

**You Get What You Pay For:
How Federal and State Investment
Decisions Affect
Child Support Performance**

Vicki Turetsky

December 1998

*Center for Law and Social Policy
1616 P Street, NW
Suite 150
Washington, DC 20036*



You Get What You Pay For: How Federal and State Investment Decisions Affect Child Support Performance

Vicki Turetsky

December 1998

CLASP's child support policy work is supported by the Ford Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Moriah Fund, the Open Society Institute and the Nathan Cummings Foundation.

This paper originally appeared in the Fall 1998 *Child Support Quarterly*, published by the National Child Support Enforcement Association.

Center for Law and Social Policy
1616 P Street, NW
Suite 150
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 328-5140  fax: (202) 328-5195
info@clasp.org  www.clasp.org

You Get What You Pay For: How Federal and State Investment Decisions Affect Child Support Performance

I. Introduction

The child support program was created to accomplish two missions. First, the program was established to promote parental responsibility and to help families remain self-supporting without the need for public assistance. Second, the program was set up to reimburse federal and state AFDC costs. Unfortunately, the service delivery role has typically taken a backseat to the cost-recovery role. From the start, it was easier to sell the program to state legislatures as a way to generate state revenues. Although state child support programs are perceived by Congress and state legislatures to be “resource-rich,” in fact state programs have been only partially successful in capturing program revenues to fund child support services. In particular, state programs have had difficulty obtaining state legislative authorization to increase child support staffing levels.

Today’s funding reality is that welfare collections are declining and non-welfare expenditures are increasing as families move off and stay off of TANF at unprecedented rates. Nationwide, about two-thirds of families receiving child support services have left welfare or never received it. State dependence on welfare collections to help fund the program is creating an unstable funding environment for the program, and builds in tension between TANF and child support programs to decrease the TANF caseload, yet prevent welfare collections from falling.

The recent changes brought about by TANF, combined with long-term trends in the child support caseload, have resulted in a misalignment between the program’s ability to deliver effective services to families and a fiscal structure that emphasizes cost-recovery. There is growing concern that many state child support programs are seriously underfunded and understaffed. The belief that the child support program should be a money-maker may have led to under-investment of new state dollars into the program, and under-accountability for program results.

II. The Focus on State Performance and “Profits”

The child support program is jointly funded by federal and state governments. The federal government reimburses states 66 percent of their program administrative costs. States are required to put up a 34 percent matching share. In addition to federal matching funds, states generate program revenues from three other sources: the state share of welfare collections, federal incentive payments, and fees and costs. Collections made on behalf of TANF families are assigned to the state as a condition of welfare eligibility and shared between the state and federal governments.

A state may use program revenues for any purpose and are not required to reinvest them in the child support program. States view them as partial reimbursement for public assistance paid out

to families, and do not necessarily earmark program revenues for the child support program. However, most state child support programs depend on program revenues to cover part of their state share of costs. Beginning on October 1, 2001, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998 will require states to reinvest incentive payments in the child support program or related activities.

The state makes a “profit” when the state’s share of program revenues exceeds the state share of program costs. In other words, the state “profit” is that portion of program revenues that is *not* reinvested in the child support program. In 1996, the state share of program revenues exceeded the state share of program expenses in two-thirds of states. Although most states realize net revenues, most state programs operate at a net cost. The net cost is absorbed by the federal government. This is because the federal government bears a disproportionate share of the costs, while states keep a disproportionate share of the revenues, under the child support financing scheme. However, it remains unclear how the 1996 and 1998 child support reforms (including capping the total pool of incentive dollars available to states) will affect the revenue balance.

The ability of states to use program revenues for unrelated purposes has reinforced federal concerns that states are making a “profit” at the expense of the federal government and families. While the term “profit” is something of a misnomer, it conveys two very real political concerns: first, that states are failing to invest sufficient funds to improve program performance, and second, that states realize a “profit” at the expense of the federal government. This federal concern with state performance and “profits” has put the child support program in a politically vulnerable position.

III. Comparison of State Performance and Investment

CLASP recently analyzed financial and caseload data reported by the states to the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement to spur further research on whether the level and structure of federal and state investment in the child support program affect performance. In order to identify general patterns relating to performance and the level of investment, states were ranked and grouped by quintile according to cost, staffing and collection ratios. In addition, state-by-state ratios were calculated for the period 1991 through 1995 to determine whether parallel trends existed over time. CLASP compared three ratios:

- C Cost per case.** Expenditures claimed by each state were compared to the state’s IV-D caseload for 1995. Statewide computer system costs federally reimbursed at the 90 percent enhanced rate were subtracted from expenditures in order to adjust for different state system development timetables and to more directly compare the operational costs of establishing and enforcing support.

- C Cases per FTE.** Each state’s IV-D caseload was compared to the number of full-time equivalent employees (FTE) reported by the state in 1995. This number includes both public employees and contractual staff. In other words, all staff employed by or under contract with the child support program are included in reported FTEs, including not just caseworkers and attorneys, but managers, computer programmers, policy staff, support staff, and other staff who do not carry cases. This means that the actual caseload carried

by each front-line caseworker is much higher than the cases per FTE ratio would suggest. Studies by the GAO and others have found that states average 1,000 or more cases per caseworker.

- C** **Collection rate.** Each state's 1995 collection rate was calculated by comparing the number of IV-D cases with a collection during the year to the IV-D caseload. This is a bottom line indicator of program effectiveness, since the denominator includes all IV-D cases with and without support orders established. A support order is a legal prerequisite to collecting support. Thus, a low collection rate may be attributable to a high proportion of cases without a legal obligation, a small number of collections made on cases with support orders in place, or both. Similarly, a low collection rate may result when a state has a large number of "dead" arrears-only cases, masking better success at collecting current support.

CLASP's analysis indicates that the level of state investment in the child support program is directly connected to the state's performance level:¹

- C** **State performance, cost, and staffing levels vary dramatically.** In 1995, state collection rates ranged from 10 percent to 40 percent, with a 19 percent national average. State cost per case ranged from \$30 to \$373, with a national average of \$135. State staffing levels ranged from 1073 cases per FTE to 170 cases per FTE, with a national average of 373.
- C** **Staffing levels are closely related to program costs.** The total number of staff employed by state and local child support programs appears to be closely related to the cost per case. With few exceptions, states with higher costs had more staff, while states with lower costs had fewer staff.
- C** **Collection rates are tied to funding and staff.** States with higher cost and staffing ratios tended to have higher collection rates, while states with lower cost and staffing ratios tended to have lower collection rates. None of the states with the lowest cost and staffing ratios exceeded the national collection rate average. Conversely, all but one state having the highest cost and staffing ratios also had the top collection rates.
- C** **The top performers were better funded and staffed.** Eight of the ten states with the top collection rates -- those with collections in more than 30 percent of their cases -- had above average cost or staffing ratios. The ten states with the highest collection rates spent an average of \$180 per case and had 286 cases per FTE.
- C** **States with the lowest collection rates had fewer program resources.** Similarly, all but one state with collection rates in the bottom quintile -- those with collection rates under 15 percent -- had below average cost or staffing ratios. The ten states with the lowest collection rates averaged \$112 per case and had 468 cases per FTE.

