



**STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

CITIZENS PLAZA BUILDING
400 DEADERICK STREET
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-1403

TELEPHONE: 615-313-4700 FAX: 615-741-4165
TTY: 1-800-270-1349
www.state.tn.us/humanserv/

BILL HASLAM
GOVERNOR

RAQUEL HATTER, MSW, Ed.D.
COMMISSIONER

March 11, 2016

Honorable Russell Johnson
District Attorney General
9th Judicial District
1008 Bradford Way, Suite 100
P.O. Box 703
Kingston, TN 37763

**Re: 9th Judicial District – Loudon, Meigs, Morgan, and Roane Counties
2015 Program and Performance Review**

Dear General Johnson:

On October 27, 2015, child support staff conducted the 2015 Program and Performance Review for the 9th Judicial District. As part of the review process the following actions occurred:

- Interviews were held with Administrator, Ms. Barbara Morgan, and key members of her staff
- Case readings were completed on a random sample of one hundred twenty-five (125) case records
- TCSES reports and management screens were reviewed
- Performance Measure Reports were analyzed

The details of our review and recommendations are contained in the enclosed report. There were no deficiencies cited; therefore, a Corrective Action plan is not required. We appreciate the cooperation extended by Ms. Morgan and the child support staff during the review process and congratulate the office for exceeding the federal requirements in all categories.

RECEIVED
MAR 17 2016

BY: _____

March 11, 2016

Thank you for your support of the Child Support Program in Tennessee. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding our review.

Sincerely,



Charles Bryson, Interim Assistant Commissioner,
Family Assistance and Child Support

CB:rl

Enclosures

- cc: Freda Cook, Interim Director, Child Support Operations
- Barbara Morgan, Administrator, 9th Judicial District
- Patti Wood, Interim Director, Child Support Field Operations and Policy
- Lana Wix, Director, Field Operations-West
- Roxanne Long, Program Coordinator, 9th Judicial District
- Bertha Graves, Program Coordinator, Tennessee District Attorneys General Conference

**2015 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS
9th JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

PAST HISTORY

2013 Program Review: There were no deficiencies found during the Program Review.

A sample of seventeen cases was read for **Paternity Establishment**; Seventeen were correct for an accuracy rate of one hundred percent (100%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of seventy-five percent.

A sample of thirty-nine cases was read for **Order Establishment**; Thirty-eight were correct for an accuracy rate of ninety-seven percent (97%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of seventy-five percent.

A sample of fifty cases was read for **Enforcement**; Forty-seven were correct for an accuracy rate of ninety percent (94%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of seventy-five percent.

A sample of thirty-one cases was read for **Expedited Process**; Thirty-one were correct for an accuracy rate of one hundred percent (100%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of seventy-five percent.

A sample of thirty cases was read for **Review and Adjustment**; Twenty-nine were correct for an accuracy rate of ninety-seven percent (97%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of seventy-five percent.

A sample of twenty-six cases was read for **Closure**; Twenty-four were correct for an accuracy rate of ninety-two percent (92%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of ninety percent.

A sample of forty-three cases was read for **Medical Support**; Forty were correct for an accuracy rate of ninety-three percent (93%). There is no recommendation as the accuracy rate exceeds the contract requirement of seventy-five percent.

**2015 PERFORMANCE REVIEW
9th JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

Performance goals for the 9th Judicial District for the July 1, 2015 through March 30, 2016 contract year are:

Percentage of Paternities Established – March 31, 2016 Goal 95%

Performance as of September 2015: 105.66 %

Percentage of Cases with Orders – March 31, 2016 Goal 95%

Performance as of September 2015: 95.73 %

Percentage of Collections on Current Support – March 31, 2016 Goal 59.50%

Performance as of September 2015: 60.30 %

Percentage of Collections on Arrears – March 31, 2016 Goal 58.05%

Performance as of September 2015: 63.13 %

Total Distributed Collections – March 31, 2016 Goal \$ 6,144,566.21 (2% increase from 2014-2015 contract year)

Based on the September 2015 Performance Measures, the 9th Judicial District's total distributed collections from July 2015-September 2015 are \$2,034,299.93.

9 th Judicial District Performance September 2015					
	PEP	Cases Under Order	Collections on Current Support	Collections on Arrears	Total Distributed Collections
Contract Goals	95%	95%	59.50%	58.05%	\$6,144,566.21
Actual Performance	105.66%	95.73%	60.30%	63.13%	\$2,034,299.93
Difference	+10.66%	+0.73%	+0.80%	+5.08%	-\$4,110,266.28