CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
P.O. Box 138006, Sacramento, CA 95813-8006

LCSA LETTER: 00-02

TO: ALL IV-D DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: PRISM ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

Please find attached the minutes from the September 7, 2000 Pre-Statewide Interim Systems Management (PRISM) Advisory Group (PAG) meeting. The PAG is a forum for consortia counties and the State (Department of Child Support Services, Department of Justice, Franchise Tax Board) to exchange information related to program policies and procedures that may impact automation. Although not all counties attend the PAG, as there are designated representatives, all counties will receive copies of the PAG meeting minutes. We anticipate PAG meetings to be held monthly.

If you have any questions, please contact Evan Auberry, PRISM Branch Manager, at (916) 263-2147.

Sincerely,

CHERYL HOTALING
Deputy Director
Technology Services Division

cc: Carole Hood
Edwina Young
Elaine Moody
Rick Torres
Sandra Poole
Richard Williams
Evan Auberry
Richard Yamadera

Meeting Minutes
PRISM Advisory Group Meeting
September 7, 2000

1) Welcome

- Cheryl Hotaling, Deputy Director, Technology Services Division
- Evan Auberry, Manager, Interim Systems, Technology Services Division

2) CS 157 Report – Edwina Young, Deputy Director, Child Support Services Division

The Five Federal Performances Measures Are:

- Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)
    - IV-D PEP children in IV-D caseload for whom Paternity was established in the report year, or,
    - Statewide PEP using Paternity Opportunity Program (POP) against children born out of wedlock in the state
- Cases with Support Orders
- Collections on Current Support (dollars owed vs. dollars collected)
- Collections on Arrears (case counts with a collection)
- Cost Effectiveness (cost vs. collection ratio)

Federal Incentives that counties receive are based on the above performance measures. The Data Reliability Audit for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1999 is currently in progress. The Federal Auditors will determine the baseline performance measures. Anything less than 90% reporting reliability means the State will not receive incentive money for that performance measure. Preliminary findings indicate that California 's data reliability findings for the Statewide PEP is less than 90%. Several issues contributed to data being less than reliable:

- Reporting the Establishment of paternity for children born out-of-wedlock in another state (not California)[1]
- Reporting the Establishment of paternity for children with an unknown state of birth[2]
- POP vs. Judgment, if paternity is established by POP you can only report the establishment of paternity once, not by both POP and a judgment.
- Duplicate case counts
- Children over the age of 18 prior to the reporting period are not to be counted in the inventory or in the task accomplished figures

[1] Other sources used to indicate a child's state of birth were outside the automated system and therefore do not count for audit purposes.
[2] See footnote #1

Meeting Minutes
PRISM Advisory Group Meeting
September 7, 2000

The table below shows how the Feds will be measuring performance based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY):

FFY 2000 10/1/99 – 9/30/00	**FFY 2001** 10/1/00 – 9/30/01	**FFY 2002** 10/1/01 – 9/30/02
1/3 earned based on performance measures	2/3 earned based on performance measures	100% earned based on performance measures

In December 1999, the Feds changed a phrase regarding paternity from "children in the state born out-of-wedlock" to "children born out-of-wedlock in the state". This revised statement changes how California's reporting is impacted by the choice of the PEP reporting.

To use the Statewide POP PEP, the state of birth must be listed for out-of-wedlock, out-of-state child support cases. Only those children born in the state can be counted in the report of children for whom paternity is established. Based on an Ad-Hoc report from CASES, 2% of cases were categorized as out-of-state and 30% of cases were categorized as unknown state of birth for the child. In the Los Angles ARS system, 100% of children's state of birth was not on the system, and therefore unknown. The table below shows the options available for meeting this requirement:

Statewide PEP	**POP/PEP**	**IV-D Caseload**
Out of Wedlock Births in the State	# of POP Declarations Signed Last Year	Out of State Births and Birth State Unknown
167,000	139,000	Unknown

Much discussion ensued regarding the best way to meet this federal requirement. Options discussed are listed below:

Least Risk	**Medium Risk**	**Greatest Risk**
• Revert to IV-D PEP – out of state and unknown state of birth won't matter. • Will lose some incentives for FFY 1999 and FFY 2000	• Clean-up – this is very resource intensive. Greatest risk for the counties. • Timing is crucial. All clean-up would have to be completed by December 15, 2000.	• Do nothing

Those counties in attendance discussed the various alternatives. Although more detailed analysis needs to be completed, it was the tentative decision to revert to IV-D PEP for FFY 1999 and FFY 2000. DCSS will complete the necessary analysis, which

includes determining what reduction in incentives, if any, will result from the change in reporting based on the IV-D PEP choice, and will inform the counties formally of any changes in policy.

