



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND ADULT LICENSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MARIANNE UDOW
DIRECTOR

October 9, 2007

Patrick Heron
Catholic Social Services of Wayne County
9851 Hamilton
Detroit, MI 48202

RE: License #: CB820201024
Investigation #: 2007C0208050
Catholic Social Services of Wayne County

Dear Mr. Heron:

Attached is the Special Investigation Report for the above referenced facility. Due to the severity of the violations, 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.
- Indicate how continuing compliance will be maintained once compliance is achieved.
- Be signed and dated.

Upon receipt of an acceptable corrective action plan, a six-month provisional license will be issued. If you do not agree to a provisional license, or fail to submit an acceptable corrective action plan, disciplinary action will result.

Please review the enclosed documentation for accuracy and feel free to contact me with any questions. In the event that I am not available and you need to speak to someone immediately, please feel free to contact the local office at (248) 975-5053.

Sincerely,

Miriam Berenstein

Miriam Berenstein, Licensing Consultant
Office of Children and Adult Licensing
Suite 358
41000 Woodward
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
(248) 975-5087

enclosure

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND ADULT LICENSING
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT**

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

License #:	CB820201024
Investigation #:	2007C0208050
Complaint Receipt Date:	07/20/2007
Investigation Initiation Date:	07/20/2007
Report Due Date:	09/18/2007
Licensee Name:	Catholic Social Services of Wayne County
Licensee Address:	9851 Hamilton Detroit, MI 48202
Licensee Telephone #:	(313) 883-2100
Administrator:	Patrick Heron
Licensee Designee:	Patrick Heron
Name of Facility:	Catholic Social Services of Wayne County
Facility Address:	9851 Hamilton Detroit, MI 48202
Facility Telephone #:	(313) 883-2100
Original Issuance Date:	08/15/1991
License Status:	REGULAR
Effective Date:	03/28/2007
Expiration Date:	03/27/2009
Capacity:	NA
Program Type:	CHILD PLACING AGENCY, PRIVATE

II. ALLEGATION(S)

ALLEGATION # 1

It is alleged that the Agency did not follow the Licensing Rules for Child Placing Agencies when initiating a Special Investigation on Foster Home I. It is further alleged that the Agency did not give Foster Parent 1 an accurate verbal summary of the findings or include the findings regarding all of the allegations.

ALLEGATION # 2

It is alleged that the Adoption process for Foster Children A & B was delayed, because the Agency did not complete the Updated Service Plans in a timely manner.

ALLEGATION # 3

It is reported that the Agency did not include significant information on Foster Child A's self abusive behaviors in the Updated Service Plan.

ALLEGATION # 4

It is alleged that Foster Child A ran away to Foster Family 2, her former foster home. It is reported that the Foster Family 2 is licensed with Vista Maria and this is not an appropriate placement for Foster Child A.

* Foster Parent 1, the complainant, listed a number of other issues that are not regulated by the Office of Children and Adult Licensing. Most significantly, the Office of Children and Adult Licensing does not regulate Children's Protective Services or the Difficulty of Care rate.

III. METHODOLOGY

07/20/2007	Special Investigation Intake 2007C0208050
07/20/2007	Special Investigation Initiated - Telephone Left message for Foster Care Supervisor and CEO regarding complaint.
07/20/2007	Contact - Telephone call received Talked to CEO regarding complaint. Onsite investigation scheduled for July 31, 2007.
07/25/2007	Contact - Telephone call made Talked to complainant. Received approval to forward copy of the complaint to the Agency.

