

- Identify what is needed for cases with an out of state component
 - The Kansas IV-D program follows the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (K.S.A. 23-36,101 et seq.). The needs for each case depend on the status of the case at the time. A general rule is that the sending state has exhausted all remedies available to it before sending the case to the receiving state and that the receiving state has personal jurisdiction over the party. UIFSA has standardized the forms to be used which are in addition to any forms that are required by the Kansas IV-D program. Once the case is processed in the receiving state, the laws of the receiving state apply to the case except for those specifically identified as belonging to the initiating state such as age of emancipation.

KAECSES

- Details on how the system will be updated
 - The scope of the CSS Modernization Re-Platforming project is to convert the 25-year-old existing code from its current technology base (CA-GEN Cobol language/Mainframe Platform) to the new State of Kansas preferred platform (C# .NET language SQL Server/ Azure Cloud Platform). There will be no change in current business process, functionality or partner interfaces, the application will function the same as it does today.
 - Maintaining the same functionality and business processes allows the state to avoid a re-certification from the Federal Partner OCSE (Office of Child Support Enforcement).
- Identify any statutes that need to be changed to make the system better
 - K.S.A. 23-3123 is the Distribution statute.



KSA 23-3123.docx

- IV-D systems are federally certified. See Automated Systems for Child Support Enforcement A Guide for States Updated 2017.
- Information related to computer systems used in other states
 - Each state selects how they operate their IV-D program in accordance with federal regulations. In addition, each state aligns their IV-D case management system in accordance with their state technology requirements and as well as their state laws. However, all IV-D systems are must be certified.
- Timeline:



- Expected changes in efficiency
 - After re-platforming, additional design, development, and implementation will need to occur for enhanced system modernization.
- Information on how to accomplish the transfer of information into a new system and how would the information be protected
 - Any adoption of a new system would be through approval by OCSE and CITO. The IV-D program works along with HS-EBITS regarding the security of any information as well as any federal and state laws and regulations regarding data security and confidentiality. A feasibility study is required to determine options if a new system is sought. Kansas completed a feasibility study in 2013. An updated feasibility process for IV-D programs was announced in March 2021. See

https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocse/march_2021_child_support_report.pdf Kansas IV-D would likely need a new feasibility study if we switch paths from modernizing KAECSSES.

- Information on what it would take to have a court trustee in all counties. Court Trustees are associated with the non-IV-D cases. The list of court trustees is updated by the Office of Judicial Administration. The current list is at <https://www.kscourts.org/KSCourts/media/KsCourts/Child%20Support%20Guidelines/Court-Trustee-Contact-List.pdf> and reflects there are court trustees in 16 judicial districts. The act relating to Court Trustees is at K.S.A. 20-375 et seq.



KSA 20 380-83.docx



- Why did the monthly meetings between DCF and court trustees stop and what will be the process for reinstating these meetings?
 - It is unknown when monthly meetings between the IV-D program and court trustees ended. Under the current administration, at least annual meetings were attempted with the Court Trustees except during the pandemic. In addition, quarterly meetings are held with Kansas Payment Center, the IV-D program, and Office of Judicial Administration. The Court Trustees and the IV-D program have agreed to quarterly virtual meetings in calendar year 2022 which are scheduled to begin in January 2022.

Full-Service Center Contracts

- How are contractors paid?
 - Each contractor is paid after they submit a monthly invoice.
- Is there a minimum benchmark still in place?
 - The full-service contracts that took effect 10/1/21 had a minimum performance in regard to the IV-D federal performance standards. Section 2.4.3.17.1 The contractors have their operational responsibilities set forth in Sec. 2.4.2.4 of the contract as well.
- Is there a penalty, and if so, what is the penalty (including funding claw backs)?
 - The contracts are set fee for service as detailed in the request for proposal and subsequent contract. The contracts did not include any provisions for bonuses or incentive pay for performance. Penalties may be assessed in customer service after 90 days, failure to maintain minimum staffing levels (Sec.2.4.1.4.8) after baseline set with the first review of minimum staffing occurring in April 2022 and implementation In April 2022, the quarterly reviews for January through March 2022 will be reviewed to determine if corrective action is needed. The month following each quarter will have the same review. Monthly reviews are scheduled to be completed throughout the transition and implementation periods. The contract provisions regarding liquated damages are as follows:

2.4.4.25 Liquidated Damages Not Subject to Corrective Action Plan: Contractor acknowledges its agreement to the following requirements:

