esota's curre	nt service delivery model has some critical problems.
Delivery of Services	Customers may receive different levels and types of services depending upon their geographical location. The current structure does not support uniform implementation and application of state policy.
Staffing / Resources	The level of resources, primarily caseworkers, varies among the counties.
Accountability	Overall program performance is dependent upon the performance and coordination of 84 county offices and the state office and there is not an effective single point of responsibility over these entities.
Authority and Control	The roles and responsibilities of the various service providers are not clearly defined. Statewide program goals and priorities cannot be efficiently or easily accomplished without the ability to control overall program expenditures and without the close coordination of the various service providers.
Flexibility and Adaptability	Program resources cannot be easily reallocated to meet changing requirements or challenges of the program.
Customer Service	Customers, particularly employer customers, lack a single point of contact for information about their interaction with the Child Support Program.

## **Options Analysis**

Our analysis of the potential benefits of various service delivery models led us to include three service delivery model options for CSED to consider.\*

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3		
State Operated Regional Offices	County Operated Regional Offices with Enhanced Governance	County Operated with Enhanced Governance		
Transforms the Minnesota Child Support Program from a county operated service delivery model to a state operated child support service delivery model.  Provides direct central control over all aspects of the program, maximizing economies of scale and resource callocation to improve efficiency, resulting in overall program savings.	<ul> <li>Consolidates all existing county offices into a regional office structure to gain the advantages associated with aconomies to scale and increased efficiencies associated with the elimination of the duplication of services which currently exist.</li> <li>Provides opportunities to centralize or specialize some functions or services now performed in the individual counties either through multi- county or multi-region consortiums or by the state.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Leaves the current county operated model in place but requires a change to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the core child support service providers.</li> <li>The state office, the county offices, and the county offices, and the county attorneys' roles would be defined in statute and via cooperative agreements that would govern the parties' relationships in order to improve the consistency of the services delivered and to define the accountability for the delivery of those services.</li> </ul>		

\* Other service delivery models were considered that we determined were not good fits for implementation in Minnesota, including a privatived service delivery model and moving child support to another specy.

## Assessment of Automated Processes (Deliverable #3) Key findings

Prism design is more complex than required

Existing Polices and Procedures have placed unnecessary burden on PRISM

PRISM and supporting systems lack functionality

A new child support system is warranted

Meloitte

-3-

_			
_			
-			
_			
_			
-			
-			
_			
-			
_			

