Date Printed: 10/20/2023 11:02:32 AM (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: Out-Of-Home Review Type: OOH 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
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>10</u>	45.45%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
East Area 4 TFI	80%	<u>22</u>	4	18.18%	1	4.55%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	0	0%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	27.78%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>27</u>	9	33.33%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	75%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	1	10%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>15</u>	38.46%	0	0%	<u>24</u>	61.54%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	29.41%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	70.59%
Statewide	92%	<u>170</u>	<u>55</u>	32.35%	<u>5</u>	2.94%	<u>110</u>	64.71%

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	60%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	4	18.18%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
East Area 4 TFI	60%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	2	9.09%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	2	13.33%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	40%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u>	29.63%	4	14.81%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	10	2	20%	2	20%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	47%	<u>39</u>	7	17.95%	<u>8</u>	20.51%	<u>24</u>	61.54%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	29.41%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	70.59%
Statewide	58%	<u>170</u>	<u>35</u>	20.59%	<u>25</u>	14.71%	<u>110</u>	64.71%

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%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	3	13.64%	<u>19</u>	86.36%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	22	1	4.55%	1	4.55%	20	90.91%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	2	13.33%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	1	5.56%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>27</u>	0	0%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>21</u>	77.78%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	2	20%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	11%	<u>39</u>	1	2.56%	8	20.51%	<u>30</u>	76.92%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	N/A	<u>17</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	100%
Statewide	8%	<u>170</u>	2	1.18%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>145</u>	85.29%

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	43%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	4	18.18%	<u>15</u>	68.18%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	2	9.09%	<u>18</u>	81.82%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	93.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	2	11.11%	<u>15</u>	83.33%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	25%	<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	11.11%	9	33.33%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	2	20%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	25%	<u>39</u>	<u>3</u>	7.69%	9	23.08%	<u>27</u>	69.23%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	17%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>11</u>	64.71%
Statewide	30%	<u>170</u>	<u>14</u>	8.24%	<u>33</u>	19.41%	<u>123</u>	72.35%

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	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	93.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	62.96%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	10	2	20%	0	0%	8	80%
West Area 2 SFM	78%	<u>39</u>	Z	17.95%	2	5.13%	<u>30</u>	76.92%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	76.47%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Statewide	92%	<u>170</u>	<u>35</u>	20.59%	<u>3</u>	1.76%	<u>132</u>	77.65%

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%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	0	0%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	1	6.67%	<u>14</u>	93.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	0	0%	22	81.48%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	1	10%	1	10%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>10</u>	25.64%	0	0%	<u>29</u>	74.36%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	76.47%
Statewide	91%	<u>170</u>	<u>32</u>	18.82%	3	1.76%	<u>135</u>	79.41%

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	75%	22	<u>15</u>	68.18%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	2	9.09%
East Area 4 TFI	91%	22	20	90.91%	<u>2</u>	9.09%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>	66.67%	<u>5</u>	33.33%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	65%	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>	61.11%	<u>6</u>	33.33%	1	5.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	93%	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>	92.59%	2	7.41%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	78%	10	Z	70%	2	20%	1	10%
West Area 2 SFM	79%	<u>39</u>	<u>31</u>	79.49%	8	20.51%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	94%	<u>17</u>	<u>15</u>	88.24%	1	5.88%	1	5.88%
Statewide	81%	<u>170</u>	<u>134</u>	78.82%	<u>31</u>	18.24%	<u>5</u>	2.94%

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	13%	22	1	4.55%	Z	31.82%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
East Area 4 TFI	85%	22	<u>11</u>	50%	2	9.09%	<u>9</u>	40.91%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	4	22.22%	<u>14</u>	77.78%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	25%	<u>27</u>	1	3.7%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>23</u>	85.19%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	10	1	10%	0	0%	<u>9</u>	90%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>39</u>	4	10.26%	2	5.13%	<u>33</u>	84.62%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	17	<u>6</u>	35.29%	2	11.76%	<u>9</u>	52.94%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>25</u>	14.71%	<u>21</u>	12.35%	<u>124</u>	72.94%

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	55%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>11</u>	50%
East Area 4 TFI	90%	<u>22</u>	9	40.91%	1	4.55%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	1	6.67%	<u>12</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	43%	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>	16.67%	4	22.22%	<u>11</u>	61.11%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	92%	<u>27</u>	<u>11</u>	40.74%	1	3.7%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	2	20%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>18</u>	46.15%	0	0%	<u>21</u>	53.85%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	64.71%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	35.29%
Statewide	82%	<u>170</u>	<u>62</u>	36.47%	<u>14</u>	8.24%	94	55.29%
Statewide	82%	170	<u>62</u>	36.47%	14	8.24%		94

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	83%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	1	4.55%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>22</u>	Z	31.82%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	68.18%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	80%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	1	6.67%	<u>10</u>	66.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	7	38.89%	0	0%	<u>11</u>	61.11%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	95%	<u>27</u>	<u>20</u>	74.07%	1	3.7%	<u>6</u>	22.22%
West Area 1 SFM	80%	10	4	40%	1	10%	<u>5</u>	50%
West Area 2 SFM	97%	<u>39</u>	<u>29</u>	74.36%	1	2.56%	<u>9</u>	23.08%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	85%	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	64.71%	2	11.76%	<u>4</u>	23.53%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Statewide	93%	<u>170</u>	<u>87</u>	51.18%	Z	4.12%	<u>76</u>	44.71%

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	60%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	2	9.09%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	80%	<u>22</u>	4	18.18%	1	4.55%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	0	0%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	60%	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>	16.67%	2	11.11%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>19</u>	70.37%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	29.63%
West Area 1 SFM	67%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	1	10%	<u>7</u>	70%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	7	17.95%	0	0%	<u>32</u>	82.05%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	47.06%	0	0%	<u>9</u>	52.94%
Statewide	89%	<u>170</u>	<u>48</u>	28.24%	<u>6</u>	3.53%	<u>116</u>	68.24%

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	80%	<u>22</u>	4	18.18%	1	4.55%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	38%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	75%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>1</u>	6.67%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	80%	<u>18</u>	4	22.22%	<u>1</u>	5.56%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>27</u>	8	29.63%	4	14.81%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	10	1	10%	1	10%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	62%	<u>39</u>	8	20.51%	<u>5</u>	12.82%	<u>26</u>	66.67%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	2	11.76%	<u>12</u>	70.59%
Statewide	63%	<u>170</u>	<u>34</u>	20%	<u>20</u>	11.76%	<u>116</u>	68.24%

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	95%	22	<u>21</u>	95.45%	1	4.55%	0	0%			
East Area 4 TFI	91%	<u>22</u>	<u>20</u>	90.91%	2	9.09%	0	0%			
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%			
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	94%	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	83.33%	1	5.56%	<u>2</u>	11.11%			
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	96%	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>	92.59%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%			
West Area 1 SFM	80%	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	80%	2	20%	0	0%			
West Area 2 SFM	87%	<u>39</u>	<u>34</u>	87.18%	<u>5</u>	12.82%	0	0%			
Wichita Area 8 TFI	94%	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	94.12%	1	5.88%	0	0%			
Statewide	92%	<u>170</u>	<u>154</u>	90.59%	<u>13</u>	7.65%	<u>3</u>	1.76%			

