

Overview of the SCAN Policies Database

The State Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database compiles data on the definitions and policies that states use in their surveillance of child maltreatment, along with data on associated risk and protective factors. The SCAN Policies Database is funded by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in collaboration with the Children's Bureau in the Administration for Children and Families at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.The project team is led by Mathematica in partnership with Child Trends.

The project's purpose is to review and compile information from states' definitions and policies, to create a database of those definitions and policies (the SCAN Policies Database) that can be used for analysis. The database is a resource for researchers, analysts, and others who are interested in examining differences between states in their definitions and policies on child maltreatment.

Content

The scope of the SCAN Policies Database includes information about state definitions and policies related to child abuse and neglect for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This information represents data collected, reviewed, and verified between May 2019 and July 2020. The data reflect the state definitions and policies for the calendar year 2019. The scope of topics in the SCAN Policies Database includes states' definitions of child abuse and neglect as well as information about policies related to reporting, screening, and investigating child maltreatment. Key aspects of the child welfare systems' response and context are also included.

The content in the database is organized into six domains. The state profiles, codebook, data collection protocol, and data file are also organized by these domains. In the protocol, each question is named with a prefix that identifies its associated domain. The six domains are listed below, with the identifying protocol number prefix.

| Domain | Question prefix |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Definitions | D |
| Reporting | R |
| Screening | S |
| Investigation | I |
| Child welfare response | W |
| Child welfare system context | С |
| | |

State Profile

This SCAN Policies Database state profile serves as a summary of the information collected about the definitions and policies for the identified state. Each profile is organized by topical domains, which contain a set of tables that depict the state's information for each variable within that domain.

This information was gathered through a document collection, review, and coding process conducted by the SCAN Policies Database team. Input from states on data collection was obtained through a confirmation and verification process. More information about the SCAN Policies Database data collection procedures can be found in the data user's guide and data collection protocol which are accessible from the Data Use Resources page https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources.

The state profile presents responses for each variable with "yes," "no," "unknown," or other response as appropriate. The response of "unknown" was used for topics that could not be located from the state's available resources or verified with the state. In some cases, "logical skip" was used when a question was not applicable to a particular state given a related response on a preceding question.

Data use resources

Several data use resources are available to support users of the SCAN Policies Database:

- Data user's guide: The guide has detailed information about the data set, including the process used to collect and review the data, the scope of information included in the data set, guidance on using the data, such as how to link the data with other data sources; and notes about specific topics. This data user's guide also has two appendices. Appendix A provides a glossary of key terms. Appendix B summarizes the decisions made on the scope and variables to include in the SCAN Policies Database after a data quality assessment.
- **Codebook:** The codebook provides information about each variable in the data set, including variable names, labels, definitions, protocol number, variable type, and frequencies. The codebook has two appendices. Appendix A contains supplemental notes that are important for accurately interpreting and using the data. Appendix B is a comprehensive list of all state statutes and policy documentation sources used to collect data for the SCAN Policies Database for each state, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.
- **Data collection protocol:** The protocol has the questions used to collect information about states' statutes and policies as part of the data review and coding process. Appendix A provides a glossary of key terms.

These data use resources can be found on the SCAN Policies Database website (<u>https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources</u>) or from National Data Archive for Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) (<u>https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/</u>).

More Information

More information about the SCAN Policies Database can be found at <u>https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com</u>. General inquiries can be submitted to <u>SCANPoliciesDatabase@mathematica-mpr.com</u>.

