County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

425 Shatto Place, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

PHILIP L. BROWNING
Director

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District
SHEILA KUEHL
Third District
DON KNABE
Fourth District
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

February 9, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Philip L. Browning
Director

MACRO HOMES, INC. GROUP HOME QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW

The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) Out-of-Home Care Management Division (OHCMD) conducted a Quality Assurance Review (QAR) of Macro Homes, Inc. Group Home (the Group Home) in January 2015. The Group Home has one site located in the Fifth Supervisorial District and provides services to the County of Los Angeles DCFS placed children and youth. According to the Group Home's program statement, its purpose is, "to provide a structured milieu that facilitates control of chronic problematic behavior and assist each child in dealing with the emotional issues that require out-of-home placement."

The QAR looked at the status of the placed children's safety, permanency and well-being during the most recent 30 days and the Group Home's practices and services over the most recent 90 days. The Group Home scored at or above the minimum acceptable score in 1 of 9 focus areas: Visitation. OHCMD noted opportunities for improved performance in the focus areas of Safety, Permanency, Placement Stability, Engagement, Service Needs, Assessment & Linkages, Teamwork, and Tracking & Adjustment.

In August 2015 OHCMD Quality Assurance Reviewer met with the Group Home to discuss results of the QAR and to provide the Group Home with technical support to address methods for improvement in the areas of Safety, Permanency, Placement Stability, Engagement, Service Needs, Assessment & Linkages, Teamwork, and Tracking & Adjustment.

The Group Home was placed on a Do Not Use status on December 24, 2015, and all placed children were removed by January 25, 2016 and therefore, a Quality Improvement Plan was not requested of the Group Home.

If you have any questions, your staff may contact me or Aldo Marin, Board Relations Manager, at (213) 351-5530.

PLB:EM:KR:rds

Attachments

c: Sachi A. Hamai, Chief Executive Officer
John Naimo, Auditor-Controller
Public Information Office
Audit Committee
Kathleen Kerrigan, Chief Executive Officer, Macro Homes, Inc. Group Home
Lajuannah Hills, Regional Manager, Community Care Licensing Division
Lenora Scott, Regional Manager, Community Care Licensing Division

MACRO HOMES, INC. GROUP HOME
QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW (QAR)
FISCAL YEAR 2014-2015

SCOPE OF REVIEW

The Out-of-Home Care Management Division (OHCMD) conducted a Quality Assurance Review (QAR) of Macro Homes, Inc. Group Home (the Group Home) in January 2015. The purpose of the QAR is to assess the Group Home's service delivery and to ensure that the Group Home is providing children with quality care and services in a safe environment, which includes physical care, social and emotional support, education and workforce readiness, and other services to protect and enhance their growth and development.

The QAR is an in-depth case review and interview process designed to assess how children and their families are benefiting from services received and how well the services are working. The QAR utilizes a six-point rating scale as a *yardstick* for measuring the situation observed in specific focus areas. The QAR assessed the following focus areas:

Status Indicators:

- Safety
- Permanency
- Placement Stability
- Visitation

Practice Indicators:

- Engagement
- Service Needs
- Assessment & Linkages
- Teamwork
- Tracking & Adjustment

For Status Indicators, the reviewer focuses on the child's functioning during the most recent 30 day period and for Practice Indicators, the reviewer focuses on the Group Home's service delivery during the most recent 90 day period.

For the purpose of this QAR, interviews were conducted with three focus children, three Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) Children's Social Workers (CSWs), three Group Home children's caseworkers, one Group Home administrator, and one facility manager.

At the time of the QAR, the focus children's average number of placements was five, their overall average length of placement was three months and their average age was 15. The focus children were randomly selected. None of the focus children were included as part of the sample for the 2014-2015 Contract Compliance Review.

QAR SCORING

The Group Home received a score for each focus area based on information gathered from on-site visits, agency file reviews, DCFS court reports and updated case plans, and interviews with the Group Home staff, DCFS CSWs, service providers, and the children. The minimal acceptable score is 6 in the area of Safety and 5 in all remaining areas.

