



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Michigan

## Final Report

## 2018



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

# Final Report: Michigan Child and Family Services Review

## INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Michigan. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Michigan are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) and submitted to the Children's Bureau on June 18, 2018. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home) conducted via a Traditional Review process at Van Buren, Wayne, and Wexford counties in Michigan during the week of August 12, 2018
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Administrative Review Board
  - Attorneys for children, parents, and the agency
  - Child welfare licensing staff
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
  - Child Serving Agency (CSA) directors, senior managers, and county directors
  - Child welfare agency program managers
  - Child welfare agency training staff
  - Division of Child Welfare Licensing staff
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff
  - Judges

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Law enforcement
- Parents
- Public and private child welfare agency supervisors and caseworkers
- Representatives from the courts and Court Improvement Program (CIP)
- Service providers
- Tribal representatives
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children’s Bureau suspended the use of the state’s performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state’s performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children’s Bureau will refer to the national standards as “national performance.” This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).<sup>1</sup>

### Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state’s substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

---

<sup>1</sup> May 2017 revised syntax (pending final verification) uses 2 years of NCANDS data to calculate performance for the Maltreatment in Foster Care indicator. National performance is based on FY 2013–2014 and 2013AB files. All other indicators use the same time periods identified in the May 2015 Federal Register notice.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Michigan's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Michigan's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### Michigan 2018 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 3 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Quality Assurance System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

#### Children's Bureau Comments on Michigan Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Michigan's overall performance:

The findings of Michigan's 2018 CFSR confirmed that MDHHS was in substantial conformity with three systemic factors: Statewide Information System, Quality Assurance System, and Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Michigan develops its CFSP and Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR) through regular and effective consultation with its partners and stakeholders. While the Children's Bureau sees this as a strength, some stakeholders said they were unclear about their role in the agency's planning or how their input is used. Building upon the strengths within these three systemic factors will have a positive effect on the state's ability to develop and implement practice and program improvements.

Data provided by the state in the statewide assessment and information collected during stakeholder interviews identified larger issues that may affect child welfare in Michigan. There is a severe shortage of foster homes, and stakeholders reported that, on occasion, children have had to stay the night in an agency child welfare office or in a hotel when a placement could not be located. There are concerns about the effectiveness of each county's and private agency's foster and adoptive parent recruitment and retention efforts. Some stakeholders reported that foster parents do not receive the support needed to provide the level of care that many of the children need. Stakeholders also reported concerns about the adequacy of training for foster and adoptive parents and said that the initial foster and adoptive parent training does not adequately prepare caregivers with the skills and knowledge needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adoptive children in their care.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

Stakeholders also reported a high level of caseworker turnover, which negatively affects the agency's ability to effectively engage families, provide services, and ensure the safety of children. Adding to the concerns about caseworker turnover is the inadequacy of initial staff training. Many stakeholders reported that although training is generally available, it does not adequately prepare new workers with the skills or knowledge necessary to perform their job duties, such as engagement of birth parents, foster parents, private agencies, and youth.

The inadequate service array is a concern raised by most stakeholders, who said that there were waiting lists and gaps in services, including substance treatment, psychological and psychiatric services, transportation, housing, trauma-informed treatment, parenting education, domestic violence services, and prevention services. The availability of services varies by area. In rural areas, for example, families may have to travel up to 3 hours to receive needed services.

The CFSR found that reports of child maltreatment were often assigned immediately and there was normally same-day commencement for face-to-face contact. However, not all of the identified children were seen timely. Caseworker contact with children is a fundamental and cross-cutting child welfare case management practice requirement that affects the achievement of desired outcomes in child safety and permanency, and child and family well-being. Case review results identified challenges in accurately assessing risk and safety concerns and in providing appropriate safety-related services to prevent children from coming into foster care. Additionally, safety planning was not always adequate or effective.

The achievement of timely permanency was negatively affected by a lack of family engagement. Caseworker challenges associated with contacting and engaging parents were evident across both foster care and in-home cases and negatively affected desired outcomes in child safety and permanency, and child and family well-being. The case review identified concerns about the frequency and quality of caseworker visits with parents and children. The lack of frequent and quality visitation affected the state's ability to ensure child safety. The lack of effective family engagement resulted in challenges in developing case plans jointly with parents. Because of a lack of adequate assessment of individual and family needs, services were not individualized to meet the unique needs of the family and address the reasons for the agency's involvement. Services were not always available, or the services provided did not match the identified needs. Waiting lists for necessary services resulted in a delay in the achievement of permanency for children in foster care. Although permanency goals were often identified timely in many of the cases reviewed, the identified goal was sometimes inappropriate given the needs of the child and the case circumstances. Delays in achieving permanency were attributed to a lack of concerted efforts by the agency and/or the courts.

