



Federal Performance Measures at a Glance

DCSS implemented the incentive funding system based on program performance as required by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). The Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998 enacted significant changes in the way federal incentives are paid to states. The methodology changed from being based on cost-effectiveness only, to five federal performance measures implemented over a three year period, beginning October 1, 1999. The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement’s (OCSE) Action Transmittal 01-01 dated January 3, 2001 contains the federal regulations that govern the incentive funding system. Since federal fiscal year (FFY) 2000, states have been evaluated annually for federal incentive funds based on the following five performance measures:

1. Paternity Establishment Percentage

- The “IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage” (PEP) measures the total number of children in the IV-D caseload in the fiscal year who have been born out-of-wedlock and for whom paternity has been established, compared to the total number of children in the IV-D caseload as of the end of the preceding fiscal year who were born out of wedlock, expressed as a percent;
OR
- The “Statewide Paternity Establishment Percentage” measures the total number of children born out-of-wedlock for whom paternity was acknowledged or established in the fiscal year compared to the total number of children in the state born out-of-wedlock in the preceding fiscal year, expressed as a percentage.

IV-D PEP

Minimum threshold: 50% + 2 - 6% increase annually if under 90%

California’s Performance:

FFY 2015	102.0%	FFY 2011	92.2%	FFY 2007	91.3%	FFY 2003	87.0%
FFY 2014	101.2%	FFY 2010	88.6%	FFY 2006	90.3%	FFY 2002	77.5%
FFY 2013	100.5%	FFY 2009	97.3%	FFY 2005	86.0%		
FFY 2012	98.4%	FFY 2008	94.2%	FFY 2004	87.6%		

Statewide PEP

Minimum threshold: 50% + 2 - 6% increase annually if under 90%

California’s Performance:

FFY 2015	98.0%	FFY 2011	107.0%	FFY 2007	106.7%	FFY 2003	105.9%
FFY 2014	98.2%	FFY 2010	102.6%	FFY 2006	109.9%	FFY 2002	108.7%
FFY 2013	98.6%	FFY 2009	103.4%	FFY 2005	106.5%		
FFY 2012	101.6%	FFY 2008	101.4%	FFY 2004	117.8%		

2. Percent of Cases with a Child Support Order

This data element measures cases with support orders as compared with the total caseload. Support orders are broadly defined as all legally enforceable orders, including orders for medical support only and zero support orders, expressed as a percentage.

Minimum threshold: 50% or 5% increase annually

California’s Performance:

FFY 2015	89.4%	FFY 2011	85.8%	FFY 2007	82.1%	FFY 2003	76.4%
FFY 2014	89.2%	FFY 2010	82.5%	FFY 2006	80.6%	FFY 2002	75.3%
FFY 2013	89.0%	FFY 2009	78.8%	FFY 2005	80.3%		
FFY 2012	87.9%	FFY 2008	80.2%	FFY 2004	78.1%		

3. Current Collections Performance

This performance standard measures the amount of current support collected as compared to the total amount of current support owed, expressed as a percentage.

Minimum threshold: 40%

California's Performance:

FFY 2015	66.5%	FFY 2011	58.6%	FFY 2007	51.5%	FFY 2003	45.2%
FFY 2014	64.9%	FFY 2010	56.0%	FFY 2006	50.4%	FFY 2002	42.4%
FFY 2013	63.3%	FFY 2009	53.4%	FFY 2005	49.3%		
FFY 2012	61.4%	FFY 2008	52.8%	FFY 2004	48.0%		

4. Arrearage Collections Performance

This performance standard measures the number of cases with child support arrearage collections as compared with the number of cases owing arrearages during the federal fiscal year, expressed as a percentage.

Minimum threshold: 40%

California's Performance:

FFY 2015	66.2%	FFY 2011	61.6%	FFY 2007	57.1%	FFY 2003	55.4%
FFY 2014	65.8%	FFY 2010	60.3%	FFY 2006	56.5%	FFY 2002	54.9%
FFY 2013	65.1%	FFY 2009	59.4%	FFY 2005	56.0%		
FFY 2012	63.5%	FFY 2008	59.1%	FFY 2004	54.9%		

5. Cost Effectiveness Performance Level

This measure compares the total amount of distributed collections to the total amount of expenditures for the fiscal year, expressed as distributed collections per dollar of expenditure.

Minimum threshold: \$2.00

California's Performance:

FFY 2015	\$2.51	FFY 2011	\$2.29	FFY 2007	\$2.01	FFY 2003	\$2.31
FFY 2014	\$2.43	FFY 2010	\$2.38	FFY 2006	\$2.03	FFY 2002	\$2.23
FFY 2013	\$2.54	FFY 2009	\$2.10	FFY 2005	\$2.15		
FFY 2012	\$2.47	FFY 2008	\$1.96*	FFY 2004	\$2.12		

*The actual FFY 2008 statewide total for cost effectiveness is \$2.04. Due to an error it had been reported as \$1.96.

Data Reliability

In addition to meeting these performance goals, for purposes of incentives and penalties, data must meet a 95 percent standard of reliability. Data must be found to be sufficiently complete and error free. Federal auditors are required to conduct audits to assess completeness, reliability and security of the data, and the accuracy of the reporting systems used in calculating performance indicators.

Failure to meet the data reliability standard puts states at risk of losing eligibility for incentive funds and incurring significant penalties unless improvements are made during the year.

Penalties

If any state falls below one or more of the performance measures or does not meet the data reliability criteria, then an automatic corrective action period of one year will ensue. If not corrected during that period, a penalty will be imposed at the end of that year. For example, if a state failed two consecutive annual audits, a penalty would be imposed. The penalty level by which payments would be reduced is one to two percent of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) grant for the first finding; two to three percent for the second consecutive finding; and three to five percent for the third and subsequent consecutive findings. Total penalties may not exceed 25 percent of the TANF grant.