



**State of Alaska
Department of Revenue
Child Support Services Division**

**Self-Assessment Review
FFY 2006**

March 27, 2007

John Mallonee, Director

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	3
SAMPLING METHODOLOGY	4
SCOPE OF THE REVIEW	4
CATEGORY 1: PROGRAM COMPLIANCE	6
REVIEW CRITERIA IN COMPLIANCE.....	6
<i>Case Closure.....</i>	6
<i>Paternity and Support Order Establishment.....</i>	7
<i>Expedited Processes.....</i>	8
<i>Enforcement.....</i>	10
<i>Disbursement.....</i>	11
<i>Medical Support Enforcement.....</i>	12
<i>Review and Adjustment of Supprt orders.....</i>	13
<i>Interstate Services.....</i>	14
CATEGORY 2: PROGRAM DIRECTION.....	16
<i>Case Closure.....</i>	16
<i>Paternity and Order Establishment.....</i>	16
<i>Expedited Processes.....</i>	18
<i>Enforcement.....</i>	19
<i>Disbursement.....</i>	20
<i>Medical Support Enforcement.....</i>	21
<i>Review and Adjustment.....</i>	23
<i>Interstate Services.....</i>	24
MANAGEMENT ISSUES:	27
CATEGORY 3: PROGRAM SERVICE ENHANCEMENTS	28

Executive Summary

CSSD's Internal Auditor conducted the annual Self-Assessment Review to measure the division's compliance with federal regulations for federal fiscal year 2006.

CSSD exceeded all federal compliance requirements.

A stable level of performance was found in most areas measured. The declines in two areas, Review and Adjustment and Responding Interstate, were statistically significant though none fell below an 88% accuracy rate (where the minimum acceptable is 75%). Review and Adjustment will improve with training and the passage of time; and Responding Interstate should conduct a supervisory review of mail handling priorities and staff training.

Using statistics from the OCSE-157 Report, CSSD's active, IV-D caseload shrunk in size from 45,259 to 44,989 (.6% smaller than in FFY 05). The number of open cases with orders was static at 92%. The agency distributed \$89.9 million in child support in FFY 06. This figure appears \$4 million lower than we reported last year, but that is because of a change to allowable collections in the reporting process (about \$5.3 million was paid to other states that can no longer be counted on the Disbursements to the Arrears line of the OCSE-157 report). Actual collections increased from the prior year. We expect a continued, stable rate of growth for collections in FFY 2007.

We have 232 full time employees. No new staff positions were added for FFY 06.

The audit review period was October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 (FFY 06). It included a detailed review of 521 cases (including the hard files). The sample was determined seeking a 90% confidence level and a +/- 2% maximum error of estimate. The review was conducted according to the requirements of 45 CFR 308.

The following table depicts the percent of cases in compliance by category:

Compliance Category	Cases Reviewed	Action Cases	Last Year	Efficiency Rate: 2006	Minimum Required
Case Closure	36	34	97%	94%	90%
Paternity/Establishment	53	51	97%	96%	75%
Expedited Processes within 6 months	21	20	97%	95%	75%
Expedited Processes within 12 months	20	20	100%	100%	90%
Enforcement	402	384	95%	96%	75%
Disbursement	261	257	100%	98%	75%
Medical Support Enforcement	80	76	91%	95%	75%
Review and Adjustment	292	257	93%	88%	75%
Interstate Services, Overall	94	84	92%	89%	75%
Initiating Interstate	69	61	89%	88%	75%
Responding Interstate	25	23	100%	92%	75%

Details of the case results are in the subsequent report text. In addition, we are submitting the optional report categories titled, Program Direction and Program Service Enhancements.

Note that all figures in the table have a margin of error of +/- 2%.

Introduction

The Alaska Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA) was created under the Department of Health and Social Services (H&SS) on July 1, 1976. In its first year of operation, 7 employees managed a caseload of 8,800 child support cases, all of which were established through judicial process. A year later, the agency was moved from H&SS to the Department of Revenue where it remains today. In 1978, the CSEA was empowered with administrative enforcement capabilities. In April 1981 CSEA was renamed the Child Support Enforcement Division (CSED). In 2004, the name changed again to Child Support Services Division (CSSD). The state legislature enacted statutes and regulations to improve support collections and meet the requirements of federal regulations. Today, CSSD has 232 full time employees who manage 44,989 active, IV-D child support cases (of which 41,500 cases have support orders). In federal fiscal year 2006 CSSD distributed \$89.9 million (as reported on OCSE Form 157), of which just over \$8 million came from the State of Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend program (PFD).

