**SOCIAL WORKER’S REPORT – INTIAL PROGRESS REVIEW**

**Update as to Children – Fact Finding**

**Baby James**

Both children remain placed with their Paternal Grandmother.

Result of the baby’s skeletal exam showed no broken bones. However, Dr. Brown remains concerned about the apparent asymmetrical development of Jame’s arms. Given other indications of excessive time lying down (see petition), Dr. Brown is concerned that Jame’s spends excessive time lying disproportionately on his right side, inhibiting the development of his right arm. James is at the very low normal range for length and weight, and head circumference is in the 25% range, which is just below the normal range for him (given where he was at birth). Paternal grandmother reports James is eating well and has gained weight – there is a pediatrics appointment for James in the next week or so. There are no signs of outward abuse, but the department retains serious concerns about neglect in the form of personal attention from his parents and insufficient nutrition. During supervised visits, the mother has paid the most attention to the James, although James often times still spends significant time in his car seat during visits – especially when the mother is taking time with Jasmine or preparing snacks for the children.

**Update for Initial Progress Review**

James continues to gain weight appropriately. Pediatrician reports indicate he is gaining weight faster than prior to removal. He has advanced near the 50% range for weight, and remains low-normal in length. His right arm still remains apparently behind his left in muscle control development, although the paternal grandmother reports the difference seems to be slightly less over the past few months. The parents were invited to medical appointments for both children. The mother attended one of two appointments. According to grandmother, James has been exhibiting slightly increased agitation after visits with the parents. She reports that he sometimes cries more than usual, and that Jasmine pays more attention to him until he calms down.

**Jasmine**

Jasmine attends the same daycare that she did prior to removal. Paternal grandmother takes responsibility to get her there, and her attendance has been 100% since placement with paternal grandmother. Jasmine too appears to have gain some weight since removal and placement with paternal grandmother. Skeletal exams of Jasmine showed an old and healed broken right arm, with no apparent residual problems. Mother reports this injury happened when Jasmine was approximately two years old when she feel out of her chair at the dinner table – mother and Jasmine lived in Oklahoma at the time, and this was prior to Mr. Jefferson and the mother getting together. The mother does not recall the name of the doctor who treated the broken arm, but says it was a public health clinic in Oklahoma City where they lived. Social worker is trying to track down information about it. During visits Jasmine is often quiet and withdrawn, according to visit supervisors, and defers to the Mother’s need to spend time with James. According to visit supervisors Jasmine appears slightly more animated when visiting with mother only, and does not initiate interaction with the father during visits. The visit supervisor could not say that he detected fearfulness in Jasmine during visits involving the father.

**Update for Initial Progress Review**

Jasmine continues to attend daycare on a daily basis, and appears to be more social over the past several months. This social worker was able to have a good conversation with Jasmine during the recent health and safety visit. She was much more willing to discuss her favorite book and toy then she was about her visits or other things about her family. The grandmother reports Jasmine had an overnight with a friend from daycare, and that this was likely the first time for her. Jasmine nodded her head ”yes” when asked if she enjoyed her overnight, but didn’t discuss it further. At home, grandmother reports that Jasmine is increasingly being attentive to her brother James.

**Update as to Parents – Fact-Finding**

Both parents have been very slow to engage in the dependency process, both in terms of working with their attorneys and engaging in services offered by the department. Mother reported having trouble connecting with her attorney several times of the first month of the case, when she would call the social worker and leave messages saying that no one was talking to her and she did not know what she was supposed to be doing to get her children returned to her. Admittedly, there was also a delay in transferring this case from CPS investigative social worker and the on-going social worker. However, since this worker took over the case and met the mother at the 30-day shelter care hearing, this worker has consistently been available to the mother. Since the 30 day hearing the mother has not sought referrals for services, nor has she sought a meeting with this worker. During messages that she leaves this worker, usually after hours, she states she doesn’t know why her children were taken from her, especially after the skeletal exam came back “clean”, and generally just asks when the children will be returned.

DNA testing established that Mr. Smith is the father of James. Mr. Smith appeared to wait until these results came in to engage in the case, with the exception of intermittently participate in visits with the children. He too has questioned the reason for the case and removal of the children in messages left for this social worker. The father has not participated in any services as far as this worker is aware.

Paternal grandmother expressed skepticism about the parents’ ability to “change their ways”. She states she has talked to the parents about their “hands-off” parenting style that she thinks leaves the children to manage their own time during the day resulting hours of boredom. She has seen several beer cans around the house at times, and has come over unannounced and been unsure about the people (“friends”) that were at the house, but she is unwilling to endorse a substance abuse/dependency problem for the father. She states the father is a good man but just has a hard time “catching a break” since he was laid off his job approximately a year ago. She states he often gets frustrated by the mother’s lack of drive to manage the household, and occasionally yells at Jasmine more than she thinks is appropriate. She states she is willing to allow the parents over to the house to see the kids, but is not interested in mediating between the two if they get into arguments.

Alleged Father of Jasmine, Frederick Smith, was served by publication in Oklahoma City, OK. His whereabouts remain unknown to the department and family. A default order is anticipated to occur on the same day as disposition for the rest of the family.

**Update for Initial Progress Review**

Mother completed a 30-day course of UA’s. All were clean and she did not miss any. These results were communicated to the CD evaluator, and the assessment did not suggest treatment for her. Mother connected with individual mental health counseling approximately two weeks after disposition, and began weekly appointments recently. No reports have been received from this service yet. Parenting classes were referred to the parents within a week of disposition. This worker does not have information on whether they have engaged that service yet.

The Father was not in touch with this worker for approximately three weeks after the dispositional hearing. This worker left a letter at the home within a week of disposition with referrals for both providers in the county for the domestic violence evaluation. There has been no word from the father regarding an appointment for the evaluation, and as a result this worker has not composed a referral/collateral contact letter for the evaluation. The father participated in 30 days of UA’s, although 3 of them were missed and one was dilute. These results will be forwarded to an evaluator when the father makes an appointment. The letter left for the father also contained providers for the CD assessment. The father reports intermittent employment through a friend with a landscape company, and states that is why he has missed some visits and UAs.

Visits between the parents and children continued during this review period similarly to those previous to the disposition. The mother attended almost all of the visits and the father attended just more than half of them. The father never attended a visit when the mother was not also present. The mother reportedly engaged both Jasmine and James during visits, and appears to have been able to take care of both at the same time, which was a difficulty noted early on by supervisors and the mother. The father continues to participate in visits at arms-length. During this reporting period he has taken a few opportunities to help the mother with preparing snacks so that she could take care of both children, but this behavior is intermittent. The father has not approached this worker for instruction or advice regarding caring for the children. He appears most interested in allowing the mother to take charge regarding childcare.