### Date Printed: 10/11/2023 01:17:55 PM (Coleman, Kevin)

### 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

Program: In-Home Review Type: IH - FP FYQTR Start: FY24QTR1 FYQTR End: FY24QTR1

### 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
Kansas City	93%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	1	4.76%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
Northeast	88%	<u>13</u>	7	53.85%	1	7.69%	<u>5</u>	38.46%
Northwest	100%	11	<u>9</u>	81.82%	0	0%	2	18.18%
Southeast	83%	Z	<u>5</u>	71.43%	1	14.29%	1	14.29%
Southwest	90%	12	9	75%	1	8.33%	2	16.67%
Wichita	81%	<u>26</u>	<u>17</u>	65.38%	<u>4</u>	15.38%	<u>5</u>	19.23%
Statewide	88%	90	<u>61</u>	67.78%	<u>8</u>	8.89%	21	23.33%

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	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	40%	21	<u>6</u>	28.57%	9	42.86%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
Northeast	75%	13	<u>6</u>	46.15%	2	15.38%	<u>5</u>	38.46%
Northwest	78%	11	7	63.64%	2	18.18%	2	18.18%
Southeast	67%	7	<u>4</u>	57.14%	2	28.57%	1	14.29%
Southwest	70%	<u>12</u>	7	58.33%	<u>3</u>	25%	2	16.67%
Wichita	71%	<u>26</u>	<u>15</u>	57.69%	<u>6</u>	23.08%	<u>5</u>	19.23%
Statewide	65%	90	<u>45</u>	50%	24	26.67%	21	23.33%

# 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	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	<b>Total Yes</b>	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	20%	<u>21</u>	2	9.52%	8	38.1%	11	52.38%
Northeast	0%	<u>13</u>	0	0%	3	23.08%	<u>10</u>	76.92%
Northwest	0%	<u>11</u>	0	0%	2	18.18%	9	81.82%
Southeast	33%	Z	1	14.29%	2	28.57%	4	57.14%
Southwest	0%	<u>12</u>	0	0%	<u>4</u>	33.33%	8	66.67%
Wichita	0%	<u>26</u>	0	0%	<u>10</u>	38.46%	<u>16</u>	61.54%

Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A	
Statewide	9%	90	<u>3</u>	3.33%	<u>29</u>	32.22%	<u>58</u>	64.44%	

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? (Be sure to assess the entire period under review.)

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>4</u>	19.05%	7	33.33%
Northeast	86%	<u>13</u>	<u>6</u>	46.15%	1	7.69%	<u>6</u>	46.15%
Northwest	88%	<u>11</u>	7	63.64%	1	9.09%	<u>3</u>	27.27%
Southeast	100%	Z	<u>3</u>	42.86%	0	0%	4	57.14%
Southwest	100%	<u>12</u>	9	75%	0	0%	<u>3</u>	25%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	9	34.62%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	65.38%
Statewide	88%	90	<u>44</u>	48.89%	<u>6</u>	6.67%	<u>40</u>	44.44%

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?

action necessary to ensure the china's safety:										
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A		
Kansas City	N/A	<u>21</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>21</u>	100%		
Northeast	N/A	<u>13</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	100%		
Northwest	N/A	11	0	0%	0	0%	11	100%		
Southeast	N/A	7	0	0%	0	0%	Z	100%		
Southwest	N/A	<u>12</u>	0	0%	0	0%	12	100%		
Wichita	N/A	<u>26</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>26</u>	100%		
Statewide	N/A	90	0	0%	0	0%	90	100%		

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
Kansas City	92%	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	57.14%	1	4.76%	<u>8</u>	38.1%
Northeast	100%	<u>13</u>	9	69.23%	0	0%	4	30.77%
Northwest	78%	<u>11</u>	7	63.64%	2	18.18%	2	18.18%
Southeast	100%	7	<u>5</u>	71.43%	0	0%	2	28.57%
Southwest	60%	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	50%	4	33.33%	2	16.67%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	20	76.92%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	23.08%
Statewide	89%	90	<u>59</u>	65.56%	Z	7.78%	24	26.67%

