



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2766
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

J. TYLER McCaULEY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

February 23, 2004

TO: Supervisor Don Knabe, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM: J. Tyler McCauley
Auditor-Controller 

SUBJECT: **GROUP HOME PROGRAM MONITORING REPORT – LINDEN
CENTER, GARDNER AND KENISTON HOUSES**

We have completed a review of Linden Center, Gardner and Keniston Houses. Each home contracts with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Probation Department (Probation), and the Department of Mental Health (DMH).

Gardner House is a six-bed facility, located in the Second Supervisorial District, which provides care for boys ages 13-17 years who exhibit behavioral, social, and emotional difficulties. At the time of the monitoring visit, Gardner was providing services for six County of Los Angeles DMH children.

Keniston House is a six-bed facility, located in the Second Supervisorial District, which provides care for girls ages 13-17 years who exhibit behavioral, social, and emotional difficulties. At the time of the monitoring visit, Keniston was providing services for six DMH children.

Scope of Review

The purpose of the review was to verify that the two agencies were providing the services outlined in their Program Statements. Additionally, the review covered basic child safety and licensing issues and included an evaluation of each home's Program Statement, internal policies and procedures, child case records, a facility inspection, and interviews with two children placed in each home at the time of the reviews. Interviews with the residents were designed to obtain their perspectives on the program services provided by each agency and to ensure adherence to the Foster Youth Bill of Rights.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

Summary of Findings

Generally, both homes are providing the services outlined in their Program Statements. However, we did note areas where improvements are needed. The Gardner and Keniston Houses need to make repairs to their facilities; provide residents with a sufficient amount of fresh food; and properly store food.

Attached are detailed reports of the findings for each home.

Review of Report

We discussed our report with the Agency's management. The Agency's management is required to provide DMH with a written corrective action plan within 15 business days from the receipt of this report. We thank the management and staff for their cooperation during our reviews.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or have your staff contact DeWitt Roberts at (626) 293-1101.

JTM:DR:CC

Attachment

c: David E. Janssen, Chief Administrative Officer
David Sanders, Ph.D., Director, DCFS
Richard Shumsky, Chief Probation Officer
Ronald E. Ricker, Executive Director, Linden Center
Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer
Public Information Office
Audit Committee

**THE LINDEN CENTER
Gardner House
170 S. Gardner Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90036
323-931-5035
License No.: 191800173
Rate Classification Level: 12**

I. FACILITY AND ENVIRONMENT

(Facility Based - No Sample)

Method of assessment – Observation

Sample size for resident interviews: None

Comments:

Gardner House is located in a residential neighborhood of Los Angeles and has moderately maintained grounds.

The facility was nicely decorated and the bedrooms were personalized by the residents. Overall the facility was moderately maintained. However, there were areas in need of improvement.

In the dining room, there was paint on the hardwood floor and the floor was dull and worn. In the kitchen, the tile floor was scratched and damaged, and the living room carpet was stained.

In bathroom number one, there were large cracks in the shower stall. In bathroom number two, light bulbs were missing from the light fixture over the sink and patch work on the wall had not been painted.

In bedroom number one, there was a broken mini blind slat, a bleach stain in the carpet, and dirty walls. In bedroom number two, the walls were dirty, an iron burn mark was on the carpet, and a sheet covered the window. In bedroom number three, the walls were dirty, patch work spots on the wall had not been painted, and a comforter on one bed was stained and torn.

There was age-appropriate play equipment including board games, video games, a TV, VCR, basketball hoop, punching bag, and ping pong table. In addition, there was a computer and a variety of books.

There was an insufficient supply of fresh fruits and vegetables and, food was improperly stored.

Recommendations

- 1. Gardner House management:**
 - a. Repair the hardwood flooring.**
 - b. Replace the kitchen floor tile.**
 - c. Remove stains from the living room carpet.**
 - d. Repair the cracks in bathroom number one's shower stall.**
 - e. Replace light bulbs in bathroom number two.**
 - f. Repair the walls in bathroom number two and bedroom number three.**
 - g. Replace the mini blinds in bedroom number one.**
 - h. Replace the carpeting in bedrooms numbers one and two.**
 - i. Clean the walls in bedrooms number one, two, and three.**
 - j. Replace the sheet from the window with a proper window covering in bedroom number two.**
 - k. Replace the comforter in bedroom three.**
 - l. Provide residents with a sufficient amount of fresh, nutritious food.**
 - m. Properly store food to prevent contamination and spoilage.**

II. PROGRAM SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

The residents met Gardner House's criteria as outlined in their Program Statement and had initial diagnostic assessments.

The Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) were realistic, measurable, and time specific. The residents participated in the development and modification of their NSPs.

The Quarterly Reports were current and focused on the goals in the NSPs.

The residents received individual and group therapy.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for the section.

III. EDUCATIONAL AND EMANCIPATION SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Both residents attended school and their records contained report cards and/or progress reports. Neither resident required an Individualized Educational Plan. The residents reported that they were assisted with their school work and that staff was supportive of their academic progress.

The residents stated that they were taught daily living skills. Neither resident was eligible for emancipation services or vocational training. The residents did not work and were able to spend their allowances as they wanted.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

IV. RECREATION AND ACTIVITIES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Gardner House followed a monthly activity schedule developed by the staff and residents. The residents had the opportunity to watch television, play games, and read at free times during the day.

Transportation was provided to and from activities.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

V. PSYCHOTROPIC MEDICATION

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents

There were six residents placed in Gardner House at the time of the review. A review of case files was conducted for the six residents prescribed psychotropic medications.

Comments:

The residents receiving psychotropic medications had parental consents on file. The residents were not dependents or wards of the court, therefore, court authorizations were not required.

Documentation confirmed that the residents were routinely seen by the prescribing psychiatrist for an evaluation of their medication.

Medication logs were properly maintained.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

VI. PERSONAL RIGHTS

Method of assessment – Resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

The residents were informed of the facility's policies, rules, and regulations, and felt that they were fair. Both residents reported that they felt safe in the home, staff treated them well, and that a sufficient number of staff was always in the home when residents were present.

Resident chores included the maintenance of their own rooms and common areas, which the residents did not feel were too demanding.

Both residents were able to have telephone contact with their families and stated that they had privacy during phone calls and visits. The residents reported that they had religious freedom and that staff was culturally sensitive to their background and

ethnicity. The residents were free of interference with daily functions, inclusive of getting water and snacks. The residents reported satisfaction with the food and facility.

Both residents reported that their health care needs were met. Upon admission, the residents signed a form indicating that they had been informed of their right to refuse medication.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

VII. CLOTHING AND ALLOWANCE

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Because they were not dependents or wards of the court, the residents' clothing was provided by their parents.

The residents received at least the required minimum weekly allowance that they were able to increase based on the Agency's behavioral system.

Gardner House provided residents with personal care items and sufficient, secure storage space.

The residents were not required to maintain a life book.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

**THE LINDEN CENTER
Keniston House
938 Keniston Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90019
323-936-7656
License No.: 191801941
Rate Classification Level: 12**

I. FACILITY AND ENVIRONMENT

(Facility Based - No Sample)

Method of assessment – Observation

Sample size for resident interviews: None

Comments:

Keniston House is located in a residential neighborhood of Los Angeles and has moderately maintained grounds.

The facility was nicely decorated and the bedrooms were personalized by the residents. Overall, the facility was adequately maintained. However, there were areas in need of improvement.

In the kitchen, the floor tile squares were separating, the standing food cabinet was not sturdy, and the shelves were broken.

In the bathrooms number one and two, the toilet seats were worn and, in bathroom number two, there was a broken towel rack. In bedroom number one, there were cracks in the walls, the paint was peeling and the wooden nightstand was warped. In bedroom number two, the walls were damaged and dirty, and there was insufficient lighting. In bedroom number three, there were cracks in the walls and ceiling.

There was age-appropriate play equipment, including board games, video games, a TV, and VCR. In addition, there was a computer and a variety of books.

There was an insufficient supply of fresh fruits and vegetables and, food was improperly stored.

Recommendations

- 1. Keniston House management:**
 - a. Repair the kitchen floor tile.**
 - b. Repair the food cabinet in the kitchen.**

- c. **Replace the toilet seats in bathrooms one and two.**
- d. **Repair towel rack in bathroom number two.**
- e. **Repair the nightstand and wood paneling in bedroom number one.**
- f. **Repair the walls in bedrooms number one, two, and three.**
- g. **Provide sufficient lighting in bedroom number two.**
- h. **Repair the ceiling in bedroom number three.**
- i. **Provide sufficient lighting in bedroom number two.**
- j. **Provide residents with a sufficient amount of fresh, nutritious foods.**
- k. **Properly store foods to prevent contamination and spoilage.**

II. PROGRAM SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

The residents met Keniston House’s population criteria as outlined in their Program Statement and had initial diagnostic assessments.

The Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) were realistic, measurable, and time specific. The residents participated in the development and modification of their NSPs.

The Quarterly Reports were current and focused on the goals in the NSPs.

The residents received individual and group therapy.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for the section.

III. EDUCATIONAL AND EMANCIPATION SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Both residents attended school and their records contained report cards and/or progress reports. The residents reported that they were assisted with their school work and that staff was supportive of their academic progress.

The residents stated that they were taught daily living skills. Emancipation services and vocational training were provided. One resident was employed and able to manage her money. Both residents were able to spend their allowances as they wanted.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

IV. RECREATION AND ACTIVITIES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Keniston House followed a monthly activity schedule developed by the staff and residents. The residents had the opportunity to watch television, play games, and read at free times during the day.

Transportation was provided to and from activities.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

V. PSYCHOTROPIC MEDICATION

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents

There were six residents placed in Keniston House at the time of the review. A review of case files was conducted for the six residents prescribed psychotropic medications.

Comments:

The residents receiving psychotropic medications had parental consents on file. The residents were not dependents or wards of the court, therefore, court authorizations were not required.

Documentation confirmed that the residents were routinely seen by the prescribing psychiatrist for an evaluation of their medication.

Medication logs were properly maintained.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

VI. PERSONAL RIGHTS

Method of assessment – Resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

The residents were informed of the facility's policies, rules, and regulations, and felt that they were fair. Both residents reported that they felt safe in the home and that a sufficient number of staff was always in the home when residents were present. The residents stated that staff treated them well.

Resident chores included the maintenance of their own rooms and common areas, which the residents did not feel were too demanding.

Both residents were able to have telephone contact with their families. The residents reported that they had privacy during phone calls and visits, had religious freedom, and that staff was culturally sensitive to their background and ethnicity. The residents were free of interference with daily functions, inclusive of getting water and snacks. The residents reported satisfaction with the food and facility.

Both residents reported that their health care needs were met. Upon admission, the residents signed a form indicating that they had been informed of their right to refuse medication.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

VII. CLOTHING AND ALLOWANCE

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Because they were not dependents or wards of the court, the residents' clothing was provided by their parents.

The residents received at least the required minimum weekly allowance that they were able to increase based on the Agency's behavioral system.

Keniston House provided residents with personal care items and sufficient, secure storage space.

The residents were not required to maintain a life book.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.