



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
LANSING

ELIZABETH HERTEL  
DIRECTOR

April 13, 2022

Shantheis Moody  
Bethany Christian Services Inc-Grand Rapids  
901 Eastern Avenue, NE  
Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0294

RE: License #: CB410200976  
Investigation #: 2022C0112007  
Bethany Christian Services Inc-Grand Rapids

Dear Mr. Moody:

Attached is the Special Investigation Report for the above referenced facility. Due to the violations identified in the report, a written corrective action plan is required. The corrective action plan is due 15 days from the date of this letter and must include the following:

- How compliance with each rule will be achieved.
- Who is directly responsible for implementing the corrective action for each violation.
- Specific time frames for each violation as to when the correction will be completed or implemented.
- How continuing compliance will be maintained once compliance is achieved.
- The signature of the responsible party and a date.

If you desire technical assistance in addressing these issues, please feel free to contact me. In any event, the corrective action plan is due within 15 days. Failure to submit an acceptable corrective action plan will result in disciplinary action.

Please note that violations of any licensing rules are also violations of the MISEP and your contract.

Please review the enclosed documentation for accuracy and contact me with any questions. In the event that I am not available, and you need to speak to someone immediately, please contact the area manager at (616) 204-6992.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Holly K. Austin".

Holly Austin, Licensing Consultant  
MDHHS\Division of Child Welfare Licensing  
Suite 200  
121 Franklin Street SE  
Grand Rapids, MI 49507  
(269) 330-7082

enclosure

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
DIVISION OF CHILD WELFARE LICENSING  
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT**

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>License #:</b>	CB410200976
<b>Investigation #:</b>	2022C0112007
<b>Complaint Receipt Date:</b>	02/14/2022
<b>Investigation Initiation Date:</b>	02/15/2022
<b>Report Due Date:</b>	04/15/2022
<b>Licensee Name:</b>	Bethany Christian Services Inc
<b>Licensee Address:</b>	901 Eastern Avenue NE Grand Rapids, MI 49503
<b>Licensee Telephone #:</b>	(616) 224-7610
<b>Administrator:</b>	Shantheis Moody, Administrator
<b>Licensee Designee:</b>	George Tyndall, Designee
<b>Name of Facility:</b>	Bethany Christian Services Inc-Grand Rapids
<b>Facility Address:</b>	901 Eastern Avenue, NE Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0294
<b>Facility Telephone #:</b>	(616) 459-6273
<b>Original Issuance Date:</b>	10/01/1994
<b>License Status:</b>	REGULAR
<b>Effective Date:</b>	09/28/2020
<b>Expiration Date:</b>	09/27/2022
<b>Capacity:</b>	Unknown
<b>Program Type:</b>	CHILD PLACING AGENCY, PRIVATE

## II. ALLEGATION(S)

	Violation Established?
Agency is not providing reasonable efforts to reunify family in a foster care case during the period of 8/21/21-11/10/21.	Yes
Lack of FTM engagement.	Yes
Lack of information in social work contacts.	Yes
Lack of documented private meetings with child.	Yes
Lack of overall contact with case members was documented.	Yes

## III. METHODOLOGY

02/14/2022	Special Investigation Intake 2022C0112007
02/15/2022	Special Investigation Initiated - Letter Email to Chief Administrator
02/28/2022	Inspection Completed On-site Interviews conducted onsite
04/05/2022	Contact - Document Sent Pre-exit email with preliminary findings
04/05/2022	Inspection Completed-BCAL Sub. Compliance

### ALLEGATION:

Agency is not providing reasonable efforts to reunify family in a foster care case during the period of 8/21/21-11/10/21.

### INVESTIGATION:

#### Interviews

On 2/14/2022 I received a complaint filed through the on-line reporting system alleging the following: Family Court finding stated the agency was not providing reasonable efforts during the period of 8/21/21-11/10/21.

**Supervisor** - On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Supervisor at the agency. Supervisor reported that during winter of last year, Foster Care Worker started working on subsidized guardianship for this case, which was approved by the guardianship office in May of 2021. Right around that same time a different Judge took over the case and was unhappy that Parent B had not been made a legal parent which delayed the guardianship. Supervisor reported the court had previously wanted Parent B listed as a putative parent on all service plans which is what was done. Once Parent B became the legal parent, a meeting was held between the agency staff and the prosecutor before returning to court in September. At the September hearing, the judge did not want to adjudicate Parent B and wanted to move toward the subsidized guardianship; however, guardianship was not appointed at that time because the judge wanted a home study and fingerprinting completed on the relative even though the guardianship office had already approved the guardianship and

those things were not needed. Additionally, the judge asked for the development of a visitation plan.