07/31/2007	Contact - Face to Face Onsite investigation. Interviewed Program Director, Foster Care Supervisor, Licensing Worker and Adoption Supervisor. Reviewed Foster Home Record of Foster Family 1.
08/03/2007	Contact - Telephone call made Notified the assigned Licensing Consultant of Vista Maria regarding the complaint regarding Foster Family 2.
08/21/2007	Contact - Face to Face Onsite investigation. Interviewed the Foster Care Worker and Foster Care Supervisor. Reviewed case records of Foster Children A & C.
08/28/2007	Contact - Face to Face Onsite Investigation. Reviewed case record of Foster Child B. Preliminary Exit Conference with Program Director.
08/28/2007	Inspection Completed On-site
09/11/2007	Contact- Face to Face- Exit Conference with Program Director.
09/20/2007	Contact- Face to Face Licensing Consultant directed to review DHS- Purchase of Service case records to determine the dates that the respective Updated Service Plans were received.
09/21/2007	Contact –Telephone call made Talked to former DHS Worker assigned to Foster Children A & B.
09/21/2007	Contact- Telephone call made Advised Program Director of review of DHS case record.
10/09/2007	Contact- Telephone call made Final Exit Conference with Program Director.

ALLEGATION # 1

It is alleged that the Agency did not follow the Licensing Rules for Child Placing Agencies when initiating a Special Investigation on Foster Home I. It is further alleged that the Agency did not give Foster Parent 1 an accurate verbal summary of the findings or include the findings regarding all of the allegations.

INVESTIGATION:

The letter received from Foster Parent 1, the complainant, was reviewed and shared with the Agency. The Foster Home Licensing Record of Foster Family 1 was reviewed, including the Special Evaluation and progress notes completed by the Licensing Worker. The following information was gathered from these records. The Foster Care Worker received and reported complaint allegations to the Licensing Worker on February 6, 2007. The Special Evaluation was assigned to the Licensing Worker on February 7, 2007. The Licensing Worker completed an OCAL-259- Special Investigation Record, and documented that it was mailed to the Office of Children and Adult Licensing (OCAL) on February 8, 2007. The Licensing Worker contacted Foster Parent 1 on February 7, 2007, to inform her that a Special Evaluation was being initiated and she would be making an onsite visit on that day. The Licensing Worker informed Foster Parent 1 of the allegations when she arrived at the home and also told her that she could involve a person of her choice before they began the interview. The Special Evaluation states that on March 2, 2007, the Licensing Worker informed Foster Parent 1 of the findings of the Special Evaluation and informed her that revocation of her license would be recommended and Foster Children B & C would be removed from her home. The Special Evaluation was completed on March 12, 2007 and a copy sent to Foster Parent 1 on March 13, 2007. The letter advised Foster Parent 1 of her right to appeal the recommendation in the report and her right to appeal the Agency's decision to remove Foster Children B & C. On March 15, 2007, Foster Parent 1 appealed the decision to remove the children to the Foster Care Review Board. The Foster Care Review Board supported the removal of the children, based on the facts presented at the hearing.

Foster Parent 1's letter states she was not interviewed until February 7, 2007, three days after the allegations were made. Foster Parent 1 states that when the Licensing Worker contacted her she did not tell her that a complaint was being initiated. Foster Parent 1 states she was not advised of the allegations until the home visit was conducted. Foster Parent 1 further states she was not told she could involve a person of her choice until the interview was completed. Foster Parent 1 states that after the interview, the Licensing Worker told her there was nothing to worry about. Foster Parent 1 also states that when the Licensing Worker contacted her to communicate the findings, the Licensing Worker told her that the investigation was closed and she was not being cited for any violations. Foster Parent 1 states that the Special Evaluation Report did not include a finding regarding the allegation that she attempted to drown Foster Child A.

The Licensing Worker was interviewed. Her statements were consistent with the information in the Foster Home Record. She states she advised Foster Parent 1 of the Special Evaluation on the telephone and informed her of the specific allegations and her right to involve a person of her choice before the interview. The Licensing Worker denies that she failed to inform Foster Parent 1 that an investigation was being initiated. She also denies that she failed to tell Foster Parent 1 that she could involve a person of

her choice until after the interview. The Licensing Worker denies that after the interview she told Foster Parent 1 that there was nothing to worry about. The Licensing Worker also states that she informed Foster Parent 1 of the findings by telephone, as stated in her report. The Licensing Worker denies that she told Foster Parent 1 that the investigation was closed and she was not being cited for any violations.

