

Child Support Advisory Committee Meeting
December 19th, 2022, 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Healthcare and Family Services (HFS)
WebEx Meeting

Committee Members Present via WebEx/Phone:

Maggie Bennett, Trent Cameron, Anousheu Ali (for The Honorable La Shawn Ford), Dr. Kirk Harris, Juanita Sanders (for Secretary Grace Hou), Elizabeth Lingle, Christina Mahoney, Turyia Clay (for The Honorable Iris Y. Martinez, The Honorable Sidney Mathias, Nicole McKinnon, Jessica Patchik, Christine Raffaele, Vickie Smith, Richard Zuckerman

Committee Members Absent:

Darryl Apperton, Maria Barlow, Howard Feldman, Geraldine Franco, The Honorable Judge Pamela Loza, Alana I. Mejias, Phillip Mohr

HFS Staff Present:

Carrie Benson, Irene Curran, Patricia Dulin, Gina Hemphill, Hilary Johns Felton, Allen Nosler, Jessica Parlier, Daun Perino, Steve Sharer, Christine Towles, Bryan Tribble, Eric Watson

Public Guests:

None

- **Welcome to CSAC members – Bryan Tribble & Richard Zuckerman**
 - Richard welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked everyone to please mute when they are not speaking. He reminded attendees that they can use the chat feature for any questions or comments.
 - Roll call of committee members
 - Introduction of state employees and members of the public
 - Approval of November 15, 2022, meeting notes.
Motion made and seconded to approve as submitted.

- **Quadrennial Review Discussion – Bryan Tribble & Richard Zuckerman**

Bryan thanked everyone who participated in creating the report. This is a very thorough report. It wouldn't have been possible without everyone's effort. Over the course of the last several months, we have seen a couple of different iterations of the report as it was moving through the drafting period before we gave it to 1 person to complete the final editing and to make certain everything was in the same voice. Bryan opened the report on WebEx to share and turned it over to everyone.

 - Table of Contents, you can see how we laid everything out in 3 separate sections. After the title page and acknowledgement page, we went into section I.
 - Section I is the Introduction and Committee Goals.
 - Section II is the Review itself.
 - Section III, where we reported our findings and recommendations were made in each of the 7 areas that are labeled A through G.
 - Appendices, not attached for everyone today, are all the appendices. These were left off for now as this is a 30-page report, and we thought your first step may be

to print it. When all the appendices are added this will be well over 200 pages. We will add these when the report is finalized. Bryan turned it over to everyone on the call for comments or questions.

- Maggie commented about this being the most thorough Quadrennial Review. It shows the committee put forth a very robust effort in getting the public's input. It is very impressive. Maggie thanked everyone for the report being well done.
- Bryan asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the individual sections?
 - Dr. Kirk Harris mentioned he did not make it all the way through the report yet but inquired about areas that were set aside for future discussions and that maybe they are in the appendices.
 - Bryan mentioned Elizabeth Lingle did the final editing. He asked Liz if she would speak to where those areas were. They were divided up into specific areas rather than have a separate section. We then talked about what the next steps would be.
 - Liz clarified Dr. Harris' question because originally there was a section regarding future proposals, and it was prepared by Bryan. It was determined that those future proposals were outside the scope of the review so that section was removed.
 - Dr. Harris discussed the area of future proposals and that we were committed to mentioning them, but if they were deemed inappropriate to have inside the report as it is beyond the scope, then he recommended respectfully a separate document that is referenced in the report.
 - Bryan stated that this is not a problem. What we will do is make the future proposals a secondary document that will be discussed by the Child Support Advisory Committee in 2023.
 - Dr. Harris stated that this was a great idea. He asked for a copy of the section that was removed. He said that for us to review it would be helpful.
 - Richard mentioned that Dr. Harris should send Bryan and Carrie a copy of what those areas were.
 - Dr. Harris mentioned he was not sure he could recall them with any level of specificity as he thought they were being documented.
 - Liz mentioned she has the original draft and read to the group the 4 areas of future proposals:
 1. Social Security Dependent Benefits
 2. Unemployment
 3. Mandatory Child Support Education Classes
 4. Creation of the Community Advisory Council
 - Bryan mentioned that the Community Advisory Council is discussed throughout the report.
 - Dr. Harris requested the 4 areas be shared and he will reference his notes.
- Bryan asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the individual sections in the report that members did not see mentioned:

