

Child Support Enforcement Reports

January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2007

Effective October 1st 1998, Federal Child Support requirements for reporting underwent significant changes. As a consequence, the source reports from the County Child Support Enforcement Agencies (CSEAs) and the Support Enforcement Tracking System (SETS) are undergoing revisions. HR 3130 mandated a change in the manner in which incentive payments are awarded to the states, that focuses on five outcome measurements. These performance measures provide an accurate picture of the progress being made by Ohio in establishing paternity and support orders as well as enforcing existing child support orders.

Data Sources

The data in these tables are a compilation of manual and automated reports submitted to the Office of Child Support (OCS) by the CSEAs and SETS. CSEAs have the option of amending their reports at any time after submitting the documents to OCS. Therefore, the tables reflect the most recent reporting period, but are subject to change as reports are revised. Some data in the reports may be estimated by the CSEAs as the conversion to SETS continues.

Performance Measurements

Twice a year, OCS estimates the CSEAs' child support incentives that are awarded based on the data submitted in their source reports. At the end of the year a reconciliation is done, based on the actual incentives that the state, as a whole, has earned from the federal government and county incentives are adjusted accordingly. The attached performance measure summary details Ohio's state-wide percentages for the period of January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2007.

- ? The states have the option, and Ohio has elected to use, a state-wide paternity establishment percentage (PEP) calculated by of the number of children having paternity established for the current year, divided by the number of children born out-of-wedlock (BOW) during the previous year. This methodology is a more accurate measure of the current methods of paternity establishment available to all families in Ohio and not just those individuals joining the child support program seeking paternity establishment and child support from the putative parent. The alternative method of determining the PEP uses the total number of children with paternity established in the child support program divided by the previous year's number of children BOW in the IV-D caseload. This method reflects only those children whose parents have separated and sought support.
- ? Support order establishment is determined by dividing the total number of IV-D cases with orders by the total number of IV-D cases.

- ? Collections on current support is determined by dividing the amount of IV-D money collected during the previous Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) by the total amount of IV-D money currently obligated to the residential parent for children residing in the home. This is the best measure of the effectiveness of current child support activity and enforcement measures. Due to dual reporting during the state-wide conversion to SETS some county percentages exceeded 100% for Collections on Current Support. These counties have an asterisk (*) in place of the inflated count from combining SETS and manual reports during the time period.
- ? Cases with collections in arrears is determined by dividing the total number of cases with collections on arrearages owed the residential parent by the total number of cases with arrearages. Due to dual reporting during the state-wide conversion to SETS some county percentages exceeded 100% for Cases with Collections in Arrears. These counties have an asterisk (*) in place of the inflated count from combining SETS and manual reports during the time period.
- ? Cost Effectiveness is determined by dividing the total amount of child support collected for the year by the total amount of administrative expenditures. The expenses only include County expenses, and do not include those for statewide contracts, the State Disbursement Unit (SDU), and those related to automation, particularly the Support Enforcement Tracking System (SETS).

The county tables not only reflect the performance measurements but also report on the total caseload and amount of collections for the period January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2007.

Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
Child Support Performance Measures
For January - June 2007

