


From Contact Center Assessment to Transformation Roadmap

A thick blue rope is shown in the upper right corner, extending from the top edge of the page. It is secured by three metal shackles, one above the other, which are attached to the rope with rings. The shackles are silver and have a rectangular shape with a handle on the side.

A contact center assessment becomes strategic when it connects frontline performance, root-cause drivers, operating model design, technology readiness, AI opportunity, and measurable transformation economics.

A contact center assessment should not be a scorecard exercise. It should be the front door to transformation.

Many organizations assess contact centers by reviewing service levels, average speed of answer, abandonment, handle time, quality scores, staffing levels, training, technology, and customer satisfaction. Those measures are useful, but they often stop at symptoms. A true transformation roadmap must go deeper and focus on the following questions: why are customers calling, what work is avoidable, where are agents compensating for upstream process failures, where do vendors create friction, and where can AI safely reduce burdens?

The contact center is often the best diagnostic lens for an organization's operating model. For example, here's what it can mean for a health plan.

A health plan contact center receives the consequences of every upstream decision:

benefit complexity, provider confusion, claim issues, prior authorization delays, enrollment changes, billing questions, network disruption, policy ambiguity, portal limitations, quality outreach, and vendor handoffs. When the contact center is under strain, the root cause is rarely only staffing. It is usually a service system issue with downstream impacts.

A useful assessment starts with a baseline.

The baseline snapshot should include contact volume by intent, repeat-contact rate, transfer rate, escalation drivers, handle time by category, after-call work, quality outcomes, member/provider sentiment, abandonment, workforce forecast accuracy, training effectiveness, knowledge utilization, system switching, vendor handoffs, and cost per contact. Without this baseline, transformation becomes opinion-based, rather than fact- and data-driven.

The second step is root-cause mapping.

Each major contact driver should be traced upstream. Continuing with our healthcare example, is the issue created by unclear communications, benefit design complexity, a provider-facing process, a claims rule, a prior authorization requirement, a vendor workflow, poor self-service, knowledge gaps, or a technology limitation? This step prevents leaders from solving the wrong problem. Adding agents to absorb avoidable volume is not transformation. Reducing avoidable volume is transformation.

The third step is maturity scoring.

A practical maturity model should evaluate strategy, governance, workforce management, training, knowledge, quality, technology, reporting, vendor management, member/provider experience, process design, and AI readiness. The maturity score is not the end product. It is the organizing framework that shows where the organization is ready to move, where foundational gaps remain, and which improvements should be sequenced first.

The fourth step is AI opportunity identification.

AI opportunities should be tied to specific operational problems: summarizing calls, reducing after-call work, improving knowledge retrieval, classifying intent, detecting repeat-contact drivers, supporting QA, automating low-risk status requests, routing

issues, forecasting demand, and generating leadership insights. The assessment should also identify what not to automate yet. If the process is unclear, the knowledge base is unreliable, or decision rights are unresolved, AI can make the problem merely faster rather than truly better.

The fifth step is measuring potential impact.

A transformation roadmap must quantify opportunity. Savings can come from lower handle time, reduced after-call work, fewer repeat contacts, lower transfer rates, improved self-service containment, reduced overtime, better forecast accuracy, lower vendor leakage, fewer escalations, reduced appeal drivers, and improved quality-related performance. The model should distinguish hard-dollar savings, productivity capacity, cost avoidance, revenue protection, quality impact, and experience improvement.

The final output should be a sequenced roadmap.

A strong roadmap includes quick wins, foundational fixes, AI-enabled improvements, vendor orchestration actions, governance changes, technology dependencies, implementation sequencing, ownership, estimated cost, expected benefit, risk level, and measurement cadence. It should make clear what can be done in 30 days, 90 days, 6 months, and 12 months.

The most valuable contact center assessment does not simply tell leaders how the contact center is performing.

It does include telling them how the service organization is performing. More importantly, it shows which problems belong inside the center, which problems originate upstream, and which opportunities require enterprise orchestration. That is how a contact center assessment becomes a transformation roadmap.



“

Adding agents to absorb avoidable volume is not transformation. Reducing avoidable volume is transformation.

“

The contact center is the receipt for every upstream service decision.

“

A strong assessment should produce an executable roadmap, not a binder of findings.

Article Sources

- **CAQH 2025 Index:** The 13th CAQH Index identifies a \$21B opportunity to reduce administrative waste and notes U.S. healthcare avoided an estimated \$258B in administrative costs in 2024 through electronic transactions and improved data exchange. [Source](#)
- **AMA 2024 Prior Authorization Physician Survey:** AMA survey materials continue to show that prior authorization creates significant administrative burden and care-delay concerns for physicians and patients. [Source](#)
- **McKinsey:** The AI opportunity for health insurers: McKinsey estimates payers could see 13% to 25% net administrative cost savings, 5% to 11% medical cost savings, and 3% to 12% higher revenue by using currently available AI technology. [Source](#)
- **CMS Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule:** CMS released CMS-0057-F to improve health information exchange and requires impacted payers to implement APIs, with Patient Access API reporting beginning in 2026 and prior authorization API requirements phasing in by 2027. [Source](#)