2024

Submitted by

Judicial Council staff
Charlene Depner, Director
Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Contact

Shelly La Botte, 916-643-7065
shelly.labotte@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

Family Code section 3204(d) requires that the Judicial Council submit a report to the Legislature, on the first day of March of each even-numbered year, on the Access to Visitation Grant programs administered by the Judicial Council. *California's Access to Visitation Grant Program (Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24): 2024 Report to the Legislature* provides information on the programs funded for federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24 under California's Access to Visitation Grant Program for Enhancing Responsibility and Opportunity for Nonresidential Parents.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The council has received this report since 2002, and each subsequent even-numbered year, on the Access to Visitation Grant programs administered by the Judicial Council. The previous 14 reports to the Legislature are available at www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-accesstovisitation.htm.

Analysis/Rationale

The Judicial Council is charged with administering and distributing California's share of federal Child Access and Visitation Grant funds from the U.S. Department of Health and Human

Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement.¹ These grants are established under section 391 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Pub.L. No. 104-193 (Aug. 22, 1996) 110 Stat. 2258) and enable states to establish and administer programs that support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children. The use of these federal grant funds in California is limited by state statute to three types of programs:

- Supervised visitation and exchange services;
- Education about protecting children during family disruption; and
- Group counseling services for parents and children.²

Family Code section 3204(d) requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature on (1) the programs funded and whether and to what extent those programs are achieving the goal of promoting and encouraging healthy parent and child relationships between noncustodial parents and their children while ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of children; and (2) other goals of the grant program. The report provides information about the grant program and the families served for federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24. The report contains no recommendations.

Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications

No costs or operational impacts will result from submission of this informational report to the Legislature.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: *California's Access to Visitation Grant Program (Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24): 2024 Report to the Legislature*

¹ Fam. Code, § 3204(a).

² Fam. Code, § 3204(b)(1).



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
*Chair, Legislation Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee*

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

*Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Michelle Williams Court
Hon. Charles S. Crompton
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Mr. David D. Fu
Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Brian Maienschein
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg*

ADVISORY MEMBERS

*Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Maria D. Hernandez
Mr. Charles Johnson
Mr. Darrel E. Parker
Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Hon. Erica R. Yew*

MS. SHELLEY CURRAN
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

February 14, 2024

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Legislative Counsel
1021 O Street, Suite 3210
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Erika Contreras
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 305
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Sue Parker
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 319
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: California's Access to Visitation Grant Program (Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24): 2024 Report to the Legislature, as required under Family Code section 3204(d).

Dear Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Contreras, and Ms. Parker:

Under Family Code section 3204(d), the Judicial Council is submitting *California's Access to Visitation Grant Program (Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24): 2024 Report to the Legislature* on the programs funded by California's Access to Visitation Grant Program for Enhancing Responsibility and Work Opportunity for Nonresidential Parents for federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24.

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Ms. Erika Contreras
Ms. Sue Parker
February 14, 2024
Page 2

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Ms. Charlene Depner, Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts, at 415-865-7572 or charlene.depner@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Shelley Curran
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

SC/CD/SLB

Enclosures

cc: Eric Dang, Counsel, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins
Emelyn Rodriguez, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas
Anita Lee, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Mark Jimenez, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Henry Ng, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Mary Kennedy, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Sandy Uribe, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Nora Brackbill, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Daryl Thomas, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Jenniffer Herman, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO

*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

HON. BRAD R. HILL

Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN

Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON

*Chair, Legislation Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee*

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI

Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE

Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz

Hon. C. Todd Bottke

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin

Hon. Carol A. Corrigan

Hon. Michelle Williams Court

Hon. Charles S. Crompton

Hon. Samuel K. Feng

Mr. David D. Fu

Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan

Ms. Rachel W. Hill

Hon. Brian Maienschein

Ms. Gretchen Nelson

Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt

Hon. Thomas J. Umberg

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Ms. Kate Bieker

Hon. Judith K. Dulcich

Hon. Maria D. Hernandez

Mr. Charles Johnson

Mr. Darrel E. Parker

Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Hon. Erica R. Yew

MS. SHELLEY CURRAN

*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

Report title: *California's Access to Visitation Grant Program (Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24): 2024 Report to the Legislature*

Code section: Family Code section 3204(d)

Date of report: March 1, 2024

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Family Code section 3204(d). The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

The Judicial Council is charged with administering and distributing California's share of federal Child Access and Visitation Grant funds from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Services. These grants are established under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Pub.L. No. 104-193 (Aug. 22, 1996) 110 Stat. 2258) and enable states to establish and administer programs that support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children.

The report provides information on the programs funded for federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24 under California's Access to Visitation Grant Program for Enhancing Responsibility and Work Opportunity for Nonresidential Parents and is legislatively mandated. Family Code section 3204(d) directs the Judicial Council to report on the programs funded and whether and to what extent those programs are achieving the goals of promoting and encouraging healthy parent and child relationships while ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of children.

The full report can be accessed at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.



California's Access to Visitation Grant Program

Federal Fiscal Years 2022–23 and
2023–24

2024 Report to the Legislature



Judicial Council of California

This report has been prepared and submitted to the California Legislature under Family Code section 3204(d).

This report is available on the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

For additional copies or more information about this report, please call the Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts at 916-643-7065, or write to:

Judicial Council of California
Operations and Programs Division
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courts.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Patricia Guerrero

*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Shelley Curran

Administrative Director

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Robert Oyung

Interim Chief Operating Officer

CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

Charlene Depner

Director

Don Will

Deputy Director

Anna Maves

Principal Managing Attorney

Gregory Tanaka

Supervising Attorney

Shelly La Botte

Senior Analyst and Primary Author of Report

Judicial Council of California (2023–24)

The Judicial Council is the policymaking body of the California Courts, the largest court system in the nation. Under the leadership of the Chief Justice and in accordance with the California Constitution, the council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice.

