Referees were integral in shaping Michigan’s new child support formula that goes into effect on October 1, 2008. This is an important development, for it is the first time that the Referees’ Association of Michigan (RAM) has been approached by the Supreme Court - State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) for input regarding the formula.

The history of the 2008 formula is rather convoluted, as it seemed for a while that no branch of government wanted to assume responsibility for the review process. The Michigan Supreme Court was first to decline in 2004, when then Chief Justice Maura Corrigan asked Governor Jennifer Granholm and the Michigan Legislature to move the review and promulgation of the child support formula out of the judiciary and into either the legislative or executive branch of government. In response, the governor’s office contacted State IV-D Office of Child Support Director, Marilyn Stephen, who in September 2004 formed a “Guideline Commission Design Committee.” The charge of the committee was not to revise the formula, but to consider who should design the formula. This was done with the support of Michigan Representative Alexander Lipsey.
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A good administrator, Marilyn Stephen realized that she needed a broad base of support and knowledge to complete the project. Consequently, the Guideline Commission Design Committee consisted of representatives from the Family Independence Agency - Office of Child Support (OCS), RAM, Friend of the Court Association (FOCA), Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan (PAAM), SCAO, and the Family Law Section of the State Bar. By December 2004, the following members had been appointed: Marilyn Stephen (OCS), Ken Randall (RAM), Jennie Barkey (FOCA – who became Probate Judge in Genesee County), Tom Robertson (PAAM), Bill Bartels (SCAO), and Carlo Martina (Family Law Section). After several meetings, the group drafted a report that asked for legislative approval to move the review process to the executive branch of government, specifically under the OCS. The report also recommended that the 2008 guideline review committee consist of members of many different groups, including referees (RAM).

But then new obstacles became apparent. Representative Lipsey disappeared, deciding instead to contemplate running for Attorney General. It didn’t take a genius to see that the mandatory four year review was in limbo. For months the clock was ticking and no progress was made. By spring 2006, nothing had been done. The need for a review by December 31, 2007 was absolute, without one there would be a substantial federal penalty potentially costing the state millions of dollars.

Eventually, a forward-thinking Dan Wright, Director of the SCAO FOC Bureau, came to the rescue. He realized that something had to be done. As a perennial friend and guest speaker at FOCA, and with his close relationship to Justice Corrigan, Dan was uniquely positioned to understand the time constraints and complexity of the review process. In the summer of 2006, Dan instructed SCAO’s Bill Bartels to begin working on conceptual updates to simplify the formula while Dan formed the State “Child Support Formula Review Committee.” Speed was now a necessity. The newly formed State committee would have less than one year to do what normally requires four years.
Perhaps taking a cue from Marilyn Stephen’s Guideline Commission Design Committee, Dan wisely asked for input from representatives of organizations across Michigan. Those members included the following: Ron Foon and Ken Randall (RAM), Bill Bartels, Kelly Howard and Steve Capps (SCAO), Denise Stork (OCS), Carlo Martina and Kent Weichmann (Family Law Section), Guy Sweet (PAAM), Ronald Kollen (MiCSES), and Suzanne Hoseth Kreeger and Jeffrey Albaugh (FOCA).

In the spring of 2007, the State Child Support Review Committee met at the Hall of Justice over a three month period and reached a consensus over what changes should be made. The significant changes to the formula include:

1. Removing the 128 shared economic responsibility cliff. Now there will be a gradual slope.

2. Removing the dollar earned equals a dollar extra child support for low income payers. These are the people least able to pay; they have the least disposable income. The spike was smoothed out to give incentive for low income people to find better jobs.

3. Removing parenting time abatements. They have been an administrative nightmare for FOCs, and the gradual sloping of shared economic responsibility will reward parents who exercise significant parenting time.

4. Increasing judges/referee flexibility by increasing deviation factors.

5. Increase threshold for minimum modification from the current $5/week or 10% - whichever is lower, to $50/month or 10% - whichever is higher.

