

PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE
FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION
MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
March 2002

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION

INTRODUCTION

This report, issued in March 2002, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Fire Marshal Division (FMD), Michigan Department of State Police (MSP).

AUDIT PURPOSE

This performance audit was conducted as part of the constitutional responsibility of the Office of the Auditor General. Performance audits are conducted on a priority basis related to the potential for improving effectiveness* and efficiency*.

BACKGROUND

FMD is composed of two sections: Field Operations and Program Services. FMD also provides support functions to the Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council (MFFTC), an administrative unit within FMD.

FMD's mission* is to provide services and training to others for fire and explosion investigation; enforcement of arson fraud, fireworks, and explosives statutes; mitigation of hazardous materials incidents; abatement of dangerous conditions; data collection and analysis; and public fire education. FMD programs include fire investigation, investigation training, fire and arson data collection and analysis, response to hazardous materials emergencies, and public fire safety education. MFFTC develops and administers curriculums and required examinations for firefighters as well as other specialized training.

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

FMD had 21 central office and 29 field employees as of July 31, 2001 and was appropriated approximately \$5.5 million for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2001.

AUDIT OBJECTIVES,
CONCLUSIONS, AND
NOTEWORTHY
ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MFFTC and fire investigation training programs.

Conclusion: Our assessment disclosed that MFFTC and Investigative Resources Unit training programs were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions* related to MFFTC firefighter examinations and training (Finding 1).

Noteworthy Accomplishments: The fire problem in Michigan, as in the entire country, centers around residential fires. FMD has developed an educational program for local fire departments to deliver in schools to address this problem. It is given, along with training, free of charge to any fire department in the State. This is consistent with FMD's mandate to provide public fire education and reduce the incidence and severity of fire.

MFFTC is in the final stages of testing and implementing an extensive computerized information management system (IMS). IMS links all business processes from the initial training application to issuance of training certificates. IMS maintains a permanent individual training record for each of the State's firefighters and is used for all business functions necessary to support the mission of MFFTC.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the fire investigators' activities.

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

Conclusion: We concluded that FMD fire investigators' activities were generally effective and efficient.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of the fire incident and insured fire loss reporting systems.

Conclusion: We concluded that the fire incident reporting system was generally effective. However, we concluded that the insured fire loss reporting system was not effective. We noted reportable conditions related to the Michigan Insured Fire Loss Reporting System (MIFLRS) and the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) (Findings 2 and 3).

**AUDIT SCOPE AND
METHODOLOGY**

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Fire Marshal Division. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Our audit procedures included examination of FMD records and activities primarily for the period October 1, 1998 through July 31, 2001. We conducted a preliminary review of FMD's operations to gain an understanding of its activities.

We tested the contract instructors' files to verify that instructors possessed the required qualifications and certifications to teach firefighters' classes. Also, we reviewed FMD course evaluations and surveyed individuals who took the firefighters' or investigators' training and chiefs of Michigan local fire departments (see supplemental information for survey results). Further, we tested firefighters' records to ensure that MFFTC certified

the fire department firefighters. In addition, we verified compliance with applicable State laws.

We examined fire investigation case files and analyzed fire investigators' case loads and response time. We also examined the case files to determine whether documentation provided evidence of supervisory review. In addition, we surveyed chiefs of Michigan local fire departments and local law enforcement agencies regarding their association with FMD investigation activities (see supplemental information for survey results).

We reviewed fire incident statistics generated by FMD via NFIRS to identify overall trends in the number of fires, injuries, deaths, and dollar losses and analyzed FMD's use of this data. Also, we evaluated the use of and the need to maintain MIFLRS.

**AGENCY RESPONSES
AND PRIOR AUDIT
FOLLOW-UP**

Our audit report contains 3 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. MSP's preliminary response indicated that it concurred with the findings and will comply with the recommendations.

