

Question Performance by DCF Region/Statewide

From Review Date: All To: All

Report Description: This report provides question level information at a DCF Region level.

Selected Criteria

Sample Case: Sample Program: Out-Of-Home Review Type: OOH FYQTR Start: FY22QTR3 - Jan, 2022 FYQTR End: FY22QTR3 - Mar, 2022

1 (A). During the PUR, were any reports accepted for investigation or assessment assigned timely in accordance with time frames and requirements outlined in PPM for reports of that priority?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	50%	28	1	3.57%	1	3.57%	26	92.86%
East Area 4 TFI	67%	20	2	10%	1	5%	17	85%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	19	4	21.05%	0	0%	15	78.95%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	19	6	31.58%	0	0%	13	68.42%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	83%	28	10	35.71%	2	7.14%	16	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	88%	21	7	33.33%	1	4.76%	13	61.9%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	25	10	40%	0	0%	15	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	10	3	30%	1	10%	6	60%
Statewide	88%	170	43	25.29%	6	3.53%	121	71.18%

1 (B). For any reports accepted for investigation or assessment during the PUR, was face-to-face contact with the child(ren) who is (are) the subject of the report made timely in accordance with time frames and requirements outlined in PPM for a report of that priority?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	28	2	7.14%	0	0%	26	92.86%
East Area 4 TFI	67%	20	2	10%	1	5%	17	85%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	25%	19	1	5.26%	3	15.79%	15	78.95%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	19	0	0%	6	31.58%	13	68.42%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	28	6	21.43%	6	21.43%	16	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	21	4	19.05%	4	19.05%	13	61.9%
West Area 2 SFM	60%	25	6	24%	4	16%	15	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	10	2	20%	2	20%	6	60%
Statewide	47%	170	23	13.53%	26	15.29%	121	71.18%

1 (C). For all reports identified in OSRI Information A and B, were the reasons for the delays due to circumstances beyond the control of the agency?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	0%	28	0	0%	1	3.57%	27	96.43%
East Area 4 TFI	67%	20	2	10%	1	5%	17	85%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	19	0	0%	3	15.79%	16	84.21%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	20%	19	1	5.26%	4	21.05%	14	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	28	0	0%	6	21.43%	22	78.57%
West Area 1 SFM	20%	21	1	4.76%	4	19.05%	16	76.19%
West Area 2 SFM	0%	25	0	0%	4	16%	21	84%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	0%	10	0	0%	3	30%	7	70%
Statewide	13%	170	4	2.35%	26	15.29%	140	82.35%

2 (A). For the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to provide or arrange for appropriate services for the family to protect children and prevent their entry into foster care after a reunification?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	28	4	14.29%	0	0%	24	85.71%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	20	1	5%	1	5%	18	90%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	19	3	15.79%	0	0%	16	84.21%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	19	2	10.53%	1	5.26%	16	84.21%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	28	4	14.29%	2	7.14%	22	78.57%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	21	2	9.52%	2	9.52%	17	80.95%
West Area 2 SFM	27%	25	3	12%	8	32%	14	56%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	0%	10	0	0%	1	10%	9	90%
Statewide	56%	170	19	11.18%	15	8.82%	136	80%

3 (B). If, during the period under review, any child was removed from the home without providing or arranging for services, was this action necessary to ensure the child's safety?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	0%	28	0	0%	1	3.57%	27	96.43%
East Area 4 TFI	N/A	20	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	19	1	5.26%	0	0%	18	94.74%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	19	1	5.26%	0	0%	18	94.74%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	28	3	10.71%	0	0%	25	89.29%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	21	2	9.52%	0	0%	19	90.48%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	25	8	32%	0	0%	17	68%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	10	1	10%	0	0%	9	90%
Statewide	94%	170	16	9.41%	1	0.59%	153	90%

4 (A). If the case was opened during the period under review, did the agency conduct in an initial assessment that accurately assessed all risk and safety concerns for the target child in foster care and/or any child(ren) in the family remaining in the home?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	28	2	7.14%	0	0%	26	92.86%
East Area 4 TFI	N/A	20	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	33%	19	1	5.26%	2	10.53%	16	84.21%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	19	1	5.26%	1	5.26%	17	89.47%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	28	5	17.86%	0	0%	23	82.14%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	21	3	14.29%	0	0%	18	85.71%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	25	11	44%	0	0%	14	56%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	10	1	10%	0	0%	9	90%
Statewide	89%	170	24	14.12%	3	1.76%	143	84.12%

5 (B). During the period under review, did the agency conduct ongoing assessments that accurately assessed all of the risk and safety concerns for the target child in foster care and/or any child(ren) in the family remaining in the home?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	85%	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	82.14%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>1</u>	3.57%
East Area 4 TFI	85%	<u>20</u>	<u>17</u>	85%	<u>3</u>	15%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	33%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>12</u>	63.16%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>12</u>	63.16%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	85%	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	82.14%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>1</u>	3.57%
West Area 1 SFM	52%	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	52.38%	<u>10</u>	47.62%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>25</u>	<u>23</u>	92%	<u>2</u>	8%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	72%	<u>170</u>	<u>119</u>	70%	<u>47</u>	27.65%	<u>4</u>	2.35%

6 (C). During the period under review, if safety concerns were present, did the agency: 1) develop an appropriate safety plan with the family and 2) continually monitor and update the safety plan as needed, including monitoring family engagement in any safety-related services?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	60%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>23</u>	82.14%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	25%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>15</u>	78.95%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	60%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>28</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>27</u>	96.43%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>21</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>20</u>	95.24%
West Area 2 SFM	N/A	<u>25</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>25</u>	100%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	64%	<u>170</u>	<u>16</u>	9.41%	<u>9</u>	5.29%	<u>145</u>	85.29%