### 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
Kansas City	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	71.43%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	0	0%
Northeast	92%	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	92.31%	1	7.69%	0	0%
Northwest	55%	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	54.55%	<u>5</u>	45.45%	0	0%
Southeast	100%	Z	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Southwest	50%	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	50%	<u>6</u>	50%	0	0%
Wichita	92%	<u>26</u>	<u>24</u>	92.31%	2	7.69%	0	0%
Statewide	78%	90	<u>70</u>	77.78%	20	22.22%	0	0%

# 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
Kansas City	67%	<u>21</u>	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
Northeast	78%	<u>13</u>	7	53.85%	<u>2</u>	15.38%	4	30.77%
Northwest	71%	11	<u>5</u>	45.45%	2	18.18%	4	36.36%
Southeast	50%	Z	2	28.57%	2	28.57%	<u>3</u>	42.86%
Southwest	45%	12	<u>5</u>	41.67%	<u>6</u>	50%	1	8.33%
Wichita	94%	<u>26</u>	<u>17</u>	65.38%	1	3.85%	8	30.77%
Statewide	72%	90	<u>46</u>	51.11%	<u>18</u>	20%	<u>26</u>	28.89%

# 7(D). During the 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?

		1 7 11 1			, , ,				
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A	
Kansas City	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	2	9.52%	<u>14</u>	66.67%	
Northeast	86%	<u>13</u>	<u>6</u>	46.15%	1	7.69%	<u>6</u>	46.15%	
Northwest	100%	11	7	63.64%	0	0%	4	36.36%	
Southeast	50%	Z	2	28.57%	2	28.57%	3	42.86%	
Southwest	60%	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>	25%	2	16.67%	Z	58.33%	
Wichita	50%	<u>26</u>	1	3.85%	1	3.85%	<u>24</u>	92.31%	
Statewide	75%	90	24	26.67%	8	8.89%	<u>58</u>	64.44%	

### 8(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	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	62%	21	<u>13</u>	61.9%	8	38.1%	0	0%
Northeast	92%	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	92.31%	1	7.69%	0	0%
Northwest	64%	<u>11</u>	7	63.64%	<u>4</u>	36.36%	0	0%
Southeast	86%	Z	<u>6</u>	85.71%	1	14.29%	0	0%
Southwest	58%	<u>12</u>	7	58.33%	<u>5</u>	41.67%	0	0%
Wichita	96%	<u>26</u>	<u>25</u>	96.15%	1	3.85%	0	0%
Statewide	78%	90	<u>70</u>	77.78%	20	22.22%	0	0%

#### 9(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	
Kansas City	0%	<u>21</u>	0	0%	<u>9</u>	42.86%	<u>12</u>	57.14%	
Northeast	78%	<u>13</u>	7	53.85%	2	15.38%	4	30.77%	
Northwest	45%	11	<u>5</u>	45.45%	<u>6</u>	54.55%	0	0%	
Southeast	83%	Z	<u>5</u>	71.43%	1	14.29%	1	14.29%	
Southwest	25%	12	<u>3</u>	25%	9	75%	0	0%	
Wichita	94%	<u>26</u>	<u>17</u>	65.38%	1	3.85%	8	30.77%	
Statewide	57%	90	<u>37</u>	41.11%	<u>28</u>	31.11%	<u>25</u>	27.78%	

### 10(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	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	<b>Total Yes</b>	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	55%	21	<u>11</u>	52.38%	9	42.86%	1	4.76%
Northeast	92%	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	92.31%	1	7.69%	0	0%
Northwest	40%	11	4	36.36%	<u>6</u>	54.55%	1	9.09%
Southeast	100%	7	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Southwest	82%	<u>12</u>	9	75%	2	16.67%	1	8.33%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	<u>24</u>	92.31%	0	0%	2	7.69%
Statewide	79%	90	<u>67</u>	74.44%	<u>18</u>	20%	<u>5</u>	5.56%

### 11(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	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	39%	21	Z	33.33%	<u>11</u>	52.38%	3	14.29%
Northeast	38%	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	23.08%	<u>5</u>	38.46%	<u>5</u>	38.46%
Northwest	75%	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	54.55%	2	18.18%	<u>3</u>	27.27%
Southeast	33%	7	1	14.29%	2	28.57%	4	57.14%
Southwest	13%	<u>12</u>	1	8.33%	7	58.33%	4	33.33%
Wichita	69%	<u>26</u>	11	42.31%	<u>5</u>	19.23%	<u>10</u>	38.46%
Statewide	48%	90	<u>29</u>	32.22%	<u>32</u>	35.56%	<u>29</u>	32.22%

