

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED]

Claimant

Reg. No: 2009-19118
Issue No: 1038
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
May 20, 2009
Genesee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Gary F. Heisler

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9; and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held on May 20, 2009. Claimant appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services properly sanction claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case for failure to participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- (1) Claimant was an ongoing recipient of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits.
- (2) On November 19, 2008, claimant was noncompliant with Work First/Jobs, Education and Training Program (JET) participation requirements.

(3) On December 9, 2008, claimant attended a triage meeting. The department determined there was no good cause for claimant's failure to participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. Claimant did not dispute the finding and signed a First Non-Compliance Letter (DHS-754). Claimant was referred back to the Work First/Jobs, Education and Training Program (JET).

(4) On December 10, 2008, claimant attended Work First. Claimant reported she had just started working 22 hours per week.

(5) On December 15, 2008, claimant did not provide Work First with a pay stub to verify her hours of work.

(6) On December 18, 2008, Work First spoke to claimant's work place. Work First worker Trent, recorded that claimant's manager informed her that claimant worked 10 hours per week.

(7) On January 7, 2009, a Work First worker recorded that claimant had participated 20 hours for the week of 12/22-26/08.

(8) On January 14, 2009, Work First determined that claimant was non-compliant some time in December 2008, based on a bi-weekly pay check stub from claimant for the pay period ending December 14, 2008.

(9) On January 28, 2009, claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case was reinstated by the Department.

(10) On February 25, 2009, Work First requested a triage with DHS for claimant.

(11) On February 26, 2009, claimant was sent a Notice of Non-Compliance (DHS-2444). The notice also scheduled an appointment for March 5, 2009.

(12) On February 26, 2009, claimant was also sent a Verification Checklist (DHS Form 3503) requesting pay check stubs and any other income information. The checklist noted

the scheduled appointment on March 5, 2009, but listed the due date for the requested information as March 6, 2009.

(13) On March 5, 2009, claimant did not appear for the scheduled meeting.

(14) On March 6, 2009, claimant came in the office because she thought that was the date for the meeting. Another meeting was scheduled for March 10, 2009.

(15) On March 10, 2009, claimant appeared for the scheduled meeting. The DHS case worker determined there was no good cause.

(16) On March 18, 2009, claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) was sanctioned.

(17) On March 31, 2009, claimant submitted a request for hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Department policy provides the following guidance for case workers. The Department's policies are available on the internet through the Department's website.

FAILURE TO MEET EMPLOYMENT AND/OR SELSUFFICIENCY-RELATED REQUIREMENTS:

FIP

DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY

FIP

DHS requires clients to participate in employment and self-sufficiency related activities and to accept employment when offered. Our focus is to assist clients in removing barriers so they can participate in activities which lead to self-sufficiency. However, there are consequences for a client who refuses to participate, without good cause.

The goal of the FIP penalty policy is to obtain client compliance with appropriate work and/or self-sufficiency related assignments and to ensure that barriers to such compliance have been identified and removed. The goal is to bring the client into compliance. Noncompliance may be an indicator of possible disabilities. Consider further exploration of any barriers.

DEPARTMENT POLICY

FIP

All Work Eligible Individual (WEI) and adult non-WEIs (except ineligible grantees, clients deferred for lack of child care (DC) and disqualified aliens), see PEM 228, who fail, without good cause, to participate in employment or self-sufficiency-related activities, must be penalized.

Depending on the case situation, penalties include the following:

- Delay in eligibility at application.
- Ineligibility (denial or termination of FIP with no minimum penalty period).
- Case closure for a minimum of three or 12 months.

See PEM 233B for the Food Assistance Program (FAP) policy when the FIP penalty is closure. For the Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) penalty policy, see PEM 233C.

NONCOMPLIANCE WITH EMPLOYMENT AND/OR SELF SUFFICIENCY RELATED ACTIVITIES

As a condition of eligibility, all WEIs and non-WEIs must work or engage in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities.

Noncompliance of applicants, recipients, or member adds means doing **any** of the following **without** good cause:

Exception: Do not apply the three or 12 month penalty to ineligible caretakers, clients deferred for lack of child care (DC) and disqualified aliens. Failure to complete a FAST or FSSP results in closure due to failure to provide requested verification. Clients can reapply at any time.

- Failing or refusing to:
 - Appear and participate with the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employment service provider.
 - Complete a Family Automated Screening Tool (FAST), as assigned as the first step in the FSSP process.

Note: FIS should clear the FAST Fall Out Report and any FAST confirmation information the client has obtained before considering a client noncompliant for FAST non-completion.
 - Develop a Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (FSSP) or a Personal Responsibility Plan and Family Contract (PRPFC).