The case reviews identified promising practices in several areas. Children were frequently placed with their siblings unless there were valid reasons for them not to be together. The review team observed that the educational needs of children in foster care were often met although to a significantly lesser degree for children in in-home cases. It is apparent that the *My Team Model* is used across the state, but additional adjustments are needed to make the meetings effective to engage all stakeholders. The Michigan Youth Outreach Initiative and Parenting Partners were also two areas of promising practice.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

A fully integrated, cross-cutting, and statewide child welfare Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) system has been institutionalized in Michigan. The Children's Bureau encourages the state to continue its efforts to maintain and build capacity to conduct case reviews on a continual basis and to make the necessary adjustments to programs and processes statewide. As Michigan develops a Program Improvement Plan to address the areas identified in this Final Report, the Children's Bureau encourages Michigan to focus on analyzing all relevant information and data to identify the root causes behind its practice performance, along with the broader systemic concerns identified during the CFSR.

## II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care and in-home services cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to MDHHS. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 82% of the 33 applicable cases reviewed.

#### ***Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance***

##### **Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires MDHHS to initiate an investigation of the child suspected of being abused or neglected no later than 24 hours after the complaint was made. Initiation is defined as an action taken, within 24 hours of a complaint, to begin this investigation. Actions may include communication or contact with the child or children, the child(ren)'s caregiver, or another person involved with the child(ren); communication or contact with a person who knows the child(ren), recently saw them, or has relevant knowledge about the family situation; and/or communication or contact with law enforcement, medical staff, or an emergency first responder who has

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

knowledge about the child(ren). Reports designated for Priority One Response require initiation to occur as soon as possible after receipt of the complaint when immediate danger of harm to the child(ren) is determined and within 12 hours. Face-to-face contact must take place with each alleged child victim within 24 hours. Reports designated for a Priority Two Response require initiation within 24 hours after receipt of the complaint, when it is determined the child is not in immediate danger of harm. Face-to-face contact must take place with each alleged child victim within 72 hours.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 82% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

### **Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 54% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 68% of the 40 foster care cases and 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

#### ***Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance***

##### **Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 55% of the 20 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 67% of the 12 applicable foster care cases and 38% of the 8 applicable in-home services cases.

##### **Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 55% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.



## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 70% of the 40 foster care cases and 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.

#### State Outcome Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 13% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

#### *Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance*

##### Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 78% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 53% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 25% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

#### State Outcome Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 70% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

#### *Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance*

##### Item 7. Placement With Siblings

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 89% of the 28 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>2</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 69% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 83% of the 12 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

---

<sup>2</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

- In 72% of the 25 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 79% of the 14 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

### Item 9. Preserving Connections

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 79% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. Relative Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 79% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>3</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 67% of the 27 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 68% of the 25 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 86% of the 14 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

#### State Outcome Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 28% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 25% of the 40 foster care cases and 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

#### Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

##### Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>4</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 28% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as a Strength in 25% of the 40 foster care cases and 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

##### Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 66% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 75% of the 40 foster care cases and 52% of the 25 in-home services cases.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 35% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 30% of the 30 applicable foster care cases and 40% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 39% of the 51 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 33% of the 43 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 63% of the 35 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>5</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 50% of the 62 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 57% of the 37 applicable foster care cases and 40% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 65% of the 37 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 58% of the 50 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 55% of the 38 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 71% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 40 foster care cases and 48% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>6</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 43% of the 54 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 45% of the 29 applicable foster care cases and 40% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 46% of the 50 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 50% of the 38 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

### Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

#### State Outcome Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 69% of the 36 applicable cases reviewed.

---

<sup>6</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### ***Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance***

#### **Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 69% of the 36 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 76% of the 33 applicable foster care cases and none of the 3 applicable in-home services cases.

### **Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 52% of the 56 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 48% of the 40 foster care cases and 63% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases.

### ***Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance***

#### **Item 17. Physical Health of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 62% of the 50 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 60% of the 40 foster care cases and 70% of the 10 applicable in-home services cases.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 51% of the 37 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 56% of the 27 applicable foster care cases and 40% of the 10 applicable in-home services cases.

## III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

### Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### Statewide Information System Item Performance

### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state is operating a statewide information system that captures the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is in foster care. Michigan



## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

ensures the data are accurate and of good quality by conducting information system reviews of randomly selected cases to verify information. When errors are identified, the state has a system in place to correct the errors.

### Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### Case Review System Item Performance

##### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that for a recent year, the Child Protective Service Plans were not consistently completed timely and parents were not consistently actively engaged in case planning. Stakeholders reported that active involvement of parents in case planning varied by county and by caseworker and many stakeholders agreed that parents are not consistently engaged in developing case plans. Some stakeholders reported that the case plan is developed without parental participation, then presented to the parent before the court hearing.

##### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment demonstrated that periodic reviews are held at least monthly, but often more frequently. Michigan provided data showing that almost all periodic reviews or hearings occurred timely.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information and data in the statewide assessment showed that Michigan conducts quality permanency hearings at a frequency of no less than every 12 months for almost all children in foster care.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) proceedings are not occurring in accordance with required provisions. Stakeholders confirmed that there is no statewide tracking system for the filing of TPR and that timely filing of TPR varies by county. Stakeholders said timeliness is not a priority in some courts, and some stakeholders reported delays in filing because the court determined that parents should be given more time.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Michigan does not have a consistent practice across the state for notifying foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of reviews or hearings held with respect to children in foster care. Stakeholders reported that notices are automated in some counties and depend on the worker in other counties. Stakeholders reported variation across the state in providing caregivers an opportunity to be heard when present at court hearings because the level of participation varies based on the judge and the county. Key stakeholders confirmed that caregivers were not always given the opportunity to be heard.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### *Quality Assurance System Item Performance*

##### Item 25. Quality Assurance System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) is operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Michigan's Quality Assurance System is fully functioning statewide. Case review and data collection processes are occurring across the state. The system provides consistent follow-up to ensure statewide issues are addressed, program improvement is evaluated, and adjustments to practice and policy are made. The CQI system informs policy and improves practice. Each local state agency has a local CQI team to ensure that services the agency provides meet key performance indicators, and if necessary, implements plans toward meeting standards. The state is providing technical assistance to assist the local CQI teams in implementing program analysis and improvement strategies.

### Staff and Provider Training

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### *Staff and Provider Training Item Performance*

#### **Item 26. Initial Staff Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the skill-based component of training is not sufficient to meet the entry-level training needs of new case managers. Stakeholders reported the need for training on navigating the state's information system and on agency policies. Stakeholders also reported a need for more hands-on training focused on daily job responsibilities and said they felt that many new caseworkers are not prepared to perform their job duties, particularly related to assessment skills and the ability to understand and engage case participants following training. Initial training is provided in two locations in the state and this can result in challenges for new case managers who have to travel to attend the trainings. New staff routinely receive initial training in a timely manner and there are no waiting lists.

#### **Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>7</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data provided in the statewide assessment shows that in a recent time period, almost all supervisors and caseworkers met the ongoing training requirements. The state tracks participation in training through the Learning Management System and has a comprehensive evaluation system. Stakeholders confirmed that training that addresses the skills and knowledge needed to perform job duties is available, and staff are able to access those trainings, although travel is a challenge for some staff located in rural areas of the state. Generally, stakeholders believed that topics covered in training are appropriate, but some stakeholders said that they would like some changes or additional topics included.

---

<sup>7</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Michigan reported that initial foster and adoptive parent training was very recently centralized and is now supported by Regional Resource Teams. Stakeholders said that training is not readily available and there are delays for foster parents in obtaining needed training. Stakeholders also said they felt that Parent Resources for Information, Development, and Education (PRIDE) training does not provide practical information and the skills and knowledge needed for foster and adoptive parents to be able to carry out their duties. For example, the training does not provide foster and adoptive parents with the skills and knowledge to be able to care for children who have experienced trauma. In the statewide assessment, Michigan reported that the Division of Child Welfare Licensing conducts inspections of licensed child-placing agencies and child care institutions to monitor compliance with training requirements. The state did not provide data showing the percentage of facilities or staff within facilities that meet the training requirements.

### Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### *Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance*

### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the availability and accessibility of services is markedly uneven across the state. Stakeholders reported significant gaps in the service array. In the northern part of the state, a family may need to travel 1½ to 3 hours to receive necessary services. Specific service gaps identified included psychological therapy, trauma-informed therapy, parent mentors, parent aid, visitation supervisors, substance abuse treatment, residential substance treatment for children, parenting education, and prevention services. Stakeholders also said that there are limited transportation and housing options. In some areas of the state where services are available, there are extensive waiting lists for key services such as substance abuse treatment, domestic violence, parenting classes, visitation, substance abuse screens, parent aid, and the Family Reunification Program.

### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state has limited ability to consistently and effectively individualize services. Stakeholders confirmed that services are not always culturally or linguistically appropriate and there are not enough service providers to meet the diverse cultural needs of the populations served. Key stakeholders confirmed that services are often “cookie cutter” and not individualized. Services are also not adjusted based on the developmental or mental health needs of the child or parents. Additionally, stakeholders reported that the ability to individualize services varies by county or area of the state, and that there is more of an opportunity to meet individual needs in larger counties.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children’s Bureau assesses the state’s performance on this systemic factor using the state’s performance on Items 31 and 32.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### *Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance*

### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state engages in ongoing consultation with key stakeholders and their input is integrated into CFSP goals and the state's APSR. Stakeholders confirmed that a variety of active stakeholder groups inform the agency's strategic direction, planning, and program development. A statewide CIP task force and community quality improvement teams are functioning or being developed in each county. The Children's Bureau encourages the state to continue utilizing and improving the work that the state is doing with the stakeholder groups.

### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Michigan provided examples of intergovernmental agreements and other interorganizational partnerships to illustrate how the state coordinates services or benefits with other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population. Michigan administers the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs, Child Care and Development Block Grant programs, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, Title IV-D Child Support Enforcement Program, Disability Determination Services for Title II and XVI funds, Community Mental Health Services Block Grant, Medicaid services, and Family Support Subsidy Program. The state also works closely with the federally recognized Tribes in Michigan and coordinates with other federal and state programs for youth, including transitional living programs.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Michigan is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

### *Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance*

#### **Item 33. Standards Applied Equally**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that state standards are applied equally to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds. Stakeholders confirmed that Michigan tracks and addresses variances. Stakeholders reported that variances are primarily granted for relative placements and to ensure siblings are placed together when possible and appropriate. Variances are not granted when safety is a concern. Standards for state child care institutions are applied equally and closely monitored by the state.

#### **Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that criminal background checks occur prior to the licensure of all foster and adoptive homes. If there is an immediate need to place a child with a relative, an initial relative screening that includes a background check is completed. Stakeholders report that required background checks are completed not only for initial licensing, but also annually before a home is re-licensed. Information in the statewide assessment and supported by stakeholders indicated that the state has a case planning process in place that addresses safety in foster and adoptive care. There are protocols to address child safety and report safety concerns for children in foster homes and child care institutions.

#### **Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.



## Michigan 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Michigan has a severe shortage of foster homes for all children. Stakeholders confirmed that children have had to sleep in offices and hotels due to a lack of foster homes. The local counties and private agencies are responsible for their own recruitment and retention plans and these plans are rolled up into the state plan. Some stakeholders said staff are overwhelmed and often there is no time to do effective recruitment. Stakeholders also reported difficulty or ineffectiveness in supporting and retaining foster families in the system.

### Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Michigan received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that for a recent time period, a little more than half of incoming requests from other states for home studies were completed within the 60-day requirement. Although some stakeholders said compliance with the 60-day requirement had improved, the state did not provide supplemental data to confirm this. Stakeholders described efforts and processes to facilitate placement of children in the state's care across jurisdictions, both within and out of state.

## Appendix A Summary of Michigan 2018 Child and Family Services Review Performance

### I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	82% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	54% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	13% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	53% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	25% Strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	70% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	89% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement†	69% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	67% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	28% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	28% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	35% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	50% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	71% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	43% Strength

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	69% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	52% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	51% Strength

## II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Case Review System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 20</b> Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 21</b> Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 22</b> Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 23</b> Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 24</b> Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Quality Assurance System</b>	Statewide Assessment	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Staff and Provider Training</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 26</b> Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 27</b> Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Item 28</b> Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Service Array and Resource Development</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 29</b> Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 30</b> Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>8</sup>

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.5%	Lower	13.6%	13.2%–14.0%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	14.68	13.42–16.07	15A–15B, FY15–16

<sup>8</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.



## Appendix A: Summary of Michigan 2018 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	42.7%	Higher	32.3%	31.1%–33.5%	15A–17B
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	45.9%	Higher	47.4%	45.7%–49.0%	17A–17B
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	36.6%	35.2%–38.0%	17A–17B
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	7.0%	5.8%–8.5%	15A–17B
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	3.64	3.52–3.75	17A–17B

\* Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP) is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

\*\* 95% Confidence Interval is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

\*\*\* Data Period(s) Used for State Performance: Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1–September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1–March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1–September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

## Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Michigan 2009 Key Findings

The Children’s Bureau conducted a CFSR in Michigan in 2009. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state’s performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children’s Bureau Region:</b> 5
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> September 21–25, 2009
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2008, through September 25, 2009
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> January 27, 2010
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> April 27, 2010
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> June 1, 2011

### Highlights of Findings

<b>Performance Measurements</b>
A. The state met the national standards for <b>one</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>none</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes.
C. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>three</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Appendix B: Michigan 2009 CFSR Key Findings

### State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	92.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.51	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	106.8	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	95.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	118.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	105.4	Meets Standard

### State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Michigan 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

### State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Michigan 2009 CFSR Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
2. Repeat Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
12. Placement With Siblings	Strength
13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix B: Michigan 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
22. Physical Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
24. Statewide Information System	Area Needing Improvement
25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
27. Permanency Hearings	Strength
28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
31. Quality Assurance System	Area Needing Improvement
32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
35. Array of Services	Strength
36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
37. Individualizing Services	Area Needing Improvement
38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength

## Appendix B: Michigan 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Area Needing Improvement
45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength