AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Nevada
AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 - September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#1 State	4	
#2 Report Date ___(mo) ___ (year)	4	
#3 Local Agency (County or Equivalent Jurisdiction)	4	The frequency report does not include every county. The staff indicated that not all of the counties have a child welfare office; some offices cover multiple counties. The program code correctly checks for a "job site" code, which is translated to a FIPS code.
#4 Record Number	4	The State uses a Statewide person identifier number.
#5 Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable) ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Hearing Documentation; Field: Hearing - Type and Date. Frequency Report (n=7,241): There are 275 records with a periodic review date that is prior to 2005. The State staff indicated the records with older dates of periodic review are probably from cases that have been closed for several years, but were not entered as closed on the system. The State conducted data clean up and has resubmitted the data. These older years should not be present in the next submission. The program code is correctly initialized to spaces. The program code maps the following court types for this element: DISP DISPOSITIONAL DIST DISPOSITIONAL AND TRANSFER EVAJ EVIDENTIARY/ADJUDICATORY FREV FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD PERD PERIODIC REVIEW PERM PERMANENCY REVIEW The only court types that are appropriate for this element are "periodic review" and "permanency review." The State indicated they no longer have Foster Care Review Boards.

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		The staff indicated that most jurisdictions do six-month periodic reviews, but some offices conduct the reviews more often. In Carson City the reviews are routinely done every 90 days. The program code correctly extracts these earlier dates if the child has been in care for nine months or less. Case file review findings: 9 (18%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There was one record reported as blank and the child had been in foster care since 1999. In four records, the reviewers found dates that were six months later than the date reported to AFCARS. There was one record with a reported periodic review date of 2003. *Post site-visit finding: The State corrected the program code. It is now only looking for the "periodic" and "permanency" reviews (LN490 of CFS728S1)*
#6 Child Birth Date ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	~~4~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): There is one child that is 37 years old. The screen contains a field "estimated." If the "estimated" box is checked, the program enters the 15th as the day of birth, regardless of what day the worker enters in the field. The system generates the age of the individual. There is a field to record a deceased date. Post site-visit finding: Due to the State incorrectly reporting youth that have emancipated from the State's responsibility for care and placement, the rating factor was changed. ACF will monitor the ages in future data submissions.
#7 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	4	Screen: Person Detail

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Nevada
AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 - September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#8 Child's Race 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	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): There are 412 (6%) records reported with more than one race. The Person Detail screen also contains a field for "Primary Language," which is a drop-down list and a field "English Speaking" that is a check box. The Person Detail screen contains the option "child abandoned." The State correctly maps this option to "unable to determine." Also, workers are correctly trained to use "child abandoned" if the parent refuses or declines to give this information. A better way to collect this information may be to add an option of declines/refuses for internal tracking purposes. If it is added, it should map to the AFCARS value "unable to determine." The program code in lines #488-495 (728_foster) incorrectly sets the value "unable to determine" as "applies," if no race information is entered. The program code must be modified to map missing data to blanks, not "unable to determine." The staff indicated they think multiple races are being underreported. This was somewhat supported by the case file review. While the number of cases found in error was very low, they did reflect instances in which more than one race did apply. *Post site-visit findings: The State added the option "Declined to Answer" on the screen. The person demographic information is now consolidated into a separate program code (CFS728_SET_PERSONAL_INFO) that is used to populate all race information. The program code was correctly modified to map missing information to blank and "declined" to "unable to determine." In the 2006A file, there are 152 records missing the child's race.*
#9 Hispanic/Latino Origin	2	Screen: Person Detail

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine		The selection list contains the options Hispanic/Latino, non-Hispanic, child abandoned, and unable to determine. The State needs to remove one of the options (unable to determine or child abandoned), or rename "unable to determine" to "decline." The program code only checks for a "yes" response in this field. If a response is not found, the program code sets this element to "no" (LN #497-501 of code_728_foster.doc). The program code needs to check for each response and map accordingly to AFCARS. *Post site-visit finding: The State modified the selections for this field on its screen. "Unable to determine" was changed to "declined to answer." A new subroutine was written to consolidate the person demographic information. The program code correctly maps the option "Hispanic/Latino" to "yes." The program code correctly maps "declined to answer" to "unable to determine." However, the program code is still incorrect. It does not directly map "child abandoned" to "unable to determine" nor does it directly map "non-Hispanic" to "no." The program code must extract each selection option on the screen.*
#10 Has the child been clinically diagnosed as having a disability(ies)? 1=Yes 2=No 3=Not yet Determined If yes, indicate each type of a disability with a "1."	2	Screen: Medical/Dental Condition Detail and Psych/Behavioral Condition Detail Fields: Condition, Diagnosed by, Source, Date identified, and End date Frequency Report (n=7,241): Yes = 1,012 (14%); No = 180 (2%); Not yet determined = 6,049 (84%) *2006A Frequency Report (n=7.011):* Yes = 940 (13%); No = 2,477 (35%); Not yet determined = 3,594 (51%) The State has a field "immunizations" on this screen. The State has a policy that children are to be seen by a physician within 30 days of removal. In some localities, staff other than caseworkers enter this information (i.e., nurses,

