

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES

P.O. Box 419064, Rancho Cordova, CA 95741-9064

Reason for this Transmittal

- State Law or Regulation Change
- Federal Law or Regulation Change
- Court Order or Settlement Change
- Clarification requested by One or More Counties
- Initiated by DCSS

LCSA LETTER NO. 01-17

TO: ALL IV-D DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: UPDATE ON COUNTY AND STATE PERFORMANCE ON THE
FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) has received and compiled data on the federal performance measures for the first nine months of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2001. The attached tables show individual county and statewide performance statistics for this period, and the federal performance standard which must be met to avoid loss of incentive funds and imposition of penalties. We realize that this is a time of tremendous change and many counties are transitioning to Local Child Support Agency status and/or are moving to new consortia automation systems. However, we are confident that these changes will strengthen the ability of LCSAs to improve their performance. Despite these new efforts we are very concerned about what the performance data shows. This letter provides a plan of action that we must take in order to improve our performance on the federal criteria.

Data for the first three quarters of FFY 2001 show that California's performance in some measures has improved slightly over the previous year. Many counties are performing well above the federal performance standards. The success of those counties demonstrates that better performance can be achieved. However, some counties continue to perform below the federal performance standards, particularly on the collections on arrears measure where the statewide performance level is just above the federal minimum performance standard of 40 percent, when calculated using the first three quarters of unduplicated case count data.

We used unduplicated case count data averaged over three quarters to determine the denominator for this performance measure, and though we recognize that this is not the same methodology which will be used in the federal performance measure, it is the best



DO YOUR PART TO HELP CALIFORNIA SAVE ENERGY
For energy saving tips, visit the DCSS website at
www.childsup.cahwnet.gov

predictor of the state's performance for this measure that we have at this time.

As is also evident from the data in Attachment 1, California is barely above the 40 percent minimum performance standard in the collections on current support measure. If our performance on either the current or arrears measure falls below 40 percent, California will be ineligible for incentive funding for these measures.

In addition to a loss of incentives, failure to improve by three percent per year in the Paternity Establishment Performance (PEP) measure can result in substantial penalties in Title IV-A funding. The State is currently at risk of significant penalties in this area. Therefore, it is critical that we take the steps necessary to improve performance in the areas of collections on arrears, collections on current support, and paternity establishment.

DCSS has identified several action steps that DCSS and the counties should undertake to achieve performance improvements. Below is a list of actions currently underway:

- The State has executed three contracts with outside vendors to develop plans to improve county performance statewide, in Los Angeles, and in three other counties (Butte, San Bernardino, Yuba).
- Staff from the Office of Research and Program Design are visiting a sample of the best performing counties to solicit their ideas on best management practices.
- As a result of the Collectibility Study and the Default Order Workgroup, recommendations will be made which will address establishing more realistic orders and actions targeted at improving the collectibility of orders established.
- The case closure, duplicate cases and case transfer policies are being re-written to reduce the over counting of cases requiring services.
- Individual county analysis of data will be helpful in determining what other activities will improve performance. We are asking each county to review the data carefully. If you identify any problems with the data for your county, please advise Donna Martin at (916) 464-5033 or Helen Faust at (916) 464-5042 immediately. Both Donna and Helen are with the Office of Research and Program Design.
- The Requirements Analysis Workgroup (RAW) is working to improve the integrity and consistency of data reported on the OCSE 157.

- Senate Bill 1410 reviews will be focused on those counties not performing well on the federal performance measures (as opposed to welfare and post welfare collections).
- Currently, the PEP measure is calculated using IV-D data. DCSS is considering the feasibility of changing back to a statewide measure. In the past, the use of a statewide measure resulted in California greatly exceeding the federal minimum standard for PEP. However, issues regarding data reliability were raised at the federal level and, as a result, the current calculation methodology was adopted.

The decision to revert to reliance on a statewide measure is contingent upon DCSS being assured that sufficient data cleanup has occurred.

In addition to the steps identified above, as a financial incentive to improve performance on the federal measures, incentives which have been paid in the past to the ten counties with the best performance on the CalWORKS recoupment (pursuant to Family Code Section 17704 and 17706) will now be paid based on specified performance measures. For State Fiscal Year 2002/2003, incentives will be paid to the ten counties with the best performance on the measures *Collections on Current Support* and *Cases with Collections on Arrears*.

