



**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

November 26, 2003

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

FROM: J. Tyler McCauley 
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: **GROUP HOME PROGRAM MONITORING REPORTS – MOZELL
PENNINGTON BOYS CENTER, BUTLER HOUSE AND ROA MANOR
SITES**

We have completed a review of two group homes operated by Mozell Pennington Boys Center, Butler House and Roa Manor. Each home contracts with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the Probation Department (Probation).

Butler House is an eight-bed facility located in the Fifth Supervisorial District that provides care for boys ages 12-17 years who exhibit behavioral, social, and emotional difficulties. At the time of the monitoring visit, Butler House was providing services for seven Los Angeles County DCFS children.

Roa Manor is a six-bed facility located in the Second Supervisorial District that provides care for boys ages 12-17 years who exhibit behavioral, social, and emotional difficulties. At the time of the monitoring visit, Roa Manor was providing services for six DCFS 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 review. The interviews with the residents were designed to obtain their perspectives on the program services provided by the homes and to ensure adherence to the Foster Youth Bill of Rights.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

Summary of Findings

Generally, both agencies were providing the services outlined in their Program Statements. However, both homes need to provide residents with daily cognitive stimulation and, Roa Manor needs to provide residents with a life book.

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 DCFS with a written corrective action plan within fifteen 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 Patrick McMahon at (213) 974-0729.

JTM:PM:CC

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

MOZELL PENNINGTON BOYS CENTER
Butler House
14818 South Butler Avenue
Compton, CA 90221
(310) 639-2472
License No.: 191600243
Rate Classification Level: 8

I. FACILITY AND ENVIRONMENT

(Facility Based - No Sample)

Method of assessment – Observation and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Butler House is one of two facilities operated by Mozell Pennington Boys Center. Located in a residential neighborhood, the home blended in with other homes on the block. There were no observable safety hazards.

The interior of the home was attractive and well-maintained. The living/family room with an adjoining dining area was spacious, nicely furnished, and appropriate for the residents' meals, homework, and relaxation. The bedrooms were spacious, comfortable, and personalized to each child's desire with posters, pictures, stuffed animals, and knick-knacks.

On-ground recreational equipment included free-weights, a basketball hoop, video games, a large TV, and table games, in good condition and age-appropriate. There were books and a daily newspaper provided.

There was a sufficient supply of properly stored frozen food, meat, canned goods, bakery items, and fresh fruit.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

II. PROGRAM SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

The residents met Butler House’s population criteria as outlined in their program statement and received an initial assessment after being admitted into the program.

The Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) were specific, realistic, measurable, and time limited. Both the children and their placement workers participated in developing and updating the NSPs.

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

Both residents were receiving individual therapy and group therapy.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this 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 were enrolled in school. One resident participated in an independent study program at a public school and his file contained report cards and/or progress reports.

The other resident has not attended school this fall. His file contained documentation from the local school district indicating that an Individual Educational Plan was recently completed but school administrators had not decided on the appropriate educational setting for the child. A Court Appointed Special Advocate has been assigned by Dependency Court to assist with the child’s educational planning.

Butler House administrators were actively involved in ensuring that the residents’ academic needs were appropriately met, however, one resident was not provided with cognitive stimulation (i.e., reading, tutoring, arts, coordination or other intellectually stimulating activities) on a daily basis as required by the Statement of Work.

One resident completed the Early Step Toward Emancipation Program and was planning to participate in the emancipation courses offered by the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)/Community College Foundation (CCF).

The other resident reported that he had completed some classes at school related to independent living but was not interested in the emancipation courses provided by DCFS/CCF. He explained that he had obtained independent living and survival skills when he resided with relatives.

One resident was employed, pursuing a career as a welterweight boxer, and stated that staff was supportive of his vocational and educational endeavors. The resident was able to manage his own money and both residents were able to spend their allowances as they wanted.

Development of daily living skills was part of Butler House's program. The residents were expected to keep their rooms clean, do their laundry, maintain good personal hygiene, and complete various household chores. The residents were involved in the planning and preparation phase of meals and employment preparation was encouraged.

