SPRING 1996

EDITORS NOTEPAD

We are working on establishing a newsletter for our chapter. This is a call for items from you that you wish the rest of us to think about, discuss, declare, or just appreciate your perspectives. Communication is the key. The following thoughts are the beginning note. Any comments you may have will be readily accepted.

Subject: Proposal for Centralized Child Protective Services Intake.

Would an 800 number, statewide, be an improvement to access reporting of child abuse and neglect? If Michigan adopted a CPS centralized intake system, this system would route all CPS complaints from Michigan’s 83 counties through one central system. This system is a 24 hour, seven day a week program. This system would assess CPS complaints for assignment for investigation or rejection. It would have the capacity to provide background information on families and perpetrators. A complaint, along with background information would be electronically transferred to field staff. The field staff would either complete a preliminary investigation or a full field investigation. The decision as to whether a full field investigation is warranted would be a field decision. The central intake staff would monitor time-lines for completing the investigation and maintain central registry information. Requests for expungement would start at central intake. The pros and cons of a centralized intake system are as follows.
CON: 1. It is not difficult for mandated reporters to have the correct local numbers. Also, if a central intake system is not funded adequately, more calls may be delayed or lost due to having to wait by the caller.
2. A centralized intake lacks the knowledge of specific local information in each county. A central system will not have as much relevant/factual information from which to render decisions for investigation. There would be a loss of personal rapport between local staff and local reporters and resources. A centralized intake staff will not be knowledgeable about the local communities.
3. There could be time delays in communication, which may place children at further risk.
4. A two-tiered system is inefficient and more costly. Staffing for a centralized intake would have to be in addition to or taken from existing field staff. It is estimated that 50 plus FTEs would be needed to initiate the program. If a central intake number is not staffed appropriately, persons attempting to report child abuse and neglect will be kept on hold; many will hang up. This could result in further harm to children.
5. Accountability issues would be diluted. It may be necessary to redistribute some existing staff to accommodate this system. This could contribute to field staff resistance to this central intake system.
6. Many calls received by a centralized intake system are inappropriate for either child or adult protective services. This increases the cost of the central intake system depending on how these calls are to be handled.

PRO: 1. A single statewide phone number would make it easier to file a complaint.
2. Phone directories encompass more than one county. As a result, callers may call the wrong county. Listings for CPS in directories are located in different locations, making it more difficult to find a number.
3. After hours numbers are usually different from those used during normal business hours. After hours CPS calls are usually handled by an answering service or another public service agency.
4. There is a variation between counties as to the interpretation of the law. The lack of consistency results in a difference in the ratio of reported and investigated abuse complaints. Training to improve consistency in interpretation is costly and difficult due to the number of staff needing to be trained and the geographic distribution of staff in 83 counties. A centralized intake staff would be more easily trained.
5. There has been a concern that there is no way to substantiate the truth of claims that reports of abuse or neglect have been made to the local DSS office without any action. Some reports may not be recorded at the local level. A centralized intake system would make it easier to track all complaints received, and give a clearer picture of abuse and neglect in Michigan.
6. This system would allow easier access to prior reports and investigations involving individuals and families. This information could be transmitted to the field with the complaint report being assigned for investigation. Ability to track clients who move frequently from county to county would be facilitated.

**UPCOMING CONFERENCES**

The Fort Wayne Women's Bureau: The Sexual Healing Journey, treating the Sexual Repercussions of Sexual Abuse. Friday, March 22, 1996 Marriott, Fort Wayne, IN


The University of Michigan School of Social Work: Fee: $95.00 per workshop

1. Depression in Students: Recognition, Management, and Treatment. 3-14-96. Michigan League, Henderson Room. Ann Arbor, MI.
5. When the Work Place is a Hurt Place. 4-19-96. Michigan League, Henderson Room.
6. School Violence: Rising to meet the Challenge. 4-24-96. Michigan League, Henderson Rm.
7. Mental disorders and deviant behavior of children and youth. 6-1 & 2-96; 6-8 & 9-96. Michigan League, Henderson Room

Workshops $355.00 per course:
9. Social Work in Schools. 6-18 to 21-96 or 7-6 & 7 and 7-13 & 14-96.


Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan 1996 Child Abuse Training Schedule. 517/334-6060
1. Specialized Child Abuse Training: Sexual Offenders: Profile and Treatability March 4-5, 1996
7. Basic Child Abuse Training. Petoskey, MI.


MIPSAC MEETING AGENDA

The Spring monthly meeting agenda of MIPSAC is
APRIL: 26 Th., 11:30 a.m. at Gateway Community services, East Lansing, MI
MAY: 24Th., 11:30 a.m. at Gateway Community services, East Lansing, MI.
JUNE: 28Th., 11:30 a.m. at Gateway Community services, East Lansing, MI.

The next MIPSAC newsletter will cover the Summer months of July, August, and September.

This is your chance to help design a logo!