COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

WENDY L. WATANABE
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

ASST. AUDITOR-CONTROLLERS

ROBERT A. DAVIS
JOHN NAIMO
JUDI E. THOMAS

May 12, 2011

TO: Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe

FROM: Wendy L. Watanabe
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: **WINGS OF REFUGE FOSTER FAMILY AGENCY CONTRACT REVIEW – A DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES PROVIDER**

We have completed a contract compliance review of Wings of Refuge Foster Family Agency (Wings of Refuge or Agency), a Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) provider. The purpose of our review was to determine whether Wings of Refuge was providing the services outlined in their Program Statement and the County contract. We completed our review in June 2009 and conducted a follow-up review in March 2010.

DCFS contracts with Wings of Refuge, a private non-profit community-based organization to recruit, train and certify foster parents for supervising children DCFS places in foster care. Once the Agency places a child, it is required to monitor the placement until the child is discharged from the program. Wings of Refuge oversees 62 certified foster homes in which 162 DCFS children were placed at the time of our review. Wings of Refuge is located in the Second and Fifth Districts. DCFS paid Wings of Refuge approximately $3.6 million during Fiscal Year 2009-10.

Results of Review

The foster children indicated that they enjoyed living with their foster parents and the foster parents indicated that the services they received from the Agency generally met their expectations. The Agency also ensured that staff possessed the required education and work experience, conducted hiring clearances, and provided ongoing

training for staff working on the County contract. However, Wings of Refuge did not always ensure that foster homes complied with other County contract and California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) Title 22 regulations. For example:

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 did not adequately secure potentially dangerous items (e.g., cleaning solutions). This issue was also noted in our Wings of Refuge contract review report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited from our original review adequately secured potentially dangerous items.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that their social workers will reinforce the requirements to foster parents during home inspections.

- Two (25%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 did not have a written disaster plan in the home. In addition, one home did not have a readily available list of emergency contacts.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited had a disaster plan and emergency numbers readily available.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that their social workers will ensure compliance during monthly home inspections.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 did not have a smoke detector in the hallway leading to the children's bedroom.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited had operable smoke detectors in the hallways leading to the children's bedrooms.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that their social workers will ensure smoke detectors are operable during home inspections.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 had a safety release for the safety bars on the children's bedroom windows that was obstructed by the bed, making it difficult to escape in case of an emergency. In addition, the children who slept in the bedroom did not know how to release the safety device. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the foster family had moved to a new home that did not have safety bars on the windows.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they will complete safety inspections to ensure safety devices are not obstructed.

- Five (63%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 were not assessed by Wings of Refuge to ensure the foster parents could care for more than two children. At the time of our review, three of the homes had three children and two homes had four children. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, we confirmed the foster homes were appropriately assessed.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they will complete home assessments as required.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 had two children sharing bedrooms with adult youths. Subsequent to our review, we confirmed that the adult youths now share a room and the foster children share a room.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, we confirmed that the home had children sharing rooms with other age appropriate children.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they will monitor and ensure compliance during staff placement meetings.

- Five (22%) of the 23 case files reviewed in 2009 did not have documentation that the children's DCFS social workers were provided with monthly updates on the children's progress. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the ten additional children's case files reviewed had documentation that the children's DCFS social worker was provided with monthly phone updates.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that their social workers will document and provide monthly updates to DCFS social workers.

- Five (22%) of the 23 case files reviewed in 2009 did not have documentation that the children were visited weekly by Wings of Refuge's social workers during the first three months of placement as required. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the ten additional children's case files reviewed had documentation that they were visited weekly.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that their social workers will document that they visit the children as required.

- Two (9%) of the 23 case files reviewed in 2009 did not have Special Incidents Reports (SIR) although the files had documentation of behavior that required the Agency to prepare the reports. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, one (10%) of the ten additional children's case files reviewed required the Agency to prepare a SIR and the Agency appropriately prepared the SIR.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they retrained their social workers.

- One (4%) of the 23 Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) reviewed in 2009 was three months past due and five (21%) NSPs reviewed did not have goals that were measurable and specific to the child. These issues were also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, two (20%) of the 10 additional NSPs reviewed did not have goals that were measurable and specific to the child. In addition, two (20%) of the 10 NSPs were both prepared two months late.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they will ensure NSPs are prepared properly and timely.

- Four (40%) of the ten children reviewed in 2009 that were taking psychotropic medications did not have required documentation of monthly evaluations by the prescribing physician in their case files. However, both the foster parents and the children indicated that they were taking their medication and were seen monthly by the prescribing physician. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, all nine additional children reviewed that were taking psychotropic medication, we confirmed they were seen monthly by the prescribing physician.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they will maintain documentation of the physician evaluations and monitor to ensure compliance.

- Eight (35%) of the 23 children reviewed in 2009 received initial dental examinations late by an average of 48 days. In addition, two (9%) children received initial medical examinations late by an average of 16 days. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

During our follow-up review in 2010, two (20%) of the 10 additional children reviewed received an initial medical examination late by an average of 59 days and one (10%)child was over four months late for their initial dental examination at the time of our review.

Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they will ensure children receive medical and dental exams within the required timeframes.

- Two social workers carried an average of 18 cases each and one supervisor carried 10 cases and supervised six social workers, which is more than the maximum caseload allowed. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, three social workers still carried an average of 17 cases each.

  Wings of Refuge's attached response indicates that they are hiring additional social workers and supervisors and will monitor compliance during weekly staff meetings.

Details of our review, along with recommendations for corrective action, are attached.

Review of Report

We discussed our report with Wings of Refuge on December 1, 2010. In their attached response (Attachment I), Wings of Refuge management indicates the actions the Agency has taken to implement the recommendations. We also notified DCFS of the results of our review. In their response (Attachment II), DCFS indicates they will monitor the Agency for compliance with our recommendations.

We thank Wings of Refuge management for their cooperation and assistance during our review. Please call me if you have any questions or your staff may contact Don Chadwick at (213) 253-0301.

WLW:JET:DC:AA

Attachments

c: William T Fujioka, Chief Executive Officer
Jackie Contreras, Ph. D, Interim Director, DCFS
James Smith, Chair, Board of Directors, Wings of Refuge
Renee Moncito, President and CEO, Wings of Refuge
Jean Chen, Community Care Licensing
Public Information Office
Audit Committee

FOSTER FAMILY AGENCY PROGRAM
WINGS OF REFUGE FOSTER FAMILY AGENCY
FISCAL YEAR 2009-10

BACKGROUND

The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) pays Wings of Refuge Foster Family Agency (Wings of Refuge or Agency) a negotiated monthly rate, per child placement, established by the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) Foster Care Rates Bureau. Based on the child's age, Wings of Refuge receives between $1,430 and $1,679 per month, per child. DCFS paid Wings of Refuge approximately $3.6 million during Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10.

PURPOSE/METHODOLOGY

The purpose of our review was to determine whether Wings of Refuge was providing the services outlined in their Program Statement and the County contract. We reviewed certified foster parent files, children's case files, personnel files and interviewed the Agency's staff. We also visited a number of certified foster homes and interviewed the children and the foster parents. We completed our review in June 2009 and conducted a follow-up review in March 2010.

BILLED SERVICES

Objective

Determine whether Wings of Refuge provided program services in accordance with their County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations.

Verification

We visited eight of the 62 Los Angeles County certified foster homes that Wings of Refuge billed DCFS in February and March 2009 and interviewed eight foster parents and 19 foster children placed in the eight homes. In addition, we reviewed case files for eight foster parents and 23 children and we reviewed the Agency's monitoring activity. During March 2010, we revisited three homes and reviewed additional case files.

Results

Wings of Refuge needs to ensure that foster homes are in compliance with the County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations and that foster parent and children's case files, Needs and Services Plans (NSPs), and Termination Reports have all the required information. In addition, the Agency needs to ensure that children's initial medical and dental examinations and NSPs are completed timely and that children are visited by the Agency social worker as required. Specifically, we noted the following:

Foster Home Visitation

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 did not adequately secure potentially dangerous items (e.g., cleaning solutions). This issue was also noted in our Wings of Refuge contract review report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited from our original review adequately secured potentially dangerous items.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 had a dirty and moldy bath tub and shower. Subsequent to our review, the Agency provided documentation that the tub and shower were refurbished.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited had bathrooms that were clean and well maintained.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 had several vacuum cleaners obstructing the hallway leading to the children's bedroom and bathroom. In addition, the home's patio was filled with tools and equipment, making it difficult to pass from the living area out to the patio. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008. Subsequent to our review, the Agency reported that the foster parents cleared the hallway and patio.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited had passageways and backyards that were clear and free of obstruction.

- Two (25%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 did not have a written disaster plan in the home. In addition, one home did not have a readily available list of emergency contacts as required.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited had a disaster plan and emergency numbers readily available.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 did not have a smoke detector in the hallway leading to the children's bedroom.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the three homes we revisited had operable smoke detectors in the hallways leading to the children's bedrooms.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 had a safety release for the safety bars on the children's bedroom windows that was obstructed by the bed, making it difficult to escape in case of an emergency. In addition, the children who slept in the bedroom did not know how to release the safety device. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

During our follow-up review in 2010, the foster family had moved to a new home that did not have safety bars on the windows.

Foster Parent Certification

- Five (63%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 were not assessed by Wings of Refuge to ensure the foster parents could care for more than two children. At the time of our review, three of the homes had three children and two homes had four children. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, we confirmed that the foster homes were appropriately assessed.

- One (13%) of the eight foster homes reviewed in 2009 had two children sharing bedrooms with adult youths. Subsequent to our review, we confirmed that the adult youths now share a room and the foster children share a room.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, we confirmed the home had children sharing rooms with other age appropriate children.

- One (13%) of the eight foster parent certification files reviewed in 2009 did not contain documentation that the foster parent completed the required 15 hours of annual continuing education training.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the five additional foster parents reviewed completed the required annual continuing education training.

Children's Case Files and Needs and Services Plans

- Five (22%) of the 23 case files reviewed in 2009 did not have documentation that the children's DCFS social workers were provided with monthly updates on the children's progress. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the ten additional children's case files reviewed had documentation that the children's DCFS social worker was provided with monthly phone updates.

- Five (22%) of the 23 case files reviewed in 2009 did not have documentation that the children were visited weekly by Wings of Refuge's social workers during the first three months of placement as required. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, the ten additional children's case files reviewed had documentation that they were visited weekly.

- Two (9%) of the 23 case files reviewed in 2009 did not have Special Incidents Reports (SIR) although the files had documentation of behavior that required the Agency to prepare the reports. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, one (10%) of the ten additional children's case files reviewed required the Agency to prepare a SIR and the Agency appropriately prepared the SIR.

- One (4%) of the 23 NSPs reviewed in 2009 was three months past due. In addition, five (21%) NSPs reviewed did not have goals that were measurable and specific to the child. These issues were also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, two (20%) of the 10 additional NSPs reviewed did not have goals that were measurable and specific to the child. In addition, two (20%) of the 10 NSPs were both prepared two months late.

Medical Services

- Four (40%) of the ten children reviewed in 2009 that were taking psychotropic medications did not have required documentation of monthly evaluations by the prescribing physician in their case files. However, both the foster parents and the children indicated that they were taking their medication and were seen monthly by the prescribing physician. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, all nine additional children reviewed that were taking psychotropic medication, we confirmed they were seen monthly by the prescribing physician.

- Eight (35%) of the 23 children reviewed in 2009 received initial dental examinations late by an average of 48 days. In addition, two (9%) children received initial medical examinations late by an average of 16 days. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

  During our follow-up review in 2010, two (20%) of the 10 additional children reviewed received an initial medical examination late by an average of 59 days and one (10%) child was over four months late for their initial dental examination at the time of our review.

Termination Reports

- Eight (32%) of the 25 Termination Reports reviewed in 2009 did not include a closing summary of the Agency's placement records as required. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

During our follow-up review in 2010, the 13 additional Termination Reports reviewed had an appropriate closing summary.

Recommendations

Wings of Refuge management ensure:

1. **Staff adequately monitor foster homes to ensure they comply with the County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations.**

2. **Foster parents adequately secure cleaning solutions and other items that could pose a potential safety hazard to children.**

3. **Foster homes are safe and well-maintained in accordance with the County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations.**

4. **Foster parents have written emergency plans and emergency numbers posted.**

5. **Foster homes have operable smoke detectors in the hallways leading to the children's bedrooms.**

6. **Window safety devices are not obstructed by beds or other items and children know how to operate the devices.**

7. **Foster home assessments are completed for homes when more than two children are placed.**

8. **Foster homes obtain exception from Community Care Licensing before foster children share a bedroom with anyone over the age of 18.**

9. **Foster parents complete the required annual continuing education training.**

10. **DCFS social workers are updated monthly regarding the children's progress.**

11. **Children are visited by Agency social workers weekly during the first three months of placement and twice a month after the first three months of placement.**

12. **Special Incidents Reports are prepared when required.**

13. **NSPs are prepared within the required timeframes, contain goals that are specific, measurable, and time-limited, and are approved by the DCFS social worker.**

14. **Children taking psychotropic medications are seen monthly by the prescribing physician.**

15. **Children's initial medical and dental examinations are conducted within the timeframes specified in the County contract.**

16. **Termination Reports include a closing summary of the Agency's records related to the child's placement.**

CLIENT VERIFICATION

Objective

Determine whether the program participants received the services that Wings of Refuge billed to DCFS.

Verification

We interviewed 19 children placed in eight Wings of Refuge certified foster homes and eight foster parents to confirm the services the Agency billed to DCFS.

Results

The foster children indicated that they enjoyed living with their foster parents and the foster parents indicated that the services they received from the Agency generally met their expectations.

Recommendation

None.

STAFFING/CASELOAD LEVELS

Objective

Verify that Wings of Refuge social workers' caseloads do not exceed 15 placements and that the supervising social worker does not supervise more than six social workers as required by the County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations.

Verification

We interviewed Wings of Refuge's administrator and reviewed caseload statistics and payroll records for the Agency's social workers and supervising social worker.

Results

Wings of Refuge is not always complying with the maximum caseload requirements. Specifically, two Agency social workers carried an average of 18 cases each during the months reviewed in 2009. In addition, one supervisor carried 10 cases and supervised six social workers during one of the months reviewed. This issue was also noted in our report issued on August 4, 2008.

During our follow-up review in 2010, three social workers still carried an average of 17 cases.

Recommendations

Wings of Refuge management:

17. **Ensure that social workers and supervisors do not have more cases than allowed by CDSS Title 22 regulations.**

18. **Hire additional social workers and supervisors if the number of cases and staff exceeds the maximum number allowed.**

STAFFING QUALIFICATIONS

Objective

Determine whether Wings of Refuge's staff possess the education and work experience qualifications required by their County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations. In addition, determine whether the Agency conducted hiring clearances prior to hiring their staff and provided ongoing training to staff.

Verification

We interviewed Wings of Refuge's administrator and reviewed each staff's personnel file for documentation to confirm their education and work experience qualifications, hiring clearances and ongoing training.

Results

Wings of Refuge's administrator, supervising social worker, and social workers possessed the required education and work experience. In addition, the Agency conducted hiring clearances prior to hiring their staff and provided ongoing training to staff working on the County contract.

Recommendation

None.

PRIOR YEAR FOLLOW-UP

Objective

Determine the status of the recommendations reported in the prior Auditor-Controller monitoring review.

Verification

We verified whether the outstanding recommendations from the FY 2006-07 monitoring review were implemented. The report was issued on August 4, 2008.

Results

The August 4, 2008 monitoring report had 24 recommendations. The Agency fully implemented 10 recommendations and partially implemented two recommendations. However, the Agency has not implemented 12 recommendations from the August 4, 2008 monitoring report.