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	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>22</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	95%	<u>22</u>	<u>21</u>	95.45%	1	4.55%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	93%	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	93.33%	1	6.67%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	<u>18</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>39</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Statewide	99%	<u>170</u>	<u>168</u>	98.82%	2	1.18%	0	0%

13 (B). Were all permanency goal	s in effect durin	g the period under re	eview establi	ished in a t	imely mann	er?		
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	36%	<u>22</u>	8	36.36%	<u>14</u>	63.64%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	85%	22	<u>17</u>	77.27%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>2</u>	9.09%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	<u>6</u>	40%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	89%	<u>18</u>	<u>16</u>	88.89%	2	11.11%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	70%	<u>27</u>	<u>19</u>	70.37%	<u>8</u>	29.63%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	70%	<u>10</u>	7	70%	<u>3</u>	30%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>39</u>	<u>36</u>	92.31%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	63%	<u>17</u>	<u>10</u>	58.82%	<u>6</u>	35.29%	1	5.88%
Statewide	73%	<u>170</u>	<u>122</u>	71.76%	<u>45</u>	26.47%	<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?

Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
68%					70 140	IOIAI IN/A	70 N/A
0070	22	<u>15</u>	68.18%	7	31.82%	0	0%
82%	<u>22</u>	<u>18</u>	81.82%	<u>4</u>	18.18%	0	0%
93%	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	93.33%	1	6.67%	0	0%
56%	<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	55.56%	<u>8</u>	44.44%	0	0%
96%	<u>27</u>	<u>26</u>	96.3%	<u>1</u>	3.7%	0	0%
80%	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	80%	<u>2</u>	20%	0	0%
79%	<u>39</u>	<u>31</u>	79.49%	<u>8</u>	20.51%	0	0%
76%	<u>17</u>	<u>13</u>	76.47%	<u>4</u>	23.53%	0	0%
79%	<u>170</u>	<u>135</u>	79.41%	<u>35</u>	20.59%	0	0%
	93% 56% 96% 80% 79%	93% 15 56% 18 96% 27 80% 10 79% 39 76% 17	93% 15 14 56% 18 10 96% 27 26 80% 10 8 79% 39 31 76% 17 13	93% 15 14 93.33% 56% 18 10 55.56% 96% 27 26 96.3% 80% 10 8 80% 79% 39 31 79.49% 76% 17 13 76.47%	93% 15 14 93.33% 1 56% 18 10 55.56% 8 96% 27 26 96.3% 1 80% 10 8 80% 2 79% 39 31 79.49% 8 76% 17 13 76.47% 4	93% 15 14 93.33% 1 6.67% 56% 18 10 55.56% 8 44.44% 96% 27 26 96.3% 1 3.7% 80% 10 8 80% 2 20% 79% 39 31 79.49% 8 20.51% 76% 17 13 76.47% 4 23.53%	93% 15 14 93.33% 1 6.67% 0 56% 18 10 55.56% 8 44.44% 0 96% 27 26 96.3% 1 3.7% 0 80% 10 8 80% 2 20% 0 79% 39 31 79.49% 8 20.51% 0 76% 17 13 76.47% 4 23.53% 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	27%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	<u>11</u>	50%
East Area 4 TFI	17%	22	1	4.55%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	75%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	1	6.67%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	44%	<u>18</u>	4	22.22%	<u>5</u>	27.78%	<u>9</u>	50%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	70%	<u>27</u>	Z	25.93%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>17</u>	62.96%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	4	40%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	73%	<u>39</u>	<u>8</u>	20.51%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>28</u>	71.79%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	64%	<u>17</u>	7	41.18%	4	23.53%	<u>6</u>	35.29%
Statewide	56%	<u>170</u>	<u>37</u>	21.76%	<u>29</u>	17.06%	<u>104</u>	61.18%

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	25%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
East Area 4 TFI	40%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>15</u>	83.33%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	11.11%	0	0%	<u>24</u>	88.89%
West Area 1 SFM	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%
West Area 2 SFM	25%	<u>39</u>	1	2.56%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>35</u>	89.74%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	1	5.88%	<u>15</u>	88.24%
Statewide	37%	<u>170</u>	<u>10</u>	5.88%	<u>17</u>	10%	<u>143</u>	84.12%

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	11%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>17</u>	77.27%	<u>3</u>	13.64%		
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>22</u>	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>2</u>	9.09%		
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	<u>6</u>	40%	0	0%		
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	47%	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	44.44%	9	50%	1	5.56%		
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	68%	<u>27</u>	<u>17</u>	62.96%	<u>8</u>	29.63%	<u>2</u>	7.41%		
West Area 1 SFM	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	4	40%	0	0%		

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 2 SFM	68%	<u>39</u>	<u>25</u>	64.1%	<u>12</u>	30.77%	2	5.13%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	47%	<u>17</u>	8	47.06%	9	52.94%	0	0%
Statewide	53%	<u>170</u>	<u>85</u>	50%	<u>75</u>	44.12%	<u>10</u>	5.88%

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	N/A	<u>22</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	100%
East Area 4 TFI	75%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	1	4.55%	<u>18</u>	81.82%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	N/A	<u>15</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	100%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	<u>2</u>	11.11%	0	0%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	11.11%	0	0%	<u>24</u>	88.89%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	1	10%	0	0%	9	90%
West Area 2 SFM	0%	<u>39</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>36</u>	92.31%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	N/A	<u>17</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	100%
Statewide	69%	<u>170</u>	9	5.29%	4	2.35%	<u>157</u>	92.35%

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	53%	<u>22</u>	9	40.91%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>10</u>	45.45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	75%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	3	20%	<u>3</u>	20%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	71%	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	27.78%	2	11.11%	<u>11</u>	61.11%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	32%	<u>27</u>	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>13</u>	48.15%	<u>8</u>	29.63%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	0	0%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	43%	<u>39</u>	<u>10</u>	25.64%	<u>13</u>	33.33%	<u>16</u>	41.03%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	67%	<u>17</u>	8	47.06%	4	23.53%	<u>5</u>	29.41%
Statewide	55%	<u>170</u>	<u>59</u>	34.71%	<u>49</u>	28.82%	<u>62</u>	36.47%

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	63%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>14</u>	63.64%		
East Area 4 TFI	67%	22	4	18.18%	<u>2</u>	9.09%	<u>16</u>	72.73%		
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	80%		
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	<u>16</u>	88.89%		
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	54%	<u>27</u>	Z	25.93%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>14</u>	51.85%		
West Area 1 SFM	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%		
West Area 2 SFM	71%	<u>39</u>	<u>10</u>	25.64%	4	10.26%	<u>25</u>	64.1%		
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	1	5.88%	<u>13</u>	76.47%		
Statewide	66%	<u>170</u>	<u>33</u>	19.41%	<u>17</u>	10%	<u>120</u>	70.59%		

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?

Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
50%	<u>22</u>	Z	31.82%	7	31.82%	<u>8</u>	36.36%
69%	22	9	40.91%	4	18.18%	<u>9</u>	40.91%
78%	<u>15</u>	Z	46.67%	2	13.33%	<u>6</u>	40%
70%	<u>18</u>	7	38.89%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>8</u>	44.44%
65%	<u>27</u>	<u>11</u>	40.74%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>10</u>	37.04%
75%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	1	10%	<u>6</u>	60%
59%	<u>39</u>	<u>16</u>	41.03%	<u>11</u>	28.21%	<u>12</u>	30.77%
50%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	4	23.53%	<u>9</u>	52.94%
63%	<u>170</u>	<u>64</u>	37.65%	<u>38</u>	22.35%	<u>68</u>	40%
	50% 69% 78% 70% 65% 75% 59%	50% 22 69% 22 78% 15 70% 18 65% 27 75% 10 59% 39 50% 17	50% 22 7 69% 22 9 78% 15 7 70% 18 7 65% 27 11 75% 10 3 59% 39 16 50% 17 4	50% 22 7 31.82% 69% 22 9 40.91% 78% 15 7 46.67% 70% 18 7 38.89% 65% 27 11 40.74% 75% 10 3 30% 59% 39 16 41.03% 50% 17 4 23.53%	50% 22 7 31.82% 7 69% 22 9 40.91% 4 78% 15 7 46.67% 2 70% 18 7 38.89% 3 65% 27 11 40.74% 6 75% 10 3 30% 1 59% 39 16 41.03% 11 50% 17 4 23.53% 4	50% 22 Z 31.82% Z 31.82% 69% 22 9 40.91% 4 18.18% 78% 15 Z 46.67% 2 13.33% 70% 18 Z 38.89% 3 16.67% 65% 27 11 40.74% 6 22.22% 75% 10 3 30% 1 10% 59% 39 16 41.03% 11 28.21% 50% 17 4 23.53% 4 23.53%	50% 22 Z 31.82% Z 31.82% B 69% 22 9 40.91% 4 18.18% 9 78% 15 Z 46.67% 2 13.33% 6 70% 18 Z 38.89% 3 16.67% 8 65% 27 11 40.74% 6 22.22% 10 75% 10 3 30% 1 10% 6 59% 39 16 41.03% 11 28.21% 12 50% 17 4 23.53% 4 23.53% 9

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	22%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	Z	31.82%	<u>13</u>	59.09%
East Area 4 TFI	56%	22	<u>5</u>	22.73%	4	18.18%	<u>13</u>	59.09%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	4	26.67%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>27</u>	0	0%	<u>10</u>	37.04%	<u>17</u>	62.96%
West Area 1 SFM	67%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	1	10%	7	70%
West Area 2 SFM	60%	<u>39</u>	<u>12</u>	30.77%	8	20.51%	<u>19</u>	48.72%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	57%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>10</u>	58.82%
Statewide	41%	<u>170</u>	<u>26</u>	15.29%	<u>38</u>	22.35%	<u>106</u>	62.35%

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?

							7% <u>9</u>				
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A			
East Area 3 KVC	54%	<u>22</u>	Z	31.82%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>9</u>	40.91%			
East Area 4 TFI	82%	22	9	40.91%	2	9.09%	<u>11</u>	50%			
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	4	26.67%	7	46.67%			
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	4	22.22%	4	22.22%	<u>10</u>	55.56%			
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	59%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	7	25.93%	<u>10</u>	37.04%			
West Area 1 SFM	25%	<u>10</u>	1	10%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>6</u>	60%			
West Area 2 SFM	85%	<u>39</u>	<u>22</u>	56.41%	4	10.26%	<u>13</u>	33.33%			
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	35.29%	2	11.76%	9	52.94%			
Statewide	66%	<u>170</u>	<u>63</u>	37.06%	<u>32</u>	18.82%	<u>75</u>	44.12%			

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	38%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
East Area 4 TFI	86%	22	<u>6</u>	27.27%	1	4.55%	<u>15</u>	68.18%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	<u>2</u>	13.33%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	1	5.56%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	<u>5</u>	18.52%	<u>17</u>	62.96%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	2	20%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	78%	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>	35.9%	4	10.26%	<u>21</u>	53.85%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>2</u>	11.76%	<u>12</u>	70.59%
Statewide	58%	<u>170</u>	<u>31</u>	18.24%	<u>22</u>	12.94%	<u>117</u>	68.82%

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	14%	22	1	4.55%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>15</u>	68.18%
East Area 4 TFI	33%	22	1	4.55%	2	9.09%	<u>19</u>	86.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	2	13.33%	<u>10</u>	66.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	2	11.11%	<u>15</u>	83.33%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	75%	<u>27</u>	9	33.33%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%
West Area 2 SFM	36%	<u>39</u>	<u>5</u>	12.82%	9	23.08%	<u>25</u>	64.1%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	40%	<u>17</u>	2	11.76%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>12</u>	70.59%
Statewide	45%	<u>170</u>	22	12.94%	<u>27</u>	15.88%	<u>121</u>	71.18%

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	14%	22	1	4.55%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>15</u>	68.18%
East Area 4 TFI	33%	<u>22</u>	1	4.55%	2	9.09%	<u>19</u>	86.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>2</u>	13.33%	<u>10</u>	66.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>15</u>	83.33%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	36%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	7	25.93%	<u>16</u>	59.26%
West Area 1 SFM	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>39</u>	<u>11</u>	28.21%	1	2.56%	<u>27</u>	69.23%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	2	11.76%	2	11.76%	<u>13</u>	76.47%
Statewide	49%	<u>170</u>	<u>22</u>	12.94%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<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)?

<u> </u>							1% 0 0%	
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	59%	<u>22</u>	<u>13</u>	59.09%	<u>9</u>	40.91%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	68%	<u>22</u>	<u>15</u>	68.18%	7	31.82%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	93%	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	93.33%	1	6.67%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	88%	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	83.33%	<u>2</u>	11.11%	<u>1</u>	5.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	85%	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	85.19%	<u>4</u>	14.81%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	80%	<u>10</u>	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	82%	<u>39</u>	<u>32</u>	82.05%	7	17.95%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	69%	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	64.71%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	1	5.88%
Statewide	78%	<u>170</u>	<u>131</u>	77.06%	<u>37</u>	21.76%	2	1.18%

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	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>20</u>	90.91%	0	0%	2	9.09%
East Area 4 TFI	95%	<u>22</u>	21	95.45%	1	4.55%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	87%	<u>15</u>	<u>13</u>	86.67%	<u>2</u>	13.33%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	94%	<u>18</u>	<u>17</u>	94.44%	1	5.56%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	85%	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	85.19%	4	14.81%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	97%	<u>39</u>	38	97.44%	1	2.56%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	69%	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	64.71%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>1</u>	5.88%
Statewide	92%	<u>170</u>	<u>153</u>	90%	<u>14</u>	8.24%	<u>3</u>	1.76%

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	100%	22	2	9.09%	0	0%	<u>20</u>	90.91%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	22	2	9.09%	0	0%	20	90.91%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	N/A	<u>15</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	100%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>27</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>24</u>	88.89%
West Area 1 SFM	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%
West Area 2 SFM	0%	<u>39</u>	0	0%	1	2.56%	<u>38</u>	97.44%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	2	11.76%	2	11.76%	<u>13</u>	76.47%
Statewide	54%	170	Z	4.12%	<u>6</u>	3.53%	<u>157</u>	92.35%

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	100%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	0	0%	<u>20</u>	90.91%
East Area 4 TFI	0%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	1	4.55%	<u>21</u>	95.45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	N/A	<u>15</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	100%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	94.44%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	0%	<u>27</u>	0	0%	2	7.41%	<u>25</u>	92.59%
West Area 1 SFM	N/A	<u>10</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	100%
West Area 2 SFM	N/A	<u>39</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>39</u>	100%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	1	5.88%	<u>13</u>	76.47%
Statewide	60%	<u>170</u>	<u>6</u>	3.53%	4	2.35%	<u>160</u>	94.12%

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?

