

*Leigh taken by Patti*

*necessary medical education required for the care and treatment of sibling-Leigh's diabetic brother; 12) MO-Leesa's marginal-to-zero responsiveness to the casework counseling provided to her as to how to best (most effectively) demonstrate her ability to adequately care for the wellbeing and safety of sibling-Leigh and her diabetic brother; 13) the collective observations of CW and their concurrence by other associate CW's, the AG's representative and the GAL, and 14) because of the physician's expressed concerns about the adequacy of MO-Leesa's (consistent and adequate) maternal abilities and the observed behavior of her under stressful circumstances (which are the past-current and likely life-circumstances that PV and sibling/sister are currently enduring."*

Based on this information, it appears to OCPO that there is a significant amount of information indicating that Leigh may have been at risk for several reasons unrelated to Jordan's lack of medical care. OCPO believes that these allegations and "suspicions" should have been thoroughly investigated and assessed by the CPS worker to determine the need for removal as it is unclear why Leigh would be considered at risk solely because of the medical neglect of her sibling. OCPO is also concerned, as there is no documentation that the CPS worker assessed whether there were any potential risks to the 15-year-old sibling. OCPO found the CPS referral does not list Leigh or Peter as siblings or show that Leigh was substantiated as a sibling at risk. OCPO notes that the CPS worker's activity logs are ambiguous, which makes it difficult to determine what assessments were made and what actions were taken on the case. OCPO is concerned that Mr. Richard's supervisor did not identify and address the oversights in this case.



Although the SAFE logs do not document when Leigh when returned to Ms. Bierly's home, on December 20, 2000, the foster care caseworker documents conducting an unannounced home visit with Leigh and Ms. Bierly. At the next court hearing held on January 11, 2001, the caseworker documented, "[Assistant Attorney General] informed court that he was taking physical custody of Leigh back today... [Assistant Attorney General] told [MS. Bierly] that she was not complying with the safety plan she had signed, which stated she would have a working phone so caseworker could contact her, and having proof of residence." The caseworker took custody of Leigh who had been outside the court waiting in a cab for her mother. On January 12, 2001, the DCFS worker documented having a conference with her supervisor, Dan Reid and Patti VanWagner about the removal of Leigh. The caseworker provided a list of her concerns regarding Leigh remaining at home. The caseworker documented, "Patti told caseworker that she was justified in her concerns in taking Leigh back into custody." There is no documentation from Ms. VanWagner or Mr. Reid regarding their involvement and perspective on this staffing. OCPO interviewed Ms. VanWagner who reported that this was not how she recalls the conversation. Ms. VanWagner stated that she recalls discussing with the worker that non-compliance is generally not a reason for taking custody of a child. Ms. VanWagner reported that the worker was relatively new and thought that was how the system worked. She stated that this was the first court hearing in which the worker's supervisor was not in attendance. Taking into consideration that the caseworker was relatively new, OCPO is hopeful that this staffing was an opportunity for DCFS to provide guidance and training to the caseworker regarding DCFS policy and other activities related to taking children into custody.

*I had a working phone also in my purse showed anman*

*Leigh taken away from me.*

The SAFE logs do not document at what point Leigh again returned to Ms. Bierly's care; however, according to the payment screen, Leigh returned to Ms. Bierly on March 30, 2001. On April 21, 2001, the caseworker attempted an unannounced home visit and saw Mr. Taylor, Leigh's father, walking down the street towards Ms. Bierly's house. Ms. Bierly was seen by the caseworker walking across the bridge towards her house with Leigh. The caseworker documented that Ms. Bierly and Mr. Taylor met and walked into the house with Leigh. This was in violation of a court