

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
#1 State	4	
#2 Report Date ___(mo) ___ (year)	4	
#3 Local Agency (County or Equivalent Jurisdiction)	4	
#4 Record Number	TBD 2	<p>There is a Statewide Index ID (SW_INDEX_ID), which is a unique number.</p> <p>For individuals that do not have an existing record, a county number is assigned to the individual first and must be cleared to the State. Once this occurs, a Statewide identifier is assigned. If at the time the records are submitted to ACF for the AFCARS report the record has not been cleared to the State, the State submits an encrypted county record number. (Information from the State’s SACWIS Assessment Review: [A] Person search is performed to determine if a client is in the SWNDX database. The “view state detail button” displays a screen with tabs for the various types of information kept in SWNDX (names, social security number, address, MAXIS (IV-A, Title XIX information), PRISM (Title IV-D information), driver’s license, offender, and county). To view state detail users must have appropriate security access. The view detail displays the current legal name and its source, date of birth and its source, gender, social security number, person master index (PMI) number from MAXIS, master client index (MCI) number from PRISM, Executive Information System (EIS) data warehouse number, and the Statewide index number (SWNDX ID #). The SWNDX data is loaded about once a month from the EIS. SWNDX contains information on persons who had activity in MAXIS (eligibility system for income maintenance and health care programs) since January 1995.)</p> <p>There are approximately 700 dropped records from the last Children’s Bureau annual file for Minnesota. This is due to the issue with the record numbers being submitted as a county number prior to a Statewide number being assigned.</p> <p>The State staff suggested always sending a subsequent submission as a solution.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p><i>Post site - visit analysis: ACF has determined that the State's two - stage methodology of assigning record numbers does not meet the AFCARS standards for record numbers. According to Appendix A to 45 CFR1355, if the State uses a unique number the record number must follow the child as long as he or she is in foster care. A unique number is an encrypted case number, which the State uses.</i></p> <p><i>Because the State sometimes submits an encrypted county number followed by a different encrypted State number, there is not a single record number that follows the child while he/she is in foster care. Not only is this inconsistent with the regulations, but this prevents ACF from matching records of the same child for the first two report periods of a child's AFCARS records, thereby, always resulting in a significant number of records being dropped between the two report periods. Because ACF uses a "rolling year" to construct annual data files, a solution of resubmitting the previous report period will not resolve the problem of dropped records or using a single number. The State must submit only one record number for a child for every AFCARS report period for the child's complete history with the child welfare agency.</i></p>
<p>#5 Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable)</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Review Tab</p> <p>Frequency Report: There are 232 records with a review date prior to 2004.</p> <p>Many local agencies use supervisory case review procedures at the time of periodic reviews. In addition, the State has implemented a placement "Data Cleanup" utility in SSIS that is available whenever a worker enters a case. This utility allows a worker to view what errors exist, directly navigate to screens where corrections or updates can be made, then immediately return to the data clean-up listing.</p> <p>The State has a reminder for the review of an "Out-of-Home Placement Plan" (OHPP) that is due 180 days, and every successive 180 days. The case worker is notified 60 days prior to the due date.</p> <p>The State has a reminder for a judicial review of a voluntary placement that is due at 90 days. The case worker is notified 45 days prior to the due date.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>The program code checks if the child was out of home for more than 24 hours and if the date is prior to the end of the report period.</p> <p>The program code checks first for an administrative review, if a date is not found than it checks for a court hearing date. If more than one date is found, it extracts the most recent of the two.</p> <p>The program code checks for the latest review date for children who have been in care for seven months or more. Reviews held in the first six-months of a removal, and for a judicial review of a voluntary placement, are not included. The State needs to remove the condition of only checking for review dates for children in care seven or more months. <i>Post site - visit review: The program code was modified and will extract a date of a periodic hearing if the child has been in foster care for more than 24 hours.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 15 (20%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The findings seem to indicate an issue with the timely entry of this data, or there is an issue with the program code not pulling the correct recent review date. Dates found by the reviewers were later than those reported to AFCARS.</p>
<p>#6 Child Birth Date</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>Screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: DOB; Age; Estimated DOB; Est. Age; Date of death</p> <p>Frequency report: There were six records with a year of birth in 1983 (21 year old) and 29 records with a year of birth in 1984 (20 year olds).</p> <p>According to the State’s training manual, workers enter an estimated age for the child and the system will calculate the date of birth by using the day and month of entry and subtracting the number of years to obtain the year of birth.</p> <p>The program code checks both the date of birth field and the estimated date of birth field.</p> <p>The State needs to modify the program code to set the day to the 15th if an estimated age is entered. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The State incorrectly modified the program code.</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p><i>Instead of setting an estimated day of birth to the 15th, the program code adds 14 days to the estimated birth date. According to the above finding, the system sets the estimated day of birth as the day of data entry. Therefore, adding 14 days to that date will not give the 15th every time (LN 336).</i></p>
<p>#7 Child Sex</p> <p>1 = Male 2 = Female</p>	4	<p>Screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: Male; Female</p>
<p>#8 Child's Race</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine</p>	<p><u>2</u> 3</p>	<p>Screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Field: Race/Tribe; Details</p> <p>The State is collecting and reporting if a child is of more than one race.</p> <p>If at least one race is selected, "unable to determine" is correctly set to "does not apply."</p> <p>The program code is initialized to "does not apply" for each race. If there are no races selected, all race categories will be set to "does not apply." The program code must be modified that if no race information is selected, these elements must be reported as blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to initialize these categories to blank. If no race information is entered into the system, all the categories will be reported as blanks.</i></p> <p>Note: While the number of errors in the case file review was minimal, there were four records in which the reviewer found an additional race for the child.</p> <p>The State may consider also adding the option of "abandoned" in order to more accurately track the number of abandoned and/or Safe Haven children entering foster care.</p>
<p>#9 Hispanic/Latino Origin</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	2	<p>Screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: Hispanic Heritage: Yes/No</p> <p>The program code defaults to "unable to determine." If data are missing this element must be mapped to blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to map missing data to blank. However, there is no mapping for the option of "unable to determine." The State needs to clarify if "unable to determine" is an option for the</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p><i>workers to select. If not, it needs to be added to the options list.</i></p> <p>Note: The State may consider also adding the option of “abandoned” in order to more accurately track the number of abandoned and/or Safe Haven children entering foster care.</p>
<p>#10 Has the child been clinically diagnosed as having a disability(ies)?</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No 3=Not yet Determined</p> <p>If yes, indicate each type of a disability with a “1.”</p>	2	<p>Screen: Client/Collateral Entry; Fields: Disability/Diagnosis; Summary View</p> <p>Frequency Report (n = 11,048): Yes = 4,248 (39%); No = 6,168 (56%); Not yet determined = 208 (2%); Not reported = 424 (4%)</p> <p>The State has a policy that all children, unless they have been seen by a physician in the previous year, are to have a well-child examination within 30 days of being removed from home.</p> <p>This element is initialized to space.</p> <p>The program code checks if any of the conditions on the screen are marked. If any are found this element is set to “yes.” If no conditions are found, the program code checks for the State codes “01, no known” and “97, currently being evaluated.” If there are no checked disabilities and if “no known” is selected, this element is mapped to “no.” If “currently being evaluated” is found, it is mapped to “not yet determined.” If no information is found, this element will remain blank.</p> <p>The screen contains the options “other clinically diagnosed condition,” “unknown,” and “other.” The State values “20, other clinically diagnosed condition” and “98, other” are incorrectly mapped to the AFCARS value “other diagnosed condition” and this element is mapped to “yes.” The State’s values of “other” are too vague and may cover conditions that should not be mapped to AFCARS. The State should consider modifying these options to make them more specific, or expand the option list.</p> <p>The State value “99, unknown” is not included in the extract code. If “unknown” is selected by the worker, it will be correctly mapped to blank.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>Case file review findings: 10 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The majority of the errors indicated that a diagnosed disability was found by the reviewer and the AFCARS response was “no.” In one error case, the AFCARS information indicated “yes,” but the reviewer found the child had no diagnosed disabilities. There were two cases in which the child had been in care for some time (in one case 11 months and the other for eight years) and there was no information reported to AFCARS as whether the child did or did not have a diagnosed disability.</p>
<p>#11 - 15 Diagnosed Disabilities</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>		<p>Screens: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: Disability/Diagnosis; Summary View and Diagnosis/Disability/Health Insurance; Subfolder Professional Determined Disabilities - Currently being evaluated; No known disability; List of diagnosed disabilities; Other; Unknown</p> <p>Elements #11- 15 are initialized to zero. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified. If element #10 is blank, then elements #11 - 15 will be blank.</i></p> <p>The State needs to add program code that if element #10 is either “no” or “not yet determined,” then elements #11-15 must be set to blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified incorrectly. The program code maps #11 – 15 to “does not apply” if the response to #10 is either “yes” or “no.”</i></p> <p>The program code needs to be modified to check for any conditions recorded on the DSM screen and map selected codes to the appropriate AFCARS value. The Federal team will provide the State with additional resources to add in the mapping of appropriate ICD-9 and DSM codes.</p>
#11 Mental Retardation	2	
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	2	
#13 Physically Disabled	2	<p>Please clarify the State’s value “14, physical disability - ambulation not limited.”</p>
<p>A physical condition that adversely affects</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
the child's day-to-day motor functioning, such as cerebral palsy, spina bifida, multiple sclerosis, orthopedic impairments, and other physical disabilities.		
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	2	Case file review findings: 8 (11%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Six of the error cases were because the response to #10 should have been “yes,” and the reviewer found conditions that mapped to this element. In two error cases, the response should have been “applies.”
#15 Other Medically Diagnosed Conditions Requiring Special Care-- Conditions other than those noted above which require special medical care such as chronic illnesses. Included are children diagnosed as HIV positive or with AIDS.	2	<p>Screens: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: Disability/Diagnosis and Health. and Diagnosis/Disability/Health Insurance; Subfolder Professional Determined Disabilities - Currently being evaluated; No known disability; List of diagnosed disabilities; Other; Unknown</p> <p>The options “chemical dependency (substance abuse) - alcohol” and “chemical dependency (substance abuse) - drugs” are incorrectly mapped to this element. The State needs to modify the program code to not include these options.</p> <p>The screen contains the options “other clinically diagnosed condition” and “other.” The State values “20, other clinically diagnosed condition” and “98, other” are mapped to this AFCARS element. The State’s values of “other” are too vague and may not cover conditions that should be mapped to AFCARS. The State should consider modifying these options to make them more specific or to expand the option list.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 11 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were four cases in error because of incorrect mapping; the response should have been “applies.” There were five error cases because the reviewer found an additional condition. There were two cases reported as “applies” that should have been “does not apply.”</p>
#16 Has this child ever been adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Removal and Adoption History. Fields: Yes/No; Age</p> <p>Screen: Adoption, Page 1 Tab; Fields: Previously adopted, Y/N; Where adoption granted - County, State, Country</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>Frequency Report (n = 11,048): Yes = 154 (1%); No = 10,639 (96%); Unable to determine = 0); Not reported = 255 (2%)</p> <p>There is a system generated count of the number of previous adoptions that displays on the screen.</p> <p>This screen contains a field to record where the most recent finalized adoption occurred.</p> <p>There is not an option on the screen for entering abandoned, i.e., “unable to determine.” The State needs to be able to record and report if this information is not known because a child had been abandoned.</p> <p>Note: While the number of errors in the case file review was minimal, there were four records in which the reviewer found that the child had been adopted prior to the current removal episode.</p> <p>The State may consider also adding the option of “abandoned” in order to more accurately track the number of abandoned and/or Safe Haven children entering foster care.</p>
<p>#17 If yes, how old was the child when the adoption was legalized?</p> <p>[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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n = 11,048): Not applicable = 255; Less than 2 = 17 (0.15%); 2 - 5 = 45 (0.41%); 6 - 12 = 85 (0.77%); 13 or older = 7 (0.06%); Not reported = 10, 639</p> <p>The frequencies for “not reported” in element #16 are equal to the number of “not applicable” responses in #17. The number of “no” responses in element #16 is equal to the number of “not reported” for this element.</p> <p>The program code maps a blank to this element if the response to element #16 is “no.” <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to map records with a “no” response in element #16 to “not applicable” in the this element.</i></p> <p>If the response to element #16 is not equal to a “yes,” it maps this element to “not applicable.” <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to map this to blank.</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>If the age field is left blank, this element is incorrectly mapped to “unable to determine.” The program code must be modified to map the number of records with a “no” response in #16 to “not applicable” in element #17. If the age field is left blank, it should be mapped to blank.</p>
<p>#18 Date of First Removal from Home ____ (mo) ____ (day) ____ (year)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plmnt Tab; Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i> Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Removal and Adoption History; Fields for Removal History: Date of first removal recorded in county; Earlier removal date if known.</p> <p>Frequency Report: There are 255 records missing a date of first removal. There are no missing data for element #19</p> <p>The State staff indicated that in some counties support staff enters the removal information. The State acknowledged that the support staff may not know what the terms mean and may not be entering the “first-ever” removal date correctly.</p> <p>The State indicated that case workers are trained to ask the family if the child had ever been in foster care, even in another State. Federal staff clarified that the State is not to include information on removals that may have occurred in another State. Only those removals that occurred in Minnesota should be included.</p> <p>The first line of the program code looks for a previous removal adoption row. If it is not blank the program code goes to first removal date. The State indicated this line needs to be removed from the program code.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 21 (29%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the cases, the reviewers were able to find dates of first removal that were prior to the one reported in AFCARS. Two of the cases reflected the date a child’s hospitalization began and not the day the agency placed the child in a foster care setting.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	2	<p>The program code looks for the statewide indicator identification.</p> <p>The program code does not include the date of first ever removal field in the overall count of removals.</p> <p>The accuracy of this number is dependent on all counties having entered prior removal episodes. If a case was closed prior to January 1995 and the child re-enters foster care in a different county it may be some time before all of this data, if ever, gets entered into SSIS. The State is relying on the family letting a worker know the child had been in foster care previously. There also is reliance that the original county(ies) staff will enter the data once notified the child has reentered care and that the removal information must be entered into SSIS.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 16 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Ten of the errors reflected an increase in the number of removals, and four reflected a decrease. Two of the error cases were due to errors in the date of first removal (#18) and latest removal (#21). The reported dates were not the same, but the number of removals reported was one.</p>