The Licensing Worker states that after the complaint was initiated, Foster Parent 1 was directed to take Foster Children B & C for an exam to rule out child abuse. She states that the exam did not indicate any abuse and Foster Children B & C were left in the foster home until the completion of the DHS Report and Agency Report. The Licensing Worker states that the decision to remove Foster Children B & C was made after the DHS and Agency investigations supported the allegations.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.12316	Special evaluation.
	<p>(1) An agency shall do both of the following when information is received that relates to possible noncompliance with any foster home rule:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) Notify the department's licensing authority within 5 working days.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) Initiate a special evaluation of the foster home as soon as is indicated, based on the information received, but not later than 7 calendar days after receipt of the information.</p> <p>(2) An agency shall inform foster parents of all of the following before they are questioned or interviewed regarding a special evaluation:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) That a special evaluation has been initiated.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) A clear description of the allegations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(c) That the foster parents have an option to involve a person of their choice in any interviews with them involving the special evaluation if the involvement does not impede the timely completion of the evaluation.</p> <p>(3) An agency shall complete a special evaluation within 45 calendar days after receipt of the information. If additional time is required, then the agency shall inform the foster parent, in writing, of the basis for the extension.</p> <p>(4) Before completion of the written report required by subrule (5) of this rule, an agency shall provide the foster parent with a verbal summary of the preliminary findings at the conclusion of the evaluation.</p> <p>(6) An agency shall do both of the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) Provide the foster parent with a copy of the report required by subrule (5) of this rule within 10 calendar days of its completion.</p>

	<p>(b) Inform the foster parent, in writing, that he or she has a right to have his or her written response included as an attachment to the report required by subrule (5) of this rule.</p>
<p>ANALYSIS:</p>	<p>(1)(a) The OCAL-259 was completed as required.</p> <p>(1)(b) All parties agree that the special evaluation was initiated on February 7, 2007, within the required time frame. The Agency is in compliance with (1)(a)(b).</p> <p>(2)(a) The Licensing Worker documented that she advised Foster Parent 1 that a Special Evaluation was being initiated when she telephoned her on February 7, 2007. Foster Parent 1 states she was not informed that this was a Special Evaluation during the telephone call. There are no witnesses to this conversation. There is insufficient information to support noncompliance.</p> <p>(2)(b) Foster Parent 1 states that she was not informed of the allegations until the home visit on February 7, 2007. This rule requires that the foster parent be advised of the allegations prior to the interview. Foster Parent 1 acknowledges that she was advised of the allegations before the interview began. The Agency is in compliance with this subsection of the rule.</p> <p>(2)(c) The Licensing Worker states that before she began the interview, she informed Foster Parent 1 of her right to involve a person of her choice. Foster Parent 1 states she was not informed of her right to involve a person of her choice until after the interview. There are no witnesses to this conversation. There is insufficient information to support noncompliance.</p> <p>(3) The Foster Home Record documents that the report was completed within 45 calendar days. The Agency is in compliance with this subsection of the rule.</p> <p>(4) The Licensing Worker reports that on March 2, 2007, she gave Foster Parent 1 a verbal summary of her findings, which included a recommendation for revocation of her license and removal of Foster Children B & C. Foster Parent 1 states that she was verbally told that there were no violations and the investigation was closed. There are no witnesses to this conversation. There is insufficient information to support noncompliance.</p> <p>(5)(a)-(d) The Special evaluation was reviewed. These subsections are in compliance.</p>

	<p>(5) (e)(f) Foster Home 1 was cited for violation of Rule 400.9403(d)(i) Foster parent duties. Foster Parent 1 was cited for using physical discipline on Foster Child A. The specific allegations that Foster Parent 1 had attempted to drown Foster Child A and pushed her down the stairs were not addressed in the report and did not include a finding of fact or conclusion. This is determined to be a noncompliance and a Corrective Action Plan is required.</p> <p>5(g)(h) A recommendation for revocation of the license of Foster Home 1 and replacement of Foster Children B & C is included in the Special Evaluation Report. The Licensing Worker states that the decision to recommend revocation of the license and to remove Foster Children B & C was not made until completion of the DHS and Agency Report. The Agency is in compliance with this subsection of the rule.</p> <p>(6)(a)(b) The Foster Home Record includes a letter to Foster Parent 1 dated March 13, 2007. The letter states a copy of the Special Evaluation is attached and Foster Parent 1 has a right to include a written response as an attachment to the report. The Agency is in compliance with this subsection of the rule.</p>
CONCLUSION:	VIOLATION ESTABLISHED

ALLEGATION # 2

It is alleged that the Adoption process for Foster Children A & B was delayed, because the Agency did not complete the Updated Service Plans in a timely manner.