State Identifying Information

Table I.A. State identifying information

| | Response |
|--|----------|
| a. State abbreviation | MI |
| b. State Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) code | 26 |
| c. Census region code | Midwest |
| d. State verified coding of information | Yes |
| e. State confirmed documents reviewed | Yes |
| f. State definitions and policies for calendar year | 2019 |

Domain D: Definitions of child maltreatment

Table II.A. State's definition of child maltreatment

| | Response |
|--|--|
| 1. Types of maltreatment included in state definition | |
| a. Physical abuse | Yes |
| b. Excessive corporal punishment | Yes |
| c. Sexual abuse | Yes |
| d. Emotional maltreatment | Yes |
| e. Neglect | Yes |
| f. Inadequate clothing | Yes |
| g. Inadequate shelter | Yes |
| h. Malnourishment, inadequate food | Yes |
| i. Medical neglect, inadequate medical care | Yes |
| j. Failure-to-thrive | Yes |
| k. Educational neglect | No |
| I. Abandonment | Yes |
| m. Injurious environment. Likelihood of harm to child's health, physical well-being | Yes |
| n. Drug Lab. Child present within structure where methamphetamine is being created | Yes |
| Inadequate supervision. Failure to meet parent or caretaker responsibilities | Yes |
| p. Drug or alcohol misuse. Parental drug or alcohol misuse causing harm to child | Yes |
| q. Prenatal exposure to drugs or alcohol | Yes |
| r. Illicit substance. Illegally providing a controlled substance to a child | No |
| s. Human trafficking, involuntary servitude, sexual servitude | Yes |
| t. Female genital mutilation | No |
| u. Shaken baby syndrome, abusive head trauma | Yes |
| v. Failure to protect. Failure to protect from harm | Yes |
| w. Domestic violence. Exposure to domestic violence | Yes |
| x. Factitious disorder by proxy | Yes |
| y. Institutional abuse/neglect | Yes |
| z. Other definition (specify) | No |
| 2. Subtypes of maltreatment included in state definition | |
| a. Subtypes of maltreatment considered abuse | Physical abuse about include prenatal exposure if there is demonstrated impact to child or parental incapacity |

Table II.A (continued)

| | | Response |
|----|--|---|
| b. | Subtypes of maltreatment considered neglect | Medical neglect, improper supervision, and failure to protect are considered their own maltreatment types but could be considered as part of neglect; Inadequate clothing, shelter, and malnourishment are not specifically a subtype of neglect but rather a condition; Domestic violence is considered improper supervision, failure to protect, or neglect |
| | Subtypes of maltreatment considered other than abuse or neglect | Driving under the influence would most likely be coded as improper supervision |
| 3. | Level of harm included in state's definition of child maltreatment | |
| a. | Inflicts harm | Yes |
| b. | Imminent danger or substantial risk of harm | Yes |
| 4. | Differences in level of harm included in state's definition of child maltreatment by type of maltreatment | Νο |
| 5. | Type of harm or injury specified in state's definition of child maltreatment | |
| a. | Death, bodily injury, impairment of physical condition | Yes |
| b. | Impairment of mental or emotional condition | Yes |
| C. | Harmful environment, conditions | Yes |
| d. | Type of harm or injury not specified | No |
| e. | Other (specify) | No |
| 6. | Variation in extent of injury or harm by maltreatment type in the state's definition of child maltreatment | No |
| 7. | Perpetrator identified as part of state's definition of child maltreatment | Yes |
| 8. | Types of perpetrators specified as part of state's definition of child maltreatment | |
| a. | Any adult | No |
| b. | Parent | Yes |
| C. | Guardian | Yes |
| d. | Caregiver/caretaker | No |
| e. | Family member/parent paramour | Yes |
| f. | Household member | Yes |
| g. | Person responsible for child | Yes |
| h. | Other (specify) | Yes - Member of the clergy |

Table II.A (continued)

| | Response |
|--|----------------|
| 9. Types of perpetrators vary by type of maltreatment | Νο |
| 10. Explanation of variation in types of perpetrator by maltreatment type | Not applicable |
| 11. Child age included in definition of child maltreatment | Yes |
| 12. Specific child age in definition of child maltreatment | Under age 18 |
| 13. Variability of child age by type of maltreatment | No |