Hon. Patricia Guerrero, Chair

Chief Justice of California
Supreme Court of California

Mr. David D. Fu

Attorney at Law
David Fu and Associates

Hon. Marla O. Anderson

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Monterey

Hon. Carin T. Fujisaki

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Three

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan

Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Hon. C. Todd Bottke

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Tehama

Hon. Brad R. Hill

Administrative Presiding Justice of the
Court of Appeal
Fifth Appellate District

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Ms. Rachel W. Hill

Attorney
Law Office of Rachel Hill &
Hill Mediation Services

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Fresno

Hon. Brian Maienschein

Assembly Member
76th Assembly District

Hon. Carol A. Corrigan

Associate Justice of the
Supreme Court of California

Hon. Ann C. Moorman

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Mendocino

Hon. Michelle Williams Court

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Gretchen Nelson

Attorney at Law
Nelson & Fraenkel LLP

Hon. Charles S. Crompton

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt

Partner
Boies Schiller Flexner LLP

Hon. Samuel K. Feng

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Hon. Thomas J. Umberg

Member of the Senate
California State Senate

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Ms. Kate Bieker

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Judith K. Dulcich

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Kern

Hon. Maria D. Hernandez

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of
California,
County of Orange

Mr. Charles Johnson

Clerk/Executive Officer
Court of Appeal
First Appellate District

Mr. Darrel E. Parker

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Erica R. Yew

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

SECRETARY

Ms. Shelley Curran

Administrative Director
Executive Office
Judicial Council of California

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

Hon. Stephanie E. Hulsey, Cochair

Judge of the Superior Court of California
County of Monterey

Hon. Amy M. Pellman, Cochair

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Charles F. Adams

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Craig E. Arthur

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of
California,
County of Sacramento

Hon. D. Brett Bianco

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Brooke A. Blecher

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Tari L. Cody

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Second Appellate District, Division One

Ms. Mary Majich Davis

Chief Deputy Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Ms. Risé A. Donolon

Deputy County Counsel
Office of the Kings County Counsel

Hon. Ana L. España

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Ms. Katherine Fogarty

Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Fresno

Hon. Suzanne Gazzaniga

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Placer

Hon. Susan M. Gill

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Kern

Hon. Jennifer Lee Giuliani

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of
California,
County of Kings

Ms. Julia Hanagan

Policy Director
Dependency Legal Services

Ms. Leslie Heimov

Executive Director
Children's Law Center of California

Mx. Cory Hernandez

Senior Managing Attorney
Family Violence Appellate Project

Ms. Diane Iglesias

Senior Deputy Director
Los Angeles Department of Children and
Family Services

Ms. Rose Klein

Client Advocacy Manager
Asian Americans for Community
Involvement

Ms. Selis Koker

Deputy Director and Chief Counsel
California Department of
Child Support Services

Mr. Joseph J. Koller

Deputy District Attorney IV
Orange County District Attorney's Office

Mr. Jonathan Laba

Assistant Public Defender
Contra Costa County
Public Defender's Office

Ms. Sharon M. Lawrence
Chief Executive Officer
California CASA Association

Hon. Frank J. Menetrez
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. Laura H. Miller
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Mr. Joe Navarro
Manager, Family and Children Services
Division
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Ms. Sherry Peterson
Certified Family Law Specialist
Law Office of Sherry Peterson

Ms. Melissa J. Poulos
Family Law Facilitator/Self-Help Program
Manager/Director of Family Court
Services/Court Manager
Superior Court of California,
County of Sutter

Mr. Brian J. Richart
Chief Probation Officer
El Dorado County Probation

Hon. Lawrence P. Riff
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. B. Scott Thomsen
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Nevada

Ms. Susan Thrall
Senior Administrator
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Mary Kreber Varipapa
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Rubén A. Villalobos
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Stanislaus

Hon. Monica F. Wiley
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

ADVISORY MEMBER

Hon. Sue Alexander (Ret.)
Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

CJER GOVERNING COMMITTEE LIAISON

Hon. Julie A. Palafox
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

TCPJAC LIAISON

Hon. Cheri Pham
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS LIAISON

Ms. Tracy Kenny
Supervising Attorney
Governmental Affairs
Judicial Council of California

JUDICIAL COUNCIL STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Stephanie Lacambra, Lead Staff
Attorney
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Judicial Council of California

Ms. Amanda Morris
Administrative Coordinator
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Judicial Council of California

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
CALIFORNIA’S ACCESS TO VISITATION PROGRAM	4
Background	4
<i>Federal and State Program Goals</i>	5
<i>Funding Allocation to States</i>	6
<i>Program Administration</i>	6
Grant Funding Eligibility	6
Grant Funding Criteria and Amounts	7
Midyear Reallocation	7
Grant Service Areas	8
<i>Supervised Visitation and Exchange</i>	8
<i>Parent Education</i>	8
<i>Group Counseling</i>	9
Promotion and Encouragement of Healthy Parent-Child Relationships	9
<i>Supervised Visitation and Exchange Service Activity</i>	9
<i>Parent Education and Group Counseling Service Activities</i>	10
Program Monitoring	11
Pandemic and Expansion of Remote Monitoring and Services	11
Program Accomplishments	12
GRANT PROGRAMS FUNDED FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2022–23 THROUGH 2023–24	15
Grant Application	15
Grant Review Process	15
CALIFORNIA’S ACCESS TO VISITATION GRANT DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING	17
Federal Grant Reporting Requirements	17
Federal Data Survey Summary	17
<i>Table 1. Summary of Program Data: October 1, 2021–September 30, 2022</i>	19
<i>Table 2. Summary of Program Data: October 1, 2022–September 30, 2023</i>	21
Important Data Collection Note	22
Hours of Service Delivery	23
<i>Table 3. Number of Service Delivery Hours</i>	24
CONCLUSION	25
APPENDIX: SUPERIOR COURTS AWARDED GRANT FUNDING IN FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2021–22 THROUGH 2023–24	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With an annual federal appropriation of \$10 million—all 50 states, as well as the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—have been able to provide access and visitation services to noncustodial parents and their families since the inception of the federal Child Access and Visitation Grant Program in 1997. The *Grants to States for access and visitation programs* (42 U.S.C. § 669b) was authorized by Congress through passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. Federal funds are granted to states based on the number of children in single-family households.

States may use the federal grant funds to establish and administer programs to support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children. Federal funding activities include mediation, development of parenting plans, visitation enforcement, education, counseling, and development of guidelines for visitation and alternative custody arrangements. The use of federal child access and visitation grant funds in California is limited by Family Code section 3204 to three types of programs: supervised visitation and exchange services, parent education, and group counseling services that are administered directly or through contracts or grants with courts, local public agencies, or nonprofit entities. Additionally, states are required to provide at least 10 percent of project funding (state match) of the federal grant award amount. Grant recipient courts and/or local service providers or subcontractors can fulfill this state match requirement via cash or in-kind contributions.

Family Code section 3204(a) requires the Judicial Council of California to apply annually for federal Child Access and Visitation Grant Program funding from the federal Administration for Children and Families and to award this funding to the superior courts throughout California. The Judicial Council's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Judicial Council on the allocation of funding. The Judicial Council's Center for Families, Children & the Courts staff is responsible for managing the grant program.

Family Code section 3204(d) also directs the Judicial Council as follows:

[R]eport to the Legislature on [access to visitation] programs funded . . . and whether and to what extent those programs are achieving the goal of promoting and encouraging healthy parent and child relationships between noncustodial or joint custodial parents and their children while ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of children . . .

For federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24,¹ California's Access to Visitation Grant Program for Enhancing Responsibility and Opportunity for Nonresidential Parents (hereafter

¹ The federal fiscal year is from October 1 through September 30, and the access to visitation state grant funding cycle refers to the contract agreement period that begins on April 1 and ends on March 31.

