

September 29, 2006

The Honorable Ulysses Currie
Chair, Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
Miller Senate Office Building
11 Bladen Street, 3 West Wing
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

The Honorable Norman H. Conway
Chair, House Committee on Appropriations
House Office Building
12 Bladen Street, Room 121
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

Dear Senator Currie and Delegate Conway:

Enclosed you will find the Report on the Cost Effectiveness of the Child Support Enforcement Programs throughout the State of Maryland. This report is submitted in response to the 2006 JCR, page 127, which states "The Committee request that the Department of Human Resources (DHR) provide a report on the cost effectiveness of child support programs throughout the State with specific attention toward the cost-effectiveness of privatization."

We appreciate this opportunity to provide information on the performance of the child support program. This report shows that the child support program at the state level and each local jurisdiction is cost effective. Also, the report shows that overall the state and each local jurisdiction is performing well in all performance indicators that affect cost effectiveness.

Please feel free to contact me at 410-767-7109 if you have any questions.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. McCabe
Secretary

Enclosure



Department of
Human Resources

311 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, MD 21201

Report dated October 1, 2006:

Cost Effectiveness of Child Support

Prepared for:

The Chairmen of the Senate Budget and
Taxation Committee and the House
Committee on Appropriations

As required by:

2006 Joint Chairmen's Report, Page 127



**COST EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE
CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS
THROUGHOUT THE
STATE OF MARYLAND**

October 1, 2006

Department of Human Resources
Child Support Enforcement Administration
311 W. Saratoga Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	3
Methodology.....	6
Results	9
Conclusions.....	20
Appendices	
Table A-1 Collections By Jurisdiction	23
Table A-2 Expenditures By Jurisdiction	24
Table A-2.1 DHR Overhead Expenditures By Jurisdiction.....	25
Table A-3 Cost Effectiveness Ratio	26
Table A-4 Court Order Establishment.....	27
Table A-5 Current Support Collected.....	28
Table A-6 Cases Paying Arrears	29
Table A-7 Average Monthly Support Order Amount	30
Table A-8 Jurisdictional Composite Rankings	31

INTRODUCTION

In 1996, under Family Law, Section 10-119.1 – 10.119.2, the privatization and demonstration pilot programs were established as a means of testing whether the private sector or the public sector was better suited for sustaining increased performance levels. These pilots continue after three extensions.

During the 2006 Legislative Session, the General Assembly included language in the Fiscal Year 2007 Budget that required the Department of Human Resources to report on the cost effectiveness of the child support programs in the State. Prior to this requirement, the Legislative Auditors required the Department to establish cost effectiveness goals for each local jurisdiction as a means of maximizing incentives for the cost effectiveness performance measure.

This report describes the methodology used to determine cost effectiveness and includes an analysis of the cost effectiveness data. This gathering of data to determine jurisdictional cost effectiveness performance levels provided a baseline for use by the Department for developing annual performance goals. In addition, this report assesses other performance measures and their relationship to setting annual cost effectiveness performance goals at the jurisdictional level.

This report examines cost effectiveness for the State and separately for each local jurisdiction. Also, the report discusses other performance factors in assessing overall program performance. This assessment is made based on meeting federal performance levels.

As will be demonstrated in the report, the overall results of this analysis are that the State exceeds federal minimum performance in every area and so does each local jurisdiction. Overall, while the State is doing well, improvement can still be made. As in the past, the data furnished in this report will be used to set future performance goals for all performance areas.

BACKGROUND

The Child Support Enforcement Program was enacted in 1975 as Title IV-D of the Social Security Act. The purpose of the program was to establish, collect and enforce child support in public assistance cases. In the early years, establishment and enforcement were carried out using judicial process in the court system. Over the next 25 years, the program expanded to include non-public assistance cases, uniform interstate laws and various administrative tools (child support guidelines, paternity affidavit, tax refund intercepts, earnings withholding, license suspension, etc.) designed to enhance establishment, collection and enforcement. In addition, the federal law provided for automation to enhance case processing, centralized collections and disbursement to include electronic payment and disbursement methods.

During the 1990s, privatization of child support services came into vogue. Many states experimented with this business model in an effort to improve customer service, increase collections and improve cost effectiveness. The first three-year privatization pilot in Baltimore City and Queen Anne's County began in Maryland in November 1996. This pilot ran concurrent with one demonstration site in Washington County. This pilot was extended for an additional three-year period and included three more demonstration sites in Calvert, Howard and Montgomery Counties. The pilot was again extended through October 31, 2009 and the remaining 18 Maryland counties are to become demonstration sites by July 2008. Of these eight counties (Allegany, Anne Arundel, Baltimore County, Carroll, Charles, Dorchester, Frederick and Prince George's) began to operate as demonstration sites in July 2005. The remaining ten (10) counties will be implemented on or before the deadline.

The Maryland General Assembly included in the 2007 Budget the requirement for the Department of Human Resources to submit a report on the Cost Effectiveness of child support programs throughout the State with specific attention toward the cost effectiveness of privatization. The report is due to the General Assembly by October 1, 2006. This report is in response to the Legislative requirement.

In conducting this analysis, CSEA considered what determines cost effectiveness. The child support program is a federal program in which nationwide performance standards are established. Program performance standards are established in five categories, paternity establishment, court order establishment, current support collected, cases paying arrears and cost effectiveness. The determining factors for each of these standards are established under federal regulations at 45 CFR 305 to arrive at the performance level for each State in each category.

