



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
LANSING

ELIZABETH HERTEL  
DIRECTOR

March 15, 2022

Chelsea Gordy  
Child and Family Charities  
4287 Five Oaks Drive  
Lansing, MI 48911

RE: License #: CB330201039  
Investigation #: 2022C0212007  
Child and Family Charities

Dear Ms. Gordy:

Attached is the Special Investigation Report for the above referenced facility. Due to the violation 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 local office at (616) 204-6992.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Heather Reilly".

Heather Reilly, Licensing Consultant  
MDHHS\Division of Child Welfare Licensing  
22 Center Street  
Ypsilanti, MI 48198  
(734) 660-8309

enclosure

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

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>License #:</b>	CB330201039
<b>Investigation #:</b>	2022C0212007
<b>Complaint Receipt Date:</b>	02/15/2022
<b>Investigation Initiation Date:</b>	02/15/2022
<b>Report Due Date:</b>	04/16/2022
<b>Licensee Name:</b>	Child and Family Charities
<b>Licensee Address:</b>	4287 Five Oaks Drive Lansing, MI 48911
<b>Licensee Telephone #:</b>	(517) 882-4000
<b>Administrator:</b>	Chelsea Gordy, Administrator
<b>Licensee Designee:</b>	Julie Thomasma, Designee
<b>Name of Facility:</b>	Child and Family Charities
<b>Facility Address:</b>	4287 Five Oaks Drive Lansing, MI 48911
<b>Facility Telephone #:</b>	(517) 882-4000
<b>Original Issuance Date:</b>	10/07/1992
<b>License Status:</b>	REGULAR
<b>Effective Date:</b>	08/07/2020
<b>Expiration Date:</b>	08/06/2022
<b>Capacity:</b>	Unknown
<b>Program Type:</b>	CHILD PLACING AGENCY, PRIVATE

## II. ALLEGATION

	Violation Established?
Agency violated a court order regarding the date a youth was to return home.	Yes

## III. METHODOLOGY

02/15/2022	Special Investigation Intake 2022C0212007
02/15/2022	Special Investigation Initiated - Telephone Phone call to CA, with email follow-up.
02/15/2022	Contact - Document Received Review of MiSACWIS case file.
02/16/2022	Contact - Document Received Email with CA and PM to schedule interviews.
02/22/2022	Contact - Face to Face Interviews completed on-site with FCW, FC Supervisor and Director
03/08/2022	Contact - Telephone call made Phone interview with foster parent
03/08/2022	Contact - Telephone call made Phone call with parent
03/10/2022	Contact - Face to Face Reviewed findings with DCWL area manager
03/11/2022	Contact - Face to Face Pre-exit Teams call with Chief Administrator
03/15/2022	Contact - Document sent Emailed Chief Administrator regarding findings

### ALLEGATION:

Agency violated a court order regarding the date a youth was to return home.

### INVESTIGATION:

On 2/15/22 it was reported to DCWL that agency staff did not follow a court order issued on 1/31/22, to return a child home. The agency maintained the child in a foster home placement until 2/3/22, despite MDHHS no longer having jurisdiction.

### Chief Administrator

On 2/16/22 the Chief Administrator (CA) and program manager were contacted by phone and informed of the investigation. A message was left, and a follow-up email was sent. The administrator responded and reported the supervisor for this case is no longer with the agency. However, another supervisor could speak to the case and would be available for face-to-face interviews at the agency, with the foster care worker. On 2/22/22 while at the agency for face-to-face interviews, the CA attended virtually via Teams. CA reported reviewing the order when it was received on 1/31/22 and being in agreement with using the foster parent like an alternative

caregiver, due to the weather and other factors that delayed return. Parent 1 and the foster parent were both in agreement with the move date of 2/3/22. On 3/11/22 a follow-up conversation occurred via Teams. The CA reported she was not present for the conversations with Parent 1 or Foster Parent. However, she believed staff knew the expectations around return home planning. She also indicated that staff are aware an FTM can be completed after return home when a child is ordered home unexpectedly.

### **Foster Care Worker**

On 2/22/22 an interview was conducted at the agency with the assigned Foster Care Worker (FCW). FCW reported there was a court hearing on 1/27/22 where it was determined the family would receive Intensive Neglect Services (INS) to assist with reunification. However, reunification was not ordered at that time. On 1/31/22 a meeting occurred to discuss the case plan and referral for INS. The referral to INS was completed and submitted after the meeting. Later that afternoon, approximately 4:00pm, the agency received a court order to return Child A to the home of his parent (Parent 1). The order was signed on 1/31/22. The agency was not expecting this return home order so quickly. A Family Team Meeting had not occurred to plan for the return home. Additionally, due to the lateness of the day and a severe storm, it was determined the child would not be transported that night. FCW clarified Parent 1 also had to work that night and needed some additional time to set up school and daycare before Child A returned home. Contact occurred with the foster parent, who agreed to maintain the unpaid placement until Thursday, 2/3/22. Parent 1 did not express any concerns with this plan.