As indicated above, I am very concerned about our current performance on the federal performance measures. Therefore, I am requiring that counties with performance scores in the measurements of *Collections on Current Support* or *Cases with Collections on Arrears* (see Attachment 2) that fall within five percent of the federal performance standards when averaged over the three quarter period, submit an analysis of reasons for current performance levels and proposed activities to improve performance, to their Regional Administrator by September 30, 2001. Counties required to submit an analysis are highlighted on Attachment 2. The format for submitting this information is provided (see Attachment 6). This information will be used to meet our requirement outlined in Family Code 17602 (e) to report to the Legislature information on individual county performance and performance improvement plans. That report is due by December 31, 2001.

The Regional Administrators will provide assistance to their counties to identify and remove barriers to good performance and share best practices identified from best performing counties. The Regional Administrators will also be scheduling visits with their counties that score under forty percent in these two categories to assist them in the development of a performance improvement strategy and implementation schedule.

We also want to acknowledge the majority of the counties whose performance exceeds the statewide average by five percent or more in the areas of current collections and

LCSA Letter No. 01-17
August 23, 2001
Page 4

arrears collections, and congratulate them on their performance. However, we want to encourage these counties as well to analyze how they may also improve performance in these performance measures.

I want to thank each county for their efforts on this project. It is a crucial step in continuing to improve the performance of the California Child Support Program.

If you have any questions concerning this letter or ideas to improve program performance, please call Linda Patterson, Manager, Office of Research and Program Design, at (916) 464-5035 or email to linda.patterson@dcss.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

CURTIS L. CHILD
Director

Enclosures

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF CALIFORNIA'S PERFORMANCE
ON FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES AS OF JULY 2001

PERFORMANCE ON FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

| PERFORMANCE MEASURE | First Quarter FFY 2001 | Second Quarter FFY 2001 | Third Quarter FFY 2001 | Average of Three Quarters Data | Performance in FFY 2000 | Federal Standard or Requirement for Improvement |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Paternity Establishment Rate | 61.13% | 63.00% | 63.70% | 62.61% | 61.30% | 90% or improvement of 3% annually |
| Support Orders Established | 69.68% | 70.16% | 70.94% | 70.26% | 65.48% | 50% or improvement of 5% annually |
| Collections on Current Support | 40.35% | 40.21% | 42.02% | 40.86% | 40.12% | 40% |
| Collections on Arrears | 36.63% | 38.97% | 44.58% | 40.06% | 53.32% | 40% |
| Cost – Effectiveness Ratio | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$3.12 | \$2.00 |

PERFORMANCE MEASURES
COLLECTIONS ON CURRENT SUPPORT - CASES WITH COLLECTIONS ON ARREARS
 PERFORMANCE MEASURES AVERAGES FOR THREE QUARTERS