Recommendations

- 1. Butler House management provide residents with daily cognitive stimulation.**

IV. RECREATION AND ACTIVITIES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Butler House followed a monthly activity schedule to which the residents could provide input. Local community organizations were utilized in developing program resources. The residents played basketball, had cookouts at the local park, and belonged to the YMCA. However, both residents expressed disinterest in the activities provided by the facility.

Residents with the approval of their authorized representatives, were provided with passes during which time they visited friends and/or engaged in self-selected activities. They reported that they preferred to utilize their weekend passes because the facility's weekend activity often consisted of a two-dollar movie. (The September 2003 activity schedule was reviewed and out of the eleven activities noted, only two were for the two-dollar movies.)

The residents had the opportunity to play table games, video games, outdoor sports, and read at free times during the day.

Transportation was provided to and from scheduled activities.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

V. PSYCHOTROPIC MEDICATION

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents

There were seven residents placed in the home at the time of the review. A review of the case file was conducted for the two residents prescribed psychotropic medications.

Comments:

Both residents receiving psychotropic medication had current court authorizations and psychiatric evaluations.

The medication logs were thorough, organized, and 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 and procedures and reported that there was an appropriate rewards and discipline system in place that was utilized in a fair manner. The residents were provided with appropriate supervision and a reasonable amount of freedom. They were comfortable with staff and stated that they were treated with respect.

The younger resident expressed fond feelings for the facility administrator. The residents reported that they felt safe in the facility. However, one resident stated that crime in the neighborhood undermined his overall feeling of safety and well-being.

The residents were permitted to make and receive telephone calls and contact their authorized representatives. The residents were assigned chores that they did not feel were too difficult. The residents stated that their ethnic and cultural lifestyles were respected and that they had religious freedom. The residents reported that they received routine and as-needed medical and dental care.

The residents expressed an overall satisfaction with the facility and the staff and were aware 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:

Butler House provides appropriate clothing, items of necessity, and allowances to the residents. Butler House supplies its residents with the required monthly clothing allowance in the amount of fifty dollars, and the residents are given the opportunity to select their own clothes. Clothing provided to the residents is of good quality and of sufficient quantity.

The residents are provided with at least the required minimum weekly allowance that they were able to increase based on the agency’s behavioral system.

Butler House provides residents with adequate personal care items and sufficient, secure space to store their personal items. Both residents declined the opportunity to maintain a life book.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

**MOZELL PENNINGTON BOYS CENTER
Roa Manor
16952 South Roa Drive
Carson, CA 90746
(323) 321-6495
License No.: 191600653
Rate Classification Level: 8**

I. FACILITY AND ENVIRONMENT

(Facility Based - No Sample)

Method of assessment – Observation and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Roa Manor is one of two facilities operated by Mozell Pennington Boys Center. Located in a residential neighborhood, the home blended in with other homes on the block. There were no observable safety hazards.

The interior of the home was attractive and well-maintained. The bedrooms were attractive, nicely furnished, and personalized by the residents.

The facility's recreational and educational equipment included video games, a piano, large screen television, and computer.

There was a sufficient supply of properly stored frozen foods, meat, canned goods, bakery items, and fresh fruit.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

II. PROGRAM SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

The residents met the Roa Manor's population criteria as outlined in their program statement and received an initial assessment after being admitted into the program.

The Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) were specific, realistic, measurable, and time limited. Both the children and their placement workers participated in developing and updating the NSPs.

The Quarterly Report for one resident was current, comprehensive, timely, and focused on the goals in the NSP. The other resident did not require a Quarterly Report at the time of the review.

Both residents received individual and group therapy.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations for this section.

III. EDUCATIONAL AND EMANCIPATION SERVICES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

One resident attended both a non-public and public school on a part-time basis and stated that staff was supportive of his academic progress by attending school meetings and conferences, providing academic support, and advocating for more personalized services such as his current part-time plan.

The other resident was not enrolled in school. Although an Individualized Education Plan had been done for him and a specialized educational placement was approved and recommended, the appropriate educational setting had not been located for the resident by the school district.