<p>#20 Date Child was Discharged from last foster care episode (if applicable)</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	3 2	<p>Frequency Report: The number of records without a prior discharge date (6,899) does not equal the number of records with only one removal reported in #19 (6,839)</p> <p>The program code correctly excludes removals that are less than 24-hours.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were seven error cases because there was more than one removal and no date was reported for this element. There were two error cases because there was actually only one removal, but two removals were reported.</p> <p>Two of the error cases were due to the dates of first removal (#18) and latest removal (#21) reported to AFCARS not being the same, and there was not a date of discharge reported for this element. The State needs to explain how this occurred.</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: Due to the findings in the frequency report and the case file</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<i>review, this element was rated a 2. The State needs to review the program code and the manner in which this data is entered.</i>
#21 Date of Latest Removal ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	3	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab; Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i></p> <p>There are two fields on the screen that workers can select to identify whether the child was out-of-home for 24 or more hours, or less than 24 hours.</p> <p>The program code uses the latest “continuous placement” start date.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 16 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In six of the cases the reviewer found earlier dates than what was reported to AFCARS. There were three error cases where the child had only one removal, not two as reported, so this date should have been the same as the date in element #18. Two of the cases reflected the date a child’s hospitalization began and not the day the agency placed the child in a foster care setting.</p>
#22 Date of Latest Removal Transaction Date ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	4	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab; Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i></p> <p>There are two fields associated with the start and end date that are the “entry dates.”</p>
#23 Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	2	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Placement Tab; Fields include a start/end date</p> <p>The State has a reminder for an “Out-of-Home Placement Plan” (OHPP) that is due 30 days after the placement start date. The case worker is notified 21 days prior to the due date.</p> <p>Case workers enter every location the child is placed in during his/her removal episode. The State developed a table that identifies whether the setting is a “placement” or a “location.” This table is not visible to the case worker. On the Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption screen there is field named “classification.” The system populates this field as either “placement” or “location” based on the information in the table. The program code only extracts information for</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>foster care elements #23, 24, and 41 that is identified as “placement” in the table.</p> <p>The table that is used to determine if a child’s living arrangement is either a “placement” or a “location” always excludes hospitals, boarding schools, ICF-MR (intermediate care facility-mental retardation), and juvenile correctional facilities (locked) as placement settings. The State must modify the system to include boarding schools, hospital stays that exceed 30 days, juvenile correctional facilities, and the ICF-MR facilities.</p> <p>The State has placement reasons of “consequences - 30 days or more” and “behavioral consequences less than 30 days” that in combination with the following setting types: foster family home - relative or non-relative; foster home - corporate/shift staff; group home; residential treatment center; juvenile correctional facility (locked); juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children); and, juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children) are not considered placements. The Federal review team needs to further evaluate whether or not the State is correctly reporting these situations. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The State must record and report all new placements. In the Child Welfare Policy Manual (CWPM), section 1.2B.7 question #7, we clarify that a new placement setting results when the foster care setting changes, for example, when a child moves from one foster family home to another or to a group home or institution.” In 1.2.B.7 question #21 of the CWPM, we address the issue of temporary absences and list certain situations that are not to be included as a placement setting, such as visitation or acute hospitalizations. It does not mean that a placement setting is defined by a 24-hour period. The placement/location table must be modified to include “consequences - 30 days or more” and “behavioral consequences less than 30 days” as placement settings.</i></p>
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	2	<p>The State uses the medical definition of acute care, but any hospitalization that is 30 days or more is considered to be a placement by the State.</p> <p>The table that is used to determine if a child’s living arrangement is either a “placement” or a “location” always excludes hospitals, boarding schools, ICF-MRs (intermediate care facility-mental retardation), and juvenile correctional facilities (locked) as placement settings. The State must modify the system to include boarding</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>schools, hospital stays that exceed 30 days, juvenile correctional facilities, and the ICF-MR facilities.</p> <p>The State needs to provide the Federal team with the “PL.LOC_REASON_CD” codes for the create view SSISREPO.V_Placement</p> <p>The State has placement reasons of “consequences - 30 days or more” and “behavioral consequences less than 30 days” that in combination with the following setting types: foster family home - relative or non-relative; foster home - corporate/shift staff; group home; residential treatment center; juvenile correctional facility (locked); juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children); and, juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children) are not considered placements. The State staff indicated the child is placed in a group home type setting generally for a period of time that is longer than 24 hours. The Federal review team needs to further evaluate whether or not the State is correctly reporting these situations. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The State must record and report all new placements. In the Child Welfare Policy Manual (CWPM), section 1.2B.7 question #7, we clarify that a new placement setting results when the foster care setting changes, for example, when a child moves from one foster family home to another or to a group home or institution.” In 1.2.B.7 question #21 of the CWPM, we address the issue of temporary absences and list certain situations that are not to be included as a placement setting, such as visitation or acute hospitalizations. It does not mean that a placement setting is defined by a 24-hour period. The placement/location table must be modified to include “consequences - 30 days or more” and “behavioral consequences less than 30 days” as placement settings.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 15 (21%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In 11 of the error cases, the reviewer found fewer moves than what was reported in AFCARS, and more moves in four of the cases.</p>
<p>#25 Manner of Removal From Home for Current placement Episode</p> <p>1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Authority Tab</p> <p>Frequency Report: There are 162 records missing information.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