Another court hearing was held in November and the judge was not satisfied with the visitation plan that had been developed because what the judge wanted a complete visit schedule, similar to a shared custody plan, for once the court was no longer involved. Supervisor did not initially understand that this is what the court meant by visitation plan as this is not something typically requested by a judge. Additionally, while the relative home study had been completed, it had not been provided to the court, unbeknownst to Supervisor. Supervisor reported that it was at this hearing that the judge ordered reasonable efforts had not been made toward the guardianship due to the court not having the home study or the detailed visitation plan. Supervisor reported these two items were subsequently provided to the court and the case is now closed with the subsidized guardianship in place.

**Foster Care Worker** - On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Foster Care Worker at the agency. Foster Care Worker's statements included the same information provided by Supervisor. She also stated that she did not understand the court's request for a visitation plan, and as soon as she created the plan the judge wanted, the judge was satisfied and ordered that reasonable efforts had been made.

### **Documents Reviewed**

On 4/5/2022 I reviewed the case record in MiSACWIS and reviewed the following:

- Court Order 9/1/21, Reasonable effort were found to have been made toward family preservation and reunification, Reasonable efforts were found to have been made toward finalizing legal guardianship.
- Court Order 11/16/21, Reasonable efforts were not found to have been made toward finalizing legal guardianship.
- Court Order 2/10/22 appointing Caregiver A as the legal guardian.
- Court Order 2/10/22 discharging court jurisdiction.

<b>APPLICABLE RULE</b>	
<b>FOM 722-06</b>	<b>REASONABLE EFFORTS</b>
	Provisions were enacted into federal law in the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980, 42 USC 670 et seq. and the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997, 42 USC 1305 et seq., as well as Michigan's Probate Code, 1939 PA 288, MCL 701.1 et seq., that require judicial oversight when a child is removed from his/her home. These provisions require a judicial determination that reasonable efforts have been made by the supervising agency. The types of reasonable efforts which must be made by the department differ, depending on the status of the child. The four types of reasonable efforts determinations are to:

	Prevent removal. Make it possible for the child to return home. Find that reasonable efforts are not required. Finalize the permanency plan.
<b>ANALYSIS:</b>	The court made a determination at one hearing that the agency staff did not make reasonable efforts toward achieving the goal of legal guardianship.
<b>CONCLUSION:</b>	<b>VIOLATION ESTABLISHED</b>

### **ALLEGATION:**

Lack of FTM engagement.

### **INVESTIGATION:**

On 2/14/2022 I received a complaint filed through the on-line reporting system alleging the following:

The home visit with Parent B that occurred on 10/18/2021 was counted as a Family Team Meeting (FTM) however, there was no social work contact added in MiSACWIS for the FTM that occurred. Additionally, there was no attempt to include both caregivers and other case members in the required FTM.

### **Interviews**

**Supervisor** - On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Supervisor at the agency. Supervisor reported Foster Care Worker had been assigned throughout the entirety of this case which had been open 3 ½ years. Supervisor reported that Parent A did not engage well with the worker and did not participate when invited to FTMs.

**Foster Care Worker** - On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Foster Care Worker at the agency. Foster Care Worker reported Parent A was invited to the majority of the FTM's, but she didn't often show up, which is documented in the case record. When the mother did show up for virtual FTM's she would attend with her camera off and wouldn't participate much, if at all. Additionally, Foster Care Worker reported Parent A and Parent B did not get along and Foster Care Worker felt it was more productive to hold FTMs for each parent separately. Foster Care Worker reported she could have more clearly documented this throughout the case as she believes after a few years of this being an issue, she didn't document the reasons the parents weren't invited to each other's FTMs each time.

### **Documents Reviewed**

On 4/5/2022 I reviewed the case record in MiSACWIS and reviewed the following:

- Case contact documented with Parent A and Parent B 8/21/21-11/10/21.

- The 10/18/21 home visit was documented as such, with quality visit narrative included.
- The 10/18/21 FTM with Parent B was documented in the FTM hyperlink; however, the required document, Family Team Activity Report (DHS 1105) was not present.
- A review of all 20 FTM's documented to have been held was completed and of those, only 4 included the required DHS 1105, which documents who participated. Of those 4, one was held in 2018 and the other three in 2019. No DHS 1105's have been uploaded since 2019.