FMD complied with the 2 prior audit recommendations included within the scope of our current audit. The other 2 recommendations were no longer applicable to FMD because these responsibilities were transferred to other departments.

February 28, 2002

Colonel Michael D. Robinson, Director
Michigan Department of State Police
714 South Harrison Road
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Colonel Robinson:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Fire Marshal Division, Michigan Department of State Police.

This report contains our executive digest; description of agency; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses and prior audit follow-up; comments, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; description of surveys and summaries of survey responses, presented as supplemental information; and a glossary of acronyms and terms.

Our comments, findings, and recommendations are organized by audit objective. The agency preliminary responses were taken from the agency's responses subsequent to our audit fieldwork. The *Michigan Compiled Laws* and administrative procedures require that the audited agency develop a formal response within 60 days after release of the audit report.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us during this audit.

AUDITOR GENERAL

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE

INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Digest	1
Report Letter	5
Description of Agency	8
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up	10

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

Training Programs	12
1. MFFTC Firefighter Examinations and Training	13
Investigators' Activities	14
Reporting Systems	16
2. MIFLRS	16
3. NFIRS	18

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Surveys	21
Summaries of Survey Responses	
Exhibit A - Investigators' Training	23
Exhibit B - Local Fire Departments' Chiefs	26
Exhibit C - Firefighters' Training	30
Exhibit D - Law Enforcement Agencies	31

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	33
--------------------------------	----

Description of Agency

Sections 29.1 - 29.33 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* (Act 207, P.A. 1941, as amended), also known as the Michigan Fire Prevention Code, outline the various responsibilities of the Fire Marshal Division (FMD), Michigan Department of State Police, with respect to fire safety.

Executive Order* No. 97-1, effective October 1, 1998, transferred responsibility for various fire safety inspections and activities to other State departments. However, FMD retained responsibility for fire investigation, investigation training, fire and arson data collection and analysis, response to hazardous materials emergencies, and public fire safety education.

FMD is composed of two sections: Field Operations and Program Services. FMD also provides support functions to the Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council (MFFTC), an administrative unit within FMD. FMD's mission is to provide services and training to others for fire and explosion investigation; enforcement of arson fraud, fireworks, and explosives statutes; mitigation of hazardous materials incidents; abatement of dangerous conditions; data collection and analysis; and public fire education.

The Field Operations Section is composed of the Investigative Resources Unit at headquarters and investigators at 18 field locations across the State. Field investigators conduct origin and cause investigations of fires and follow up arson and fire-related frauds. The Investigative Resources Unit is responsible for training State and local fire investigators and maintains the Michigan Insured Fire Loss Reporting System (MIFLRS). MIFLRS collects loss information on fire insurance claims.

The Program Services Section is responsible for handling the overall administrative functions for FMD. The Section develops a public fire safety education program delivered by the local agencies. Also, the Section provides computer support for FMD operations and maintains the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS). NFIRS compiles fire activity data as reported by fire departments in Michigan.

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

Act 291, P.A. 1966, created MFFTC. MFFTC's purpose is to promote fire service professionalism, firefighter safety, and community service effectiveness within Michigan fire service through the establishment of training standards, course development, training program delivery, professional certification, and coordination of State training activities. MFFTC develops and administers curriculums and required examinations for firefighters as well as other specialized training.

FMD had 21 central office and 29 field employees as of July 31, 2001 and was appropriated approximately \$5.5 million for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2001.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Fire Marshal Division (FMD), Michigan Department of State Police (MSP), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council (MFFTC) and fire investigation training programs.
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the fire investigators' activities.
3. To assess the effectiveness of the fire incident and insured fire loss reporting systems.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Fire Marshal Division. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Audit Methodology

Our audit procedures, conducted from June through August 2001, included examination of FMD records and activities primarily for the period October 1, 1998 through July 31, 2001. We conducted a preliminary review of FMD's operations to gain an understanding of its activities. This included interviewing FMD personnel and identifying performance measures and performance objectives that FMD uses to evaluate its effectiveness and efficiency. Also, we reviewed applicable laws, regulations, the strategic plan, and policies and procedures to gain an understanding of management control related to pertinent FMD functions. We used this information to perform a risk assessment in order to determine which areas to emphasize in our audit and the extent of our detailed analysis and testing.