3 = Not Yet Determined		<p>For voluntary placements, there is a reminder that in order to maintain IV-E eligibility a court order is due 90 days after the placement start date.</p> <p>The program code is initialized to blank.</p> <p>“Police holds” are correctly mapped to “not yet determined.”</p> <p>Case file review findings: 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were eight cases reported as “court ordered,” but the reviewer noted it was “voluntary” removal. There was one case reported as “not yet determined” and the child was in care for six months. The reviewer found that a voluntary agreement was in place. There were error cases that the child was in care and either the AFCARS response was “not yet determined” (one), or it was blank (two). Reviewers found court orders for the removals.</p>
<p>#26 - 40 Actions or Conditions Associated With Child’s Removal (Indicate all that apply with a “1”.)</p> <p>[0-Does not Apply] 1-Applies</p>		<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Removal Conditions Tab</p> <p>The screen contains fields for a “primary removal condition” and “removal conditions finalization date.”</p> <p>The program code is initialized to zero.</p> <p>Case file review findings: This information was found to be underreported.</p>
#26 Physical Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 4 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#27 Sexual Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 3 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#28 Neglect	3	Case file review findings: 13 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were ten cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were nine cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were eight cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 6 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The cases were reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#32 Child Drug Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#33 Child Disability	3	Case file review findings: 3(4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#34 Child’s Behavior Problem	3	Case file review findings: 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There was one case reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply. There were four cases reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#35 Death of Parent	3	Case file review findings: 1 (1%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The case was reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#36 Incarceration of Parent	3	Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reasons	3	Case file review findings: 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#38 Abandonment	3	<p>The State may want to consider splitting this into two categories in order to track those children that have truly been abandoned from those that were left with relatives. This would also provide an additional means to ensure that if responses for “unable to determine” are extracted for AFCARS that it represents “abandoned” children.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 1 (1%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The case was reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
#39 Relinquishment	3	The State has a Safe Haven program for infants a week or less old. The State may want to add this as an option to the conditions associated with removal in order to track the data. In the interim, the State should map these to “relinquishment.”
#40 Inadequate Housing	3	Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There was one case reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply. There was one case reported as “applies” and 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	2	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Placement Tab; Fields include a start/end date and end reason</p> <p>If no data are entered, this element is mapped to blank.</p> <p>The State has placement reasons of “consequences - 30 days or more” and “behavioral consequences less than 30 days” that in combination with the following setting types: foster family home - relative or non-relative; foster home - corporate/shift staff; group home; residential treatment center; juvenile correctional facility (locked); juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children); and, juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children) are not considered placements. The State staff indicated the child is placed in a group home type setting generally for a period of time that is longer than 24 hours. The Federal review team needs to further evaluate whether or not the State is correctly reporting these situations. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The State must record and report all new placements. In the Child Welfare Policy Manual (CWPM), section 1.2B.7 question #7, we clarify that a new placement setting results when the foster care setting changes, for example, when a child moves from one foster family home to another or to a group home or institution.” In 1.2.B.7 question #21 of the CWPM, we address the issue of temporary absences and list certain situations that are not to be included as a placement setting, such as visitation or acute hospitalizations. It does not mean that a placement setting is defined by a 24-hour period. The placement/location table must be modified to include “consequences - 30 days or more” and “behavioral consequences less than 30 days” as placement settings.</i></p> <p>The table that is used to determine if a child’s living arrangement is either a “placement” or a “location” always excludes hospitals, boarding schools, ICF-MRs</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>(intermediate care facility-mental retardation), and juvenile correctional facilities (locked) as placement settings. The State must modify the system to include boarding schools, hospital stays that exceed 30 days, juvenile correctional facilities, and the ICF-MR facilities.</p> <p>From the case file review: In one error case, the child was a runaway, but the living arrangement was reported as “group home.”</p> <p>Note: One error case was marked in error because the reported setting was non-relative and the reviewer marked relative and added note saying it met their definition of relative. Provide ACF with the State’s definition of relative.</p>
<p>#42 Is Current Placement Out-of-State?</p> <p>1=Yes (Out of State placement) 2=No (In-State placement)</p>	4	
<p>#43 Most recent case plan goal</p> <p>1 = Reunify With Parent(s) Or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live With Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established</p>	2 3	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Permanency Plans Tab; Options: Reunify; Live w/relative - adoption; Live w/relative - long term foster care; Adoption - non-relative; Long term foster care - non-relative; Guardianship - non-relative; Independent living; Not yet determined</p> <p>The State has a reminder for the review of an “Out-of-Home Placement Plan” (OHPP) that is due 180 days, and every successive 180 days. The case worker is notified 60 days prior to the due date.</p> <p>Training Manual: Adoption and guardianship information are entered prior to a TPR. The State’s value “8, Independent living” is incorrectly mapped to “not yet established.” It should be mapped to “emancipation.” <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was corrected.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings																									
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reported as:</th> <th>Reviewer found:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reunify</td> <td>Long-term foster care (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reunify</td> <td>Emancipation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reunify</td> <td>Adoption</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reunify</td> <td>TLC(?)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Live with other relative</td> <td>Long-term foster care</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adoption</td> <td>Long-term foster care</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adoption</td> <td>Emancipation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-term foster care</td> <td>Emancipation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emancipation</td> <td>Long-term foster care</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Guardianship</td> <td>Long-term foster care</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not yet determined</td> <td>Emancipation (child in care for 12 years)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Reported as:	Reviewer found:	Reunify	Long-term foster care (3)	Reunify	Emancipation	Reunify	Adoption	Reunify	TLC(?)	Live with other relative	Long-term foster care	Adoption	Long-term foster care	Adoption	Emancipation	Long-term foster care	Emancipation	Emancipation	Long-term foster care	Guardianship	Long-term foster care	Not yet determined	Emancipation (child in care for 12 years)	
Reported as:	Reviewer found:																										
Reunify	Long-term foster care (3)																										
Reunify	Emancipation																										
Reunify	Adoption																										
Reunify	TLC(?)																										