Table II.B. Child maltreatment definition exemptions

| | | Response: Yes/No/Unknown |
|----|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. | Exemption included in state's definition of child maltreatment | |
| a. | Financial issues, financial inability to provide for a child | Yes |
| b. | Discipline, physical discipline as long as it is reasonable and causes no bodily injury to the child | Yes |
| C. | Safe haven exemption, newborn relinquished or abandoned in accordance with infant safe haven laws | Yes |
| d. | Infant testing positive drugs – medical, newborn with positive test for controlled substance as a result of parent's medical treatment | Yes |
| e. | Religious observance, parent relies on spiritual or religious forms of medical treatment | Yes |
| f. | Other exemption (specify) | No |
| 2. | Safe haven exemption included in state's definition of child maltreatment | |
| a. | Must leave a child at specific safe haven locations | Yes |
| b. | Child must be left by parent or parent's agent | Yes |
| C. | Child must be left by a certain age (specify) | Yes - 72 hours old or younger |
| d. | No intent to return | Yes |
| e. | Child must be left unharmed | Yes |
| f. | Other (specify) | No |

Domain R: Reporting child abuse and neglect

Table III.A. Reporting policies

| | Response |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Statewide centralized reporting | Yes |
| 2. How reporting is decentralized | |
| a. Each county or region has its own reporting hotline | Logical Skip |
| b. Some counties or regions have own reporting hotline | Logical Skip |
| c. During some times of the day, counties or regions have their own reporting hotline | Logical Skip |
| d. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |
| 3. Standard for reporting child maltreatment | |
| a. Known abuse and neglect | Yes |
| b. Reasonable cause to believe a child was abused or neglected | Yes |
| 4. Universal mandated reporting | No |
| 5. Required training for mandated reporters | No |
| 6. Penalties for failure to report | Yes, all mandated reporters |
| 7. Specific penalties for failure to report | |
| a. Criminal charges | Yes |
| b. Civil charges | Yes |
| c. Professional licensure suspended or revoked | No |
| d. Other (specify) | No |
| 8. Penalties for false reporting | Yes |
| 9. Specific penalties for false reporting | |
| a. Criminal charges | Yes |
| b. Civil charges | No |
| c. Professional license suspended or revoked | No |
| d. Other (specify) | No |
| e. Unknown | No |
| 10. Immunity for reporters of child abuse and neglect | Yes |
| 11. Information requested at the time of report | |
| a. Identifying information of child | Yes |
| b. Location/contact information of child and family | Yes |
| c. Type/severity of suspected maltreatment | Yes |
| d. Date of suspected maltreatment | No |
| e. Identifying and other information of alleged perpetrator(s) | No |
| f. Identifying and other information of reporter | No |
| g. Identifying information of child's parents, guardian, or caregiver/caretaker | Yes |
| h. Identifying and other information of family/household members | Yes |
| i. Information on prior maltreatment | No |
| j. Other (specify) | No |
| 12. Anonymity of reporter | |
| a. All reporters (including mandated reports) can stay anonymous | No |

Table III.A (continued)

| | Response | |
|---|--|--|
| b. The general public can be anonymous (mandated reporters cannot remain anonymous) | Yes | |
| c. Reporters (including mandated reporters) cannot be anonymous | No | |
| d. Unknown | No | |
| 13. Tribal involvement in accepting reports of tribal cases | | |
| a. Tribes are not involved | No | |
| b. Tribes accept reports (specify tribes) | Yes - Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians; Keweenaw Bay Indian Community; Bay Mills Indian Community; Hannahville Indian Community; Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians | |
| c. Collaboration of tribes with state/local public child welfare agency accept reports (specify tribes) | No | |
| d. Unknown | No | |