| County | IV-D Caseload | IV-D Disbursements | IV-D Paternity Establishment | IV-D Support Establishment | IV-D Collections on Current Support | IV-D Collections on Arrears | (a) Cost Effectiveness |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| State-Wide | 983,873 | \$869,086,667.87 | 83.02% | 73.31% | 69.49% | 49.19% | 8.69 |
| Adams | 2,018 | \$1,728,579.87 | 82.29% | 81.67% | 71.25% | 59.93% | 4.56 |
| Allen | 11,939 | \$9,919,147.92 | 94.70% | 89.97% | 68.62% | 50.16% | 7.96 |
| Ashland | 3,121 | \$3,940,878.27 | 96.67% | 88.98% | 76.59% | 59.25% | 12.90 |
| Ashtabula | 9,189 | \$8,127,346.77 | 87.67% | 78.64% | 66.72% | 48.98% | 9.04 |
| Athens | 4,391 | \$3,069,505.80 | 86.63% | 82.15% | 65.08% | 43.00% | 5.01 |
| Auglaize | 2,824 | \$3,437,122.45 | 99.67% | 90.01% | 77.53% | 61.02% | 10.47 |
| Belmont | 5,335 | \$4,913,139.96 | 82.43% | 83.15% | 76.99% | 60.72% | 8.13 |
| Brown | 3,332 | \$3,071,267.54 | 93.55% | 88.42% | 69.28% | 57.07% | 13.49 |
| Butler | 27,038 | \$25,567,239.70 | 98.88% | 81.33% | 70.17% | 50.42% | 10.70 |
| Carroll | 1,915 | \$2,318,304.68 | 97.77% | 89.77% | 78.34% | 61.80% | 8.52 |
| Champaign | 2,739 | \$3,050,160.06 | 96.92% | 82.91% | 73.91% | 57.59% | 15.88 |
| Clark | 16,856 | \$12,685,939.21 | 97.85% | 88.91% | 61.96% | 40.90% | 6.94 |
| Clermont | 13,544 | \$16,963,996.01 | 102.26% | 88.51% | 73.06% | 56.35% | 8.57 |
| Clinton | 3,301 | \$3,302,441.60 | 82.34% | 77.46% | 69.68% | 52.37% | 7.67 |
| Columbiana | 10,172 | \$9,054,602.43 | 86.54% | 84.29% | 68.66% | 51.03% | 9.08 |
| Coshocton | 3,117 | \$3,002,257.07 | 103.71% | 88.61% | 76.97% | 59.97% | 6.50 |
| Crawford | 4,864 | \$4,192,011.32 | 91.20% | 87.54% | 68.71% | 52.51% | 9.93 |
| Cuyahoga | 139,104 | \$101,659,990.63 | 75.41% | 62.55% | 62.56% | 41.26% | 7.74 |
| Darke | 3,115 | \$3,915,383.03 | 95.31% | 87.67% | 75.95% | 59.64% | 9.98 |
| Defiance | 2,866 | \$3,461,426.11 | 104.03% | 89.57% | 76.82% | 59.96% | 9.76 |
| Delaware | 4,268 | \$8,461,372.06 | 100.27% | 87.70% | 80.31% | 58.64% | 15.50 |
| Erie | 7,607 | \$7,203,030.91 | 89.98% | 88.41% | 68.42% | 54.81% | 7.95 |

Footnotes: (a) The expenses only include County expenses, and do not include those on statewide contracts, the State Distribution Unit (SDU), and those related to automation, particularly the Support Enforcement Tracking System (SETS)."

**Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
Child Support Performance Measures
For January - June 2007**

| County | IV-D Caseload | IV-D Disbursements | IV-D Paternity Establishment | IV-D Support Establishment | IV-D Collections on Current Support | IV-D Collections on Arrears | (a) Cost Effectiveness |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Fairfield | 7,850 | \$8,852,367.09 | 88.38% | 79.54% | 72.48% | 49.92% | 8.42 |
| Fayette | 3,565 | \$2,663,078.43 | 59.25% | 64.35% | 70.74% | 52.94% | 9.25 |
| Franklin | 94,686 | \$74,952,387.63 | 70.15% | 50.46% | 69.60% | 50.17% | 11.53 |
| Fulton | 2,599 | \$3,242,025.42 | 101.19% | 83.99% | 79.49% | 60.79% | 9.26 |
| Gallia | 2,381 | \$1,721,664.50 | 94.41% | 73.50% | 74.40% | 55.20% | 4.45 |
| Geauga | 2,857 | \$6,319,091.14 | 96.19% | 90.72% | 80.93% | 60.84% | 14.32 |
| Greene | 9,055 | \$10,631,762.67 | 95.61% | 85.55% | 73.76% | 53.26% | 8.95 |
| Guernsey | 4,091 | \$3,861,234.11 | 106.80% | 95.55% | 69.64% | 55.47% | 5.37 |
| Hamilton | 87,368 | \$67,672,436.96 | 73.13% | 66.94% | 65.82% | 46.22% | 7.41 |
| Hancock | 4,557 | \$5,018,739.43 | 98.53% | 85.52% | 72.26% | 56.14% | 10.84 |
| Hardin | 2,428 | \$2,866,268.08 | 96.16% | 92.30% | 76.81% | 58.33% | 9.70 |
| Harrison | 1,052 | \$1,108,008.92 | 97.10% | 84.22% | 75.07% | 58.03% | 4.10 |
| Henry | 1,736 | \$2,363,409.99 | 101.79% | 90.61% | 79.74% | 66.34% | 9.13 |
| Highland | 3,358 | \$3,128,994.19 | 102.69% | 89.52% | 71.79% | 55.50% | 9.36 |
| Hocking | 2,812 | \$2,038,556.71 | 96.68% | 76.99% | 65.55% | 46.66% | 12.99 |
| Holmes | 1,107 | \$1,380,041.01 | 99.63% | 95.30% | 77.10% | 61.90% | 4.88 |
| Huron | 5,394 | \$5,902,859.08 | 98.49% | 91.86% | 72.29% | 56.97% | 20.04 |
| Jackson | 2,801 | \$2,375,606.66 | 93.87% | 67.19% | 75.91% | 57.26% | 8.31 |
| Jefferson | 6,065 | \$5,229,481.28 | 84.92% | 79.74% | 73.20% | 52.75% | 6.98 |
| Knox | 3,499 | \$3,612,864.86 | 97.11% | 83.91% | 71.76% | 58.50% | 10.13 |
| Lake | 11,779 | \$15,350,442.16 | 91.25% | 80.41% | 75.84% | 58.92% | 10.49 |
| Lawrence | 6,308 | \$4,107,829.74 | 75.91% | 68.45% | 70.02% | 51.37% | 8.69 |