<b>APPLICABLE RULE</b>	
<b>FOM 722-06B</b>	<b>Family Team Meetings</b>
	<p><b>P. 16 PARENT/ CAREGIVER PARTICIPATION</b>  Parent/caregiver participation in a pre-meeting discussion or FTM is voluntary. If a parent/caregiver declines to attend or participate in the pre-meeting discussion or FTM, the meeting must proceed with other participants in attendance. If no other participants are identified, the caseworker and supervisor must proceed with a case conference to assess and plan for the child's safety, permanency, and well-being. The caseworker must make active efforts to engage the parent or caregiver in the FTM process until case closure. Engagement efforts and a parent's denial of participation must be documented in the case service plan</p> <p><b>P. 12 &amp; 16 FTM PRACTICE GUIDANCE</b> Documentation The DHS-1105, Family Team Meeting Report, is used to capture family demographics, FTM logistical information, needs, strengths, action steps, safety concerns and the safety plan, and any recommendations made for the family during the FTM. The DHS-1105, FTM Report, must be completed for every FTM</p> <p>Post FTM Following the FTM, the caseworker is responsible for the following: • Completing the DHS-1105, Family Team Meeting Report, checking it for accuracy, identifying areas needing follow-up, and recording the outcome data. • Providing the DHS-1105, Family Team Meeting Report, to all participants (in person and by phone), legal parents, and casework supervisor. These documents must also be uploaded into MISACWIS. The caseworker must enter the FTM information in MiSACWIS using the FTM hyperlink within seven business days of the FTM.</p>

<b>ANALYSIS:</b>	<p>Active efforts made to engage both parents in FTM participation was not documented.</p> <p>Required Family Team Meeting Reports have not been uploaded into the system since 2019.</p>
<b>CONCLUSION:</b>	<p><b>REPEAT VIOLATION ESTABLISHED</b></p> <p><b>2021 INTERIM, CAP approved 11/10/2021</b></p> <p><b>2020 RENEWAL, CAP approved 10/1/2020</b></p>

## **ALLEGATION:**

Lack of information in social work contacts.

## **INVESTIGATION:**

On 2/14/2022 I received a complaint filed through the on-line reporting system alleging the following:

There was a lack of quality social work contacts within the investigative period (8/21/21-11/10/21.) There was a lack of narrative included in the social work contacts documenting parenting times occurring with the youth. There was a lack of narrative included in the social work contacts documenting foster home visits. Specifically, there was limited context provided regarding conversations occurring between the foster care worker and relative caregiver.

### **Interviews**

**Foster Care Worker** - On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Foster Care Worker at the agency. Foster Care Worker reported there were contacts she had not yet entered into the system or that did not contain all of the information.

### **Documents Reviewed**

On 4/5/2022 I reviewed the case record in MiSACWIS and reviewed the following:

- All of the documented parenting times 8/21/21-11/10/21 included minimal narrative, most of which included two sentences.
- The caregiver home visits documented to have taken place in August, September, October, and November of 2021 included minimal narrative lacking the required discussion and failing to meet quality contact standards.

<b>APPLICABLE RULE</b>	
<b>FOM 722-6H</b>	<b>Case Contacts</b>
	<p><b>P.13 &amp; 14 Required Discussion</b> The caseworker must discuss the following topics monthly with the child's caregiver and document the information provided by the caregiver in the appropriate work area in MiSACWIS. This discussion may occur at the monthly home visit: • Efforts to co-parent or support the legal parent or guardian. • Date of child's last physical and dental exam. • Medication dosages and diagnoses for the child.</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Psychotropic medication compliance and treatment effects; see FOM 802-1, Psychotropic Medication in Foster Care.</li> <li>• Medical, dental, and mental health concerns, appointments, treatment, follow-up care, and progress updates.</li> <li>• Child behaviors, concerns, developmental milestones.</li> <li>• Safe sleep guidelines for children under 12 months.</li> <li>• Educational or school status, efforts, behaviors, and services provided.</li> <li>• Caregiver's tasks to meet child's needs, including any ongoing extraordinary care required of the caregiver; see FOM 903-03, Payments for Foster Family Care.</li> <li>• Child's adjustment to the caregiver's family.</li> <li>• Caregiver needs to support the child's placement.</li> <li>• Permanency plan.</li> <li>• Safety plan, if applicable</li> </ul> <p>Any delinquency charges filed since the last visit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The caregiver's understanding and application of the prudent parent standard; see FOM 722-11, Prudent Parent Standard and Delegation of Parental Consent.</li> <li>• Any CPS or foster home licensing complaints made regarding the placement since the last visit.</li> <li>• If the caregiver is pursuing licensure, obtain an update on licensing progress.</li> <li>• For children placed in a residential care program, discharge planning and preparation is required</li> </ul>
<b>ANALYSIS:</b>	Required discussions were not documented in foster home contacts.
<b>CONCLUSION:</b>	<b>REPEAT VIOLATION ESTABLISHED</b> <b>2020 RENEWAL, CAP approved 10/1/2020</b>