Recommendation

19. Wings of Refuge management implement the outstanding recommendations from the August 4, 2008 monitoring report.

FAMILIES
COMMUNITIES

November 30, 2010

TO: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM: Paulette Buchanan, FFC Administrator

SUBJECT: Wings of Refuge (WOR) Contract Review Corrective Action Plans

In response to your contract compliance review, the following is WOR corrective action plan for your review/approval. During this audit, there was one administrator responsible for the Los Angeles Office, as well as a newly appointed administrator for the Palmdale Office. There were also several social worker staffing changes in the Palmdale office just prior to the audit. These transitions no doubt impacted the initial audit review. However, by the time of our follow up audit review, there was marked overall improvement in the identified areas of concern. Subsequent 2010 DCFS audits have also substantiated these improvements. Wings of Refuge continue to demonstrate its ability to provide exemplary care for the children placed under its care.

The following are the Corrective Action Plans that address the County review recommendations:

3777 CENTER BLVD.
WINGSOFREFUGE@GMAIL.COM
SUITE 910
LOS ANGELES, CA. 90065

WWW.WINGSOFREFUGE.ORG

(310) 670-6767 OFFICE
(310) 670-2626 FAX

Wings of Refuge Foster Family Agency
2009 Contract Review
December 1, 2010

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Since the changes have been made in both offices, The Social workers staff will continue to closely monitor foster homes to make sure that they comply with the County contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations. This requirement will continue to be monitored through the regular weekly FFA supervision process.

2. CFP are trained on an ongoing basis regarding Title 22 regulations to include, but not limited to ensure foster parents adequately secure detergents, cleaning solutions, alcoholic beverages and other items that could pose a potential safety hazard to children. Social workers will reinforce these regulations through regularly scheduled home inspections to insure compliance.

3. Social workers are required to ensure foster homes are safe and well-maintained in accordance with the County Contract and CDSS Title 22 regulations through monthly home inspections and follow through. Compliance is monitored during weekly/biweekly visits from the social workers.

4. All Wings of Refuge certified foster homes are required to post emergency plans and emergency numbers. Monthly home inspections by social workers provide additional oversight to ensure compliance.

5. Routine home inspections by social workers provide additional oversight to ensure every home has an operable smoke detector in hallways leading to children's bedrooms

6. As a routine, safety inspections are completed to ensure window safety devices are not obstructed by furniture or other devices. The CFP demonstrate and teach the children how to operate the window devices.

7. Administrative staff is mandated to complete foster home assessments where more than two children are placed. Routine administrative staff file reviews help to monitor compliance.

   - CFP are able to provide quality care and adequate supervision.
   - CFP is able to provide age appropriate of all the children placed in their homes.
   - CFP are required to have at least 12 months experience before more than two children are placed in their home.

8. Wings of Refuge requires that all appropriate CCL exceptions are requested and provided prior to placing children in our agency. As such, this includes the rare occasion if there is a request to place a foster child to share a room with anyone over the age of 18. Weekly staff placement meetings help to ensure monitoring and compliance.

9. Wings of Refuge requires that all certified foster parents complete the required annual recertification continuing education trainings provided to ensure compliance. Periodic foster parent file audits are completed to ensure that the CFP training hours have been documented and filed.

10. Social workers are required to update and document monthly DCFS social worker contact. The supervision process ensures that agency social workers contact DCFS CSW monthly and document the details of the children's progress to ensure that sufficient detail is provided to permit an evaluation of services provided to the children.

11. The supervision process ensures that per the County Contract, the social worker visits and document that children are visited weekly during the first 3 months of placements and bi monthly thereafter.

12. The new social worker staff has been trained to complete SIR promptly and comprehensive Termination reports when children leave the agency.

13. The supervision process continue to provide the monitoring that the NSPs (new format) are prepared within the required timeframes and are appropriately updated and the goals are specific, measurable, time limited and approved by the DCFS children's social worker.

14. Children taking psychotropic medications are routinely monitored by the agency to ensure that they are seen monthly or as required by the prescribing physician. A psychotropic log is maintained and reviewed monthly to ensure compliance.

15. Wings of Refuge continues to ensure that children's initial medical and dental appointments are conducted within the timeframes specified in the County contract. The supervision process ensures monitoring and compliance.