Table III.B. Types of mandated reporters

| | Response | Response | Response |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Types of mandated reporters | Included in state's definition of mandated reporters | Training required ¹ | Subject to penalties for failure to report ² |
| a. Foster parents | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| b. School staff – teachers | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| c. School bus drivers or other transportation staff | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| d. Before/after school program staff | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| e. Child care staff | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| f. Camp counselors, directors, or administrators | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| g. Athletic coaches or staff | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| h. Medical or dental professionals | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| i. Substance abuse disorder treatment providers | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| j. Mental health, counselors, or other social service professionals | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| k. Police or other law enforcement | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| I. Emergency medical technicians, firefighters, or other emergency personnel | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| m. Judges | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| n. District attorneys or other attorneys | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| o. Guardian ad litems or Court-appointed special advocates | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| p. Other court personnel | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| q. Shelter staff | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| r. Those who work in fields processing or monitoring print, film, or computer images | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |
| s. Religious clergy | Yes | Logical Skip | Yes |
| t. Volunteers | No | Logical Skip | Logical Skip |

Table III.B (continued)

| Response | Response | Response |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Response Other type of mandated porter (specify) Yes - Michigan Department of Health and Human Services staff under the following categories: (1) eligibility specialist, (2) family independence manager, (3) family independence specialist, (4) social services specialist, (6) social work specialist manager, (7) welfare services specialist; Medical examiners; Any employee of an organization or entity that, as a result of federal funding statutes, regulations, or contracts, would be prohibited from reporting in the absence of a state mandate or court order | Response Logical Skip | Response Yes - Michigan Department of Health and Human Services staff under the following categories: (1) eligibility specialist, (2) family independence manager, (3) family independence specialist, (4) social services specialist, (5) social work specialist, (6) social work specialist manager, (7) welfare services specialist; Medical examiners; Any employee of an organization or entity that, as a result of federal funding statutes, regulations, or |

¹Responses in this column can equal logical skip when the given type of mandated reporter is not included in the state's definition of mandated reporters or when no training is required for mandated reporters (Table III.A.5). Responses in this column can be yes when a state has universal mandated reporting (Table III.A.4) and all mandated reporters require training (Table III.A.5).

²Responses in this column can equal logical skip with the given type of mandated reporter is not included in the state's definition of mandated reporters or when no mandated reporters are subject to penalties (Table III.A.6). Reponses in this column can be yes when a state has universal mandated reporting (Table III.A.4) and when all adults or all mandated reporters are subject to penalties (Table III.A.6).

Domain S: Screening reports of child abuse and neglect

Table IV.A. Screening policies

| | Response |
|--|--|
| 1. Statewide centralized screening | Yes |
| 2. How screening is decentralized | |
| a. Each county or region has its own screening unit | Logical Skip |
| b. Some counties or regions have their own screening units | Logical Skip |
| c. During certain times of the day, counties or regions have their own screening units | Logical Skip |
| d. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |
| 3. Information required to screen in report | |
| a. Identifying information of child | No |
| b. Location/contact information of child and family | No |
| c. Type/severity of suspected maltreatment | Yes |
| d. Date of suspected maltreatment | No |
| e. Identifying and other information of alleged perpetrator(s) | Yes |
| f. Other (specify) | Yes - Four elements must be present in order to assign a complaint for investigation: (1) Allegations of harm or threatened harm (2) to a child's health or welfare (3) through non-accidental or neglectful behavior (4) by a person responsible for the child's health and welfare; Ask if the child has native heritage |
| g. Unknown | No |

Table IV.B. Screening Decision Process and Activities

| | Response | Required cases | Conditions or types of cases |
|---|--|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Decision processes used during screening | Response | Required cases | types of cases |
| | Vaa | Deguired for all | |
| a. Supervisory review | Yes | Required for all | — |
| b. Team-based decision | No | Logical Skip | — |
| c. Individual screener | No | Logical Skip | — |
| d. Other (specify) | No | Logical Skip | — |
| e. Unknown | No | — | — |
| 2. Variability of decision process used for screening | | | |
| a. Consistent statewide | Yes | — | — |
| b. Varies locally | No | — | |
| c. Unknown | No | — | _ |
| 3. Certain activities or information are required as part of screening | Yes | | |
| 4. Activities/information required as part of screening | | | |
| a. Safety or risk assessment | No | Logical Skip | Not applicable |
| B. Review agency records for prior involvement with child protective services | No | Logical Skip | Not applicable |
| c. Other (specify) | Yes - Determination of priority response of the case using a minimal priority response criteria | Required for all | Not applicable |
| 5. Types of safety/risk assessment used during screening | | | |
| a. Structured Decision Making | Logical Skip | — | — |
| b. Other (specify) | Logical Skip | — | — |
| 6. Consistency of screening activities/information | | | |
| a. Consistent statewide | Yes | _ | — |
| b. Varies locally (specify) | No | — | _ |
| c. Unknown | No | _ | _ |