Determination of Cost Effectiveness Performance Level:

The cost-effectiveness performance for a State for a fiscal year is equal to the total amount collected during the fiscal year under the State plan approved under this part divided by the total amount expended during the fiscal year under the State plan, expressed as a ratio. The formula is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Cost Effectiveness} = \frac{\text{Total Child Support Collected During the Fiscal Year}}{\text{Total Amount Expended During the Fiscal Year}}$$

States are required to capture information about collections and expenditures on two reports. The Report used to capture collection data is the OCSE 157 Annual

Performance Report. The Report used to capture expenditure data is the OCSE 396A Quarterly Report of Expenditures.

To determine the cost effectiveness of child support programs in the State, it was necessary for CSEA to determine for each Maryland jurisdiction its proportionate share of the total State collections and the total State expenditures as reported on the OCSE 34-A and OCSE 396A. Using the formula described above, the cost effectiveness of each of the 24 jurisdiction's child support programs in Maryland was determined.

In addition, performance levels for court order percentage, current support collected and cases paying arrears was considered in assessing each jurisdictions overall performance. While not a federal performance category, a jurisdiction's average monthly support order amount affects its collection base. Therefore, this factor is considered in the analysis of cost effectiveness. Its affects are discussed later in the report.

METHODOLOGY

The Maryland Child Support Enforcement Administration applied the Federal definition of how a State's cost effectiveness is measured to calculate the cost-effectiveness of each the local jurisdiction. According to the Federal Regulations at 45 CFR 305, "A State's Cost-effectiveness performance level for a fiscal year is equal to the total amount of IV-D support collected and disbursed or retained, as applicable during the fiscal year, divided by the total amount expended during the fiscal year".

In calculating the cost-effective ratios for the local jurisdictions including the privatized jurisdictions, the following sources of information were utilized:

- (a) The total collections per jurisdiction were based on summary data submitted to the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) on the OCSE 157 Annual Performance Report for Federal fiscal year 2005. Table A-1, Collections By Jurisdiction provides jurisdiction specific collections and total State collections.
- (b) The calculations of the total expenditures per jurisdiction were based on data reported on the Federal OCSE-396A Quarterly Report of expenditures. The OCSE-396A includes the summary of child support expenditures for the state to include local child support offices (18 Local Departments of Social Services, four (4) Local Offices of Child Support Enforcement and two (2) privatized offices); 36 Cooperative Reimbursement Agreement (CRA) Agencies; the Child Support Enforcement Administration (CSEA), Department of Human Resources (DHR) overhead and Local Department of Social Services' (LDSS) local general

administration (LGA) costs. The State Financial Management Information System (FMIS) was used for gathering expenditure data for the Department of Human Resources, Child Support Enforcement Central and Local Child Support Offices. Expenditures for the CRA Agencies were gathered from the CRA Quarterly Expenditure Reports.

To arrive at each jurisdiction's proportionate share of expenditures, the actual jurisdictional expenditures (local child support office and each jurisdiction's actual CRA expenditures) were added to the allocated CSEA, DHR and LDSS overhead expenditures. LDSS overhead expenditures were allocated to the 18 local LDSS child support offices. The same factor (each jurisdiction's percentage of total collections) was used to allocate expenditures. Table A-2, Expenditures by Jurisdiction, provides the distribution of total expenditures to each jurisdiction and Table A-2.1, DHR Overhead Expenditures By Jurisdiction, provides the distribution of DHR expenditures to each jurisdiction.

(c) The cost effectiveness performance level for each jurisdictions was determined by using the formula as expressed below:

$$\text{Cost Effectiveness} = \frac{\text{Total Child Support Collected During the Fiscal Year}}{\text{Total Amount Expended During the Fiscal Year}}$$

Table A-3, Cost Effectiveness Ratio, provides the cost effectiveness levels for each jurisdiction.

Using FFY (federal fiscal year) 2005¹ data, the Department is beginning to determine jurisdictional cost effectiveness performance levels. The FFY 2005 level will be used as a baseline for developing goals beginning with FFY 2007. In addition to the

¹FFY 2005 is the last year that all data used in this report are available.

cost effectiveness baseline data, the Department will use other factors (court orders established, current support collected and cases paying arrears levels) to determine annual cost effectiveness goal levels. These other factors will be considered to possibly explain situations where jurisdictions that are high performers in other performance categories (such as court order establishment and current support collected) and who at the same time have less opportunity for increasing their cost effectiveness level than other jurisdictions that have more growth potential in these areas. Tables A-4, Support Order Establishment, A-5, Current Support Collected and A-6, Cases Paying Arrears provide jurisdictional performance levels in the other performance categories. In addition, an assessment is made of each jurisdiction's average monthly support order amount. This is one contributing factor that contributes significantly in determining a jurisdiction's collection base. A Jurisdiction's collection base may impact cost effectiveness in terms of a jurisdiction's potential to increase collections while managing expenditures at a level necessary to provide effective services. Table A-7, Average Monthly Support Order Amount, shows average monthly support order amount by jurisdiction.

RESULTS

The Child Support Enforcement Administration (CSEA) is required to report on the cost effectiveness of the child support program throughout the State of Maryland. In the previous chapter, CSEA described the methodology used to arrive at the cost effectiveness ratio and the other performance measures that impact that ratio. The determination of how well the State and each jurisdiction are doing with regard to any performance measure must be based on benchmarks against which that performance can be judged. The federal OCSE under 45 CFR 305 established and defined the specific performance measures for judging the child support enforcement program. Along with the performance measures, the federal Office established a methodology for States to earn incentive payments for reinvestment in the child support program. States are eligible to earn incentive payments in each of five performance categories based on achieving by category specific performance levels. To earn 100% of incentives in any category, a State must achieve the maximum performance level in that category. Also, to earn any incentives in a category, States must achieve a minimum level of performance for that category.