				0/ 1/		0/ 11		0/ 11/6
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	89%	22	<u>8</u>	36.36%	1	4.55%	<u>13</u>	59.09%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	40%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	44.44%	0	0%	<u>10</u>	55.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>13</u>	48.15%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	51.85%
West Area 1 SFM	83%	10	<u>5</u>	50%	1	10%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	93%	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>	35.9%	1	2.56%	<u>24</u>	61.54%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	<u>10</u>	58.82%	0	0%	7	41.18%
Statewide	96%	<u>170</u>	<u>72</u>	42.35%	<u>3</u>	1.76%	<u>95</u>	55.88%

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	50%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
East Area 4 TFI	42%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	7	31.82%	<u>10</u>	45.45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	1	6.67%	<u>12</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	60%	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>	16.67%	2	11.11%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	92%	<u>27</u>	<u>11</u>	40.74%	1	3.7%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	2	20%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	74%	<u>39</u>	<u>17</u>	43.59%	<u>6</u>	15.38%	<u>16</u>	41.03%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	67%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	2	11.76%	<u>11</u>	64.71%
Statewide	64%	<u>170</u>	<u>47</u>	27.65%	<u>26</u>	15.29%	<u>97</u>	57.06%

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	56%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	4	18.18%	<u>13</u>	59.09%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	22	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	67%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	1	6.67%	<u>12</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	67%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	1	5.56%	<u>15</u>	83.33%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	83%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	2	7.41%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	1	10%	<u>9</u>	90%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>	35.9%	Z	17.95%	<u>18</u>	46.15%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	67%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	2	11.76%	<u>11</u>	64.71%
Statewide	65%	<u>170</u>	<u>42</u>	24.71%	<u>23</u>	13.53%	<u>105</u>	61.76%

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?

3									
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A	
East Area 3 KVC	21%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>11</u>	50%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	
East Area 4 TFI	23%	22	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	9	40.91%	
Kansas City Area 5 COC	56%	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	33.33%	4	26.67%	<u>6</u>	40%	
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	22%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	<u>Z</u>	38.89%	<u>9</u>	50%	
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	56%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	<u>8</u>	29.63%	9	33.33%	
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	2	20%	<u>6</u>	60%	
West Area 2 SFM	66%	<u>39</u>	<u>19</u>	48.72%	<u>10</u>	25.64%	<u>10</u>	25.64%	
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	4	23.53%	9	52.94%	
Statewide	46%	<u>170</u>	<u>48</u>	28.24%	<u>56</u>	32.94%	<u>66</u>	38.82%	

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	22%	22	2	9.09%	7	31.82%	<u>13</u>	59.09%
East Area 4 TFI	11%	22	1	4.55%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	<u>13</u>	59.09%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	4	26.67%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	2	11.11%	<u>15</u>	83.33%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	40%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>17</u>	62.96%
West Area 1 SFM	33%	<u>10</u>	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%
West Area 2 SFM	60%	<u>39</u>	<u>12</u>	30.77%	8	20.51%	<u>19</u>	48.72%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>11</u>	64.71%
Statewide	38%	<u>170</u>	<u>24</u>	14.12%	<u>40</u>	23.53%	<u>106</u>	62.35%

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	95%	<u>22</u>	<u>21</u>	95.45%	1	4.55%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	95%	22	<u>21</u>	95.45%	1	4.55%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	73%	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>	73.33%	<u>4</u>	26.67%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	83%	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	83.33%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	77%	<u>39</u>	<u>30</u>	76.92%	<u>9</u>	23.08%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	94%	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	94.12%	1	5.88%	0	0%
Statewide	89%	<u>170</u>	<u>151</u>	88.82%	<u>19</u>	11.18%	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	64%	<u>22</u>	Z	31.82%	4	18.18%	<u>11</u>	50%		
East Area 4 TFI	83%	<u>22</u>	<u>10</u>	45.45%	2	9.09%	<u>10</u>	45.45%		
Kansas City Area 5 COC	40%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>10</u>	66.67%		
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	71%	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	27.78%	2	11.11%	<u>11</u>	61.11%		
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	0	0%	<u>23</u>	85.19%		
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	9	90%	0	0%	1	10%		
West Area 2 SFM	76%	<u>39</u>	<u>28</u>	71.79%	9	23.08%	<u>2</u>	5.13%		
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	1	5.88%	<u>15</u>	88.24%		
Statewide	76%	<u>170</u>	<u>66</u>	38.82%	<u>21</u>	12.35%	<u>83</u>	48.82%		

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	47%	<u>22</u>	<u>8</u>	36.36%	9	40.91%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
East Area 4 TFI	86%	<u>22</u>	<u>12</u>	54.55%	2	9.09%	<u>8</u>	36.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	40%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>5</u>	33.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	64%	<u>18</u>	7	38.89%	4	22.22%	<u>7</u>	38.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	72%	<u>27</u>	<u>13</u>	48.15%	<u>5</u>	18.52%	<u>9</u>	33.33%
West Area 1 SFM	43%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	4	40%	<u>3</u>	30%
West Area 2 SFM	60%	<u>39</u>	<u>18</u>	46.15%	<u>12</u>	30.77%	<u>9</u>	23.08%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	70%	<u>17</u>	Z	41.18%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	7	41.18%
Statewide	62%	<u>170</u>	<u>72</u>	42.35%	<u>45</u>	26.47%	<u>53</u>	31.18%

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	33%	<u>22</u>	4	18.18%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	<u>10</u>	45.45%
East Area 4 TFI	73%	<u>22</u>	8	36.36%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>11</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	20%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	4	26.67%	<u>10</u>	66.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	40%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	36%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	9	33.33%	<u>13</u>	48.15%
West Area 1 SFM	57%	<u>10</u>	4	40%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>3</u>	30%
West Area 2 SFM	52%	<u>39</u>	<u>13</u>	33.33%	<u>12</u>	30.77%	<u>14</u>	35.9%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	4	23.53%	9	52.94%
Statewide	47%	<u>170</u>	<u>41</u>	24.12%	<u>46</u>	27.06%	<u>83</u>	48.82%