Table IV.C. Screeners

| | Response |
|--|---|
| 1. Screener of abuse and neglect reports | |
| a. Case workers (frontline staff) | No |
| b. Case managers (supervisors) | No |
| c. Staff in specialized screening unit | Yes |
| d. Other (specify) | No |
| 2. Qualifications of screener | |
| a. Associate's degree | No |
| b. Bachelor's degree | No |
| c. Master's degree | No |
| d. Training for screening (specify) | Yes - All MDHHS, All MDHHS and private child placing agency employees with access to the Michigan Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (MiSACWIS) must complete the MiSACWIS Security computer-based training (CBT) and pass the associated exam with a score of 90 percent or higher prior to accessing MiSACWIS; Centralized intake (CI) specialists who have not previously completed a pre-service institute (PSI) must complete PSI for Child Protection Services (CPS); CI specialists who have previously completed PSI but have not worked in CPS must attend centralized intake program-specific transfer training (PSTT) with the Office of Workforce Development Training (OWDT) and CI Local Office Experts (LOE); CI specialists with prior CPS experience must attend training with CI LOEs; CI supervisors must attend NSI training for CPS within 112 days of hire/promotion if not previously completed; All will receive on-the job training from CI LOEs |
| e. Years of experience (specify) | No |
| f. Other (specify) | No |
| g. Unknown | No |
| 3. Tribal involvement in screening process of tribal cases | |
| a. Tribes are not involved | Yes |
| b. Tribes conduct screening (specify tribes) | No |
| c. Collaboration of tribes with state/local public child welfare agency (specify tribes) | No |
| d. Unknown | No |

Domain I: Investigations of child abuse and neglect

Table V.A. Investigations policies

| | Response |
|--|---|
| 1. Child maltreatment investigations lead to criminal penalties | Yes |
| 2. Investigator for reports | |
| a. Case workers (frontline staff) | Yes |
| b. Case managers (supervisors) | Yes |
| c. Staff in specialized investigations unit | Yes |
| d. Law enforcement | Yes |
| e. Other (specify) | Yes - Tribal case workers if there is an agreement between the tribe and the department |
| 3. Qualifications of investigator | |
| a. Associate's degree | No |
| b. Bachelor's degree | Yes |
| c. Master's degree | Yes |
| d. Training for conducting investigations (specify) | Yes - All MDHHS and private child placing agency employees with access to the Michigan Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (MiSACWIS) must complete the MiSACWIS Security computer-based training (CBT) and pass the associated exam with a score of 90 percent or higher prior to accessing MiSACWIS; Must complete the pre-service institute (PSI) within 112 days of hire if not previously completed |
| e. Years of experience (specify) | Yes - Supervisors must have either: (1) a master's degree from an accredited college or university in a social work or related human services field and 3 years of experience in a child welfare agency, a child caring institution, or in an agency performing a child welfare function or (2) a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university in social work or a related human services field and 4 years of experience in a child welfare agency, a child caring institution, or in an agency performing a child welfare function |
| f. Other (specify) | No |
| g. Unknown | No |
| 4. Level of evidence required for substantiation (founded/indicated/confirmed) | |
| a. Preponderance of evidence | Yes |
| b. Credible or substantial evidence | No |

Table V.A (continued)

| | Response |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| c. Probable or reasonable cause | No |
| d. Other (specify) | No |

Table V.B. Required activities/information for investigation

| | Response | Required cases | Conditions or types of cases |
|--|----------|-------------------|--|
| 1. Certain activities/information required for the investigation process | Yes | | |
| 2. Specific activities or information required for investigation | | | |
| a. Review agency records for prior involvement with child protective services | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| b. Visit to child's home | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| c. Interview or observation of child victim | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| d. Interview or observation of other children living in child's home | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| e. Risk or safety assessment | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| f. Evaluation of home environment or home study | No | Logical Skip | Not applicable |
| g. Interviews with child's parents, caregivers, or other adults residing in child's home | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| h. Check of criminal records for adults in home | Yes | Required for some | Physical abuse; Sexual abuse; Human trafficking cases |
| i. Check of child welfare or central registry for prior child maltreatment allegations against adults in home | Yes | Required for some | When there is a history/trend of child abuse |

Table V.B (continued)

| | | | Conditions or types of |
|--|---|-------------------|--|
| | Response | Required cases | Cases |
| j. Medical evaluation | Yes | Required for some | Physical abuse; Sexual abuse; Allegations or indication that the child has been seriously or repeatedly physically injured as a result of abuse and/or neglect; The extent of the alleged abuse could cause unseen injuries (such as internal injuries or brain injuries); There is indication that the child suffers from malnourishment; There is indication that the child may need medical treatment; The child has been exposed to or had contact with methamphetamine production; An infant who is not mobile and has marks or bruises; The child has an injury and the parent, child or caretaker has provided an explanation of the injury that is not credible or is suspicious; The child has unusual bruises, marks or signs of extensive or chronic physical injury; The child has an injury and also appears to be fearful of parent(s)/caregiver(s) or exhibits characteristics such as anxiousness or being withdrawn; The child has an injury alleged or suspected to be from abuse and the parent/caregiver/alleged perpetrator has previously been found to be a perpetrator of severe physical injury |
| k. Mental health evaluation | No | Logical Skip | Not applicable |
| I. Interview alleged perpetrator | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| m. Interview reporter or collateral source | Yes | Required for all | Not applicable |
| n. Other (specify) | Yes - History/trends limited to those listed as case members; Visual assessment to view marks or bruises if alleged (if child reports visual assessment should also ensue) | Required for all | Not applicable |

Domain W: Child welfare response

Table VI.A. Differential or alternative response

| | Response |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Differential/alternative response | |
| a. No | Yes |
| b. Yes—implemented statewide | No |
| c. Yes—implemented in specific counties or regions (specify) | No |
| d. Unknown | No |
| 2. Types of maltreatment eligible for differential/alternative response | |
| a. All types of maltreatment are eligible | Logical Skip |
| b. Only certain types of maltreatment are eligible | Logical Skip |
| c. Unknown | Logical Skip |
| 3. Types of maltreatment <u>not</u> eligible for differential/alternative response | |
| a. Cases involving child fatalities | Logical Skip |
| b. Substance-exposed infants | Logical Skip |
| c. Physical abuse | Logical Skip |
| d. Sexual abuse | Logical Skip |
| e. Neglect | Logical Skip |
| f. Abandoned infants | Logical Skip |
| g. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |
| 4. Eligibility for differential/alternative response determined by a risk determination | |
| a. No | Logical Skip |
| b. Yes | Logical Skip |
| c. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |
| d. Unknown | Logical Skip |
| 5. Tools used to determine risk for differential/alternative response | Logical Skip |
| 6. Risk level eligible for differential/alternative response | |
| a. No risk | Logical Skip |
| b. Low risk | Logical Skip |
| c. Moderate risk | Logical Skip |
| d. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |
| e. Unknown | Logical Skip |
| 7. Other types of cases or conditions eligible for differential/alternative response | |
| a. No immediate safety concerns | Logical Skip |
| b. No prior reports of child abuse or neglect | Logical Skip |
| c. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |

Table VI.A (continued)

| | Response |
|---|--------------|
| 8. When is determination made for differential/alternative response | |
| a. At time of screening to screen-out to differential response | Logical Skip |
| b. After a report is screened-in | Logical Skip |
| c. Other (specify) | Logical Skip |
| 9. Referrals to community services for cases engaged in differential response | |
| a. No | Logical Skip |
| b. Yes—for all cases | Logical Skip |
| c. Yes—when families express interest | Logical Skip |
| d. Yes—when there is a determination of risk | Logical Skip |
| e. Yes—other (specify) | Logical Skip |

Table VI.B. In-home services and foster care

| | Response |
|--|--|
| 1. In home services provided for | |
| unsubstantiated cases to maintain intact | |
| families | |
| a. No | Yes |
| b. Yes—implemented statewide | No |
| c. Yes—implemented in specific counties or regions | No |
| d. Unknown | No |
| 2. In home services provided post reunification | |
| a. No | No |
| b. Yes—implemented statewide | Yes |
| c. Yes—implemented in specific counties or regions | No |
| d. Unknown | No |
| 3. Tribal involvement in foster care for tribal cases | |
| a. Tribes do not provide foster care | No |
| b. Tribes provide foster care (specify tribes) | Yes - Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians |
| c. Unknown | No |
| 4. Foster care extension for those older than 18 years | Yes |
| 5. Age youth are allowed to remain in extended foster care | |
| a. Age 21 | Yes |
| b. Other (specify) | No |
| 6. Foster care case management staff | |
| a. State/county public agency staff | Yes |
| b. Contracted provider staff | No |
| c. Tribal agency staff | Yes |
| d. Unknown | No |
| 7. Qualifications of foster care case managers | |
| a. Associate's degree | No |
| b. Bachelor's degree | Yes |
| c. Master's degree | No |
| d. Training for case management (specify) | Yes - All MDHHS and private child placing agency employees with access to the Michigan Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (MiSACWIS) must complete the MiSACWIS Security computer-based training (CBT) and pass the associated exam with a score of 90 percent or higher prior to accessing MiSACWIS; Foster care caseworkers must complete the pre-service institute (PSI) within 112 days of hire, if not previously completed |
| e. Years of experience (specify) | No |
| f. Other (specify) | No |
| g. Unknown | No |

Table VI.C. Permanency

| | Response |
|--|----------|
| 1. Kinship guardianship as a permanency option | Yes |
| 2. Subsidized guardianship | Yes |
| 3. Subsidized kinship guardianship | Yes |
| 4. Subsidized adoption | Yes |

Domain C: Child welfare system context

Table VII.A. Child welfare system context

| | Response |
|--|---|
| 1. State or county-administered child welfare system | |
| a. State-administered | Yes |
| b. County-administered | No |
| c. Hybrid (partially administered by the state and partially administered by the counties) | No |
| d. Unknown | No |
| 2. State operates under legal consent decree or other court-ordered monitoring | Yes - Dwayne B. vs. Snyder; Dwayne B. vs. Granholm |

Supplemental Notes on State

Definitions

Findings for neglect coded "parent responsibilities" would be considered "improper supervision" by the state.

Concerns about providing illegal substances to a child would be assigned if not medically advised, and the caseworker would need to assess impact to the child. There is not a specific type of maltreatment this is classified under, although if there is enough evidence, it would likely be improper supervision neglect according to the state.

Exposing a child to a drug lab is not a distinct type of maltreatment, but a child present in a location of methamphetamine production is explicitly a cause for reaching a finding by statute and policy.

Female genital mutilation is not explicitly covered in policy, but a complaint of female genital mutilation would be investigated and, if a finding were reached, it would likely be for improper supervision neglect.

Shaken baby/abusive head trauma is not explicitly in policy, although brain damage is included in policy as physical abuse.