Access to Visitation Grant Program or AV) served primarily low-income² noncustodial parents and their children. Superior court AV-funded programs included regional court collaborations and community-based, nonprofit subcontractors. Under Family Code section 3203, the supervised visitation and exchange programs, parent education, and group counseling services facilitated noncustodial parents and their children to participate in the AV-funded service activities irrespective of whether the parties were married to each other or living separately and apart on a permanent or temporary basis. As stated in Family Code sections 3203 and 3204, low-income, divorced, separated, and/or unmarried noncustodial parents who are involved in custody and visitation proceedings under the Family Code were identified as the target population recipients for AV services.³

The federal and state goals of the grant program are to “remove barriers and increase opportunities for biological parents, not living in the same household as their children, to become more involved in their children’s lives”⁴ while ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of children. California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program service activities have been helpful in maximizing noncustodial parenting time by providing opportunities for noncustodial parents to establish healthy and positive relationships with their children. The grant program seeks to promote and encourage healthy parent-child relationships by:

- Improving parents’ compliance with court orders;
- Increasing the likelihood of financial support for children through increased child support payments;
- Facilitating safe contact between noncustodial parents and their children;
- Teaching parents effective conflict resolution and communication skills for problem solving and strategies for co-parenting; and
- Increasing opportunities for noncustodial parents and their children to maintain continued contact, such as through safe and secure supervised visitation services that allow noncustodial parenting time.

The grant-related services have been instrumental in supporting increased noncustodial parenting time and helping parents rebuild and sustain healthy parent-child relationships. The AV-funded parent education and counseling programs seek to help parents—whether divorced, separated, or never married—obtain a greater understanding of how divorce and separation affect their children and what they can do to make the circumstances easier for their children. The grant service activities help parents recognize and address the emotional consequences of separation and divorce by learning techniques and strategies for communicating better to reduce conflict and focus on the best interests of their children.

² See Tables 1.5 and 2.5 for annual individual income reported by parents.

³ The full text of the relevant Family Code sections is available at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=8.&chapter=13.&part=2.&lawCode=FAM

⁴ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Services, State Access and Visitation Administrators, State Profiles Information, Memorandum (1998).

During federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24, California’s grant program successfully provided statewide services to a combined 1,029 clients. California’s Access to Visitation Program Data Collection and Reporting System includes the total number of fathers, mothers, grandparents, and legal guardians who received direct services. Each person who received direct services was counted once within a federal fiscal year regardless of the number of times a person used an AV program in that time span. Moreover, 871 children were served over the two federal fiscal years, and 11,038 hours of services were delivered by grant recipient courts and their local service providers under the grant program.

Despite the many accomplishments of California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program, the lack of additional funding to support the courts and subcontractors that provide these vital services continues to impede their ability to adequately meet the increased need for professional supervised visitation services for low-income parents statewide. Although direct client services were significantly reduced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and during the time period required to transition in-person services to remote virtual services, service providers have continued to report, since reopening, that waiting lists and increased demand for AV-funded services persist. Federal funding increased by only \$59,000 or approximately 7 percent over the period described in this report. The ability of the grant program to meet the demand for services with this limited funding is underscored through repeated requests for additional funding from courts and subcontractors during the annual midyear reallocation process and biannual progress summary reports collected by the AV grant program.

The Access to Visitation Grant Program will continue to work closely with the federal Office of Child Support Services, the Judicial Council’s Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, courts, grant recipients, key stakeholders, and the state Legislature to address funding challenges for California families in need of access to visitation services.

CALIFORNIA'S ACCESS TO VISITATION PROGRAM

On August 22, 1996, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA)⁵ was signed into law. Beginning in 1997, Congress authorized \$10 million in block grants—Grants to States for Child access and visitation—as part of PRWORA to enable states to establish programs that support and facilitate noncustodial parents' visitation with and access to their children. Family Code section 3204 requires the Judicial Council of California to annually apply to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families, Office of Child Support Services, under title 42 United States Code section 669b of PRWORA, for federal Child Access and Visitation Grant Program funds and to award this funding to the superior courts throughout California.

Family Code section 3204(d) also directs the Judicial Council as follows:

[R]eport to the Legislature on [access to visitation] programs funded . . . and whether and to what extent those programs are achieving the goal of promoting and encouraging healthy parent and child relationships between noncustodial or joint custodial parents and their children while ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of children . . .

This report provides the Legislature with information on the programs funded for federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24 under California's Access to Visitation Grant Program.⁶ The report also provides a snapshot of the clients served, number of participants, and hours of service delivery administered during the grant funding period.

Although the report makes no recommendations, the existing inadequacy of program funding to ensure accessible, affordable services statewide remains an ongoing challenge. The need for access to visitation services is high, and current funding levels cannot meet the demand for services.

Background

The Judicial Council is charged with administering and distributing California's share of federal child access and visitation grant funds from the federal Office of Child Support Services.⁷ These grants, established under section 391 of PRWORA, enable states to establish and administer programs that support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children. Funding allocations to states are based on the number of single-

⁵ Pub.L. No. 104-193 (Aug. 22, 1996) 110 Stat. 2105.

⁶ The federal fiscal year is from October 1 through September 30, and the Access to Visitation state grant funding cycle refers to the contract agreement period that begins on April 1 and ends on March 31.

⁷ Fam. Code, § 3204(a).

parent households and the total number of children.⁸ California receives the maximum amount of eligible funds (approximately \$876,000 annually), which represents less than 10 percent of the total national funding. States are required under the grant to provide a 10 percent state match share. The California Access to Visitation Grant Program requires an additional 10 percent match for a total of 20 percent (nonfederal) match under the grant program. The additional 10 percent match by either the court and/or its local service provider or subcontractor aims to assist with program sustainability planning.

Federal and State Program Goals

Congress' stated goal of the Child Access and Visitation Grant Program is to remove barriers and increase opportunities for biological parents who are not living in the same household as their children to become more involved in their children's lives. Under the federal statute, Child Access and Visitation Grant funds may be used as follows:

[T]o support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation [with] their children, by means of activities including mediation (both voluntary and mandatory), counseling, education, development of parenting plans, visitation enforcement (including monitoring, supervision and neutral drop-off and pickup), and development of guidelines for visitation and alternative custody arrangements.⁹

The use of the funds in California, however, is limited by state statute to three types of programs:¹⁰

- Supervised visitation and exchange services;
- Education about protecting children during family disruption; and
- Group counseling services for parents and children.

The primary goals of California's Access to Visitation Grant Program are (1) to enable parents and children to participate in supervised visitation, education, and group counseling programs—irrespective of the parents' marital status and whether the parties are living separately on a permanent or temporary basis;¹¹ and (2) to promote and encourage healthy relationships between noncustodial parents and their children while ensuring the children's health, safety, and welfare.¹² The overarching policy goal of the grant program has been to

⁸ See Office of Child Support Services, Access and Visitation Mandatory Grant Program, for a description of the federal funding formula: www.acf.hhs.gov/css/outreach-material/access-and-visitation-mandatory-grant-program.