Roa Manor administrators were actively involved in ensuring that the residents' academic needs were appropriately met however, one resident was not provided with cognitive stimulation (i.e., reading, tutoring, arts, coordination or other intellectually stimulating activities) on a daily basis as required by the Statement of Work.

One resident had not been at the facility long enough to participate in emancipation and/or vocational services. The other resident completed the independent living and emancipation courses provided by the Department of Children and Family Services and the Community College Foundation. The resident stated that he completed some preliminary vocational training that included several part-time jobs. He was currently unemployed, but reported that when he worked he could manage his own money. Both residents could spend their allowances as they wanted.

Development of daily living skills was a part of Roa Manor's program. Both residents regularly practiced daily living and survival skills such as maintaining good personal hygiene, making their beds, doing their laundry, completing household chores, and assisting with meal preparation.

Recommendations

- 1. Roa Manor management provide residents with daily cognitive stimulation.**

IV. RECREATION AND ACTIVITIES

Method of assessment – Review of relevant documents and resident interviews

Sample size for resident interviews: Two

Comments:

Roa Manor followed a monthly activity schedule to which the residents could provide input. Neither resident was interested in planning recreational activities. Local community organizations were utilized in developing program resources. The residents played basketball, had cookouts at the local park, and belonged to the YMCA. However, both residents expressed disinterest in the activities provided by the facility.

The residents, with the approval of their authorized representatives, were provided with passes during which time they visited friends and/or engaged in self-selected activities. They indicated that they preferred to utilize their weekend passes to visit friends or go places alone because the facility's weekend activity often consisted of a two-dollar movie. (The September 2003 activity schedule was reviewed and out of the eleven activities noted, only two were the two-dollar movies.) The residents also stated that some of the activities were not enjoyable because they were not provided with sufficient funds to enjoy them. For example, they were not given money for lunch or to play the arcades when they went to the pier.

This was discussed with management during the exit conference who disputed the residents' claim adding that residents were provided with snacks during movies, lunch on various outings, etc. Management also explained that they were cautious about providing their residents with excessive amounts of money due to drugs and other paraphernalia available to the residents in and around the community.

One resident expressed satisfaction with the activities available at the facility, specifically, cable television, video games, computer games, or just relaxing.

Transportation was provided to and from scheduled 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 the home at the time of the review. A review of case files was conducted for the one resident prescribed psychotropic medication.

Comments:

The court authorization for the resident receiving psychotropic medication was current. Documentation confirmed that the prescribing psychiatrist saw the resident on a monthly basis.

The medications log was clear, accurate, and organized.

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 agency's policies and procedures and indicated that an appropriate rewards and discipline system was in place that was utilized in a fair manner. The residents were provided with appropriate supervision and a reasonable amount of freedom.

The residents expressed a high level of comfort and satisfaction with staff: One resident stated that living at the facility "was a beautiful situation" and the other stated that staff was great because they "gave him lots of food on his plate." Both residents indicated that they were treated with respect. One resident indicated that he did not feel safe in the facility because of another resident who made two separate aggressive gestures toward him. The resident acknowledged that staff had intervened appropriately in both incidents.

The residents were permitted to make and receive private telephone calls and contact their authorized representatives. The residents were assigned chores that they did not feel were too difficult. The residents stated that their ethnic and cultural lifestyles were respected and that they had religious freedom. The residents indicated that they received routine and as-needed medical and dental care.

The residents expressed an overall satisfaction with the facility and the staff and were aware 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:

Roa Manor provides appropriate clothing, items of necessity, and allowances to the residents. Roa Manor supplies its residents with the required monthly clothing allowance in the amount of fifty dollars, and the residents are given the opportunity to select their own clothes. Clothing provided to the residents is of good quality and of sufficient quantity.

The residents are provided with at least the required minimum weekly allowance that they were able to increase based on the agency's behavioral system.

Roa Manor provides residents with adequate personal care items and sufficient, secure space to store their personal items.

One resident did not have a life book.

Recommendations

- 2. Roa Manor management offer each resident a life book.**