INVESTIGATION:

The Foster Home Records of Foster Children A & B were reviewed. The Updated Service Plans from the time of placement with Foster Family 1 were reviewed. Foster Child A was placed with Foster Family 1 on October 23, 2004 and truanted on February 3, 2007. Foster Child B was placed with Foster Family 1 on November 13, 2004 to be reunited with his sister, Foster Child A. He was removed on March 2, 2007, as a result of a complaint investigation on Foster Home 1.

All of the Updated Service Reports in the case records appeared to be on time. The reports had the required worker and supervisor signatures with a date that indicated they were completed every 90 days. However, the Adoption Progress Report enclosed in the case records, beginning February 2005 through September 2006, states that the Adoption Petition could not be filed because Foster Parent 1 had not submitted all of the paperwork and the Updated Service Plans were not up to date.

The Foster Care Supervisor was interviewed regarding the dates on the Updated Service Plans. The Foster Care Supervisor admitted that reports were signed with the dates they were due, not the dates they were actually written. He acknowledged that reports were late.

On September 20, 2007, the combined Updated Service Plans (USP's) of Foster Children A & B were reviewed in the DHS- Purchase of Service case record. The USP's were reviewed to determine the date they were received by DHS. This is determined to be the approximate date that reports were completed. The report dates are as follows:

- October 30, 2004- January 30, 2005- date stamped by DHS on March 27, 2006.
- January 30, 2005- April 30, 2005- date stamped by DHS on March 24, 2006.
- April 30, 2005- July 30, 2005- date stamped by DHS on June 28, 2006.
- July 30, 2005- October 30, 2005- date stamped by DHS on June 28, 2006.
- October 30, 2005- January 30, 2006- date stamped by DHS on June 28, 2006.
- January 30, 2006-April 30, 2006- date stamped by DHS on June 28, 2006.
- April 30, 2006-July 30, 2006-date stamped November 27, 2006
- July 30, 2006-October 30, 2006- USP could not be located in DHS record. The USP is in the CSS record.
- October 30, 2006- January 30, 2007- The Worker noted that the USP was received at the Team Decision Making Meeting on March 6, 2007.
- January 30, 2007-April 30, 2007- date stamped by DHS on June 18, 2007.
- April 30, 2007-July 30, 2007- date stamped by DHS on August 17, 2007.

It should be noted that the DHS Worker that was interviewed was assigned to this case from September 2004 until August 7, 2007. She states that reports were consistently very late. The case record has periodic reminders to the Agency regarding overdue reports. There was a reminder sent on June 12, 2006 that stated there were missing USP's for July 2005; October 2005; January 2006; and April 2006.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.12418	Service plans; initial and updated.
	(1) An agency shall complete written service plans for each child as follows: (b) Within 90 calendar days after the initial service plan and at least once every 90 calendar days after the initial service plan.
ANALYSIS:	The Adoption Progress Reports in the case records of Foster Children A & B document that one of the reasons the Adoption Petition could not be filed was because the Updated Service Plans were not up to date. The Foster Care Supervisor stated that the reports were signed with the dates they were due, not with the dates they were completed. He acknowledged that reports were late. The amount of time that reports were late cannot be accurately established. However, the date reports were received by the DHS Purchase of Service Worker is determined to be the approximate date that reports were completed. The Licensing Rule requires that reports be signed and dated at the time they are completed. Signing reports by indicating the date they were due is not acceptable.
CONCLUSION:	VIOLATION ESTABLISHED

ALLEGATION # 3

It is reported that the Agency did not include significant information on Foster Child A's self abusive behaviors in the Updated Service Plan.

