



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Kansas

## Final Report

## November 2015



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

# Final Report: Kansas Child and Family Services Review Report Issued: November 2015

## INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the State of Kansas. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Kansas are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 20, 2015. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP)
- The state's performance on national standards for 7 statewide data indicators
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home cases) conducted via a "State Conducted Case Review" process in the East, West, Kansas City, and Wichita regions in Kansas between April 1, 2015, and May 22, 2015.
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included representatives from:
  - Attorneys, district attorneys, and prosecutors
  - Child care institution staff
  - Child welfare agency senior managers and director
  - Child welfare agency program managers
  - Child welfare caseworkers and supervisors
  - Citizen Review Board members and Court Appointed Special Advocates
  - Education and special education providers
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Interstate Compact and adoption exchange staff

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Judges
- Licensing staff
- Medical and mental health service providers
- Parents served by the agency
- Quality assurance and data management staff
- Representatives from the court system and court improvement project
- Representatives from the child placing agencies
- Service providers
- Training partners
- Tribal representatives
- Youth served by the agency

### Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates one or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome. Two outcomes—Safety Outcome 1 and Permanency Outcome 1—also are evaluated based on state performance with regard to statewide data indicators. For a state to be in substantial conformity with these outcomes, both the national standards for each relevant statewide data indicator must be met or considered no different than the national standard, and 95% of the applicable cases must be rated as having been substantially achieved.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the CFSP for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Kansas's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Kansas's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### **Kansas 2015 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes, Systemic Factors, and Performance on Statewide Data Indicators**

The following 1 of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity:

- Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

The following 4 of 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Quality Assurance System
- Staff and Provider Training
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The state met the national standards for the following 4 of 7 statewide data indicators:

- Recurrence of maltreatment pertaining to Safety Outcome 1
- Maltreatment in foster care pertaining to Safety Outcome 1
- Permanency in 12 months for children in care 12-23 months pertaining to Permanency Outcome 1
- Re-entry to foster care in 12 months pertaining to Permanency Outcome 1

#### **Children's Bureau Comments on Kansas's Performance**

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Kansas's overall performance:

The results of the case review identified practices that appear to have helped the agency achieve outcomes. These included the placement of children with their siblings and the use of relatives as placement resources for children in foster care. These two practices may support the agency's effort to reduce trauma and preserve connections for children. Meeting the educational needs of children was an area of higher performance for the state. During case reviews, examples were found of case managers and foster parents working diligently to ensure that children received necessary educational services.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

The results of the case review identified key practice issues that appeared to create barriers to achieving Safety outcomes. Assessing the safety of children at the time of initial case opening, throughout the life of the case, and at case closure was not adequate. Cases reviewed identified missed opportunities to gather quality information directly from children to fully assess safety in the home and inform service provision. Safety, particularly in in-home cases, was not discussed during home visits with children. This reduced the opportunity to fully assess the safety of children and the effectiveness of service provision. The Children's Bureau noted that Kansas's policy for CINC-NAN (Children in Need of Care—Non Abuse and Neglect) cases does not require face-to-face interviews with children. The Children's Bureau encourages Kansas to consider how existing policies in CINC-NAN cases regarding face-to-face interviews with children affect the state's ability to conduct comprehensive assessments. The results of the case review also found that safety assessments did not occur at critical times in cases, such as before case closure or when significant events occurred like the addition of a new household member. Collectively, the lack of adequate assessments of safety at case opening, during the life of the case, and at case closure created barriers to ensuring child safety, reducing re-entry into foster care, and reducing repeat maltreatment, and negatively affected the state's ability to perform successful case planning and service provision.