| | Collections on Current Support | Cases with Collections on Arrears |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| STATEWIDE | 40.95% | 40.06% |
| Alameda | 54.33 | 51.19 |
| Alpine | 44.36 | 30.52 |
| Amador | 62.94 | 53.61 |
| Butte | 39.89 | 40.68 |
| Calaveras | 42.13 | 37.92 |
| Colusa | 62.57 | 50.08 |
| Contra Costa | 47.66 | 40.83 |
| Del Norte | 48.98 | 41.82 |
| El Dorado | 48.99 | 45.10 |
| Fresno | 41.91 | 40.36 |
| Glenn | 49.37 | 46.44 |
| Humboldt | 54.80 | 48.44 |
| Imperial | 32.24 | 41.34 |
| Inyo | 54.94 | 43.73 |
| Kern | 28.92 | 41.51 |
| Kings | 54.80 | 43.82 |
| Lake | 47.90 | 44.24 |
| Lassen | 60.22 | 55.96 |
| Los Angeles | 31.78 | 30.73 |
| Madera | 49.56 | 48.33 |
| Marin | 59.54 | 56.57 |
| Mariposa | 64.89 | 53.81 |
| Mendocino | 40.34 | 51.06 |
| Merced | 53.55 | 44.97 |
| Modoc | 54.89 | 46.90 |
| Mono | 62.31 | 51.58 |
| Monterey | 49.00 | 42.96 |
| Napa | 47.85 | 46.07 |
| Nevada | 44.34 | 38.36 |
| Orange | 45.26 | 46.11 |
| Placer | 53.54 | 53.88 |
| Plumas | 58.36 | 48.17 |
| Riverside | 39.73 | 38.86 |
| Sacramento | 45.82 | 45.22 |
| San Benito | 44.61 | 40.27 |
| San Bernardino | 36.26 | 37.14 |
| San Diego | 35.64 | 32.50 |
| San Francisco | 59.24 | 46.08 |
| San Joaquin | 47.26 | 48.28 |
| San Luis Obispo | 60.78 | 50.46 |
| San Mateo | 58.02 | 54.29 |
| Santa Barbara | 59.75 | 54.79 |
| Santa Clara | 49.06 | 45.40 |
| Santa Cruz | 49.93 | 47.86 |
| Shasta | 39.60 | 46.78 |
| Sierra | 61.99 | 48.02 |
| Siskiyou | 51.89 | 44.52 |
| Solano | 50.44 | 45.06 |
| Sonoma | 59.94 | 50.15 |
| Stanislaus | 46.73 | 47.03 |
| Sutter | 57.70 | 50.81 |
| Tehama | 41.44 | 37.03 |
| Trinity | 47.04 | 41.15 |
| Tulare | 45.06 | 40.18 |
| Tuolumne | 47.44 | 38.65 |
| Ventura | 45.31 | 44.74 |
| Yolo | 45.67 | 42.35 |
| Yuba* | 24.05 | 14.17 |

* Data not available for the June 2001 quarter

SECTION G - PERFORMANCE MEASURES
TABLE 20
COUNTY PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUMMARY
FOR THE QUARTER

