



the foster parent could no longer handle his behavior. He next went to a shelter where he continued his physical and verbal abusive behavior and was transferred to a psychiatric hospital for a month. He was subsequently transferred to a residential facility where he still was residing at the time of the dispositional hearing. At the residential facility he was receiving group and individual therapy for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and oppositional defiance disorder and was attending his prior school for special education. Once mother stipulated to the amended abuse petition, the court found D.M. to be abused. After a dispositional hearing, the court made the minor a ward of the court, found mother to be unfit to have care and custody of the minor, and granted guardianship and custody of him to DCFS. The caseworker for D.M. opined that he should not be returned home until mother had completed a psychological evaluation and complied with anger management and mental health services. Even though the permanency goal was return home in five months, the caseworker believed that placement in the residential facility was in the minor's best interest. Mother has also been diagnosed with ADHD and bipolar disorder and was receiving medications for these conditions.

¶ 4 Mother argues on appeal that the court's finding of her unfitness is against the manifest weight of the evidence. She points out that since an early age D.M. has been a troubled and difficult child to deal with because of his behavior. Throughout his life, however, she cared for him, took him to medical appointments, and was involved with his education. Ultimately the stress of dealing with his behavior issues resulted in her slapping the minor on the face. She did not mean to harm him. She argues she should not be found unfit for a one-time incident of slapping her son under stress when she had been complying with DCFS's directives for over three years. She does not believe it to be in D.M.'s best interest to be taken from his stable life with his mother and school and be shuffled through various foster care and residential facility placements.

¶ 5 The standard of proof for a finding of parental unfitness that does not involve a termination of parental rights is a preponderance of the evidence. *In re C.S.*, 376 Ill. App. 3d 114, 117, 878 N.E.2d 110, 113 (2007). The court's determination of unfitness will not be disturbed on review unless that finding is against the manifest weight of the evidence. *In re M.B.*, 332 Ill. App. 3d 996, 1004, 773 N.E.2d 1204, 1210 (2002). A decision is against the manifest weight of the evidence only when a review of the record clearly demonstrates that the opposite conclusion is proper. *In re M.B.*, 332 Ill. App. 3d at 1004, 773 N.E.2d at 1210-11. We see no error in this instance.

¶ 6 The court found mother to be unfit for reasons other than financial circumstances alone to care for, protect, train, educate, supervise, or discipline the minor. The court further determined that placement with mother was contrary to the health, safety, and best interests of the minor because mother admitted to slapping him causing bruising on his face. Mother admitted that she has anger issues which cause her to physically abuse D.M. when she is stressed by him and his behavior. Mother also admitted to suffering from ADHD and bipolar disorder, and although she has been prescribed medication for these conditions, she did not always take the medications. The caseworker testified that she had been unable to document that mother was receiving her own mental health help, counseling, or anger management services or that she was cooperating with her service plan as it related to mental health and anger management. The caseworker believed mother was not capable of taking care of her son at the time of the dispositional hearing. We agree that the court's finding of mother's unfitness was supported by the record and was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. See *e.g.*, *In re J.C.*, 396 Ill. App. 3d 1050, 920 N.E.2d 1285 (2009).

¶ 7 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court of St. Clair County finding D.M. to be an abused child, finding mother unfit to care for him, and placing the minor under the guardianship of DCFS.

¶ 8 Affirmed.