#### 12(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
Kansas City	47%	<u>21</u>	7	33.33%	<u>8</u>	38.1%	<u>6</u>	28.57%
Northeast	77%	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	76.92%	<u>3</u>	23.08%	0	0%
Northwest	10%	11	1	9.09%	<u>9</u>	81.82%	1	9.09%
Southeast	86%	Z	<u>6</u>	85.71%	1	14.29%	0	0%
Southwest	9%	12	1	8.33%	<u>10</u>	83.33%	1	8.33%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	<u>17</u>	65.38%	0	0%	<u>9</u>	34.62%
Statewide	58%	90	<u>42</u>	46.67%	<u>31</u>	34.44%	<u>17</u>	18.89%

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

and period and control and another period appropriate services to an action to accompany								
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	11%	<u>21</u>	1	4.76%	8	38.1%	12	57.14%
Northeast	17%	<u>13</u>	1	7.69%	<u>5</u>	38.46%	Z	53.85%
Northwest	38%	11	3	27.27%	<u>5</u>	45.45%	<u>3</u>	27.27%
Southeast	33%	7	1	14.29%	2	28.57%	4	57.14%
Southwest	13%	<u>12</u>	1	8.33%	7	58.33%	4	33.33%
Wichita	64%	<u>26</u>	9	34.62%	<u>5</u>	19.23%	<u>12</u>	46.15%
Statewide	33%	90	<u>16</u>	17.78%	32	35.56%	42	46.67%

14(A). During the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to actively involve the child in the case planning process?										
Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A		
Kansas City	67%	21	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>6</u>	28.57%		

Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Northeast	70%	13	Z	53.85%	<u>3</u>	23.08%	<u>3</u>	23.08%
Northwest	70%	<u>11</u>	7	63.64%	<u>3</u>	27.27%	1	9.09%
Southeast	29%	Z	2	28.57%	<u>5</u>	71.43%	0	0%
Southwest	67%	<u>12</u>	8	66.67%	<u>4</u>	33.33%	0	0%
Wichita	73%	<u>26</u>	<u>16</u>	61.54%	<u>6</u>	23.08%	4	15.38%
Statewide	66%	90	<u>50</u>	55.56%	<u>26</u>	28.89%	14	15.56%

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

Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	70%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	1	4.76%
Northeast	85%	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>	84.62%	2	15.38%	0	0%
Northwest	50%	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	45.45%	<u>5</u>	45.45%	1	9.09%
Southeast	86%	Z	<u>6</u>	85.71%	1	14.29%	0	0%
Southwest	91%	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	83.33%	1	8.33%	1	8.33%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	<u>22</u>	84.62%	0	0%	4	15.38%
Statewide	82%	90	<u>68</u>	75.56%	<u>15</u>	16.67%	7	7.78%

### 16(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
Kansas City	35%	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>	28.57%	<u>11</u>	52.38%	4	19.05%
Northeast	25%	<u>13</u>	2	15.38%	<u>6</u>	46.15%	<u>5</u>	38.46%
Northwest	88%	<u>11</u>	Z	63.64%	1	9.09%	<u>3</u>	27.27%
Southeast	25%	7	1	14.29%	<u>3</u>	42.86%	<u>3</u>	42.86%
Southwest	38%	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>	25%	<u>5</u>	41.67%	4	33.33%
Wichita	76%	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>	50%	4	15.38%	9	34.62%
Statewide	52%	<u>90</u>	<u>32</u>	35.56%	<u>30</u>	33.33%	28	31.11%

17(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
Kansas City	71%	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	71.43%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	0	0%
Northeast	69%	<u>13</u>	9	69.23%	4	30.77%	0	0%
Northwest	36%	<u>11</u>	4	36.36%	7	63.64%	0	0%
Southeast	29%	Z	2	28.57%	<u>5</u>	71.43%	0	0%
Southwest	75%	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	75%	<u>3</u>	25%	0	0%
Wichita	92%	<u>26</u>	<u>24</u>	92.31%	2	7.69%	0	0%
Statewide	70%	90	<u>63</u>	70%	<u>27</u>	30%	0	0%

