



MICHIGAN

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDIT REPORT



THOMAS H. MCTAVISH, C.P.A.
AUDITOR GENERAL

The auditor general shall conduct post audits of financial transactions and accounts of the state and of all branches, departments, offices, boards, commissions, agencies, authorities and institutions of the state established by this constitution or by law, and performance post audits thereof.

– Article IV, Section 53 of the Michigan Constitution

Audit report information can be accessed at:

<http://audgen.michigan.gov>



Michigan
Office of the Auditor General
REPORT SUMMARY

Performance Audit

Report Number:
 431-0316-06

Training and Staff Development

Department of Human Services

Released:
 March 2007

The Department of Human Services (DHS) has divided the responsibility for employee training among the Office of Professional Development, the Office of Training and Staff Development, and the Office of Child Support. In addition, the Purchased Services Division (PSD) and the Community Support Division (CSD) are responsible for ensuring that private agency contractors receive training as stated in their agreements with the contractors.

Audit Objective:

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of DHS's administration of the training and staff development functions.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that DHS was moderately effective and was efficient in administering the training and staff development functions. We identified one material condition. DHS had not instituted initial instruction requirements for newly hired family independence specialists (FIS) and eligibility specialists (ES) and continuing education requirements for all services specialists, FIS, and ES (Finding 1). We also identified a reportable condition related to the monitoring of private agency training (Finding 2).

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Audit Objective:

To assess the effectiveness of DHS's efforts in evaluating its training programs.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that DHS was not effective in evaluating its training programs. We identified one material condition. DHS had not developed a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness of its training programs for services specialists (Finding 3). We also identified a reportable condition related to child support specialist training (Finding 4).

While we did not identify any reportable conditions related to DHS's evaluation of training programs provided to FIS and ES, in reaching our conclusion, we considered the significant impact that critical decisions made by services specialists have on public safety and well-being. Effective training programs are crucial in providing these staff with the skills and knowledge needed to make consistent and accurate decisions.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Audit Objective:

To assess the effectiveness of DHS's efforts to ensure that protective service workers met the bachelor's degree requirement.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that DHS was effective in ensuring that protective service workers met the bachelor's degree requirement. Our report does not include any reportable conditions related to this audit objective.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Agency Response:

Our audit report contains 4 findings and 5 corresponding recommendations. DHS indicated that it agrees with the recommendations and has complied or will comply with them.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

A copy of the full report can be obtained by calling 517.334.8050 or by visiting our Web site at: <http://audgen.michigan.gov>



Michigan Office of the Auditor General
201 N. Washington Square
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Thomas H. McTavish, C.P.A.
Auditor General

Scott M. Strong, C.P.A., C.I.A.
Deputy Auditor General



STATE OF MICHIGAN
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL
201 N. WASHINGTON SQUARE
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
(517) 334-8050
FAX (517) 334-8079

THOMAS H. MCTAVISH, C.P.A.
AUDITOR GENERAL

March 27, 2007

Mrs. Marianne Udow, Director
Department of Human Services
Grand Tower
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mrs. Udow:

This is our report on the performance audit of Training and Staff Development, Department of Human Services (DHS).

This report contains our report summary; description; audit objectives, scope and methodology and agency responses; comments, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; a summary of critical job duties of DHS services specialists, family independence specialists, and eligibility specialists, 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 the audit.

AUDITOR GENERAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
Report Summary	1
Report Letter	3
Description	7
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses	9
COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES	
Effectiveness and Efficiency of Administration of Training and Staff Development Functions	13
1. Initial and Continuing Education Requirements	13
2. Monitoring of Private Agency Training	15
Effectiveness of Efforts in Evaluating Training Programs	18
3. Evaluation of Services Specialist Training	18
4. Child Support Specialist Training	21
Effectiveness of Efforts to Ensure Protective Service Workers Met the Bachelor's Degree Requirement	22
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION	
Critical Job Duties of DHS Services Specialists, Family Independence Specialists, and Eligibility Specialists	25

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

27

Description

The Department of Human Services (DHS) was created by the Executive Organization Act of 1965. DHS's mission* is to assist children, families, and vulnerable adults to be safe, stable, and self-supporting. DHS's values include developing its work force at all levels and ensuring accuracy and integrity in its work and programs.

In August 1998, DHS reengineered its training function by establishing the Office of Professional Development (OPD) within its Bureau of Human Resources. Previously, each administration that developed policy or systems was responsible for providing training to staff that implemented the policy or used the system.