| | Paternity Establishment Percentage | Cases With Support Orders | Collections on Current Support | Cases with Collections on Arrears | Cost Effectiveness* |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| STATEWIDE | 61.13% | 69.68% | 40.35% | 36.63% | |
| Alameda | 90.22 | 87.67 | 53.97 | 49.52 | |
| Alpine | 51.61 | 81.18 | 46.62 | 26.55 | |
| Amador | 83.14 | 88.77 | 62.50 | 52.18 | |
| Butte | 32.88 | 65.35 | 37.87 | 37.58 | |
| Calaveras | 36.89 | 76.44 | 28.96 | 32.44 | |
| Colusa | 77.19 | 85.47 | 62.71 | 49.60 | |
| Contra Costa | 74.85 | 62.37 | 46.97 | 38.58 | |
| Del Norte | 49.83 | 82.28 | 49.29 | 39.22 | |
| El Dorado | 90.07 | 86.93 | 48.65 | 43.22 | |
| Fresno | 78.40 | 83.61 | 40.68 | 40.31 | |
| Glenn | 51.20 | 85.25 | 44.13 | 35.83 | |
| Humboldt | 99.46 | 90.56 | 55.12 | 49.86 | |
| Imperial | 72.52 | 83.15 | 32.28 | 41.36 | |
| Inyo | 73.95 | 89.78 | 54.33 | 41.04 | |
| Kern | 78.29 | 74.02 | 28.94 | 39.18 | |
| Kings | 86.11 | 83.63 | 53.61 | 42.11 | |
| Lake | 40.06 | 65.56 | 47.84 | 42.68 | |
| Lassen | 77.27 | 77.98 | 59.30 | 55.66 | |
| Los Angeles | 51.20 | 59.45 | 31.16 | 28.51 | |
| Madera | 51.36 | 78.40 | 50.29 | 48.72 | |
| Marin | 67.67 | 81.73 | 59.32 | 54.60 | |
| Mariposa | 69.14 | 90.11 | 65.13 | 50.00 | |
| Mendocino | 68.04 | 80.19 | 39.03 | 48.81 | |
| Merced | 84.16 | 86.49 | 52.73 | 42.41 | |
| Modoc | 42.26 | 74.45 | 54.10 | 43.93 | |
| Mono | 44.75 | 58.27 | 62.15 | 52.00 | |
| Monterey | 74.88 | 75.43 | 47.64 | 40.63 | |
| Napa | 50.50 | 80.51 | 32.98 | 41.21 | |
| Nevada | 56.93 | 81.67 | 43.79 | 35.77 | |
| Orange | 64.40 | 76.06 | 44.50 | 44.00 | |
| Placer | 71.89 | 78.36 | 52.71 | 48.51 | |
| Plumas | 80.19 | 88.93 | 59.88 | 46.61 | |
| Riverside | 55.51 | 62.93 | 36.93 | 34.94 | |
| Sacramento | 52.86 | 57.48 | 45.31 | 42.38 | |
| San Benito | 45.44 | 66.40 | 43.31 | 34.81 | |
| San Bernardino | 52.15 | 53.53 | 35.70 | 34.14 | |
| San Diego | 74.80 | 83.94 | 35.87 | 18.42 | |
| San Francisco | 98.80 | 86.47 | 58.83 | 44.26 | |
| San Joaquin | 48.45 | 95.91 | 58.64 | 46.34 | |
| San Luis Obispo | 106.30 | 92.67 | 61.07 | 47.94 | |
| San Mateo | 67.73 | 83.11 | 56.63 | 51.63 | |
| Santa Barbara | 66.95 | 75.23 | 59.90 | 52.80 | |
| Santa Clara | 65.64 | 69.58 | 47.48 | 42.90 | |
| Santa Cruz | 74.11 | 74.49 | 49.49 | 46.73 | |
| Shasta | 73.24 | 82.15 | 38.96 | 44.03 | |
| Sierra | 101.30 | 91.08 | 57.73 | 46.75 | |
| Siskiyou | 75.80 | 89.32 | 52.43 | 43.63 | |
| Solano | 76.01 | 81.77 | 49.82 | 42.20 | |
| Sonoma | 77.70 | 86.54 | 60.44 | 48.86 | |
| Stanislaus | 86.77 | 80.03 | 46.25 | 44.41 | |
| Sutter | 72.03 | 70.55 | 58.74 | 48.74 | |
| Tehama | 54.15 | 85.79 | 40.82 | 34.54 | |
| Trinity | 80.61 | 78.29 | 47.15 | 37.80 | |
| Tulare | 70.39 | 81.67 | 43.88 | 37.08 | |
| Tuolumne | 69.91 | 79.06 | 38.17 | 30.68 | |
| Ventura | 80.05 | 77.85 | 44.71 | 42.29 | |
| Yolo | 43.31 | 76.35 | 46.69 | 39.58 | |
| Yuba | 43.32 | 58.02 | 35.26 | 21.35 | |

* Data not available

SECTION G - PERFORMANCE MEASURES
TABLE 20
COUNTY PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUMMARY
FOR THE QUARTER

| | Paternity Establishment Percentage | Cases With Support Orders | Collections on Current Support | Cases with Collections on Arrears | Cost Effectiveness* |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| STATEWIDE | 63.00% | 70.16% | 40.48% | 38.96% | |
| Alameda | 90.72 | 88.15 | 54.76 | 50.62 | |
| Alpine | 54.55 | 84.05 | 40.34 | 29.06 | |
| Amador | 93.58 | 89.98 | 61.73 | 51.59 | |
| Butte | 56.99 | 64.97 | 39.06 | 38.80 | |
| Calaveras | 37.55 | 78.02 | 49.16 | 37.95 | |
| Colusa | 82.98 | 86.85 | 60.96 | 45.81 | |
| Contra Costa | 75.70 | 83.32 | 48.31 | 39.29 | |
| Del Norte | 52.10 | 83.89 | 48.23 | 39.80 | |
| El Dorado | 77.27 | 87.43 | 48.50 | 43.16 | |
| Fresno | 79.95 | 83.67 | 40.61 | 39.88 | |
| Glenn | 48.31 | 83.93 | 50.54 | 48.09 | |
| Humboldt | 102.98 | 90.26 | 54.31 | 49.76 | |
| Imperial | 69.15 | 80.48 | 33.45 | 39.72 | |
| Inyo | 70.51 | 91.10 | 55.04 | 42.65 | |
| Kern | 79.55 | 73.01 | 28.12 | 39.94 | |
| Kings | 87.22 | 84.07 | 56.10 | 42.15 | |
| Lake | 47.91 | 67.72 | 46.66 | 42.27 | |
| Lassen | 81.04 | 77.02 | 60.95 | 53.36 | |
| Los Angeles | 52.67 | 60.74 | 32.21 | 29.21 | |
| Madera | 49.80 | 78.46 | 52.76 | 48.85 | |
| Marin | 67.44 | 81.34 | 58.11 | 55.09 | |
| Mariposa | 71.04 | 90.44 | 64.61 | 53.03 | |
| Mendocino | 68.96 | 83.14 | 40.52 | 50.70 | |
| Merced | 84.94 | 86.44 | 53.76 | 43.79 | |
| Modoc | 41.94 | 75.85 | 54.54 | 43.22 | |
| Mono | 48.26 | 59.55 | 60.69 | 48.03 | |
| Monterey | 82.43 | 76.57 | 48.62 | 40.88 | |
| Napa | 51.75 | 80.91 | 54.92 | 45.85 | |
| Nevada | 55.91 | 81.50 | 42.93 | 36.10 | |
| Orange | 64.48 | 76.11 | 45.53 | 44.78 | |
| Placer | 73.98 | 79.53 | 52.34 | 49.20 | |
| Plumas | 86.35 | 91.08 | 58.33 | 47.69 | |
| Riverside | 57.52 | 64.47 | 41.77 | 37.70 | |
| Sacramento | 52.61 | 57.24 | 45.58 | 43.44 | |
| San Benito | 44.85 | 67.48 | 44.62 | 39.98 | |
| San Bernardino | 59.88 | 52.94 | 36.76 | 34.05 | |
| San Diego | 79.42 | 83.97 | 28.20 | 35.08 | |
| San Francisco | 83.33 | 87.64 | 59.84 | 44.55 | |
| San Joaquin | 49.58 | 93.17 | 42.23 | 48.90 | |
| San Luis Obispo | 108.00 | 93.72 | 59.93 | 48.59 | |
| San Mateo | 67.23 | 84.45 | 58.13 | 53.40 | |
| Santa Barbara | 71.74 | 76.15 | 59.69 | 52.65 | |
| Santa Clara | 66.06 | 69.61 | 49.85 | 43.80 | |
| Santa Cruz | 71.96 | 74.77 | 49.98 | 45.95 | |
| Shasta | 75.35 | 83.43 | 39.32 | 44.85 | |
| Sierra | 93.98 | 92.75 | 62.39 | 46.98 | |
| Siskiyou | 75.45 | 89.65 | 51.85 | 41.68 | |
| Solano | 78.34 | 82.76 | 51.12 | 43.70 | |
| Sonoma | 79.50 | 86.67 | 59.95 | 48.17 | |
| Stanislaus | 86.12 | 79.97 | 46.81 | 45.43 | |
| Sutter | 73.65 | 71.11 | 56.84 | 48.67 | |
| Tehama | 53.76 | 85.30 | 40.45 | 35.41 | |
| Trinity | 78.26 | 78.97 | 45.75 | 37.69 | |
| Tulare | 73.02 | 82.75 | 45.60 | 39.63 | |
| Tuolumne | 70.48 | 79.40 | 51.13 | 38.98 | |
| Ventura | 79.18 | 79.26 | 45.00 | 43.46 | |
| Yolo | 46.71 | 79.13 | 46.70 | 38.02 | |
| Yuba | 42.15 | 59.59 | 36.88 | 21.15 | |

* Data not available

SECTION G - PERFORMANCE MEASURES

TABLE 20
COUNTY PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUMMARY
FOR THE QUARTER