Focus Area	Minimum Acceptable Score	GH QAR Score	GH QAR Rating
Safety - The degree to which the Group Home ensures that the child is free of abuse, neglect, and exploitation by others in his/her placement and other settings.	6	5	**Good Safety Status** - The focus children are generally and substantially avoiding behaviors that cause harm to self, others, or the community and are free from abuse, neglect exploitation, and/or intimidation in placement.
Permanency - The degree to which the child is living with caregivers, who are likely to remain in this role until the child reaches adulthood, or the child is in the process of returning home or transitioning to a permanent home and the child, the Group Home staff, caregivers and DCFS CSW, support the plan.	5	3	**Marginally Inadequate Status** - The focus children are living on a temporary basis with an out-of-home caregiver, but likelihood of reunification or finding another permanent home remains uncertain. The focus children reside in a group home and DCFS reunification or permanency goals are barely supported by the Group Home.
Placement Stability - The degree to which the Group Home ensures that the child's daily living, learning, and work arrangements are stable and free from risk of disruptions and known risks are being managed to achieve stability and reduce the probability of future disruption.	5	2	**Poor Stability** - The focus children have substantial and continuing problems of instability in placement and/or school settings with multiple disruptions in settings within the past 12 months and at least one change in the past 60 days. The child may feel insecure and concerned about his/her situation. Multiple, dynamic factors are in play, creating a "fluid pattern of uncertain conditions" in the child's life, leading to ongoing instability. Intervention efforts to stabilize the situation may be limited or undermined by current system of care difficulties.

Focus Area	Minimum Acceptable Score	GH QAR Score	GH QAR Rating
Visitation - The degree to which the Group Home staff support important connections being maintained through appropriate visitation.	5	5	**Substantially Acceptable Maintenance of Visitation & Connections** - Generally effective family connections are being sought for all significant family/Non-Related Extended Family Members (NREFMs) through appropriate visits and other connecting strategies.
Engagement - The degree to which the Group Home staff working with the child, biological family, extended family and other team members for the purpose of building a genuine, trusting and collaborative working relationship with the ability to focus on the child's strengths and needs.	5	4	**Minimally Adequate to Fair Engagement Efforts** - To a minimally adequate degree, a rapport has been developed, such that the Group Home staff, DCFS CSW, certified foster parent and the focus children feel heard and respected. Reports indicate that minimally adequate to fair efforts are being used by Group Home staff, as necessary to find and engage the child, caregivers, and other key people.
Service Needs - The degree to which the Group Home staff involved with the child, work toward ensuring the child's needs are met and identified services are being implemented and supported and are specifically tailored to meet the child's unique needs.	5	4	**Fair Supports & Services -** A fair array of supports and services somewhat matches intervention strategies identified in the case plan. The services are minimally to fairly helping the children make progress toward planned outcomes. A minimally adequate to fair set of supports and services is usually available, used, and seen as somewhat satisfactory. The array provides few options, limiting choice in the selection of providers.

Focus Area	Minimum Acceptable Score	GH QAR Score	GH QAR Rating
Assessment & Linkages - The degree to which the Group Home staff involved with the child and family understand the child's strengths, needs, preferences, and underlying issues and services are regularly assessed to ensure progress is being made toward case plan goals.	5	3	**Marginally Inadequate Assessment and Understanding** - The children's functioning and support system are marginal and insufficiently understood. Information necessary to understand the children's needs and preferences is limited and occasionally updated. Present strengths, risks, and underlying needs requiring intervention or supports are partly understood on a limited or inconsistent basis. Necessary changes in behavior or conditions are somewhat recognized, but may not be usefully interpreted to support change strategies used.
Teamwork - The degree to which the "right people" for the child/youth and family, have formed a working team that meets, talks, and makes plans together.	5	4	**Minimally Adequate to Fair Teamwork** - The team contains some of the important supporters and decision makers in the focus children's lives, including informal supports. The team has formed a minimally adequate to fair working system that meets, talks, and/or plans together; at least one face-to-face team meeting has been held to develop plans.
Tracking & Adjustment - The degree, to which the Group Home staff who is involved with the child and family is carefully tracking the progress that the child is making, changing family circumstances, attainment of goals and planned outcomes.	5	2	**Fragmented or Shallow Tracking and Adjustment Process** - Poor intervention strategies, supports, and services may be provided to the focus children and may not be responsive to changing conditions. Rare, spotty, or shallow monitoring, poor communications, and/or an inadequate team may be unable to function effectively in planning, providing, monitoring, or adapting services. Few sensible modifications may be planned or implemented. The service process may be stuck and unchanging. The focus children's status may be poor in several areas. Serious problems may continue unresolved.

STATUS INDICATORS
(Measured over last 30 days)

What's Working Now (Score/Narrative of Strengths for Focus Area)

Visitation (5 Substantially Acceptable)

Visitation Overview: The Group Home provides substantially acceptable maintenance of family connections for the focus children. The Group Home engages the DCFS CSWs and appropriate family members in discussing and arranging visitation. The Group Home also provides monitoring of visits when necessary, and assists in the transportation to and from visits. The Group Home also provides transportation funds or passes for public transportation to ensure the focus children were able to visit family members.