7 (D). During the review period under review, there were no safety concerns pertaining to the target child in foster care and/or any child(ren) in the family remaining in the home that were not adequately or appropriately addressed by the agency?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	0	0%	<u>23</u>	82.14%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	89%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>10</u>	52.63%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>22</u>	78.57%
West Area 1 SFM	56%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>12</u>	57.14%
West Area 2 SFM	70%	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	28%	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>15</u>	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	10%	0	0%	<u>9</u>	90%
Statewide	82%	<u>170</u>	<u>45</u>	26.47%	<u>10</u>	5.88%	<u>115</u>	67.65%

8 (E). During the period under review, was there no safety concerns related to the target child in foster care during visitation with parents/caretakers or other family members?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	92%	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>	45%	0	0%	<u>11</u>	55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	92%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>7</u>	36.84%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	90%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>9</u>	47.37%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	94%	<u>28</u>	<u>16</u>	57.14%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>11</u>	39.29%
West Area 1 SFM	86%	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	57.14%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>7</u>	33.33%
West Area 2 SFM	95%	<u>25</u>	<u>18</u>	72%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>6</u>	24%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	93%	<u>170</u>	<u>90</u>	52.94%	<u>7</u>	4.12%	<u>73</u>	42.94%

9 (F). For foster care cases only, during the review period under review, there were no concerns for the target child's safety related to the foster parents, members of the foster parents' family, other children in the foster home or facility, or facility staff members, that was not adequately or appropriately addressed by the agency?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	0	0%	<u>25</u>	89.29%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	52.63%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	89%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>10</u>	52.63%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	80%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>23</u>	82.14%
West Area 1 SFM	80%	<u>21</u>	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>16</u>	76.19%
West Area 2 SFM	88%	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	28%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>17</u>	68%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	92%	<u>170</u>	<u>44</u>	25.88%	<u>4</u>	2.35%	<u>122</u>	71.76%

10 (B). Were all placement changes during the period under review planned by the agency in an effort to achieve the child's case goals or to meet the needs of the child?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	30%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>14</u>	70%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	89.47%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>16</u>	84.21%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	42%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>17</u>	80.95%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>25</u>	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>21</u>	84%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	47%	<u>170</u>	<u>20</u>	11.76%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>127</u>	74.71%

11 (C). Is the child's current placement setting (or most recent placement if the child is no longer in foster care) stable?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	96%	<u>28</u>	<u>27</u>	96.43%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	95%	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	95%	<u>1</u>	5%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	89%	<u>19</u>	<u>17</u>	89.47%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	89%	<u>19</u>	<u>17</u>	89.47%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	89%	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	85.71%	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>1</u>	3.57%
West Area 1 SFM	95%	<u>21</u>	<u>20</u>	95.24%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	96%	<u>25</u>	<u>24</u>	96%	<u>1</u>	4%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	93%	<u>170</u>	<u>158</u>	92.94%	<u>11</u>	6.47%	<u>1</u>	0.59%

12 (A.3). Is (are) the child's permanency goal(s) specified in the case file?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	96%	<u>28</u>	<u>27</u>	96.43%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	95%	<u>19</u>	<u>18</u>	94.74%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>28</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	99%	<u>170</u>	<u>168</u>	98.82%	<u>2</u>	1.18%	0	0%

13 (B). Were all permanency goals in effect during the period under review established in a timely manner?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	68%	<u>28</u>	<u>19</u>	67.86%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	75%	<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>	75%	<u>5</u>	25%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	58%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	24%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>13</u>	68.42%	<u>2</u>	10.53%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	64%	<u>28</u>	<u>18</u>	64.29%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	95%	<u>21</u>	<u>19</u>	90.48%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>1</u>	4.76%
West Area 2 SFM	96%	<u>25</u>	<u>24</u>	96%	<u>1</u>	4%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	50%	<u>5</u>	50%	0	0%
Statewide	69%	<u>170</u>	<u>115</u>	67.65%	<u>52</u>	30.59%	<u>3</u>	1.76%

14 (C). Were all permanency goals in effect during the period under review appropriate to the child's needs for permanency and to the circumstances of the case?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	82%	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	82.14%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	63%	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	63.16%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	95%	<u>19</u>	<u>18</u>	94.74%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	93%	<u>28</u>	<u>26</u>	92.86%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	71.43%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	<u>4</u>	40%	0	0%
Statewide	85%	<u>170</u>	<u>145</u>	85.29%	<u>25</u>	14.71%	0	0%

15 (F). Did the agency file or join a termination of parental rights petition before the period under review or in a timely manner during the period under review?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	25%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
East Area 4 TFI	80%	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	40%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	90%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>9</u>	47.37%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	69%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>6</u>	31.58%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	91%	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
West Area 1 SFM	45%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	<u>10</u>	47.62%
West Area 2 SFM	71%	<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>18</u>	72%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>7</u>	70%
Statewide	64%	<u>170</u>	<u>49</u>	28.82%	<u>28</u>	16.47%	<u>93</u>	54.71%

16 (G). Did an exception to the requirement to file or join a termination of parental rights petition exist?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	33%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>19</u>	67.86%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>2</u>	10%	0	0%	<u>18</u>	90%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	0	0%	<u>18</u>	94.74%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>28</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>27</u>	96.43%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>21</u>	0	0%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>16</u>	76.19%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>3</u>	12%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	88%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>15</u>	8.82%	<u>13</u>	7.65%	<u>142</u>	83.53%

17 (B). During the period under review, did the agency and court make concerted efforts to achieve permanency in a timely manner?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	42%	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>15</u>	53.57%	<u>2</u>	7.14%
East Area 4 TFI	74%	<u>20</u>	<u>14</u>	70%	<u>5</u>	25%	<u>1</u>	5%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	47%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>10</u>	52.63%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	61%	<u>28</u>	<u>17</u>	60.71%	<u>11</u>	39.29%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	55%	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	52.38%	<u>9</u>	42.86%	<u>1</u>	4.76%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>25</u>	<u>23</u>	92%	<u>2</u>	8%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	<u>4</u>	40%	0	0%
Statewide	61%	<u>170</u>	<u>100</u>	58.82%	<u>65</u>	38.24%	<u>5</u>	2.94%