Note: FIS must have scheduled a FSSP completion appointment with the client and the client failed to attend before considering a client noncompliant for FSSP non-completion.
 - Comply with activities assigned to on the Family Self Sufficiency Plan (FSSP) or PRPFC.
 - Provide legitimate documentation of work participation.
 - Appear for a scheduled appointment or meeting.
 - Participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities.
 - Accept a job referral.
 - Complete a job application.
 - Appear for a job interview (see the exception below).
- Stating orally or in writing a definite intent not to comply with program requirements.

- Threatening, physically abusing or otherwise behaving disruptively toward anyone conducting or participating in an employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activity.
- Refusing employment support services if the refusal prevents participation in an employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activity.

Refusing Suitable Employment.

Refusing suitable employment means doing any of the following:

- Voluntarily reducing hours or otherwise reducing earnings.
- Quitting a job (see exception below).

Exception: This does NOT apply if:

- The MWA verifies the client changed jobs or reduced hours in order to participate in an MWA approved education and training program.
- A teen parent or dependent child quits a seasonal job to return to a high school or GED program.
- Firing for misconduct or absenteeism (not for incompetence).

Note: Misconduct sufficient to warrant firing includes any action by an employee or other adult group member that is harmful to the interest of the employer, and is done intentionally or in disregard of the employer's interest, or is due to gross negligence. It includes but is not limited to drug or alcohol influence at work, physical violence, and theft or willful destruction of property connected with the individual's work.

- Refusing a bona fide offer of employment or additional hours up to 40 hours per week. A bona fide offer of employment means a definite offer paying wages of at least the applicable state minimum wage. The employment may be on a shift; full or part time up to 40 hours per week; and temporary, seasonal or permanent.

GOOD CAUSE FOR NONCOMPLIANCE

Good cause is a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors

that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. A claim of good cause must be verified and documented for member adds and recipients.

NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTIES AT APPLICATION

Noncompliance by a WEI while the application is pending results in group ineligibility. A WEI applicant who refused employment without good cause, within 30 days prior to the date of application or while the application is pending must have benefits delayed.

A good cause determination is not required for applicants who are noncompliant prior to FIP case opening.

NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTIES FOR ACTIVE FIP CASES AND MEMBER ADDS

The penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP closure.

Effective April 1, 2007, the following minimum penalties apply:

- For the first occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 3 calendar months unless the client is excused from the noncompliance as noted in “First Case Noncompliance Without Loss of Benefits” below.
- For the second occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 3 calendar months.
- For the third and subsequent occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 12 calendar months.

The penalty counter also begins April 1, 2007 regardless of the previous number of noncompliance penalties.

Begin the sanction period with the first pay period of a month. Penalties are automatically calculated by the entry of noncompliance without good cause on the FSSP. This applies to active FIP cases, including those with a member add who is a WEI JET participant.

TRIAGE

JET participants will not be terminated from a JET program without first scheduling a “triage” meeting with the client to jointly discuss noncompliance and good cause. Locally coordinate a

process to notify the MWA case manager of triage meetings including scheduling guidelines.

Clients can either attend a meeting or participate in a conference call if attendance at the triage meeting is not possible. If a client calls to reschedule an already scheduled triage meeting, offer a phone conference at that time. Clients must comply with triage requirements within the negative action period.

When a phone triage is conducted for a first noncompliance and the client agrees to comply, complete the DHS-754, First Noncompliance Letter, as you would complete in a triage meeting. Note in the client signature box "Client Agreed by Phone". Immediately send a copy of the DHS-754 to the client and phone the JET case manager if the compliance activity is to attend JET.

Determine good cause based on the best information available during the triage and prior to the negative action date. Good cause may be verified by information already on file with DHS or MWA.

HEARINGS

Expedited Hearings

Staff must identify cases for SOAHR (administrative hearings) when a client files a hearing based on closure due to noncompliance with an employment and/or self-sufficiency related activity. SOAHR has agreed to expedite these hearing requests in an effort to engage clients in a timely manner and improve the state's overall work participation rate.

Write "**Expedited Hearing E&T**" at the top of the hearing request so that it can be easily identified as a priority. Refer to PAM 600, "[Expedited Hearings](#)" for additional instructions.

Hearing Decisions

When a hearing decision is upheld for noncompliance, impose the penalty for the first full month possible for either 3 or 12 months. Do not recoup benefits.

In an Administrative Law Hearing requested by a Department of Human Services client, the client is disputing the validity of an action taken by the department. The department has the initial burden of proof to show that their action was correct. To meet that burden the department is required to present sufficient evidence to show: what their action was, that the client had

appropriate notice of the action, and the facts that justify the action. Department policy does not provide much guidance on the reliability of information which a caseworker can use in deciding to take action. Nothing in Department of Human Services policy prohibits a caseworker from taking action on what they believe happened. The evidentiary standard of an Administrative Law Hearing are more stringent.