The Group Home is supportive of the visitation plans for the focus children and follows the visitation recommendations set by DCFS. Each of the focus children is visiting with family members, and the Group Home encourages the focus children to maintain telephone contact with their family.

The first focus child maintains telephone contact with her mother who resides out-of-state. The focus child has unmonitored visits with her brother and maternal aunt and she maintains regular telephone contact with them. She reported spending a holiday with them and that the Group Home provided transportation for a visit. She shared that she enjoyed visiting with her family. The focus child's DCFS CSW stated that the Group Home supports the focus child's visitation plan and ensures that the focus child maintains contact with her family.

The second focus child has court-ordered weekend visits with her father. The focus child reported that she loves visiting her father's home, because she gets to see her neighborhood friends. The focus child also has approved unmonitored visits with her mother; however, she does not wish to visit with her. The focus child has an older brother who is in college, and she has occasional contact with him. She reported that she likes to spend time with him when he is not busy. The focus child stated that she is also able to call her family from the Group Home phone, or sometimes she uses her cell phone. The focus child reports no problems with her visitation. The DCFS CSW reported that the Group Home staff keeps him informed regarding the focus child's visits with her family members. The DCFS CSW also reported that the focus child's father has open communication with the Group Home regarding the visits.

The third focus child is a teen parent; her infant son is not a court dependent. Her infant son resides with the focus child's aunt in Northern California. The focus child maintains regular contact with her aunt via telephone, but she has not had any recent visits while residing at the Group Home. The focus child's mother is not actively involved in the child's case plan; however, the focus child maintains unmonitored phone contact with her. The focus child also reported that she has an adult sister in the armed forces who resides in San Diego. The focus child has unmonitored visits with her sister. According to the focus child, she can only visit with her sister during the holidays, as her sister resides in San Diego; however, she maintains regular telephone contact with her sister. The Group Home has provided transportation funds for the focus child to ride the train to San Diego to visit her sister. The focus child shared that she loves her visits with her sister. The focus child's DCFS CSW reported that she has spoken to the Group Home staff and the focus child's sister regarding how

visits are going, as the focus child has expressed wanting to live with her sister. The DCFS CSW reported that the Group Home is supportive of the visitation plan.

What is Not Working Now and Why (Score/Narrative of Opportunities for Improvement)

Safety (5 Good Safety Status)

Safety Overview: The Group Home's safety status is good. The focus children reported that they felt safe at the Group Home and that they were more satisfied there than in their prior placements. The three focus children reported that the Group Home staff treats them well. All three focus children reported that the Group Home is a safe place to live and that there were no concerns regarding their safety.

The first focus child reported that although she does not like living in a group home, she feels safe and protected. She stated that staff is always present to provide supervision. She shared that there have not been any incidents at the Group Home in which someone has been hurt and that she can go to the Group Home staff if there are any concerns or if she would ever be injured.

The second focus child reported that she always feels safe at the Group Home. She shared that she feels safe because the Group Home has rules, and the children are informed of the rules at the time of placement. She further reported that she has never been hurt while at the Group Home and that she is never left alone, as staff is always present.

The third focus child reported that the Group Home staff enforces the rules to ensure there is no violence in the Group Home, and that she feels protected by the staff. She shared that she can talk with the Group Home staff when she needs assistance, as staff is always present.

The DCFS CSWs for the focus children reported that the focus children experience safe living situations at the Group Home with staff, which are reliable and competent.

The Out-of-Home Care Investigations Section and Community Care Licensing reported that no referrals or complaints were received during the last 30 days.

The Group Home administration ensures that the placed children feel safe at the Group Home. The Group Home staff reported that they receive training on different topics to be able to identify problems that may pose a child safety risk to the placed children, and that the Group Home staff report the placed children's disruptive behavior to their DCFS CSWs. The Group Home works together in solving risky behaviors to ensure the children's safety. The Group Home staff reported having the required training and certification in Pro-Act and CPR. The Group Home reported that they have a good relationship with the local law enforcement agency and knew how to protect placed children.