The PFD is a significant part of the Alaskan economy, paying about \$500 million dollars to the population last year. In the past, the amount has exceeded a billion dollars in a single year. The money itself helps all families, and for those people owing child support, it helps them pay their child support with money that does not come directly from their paychecks. The money the Fund contributes to the economy significantly affects CSSD's annual collections as it filters through local businesses and turns up as wages and assets for nearly every resident of working age. By matching CSSD information with the data kept by the Permanent Fund Dividend Division we are also able to locate many people who owe or are owed child support. The PFD benefits CSSD on several levels, but even if it is not factored into our statistics CSSD still shows full-spectrum successes in performing our duties.

Sampling Methodology

In accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 308), we extracted a statistically valid random sample of the statewide caseload. This sample gives a 90% confidence level with a $\pm 2\%$ margin of error.

We did not omit any segment of the IV-D universe from the sampling process. The population, numbering 49,453, consisted of every case that was open as of September 30, 2006, and included every case closed during the audit period, October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006. We excluded all Non-IV-D cases from the population.

A minimum sample of 320 cases was required. To improve our statistical accuracy we took a sample of 521 cases.

The skip interval was 95. We used Microsoft Excel to generate a random starting number between 1 and 95. CSSD Systems personnel extracted the audit sample from the online caseload. Of the 521 cases reviewed, 42 had no measurable actions or were excluded for other reasons. The exclusion rate was 8%.

Scope of the Review

The criteria for the review were 45 CFR 308. As in the past, we held Interstate Initiating to a more restrictive standard. We did so because the CFR only requires that a case be initiated within 20 days of receiving the information needed to complete the interstate forms. It does not set any standards for soliciting that information from the custodian of the children or answering their questions. We determined that we should measure this preliminary process as a way of determining the quality of the service we provide to the public. The following additional criteria provide a more accurate assessment of the agency's provision of Interstate services:

- A General Testimony packet, or a Registration of Foreign Order packet, should be sent to the custodial parent within a reasonable amount of time (30 days), when required to initiate a case.
- Follow-up actions should occur until we receive the information needed to process the case. (Such actions will include contacting the custodial parent about returning the initial paper work, or supplying any other information if the case was already initiated to another state). The time allowed for these follow up actions varies from 30 to 90 days based on whether the case was already initiated and what type of follow up action can reasonably be expected to produce a positive result.
- Timely responses should be made to other states and case parties to facilitate customer service, not just to meet CFR requirements. The CFR sets a response timeframe for Status Requests and for information requests from other states. We expanded this requirement to include contacts with case parties and attorneys, allowing up to 30 days to make a reply or forward a query to the other state.

The Quality Control auditor reviewed case record information from both online case records and physical case files. We recorded our findings in a Microsoft Access database.


Category 1: Program Compliance

Review Criteria in Compliance

We calculated all percentages by dividing the total-cases-measured for the criterion into the number of cases that had no measurable errors. Fractional numbers were rounded up when the fraction equaled .5 or greater, and were rounded down if it was .4 or less. The charts show five-year histories to better illustrate overall performance.

Case Closure: 94% (Minimum Acceptable: 90%)

Out of 36 cases measured, two had errors. This criterion remains compliant. The five-year average performance is 96%.




Paternity and Support Order Establishment: 96% (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Of the 53 cases measured, 2 had errors. This criterion remains compliant with federal guidelines. The five-year average performance is 88%.

The total number of new orders established for the year was 2,175. The caseload as a whole has orders for 92% of the open cases. CSSD exceeded the performance requirement for this measurement category, but did not reach the 94% target set in the last annual self assessment review.

For 2007 the division should, again, try to achieve the 94% goal for “Cases with Orders” (Line 2 on the OCSE 157).



Expedited Processes: Within 6 months: 95%, 12 months: 100%.
(Minimum Acceptable: 75% and 90% respectively)

These criteria remain compliant.


Altogether, we measured 21 cases for expedited processes. All were measured for the 6-month timeframe. There was 1 error in this tier of measurement.

We measured 20 of the 21 for the 12-month timeframe. We could not measure one of the cases for the 12-month tier because the audit review period ended before the timeframe expired. We found no errors in this group.