6. Treat all children equally. Currently child support orders can vary greatly depending who obtained the earlier order. Now child support will be equalized for children in one or multiple cases.

7. Reduce the mandatory $80/mo minimum arrearage payment to $50/mo. (Many judges and referees were already doing this.)

There are other changes, but the above list comprises the meat of the more drastic modifications. One change the committee could not consider (that many people would like to see) is the removal of the federal requirement that the custodial parent first pay $289/child in uninsured health expenses before the uninsured health expense ratio applies.
Before I finish discussing the State Child Support Review Committee, I’d like to compliment SCAO’s Bill Bartels. In one forth the time usually allocated, Bill was able to retype, intellectually digest, and recommend improvements to simplify the child support formula. (Remember, by necessity, he had worked on this project before Dan Wright was able to form a group.) To Bill’s great credit, when the group disagreed with some of his proposed changes – changes he had been working on for months – Bill acquiesced to the greater wisdom of the group. The most poignant example of this was his proposal to base all child support on gross income (which is done in many states), not net income.

After the committee reached consensus, Bill Bartels spent much of the summer of 2007 drafting the proposed 2008 formula, still not knowing if it would ever have a parent – would it be approved by the Michigan Supreme Court? Given the history, no one could be sure. Eventually, with the support of Justice Corrigan, in November 2007, one month shy of the four year review deadline, the Michigan Supreme Court approved the review and adopted the committees’ 2008 child support formula.

Referees had a strong voice in shaping the new formula. In February 2007, RAM members expressed their wish list for changes to the child support guidelines on RAM’s listserv. In all, 36 emails expressed varying opinions (You may view these comments in our members-only email archives at www.referees-association.org.) These suggestions were compiled and handed out at the Hall of Justice. Also, the committee consisted of not only Ron and Ken, representing RAM, but also Kent Weichmann and Suzanne Hoseth Kreeger, both of whom are RAM members (though Kent represented the Family Law Section and Suzanne represented FOCA).

If I can make one suggestion to RAM for the 2011 review (assuming RAM is asked for input), it is this: RAM should speak as a group, not as a compilation of different opinions. Political strength comes from speaking as one voice (as a tribe, not as a bunch of Indians.) Other groups, such as the members of the Family Lawyers, had specific marching orders what to ask for that had been voted on by their association. In contrast, RAM had no vote on changes to the formula, and Ron and I were armed with a hodgepodge of sometimes contradictory referee opinions regarding formula changes. Some we agreed with, some we did not. What I can say is that both Ron and I did agree with the final changes to the 2008 formula, most of which were requested by individual referees. (It is interesting to note that one idea expressed by a few referees, but no other group, was the idea NOT to do away with the 128 overnight shared economic cliff.)
The 2008 State Child Support Review Committee worked well together. Many ideas were expressed and analyzed though different philosophical perspectives. In the end, we all reached a consensus as to the changes. The group also discussed the concept that change brings contempt. People naturally are resistant to change. So we expect criticism to the 2008 formula. We also discussed the concept of the “law of unintended consequences.” Would our formula changes require further modification in 2011? Time will tell. But no formula is perfect, so the answer is almost assuredly “yes.” (But don’t be overly vociferous in your criticism; remember, the 2008 child support formula was shaped in part by referees!)

So now our training begins. In November 2007, Bill Bartels lectured referees regarding the proposed new formula at a MJI conference at the Hall of Justice. But he did that prior to the Supreme Court’s adoption of the new formula. Now that it’s going to happen, a second more relevant MJI conference formula training is set for March 2008. (MJI had asked me to be a co-presenter for this, which I had to decline due to surgery on my neck. Believe me, I would much rather be there!)