INVESTIGATION

The Updated Service Plans (USP's) from the time of placement with Foster Family 1 were reviewed. Foster Child A, D.O.B. January 10, 1997, was placed with Foster Family 1 on October 23, 2004 and truanted on February 3, 2007. The USP's include consistent information regarding Foster Child A's self abusive behaviors. The USP dated January 30, 2006-April 30, 2006, included detailed information regarding the Incident on April 21, 2006, when Foster Child A was taken to the Emergency Room for injuries that reportedly occurred from self abuse. Medical documentation of this Emergency Room examination was included.

Foster Child A was participating in therapy with a Mental Health Center from the time of placement. The Agency had documentation of unsuccessful efforts to obtain information

from the Mental Health Center. Information was denied due to confidentiality issues. At the time of this review, the Agency was able to obtain a brief summary of services.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.12418	Service plans; initial and updated.
	(6) An updated service plan shall include all of the following information: (c) A summary of information pertinent to the updated services plan received since the last service plan from the child, the child's parents or legal guardian, foster parents, referring agency, and others, unless the agency documents why any of these entities cannot be involved.
ANALYSIS:	The Updated Service Plans (USP's) include consistent information regarding Foster Child A's self abusive behaviors.
CONCLUSION:	VIOLATION NOT ESTABLISHED

ALLEGATION # 4

It is alleged that Foster Child A ran away to Foster Family 2, her former foster home. It is reported that the Foster Family 2 is licensed with Vista Maria and this is not an appropriate placement for Foster Child A.

INVESTIGATION

Foster Child A's case record documents that she ran away from Foster Home 1 and went to her former foster home, Foster Home 2. The case record reports that Foster Home 2 was previously licensed by Catholic Social Services and is currently licensed with Vista Maria. It was reported that Foster Parent 1 notified the Agency and the Police that Foster Child A had truanted on February 3, 2007. Foster Parent 1 stated that DHS contacted her to inform her that Foster Child A was at the home of Foster Family 2. Foster Parent 1 states she related this information to the Foster Care Worker.

The Foster Care Supervisor states that Foster Child A truanted on February 3, 2007, a Saturday. The Foster Care Supervisor states he talked to the DHS Worker and advised her that he did not want Foster Child A to remain in Foster Home 2 and requested a Shelter. The Foster Care Supervisor states he made this request, because he had some concerns regarding Foster Child A's previous placement in Foster Home 2. The Foster Care Supervisor states that the DHS Worker would not move Foster Child A to a Shelter. He states that he did not take further action to remove Foster Child A, because he thought DHS had placement responsibility.

The Foster Care Supervisor states that the Agency was closed from Monday, February 5, 2007 through Wednesday, February 7, 2007, due to a problem with the furnace, but

he and the Foster Care Worker were in contact with Foster Parent 2. He states Foster Child A remained in Foster Home 2 until a Team Decision Meeting was conducted on February 9, 2007 and at that time she was removed to Foster Home 3.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.12315	Borrowed home.
	<p>(1) Before placing a child in a foster home certified by another agency, an agency shall have a record containing all of the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Prior approval from the certifying agency authorizing the placement of a child in the home. (b) Documentation that the foster parent is willing to accept the foster child. (c) A copy of the initial evaluation with written endorsement by the borrowing agency that the evaluation is acceptable. (d) A copy of the current reevaluation with written endorsement by the borrowing agency that the evaluation is acceptable. (e) A list of all children currently placed in the home. (f) Documentation that the foster parent has received orientation to the policies of the borrowing agency. (g) A copy of the placement agreement signed by the foster parent and the borrowing agency. (h) A copy of the current license certification documents from the certifying agency. (i) A copy of all special evaluations completed during the last 2 years.

