STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF
LIFELONG EDUCATION, ADVANCEMENT, AND POTENTIAL
LANSING

GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

BEVERLY WALKER-GRIFFEA
DIRECTOR

Tina Quirk-Harmer
YMCA of Metropolitan Detroit
1401 Broadway Blvd, Suite 3A
Detroit, MI 48226

December 20, 2024

RE: License #: CD630411515
Investigation #: 2024C0434027
Farmington Family YMCA Day Camp

Dear Tina Quirk-Harmer :

Attached is the Special Investigation Report for the above referenced facility. Due to the violations 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 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 camp licensing unit at 517-284-9730.

Sincerely,

James VandenHeuvel

James P. VandenHeuvel, Licensing Consultant
Camp Licensing Unit
105 W. Allegan St. 2nd Floor
Lansing, MI 48933
(616) 901-3730
enclosure

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF
LIFELONG EDUCATION, ADVANCEMENT, AND POTENTIAL
CAMP LICENSING UNIT
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

License #:	CD630411515
Investigation #:	2024C0434027
Complaint Receipt Date:	08/29/2024
Investigation Initiation Date:	09/05/2024
Report Due Date:	10/28/2024
Licensee Name:	YMCA of Metropolitan Detroit
Licensee Address:	Suite 3A 1401 Broadway Blvd Detroit, MI 48226
Licensee Telephone #:	734-453-2904
Licensee Designee:	Tina Quirk-Harmer
Name of Facility:	Farmington Family YMCA Day Camp
Facility Address:	28100 Farmington Rd. Farmington Hills, MI 48334
Facility Telephone #:	248-553-4020
Original Issuance Date:	05/27/2022
License Status:	REGULAR
Effective Date:	08/24/2023
Expiration Date:	08/23/2025
Capacity:	150
Program Type:	CHILD CAMP - DAY

II. ALLEGATION(S)

	Violation Established?
The camp did not determine suitability of a staff member.	No
The camp did not follow the child protection policy.	Yes

III. METHODOLOGY

08/29/2024	Special Investigation Intake 2024C0434027
09/04/2024	Special Investigation Initiated - Telephone
09/04/2024	Contact - Telephone call received
09/12/2024	Contact - Face to Face
09/12/2024	Contact – Document received
09/17/2024	Contact - Telephone call received
11/22/2024	Contact-Received Police Report #240032289
12/17/2024	Contact-Telephone call received
12/17/2024	Inspection Complete: Sub-Compliance
12/20/2024	Corrective Action Plan Requested and Due By 01/04/25
12/20/2024	Exit Conference with Ms. Quirk-Harmer by telephone.

ALLEGATION:

The camp did not determine suitability of a staff member.

INVESTIGATION:

On 8/29/24, the department received a complaint alleging a camp staff member violating personal boundaries with a camper. The complaint also alleged staff did not report grooming behaviors to authorities.

On 9/3/24, camp licensing consultant Autumn Palmer contacted Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) Centralized Intake (CI) to make a report of alleged abuse. The log number was #143570934.

On 9/4/24, Ms. Palmer interviewed the complainant by telephone. The complainant provided details about the discovery of a note written by a camp staff member to a camper. In addition, the complainant expressed concerns about the apparent grooming behavior exhibited by the camp staff member.

Ms. Palmer reviewed the notes written by Staff Member 1 (SM1). The notes allegedly created by SM1 included adjectives and the Camper A's name including talented, adventure, and exciting. One written note read:

> *"Dear Camper A, It was very nice to meet you! You are a special and talented girl. I hope you enjoy the rest of your summer here in Michigan. Maybe next year we can play more Uno at Camp! Keep using your wonderful imagination and creativity. Keep your wonderful spirit of joy and adventure. You are truly special! I will miss you! Sincerely, [SM1]"*

On 9/4/24, Ms. Palmer received a call from Farmington Hills City Police officer about the allegation. The police report number is #240032289.

On 9/12/24, Ms. Palmer conducted an onsite visit at Farmington Hills YMCA. She met with Tina Quirk-Harmer, the licensee designee. Ms. Quirk-Harmer was aware of the concerns and gave account of the events. She stated on 8/21/24 they received the complaint about a Staff Member 1's (SM1) conduct. They immediately suspended SM1 that day. Ms. Quirk- Harmer stated SM1 was worked during the before and aftercare program.

Ms. Palmer reviewed the staff file for SM1. There was record of training, background checks, three positive references, interview, and signed acknowledgement of the child abuse policy and employee handbook.

On 11/22/24, I reviewed the Farmington Hills Police Department (FHPD) Report #240032289. The report included investigation actions taken by FHPD.

I reviewed SM1 application for hire. The application included submission of personal information, prior work experience history, education history, and preferred work schedule. The document also included the YMCA Employee Profile for SM1. The profile identified original hire date as 6/26/24 and the date of end of employment as 8/28/24.