Live with other relative	Long-term foster care																										
Adoption	Long-term foster care																										
Adoption	Emancipation																										
Long-term foster care	Emancipation																										
Emancipation	Long-term foster care																										
Guardianship	Long-term foster care																										
Not yet determined	Emancipation (child in care for 12 years)																										
<p>#44 Caretaker Family Structure</p> <p>1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab; Fields: Married Couple; Unmarried couple; Single female; Single male; Structure unknown - abandoned child; Structure unknown - no identified caretaker</p> <p>Frequency Report: Invalid value of “6” = 54 records</p> <p>This element is initialized to space.</p> <p>The State has a value “6, structure unknown, no identified caretaker” that is being extracted and appears as “invalid data” in the AFCARS. The State needs to map this value to blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was corrected to map the State’s value “unknown” to blank in AFCARS.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. One error case had “single female” and reviewer found “single male.” Three error cases reported with a status of single and the reviewer found “married couple.” Two error cases were reported as blank, but the reviewer found the information.</p> <p>Note: The State may consider also adding the option of “abandoned” in order to more accurately track the number of abandoned and/or Safe Haven children entering foster</p>																									

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		care.
#45 1 st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	3 4	<p>Frequency report: The report contained the dates: 1900 = 1; 1901 = 5; 1994 to 2004 = 13; and invalid dates.</p> <p>The program code is initialized to blank and checks for birth year or estimated birth year.</p>
#46 2 nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year (if applicable) ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	3 4	<p>Frequency report: The report contained the dates: 1900 = 1; 1901 = 3; 1993 to 2004 = 32; and invalid dates.</p> <p>The program code is initialized to blank and checks for birth year or estimated birth year.</p>
#47 Mother's Date of TPR ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	3	<p>Screen: Guardianship/TPR/Special Needs; TPR Tab</p> <p>According to the training manual, adoption and guardianship information are entered prior to a TPR.</p> <p>The program code checks for a status of "voluntary" or "involuntary." If a date is not found, it also checks for "deceased" date.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Nine of the error cases were missing the information in AFCARS and the reviewers found dates of TPR. One error case was reported as blank, but reviewer found a "deceased" date.</p>
#48 Legal or Putative Father's TPR ___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)	3	<p>Screen: Guardianship/TPR/Special Needs; TPR Tab</p> <p>According to the training manual, adoption and guardianship information are entered prior to a TPR.</p> <p>The program code checks for a status of "voluntary" or "involuntary." If a date is not found, it also checks for "deceased" date.</p> <p>The State needs to clarify what date workers are to enter - the hearing, signature, or filing date.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		Case file review findings: 10 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. All of the error cases were missing the information in AFCARS and the reviewers found dates of TPR.
#49 Foster Family Structure 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	2 3	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Placements/Locations/Absentee; Foster Parent Tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n = 11,048): Not applicable = 3,829 (35%); Married couple = 4,763 (43%); Unmarried couple = 321 (3%); Single Female = 1,987 (18%); Single Male = 149(1%); Not reported = 0</p> <p>The program code is initialized to “not applicable.” This element should be initialized to blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: This program code was modified and this element is initialized to blank.</i></p>
#50 1 st Foster Caretaker’s Birth Year	3	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Placements/Locations/Absentee; Foster Parent Tab</p> <p>Frequency report: The report contained the dates: 1900 = 4; 1901 = 2; 1999 - 2004 = 8. The number of records with no foster parent date of birth is 4,511. This is more than the number of children in non-foster home settings.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In eight error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and this information was missing.</p>
#51 2 nd Foster Caretaker’s Birth Year	3	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Placements/Locations/Absentee; Foster Parent Tab</p> <p>Frequency report: The report contained the dates: 1900 = 2; 1901 = 1; 1996 - 2000 = 4. The number of dates reported (4,251) does not equal the number of “married” and “unmarried” couples in #49 (5,084).</p> <p>Case file review findings: 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In nine error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and this information was missing.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
<p>#52 1st Foster Caretaker's Race</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>The program code is initialized to "does not apply." If all race categories are "does not apply," these categories should be set to blank.</p> <p>If the response to element #41 is other than a family foster home, the race categories should be blank.</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to initialize this element to blank and to report the race categories as blank if the child is not in a foster home.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 8 (11%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In eight error cases, element #49 was "married couple" and all race categories were reported as "no." The reviewer found the information.</p>
<p>#53 1st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic or Latino Origin</p> <p>[0 = Not Applicable] 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>The program code defaults to "unable to determine." Missing data should be mapped to blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to initialize this element to blank.</i></p> <p>If the response to element #41 is other than a foster home setting, this should be mapped to "not applicable." <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to report this element as "not applicable" if the child is not in a foster home.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In eight error cases, element #49 was "married couple" and this information was missing.</p>
<p>#54 2nd Foster Caretaker's Race (if applicable)</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>The program code is initialized to "do not apply." If all race categories are "does not apply" this should be set to blank.</p> <p>If the response to element #41 is other than a family foster home, these categories should be blank.</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to initialize this element to blank and to report the race categories as blank if the child is not in a foster home.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
<p>#55 2nd Foster Caretaker’s Hispanic Origin</p> <p>[0 = Not Applicable] 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>The program code defaults to “unable to determine.” Missing data should be mapped to blank. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to initialize this element to blank.</i></p> <p>If the response to element #41 is other than a family foster home, this should be mapped to “not applicable.” <i>Post site - visit analysis: The program code was modified to report this element as “not applicable” if the child is not in a foster home.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and this information was missing. One error case was reported as “no,” but the reviewer found that the individual is Hispanic.</p>
