

Did You Know...



Federal Performance Measures in a Nutshell

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 system. Since Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2000, states are evaluated for federal incentive funds based on 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 preceding fiscal year, expressed as a percentage.

IV-D PEP

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

California's Performance:

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%		
FFY 2011	92.2%	FFY 2007	91.3%	FFY 2003	87.0%		

Statewide PEP

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

California's Performance:

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%		
FFY 2011	107.0%	FFY 2007	106.7%	FFY 2003	105.9%		

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 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%		
FFY 2011	85.8%	FFY 2007	82.1%	FFY 2003	76.4%		

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 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%		
FFY 2011	58.6%	FFY 2007	51.5%	FFY 2003	45.2%		

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 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%		
FFY 2011	61.6%	FFY 2007	57.1%	FFY 2003	55.4%		

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 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		
FFY 2011	\$2.29	FFY 2007	\$2.01	FFY 2003	\$2.31		

**The actual FFY 2008 statewide total for cost effectiveness is \$2.04. Due to a reporting 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 beginning in the fiscal year 2001. Reliable data means the most recent data available found by the Secretary to be reliable for the purposes of computing each of the Federal performance measures. Data must be found to be sufficiently complete and error free to be convincing for their purpose and context. 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 five federal performance standards or the 95 percent data reliability standard puts California at risk of losing eligibility for incentive funds and incurring significant penalties if no improvement is made during the year.

Penalties

The penalty system is used to penalize states that fail to perform at acceptable levels or fail to submit complete and reliable data. If the state falls below one or more of the performance measures, or does not meet the data reliability criteria, 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 the year. For example, the corrective action period for the data reliability audit done for FFY 2012 ends September 30, 2013. If the state fails the FFY 2012 audit and also fails the FFY 2013 audit, a penalty could be imposed. The penalty level by which payments will 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.