Performance remains consistent. The five year average for the 6-month tier is 87%. The five year average for the 12-month tier is 98%. These percentages are up slightly over last year.

The division should maintain this level of performance for establishing orders.


Note: The Expedited Processes criterion measures the time allowed under the CFR to establish child support orders. The timeframe measured begins with the initial service of documents on the non-custodial parent and ends with the establishment of a child support order. At least 75% of the cases must have an order established within 6 months of serving the non-custodial parent with notice of a paternity complaint or of a duty to support a child. A minimum of 90% of the cases must have an order established within 12 months.



Enforcement: 96% (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)


Of the 402 cases measured, 18 cases had errors.

This criterion remains compliant. The five-year average performance is 93%.




Disbursement: 98% (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Of 261 cases measured, 4 had errors. This criterion remains compliant. The five-year average performance is 97%.




Medical Support Enforcement: 95% (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Out of 80 cases measured, 4 had errors. This criterion remains compliant. The five-year average performance is 92%.



Review and Adjustment of Support Orders: 88% (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

292 cases were measured and 35 had errors. This criterion remains compliant. Average performance over the last three years was 88%.



Interstate Services: 89% (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)


We measured a total of 94 cases, of which 10 had errors. This criterion remains compliant. Eighty-nine percent is a performance composite for Central Registry, Initiating and Responding actions.

The **Initiating** subcategory is 88% in compliance. There were 69 cases measured. Eight had errors. Five errors were due to taking too long to initiate the case to another state. One case failed as we did not issue the general testimony to the custodian within 30 days. One case failed because we did not supply requested information to the responding state in a timely manner. One case received address information on the non custodial parent but the caseworker did not forward it to the other state within 10 days.

The **Responding** subcategory is 92% in compliance. Of the 25 cases measured, we found two errors. Both errors were due to the case worker not replying to a status request within five days (replies took over thirty days).

In addition to the criteria in 45 CFR 308, we measured actions that are necessary to process an initiating case successfully. Such actions include sending appropriate documents (such as the General Testimony, and Paternity Affidavits) to the custodial parent within a reasonable timeframe (30 days is considered a reasonable span of time to take such actions). The team must also provide follow up support as necessary, and respond to inquiries from case parties to facilitate customer satisfaction.

This extra measurement was the cause of one error in the sample, as noted above.



Category 2: Program Direction

Case Closure: 94%. (Minimum Acceptable: 90%)

Prior Audit Findings. Of the 70 cases measured two had errors. One was closed without sending a “notice of intent to close” letter. In the second, we issued the closure notice, but we closed the case after only 30 days instead of the 60 days mandated by CFR. Otherwise, they were appropriate for closure. Ongoing training should continue in order to maintain the present compliance level. The five-year average performance is 97%.

Current Audit Findings. Of the 36 cases measured two had errors. In both we issued the closure notice, but we closed the case before the 60 day waiting period mandated by CFR. Otherwise, they were appropriate for closure. Ongoing training should continue in order to maintain the present compliance level. The five-year average performance is 96%.

Paternity and Order Establishment: 96%. (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Of 53 cases measured, 2 cases had errors.

Prior Audit Findings. The total number of new orders established for the year was 2,878. The caseload as a whole now has orders for 92% of the open cases (compared to 87% in 2004). CSSD exceeded the performance goals for this measurement category.

For 2006 the division should target 94% as a goal for “Cases with Orders” (Line 2 on the OCSE 157).

Current Audit Findings. We found 2 error cases. Both errors were due to not opening the case within 20 days of the application or referral. We measured 8 cases for ‘case opening within 20 days’. Both error cases were processed between late July and early August. During this period certain staff were reassigned from normal case opening duties in order to in-process interstate cases for a special enforcement technique we call “Permanent Fund Dividend Intercept Only.” This is an ongoing practice for CSSD as it is very effective and has a “low cost.” These PFD Only cases have a very high likelihood of getting a collection. We give them a higher priority than regular cases during late July, August and early September each year. Approximately 1,000 such cases are handled each year. (The initiating state simply transmits an interstate referral asking for a one-time enforcement remedy. These cases are otherwise handled by direct withholding orders between the other states and the employers so a full interstate case is not opened. It is a more effective way of handling such cases.)