Footnotes: (a) The expenses only include County expenses, and do not include those on statewide contracts, the State Distribution Unit (SDU), and those related to automation, particularly the Support Enforcement Tracking System (SETS)."

Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
Child Support Performance Measures
For January - June 2007

| County | IV-D Caseload | IV-D Disbursements | IV-D Paternity Establishment | IV-D Support Establishment | IV-D Collections on Current Support | IV-D Collections on Arrears | (a) Cost Effectiveness |
|------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Licking | 11,878 | \$11,091,965.06 | 89.06% | 82.99% | 66.84% | 52.43% | 6.44 |
| Logan | 3,931 | \$4,301,555.45 | 90.96% | 87.59% | 74.82% | 57.20% | 9.29 |
| Lorain | 27,544 | \$25,668,027.78 | 89.06% | 78.95% | 68.17% | 47.03% | 8.64 |
| Lucas | 56,462 | \$40,076,173.34 | 88.94% | 83.15% | 63.56% | 42.70% | 8.18 |
| Madison | 2,412 | \$2,414,101.55 | 81.70% | 64.64% | 75.68% | 59.09% | 9.74 |
| Mahoning | 24,873 | \$16,282,529.82 | 71.95% | 56.88% | 72.55% | 46.52% | 6.00 |
| Marion | 6,090 | \$5,316,153.51 | 100.16% | 82.33% | 70.62% | 55.48% | 9.40 |
| Medina | 7,225 | \$12,473,835.15 | 97.69% | 91.82% | 76.59% | 57.77% | 12.84 |
| Meigs | 2,252 | \$1,377,234.05 | 91.03% | 82.95% | 68.40% | 48.23% | 7.87 |
| Mercer | 1,968 | \$2,278,165.73 | 104.14% | 92.43% | 77.61% | 62.83% | 8.34 |
| Miami | 7,890 | \$8,811,845.73 | 89.05% | 86.16% | 69.51% | 51.55% | 14.73 |
| Monroe | 1,127 | \$940,364.00 | 56.88% | 63.80% | 79.55% | 55.93% | 8.82 |
| Montgomery | 56,199 | \$45,717,607.74 | 78.92% | 65.20% | 70.63% | 46.50% | 6.47 |
| Morgan | 1,202 | \$975,524.57 | 80.58% | 70.63% | 73.45% | 52.58% | 8.49 |
| Morrow | 1,947 | \$2,069,410.51 | 101.88% | 89.37% | 69.80% | 57.25% | 6.04 |
| Muskingum | 8,454 | \$7,404,197.29 | 106.03% | 79.83% | 71.29% | 56.54% | 4.24 |
| Noble | 648 | \$827,709.59 | 101.66% | 93.06% | 79.45% | 65.75% | 5.66 |
| Ottawa | 2,369 | \$3,193,984.52 | 105.26% | 92.95% | 76.26% | 60.25% | 9.31 |
| Paulding | 1,193 | \$1,588,298.43 | 102.74% | 90.44% | 78.81% | 63.46% | 10.53 |
| Perry | 3,300 | \$2,458,609.20 | 77.21% | 75.82% | 67.87% | 48.59% | 9.25 |
| Pickaway | 3,377 | \$3,577,136.38 | 98.79% | 87.59% | 69.95% | 54.29% | 8.75 |
| Pike | 2,218 | \$1,731,222.41 | 83.03% | 76.28% | 62.40% | 48.86% | 9.02 |