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		support staff, etc.). There also is a screen "examination." This screen contains the date a child was seen by a physician. There is no link between this screen and the "medical/dental condition detail screen." The program code initializes this element to "not yet determined" (LN 508). This element must be initialized to blank. If a diagnosed condition is found, the program code sets element #10 to "yes," and sets the appropriate category(ies) for elements #11-15. The program code then checks the psych/behavior condition screen for a diagnosis and sets elements #10 and #14 accordingly. A better way to collect this information might be to combine all of this information on one screen, and/or add the question "has this child been clinically diagnosed with a disability?" with the options of "yes," "no," and "not yet determined." If the case worker answers the question with a "yes," then the worker would be directed to answer the appropriate diagnoses fields. As a short term solution, the program code can be changed to look at the exam date. If one is found, it should then check if there are also diagnosed conditions. Supervisors need to be instructed to ensure workers are entering the medical information from the exam reports. The program code at LN 697 - 700 indicates that if a medical and physical condition is found, and if the "child's disability is "not yet determined," set this element to "no." This is incorrect, it should be mapped to "yes." The State indicated this is an area for the policy workgroups to address and work with the IT staff to come up with a solution.

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		There are internal reports and/or edit checks that could be implemented to check against a child's placement. Depending on the location, or level of care, if no diagnosed conditions were entered it would flag the record as having an inconsistency. This is also a training issue. The State needs to ensure that everyone understands the use and purpose of this field and what needs to be entered, in a timely manner. Also, this is an area supervisors need to be made aware to check if the data have been entered. Case file review findings: 25 (42%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The majority of the errors were due to "not yet determined" responses in AFCARS, but the reviewers found the child had been to a doctor. The majority should have been "yes." *Post site-visit findings: The State modified the program code to check for an examination type other than "coroner consult," "exam by worker," "sex abuse exam," "speech evaluation," or "WIC exam." If an exam type and date is found then this element is set to "no." The State indicated this is a short term solution. The State indicated they will continue working with the program staff to address training needs and system modifications in order to report accurate data in this area. Explain the note at line 706, "A med condition or phsy behavior was found, but none of them were reported to AFCARS, so set the value to No." Does this mean that there is a condition, but it is one that is not mapped to AFCARS?*
#11 Mental Retardation [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State maps developmental disability (MENT) to this element. Since this can mean either a cognitive or physical developmental disability, the State needs to further distinguish the area of developmental disability and map accordingly.
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State's value "hearing or visually impaired" is vague. If this includes a need for glasses, then it should not be mapped to AFCARS.
#13 Physically Disabled	2	The State maps "cleft palate" to this element. It should be mapped to "other diagnosed

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies		condition." The State has a value "medical equipment/procedure required." This is a vague description and is not a medical diagnosis. It should be removed from the mapping and the actual diagnosis needs to be mapped to AFCARS.
#14 Emotionally Disturbed [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State maps autism to this element. It should be mapped to element #15, other diagnosed condition." The State includes "other DSM condition." This should be removed as there are many DSM conditions that are not mapped to AFCARS, or may not be mapped to this element. "Unable to bond" is not a diagnosed condition. Remove it from the program code. Case file review analysis: The majority of the errors were for this element.
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	Cerebral Palsy is incorrectly mapped to this element. It should be mapped to element #13, physically disabled." The State has a value for HIV positive and it is not mapped to AFCARS. The State should include it. The State's mapping in the program code includes the following: apnea monitor, dialysis, drug affected, head trauma, and other medical diagnosis. These should be removed from the program code and only the actual diagnosed condition should be mapped.
#16 Has this child ever been adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	3	Screen: Participant Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Yes = 120 (2%); No = 760 (80%); Unable to determine = 412 (6%); Not reported = 949 (13%) The screen contains a field for "adoption history," and there is the question "Child ever