- 2.4.4.25.1 If the Contractor fails to handle inquiries, complaints, or responses to DCF in accordance with the requirements described in Sections 3.4.4.11 and 3.4.4.12 of this Contract, DCF shall impose liquidated damages of one-thousand dollars (\$1,000) per day on each inquiry or complaint not resolved timely or appropriately as described in Sections 3.4.4.11 and 3.4.4.12 of this Contract. DCF will cease assessing damages on a particular case when requested information is provided, or all issues raised in the complaint or inquiry have been addressed, and the case has been handled appropriately as determined by DCF.
 - 2.4.4.25.2 Pursuant to Section 3.4.4.12 of this Contract, if the Contractor fails to escalate calls in accordance with approved escalation protocol or fails to return a call within forty-eight (48) hours when a customer requests a call back, DCF shall impose liquidated damages of one-thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each violation known to DCF.
 - 2.4.4.25.3 DCF will prepare a monthly report of all cases not properly handled or resolved in accordance with this Contract and submit to the Contractor. The Contractor will have five (5) business days to prepare a response for each cited case on the report. DCF will review the responses and issue a final report.
 - 2.4.4.25.4 DCF will use the final report to determine the number of inquiries or complaints subject to liquidated damages. These liquidated damages shall be withheld from Contractor's monthly invoice the following month. Imposition of such liquidated damages shall not preclude contract termination.
 - 2.4.4.25.5 Liquidated damages shall not be assessed or imposed until three (3) months after contract start date and/or execution of contract whichever occurs last. Liquidated damages shall not exceed 10% of the total charges invoiced for the month damages are assessed.
- 2.4.1.4.1 **Implementation Plan Liquidated Damages.** DCF shall impose liquidated damages for Contractor's failure to meet Implementation Plan deadlines and requirements as prescribed herein or as amended. To the extent such failure is beyond the control of the Contractor, as determined by DCF, liquidated damages shall not be imposed. The liquidated damages shall initially be ten-thousand dollars (\$10,000) per day and shall continue for each subsequent day of failure until the failure is remedied or corrected. Liquidated damages shall begin to accrue on the date immediately following any prescribed deadline or on the date DCF provides notice to Contractor that Implementation requirement is not met. Liquidated damages shall be withheld from Contractor's monthly invoice immediately following the missed deadline or the date immediately following DCF notice to Contractor of outstanding requirement. Imposition of such liquidated damages shall not preclude contract termination.

- If you do not meet performance measures, what happens?
 - The contract in Section 2.4.3.21.1 states “DCF retains authority for interpreting performance under the terms of this contract. DCF may request a Corrective Action Plan to address any deficiency or deficiencies discovered by DCF monitoring, State Auditor, Federal Auditor, or IRS.”
 - If a corrective action plan is put in place, at no additional cost to DCF, the contractor may be required to add additional staff (Sec.2.4.1.1.7).
 - If customer service issues are not resolved timely or appropriately damages for each documented and escalated occurrence may be assessed.
- How long are the contracts?
 - The original term is October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2024. There is an option to renew for four (4) additional twelve-month periods.
- Details of the contracts
 - YoungWilliams is Contract Award #50314.

YW Fully Executed
Contract.pdf
 - Maximus is Contract Award #50313.

Fully Executed-
Contract Award - M:
- What does customer service look like within the contracts?
 - Customer service was reimagined in the 10/1/21 full-service contracts. Section 2.4.4.12 sets forth the Customer Service expectation for contractors. The service delivery model is that there is a statewide toll-free number available. There is an automated portion available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Customer Service Representatives (CSR) are available from 7 am to 6 pm. The caller inputs specific information and is routed to the full-service provider for their case. The caller is to be able to speak directly to a CSR at their provider who is able to answer the caller’s questions or connect them to a caseworker, supervisor, attorney, manager, or ombudsman through the escalation process to address the caller’s specific concern.
 - In addition, 11 offices were required to be open in Topeka, Pittsburg, Independence, Kansas City, Overland Park, Wichita, Hays, Manhattan or Junction City, Dodge City or Garden City, Emporia, Great Bend or Hutchinson. locations. At least monthly visits are to occur to any city that has a DCF office as well which is 25 locations. Currently, virtual visits are also available for scheduling at the customer’s request.
 - Contractors are to have an escalation for customer service in accordance with the inquiry and complaint section 2.4.4.11 of the contract.
 - Customer service surveys will be developed and utilized in this contract.
 - A mobile application was purchased from Maximus and will be made available in 2022.

- Budgetary information for CSS and contracts**

Return on investment / Cost Effectiveness Ratio

CSPIA: Child Support Performance and Incentive Act

Total IVD Dollars Collected: OCSE-34A, Line 4b + Line 4c + Line 8 + Line 11 of column G

Total IVD Dollars Expended: OCSE-396A, Line 7 column [A] + [C] less Line 1c column [A] + [C]