18 (C). For a child with a goal of other planned permanent living arrangement during the period under review, did the agency and court make concerted efforts to place the child in a living arrangement that can be considered permanent until discharge from foster care?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	3.57%	0	0%	<u>27</u>	96.43%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	15%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	85%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	89.47%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	N/A	<u>19</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>19</u>	100%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	N/A	<u>28</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>28</u>	100%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>21</u>	0	0%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>19</u>	90.48%
West Area 2 SFM	N/A	<u>25</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>25</u>	100%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%
Statewide	75%	<u>170</u>	<u>6</u>	3.53%	<u>2</u>	1.18%	<u>162</u>	95.29%

19 (A). During the period under review, was the child placed with all siblings who also were in foster care?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	42%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>9</u>	32.14%
East Area 4 TFI	58%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>5</u>	25%	<u>8</u>	40%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	64%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>5</u>	26.32%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	71%	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	63.16%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>2</u>	10.53%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	52%	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>7</u>	25%
West Area 1 SFM	46%	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>	28.57%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	<u>8</u>	38.1%
West Area 2 SFM	79%	<u>25</u>	<u>11</u>	44%	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>11</u>	44%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>5</u>	50%
Statewide	58%	<u>170</u>	<u>67</u>	39.41%	<u>48</u>	28.24%	<u>55</u>	32.35%

20 (B). If the answer to question 19 (A) is No, was there a valid reason for the child's separation from the siblings?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	45%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
East Area 4 TFI	60%	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>15</u>	75%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	80%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	80%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
West Area 1 SFM	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>14</u>	66.67%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>3</u>	12%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	88%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	69%	<u>170</u>	<u>33</u>	19.41%	<u>15</u>	8.82%	<u>122</u>	71.76%

21 (A). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to ensure that visitation (or other forms of contact if visitation was not possible) between the child and his or her mother was of sufficient frequency to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	47%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>11</u>	39.29%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>10</u>	52.63%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	63%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	53%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>13</u>	46.43%
West Area 1 SFM	57%	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u>	38.1%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	<u>7</u>	33.33%
West Area 2 SFM	82%	<u>25</u>	<u>14</u>	56%	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>8</u>	32%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	20%
Statewide	66%	<u>170</u>	<u>65</u>	38.24%	<u>33</u>	19.41%	<u>72</u>	42.35%

22 (B). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to ensure that visitation (or other forms of contact if visitation was not possible) between the child and his or her father was of sufficient frequency to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	44%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>12</u>	42.86%
East Area 4 TFI	78%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>11</u>	55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>17</u>	89.47%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	75%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>15</u>	78.95%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	38%	<u>21</u>	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>13</u>	61.9%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	32%	<u>4</u>	16%	<u>13</u>	52%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	67%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>4</u>	40%
Statewide	57%	<u>170</u>	<u>39</u>	22.94%	<u>30</u>	17.65%	<u>101</u>	59.41%

23 (C). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to ensure that the quality of the visitation between the child and the mother was sufficient to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	46%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>15</u>	53.57%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	43%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>12</u>	63.16%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	71%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>12</u>	63.16%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	86%	<u>28</u>	<u>12</u>	42.86%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>14</u>	50%
West Area 1 SFM	83%	<u>21</u>	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>9</u>	42.86%
West Area 2 SFM	94%	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	60%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>9</u>	36%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>5</u>	50%
Statewide	76%	<u>170</u>	<u>64</u>	37.65%	<u>20</u>	11.76%	<u>86</u>	50.59%

24 (D). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to ensure that the quality of the visitation between the child and the father was sufficient to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	30%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	86%	<u>20</u>	<u>6</u>	30%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>18</u>	94.74%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>16</u>	84.21%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>19</u>	67.86%
West Area 1 SFM	75%	<u>21</u>	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>17</u>	80.95%
West Area 2 SFM	90%	<u>25</u>	<u>9</u>	36%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>15</u>	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	65%	<u>170</u>	<u>31</u>	18.24%	<u>17</u>	10%	<u>122</u>	71.76%

25 (E). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to ensure that visitation (or other forms of contact if visitation was not possible) between the child and his or her sibling(s) was of sufficient frequency to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	25%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	75%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	20%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	40%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	36%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
West Area 1 SFM	33%	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>15</u>	71.43%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>25</u>	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>22</u>	88%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	0	0%	<u>7</u>	70%
Statewide	50%	<u>170</u>	<u>25</u>	14.71%	<u>25</u>	14.71%	<u>120</u>	70.59%

26 (F). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to ensure that the quality of the visitation between the child and his or her sibling(s) was sufficient to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	70%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	25%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	75%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	25%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>15</u>	78.95%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>15</u>	78.95%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	55%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	0	0%	<u>16</u>	76.19%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>25</u>	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>22</u>	88%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	0	0%	<u>7</u>	70%
Statewide	69%	<u>170</u>	<u>31</u>	18.24%	<u>14</u>	8.24%	<u>125</u>	73.53%

27 (A). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to maintain the child's important connections (for example, neighborhood, community, faith, language, extended family members including siblings who are not in foster care, Tribe, school, and/or friends)?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	57%	<u>28</u>	<u>16</u>	57.14%	<u>12</u>	42.86%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	70%	<u>20</u>	<u>14</u>	70%	<u>6</u>	30%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	74%	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>	73.68%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	84%	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	84.21%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>21</u>	75%	<u>7</u>	25%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	86%	<u>21</u>	<u>18</u>	85.71%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	88%	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	88%	<u>3</u>	12%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	90%	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	90%	<u>1</u>	10%	0	0%
Statewide	76%	<u>170</u>	<u>130</u>	76.47%	<u>40</u>	23.53%	0	0%

28 (B). Was a sufficient inquiry conducted with the parent, child, custodian, or other interested party to determine whether the child may be a member of, or eligible for membership in, a federally recognized Indian Tribe?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	93%	<u>28</u>	<u>26</u>	92.86%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	95%	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	95%	<u>1</u>	5%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	58%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	89%	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	84.21%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>28</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	90%	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	90%	<u>1</u>	10%	0	0%
Statewide	92%	<u>170</u>	<u>155</u>	91.18%	<u>14</u>	8.24%	<u>1</u>	0.59%