For the purpose of this report, CSEA is assessing whether jurisdictions fall between the federal minimum and maximum performance levels as the benchmarks for assessing how well jurisdictions are performing. In addition to assessing each jurisdiction's cost effectiveness, CSEA assesses the benchmarks for court order establishment, current support collected and cases paying arrears and the impact of

these factors on cost effectiveness². Also to level the playing field, CSEA is assessing how the average court ordered amount affects a jurisdiction's collection base and cost effectiveness.

The maximum performance levels established by federal OCSE in each of the performance measure categories used in this report to assess jurisdictional overall performance and preliminary data³ on State averages are shown in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1
Federal Performance Measures

Performance Measure Category	Maximum Performance Level	Minimum Performance for Incentive Earnings	State Average	State's Incentive Percentage
Cost Effectiveness	\$5.00	\$1.99	\$4.91	90%
Support Order Establishment	80.0%	51.0%	74.65%	88%
Current Support Collected	80.0%	41.0%	63.08%	73.0%
Cases Paying Arrears	80.0%	41.0%	63.92%	73.0%

² This report covers four (4) of the five (5) federal performance measures. The measure for paternity establishment is not included because the focus of this report is cost effectiveness. In this context, paternity establishment does not affect collections as do the other three performance measures, support order establishment, current support collected and cases paying arrears.

³ The Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement issues the official data on State performance after finalizing its analysis of nationwide Data Reliability Audit information. Generally, each state is notified in November of the year after the performance period being reviewed. We anticipate receiving the official FFY 2005 performance levels in November 2006.

Cost Effectiveness

Table-A3, Cost Effectiveness Ratio provides the FFY 2005 cost effectiveness levels of the State and each jurisdiction. The benchmark for maximum cost effectiveness performance is \$5.00 collected for every dollar spent. The State as a whole is very close to achieving maximum performance in this area. Based on the State's performance level, for FFY 2005, the State should earn 90% of the available incentives in this category.

Four local jurisdictions (Prince George's, Baltimore County, Howard and Montgomery) exceeded the benchmark for maximum cost effectiveness performance. These jurisdictions, along with Charles County, exceeded the State average.

The jurisdictions were ranked by performance levels. The top ten jurisdictions (Prince George's, Baltimore County, Howard, Montgomery, Charles, Cecil, Anne Arundel, Queen Anne's, St. Mary's, and Washington) included the four metropolitan counties, two large counties (caseload of 5,000 – 10,000), three medium counties (caseloads of 3,000 – 4,999) and one small county (caseloads under 3,000). Baltimore City with the largest caseload was in the top fifteen and Somerset County with one of the smallest caseload had the lowest ranking. However, all jurisdictions performed above the minimum performance level of \$1.99 collected to every dollar spent.

The question remains, could jurisdictional cost effectiveness performance levels be better? A jurisdiction's cost effectiveness is based on collections and expenditures. The cost half of the formula is displayed in Table A-2, Expenditures By Jurisdiction, where we examined all of the expenditure factors which consisted of local office specific costs, local CRA specific costs and DHR, CSEA and local overhead allocated costs.

The collections half of the formula is displayed in Table A-1, Collections By Jurisdiction, which includes the total distributed collections for each jurisdiction. However, these factors alone may not tell the whole story.

Collection Base:

To determine whether a jurisdiction is performing well from a collection's standpoint, an examination is needed of its performance in collecting against the collections base. In addition, a jurisdiction's collections base is determined by how well the jurisdiction is doing in establishing support orders based on caseload and the average support order amount. For example, a jurisdiction with a high percentage of cases under order, a high percent of current support collected may have a proportionately lower cost effectiveness ratio because of comparatively lower average support order amounts.

Support Order Establishment:

Table A-4, Support Order Establishment, provides the FFY 2005 support order establishment levels of the State and each jurisdiction. The benchmark for maximum court order establishment performance is 80.0%. The State as a whole is at 74.65 %, which is close to achieving maximum performance in this area. Based on the State's performance level, for FFY 2005, the State should earn 88% of the available incentives in this category. Twenty-one (21) local jurisdictions exceeded the benchmark for maximum support order establishment performance.

The jurisdictions were ranked by performance levels. The top ten jurisdictions (Queen Anne's, Calvert, Worcester, Allegany, Dorchester, Kent, Washington, Caroline, Talbot, Garrett) included one large county (caseload of 5,000 – 10,000) one medium

county (caseload between 3,000 – 4,999) and eight small sized counties (caseloads under 3,000). Other jurisdictions exceeding the maximum performance level included two metropolitan counties (Anne Arundel and Montgomery), four large sized counties (Charles, Frederick, Harford and Wicomico), four medium sized counties (Carroll, Cecil, Howard and St. Mary's) and one small (Somerset). The remaining jurisdictions, including the two largest (Baltimore City and Prince George's County) all performed well above the minimum performance level of 51.0%. Based on this, jurisdictions below the maximum performance level for support order establishment have room for improvement in terms of increasing their collection base. It may be harder for jurisdictions at or above the maximum performance level, especially those at 90 percent or better, to increase their collection base in this category.

Current Support Collected:

Table A-5, Current Support Collected provides the FFY 2005 current support collected performance levels for the State and each jurisdiction. The benchmark for maximum support order establishment performance is 80.0%. The State as a whole is at 63.08%. Based on the State's performance level, for FFY 2005, the State should earn 73.0% of the available incentives in this category. None of the twenty-four local jurisdictions exceeded the benchmark for maximum current support collected performance incentives.

The jurisdictions were ranked by performance levels. The top ten jurisdictions (Washington, Calvert, Carroll, Talbot, Howard, Frederick, Allegany, Charles, St. Mary's, and Montgomery) included one metropolitan county, three large counties, four medium counties and two small counties. The remaining jurisdictions, including the two largest

(Baltimore City and Prince George's County) all performed above the minimum performance level of 41.0%. Based on this, all jurisdictions have room for improvement. By increasing the percent of current support collections while at the same time not disproportionately increasing expenditures, jurisdictions will be able to increase their cost effectiveness ratios.