18(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
Kansas City	71%	21	<u>15</u>	71.43%	<u>6</u>	28.57%	0	0%
Northeast	38%	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>	38.46%	8	61.54%	0	0%
Northwest	30%	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	27.27%	7	63.64%	1	9.09%
Southeast	50%	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	42.86%	<u>3</u>	42.86%	1	14.29%
Southwest	9%	<u>12</u>	1	8.33%	<u>10</u>	83.33%	1	8.33%
Wichita	81%	<u>26</u>	<u>21</u>	80.77%	<u>5</u>	19.23%	0	0%
Statewide	55%	90	48	53.33%	<u>39</u>	43.33%	<u>3</u>	3.33%

19(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?

ouis.									
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A	
Kansas City	65%	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	61.9%	7	33.33%	1	4.76%	
Northeast	77%	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	76.92%	<u>3</u>	23.08%	0	0%	
Northwest	40%	11	4	36.36%	<u>6</u>	54.55%	1	9.09%	
Southeast	71%	Z	<u>5</u>	71.43%	2	28.57%	0	0%	
Southwest	91%	12	<u>10</u>	83.33%	1	8.33%	1	8.33%	
Wichita	95%	<u>26</u>	21	80.77%	1	3.85%	4	15.38%	
Statewide	76%	90	<u>63</u>	70%	<u>20</u>	22.22%	Z	7.78%	

20(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
Kansas City	47%	<u>21</u>	8	38.1%	<u>9</u>	42.86%	4	19.05%
Northeast	43%	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	23.08%	4	30.77%	<u>6</u>	46.15%
Northwest	75%	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	54.55%	<u>2</u>	18.18%	<u>3</u>	27.27%
Southeast	33%	Z	1	14.29%	<u>2</u>	28.57%	4	57.14%
Southwest	29%	<u>12</u>	2	16.67%	<u>5</u>	41.67%	<u>5</u>	41.67%
Wichita	81%	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>	50%	<u>3</u>	11.54%	<u>10</u>	38.46%
Statewide	57%	90	<u>33</u>	36.67%	<u>25</u>	27.78%	<u>32</u>	35.56%

### 21(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
Kansas City	65%	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	61.9%	7	33.33%	1	4.76%
Northeast	85%	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>	84.62%	2	15.38%	0	0%
Northwest	40%	<u>11</u>	4	36.36%	<u>6</u>	54.55%	1	9.09%
Southeast	100%	Z	Z	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Southwest	60%	12	<u>6</u>	50%	4	33.33%	2	16.67%
Wichita	95%	<u>26</u>	<u>21</u>	80.77%	1	3.85%	4	15.38%
Statewide	76%	<u>90</u>	<u>62</u>	68.89%	20	22.22%	8	8.89%

## 22(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
Kansas City	58%	<u>21</u>	7	33.33%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	9	42.86%
Northeast	40%	<u>13</u>	2	15.38%	3	23.08%	8	61.54%
Northwest	63%	11	<u>5</u>	45.45%	3	27.27%	3	27.27%
Southeast	100%	Z	1	14.29%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	85.71%
Southwest	67%	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	33.33%	2	16.67%	<u>6</u>	50%
Wichita	93%	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>	50%	1	3.85%	<u>12</u>	46.15%
Statewide	70%	<u>90</u>	<u>32</u>	35.56%	<u>14</u>	15.56%	<u>44</u>	48.89%

23(A). During the period under review, did the agency make concerted efforts to accurately assess the child(ren)'s educational needs?											
Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A			
Kansas City	41%	21	Z	33.33%	<u>10</u>	47.62%	4	19.05%			
Northeast	100%	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>	38.46%	0	0%	8	61.54%			
Northwest	63%	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	45.45%	<u>3</u>	27.27%	<u>3</u>	27.27%			
Southeast	86%	7	<u>6</u>	85.71%	1	14.29%	0	0%			
Southwest	55%	12	<u>6</u>	50%	<u>5</u>	41.67%	1	8.33%			
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	10	38.46%	0	0%	<u>16</u>	61.54%			
Statewide	67%	90	<u>39</u>	43.33%	<u>19</u>	21.11%	<u>32</u>	35.56%			