We still consider service of process one of our most important functions. It is the first step in obtaining a paternity or child support order. Consequently, we are always looking for ways to improve our rate of service. In total, counting certified mail and all service methods, about 89% of our orders are served on the first attempt. For certified mailings we continue to use **The UPS Store** as a ‘Return Address’ mail-service for all of our certified mailings. We list the return addresses on our letters as being one of several UPS Stores and we do not use official envelopes. We consider these measures to be “best practices.”

Establishment of orders is a significant success for Alaska. Between 2001 and 2005 we moved up the national rankings for IV-D agencies from 12th to 2nd. At present over 92% of all open, IV-D cases have an enforceable order.

The number of new orders established in the fiscal year was down to 2,175 from 2005’s 2,878 (as stated on the OCSE-157 Report). This is a continuing trend for the agency since we eliminated our backlog of new cases, and more child support orders are handled as Non-IV-D matters. The number of Non-IV-D, Case Registry cases has grown to over 9,500.

For the future, the establishment teams should ensure that backlogs do not rebuild. The supervisors should continue with their current internal quality checks to ensure that all training needs are met.

The five-year average performance is 88%.

Expedited Processes: 6-month tier 95%; 12-month tier 100%.
(Minimum Acceptable: 75% and 90% respectively)

CSSD passed both criteria in this audit. We measured 21 cases for the 6-month timeframe and 20 for the 12-month timeframe. 2006 was the third full year with the new 'service of process' contractor. The contractor's rate of success in 2006 remained stable compared to 2004-05.

Prior Audit Findings. The one error case fell under the 6-month timeframe criterion. This case took 9 months from service of the paternity paperwork until the administrative order was final. The main reason for the delay was due to the difficulty in serving the second set of order paperwork on the non-custodial parent. This category made a substantial improvement. The five year average for performance at the 6-month tier was 85% and at the 12-month tier it was 96%.

Current Audit Findings. Performance remains consistent. The one error case was measured in the 6-Month Timeframe criterion. This case took 10 months from service of the paternity paperwork on the non-custodial parent until the administrative order was final. The main reason for the delay was due to the difficulty in serving the second set of order paperwork on the custodial parent. It is less common for the mother of a child to avoid service of process, but in this case it added substantial time to the overall establishment action. The order was final after the end of the audit period.

The total number of cases measured for these criteria was less than in 2005, but this was likely a factor of the 25% decline in the number of orders produced and a statistical anomaly. Even though only 21 cases were measured, we believe they show an accurate representation of CSSD's performance.

The five year average for performance at the 6-month tier was 87% and at the 12-month tier it was 97%.

Note: The Expedited Processes criterion measures the time allowed under the CFR to establish child support orders. The timeframe measured begins with the initial service of documents on the non-custodial parent and ends with the establishment of a child support order. At least 75% of the cases must have an order established within 6 months of serving the non-custodial parent with notice of a paternity complaint or of a duty to support a child. A minimum of 90% of the cases must have an order established within 12 months.

Enforcement: 96%. (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

We measured 402 cases, and found 18 errors. Performance was slightly improved over 2005. Average performance over the past 5 years was 93%.

Prior Audit Findings. There were eleven locate errors which comprised 55% of the 20 total errors. Three cases took longer than two days to issue a withholding order (which is better than in 2004 when 13 cases had errors for this failure). Five cases were not submitted for federal tax refund intercept due to a coding error. One case was not opened within 20 days as required. Overall, the enforcement teams nearly achieved their performance goal of 96%. We recommend the supervisors and staff review their procedure for ensuring the IRS

intercept codes are correct. The performance goal of 96% should remain for the 2006 review period.

Current Audit Findings. Out of fifty-one cases measured for locate, there were eight errors (16%). As a percentage of total errors for enforcement, these eight amounted to 44% of the eighteen. Four cases took longer than two days to issue a withholding. Six cases were not submitted for federal tax refund intercept due to coding errors. Case opening was not a problem for enforcement cases. The performance goal of 96% was met for the 2006 review period. Since 2002, Alaska has been in the top ten nationally for collections on arrears.

The enforcement teams should maintain this high level of performance in the future. Team supervisors should emphasize in training that the IRS submission codes should be checked whenever routine casework is performed.

Disbursement: 98%. (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Prior Audit Findings. There was 1 error out of 246 measurable disbursements. Over the past five years performance has averaged 96%. The staff is well trained, and supervisors perform regular training throughout the year. The amount of money on hold at a point in time (9/30/04 versus 9/30/05) declined 26% from \$800,000 to \$589,000 (when future holds and IRS holds are not counted). We've seen a 41% decrease in held funds the past two years. Current staff is adequately maintaining control over distribution and disbursement of child support.