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Adopted" with the options "yes," "no," and "unable to determine." There also is a field for "age when finalized." If the answer to whether the child was ever adopted is "yes," the age field must be completed before the worker can save the information. Since this is a mandatory field, it will never be blank. If it is blank, the program code runs an error report and flags it. There are data quality issues with this element. One of the issues is that the intake workers in the southern region of the State are trained to enter "no" at the time the intake call comes in. This section should be completed following a family assessment, not by an intake worker. Suggestions to capture this information more accurately: under "Type" field, add private agency - NV; private agency - out of state agency; out of state public agency; out of country. Some States have all States and countries listed that the worker can select where the adoption took place. The "Type" pull down currently contains the options of foster parent, non-relative, relative, or stepparent, which is related more to relationship of the individual to the child versus the type of agency. If the State makes changes to this field, they may want to add a field for the adoption legalization date for internal tracking purposes. It also could be used to calculate the age when the child was adopted. The worker may only be able to collect information on the year, so that date field would need to be flexible. Case file review findings: 11 (18%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The majority of the error cases were reported to AFCARS as "unable to determine," but the reviewers were able to determine the child had never been previously adopted. In three of the error cases, the response was "no," but the reviewers found it should have been "yes."
#17 If yes, how old was the child when the adoption was legalized?	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Participant Detail; Field "Adoption History"

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
[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		Frequency Report (n=7,241): Not applicable = 0; Not reported = 6,709 (93%) If the response to element #16 is "no," this element is incorrectly mapped to blank. It should be mapped to "not applicable." The age is a mandatory field if the answer on the screen is "yes" to "has this child been previously adopted." *Post site-visit findings: The program code was modified to map this element to "not applicable" if the child has not been previously adopted. Also, the default of "unable to determine" was removed from the program code. If "unable to determine" is selected by the worker for whether the child was previously adopted, this element is now set to "unable to determine." (LN 772 CFS728S1_AFCARS_EXT_FC.) The 2006A data indicate that there are 250 records missing information in element #16, and element #17 indicates 239 missing records. The number of "not applicable" responses to element #17 match the number of "no" responses in element #16.*
#18 Date of First Removal from Home ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	~~2~~ 3	Screen: AFCARS Episode History Detail Fields: Date of first removal from home; date of discharge from last episode; and total number of previous foster care episodes. In instances where the child's first living arrangement is a hospital or a locked facility at the time the agency obtains responsibility for care and placement, the program code incorrectly extracts the date the child entered the hospital or locked facility as the removal date. The program code must be modified to extract the date the child is placed in a foster care setting. Case file review findings: 9 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated that the date of first removal and latest removal were different, the number of removals was one, and there was no date of discharge from a prior removal episode. The reviewer found that the date of first removal was incorrect and should have been the same as current removal date.

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		There were three error cases where the reviewers found an earlier date than what was reported to AFCARS (between one year and one month). In one case, the date was three years later than the one reported to AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified for situations in which the first "placement" is a hospital or a locked facility (LN 863 of CFS728S1_AFCARS_EXT_FC; LN 271 of CFS728_GET_PLACEMENT_INFO). If so, then it continues checking in ascending date order (earliest first, most recent is last) for the next living arrangement that is not a hospital or a locked facility and uses the starting date of that living arrangement as the value of this element. The 2006A data file indicates there are 24 records with an invalid date of 00000000.*
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	3	Screen: Removal Status Case file review findings: 7 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In five error cases, the number of removals was less than the number reported to AFCARS. In two error cases, the number of removals was more.
#20 Date Child was Discharged from last foster care episode (if applicable) ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	3	Screen: Legal Status Frequency Report: There are 2 records with invalid data (0000). This may have been entered on the conversion screen. The State will check the next submission frequency for invalid data. *The 2006A data did not contain any invalid dates.* The code correctly checks for the legal status/court order end date. Case file review findings: 9 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were two questionable findings due to the date being several years after the date of latest removal. In one error case, the date reported to AFCARS was three years after the date reported in element #21, and the date found by the reviewer did not match what was reported to AFCARS. In one error case the date of discharge from the previous removal episode was two years prior to what was reported to AFCARS. In one error case, the date reported to AFCARS was two years after the