Year	Total IVD \$\$ Collected	Total IVD \$\$ Expended	CER	Nat'l Rank	Coll Change	Exp Change	CER Change
2020	245,332,012	37,500,692	6.54	15	11.83%	0.58%	11.32%
2019	216,297,186	37,282,737	5.80	20	2.78%	1.95%	0.84%
2018	210,287,811	36,554,043	5.75	20	2.78%	2.18%	0.61%
2017	204,432,313	35,755,490	5.72	19	0.03%	-0.49%	0.52%
2016	204,368,109	35,931,472	5.69	23	2.87%	4.71%	-1.93%
2015	198,502,557	34,239,531	5.80	18	0.28%	1.80%	-1.55%
2014	197,950,283	33,623,207	5.89	17	-3.89%	-48.37%	29.98%
2013	205,647,922	49,885,438	4.12	41	-0.68%	-10.42%	8.82%
2012	207,037,624	55,081,413	3.76	45	3.36%	-5.43%	8.34%
2011	200,080,966	58,074,612	3.45	46	2.75%	1.65%	1.12%
2010	194,580,583	57,117,712	3.41	45	-1.67%	-0.65%	-1.01%
2009	197,820,882	57,489,345	3.44	48	0.39%	3.50%	-3.23%
2008	197,055,629	55,476,934	3.55	47	8.71%	10.04%	-1.48%
2007	179,895,252	49,909,435	3.60	45	5.00%	-1.24%	6.16%
2006	170,907,437	50,529,850	3.38	47	3.69%	3.89%	-0.20%
2005	164,601,472	48,566,286	3.39	47			7.14%
2004	153,629,779	48,816,750	3.15	48			0.76%
2003	149,459,446	47,853,034	3.12	44			16.43%
2002	143,341,603	54,992,953	2.61	50			

- Amount that should be collected and what is unable to be distributed

Each of these tables shows a five year look at a specific data element that is collected for all states and calculated by OCSE in their annual report. Only Kansas data is reported here. The data report is from the OCSE FY 2020 Child Support Enforcement Preliminary Report found at https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocse/fy_2020_preliminary_data_report.pdf

This table reflects the total dollar amount of current support that was due in Kansas for IV-D cases during the federal fiscal year.

Table P-83 Amount of Current Support Due for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	241,591,163	246,596,604	252,283,377	249,754,171	249,375,330

This table reflects the dollar amount of current support that was distributed to IV-D families.

Table P-84 Amount of Support Distributed as Current Support for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	133,970,994	137,764,787	141,799,559	145,050,101	144,418,949

These tables reflect the dollar amount of undistributed collections and the second table translates that into a percentage.

Table P-16 Net Undistributed Collections for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years (4th quarter data)

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	1,417,745	2,877,385	2,664,982	3,347,828	8,151,794

Table P-17 Percent of Undistributed Collections (UDC) for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years (4th quarter data)

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	0.75	1.51	1.36	1.65	3.44

- Quantify how many children are impacted, number of households and if they are receiving no, one, or monthly on time payments
 - Each of these tables shows a five year look at a specific data element that is collected for all states and calculated by OCSE in their annual report. Only Kansas data is reported here. The data report is from the OCSE FY 2020 Child Support Enforcement Preliminary Report found at https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocse/fy_2020_preliminary_data_report.pdf

IV-D programs report information based upon the total number of children served by the program.

Table P-93 Total Number of Children in IV-D Cases for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	146,900	144,524	143,253	140,219	130,868

IV-D programs report by cases. A household may have multiple cases associated with it depending of the legal parentage of children associated with a household. For example, if a household has two children in it where Parent A is the same but Parent B is different for each child and Parent A is the person who enrolled in services, then that household would have two cases associated with it – one for each child. Alternatively, if a household had three children and Parent A and Parent B are the same for all children and reside with Parent B, then only one IV-D case would exist for Parent A.

Table P-52 Total Caseload for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	141,105	138,914	139,768	135,773	126,588

This table reflects the number of cases that had an order in place and a collection was made on that case during the federal fiscal year.

Table P-75 Number of Cases in Which a Collection Was Made on an Obligation for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	80,776	80,891	81,438	81,688	86,821

This table reflects how many cases have arrears owed to a case.

Table P-87 Cases with Arrears Due for Five Consecutive Fiscal Years

STATES	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
KANSAS	108,655	108,432	109,287	109,030	103,018

A report was recently created that looked at FFY 2020 and the number of cases that owed current support. On the IV-D cases that owe current support, the average amount due annually is \$3209.73 or \$267.48 per month. In FFY 2020, Kansas had 77,689 cases that current monthly support was owed. Of those cases, 59,844 or 77% made a payment during FFY 20 on their support obligation. The remainder or 23% did not make any payment on their current support obligation during FFY 2020.

This is general info about the cases with Current Support Due in FFY 2020.				
Category for FFY 2020	# of Cases	Percentage	Average Amount of Current Support Due Per Case	Average Amount of Current Support Paid Per Case
Total Cases with Current Support Due	77,689	100%	3,209.73	1,858.89
Cases with Current Support Due and Paying on Current Support	59,844	77%	3,416.62	2,413.19
Cases with Current Support Due but Not Paying on Current Support	17,845	23%	2,515.90	0.00

Source: KAECSES OCSE-157 Audit Table for FFY 20