¹ An earlier study by the Children's Defense Fund found a similar connection. See Nancy Ebb, *Enforcing Child Support: Are States Doing the Job?* (1994).

- c **Performance, funding, and staffing often followed parallel trends.** State-by-state data for 1991 through 1995 suggest that collection, cost, and staffing ratios increased or decreased at the same time in about two-thirds of the states. In about a quarter of states, collection rates went up as funding and staffing levels went up. In another quarter of states, collection rates went down as funding and staffing levels went down. In an additional half-dozen states, collection, cost, and staffing ratios declined during the early years, but increased in the later years. This last pattern is consistent with general caseload trends.

IV. Comparison of Spending, Child Poverty, and State Resources

States have been dealt different hands in terms of child support caseload difficulty and fiscal capacity. States vary considerably on their child poverty, nonmarital birth, unemployment rates, and per capita income rates. These differences in state demographics raise questions concerning the relationship between program investment, level of family need, and fiscal capacity. Do states invest more when they can afford more? Do they invest more or less when the need is greater?

In a recent study, the Urban Institute analyzed the variation among states on their need, capacity, and willingness to spend on children's programs.² Unpublished data from the Urban Institute indicate that child support spending is not closely related to fiscal capacity. While state per capita income appears to influence the level of state child support spending, it is not the key factor. Child poverty appears to have a stronger effect on state child support spending. States with less child poverty tend to spend more on the child support program, while states with more child poverty tend to spend less.

However, the Urban Institute data indicate that demographic differences among states do not fully explain variations in child support funding levels. The data indicate that spending in the child support program, like other children's programs, depends in part on the state's willingness to fund the services. The data show that spending in the child support program (along with AFDC spending) varies more across states than other federal matching children's programs. The data indicate that most states have the ability to increase child support program investments.

It is apparent from child support fiscal and caseload data that states have made different funding and programmatic choices affecting their investment levels. Some states have maximized net revenues and generated large "profits" by focusing their collection efforts on current welfare cases. Other states appear to concentrate on non-welfare cases, where payments go directly to the families. Other states seem to apply their collection efforts evenly across the entire caseload. Still other states leverage additional federal matching dollars by providing services to all or most child support orders entered within the state.

Financing mechanisms that allow some states to retain substantial "profits" sometimes reward performance, but just as often reward miserly investment. The current financing structure appears to encourage some states to compromise performance and to underserve former welfare

² See Douglas, Toby and Kimura Flores, *Federal and State Funding of Children's Programs* (Urban Institute, March 1998).

and non-welfare clients in order to keep costs very low and state profits high. The high cost-effectiveness of many of the high “profit”/ low cost states suggests that they may be very good at defining and targeting program priorities. The irony is that if these state programs were adequately funded, they probably could achieve much higher collection rates. Since budget decisions are primarily made by the state legislature, governor, and cabinet-level administrators, the child support program may in fact have little control or influence over the level of state investment.

The data also suggest that poorer states are penalized by the current financing structure. This is because the amount of welfare collections returned to the federal government depends on the state’s Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate. The FMAP rate, the level at which the federal government reimburses states for Medicaid costs, is based on the state’s per capita income. This means that states with less fiscal capacity receive more federal help with Medicaid costs, but they are required to return a larger proportion of welfare collections to the federal government. This results in a “reverse” FMAP rate, where poorer states keep a smaller proportion of child support revenues (and are less likely to realize a “profit”) than more affluent states, even when they perform just as well.

- C Some of the states with the largest “profits” have the lowest investment levels and worst performance.** Half of the ten states with the largest “profits” had below average collection rates, costs and staffing. Three of the states were in the bottom quintile for collection rates, while two of those states spent the least per case and had the lowest staffing levels. The states in this group tended to have very low costs per case; above average IV-D cost effectiveness ratios; more welfare cases and fewer non-welfare cases; lower FMAP rates; and lower family payments. They are states with per capita incomes and child poverty levels in the median range, neither the highest nor the lowest ability states.
- C Other states with large “profits” are top performers.** The other half of the states with the largest “profits” had above average collection rates. A third of the states were in the top quintile for collection rates. These states had larger welfare collections and sometimes lower costs; above average IV-D cost-effectiveness ratios; fewer non-welfare cases; lower FMAP rates; and lower family payments. They have per capita incomes and child poverty levels in the median range.
- C Most states with the largest “deficits” are poorer states.** Of the ten states with the largest “deficits,” half had above average and half had below average collection rates. Half had above average and half had below average spending and staff. Most states had a larger proportion of non-welfare cases than welfare cases. Most states had below average IV-D cost-effectiveness ratios. Most states had higher FMAP rates and higher family payments, both characteristics of poorer states. Most states are the lowest ability states in the Urban Institute study-- states with lower per capita incomes and higher child poverty.

V. Comparison of AFDC and Child Support Administrative Costs

A comparison of child support and AFDC administrative costs also suggests that the child support program may be underfunded. Nationwide, child support costs were less than half of

AFDC administrative costs in 1995³. States spent \$724 per AFDC case and \$380 per AFDC recipient child on average, while they spent only \$135 per IV-D case. While the programs are not completely comparable, a case can be made that staffing needs are similar. Clearly, a well-run child support program requires more individualized case work and client contact than states typically provide.

The disparity in costs was greater in states with lower cost and collection rates than in states with higher cost and collection rates. Child support costs per case were roughly equivalent to AFDC administrative costs per recipient child in five states with relatively high collection rates and costs.

VI. Conclusions

While state spending is not the only factor affecting performance, the data confirm the direct connection between performance and program investment. The data also suggest that most state child support programs are substantially underfunded and understaffed, and that performance may improve with increased investment. In addition, the data suggest that the current federal financing structure of the child support program may encourage some states to underinvest in the program in order to maximize state “profits.”