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	35%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>11</u>	50%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
East Area 4 TFI	77%	22	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	9	40.91%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	33%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>6</u>	40%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	25%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>14</u>	77.78%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	60%	<u>27</u>	9	33.33%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>12</u>	44.44%
West Area 1 SFM	43%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	4	40%	<u>3</u>	30%
West Area 2 SFM	57%	<u>39</u>	<u>17</u>	43.59%	<u>13</u>	33.33%	9	23.08%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	4	23.53%	9	52.94%
Statewide	51%	<u>170</u>	<u>53</u>	31.18%	<u>50</u>	29.41%	<u>67</u>	39.41%

41 (B4). During the period under	review, did the	agency provide appr	opriate servi	ices to the	father to ad	dress iden	tified needs?	
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	18%	22	2	9.09%	9	40.91%	11	50%
East Area 4 TFI	60%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	4	18.18%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	25%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>11</u>	73.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	1	5.56%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	23%	<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>10</u>	37.04%	<u>14</u>	51.85%
West Area 1 SFM	57%	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>3</u>	30%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 2 SFM	46%	<u>39</u>	<u>12</u>	30.77%	<u>14</u>	35.9%	<u>13</u>	33.33%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	33%	<u>17</u>	2	11.76%	4	23.53%	<u>11</u>	64.71%
Statewide	38%	<u>170</u>	<u>30</u>	17.65%	<u>48</u>	28.24%	<u>92</u>	54.12%

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	64%	<u>22</u>	<u>14</u>	63.64%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	81%	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	77.27%	4	18.18%	1	4.55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	43%	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>8</u>	53.33%	1	6.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	75%	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	66.67%	4	22.22%	<u>2</u>	11.11%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	88%	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	85.19%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>1</u>	3.7%
West Area 1 SFM	90%	<u>10</u>	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	49%	<u>39</u>	<u>18</u>	46.15%	<u>19</u>	48.72%	2	5.13%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	81%	17	<u>13</u>	76.47%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	1	5.88%
Statewide	69%	<u>170</u>	<u>112</u>	65.88%	<u>50</u>	29.41%	8	4.71%

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?

Performance							
remonitance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
40%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>9</u>	40.91%	<u>7</u>	31.82%
62%	<u>22</u>	8	36.36%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>9</u>	40.91%
0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	<u>10</u>	66.67%	<u>5</u>	33.33%
20%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	4	22.22%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
79%	<u>27</u>	11	40.74%	<u>3</u>	11.11%	<u>13</u>	48.15%
80%	<u>10</u>	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%
46%	<u>39</u>	<u>16</u>	41.03%	<u>19</u>	48.72%	<u>4</u>	10.26%
57%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>10</u>	58.82%
50%	<u>170</u>	<u>54</u>	31.76%	<u>55</u>	32.35%	<u>61</u>	35.88%
	62% 0% 20% 79% 80% 46% 57%	62% 22 0% 15 20% 18 79% 27 80% 10 46% 39 57% 17	62% 22 8 0% 15 0 20% 18 1 79% 27 11 80% 10 8 46% 39 16 57% 17 4	62% 22 8 36.36% 0% 15 0 0% 20% 18 1 5.56% 79% 27 11 40.74% 80% 10 8 80% 46% 39 16 41.03% 57% 17 4 23.53%	62% 22 8 36.36% 5 0% 15 0 0% 10 20% 18 1 5.56% 4 79% 27 11 40.74% 3 80% 10 8 80% 2 46% 39 16 41.03% 19 57% 17 4 23.53% 3	62% 22 8 36.36% 5 22.73% 0% 15 0 0% 10 66.67% 20% 18 1 5.56% 4 22.22% 79% 27 11 40.74% 3 11.11% 80% 10 8 80% 2 20% 46% 39 16 41.03% 19 48.72% 57% 17 4 23.53% 3 17.65%	62% 22 8 36.36% 5 22.73% 9 0% 15 0 0% 10 66.67% 5 20% 18 1 5.56% 4 22.22% 13 79% 27 11 40.74% 3 11.11% 13 80% 10 8 80% 2 20% 0 46% 39 16 41.03% 19 48.72% 4 57% 17 4 23.53% 3 17.65% 10

44 (A). During the period under i	eview, did the a	gency make concerte	ed efforts to	actively in	volve the ch	ild 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>22</u>	8	36.36%	Z	31.82%	7	31.82%
East Area 4 TFI	71%	22	<u>12</u>	54.55%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	36%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	7	46.67%	<u>4</u>	26.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	82%	<u>18</u>	9	50%	2	11.11%	7	38.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	37%	<u>27</u>	7	25.93%	<u>12</u>	44.44%	<u>8</u>	29.63%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	4	40%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	90%	<u>39</u>	<u>19</u>	48.72%	2	5.13%	<u>18</u>	46.15%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	38%	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>8</u>	47.06%	<u>4</u>	23.53%
Statewide	61%	<u>170</u>	<u>68</u>	40%	<u>43</u>	25.29%	<u>59</u>	34.71%

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	29%	22	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>12</u>	54.55%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
East Area 4 TFI	64%	<u>22</u>	9	40.91%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>8</u>	36.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	30%	<u>15</u>	3	20%	Z	46.67%	<u>5</u>	33.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	36%	<u>18</u>	<u>4</u>	22.22%	7	38.89%	<u>7</u>	38.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	56%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	<u>8</u>	29.63%	<u>9</u>	33.33%
West Area 1 SFM	83%	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	50%	1	10%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	70%	<u>39</u>	<u>21</u>	53.85%	9	23.08%	<u>9</u>	23.08%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	40%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	<u>6</u>	35.29%	Z	41.18%
Statewide	53%	<u>170</u>	<u>61</u>	35.88%	<u>55</u>	32.35%	<u>54</u>	31.76%

46 (C). During the period under r	eview, did the a	gency make concerte	ed efforts to	actively in	volve the fa	ther in the	case plannin	g process?
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	9%	22	1	4.55%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>11</u>	50%
East Area 4 TFI	55%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>11</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	14%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>8</u>	53.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	20%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	4	22.22%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	31%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	9	33.33%	<u>14</u>	51.85%
West Area 1 SFM	83%	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	50%	1	10%	4	40%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 2 SFM	58%	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>	35.9%	<u>10</u>	25.64%	<u>15</u>	38.46%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	33%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>6</u>	35.29%	<u>8</u>	47.06%
Statewide	41%	<u>170</u>	<u>35</u>	20.59%	<u>51</u>	30%	<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	68%	22	<u>15</u>	68.18%	7	31.82%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	73%	22	<u>16</u>	72.73%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	<u>6</u>	40%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	78%	<u>18</u>	<u>14</u>	77.78%	4	22.22%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	93%	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>	92.59%	2	7.41%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	90%	<u>10</u>	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	62%	<u>39</u>	<u>24</u>	61.54%	<u>15</u>	38.46%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	94%	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	94.12%	1	5.88%	0	0%
Statewide	75%	<u>170</u>	<u>128</u>	75.29%	<u>42</u>	24.71%	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	10%	<u>22</u>	<u>2</u>	9.09%	<u>19</u>	86.36%	1	4.55%
East Area 4 TFI	77%	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	77.27%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	40%	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	40%	9	60%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	56%	<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	55.56%	<u>8</u>	44.44%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	78%	<u>27</u>	<u>21</u>	77.78%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	4	40%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	28%	<u>39</u>	<u>11</u>	28.21%	<u>28</u>	71.79%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	88%	<u>17</u>	<u>15</u>	88.24%	2	11.76%	0	0%
Statewide	52%	<u>170</u>	88	51.76%	<u>81</u>	47.65%	1	0.59%