### **Supervisor**

On 2/22/22 an interview was completed at the agency with Supervisor. Supervisor clarified that INS is a reunification program, which keeps the court case open for supervision and services, but closes the agency/DHHS case. Supervisor reported there are two other children in this family that remain in care, therefore the family's case is open, despite Child A's case responsibility ending on 1/31/22. Supervisor indicated that due to all parties being in agreement that return home could physically occur on 2/3/22, they viewed the foster parent as "babysitting" to assist Parent 1. The foster parent understood this was not an official placement and she would not be paid for February 1-3. Foster Parent (FP) and Parent 1 had a good relationship and agreed giving Child A time to pack and say goodbye to people at school would be beneficial.

### **Foster Parent**

On 3/8/22 a phone interview occurred with Foster Parent (FP). It was confirmed there was a court order dated 1/31/22, but Child A did not return home until 2/3/22. Foster Parent stated she was informed via text from FCW. FCW set a date with FP to transport Child A on 2/3/22 to return home. FP stated she was not sure why that date was chosen, and she did not receive any paperwork about Child A leaving until after he moved. FP clarified that she was informed of the return home on Monday 1/31/22 and agreed to transport Child A home on Thursday 2/3/22, understanding it

was no longer considered a placement. FP denied having any contact with Parent 1 about the situation.

### **Parent 1**

On 3/8/22 a phone interview occurred with Parent 1. Parent 1 reported that during the 1/27/22 court hearing, there was no discussion about a return home date. Parent 1 participated in a meeting on 1/31/22, but return home was not discussed. On Wednesday 2/2/22, Parent 1 was informed Child A would be returned to her care. Parent 1 stated that she offered to pick Child A up, but FCW stated FP would be transporting him on 2/3/22. Parent 1 stated that she did not ask for a delay and she was ready for Child A to return home right away. Parent 1 reported being upset about the delay but did not report anything as she was overall happy with the agency and wanted to “go with the flow”.

### **Documents reviewed**

- Court order signed 1/27/22- no mention of return home.
- Court order, Ex Parte General Order signed 1/31/22 indicated:
  - The (Child A) is placed with his mother, (Parent 1).
  - The commitment to the MDHHS is hereby rescinded.
  - The parents and child are committed to the INS program under the supervision of JCO.
- Case contacts in MiSACWIS
  - 1/31/22- from FCW to Parent 1 (prior to court order being received to return home) FCW informed Parent 1 that INS meeting occurred and determined Child A would be staffed by INS, under her. Parent 1 was happy and asked what she had to do. FCW explained the process and that Parent 1 would need to get Child A registered for school, set up daycare, and fill his medication.
  - 1/31/22 from FCW to FP. FCW text FP to request Child A be transported as soon as possible. FP informed she would no longer be paid for placement. FP stated that Thursday would work for transport. A time was set with the FP.
  - 1/31/22 text from FCW to Parent 1. FCW informed Parent 1 they were planning to place Child A in her care on Thursday. Parent 1 agreed and discussed what she need to do prior to his arrival, such as daycare.
  - 2/2/22 text from FCW to FP. FCW informed FP the agency could not transport Child A due to the weather. FP stated she would transport Child A.
  - 2/2/22 text from FCW to Parent 1. FCW notified Parent 1 of an FTM that day. Parent 1 confirmed the time for return home on 2/3/22.
- TDM 1105 report dated 2/3/22: FCW recommends Child A return home; case accepted by INS program; FP planned to transport Child A to Parent 1's home.

<b>APPLICABLE RULE</b>	
<b>FOM 722-15</b>	<b>Case Closing</b>
	Caseworkers are required to continue and document all case management activities and services to the child and family until a written court order is received by the department ending the department's supervision of the child. Caseworkers do not have the authority to require the child and/or family to continue participating in case management activities and services after dismissal of court jurisdiction, even if the written order has not yet been received by the department.
<b>ANALYSIS:</b>	The agency is in violation of this policy as the court ended jurisdiction on 1/31/22 and the agency did not return the child home until 2/3/22. Policy states the agency cannot continue case management services after the court order. Therefore, a delayed return home, facilitated by the agency is not permitted.
<b>CONCLUSION:</b>	<b>VIOLATION ESTABLISHED</b>

#### IV. RECOMMENDATION

Upon receipt of an acceptable CAP, I recommend no change in the license status.



March 14, 2022

Heather Reilly  
Licensing Consultant

Date

Approved By:



March 15, 2022

Jessica VandenHeuvel  
Area Manager

Date