AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#3 Local FIPS Code	56	1	0	1	In one error case, the responsibility for the case was from another county (Rootenaire). In one case, there was no documentation found for the county with responsibility.
#5 Most Recent Periodic Review Date	42	10	1	5	There were eight error cases in which the reviewer found a review date that was later than the date reported to AFCARS. In one error case, the date was missing in the AFCARS report, but the child had been in care for seven months. The reviewer found a review date. One error case was reported as missing a date of review, but the child has been in foster care since 2004.
#6 Child Birth Date	57	1	0	0	
#7 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	58	0	0	0	
#8 Child Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	49	8	1	0	In seven of the error cases, American Indian or Alaska Native was an additional race identified by the reviewers.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated "no," but the paper file indicated "yes." In the questionable case, the AFCARS indicated "no," but the reviewers note stated that the Cherokee Tribe had turned down the application. This would imply that the individual was self-identifying as an American Indian.
b. Asian	58	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	58	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	58	0	0	0	
e. White	55	3	0	0	In the error cases, an additional race was identified by the reviewers.
f. Unable to Determine	58	0	0	0	
#9 Child Hispanic Origin 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	57	1	0	0	There was one case where AFCARS data indicated "no," but the reviewer found the child was of Hispanic origin.
#10 Has Child Been Diagnosed with Disability?	40	17	1	0	In five of the error cases, the AFCARS response was "not yet determined," but for two of the cases the child had been in care over one year. In one the child was in care since 1990; one since 1995; and, one since 1997.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					There were 12 error cases with AFCARS response of "not yet determined," and the reviewers found the information. In five there was a diagnosed disability. In seven of the records the response should have been "no." In the questionable case, the response to AFCARS was "not yet determined," but the child entered foster care in May 2005.
#11 Mental Retardation	49	3	6	0	In all of the error cases the response should have been "applies." In one case the diagnosis was "mild mental retardation" and in another it was "borderline intellectual functioning." In one questionable case, the response to AFCARS was "not yet determined," but the child entered foster care in May 2005. The other five questionable cases were the ones reported as "not yet determined" in element #10, but the child had been in care for a year or more.
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	52	0	6	0	In one questionable case, the response to AFCARS was "not yet determined," but the child entered foster care in May 2005.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					The other five questionable cases were the ones reported as "not yet determined" in element #10, but had been in care for a year or more.
#13 Physically Disabled	52	0	6	0	In one questionable case, the response to AFCARS was "not yet determined," but the child entered foster care in May 2005. The other five questionable cases were the ones reported as "not yet determined" in element #10, but the child had been in care for a year or more.
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	25	27	6	0	In all of the error cases the response should have been "applies." In one questionable case, the response to AFCARS was "not yet determined," but the child entered foster care in May 2005. The other five questionable cases were the ones reported as "not yet determined" in element #10, but the child had been in care for a year or more.
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	28	24	6	0	In 16 of the error cases, the response should have been "does not apply." In eight of the error cases, the response should have been

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					"applies." In one questionable case, the response to AFCARS was "not yet determined," but the child entered foster care in May 2005. The other five questionable cases were the ones reported as "not yet determined" in element #10, but the child had been in care for a year or more.
#16 Has Child Ever Been Adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	51	7	0	0	In six error cases, the reviewers found the child had been previously adopted, and the AFCARS response was "no." In one error case, the reviewer found that the child had not been previously adopted, but the AFCARS response was "yes."
#17 Age at Previous Adoption 0 = Not Applicable 1 = less than 2 years old 2 = 2-5 years old 3 = 6-12 years old 4 = 13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine	49	9	0	0	In five of the error cases, the reviewer found that the child was previously adopted, however their age at the time of their previous adoption could not be found. In three of the error cases, the AFCARS information was "not applicable," but the reviewer found age of previous adoption.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					In the one case where the reviewer found that the child had not been previously adopted, an age was given.
#18 Date of First Removal from Home	37	9	0	12	In five error cases, the reviewer found earlier dates of first removal than the data reported to AFCARS. In three error cases, the reviewer found later dates of first removal than the data reported to AFCARS.
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	42	3	0	13	In one error case there were more removals than actually reported to AFCARS (three instead of two). There was one case with more removals reported to AFCARS than what the reviewer could find.
#20 Date of Discharge from Previous Episode	44	2	0	12	
#21 Date of Latest Removal	48	7	0	3	In three error cases the actual date of removal was later than the date reported to AFCARS. In two of these cases, the date reported to AFCARS included the date the child was placed in the hospital or detention as the first placement. In three error cases, the actual date of removal was earlier than the date