Cases Paying Arrears:

Table A-6, Cases Paying Arrears, provides the FFY 2005 cases paying arrears performance levels for the State and each jurisdiction. The benchmark for maximum cases paying arrears performance is 80.0%. The State as a whole is at 63.92%. Based on the State's performance level, for FFY 2005, the State should earn 73.0% of the available incentives in this category. Two local jurisdictions (Calvert County and Washington County) exceeded the benchmark for maximum cases paying arrears performance.

The jurisdictions were ranked by performance levels. The top ten jurisdictions (Calvert, Washington, Charles, Carroll, Kent, Howard, Frederick, Talbot, Allegany, and Garrett) include three large counties, three medium counties and four small counties. The remaining jurisdictions, including the two largest (Baltimore City and Prince George's County) all performed above the minimum performance level of 41.0%. Based on this, all jurisdictions have room for improvement. By increasing the percent of cases paying arrears and arrears collections and not disproportionately increasing expenditures, jurisdictions will be able to increase their cost effectiveness ratios.

Average Monthly Support Order Amount:

TableA-7, Average Support Order Amount, provides the FFY 2005 average support order amounts of the State and each jurisdiction. Although the average support order amount does not have a performance measure, this information is useful in assessing a jurisdiction's collection base. Support order amounts are based generally on Maryland Guidelines. The Guidelines consist of schedules in which a support amount is determined based on the combined incomes of both parents. Each parent's share of the support amount is based on the each parent's proportion of the combined income. The support order amount is the non-custodial parent share of the support amount. In this regard, generally jurisdictions with higher median incomes produce higher average support order amounts. The average support order amount for the State as a whole is \$232 per month.

The jurisdictions were ranked by their average support order amount. The top ten jurisdictions (Howard, Charles, Calvert, Montgomery, Baltimore County, Cecil, Carroll, Harford, Anne Arundel and St. Mary's) include three metropolitan counties, two large counties, four medium counties and one small county. The average support orders amounts in the top ten counties range from \$436 per month to \$287 per month and are all above the State average. The average support orders for remaining jurisdictions range from \$280 per month to \$133 per month. Eight of these jurisdictions' average support order amounts ranging from \$229 to \$133 are below the State average. Baltimore City has the lowest average support order amount of \$133.00 per month.

Privatization Jurisdictions:

Under a three year pilot program beginning November 1996, Baltimore City and Queen Anne’s County were privatized. This pilot program was extended two additional times with a current sunset date of October 31, 2009. The legislature required that specific attention be given to the privatized jurisdiction in discussing child support performance. The two privatization pilot jurisdictions are performing well in all performance categories. Both have exceeded the federal bench mark for minimum performance in each category.

Baltimore City

Performance for Baltimore City is displayed in Table 3 below:

**Baltimore City Performance
Table 3**

Performance Category	Performance Level
Cost Effectiveness	3.90
Support Order Establishment	69.95%
Current Support Collected	49.63%
Cases Paying Arrears	50.63%
Average Monthly Support Order Amount	\$133

Baltimore City ranked among the top 15 jurisdictions for cost effectiveness and achieved a support order establishment percentage well above the federal minimum level. Current support collected and cases paying arrears performance were at 49.65% and 50.63% respectively and were above the federal minimal levels for these categories. In addition, Baltimore City with the largest number of cases has the lowest average support order amount of any jurisdiction in the State. As a result, the amount

available to be collected, collection base, is less than jurisdictions with higher average support order amounts. While doing well, Baltimore City has room for improvement in order to achieve maximum levels in all performance categories.

Queen Anne’s County

Performance for Queen Anne’s County is displayed in Table 4 below:

**Queen Anne’s County Performance
Table 4**

Performance Category	Performance Level
Cost Effectiveness	4.77
Support Order Establishment	92.55%
Current Support Collected	66.55%
Cases Paying Arrears	72.94%
Average Monthly Support Order Amount	\$265

Queen Anne’s ranked among the top 10 jurisdictions for cost effectiveness and is very close to the federal maximum performance level in this category. For support order establishment, Queen Anne’s achieved the number 1 ranking and exceeded the federal maximum in this area. Current support collected and cases paying arrears performance were at 66.55% and 72.94% respectively, well above the federal minimal levels for these categories. In addition, Queen Anne’s ranked thirteenth for the state in both categories. Queen Anne’s average support order amount is ranked 12th in the state. Queen Anne’s ranked number 4 overall. While doing very well overall by achieving top rankings in State for two performance categories, Queen Anne’s does have room for improvement in order to achieve maximum performance in three of the four performance categories.

Jurisdictional Composite Ranking:

Table A-8, Jurisdictional Composite Rankings, provides the FFY 2005 each jurisdiction’s composite ranking. In this Table a composite ranking is derived by totaling the rankings for each performance measure category discussed in this report and the average support order amount and dividing by five (5), the number factors included in the total. From this the overall jurisdictional ranking is derived. These rankings ranged from 1 – 14 because there were a number of jurisdictions tied. Table 5 below displays each of the 14 composite ranks and the jurisdictions in each rank.