Action Items:

- DCSS will develop instructions for reporting requirements, which include data to be reported, which methodology was chosen, and instructions for developing Maintenance and Operations (M&O) estimates to accomplish the revised reporting requirements (see handouts).

- DCSS will issue a letter discussing format and time requirements for submission to the Master Case Listing (MCL), which is required by the federal auditors for the Data Reliability Audit for FFY 2000.

Handouts:

- CS 155 Report – Child Support Services **Quarterly** Data and Accounts Receivable Report, (draft version – comments/suggestions).
- CS 156 Report – Child Support Services **State Fiscal Year Annual** Data and Accounts Receivable Report (draft version – comments/suggestions).
- CS 157 Report – Child Support Services **Federal Fiscal Year Annual** Data and Accounts Receivable Report (no changes allowed).

Comments and suggestions are welcomed on CS 155 and CS 156. Please send your comments to Helen Faust [(916) 464-5042, helen.faust@dcss.ca.gov] or Donna Martin [(916) 464-5033, donna.martin@dcss.ca.gov].

Plans for Next Year for Cleaning-Up Caseloads:

- Enter the State of Birth for all children, at intake, at time of judgment, at time of paternity interview, on cleanup reports run for the express purpose.
- Take the children out of the inventories who reached age 18 prior to the report period.
- Run a match against the POP database and ID all kids who have had paternity established by POP, thereby reducing the inventory of those needing service and increasing the count of those for whom paternity has been established.
- Consider closing unknown father cases as permitted (need results of P3)
- Consider closing cases without social security numbers (need results of P3)

Meeting Minutes
PRISM Advisory Group Meeting
September 7, 2000

3) Family Violence Indicator – Edwina Young

Feedback on sample letters sent to Custodial and Non-Custodial Parents. Comments were received stating:

- The letters were unclear and bureaucratic. They need to be simplified.
- More language translations are needed. Once the letters are translated, they can be shared among the counties using the same document generation software, so each county does not have to do its own translation.

- **Bruce Kaspari – DOJ Parent Locator Service**

Independent Contractor Registry (ICR)

- Legislation requires that all companies report independent contractors to EDD.
- The ICR database should be ready by 3/1/01, but it's still unclear how big the database will be.
- Each county will receive two reports - the ICR and the New Employee Registry (NER). Bruce handed out a document that explains the difference between ICR and NER.
- The ICR needs to be part of the statewide development.
- DOJ is trying to get records from Dept. of Corrections and is also trying to get death records for data match.

4) Wrap-Up

- The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 5th, 9:00am to 3:00pm (the day following the IV-D Directors Meeting).
- Future meetings will include the Consortia leads, CAMP representatives, and statewide development representatives.

Suggestions for next meeting:

- Have lunch brought in again. It's easier than going out and saves time.
- Send the meeting minutes to all counties so that everyone is knowledgeable of the issues addressed.
- Link the discussion of policy changes to automation requirements.

Meeting Minutes
PRISM Advisory Group Meeting
September 7, 2000

ATTENDEES

1) Elaine Lyman – El Dorado
2) Roberta Carillo – Fresno
3) Jim Mohler – Kern (KIDZ)
4) Bill Malloy – Kern
5) Jim Crum – Los Angeles (ARS)
6) Daniel Scott – Los Angeles
7) Gail Thomas – Riverside (STAR/KIDS)
8) Milton Hyams – San Francisco (CASES)
9) Christine Anderson – San Francisco
10) Melinda Bigelow – San Francisco
11) Jim Beaumont – San Mateo (CHASER)
12) Stephen Gibbons – Santa Clara
13) Maureen Kelley – Santa Clara
14) Dennis Covell – Solano
15) Lisa Cruz – Solano
16) Laura Larrow – Sonoma
17) Peggy Anderson – Tulare
18) Cindy Elkins – Tulare
19) Stan Trom – Ventura
20) Lynn Miner – Yuba
21) Cheryl Hotaling – DCSS
22) Edwina Young – DCSS
23) Elaine Moody - DCSS
24) Evan Auberry – DCSS
25) Michael Graham – DCSS
26) Rick Torres – DCSS
27) Linda Patterson – DCSS
28) Helen Faust – DCSS
29) Donna Martin– DCSS
30) Hossein Moftakhar – DCSS
31) Richard Yamadera - FTB