- Liz Lingle brought up that she mentioned in the draft regarding the multi-family adjustment and adding the word ‘minor’ to child as far as the section on adjustment without a court order. As she was editing, she had concerns that adding the word ‘minor’ would cause some conflict within 505 since child was already previously defined at the beginning of 505. She has not changed the substance of what was put in the report. She just highlighted it as a point of discussion we needed to have, but if not, that is fine too.
- Bryan shared page 27 with the group. When this was further reviewed, there was already a definition of the word ‘child’ that incorporated “minor”. The concern is it could introduce confusion because it must mean something other than the word “child” that is already defined or why would the drafters have included the word “minor”. He asked if that was what Liz was wanting to set off?
- Liz confirmed yes and mentioned her concern of defining “child” differently in 2 different parts of 505 and what the ramifications could be down the road. Do we want to be responsible for causing confusion? If this goes to the Legislature, they will not know the importance of this.
- Richard inquired if Maggie would like to speak to this.
- Maggie discussed the multi-family provisions in which there has been confusion regarding the multi-family Section II. With court orders you have a termination date, however in Section II this is for the payors that are supporting children either in or outside the home. When there is no termination date, with self-represented people, they go to the internet to get information as it relates to children with no order. You are reducing child support based upon the fact the payor is supporting children, but in the payor’s mind, and the mind of the payor’s family, this can be college-aged children. This would be clarified during the drafting; it is meant to give the self-represented person the opportunity to understand that the person they are supporting is an unemancipated child. You have a whole team at LRB, and individual sponsors. The sponsor will make sure that all that is resolved in the drafting, and it has to go through one of the gateway committees before it can ever make it to the floor of the House or the Senate. Maggie mentioned that they also made changes in the technical corrections to the original income shares because this was problematic. For purposes of this section, Maggie thinks the term should include children under the age of 18 or any child 19 or younger who is still attending high school.
- Richard mentioned his concern that if there is already confusion amongst this committee, we don’t want to send something that creates further confusion and leave it up to other people to define what we are doing. What is wrong with adopting the definition of what is contained in Section 505 already and referring to that without adding the word “minor”? “Minor” in the state of Illinois, refers to someone under the age of 18, not the specific definition that is used for Section 505. Richard stated he understands we do not need the word “minor”.

- Maggie stated we can put it in multifamily or we can say as defined in Section 505. Once you give someone a credit for supporting children, when does that credit end? It is not fair in multifamily situations.
- Liz mentioned this is stated in Section 505. Section 505 starts with for the purposes of this section, the term child shall include...
- Maggie stated we know it because we are child support professionals, but many people do not know it. That is the problem and that is why we need to be specific and that is one of the reasons many people do not understand the multifamily formula. We know in Article 1 when a child will exit the child support system, but in Section II we do not.
- Richard mentioned our recommendation would be to clarify that the use of the term child in this section would be consistent with the use of the term throughout Section 505.
- Maggie agreed the term child has to be consistent.
- Bryan asked if there were any other questions or comments.

- **Meeting Adjourned**

Hearing no questions, Richard asked for a motion to approve the substance of the draft of the final report of the Quadrennial Review for the State of Illinois for 2022.

Moved by Maggie, seconded by Vickie Smith. Passed by voice vote unanimously.

Richard thanked everyone for participating and getting this to the proper people in a timely manner.

- **Old Business**

Richard reminded everyone to complete the mandatory trainings.

- **New Business**

Richard mentioned the letters of appointment to the 2023 Child Support Advisory Committee will go out sometime in January with the first meeting being at the end of January or the first of February.

- **Public Comments**

None

Richard and Bryan thanked everyone for their service to this committee and wished everyone happy holidays.

Motion to adjourn approved by the group.