CPS SAFETY ASSESSMENT
Michigan Department of Human Services

Case Name: First	Last	Case Number	Complaint Date
Sheryl	James	10/01/XXXX	10/01/XXXX

County Name	Worker Name	County	District	Section	Unit	Worker
Ingham	Matthew Smith	33	xx	xx	xx	xx

Initial ☒ Review ☐ (Check one) Assessment Date **Xx/xx/xxxx**

SECTION 1: SAFETY ASSESSMENT

1. ☒ Yes ☐ No Caretaker(s) caused serious harm to the child and/or made a plausible threat to cause serious physical harm in the current investigation, indicated by:

☒ Severe injury or abuse to child other than accidental.

☐ Threat to cause harm or retaliate against child.

☒ Excessive discipline or physical force.

☐ Potential harm to child as a result of domestic violence.

☐ One or more caretaker(s) fear they will maltreat child.
☐ Alcohol/drug exposed infant.

Sheryl James, mother, hit William with a bat causing him to have broken ribs. During the medical examination, it was determined that William also had ribs which had been previously broken and had since healed. During the investigation it was learned that Melissa and Amanda have been physically harmed by their mother. Melissa reported her mother has given her a black eye and knocked out one of her baby teeth. Amanda reported her mother hits her as well.

2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Caretaker(s) has previously maltreated a child in their care and the severity of the maltreatment of the caretaker(s)' response to the previous incident **and** current circumstances suggest that child safety may be an immediate concern. There must be both current immediate threats to child safety and related previous maltreatment that was severe and/or represents an unresolved pattern of maltreatment. Check all that apply:

☐ Prior death of a child.

☐ Previous maltreatment that caused severe harm to any child.

☐ Prior termination of parental rights.

☐ Prior removal of any child.

☒ Prior confirmed CPS case.
☐ Prior threat of serious harm to child.

On 06/01/XXXX a complaint was investigated alleging improper supervision. During the investigation it was learned the children, Amanda and Melissa, were left home alone for hours at a time on a regular basis, approximately 1-2 times per week. It was also learned Amanda was being hit with a yard stick by mother, Sheryl, on a weekly basis. The children reported being afraid of being left alone in the home. Amanda reported of being hurt when hit with the stick. Welt marks were observed on Amanda. A preponderance of evidence was found for improper supervision and physical abuse. The case was opened as a Category II with Families First Services. This is the second compliant received where allegations are pertaining to physical abuse. There is a trend of physical abuse for this family.

3. ☒ Yes ☐ No Caretaker fails to protect child(ren) from serious harm or threatened harm.

Training Material
Training Material

CPS SAFETY ASSESSMENT
Michigan Department of Human Services

Case Name: First	Last	Case Number	Complaint Date
Sheryl	James	10/01/XXXX	10/01/XXXX

County Name	Worker Name	County	District	Section	Unit	Worker
Ingham	Matthew Smith	33	xx	xx	xx	xx

Initial ☒ Review ☐ (Check one) Assessment Date **Xx/xx/xxxx**

☒ Yes ☐ No Live-in partner found to be a perpetrator.

Steven Miller, father of Melissa and William, was aware of the extreme physical discipline methods that mother, Sheryl James, was utilizing with the children. Mr. Miller failed to protect the children from physical harm caused by Ms. James and made no attempt to prevent her from physically abusing the children in the home.

4. ☒ Yes ☐ No Caretaker(s)' explanation of an injury to a child is unconvincing and the nature of the injury suggests that the child's safety may be of immediate concern.

Ms. James continues to report that William's injury was caused by William falling off his bike. Mr. Miller also reported William's injury was a result of William falling of his bike. However, Dr. Adams reported the nature and location of the injury did not appear consistent with injuries that would be sustained by falling off a bike, especially in light of the lack of scrapes or scratches which one would expect to see if William had indeed fallen off a bike. Dr. Adams reported that William's injury appeared consistent with being hit with a blunt object with significant force. Dr. Adams also noted that William has several bruises on his arms, back, and legs, all of which appear to be of varying ages and stages of healing, and Ms. James has not offered any explanation as to these contusions.

5. ☐ Yes ☒ No The family refuses access to the child, or there is reason to believe the family is about to flee, or the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained.

6. ☒ Yes ☐ No Child is fearful of caretaker(s), other family members, or other people living in or having access to the home.

William reported he is afraid to go home with his mom as she will be mad. William reported his mother would be mad because they had to come to the hospital and he has been talking about what happens at home. Melissa reported she is scared of her mom when her mom gets mad.

7. ☐ Yes ☒ No Caretaker(s) does not provide supervision necessary to protect child from potentially serious harm.

8. ☐ Yes ☒ No Caretaker(s) does not meet the child's immediate need for food, clothing, shelter and/or medical or mental health care.

9. ☐ Yes ☒ No Child's physical living conditions are hazardous and immediately threatening based on the child's age and developmental stage.

10. ☒ Yes ☐ No Caretaker(s)' current substance use seriously affects his/her ability to supervise, protect or care for the child.

Training Material
Training Material

CPS SAFETY ASSESSMENT
Michigan Department of Human Services

Case Name: First	Last	Case Number	Complaint Date
Sheryl	James	10/01/XXXX	10/01/XXXX

County Name	Worker Name	County	District	Section	Unit	Worker
Ingham	Matthew Smith	33	xx	xx	xx	xx

Initial ☒ Review ☐ (Check one) Assessment Date **Xx/xx/xxxx**

Amanda and Melissa reported that their mother becomes easily angered and hits them when she has been consuming alcoholic beverages. Melissa also noted that her mother falls asleep when she has been drinking and cannot be awoken.