Current Audit Findings. There were 4 errors out of 261 measurable disbursements. Over the past five years performance has averaged 97%. All four errors were due to a system feature that prevents a check of less than \$5.00 being sent out automatically. This is a cost-efficiency matter.

The staff is well trained, and supervisors continue regular training throughout the year. The amount of money on hold on the last day of the federal fiscal year continues to decline. For 2006 the amount was \$422,646 (when future holds, bad-address holds and IRS holds are not counted), which is a 12% decrease from FY 05. The amount on hold has been nearly halved in the last three years.

Current staff is adequately maintaining control over distribution and disbursement of child support.

The imaging system for receipting continues to perform as intended.

CSSD continues to increase the use of Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT).

Medical Support Enforcement: 95%. (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

We measured 80 cases, and found 4 errors. Average performance over the past 5 years was 92%.

Prior Audit Findings. The division should take steps to ensure that in cases where insurance was in place, but the non-custodian has changed employers, the case worker must review and update the database with the current status of medical insurance (i.e., is it still in place or not?). Even though we found no errors stemming from this issue, it is important to have the most recent data in the system. As of February 2006, the division implemented a long term project to review and 'clean up' medical insurance data.

Errors occurred in two cases when we confirmed that the non-custodian had insurance for the children and we thereafter decided not to issue the National Medical Support Notice (NMSN). When an NMSN is returned to CSSD it triggers follow up actions by the case worker, such as notifying the custodian of insurance. We failed to notify the custodian because the case worker was not prompted to do so by a *normally returned* NMSN. Also, by not issuing the NMSN we failed to inform the insurance provider that they

must notify the division of lapses in coverage (the text of this notice is included in the NMSN forms). Even though this is a narrow area for possible mistakes, management and workers need to be aware of it and take proper precautions.

In preparation for the new medical enforcement incentive measurements, the division's auditor plans to perform a focused audit on medical enforcement cases during 2006.

Current Audit Findings. The division's long term project to review and 'clean up' medical insurance data involved generating computer lists of suspect cases and having case workers review all cases on the lists. (Some older cases have an X code that prevents normal enforcement actions; the X was an exclusion code in our prior system and it converted as an X to the new system in 1998. This project was undertaken in multiple stages and is now complete. The workers also issued notices to case parties wherever necessary, to alert them to the requirement to provide insurance. In some cases enforcement actions were taken to pursue coverage for the children. Procedures were changed so case workers would update medical data when a payor parent changed employment and insurance lapsed.

In preparation for the new medical enforcement incentive measurements, the division's auditor performed a focused audit on medical enforcement cases in March and April, 2006. One hundred forty-seven cases were reviewed to a standard 90% confidence level with a +/- 3% margin of error. 27% of the cases had no minor children and no requirement for medical enforcement under the order. There were 3 unarguable coding errors but nine others that might be found in error depending on the final auditing guidelines employed by the federal auditors. Six of the nine errors were addressed by pulling computer runs of cases with the problematic "X" code, and correcting those cases. Three other possible errors were found where either Medicaid was not informed of the insurance or where insurance was in place by one parent, but not provided by both parents as ordered. The main problem of improper "X" codes should now be fixed. The next self assessment audit will review cases with that issue in mind.

Review and Adjustment: 88%. (Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Of 292 cases measured, there were 35 errors (all for the failure to send Notices of Rights to Request a Review triennially). All 35 errors were due to exclusion codes left on cases from past years. This is a repeat finding, and one that is gradually being corrected as the “old cases” are reviewed by case workers. At present, the number of cases negatively impacted is small enough that management feels a special project to clean up the codes is not warranted. If the number of errors of this type increases next year, the auditor will recommend a clean-up project to address the matter.

Average performance over the last three years was 88%.

Prior Audit Findings. Twenty cases were found in this audit where an “old case” was still coded to exclude the Notice of Right to Request a Review (NRRR). This is a 9% decline from the same type of error in the 2004 audit. It is expected that over time the number of errors for this reason will continue to decline as case workers gradually correct the system codes. About 90% of the cases measured for the review criterion are only measured for issuance of the NRRR.