It was heartening to see referee Lisa Wenger’s listserv email on 1/16/08, where she volunteers to monitor a list of RAM member comments on how to improve the 2008 formula. No doubt if this happens, and referees follow her request to entitle emails “changes to the formula,” RAM will be better prepared to comment – as a group with board approval – for the 2011 review. (You can search archived listserv subjects through our web site’s internal search porthole. There is a growing wealth of information there.) The truly important, yet unstated, presumption of Lisa’s email is the thought that RAM has a say in the development of the 2011 formula. That in and of itself is a wonderful thing that did not heretofore exist. Dan Wright should be commended for requesting input from many sources, including RAM, in developing the 2008 child support formula. I sincerely hope that RAM’s involvement will continue in 2011.

Ken Randall

SCAO Website – Child Support Formula Information
http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/services/focb/mcsf.htm

DHS Website – Child Support Information
http://michigan.gov/dhs/0,1607,7-124-5453_5528---,00.html
Referees are accustomed to conflict resolution. They listen to people with differing views about their children everyday. This occurs in the area of child protection and domestic law. Sometimes the solutions are clear, and other times the solution is elusive.

There is a movement toward more collaborative efforts to resolve cases, mediate results, and have a consensus on how to deal with issues presented. Certainly, the more families can solve their own problems without the aid and intervention of the court will be appreciated by those who truly need the court to step into their lives. At times the referees are active participants in conflict resolution, when they have situations that come to their attention.

People are oftentimes focused on their needs, and forget to look at needs of the whole or the big picture of what they want to accomplish. They are invested in their own piece of the puzzle and the fail to recognize how it affects others. As referees we are forced to examine the little pieces of people’s lives that they bring to our attention. We must keep this in focus with current court orders, and the best interests of the children as the backdrop. Recommendations made by referees are intended to improve the situation for families and especially children.

By putting our heads together with others, we have accomplished getting the child support formula updated with input from many interest groups. The thoughtful leadership of Dan Wright in this process was instrumental to achieving this goal. Some would have thought that this was an impossible task. While the results may not make everyone happy there was a review of the formula as mandated. We were not sitting on our hands like the legislature. By the way if you are dissatisfied with the current method of calculating child support, you too can work for change.

I am impressed and amazed at what referees can accomplish by working together. Different jurisdictions have their various ways of implementing court rules and referee positions; listening to how others do their job and process their cases can provide ideas on improving work and have constructive suggestions for colleagues. Being able to talk face to face with others of our ilk is the best benefit from the Referees’ Conference in May. Hope to see you in Petoskey. Bring your ideas or gripes. We will empathize and help support you.

Kathleen M. Oemke
April 4, 2008
Referees' Association of Michigan  
2008 Membership Application

Name: ___________________________________________  
e-mail:___________________________________________

2007 members PLEASE indicate “no change” if there is no change:
Title: _______________  Court: ____________________
Address: _________________________________________
__________________________________________
Phone:_______________________Fax:_________________

DUES: $25.00
Send to:

Erin Magley  
Referee, Ottawa County  
414 Washington St.  
Room 206  
Grand Haven, MI 49417

Please check here for permission to send notices, nomination forms and ballots to you via electronic mail rather than via postal mail: ____
Please check here if you would like to receive list-serv communications: ____

Law School: ___________________  Date of Admission to the Bar:______
Number of Years as Referee:______  Juvenile or Domestic:________

Please list names of the other Referees (Juvenile/Domestic Relations) in your County:
____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

The following information is optional:
RAM activities in which you have participated:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Other professional organizations in which you are a member:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Juvenile/family law activities you have completed this year:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Books/articles/materials you have published this year:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Seminar/guest speaker presentations you have made or special projects you have worked on this year:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
How can RAM better serve and represent Referees?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Personal news you would like to share with your colleagues:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Please send Membership Form with payment to:  

Erin Magley  
Referee, Ottawa County 414 Washington St.  
Room 206  
Grand Haven, MI 49417
The latest edition of the **FAMILY LAW TRIAL BOOK FOR MICHIGAN REFEREES** is now available. The cost is $60.00, plus $5.00 shipping. If you have a state tax exemption number, there is no sales tax; otherwise the tax is an additional $3.60 for a total of $68.60.

Checks or money orders should be payable to Gwen Dilworth.

