

**OKLAHOMA COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH  
OFFICE OF JUVENILE SYSTEM OVERSIGHT**

---

**Name and Location of Facility:** Peppers Ranch  
Guthrie, Oklahoma

**Date of Visit:** December 13, 2006

**Oversight Reviewer:** Dana S. Holden, Oversight Specialist

**Focus of Visit:** Announced Visit, 2006

**Date:** April 4, 2007

---

**General Information**

The Office of Juvenile System Oversight (OJSO) conducted an announced visit on December 13, 2006, at Peppers Ranch, located in Guthrie, Oklahoma. The purpose of the visit was to assess compliance with established responsibilities. The facility was licensed for sixteen residents by the Division of Child Care of the Department of Human Services. The program serves male adolescents and provides long-term residential care. On the day of the OJSO visit, the census was fifteen.

Persons Interviewed

- Entry interview and an exit conference with the program director
- Six residents
- Two direct care staff members

Documentation Reviewed

- Files on six residents
- Personnel files of four direct care staff members
- Office of the Oklahoma State Fire Marshal inspection report, dated January 30, 2006
- Oklahoma State Department of Health inspection report, dated December 8, 2005
- DHS Division of Child Care inspection report, dated June 29, 2006

Areas Toured

- Two cottages

## Overview

### Interviews

The OJSO interviewed six residents, three representatives each from the two cottages in use on the day of the visit. The interview questions pertained to the residents' perceptions of safety, program services, the rights of residents, discipline practices, quality of life, and other residential program issues. Two houseparents were interviewed. The interview questions pertained to the staff members' perceptions of program services, the rights of residents, discipline policies, and other residential program issues. The houseparents demonstrated appropriate knowledge of the policy and procedures for their positions. No issues of concern were noted from the resident and staff interviews.

### File Reviews

The OJSO reviewed the files on six residents. The files were well-organized. The OJSO noted:

1. The initial service plans for three residents did not document the signatures of the participants in the development of the service plans, nor were the reasons for non-participation documented.
2. Documentation indicated the initial service plans for two residents were not completed within the required timeframe.
3. The ninety-day reviews of three service plans did not document the signatures of the participants, nor were the reasons for non-participation documented.
4. Documentation indicated the ninety-day reviews of three service plans were not completed within the required timeframe.
5. Six-month reviews of three service plans did not document the signatures of the required participants, nor were the reasons for non-participation documented.
6. Documentation indicated six-month reviews of four service plans were not completed within the required timeframe.
7. A document signed by the parent or custodian authorizing medical treatment for the resident was not contained in one file.
8. A signed document to indicate the resident was advised of the rights of residents was not contained in two files.
9. A signed document to indicate the resident was advised of the facility rules was not contained in two files.
10. A signed document to indicate the resident was advised of the grievance process was not contained in two files.
11. A signed document to indicate the resident's parents or custodian were advised of the rights of residents was not contained in two files.
12. A signed document to indicate the resident's parents or custodian were advised of the facility rules was not contained in three files.
13. A signed document to indicate the resident's parents or custodian were advised of the grievance process was not contained in two files.

The personnel files of four houseparents were reviewed. The materials in the files were easy to locate. The OJSO noted that a state other than Oklahoma was listed as a state of residence for each of the four houseparents prior to their employment at Peppers Ranch. The facility had received responses from the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation regarding the facility's requests for criminal history records searches in Oklahoma, but there was not documentation to indicate searches were requested from the other state.

### Observational Tour

The OJSO conducted a tour of the two cottages in use on the day of the visit. Both were clean and were well-maintained. No issues of concern were noted from the observational tour.

### **Summary**

On the day of the OJSO visit, the interactions observed between the residents and the staff members were appropriate. The staff demonstrated a desire and willingness to provide appropriate care to the residents, and the residents made positive comments regarding the program and the staff.

### **Findings**

1. The service plans in three files reviewed did not document the signatures of the residents, the custodians, and/or staff members to indicate participation in the development of the service plans, nor were the reasons for non-participation documented in the service plans. Department of Human Services licensing standards, Section 154, Social services, (b), Service planning, (1), Comprehensive service plan, (A), and (B), (vi), states, "The facility involves the resident and parents or custodian in the development of the service plan. If the parents or custodian do not participate in the development of the service plan, the reason for non-participation is documented in the service plan. The service plan identifies and includes the names and signatures, with the date, of those participating in developing the service plan."
2. Ninety-day and/or six-month reviews of the service plans in three files reviewed did not document the signatures of the residents, the custodians, and/or staff members to indicate participation in the service plan reviews, nor were the reasons for non-participation documented in the service plans. Department of Human Services licensing standards, Section 154, Social services, (b), Service planning, (2), Service plan review, (B), and (C), (v), states, "The facility involves the resident and parents or custodian in the service plan review. If the parents or custodian do not participate in the service plan review, the reason for non-participation is documented in the service plan. The service plan review includes the names, and signatures, with the date, of those participating in the review."
3. Two files reviewed documented that the service plans for the residents were not completed within the required timeframe. Department of Human Services licensing

standards, Section 154, Social services, (b), Service planning, (1), Comprehensive service plan, states, "A written service plan is developed and documented for each resident within 30 days of admission."

4. Ninety-day and/or six-month reviews of the service plans in four files reviewed documented that the reviews were not completed within the required timeframe. Department of Human Services licensing standards, Section 154, Social services, (b), Service planning, (2), Service plan review, (A), states, "The service plan is reviewed within 90 days after it has been developed and at least every six months thereafter."
5. One file reviewed did not contain a signed document to indicate the parent or custodian authorized medical treatment for the resident. Department of Human Services licensing standards, Section 154, Social services, (a), Admission, (4), (B), states, "Upon admission, the facility obtains authorization, by the parents' or custodian's signature, of authority to provide medical care."
6. Two files reviewed did not contain signed documents to indicate the residents and/or the parents/custodians were advised of the resident's rights, the facility rules, and/or the grievance procedures. Department of Human Services licensing standards, Section 154, Social services, (e), Resident's records, (1), (J), states, "The [resident] record includes signed documentation that the resident and parents or custodian have been provided written copies of the facility's policies on resident's rights, grievance procedures, behavior management policies, trips away from the facility, use of volunteers and frequency of reports to the parent or custodian."
7. Documentation of requests for criminal records background checks from a previous state of residence other than Oklahoma was not contained in the files of four houseparents. Title 10 of the Oklahoma Statutes, Section 404.1, Criminal history records search—Foster parent eligibility, A, 2 and 3, in part, states, "Every child care facility shall arrange, prior to employment, for a criminal history record search to be conducted by the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation for any person to be employed by the child care facility. If the adult has lived in Oklahoma for less than one (1) year, a criminal history records search shall also be obtained from the previous state of residence."

DSH:js