We examined 25 of the 274 cases for complete reviews of the orders. We completed 16 order reviews within 180 days for a compliance rate of 76%. Five took longer than 180 days. One error case took just over 12 months, one took 9 months, two took 7 months and one took 6.5 months. Two cases were modified by the court, but we could not measure the 180-day timeframe as we did not have the court documents showing when the action started. A focused audit of modification cases in 2004 showed that 81% of our cases met the 180 day timeframe, so from the current audit sample it appears that our performance may have slipped slightly, though the sample size of 23 is smaller and less reliable than our 2004 focused audit. The division needs to monitor this performance indicator.

CSSD and the Department of Law are currently looking at ways to speed up the modification process in judicial cases. Judicial modification cases are the most likely to exceed the 180-day timeframe (about 35% take longer than 180 days to complete).

Current Audit Findings. All 35 error cases found in this audit were “old cases” still coded to exclude the NRRR. This is an increase of 15 errors over the 2005 audit. It is expected that over time the number of errors for this reason will continue to decline as case workers gradually correct the system codes. Additional training of staff will be performed to ensure these “old cases” are found during the course of normal case work and corrected.

In addition, we examined 23 of the 292 cases for complete reviews of the orders. We completed 14 of those order reviews within 180 days for a compliance rate of 61%. However, the sample had a skewed proportion of court modifications (90%). Only four cases were administrative, when normally the division is about 50/50 for case types. This is almost certainly a statistical anomaly as we would expect to find the overall compliance rate at around 80-84% as was found in our focused audit in 2004. The reviewer expects to find a more “normal” number in the future, but will watch this performance measure closely.

The division needs to monitor this performance indicator each year as the inherent problem is always that the courts press the 180 time frame to the limits. If court actions begin to routinely take over 180 days, the division will need to consider procedural or staff remedies. About 35% of court modifications take longer than 180 days to complete (according to our 2004 focused audit).

Interstate Services: 89%.

(Minimum Acceptable: 75%)

Eighty-nine percent is the performance composite for Central Registry, Initiating and Responding cases. Of the 94 cases measured, 10 had errors.

The failures were as follows:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Acknowledge receipt of Interstate Transmittal: | 0 |
| • Reply to a status request within 5 days: | 2 |
| • Forward new information within 10 days: | 1 |
| • Reply to a more complex inquiry within 30 days: | 1 |
| • Send out the General Testimony to the Custodian | 1 |
| • Transmit a new case to another state within 20 days: | 5 |
| • Forward a request for review to the other state: | 0 |

Prior Audit Findings. Responses to telephonic, email and fax requests are timely. Overall performance has improved and the number of errors is down slightly. As a performance goal, the division should aim to improve compliance by at least 2% for 2006.

Current Audit Findings. Incoming mail proved the problem with the replies to status requests: delays in handling or giving the requests the wrong priority when distributing the mail apparently caused the delay in both error cases. Responses to telephonic, email and fax requests are timely in all of the observed cases. Overall performance has declined slightly, which means the goal of a 2% improvement for 2006 was not met.

As a performance goal, the division should aim to improve compliance by at least 2% for 2007. Refresher training on mail handling and prioritizing should be performed.

- Average performance for all interstate functions over the past 5 years was 89%.
- Average performance for the Initiating functions over the past 5 years was 87%.
- Average performance for the Responding functions over the past 5 years was 93%.

2006 performance, when compared to the 5-year average, appears to be either static or a slight improvement (though the numbers are so close together we can't say with statistical certainty).

The **Initiating** subcategory is 88% in compliance.

Of the 69 cases measured, 8 had errors. Not sending an interstate transmittal to another state within 20 days happened in five cases. All errors appeared to be the result of the case worker not following up on an action or not handling new information promptly (e.g., new-mail handling). The auditor found no instances where court processes or outside forces caused the problem. These errors can be eliminated with training and experienced staff. A compliance measure of 90% should be the target for 2006.

Note: As discussed in Scope of the Review, on page 4, we used a more restrictive set of audit criteria for measuring Initiating Interstate to gain a more thorough evaluation of the efficiency and quality of interstate case processing. The more restrictive criteria relates to sending the general testimony to the custodian within 30 days of determining that the other party is in another state.

This resulted in one additional error case, though it may have been reported under “failure to initiate the case within 20 days of locating the NCP in another state” instead.

The **Responding** subcategory is 92% in compliance.

This is an 8% decrease from last year. Twenty-five cases were measured. 2005’s 100% compliance rate was, just as expected, a bit of good luck. The present 92% performance rate is more in keeping with the historical trend. It is within the audit’s 2% margin for error of the five year average of 93%.