Admission of evidence during an Administrative Law Hearing on Department of Human Services' matters is not strictly governed by the Michigan Rules of Evidence. In accordance with the Michigan Administrative Procedures Act, an Administrative Law Judge may admit and give probative effect to any evidence. However, the final decision and order must be supported by and in accordance with competent, material, and substantial evidence.

Black's Law Dictionary defines competent evidence as: "That which the very nature of the thing to be proven requires, as, the production of writing where its contents are the subject of inquiry. Also generally, admissible or relevant, as the opposite of incompetent."

Black's Law Dictionary defines incompetent evidence as: "Evidence which is not admissible under the established rules of evidence; evidence which the law does not permit to be presented at all, or in relation to the particular matter, on account of lack of originality or of some defect in the witness, the document, or the nature of the evidence itself."

The Michigan Rules of Evidence include:

Rule 102 Purpose

These rules are intended to secure fairness in administration, elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay, and promotion of growth and development of the law of evidence to the end that the truth may be ascertained and proceedings justly determined.

Rule 601 Witnesses; General Rule of Competency

Unless the court finds after questioning a person that the person does not have sufficient physical or mental capacity or sense of obligation to testify truthfully and understandably, every person is

competent to be a witness except as otherwise provided in these rules.

Rule 602 Lack of Personal Knowledge

A witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter. Evidence to prove personal knowledge may, but need not, consist of the witness' own testimony. This rule is subject to the provisions of Rule 703, relating to opinion testimony by expert witnesses.

Rule 801 Hearsay; Definitions

The following definitions apply under this article:

(a) *Statement*. A "statement" is (1) an oral or written assertion or (2) nonverbal conduct of a person, if it is intended by the person as an assertion.

(b) *Declarant*. A "declarant" is a person who makes a statement.

(c) *Hearsay*. "Hearsay" is a statement, other than the one made by the declarant while testifying at the trial or hearing, offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted.

Rule 802 Hearsay Rule

Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules.

Rule 803 Hearsay Exceptions; Availability of Declarant Immaterial

The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule, even though the declarant is available as a witness:

(6) *Records of regularly conducted activity*. A memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, in any form, of acts, transactions, occurrences, events, conditions, opinions, or diagnoses, made at or near the time by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge, if kept in the course of a regularly conducted business activity, and if it was the regular practice of that business activity to make the memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, all as shown by the testimony of the custodian or other qualified witness, or by certification that complies with a rule promulgated by the supreme court or a statute permitting certification, unless the source of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness. The term "business" as used in this paragraph

includes business, institution, association, profession, occupation, and calling of every kind, whether or not conducted for profit.

In this case, the Department of Human Services sanctioned claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case because claimant did not meet her participation requirements for the Work First/Jobs, Education and Training Program (JET). Work First is a separate entity from the Department of Human Services. Work First established claimant's participation requirements, monitored claimant's participation activities, and informed the Department of Human Services that claimant was not in compliance. The witnesses present at the hearing were a DHS caseworker supervisor and a DHS caseworker who was not managing claimant's case during the time it is alleged that claimant was non-compliant. The DHS caseworker who was managing claimant's case during the time it is alleged that claimant was non-compliant, was not present to testify. No one from Work First was present to testify either.

Despite the absence of any competent witnesses for the department, some admissible evidence was submitted. The regularly kept records of Work First and the DHS caseworker are theoretically admissible and competent as exceptions to the hearsay rule. The majority of this competent evidence is from the Michigan Information System (MIS) which is a data base accessible by both Work First and DHS personnel. The MIS notes are listed chronologically. In this case, there are numerous notes that were made weeks after the period the information relates to. As an example, a January 14, 2009, entry describes claimant submitting a pay check stub for the pay period ending December 14, 2008, and ensuing calculations using the number of hours worked (as derived from the check stub) and hours of attendance during that period to arrive at a conclusion that claimant did not meet her 20 hour participation requirement. Neither the check stub nor any documentation of the hours of attendance are in evidence. This determination of insufficient hours is not admissible because no admissible evidence of the number of hours

worked is in evidence and neither is there any admissible evidence of the hours of participation in evidence.

There is also an MIS note dated February 20, 2009, from the DHS caseworker who was managing claimant's case at the time. The note states that the Work First coordinator and the DHS caseworker agree claimant is non-compliant. The note does not provide any facts to support what claimant did or did not do. Obviously the DHS caseworker believes that claimant was non-compliant. Her admissible statement that she believes claimant was non-compliant, does not prove the belief.

A thorough and time consuming review of the admissible evidence in this case DID NOT provided sufficient competent evidence to meet the department's burden of proof. No further analysis is required to decide this case.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the Department of Human Services DID NOT properly sanction claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case for failure to participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities.

It is ORDERED that the actions of the Department of Human Services, in this matter, are REVERSED.

/s/

Gary F. Heisler
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 26, 2009

Date Mailed: May 27, 2009

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

GFH [REDACTED]

cc: [REDACTED]