The Children's Bureau agrees with Kansas's statement in its statewide assessment that the CFSR provided the state with an opportunity to gather additional information to better understand the strengths of Kansas's engagement and case planning practices. Stakeholders reported varying experiences during case planning conferences. According to stakeholders, some case plans were created in advance of case planning conferences and given to the families without prior discussion. Therefore, it was unclear whether there was true engagement of families in the case planning process, or whether parents and children simply attended case planning conferences. Case review results indicated that some children and parents—more often fathers—were not engaged or involved in case planning. Engaging parents in case planning along with adequate assessments provide the basis for determining service needs. When needed services were not available or current services could not be individualized, case planning appeared to be less effective and to lessen parental involvement.

The Kansas DCF leadership is committed to supporting a robust quality assurance process and to the federal State Conducted Case Review process. Kansas has a well-developed Continuous Performance Improvement (CPI) process and years of experience with case record reviews. However, the Children's Bureau raised concerns with the state during the CFSR case review period regarding implementation of its quality assurance. For CFSR purposes, this issue was discussed with agency leadership and addressed through additional technical support from the Administration for Children and Families. Kansas will need to pay continued attention to strengthening the quality assurance component as the state continues case reviews with integrated interviews, monitors outcomes for continuous quality improvement, and involves key stakeholders in program improvement planning and efforts.

In the statewide assessment, Kansas noted that the state did not have a clear and consistent understanding of how the agency and courts file termination of parental rights proceedings in accordance with Adoption and Safe Families Act provisions. This was confirmed during stakeholder interviews. Additionally, documentation in case files was lacking when exceptions to filing for termination of parental rights existed. There are also no data to clearly demonstrate whether the notices of hearings are sent to all parties in a timely manner. All of these issues affect the permanency planning process and timely permanency for children and families.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

Kansas is not meeting the national standard for the Service Array systemic factor. Not all services were accessible or available statewide. The lack of available foster homes in communities in close proximity to the child's home of origin influenced ratings on Item 5 as well as Kansas's performance on Placement Stability. Stakeholders reported situations where foster homes were available but only to specific contractors. Targeted statewide recruitment of appropriate foster homes for children with special needs may need further exploration with contractors.

Kansas's stakeholders were concerned with the process of identifying and assessing children who have significant behavioral and mental health needs for admission into psychiatric hospitals, known as Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities. The Children's Bureau discussed this issue with foster parents, case managers, the managed care organizations that manage the facilities, supervisors, child placing agency staff, and Tribal staff. The prevailing concern expressed by stakeholders was that children are subject to several assessments before they are admitted for care. We encourage the state to evaluate whether it has the necessary resources to address the needs of such children and clarify the admissions process in a way that considers the impact on children of multiple assessments and the need for timely services.

In Kansas, children can enter foster care when a report originates through the non-abuse and neglect track known as CINC-NAN. According to publicly available information in Kansas, about 50% of children in foster care in recent prior years have entered foster care through the CINC-NAN track. As stated earlier, in CINC-NAN cases, face-to-face contacts with children are not required. There is also a 20-day maximum response time per Kansas policy for CINC-NAN cases. The Onsite Review Instrument and Instructions (OSRI) assesses the timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment in Item 1. Given Kansas's policies, Item 1 did not apply fully to CINC-NAN cases. The absence of a face-to-face contact policy requirement combined with the longer response time frame and the number of children being placed into foster care through the CINC-NAN path raises questions about the policy and classification of these calls. The Children's Bureau believes this is an area that Kansas should further explore.

Significant practice differences were found between foster care and in-home cases in the areas of safety and risk assessments, and caseworker visits with children and parents. Typically practice was rated higher in these areas in foster care cases than in in-home cases. Across both case types, the needs of and services to parents often were not adequately addressed. This occurred more often with fathers than mothers.

We encourage Kansas to do further analysis and consideration about the impact that multiple contracts, caseloads, and experience levels of workers have on the quality of services provided to children and the ability of families to engage with the agency in a way that supports achieving timely permanency. Stakeholders expressed concerns that the multiple contracts resulted in families being assigned many different workers and the workers having limited information about cases.