DHS has since divided the responsibility for training its employees among OPD, the Office of Training and Staff Development (OTSD), and the Office of Child Support (OCS) Training Section. In addition, the Purchased Services Division (PSD) and the Community Support Division (CSD) are responsible for ensuring that private agency contractors receive training as stated in their agreements with the contractors.

OPD's mission is to provide learning and performance support to develop and retain employees who deliver excellent service to vulnerable families, children, and adults. OPD provides training to all DHS staff on administrative issues and training support services for the program offices that provide policy training. OPD manages the seven regional training centers.

OTSD's mission is to improve individual work performance by equipping people with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they must possess to be successful in their work. OTSD was established for the purpose of providing a coordinated training effort for local office staff in the Field Services Administration.

The OCS Training Section's purpose is to develop and deliver child support programmatic training and training materials to child support staff. This staff includes people involved in child support operations from the Friend of the Court offices, prosecuting attorney offices, and OCS.

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

PSD and CSD are responsible for ensuring that contracted agencies adhere to training requirements necessary to meet DHS's mission.

As of July 31, 2006, DHS had 10,107 employees, including 79 who administered the training programs as follows:

<u>Office or Division</u>	<u>Number of Employees</u>
OPD	11
OTSD	48
OCS	6
PSD	8
CSD	6
Total	<u>79</u>

OPD, OTSD, and OCS spent approximately \$6.1 million on training functions as of July 31, 2006. PSD and CSD expenditure details for their training functions were not available.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit* of Training and Staff Development, Department of Human Services (DHS), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness* and efficiency* of DHS's administration of the training and staff development functions.
2. To assess the effectiveness of DHS's efforts in evaluating its training programs.
3. To assess the effectiveness of DHS's efforts to ensure that protective service workers met the bachelor's degree requirement.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Department of Human Services' training and staff development functions. 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, performed from March 2002 through September 2006, included an examination of DHS training and staff development records for the period October 1999 through August 2006.

Audit Methodology

We interviewed DHS program staff to obtain an understanding of DHS's training and staff development operations. Also, we reviewed pertinent State statutes, contract language, policies, and procedures relating to the training requirements of DHS programs.

To accomplish our first objective, we reviewed program descriptions, policies, procedures, and State and federal regulations to determine the training requirements for the Office of Financial Assistance programs, Child Welfare programs, Adult Services programs, and Community and Support Services programs. We determined what types

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

of training were provided to program and contract employees. We identified the population of employees that should have received required training and tested a sample of them to determine if they attended all required training. In addition, we reviewed DHS's procedures for monitoring whether contract agency employees received all required training. We reviewed the frequency that training was provided during our audit period. Finally, we reviewed DHS's overall administrative responsibilities related to staff and professional development, including the services provided by DHS's Office of Professional Development and the tracking of training costs.

To accomplish our second objective, we reviewed what types of training were provided by the program areas, local offices, and contract agencies. We reviewed the types of assessments done by the program areas on the effectiveness of the training provided and how DHS used these assessments to improve training. We reviewed program descriptions, policies, procedures, and State and federal regulations to determine the training requirements for the Child Support Program. We determined what types of training was provided to program employees. We identified the population of employees that should have received required training and tested these to determine if they attended all required training. In addition, we reviewed DHS's procedures for monitoring whether contract agency employees received all required training. We reviewed the frequency that training was provided during our audit period.

To accomplish our third objective, we determined that the minimum education qualifications established by DHS and the Department of Civil Service for protective service workers was a bachelor's degree in one of 14 human services areas. We tested a sample of qualification information from the DHS databases to verify that the information was accurate and complete. We then tested qualification information from the DHS databases for all protective service workers hired from January 1999 to April 2006 to determine whether they met the minimum requirements.

We use a risk and opportunity based approach when selecting activities or programs to be audited. Accordingly, our audit efforts are focused on activities or programs having the greatest probability for needing improvement as identified through a preliminary review. By design, our limited audit resources are used to identify where and how improvements can be made. Consequently, our performance audit reports are prepared on an exception basis.

Agency Responses

Our audit report contains 4 findings and 5 corresponding recommendations. DHS indicated that it agrees with the recommendations and has complied or will comply with them.

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 DHS to develop a formal response to our audit findings and recommendations within 60 days after release of the audit report.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS,
AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT FUNCTIONS

COMMENT

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department of Human Services' (DHS's) administration of the training and staff development functions.