# 24(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
Kansas City	8%	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	4.76%	<u>11</u>	52.38%	<u>9</u>	42.86%
Northeast	100%	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>	30.77%	0	0%	9	69.23%
Northwest	43%	11	<u>3</u>	27.27%	<u>4</u>	36.36%	4	36.36%
Southeast	83%	Z	<u>5</u>	71.43%	1	14.29%	1	14.29%
Southwest	25%	12	2	16.67%	<u>6</u>	50%	4	33.33%
Wichita	88%	<u>26</u>	7	26.92%	1	3.85%	<u>18</u>	69.23%
Statewide	49%	90	22	24.44%	23	25.56%	<u>45</u>	50%

### 25(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
Region	remonitance	Total Case Reads	iotal les	70 TES	TOTAL INO	70 INO	Iotal N/A	70 N/A
Kansas City	57%	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	57.14%	<u>9</u>	42.86%	0	0%
Northeast	100%	<u>13</u>	<u>6</u>	46.15%	0	0%	7	53.85%
Northwest	100%	11	4	36.36%	0	0%	Z	63.64%
Southeast	100%	7	<u>2</u>	28.57%	0	0%	<u>5</u>	71.43%
Southwest	71%	12	<u>5</u>	41.67%	2	16.67%	<u>5</u>	41.67%
Wichita	93%	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>	50%	1	3.85%	12	46.15%
Statewide	78%	90	<u>42</u>	46.67%	<u>12</u>	13.33%	<u>36</u>	40%

26(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		
Kansas City	43%	21	9	42.86%	<u>12</u>	57.14%	0	0%		

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Northeast	100%	13	4	30.77%	0	0%	9	69.23%
Northwest	100%	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	27.27%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	72.73%
Southeast	100%	Z	2	28.57%	0	0%	<u>5</u>	71.43%
Southwest	83%	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	41.67%	1	8.33%	<u>6</u>	50%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	4	15.38%	0	0%	22	84.62%
Statewide	68%	90	27	30%	<u>13</u>	14.44%	<u>50</u>	55.56%

### 27(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
Kansas City	0%	<u>21</u>	0	0%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>16</u>	76.19%
Northeast	80%	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>	30.77%	<u>1</u>	7.69%	<u>8</u>	61.54%
Northwest	0%	<u>11</u>	0	0%	1	9.09%	<u>10</u>	90.91%
Southeast	100%	Z	1	14.29%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	85.71%
Southwest	50%	12	2	16.67%	2	16.67%	8	66.67%
Wichita	100%	<u>26</u>	4	15.38%	0	0%	22	84.62%
Statewide	55%	90	<u>11</u>	12.22%	9	10%	<u>70</u>	77.78%

### 28(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
Kansas City	9%	<u>21</u>	1	4.76%	<u>10</u>	47.62%	10	47.62%
Northeast	100%	<u>13</u>	3	23.08%	0	0%	10	76.92%
Northwest	0%	11	0	0%	1	9.09%	10	90.91%
Southeast	100%	Z	1	14.29%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	85.71%
Southwest	50%	<u>12</u>	1	8.33%	1	8.33%	<u>10</u>	83.33%
Wichita	N/A	<u>26</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>26</u>	100%
Statewide	33%	90	<u>6</u>	6.67%	<u>12</u>	13.33%	<u>72</u>	80%

29(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
Kansas City	47%	<u>21</u>	9	42.86%	<u>10</u>	47.62%	<u>2</u>	9.52%

Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Northeast	91%	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	76.92%	1	7.69%	2	15.38%
Northwest	70%	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	63.64%	<u>3</u>	27.27%	1	9.09%
Southeast	100%	Z	<u>6</u>	85.71%	0	0%	1	14.29%
Southwest	75%	<u>12</u>	9	75%	<u>3</u>	25%	0	0%
Wichita	88%	<u>26</u>	<u>22</u>	84.62%	<u>3</u>	11.54%	1	3.85%
Statewide	76%	90	<u>63</u>	70%	20	22.22%	Z	7.78%