Management Issues:

CSSD resolved all management issues from prior audits.

With the pending addition of Medical Support Enforcement to performance incentive measures, staff reviewed the current state of relevant data in the system. The computer system currently tracks which parent provides insurance, which children are covered, what insurance company provides the coverage and the dates coverage is in effect. These are the main items required for system certification. The programming for the annual OCSE 157 Report was completed in 2006 so the new medical data could be extracted and reported. Management believes the system is ready for a federal audit of the new incentive requirements. In addition, we amended procedures to help case workers properly perform the new duties related to medical coverage enforcement.

Category 3: Program Service Enhancements

CSSD took several steps to improve services to Child Support clients:

- During FFY 06 our Anchorage Customer Service Reception area and our Phone Bank handled 79,145 phone calls (down about 3% from last year) and 11,369 walk-ins (down about 3%). Our field offices in Juneau, Fairbanks and Wasilla handled approximately 18,200 phone calls (up about 13%) plus 11,500 walk-ins (down about 4%). Division wide (including all of our caseworkers not already counted above) we normally handle around 150,000 phone calls per year.
- Our Outreach Program is still in place and is working well. CSSD staff traveled to four communities and met with people who have little or no opportunity to meet a caseworker. Staff flew or drove about 3,100 miles to visit these towns, but several visits to local prisons were also undertaken. In the past we traveled more widely in the state, and will do so again now that we've rehired an experienced individual to fill our outreach position. Outreach is especially valuable in Alaska where cultural differences and isolation make it harder to help case parties. In past years we visited more than a dozen remote towns and villages, and will serve many of them again in 2007. The towns visited in 2006 were:
 - ⇒ Homer
 - ⇒ Juneau
 - ⇒ Kenai & Soldotna
 - ⇒ Sitka
- People within the Division who speak, read or write foreign languages, and are willing to volunteer their skills, were organized into an in-house translation service (for informal needs, not for court testimony). At present, we have 13 people who can communicate in German, Hindi, Ilocano, Polish, Russian, Samoan, Spanish, Tagalog, Ukrainian, and Vietnamese.

- CSSD's outreach program is our first point of contact for all 236 federally recognized tribes in Alaska, and for all Tribal Programs that affect Child Support. We are presently offering our assistance, as needed, to the following tribal entities.
 - ⇒ Cook Inlet Tribal Corporation, Tanana Chief's Conference, Tlingit-Haida Association and Association of Village Council Presidents all operate Tribal TANF programs.
 - ⇒ A new Tribal TANF program for 2007 is now operated by Bristol Bay Native Association.
 - ⇒ Federal funding was granted for comprehensive IV-D program operation by Tlingit-Haida Association.
 - ⇒ Aleutian-Pribilof Island Association was approved for their 2-year startup funding.
 - ⇒ The Association of Village Council Presidents and Tanana Chief's Conference have started the application process for a IV-D program.
 - ⇒ Tribal Courts - we track tribal child support orders that affect our cases.

- Recurring local outreach meetings in and near Anchorage help address the needs of civic and military organizations, and case parties in Alaska's core population area. The primary places we target for outreach services are:
 - ⇒ Covenant House (for homeless teens)
 - ⇒ Brother Francis Homeless Shelter
 - ⇒ Operation Stand Down (for veterans who need help)
 - ⇒ Indian Child Welfare Conference
 - ⇒ Rural Small Business Conference
 - ⇒ Wellness Court (focusing on men released from jail and helping them move back into society)
 - ⇒ Family Care Court (focusing on women and their children)

- ⇒ Alaska Public Defender Agency
 - ⇒ AWAIC (for women in crisis)
 - ⇒ Alaska Family Law Self Help Center (where the public gets help with child support matters without needing an attorney)
 - ⇒ Municipality of Anchorage- Fairview Recreational Center
- CSSD formed partnerships with agencies and individuals in the private sector to present “Town Hall” like clinics in rural areas and around Anchorage. The following are partners with CSSD:
 - ⇒ Alaska Native Justice Center
 - ⇒ Disability Law Center of Alaska
 - ⇒ Alaska Legal Services
 - ⇒ Alaska Division of Vital Statistics (In Hospital Acknowledgment Program)
 - ⇒ Alaska Business Development Center
 - ⇒ “Let’s Talk Healthy Relationships” (reaching out to teens about building healthy relationships)
 - ⇒ Various local shelters for people in need
 - ⇒ Various private attorneys who deal in Family Law
- State correctional facilities are on our list of places to visit as often as is practicable (which may be once per year or once every other year):
 - ⇒ Anvil Mountain in Nome
 - ⇒ Lemon Creek in Juneau
 - ⇒ Yukon-Kuskokwim in Bethel
 - ⇒ Palmer Correctional Center in Palmer
 - ⇒ Highland Mountain Women’s Facility in Eagle River
 - ⇒ Cook Inlet Correctional Complex in Anchorage
 - ⇒ Point MacKenzie Correctional Farm at Pt. MacKenzie