16. The supervision process continues to provide the monitoring of termination reports to ensure that a closing summary of the agency's record to the child's placement. The new NSP format is utilized to provide the closing summary of the child's placement history.

STAFFING/CASELOAD LEVELS

RECOMMENDATIONS:

17. Wings management continues to ensure that social workers and supervisors do not have more cases than allowed by CDSS Title 22 regulations. This process is monitored during weekly staff placement meetings.

18. Wings management continues to hire additional social workers and supervisors if the numbers of cases exceed the maximum number allowed by CDSS Title 22 regulations.

PRIOR YEAR FOLLOW-UP

19. Please see our responses to implement the outstanding 12 recommendations for the fiscal year 2008-2009.

We are working on implementing the remaining outstanding five recommendations from fiscal year 2008-2009.

We thank you for the opportunity to address the recommendations.

Cc: Jason S. Stempanski, CIA
Wendy C. Watanabe, Controller
Cassandra Youngblood, Contract Monitor
Renee Monzito, CEO

County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

9320 Telstar Ave., Suite 216, El Monte, California 91731
(626) 569-6801

Antonia Jiménez, Deputy CEO
Interim Director

Board of Supervisors
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH, MAYOR
Fifth District
GLORIA MOLINA
First District
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District
ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District
DON KNABE
Fourth District

December 30, 2010

TO: Aggie Alonso, Chief Accountant-Auditor
Countywide Contract Monitoring Division

FROM: Elizabeth A. Howard, Section Head
Out of Home Care Management Division
Foster Family Agency/Group Home Performance Management

DCFS RESPONSE TO THE AUDITOR CONTROLLER'S CONTRACT REVIEW OF WINGS OF REFUGE FOSTER FAMILY AGENCY

The Auditor Controller's (A-C) Contract Review of Wings of Refuge Foster Family Agency was conducted during May and June 2009. On December 14, 2010, the A-C informed the Out of Home Care Management Division (OHCMD) that they also conducted a follow-up review in March 2010 and provided their December 14, 2010 final draft report of the contract compliance review including their follow-up review results. The DCFS monitor reviewed the report on December 16, 2010.

The A-C's compliance and follow-up reviews found no egregious findings which rose to the level of a referral to the Child Protection Hotline. The A-C's May and June 2009 compliance review noted about seventeen findings. The FFA's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) dated November 30, 2010 indicates that their staffing changes just prior to the A-C's compliance review impacted its results. The FFA has made notable improvement since the compliance review and the A-C's follow-up review reflects the FFA's implementation of the A-C's recommendations in most of the areas of concerns, except in three areas. The A-C's follow-up review noted that two of the ten reviewed Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) were two months late and had goals that were not child specific and measurable; two of the ten reviewed children received late initial medical examinations and one child received a late initial dental examination; and three social workers carried an average of seventeen cases, exceeding the maximum number allowed for the social worker/case ratio. The FFA's CAP dated November 20, 2010 indicated that they are hiring additional social workers and supervisors and providing closer supervision. The A-C approved the Wings of Refuge FFA's CAP.

On December 16, 2010, the DCFS monitor followed up on the three remaining findings. The FFA's administrator informed the monitor that they have provided extensive staff training on NSPs, that they are fully utilizing their Accountability Report as an internal

audit tool, and that they are conducting weekly supervision to review their social workers' compliance. The FFA administrator provided the Accountability Report for review, and it reflects a comprehensive tracking system including the timelines of the initial medical and dental examinations. The FFA administrator also provided the current social worker/case ratio roster for review, and it reflects that the social workers carry fifteen or less cases in accordance with State regulations. This finding has been corrected.

The OHCMD will continue to monitor the FFA's full compliance with State regulations including the remaining non-implemented A-C's recommendations within six months after the issuance of the A-C's final report.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (626) 569-6804.

KR:EAH:ek

c: David Seidenfeld, CEO, Children & Families Well-Being Cluster
Wendy L. Watanabe, Auditor-Controller
Antonia Jimenez, Interim Director, DCFS
Lisa Parrish, Deputy Director, DCFS