ANALYSIS:	<p>Foster Child A ran away to her former foster home, Foster Home 2. Foster Home 2 was previously licensed by Catholic Social Services and is currently licensed by Vista Maria. Foster Child A remained in Foster Home 2 from February 3, 2007 to February 9, 2007. Catholic Social Services did not request approval from Vista Maria, the certifying agency, to borrow the bed and authorize the placement. The Licensing Consultant for Vista Maria has been informed of the concerns regarding the license capacity of Foster Home 2.</p> <p>It is determined that at the time Foster Child A ran away from Foster Home 1 she was under the care and supervision of Catholic Social Services. It is further determined that Catholic Social Services had placement responsibility and did not receive approval from Agency 2 to borrow a bed for Foster Child A.</p>
CONCLUSION:	VIOLATION ESTABLISHED

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS:

INVESTIGATION:

During a review of Foster Child A's case record, an Incident regarding a serious injury was reported. This injury occurred during her placement in Foster Home 3. Foster Parent 3 contacted the Agency to report that on June 2, 2007, Foster Child A had fallen off her bike. Foster Parent 3 reported that Foster Child A was diagnosed with a fractured right arm. Prior to a request from the Licensing Consultant during this investigation, the Agency did not obtain a copy of the Medical Report to document the medical care received and to assure that child abuse was not suspected.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.12413	Medical and dental care policy.
	(2) An agency shall document all medical and dental care received by a foster child.
ANALYSIS:	Foster Parent 3 reported that Foster Child A fractured her right arm when she fell off her bike. Prior to a request from the Licensing Consultant, the Agency did not obtain a copy of the Medical Report to document the medical care received and to assure that child abuse was not suspected.
CONCLUSION:	VIOLATION ESTABLISHED

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS:

INVESTIGATION:

The Updated Service Plans of Foster Children B & C were reviewed, as there was an allegation that the UPS's were significantly late.

Foster Child B, D.O.B. 06/13/2004, was born cocaine addicted and two weeks premature. He was admitted to the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit for respiratory distress. He remained in the Hospital until he was placed in Foster Home 5 on 08/04/2004. He was replaced with Foster Family 1 on 11/13/2004 to be reunited with his sister, Foster Child A. He was removed on 03/02/2007, as a result of a complaint investigation on Foster Home 1.

Prior to Foster Child B's removal, monthly Foster Home Visits were made to Foster Home 1. A visitation form was completed and repeatedly stated, from January 2006-February 2007, that Foster Child B was doing well and developing on target. There was very limited information on the forms regarding Foster Child B. There was only one visit, conducted by the Licensing Worker in September 2006 that noted that Foster Parent 1 requested an Early On assessment.

The Updated Service Plans since the initial placement repeatedly stated that Foster Child B was developing normally. USP's during three report periods that include April 2006-January 2007, have a paragraph that is repeated verbatim regarding Foster Child B's development. The information from the September 2006 Foster Home Visit requesting an Early On Assessment was not in the Updated Service Plan for that time frame.

On March 2, 2007, the date that Foster Child B was placed in Foster Home 5, Foster Parent 5 called the Foster Care Worker to report that Foster Child B's two front teeth were broken. On March 13, 2007, Foster Parent 5 took Foster Child B to the Hospital Medical Clinic for an exam. He was referred to an audiologist and speech specialist and a dentist. During March-May 2007, Foster Child B had a series of Dr. appointments related to his speech and hearing. Foster Child B was diagnosed with moderate to severe hearing loss and auditory neuropathy. This means that he cannot process what he hears. He will need to learn sign language and began attending the speech and language clinic at the Hospital. He will be referred to Oakland Schools that provides education for the hearing impaired. Additionally, Foster Child B's dental work was completed. He had a root canal on both front teeth and they were capped.

The Updated Service Plan, dated January 30, 2007- April 30, 2007, includes the above information. The Foster Care Worker states that Foster Parent 5 notified the Agency that Foster Child B's two front teeth were broken and he had a speech and language delay. The Foster Care Worker states that Foster Parent 1 had not given an accurate account of Foster Child B's speech development. The Foster Care Worker also states

that during medical exams the doctor did not report a speech delay or hearing problems. The Foster Care Worker states that when Foster Child B was initially placed with Foster Parent 1 she was told to take him to a hearing specialist. There is a letter in the case record dated January 2005, requesting Foster Parent 1 to follow up with a developmental assessment. There is no documentation of efforts by the Agency to follow up with this request. Foster Child B had well baby exams in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 & 2007, as required. The doctors reported normal exams.