The Children's Bureau believes that certain mechanisms operating in Kansas can both inform and support performance improvement efforts. Kansas has three Citizen Review Panels, with a facilitator, consisting of contract staff, state staff, judges, Tribes, and representatives from other disciplines related to child welfare. The panels work to gather information, identify practice issues in the child welfare system, and report back to the state on strategies that are included in the CFSP and the Annual Progress and Services Report. In addition, there is a Kansas Supreme Court Task Force on Permanency Planning through the Court Improvement Project. The state agency is a member of the Task Force. The Task Force addresses issues such as meeting permanency court dates,

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

training for legal and state staff, and Indian Child Welfare Act training, and has a study in progress regarding youth participation in court hearings.

### II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings and statewide data indicators (when relevant). The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care and in-home services cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to Kansas. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

#### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1 and on two statewide data indicators related to safety.

##### **State Outcome Performance**

Kansas is in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 98% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed. The state met both of the national standards for the applicable statewide data indicators.

##### ***Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance***

##### **Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that reports assigned for abuse/neglect concerns shall be assigned with either a same-day or 72-hour response time. Within the assigned response time, the DCF social worker shall determine safety of the child(ren) who is the subject of the assigned report. Kansas also accepts reports as CINC-NAN. CINC-NAN reports require a 20-day response time. A face-to-face contact with the child is not required for a CINC-NAN.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 1 because 98% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.



## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### Safety Statewide Data Indicator Performance

#### Recurrence of Maltreatment

The indicator is described as: Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated report of maltreatment during a 12-month reporting period, what percent were victims of another substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation within 12 months of their initial report?

- Kansas met this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 5.2%, which met the national standard of 9.1%.

#### Maltreatment in Foster Care

The indicator is described as: Of all children in foster care during a 12-month period, what is the rate of victimization per day of foster care?

- Kansas met this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 7.59 victimizations per 100,000 days in care, which is considered no different than the national standard of 8.50 victimizations per 100,000 days in care.

### Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

#### State Outcome Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 77% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 83% of the 40 foster care cases, and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.

#### Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance

##### Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry into Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 88% of the 26 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 90% of the 10 applicable foster care cases, and 88% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases.

### Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 78% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 40 foster care cases, and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6, and on 5 statewide data indicators related to permanency.

#### State Outcome Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 43% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed. The state met or was no different than the national standards for 2 of the 5 national standards for the applicable statewide data indicators.

#### Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance

##### Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 70% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 65% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 63% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Permanency Statewide Data Indicator Performance

#### Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care

This indicator is described as: Of all children who enter foster care in a 12-month period, what percent discharged to permanency within 12 months of entering foster care? Permanency, for the purposes of this indicator and the other permanency-in-12-months indicators, includes discharges from foster care to reunification with parents or primary caregivers, living with other relatives, adoption, and guardianship.

- Kansas did not meet this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 38.2%, which did not meet the national standard of 40.5%

#### Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12 to 23 months

This indicator is described as: Of all children in foster care on the first day of a 12-month period who had been in foster care (in that episode) between 12 and 23 months, what percent discharged from foster care to permanency within 12 months of the first day of the period?

- Kansas met this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 42.0%, which is considered no different than the national standard of 43.6%.

#### Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or longer

This indicator is described as: Of all children in foster care on the first day of a 12-month period who had been in foster care (in that episode) for 24 months or more, what percent discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day of the 12-month period?

- Kansas did not meet this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 26.3%, which did not meet the national standard of 30.3%.

#### Re-entry into foster care in 12 months

This indicator is described as: Of all children who enter foster care in a 12-month period who discharged within 12 months to reunification, living with a relative(s), or guardianship, what percent re-enter foster care within 12 months of their discharge?

- Kansas met this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 5.4%, which met the national standard of 8.3%.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### Placement stability

This indicator is described as: Of all children who enter foster care in a 12-month period, what is the rate of placement moves per day of foster care?