11. ☒ Yes ☐ No Caretaker(s)' behavior toward child is violent or out-of-control.

William reported that his mother told him to clean his room, and that his mother hit him with his sister's softball bat because he was not cleaning his room fast enough. Ms. James' reaction was extreme, especially in light of Amanda's disclosure that Ms. James had only given William approximately 5 minutes to clean his room prior to attacking him with the softball bat.

12. ☐ Yes ☒ No Caretaker(s) describes or acts toward child in predominantly negative terms or has extremely unrealistic expectations.

13. ☐ Yes ☒ No Child sexual abuse is suspected and circumstances suggest that child safety may be an immediate concern.

14. ☐ Yes ☒ No Caretaker(s)' emotional stability seriously affects current ability to supervise, protect or care for the child.

15. ☐ Yes ☐ No Other (specify): _____

IF NO SAFETY FACTORS ARE PRESENT, GO TO SECTION 3: SAFETY DECISION AND CHECK "SAFE"

SECTION 2: SAFETY RESPONSE - PROTECTING INTERVENTIONS

A protecting intervention is a safety response taken by staff or others to address the unsafe situation identified in the assessment. These interventions help protect the child from present or imminent danger. **A protecting intervention must be deployed if any safety factor is indicated.** If one or more safety factors are present, it does not automatically indicate that a child must be placed outside the home. In many cases, it will be possible to initiate a temporary plan that will mitigate the safety factor(s) sufficiently so that the child may remain in the home while the investigation continues. Consider the relative severity of the safety factor(s), the caregiver(s)' protective capacities and response to the investigation/situation, and the vulnerability of the child when identifying protecting interventions.

For each safety factor identified in Section 1, consider the resources available in the family and the community that might help to keep the child safe. Check each protecting intervention taken to protect the child and explain below. Describe all protecting safety interventions taken or immediately planned by you or anyone else, and explain how each intervention protects (or protected) each child.

☐ 1. Monitoring or direct services by DHS worker.
☐ 2. Use of family resources, neighbors or other individuals in the community as safety resources.
☐ 3. Use of community agencies or services as safety resources (check one).
  ☐ Intensive home based. ☐ Other community services.
☐ 4. Recommend that the alleged perpetrator leave the home, either voluntarily or in response to legal action.
☐ 5. Recommend that the non-maltreating caretaker move to a safe environment with the child.
☐ 6. Recommend that the caretaker(s) place the child outside the home.
☐ 7. Other _____
☒ 8. Legal action must be taken to place child(ren) outside the home, e.g., placement with a relative or a licensed foster home.

Explain Safety Response-Protecting Interventions

Training Material Training Material

CPS SAFETY ASSESSMENT
Michigan Department of Human Services

Case Name: First	Last	Case Number	Complaint Date
Sheryl	James	10/01/XXXX	10/01/XXXX

County Name	Worker Name	County	District	Section	Unit	Worker
Ingham	Matthew Smith	33	xx	xx	xx	xx

Initial ☒ Review ☐ (Check one) Assessment Date **Xx/xx/xxxx**

If CPS is initiating legal action and placing the child: 1) explain why responses 1-7 could not be used to keep the child safe in the reasonable efforts section of the Transfer to Foster Care module of SWSS CPS; and 2) describe your discussion with the caretaker(s) regarding placement in SWSS CPS.

Due to the nature of abuse, severity of the physical injuries sustained by William and the children's statements that they are fearful to return home, a petition was filed requesting the children to be taken into custody and removed from the home. William and Melissa were removed from the hospital. Amanda was removed from her school. A MiTeam Meeting was held on XX/XX/XXX at which time it was decided to have the children remain under DHS care and supervision. Prospective relative caregivers were identified during the MiTeam Meeting. Home assessments will be conducted on identified relatives for relative placement of children.

If services were recommended but caretakers refused to participate, briefly describe the services that were offered.

SECTION 3: SAFETY DECISION

Identify your safety decision by checking the appropriate box below. Check one box only. This decision should be based on the assessment of all safety factors, protecting interventions and any other information known about this case. "A" (Safe) should be checked only if no safety factors were identified in Section 1, Part A, Safety Factor Identification.

A. Safe ☐ Children are safe; no safety factors exist.

B. Safe with Services ☐ At least one safety factor is indicated and at least one protecting intervention has been put into place.

C. Unsafe: ☒ At least one safety factor is indicated and placement is the only protecting intervention possible for the child. Without placement, the child will likely be in danger of imminent harm

If the investigation is not confirmed and any safety factor is present, briefly explain the safety intervention or plan.

INJURY TO THE CHILD

Was any child injured in this case? (**Note:** Prenatal drug exposure is considered an injury to a child.) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, indicate the age of youngest child with most serious injury. **William James (age 4)**

If yes, indicate what was the most serious injury to the child. **William James suffered broken bones to his left rib cage.**

☐ 1. Death of a child.
☐ 2. Hospitalization required.
☒ 3. Medical treatment required, but no hospitalization.
☐ 4. Exam only of alleged injuries. No medical treatment required.
☐ 5. Bruises, cuts, abrasions or other injuries: no medical exam or treatment.

Training Material Training Material

Training Material Training Material