Federal financing mechanisms have both helped and hurt state child support programs. By providing an open-ended federal match, the federal government has helped state programs maintain and expand their capacity to establish paternity and collect support for a rapidly increasing caseload. In addition, their revenue-producing role has helped insulate state programs from state budget competition by giving them a source of off-budget funds. In some states, program revenues have been earmarked for use by the child support program, such as a trust fund, revolving fund, or other budget device. In other states, child programs have been able to use program revenues as a negotiating tool to leverage additional funding and staff.

On the other hand, the child support program has paid a price for its cost-recovery role. The financing structure may provide incentives for some states to underinvest in the program and to underserve low-income working families who have left or never received welfare. States with higher “profits” do not automatically invest more in the child support program or perform better. In some states, the political imperative to produce a profit overwhelms service delivery needs, and forces child support programs to make do with a budget too meager to provide even minimal services to many of the families in their caseloads.

The cost recovery role also may have led to a political “double bind” for many state child support programs attempting to address legislative concerns with performance levels. They can not ask for more money from the legislature until they can show improved performance, but they can not improve their performance until they get more resources. In effect, they are shut out the state appropriations process, with limited prospects for improving their performance.

Equally as important, the program’s cost recovery role has weakened its position within the state

³ FN: In 1996, Congress replaced the AFDC program with TANF. Because many states have reconfigured service delivery under TANF, TANF administrative costs per case may not resemble those under AFDC.

human services bureaucracy. Many human services administrators are skeptical about the value of the child support program. Although the child support program touches almost three times as many families as the TANF program, its reimbursement functions seriously undercut its visibility and status within the human services bureaucracy. Often, the child support program has trouble getting a seat at the welfare reform table because it is not seen as a program intended to help people. To the extent that the child support program can not show performance results, it has trouble attracting a constituency that will champion its concerns.

As welfare collections decline, some state programs may see their budget and performance deteriorate unless they can successfully persuade state legislatures to replace declining welfare collections with new state funds. To a state legislature accustomed to seeing a “profit” from the child support program, declining welfare collections may look like failure, not success. It will not be easy to change these funding dynamics. It requires a fundamental change in the program message from cost recovery to service delivery. Only if state human services commissioners, public health administrators, budget officers, governors, and legislators begin to see the potential of the child support program to promote parental responsibility, to initiate parent-child relationships, and to provide income support to low-wage families, will the child support program have a chance to realize its potential.

Cost Per Child Support Case FY 1995

First Quintile (Lowest)

Rank in cost	State	Cost/case ⁴	Cases/FTE	Collection rate
50	Indiana	\$30	1073	10%
49	Tennessee	\$54	919	11%
48	Michigan	\$70	676	15%
47	Louisiana	\$89	527	13%
46	Rhode Island	\$98	564	13%
45	Mississippi	\$100	366	13%
44	Florida	\$102	537	16%
43	Georgia	\$106	455	19%
42	Oregon	\$114	467	19%
41	Pennsylvania	\$115	356	31%

Second Quintile (Next to Lowest)

Rank in cost	State	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Collection rate
40	Iowa	\$117	437	21%
39	Kentucky	\$117	368	16%
38	Wyoming	\$119	413	12%
37	Nebraska	\$119	379	19%
36	Alabama	\$122	469	21%
35	Illinois	\$122	445	11%
34	South Carolina	\$126	650	26%
33	Wisconsin	\$127	403	38%
32	South Dakota	\$133	376	33%
31	New Mexico	\$134	402	16%

⁴ Cost per case is calculated without statewide system costs reimbursed at the 90 percent rate.

Third Quintile (Middle)

Rank in cost	State	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Collection rate
	NATIONAL	\$135	373	19%
30	Arkansas	\$137	232	26%
29	New York	\$139	451	15%
28	Missouri	\$147	211	18%
27	North Dakota	\$150	349	25%
26	California	\$151	394	14%
25	Virginia	\$151	314	38%
24	Idaho	\$151	289	29%
23	Maryland	\$156	336	23%
22	Ohio	\$156	206	28%
21	Oklahoma	\$157	286	18%

Fourth Quintile (Next to Highest)

Rank in cost	State	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Collection rate
20	Arizona	\$158	255	12%
19	Colorado	\$164	323	15%
18	Maine	\$164	307	36%
17	North Carolina	\$172	334	22%
16	West Virginia	\$177	305	24%
15	Connecticut	\$178	402	16%
14	Montana	\$179	234	21%
13	Texas	\$183	303	19%
12	New Jersey	\$185	254	24%
11	Nevada	\$207	259	22%

Fifth Quintile (Highest)

Rank in cost	State	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Collection rate
10	Utah	\$211	249	20%
9	Massachusetts	\$229	263	27%
8	Delaware	\$247	325	28%
7	New Hampshire	\$267	217	35%
6	Minnesota	\$278	180	40%
5	Washington	\$290	210	33%
4	Alaska	\$293	264	17%
3	Hawaii	\$309	260	25%
2	Vermont	\$356	170	35%
1	Kansas	\$373	210	34%

Data source: HHS

Prepared by Vicki Turetsky, CLASP (6/98).

Child Support Cases Per Employee

FY 1995

First Quintile (Lowest)

Rank in FTE	State	Cases/FTE	Cost/case ⁵	Collection rate
50	Indiana	1073	\$30	10%
49	Tennessee	919	\$54	11%
48	Michigan	676	\$70	15%
47	South Carolina	650	\$126	26%
46	Rhode Island	564	\$98	13%
45	Florida	537	\$102	16%
44	Louisiana	527	\$89	13%
43	Alabama	469	\$122	21%
42	Oregon	467	\$114	19%
41	Georgia	455	\$106	19%

Second Quintile (Next to Lowest)

Rank in FTE	State	Cases/FTE	Cost/case	Collection rate
40	New York	451	\$139	15%
39	Illinois	445	\$122	11%
38	Iowa	437	\$117	21%
37	Wyoming	413	\$119	12%
36	Wisconsin	403	\$127	38%
35	New Mexico	402	\$134	16%
34	Connecticut	402	\$178	16%
33	California	394	\$151	14%
32	Nebraska	379	\$119	19%
31	South Dakota	376	\$133	33%

⁵ Cost per case is calculated without statewide system costs reimbursed at the 90 percent rate.