If anyone wants a copy of the order form, Ron Foon ([foonr@oakgov.com](mailto:foonr@oakgov.com)) can fax it to you. Otherwise contact Gwen at (248) 623-9315, or email her at [gdillworth@sbcglobal.net](mailto:gdillworth@sbcglobal.net).

---

**Calling all Referees!!**

It's not too late to join the Referees Association of Michigan for 2008! And while you are doing so, register for our 2008 Conference at a discount! You may not know that membership is still at the **low** rate of just $25.00! Need more information regarding our organization? Please visit our website: [www.referees-association.org](http://www.referees-association.org)

Included among the many benefits of membership is our publication “The Referees Quarterly” and our Referees’ Conference every spring. The **24th Annual RAM Conference** will be held May 21-23, 2008 at the historic Stafford Perry Hotel in beautiful Petoskey! Don't miss out on a fun opportunity to network with and learn from your colleagues, as well as hear some great speakers!

Your membership is important to the strength of our Association! RAM is your organization for obtaining information and having input into law and policy development. For example, RAM coordinates with the SCAO Family Services Bureau and representatives from RAM serve on various state child support Formula, ethics, State Bar section, ethics, and forms committees and can serve as conduits for referee input and influence. Much of the sharing of information and ideas is accomplished through the list-serv, which is a valuable and quick resource for answers from your colleagues regarding legal issues, as well as policy and procedure in other counties and a place for some interesting discussion. **Please be aware that as of April 2008, any non-renewing members will be unsubscribed from the list-serv.**

If you have any questions regarding the benefits of membership, please do not hesitate to contact me, or any of the other board members listed on our website.

**Erin Magley, RAM executive secretary**  [emagley@co.ottawa.mi.us](mailto:emagley@co.ottawa.mi.us)  616-786-4101
Rivette v Rose-Molina, ___ NW2d ___, 2008 WL 818752 (March 27, 2008).

Defendant appeals as of right from the trial court's order denying his amended petition for change of custody and other relief. Because both the referee and the trial court erred in making a custody determination without consideration of the statutory best-interest factors, we reverse.

On appeal, defendant argues that the referee erred in not making findings of fact or considering the best interest factors in determining custody of the parties' minor child and that the trial court erred in upholding the referee's custody recommendation and ruling that the issue of custody could not be revisited.

Complete opinion at: http://courtofappeals.mijud.net/DOCUMENTS/OPINIONS/FINAL/COA/20080327_C280922_35_280922.OPN.PDF


In Bowers, just prior to the Quarterly's publication, the Michigan Court of Appeals ruled that miles under the "100 mile rule" are to be measured as radial miles (not road miles). There are many problems with this method of calculation, as articulated in Ken Randall's article "How Many Lawyers Does it Take To Measure a Mile?" in the September 2007 Referees' Quarterly.

Complete opinion at: http://courtofappeals.mijud.net/DOCUMENTS/OPINIONS/FINAL/COA/20080325_C274377_48_274377.OPN.PDF

Thanks to Ed Messing for the heads-up on these two new cases!
The Supreme Court reinstated Family Court’s denial of a juvenile’s motion to set aside his plea in *In re Barnes Sup Ct # 134934 1/24/08*. The Court cited the Court of Appeals dissent (#269384, 8/28/07), which found that a plea had been properly taken. Also, there was no ineffective assistance of counsel as the juvenile had failed to show the relevance of a claimed “potential witness”, that a different result was likely if he went to trial, or that it was proper for counsel to advise the juvenile that he faced long term detention if he went to trial, and counsel’s advice that the juvenile had no defense shows his defenses were considered and discussed. The court in *In re Hutchinson Mich App__ (2008) #274286 2/21/08* held that an adjudication which involved more than one offense is ineligible to set aside under MCL 712A.18e.