# 30(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
Kansas City	50%	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>5</u>	23.81%	<u>11</u>	52.38%
Northeast	70%	<u>13</u>	7	53.85%	<u>3</u>	23.08%	<u>3</u>	23.08%
Northwest	50%	11	<u>5</u>	45.45%	<u>5</u>	45.45%	1	9.09%
Southeast	100%	Z	<u>6</u>	85.71%	0	0%	1	14.29%
Southwest	50%	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	50%	<u>6</u>	50%	0	0%
Wichita	74%	<u>26</u>	<u>17</u>	65.38%	<u>6</u>	23.08%	<u>3</u>	11.54%
Statewide	65%	90	<u>46</u>	51.11%	<u>25</u>	27.78%	<u>19</u>	21.11%

#### 31. During the period under review, did the agency complete a substance abuse screening tool on all family members?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	67%	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	66.67%	7	33.33%	0	0%
Northeast	82%	<u>13</u>	9	69.23%	2	15.38%	2	15.38%
Northwest	80%	<u>11</u>	8	72.73%	2	18.18%	1	9.09%
Southeast	100%	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	85.71%	0	0%	<u>1</u>	14.29%
Southwest	82%	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	75%	2	16.67%	<u>1</u>	8.33%
Wichita	44%	<u>26</u>	<u>11</u>	42.31%	<u>14</u>	53.85%	1	3.85%
Statewide	68%	90	<u>57</u>	63.33%	<u>27</u>	30%	<u>6</u>	6.67%

2. During the p	period under review	v, did the agency provid	le appropriate	services to a	ddress the fa	milies' subst	ance abuse nee	eds?
Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	20%	21	1	4.76%	4	19.05%	<u>16</u>	76.19%
Northeast	50%	13	2	15.38%	2	15.38%	9	69.23%
Northwest	20%	11	1	9.09%	4	36.36%	<u>6</u>	54.55%
Southeast	100%	Z	2	28.57%	0	0%	<u>5</u>	71.43%
Southwest	0%	12	0	0%	3	25%	9	75%
Wichita	37%	26	Z	26.92%	12	46.15%	Z	26.92%
Statewide	34%	90	<u>13</u>	14.44%	<u>25</u>	27.78%	<u>52</u>	57.78%

### 33. 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	
Kansas City	57%	<u>21</u>	<u>4</u>	19.05%	<u>3</u>	14.29%	<u>14</u>	66.67%	
Northeast	50%	<u>13</u>	2	15.38%	2	15.38%	9	69.23%	
Northwest	0%	11	0	0%	1	9.09%	<u>10</u>	90.91%	
Southeast	N/A	Z	0	0%	0	0%	Z	100%	
Southwest	0%	<u>12</u>	0	0%	1	8.33%	<u>11</u>	91.67%	
Wichita	N/A	<u>26</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>26</u>	100%	
Statewide	46%	90	<u>6</u>	6.67%	7	7.78%	77	85.56%	

### 34. Is there documentation supporting a supervisor staffing occurred as required, per PPM 5122?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	95%	<u>21</u>	<u>20</u>	95.24%	1	4.76%	0	0%
Northeast	54%	<u>13</u>	7	53.85%	<u>6</u>	46.15%	0	0%
Northwest	55%	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	54.55%	<u>5</u>	45.45%	0	0%
Southeast	57%	Z	4	57.14%	<u>3</u>	42.86%	0	0%
Southwest	58%	<u>12</u>	7	58.33%	<u>5</u>	41.67%	0	0%
Wichita	73%	<u>26</u>	<u>19</u>	73.08%	7	26.92%	0	0%
Statewide	70%	90	<u>63</u>	70%	<u>27</u>	30%	0	0%

5. Was a Plan o	f Safe Care comple	ted as required per PPN	1 2050 and PPN	1 5122, if ap	plicable?			
Region	Performance	<b>Total Case Reads</b>	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City	N/A	<u>21</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>21</u>	100%
Northeast	N/A	13	0	0%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	100%
Northwest	100%	11	1	9.09%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	90.91%
Southeast	N/A	Z	0	0%	0	0%	Z	100%
Southwest	N/A	12	0	0%	0	0%	12	100%
Wichita	N/A	<u>26</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>26</u>	100%
Statewide	100%	90	1	1.11%	0	0%	89	98.89%