PETE CERVINKA
DIRECTOR

CALIFORNIA HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES
1215 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 • www.dds.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES' AUDIT OF DEVELOPMENTAL PATHWAYS, INC.

Programs and Services:

Behavior Analyst – PL1738

Audit Period: January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025

DEPARTMENT TEAM
Edward Yan, Branch Chief, Audit Services Branch
Brandon Carter, Audit Manager, Audit Services Branch
Hung Bang, Chief, Vendor Audit Section
Ermias Tecle, Supervisor
Audit Staff: Chai Saechao

DEVELOPMENTAL PATHWAYS, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
BACKGROUND 2
OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY 2
CONCLUSION 4
VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS 4
RESTRICTED USE 4
ATTACHMENT A – VENDOR'S RESPONSE 5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Developmental Services (Department) has audited Developmental Pathways, Inc. (DPI). The audit was performed upon the Behavior Analyst program (BA) for the period of January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025.

The result of the audit disclosed no issues of non-compliance.

BACKGROUND

The Department is responsible, under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act, for ensuring that persons with developmental disabilities receive the services and supports they need to lead more independent, productive and normal lives. The Department contracts with 21 private, nonprofit regional centers that provide fixed points of contact in the community for serving eligible individuals with developmental disabilities and their families in California. In order for regional centers to fulfill their objectives, they secure services and supports from qualified service providers and/or contractors. Pursuant to the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC), Section 4648.1, the Department has the authority to audit those service providers and/or contractors that provide services and supports to persons with developmental disabilities.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Objective

The audit was conducted to determine whether DPI's program was compliant with the WIC, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 17, State laws and regulations and the regional centers' contracts with DPI for the period of January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025.

Scope

The audit was conducted in accordance with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. The auditors did not review the financial statements of DPI, nor was this audit intended to express an opinion on the financial statements. The auditors limited the review of DPI's internal controls to gain an understanding of the transaction flow and invoice preparation process, as necessary, to develop appropriate auditing procedures. The audit scope was limited to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that DPI complied with WIC and CCR, Title 17. Any complaints that the Department's Audit Services Branch was aware of regarding non-compliance with laws and regulations were also reviewed and addressed during the course of the audit.

The audit scope was determined by reviewing the programs and services provided to North Los Angeles County Regional Center (NLACRC) that utilized DPI's services during the audit period. DPI provided two different types of services, of which the Department audited one. Services chosen by the Department were based on the amount of purchase of service (POS) expenditures invoiced by DPI. By analyzing the information received from the vendor, an internal control questionnaire and a risk analysis, it was determined that a two-month sample period would be sufficient to fulfill the audit objectives.

Behavior Analyst

During the audit period, DPI operated one BA program. The audit included the review of one of DPI's BA program, Vendor Number PL1738, SC 612 and testing was done for the sampled months of May 2025 and June 2025.

Methodology

The following methodology was used by the Department to maintain the audit objectives were met. The methodology was designed to obtain a reasonable assurance that the evidence provided was sufficient and appropriate to support the findings and conclusions in relation to the audit objectives. The procedures performed included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Reviewed vendor files for contracts, rate letters, program designs, POS authorizations and correspondence pertinent to the review.
- E-mailed Regional Center staff for vendor background information and to obtain insight into the vendor's operations.
- Interviewed vendor staff and management to gain an understanding of the vendor's accounting procedures and processes for Regional Center billing.
- Obtained and reviewed the vendor's internal control questionnaire.
- Reviewed vendor service/attendance records to determine if the vendor had sufficient and appropriate evidence to support the direct care services billed to the Regional Center(s).
- Analyzed the vendor's payroll and attendance/service records to determine if the appropriate level of staffing was provided.

CONCLUSION

The audit of DPI revealed that this vendor maintained its records in accordance with the requirements of CCR, Title 17. For the sampled months tested, the Department was able to obtain the evidence necessary to achieve the audit objectives. The billing for the program audited was found to have sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence to support the direct-care hours billed.

VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

This section of the audit report was discussed during the informal exit with the vendor. The vendor was in compliant with the WIC, CCR, Title 17, State laws and regulations and the Regional Center's contract.

RESTRICTED USE

This report is solely for the information and use of the Department, Department of Health Care Services, NLACRC and DPI. This restriction is not intended to limit distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

ATTACHMENT A – VENDOR'S RESPONSE

DEVELOPMENTAL PATHWAYS, INC.

As part of the audit report process, DPI was afforded the opportunity to respond to the draft audit report. However, DPI did not submit a response to the draft audit report.