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	6%	<u>22</u>	1	4.55%	<u>16</u>	72.73%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
East Area 4 TFI	36%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	9	40.91%	<u>8</u>	36.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	40%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>5</u>	33.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	36%	<u>18</u>	4	22.22%	7	38.89%	7	38.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	61%	<u>27</u>	<u>11</u>	40.74%	7	25.93%	9	33.33%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>39</u>	<u>15</u>	38.46%	<u>15</u>	38.46%	9	23.08%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	44%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>8</u>	47.06%
Statewide	41%	<u>170</u>	<u>47</u>	27.65%	<u>68</u>	40%	<u>55</u>	32.35%

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	0%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>12</u>	54.55%
East Area 4 TFI	17%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>10</u>	45.45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	17%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	<u>5</u>	33.33%	<u>9</u>	60%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	20%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	4	22.22%	<u>13</u>	72.22%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	31%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	<u>9</u>	33.33%	<u>14</u>	51.85%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>3</u>	30%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	46%	<u>39</u>	<u>11</u>	28.21%	<u>13</u>	33.33%	<u>15</u>	38.46%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	38%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>9</u>	52.94%
Statewide	30%	<u>170</u>	<u>25</u>	14.71%	<u>59</u>	34.71%	<u>86</u>	50.59%

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	23%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	9	40.91%
East Area 4 TFI	73%	22	8	36.36%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>11</u>	50%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	57%	<u>15</u>	4	26.67%	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>8</u>	53.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	40%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>13</u>	72.22%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	63%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>11</u>	40.74%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	4	40%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	85%	<u>39</u>	<u>22</u>	56.41%	4	10.26%	<u>13</u>	33.33%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	44%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>8</u>	47.06%
Statewide	63%	<u>170</u>	<u>57</u>	33.53%	<u>34</u>	20%	<u>79</u>	46.47%

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	0%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	63%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	1	5.56%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	40%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>17</u>	62.96%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	10	4	40%	0	0%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	74%	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>	35.9%	<u>5</u>	12.82%	<u>20</u>	51.28%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	29%	<u>17</u>	2	11.76%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>10</u>	58.82%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>30</u>	17.65%	<u>26</u>	15.29%	<u>114</u>	67.06%

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	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>21</u>	95.45%	0	0%	1	4.55%
East Area 4 TFI	100%	<u>22</u>	20	90.91%	0	0%	2	9.09%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	57%	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	53.33%	<u>6</u>	40%	1	6.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	54%	<u>18</u>	7	38.89%	<u>6</u>	33.33%	<u>5</u>	27.78%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	96%	<u>27</u>	<u>22</u>	81.48%	1	3.7%	<u>4</u>	14.81%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	91%	<u>39</u>	<u>32</u>	82.05%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>4</u>	10.26%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	92%	<u>17</u>	<u>12</u>	70.59%	1	5.88%	<u>4</u>	23.53%
Statewide	89%	<u>170</u>	<u>132</u>	77.65%	<u>17</u>	10%	<u>21</u>	12.35%

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	86%	<u>22</u>	<u>12</u>	54.55%	2	9.09%	<u>8</u>	36.36%
East Area 4 TFI	92%	<u>22</u>	11	50%	1	4.55%	<u>10</u>	45.45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	33%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>6</u>	40%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	4	22.22%	<u>12</u>	66.67%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	42%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	7	25.93%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	0	0%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	76%	<u>39</u>	<u>19</u>	48.72%	<u>6</u>	15.38%	<u>14</u>	35.9%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>11</u>	64.71%
Statewide	68%	<u>170</u>	<u>61</u>	35.88%	<u>29</u>	17.06%	<u>80</u>	47.06%

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	55%	<u>22</u>	<u>12</u>	54.55%	<u>10</u>	45.45%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	68%	<u>22</u>	<u>15</u>	68.18%	Z	31.82%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	<u>6</u>	40%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	83%	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	83.33%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	70%	<u>27</u>	<u>19</u>	70.37%	<u>8</u>	29.63%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	60%	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	60%	4	40%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	56%	<u>39</u>	22	56.41%	<u>17</u>	43.59%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	65%	<u>17</u>	11	64.71%	<u>6</u>	35.29%	0	0%
Statewide	64%	<u>170</u>	<u>109</u>	64.12%	<u>61</u>	35.88%	0	0%

56 (A2). During the period under	review, did the	agency accurately as	sess the chil	d's dental	health care r	needs?		
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	62%	<u>22</u>	<u>13</u>	59.09%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	1	4.55%
East Area 4 TFI	67%	<u>22</u>	<u>14</u>	63.64%	7	31.82%	1	4.55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	40%	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	40%	9	60%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	76%	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	72.22%	4	22.22%	1	5.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	66.67%	9	33.33%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	90%	<u>10</u>	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 2 SFM	46%	<u>39</u>	<u>18</u>	46.15%	<u>21</u>	53.85%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	50%	<u>17</u>	Z	41.18%	7	41.18%	<u>3</u>	17.65%
Statewide	60%	<u>170</u>	<u>98</u>	57.65%	<u>66</u>	38.82%	<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	33%	22	2	9.09%	<u>4</u>	18.18%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
East Area 4 TFI	25%	22	1	4.55%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>18</u>	81.82%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	33%	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	4	26.67%	9	60%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	25%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	<u>6</u>	33.33%	<u>10</u>	55.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	71%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	2	7.41%	<u>20</u>	74.07%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	2	20%	<u>6</u>	60%
West Area 2 SFM	39%	<u>39</u>	Z	17.95%	<u>11</u>	28.21%	<u>21</u>	53.85%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	17	<u>3</u>	17.65%	1	5.88%	<u>13</u>	76.47%
Statewide	42%	<u>170</u>	<u>24</u>	14.12%	<u>33</u>	19.41%	<u>113</u>	66.47%

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?