<p>#56 Date of Discharge from foster care</p> <p>___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)</p>	<p>4 2</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab; Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i></p> <p>Case finding notes: One error case was due to the child reported as reunified when the child actually ran away. There was no indication that the child was found and placed back in foster care.</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: The State modified the program code to account for youth that turn 18 during the report period and are not receiving title IV-E funds, and youth that turn 19 during the report period who were receiving title IV-E funds. It appears that instead of inserting the child’s birth day it calculates a date. The State needs to explain its approach to ACF.</i></p>
<p>#57 Date of Discharge Transaction Date</p> <p>___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)</p>	<p>4 2</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab; Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i></p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: The State modified the program code to account for the discharge of youth 18 and older. The transaction date is set to the report period end date. It should be the same date as the youth’s birthday. The State needs to explain its approach to ACF.</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
<p>#58 Reason for Discharge</p> <p>[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</p>	<p>2 3</p>	<p>Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab; Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i></p> <p>The program code needs to be modified for “youth on runaway that turn 18.” The State maps these as “runaway” instead of “emancipation.”</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: The revised program code was revised. Youth 18 and older will be reported as discharged, including those on runaway status at their 18th birthday.</i></p>
<p>#59 Title IV-E (Foster Care)</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p>2 4</p>	<p>For voluntary placements, there is a reminder that in order to maintain IV-E eligibility a court order is due 90 days after the placement start date.</p> <p>The program code is initialized to “does not apply.”</p> <p>The program code looks for service code “A - maintenance” and a payment to a vendor greater than zero.</p> <p>This information is extracted through the interface with MAXIS (IV-A, Title XIX information). There is a delay between when the county sends the data to DHS for claims and when the county actually makes the payment to the vendor. The State must report whether the county made a payment on behalf of the child during a report period, not when the county claims the payment from the State (or when the State files a claim with the Federal government).</p> <p>Case file notes: There were five cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: Based on further clarification with the State regarding the collection and extraction of this data, it was determined that the program code is correctly extracting this information. If the child and the placement setting meets all of</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<i>the title IV-E requirements, then this element is correctly set to “applies.”</i>
#60 Title IV-E (Adoption Subsidy)	4	State does not pay adoption subsidy prior to a finalized adoption.
#61 Title IV-A (Aid to Families with Dependent Children)	2 3	<p>The program code initialized to blank.</p> <p>The program code checks the MAXIS program code for “AF, AFDC” or “MF, MFIP” prior to the month of removal. This is incorrect, the program code needs to check if title IV-A payment was made on behalf of the child after his/her removal. <i>Post site - visit analysis: The State has determined that title IV-A would not be paid on behalf of a child in foster care in the State of Minnesota. This has been hard coded to zero.</i></p>
#62 Title IV-D (Child Support)	2	<p>The program code is initialized to blank.</p> <p>The program checks the Prism (child support) system for a payment and support payment indicator of “Y.”</p> <p>The State is not reporting whether a child support payment was made on behalf a child that is not receiving public assistance. The State indicated that their child support office (the attorney’s) stated they were not able to legally provide that data to the child welfare agency. <i>Post site - visit analysis: During the post site-visit phase, the Children’s Bureau asked clarification from the ACF Office of Child Support regarding this matter. While there is currently an omission in the Child Support regulation regarding sharing of information via the Parent Locator Service and a proposed rule addressing it has been published, there is no limitation on the child support offices sharing payment information with the child welfare agency, county or State level. The ACF Child Support Office and ACF Region V are working with the State to remedy the problem. The State child welfare agency is required to report information on whether a child support payment was made on behalf of all children in foster care during the six-month report period. The State is expected to have this issue addressed for the 2005B data submission, and no later than the 2006A report period.</i></p>
#63 Title XIX (Medicaid)	4	
#64 SSI or other Social Security Act Benefits	4	Case file review findings: 8 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were six cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply. There were two cases that had missing information. In one, the reviewer found the information.

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31 (2005A)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
#65 None of the Above	4	
#66 Amount Of Monthly Foster Care Payment (regardless of source)	2 3	<p>The program code checks for a full monthly amount within the six-month report period where the service code is “A” – maintenance or “D” – administration.</p> <p>If a partial payment was made for the month, the State calculates it for a 30-day period. This is incorrect; the State is to include only full monthly payments, not partial payments that have been calculated to equal a full month.</p> <p>This amount should reflect a full monthly maintenance payment regardless of the source(s) of the funds.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 38 (60%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p><i>Post site - visit analysis: The State modified the program code to report a full monthly payment, regardless of source. It no longer calculates a payment.</i></p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
#1 State FIPS Code	I ¹	The Access database program code has this element hard-coded to the State FIPS code.
#2 Report Period End Date	I	
#3 Record Number	I	Adoption does not have the SWINDEX number. The State has not yet implemented it for the adoption records. There is a separate unique ID for adoption.
#4 State Agency Involvement 1 = Yes 2 = No	I	The Access database program code has this element hard-coded to “yes.” Having all responses as “yes” is permissible as the only adoptions the State reports will be those in which there is state-agency involvement.
#5 Child Date of Birth	I	This data can be recorded in the SSIS screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: DOB; Age; Estimated DOB; Est. Age; Date of death The Access database program code correctly extracts this information.
#6 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	I	This data can be recorded in the SSIS screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: Male; Female The Access database program code correctly extracts this information.
#7 Child Race a = American Indian or Alaska Native b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander e = White f = Unable to Determine	I	This data can be recorded in the SSIS screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Field: Race/Tribe; Details Frequency report: There are 46 (15%) records reporting more than one race. The State staff indicated the State has been collecting multi-racial information for fifteen years. <u>Access Screen:</u> The screen incorrectly contains fields for four races only.

¹ **I = Incomplete. Assessment of adoption elements could not be completed as a part of the review process.**

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p><u>Access Program Code:</u> The State code for “American Indian or Alaska Native” is incorrectly mapped to “Asian.” It should be mapped to “I.”</p> <p>If none of the races are selected, the program code incorrectly defaults to “unable to determine.”</p> <p>See the findings for race in the foster care matrix.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two of the error cases, the reviewer found an additional race that was not reported. The other error case is due to the reviewer finding a race and the AFCARS data indicated “unable to determine” applied.</p>
<p>#8 Child Hispanic/Latino Origin</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>This data can be recorded in the SSIS screen: Client/Collateral Entry. Fields: Hispanic Heritage: Yes/No</p> <p><u>Access Program Code:</u> The program code incorrectly defaults to “unable to determine.”</p> <p>See the findings for child Hispanic/Latino origin in the foster care matrix.</p>
<p>#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>SSIS Screen: Guardianship/TPR/Special Needs; Special Needs Tab The Access database does not contain this information.</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): Yes = 273; No = 27</p> <p>There is an inconsistency between the responses reported for this element and the responses for element #35 (is child receiving a monthly subsidy). There should be fewer “no” responses for this element.</p> <p>The screen in SSIS contains a list, which includes “no known special needs,” in addition to conditions of special needs. The new program code that extracts data from SSIS should map “no known special needs” to “no.” If any category is selected, this element would be mapped to “yes,” and if all options are left blank, then this element</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>should be mapped to blank.</p> <p><u>Access Program Code:</u> The program code derives this information based on what is entered on page three of the Access adoption screen. If “unknown” for a special need is entered, and no other special needs are entered on the screen, the program code incorrectly maps this element to “no.” If the only value entered is “unknown” then element #9 should be mapped to blank.</p>
<p>#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs</p> <p>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 State Defined Special Needs</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>SSIS Screen: Guardianship/TPR/Special Needs; Special Needs Tab Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 3.</p> <p><u>SSIS Screen:</u> The screen in SSIS contains a list, which includes “no known special needs,” in addition to conditions of special needs. There is no indicator of which item is the primary basis for determining special needs.</p> <p><u>Access Screen:</u> There is not a field for identifying the primary basis of special needs. The screen has two columns of five rows, one for “Disability” and the other for “Special Needs.”</p> <p><u>Access Program Code:</u> This field is initialized to zero.</p> <p>There are several issues with the way data are entered into the Access screen. The State staff indicated workers are trained to enter the “primary” basis in the first field under the heading “Special Needs.” Based on the case file review findings, it appears that workers are selecting the AFCARS value “4, medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities” when the child was “at risk” for one of these conditions. Also, there appeared to be instances where another basis seemed to be the bigger barrier to adoption. The State staff indicated there is more training that is needed and that perhaps rephrasing the terms used to describe what is wanted will be helpful for workers.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>The State should use the SSIS screen for the collection of this data and consider adding a designator for the primary basis for special needs. The State could also track additional bases of special needs in addition to collecting the data needed for AFCARS reporting.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 6 (21%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. One of the error cases was reported as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities,” but the reviewer found that the child was at risk of medical/emotional factors. Two error cases were reported as “not applicable,” but element #35 was reported as the child receiving a monthly subsidy. The reviewer found that the child had a diagnosed medical condition in one case and in the other the child was at-risk for future medical disabilities. Two of the error cases were incorrect because the AFCARS information reflected the wrong category.</p>
<p>#11 Mental Retardation #12 Visually/Hearing Impaired #13 Physically Disabled #14 Emotionally Disturbed #15 Other Diagnosed Condition</p>	<p align="center">I</p>	<p>See foster care findings for elements #11 - 15.</p> <p>The SSIS screen “General Information for Adoption” contains a field for recording if a child has a professionally diagnosed disability. This field could be used for reporting information in adoption elements #11-15 if the answer to adoption element #10 is the AFCARS value “4.” Otherwise, this information should not be mapped to these elements.</p> <p>Case file review findings element #14: 4 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. One of the error cases was reported as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities” in element #10, but the reviewer found that the child was at risk of medical/emotional factors. This element was incorrectly reported as “applies.”</p> <p>In one error case, the reviewer found this element did not apply because the information reported in element #10 was not “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p> <p>One error cases indicated that this should have been “applies,” instead of “does not apply.”</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>Case file review findings element #15: 3 (11%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. One error case is because the condition did apply and elements #9 and 10 were not marked as applying.</p> <p>In two error cases, the reviewer found this element did not apply because the information reported in element #10 was not “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p>
#16 Mother's Birth Year	I	<p>Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 4, Birth Parents This data can be recorded in the SSIS screen: Client.</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): There were three records missing the mother’s date of birth.</p>
#17 Father's Birth Year	I	<p>Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 4, Birth Parents This data can be recorded in the SSIS screen: Client</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): There were 64 (21%) records missing the father’s date of birth.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The error cases were all reported as blank, but the reviewers found dates of birth.</p>
<p>#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	I	<p>SSIS Screen: General Information for Adoption, page 3; Marital Status Information; fields: Status when child was born or adopted and Status at time of release adoption Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 4. Two fields: Marital Status and Marital Status on Child’s DOB</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): Yes = 54 (18%); No = 234 (78%); Not reported = 12 (4%)</p> <p><u>SSIS Screen:</u> The State needs to modify the wording of the field “status when child was born or adopted.” For AFCARS purposes, this element only wants to know the marital status of the birth mother.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>There is no State value for “3 = unable to determine.” This needs to be added for instances when a child is abandoned.</p> <p><u>Access Program Code:</u> “Unknown” is correctly mapped to blank.</p>
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	I	<p>SSIS Screens: Guardianship/TPR/Special Needs; TPR Tab and General Information for Adoption, page 3 Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 3</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): There were six records missing the mother’s TPR date.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that the data entered on the TPR tab of the Guardianship screen and the data on the General Information for Adoption screen match. Also, if TPR hearings are entered on the “Court Actions” screen, the data must be the same in all locations in SSIS.</p> <p>See the findings for TPR in the foster care matrix.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 4 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases the reviewer found an earlier date than what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case the data was missing, but the reviewer found that the mother was deceased.</p>
#20 Date of Father's TPR	I	<p>SSIS Screens: Guardianship/TPR/Special Needs; TPR Tab and General Information for Adoption, page 3 Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 4</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): There were eight records missing the father’s TPR date.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that the data entered on the TPR tab of the Guardianship screen and the data on the General Information for Adoption screen match. Also, if TPR hearings are entered on the “Court Actions” screen, the data must be the same in</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		<p>all locations in SSIS.</p> <p>See the findings for TPR in the foster care matrix.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case the reviewer found an earlier date than what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case the data was missing, but the reviewer found that the father was deceased.</p>
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Continuous Placement; Cont plcmt Tab Fields: Start date; <i>entry date</i>; Discharge date; <i>discharge entry date</i></p> <p><u>Access Database Screen:</u> There is no clearly identifiable field for the date the adoption was legalized.</p>
#22 Adoptive Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Adoption, Page 2 Tab. Field: Adopting Family Structure Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): Married = 220 (73%); Unmarried couple = 10 (3%); Single female = 58 (19%); Single Male = 7 (2%); Not reported = 5 (2%)</p> <p><u>Access Program Code:</u> Missing data is correctly mapped to blank.</p>
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Client Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): There were seven records that were missing data.</p>
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Client Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): There were 69 records that were missing data. SSIS Client Screen</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
<p>#25 Adoptive Mother's Race</p> <p>a = American Indian or Alaskan Native b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander e = White f = Unable to Determine</p>	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Client Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): Unable to determine = 15 applies</p> <p><u>Access Screen:</u> The State is collecting only two races for the adoptive mother.</p> <p><u>Access Program Code:</u> State needs to provide information regarding the missing code for extracting the adoptive mother's race.</p> <p>If the adoptive parent marital status in element #22 is "single male," then the race categories for adoptive mother should be blank.</p> <p>See findings for race elements in the foster care matrix.</p>
<p>#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic/Latino Origin</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Client Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>If the adoptive parent marital status in element #22 is "single male," then this element should be mapped to "not applicable."</p> <p>See findings for Hispanic/Latino origin in foster care matrix.</p>
<p>#27 Adoptive Father's Race</p> <p>a = American Indian or Alaskan Native b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander e = White f = Unable to Determine</p>	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Client Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>Frequency report (n=300): Unable to determine = 5 applies</p> <p>If the adoptive parent marital status in element #22 is "single female," then the race categories for adoptive father should be blank.</p> <p>See findings for race elements in the foster care matrix.</p>
<p>#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic/Latino</p>	I	<p>SSIS Screen: Client</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
<p>Origin</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>		<p>Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 5 - Adoptive Parents</p> <p>If the adoptive parent marital status in element #22 is “single female,” then this element should be mapped to “not applicable.”</p> <p>See findings for Hispanic/Latino origin in foster care matrix.</p>
<p>#29 –32 Relationship of child to adoptive parent</p> <p>0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies</p>		<p>Access database: Main Adoption Screen, page 6, fields “adoptive parent relationship 1” and “adoptive parent relationship 2”</p> <p>SSIS screen: Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption, Placements/Locations/Absentee; Foster Parent Tab contains the relationship of the foster parents to the child.</p> <p>The State is not reporting more than one relationship between the child and the adoptive parents. The State needs to modify the SSIS screen and the reporting of this data in order to report all possible relationships between the child and his/her adoptive parents.</p>
<p>#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent</p>	I	
<p>#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative</p>	I	<p>There was one error in the case file review findings and the reviewer found this condition applied.</p>
<p>#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent</p>	I	<p>Case file review findings: 8 (27%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all of the error cases there was an additional relationship found that was not reported in AFCARS.</p>
<p>#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative</p>	I	<p><u>Access Program Code:</u> The State incorrectly maps “unknown” to “other non-relative.” Unknown should be mapped to blank.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one of the error cases there was an additional relationship found that was not reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>One error case was reported as “applies” in addition to element #31. The reviewer found this element did not apply.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
<p>#33 Child Was Placed from</p> <p>1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country</p>	I	<p>In one error case, the AFCARS data showed that it applied and the reviewer indicated it did not apply.</p> <p><u>SSIS Screen:</u> Placements/Locations/Removal and Adoption; Removal and Adoption History</p> <p>There is a field “Most recent finalized adoption was from: Within Minnesota; Another State/US Territory; Another Country.” If this field is for the collection of adoption element #33, it needs to be located on a screen in the “Adoption” folder not the history screen.</p> <p>There was no other distinguishable field in SSIS for the collection of this information.</p> <p><u>Access Database Screen:</u> On page six of the “Main Adoption Screen” there are the fields: “responsible agency” and “reporting agency.”</p> <p>The State does not include private agency subsidized adoptions, therefore, all records indicated “within State.”</p>
<p>#34 Child Was Placed by</p> <p>1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent</p>	I	<p>SSIS Screen: General Information for Adoption, page 4; fields “Responsible agency” and “other agency.” It is not clear if this screen can be used to collect the data for this element.</p> <p><u>Access Database Screen:</u> On page six of the “Main Adoption Screen” there are the fields: “placing agency,” “responsible agency” and “reporting agency.”</p> <p>The Access database program code has this element hard-coded to “1, public agency.” This is incorrect because the State does have adoption agreements with families that are adopted through a private agency.</p>
<p>#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No</p>	I	<p>There is no field/means in SSIS to collect this data. It currently is recorded in the Access database.</p> <p>Frequency report (n = 300): Yes = 299; No = 1</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Data Elements
State: Minnesota
AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings
		The program looks for supplemental as well as a maintenance payment. The State needs to check whether “supplemental” includes Medicaid.
#36 Monthly Amount	I	There is no field/means in SSIS to collect this data. It currently is recorded in the Access database.
#37 Adoption Assistance IV-E 1=Yes 2=No	I	There is no field/means in SSIS to collect this data. It currently is recorded in the Access database.