**Jurisdictions By Composite Rank
Table 5**

Rank	Jurisdictions
1	Calvert,
2	Howard
3	Charles, Washington
4	Queen Anne’s
5	Carroll, Talbot
6	Allegany, Frederick, Montgomery, St. Mary’s
7	Baltimore County, Cecil, Kent
8	Caroline, Garrett
9	Anne Arundel, Harford, Worcester
10	Prince George’s
11	Dorchester
12	Somerset
13	Wicomico
14	Baltimore City

Eleven jurisdictions achieved composite rankings between 1 and 6. Of these jurisdictions, five (Calvert, Carroll, Charles, Howard, and St. Mary’s) were in the top ten for average support order amount, five were in the top ten for support order establishment (Allegany, Calvert, Queen Anne’s, Talbot, and Washington); ten were in the top ten for current support collected (Allegany, Calvert, Carroll, Charles, Frederick,

Howard, Montgomery, St. Mary's Talbot, and Washington); eight were in the top ten for cases paying arrears (Allegany, Calvert, Carroll, Charles, Frederick, Howard, Talbot, and Washington); and four were in the top ten for cost effectiveness (Charles, Howard, Montgomery, and Queen Anne's. Of these eleven jurisdictions, one is a metropolitan county, three are large counties, five are medium counties and three are small counties.

CONCLUSIONS

This report discusses cost effectiveness performance for the state and each local jurisdiction. In that discussion, data was provided on the definition of cost effectiveness, the establishment of federal performance measures and benchmarks for judging performance levels. In addition, data was provided on other performance measures that impact cost effectiveness as well as average support order amount as a factor that impacts the collection base.

The cost effective formula is based on total distributed collections divided by total expenditures as reported to the federal government on the OCSE 157 Annual Statistical Report and OCSE-396A Quarterly Expenditure Report. Each jurisdiction's share of collections and expenditures were determined. Collections were based on the actual amount of the jurisdiction's distributed collections. Expenditures were determined by the actual local office expenditures, actual CRA expenditures in the jurisdiction, allocated LDSS overhead (LGA) to LDSS jurisdictions and allocated DHR and CSEA overhead to all jurisdictions.

In addition, the state and each jurisdiction's performance levels were assessed based on the federal benchmark for each performance area. Based on this assessment, the state and every jurisdiction performed above the minimum performance level for each performance measure. Four jurisdictions achieved performance levels above the maximum level of \$5.00 for cost effectiveness and twenty jurisdictions achieved performance levels above the maximum of 80% for support order establishment.

Overall, the results of this analysis clearly indicate that, overall the State is performing very well. For cost effectiveness, the State's cost effectiveness performance of 4.91 is just below the federal maximum performance level of 5.0. For the other three performance categories, the State is performing just below the maximum level for support order establishment and well above the minimum level for current support collected and cases paying arrears. In addition, all local jurisdictions are doing well by exceeding the federal minimum performance level in all categories. Several jurisdictions exceeded the maximum performance levels for cost effectiveness and support order establishment.

While the State and all local jurisdictions are performing well, there is still room for improvement as CSEA strives to reach maximum performance levels in each performance category. Marylanders can be proud of the child support program as CSEA and local offices continually strive to improve services throughout the State.

In addition, this report demonstrates that the good performance of child support agencies depends on good management. Good management is found throughout the State in the publicly run agencies (twenty-two jurisdictions) and the privately run agencies (two jurisdictions). At this time, maintaining the status quo seems to be the most prudent course. Therefore, this report does not recommend any changes from the current configuration of publicly and privately run offices.

Appendices

Content:

Table A-1	Collections By Jurisdiction
Table A-2	Expenditures By Jurisdiction
Table A-2.1	DHR Overhead Expenditures By Jurisdiction
Table A-3	Cost Effectiveness Ratio
Table A-4	Court Order Establishment
Table A-5	Current Support Collected
Table A-6	Cases Paying Arrears
Table A-7	Average Monthly Support Order Amount
Table A-8	Jurisdictional Composite Rankings

**Collections by Jurisdiction
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 – 09/30/2005)**

TABLE A-1

Jurisdiction	Current Support Disbursed	Arrears Disbursed	Total Distributed Collections
Allegany	\$5,391,997	\$1,630,111	\$7,022,108
Anne Arundel	\$25,915,731	\$7,992,215	\$33,907,946
Baltimore City	\$56,967,210	25,228,193	\$82,195,393
Baltimore County	\$41,945,743	\$12,095,478	\$54,041,221
Calvert	\$7,215,730	\$2,129,835	\$9,345,565
Caroline	\$2,613,667	\$757,799	\$3,371,466
Carroll	\$6,311,257	\$1,704,278	\$8,015,535
Cecil	\$7,414,453	\$2,074,322	\$9,488,775
Charles	\$13,466,352	\$3,546,510	\$17,012,862
Dorchester	\$2,938,044	\$829,442	\$3,767,486
Frederick	\$11,040,113	\$3,102,042	\$14,142,155
Garrett	\$1,557,298	\$477,804	\$2,035,102
Harford	\$12,185,855	\$3,418,016	\$15,603,871
Howard	\$13,043,264	\$3,061,206	\$16,104,470
Kent	\$1,548,025	\$442,763	\$1,990,788
Montgomery	\$35,513,418	\$10,095,046	\$45,608,434
Prince George's	\$82,025,897	\$22,042,104	\$104,068,001
Queen Anne's	\$2,476,343	\$719,778	\$3,196,121
St. Mary's	\$8,535,287	\$2,088,924	\$10,624,211
Somerset	\$1,873,217	\$644,322	\$2,517,539
Talbot	\$2,232,819	\$480,083	\$2,712,902
Washington	\$11,517,482	\$2,739,388	\$14,256,870
Wicomico	\$6,040,452	\$2,031,715	\$8,072,167
Worcester	\$2,951,085	\$947,677	\$3,898,762
State	\$362,739,056	\$110,284,348	\$473,023,404