Although the mother had filed for a divorce and PPO against father in *In re Archer Mich App__ (2007) # 275650 10/23/07 lv den 275650 12/21/07*, the court found clear and convincing evidence that she failed to protect her children, and there was a reasonable likelihood that they would be harmed if returned to her home. Mother had failed to intervene and prevent injury or abuse when father hit her son with a hammer, tied him to a chair, and hog-tied him; she also associated with known sex offenders, allowing one to live in her home. Further the court properly conducted of a pre-trial MCR 3.972(C)(2) hearing, viewing a DVD of interviews of the children by a forensic interviewer regarding sexual abuse by the father, as this evidence was not later used during the adjudicative phase. The statements on the DVD were properly considered after the adjudication as there were adequate indicia of trustworthiness, as shown by the referee’s detailed ruling.

When a petition alleges that only the father was abusive but mother was not abusive or neglectful as she promptly reported father’s sexual abuse of the children, the court cannot rely on mother’s plea of jurisdiction but must either conduct a trial or receive a plea from father admitting to jurisdiction before proceeding according to *In re S.L.H. Mich App__ 2008) #276631 1/24/08*. Although the mother was a party, she is not a “Respondent” to allegations of wrongdoing on her behalf and cannot enter a plea.

Both parent’s parental rights were properly terminated in *In re Jordan Mich App__ (2008) #276924 2/12/08* as there was no reasonable expectation that they would provide proper care within a reasonable period. Both parents had limited income and long term substance abuse problems. Father (of 1 of the children) had an extensive criminal history, had failed to provide support, contact, or care for his child prior to establishing paternity and failed to establish paternity until 3 months prior to the termination hearing. There was no evidence termination was not in the child(ren)’s best interest based on father’s failure to provide proper care or to attempt to establish paternity for 17 months after being instructed to do so, and mother’s failure to consistently attend drug screens and obtain suitable housing.
CASELAW, STATUTE AND COURT RULE UPDATE

According to In re Zimmerman __Mich App__(2008) # 279696 1/3/08, the court denying a petition for adoption has the authority to award temporary custody to a putative father after declining to terminate his rights when the mother has not yet released her rights.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS

Hague Convention issues were again addressed in Simcox v Simcox US Ct of Appeals 6th Cir #07-3911 12/28/07 The court erred in ordering the children’s return to Mexico because the children’s testimony of father’s abusive behavior was clear and convincing evidence that there was a “grave risk of physical or psychological harm” without sufficient conditions to ensure their safety upon return to Mexico pending custody proceedings.

Once Plaintiff establishes residency in the county, the residency requirement was met despite her temporary absence during the 10 days immediately preceding the filing, Berger v Berger __Mich App__(2008) #279025 1/31/08. The fact that Plaintiff was busy outside of the home does not preclude a finding that she had the established custodial environment of the children, and the court could consider Defendant’s extramarital affair with the children’s nanny under the moral fitness factor because it showed his lack of judgment and choice of self-gratification over the need to provide immediate care of the children. The Court properly eliminated Defendant’s mid-week parenting time because it was too disruptive, but should have imputed $50,000/yr income to Plaintiff after finding that she had the ability to earn that much full time; use of her actual income was appropriate when setting short term spousal support while Plaintiff transitioned to full time employment.

Under Thornton v Thornton __Mich App__(2007) #270931 10/23/07 the court must find a change of circumstances on the record based on evidence in order to modify spousal support, and a QDRO is part of the judgment and cannot be modified years later. An adoption subsidy is meant as payment of support for a child and not considered as income to a parent when determining spousal support.

RELATED DECISIONS

The court in Shah v City of Farmington Hills __Mich App (2008)#271252 2/21/08 cited Genessee Co Friend of the Court v General Motors Corporation, 464 Mich 44 (2001), holding that a Ford Motor Company lump sum severance payment is “earnings”, and a garnishment of the same is subject to the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act, 15 USC 1671 et seq. Wilkins v Timmerman-Cooper U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Cir #07-3339 1/14/08 addressed the constitutionality of using Videoconferencing technology, finding that it is the functional equivalent to live in person testimony for purposes of a hearing resulting in incarceration.
**Referees Association of Michigan**  
**24th Annual Conference - Petoskey, Michigan - May 21, 22, 23, 2008**

**CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>__________________________________________________</th>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>_________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURT &amp; COUNTY:</td>
<td>____________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS:</td>
<td>____________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE: ___________________________**  **E-MAIL: ___________________________**

**CONFERENCE FEE:** Conference Fees include registration, materials, group dinner, group breakfast, and RAM membership for non-member Referees. **Please CHECK the option(s) selected below.**

- **RAM Members:**  
  - Registration Fee $150.00 if paid on or before April 15, 2008, $200.00 if paid after.
  - Non-Members:  
    - Registration Fee $175.00 if paid on or before April 15, 2008, $225.00 if paid after.

- **Per Diem Rate:**  
  - $75.00 per day for RAM Members (Circle Day(s) Selected: Wednesday, Thursday, Friday)
  - $85.00 per day for Non-Members (Circle Day(s) Selected: Wednesday, Thursday, Friday)

- **Guest Meal Rate:**  
  - Wednesday Group Dinner(s): $35.00 each  
    - (# of additional persons)
  - Friday Group Breakfast(s): $15.00 each  
    - (# of additional persons)

**REGISTRATION FEE ENCLOSED:** $ _____________

**TOTAL GUEST MEAL(S):** $ _____________

**TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED:** $ _____________

**GROUP DINNER ENTRÉE SELECTION:** If you are planning to attend the group dinner, please select one entrée from the following list. If you are paying for guest(s) to attend, please indicate their selection, as well:

- **Petite Sirloin:** A 7 oz. center cut Sirloin char-broiled and served with a leak, bacon and mushroom compote and a red wine bordelaise.
- **Whitefish Grenoble:** Fresh Lake Superior whitefish sautéed with butter, white wine, lemon juice and capers.
- **Pecan Chicken:** Pecan encrusted boneless chicken breast topped with Michigan apple chutney.
- **Angel Hair Pasta:** Angel Hair pasta tossed with tomatoes, black olives, roasted yellow peppers with a spicy balsamic vinaigrette and fresh parmesan.

*Each member and selected others will receive a RAM Coffee Mug as a free gift.*

Please send this Registration Form, along with a **check** made payable to “**R.A.M.**” to the following:

**RAM c/o Referee Paul Jacokes**
**Macomb County Circuit Court**
**40 North Main, 6th Floor**
**Mt. Clemens, Michigan 48043-8606**

*Stafford’s Perry Hotel* is offering a special room rate of $80 per night, plus tax. Bayside rooms are $110 per night, plus tax.  
Contact the *Stafford’s Perry Hotel* by **April 10, 2008** for room reservations: **1-231-347-4000 or 1-800-737-1899** or **www.theperryhotel.com**

***DO NOT SEND YOUR REGISTRATION FORM AND FEE TO THE HOTEL***
SCHEDULE OF EVENTS
24th ANNUAL RAM CONFERENCE
MAY 21, 22, 23, 2008

Wednesday, May 21, 2008:
12:00 p.m. to 1:45 p.m.
Conference Registration at the Stafford’s Perry Hotel.
Location: Reycraft Room.

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
“Juggling All of your Hats while Maintaining Your Sanity”.
Presenter: Laurie Young, M.S., L.P.C. of Laughter Works.
Laurie Young is a Holistic Health Specialist and nationally
recognized expert of health and humor. She will offer a unique,
memorable, and enjoyable program while providing concrete
skills and strategies that involve the audience and reinforce
concepts. Location: Reycraft Room.

4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Arlington Hospitality Suite: Meet and greet fellow Referees.

6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Group Dinner: In the H.O. Rose Dining Room of the Perry
Hotel.

Thursday, May 22, 2008:
7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.
Continental Breakfast: (at your leisure) available by the
Reycraft Room.

9:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.
"Difficult Adolescents in Juvenile and High Conflict
Divorce Settings" Presenter: Jerome Price, MA, the
author of Defusing High-Conflict Divorce, a Treatment
Guide for Working with Angry Couples. He is a therapist
and parenting time coordinator and expert on high conflict
resolution and difficult children. Children in Juvenile
Delinquency present difficult issues for the court and
parents. Mr. Price will offer his expertise to us and have
some hands-on suggestions for dispositions in juvenile
matters and parent solutions for divorce matters.

12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Lunch: On your own . . Enjoy!

1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
“Evidentiary issues in Referee Hearings” Presenter:
Elliot Glicksman, JD, Professor of Evidence at Cooley
Law School. Prof. Glicksman will focus on evidentiary
issues arising in all referee hearings. From hearsay to
admission of documents, he will focus on procedural issues
and substantive differences.
3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. **Joint Roundtable Discussions.** Topics: To be Announced.

5:00 p.m. **Dinner:** On your own.

5:00 p.m. to ??? **Arlington Hospitality Suite** will be open.

**Friday, May 23, 2008:**

8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. **Group Breakfast Buffet.** Location: Reycraft Room (**Board meeting at 9:00 a.m.**)

9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. **Executive Board Meeting.** Location: Reycraft Room.

10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. **“Role of the Friend of the Court in Child Welfare Cases: MCR 3.973 court rule amendments”** Presenter: Suzanne Hollyer, JD, Oakland County Friend of the Court. Ms. Hollyer has graciously agreed to address the implementation of the new court rule for Juvenile cases and how it practically will be applied in the Friend of the Court.

11:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. **Awards Ceremony and Conclusion of Conference.** (Please turn in your evaluation forms).

---

**Join Us For The Spring Conference!**

**May 21st—23rd, 2008**

**Perry Hotel, Petoskey**
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<td>Mount Clemens, MI 48043 (586) 469-7841 <a href="mailto:Jacobsbm26@comcast.com">Jacobsbm26@comcast.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone/Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth D. Randall</td>
<td>42nd Judicial Circuit</td>
<td>Midland County (989) 832-6885 Phone (989) 832-6607 Fax <a href="mailto:KDRandall@aol.com">KDRandall@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald H. Foon</td>
<td>6th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Pontiac, MI 48343-6012 (248) 838-0437 Foon838-2050 Fax <a href="mailto:foont838@co.oakland.mi.us">foont838@co.oakland.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Magley</td>
<td>20th Circuit Court</td>
<td>Lansing, MI 48901 (517) 483-6280 Phone (517) 483-6107 Foon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy L. Thane</td>
<td>Tuscola County Family Court</td>
<td>(517) 484-6280 Phone (517) 483-6107 Foon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jacobs</td>
<td>16th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Mount Clemens, MI 48043 (586) 469-7841 <a href="mailto:Jacobsbm26@comcast.com">Jacobsbm26@comcast.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen M. Transt</td>
<td>16th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Mount Clemens, MI 48043 (586) 469-6276 Fax <a href="mailto:kites@gwbecopenwest.com">kites@gwbecopenwest.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda S. Weiss</td>
<td>42nd Circuit Court Family Division</td>
<td>Juvenile Referee &amp; Dep. Court Admin. 301 West Main St Midland, MI 48640-5813 (989) 832-6607 Fax <a href="mailto:lweiss@co.midland.mi.us">lweiss@co.midland.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Committees and Liaisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law and Court Rule Committee</td>
<td>Jon T. Ferrier, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Flood</td>
<td>Barbara Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Committee</td>
<td>Dan Loomis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Committee</td>
<td>Erin Magley, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Benefits Committee</td>
<td>Bob Hotchkiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artkag Speake</td>
<td>Mark D. Sherbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Puckley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bar Family Law Section Co-Liaisons</td>
<td>Barbara Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon T. Ferrier</td>
<td>Traci L. Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
<td>Paul Jacobs, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards Committee</td>
<td>Karen M. Transt, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAO Liaison</td>
<td>Dan Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution and By-Laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Foon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth D. Randall, Co-Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda S. Weiss, Co-Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth D. Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent those of the Board of Directors of the Referees’ Association of Michigan.