Footnotes: (a) The expenses only include County expenses, and do not include those on statewide contracts, the State Distribution Unit (SDU), and those related to automation, particularly the Support Enforcement Tracking System (SETS)."

Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
Child Support Performance Measures
For January - June 2007

| County | IV-D Caseload | IV-D Disbursements | IV-D Paternity Establishment | IV-D Support Establishment | IV-D Collections on Current Support | IV-D Collections on Arrears | (a) Cost Effectiveness |
|--------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Portage | 9,255 | \$9,656,155.87 | 84.04% | 71.43% | 72.68% | 51.52% | 8.44 |
| Preble | 2,679 | \$3,087,008.88 | 98.47% | 84.47% | 72.24% | 56.58% | 9.03 |
| Putnam | 1,314 | \$1,867,748.58 | 106.16% | 92.39% | 80.88% | 67.33% | 10.37 |
| Richland | 10,847 | \$10,740,686.51 | 89.94% | 78.42% | 70.90% | 51.89% | 12.50 |
| Ross | 6,731 | \$5,950,158.89 | 100.74% | 78.16% | 68.83% | 51.92% | 13.52 |
| Sandusky | 5,334 | \$5,665,843.69 | 101.72% | 88.77% | 72.07% | 55.58% | 12.49 |
| Scioto | 7,827 | \$5,216,920.41 | 104.59% | 77.05% | 69.57% | 46.61% | 9.79 |
| Seneca | 4,633 | \$4,381,063.54 | 100.21% | 88.75% | 68.85% | 52.91% | 10.19 |
| Shelby | 4,050 | \$3,734,444.89 | 92.26% | 79.43% | 72.26% | 54.53% | 12.00 |
| Stark | 30,258 | \$28,787,649.74 | 83.94% | 73.04% | 76.17% | 52.70% | 13.37 |
| Summit | 51,511 | \$40,851,662.66 | 83.89% | 75.78% | 68.03% | 46.00% | 10.81 |
| Trumbull | 19,525 | \$16,466,109.06 | 86.48% | 71.32% | 66.55% | 45.14% | 6.34 |
| Tuscarawas | 7,413 | \$7,319,383.30 | 100.65% | 90.18% | 70.83% | 55.67% | 8.21 |
| Union | 2,518 | \$3,574,573.15 | 99.47% | 89.99% | 79.05% | 60.24% | 10.11 |
| Van Wert | 1,881 | \$2,232,154.90 | 105.82% | 90.75% | 79.37% | 60.36% | 7.68 |
| Vinton | 1,181 | \$852,777.15 | 82.70% | 69.94% | 72.47% | 52.11% | 16.95 |
| Warren | 10,620 | \$15,401,097.01 | 96.20% | 91.74% | 74.67% | 47.74% | 11.83 |
| Washington | 3,982 | \$4,004,406.90 | 99.14% | 86.49% | 73.69% | 55.86% | 10.26 |
| Wayne | 6,937 | \$7,711,230.21 | 102.38% | 89.97% | 75.10% | 57.22% | 9.53 |
| Williams | 3,219 | \$3,614,067.10 | 98.26% | 90.28% | 76.19% | 60.39% | 10.94 |
| Wood | 6,243 | \$8,044,713.38 | 96.07% | 90.25% | 77.13% | 57.60% | 9.28 |
| Wyandot | 1,353 | \$1,906,868.02 | 98.20% | 91.87% | 77.48% | 65.20% | 8.70 |
| TOTAL | 983,873 | \$869,086,667.87 | 83.02% | 73.31% | 69.49% | 49.19% | 8.69 |

Footnotes: (a) The expenses only include County expenses, and do not include those on statewide contracts, the State Distribution Unit (SDU), and those related to automation, particularly the Support Enforcement Tracking System (SETS)."