

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		INVESTIGATIVE REPORT
Case No.	Report Date	Investigator Name
1218-0198	October 17, 2018	XXXXX
<b>Agency Name</b>		
Marcfirst		
<b>Agency Address</b>		<b>Location</b>
1606 Hunt Drive Normal, Illinois 61761		XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

**Allegation**

On October 12, 2017, the Office of the Inspector General received a reported allegation of neglect regarding Marcfirst. It is alleged that, after XX XXXXX XXX was sent to the hospital on October 12, 2017, due to an altercation with another individual, Marcfirst refused to allow XX XXX to return to the agency. XXXXX picked XX XXX up at the hospital and took her to XXXXX. XXXXX wrote a statement out that XX XXX did not want any further services from Marcfirst, had XX XXX sign it and then left her with her medication and one outfit and no food.

**Synopsis**

An Amended investigative report was issued for this investigation based on a granted reconsideration request submitted by XXXXX. The findings in this case related to her were changed as noted below.

On October 12, 2017, XX XXX attacked XX XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX, requiring 911 be called and both were transported to the hospital ER for treatment. XXXXX made the decision that XX XXXX would not be allowed to return to the CILA out of concern for the other individuals in the home. At the hospital, Marcfirst XXXXX was told by XXXXX that XX XXX could not return to the CILA due to her actions and for the safety of the other individuals. XXXXX told XXXXX that XX XXX was still the responsibility of Marcfirst, which she relayed to XXXXX. XXXXX told her XX XXX was her own guardian and not Marcfirst’s responsibility. After XXXXX came to the hospital, they worked with PATH to find a shelter for XX XXX and she was temporarily placed at XXXXX on XXXXXX Street, in XXXXXXXXXXXX.

XXXXX said XX XXX did not want services/support from the agency, discharged herself and refused to return to Marcfirst, so she requested XXXXX to get it in writing. However, XXXXX said it was not until she was told she could not return to Marcfirst that XX XXX said she was fine about not going back to Marcfirst. Also, XX XXX denied she wanted to be discharged on this day or wanted to terminate her services at this point. Per XXXXX’s instructions, XXXXX wrote out on a piece of paper about XX XXX wanting to be discharged, read it aloud to her, and had her sign it. However, XX XXX did not understand what was going to happen and she felt pressured into signing the paper. Due to her inability to understand the document, XX XXX could not give nor did give any level of informed consent about terminating her services on this day. Therefore, she could not voluntarily withdraw from her CILA services and the agency terminated her services.

XXXXX said XXXXX did not indicate any safety or ISP concerns for XX XXX staying at the hotel, she

OIG Case Summary

---

did not give XXXXX any instructions on what she should do with XX XXX because she assumed that the father was involved in her supports as communicated by XXXXX, nor did she assign a staff member to stay with XX XXX because she did not get such request from XXXXX. However, both XXXXX and XXXXX said they had several conversations with XXXXX informing her that XX XXX was Marcfirst's responsibility and the agency was required to provide services for her. Neither told XXXXX that XX XXX had no alone time in the community during his conversations with her, but assumed she knew her level of supervision as Marcfirst wrote her plan. In addition, as XXXXX was involved in the process of trying to find XX XXX a new placement at another agency, she should have been aware of her supervision and other needs at the time of this incident. If not, she should have asked XXXXX when giving these instructions.

After working with XXXXX and receiving emergency housing at XXXXX provided by homeless shelter PATH, XXXXX took XX XXX there, got her settled in her room and left her there alone, per the instructions she said she received from XXXXX, in direct contraindication of her Personal Plan which states she had no alone time in the community. After XXXXX departed, XX XXX walked by herself to XXXXX adjacent to the hotel for food and returned to the room. She then walked a 1/2 mile to a Family Dollar store having to cross a four-lane state highway, where she was found by XXXXX. She was unsupervised for a few hours.

XX XXX is her own guardian, but she has no approved alone community time. Her Personal Plan documents a history of being at risk for: XXXXXXXXXXXX X XXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXX XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXX XXXX XXX XXX XXXXXXXX XXXX, XXX XXXXXXXX XXX XXX XXXXX XXXXXXXX XX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXX XX XXXX XX XXXXX XXXX XXX XX/XXXXXXXX XX XX XXXXXXXX XXX/XXXX, XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XX XXX XXXX XXX XXXXXXXX XX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXX XX XXXXX XX XXXX.

**Findings**

Based on the facts in this case the following was concluded: The allegation of neglect is substantiated against XXXXX. The allegation of neglect is unsubstantiated against XXXXX.