29 (C). If the child may be a member of, or eligible for membership in, a federally recognized Indian Tribe, during the period under review, was the Tribe provided timely notification of its right to intervene in any state court proceedings seeking an involuntary foster care placement or termination of parental rights?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	67%	<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>25</u>	89.29%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>20</u>	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>18</u>	90%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>12</u>	63.16%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>17</u>	89.47%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	3.57%	0	0%	<u>27</u>	96.43%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	4.76%	0	0%	<u>20</u>	95.24%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>1</u>	4%	0	0%	<u>24</u>	96%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	42%	<u>170</u>	<u>8</u>	4.71%	<u>11</u>	6.47%	<u>151</u>	88.82%

30 (D). If the child is a member of, or eligible for membership in, a federally recognized Indian Tribe, was the child placed in foster care in accordance with Indian Child Welfare Act placement preferences or were concerted efforts made to place the child in accordance with the Act's placement preferences?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	67%	<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>25</u>	89.29%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>2</u>	10%	0	0%	<u>18</u>	90%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>12</u>	63.16%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	N/A	<u>19</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>19</u>	100%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>28</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>27</u>	96.43%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	4.76%	0	0%	<u>20</u>	95.24%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>1</u>	4%	0	0%	<u>24</u>	96%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	41%	<u>170</u>	<u>7</u>	4.12%	<u>10</u>	5.88%	<u>153</u>	90%

31 (A2). If the child's current or most recent placement is with a relative, is (or was) this placement stable and appropriate to the child's needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>13</u>	46.43%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	53.57%
East Area 4 TFI	91%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>9</u>	45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	87%	<u>19</u>	<u>13</u>	68.42%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>4</u>	21.05%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	35.71%	0	0%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>7</u>	33.33%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	66.67%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>12</u>	48%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	52%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	0	0%	<u>4</u>	40%
Statewide	96%	<u>170</u>	<u>79</u>	46.47%	<u>3</u>	1.76%	<u>88</u>	51.76%

32 (B). Did the agency, during the period under review, make concerted efforts to identify, locate, inform, and evaluate maternal relatives as potential placements for the child, with the result that maternal relatives were ruled out as placement resources (due to fit, relative's unwillingness, or child's placements for the child's best interests) during the period under review?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	58%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
East Area 4 TFI	75%	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>16</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>13</u>	68.42%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	82%	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	47.37%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>8</u>	42.11%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>10</u>	35.71%
West Area 1 SFM	75%	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	42.86%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>9</u>	42.86%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>25</u>	<u>11</u>	44%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>13</u>	52%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	67%	<u>170</u>	<u>53</u>	31.18%	<u>26</u>	15.29%	<u>91</u>	53.53%

33 (C). Did the agency, during the period under review, make concerted efforts to identify, locate, inform, and evaluate paternal relatives as potential placements for the child, with the result that paternal relatives were ruled out as placement resources (due to fit, relative's unwillingness, or child's best interests) during the period under review?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>14</u>	70%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	20%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	70%	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>9</u>	47.37%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	38%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>12</u>	42.86%
West Area 1 SFM	60%	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>	28.57%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>11</u>	52.38%
West Area 2 SFM	89%	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	32%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>16</u>	64%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>38</u>	22.35%	<u>32</u>	18.82%	<u>100</u>	58.82%

34 (A). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	30%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>14</u>	50%	<u>8</u>	28.57%
East Area 4 TFI	78%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>11</u>	55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	38%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	80%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	47%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>13</u>	46.43%
West Area 1 SFM	64%	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	42.86%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>7</u>	33.33%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>25</u>	<u>12</u>	48%	<u>6</u>	24%	<u>7</u>	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>2</u>	20%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>52</u>	30.59%	<u>45</u>	26.47%	<u>73</u>	42.94%

35 (B). During the period under review, were concerted efforts made to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	29%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>14</u>	50%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	20%	<u>4</u>	20%	<u>12</u>	60%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>18</u>	94.74%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>16</u>	84.21%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	69%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>15</u>	53.57%
West Area 1 SFM	13%	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	<u>13</u>	61.9%
West Area 2 SFM	62%	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	32%	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>12</u>	48%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>4</u>	40%
Statewide	47%	<u>170</u>	<u>31</u>	18.24%	<u>35</u>	20.59%	<u>104</u>	61.18%

36 (A1). During the period under review, did the agency conduct a formal or informal initial and/or ongoing comprehensive assessment that accurately assessed the child's needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>28</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	58%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	68%	<u>19</u>	<u>13</u>	68.42%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	93%	<u>28</u>	<u>26</u>	92.86%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	81%	<u>21</u>	<u>17</u>	80.95%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	96%	<u>25</u>	<u>24</u>	96%	<u>1</u>	4%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	88%	<u>170</u>	<u>149</u>	87.65%	<u>21</u>	12.35%	0	0%

37 (A2). During the period under review, were appropriate services provided to meet the child's identified needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>7</u>	36.84%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	57%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>5</u>	26.32%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	82%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
West Area 1 SFM	75%	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	71.43%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>1</u>	4.76%
West Area 2 SFM	71%	<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>18</u>	72%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	72%	<u>170</u>	<u>58</u>	34.12%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>89</u>	52.35%

38 (B1). During the period under review, did the agency conduct a formal or informal initial and/or ongoing comprehensive assessment that accurately assessed the mother's needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>8</u>	28.57%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>9</u>	47.37%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	88%	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	44%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>10</u>	35.71%
West Area 1 SFM	82%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>4</u>	19.05%
West Area 2 SFM	75%	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	60%	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>5</u>	20%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	71%	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	50%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>3</u>	30%
Statewide	68%	<u>170</u>	<u>75</u>	44.12%	<u>35</u>	20.59%	<u>60</u>	35.29%