Threatened harm, which includes injurious environment, is only in the historical context of an egregious act and threatened harm may only be used as a secondary maltreatment and must be applied with the original form of abuse (in the historical context).

Domestic violence may be assigned as improper supervision neglect, neglect, failure to protect, or even abuse depending on the conditions of the situation.

Failure to protect is only appropriately applied when there is a finding of harm, such as abuse, and a parent who then permitted or did not prevent the abuse from taking place, thereby failing to protect the child.

Screening

The child's name is preferred, but not required, in order to screen in a report.

The perpetrator's name is also preferred, but not required; however, the perpetrator must be a person who is responsible for the child.

Tribes are not involved in the screening process. If maltreatment occurred on tribal property, the case may be transferred to the tribe for investigation. In some instances, agreements exist.

Investigations

During the investigation, if it is difficult to make contact with other children who live in the home, children's well-being can be verified by a collateral contact.

Child welfare response

Kinship guardianship is called "relative/unrelated caregiver care."

Community services are only provided (referred/recommended) for unsubstantiated cases depending on the concern and commensurate with the risk. These are not always in-home services and are not provided by Child Protective Services.

State Statutes and Policy Documentation Sources

- Children, Mich. Comp. Laws Serv. § 722 (2019). Retrieved September 20, 2019, from https://codes.findlaw.com/mi/chapter-722-children/
- Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2014). *Child guardianship manual: Extensions for youth entering guardianship at ages 16–17*. Retrieved July 24, 2019, from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/GD/Public/GDM/716.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks

Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2014). *Children's foster care manual: Case planning*. Retrieved July 24, 2019, from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/FO/Public/FOM/722-06.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks

Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2016). *Mandated reporter - child*. Retrieved July 24, 2019, from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/AP/Public/APR/200.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks

Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). *Mandated reporters' resource guide*. Retrieved May 13, 2019, from

https://courts.michigan.gov/Administration/SCAO/OfficesPrograms/CWS/Documents/Mandat ed_Reporters_Resource_Guide.pdf

- Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). *Services requirements manual: Staff qualifications and training*. Retrieved July 24, 2019, from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/SR/Public/SRM/103.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks
- Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Adoption assistance manual: Adoption assistance eligibility and funding source determination*. Retrieved July 1, 2019, from

https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/AA/Public/AAM/200.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks

- Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Children's protective services policy manuals*. Retrieved March 5, 2019, from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWeb/ex/PS/Mobile/PSM/PSM%20Mobile.pdf
- Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Native American affairs policy manuals*. Retrieved July 24, 2019, from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWeb/ex/NA/Mobile/NAA/NAA%20Mobile.pdf

Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Procedures and best practices: Michigan's centralized intake*.

Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. (2020). *CPS investigation—general instructions*. Retrieved January 31, 2020 from https://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/PS/Public/PSM/713-01.pdf

- Michigan Department of Social Services. (2014). *Tribal agreements: Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians Title IV-E agreement*. Retrieved March 6, 2020, from http://dhhs.michigan.gov/OLMWEB/EX/NA/Public/TAM/250.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks
- Michigan Penal Code, Mich. Comp. Laws Serv. § 750 (2019). Retrieved September 20, 2019, from http://legislature.mi.gov/documents/mcl/pdf/mcl-chap750.pdf
- Probate Code, Mich. Comp. Laws Serv. § 701–713 (2019). Retrieved September 20, 2019, from https://law.justia.com/codes/michigan/2014/chapters-701-713/

Social Services, Mich. Comp. Laws Serv. § 400 (2019). Retrieved September 20, 2019, from https://codes.findlaw.com/mi/chapter-400-socialservices/#!tid=NEE1E00D0315011DB82B5812474B50C31

State of Michigan Governor's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect. (2017). *Medical child abuse: A collaborative approach to identification, investigation, assessment and intervention*. Michigan Department of Human Services. Retrieved May 13, 2019, from https://www.michigan.gov/documents/dhs/DHS_PUB_0017_200457_7.pdf