**Expenditures by Jurisdiction
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 to 09/30/2005)**

Table A-2

Jurisdiction	DHR	LGA	Local Agency	CSEA	CRA	Total Expenditures
Allegany	\$222,900	\$217,199	\$1,364,406	\$228,553	\$114,040	\$2,147,098
Anne Arundel	\$1,076,326	\$0	\$4,095,370	\$1,103,625	\$783,220	\$7,058,542
Baltimore City	\$2,609,096	\$0	\$13,010,122	\$2,675,270	\$2,805,520	\$21,100,008
Baltimore County	\$1,715,409	\$0	\$4,590,738	\$1,758,917	\$696,938	\$8,762,002
Calvert	\$296,653	\$170,579	\$664,981	\$304,177	\$789,558	\$2,225,947
Caroline	\$107,019	\$107,296	\$609,799	\$109,733	\$19,537	\$953,384
Carroll	\$254,434	\$191,377	\$866,357	\$260,887	\$669,037	\$2,242,092
Cecil	\$301,198	\$246,201	\$1,070,582	\$308,838	\$44,830	\$1,971,649
Charles	\$540,033	\$356,613	\$873,594	\$553,729	\$1,114,227	\$3,438,196
Dorchester	\$119,590	\$143,739	\$905,087	\$122,623	\$26,173	\$1,317,212
Frederick	\$448,909	\$370,033	\$1,040,071	\$460,294	\$1,201,029	\$3,520,337
Garrett	\$64,599	\$61,821	\$395,895	\$66,238	\$33,663	\$622,216
Harford	\$495,307	\$412,646	\$1,290,287	\$507,870	\$1,104,868	\$3,810,978
Howard	\$511,198	\$255,296	\$1,289,560	\$524,163	\$175,952	\$2,756,169
Kent	\$63,193	\$54,952	\$470,643	\$64,796	\$10,006	\$663,589
Montgomery	\$1,447,730	\$0	\$4,027,980	\$1,484,449	\$1,053,306	\$8,013,466
Prince George's	\$3,303,389	\$0	\$5,166,975	\$3,387,173	\$2,071,542	\$13,929,080
Queen Anne's	\$101,453	\$0	\$449,405	\$104,026	\$14,465	\$669,349
St. Mary's	\$337,240	\$270,560	\$709,375	\$345,794	\$587,509	\$2,250,478
Somerset	\$79,913	\$113,338	\$539,221	\$81,940	\$191,327	\$1,005,739
Talbot	\$86,115	\$80,265	\$343,482	\$88,299	\$142,008	\$740,168
Washington	\$452,550	\$356,549	\$1,786,119	\$464,028	\$237,691	\$3,296,938
Wicomico	\$256,232	\$384,152	\$1,570,773	\$262,730	\$69,949	\$2,543,837
Worcester	\$123,757	\$136,234	\$824,947	\$126,896	\$71,067	\$1,282,900
State	\$15,014,243	\$3,928,848	\$47,955,769	\$15,395,050	\$14,027,464	\$96,321,374

**DHR Overhead Expenditures by Jurisdiction
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 to 09/30/2005)**

Table A-2.1

Jurisdiction	A0101 OS	B0004 SSA	C0101 CSA	C0107 A S CSA	E0101 B&F	E0102 OAO	F0002 Major IT	F0004 OTHS	G0002 FI Local	G0003 Child Wel	G0004 Adult Ser	I0004 FIA State	DHR
Allegany	13,191	553	1	12	22,803	24,856	-4,145	161,167	464	3,427	462	110	\$222,900
Anne Arundel	63,694	2,669	5	56	110,112	120,022	-20,017	778,235	2,241	16,549	2,231	529	\$1,076,326
Baltimore City	154,398	6,471	13	137	266,919	290,942	-48,523	1,886,500	5,433	40,116	5,408	1,282	\$2,609,096
Baltimore County	101,513	4,254	8	90	175,492	191,286	-31,902	1,240,322	3,572	26,375	3,556	843	\$1,715,409
Calvert	17,555	736	1	16	30,349	33,080	-5,517	214,494	618	4,561	615	146	\$296,653
Caroline	6,333	265	1	6	10,948	11,934	-1,990	77,380	223	1,645	222	53	\$107,019
Carroll	15,057	631	1	13	26,029	28,372	-4,732	183,968	530	3,912	527	125	\$254,434
Cecil	17,824	747	1	16	30,814	33,587	-5,602	217,781	627	4,631	624	148	\$301,198
Charles	31,957	1,339	3	28	55,247	60,219	-10,043	390,469	1,125	8,303	1,119	265	\$540,033
Dorchester	7,077	297	1	6	12,234	13,336	-2,224	86,469	249	1,839	248	59	\$119,590
Frederick	26,565	1,113	2	24	45,925	50,058	-8,349	324,582	935	6,902	930	221	\$448,909
Garrett	3,823	160	0	3	6,609	7,204	-1,201	46,708	135	993	134	32	\$64,599
Harford	29,311	1,228	2	26	50,672	55,232	-9,211	358,131	1,031	7,616	1,027	243	\$495,307
Howard	30,251	1,268	3	27	52,297	57,004	-9,507	369,620	1,064	7,860	1,060	251	\$511,198
Kent	3,740	157	0	3	6,465	7,047	-1,175	45,691	132	972	131	31	\$63,193
Montgomery	85,672	3,590	7	76	148,107	161,437	-26,924	1,046,778	3,015	22,259	3,001	711	\$1,447,730
Prince George's	195,484	8,193	16	173	337,947	368,363	-61,435	2,388,508	6,879	50,791	6,847	1,623	\$3,303,389
Queen Anne's	6,004	252	1	5	10,379	11,313	-1,887	73,355	211	1,560	210	50	\$101,453
St. Mary's	19,957	836	2	18	34,501	37,606	-6,272	243,841	702	5,185	699	166	\$337,240
Somerset	4,729	198	0	4	8,175	8,911	-1,486	57,781	166	1,229	166	39	\$79,913
Talbot	5,096	214	0	5	8,810	9,603	-1,602	62,265	179	1,324	178	42	\$86,115
Washington	26,781	1,122	2	24	46,297	50,464	-8,416	327,215	942	6,958	938	222	\$452,550
Wicomico	15,163	635	1	13	26,213	28,573	-4,765	185,268	534	3,940	531	126	\$256,232
Worcester	7,324	307	1	6	12,661	13,800	-2,302	89,482	258	1,903	257	61	\$123,757
State	888,497	37,236	74	788	1,536,005	1,674,247	-279,227	10,856,012	31,264	230,850	31,120	7377	\$15,014,243