- Kansas did not meet this national standard. The state's risk-standardized performance on this indicator was 5.28 moves per 1,000 days in care, which did not meet the national standard of 4.12 moves per 1,000 days in care.

### Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

#### State Outcome Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 90% of the 40 applicable foster care cases reviewed.

#### Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance

##### Item 7. Placement With Siblings

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 7 because 100% of the 14 applicable foster care cases were rated as Strength.

##### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>1</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 85% of the 26 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In 75% of the 8 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 90% of the 21 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 92% of the 12 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

### Item 9. Preserving Connections

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 83% of the 40 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength. .

### Item 10. Relative Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 86% of the 37 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>2</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 79% of the 24 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>2</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In 81% of the 21 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother
- In 92% of the 12 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

### Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

#### State Outcome Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 55% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 40 foster care cases, and 44% of the 25 in-home services cases.

#### Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

##### Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>3</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 58% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 40 foster care cases, and 52% of the 25 in-home services cases.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

### Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 85% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 90% of the 40 foster care cases, and 76% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 61% of the 56 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 31 applicable foster care cases; and 56% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 75% of the 52 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 53% of the 38 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 86% of the 35 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>4</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 65% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 68% of the 38 applicable foster care cases, and 60% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 81% of the 42 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 79% of the 53 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 66% of the 35 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 78% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 40 foster care cases, and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>5</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 55% of the 56 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 48% of the 31 applicable foster care cases, and 64% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 69% of the 51 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 53% of the 34 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “Mother” and “Father” is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.



## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### **Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 91% of the 47 applicable cases reviewed.

#### **Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance**

##### **Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 91% of the 47 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 94% of the 35 applicable foster care cases, and 83% of the 12 applicable in-home services cases.

### **Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 63 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 40 applicable foster care cases, and 74% of the 23 applicable in-home services cases.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance

#### Item 17. Physical Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 81% of the 48 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 80% of the 40 foster care cases, and 88% of the 8 applicable in-home services cases.

#### Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 78% of the 54 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 79% of the 34 applicable foster care cases, and 75% of the 20 applicable in-home services cases.

## III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

### Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### Statewide Information System Item Performance

#### Item 19. Statewide Information System

The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided the results of recently completed comparative analysis of the information contained within the state's statewide information system—FACTS—with the information contained in case files using a statewide sample of cases. Kansas has completed this type of comparative analysis on an ongoing basis since state fiscal year 2010. These analyses have consistently provided a high validation rate for the required information to demonstrate that Kansas's statewide information system is functioning to ensure that the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been in foster care.

### Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Case Review System Item Performance

#### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided information from case reviews showing that during state fiscal year 2014, the majority of families had a case plan developed within 20 days of referral to case management services. This information also indicated that the agency made concerted efforts to actively involve the parents in the case planning process for foster care

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

cases; however, it did not evaluate whether the case plan was developed jointly with the parents. During interviews, stakeholders said that written case plans, procedures, and the process for engaging parents in case planning were not consistent across the state and resulted in unclear communication about case plans and placement decisions.

### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Kansas did not provide sufficient data in the statewide assessment to demonstrate the functioning of this systemic factor item. In interviews, stakeholders consistently reported that periodic reviews were routinely occurring across the state. The courts are holding periodic reviews at least every 6 months, some as often as every 30 or 90 days. Stakeholders reported that there are systems in place such as the Juvenile Compliance System, FACTS system, Full Court System, and contractors' individual tracking systems that provide tickler or advance information for planning purposes, and most capture the date of periodic reviews. There is however, no statewide data system to track and report on periodic reviews.

### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided data on a recent cohort of children demonstrating that the majority of children have permanency hearings in the first year and subsequently within the next 12 months. Stakeholders agreed that permanency hearings occur timely, with most occurring every 6 months. Stakeholders also indicated that some regions use judge journal entries to track whether permanency hearings happen within 365 days and notify judges when such information is missing.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Kansas did not provide data or information on the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings or cases where a compelling reason should have been documented. During interviews, stakeholders indicated that a consistent process to ensure the timely filing of termination of parental rights was not in placement across all jurisdictions, and that tracking of timely filing of TPRs varies.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas described the two methods for providing notice of hearings and reviews to caregivers. Kansas was not able to provide data or information to show whether either method was occurring. Information collected through stakeholder interviews revealed that notification of court hearings is inconsistent across the state. There is no statewide data system for collecting information on the foster parent's court notifications. Stakeholders also reported that caregivers' ability to be heard is dependent on the judge overseeing the case.

## Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### Quality Assurance System Item Performance

#### Item 25. Quality Assurance System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it is operating an identifiable quality assurance system that is (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided data and information on CPI—the state’s quality assurance process that is applied consistently across the state. The data and information included case review results and performance data from the management information system. Case reviews using the federal Onsite Review Instrument are conducted quarterly in each regional office on a sample of cases that include the three components of in-home child welfare cases (family preservation, family services, and alternative response), out-of-home cases, and review of the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System. Beginning in state fiscal year 2013, Kansas augmented its case review in one region per quarter with case-related interviews and added second-level quality assurance for all cases in state fiscal year 2015 during the CFSR case review. Additionally, targeted case reviews are conducted as needed for policy compliance or continuous performance improvement projects. Case review and management information systems data are available to internal stakeholders through a secure website and used at the statewide, regional, county, judicial district, unit, and worker levels. Information is shared with external stakeholders through a public website, Quarterly CPI Review meetings, Citizen Review Panel meetings, and Data Dabbles.

### Staff and Provider Training

The Children’s Bureau assesses the state’s performance on this systemic factor using the state’s performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. All three of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

##### Item 26. Initial Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas described the pre-service and pre-caseload training requirements for social work specialists and special investigators. Additional information collected during interviews with stakeholders indicated that the Kansas DCF requires the completion of 40 hours of mandatory online training for providers. The information provided in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders showed that the state has an established process and system to track all trainings. Kansas provided data documenting the percentage of staff hired between state fiscal year 2010 and state fiscal year 2014 who completed each pre-service training requirement within 90 days of hire and the average number of days between hire date and training end date for each training. Information from stakeholder interviews with frontline workers, trainers, and administrators reported that initial training is occurring statewide and is effective in preparing the workers.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

### Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>6</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 27. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided information on staff degree, licensure, and ongoing training requirements. The state noted that the hours of continuing education required to maintain a license vary across disciplines. In the statewide assessment, Kansas also provided data regarding the number of staff who completed each of the special topic trainings provided by the state agency and the Child Welfare Case Management Providers (CWCMPs). During interviews, stakeholders explained the process of monitoring licensure, which outlined how compliance with ongoing training requirements is consistently monitored. With few exceptions, stakeholders reported that the ongoing training provided to staff was adequate for continued learning, focused on relevant topics, and assisted case managers and supervisors in continually improving their performance and understanding.

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas identified the Partnering for Safety and Permanency—Model Approach to Partnerships in Parenting (PS-MAPP) as the curriculum completed by prospective foster and adoptive parents. Relatives may be directed to complete the training if deemed necessary. Children cannot be placed in foster or adoptive homes until the training is complete, although exceptions are allowed for relatives and non-related kin. Information gathered during stakeholder interviews indicated that initial foster and adoptive parent training is occurring consistently on a statewide basis. Stakeholders

---

<sup>6</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

reported the Child Placing Agencies monitor ongoing training requirements for foster parents. The consensus of the stakeholders interviewed was that all foster parents complete initial training before licensure. Stakeholders said that initial and ongoing training is monitored for the state licensed and other approved facilities. All facility staff are trained before the opening of a new program.

### Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance

#### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas indicated that family services, family preservation, foster care, adoption, and independent living services were available in all 105 counties. Community mental health, substance abuse services, and intellectual developmental disability services were also available. However, information received from stakeholders during interviews indicated that this systemic factor item was not routinely functioning statewide. Stakeholders noted a lack of mental health services, specialized foster homes, substance abuse treatment, and contracted case managers. Stakeholders reported that although there are mental health centers across the state, these centers are short-staffed with waiting lists ranging from 2 weeks to 30 days. A main concern of some stakeholders was the lack of admissions to psychiatric residential treatment facilities for children with severe behavioral and mental health needs. Stakeholders also reported a notable difference in the array, availability, and accessibility of mental health services in the urban versus rural areas of the state.

#### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.



## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas did not provide quantitative or substantive qualitative information for this systemic factor item that demonstrated functioning. Stakeholders were inconsistent in their opinions regarding whether services were individualized to meet the needs of children and families. Several stakeholders described a “cookie cutter” approach to service identification and provision, while other stakeholders reported that case plans do identify the individual needs of children and families. However, these stakeholders indicated that although individual needs were identified, the services to address those needs were either not available statewide or obtaining them was difficult.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children’s Bureau assesses the state’s performance on this systemic factor using the state’s performance on Items 31 and 32.

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance

#### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength on Item 31. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas described consultation and coordination with a wide variety of stakeholders. Information collected from stakeholders during interviews confirmed that the state agency collaborates with a variety of entities and that their input is integrated into the agency’s CFSP and yearly APSR updates.

#### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state’s services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided descriptive information about stakeholder consultation and engagement in developing its CFSP and how these efforts have resulted in opportunities to coordinate services and benefits of other federally assisted programs serving the same population. Specifically, collaborative efforts have resulted in youth receiving educational enrichment and financial support through post-secondary scholarships, agency and Child Welfare Case Management Provider staff accessing training and networking opportunities, and Memoranda of Understanding with the Kansas Department of Education and military installations for the purpose of investigations and assessments. The Kansas DCF also coordinates with Family Advocacy Programs administered by the military.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Kansas is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance

#### Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas referenced the results of its 2011 and 2014 federal title IV-E foster care eligibility reviews, which contained no significant findings regarding meeting licensing standards. In interviews, stakeholders reported that standards are applied equally to all licensed or approved foster homes and child care institutions and monitored by trained staff using standardized survey tools designed for each type of facility. Citations are issued and a corrective action plan is developed for infractions. Child placement agencies review corrective action plans to identify patterns or trends and develop plans to address issues.

#### Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Kansas received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas provided information from the 2011 and 2014 federal IV-E reviews, which contained no significant findings with regard to criminal background clearances. The state noted that a full license is issued only after prospective foster parents clear the criminal background, fingerprint, and child abuse registry checks. In interviews, stakeholders consistently stated that criminal background checks were being completed on a statewide basis. Information collected through stakeholder interviews described the oversight of the residential facilities by the state licensing agency and the process for addressing safety in foster and adoptive home placements. No delays in the process were reported.

### Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas stated that contract providers recruit foster homes and subcontract with Child Placing Agencies for placement of children in foster homes. The Child Placing Agencies conduct analysis to develop local plans for general and targeted recruitment as well as child-specific recruitment plans. During interviews, stakeholders said that a statewide recruitment plan is being developed; however, no statewide plan currently exists.

### Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Kansas received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Kansas described the process for identifying adoptive resources for children using the Kansas Adoption Exchange and AdoptUSKids. Kansas said that the state does not have a way to track the timelines of completion of home studies, but noted that requests from other states for home studies are completed and results provided to the sending state within 60 calendar days of the request. During interviews, stakeholders generally reported that the use of cross-jurisdiction placements was not consistent statewide. They cited difficulties in working with other states and the effort required for workers with full caseloads as reasons.