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					reported to AFCARS.
#23 Date of Placement in Current Setting	39	6	3	10	In four of the error cases, the reviewers found an earlier date than the one reported to AFCARS. In two of the error cases, the dates found by the reviewers were later than the one reported to AFCARS.
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	37	8	3	10	There was generally an over-count of placements reported to AFCARS.
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for This Episode 1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	56	0	0	2	In two cases the reviewer could not verify "court ordered."
#26 Physical Abuse	54	4	0	0	All of the error cases were reported as "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did apply.
#27 Sexual Abuse	56	2	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."
#28 Neglect	55	3	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	53	5	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	45	13	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	58	0	0	0	
#32 Child Drug Abuse	58	0	0	0	
#33 Child Disability	56	2	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	48	10	0	0	In nine cases reported as "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply." One case was reported as "applies," but the reviewer found that it "did not apply."
#35 Death of Parent	58	0	0	0	
#36 Incarceration of Parent	52	6	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope	54	4	0	0	In the error cases, AFCARS indicated "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply."
#38 Abandonment	58	0	0	0	
#39 Relinquishment	57	0	0	1	In one case the reviewer was unable to verify if the condition "applies."
#40 Inadequate Housing	55	3	0	0	In two cases reported as "does not apply," but the reviewer found that it did "apply." In one case reported as "applies,"

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					but the reviewer found that it did not "apply."
#41 Current Placement Setting 1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative) 3 = Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit	49	6	0	3	In the error cases, the AFCARS data indicated the child as being in a "group home," but the reviewer found the child was in a "foster family home."
#42 Out of State Placement	55	2	0	1	In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated "no," but the reviewer found that child was placed out-of-State. In one error case, the AFCARS indicated the child was placed out-of-State, but the reviewer found that it was an in-State placement.
#43 Most Recent Case Plan Goal 1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other	48	8	0	2	In the error cases, the reviewers found: **Reported as:** — **Reviewer found:** Not yet determined (2) — Return home

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established					Not yet determined / Adoption Not yet determined / Guardianship Long term FC / Emancipation Reunify / Long term FC Guardianship / Long term FC There were five error cases that had "case plan goal not yet established" in the AFCARS file and the child had been in care for more than 60 days. In one case the child had been in foster care since 2002.
#44 Caretaker Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	51	7	0	0	In four error cases, "single female" was reported to AFCARS, but the reviewer found "married couple" information. One error case was because "unmarried couple" was reported to AFCARS, but the reviewer found "married" information. One error case was because "married couple" was reported to AFCARS, but the reviewer found divorce information that indicated an unmarried couple living together. In one error case, "single male" was

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					reported to AFCARS, but the reviewer found "single female."
#45 1st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	58	0	0	0	
#46 2nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	54	4	0	0	The error cases were incorrect because data element #44 should have been either a "married couple" or an "unmarried couple." In two of the cases the reviewers found dates for the second caretaker's birth year.
#47 Mother's Date of TPR	50	7	0	1	In three of the error cases, reviewers found dates of TPR, but the AFCARS field was blank. In two of the error cases, the reviewers found a TPR date later than the date reported to AFCARS. In two error cases, the reviewers found TPR dates earlier than information provided in AFCARS.
#48 Father's Date of TPR	52	4	0	2	In two of the error cases, the reviewers found TPR dates later than the date reported to AFCARS. In two of the error cases, reviewers found dates of TPR, but the AFCARS field was blank.
#49 Foster Family Structure	51	7	0	0	Six of the error cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male					found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported. Therefore, the foster family information was also incorrect. In one error case the AFCARS indicated a "single female" and the reviewer noted "married couple."
#50 1st Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	42	7	0	9	Six of the error cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported. Therefore, the foster family information was also incorrect.
#51 2nd Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	45	1	6	6	The six questionable cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported.
#52 1st Foster Caretaker's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	42	6	0	10	The six error cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported. Therefore, the foster family information was also incorrect.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
b. Asian	42	6	0	10	
c. Black or African American	42	6	0	10	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	42	6	0	10	
e. White	42	6	0	10	
f. Unable to Determine	42	6	0	10	
#53 1st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	41	7	0	10	Six of the error cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported. Therefore, the foster family information was also incorrect. The other error case was reported as "unable to determine," but the reviewer found the individual was not of Hispanic/Latino origin.
#54 2nd Foster Caretaker's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	44	1	6	7	The six questionable cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported.
b. Asian	45	0	6	7	
c. Black or African American	45	0	6	7	
d. Native Hawaiian or	45	0	6	7	