Audit Conclusion: We concluded that DHS was moderately effective and was efficient in administering the training and staff development functions. We identified one material condition*. DHS had not instituted initial instruction requirements for newly hired family independence specialists (FIS) and eligibility specialists (ES) and continuing education* requirements for all services specialists*, FIS, and ES (Finding 1). We also identified a reportable condition* related to monitoring of private agency training (Finding 2).

FINDING

1. Initial and Continuing Education Requirements

DHS had not instituted initial instruction requirements for newly hired FIS and ES and continuing education requirements for all services specialists, FIS, and ES.

The lack of initial instruction and continuing education requirements limited DHS's assurance that its services specialists, FIS, and ES had or maintained the skills necessary to fulfill their responsibilities, including ensuring public safety. We had identified conditions regarding services specialists, FIS, and ES not including supporting documentation in service plans, conducting timely reviews, or ensuring necessary services were provided in the DHS Single Audit* report (43-100-05), the Children's Foster Care Program audit report (43-278-03), the Adult Protective Services audit report (43-260-02), and Adult Protective Services audit follow-up report (43-260-02F). Often, DHS responded that it would provide policy instruction and implement new policies and processes to correct the conditions. Staff training would be an integral part of implementing these corrective actions.

* See glossary at end of report for definition.

Our review of the administration of training and staff development functions noted:

- a. DHS did not require its newly hired FIS or ES to attend initial instruction.

Initial instruction is essential for these newly hired staff to provide effective casework services to socially and economically disadvantaged clients. Initial instruction would provide staff with the specific skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed to perform their functions. DHS has developed a competency-based core curriculum for FIS and ES as required by the DHS Administrative Handbook. According to the Handbook, the curriculum is expected to be mandatory for newly hired FIS and ES.

However, DHS did not ensure that all FIS and ES hired between February 1, 2004 and February 26, 2006 completed initial instruction. We found that 5 (9%) of 57 and 2 (6%) of 35 FIS and ES, respectively, did not complete initial instruction.

DHS informed us that it did not enforce mandatory initial training attendance because it wanted to provide local DHS offices with flexibility in hiring and training new workers in-house.

- b. DHS did not require all services specialists, FIS, and ES to obtain continuing education.

Continuing education provides staff with additional skills, knowledge, and attitudes to enhance and improve their effectiveness. Section 722.629 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* requires that DHS ensure a continuing education program for its child welfare staff. DHS requires some services specialists, foster care workers, and adoption workers to meet a minimum of 16 hours of continuing education each year. However, the other DHS services specialists (child protective service, adult service, and juvenile justice workers) had no continuing education requirements. In addition, the DHS Administrative Handbook states that DHS is committed to investing in its employees by providing professional development opportunities to support excellence in performance.

We reviewed DHS's training attendance records for the period February 1, 2004 through February 25, 2006 and found that 472 (90%) of 525 adult service staff; 1,107 (56%) of 1,973 FIS; and 676 (46%) of 1,479 ES did not obtain any continuing education.

Job specifications for services specialists, FIS, and ES include interpreting behavioral problems, developing plans, providing counseling, coordinating programs and services, and providing casework services and preparing social case histories (see supplemental information). Continuing education is an essential activity for ensuring quality services for clients.

Our discussions with adult service staff indicated a desire for continuing education or refresher training. DHS informed us that adult service staff could have attended some training sponsored by DHS local offices, but the sessions were not documented in its training database. Interviews conducted with FIS and ES noted that 12 (36%) of 33 and 16 (53%) of 30, respectively, stated that they needed continuing education to effectively perform their functions.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DHS institute initial instruction requirements for newly hired FIS and ES and continuing education requirements for all services specialists, FIS, and ES.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DHS agrees and it informed us that, effective January 1, 2007, all newly hired FIS and ES are required to attend initial instruction. Also, DHS agrees that all services specialists, FIS, and ES should receive continuing education training. DHS will improve its documentation process to demonstrate that staff are attending such training.

FINDING

2. Monitoring of Private Agency Training

DHS had not instituted a monitoring process to ensure that contracted private agency staff providing adoption services received all required training. Also, DHS did not ensure that contracted private agency staff providing foster care and Families First of Michigan (FFM) services attended all required training. As a

result, DHS had limited assurance that private agency staff had the skills necessary to help ensure the safety and well-being of Michigan children and to preserve family life.