⁹ 42 U.S.C. § 669b.

¹⁰ Fam. Code, § 3204(b)(1).

¹¹ Fam. Code, § 3203.

¹² Fam. Code, § 3204(d).

ensure accessible and available services statewide for low-income families with children whose custody and visitation issues are now or have been before the family courts.

The recipients of California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program are low-income separated, separating, divorced, or unmarried parents and their children who are involved in custody and visitation proceedings under the Family Code. Grant funds serve noncustodial parents (i.e., parents who do not live with their children) as the target population clientele.¹³

Funding Allocation to States

Federal grant funds are awarded to the states effective October 1 of each federal fiscal year, and those funds are allocated to the courts for a 12-month period beginning the following April. California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program funding period begins on April 1 and ends on March 31 of the following year.¹⁴ The federal funding allocation to California for federal fiscal year 2022–23 was \$817,855, and for federal fiscal year 2023–24 it was \$876,618. On January 22, 2021, the Judicial Council approved the annual funding allocation and distribution of approximately \$655,000 to \$670,000 to nine superior courts for California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program for fiscal years 2021–22 through 2023–24.¹⁵

Program Administration

The Judicial Council is charged with overall responsibility for administering Access to Visitation Grant Program funds under Family Code section 3204(a). In addition to federal terms and conditions and the Family Code statutory provisions governing the administration of the grant funds (Fam. Code, §§ 3200–3204), the grant program receives guidance from the Judicial Council’s Executive and Planning Committee and Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and the federal Administration for Children and Families. The Judicial Council’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts has primary responsibility for implementing and managing the grant program.

Grant Funding Eligibility

All superior courts in California are eligible to apply for and receive Access to Visitation Grant Program funds through a statewide request for proposal issued by the Judicial Council.

¹³ Supervised visitation and exchange services are for noncustodial parents (*not* custodial parents, grandparents, distant relatives, etc.). According to the goal of the federally funded Child Access and Visitation Grant Program, grant funding to the states increases opportunities for *biological parents who are not living in the same household as their children* to become involved in their children’s lives.

¹⁴ California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program funding period follows the standard contract agreement period for the grant program, which begins on April 1 and ends on March 31 each fiscal year. The grant program does not operate on the federal fiscal year cycle (i.e., October 1 through September 30) except for the required data collection-reporting period each fiscal year.

¹⁵ The difference between the federal funding allocation to the state and the amount allocated to the courts represents the amount of funds necessary for Judicial Council staff and contractors to provide the funded courts with technical assistance, education and training, evaluative site visits, and assistance in required program data collection. Some portions of the grant funds have been allocated to provide statewide services since the inception of the grant program in 1997.

The family law divisions of the superior courts are required to administer the programs. Given the limited funding available, applications involving multiple courts and counties in the proposed programs are strongly encouraged, designating one court as the lead or administering court. Service provider agencies that wish to participate are not allowed to apply directly for these grant funds but instead must do so as part of that court's Access to Visitation Grant Program application. Contract agreements are made only with the designated superior court.

Grant Funding Criteria and Amounts

Family Code section 3204(b)(2) authorizes the Judicial Council to determine the final number of and amounts for grants. The Judicial Council has approved both the funding allocation process and the amount of funds distributed to the courts since the inception of the grant program in 1997.

California's Access to Visitation Grant Program funding allocation formula sets the maximum grant funding levels, as adopted and approved by the Judicial Council in federal fiscal year 2015–16.

The grant funding cap and grant funding amounts are divided into three categories: maximum of \$45,000, maximum of \$60,000, and maximum of \$100,000. Two demographic factors are used to determine which of the three funding categories applies to a given court: (1) the number of single-parent households in the county, and (2) the number of individuals with income below the federal poverty level in the county.¹⁶ Each of these factors is weighted equally. Counties are ranked by this measure, with counties in the top third eligible for up to \$100,000, counties in the middle third eligible for up to \$60,000, and counties in the lowest third eligible for up to \$45,000 in funding. A list of superior courts and grant amount eligibility is available on the California Courts "Access to Visitation" webpage at www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-accesstovisitation.htm.

Midyear Reallocation

Under the Child Access and Visitation Grant Program, the federal Office of Child Support Services is required to monitor and track whether states have spent their full grant award allocations. Under federal guidelines, unused funds do not roll over to the next fiscal year but instead revert to the federal government. To ensure that all state grant funds are spent, California's program instituted a midyear reallocation process to allow the state and grant recipient courts to assess spending to determine whether potential funds will need to be redistributed among the grantees. Judicial Council staff conduct a midyear reallocation process during the fiscal year funding period to determine whether grant recipient courts and their subcontractors will spend their full grant award. Each grant recipient court receives a midyear reallocation questionnaire that helps Judicial Council program staff use established

¹⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, *2011–2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*, Table B09002: Own Children Under 18 Years by Family Type and Age; and Table S1701: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months.

criteria to evaluate the grant recipient court or subcontractor's funding needs and to determine whether courts will use their full grant award allocation.

Under the Judicial Council's approved funding allocation methodology, grant funds that become available when a grantee court withdraws from the program or does not spend its full grant award will be distributed to courts that are currently receiving Access to Visitation Grant Program funds through this midyear reallocation process. Reallocation of additional funds is based on a needs assessment of all requesting courts, with an opportunity given to courts to submit a justification for why they should receive additional funding. The Judicial Council must approve any reallocation of grant funds.

Grant Service Areas

Family Code section 3204(b)(1) provides that the grant funds must be used to fund supervised visitation and exchange services, education about protecting children during family disruption, and group counseling services for parents and children.

Supervised Visitation and Exchange

Supervised visitation and exchange under California's Access to Visitation Grant Program is "visitation between the noncustodial party and one or more children in the presence of a neutral third person." "Supervised exchange service" is defined as "the supervision of the transfer of the child from one parent to another for the purpose of visitation."¹⁷ Eligible providers of supervised visitation and exchange services are local public agencies¹⁸ or nonprofit entities that satisfy standard 5.20 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration (Uniform standards of practice for providers of supervised visitation).¹⁹

Parent Education

Parent education is defined under Family Code section 3201.5 and includes education on parenting skills and the impact of parental conflict on children, the way to put a parenting agreement into effect, and the responsibility of both parents to comply with custody and visitation orders. Eligible providers of education are professionals with a bachelor's or master's degree in human behavior, child development, psychology, counseling, family-life education, or a related field, and with specific training in subjects related to child and family development, substance abuse, child abuse and neglect, child sexual abuse, domestic violence,

¹⁷ Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, *Data Collection and Reporting System Handbook, Access to Visitation Grant Program* [version 3] (2010), p. 36.