I reviewed the document titled "Child Care Reference Check." The document was completed on 6/11/24 and included a summary of four personal references for SM1. The reference document combines the four attestations of character into a report for

quick review. The reference questions include but were not limited to: *Have you ever known SM1 to use harsh or abusive discipline with a youth? Would you be comfortable placing your own loved ones in the care of SM1? Are you aware of any reason why we should not allow SM1 to work with youths we serve?* The references were completed by four individuals were completed by non-relative individuals.

I reviewed the ICHAT criminal history background check for SM1. The ICHAT was dated 6/11/24 and had no findings. I reviewed a document titled “Michigan Child Care Background Check” dated 6/13/24 providing attestation that SM1 was “eligible” to be connected with a child care facility. This document attests that a central registry check was run at that time.

I reviewed the document titled “Phone/Digital Screening Guidance” and “Face-to-Face Interview Guidance” for SM1 interview. The structured interview document includes a suggested steps to follow for screening, script and questions to ask applicant, and space to document answers from interview. On the Face-to-Face Interview protocol there is a section titled “Required Interview Questions for All Staff”. The questions included information gathering to determine interests, character traits, attitudes, and past experiences and behaviors. All the required interview questions had responses noted on the form.

I reviewed the document titled “Hiring Manager Toolkit” for SM1. The document is a new hire checklist and has the instructions reading “complete this checklist and include it with the paper forms that are scanned to Payroll for the new hire”. The checklist includes titled sections “application”, “phone/digital screening”, “Face-to-Face Interview”, “reference check”, “offer letter”, and “screenings”. Within each section, a series of sub-tasks and check-boxes are listed. This form included a Strick-through line on each of the boxes indicating completion. Within the Face-to-Face Interview section the sub-tasks included “standard interview questions used, interview responses documented, interpretive guide used to evaluate responses.”

I reviewed the document titled “Praesidium Academy: YMCA of the USA Transcript” for SM1. The document listed course training title and date of completion. The transcript identified SM1 completed the following trainings: Foundations: preventing abuse in Youth-Serving Organizations on 6/24/24; Promoting a Safe Environment: Employee Sexual Harassment Training on 6/25/24; and Duty to Report: Mandated Reporter on 6/15/24.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.11109	**Staff.**
	(6) Before assignment, a camp shall evaluate all of the following characteristics for each staff member in relation to the duties to be assigned: **(a) Character.** **(b) Emotional stability.**

	(c) Health. **(d) Ability.** **(e) Experience.** **(f) Education.**
ANALYSIS:	Interviews and a review of records reveal the camp has a process for determining suitability of the staff member including background checks, references, and interviews prior to assignment. The camp complied with this administrative rule.
CONCLUSION:	**VIOLATION NOT ESTABLISHED**

ALLEGATION

The camp staff did not follow the child protection policy.

INVESTIGATION:

On 09/12/24, Ms. Palmer interviewed Ms. Quirk-Harmer. She stated the organization conducted an internal investigation and interviewed staff members that worked with SM1. She reported staff members did not have concerns about inappropriate grooming behaviors. Staff members mentioned SM1 struggled with disciplining campers and setting appropriate boundaries, including taking kids to get a popsicle from the office. SM1's supervisor, Staff Member 2 (SM2) reported SM1 asked about his performance, and SM2 told him he needed to be more disciplined with the kids and hold them more accountable. Ms. Quirk-Harmer stated SM1 was terminated on 8/28/24 for violating the YMCA child protection policy.

Ms. Palmer reviewed the child protection policy staff conduct statement. The policy reads in part: "*Staff members may not single out children for favored attention and may not give gifts to youth or their parents…Staff and volunteers will not have secrets with youth and will only give gifts in accordance with Y policies.*" Ms. Quirk-Harmer stated SM1 violated the policy and was subsequently terminated.

I reviewed the Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) Centralized log number was #143570934. The case was assigned for Child Protective Services-Placement in Care Unit (CPS-PCU) review on 9/4/24. I received an update on the case from the CPS-PCU worker and reviewed the case summary. The case summary read the case was transferred to law enforcement and not investigated by Child Protective Services.

I reviewed the document titled "Employee Handbook-2024". The document included employee policies and procedures. In the section titled "reporting child abuse" the policy reads "*Our Y has zero tolerance for abuse. It is imperative that every employee or volunteer actively participates in the protection of youth. In the event*

that employees or volunteers observe red-flag or inappropriate behaviors and/or policy violations by other employees or volunteers, it is their professional and personal responsibility to immediately report their observations in accordance with the Y's reporting procedures." The employee handbook lists examples of "red-flag or inappropriate behaviors that all employees and volunteers are required to report: any violation of the Y's abuse prevention policies, seeking unauthorized private time or one-on-one time with youth, seeing or visiting with youth outside of scheduled programing, buying gifts for individual youth, sending unauthorized electronic communications through text messaging, social media, online gaming, etc. in violation of the Y's electronic communication policy, making suggestive comments to youth, showing favoritism towards a youth or type of youth, youth disclosing that an employee or volunteer makes them feel uncomfortable."