**Cost Effectiveness Ratio
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 – 09/30/2005)**

TABLE A-3

Jurisdiction	Total Distributed Collections	Total Expenditures	Cost Effectiveness Ratio	Rank
Allegany	\$7,022,108	\$2,147,098	\$3.27	18
Anne Arundel	\$33,907,946	\$7,058,542	\$4.80	7
Baltimore City	\$82,195,393	\$21,100,008	\$3.90	14
Baltimore County	\$54,041,221	\$8,762,002	\$6.17	2
Calvert	\$9,345,565	\$4,225,947	\$4.20	11
Caroline	\$3,371,466	\$953,384	\$3.54	17
Carroll	\$8,015,535	\$2,242,092	\$3.58	16
Cecil	\$9,488,775	\$1,971,649	\$4.81	6
Charles	\$17,012,862	\$3,438,196	\$4.95	5
Dorchester	\$3,767,486	\$1,317,212	\$2.86	22
Frederick	\$14,142,155	\$3,520,337	\$4.02	13
Garrett	\$2,035,102	\$622,216	\$3.27	18
Harford	\$15,603,871	\$3,810,978	\$4.09	12
Howard	\$16,104,470	\$2,756,169	\$5.84	3
Kent	\$1,990,788	\$663,589	\$3.00	21
Montgomery	\$45,608,434	\$8,013,466	\$5.69	4
Prince George's	\$104,068,001	\$13,929,080	\$7.47	1
Queen Anne's	\$3,196,121	\$669,349	\$4.77	8
St. Mary's	\$10,624,211	\$2,250,478	\$4.72	9
Somerset	\$2,517,539	\$1,005,739	\$2.50	23
Talbot	\$2,712,902	\$740,168	\$3.67	15
Washington	\$14,256,870	\$3,296,938	\$4.32	10
Wicomico	\$8,072,167	\$2,543,837	\$3.17	19
Worcester	\$3,898,762	\$1,282,900	\$3.04	20
State	\$472,999,750	\$96,321,374	\$4.91	

**SUPPORT ORDER ESTABLISHMENT
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 – 09/30/2005)**

TABLE A-4

Jurisdiction	Total Cases	Total Cases with Orders	Percent of Cases with Orders	Rank
Allegany	3,415	3,130	91.65%	4
Anne Arundel	13,791	11,473	83.19%	18
Baltimore City	102,283	71,549	69.95%	23
Baltimore County	23,205	17,357	74.80%	22
Calvert	2,682	2,476	92.32%	2
Caroline	1,687	1,510	89.51%	8
Carroll	3,009	2,467	81.99%	20
Cecil	3,871	3,306	85.40%	14
Charles	5,607	4,681	83.48%	17
Dorchester	2,260	2,056	90.97%	5
Frederick	5,818	4,858	83.50%	16
Garrett	972	856	88.07%	10
Harford	6,488	5,282	81.41%	21
Howard	4,014	3,515	87.57%	11
Kent	864	778	90.05%	6
Montgomery	16,705	13,790	82.55%	19
Prince George's	57,091	37,467	65.63%	24
Queen Anne's	1,249	1,156	92.55%	1
St. Mary's	4,254	3,695	86.86%	12
Somerset	1,782	1,529	85.80%	13
Talbot	1,262	1,117	88.51%	9
Washington	5,606	5,033	89.78%	7
Wicomico	6,040	5,078	84.07%	15
Worcester	2,142	1,973	92.23%	3
State	276,167	206,150	74.65%	

**CURRENT SUPPORT COLLECTED
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 – 09/30/2005)**

TABLE A-5

Jurisdiction	Total Current Support Due	Total Current Support Disbursed	Percent Current Support Disbursed	Rank
Allegany	\$7,668,565	\$5,391,997	70.31%	7
Anne Arundel	\$41,018,804	\$25,915,731	63.18%	18
Baltimore City	\$114,778,249	\$56,967,210	49.63%	23
Baltimore County	\$63,661,853	\$41,945,743	65.89%	14
Calvert	\$10,099,690	\$7,215,730	71.45%	2
Caroline	\$3,916,228	\$2,613,667	66.74%	11
Carroll	\$8,843,726	\$6,311,257	71.36%	3
Cecil	\$12,127,485	\$7,414,453	61.14%	19
Charles	\$19,750,210	\$13,466,352	68.18%	8
Dorchester	\$4,986,644	\$2,938,044	58.92%	22
Frederick	\$15,652,099	\$11,040,113	70.53%	6
Garrett	\$2,334,083	\$1,557,298	66.72%	12
Harford	\$18,600,040	\$12,185,855	65.52%	15
Howard	\$18,345,742	\$13,043,264	71.10%	5
Kent	\$2,326,217	\$1,548,025	66.55%	12
Montgomery	\$52,723,283	\$35,513,418	67.36%	10
Prince George's	\$125,782,804	\$82,025,897	65.21%	16
Queen Anne's	\$3,721,133	\$2,476,343	66.55%	13
St. Mary's	\$12,532,990	\$8,535,287	68.10%	9
Somerset	\$3,088,037	\$1,873,217	60.66%	20
Talbot	\$3,133,568	\$2,232,819	71.25%	4
Washington	\$15,284,455	\$11,517,482	75.35%	1
Wicomico	\$10,058,656	\$6,040,452	60.05%	21
Worcester	\$4,580,894	\$2,951,085	64.42%	17
State	\$575,085,468	\$362,739,056	63.08%	