39 (B2). During the period under review, did the agency conduct a formal or informal initial and/or ongoing comprehensive assessment that accurately assessed the father's needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	44%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>12</u>	42.86%
East Area 4 TFI	78%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>11</u>	55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>13</u>	68.42%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>13</u>	68.42%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	29%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>14</u>	50%
West Area 1 SFM	53%	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u>	38.1%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
West Area 2 SFM	56%	<u>25</u>	<u>10</u>	40%	<u>8</u>	32%	<u>7</u>	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>5</u>	50%
Statewide	48%	<u>170</u>	<u>43</u>	25.29%	<u>46</u>	27.06%	<u>81</u>	47.65%

40 (B3). During the period under review, did the agency provide appropriate services to the mother to meet identified needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	39%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>10</u>	35.71%
East Area 4 TFI	90%	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>	45%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	56%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>10</u>	52.63%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	75%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	53%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>11</u>	39.29%
West Area 1 SFM	82%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>4</u>	19.05%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>25</u>	<u>12</u>	48%	<u>6</u>	24%	<u>7</u>	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	64%	<u>170</u>	<u>65</u>	38.24%	<u>36</u>	21.18%	<u>69</u>	40.59%

41 (B4). During the period under review, did the agency provide appropriate services to the father to address identified needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	29%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>14</u>	50%
East Area 4 TFI	78%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>11</u>	55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>13</u>	68.42%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	60%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	36%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
West Area 1 SFM	53%	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u>	38.1%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
West Area 2 SFM	53%	<u>25</u>	<u>9</u>	36%	<u>8</u>	32%	<u>8</u>	32%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	47%	<u>170</u>	<u>38</u>	22.35%	<u>43</u>	25.29%	<u>89</u>	52.35%

42 (C1). During the period under review, did the agency adequately assess the needs of the foster or pre-adoptive parents on an ongoing basis (with respect to services they need to provide appropriate care and supervision to ensure the safety and well-being of the children in their care)?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	92%	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	85.71%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>2</u>	7.14%
East Area 4 TFI	84%	<u>20</u>	<u>16</u>	80%	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>1</u>	5%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	17%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>15</u>	78.95%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	56%	<u>19</u>	<u>10</u>	52.63%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	92%	<u>28</u>	<u>22</u>	78.57%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>4</u>	14.29%
West Area 1 SFM	67%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	80%	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>	80%	<u>5</u>	20%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	78%	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	70%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>1</u>	10%
Statewide	73%	<u>170</u>	<u>116</u>	68.24%	<u>44</u>	25.88%	<u>10</u>	5.88%

43 (C2). During the period under review, were the foster or pre-adoptive parents provided with appropriate services to address identified needs that pertained to their capacity to provide appropriate care and supervision of the children in their care?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	78%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>19</u>	67.86%
East Area 4 TFI	70%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	12%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>15</u>	78.95%	<u>2</u>	10.53%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	47%	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>4</u>	21.05%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	71%	<u>28</u>	<u>12</u>	42.86%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>11</u>	39.29%
West Area 1 SFM	59%	<u>21</u>	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	<u>4</u>	19.05%
West Area 2 SFM	60%	<u>25</u>	<u>6</u>	24%	<u>4</u>	16%	<u>15</u>	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	55%	<u>170</u>	<u>54</u>	31.76%	<u>45</u>	26.47%	<u>71</u>	41.76%

44 (A). During the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to actively involve the child in the case planning process?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	53%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>11</u>	39.29%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>14</u>	70%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	30%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	38%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>6</u>	31.58%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>7</u>	36.84%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>8</u>	28.57%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	0	0%	<u>7</u>	33.33%
West Area 2 SFM	76%	<u>25</u>	<u>13</u>	52%	<u>4</u>	16%	<u>8</u>	32%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	43%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>3</u>	30%
Statewide	63%	<u>170</u>	<u>72</u>	42.35%	<u>42</u>	24.71%	<u>56</u>	32.94%

45 (B). During the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to actively involve the mother in the case planning process?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	35%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>13</u>	46.43%	<u>8</u>	28.57%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>9</u>	47.37%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	63%	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	44%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>10</u>	35.71%
West Area 1 SFM	81%	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	61.9%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>5</u>	23.81%
West Area 2 SFM	70%	<u>25</u>	<u>14</u>	56%	<u>6</u>	24%	<u>5</u>	20%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>2</u>	20%
Statewide	60%	<u>170</u>	<u>66</u>	38.82%	<u>44</u>	25.88%	<u>60</u>	35.29%

46 (C). During the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to actively involve the father in the case planning process?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	38%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>12</u>	42.86%
East Area 4 TFI	78%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>11</u>	55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	20%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>14</u>	73.68%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>13</u>	68.42%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	42%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	67%	<u>21</u>	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>25</u>	<u>9</u>	36%	<u>9</u>	36%	<u>7</u>	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	40%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>5</u>	50%
Statewide	49%	<u>170</u>	<u>42</u>	24.71%	<u>44</u>	25.88%	<u>84</u>	49.41%

47 (A). During the period under review, was the frequency of the visits between the caseworker (or other responsible party) and the child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	79%	<u>28</u>	<u>22</u>	78.57%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	80%	<u>20</u>	<u>16</u>	80%	<u>4</u>	20%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	79%	<u>19</u>	<u>15</u>	78.95%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	84%	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	84.21%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	86%	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	85.71%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	67%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	<u>7</u>	33.33%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	84%	<u>25</u>	<u>21</u>	84%	<u>4</u>	16%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	81%	<u>170</u>	<u>138</u>	81.18%	<u>32</u>	18.82%	0	0%

48 (B). During the period under review, was the quality of the visits between the caseworker and the child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals (for example, did the visits between the caseworker or other responsible party and the child(ren) focus on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery, and goal achievement)?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	21%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>22</u>	78.57%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	40%	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	40%	<u>12</u>	60%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	32%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>13</u>	68.42%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	53%	<u>19</u>	<u>10</u>	52.63%	<u>9</u>	47.37%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>21</u>	75%	<u>7</u>	25%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	57%	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	57.14%	<u>9</u>	42.86%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	60%	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	60%	<u>10</u>	40%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	52%	<u>170</u>	<u>88</u>	51.76%	<u>82</u>	48.24%	0	0%

