

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of JOSEPH CRAMER, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner - Appellee,

v

RONALD HAISLIP,

Respondent - Appellant,

and

ALICE NARBUT,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

October 31, 2000

No. 223786

Macomb Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-045819-NA

Before: Markey, P.J., and Murphy and Collins, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Ronald Haislip appeals as of right the termination of his parental rights to Joseph Cramer pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

In order to terminate parental rights, the circuit court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination has been met by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). Once a statutory ground is established, termination of parental rights is mandatory unless the court finds that termination clearly is not in the child's best interest. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). We review the family court's findings of fact for clear error. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999).

Termination in this case was supported by clear and convincing evidence. Although the evidence indicated that the home conditions had improved slightly, they were still unsatisfactory.

Furthermore, testimony at the final hearing showed that respondent made no real progress in improving his parenting skills during the year that the minor child was in foster care, notwithstanding the numerous services offered by the Family Independence Agency. Although respondent completed parenting classes, testimony showed that it made no difference in his behavior toward his child at his visits. We conclude, therefore, that the circuit court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent's parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence. Further, the evidence did not establish that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *Trejo, supra*.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey
/s/ William B. Murphy
/s/ Jeffrey G. Collins