Performance 39% 48% 33%	Total Case Reads 22 22	Total Yes Z 10	% Yes 31.82% 45.45%	11 11	% No	Total N/A	% N/A 18.18%
48%	22					<u>4</u>	18.18%
		<u>10</u>	45.45%	11			
33%				<u>11</u>	50%	1	4.55%
	<u>15</u>	2	13.33%	4	26.67%	<u>9</u>	60%
57%	<u>18</u>	4	22.22%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>11</u>	61.11%
40%	<u>27</u>	<u>6</u>	22.22%	9	33.33%	<u>12</u>	44.44%
56%	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	50%	<u>4</u>	40%	<u>1</u>	10%
41%	<u>39</u>	<u>15</u>	38.46%	<u>22</u>	56.41%	<u>2</u>	5.13%
38%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>9</u>	52.94%
43%	<u>170</u>	<u>52</u>	30.59%	<u>69</u>	40.59%	<u>49</u>	28.82%
	56% 41% 38%	56% 10 41% 39 38% 17	56% 10 5 41% 39 15 38% 17 3	56% 10 5 50% 41% 39 15 38.46% 38% 17 3 17.65%	56% 10 5 50% 4 41% 39 15 38.46% 22 38% 17 3 17.65% 5	56% 10 5 50% 4 40% 41% 39 15 38.46% 22 56.41% 38% 17 3 17.65% 5 29.41%	56% 10 5 50% 4 40% 1 41% 39 15 38.46% 22 56.41% 2 38% 17 3 17.65% 5 29.41% 9

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	44%	<u>22</u>	Z	31.82%	9	40.91%	<u>6</u>	27.27%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>22</u>	9	40.91%	9	40.91%	4	18.18%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	<u>8</u>	53.33%	<u>7</u>	46.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	33%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	4	22.22%	<u>12</u>	66.67%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	35%	<u>27</u>	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>11</u>	40.74%	<u>10</u>	37.04%
West Area 1 SFM	78%	<u>10</u>	Z	70%	2	20%	1	10%
West Area 2 SFM	34%	<u>39</u>	<u>13</u>	33.33%	<u>25</u>	64.1%	1	2.56%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	30%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>7</u>	41.18%	<u>7</u>	41.18%
Statewide	39%	<u>170</u>	<u>47</u>	27.65%	<u>75</u>	44.12%	<u>48</u>	28.24%

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	90%	<u>22</u>	<u>18</u>	81.82%	2	9.09%	2	9.09%
East Area 4 TFI	86%	22	<u>18</u>	81.82%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	1	4.55%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	43%	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	40%	8	53.33%	1	6.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	87%	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	72.22%	2	11.11%	<u>3</u>	16.67%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	93%	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>	92.59%	2	7.41%	0	0%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	92%	<u>39</u>	<u>34</u>	87.18%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	2	5.13%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	76%	<u>17</u>	<u>13</u>	76.47%	4	23.53%	0	0%
Statewide	85%	<u>170</u>	<u>137</u>	80.59%	<u>24</u>	14.12%	9	5.29%

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	75%	<u>22</u>	<u>6</u>	27.27%	2	9.09%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
East Area 4 TFI	38%	<u>22</u>	3	13.64%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	83%	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	27.78%	1	5.56%	<u>12</u>	66.67%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	50%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	4	14.81%	<u>19</u>	70.37%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>39</u>	9	23.08%	9	23.08%	<u>21</u>	53.85%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	29%	<u>17</u>	2	11.76%	<u>5</u>	29.41%	<u>10</u>	58.82%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>32</u>	18.82%	<u>27</u>	15.88%	<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	72%	<u>22</u>	<u>13</u>	59.09%	<u>5</u>	22.73%	<u>4</u>	18.18%
East Area 4 TFI	65%	22	<u>11</u>	50%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>5</u>	22.73%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	45%	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	33.33%	<u>6</u>	40%	<u>4</u>	26.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>	61.11%	0	0%	<u>7</u>	38.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	71%	<u>27</u>	<u>15</u>	55.56%	<u>6</u>	22.22%	<u>6</u>	22.22%
West Area 1 SFM	80%	<u>10</u>	4	40%	1	10%	<u>5</u>	50%
West Area 2 SFM	59%	<u>39</u>	<u>16</u>	41.03%	<u>11</u>	28.21%	<u>12</u>	30.77%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>17</u>	9	52.94%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>5</u>	29.41%
Statewide	69%	<u>170</u>	<u>84</u>	49.41%	<u>38</u>	22.35%	<u>48</u>	28.24%

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	18%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	9	40.91%	<u>11</u>	50%
East Area 4 TFI	43%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	4	18.18%	<u>15</u>	68.18%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	88%	<u>15</u>	7	46.67%	1	6.67%	<u>7</u>	46.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	88%	<u>18</u>	7	38.89%	1	5.56%	<u>10</u>	55.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	64%	<u>27</u>	9	33.33%	<u>5</u>	18.52%	<u>13</u>	48.15%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 1 SFM	33%	10	2	20%	4	40%	<u>4</u>	40%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>39</u>	<u>10</u>	25.64%	<u>5</u>	12.82%	<u>24</u>	61.54%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	30%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	7	41.18%	<u>7</u>	41.18%
Statewide	54%	<u>170</u>	<u>43</u>	25.29%	<u>36</u>	21.18%	<u>91</u>	53.53%

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>22</u>	0	0%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	<u>14</u>	63.64%
East Area 4 TFI	15%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>11</u>	50%	<u>9</u>	40.91%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	4	22.22%	4	22.22%	<u>10</u>	55.56%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u>	29.63%	4	14.81%	<u>15</u>	55.56%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	1	10%	0	0%	<u>9</u>	90%
West Area 2 SFM	71%	<u>39</u>	<u>10</u>	25.64%	4	10.26%	<u>25</u>	64.1%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	35.29%	2	11.76%	<u>9</u>	52.94%
Statewide	51%	<u>170</u>	<u>34</u>	20%	<u>33</u>	19.41%	<u>103</u>	60.59%

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	80%	<u>22</u>	4	18.18%	1	4.55%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	92%	<u>22</u>	<u>11</u>	50%	1	4.55%	<u>10</u>	45.45%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	2	11.11%	0	0%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	92%	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>	44.44%	1	3.7%	<u>14</u>	51.85%
West Area 1 SFM	0%	<u>10</u>	0	0%	1	10%	9	90%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>12</u>	30.77%	0	0%	<u>27</u>	69.23%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	9	52.94%	0	0%	8	47.06%
Statewide	93%	<u>170</u>	<u>53</u>	31.18%	4	2.35%	<u>113</u>	66.47%

66. Are the required releases of e	ducational recor	ds forms in the child	l's file?					
Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	70%	<u>22</u>	<u>14</u>	63.64%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	2	9.09%
East Area 4 TFI	56%	<u>22</u>	<u>10</u>	45.45%	<u>8</u>	36.36%	<u>4</u>	18.18%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	93.33%	0	0%	1	6.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	<u>16</u>	88.89%	0	0%	2	11.11%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	85.19%	0	0%	<u>4</u>	14.81%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	9	90%	0	0%	1	10%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>25</u>	64.1%	0	0%	<u>14</u>	35.9%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	87%	<u>17</u>	<u>13</u>	76.47%	2	11.76%	<u>2</u>	11.76%
Statewide	89%	<u>170</u>	<u>124</u>	72.94%	<u>16</u>	9.41%	<u>30</u>	17.65%