49 (A2). During the period under review, was the frequency of the visits between the caseworker (or other responsible party) and the mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	5%	28	1	3.57%	19	67.86%	8	28.57%
East Area 4 TFI	10%	20	1	5%	9	45%	10	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	30%	19	3	15.79%	7	36.84%	9	47.37%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	19	4	21.05%	4	21.05%	11	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	28%	28	5	17.86%	13	46.43%	10	35.71%
West Area 1 SFM	41%	21	7	33.33%	10	47.62%	4	19.05%
West Area 2 SFM	65%	25	13	52%	7	28%	5	20%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	10	4	40%	4	40%	2	20%
Statewide	34%	170	38	22.35%	73	42.94%	59	34.71%

50 (B2). During the period under review, was the frequency of the visits between the caseworker (or other responsible party) and the father sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	6%	28	1	3.57%	16	57.14%	11	39.29%
East Area 4 TFI	20%	20	2	10%	8	40%	10	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	20%	19	1	5.26%	4	21.05%	14	73.68%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	19	0	0%	4	21.05%	15	78.95%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	33%	28	4	14.29%	8	28.57%	16	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	40%	21	6	28.57%	9	42.86%	6	28.57%
West Area 2 SFM	28%	25	5	20%	13	52%	7	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	20%	10	1	10%	4	40%	5	50%
Statewide	23%	170	20	11.76%	66	38.82%	84	49.41%

51 (C). During the period under review, was the quality of the visits between the caseworker (or other responsible party) and the mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	67%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>19</u>	67.86%
East Area 4 TFI	90%	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>	45%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>13</u>	68.42%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	75%	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	71.43%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
West Area 2 SFM	89%	<u>25</u>	<u>16</u>	64%	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>7</u>	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	57%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>3</u>	30%
Statewide	79%	<u>170</u>	<u>67</u>	39.41%	<u>18</u>	10.59%	<u>85</u>	50%

52 (D). During the period under review, was the quality of the visits between the caseworker (or other responsible party) and the father sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
East Area 4 TFI	86%	<u>20</u>	<u>6</u>	30%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>18</u>	94.74%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>19</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>18</u>	94.74%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	88%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
West Area 1 SFM	75%	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	42.86%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>9</u>	42.86%
West Area 2 SFM	91%	<u>25</u>	<u>10</u>	40%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>14</u>	56%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	33%	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>7</u>	70%
Statewide	73%	<u>170</u>	<u>37</u>	21.76%	<u>14</u>	8.24%	<u>119</u>	70%

53 (A). During the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to accurately assess the child(ren)'s educational needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	92%	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	82.14%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>3</u>	10.71%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>3</u>	15.79%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	72%	<u>19</u>	<u>13</u>	68.42%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>18</u>	64.29%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>4</u>	14.29%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>20</u>	95.24%	0	0%	<u>1</u>	4.76%
West Area 2 SFM	96%	<u>25</u>	<u>23</u>	92%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>1</u>	4%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	88%	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	70%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>2</u>	20%
Statewide	85%	<u>170</u>	<u>132</u>	77.65%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>15</u>	8.82%

54 (B). During the period under review, did the agency engage in concerted efforts to address the child(ren)'s educational needs through appropriate services?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	76%	<u>28</u>	<u>16</u>	57.14%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>7</u>	25%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	33%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>7</u>	36.84%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	54%	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>6</u>	31.58%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>14</u>	50%
West Area 1 SFM	92%	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	57.14%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>8</u>	38.1%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	32%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	68%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	71%	<u>170</u>	<u>67</u>	39.41%	<u>28</u>	16.47%	<u>75</u>	44.12%

55 (A1). During the period under review, did the agency accurately assess the child's physical health care needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	43%	<u>28</u>	<u>12</u>	42.86%	<u>16</u>	57.14%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	50%	<u>10</u>	50%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	58%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	61%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	82%	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	82.14%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	57%	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	57.14%	<u>9</u>	42.86%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	56%	<u>25</u>	<u>14</u>	56%	<u>11</u>	44%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	90%	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	90%	<u>1</u>	10%	0	0%
Statewide	60%	<u>170</u>	<u>102</u>	60%	<u>67</u>	39.41%	<u>1</u>	0.59%

56 (A2). During the period under review, did the agency accurately assess the child's dental health care needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	36%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>16</u>	57.14%	<u>3</u>	10.71%
East Area 4 TFI	37%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>12</u>	60%	<u>1</u>	5%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	44%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>10</u>	52.63%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	53%	<u>19</u>	<u>10</u>	52.63%	<u>9</u>	47.37%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	93%	<u>28</u>	<u>26</u>	92.86%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	52%	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	52.38%	<u>10</u>	47.62%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	48%	<u>25</u>	<u>12</u>	48%	<u>13</u>	52%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	89%	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	80%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>1</u>	10%
Statewide	55%	<u>170</u>	<u>91</u>	53.53%	<u>73</u>	42.94%	<u>6</u>	3.53%

57 (B1). For foster care cases only, during the period under review, did the agency provide appropriate oversight of prescription medications for physical health issues?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	80%	28	8	28.57%	2	7.14%	18	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	20	4	20%	0	0%	16	80%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	29%	19	2	10.53%	5	26.32%	12	63.16%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	17%	19	1	5.26%	5	26.32%	13	68.42%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	83%	28	10	35.71%	2	7.14%	16	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	40%	21	4	19.05%	6	28.57%	11	52.38%
West Area 2 SFM	75%	25	6	24%	2	8%	17	68%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	80%	10	4	40%	1	10%	5	50%
Statewide	63%	170	39	22.94%	23	13.53%	108	63.53%