¹⁸ Under Government Code section 66905.8, "'local public agency' means a city, county, district, or joint powers agency." Under Public Resources Code section 31017, "'public agency' includes, but is not limited to, local public agencies, state agencies, federal agencies, colleges and universities, intergovernmental bodies, and federally recognized Indian tribes." For purposes of the California Access to Visitation Grant Program, the legislative intent behind "local public agency" as an eligible provider under the grant per Family Code section 3202(b)(1) was to allow colleges and universities to provide services as a grant recipient.

¹⁹ The standards are available at www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=standards&linkid=standard5_20.

effective parenting, and the impact of divorce and interparental conflict on children. Interns working under the direct supervision of such professionals are also eligible providers.²⁰

Group Counseling

Group counseling services include but are not limited to those provided by mental health professionals and social workers to help parents work through their interpersonal conflicts by focusing on the best interest of the child and the importance of shared parenting. Desired results include reduced parental conflict, increased noncustodial parent access to their children, and/or an improvement in co-parenting relationships. Eligible providers of group counseling are professionals licensed to practice psychotherapy in this state—including but not limited to licensed psychiatrists, psychologists, clinical social workers, and marriage and family therapists—or mental health interns working under the direct supervision of professionals licensed to practice psychotherapy.

Promotion and Encouragement of Healthy Parent-Child Relationships

California's Access to Visitation Grant Program—funded service activities have been instrumental in maximizing noncustodial parenting time by providing opportunities for noncustodial parents to establish healthy and positive relationships with their children. The grant-related services seek to promote and encourage healthy parent-child relationships by:

- Improving parents' compliance with court orders;
- Facilitating safe contact between noncustodial parents and their children;
- Teaching parents effective conflict resolution and communication skills for problem solving and strategies for co-parenting separately; and
- Increasing opportunities for noncustodial parents and their children to maintain continued contact through safe and secure supervised visitation and exchange services that allow noncustodial parenting time with trained, skilled professionals.

Supervised Visitation and Exchange Service Activity

All supervised visitation and exchange programs funded through California's Access to Visitation Grant Program must comply with Family Code section 3200.5 and standard 5.20 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration (Uniform standards of practice for providers of supervised visitation). These standards include the duties and obligations for providers of supervised visitation under Family Code sections 3200 and 3200.5. The goal of these standards of practice is to assure the safety and welfare of the children, adults, and providers of supervised visitation. Additionally, grant recipient courts and local service providers or subcontractors selected for grant funding must certify compliance with standard 5.20 through submission of a Certification Statement for standard 5.20 and Family Code section 3200.5 as a term and condition under the Judicial Council contract agreement. Compliance also includes completion of the Judicial Council's *Declaration of Supervised*

²⁰ Fam. Code, § 3203.

Visitation Provider (Professional) (form FL-324(P)), regarding compliance with the statutory requirements.

Court-ordered, professionally supervised visitation and/or exchange services are often not available or affordable for parents, or parents have to use nonprofessional supervised visitation providers who are not trained. Often, low-income families lose contact with one another because the parent is unable to facilitate the visit because of cost and accessibility barriers. The grant program aims to support the goal of noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children by increasing the likelihood of subsidized financial assistance to help satisfy the requirement of the court order that visitation be professionally supervised.

Supervised visitation and/or exchange services provide an essential service for cases when there are potential risks from abuse or violence, mental illness, substance use or misuse, or parenting concerns. A safe and secure environment with trained, skilled staff allows for contact between the noncustodial parents and the child, *when appropriate*, to help strengthen the parent-child relationship.

Parent Education and Group Counseling Service Activities

California's Access to Visitation Grant Program parent education and counseling programs are designed to support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access and visitation with their children. The programs teach noncustodial parents how to put parenting agreements into effect that (1) encourage and promote the best interests of their children; (2) rebuild and maintain healthy parent-child relationships; and (3) provide opportunities for the noncustodial parents to become more involved in the lives of their children by focusing on the relationship they have with their children in a safe environment that includes parent education and/or counseling facilitators.

The parent education programs seek to help parents obtain a greater understanding of how separate parenting affects their children and what they can do to make the circumstances easier for their children, both of which help noncustodial parents continue to build positive, healthy relationships with their children. Both the education and the counseling service help parents learn to recognize and address the emotional consequences of separation and divorce by teaching them techniques and strategies for communicating better to help maintain their relationships with their children.

The AV-funded service activities have improved noncustodial parenting time by helping parents (1) use constructive methods for dealing with their feelings and experiences about the divorce or separation; (2) talk about changes in the family; (3) receive information and resources on parenting and child support; and (4) increase their understanding about the basic legal processes associated with separation, divorce, and custody decisionmaking. These service activities affect noncustodial parents' parenting time and access to and visitation with their children.

Program Monitoring

According to federal statute, states are required to annually monitor, evaluate, and report on programs funded through the grant in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (45 C.F.R. § 303.109). California's Access to Visitation Grant Program draws on multiple resources and methods to monitor the grant recipient programs. These resources include feedback from the courts, clients, community stakeholders, and service providers at local, regional, and state levels.

In addition, grant recipients are required to submit quarterly statistical data reports using California's Access to Visitation Grant Program Data Collection and Reporting System. The data collection system complies with state and federal grant reporting requirements. These reports provide information about the families served by the program. Monitoring of service providers is also conducted through submission of biannual progress summary reports. The biannual report provides a thorough and accurate account of project activities, programmatic challenges, and court and subcontractor compliance during the required reporting period.

Furthermore, to ensure grant recipients' adherence to timely submission of federal and state grant reporting requirements, Judicial Council program staff use an *Acceptance and Sign-Off Form* containing a Description of Work Provided by Court section required under the grant program. Under the Judicial Council's standard contract agreement, the courts or subcontractors are required to provide the work to the state in accordance with direction from Judicial Council program staff. The state is required to accept the work, provided the court has delivered the work in accordance with the criteria outlined in the contract agreement. Judicial Council program staff use this form to notify grant recipients of their work's acceptability.

Moreover, grant recipients must monitor and evaluate whether the programs are doing what they are intended to do and whether the programs are accomplishing program goals and objectives. Grant recipient programs follow their individual program logic models that provide a roadmap demonstrating goals, objectives, and outcomes for qualitative and quantitative data in system evaluations. Feedback from these systems is used to identify program strengths and weaknesses, and to improve overall service delivery.²¹

Pandemic and Expansion of Remote Monitoring and Services

Despite the unprecedented challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic, the California Access to Visitation Grant Program adapted its program monitoring activities to ensure continued compliance with applicable federal and state grant requirements. Because of health and safety concerns throughout the pandemic, monitoring methods did not include in-person site visits to county court programs and nonprofit agencies. Thus, alternative methods of remote program monitoring during the pandemic were developed and included:

²¹ For a discussion of adaptations by grant recipient courts and subcontractors during the pandemic, see *Pandemic and Expansion of Remote Monitoring and Services*, below.