| | Paternity Establishment Percentage | Cases With Support Orders | Collections on Current Support | Cases with Collections on Arrears | Cost Effectiveness a/ |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| STATEWIDE | 63.70% | 70.94% | 42.02% | 44.58% | |
| Alameda | 89.42 | 87.45 | 54.26 | 53.41 | |
| Alpine | 48.72 | 85.09 | 46.13 | 35.96 | |
| Amador | 97.29 | 89.51 | 64.58 | 57.05 | |
| Butte | 57.03 | 65.91 | 42.74 | 45.65 | |
| Calaveras | 38.25 | 80.13 | 48.27 | 43.38 | |
| Colusa | 84.90 | 85.68 | 64.04 | 54.83 | |
| Contra Costa | 85.20 | 68.78 | 47.70 | 44.64 | |
| Del Norte | 56.60 | 84.95 | 49.42 | 46.44 | |
| El Dorado | 78.23 | 87.97 | 49.81 | 48.94 | |
| Fresno | 80.41 | 83.32 | 44.43 | 40.90 | |
| Glenn | 48.46 | 83.82 | 53.44 | 55.41 | |
| Humboldt | 107.10 | 90.68 | 54.97 | 45.70 | |
| Imperial | 72.58 | 81.60 | 31.00 | 42.93 | |
| Inyo | 73.94 | 90.36 | 55.43 | 47.49 | |
| Kern | 79.96 | 72.40 | 29.70 | 45.42 | |
| Kings | 88.38 | 83.45 | 54.67 | 47.21 | |
| Lake | 52.32 | 68.41 | 49.19 | 47.79 | |
| Lassen | 83.34 | 77.36 | 60.40 | 58.87 | |
| Los Angeles | 52.56 | 61.86 | 31.95 | 34.46 | |
| Madera | 70.04 | 76.04 | 45.64 | 47.41 | |
| Marin | 65.54 | 81.37 | 61.19 | 60.02 | |
| Mariposa | 77.05 | 90.43 | 64.92 | 58.41 | |
| Mendocino | 71.32 | 84.91 | 41.47 | 53.66 | |
| Merced | 85.24 | 86.61 | 54.16 | 48.71 | |
| Modoc | 47.21 | 77.96 | 56.04 | 53.55 | |
| Mono | 49.62 | 61.33 | 64.08 | 54.72 | |
| Monterey | 83.79 | 75.67 | 50.74 | 47.38 | |
| Napa | 52.24 | 81.29 | 55.64 | 51.14 | |
| Nevada | 55.58 | 82.67 | 46.30 | 43.20 | |
| Orange | 67.55 | 76.50 | 45.73 | 49.54 | |
| Placer | 77.76 | 80.51 | 55.57 | 63.93 | |
| Plumas | 89.91 | 91.50 | 56.86 | 50.20 | |
| Riverside | 65.39 | 67.54 | 40.48 | 43.93 | |
| Sacramento | 54.17 | 58.03 | 46.58 | 49.84 | |
| San Benito | 45.64 | 68.02 | 45.89 | 46.02 | |
| San Bernardino | 61.89 | 53.04 | 36.32 | 43.22 | |
| San Diego | 76.20 | 84.34 | 42.84 | 44.01 | |
| San Francisco | 84.04 | 87.75 | 59.04 | 49.41 | |
| San Joaquin | 49.04 | 91.57 | 40.90 | 49.59 | |
| San Luis Obispo | 104.28 | 93.84 | 61.34 | 54.86 | |
| San Mateo | 68.01 | 85.04 | 59.29 | 57.82 | |
| Santa Barbara | 77.84 | 76.68 | 59.67 | 58.92 | |
| Santa Clara | 66.68 | 70.06 | 49.84 | 49.51 | |
| Santa Cruz | 71.60 | 74.84 | 50.30 | 50.88 | |
| Shasta | 75.38 | 84.04 | 40.51 | 51.47 | |
| Sierra | 91.76 | 91.90 | 65.84 | 50.32 | |
| Siskiyou | 78.70 | 89.60 | 51.39 | 48.25 | |
| Solano | 81.48 | 83.68 | 50.38 | 49.27 | |
| Sonoma | 77.34 | 86.63 | 59.43 | 53.42 | |
| Stanislaus | 87.42 | 80.95 | 47.11 | 51.24 | |
| Sutter | 76.16 | 73.08 | 57.52 | 55.02 | |
| Tehama | 53.03 | 87.04 | 43.05 | 41.14 | |
| Trinity | 76.80 | 80.72 | 48.23 | 47.95 | |
| Tulare | 79.94 | 82.49 | 45.72 | 43.83 | |
| Tuolumne | 73.87 | 79.36 | 53.01 | 46.31 | |
| Ventura | 78.45 | 80.27 | 46.22 | 48.47 | |
| Yolo | 49.35 | 80.90 | 43.61 | 49.43 | |
| Yuba* | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |

a/ Data not available

*County has not reported

CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES PROGRAM
APRIL - JUNE 2001*
Third Quarter Federal Fiscal Year

| | 3rd Quarter FFY 2001 Apr - Jun 01 | Previous Qtr FFY 2001 2nd Qtr Jan - Mar 2001 | % Change From Previous Qtr | 3rd Quarter FFY 2000 Apr - Jun 00 | % Change 3rd Qtr FFY 2000 to FFY 2001 | FFY 2000 |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| Total Caseload | 2,015,302 | 2,030,650 | -0.76% | 2,023,739 | -0.42% | 2,027,788 |
| Current Assistance | 554,949 | 546,432 | 1.56% | 640,312 | -13.33% | 585,992 |
| Former Assistance | 1,072,861 | 1,119,343 | -4.15% | 1,018,462 | 5.34% | 1,090,844 |
| Never Assistance | 387,492 | 364,875 | 6.20% | 364,965 | 6.17% | 350,952 |
| Total Collections Distributed | \$647,639,291 | \$476,205,723 | 36.00% | \$611,725,007 | 5.87% | \$1,939,998,126 |
| Current Assistance | \$101,540,765 | \$68,307,110 | 48.65% | \$120,504,861 | -15.74% | \$349,391,370 |
| Former Assistance | \$366,238,681 | \$252,685,881 | 44.94% | \$329,374,178 | 11.19% | \$1,018,072,284 |
| Never Assistance | \$179,859,845 | \$155,212,732 | 15.88% | \$161,845,969 | 11.13% | \$572,534,471 |
| Current Support Dist. | \$281,946,978 | \$274,253,116 | 2.81% | \$264,401,898 | 6.64% | \$1,026,426,645 |
| Current Assistance | \$40,963,591 | \$39,832,573 | 2.84% | \$45,752,388 | -10.47% | \$179,697,000 |
| Former Assistance | \$133,916,648 | \$131,004,355 | 2.22% | \$121,973,996 | 9.79% | \$475,154,434 |
| Never Assistance | \$107,066,738 | \$103,416,188 | 3.53% | \$96,675,515 | 10.75% | \$371,575,210 |
| Arrears & Interest Dist. | \$365,692,313 | \$201,952,607 | 81.08% | \$347,323,109 | 5.29% | \$913,571,481 |
| Current Assistance | \$60,577,173 | \$28,474,537 | 112.74% | \$74,752,473 | -18.96% | \$169,694,370 |
| Former Assistance | \$232,322,033 | \$121,681,526 | 90.93% | \$207,400,182 | 12.02% | \$542,917,850 |
| Never Assistance | \$72,793,107 | \$51,796,544 | 40.54% | \$65,170,453 | 11.70% | \$200,959,261 |
| Paternities Established | 45,014 | 45,197 | -0.40% | 51,428 | -12.47% | 205,248 |
| Support Orders Established | 40,133 | 40,924 | -1.93% | 44,378 | -9.57% | 170,368 |

PERFORMANCE ON FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

| PERFORMANCE MEASURE | 3rd Quarter FFY 2001 Apr - Jun 01 | Previous Qtr FFY 2001 2nd Qtr Jan - Mar 2001 | 3rd Quarter FFY 2000 Apr - Jun 00 |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Paternity Establishment Rate | 63.70% | 63.00% | 63.87% |
| Support Orders Established | 70.94% | 70.16% | 67.49% |
| Collections on Current Support | 42.02% | 40.48% | 40.49% |
| Collections on Arrears | 44.58% | 38.96% | 52.21% |
| Cost - Effectiveness Ratio | n/a | n/a | n/a |

| FFY 1999 Oct 98 - Sep 99 | FFY 2000 Oct 99 - Sep 00 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 61.30% | 60.37% |
| 65.48% | 68.99% |
| 40.52% | 40.12% |
| 59.78% | 53.32% |
| \$3.36 | \$3.12 ^{a/} |

*Yuba County has not reported

a/ Draft data

(Data Source: CS 157)

Data represents the most current statistics available at the time of publication.

For additional information, contact the Office of Research and Program Design at (916) 464-5080.