The Foster Care Worker states that she was initially assigned the case of Foster Children A & B. She states that due to a leave, the case was covered by the Foster Care Supervisor for a length of time. It should be noted that although all of the home visits to Foster Home 1 were completed and documented, they were conducted by rotating social service staff. The home visits included visits by the Foster Care Worker, the Foster Care Supervisor, the Intake Worker, the Adoption Worker and the Licensing Worker.

Foster Child C, D.O.B. May 25, 2006, was born positive for cocaine. Her Intake Assessment states she needs medical follow up and an Early On Referral. She was placed in Foster Home 1 on May 31, 2006. A visitation form was completed and repeatedly stated, from May 2006-February 2007, that Foster Child C was doing well. The USP dated June 25, 2006- September 25, 2006 states Foster Child C is developing age appropriately and should be assessed by Early On at six months. The Updated Service Plan dated September 25, 2006-December 25, 2006 states Foster Child C is developing age appropriately and has an Early On appointment in January 2007. This assessment did not occur in January 2007. In February 2007, the Foster Care Worker noted that Foster Parent 1 was now expressing concern regarding Foster Child C's development. The Foster Care Worker states she requested Foster Parent 1 to take Foster Child C to Children's Hospital for a developmental exam.

Foster Child C was removed from Foster Home 1 on March 2, 2007, as a result of a complaint investigation on Foster Home 1. On March 14, 2007, Foster Child C was visited in her new foster home, Foster Home 4, by the Agency Early On Coordinator. The Early On Coordinator documented that she had concerns regarding Foster Child C being failure to thrive and she referred her to Children's Hospital of Michigan for a complete examination. An Early On assessment was completed on April 3, 2007. There was no documentation of failure to thrive. However, there were concerns noted regarding delayed gross and fine motor skills and language and communication. Foster Child C was in the 5th percentile for weight.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.12207	Staff responsibilities.
	<p>(3) An agency shall require that social service workers be directly responsible for all of the following activities:</p> <p>(a) Placing and supervising children in foster care, adoptive homes, or independent living. Social service workers shall work directly with the children, their families, and other relevant individuals and be primarily responsible for the development, implementation, and review of service plans for the children and their families.</p>
ANALYSIS	<p>In regard to Foster Child B. Foster Child B was visited monthly by rotating social service workers from the time of placement in Foster Home 1 until his removal on March 2, 2007. No social service worker or supervisor noticed his developmental delays or broken teeth. The Agency did not follow up on recommended referrals for Foster Child B.</p> <p>On the day Foster Child B was removed from Foster Home 1, the new foster parent, Foster Parent 5, immediately noticed his broken teeth and developmental delays. Foster Parent 5 made the necessary medical appointments. Foster Child B was diagnosed with a severe to moderate hearing loss and auditory neuropathy. He also had two root canals and his teeth capped.</p> <p>In regard to Foster Child C. Foster Child C was visited monthly by rotating social service workers from the time of placement in Foster Home 1 until her removal on March 2, 2007. No social service worker or supervisor noticed her developmental delays or followed up to obtain an Early On assessment. These assessments were made after she was placed in her new foster home.</p> <p>The Agency is responsible for supervising Foster Children B and C and to develop service plans to meet their medical and developmental needs. Despite monthly home visits, it is clear by reviewing the Foster Home Visit Logs and USP's that the Agency failed to properly supervise Foster Children B & C.</p>
CONCLUSION:	VIOLATION ESTABLISHED

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Upon receipt of an acceptable Corrective Action Plan, it is recommended that the Agency's license be modified to a 1st Provisional license.

Miriam Berenstein

Miriam Berenstein
Licensing Consultant

October 9, 2007
Date

Approved By:

Linda Lee

Linda Lee
Area Manager

October 9, 2007

Date