DHS contracts with private agencies to provide certain foster care, adoption, short-term crisis intervention, and family education services. These services are critical to ensure the safety and well-being of Michigan children and to preserve family life. Approximately 37% of the foster care and adoption services DHS provides are from contracted private agencies. All of the FFM services DHS provides are from contracted private agencies.

Section 722.629 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* provides that DHS shall ensure a continuing education program for department, probate court, and private agency personnel. The program is required to include training relating to the diagnosis and treatment of child abuse and neglect to safeguard and enhance the welfare of children and preserve family life. Also, DHS stipulates through its contract or other communications with private agencies that their staff will receive program specific training within specified time periods after they are hired. In 1997, DHS established the Child Welfare Institute (CWI), an eight-week, skill-based training program for all newly hired DHS child welfare employees, supervisors, and contracted private agency staff.

We selected samples of private agency staff that DHS contracted to provide adoption, foster care, and FFM services from February 1, 2004 to August 2, 2005 to determine if the staff had obtained the required training. We determined:

- a. Four (21%) of 19 private agency staff providing adoption services did not attend all of the required CWI training courses within 6 months of hire as required by DHS letters to the adoption service agencies. DHS informed us that it did not have a monitoring process to ensure that these staff attended the CWI training program.
- b. Six (30%) of 20 private agency staff providing foster care services did not complete the required CWI training courses on a timely basis. These 6 staff worked an average of over 8 months before receiving the required training. DHS conducted periodic reviews of the agencies providing foster care services to ensure that agencies adhered to contract provisions requiring CWI training

for newly hired staff within 3 months of hire date. However, DHS was unable to monitor compliance with the training requirement because the periodic reviews were not made at intervals that would identify newly hired staff promptly and DHS did not require these private agencies to contact it when a new worker was hired. DHS informed us that foster care staff at private agencies can change weekly.

- c. Two (20%) of 10 private agency staff who began providing FFM services in 2004 had not completed all required core training as of July 31, 2005. The FFM contract provisions and the FFM Handbook required staff to receive initial training before working any cases. DHS informed us that the two staff missed only one day of the core training each. However, the core training was segregated into three courses, and one staff member missed 33% of the Core A course and the other staff member missed 50% of the Core B course.
- d. Eleven (73%) of 15 private agency staff providing FFM services had not completed mandatory special topic training such as domestic violence, substance abuse, and supervisory training required for workers or supervisors. The FFM contract provisions and the FFM Handbook require staff to participate in ongoing training. When we informed DHS of these exceptions, it stated that there is no set time period for the private agency staff to complete this training. However, in our review of the DHS training correspondence, training schedules to the FFM contract agencies, and contract provisions, we noted that the mandatory special topic training should be completed after the worker or supervisor is working for 3 or 6 months depending on the topic. We determined that the staff had been working for 7 to 17 months without taking the mandatory special topic training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that DHS institute a monitoring process to ensure that contracted private agency staff providing adoption services receive all required training.

We also recommend that DHS ensure that contracted private agency staff providing foster care and FFM services attend all required training.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DHS agrees and informed us that it has put a corrective action plan in place to ensure that contractually required training is completed by private agency staff.

EFFECTIVENESS OF EFFORTS IN EVALUATING TRAINING PROGRAMS

COMMENT

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of DHS's efforts in evaluating its training programs.

Audit Conclusion: **We concluded that DHS was not effective in evaluating its training programs.** We identified one material condition. DHS had not developed a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness of its training programs for services specialists (Finding 3). We also identified a reportable condition related to child support specialist training (Finding 4).

While we did not identify any reportable conditions related to DHS's evaluation of training programs provided to FIS and ES, in reaching our conclusion, we considered the significant impact that critical decisions made by services specialists have on public safety and well-being. Effective training programs are crucial in providing these staff with the skills and knowledge needed to make consistent and accurate decisions.

FINDING

3. Evaluation of Services Specialist Training

DHS had not developed a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness of its training programs for services specialists. As a result, DHS had limited assurance that these staff had the opportunity to develop the skills necessary to make correct and consistent decisions in fulfilling their responsibilities.

Generally, a comprehensive training program would include an identification of current and future training needs for services specialists, development of training courses to train staff in areas that relate to critical decision making as well as functional aspects of their responsibilities, and methods to evaluate the

effectiveness of the training. In our review of the DHS training evaluation process, we noted:

- a. DHS did not fully identify current and future training needs of its services specialists. For example, DHS did not document training needs based on staff performance weaknesses, changes in State policy, federal mandates, and computer systems. DHS identifies professional development as an important process that its supervisors need to support in its Administrative Handbook. The DHS Administrative Handbook states that, before professional development is initiated, the supervisor should determine staff training needs, how to meet these identified needs, and how to evaluate whether the training needs are met.

DHS informed us that it relies on local offices for notification of identified staff training needs by way of local office management and combined local and central office committees. However, our interviews of DHS local office services specialists and supervisors noted that only informal, undocumented discussions between staff and supervisors are held regarding training needs related to program specific issues. Consequently, there is no assurance that training needs discussed between staff and supervisors reach DHS central office for analysis.

- b. DHS did not fully evaluate the effectiveness of its training programs for its services specialists. Such a process would include initial and follow-up evaluation from services specialists and supervisors, identification of how the current training did or did not meet the needs and expectations of staff, and the use of evaluations to precipitate changes to existing training programs or the development of new training programs. We noted:
 - (1) DHS's process is to obtain initial evaluations of services specialist training that it provided. We sampled training programs offered by the Office of Training and Staff Development (OTSD) for services specialists and noted that 7 (64%) of 11 training program files did not contain the specialists' initial evaluations. The DHS Administrative Handbook states that the professional development process should utilize feedback from trainees to make improvements on an ongoing basis.

- (2) DHS frequently did not make follow-up contact with services specialists or their supervisors to determine if the training provided was effective after the specialists returned to their duties. The DHS Administrative Handbook requires, in addition to utilizing feedback from trainees, that supervisors identify what training competencies went well and what could be done differently. Our sample of training programs offered by OTSD for services specialists noted that none of the 11 training program files contained documentation of follow-up evaluations with specialists after the specialists had returned to their duties. Follow-up evaluations of training would give DHS information on how well the training provided met the needs and expectations of the specialists to effectively perform their duties and aid in their decision making.

Services specialists informed us that they felt they could provide better evaluations of their training after they had used the training on the job. DHS performs follow-up evaluations with ES and FIS regarding training they receive, and we were informed by DHS that these follow-up evaluations are beneficial in determining what training was effective and future training needs.

- c. DHS did not obtain written evaluations of training provided to services specialists by other public agencies, private vendors, and DHS local offices. As a result, DHS was unable to consider whether this training met the needs and expectations of services specialists and whether it should be provided on a Statewide basis. An understanding of training used by each DHS local office would help DHS to coordinate the best training available to all services specialists across the State. The DHS Administrative Handbook encourages the use of outsourced training programs that meet identified professional development needs.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DHS develop a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness of its training programs for services specialists.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DHS agrees that a comprehensive evaluation process for training programs is important and will expand and enhance its evaluation process.

FINDING

4. Child Support Specialist Training

DHS should further enhance its child support specialist training process by developing a recordkeeping system that includes long-term tracking of attendance and documentation of the evaluation of training provided to child support specialists.

The development of such a system would help DHS ensure that its child support specialists received the training necessary to effectively and efficiently administer the Child Support Program. Documentation is necessary for DHS to ensure that all information is considered at the time DHS makes changes to training courses.

During our audit fieldwork, DHS established a Statewide training program for child support specialists. However, DHS had not implemented key elements of a comprehensive program. Our review disclosed:

- a. DHS did not have a permanent recordkeeping system to provide long-term tracking of the type, duration, and dates of training completed by child support specialists. Such a system would allow DHS to determine if child support specialists received training for the competency-based core curriculum and help to identify current and future training needs.

DHS's tracking of training completed by child support specialists consisted of a paper sign-in sheet, which the record retention schedule required DHS to maintain for up to two years, and course evaluations, which were retained for no more than a year. DHS should establish a more permanent electronic training tracking system, such as an electronic spreadsheet, or modify its record retention schedule to require the permanent retention of training records to ensure that DHS has historical training information on its child support specialists.

- b. DHS's training evaluation process did not include documentation of follow-up evaluations from child support specialist staff and supervisors, documentation identifying how the current training did or did not meet those needs, and documentation of the use of the information to precipitate changes to existing training programs or the development of new training programs.

DHS informed us that it held discussions regarding whether the training resulted in observable performance improvements and met child support specialist needs and supervisor expectations of key operational performance. However, DHS did not believe it was necessary to document these discussions.