**Appendix A**

**Summary of Kansas 2015 Child and Family Services Review Performance**

**I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes, Items, and Performance on Statewide Data Indicators**

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome. For Safety Outcome 1 and Permanency Outcome 1, the state must also meet or be considered no different than all of the associated national standards for the statewide data indicators.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

**Statewide Data Indicator Achievement:** The state’s performance is measured against the national standard for each statewide data indicator. State performance may meet the national standard, not meet the national standard, or be considered no different than the national standard. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state’s performance for the statewide data indicator.

**SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	In Substantial Conformity	98% substantially achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Strength	98% strength
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Recurrence of Maltreatment	Met the national standard of 9.1%	Risk-Standardized Performance: 5.2%
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Maltreatment in Foster Care	Is considered no different than the national standard of 8.5 victimizations*	Risk-Standardized Performance: 7.59 victimizations*

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix A

\* per 100,000 days in care

### SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	77% substantially achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	88% strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	78% strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	43% substantially achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	70% strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	65% strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	63% strength
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	Did not meet the national standard of 40.5%	Risk-Standardized Performance: 38.2%

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix A

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	Is considered no different than the national standard of 43.6%	Risk-Standardized Performance: 42%
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months and longer	Did not meet the national standard of 30.3%	Risk-Standardized Performance: 26.3%
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Re-entry into foster care in 12 months	Met the national standard of 8.3%	Risk-Standardized Performance: 5.4%
<b>Statewide Data Indicator</b> Placement stability	Did not meet the national standard of 4.12 moves*	Risk-Standardized Performance: 5.28 moves*

\* per 1,000 days in care

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	90% substantially achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Strength	100% strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	85% strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	82.5% strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	86% strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	79% strength

**Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix A**

**WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.**

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	55% substantially achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	58% strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	85% strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	61% strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	86% strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	65% strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	78% strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	55% strength

**WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.**

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	91% substantially achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	91% strength

## WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

[This cell intentionally left blank]	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	75% substantially achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	81% strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	78% strength

### II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the seven systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than one of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Case Review System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity



## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix A

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Source of Data and Information</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Item 20</b> Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 21</b> Periodic Review	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 22</b> Permanency Hearing	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 23</b> Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 24</b> Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Source of Data and Information</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Source of Data and Information</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
Staff and Provider Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 26</b> Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 27</b> Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 28</b> Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix A

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Service Array and Resource Development	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 29</b> Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 30</b> Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix A

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Source of Data and Information</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix B

### Summary of CFSR Round 2 Kansas 2007 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Kansas in 2007. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

#### 1. Identifying Information and Review Dates

General Information
<b>Children's Bureau Region:</b> 7
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> June 11–15, 2007
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2006, through June 11, 2007
<b>Date Final Report Issued:</b> March 17, 2008
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> April 1, 2008
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> October 1, 2008

#### 2. Highlights of Findings

Performance Measurements
A. The State met the national standards for <b>three</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The State achieved substantial conformity for <b>none</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes
C. The State achieved substantial conformity for <b>four</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix B

### 3. State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	94.6	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.87	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	115.6	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	86.3	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	123.9	Meets Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	77.5	Does Not Meet Standard

### 4. State's Conformance With the National Standards

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix B

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

### 5. State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System.	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

### 6. Key Findings by Item Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Strength
2. Repeat Maltreatment	Strength
3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Strength
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix B

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
12. Placement With Siblings	Strength
13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Strength
14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
15. Relative Placement	Strength
16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Strength
17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
22. Physical Health of the Child	Strength
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
24. Statewide Information System	Strength
25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement

## Kansas 2015 CFSR Final Report: Appendix B

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
27. Permanency Hearings	Area Needing Improvement
28. Termination of Parental Rights	Strength
29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Strength
30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
32. Initial Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
35. Array of Services	Area Needing Improvement
36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
37. Individualizing Services	Strength
38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Strength
45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength