DCSS P3 PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE MEASURES WORKGROUP
SEPTEMBER 20, 2000
MEETING SUMMARY

A. GENERAL

On Wednesday, September 20, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Performance Measures Workgroup had a session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

.

- ☑ Linda Anisman (Small County Rep – Inyo County)
- ☑ Mica Bennett (FTB Rep), Scribe
- ☑ John Braun (DCSS Analyst)
- ☐ Carmen Cody (DCSS Co-Leader)
- ☑ Michael Coleman (DCSS Rep)
- ☐ Sharon Covarrubias (FTB Rep)
- ☐ Marsha Devine (Judicial Council Rep)
- ☐ Lenny Goldberg (Advocates Rep)
- ☐ Leora Gershenzon for Lenny Goldberg
- ☑ Susan Green (County Co-Leader – San Diego County)
- ☑ Deborah Harper (SEIU Rep)
- ☐ Rita Hayes-Thompson (Medium County Rep – Ventura County)
- ☑ Alan Hiromura (CSAC Rep)
- ☑ Joan Neblett (replacing Gail Juiliano) (Large County Rep – Los Angeles County)
- ☑ Ken Masuda (CSAC Rep)
- ☑ Liz Mechem (CSSAS Rep)
- ☑ Nancy Melton (County Analyst – Riverside County)
- ☐ Barb Saunders (OCSE Rep)
- ☑ Melanie Snider (Advocates Rep)
- ☑ Mark Whitmore (County Co-Leader – San Diego County)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☑ Jim Hennessey (SRA Team – PSI)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made at the September 20, 2000 meeting. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Susan Green: sgreen@sdcda.org.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Mark Whitmore opened the discussion with a review of the tentative agenda and of the minutes. John Braun had several corrections to last meetings minutes. Specifically, Section F should read:

> ***SB1410 EVALUATION****: SB 1410 required DCSS to evaluate those counties in the "lowest quartile" with respect to the measure of:*
>
> $$\frac{\textit{welfare collections}}{\textit{IVA caseload}}$$
>
> *John Braun of DCSS, who was previously involved in the evaluations of those counties, commented that the value of that process was in learning county practices.*
>
> *The following conclusions were reached through group discussion:*
>
> - *As the IVD agencies cannot control the IVA caseload[1], a component of the measure, they have limited control over the outcome. It is reasonable to assume that the same counties would appear in the bottom year after year.*
> - *This could drive counties to collect welfare dollars over dollars for former or never assistance cases.*
> - *Currently, only certain counties benefit from State review. DCSS resources should be redirected to review all counties – the purpose would be to evaluate current practices and share those considered of value.*
> - *This measure seems to focus more on cost recovery (reimbursing the State/Feds for past aid paid) than cost avoidance (collecting support to keep people off aid).*
>
> ***Recommendation:*** *Work, through legislation, to eliminate this measure. Reallocate those State resources from evaluating bottom quartile counties to conducting reviews of all county agencies in an effort to gain an in-depth understanding and sharing of county practices.*

Other Comments

Jim noted that DCSS is asking the group to help identify goals and objectives that would go into the development of the state strategic plan.

[1] IVA practices can affect the size of the caseload. For example, concentrated efforts on fraud detection and prevention tend to lower the caseload, more liberal policies regarding granting standards could result in a higher caseload – none of which is controllable by the IVD agency.

Action Items

No outstanding action items were noted.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Estimated Timeframe	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader(s)
8:30-8:45	- Greetings - Housekeeping items - Acceptance of previous meeting minutes - Review of current Action Items List	Mark Whitmore & Carmen Cody
8:45 - 10:15	Review of Workgroup Report - Overview of current status of report drafting - Chapter 2: Process	 Mark and Carmen John
10:15 – 10:30	Break	
10:30 – 12:00	Review of Workgroup Report - Chapter 3: Results and Recommendations	 Mica and Melanie
12:00 – 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 – 2:00	Review of Workgroup Report - Chapter 4: Next Steps	 Susan
2:00 – 2:15	Break	
2:15 – 3:45	Review of Workgroup Report - Executive Summary - Acknowledgments and appendices - Review roster for accuracy on workgroup member listings Identify elements to include in state's overall strategy for the child support program	 Melanie Mark and Carmen Carmen
3:45 – 4:00	Wrap-up	Mark and Carmen
4:00	Adjourn	

D. REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT

The four components to the draft report were presented for discussion:

a. Process: John Braun discussed the format of the "process" piece. Comments regarding the following were noted for incorporation:

Edit: omit workgroup member names
Edit: keep the tone positive
Clarification: That the five federal measures were reviewed and included as they were consistent with the goals, objectives, and overall mission of the program.

b. Recommendations: Mica Bennett discussed the format for the "recommendations" component. The following comments were taken for inclusion:

Change: use federal numbering system for weighting
Edit: add a table for clarification
Add: discussion of the appropriateness of each measure
Include: the Federal Strategic Plan as an attachment

c. Next Steps: Susan Green discussed the format for the "next steps" component. The following comments were taken for inclusion:

Edit: remove the term "data warehouse" and include other descriptive language
Add: recommendation for statewide system to include child-based data
Include: the need for DCSS to develop expertise necessary to train on measures

d. Executive Summary: Melanie Snider discussed the format for the "executive summary". The following comments were taken for inclusion:

Edit: Minor format changes only

All revisions were to be complete by Friday and e-mailed to both Joan Neblett and Larry Wilson.

E. REPORT ON OTHER GROUPS

Ken reported on the correspondence he has had with other P3 groups. Although both the Case Closure and Training Workgroups had wanted either specific measures recommended or recommendations made to OCSE, neither appeared appropriate for inclusion in the scope of the Performance Measures Workgroup. Ken stated he would communicate back to these Workgroups.

F. STRATEGIC PLAN

Jim stated he would communicate the following recommendations back to DCSS:

- DCSS should consider adopting the Federal Strategic Plan because it:
  - Is concise
  - Represents the overall goals/mission of the program

- As performance measures are considered a component of the strategic plan, the Performance Measures Workgroup (future group) should be a part of the planning process.

G. NEXT MEETING

At our next meeting, on Wednesday, October 18, 2000, 10:00a.m., the Workgroup will discuss feedback from focus groups and incorporate into the report as appropriate.