58 (B2). During the period under review, did the agency ensure that appropriate services were provided to the child to address all identified physical health needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	33%	28	8	28.57%	16	57.14%	4	14.29%
East Area 4 TFI	38%	20	6	30%	10	50%	4	20%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	30%	19	3	15.79%	7	36.84%	9	47.37%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	43%	19	3	15.79%	4	21.05%	12	63.16%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	86%	28	12	42.86%	2	7.14%	14	50%
West Area 1 SFM	37%	21	7	33.33%	12	57.14%	2	9.52%
West Area 2 SFM	48%	25	12	48%	13	52%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	10	3	30%	1	10%	6	60%
Statewide	45%	170	54	31.76%	65	38.24%	51	30%

59 (B3). During the period under review, did the agency ensure that appropriate services were provided to the child to address all identified dental health needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	24%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>16</u>	57.14%	<u>7</u>	25%
East Area 4 TFI	19%	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	15%	<u>13</u>	65%	<u>4</u>	20%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	27%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>4</u>	21.05%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	17%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>10</u>	52.63%	<u>7</u>	36.84%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	88%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
West Area 1 SFM	45%	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	42.86%	<u>11</u>	52.38%	<u>1</u>	4.76%
West Area 2 SFM	48%	<u>25</u>	<u>12</u>	48%	<u>13</u>	52%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	36%	<u>170</u>	<u>43</u>	25.29%	<u>76</u>	44.71%	<u>51</u>	30%

60 (A). During the period under review, did the agency conduct an accurate assessment of the children's mental/behavioral health needs either initially (if the child entered foster care during the period under review or if the in-home services case was opened during the period under review) and on an ongoing basis to inform case planning decisions?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	96%	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	85.71%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>3</u>	10.71%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	95%	0	0%	<u>1</u>	5%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	69%	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	57.89%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>3</u>	15.79%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	63.16%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>1</u>	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	96%	<u>28</u>	<u>25</u>	89.29%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>2</u>	7.14%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>18</u>	85.71%	0	0%	<u>3</u>	14.29%
West Area 2 SFM	96%	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	88%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>2</u>	8%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	91%	<u>170</u>	<u>141</u>	82.94%	<u>14</u>	8.24%	<u>15</u>	8.82%

61 (B). For foster care cases only, during the period under review, did the agency provide appropriate oversight of prescription medications for mental/behavioral health issues?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	80%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	64%	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>4</u>	20%	<u>9</u>	45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	75%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>15</u>	78.95%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	13%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
West Area 1 SFM	43%	<u>21</u>	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>14</u>	66.67%
West Area 2 SFM	63%	<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>17</u>	68%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	0	0%	<u>7</u>	70%
Statewide	61%	<u>170</u>	<u>36</u>	21.18%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>111</u>	65.29%

62 (C). During the period under review, did the agency provide appropriate services to address the child(ren)'s mental/behavioral health needs?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>15</u>	53.57%	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>8</u>	28.57%
East Area 4 TFI	94%	<u>20</u>	<u>16</u>	80%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>3</u>	15%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	62%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>6</u>	31.58%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	63%	<u>19</u>	<u>10</u>	52.63%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>3</u>	15.79%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	89%	<u>28</u>	<u>17</u>	60.71%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>9</u>	32.14%
West Area 1 SFM	79%	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	52.38%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>7</u>	33.33%
West Area 2 SFM	78%	<u>25</u>	<u>14</u>	56%	<u>4</u>	16%	<u>7</u>	28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	88%	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	70%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>2</u>	20%
Statewide	78%	<u>170</u>	<u>98</u>	57.65%	<u>27</u>	15.88%	<u>45</u>	26.47%

63. If the child's current or most recent placement is with a relative, is there documentation that a home assessment, KBI, FBI, Child Abuse Central Registry check is completed?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	15%	<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>15</u>	53.57%
East Area 4 TFI	18%	<u>20</u>	<u>2</u>	10%	<u>9</u>	45%	<u>9</u>	45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>5</u>	26.32%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	0	0%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	45%	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	17.86%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>17</u>	60.71%
West Area 1 SFM	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>14</u>	66.67%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>25</u>	<u>12</u>	48%	<u>1</u>	4%	<u>12</u>	48%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	0	0%	<u>4</u>	40%
Statewide	57%	<u>170</u>	<u>47</u>	27.65%	<u>36</u>	21.18%	<u>87</u>	51.18%

64. During the period under review, was the child (if 10 or older) offered the opportunity to use the "Monthly Individual Contact" form PPS 3061?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	0%	<u>28</u>	0	0%	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>18</u>	64.29%
East Area 4 TFI	42%	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	25%	<u>7</u>	35%	<u>8</u>	40%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	13%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	43%	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>	15.79%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>12</u>	63.16%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	65%	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	39.29%	<u>6</u>	21.43%	<u>11</u>	39.29%
West Area 1 SFM	60%	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>	28.57%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>11</u>	52.38%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>5</u>	20%	<u>15</u>	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	20%	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>5</u>	50%
Statewide	41%	<u>170</u>	<u>32</u>	18.82%	<u>47</u>	27.65%	<u>91</u>	53.53%

65. For each initial placement and placement change during the PUR, was the child enrolled in school timely?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	78%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>19</u>	67.86%
East Area 4 TFI	83%	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	25%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>14</u>	70%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	0	0%	<u>18</u>	94.74%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>16</u>	84.21%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	83%	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>2</u>	7.14%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>	28.57%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	71.43%
West Area 2 SFM	57%	<u>25</u>	<u>4</u>	16%	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>18</u>	72%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	60%
Statewide	81%	<u>170</u>	<u>39</u>	22.94%	<u>9</u>	5.29%	<u>122</u>	71.76%

66. Are the required releases of educational records forms in the child's file?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	43%	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	35.71%	<u>13</u>	46.43%	<u>5</u>	17.86%
East Area 4 TFI	25%	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	20%	<u>12</u>	60%	<u>4</u>	20%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>8</u>	42.11%	<u>3</u>	15.79%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	76%	<u>19</u>	<u>13</u>	68.42%	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>2</u>	10.53%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>22</u>	78.57%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	21.43%
West Area 1 SFM	94%	<u>21</u>	<u>16</u>	76.19%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>4</u>	19.05%
West Area 2 SFM	89%	<u>25</u>	<u>17</u>	68%	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>6</u>	24%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	88%	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	70%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>2</u>	20%
Statewide	70%	<u>170</u>	<u>97</u>	57.06%	<u>41</u>	24.12%	<u>32</u>	18.82%

67. If the child's first OOH placement occurred during the PUR, was a health assessment completed 30 days before or after the placement? If not, were there attempts to schedule it within 14 days?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>24</u>	85.71%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>20</u>	<u>1</u>	5%	0	0%	<u>19</u>	95%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>16</u>	84.21%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>1</u>	5.26%	<u>17</u>	89.47%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	88%	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	25%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
West Area 1 SFM	25%	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>17</u>	80.95%
West Area 2 SFM	82%	<u>25</u>	<u>9</u>	36%	<u>2</u>	8%	<u>14</u>	56%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	74%	<u>170</u>	<u>26</u>	15.29%	<u>9</u>	5.29%	<u>135</u>	79.41%

68. Are the child's immunizations current?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	50%	<u>28</u>	<u>14</u>	50%	<u>14</u>	50%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	60%	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>	60%	<u>8</u>	40%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	74%	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>	73.68%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	63%	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	63.16%	<u>7</u>	36.84%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	86%	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	85.71%	<u>4</u>	14.29%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	95%	<u>21</u>	<u>20</u>	95.24%	<u>1</u>	4.76%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	88%	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	88%	<u>3</u>	12%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	80%	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	80%	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%
Statewide	74%	<u>170</u>	<u>126</u>	74.12%	<u>44</u>	25.88%	0	0%

69. During the PUR, did the placement provider receive appropriate medical and surgical consent forms for the child?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	71%	28	20	71.43%	8	28.57%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	85%	20	17	85%	3	15%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	84%	19	16	84.21%	3	15.79%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	72%	19	13	68.42%	5	26.32%	1	5.26%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	92%	28	22	78.57%	2	7.14%	4	14.29%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	21	21	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	84%	25	21	84%	4	16%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	10	5	50%	5	50%	0	0%
Statewide	82%	170	135	79.41%	30	17.65%	5	2.94%

70. Did a case transfer staffing occur, if applicable, as documented by completing the PPS 3005?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	33%	28	4	14.29%	8	28.57%	16	57.14%
East Area 4 TFI	14%	20	1	5%	6	30%	13	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	36%	19	4	21.05%	7	36.84%	8	42.11%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	19	3	15.79%	6	31.58%	10	52.63%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	70%	28	7	25%	3	10.71%	18	64.29%
West Area 1 SFM	75%	21	12	57.14%	4	19.05%	5	23.81%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	25	15	60%	0	0%	10	40%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	67%	10	2	20%	1	10%	7	70%
Statewide	58%	170	48	28.24%	35	20.59%	87	51.18%

71. During the PUR, did the agency provide an Initial Mental Health and Trauma Screen within thirty (30) days upon the child's entry into the foster care?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	33%	28	1	3.57%	2	7.14%	25	89.29%
East Area 4 TFI	N/A	20	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	19	2	10.53%	1	5.26%	16	84.21%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	19	2	10.53%	0	0%	17	89.47%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	33%	28	2	7.14%	4	14.29%	22	78.57%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	21	4	19.05%	0	0%	17	80.95%
West Area 2 SFM	90%	25	9	36%	1	4%	15	60%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	10	1	10%	0	0%	9	90%
Statewide	72%	170	21	12.35%	8	4.71%	141	82.94%

72. Was the assessment performed by a person who has been trained to reliably administer the Screen, and who is either a Qualified Mental Health Professional or a professional who holds a bachelor's degree in the field of human services or a related field?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	0%	28	0	0%	2	7.14%	26	92.86%
East Area 4 TFI	N/A	20	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	19	2	10.53%	0	0%	17	89.47%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	19	2	10.53%	0	0%	17	89.47%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	28	1	3.57%	1	3.57%	26	92.86%
West Area 1 SFM	67%	21	2	9.52%	1	4.76%	18	85.71%
West Area 2 SFM	56%	25	5	20%	4	16%	16	64%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	10	1	10%	1	10%	8	80%
Statewide	59%	170	13	7.65%	9	5.29%	148	87.06%

73. For a child who is legally free for adoption, did the agency utilize the Adoption Tracking Tool (ATT), PPS 5400 to compile and track information as the case moves toward adoption?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	0%	<u>28</u>	0	0%	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>19</u>	67.86%
East Area 4 TFI	14%	<u>20</u>	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>6</u>	30%	<u>13</u>	65%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	25%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	<u>6</u>	31.58%	<u>11</u>	57.89%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	44%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	<u>5</u>	26.32%	<u>10</u>	52.63%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	32.14%	<u>3</u>	10.71%	<u>16</u>	57.14%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>2</u>	9.52%	<u>17</u>	80.95%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>25</u>	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>3</u>	12%	<u>19</u>	76%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	67%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	<u>1</u>	10%	<u>7</u>	70%
Statewide	40%	<u>170</u>	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>35</u>	20.59%	<u>112</u>	65.88%

74. If the ATT – PPS 5400 was utilized, were the appropriate sections of the form completed based on the status of the case?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	0%	<u>28</u>	0	0%	<u>1</u>	3.57%	<u>27</u>	96.43%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>20</u>	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>1</u>	5%	<u>18</u>	90%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>2</u>	10.53%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	89.47%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	21.05%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	78.95%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	28.57%	0	0%	<u>20</u>	71.43%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>	9.52%	0	0%	<u>19</u>	90.48%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>25</u>	<u>2</u>	8%	0	0%	<u>23</u>	92%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
Statewide	91%	<u>170</u>	<u>21</u>	12.35%	<u>2</u>	1.18%	<u>147</u>	86.47%