- Organizing regular online meetings;
- Conducting routine check-in status update meetings that involved reviewing new policies and safety protocols;
- Reviewing complaint or grievance processes;
- Providing technical assistance and training;
- Reviewing the monthly submission of invoices;
- Providing data collection audits and technical assistance;
- Providing feedback and resources for successfully transitioning from in-person to online virtual or hybrid models for services;
- Establishing various alternative communication channels (e.g., videoconferencing and one-to-one technical assistance calls); and
- Holding collaborative meetings with community justice partners and stakeholders to exchange information on best practices, innovations, and strategies for continuing to serve families.

Despite facing different challenges, the AV grantee programs worked closely with the courts and local community partners to maintain the health and safety of families, experts, service providers, and court personnel as the highest priority during the pandemic. Many of the programs reported unexpected benefits when they transitioned from in-person to remote services. Benefits included:

- The ability to offer more frequent visits for families;
- Scheduling flexibility because children were home and not in school during the stay-at-home directives;
- A reduction in no-show and cancellation rates;
- The expansion of organizational capacity to handle more cases; and
- New and expanded community partnerships and collaborations.

The programs also reported that they developed strategies on helping parents co-parent during a state of emergency and a pandemic, an understanding of the importance of creating a business continuity plan for future emergencies and exercising more flexibility and adaptability in seeking to provide continuity of services. As the pandemic ended and service providers transitioned back to in-person direct services, the grantee programs added remote (virtual) supervised visitation as a new provision of supervised visitation service delivery, when suitable. The Access to Visitation Grant Program remains committed to assessing and adopting creative approaches and innovations to better serve clients and keep families safe. This work includes the continued successful use of technology and remote services, when appropriate.

Program Accomplishments

The federal funding for this program is extremely limited. Because the grant program is not a continuation grant, courts must competitively apply for new funding every three years. For some programs, lack of additional funding has meant that the availability of accessible

supervised visitation and exchange centers with trained and skilled professionals remains limited or is nonexistent or that court-community programs have closed down or both. The support provided by the federal grant funds has allowed for continued free and low-cost, sliding-scale access to visitation services. In addition, the efforts by grant recipient courts and subcontractors working together to build stronger partnerships and bridging resources with other community-based organizations that share a common mission and purpose have assisted many of the programs to cost-effectively maximize the use of grant funds.

During federal fiscal years 2022–23 and 2023–24, Judicial Council staff to California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program worked on several projects to expand the availability of services, including throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. A variety of online educational resources were developed for the courts, parents, and other professionals and organizations to better understand how supervised visitation and exchange services operate in California.

To improve the quality and efficiency of services throughout the state, Judicial Council staff accomplished the following:

- Provided remote technical assistance statewide to grant recipient courts and court-community justice partners on their supervised visitation and exchange policies and procedures. This support included the development of strategies and best practices for establishing local supervised visitation and exchange programs or an effective framework for implementation of Family Code section 3200.5 and standard 5.20 requirements or both. Technical assistance support included but was not limited to peer-to-peer information exchanges, teleconference calls, online grantee check-in meetings, and the production of sample templates and forms as educational resources.
- Conducted eight in-person and remote statewide trainings to approximately 190 multidisciplinary organizational professionals, court staff, and community justice partners on how to successfully implement the uniform standards of practice for providers of supervised visitation as stated under standard 5.20 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration.
- Developed several online resources for professional providers of supervised visitation and exchange services who were offering remote services to families during the pandemic. These included:
 - An information sheet, *Supervised Visits With Your Child During COVID-19* (to prepare parents for virtual visits);
 - A checklist for providers considering virtual visitation during COVID-19;
 - Ideas for virtual visits; and

- A checklist for providers on considerations for continuing and reopening in-person programs during COVID-19.²²
- Worked with an outside consultant to create and complete an animated YouTube video on Virtual Visitation²³—an educational tool designed to assist courts and parents in better understanding how virtual visitation operates in California consistent with standard 5.20 requirements.²⁴
- Worked on development of two new Judicial Council family law forms: *Declaration of Supervised Visitation Provider (Professional)* (form FL-324(P)) and *Declaration of Supervised Visitation Provider (Nonprofessional)* (form FL-324(NP)).
- In three peer-to-peer discussion sessions, facilitated a new AV Grant Program *Link Up Series*, to a total of approximately 100 statewide professional providers and community-based agencies. The series was divided into two parts: part one, “Fostering Common Ground, Cultivating Connections,” is designed to gather information in helping to build program sustainability efforts, and part two, “What’s Trending, Forward Thinking,” is for creating a new strategic road map toward shaping the future landscape for the field of supervised visitation and exchange services.

²² California Courts, “Access to Visitation,” www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-accesstovisitation.htm.

²³ Available in February 2024; see www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-accesstovisitation.htm.

²⁴ See Sen. Bill 599 (Stats. 2023, ch. 493), <https://legiscan.com/CA/text/SB599/id/2844674>.

GRANT PROGRAMS FUNDED FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2022–23 THROUGH 2023–24

Grant Application

On July 29, 2020, the Judicial Council’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts released an open, competitive request for proposals (RFP) grant application for federal fiscal years 2022–23 through 2023–24 to fund California’s statutory AV-related services: supervised visitation and exchange, parent education, and group counseling for child custody and visitation family law cases.

The Center for Families, Children & the Courts staff received from the superior courts 11 grant applications representing 16 counties and involving 14 subcontractor agencies (i.e., local court community-based service providers that provide the direct services on behalf of the court to families). The total funding requested from the RFP applicant courts was \$793,749, and the total available statewide funding was \$655,000 to \$670,000 (subject to final federal allocation in 2021 and 2022). The total request for funding exceeded available funds by \$123,749 to \$138,749.

A list of superior courts approved for grant funding for federal fiscal years 2021–22 through 2023–24 is shown in the appendix of this report.

Grant Review Process

The Judicial Council is required to determine the final number of grants and award amounts for each under Family Code section 3204. Family Code section 3204(b)(1) requires that the Judicial Council allocate funds through an RFP process that complies with state and federal requirements for receiving Access to Visitation Grant Program funds. Family Code section 3204(b)(2) provides that the grant funds must be awarded with the intent of approving as many requests for proposals as possible while ensuring that each approved proposal will provide beneficial services and satisfy the overall goals of the program. This Family Code section also specifies certain required selection criteria, as follows:

- Availability of services to a broad population of parties;
- Ability to expand existing services;
- Coordination with other community services;
- Hours of service delivery;
- Number of counties or regions participating;
- Overall cost-effectiveness; and
- Promotion and encouragement of healthy parent and child relationships between noncustodial parents and their children, while ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of the children.