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	83%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	1	4.55%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
East Area 4 TFI	60%	22	<u>3</u>	13.64%	2	9.09%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	2	11.11%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	67%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	2	7.41%	<u>21</u>	77.78%
West Area 1 SFM	50%	<u>10</u>	1	10%	1	10%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	50%	<u>39</u>	<u>5</u>	12.82%	<u>5</u>	12.82%	<u>29</u>	74.36%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	75%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	1	5.88%	<u>13</u>	76.47%
Statewide	59%	<u>170</u>	<u>22</u>	12.94%	<u>15</u>	8.82%	<u>133</u>	78.24%

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	73%	<u>22</u>	<u>16</u>	72.73%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	0	0%	
East Area 4 TFI	68%	<u>22</u>	<u>15</u>	68.18%	7	31.82%	0	0%	
Kansas City Area 5 COC	60%	<u>15</u>	9	60%	<u>6</u>	40%	0	0%	
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	78%	<u>18</u>	<u>14</u>	77.78%	4	22.22%	0	0%	
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	74%	<u>27</u>	20	74.07%	7	25.93%	0	0%	
West Area 1 SFM	90%	<u>10</u>	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 2 SFM	95%	<u>39</u>	<u>37</u>	94.87%	2	5.13%	0	0%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	88%	<u>17</u>	<u>15</u>	88.24%	<u>2</u>	11.76%	0	0%
Statewide	79%	<u>170</u>	<u>135</u>	79.41%	<u>35</u>	20.59%	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	91%	22	<u>20</u>	90.91%	2	9.09%	0	0%
East Area 4 TFI	86%	<u>22</u>	<u>19</u>	86.36%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	93%	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	93.33%	1	6.67%	0	0%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	94%	<u>18</u>	<u>17</u>	94.44%	1	5.56%	0	0%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	96%	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>	92.59%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	100%	0	0%	0	0%
West Area 2 SFM	97%	<u>39</u>	<u>37</u>	94.87%	1	2.56%	1	2.56%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	44%	<u>17</u>	Z	41.18%	9	52.94%	1	5.88%
Statewide	89%	<u>170</u>	<u>149</u>	87.65%	<u>18</u>	10.59%	<u>3</u>	1.76%

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	40%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	0%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	2	9.09%	<u>20</u>	90.91%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	50%	<u>15</u>	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	<u>13</u>	86.67%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	2	11.11%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	91%	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	37.04%	1	3.7%	<u>16</u>	59.26%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	<u>18</u>	46.15%	0	0%	<u>21</u>	53.85%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	20%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	4	23.53%	<u>12</u>	70.59%
Statewide	72%	<u>170</u>	<u>34</u>	20%	<u>13</u>	7.65%	<u>123</u>	72.35%

71. If the child entered foster care during the PUR- Did the agency provide an allowable Initial Mental Health and Trauma Screen at any point after the child entered into care?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	50%	<u>22</u>	3	13.64%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	1	6.67%	<u>14</u>	93.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	81.48%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	89%	<u>39</u>	8	20.51%	1	2.56%	<u>30</u>	76.92%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	33%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	2	11.76%	<u>14</u>	82.35%
Statewide	76%	<u>170</u>	<u>25</u>	14.71%	8	4.71%	<u>137</u>	80.59%

72. If the child entered foster care during the PUR- Did the agency provide an Initial Mental Health and Trauma Screen within thirty (30) days upon the child's entry into care?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	60%	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	13.64%	2	9.09%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	40%	<u>22</u>	2	9.09%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	0%	<u>15</u>	0	0%	1	6.67%	<u>14</u>	93.33%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	50%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	<u>16</u>	88.89%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	80%	<u>27</u>	4	14.81%	1	3.7%	<u>22</u>	81.48%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>39</u>	<u>6</u>	15.38%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>30</u>	76.92%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	33%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	2	11.76%	<u>14</u>	82.35%
Statewide	59%	<u>170</u>	<u>19</u>	11.18%	<u>13</u>	7.65%	<u>138</u>	81.18%

73. If the child entered into foster care and received an initial mental health and trauma screen during the PUR- Was the screen performed by a person who has been trained to reliably administer the specific screen provided?

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
East Area 3 KVC	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	0%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>19</u>	86.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	N/A	<u>15</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	100%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	81.48%

Region	Performance	Total Case Reads	Total Yes	% Yes	Total No	% No	Total N/A	% N/A
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	75%	<u>39</u>	<u>6</u>	15.38%	2	5.13%	<u>31</u>	79.49%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	0%	<u>17</u>	0	0%	1	5.88%	<u>16</u>	94.12%
Statewide	76%	<u>170</u>	<u>19</u>	11.18%	<u>6</u>	3.53%	<u>145</u>	85.29%

74. If the child entered into foster care and received an initial mental health and trauma screen during the PUR- Was the assessment performed by a person 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	100%	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	22.73%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
East Area 4 TFI	0%	<u>22</u>	0	0%	<u>3</u>	13.64%	<u>19</u>	86.36%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	N/A	<u>15</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>15</u>	100%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	100%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	0	0%	<u>17</u>	94.44%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	81.48%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	2	20%	0	0%	<u>8</u>	80%
West Area 2 SFM	100%	<u>39</u>	8	20.51%	0	0%	<u>31</u>	79.49%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	100%	<u>17</u>	1	5.88%	0	0%	<u>16</u>	94.12%
Statewide	88%	<u>170</u>	<u>22</u>	12.94%	<u>3</u>	1.76%	<u>145</u>	85.29%

75. 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>22</u>	0	0%	<u>6</u>	27.27%	<u>16</u>	72.73%
East Area 4 TFI	20%	<u>22</u>	1	4.55%	4	18.18%	<u>17</u>	77.27%
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	80%
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	25%	<u>18</u>	1	5.56%	<u>3</u>	16.67%	<u>14</u>	77.78%
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	81.48%
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	30%	0	0%	7	70%
West Area 2 SFM	70%	<u>39</u>	7	17.95%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>29</u>	74.36%
Wichita Area 8 TFI	57%	<u>17</u>	4	23.53%	<u>3</u>	17.65%	<u>10</u>	58.82%
Statewide	56%	<u>170</u>	<u>24</u>	14.12%	<u>19</u>	11.18%	<u>127</u>	74.71%

76. 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	N/A	<u>22</u>	0	0%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	100%	
East Area 4 TFI	100%	22	1	4.55%	0	0%	<u>21</u>	95.45%	
Kansas City Area 5 COC	100%	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	20%	0	0%	<u>12</u>	80%	
Kansas City Area 6 KVC	0%	<u>18</u>	0	0%	2	11.11%	<u>16</u>	88.89%	
Sedgwick County Area 7 SFM	100%	<u>27</u>	<u>5</u>	18.52%	0	0%	<u>22</u>	81.48%	
West Area 1 SFM	100%	<u>10</u>	3	30%	0	0%	7	70%	
West Area 2 SFM	67%	<u>39</u>	<u>6</u>	15.38%	<u>3</u>	7.69%	<u>30</u>	76.92%	
Wichita Area 8 TFI	60%	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	17.65%	2	11.76%	<u>12</u>	70.59%	
Statewide	75%	<u>170</u>	<u>21</u>	12.35%	7	4.12%	<u>142</u>	83.53%	