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		date reported in element #21. Two error cases were because the child actually had only one removal episode.
#21 Date of Latest Removal ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Removal Status In instances where the child's first living arrangement is a hospital or a locked facility at the time the agency obtains responsibility for care and placement, the program code extracts the date the child entered the hospital or locked facility as the removal date. The program code must be modified to extract the date the child is placed in a foster care setting. Case file review findings: 8 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the child had only one removal and the date should have been the same as the date in element #18. In two error cases, the dates of latest removal were actually prior to the date reported to AFCARS. In four error cases, the dates of removal were between one month and six months earlier than what was reported to AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified for situations in which the first "placement" is a hospital or a locked facility (LN 863 of CFS728S1_AFCARS_EXT_FC; LN 271 of CFS728_GET_PLACEMENT_INFO). If so, then it continues checking in ascending date order (earliest first, most recent is last) for the next living arrangement that is not a hospital or a locked facility and uses the starting date of that living arrangement as the value of this element.*
#22 Date of Latest Removal Transaction Date ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	2	This is a system-generated date. However, during the review it was discovered that the State technical staff will delete a record in situations where the worker may have entered the wrong removal date. The staff indicated they were instructed by the SACWIS review team to freeze the removal and legal status dates once they have been entered and saved. Consequently, in situations where a worker may have entered the wrong date and needs it corrected, and after the record has been deleted, a new transaction date is generated which may then fail the timeliness standard for foster care element #22. Additionally, depending on when the error was found, all the remaining case data may

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		need to be re-entered. Or, if it is never corrected, the wrong date of removal will be in the system. This could affect some performance measurements such as, length of time in care. While the AFCARS team agrees workers should have limited ability to change data once it is entered, we also recognize that errors will occur that must be corrected. Additionally, the AFCARS team strongly discourages the deletion of entire records in the event of errors in data entry fields. It is the AFCARS review team position that 1) only a Database Administrator have deletion rights to a case or fields; 2) that there be a policy and procedure on when it is acceptable to delete a record; 3) one of the few reasons a case should be deleted is in the event a removal case was opened when in fact the child was never removed from his/her home; and, 4) incorrect information in a field may be deleted, not the entire record, with supervisory approval.
#23 Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	2	Screens: Placement/Location Directory and Placement/Location Detail *2006A Frequency Report (n=7.011): There are 70 records missing a placement date.* The program code checks for the begin date of the placement. If there is no placement date, the program code checks the removal date. The check for the removal date needs to be removed. *Post site-visit findings: The check for the removal date has been removed from the extract code.* If the child is taken into care and custody of the State but goes on runaway status prior to entering a placement, the date of placement should reflect the date the child ran away, which should be the same date as they were taken into care. Test Case: The date reported incorrectly reflected the date the foster home became a “pre-adopt” home. The foster family remained the same. Case file review findings: 24 (44%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In 12 records, the reviewers found a date for the current

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		placement that was a year earlier than the one reported in AFCARS.
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	2	Screens: Placement/Location Directory and Placement/Location Detail Frequency Report: There are 463 records with zero placements. This is an improvement from previous data submissions. The State staff indicated these numbers reflect the timeframe during which Clark County was not using Unity and, therefore, should improve. *In the 2006A file there are no records with zero placements. There are 82 records reported as blank.* In Nevada, DCFS caseworkers are responsible for entering and tracking contracted foster care services information, such as institutions. However, the caseworkers rely on the contract workers to forward the information. Therefore, in cases where information is not forwarded to the DCFS worker, contracted placement changes within an institution are not always reported to AFCARS. The State has made efforts to increase accurate reporting of this data by providing incentive for caseworkers to collect this information. Also, some of the records converted from paper files may not contain the full placement history for those cases that were open at the time of conversion. If the case was open, the full placement history for that removal episode should have been converted. The program code was checking the CWAF system for placement history of converted cases (Clark County) and ESCAT for Washoe county. This line has been commented out (LN812/813). Modify the program code to read this line. *Post site-visit findings: The program code was modified to look for converted placement count for children whose current episode started prior to August 2000. The State also found an error in the coding of the "get placement action block" that was preventing the count of placement to be accurate. (Line 925 of CFS728S1, and lines 222 thru 266 of CFS728_GET_PLACEMENT_INFO.)* The program code does check for status changes and correctly does not include them in the placement count.

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Respite, runaways, and trial home visits are correctly not counted as a placement move. It is acceptable to have cases with a placement count of zero **if** it reflects children with runaway as their only placement setting. The program code must count non-acute care hospital stays. The State's program code checks if the hospital stay is less than or more than 30 days. The staff does not believe this time frame is defined in policy or by insurance companies to be "acute." Therefore, the State needs to research how long Medicaid and other insurance companies determine the number of days to be acute care stays and modify the program code accordingly. *Post site-visit findings: The program code was modified to not include as a placement setting hospital stays seven days or less. The program code will use the previous placement setting. If the hospital stay is more than seven days, it will be mapped to institution and the count will be incremented.* The State asked for clarification regarding institutions with several cottages on their campus. The State asked if a child moves within the same institution from cottage to cottage and there is no change in the level of care should each move be counted. If cottages are on same campus, and the child moves from cottage to cottage, this is not counted as a placement move. *Post site-visit findings: In regard to institutions with several cottages on their campus, the State is not to count a move from one cottage to another.* Case file review findings: 38 (68%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all of the error cases, only one had fewer (one instead of two) placement moves. There were a significant number of records having one placement move reported, and the actual number of placements were between two and five. Also, there were several records indicating there were more than six placement moves. Based on the case file review, placements appear to be undercounted. Also, it appears there are some placements that are entered into the system, but the program code is not