To ensure a fair and unbiased selection process, the council's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee approved the establishment of a Grant Review Group (GRG). The role of the GRG reviewers is to read, score, and make proposed funding allocation recommendations to the Judicial Council's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, which would subsequently make recommendations to the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee. The Judicial Council makes the final determinations on the number and amount of grant funding allocations.

GRG reviewers were experts representing members of the advisory committee; professional subject-matter experts from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts; and several community-based service providers with expertise in the areas of supervised visitation, domestic violence, and child abuse. All GRG reviewers participated in an orientation teleconference. Neither GRG reviewers nor Judicial Council staff to the Access to Visitation Grant Program read or scored grant application proposals from their own courts or counties.

The GRG used a three-tiered screening system. All grant application proposals were evaluated and scored according to a system of points, with each criterion in the grant application narrative section assigned a maximum point value. GRG reviewers used both a reviewer rating sheet—with clear, quantifiable measures for evaluation and scoring of the proposals—and a rating scale to tabulate the applicant's response to each question. The grant application proposals were ranked strictly by score: each court's application score determined its rank. Additionally, grant decisions sought to ensure that the program goals represented statewide geographical diversity in service delivery, including population and court size.

CALIFORNIA'S ACCESS TO VISITATION GRANT DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

Federal Grant Reporting Requirements

Under section 469B(e)(3) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 391 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, states are required to monitor, evaluate, and report on programs funded through grants from the Child Access and Visitation Grant Program.²⁵ The purpose of this data requirement is to provide information to Congress on the progress of services provided under the program, the goal of which is to support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation with their children.

Each state is required to collect and submit an annual report that includes two types of data:

- *Program descriptions*, including service providers and administrators, service area, population served, program goals, referral process, voluntary or mandatory nature of the programs, types of activities, and length and features of the program; and
- *Participant characteristics*, including the number of referrals for each program, participating individuals, and persons who have completed program requirements through authorized activities.²⁶

Grant recipients are required to collect data on one mandatory federal outcome measure: increased noncustodial parents' time with children. This is defined as "[a]n increase in the number of hours, days, weekends, and/or holidays as compared to parenting time prior to the provision of access and visitation services."²⁷

Federal Data Survey Summary

California's Access to Visitation Grant Program utilizes an automated data collection system that collects the federally required data elements. The data collection and reporting system is standardized across all the grant recipient courts in California. The grant recipients are required to collect data in a uniform, standardized manner, which prevents programs from misinterpreting or inaccurately reporting the federally mandated data elements. The data reported includes only parents who receive direct services, and service counts do not include multiple visits for the program services. That is, clients are counted only once per service category. Judicial Council program staff provide technical support and training on the data collection system to grant recipient courts and their local service providers.

²⁵ See State Child Access Program Survey: Instructions, available at <https://vdocuments.net/health-and-human-services-omb-0970-0204.html>.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

Table 1 presents a summary of California’s Access to Visitation Grant Program data for federal fiscal year 2021–22 (Oct. 1, 2021–Sept. 30, 2022). Table 2 highlights California’s grant program data for federal fiscal year 2022–23 (Oct. 1, 2022–Sept. 30, 2023). Below Table 2, please see the notes that outline the collection methodology and limitations.

Table 1. Summary of Program Data: October 1, 2021–September 30, 2022

1.1. Clients Served. The total number of clients includes fathers, mothers, grandparents, and legal guardians. Both custodial and noncustodial parents are included. Each person is counted only once.

Total No. of Clients Served	No. of Custodial parents	No. of Noncustodial Fathers	No. of Noncustodial Mothers	No. of Grandparents & Legal Guardians
649	296	228	119	6

1.2. Children of Clients Served. The total number of children involved includes only children of the biological parents and those under the care of grandparents and/or legal guardians.

Total No. of Children in Common
425

1.3. Services Provided to Clients. The services provided to clients are the total number of services provided to a client who received service under each category. Some clients may have received more than one service and, as a result, are counted under more than one service category. Clients are only reported once under each service received. The frequency of service is not reported.

Mediation	Parenting Plans	Counseling	Parent Education	Neutral Drop-off	Supervised Visitation	Visitation Enforcement
0	0	0	115	4	596	0

1.4. Marital Status Between Biological Parents. Marital status is counted between biological parents only and does not include the marital status of grandparents or legal guardians.

Never Married to Each Other	Married to Each Other	Separated From Each Other	Divorced From Each Other	Data Not Reported
360	0	162	104	23

1.5. Annual Income. Annual income is reported by the client, includes all sources of annual income before taxes, and does not include income of any other household members.

Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$20,000 to \$29,999	\$30,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 & Above	Data Not Reported
182	88	74	72	127	106

1.6. Race/Ethnicity. Race/ethnicity (self-reported) reports the data for each client served: parents, grandparents, and legal guardians.

American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Data Not Reported
9	20	39	224	2	277	49	29

1.7. Source of Client Referrals to Services. The source of client referrals to services is reported for each client served: parents, grandparents, and legal guardians.

Self	Court	Child Support Agency	Domestic Violence Agency	Child Protection Agency	Other	Data Not Reported
10	629	4	0	0	4	2

1.8. Outcome Data. Outcome data is reported for biological noncustodial mothers and noncustodial fathers only. It does not include parental education.

Noncustodial Parents Who Gained Increased Parenting Time With Children	Total No. Served	No. Gaining Increased Parenting Time	Percentage Gaining Increased Time
Mothers	119	119	100%
Fathers	228	228	100%
Total	347	347	100%

Table 2. Summary of Program Data: October 1, 2022–September 30, 2023

2.1. Clients Served. The total number of clients includes fathers, mothers, grandparents, and legal guardians. Only noncustodial parents are included because of a change in data reporting. Each person is counted only once.

Total No. of Clients Served	No. of Noncustodial Fathers	No. of Noncustodial Mothers	No. of Grandparents & Legal Guardians
380	245	135	0

2.2. Children of Clients Served. The total number of children includes only children of the biological parents and those under the care of grandparents and/or legal guardians.

Total No. of Children in Common
446

2.3. Services Provided to Clients. The total number of clients are those who received services under each category; some clients may have received more than one service and are counted only once under each service category.

Mediation	Parenting Plans	Counseling	Parent Education	Neutral Drop-off	Supervised Visitation	Visitation Enforcement
0	0	0	101	5	308	0

2.4. Marital Status Between Biological Parents. Marital status is counted between biological parents only and does not include the marital status of grandparents or legal guardians.

Never Married to Each Other	Married to Each Other	Separated From Each Other	Divorced From Each Other	Data Not Reported
225	0	90	57	8

2.5. Annual Income. Annual income is reported by the client, includes all sources of annual income before taxes, and does not include income of any other household members.

Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$20,000 to \$29,999	\$30,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 & Above	Data Not Reported
117	56	48	51	56	52

2.6. Race/Ethnicity. Race/ethnicity (self-reported) reports the data for each client served: parents, grandparents, and legal guardians.

American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Data Not Reported	Other
10	3	28	103	25	144	28	29	10

2.7. Source of Client Referrals to Services. The source of client referrals to services is reported for each client served: parents, grandparents, and legal guardians.

Self	Court	Child Support Agency	Domestic Violence Agency	Child Protection Agency	Other	Data Not Reported
13	357	3	0	0	7	0

2.8. Outcome Data. Outcome data is reported for biological noncustodial mothers and noncustodial fathers only. It does not include parental education.

No. of Noncustodial Parents Who Gained Increased Parenting Time With Children	Total No. Served	No. Gaining Increased Parenting Time	Percentage Gaining Increased Time
Fathers	245	245	100%
Mothers	135	135	100%
Total	380	380	100%

Important Data Collection Note

Although grant recipients remain challenged with the limitations of funding and rising costs for overall service delivery, the COVID-19 pandemic was the greatest programmatic challenge ever encountered for the AV-funded programs. As mentioned previously, the restrictions on personal movement as a result of the pandemic resulted in decreased referrals for services, a decline in requests for anticipated in-person clients to be served, general challenges with transitioning to remote services, and need for implementation of a remote program service delivery model. Inadequate funding and an anticipated increase in demand for services continue to impede the courts' and local service providers' ability to maintain or expand current service delivery levels for parents and children. The cost of delivery of service continues to steadily increase, while federal funding has remained stagnant since the inception of the grant program in 1997. As operating costs rise, current funding levels result in fewer clients served and growing waiting lists. Additionally, economic instability and financial constraints of especially low-income clients will continue to negatively affect the availability of affordable supervised visitation programs statewide, as well as the sustainability of AV grant program service delivery levels.

Hours of Service Delivery

The number of service delivery hours from grant recipient service providers is highlighted in Table 3. The methodology for counting the time spent on various services varied depending on the service type. The hours indicated in Table 3 under supervised visitation include only the time of the actual supervised visitation contact between the noncustodial parent and the child. The hours noted do not include transition time or other essential program components such as time spent on intake, orientation, or administrative tasks. However, the hours indicated for supervised exchanges do include the total time spent during each exchange session, including the time that staff spent waiting for the parent to arrive.

The reporting of service hours for parent education and group counseling services is based on the time spent providing services in a group setting. For each session, programs completed a summary form to capture the number of noncustodial and custodial parents, the number of families served, the number of sessions held, and the hours spent providing the service for each type of group session.

The hours of service delivery are collected and reported by the State of California to provide a more accurate picture of overall service delivery and program workload by grant recipient courts and their local service providers. For instance, supervised visitation and exchange services required more time of program staff and time spent with a parent than did parent education. The reason was that the visitation sessions occur over a longer period of time and were more intensive, whereas parent education was oftentimes a single workshop or class.

Access to Visitation Grant Program supervised visitation and exchange services were provided to families when unsupervised visits could pose serious safety concerns. Local service providers were required to ensure the safety and welfare of clients served under the grant. The practice of assuring safety often required staff to spend increased time working with the parent and child to ensure that reasonable safeguards were in place before, during, and after the scheduled visitation session. Such precautions included programs using two staff (rather than one) for the scheduled visit and ensuring that visits do not exceed two hours in duration based on statutory requirements for professional providers of supervised visitation. In addition, supervised visitation and exchange services require highly trained, skilled staffing to address the multifaceted issues associated with custody and visitation disputes in family law cases.

Table 3. Number of Service Delivery Hours

California Grant Service Areas	October 1, 2021, through September 30, 2022	October 1, 2022, through September 30, 2023
Group counseling*	0	0
Parent education	101	98
Supervised exchange	195	15
Supervised visitation	6,029	4,600
Total service hours	6,325	4,713

* Under the Access to Visitation Grant Program, data was collected on clients served (i.e., noncustodial parent, mother and father, legal guardian, and grandparents) through three grant service areas: supervised visitation and exchange, parent education, and group counseling services. Data on clients served also included the number of hours of service. Children were counted and reported as part of the client (parent) data but not as part of the services provided to clients. Under parent education and group counseling service areas, a parent may or may not have participated in and/or completed the counseling or parent education session itself; however, the child may have participated in the service without the noncustodial parent.

CONCLUSION

The services provided by the grant recipient courts and their local subcontractors for California's Access to Visitation Grant Program were critical to helping ensure the health, safety, and welfare of parents and children during visits between noncustodial parents and their children. Despite the many accomplishments of California's Access to Visitation Grant Program and the tireless efforts of the courts and subcontractors to identify and secure additional funding to support their services, inadequate funding continues to impede their ability to maintain current service delivery levels. The reduction of access to services, including during the COVID-19 pandemic, means that the courts, together with their subcontractors, must struggle to meet the ever-increasing demand for services—inclusive of online and remote visitation at a subsidized rate and the limitations on affordable, available, and accessible services statewide. The demand for grant-related services outpaced the resources available to offer both in-person and remote technology-based services. Increased funding for California's Access to Visitation Grant Program is needed to support ongoing and future AV-funded services and facilitate the establishment and implementation of AV programs in all 58 counties in California.

The Access to Visitation Grant Program will continue to work closely with the federal Office of Child Support Services, the Judicial Council's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, courts, grant recipients, key stakeholders, and the state Legislature, and will support the grantees in actively seeking diverse supplementary funding to provide critical services. It will continue to support the programs to administer and operate high-quality program services, address programmatic challenges, and enhance service delivery for all California families in need of access to visitation services.

APPENDIX: SUPERIOR COURTS AWARDED GRANT FUNDING IN FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2021–22 THROUGH 2023–24

	Applicant Court	Counties Served	No. of Subcontracting Agencies	Region Service Area*	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Exchange	Parent Education	Group Counseling	Grant Award Allocation
1	Del Norte†	Del Norte	1	NO	X	X			\$34,000
2	Humboldt	Humboldt	1	BA	X	X			\$48,819
3	Orange	Orange	2	SO	X	X			\$97,642
4	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	2	SO	X	X			\$97,642
5	San Francisco	Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo	1	BA	X	X			\$97,642
6	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	1	BA	X	X			\$64,443
7	Shasta	Shasta and Trinity	1	NO	X	X	X	X	\$58,585
8	Tulare	Kings and Tulare	1	NO	X				\$97,642
9	Yuba	Sutter and Yuba	1	NO	X				\$58,585
	Subtotal	14	11						\$655,000
* BA = Bay Area/Northern Coastal Region; NO = Northern/Central Region; SO = Southern Region. † The Superior Court of Del Norte County closed its Access to Visitation Grant Program in fiscal year 2022–23.									