## **ALLEGATION:**

Lack of documented private meetings with child.

## **INVESTIGATION:**

On 2/14/2022 I received a complaint filed through the on-line reporting system alleging the following:

No private meetings were documented as having occurred between Youth A and the foster care worker in the social work contacts included in the USP with a report period of 8/21/21 - 11/1/21.

## **Interviews**

On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Foster Care Worker, Supervisor, and Director at the agency. Foster Care Worker reported Youth A is autistic and was non-verbal at the onset of the case. The youth's verbal skills improved; however, she was not able to engage in quality conversations. Foster Care Worker stated she could have documented more specifically in her case contact narrative that she met alone with the youth and attempted to engage in conversation during each visit.

**Documents Reviewed**

On 4/5/2022 I reviewed the case record in MiSACWIS and reviewed the following:

- Foster home visits documented between 8/21/21-11/1/21 did not contain documentation of private meeting held with the youth.

<b>APPLICABLE RULE</b>	
<b>722-06H</b>	<b>Case Contacts</b>
	<b>P. 4 MiSACWIS Documentation</b> Caseworkers must identify whether a private meeting, or safe sleep verification for infants, occurred for each child participant in the Participant screen within the Social Work Contact section of MiSACWIS.
<b>ANALYSIS:</b>	Home visit contacts did not document a private meeting with Youth A and Foster Care Worker.
<b>CONCLUSION:</b>	<b>VIOLATION ESTABLISHED</b>

**ALLEGATION:**

Lack of overall contact with case members was documented.

**INVESTIGATION:**

On 2/14/2022 I received a complaint filed through the on-line reporting system alleging the following:

No face-to-face contact between the foster care caseworker and Parent A was documented within MiSACWIS social work contacts within the investigative period of 8/21/21 - 11/10/21 as required within. Multiple phone and text communications were documented as occurring between the caseworker and Parent A within the investigative period, however the content of those contacts was limited. No virtual face-to-face contacts were documented as attempted or having occurred within the investigative period.

**Interviews**

On 2/28/2022 I interviewed Foster Care Worker, Supervisor, and Director at the agency. Foster Care Worker reported she could have more clearly and consistently documented her conversations with Parent A. She reported she could have documented all attempts to reach Parent A, even if Parent A refused to participate. Foster Care Worker stated Parent A did not want to work with her and just wanted to work directly with Caregiver A.

**Documents Reviewed**

On 4/5/2022 I reviewed the case record in MiSACWIS and reviewed the following documentation between 8/21/21 - 11/10/21:

- Multiple phone and text communications with Parent A; however, no face-to-face meetings took place. Additionally, none of the contacts included documentation that Foster Care Worker attempted to schedule face to face meetings with Parent A.

<b>APPLICABLE RULE</b>	
<b>MISEP 6.22</b>	<b>Visits, Worker-Parent (Commitment 76)</b>
	<p>(a) For each child in foster care with a permanency goal of reunification, the child's caseworker shall have face-to-face contacts with the child's parent(s) as follows:</p> <p>(1) for the first month the child is in care, two face-to-face contacts with each parent, at least one of which must occur in the parent's place of residence.</p> <p>(2) for each subsequent month, at least one face-to-face contact with each parent and phone contact as needed, with at least one contact in each three-month period occurring in the parent's place of residence.</p>
<b>ANALYSIS:</b>	No face-to-face contacts were made with Parent A either virtually, in person, or at Parent A's home.
<b>CONCLUSION:</b>	<b>VIOLATION ESTABLISHED</b>

#### IV. RECOMMENDATION

Upon receipt of an acceptable corrective action plane, I recommend no change to the license.



April 5, 2022

---

Holly Austin  
Licensing Consultant

Date

Approved By:



April 12, 2022

---

Jessica VandenHeuvel  
Area Manager

Date