To accomplish our first objective, we tested the contract instructors' files to verify that instructors possessed the required qualifications and certifications to teach firefighters' classes. Also, we reviewed FMD course evaluations to assess how MFFTC and the

Investigative Resources Unit monitored the effectiveness of instructors. In addition, we surveyed individuals who took the MFFTC firefighters' or Investigative Resources Unit investigators' training and chiefs of Michigan local fire departments (see supplemental information for survey results). Further, we tested firefighters' records to ensure that MFFTC certified the fire department firefighters. In addition, we verified compliance with applicable State laws, including the MFFTC enabling act, Act 291, P.A. 1966.

To accomplish our second objective, we examined fire investigation case files and analyzed fire investigators' case loads and response time. We also examined the case files to determine whether documentation provided evidence of supervisory review. In addition, we surveyed chiefs of Michigan local fire departments and local law enforcement agencies regarding their association with FMD investigation activities (see supplemental information for survey results).

To accomplish our third objective, we reviewed fire incident statistics generated by FMD via the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) to identify overall trends in the number of fires, injuries, deaths, and dollar losses and analyzed FMD's use of this data.

Also, we evaluated the use of and need to maintain the Michigan Insured Fire Loss Reporting System (MIFLRS).

Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up

Our audit report contains 3 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. MSP's preliminary response indicated that it concurred with the findings and will comply with the recommendations.

The agency preliminary response that follows each recommendation in our report was taken from the agency's written comments and oral discussion subsequent to our audit fieldwork. Section 18.1462 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* and Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide procedure 1280.02 require MSP to develop a formal response to our audit findings and recommendations within 60 days after release of the audit report.

FMD complied with the 2 prior audit recommendations included within the scope of our current audit. The other 2 recommendations were no longer applicable to FMD because these responsibilities were transferred to other departments.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

TRAINING PROGRAMS

COMMENT

Background: Act 291, P.A. 1966, established the Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council (MFFTC). MFFTC serves the training needs of the State's 1,079 fire departments and more than 32,000 firefighters. MFFTC prepares and publishes training standards, establishes courses of study, certifies instructors, and establishes regional training centers to assist local fire departments with training. Also, MFFTC cooperates with State, federal, and local fire agencies to train firefighters and develop and administer mandatory certification examinations for new firefighters.

In calendar year 2000, MFFTC administered 1,168 courses and issued certificates to 19,685 individuals who successfully completed the training. Additional services provided in 2000 included the testing and certification of 2,666 new firefighters and the certification of 769 fire officers at the supervisory, managerial, and administrative levels.

Also, the Investigative Resources Unit, Fire Marshal Division (FMD), Michigan Department of State Police (MSP), develops and provides instruction for basic, advanced, vehicle, arson follow-up, and mobile home fire investigations to local and State fire investigators.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MFFTC and fire investigation training programs.

Conclusion: Our assessment disclosed that MFFTC and Investigative Resources Unit training programs were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted reportable conditions related to MFFTC firefighter examinations and training.

Noteworthy Accomplishments: The fire problem in Michigan, as in the entire country, centers around residential fires. FMD has developed an educational program for local fire departments to deliver in schools to address this problem. It is given, along with training, free of charge to any fire department in the State. This is consistent with FMD's mandate to provide public fire education and reduce the incidence and severity of fire.

MFFTC is in the final stages of testing and implementing an extensive computerized information management system (IMS). IMS links all business processes from the initial training application to issuance of training certificates. IMS maintains a permanent individual training record for each of the State's firefighters and is used for all business functions necessary to support the mission of MFFTC.

FINDING

1. MFFTC Firefighter Examinations and Training

MFFTC should enhance efforts toward obtaining amendatory legislation to require that firefighter examinations cover current standards issued by the National Fire Protection Association. In addition, MFFTC should update its firefighter training programs in a timely manner.

Section 29.369 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* requires firefighters to pass firefighters' examinations to be eligible for employment as a firefighter. This Section also requires MFFTC to:

. . . develop and administer an examination, which shall include a practical demonstration, a written or oral test, or a combination thereof, to determine a person's competency in regard to the knowledge and skill requirements set forth in fire fighter I and II standards of the 'fire fighter professional qualifications,' national fire protection association pamphlet no. 1001, 1987 edition.

However, because of Section 29.369 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws*, MFFTC has not updated its examination program beyond the 1987 standards. MFFTC has updated the firefighter fire training programs to 1992 standards, but it will not implement the 1997 standards until October 1, 2001.

The examinations given to firefighters to obtain the Fire Fighter I and II certifications should correspond with the latest reviewed, approved, and instructed Fire Fighter I and II courses. A change to accomplish this is incorporated in a bill currently being considered by the Legislature. The bill also addresses other subjects, thereby compromising the importance and urgency associated with this issue. It appears that a separate bill addressing only the examination provision of the act should be introduced.

Because the statute does not reference current standards, MFFTC does not test based on the latest national standards. Therefore, there is no assurance that Michigan firefighters are tested in the latest firefighting methods.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that MFFTC enhance efforts toward obtaining amendatory legislation to require that firefighter examinations cover current standards issued by the National Fire Protection Association.

We also recommend that MFFTC update its firefighter training programs in a timely manner.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MSP concurred with the finding that the statute must be changed and that the issue is of sufficient importance to seek a dedicated legislative action. FMD previously contacted MSP's Executive Division, which manages legislative affairs for MSP, and discussed this issue. MSP informed us that it is presently seeking introduction of the appropriate legislation. Once the statute is amended, testing and certification as well as the related recommended courses of study will be maintained current.

INVESTIGATORS' ACTIVITIES

COMMENT

Background: As of July 31, 2001, FMD employed 19 investigators located at 18 MSP posts. During calendar year 2000, the investigators performed 949 original investigations and determined that 354 of the fires investigated were arson fires, 205 were accidental fires, and 390 fires were undeterminable.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the fire investigators' activities.

Conclusion: We concluded that FMD fire investigators' activities were generally effective and efficient.

REPORTING SYSTEMS

COMMENT

Background: The Michigan Insured Fire Loss Reporting System (MIFLRS) was implemented during 1998. MIFLRS collects insured fire loss information on claims that exceed \$1,000. MIFLRS is able to track and cross-reference all types of fire loss data and provide investigators with a valuable tool for arson and fraud detection.

Michigan implemented the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) on January 1, 1999. NFIRS collects data from the State's 1,079 fire departments regarding their responses to fires and hazardous materials incidents. FMD responds to special user requests for fire information that cannot be satisfied through local resources. This data is used at the local, state, and national levels to identify trends in fire causes, fire-related injuries and deaths, product and equipment failures, and other significant fire problems. The data is also used to assist fire investigators, validate the need for fire-related legislation, develop and update fire codes and standards, foster research in fire protection, identify safety and training needs, develop fire code enforcement programs, provide public fire safety awareness information, and maximize the allocation of resources available to effectively deal with the fire problem. Also, NFIRS compiles comprehensive statistical reports of all fires and hazardous materials incidents and FMD distributes the reports to the appropriate agencies and users.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of the fire incident and insured fire loss reporting systems.

Conclusion: We concluded that the fire incident reporting system was generally effective. However, we concluded that the insured fire loss reporting system was not effective. We noted reportable conditions related to MIFLRS and NFIRS.

FINDING

2. MIFLRS

FMD should perform an analysis of MIFLRS to determine whether FMD should abandon MIFLRS or develop a method to obtain from insurance companies the information necessary to analyze fire loss data.