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Other Pacific Islander					
e. White	43	2	6	7	
f. Unable to Determine	45	0	6	7	
#55 2nd Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	44	1	6	7	The six questionable cases were due to incorrect reporting for the current placement setting. The reviewers found that the child was placed in a foster home and not a group home as reported. The error case was reported as "unable to determine," but the reviewer found the individual was not of Hispanic/Latino origin.
#56 Date of Discharge	58	0	0	0	
#58 Reason for Discharge 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child	58	0	0	0	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#4 State Agency Involvement 1 = Yes 2 = No	30	0	0	0	
#5 Child Date of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#6 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	30	0	0	0	
#7 Child Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	27	3	0	0	The three error cases were all reported as "white," but the reviewers found the children were also American Indian. Two of the children were Canadian Mohawk and one was a Sioux.
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	30	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	26	4	0	0	In the error cases, this was an additional race.
f. Unable to Determine	30	0	0	0	
#8 Child Hispanic Origin 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	27	3	0	0	The error cases were reported as "no," but the reviewer found the child to be identified as "Hispanic."

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs	30	0	0	0	
#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Racial/Original Background 2 = Age 3 = Membership in a Sibling Group 4 = Medical Conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5 = Other	19	5	6	0	One error case was reported as "age," but the reviewer found the reason was "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." In two error cases, the AFCARS file indicated "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities," but the child was at risk for one of these conditions. In two error cases, the AFCARS indicated "other," but the reviewer found diagnosed conditions. In four of the questionable cases, it was not clear whether the response should have been "age" or "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." The AFCARS file contained responses to one of elements #11-15. The reviewer also found both situations to be applicable. In two questionable cases, the AFCARS indicated that "age" and "mental retardation" were marked as "applies." The reviewer noted both to be the case.

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#11 Mental Retardation	29	0	2	0	
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	30	0	0	0	
#13 Physically Disabled	30	0	0	0	
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	23	3	4	0	In all of the error cases, the response should have been "applies."
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	10	18	2	0	In three of the error cases, the response should have been "does not apply." The child was diagnosed with an "emotionally disturbed" condition and it was mis-mapped. In 11 error cases, the response in element #10 was "age" and this category was also marked as "applies." In two error cases, the response was "applies," but should have been "does not apply." The child was "at-risk" but had not been diagnosed with any conditions.
#16 Mother's Birth Year	30	0	0	0	
#17 Father's Birth Year	27	1	0	2	
#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth 1 = Yes 2 = No	24	6	0	0	In four of the error cases, the AFCARS indicated "no," but the reviewer found that the mother was married at the time of the child's birth. In two error cases, the mother was not

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
3 = Unable to Determine					married and the AFCARS file indicated "yes."
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	22	8	0	0	
#20 Date of Father's TPR	25	5	0	0	In two of the error cases, the AFCARS data did not reflect the last TPR date for the fathers.
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	30	0	0	0	
#22 Adoptive Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	30	0	0	0	
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	29	0	0	1	
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#25 Adoptive Mother's Race a. American Indian or	29	0	0	1	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Alaska Native					
b. Asian	29	0	0	1	
c. Black or African American	29	0	0	1	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	29	0	0	1	
e. White	29	0	0	1	
f. Unable to Determine	29	0	0	1	
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin	29	0	0	1	
#27 Adoptive Father's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	30	0	0	0	
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	30	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	30	0	0	0	
f. Unable to Determine	30	0	0	0	
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin	30	0	0	0	
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent	30	0	0	0	
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative	28	2	0	0	In one error case, this was an additional relationship.

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Idaho
Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent	18	12	0	0	In eleven of the error cases, this was an additional relationship.
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	29	1	0	0	This was an additional relationship.
#33 Child Was Placed from 1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country	30	0	0	0	
#34 Child Was Placed by 1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	29	0	1	0	The AFCARS file indicated “private agency” adoption, but the reviewer noted attorney.
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy	30	0	0	0	
#36 Monthly Amount	27	2	0	1	
#37 Adoption Assistance	30	0	0	0	