Third Quintile (Middle)

Rank in FTE	State	Cases/FTE	Cost/case	Collection rate
	NATIONAL	373	\$135	19%
30	Kentucky	368	\$117	16%
29	Mississippi	366	\$100	13%
28	Pennsylvania	356	\$115	31%
27	North Dakota	349	\$150	25%
26	Maryland	336	\$156	23%
25	North Carolina	334	\$172	22%
24	Delaware	325	\$247	28%
23	Colorado	323	\$164	15%
22	Virginia	314	\$151	38%
21	Maine	307	\$164	36%

Fourth Quintile (Next to Highest)

Rank in FTE	State	Cases/FTE	Cost/case	Collection rate
20	West Virginia	305	\$177	24%
19	Texas	303	\$183	19%
18	Idaho	289	\$151	29%
17	Oklahoma	286	\$157	18%
16	Alaska	264	\$293	17%
15	Massachusetts	263	\$229	27%
14	Hawaii	260	\$309	25%
13	Nevada	259	\$207	22%
12	Arizona	255	\$158	12%
11	New Jersey	254	\$185	24%

Fifth Quintile (Highest)

Rank in FTE	State	Cases/FTE	Cost/case	Collection rate
10	Utah	249	\$211	20%
9	Montana	234	\$179	21%
8	Arkansas	232	\$137	26%
7	New Hampshire	217	\$267	35%
6	Missouri	211	\$147	18%
5	Washington	210	\$290	33%
4	Kansas	210	\$373	34%
3	Ohio	206	\$156	28%
2	Minnesota	180	\$278	40%
1	Vermont	170	\$356	35%

Data source: HHS

Prepared by Vicki Turetsky, CLASP (6/98)

Child Support Collection Rate

FY 1995

First Quintile (Lowest)

Rank in collection rate ⁶	State	Collection rate	Cost/case ⁷	Cases/FTE
50	Indiana	10%	\$30	1073
49	Illinois	11%	\$122	445
48	Tennessee	11%	\$54	919
47	Arizona	12%	\$158	255
46	Wyoming	12%	\$119	413
45	Mississippi	13%	\$100	366
44	Rhode Island	13%	\$98	564
43	Louisiana	13%	\$89	527
42	California	14%	\$151	394

Second Quintile (Next to Lowest)

Rank in collection rate	State	Collection Rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE
41	Colorado	15%	\$164	323
40	New York	15%	\$139	451
39	Michigan	15%	\$70	676
38	Connecticut	16%	\$178	402
37	New Mexico	16%	\$134	402
36	Kentucky	16%	\$117	368
35	Florida	16%	\$102	537
34	Alaska	17%	\$293	264
33	Missouri	18%	\$147	211
32	Oklahoma	18%	\$157	286

⁶ Approximate due to ties in collection rates among states.

⁷ Cost per case is calculated without statewide computer system costs reimbursed at the 90 percent rate.

Third Quintile (Middle)

Rank in collection rate	State	Collection Rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE
	NATIONAL	19%	\$135	373
31	Texas	19%	\$183	303
30	Nebraska	19%	\$119	379
29	Oregon	19%	\$114	467
28	Georgia	19%	\$106	455
27	Utah	20%	\$211	249
26	Montana	21%	\$179	234
25	Alabama	21%	\$122	469
24	Iowa	21%	\$117	437
23	Nevada	22%	\$207	259
22	North Carolina	22%	\$172	334
21	Maryland	23%	\$156	336

Fourth Quintile (Next to Highest)

Rank in collection rate	State	Collection rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE
20	New Jersey	24%	\$185	254
19	West Virginia	24%	\$177	305
18	Hawaii	25%	\$309	260
17	North Dakota	25%	\$150	349
16	Arkansas	26%	\$137	232
15	South Carolina	26%	\$126	650
14	Massachusetts	27%	\$229	263
13	Delaware	28%	\$247	325
12	Ohio	28%	\$156	206
11	Idaho	29%	\$151	289

Fifth Quintile (Highest)

Rank in collection rate	State	Collection Rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE
10	Pennsylvania	31%	\$115	356
9	Washington	33%	\$290	210
8	South Dakota	33%	\$133	376
7	Kansas	34%	\$373	210
6	Vermont	35%	\$356	170
5	New Hampshire	35%	\$267	217
4	Maine	36%	\$164	307
3	Virginia	38%	\$151	314
2	Wisconsin	38%	\$127	403
1	Minnesota	40%	\$278	180

Prepared by Vicki Turetsky, CLASP (6/98)

State Investment and Performance

FY 1991-1995

National	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$134	\$131	\$131	\$137	\$157
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$130	\$126	\$124	\$127	\$135
Cases/FTE	339	360	383	378	373
% cases with collections	19%	19%	18%	18%	19%

Alabama	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$142	\$127	\$119	\$133	\$170
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$127	\$126	\$116	\$128	\$122
Cases/FTE	279	306	455	429	469
% cases with collections	24%	24%	23%	22%	21%

Alaska	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$226	\$221	\$231	\$234	\$331
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$226	\$220	\$228	\$232	\$293
Cases/FTE	325	321	357	296	264
% cases with collections	18%	17%	17%	17%	17%

Arizona	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$105	\$151	\$141	\$142	\$222
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$87	\$124	\$128	\$125	\$158
Cases/FTE	320	217	294	312	255
% cases with collections	7%	9%	5%	6%	12%

Arkansas	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$114	\$120	\$131	\$165	\$178
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$105	\$107	\$114	\$137	\$137
Cases/FTE	283	302	265	237	232

Arkansas	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
% cases with collections	21%	23%	26%	24%	26%

California	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$192	\$167	\$158	\$157	\$167
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$187	\$163	\$151	\$150	\$151
Cases/FTE	269	330	400	378	394
% cases with collections	19%	14%	12%	13%	14%

Colorado	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$106	\$139	\$160	\$168	\$185
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$101	\$130	\$138	\$147	\$164
Cases/FTE	330	347	372	331	323
% cases with collections	13%	14%	14%	14%	15%

Connecticut	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$ 238	\$191	\$162	\$159	\$180
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$228	\$189	\$162	\$155	\$178
Cases/FTE	278	330	457	391	402
% cases with collections	22%	20%	18%	16%	16%

Delaware	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$195	\$208	\$238	\$236	\$254
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$193	\$207	\$238	\$228	\$247
Cases/FTE	263	233	247	207	325
% cases with collections	27%	27%	28%	27%	28%

DC	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$128	\$114	\$112	\$148	\$138
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$127	\$108	\$79	\$116	\$127

DC	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cases/FTE	284	399	359	372	n/a
% cases with collections	11%	11%	12%	11%	11%

Florida	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$118	\$118	\$87	\$98	\$104
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$107	\$105	\$86	\$98	\$102
Cases/FTE	390	418	474	485	537
% cases with collections	19%	17%	15%	15%	16%

Georgia	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$99	\$97	\$96	\$101	\$135
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$98	\$96	\$97	\$94	\$106
Cases/FTE	416	442	471	472	455
% cases with collections	17%	17%	17%	17%	19%

Hawaii	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$136	\$142	\$149	\$238	\$392
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$136	\$139	\$146	\$170	\$309
Cases/FTE	273	288	331	281	260
% cases with collections	24%	33%	32%	29%	25%

Idaho	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$172	\$161	\$185	\$239	\$275
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$159	\$150	\$154	\$174	\$151
Cases/FTE	286	300	278	263	289
% cases with collections	29%	29%	31%	32%	29%

Illinois	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$81	\$95	\$110	\$121	\$137

Illinois	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$81	\$92	\$107	\$114	\$122
Cases/FTE	596	546	524	533	445
% cases with collections	9%	9%	10%	10%	11%

Indiana	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$41	\$34	\$29	\$31	\$43
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$40	\$32	\$25	\$26	\$30
Cases/FTE	738	976	1206	1245	1073
% cases with collections	15%	14%	10%	9%	10%

Iowa	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$154	\$131	\$136	\$144	\$158
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$139	\$127	\$113	\$122	\$117
Cases/FTE	282	365	416	407	437
% cases with collections	25%	23%	21%	21%	21%

Kansas	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$151	\$156	\$194	\$240	\$446
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$151	\$153	\$183	\$217	\$373
Cases/FTE	294	238	191	188	210
% cases with collections	23%	25%	28%	31%	34%

Kentucky	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$144	\$130	\$124	\$116	\$133
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$131	\$119	\$109	\$104	\$117
Cases/FTE	262	292	341	370	368
% cases with collections	17%	17%	17%	16%	16%

Louisiana	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$142	\$130	\$112	\$105	\$105
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$141	\$129	\$101	\$96	\$89
Cases/FTE	276	341	416	368	527
% cases with collections	17%	16%	14%	14%	13%

Maine	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$217	\$217	\$197	\$167	\$177
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$170	\$155	\$147	\$162	\$164
Cases/FTE	266	299	287	356	307
% cases with collections	28%	22%	28%	33%	36%

Maryland	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$143	\$146	\$153	\$154	\$180
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$134	\$135	\$132	\$142	\$156
Cases/FTE	326	336	344	332	336
% cases with collections	23%	25%	24%	23%	23%

Massachusetts	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$213	\$210	\$212	\$329	\$289
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$210	\$208	\$199	\$292	\$229
Cases/FTE	269	253	207	207	263
% cases with collections	16%	20%	21%	25%	27%

Michigan	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$79	\$81	\$84	\$81	\$79
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$73	\$72	\$77	\$72	\$70
Cases/FTE	632	619	671	638	676
% cases with collections	18%	18%	18%	16%	15%

Minnesota	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$258	\$244	\$257	\$298	\$317
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$245	\$244	\$237	\$269	\$278
Cases/FTE	219	224	245	194	180
% cases with collections	29%	34%	37%	38%	40%

Mississippi	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$94	\$83	\$96	\$115	\$110
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$92	\$79	\$83	\$101	\$100
Cases/FTE	353	377	351	436	366
% cases with collections	8%	9%	11%	12%	13%

Missouri	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$108	\$113	\$134	\$154	\$186
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$107	\$110	\$126	\$134	\$147
Cases/FTE	300	366	308	264	211
% cases with collections	18%	20%	19%	19%	18%

Montana	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$221	\$334	\$251	\$182	\$203
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$211	\$214	\$186	\$182	\$179
Cases/FTE	165	166	230	236	234
% cases with collections	22%	25%	23%	19%	21%

Nebraska	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$144	\$164	\$141	\$134	\$189
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$107	\$149	\$127	\$115	\$119
Cases/FTE	334	359	382	401	379
% cases with collections	20%	19%	20%	20%	19%

Nevada	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$159	\$166	\$218	\$192	\$324
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$157	\$164	\$191	\$166	\$207
Cases/FTE	288	272	300	287	259
% cases with collections	16%	19%	20%	19%	22%

New Hampshire	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$233	\$217	\$258	\$264	\$383
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$152	\$165	\$232	\$256	\$267
Cases/FTE	295	234	240	246	217
% cases with collections	23%	29%	31%	34%	35%

New Jersey	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$182	\$163	\$173	\$190	\$188
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$182	\$162	\$173	\$188	\$185
Cases/FTE	270	297	291	281	254
% cases with collections	19%	20%	21%	23%	24%

New Mexico	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$172	\$145	\$132	\$196	\$189
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$144	\$132	\$124	\$134	\$134
Cases/FTE	295	336	382	334	402
% cases with collections	21%	17%	15%	15%	16%

New York	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$176	\$151	\$151	\$137	\$142
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$172	\$147	\$148	\$132	\$139
Cases/FTE	282	338	399	415	451
% cases with collections	19%	18%	16%	15%	15%

North Carolina	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$133	\$142	\$151	\$157	\$220
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$132	\$138	\$141	\$143	\$172
Cases/FTE	397	394	373	389	334
% cases with collections	19%	19%	20%	20%	22%

North Dakota	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$131	\$124	\$131	\$141	\$165
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$121	\$114	\$116	\$126	\$150
Cases/FTE	353	378	376	374	349
% cases with collections	22%	21%	21%	23%	25%

Ohio	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$118	\$138	\$136	\$148	\$174
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$115	\$136	\$133	\$141	\$156
Cases/FTE	277	283	254	235	206
% cases with collections	21%	20%	22%	25%	28%

Oklahoma	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$129	\$188	\$153	\$151	\$201
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$124	\$178	\$146	\$140	\$157
Cases/FTE	370	238	302	304	286
% cases with collections	11%	15%	16%	17%	18%

Oregon	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$116	\$108	\$115	\$110	\$129
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$116	\$106	\$103	\$97	\$114
Cases/FTE	413	491	501	486	467
% cases with collections	18%	18%	18%	19%	19%

Pennsylvania	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$122	\$101	\$101	\$105	\$125
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$121	\$99	\$99	\$96	\$115
Cases/FTE	360	370	393	402	356
% cases with collections	33%	31%	30%	29%	31%

Rhode Island	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$118	\$143	\$76	\$111	\$122
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$86	\$105	\$71	\$96	\$98
Cases/FTE	644	592	591	586	564
% cases with collections	10%	9%	9%	10%	13%

South Carolina	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$120	\$107	\$103	\$128	\$166
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$118	\$105	\$100	\$112	\$126
Cases/FTE	673	760	797	603	650
% cases with collections	16%	24%	24%	25%	26%

South Dakota	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$136	\$143	\$142	\$149	\$155
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$128	\$140	\$137	\$138	\$133
Cases/FTE	336	338	361	382	376
% cases with collections	26%	28%	29%	29%	33%

Tennessee	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$50	\$51	\$41	\$50	\$67
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$50	\$51	\$41	\$39	\$54
Cases/FTE	712	795	800	940	919
% cases with collections	13%	12%	11%	10%	11%

Texas	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$141	\$142	\$178	\$199	\$203
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$139	\$139	\$170	\$188	\$183
Cases/FTE	366	339	310	302	303
% cases with collections	13%	13%	14%	17%	19%

Utah	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$252	\$235	\$243	\$234	\$293
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$226	\$218	\$229	\$220	\$211
Cases/FTE	214	233	218	223	249
% cases with collections	24%	23%	22%	20%	20%

Vermont	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$193	\$275	\$239	\$359	\$408
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$191	\$270	\$238	\$358	\$356
Cases/FTE	202	212	218	211	170
% cases with collections	34%	40%	38%	31%	35%

Virginia	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$186	\$170	\$151	\$135	\$172
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$184	\$159	\$138	\$125	\$151
Cases/FTE	238	315	353	404	314
% cases with collections	26%	23%	22%	19%	38%

Washington	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$261	\$301	\$292	\$294	\$311
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$261	\$300	\$282	\$285	\$290
Cases/FTE	185	194	204	201	210
% cases with collections	32%	34%	34%	36%	33%

West Virginia	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$139	\$169	\$222	\$241	\$192
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$138	\$165	\$171	\$186	\$177
Cases/FTE	245	227	251	254	305
% cases with collections	17%	19%	22%	27%	24%

Wisconsin	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$130	\$119	\$117	\$122	\$171
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$126	\$117	\$113	\$117	\$127
Cases/FTE	365	372	395	395	403
% cases with collections	33%	31%	33%	37%	38%

Wyoming	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Cost/case	\$119	\$89	\$211	\$266	\$213
Cost less 90% APD/case	\$117	\$83	\$169	\$176	\$119
Cases/FTE	256	180	185	176	413
% cases with collections	23%	22%	14%	14%	12%

Data source: HHS

Prepared by Vicki Turetsky, CLASP (5/98)

Factors Affecting Difficulty of State Child Support Caseloads

(50 States Ranked from Most to Least Advantaged)

FY 1995

	Rank in IV-D collection rate ⁸	Rank in fiscal capacity and child poverty ⁹	Rank in fiscal capacity ¹⁰	Rank in child poverty ¹¹	Rank in nonmarital birth rate ¹²	Rank in unemployment rate ¹³
Alabama	25	40	38	36	40	43
Alaska	34	4	12	1	23	48
Arizona	47	41	35	41	46	25
Arkansas	16	43	48	37	34	22
California	42	38	11	42	32	49
Colorado	41	5	15	4	8	10
Connecticut	38	7	1	25	27	34
Delaware	13	3	6	7	41	12
Florida	35	34	20	44	43	33
Georgia	28	28	25	28	42	21
Hawaii	18	11	9	9	21	38
Idaho	11	39	41	29	2	32
Illinois	49	26	8	33	38	27
Indiana	50	21	28	19	30	16
Iowa	24	20	33	18	9	4
Kansas	7	25	23	22	11	13
Kentucky	36	46	42	46	19	31

⁸ CLASP calculations and ranking based on data from HHS, *20th Annual Report to Congress*.

⁹ Indexed and ranked by Urban Institute based on state's level of personal income per poor child.

¹⁰ Indexed and ranked by Urban Institute based on per capita income.

¹¹ Indexed and ranked by Urban Institute based on number of children in poverty. Toby Douglas and Kimura Flores, *Federal and State Funding of Children's Programs* (March 1998).

¹² Ranking by CLASP based on 1995 data from National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Monthly Vital Statistics Report* (Sept. 11, 1997).

¹³ Ranking by CLASP based on 1995 data from Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, <http://146.142.4.24/cgi-bin/dsrv>.

	Rank in IV-D collection rate⁸	Rank in fiscal capacity and child poverty⁹	Rank in fiscal capacity¹⁰	Rank in child poverty¹¹	Rank in nonmarital birth rate¹²	Rank in unemployment rate¹³
Louisiana	43	49	40	50	48	46
Maine	4	19	36	17	17	35
Maryland	21	8	5	16	37	24
Massachusetts	14	10	3	20	10	30
Michigan	39	33	16	35	39	28
Minnesota	1	14	14	14	5	7
Mississippi	45	50	50	49	50	40
Missouri	33	29	24	31	31	20
Montana	26	35	45	26	13	37
Nebraska	30	13	27	6	6	1
Nevada	23	12	10	13	47	29
New Hampshire	5	2	7	2	3	8
New Jersey	20	1	2	10	16	45
New Mexico	37	48	47	48	49	42
New York	40	27	4	40	45	41
North Carolina	22	31	31	32	29	11
North Dakota	17	22	43	11	4	3
Ohio	12	32	21	34	35	19
Oklahoma	32	44	44	39	26	15
Oregon	29	24	26	24	20	18
Pennsylvania	10	18	19	27	33	36
Rhode Island	44	16	17	23	28	47
South Carolina	15	45	39	45	44	23
South Dakota	8	36	37	30	18	2
Tennessee	48	37	32	38	36	26
Texas	31	42	30	43	24	39
Utah	27	30	46	5	1	5
Vermont	6	9	29	3	7	9

	Rank in IV-D collection rate⁸	Rank in fiscal capacity and child poverty⁹	Rank in fiscal capacity¹⁰	Rank in child poverty¹¹	Rank in nonmarital birth rate¹²	Rank in unemployment rate¹³
Virginia	3	6	13	8	22	14
Washington	9	17	18	21	14	44
West Virginia	19	47	49	47	25	50
Wisconsin	2	15	22	12	15	6
Wyoming	46	23	34	15	12	17

Factors Related to State Child Support Spending

(50 States Ranked from Most to Least Funds)

FY 1995

	Rank in IV-D cost per case ¹⁴	Rank in IV-D spending relative to child poverty ¹⁵	Rank in IV-D spending relative to fiscal capacity ¹⁶	Rank in state and local tax effort ¹⁷	Rank in state IV-D “profit” ¹⁸
Alabama	36	27	7	50	50
Alaska	4	1	1	2	10
Arizona	20	30	10	12	49
Arkansas	30	40	30	43	38
California	26	36	29	34	8
Colorado	19	16	38	42	13
Connecticut	15	18	41	13	28
Delaware	8	2	8	23	39
Florida	44	44	49	41	24
Georgia	43	34	35	31	18
Hawaii	3	6	11	4	34
Idaho	24	22	6	24	30
Illinois	35	38	48	35	31
Indiana	50	42	50	33	2
Iowa	40	26	32	9	3
Kansas	1	5	2	20	44
Kentucky	39	39	23	25	26
Louisiana	47	50	34	44	43

¹⁴ Cost per case is calculated as IV-D expenditures (less statewide computer system costs reimbursed at 90 percent enhanced rate) divided by IV-D cases. CLASP calculations and ranking based on data from HHS, *Child Support Enforcement: 20th Annual Report to Congress*.

¹⁵ Indexed by Urban Institute based on IV-D spending compared to number of children in poverty. Toby Douglas and Kimura Flores, *Federal and State Funding of Children’s Programs* (March 1998). Ranked by CLASP.

¹⁶ Indexed by Urban Institute based on IV-D spending compared to per capita income. Ranked by CLASP.

¹⁷ Indexed and ranked by Urban Institute based on tax revenues compared to state per capita income.

¹⁸ State “profit” is calculated as state share of child support revenues divided by state share of expenditures. In 1995, the state share of collections is net of family payments. Calculations and ranking by CLASP based on HHS data.

	Rank in IV-D cost per case¹⁴	Rank in IV-D spending relative to child poverty¹⁵	Rank in IV-D spending relative to fiscal capacity¹⁶	Rank in state and local tax effort¹⁷	Rank in state IV-D “profit”¹⁸
Maine	18	19	25	10	4
Maryland	23	15	31	32	29
Massachusetts	9	23	45	22	5
Michigan	48	31	28	11	6
Minnesota	6	11	14	6	17
Mississippi	45	45	12	29	47
Missouri	28	24	20	49	22
Montana	14	33	24	27	37
Nebraska	37	8	9	21	45
Nevada	11	10	15	38	41
New Hampshire	7	3	21	47	27
New Jersey	12	13	36	16	20
New Mexico	31	46	22	5	46
New York	29	37	46	1	11
North Carolina	17	20	16	26	33
North Dakota	27	25	27	17	21
Ohio	22	21	18	30	32
Oklahoma	21	48	40	37	25
Oregon	42	29	33	18	19
Pennsylvania	41	32	42	36	9
Rhode Island	46	28	37	19	1
South Carolina	34	41	26	40	36
South Dakota	32	47	47	45	7
Tennessee	49	43	44	48	16
Texas	13	49	43	39	40
Utah	10	12	4	14	42
Vermont	2	9	17	8	14
Virginia	25	17	39	46	23

	Rank in IV-D cost per case¹⁴	Rank in IV-D spending relative to child poverty¹⁵	Rank in IV-D spending relative to fiscal capacity¹⁶	Rank in state and local tax effort¹⁷	Rank in state IV-D “profit”¹⁸
Washington	5	7	5	15	12
West Virginia	16	35	13	28	48
Wisconsin	33	14	19	3	15
Wyoming	38	4	3	7	35

Urban Institute: Child Support Spending

State	IV-D Spending per \$1000 of Personal Income	Index*	IV-D Spending per Poor Child	Index*
Alabama	0.77	119	247	74
Alaska	1.22	187	941	284
Arizona	0.73	113	227	68
Arkansas	0.52	79	148	45
California	0.52	80	178	54
Colorado	0.40	62	304	92
Connecticut	0.39	60	283	85
Delaware	0.75	115	608	183
Florida	0.32	50	124	37
Georgia	0.45	69	194	59
Hawaii	0.71	109	485	146
Idaho	0.78	120	260	78
Illinois	0.33	51	153	46
Indiana	0.27	42	140	42
Iowa	0.49	75	251	76
Kansas	1.03	159	485	146
Kentucky	0.56	86	151	45
Louisiana	0.47	72	87	26
Maine	0.54	83	278	84
Maryland	0.49	76	345	104
Massachusetts	0.37	57	259	78
Michigan	0.52	80	216	65
Minnesota	0.65	100	392	118
Mississippi	0.70	108	121	37
Missouri	0.60	93	258	78
Montana	0.55	85	202	61

State	IV-D Spending per \$1000 of Personal Income	Index*	IV-D Spending per Poor Child	Index*
Nebraska	0.74	115	462	139
Nevada	0.65	99	433	131
New Hampshire	0.58	89	495	149
New Jersey	0.43	66	370	111
New Mexico	0.57	88	120	36
New York	0.36	56	165	50
North Carolina	0.64	99	274	83
North Dakota	0.52	80	255	77
Ohio	0.63	97	264	79
Oklahoma	0.39	60	111	33
Oregon	0.48	74	228	69
Pennsylvania	0.39	59	202	61
Rhode Island	0.40	62	233	70
South Carolina	0.52	80	147	44
South Dakota	0.33	51	118	36
Tennessee	0.38	58	132	40
Texas	0.38	58	109	33
Utah	0.91	140	389	117
Vermont	0.64	98	444	134
Virginia	0.39	61	285	86
Washington	0.87	134	464	140
West Virginia	0.70	107	181	55
Wisconsin	0.62	95	363	109
Wyoming	0.99	153	485	146
50 State Median	\$0.65	100	\$332	100

Source: Urban Institute 1997. Published with permission.

*Based on 50 State median of 100.

Urban Institute:
Program Spending Trends Per Poor Child In the
Ten Highest and Lowest Ability States

Program 10 High	Index*	10 Low	Index*	Difference	
AFDC	2,505	198	649	51	285.8
Food Stamps	1,538	122	1,250	99	23.1
AFDC & Food Stamps	4,043	164	1,899	77	112.9
Medicaid	2,589	145	1,248	70	107.4
EITC	1,694	114	1,488	100	13.9
Child Support	433	131	140	42	209.2
All Other	3,243	142	1,812	79	79.0
Total	\$12,003	140	\$6,588	77	82.2%

Source: Urban Institute 1997. Published with permission.

Based on USDHHS, HCFA, USDA, IRS, OMB.

*Based on 50 State Median of 100

States Ranked by Percentage of Child Support “Profit” FY 1995

First Quintile (lowest)

Rank in state “profit”	State	% of State “Profit”	FMAP rate	% of non-AFDC cases	AFDC costeffective ratio	% of family payments
50	Alabama	49%	70.45	66%	.34	21%
49	Arizona	60%	66.40	47%	.38	21%
48	West Virginia	65%	74.60	58%	.62	21%
47	Mississippi	66%	78.58	39%	.70	28%
46	New Mexico	77%	73.31	53%	.53	15%
45	Nebraska	80%	60.40	76%	.43	17%
44	Kansas	81%	58.90	52%	.48	12%
43	Louisiana	82%	72.65	49%	.73	32%
42	Utah	83%	73.48	37%	.65	15%
41	Nevada	85%	50.00	58%	.32	13%

Second Quintile (next to lowest)

Rank in state “profit”	State	% of State “Profit”	FMAP rate	% of non-AFDC cases	AFDC costeffective ratio	% of family payments
40	Texas	87%	63.31	55%	.59	15%
39	Delaware	96%	50.00	64%	.57	19%
38	Arkansas	97%	73.75	51%	.73	23%
37	Montana	101%	70.81	53%	.84	15%
36	South Carolina	102%	70.71	66%	.77	23%
35	Wyoming	104%	62.87	69%	.47	11%
34	Hawaii	109%	50.00	67%	.55	11%
33	North Carolina	110%	64.71	33%	.77	22%
32	Ohio	112%	60.69	51%	.76	17%
31	Illinois	113%	50.00	37%	.66	23%

Third Quintile (middle)

Rank in state "profit"	State	% of State "Profit"	FMAP rate	% of non-AFDC cases	AFDC costeffective ratio	% of family payments
30	Idaho	118%	70.14	50%	.64	10%
29	Maryland	124%	50.00	49%	.73	20%
28	Connecticut	126%	50.00	37%	1.23	50%
27	New Hampshire	127%	50.00	54%	.63	19%
26	Kentucky	130%	69.58	56%	.96	20%
25	Oklahoma	132%	70.05	55%	.94	11%
24	Florida	133%	56.28	55%	.80	15%
23	Virginia	138%	50.00	62%	.77	17%
22	Missouri	139%	59.86	43%	.83	18%
21	North Dakota	142%	68.73	50%	1.03	11%
	NATIONAL	146%		46%	.89	18%

Fourth Quintile (next to highest)

Rank in state "profit"	State	% of state "profit"	FMAP rate	% of non-AFDC cases	AFDC costeffective ratio	% of family payments
20	New Jersey	150%	50.00	54%	.88	14%
19	Oregon	154%	62.36	54%	.94	15%
18	Georgia	154%	62.23	49%	1.22	58%
17	Minnesota	155%	54.27	47%	.90	12%
16	Tennessee	162%	66.52	48%	1.14	15%
15	Wisconsin	165%	59.81	41%	1.35	10%
14	Vermont	167%	60.82	41%	1.05	24%
13	Colorado	167%	53.10	45%	.86	13%
12	Washington	171%	51.97	43%	.98	12%
11	New York	172%	50.00	52%	1.02	15%

Fifth Quintile (highest)

Rank in state “profit”	State	% of State “Profit”	FMAP rate	% of non- AFDC cases	AFDC costeffective ratio	% of family payments
10	Alaska	176%	50.00	42%	.91	12%
9	Pennsylvania	189%	54.27	55%	1.23	18%
8	California	189%	50.00	33%	1.02	12%
7	South Dakota	195%	68.06	43%	1.30	11%
6	Michigan	232%	56.84	24%	1.41	13%
5	Massachusetts	240%	50.00	33%	1.22	16%
4	Maine	248%	63.30	41%	2.12	31%
3	Iowa	256%	62.62	47%	1.42	11%
2	Indiana	304%	63.03	49%	1.51	17%
1	Rhode Island	318%	55.49	46%	1.87	19%

Data source: HHS.

Prepared by Vicki Turetsky, CLASP (6/98).

Child Support Collection Rate Compared to Costs, Staff and “Profit”
 Ranked by Quintiles¹⁹
 FY 1995

First Quintile (lowest)

State	Collection rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Profit
Indiana	1	1	1	5
Illinois	1	2	2	2
Tennessee	1	1	1	4
Arizona	1	4	4	1
Wyoming	1	2	2	2
Mississippi	1	1	3	1
Rhode Island	1	1	1	5
Louisiana	1	1	1	1
California	1	3	2	5

Second Quintile (Next to Lowest)

State	Collection Rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Profit
Colorado	2	4	3	4
New York	2	3	2	4
Michigan	2	1	1	5
Connecticut	2	4	2	3
New Mexico	2	2	2	1
Kentucky	2	2	3	3
Florida	2	1	1	3
Alaska	2	5	4	5
Missouri	2	3	5	3
Oklahoma	2	3	4	3

¹⁹ States are ranked lowest to highest quintile based on collection rate.

Third Quintile (Middle)

State	Collection Rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Profit
NATIONAL	3	3	3	3
Texas	3	4	4	2
Nebraska	3	2	2	1
Oregon	3	1	1	4
Georgia	3	1	1	4
Utah	3	5	5	1
Montana	3	4	5	2
Alabama	3	2	1	1
Iowa	3	2	2	5
Nevada	3	4	4	1
North Carolina	3	4	3	2
Maryland	3	3	3	3

Fourth Quintile (Next to Highest)

State	Collection rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Profit
New Jersey	4	4	4	4
West Virginia	4	4	4	1
Hawaii	4	5	4	2
North Dakota	4	3	3	3
Arkansas	4	3	5	2
South Carolina	4	2	1	2
Massachusetts	4	5	4	5
Delaware	4	5	3	2
Ohio	4	3	5	2
Idaho	4	3	4	3

Fifth Quintile (Highest)

State	Collection Rate	Cost/case	Cases/FTE	Profit
Pennsylvania	5	1	3	5
Washington	5	5	5	4
South Dakota	5	2	2	5
Kansas	5	5	5	1
Vermont	5	5	5	4
New Hampshire	5	5	5	3
Maine	5	4	3	5
Virginia	5	3	3	3
Wisconsin	5	2	2	4
Minnesota	5	5	5	4

Data source: HHS

Prepared by Vicki Turetsky, CLASP (6/98)