Although each of the focus children and their DCFS CSWs reported no safety concerns, the Group Home fell below the minimum score in the area of Safety due to not complying with the procedures and protocols for submitting Special Incident Reports (SIRs). The Group Home submitted 19 SIRs during the last 30 days. The SIRs submitted were not submitted timely or properly documented and were submitted under an unrelated or inaccurate incident category. Further, the SIRs did not provide clear documentation of the incidents or the Group Home's follow-up to address issues of concern.

Eight SIRs involved the first and third focus children. The first focus child was involved in four SIRs: an argument with a peer at the Group Home; an argument with Group Home staff and refusal to go to urgent care for treatment of a migraine headache; and two refusals to attend school. The third focus child was involved in three incidents in which she refused to attend school or complete schoolwork, and the Group Home utilized a SIR as a means of reporting that the focus child had received her clothing allowance.

Permanency (3 Marginally Inadequate Status)

Permanency Overview: The Group Home provided marginally inadequate permanence for the focus children. Although permanency plans are documented in the focus children's Needs and Services Plans (NSPs) and the Group Home staff reported they support the focus children's permanency plans, placement at the Group Home appears uncertain and unstable. The focus children have a long history of behavior and emotional problems, placement non-compliance, and a refusal to attend school and continue to have substantial problems of instability at the Group Home, and these behaviors put their plans for permanency at risk. Further, the Group Home staff is experiencing difficulty with getting the focus children to comply with their treatment plans.

The permanency plan for the first focus child is Permanent Planned Living Arrangement (PPLA). The Group Home is supportive of the focus child maintaining family connections. However, the focus child openly shared that she did not like to comply with the Group Home staff's requests. She also shared that she was not following her case plan, because she wanted to go to a foster home. Her DCFS CSW reported that she was planning to replace the focus child in another Group Home.

The permanency plan for the second focus child is Family Reunification with her father, and her concurrent plan is PPLA. Although the plan is for the focus child to reunify with her father, they have both expressed to their DCFS CSW and the Group Home staff that they do not wish to be reunified. The focus child's father expressed that the focus child's behavioral and emotional needs are difficult to deal with. The focus child says she would like to remain in extended foster care and eventually become independent. The focus child has been disruptive and non-compliant while being placed at the Group Home.

The permanency plan for the third focus child is Family Reunification. According to a review of records, the plan is to place the focus child with her adult sister who resides in San Diego. The focus child speaks about wanting to be reunified with family in Northern California and shared that she is waiting for her case to be transferred to the appropriate county. The Group Home supported the plan by ensuring the focus child maintained a relationship with her family members and provided transportation funds to allow the focus child to visit her family.

Placement Stability (2 Poor Stability)

Placement Stability Overview: The placement stability of the focus children is poor. Prior to their placement at the Group Home, each of the focus children presented a history of complex needs, behaviors and emotional problems. The focus children continued to have substantial problems of instability at the Group Home and at school. The needs of the focus children would have been more appropriately addressed in a placement setting that is more restrictive and highly structured.

The first focus child was discharged from the Group Home approximately two weeks after completing her QAR interview. While at the Group Home, the focus child was not working her treatment program, and she refused to attend school. She was disruptive, verbally aggressive and engaged in property destruction. Case files also documented that the Group Home administrator had informed the focus child that she would be discharged from the Group Home if her behavior continued. The Group Home developed a placement contract with the focus child. However, she was unable to comply with the contract. Further, the focus child's behaviors appear to have escalated, as verbal aggression led to property destruction, which resulted in the focus child not being discharged from the Group Home according to the permanency plan, but rather being placed in a more restrictive environment.

The Group Home shared that it was making efforts to motivate the focus child to follow the Group Home's program, attend school and therapy, but the child refused. The Group Home staff reported that the child was making demands that they could not meet.

The DCFS CSW for the first focus child reported that the focus child is difficult and that the Group Home struggled with her behavior. Her DCFS CSW also confirmed that a seven-day notice of intent to discharge had been issued by the Group Home and that she was searching for a different group home that could handle the focus child and address her needs.

The second focus child stated that she liked the Group Home. Although the child wanted to reside at the Group Home, she was not following Group Home rules, was not complying with her treatment plan, and the Group Home had a difficult time keeping the child stable. Further, case records documented that the focus child was not doing well. The focus child had a history of substance abuse, and did not show improvement while at the Group Home, as "she manifested signs of illicit drug use."

The third focus child has a history of running away. Placement records document placement instability at the Group Home and the focus child stating that she did not want to be at the Group Home. In addition, efforts were being made by her DCFS CSW to locate a placement, as her DCFS CSW feels the lack of structure and the needing to complete school credits would be detrimental to the focus child's long term plan of transferring to Southern California. The focus child was not complying with the Group Home's program, and she was not attending school. The focus child had shared that she wanted to remain at the Group Home until she was placed with her adult sister. However, the focus child was experiencing difficulty and non-compliance with the Group Home program and school.

PRACTICE INDICATORS

(Measured over last 90 days)

What is Not Working Now and Why (Score/Narrative of Opportunities for Improvement)

Engagement (4 Minimally Adequate to Fair Engagement Efforts)

Engagement Overview: The Group Home has demonstrated minimally adequate to fair efforts in developing rapport and engaging the focus children, the DCFS CSWs, the Group Home staff, and other key people in the focus children's lives. Although, the Group Home does ensure that the focus

children are in contact with their DCFS CSWs and provides monitoring, they do not engage as a team to discuss the children's participation in the Group Home's activities, challenges and progress.

The first focus child reported that she counts on her DCFS CSW, on her peer group at the Group Home, and her friends at school. However, she prefers to count on herself. She did not elaborate. She also shared that she feels her DCFS CSW and the Group Home staff work together, and that they communicated via telephone or when her DCFS CSW visits her.

The second focus child stated that she counts on her DCFS CSW. However, when things come up at the Group Home, she depends on Group Home staff to work things out. She also shared that she does not depend on her father, as he is not supportive of her plans. The focus child said that she knows the Group Home staff and her DCFS CSW meet and talk about her needs. She also shared that the Group Home staff calls her DCFS CSW and provides her DCFS CSW with reports. The DCFS CSW for the focus child stated that the Group Home does communicate with her and engages her; however, this occurs mostly when there are problems with the focus child.

The third focus child shared that she counts on the Group Home staff and her DCFS CSW. She shared that her DCFS CSW and the Group Home staff communicate via telephone and during the CSW's visits to the Group Home.

The Group Home was aware that the focus children had special needs at the time of placement. However, the Group Home staff reported that they are not always provided with information regarding the children's history and traumas that would help the Group Home prepare prior to placement. Additionally, the Group Home staff was not communicating with the focus children individually to ensure that their needs were being met.

The DCFS CSWs for the three focus children reported that they have no concerns regarding the ongoing support and communication provided by the Group Home. The DCFS CSW did share however, that although the Group Home contacts them to discuss the needs or issues involving the focus children, communication was usually done via telephone or e-mail.

Service Needs (4 Fair Supports & Services)

Service Needs: The Group Home provides a fair array of supports and services which somewhat matches intervention strategies identified in the focus children's case plans. The focus children did not express concerns regarding their services. However, the focus children do not appear to be benefitting from the services provided. The focus children are non-compliant with their treatment plans, and the Group Home is experiencing difficulty in enforcing the treatment program and in getting the focus children to participate or "buy in" to the services provided.

The first focus child stated that the Group Home meets her needs, as they provide her with a home, food, clothing, and they give her a weekly allowance. The focus child requires substance abuse treatment; however, she is resistant to attending. The focus child is also refusing to attend individual counseling. The Group Home attempts to ensure the focus child's educational needs are met by providing transportation in efforts to ensure the focus child attends school, and the Group Home makes efforts to provide educational supports, such as tutoring, as the focus child is deficient in school credits, and she is refusing to attend school.

The second focus child is receiving substance abuse counseling through a community agency. The child attends a non-public school; however, she does not attend school consistently. She is not performing at grade level. There is an Individualized Education Plan on file for the focus child. Case records document that the focus child is running her own program at the Group Home and is not compliant with services and treatment. Further, case records indicate that monetary incentives have been implemented in efforts to get the focus child to participate in her case plan. It appears, however, that the Group Home's behavioral modification program has not been successful.

The third focus child stated that the Group Home is providing her basic needs and that she is satisfied with the Group Home. However, case records document that the focus child has been non-compliant with the Group Home program. Additionally, the focus child does not attend school regularly, and she does not complete school assignments. The focus child reportedly did not earn any school credits during the last trimester, as the child had complained about not being able to concentrate at the Group Home and that she wanted to attend a mainstream public school rather than a charter school.

Assessment & Linkages (3 Marginally Inadequate Assessments and Understanding)

Assessment & Linkages Overview: The Group Home's assessment and understanding of the focus children's functioning, challenges, earlier life traumas and support systems appears to be marginal. There is concern that the focus children made very little, if any progress while being placed at the Group Home. It appears that placement at the Group Home was only a temporary arrangement until a more appropriate placement became available. Based on available documentation, each of the focus children were non-compliant with the Group Home's program, as well as their treatment plans. None of the focus children appeared to be able to function without difficulty at the Group Home, school, or in the community.