FMD reported that arsonists are frequently responsible for multiple fires within a community or throughout the State. Although these fires result in the loss of life and property, current reporting systems are unable to link the arsonists with these

crimes. In addition, fire fraud schemes by landlords, public adjustors, and insurance policy holders occur Statewide. Often, these crimes are not detected and linked because they involve a number of different insurance carriers. Current fire loss reporting systems are of little assistance to investigators investigating these crimes.

MIFLRS cost \$329,923 and was designed to automate the process of reporting fire losses and assisting in arson and fraud investigations. In calendar year 1998, the State experienced a total of 51,552 fires. Incendiary and suspicious fires accounted for 11,421 (22.2%) of the fires. The dollar loss for the incendiary and suspicious fires totaled approximately \$163.6 million. The State Fire Marshal believes that these figures are significantly underestimated because they are submitted by local fire departments. Local fire department personnel are not trained in adjusting fire losses, and reported data does not include business interruption, job loss, and other relevant factors.

A complete and accurate fire loss database would allow FMD to make a comprehensive analysis of policyholders, insurance agents, insurance adjustors, public adjustors, and repair contractors involved in fire loss claims in an effort to link arsons to the criminal conspirators.

Section 29.4(2) of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* requires that insurance companies authorized to do business in Michigan promptly furnish information concerning a fire in Michigan on request. This report shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any other report required by law to be made by the company to other State agencies.

There were approximately 500 insurance companies registered in Michigan as of August 23, 2001. FMD personnel informed us that only 16 insurance companies reported fire loss data to FMD during calendar year 2001. FMD personnel indicated to us that they believe this is because the insurance companies want to guard their financial data. This lack of reporting causes an incomplete database, which greatly diminishes MIFLRS's value as a criminal investigation tool.

MIFLRS is not effective because the insurance companies do not provide FMD with the information necessary to comprehensively analyze fire loss statistics and determine individuals involved in fraudulent schemes.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that FMD perform an analysis of MIFLRS to determine whether FMD should abandon MIFLRS or develop a method to obtain from insurance companies the information necessary to analyze fire loss data.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MSP concurred with the finding that MIFLRS has not been effective because of a lack of insured loss data. MSP informed us that FMD has initiated an in-depth analysis of all factors to identify a methodology for obtaining the data to enable the system to function effectively.

FINDING

3. NFIRS

FMD did not receive the required fire incident reports from all fire departments. Therefore, this data was not entered into NFIRS.

Section 29.4 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* requires that each fire department report to FMD each fire occurring in the fire department's jurisdiction. On January 1, 1999, Michigan converted from a 1970s vintage fire incident reporting system to the new, Internet-based, NFIRS 5.0 system. The new system provides more complete data, has built-in checks and balances, and is a more effective and efficient way to receive and analyze fire data. FMD worked with the fire departments, providing them with either an electronic or a paper reporting program, depending on the fire departments' needs. FMD has contacted the nonreporting fire departments, explained the advantages of reporting and the consequences of not reporting, and offered to help the departments report this data.

Our review disclosed that 131 (12.1%) of 1,079 Michigan local fire departments did not supply fire incident information to FMD for calendar year 2000. While we could not determine the number of unreported fires for the year, we noted that 94 of the 131 nonreporting fire departments reported 3,878 (7.5%) of the 51,552 fires reported in calendar year 1998. Also, one fire department, which accounted for 14,001 (27.2%) of the fires reported for 1998, did not provide usable data to NFIRS for calendar year 2000.

NFIRS is used at the local, state, and national levels to identify trends in fire causes, fire-related injuries and deaths, product and equipment failures, and other

significant fire problems. The data is also used to assist fire investigators, validate the need for fire-related legislation, develop and update fire codes and standards, foster research in fire protection, identify safety and training needs, develop fire code enforcement programs, provide public fire safety awareness information, and maximize the allocation of resources available to effectively deal with the fire problem. Also, NFIRS compiles comprehensive statistical reports of all fires and hazardous materials incidents and FMD distributes these reports to various users.

Without usable data from these fire departments, NFIRS information is incomplete and possibly misleading.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that FMD continue its efforts to obtain the required fire incident reports from all fire departments.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MSP informed us that FMD fully intends to continue its efforts to obtain fire incident data from all fire departments and to obtain that data electronically. Electronic reporting builds in checks and balances that result in more accurate data and is much more efficient for the user and the State. MSP also informed us that Michigan has always been a leader in fire incident reporting nationally. Michigan has now, and has had for many years, the highest percentage of reporting departments of any state. Michigan was the first state to implement the new NFIRS and the first state to begin filing reports electronically under the new system.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Surveys

We developed four surveys (Exhibits A through D) requesting feedback from various individuals and agencies related to the effectiveness and efficiency of services provided to them by the Fire Marshal Division (FMD):

1. Investigators' Training

We mailed copies of this survey to 52 local investigators who had participated in FMD training programs during the period October 1, 1998 through July 31, 2001. This survey focused on the training requirements established by the respondents' employers and their satisfaction with courses administered by FMD. We received 32 (61.5%) responses, which are summarized in Exhibit A. A review of the responses indicated that 14 (43.8%) of the respondents' employers required investigators to maintain investigator certification and 17 (53.1%) required investigators to obtain continued training. Thirty (93.8%) of 32 respondents indicated that they were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the training provided by FMD. Also, most respondents indicated that they were admitted to an investigation school on the first application. However, a few respondents indicated that they applied from 2 to more than 5 times before they were accepted.

2. Local Fire Departments' Chiefs

We mailed copies of this survey to 97 fire departments throughout the State. This survey focused on personnel training requirements, extent of participation in and satisfaction with FMD training programs, and satisfaction with other services provided by FMD. We received 44 (45.4%) responses, which are summarized in Exhibit B. A review of the responses indicated that a majority of the fire departments with investigators required them to obtain some training and continuing education. A majority of the respondents were satisfied with the training provided. However, several respondents indicated that the firefighting training programs need to be updated. FMD has updated Fire Fighter I and II training, effective October 1, 2001. Overall, fire departments were very satisfied with the services provided by FMD.

3. Firefighters' Training

We mailed copies of this survey to 98 local firefighters who had participated in Michigan Fire Fighter Training Council training programs during the period October 1, 1998 through July 31, 2001. This survey focused on the respondents'

satisfaction with the training programs. We received 19 (19.4%) responses, which are summarized in Exhibit C. A review of the responses indicated that a majority of the individuals felt that the training provided by the Michigan Fire Fighter Training Council was effective.

4. Law Enforcement Agencies

We mailed copies of this survey to 41 local law enforcement agencies to which FMD had forwarded fire investigation cases for further investigation. This survey focused on the respondents' satisfaction with FMD investigation activities. We received 26 (63.4%) responses, which are summarized in Exhibit D. A review of the responses indicated that a majority of the agencies were very satisfied with FMD investigative assistance.

Following are copies of the surveys that include the number of responses received for each item. The total number of responses for each item may not agree with the number of responses reported above because some respondents provided more than one response to an item and other respondents did not answer all items.

FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION (FMD)
Michigan Department of State Police
Investigators' Training
Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed	52
Number of Responses	32
Response Rate	61.5%

1. Are you a certified arson or fire investigator? (If No, please go to question 3.)

<u>19</u>	Yes
<u>12</u>	No

2. If Yes, what organization are you certified under?

<u>9</u>	International Association of Arson Investigators
<u>10</u>	National Fire Protection Association
<u>9</u>	Other