The employee handbook provides instructions for employees or volunteers to report to a supervisor, director, or other authority. In addition, the handbook provides written instructions for a supervisor response. The handbook reads that the supervisor will report to the next level supervisor, speak with the employee or volunteer who has been reported, review the file of the employee or volunteer to determine if similar complaints were reported, determine the appropriate response based on the report by taking into consideration factors such as:

- context of red-flag or inappropriate behavior or policy violation,
- severity of red-flag or inappropriate behavior or policy violation,
- history of red-flag or inappropriate behaviors or policy violations; and
- trainability of employee or volunteer.

In addition, the instructions read "if at any point in gathering information about a report of red-flag or inappropriate behavior, a concern rises about possible abuse, contact the state authorities and file a report." On page 55, the policy reads within the section titled "*supervisor response to abuse"* among other actions, the supervisor would suspend the accused employee or volunteer until the investigation is completed.

I reviewed the document titled "internal investigation notes". The document included origin of the concerns, description of actions, and dates of actions taken by the camp organization. The notes attest the camp leadership, upon notification of the concerning behavior on 8/21/24, suspended SM1 "until which time an investigation could be completed". The notes also outlined the steps the organization completed within the internal investigation including interviews with other staff members and youth protection consultants at Praesidium.

I reviewed the internal investigation interview notes of Staff Member 3 (SM3) gathered by Ms. Quirk-Harmer on 8/22/24. SM3 stated she observed SM1 alone with a camper within the staff break room on one occasion. SM3 stated also had a tendency to share personal information about himself with fellow staff and campers.

I reviewed the internal investigation interview notes of Staff Member 4 (SM4) gathered by Ms. Quirk-Harmer on 8/22/24. SM4 stated SM1 had “loose” boundaries and struggles to manage camper challenging behaviors. SM4 stated SM1 needed to be reminded that campers cannot climb on him, hug him, and needed to create distance when sitting at the table together during activities. SM4 stated that girls gravitated to SM1.

I reviewed the internal investigation interview notes of Staff Member 5 (SM5) gathered by Ms. Quirk-Harmer on 8/22/24. SM5 corroborated SM4 statements about SM1 difficulty handling challenging behaviors of campers.

I reviewed the internal investigation interview notes of Staff Member 6 (SM6) gathered by Ms. Quirk-Harmer on 8/22/24. SM6 stated SM1 always had the girls at his table and didn’t seem to interact with the boys very often. SM6 stated SM1 was not good at enforcing expectations and on one occasion SM6 had observed SM1 with a girl sitting on his knee.

I reviewed the internal investigation interview notes of Staff Member 7 (SM7) gathered by Ms. Quirk-Harmer on 8/22/24. SM7 stated SM1 was always very friendly and the girls in the camp always seemed to be around him. SM7 stated SM1 lacked setting boundaries for behaviors.

I reviewed the document titled “Acknowledge of Receipt of Employee Handbook and Policy Agreements”. The policy acknowledgement includes an overview of the policy and procedures regarding child abuse/neglect. The policy references Child Protection Law Act 238 of 1975 and affirms the YMCA’s commitment to the personal growth and development of children and families through high standards of quality and safety in all program services provided or sponsored by the association. The policy outlines the reporting requirements in the section titled “reporting procedures” and includes the requirement of confidentially and separate the alleged perpetrator from supervision of children.

APPLICABLE RULE	
R 400.11115(1)	**Child and adult protection plan.**
	(1) A camp shall develop and follow a written plan to assure compliance with 1975 PA 238, MCL 722.621 and known as the child protection law, and sections 11 to 11f and 14 of 1939 PA 280, MCL 400.11 to 400.11f and 400.14, and known as the adult protection law.
ANALYSIS	Interviews and records reveal the camp has a child protection policy that is consistent with the Child Protection Law. The

	YMCA policies further identify unacceptable conduct by staff members and reporting procedures. The YMCA policies include but are not limited to: limiting one-to-one interactions, no gift giving, and no showing favoritism to individual campers. The camp licensing rules require not only a written plan but also following the written plan. Staff Members observed policy violations but did not report the concerns to camp administration. Once the complaint was investigated by the camp administration, SM1 had been found to have violated child protection policies and was separated from service and ultimately terminated. The findings reveal the camp staff did not report policy violations to camp leadership according to their own written child protection policy.
CONCLUSION	**VIOLATION ESTABLISHED**

On 12/20/2024, I conducted an exit conference with Ms. Quirk-Harmer by telephone. I reviewed the findings of this report. She stated she understood the findings and will be developing a written corrective action plan within the timelines required.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Upon submission of an acceptable written corrective action plan, I recommend no change in licensing status.

James Vanden Heuvel 12/20/24

James P. VandenHeuvel Date
Lead Licensing Consultant

Approved By:

D. S. Ramsey 12/20/24

Deondra Ramsey, Manager Date
Out-of-School Time Learning and Camp Licensing