

Fiscal Year 2023 CSA Local Agency - Annual Risk Assessment Survey

The Program Audit Activity of the Office of Children's Services (OCS) is responsible for evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of governance, risk management, internal control, and compliance activities of local CSA programs, governed by requirements established in the Code of Virginia, Children's Services Act (§ 2.2-5200) and policies adopted by the State Executive Council (SEC). The basis for audit selections include risk assessment, management and stakeholder input, and the established audit cycle (every three years). The purpose of this survey is to collect information pertaining to local CSA programs that is necessary to complete the risk assessment, and to solicit input from local agency stakeholders that is specific to each of the individual programs.

Instructions: Survey questions may be discussed with the full Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT). However, the CPMT Chair or designee should complete and submit only one survey per locality. Responses are due by 5:00pm on Monday, May 16, 2022.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Stephanie Bacote, Program Audit Manager at (804) 662-7441.

Respondent's Contact Information (In case follow-up is necessary)

Locality Name *

Dinwiddie

Respondent's Name *

Natachia Randles

Respondent's Title *

CPMT Chair

Respondent's Phone Number *

804-469-4524

Inherent Risk Evaluation

The following risk factors may hinder achievement of objectives, if mitigating actions are not taken. Please rate the degree in which your local CSA program has experienced or have been affected by the situations described below.

(Note: A high rating is indicative that the risk exposure described exists and has significantly affected the local program. A low rating is indicative that the risk exposure is not present, or where it exists that there has been little or no affect to the local program.)

CHANGES IN OPERATIONS: Extent to which changes in funding, staffing, operating practices/procedures over the last 24 months have affected your local program as the changes are absorbed. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

PRESSURE TO MEET OBJECTIVES: Extent to which the local program has been vulnerable to reductions in the quality of service provided, increased operating cost, or lessening of controls/ procedures to achieve federal, state, and local objectives. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

ADVERSE PUBLICITY: Extent to which unfavorable exposures (industry and/or public media) over the last 24 months have affected your local program's ability to secure and maintain public trust and confidence. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

SERVICE DELAYS: Over the last 24 months, the extent to which failure to meet stated service ^{*} levels has seriously affected relations with stakeholders, created serious internal problems, and/or affected the program's reputation.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA: Extent of loss or embarrassment over the last 24 months that ^{*} was due to unauthorized or premature disclosure of protected information.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

INACCURATE DATA: Extent that incorrect data generated over the last 24 months has affected the integrity and reliability of data reported by the local program, and consequently shared by other state and local stakeholders. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

PROCESSING SOPHISTICATION: Extent to which the reliability of manual and/or automated technology processes used in the local program's process flow over the last 24 months has impacted performance of daily operating activities. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

HISTORY OF FRAUD: Extent to which actual or alleged incidences fraud occurring with in the ^{*} past 24 months has impacted the local program.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

Control Risk Evaluation

The following factors that are established to mitigate risks could potentially lose their effectiveness over time, and thus no longer function as intended. Please rate the degree in which your local CSA program has experienced or has been affected by the situations described below.

(Note: A low rating is indicative that the risk control described exists and is functioning as intended. A high rating is indicative that the risk control described does not exist, or where it does exist that the control is not working as intended).

EXPERIENCE LEVEL OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM: Collectively, the extent of management's ^{*} understanding of state and local CSA operations and understanding of management principles (planning, directing, and monitoring). Consider length of CSA experience.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECURITY: Extent that appropriate actions have been taken to * protect sensitive/confidential data from unauthorized access, such as the use of restricted areas, passwords, and encryption devices.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

AUDIT COVERAGE: Extent that internal and/or external reviews are of a quality and frequency * of which to provide comprehensive evaluations of the local program.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

ABILITY TO OVERRIDE POLICY: Extent of the ease to which management takes actions that supersede the state and local policies/procedures adopted that govern the local program. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

CONTINGENCY PLANNING: Existence of a documented plan to ensure continuation of services in the event of an emergency (e.g. natural disaster) or other short/long-term service disruptions (e.g. extended absence of CSA Coordinator). *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

ADEQUACY OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: Extent to which local program policies and procedures are written, comprehensive, clear, accessible, aligned w/federal and state laws and policies where applicable, periodically reviewed and updated. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

MEASURABLE GOAL/OBJECTIVES/PERFORMANCE TARGETS: Extent to which the management team has established benchmarks to gauge achievement; that are documented, reviewed/updated periodically, and disseminated. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

MANAGEMENT REVIEW/QUALITY ASSURANCE: Extent to which the management team regularly receives and effectively acts upon formal reports detailing major aspects of the local program to ensure compliance with state and local requirements. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

TRAINING: Extent to which a conscious effort is made to regularly provide training to local program stakeholders; that there is evidence that training needs of key stakeholders are met. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

SEGREGATION OF DUTIES: Extent to which duties in the local program's processing stream (i.e., service planning recommendations by FAPT and funding authorizations by CPMT) are optimally separate. *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Extent to which local representatives adhere to state and local disclosure requirements (i.e. timely notification; completed disclosure forms; abstain from voting where applicable). *

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

Stakeholder Feedback

All local programs are scheduled to be audited during the current three year audit cycle (Fiscal Years 2020-2022). Audit selections are based on the evaluation of many factors, including but not limited to risk/severity concerns, availability of resources, and input from OCS management and other state/local CSA stakeholders. Please note that a response to the following questions would NOT automatically result in the local CSA program receiving a higher risk ranking in the scheduling of audit priorities.

Please list and briefly describe any best practices, major achievements, and/ or concerns that you have regarding your local CSA program.

It helps that the local CSA Coordinator communicates well with members and provide adequate training year round. Best practice that I would share is that the CSA Coordinator lead the CPMT meetings and are well versed in the content being presented.

Are there any particular areas of your program that you would like a callback from an auditor to discuss considerations for a more focused review? If yes, please provide a brief description.

no

This form was created inside of Commonwealth of Virginia.

Google Forms