Teamwork (4 Minimally Adequately to Fair Teamwork)

Teamwork Overview: The Group Home has formed a minimally adequate system of teamwork, involving only some of the important supporters and decision makers in the focus children's lives. It appears that the majority of the discussions occur between the Group Home administrator and the Group Home staff. The Group Home is familiar with the focus children's team members, however, there appears to be little emphasis on involving the important supporters in meetings or in the decision making process. Each of the focus children are aware of the people who are part of their team, such as their parents, sibling, and extended family members; however, these individuals are not included in team meetings. Although the DCFS CSWs are kept informed regarding the focus children, communication occurs primarily via telephone and email when there are concerns or problems.

When the first focus child was asked who her team members were, she stated that her team was the Group Home staff. She shared that she is aware that the Group Home staff meets to discuss her needs. She added that neither she nor her DCFS CSW attend the team meetings. When asked about how she felt about how her team functions, she replied that when she does not like how the team functions, she will leave the Group Home or AWOL. The focus child's DCFS CSW stated that she has not participated in any Group Home team meetings and that she has not been notified of said meetings. The DCFS CSW did express that she would like to be involved in the planning for the focus child.

The second focus child reported that she is aware that the Group Home Director meets with the Group Home staff, but she does not participate in the meetings. She added that she does not know when they meet; she is only informed of the meetings after they occur.

The third focus child also reported that her team consists of the Group Home Director and the Group Home staff, but she is not part of the team. She stated however, that she does let them know about her needs and plans. She added that she does not know when the Group Home Director meets with the Group Home staff, but that she and the other residents are notified that meetings were held. She said that the Group Home staff does discuss her plans and goals with her.

Although the Group Home administrator and program manager or the Group Home staff communicates with the focus children and their DCFS CSWs as needed, the Group Home would benefit greatly by including all of the team members in team meetings to support them and the focus children. Also, the focus children need to be included and informed of their progress, so everyone is working together to assist the focus children in meeting their goals. In addition, although the Group Home may inform the DCFS CSWs of the focus children's needs, more emphasis is needed on having regularly scheduled meetings with all the team members, including the DCFS CSW and the focus children.

Tracking & Adjustment (2 Fragmented or Shallow Tracking and Adjustment Process)

Tracking & Adjustment Overview: The Group Home provides poor intervention strategies, supports, and services to the focus children that are not responsive to changing conditions and few sensible modifications are planned or implemented. Additionally, modifications to services are unclear. Monitoring and communication of the focus children's progress appeared to be infrequent and shallow. It further appears that the team, which primarily consisted of the Group Home administrator and staff, was unable to adequately monitor, address, and plan for the focus children's needs, as the focus children arrived at the Group Home displaying chaotic and disruptive behaviors, and it appears that these behaviors persisted during placement. Further, it appears that the Group Home was not fully equipped to address the needs of the focus children. Case records revealed that each of the focus children refused to comply with the Group Home's treatment program and services. The focus children made little if any progress in treatment or toward their case plan goals, and the poor status of the children was evident. Further, the Group Home utilize a monetary incentives reward system to reward the children for positive behaviors or following the Group Home's rules; however, the reward system appeared ineffective, as it did not assist in getting the focus children to attend school or to curb runaway incidents or non-compliance.

NEXT STEPS TO SUSTAIN SUCCESS AND OVERCOME CURRENT CHALLENGES

In February 2015, the OHCMD provided the Group Home with technical support regarding SIRs and development of comprehensive Needs and Services Plans.

In August 2015, the OHCMD Quality Assurance Reviewer met with the Group Home to discuss the results of the QAR and to provide the Group Home with technical support to addressing methods for improvement in the areas of Safety, Permanency, Placement Stability, Engagement, Service Needs, Assessment & Linkages, Teamwork, and Tracking & Adjustment.

On September 17, 2015, the Group Home was placed on an Investigative Hold due to Community Care Licensing complaints from children placed at the Group Home. A Review Conference was held with the Group Home on October 19, 2015, and a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was requested. To date, the Group Home has not submitted a CAP that could be approved and child safety concerns remain. Further, there is a concern regarding the quality of care the children received while placed at the Group Home. The Group Home was subsequently placed on a Do Not Use status on December 24, 2015, and all placed children were removed by January 25, 2016, and therefore, a Quality Improvement Plan was not requested of the Group Home.