**CASES PAYING ARREARS
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 – 09/30/2005)**

TABLE A-6

Jurisdiction	Total Cases With Arrears	Total Cases Paying Arrears	Percent of Cases with Orders	Rank
Allegany	3,267	2,439	74.66%	9
Anne Arundel	11,501	8,136	70.74%	19
Baltimore City	65,317	33,071	50.63%	24
Baltimore County	16,473	11,755	71.36%	18
Calvert	2,388	1,964	82.24%	1
Caroline	1,519	1,102	72.55%	14
Carroll	2,424	1,859	76.69%	4
Cecil	3,284	2,362	71.92%	16
Charles	4,396	3,458	78.66%	3
Dorchester	2,065	1,385	67.07%	21
Frederick	4,567	3,446	75.45%	7
Garrett	820	606	73.90%	10
Harford	5,013	3,657	72.95%	12
Howard	3,294	2,507	76.11%	6
Kent	804	616	76.62%	5
Montgomery	12,797	9,005	70.37%	20
Prince George's	32,688	21,258	65.03%	22
Queen Anne's	1,190	868	72.94%	13
St. Mary's	3,509	2,535	72.24%	15
Somerset	1,494	1,071	71.69%	17
Talbot	1,030	778	75.53%	8
Washington	5,347	4,321	80.81%	2
Wicomico	4,783	3,040	63.56%	23
Worcester	2,040	1,500	73.53%	11
State	192,021	122,745	63.92%	

**Average Monthly Support Order Amount
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 to 09/30/2005)**

Table A-7

Jurisdiction	Current Support Due	Cases w/ Orders	Avg Annual Support Amt	Avg Monthly Support Amt	Rank
Allegany	\$7,668,565	3,174	\$2,416	\$201	18
Anne Arundel	\$41,018,804	11,659	\$3,518	\$293	9
Baltimore City	\$114,788,249	71,841	\$1,598	\$133	23
Baltimore Co.	\$63,661,853	17,159	\$3,710	\$309	5
Calvert	\$10,099,690	2,467	\$4,094	\$341	3
Caroline	\$3,916,228	1,510	\$2,594	\$216	17
Carroll	\$8,843,726	2,484	\$3,560	\$297	7
Cecil	\$12,127,845	3,291	\$3,685	\$307	6
Charles	\$19,750,210	4,674	\$4,226	\$352	2
Dorchester	\$4,986,644	2,111	\$2,362	\$197	19
Frederick	\$15,652,099	4,922	\$3,180	\$265	12
Garrett	\$2,334,083	849	\$2,749	\$229	16
Harford	\$18,600,040	5,229	\$3,557	\$296	8
Howard	\$18,345,742	3,503	\$5,237	\$436	1
Kent	\$2,326,217	782	\$2,975	\$248	14
Montgomery	\$52,723,283	13,638	\$3,866	\$322	4
Prince George's	\$125,782,804	37,431	\$3,360	\$280	11
Queen Anne's	\$3,721,133	1,168	\$3,186	\$265	12
St. Mary's	\$12,532,990	3,633	\$3,450	\$287	10
Somerset	\$3,088,037	1,511	\$2,044	\$170	21
Talbot	\$3,133,568	1,120	\$2,798	\$233	15
Washington	\$15,284,455	5,072	\$3,013	\$251	13
Wicomico	\$10,058,656	5,104	\$1,971	\$164	22
Worcester	\$4,580,894	2,014	\$2,275	\$190	20
State	\$575,085,468	206,365	\$2,787	\$232	

**Jurisdictional Composite Ranking
FFY 2005 (10/01/2004 to 09/30/2005)**

Table A-8

Jurisdiction	Average Monthly Support Amount	Court Order Establishment	Current Support Collected	Cases Paying Arrears	Cost Effectiveness	Total Composite Rank	Average Composite	Rank
Allegany	18	4	7	9	18	56	11	6
Anne Arundel	9	18	18	19	7	71	14	9
Baltimore City	23	23	23	24	14	107	21	14
Baltimore County	5	22	14	18	2	61	12	7
Calvert	3	2	2	1	11	19	4	1
Caroline	17	8	11	14	17	67	13	8
Carroll	7	20	3	4	16	50	10	5
Cecil	6	14	19	16	6	61	12	7
Charles	2	17	8	3	5	35	7	3
Dorchester	19	5	22	21	22	89	18	11
Frederick	12	16	6	7	13	54	11	6
Garrett	16	10	12	10	18	66	13	8
Harford	8	21	15	12	12	68	14	9
Howard	1	11	5	6	3	26	5	2
Kent	14	6	12	5	21	58	12	7
Montgomery	4	19	10	20	4	57	11	6
Prince George's	11	24	16	22	1	74	15	10
Queen Anne's	12	1	13	13	8	47	9	4
St. Mary's	10	12	9	15	9	55	11	6
Somerset	21	13	20	17	23	94	19	12
Talbot	15	9	4	8	15	51	10	5
Washington	13	7	1	2	10	33	7	3
Wicomico	22	15	21	23	19	100	20	13
Worcester	20	3	17	11	20	71	14	9