The OCS Training Section's mission statement states that its comprehensive training program would include an identification of current and future training needs, development of training courses to meet those needs, and evaluations by management and staff of the training taken by child support specialists.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DHS further enhance its child support specialist training process by developing a recordkeeping system that includes long-term tracking of attendance and documentation of the evaluation of training provided to child support specialists.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DHS agrees and informed us that it has developed a spreadsheet that will provide a long-term record of training attendance. DHS also will document supervisory input of training effectiveness.

EFFECTIVENESS OF EFFORTS TO ENSURE PROTECTIVE SERVICE WORKERS MET THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE REQUIREMENT

BACKGROUND

DHS protective service workers are required to possess at least a bachelor's degree in one of 14 human services areas as detailed in the Department of Civil Service's job specifications. DHS maintains this degree information for protective service workers hired from 1998 to 2006 on two DHS databases.

COMMENT

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of DHS's efforts to ensure that protective service workers met the bachelor's degree requirement.

Audit Conclusion: We concluded that DHS was effective in ensuring that protective service workers met the bachelor's degree requirement. Our report does not include any reportable conditions related to this audit objective.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Department of Human Services (DHS)

Critical Job Duties of DHS Services Specialists, Family Independence Specialists, and Eligibility Specialists

DHS Services Specialists	DHS Family Independence Specialists	DHS Eligibility Specialists
Interprets behavioral problems for parents and other caregivers and otherwise assists them in providing appropriate care to children; conducts family assessment and placement studies.	Interviews clients to assess employment potential and determine any barriers to self-sufficiency.	
Screens individuals newly committed to DHS and develops plans for care, service, treatment, and learning.	Develops plans to address clients' problems in housing, transportation, child care, training, counseling, and other areas that are barriers to employment.	
Provides direct counseling services to clients.	Provides direct counseling services to clients.	
Provides or secures protective services for endangered children and adults; provides 24-hour crisis intervention assistance; recruits and trains new foster parents; determines the appropriate methods and courses of action to implement service, treatment, and learning plans; finds resources to address clients' and families' problems in housing, counseling, and other areas.	Determines the appropriate methods and courses of action to implement service, treatment, and learning plans. Also, serves as liaison between DHS and community groups.	Refers clients to other agencies or service programs as appropriate; contacts landlords, nursing homes, physicians, court officials, and others to verify eligibility decisions; authorizes immediate assistance on an emergency basis when warranted.
Provides casework services to dependent, neglected, abused, disabled, and delinquent children and youths; socially and economically disadvantaged and dependent adult clients; and other individuals and families.	Interviews clients to make eligibility determinations for assistance programs; explains program requirements; conducts periodic case review interviews; explains social contract obligation to clients; computes clients' budgets for assistance; assists clients in the completion of application forms for assistance programs.	Maintains an ongoing caseload for assigned clients; determines the type and amount of assistance for which clients are eligible; conducts annual redeterminations of clients' eligibility status for assistance programs; processes changes as necessary to clients' cases.
Writes and maintains social case histories, case summaries, case records, and related reports.	Writes and maintains social case histories, case summaries, case records, and related reports.	Keeps case history files current; writes social summaries for medical assistance cases; writes hearing summaries.

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

continuing education	Education and training that are oriented to maintain, improve, or enhance knowledge, values, and skills.
CSD	Community Support Division.
CWI	Child Welfare Institute.
DHS	Department of Human Services.
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical with the minimum amount of resources.
ES	eligibility specialists.
FFM	Families First of Michigan.
FIS	family independence specialists.
material condition	A reportable condition that could impair the ability of management to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner and/or could adversely affect the judgment of an interested person concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
mission	The agency's main purpose or the reason that the agency was established.
OCS	Office of Child Support.
OPD	Office of Professional Development.
OTSD	Office of Training and Staff Development.

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.
PSD	Purchased Services Division.
reportable condition	A matter that, in the auditor's judgment, represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.
services specialists	Employees who complete and oversee a variety of professional assignments to provide services to socially and economically disadvantaged individuals in programs administered by the Department of Human Services such as protective services, foster care, adoption, juvenile justice, foster home licensing, and adult services.
Single Audit	A financial audit, performed in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996, that is designed to meet the needs of all federal grantor agencies and other financial report users. In addition to performing the audit in accordance with the requirements of auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in <i>Government Auditing Standards</i> issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, a Single Audit requires the assessment of compliance with requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program and the consideration of internal control over compliance in accordance with U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133.