- ⇒ Matanuska-Susitna Pre-Trial Facility
- ⇒ Wildwood Correctional Center in Kenai

- One Thousand and sixty-two individuals currently use debit cards issued by JP Morgan as their means to receive child support payments. This is about 35% more than last year.

- CSSD continues to circulate specialized booklets, brochures and a video for the public. Materials distributed include:
 - ⇒ Child Support for Children in State Custody
 - ⇒ OCSE DVD explaining paternity establishment (provided to hospitals & birthing centers)
 - ⇒ Video produced by Alaska CSSD: “Building a Healthy, Happy Child”
 - ⇒ Electronic Funds Transfer for Employers
 - ⇒ Child Support If You Are Incarcerated
 - ⇒ Employers' Guide to Wage Withholding (including a special section on the National Medical Support Notice)
 - ⇒ Judicial Reference Guide for Judges, Magistrates and Masters in Alaska Courts
 - ⇒ Direct Deposit of Child Support, For Individuals
 - ⇒ Review and Adjustment of Orders (including the forms to make a request for a modification)
 - ⇒ How to contact and do business with CSSD (by phone, on line or in person)
 - ⇒ Brochures about establishing paternity and why it is important to children
 - ⇒ Child Support a Guide for Parents
 - ⇒ New Hire Reporting Informational Guide (for employers)
 - ⇒ How non-custodians can make child support payments via Western Union
 - ⇒ Child Support Services FAQ and list of contacts.

- CSSD and the Alaska Court System continued to facilitate the *pro se* support order modification process by disseminating forms and answering basic questions. The service is very successful. CSSD and the courts created the *pro se* forms in FFY 2001. This collaboration enables the public to take a more direct hand in getting their support orders modified in court. The court system maintained their customer service center in order to help people help themselves. Anecdotal evidence indicates the public continues to be very happy with this service. The clerk of court also thinks it is worthwhile.
- CSSD cooperates with state and local police agencies to get child support collections from people who are arrested. Following the arrest, and if the person is carrying a sum of cash, the police contact CSSD to see if a child support debt exists. Then CSSD serves a withholding order on the police department for the money being held. In 2006 over \$62,800 was collected via cash and property withholding orders.
- The division has three investigators who work on criminal and difficult to enforce cases. Criminal investigations resulted in six convictions, and they filed seven petitions to revoke probation for those who failed to make support payments as conditions of prior year convictions. Convicted payors in these cases are on court probation and payment of child support is a requirement for their probation. The investigators also processed cases for passport revocation and in those cases they were able to compel parents to pay over \$320,200 (about \$87,000 more than last year, in part due to the changes in the revocation threshold to \$2,500).
- CSSD maintains a web site with numerous features including:
 - ⇒ Links to state and federal web sites
 - ⇒ A directory of employees to help clients contact us by fax or email
 - ⇒ A summary of CSSD services
 - ⇒ News covering child support related events and issues

- ⇒ Online forms availability where numerous forms, including an application for services, may be ordered from a home computer
- ⇒ A support guidelines calculator (to estimate child support)
- ⇒ Recent case payment information (individuals may inquire on their own case)
- ⇒ Information for employers about new Hire Reporting, child support laws and income withholding orders
- ⇒ Frequently asked questions
- ⇒ Employer information
- ⇒ Press releases
- ⇒ CSSD regulations
- ⇒ CSSD publications
- ⇒ News about CSSD staff visiting remote towns and villages

Our web site, <http://childsupport.alaska.gov>, continually evolves to provide more and better service to the public and to agency workers.

- We also have an Intranet Homepage for our staff to use in downloading work related information and news, as well as an online phone directory for workers. The page also has a link for CSSD policies and regulations. This intranet asset helps answer questions that would otherwise go to administrative staff or system support workers.