3. Does your department require investigator certification?

<u>14</u>	Yes
<u>18</u>	No

4. Does your department require investigative training?

<u>21</u>	Yes
<u>11</u>	No

5. Does your department require continuing education for investigators?

<u>17</u>	Yes
<u>15</u>	No

6. How many years have you been investigating fires?

<u>15</u>	1 - 2 years
<u>12</u>	3 - 5 years
<u>0</u>	6 - 8 years
<u>5</u>	More than 8 years

7. Which FMD fire investigation schools have you completed and when?

<u>27</u>	Basic
<u>16</u>	Advanced
<u>15</u>	Vehicle
<u>10</u>	Follow-Up
<u>4</u>	Other

8. For each of the following, please identify how many times you applied to an investigation school before you were admitted?

<u>Type of School</u>	<u>1 time</u>	<u>2 times</u>	<u>3 times</u>	<u>4 times</u>	<u>5 or more times</u>
a. Basic	20	4	1	1	1
b. Advanced	13	3			
c. Vehicle	13	2			
d. Follow-Up	9		1		

9. How satisfied were you with the comprehensiveness and thoroughness of the training offered by FMD?

<u>27</u>	Very satisfied
<u>3</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>1</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>1</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	No opinion

10. How satisfied are you that FMD training enabled you to become a better fire investigator?

<u>23</u>	Very satisfied
<u>7</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>1</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>1</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	No opinion

11. Would you take other investigative training provided by FMD in the future?

<u>30</u>	Yes
<u>2</u>	No

12. Would you recommend FMD training to others?

<u>23</u>	Would highly recommend
<u>8</u>	Would recommend
<u>1</u>	Would not recommend

13. Are there any areas in which FMD could improve the quality of its investigative training program?

<u>17</u>	Yes
<u>15</u>	No

FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION (FMD)
Michigan Department of State Police
Local Fire Departments' Chiefs
Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed	97
Number of Responses	44
Response Rate	45.4%

Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council (MFFTC)

1. Which of the following training programs have your firefighters participated in since October 1, 1999? (Please select all that apply.)

<u>32</u>	Fire Fighter I
<u>29</u>	Fire Fighter II
<u>21</u>	Other

2. How effective were MFFTC programs in training your firefighters?

<u>26</u>	Very effective
<u>16</u>	Somewhat effective
<u>1</u>	Somewhat ineffective
<u>0</u>	Very ineffective
<u>1</u>	No opinion

3. Do any of the programs need to be updated to provide more relevance in fighting today's fires?

<u>16</u>	Yes
<u>27</u>	No

4. Is MFFTC receptive to changes in training programs to meet today's needs?

<u>35</u>	Yes
<u>8</u>	No

5. Are there other firefighters' training programs that MFFTC should consider which are not currently provided?

<u>12</u>	Yes
<u>30</u>	No

6. Are there any areas in which MFFTC could improve the quality of its firefighting training programs?

<u>20</u>	Yes
<u>24</u>	No

Investigative Resources Unit, Fire Marshal Division

7. Does your department have a fire investigator? (If No, please go to question 10)

<u>22</u>	Yes
<u>22</u>	No

8. If Yes to question 7, does your department require fire investigators to become certified?

<u>10</u>	Yes
<u>12</u>	No
<u>22</u>	Not applicable

9. Does your department require continuing education for its investigators?

<u>15</u>	Yes
<u>8</u>	No
<u>21</u>	Not applicable

10. How often do your fire department personnel interact with FMD investigators?

<u>0</u>	Daily
<u>1</u>	Weekly
<u>7</u>	Monthly
<u>10</u>	Annually
<u>10</u>	Never
<u>15</u>	Other

11. Annually, about how many times have you asked FMD to investigate a fire?

<u>13</u>	None
<u>24</u>	1 – 3
<u>5</u>	4 – 6
<u>2</u>	7 – 10
<u>1</u>	More than 10

12. How satisfied are you with the overall investigative assistance you receive from FMD?

<u>25</u>	Very satisfied
<u>7</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>0</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>10</u>	No opinion

13. How satisfied are you with the timeliness of the investigative assistance you receive from FMD?

<u>22</u>	Very satisfied
<u>10</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>0</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>10</u>	No opinion

14. How satisfied are you with the quality of investigative assistance you received from FMD?

<u>25</u>	Very satisfied
<u>6</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>0</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>10</u>	No opinion

15. How satisfied are you with the training your investigators received from FMD?

<u>19</u>	Very satisfied
<u>5</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>0</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>15</u>	No opinion

16. Would you recommend FMD investigation training to your department personnel?

$\frac{36}{1}$	Yes
	No

17. Are there any areas in which FMD could improve its specific investigation or investigative training programs?

$\frac{11}{27}$	Yes
	No

FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION (FMD)
Michigan Department of State Police
Firefighters' Training
Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed	98
Number of Responses	19
Response Rate	19.4%

1. Which of the following Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council (MFFTC) training programs have you participated in since October 1, 1999? (Please select all that apply.)

<u>13</u>	Fire Fighter I
<u>13</u>	Fire Fighter II
<u>5</u>	Other

2. How effective are MFFTC programs in helping you with your firefighting duties?

<u>12</u>	Very effective
<u>7</u>	Somewhat effective
<u>0</u>	Somewhat ineffective
<u>0</u>	Very ineffective
<u>0</u>	No opinion

3. Do any of the programs need to be updated to provide more relevance in fighting today's fires?

<u>5</u>	Yes
<u>14</u>	No

4. Are there other programs that MFFTC should consider for training which are not currently provided?

<u>3</u>	Yes
<u>14</u>	No

5. Are there any areas in which MFFTC could improve the quality of its training programs?

<u>9</u>	Yes
<u>9</u>	No

FIRE MARSHAL DIVISION (FMD)
 Michigan Department of State Police
 Law Enforcement Agencies
Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed 41
 Number of Responses 26
 Response Rate 63.4%

1. How often does your department personnel interact with FMD?

2	Daily
5	Weekly
1	Monthly
6	Annually
2	Never
10	Other

2. In the last 12 months, how many times has FMD referred a fire investigation case file to you for follow-up?

12	None
10	1 - 3
0	4 - 6
2	7 - 10
1	More than 10

3. How satisfied are you with the overall investigative assistance you receive from FMD?

21	Very satisfied
3	Somewhat satisfied
0	Somewhat dissatisfied
0	Very dissatisfied
2	No opinion

4. How satisfied are you with the completeness and accuracy of the case files you receive from FMD?

<u>21</u>	Very satisfied
<u>4</u>	Somewhat satisfied
<u>0</u>	Somewhat dissatisfied
<u>0</u>	Very dissatisfied
<u>1</u>	No opinion

5. Is there additional information that FMD could provide to you which would facilitate your investigations?

<u>3</u>	Yes
<u>23</u>	No

6. Do you have any other suggestions or comments regarding how FMD could improve its investigation activities?

<u>1</u>	Yes
<u>23</u>	No

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical for the amount of resources applied or minimizing the amount of resources required to attain a certain level of outputs or outcomes.
executive order	An official pronouncement of the Governor to reassign functions within the executive branch, establish boards or commissions, or carry out special projects appropriate to the executive authority of the Governor.
FMD	Fire Marshal Division.
IMS	information management system.
MFFTC	Michigan Fire Fighters Training Council.
MIFLRS	Michigan Insured Fire Loss Reporting System.
mission	The agency's main purpose or the reason that the agency was established.
MSP	Michigan Department of State Police.
NFIRS	National Fire Incident Reporting System.
performance audit	An economy and efficiency audit or a program audit that is designed to provide an independent assessment of the performance of a governmental entity, program, activity, or function to improve public accountability and to facilitate decision making by parties responsible for overseeing or initiating corrective action.

reportable condition

A matter coming to the auditor's attention that, in the auditor's judgment, should be communicated because it represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.