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		counting them.
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for Current placement Episode 1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	4	Screen: Removal Status; Field: Initial Manner of Removal
Actions or Conditions Associated With Child's Removal (Indicate all that apply with a "1".) [0-Does not Apply] 1-Applies		Screen: Removal Status; Field: Reasons *2006A Frequency Report (n=7.011): There are 18 records missing information.* The State needs to provide training on selecting all conditions associated with the removal, not just selecting what was on the petition. Case file review findings: There were a significant number of errors across these data elements. In the majority of the cases, there should have been more conditions reported as reasons associated with a child's removal.
#26 Physical Abuse	3	
#27 Sexual Abuse	3	
#28 Neglect	3	The program code includes "domestic violence," but it is not on the selection list on the screen. *Post site-visit analysis: Domestic violence has been added as a removal reason.* It appears case workers are only entering neglect, regardless of whether other conditions applied.
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	3	
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	3	Frequency showed only 22% "applies" for this element. The State staff indicated drug abuse is a significant issue in Nevada. The State needs to provide additional training to ensure case workers enter this information.
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	3	
#32 Child Drug Abuse	3	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Nevada
AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 - September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#33 Child Disability	3	
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	3	
#35 Death of Parent	3	
#36 Incarceration of Parent	3	
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reasons	3	
#38 Abandonment	~~2~~ 3	The program code (LNs 899 and 900) checks for a reason for removal of "abandonment." If it is "applies," the program code incorrectly sets elements #16 and #17 to "unable to determine." The AFCARS definition of abandonment in foster care element #38 is a broad definition of abandonment. It also would include those children left at a grandparent. Therefore, element #16 and #17 cannot be set based on an "applies" response to this element. *Post site-visit analysis: This section of the program code was removed.*
#39 Relinquishment	3	
#40 Inadequate Housing	3	
#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	Screens: Placement/Location Directory and Placement/Location Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Pre-adopt home = 0; Foster Family Home-Relative = 2,073 (29%); Foster Family Home-Non-Relative = 2,159 (30%); Group Home = 154 (2%); Institution = 811 (11%); Supervised Independent Living = 118 (2%); Runaway = 80 1%); Trial Home Visit = 885 (12%); Not reported = 961 *2006A Frequency Report (n=7,011): There are fewer records with missing data, 93.* The State indicated they currently do not report "pre-adoptive homes." The State must modify the selection list and/or the program code to include "pre-adopt homes." The program code first checks for a hospital stay (LN 936- 941). If one is found, it checks if the stay is more or less than 30 days. If less, it will extract the prior placement setting. The Federal team requested the State's policy and/or insurance guides that indicate an acute care stay is defined as 30 days. Using thirty days as the point at which

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		a hospital stay becomes a placement is not a matter of Nevada policy. Anything beyond a brief stay is to be counted in the placement count and as the placement setting. The State uses "Abscondance" as a placement setting. If it is used in the context of a parent taking the child from his/her foster care setting, then continue to report the location from which the child was absconded. If it is used because the child ran away from his/her placement setting, then it should be reported as "runaway." Case file review findings: 15 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were seven records in which the reviewer found the child's placement was a "pre-adoptive home." Also, in three cases, the AFCARS data was blank, but the reviewers found the placement setting information. In two cases, the AFCARS data indicated "foster home - non-relative," but the reviewer found the child was living with relatives. *Post site-visit findings: The program code was modified to not include as a placement setting hospital stays seven days or less. The program code will use the previous placement setting. If the hospital stay is more than seven days, it will be mapped to institution.*
#42 Is Current Placement Out-of-State? 1=Yes (Out of State placement) 2=No (In-State placement)	~~2~~ 3	Screens: Placement/Location Directory and Placement/Location Detail The program code is defaulting to "no" (LN 1252 – 1254). Map missing data to blanks. The State may want to create an error report to identify missing information. Case file review findings: 8 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In most instances, the child was placed out-of-State, but was reported as placed in-State. *Post site-visit findings: The default of missing data to "no" was removed (LN 1395). The 2006A data indicate 85 records missing information.*
#43 Most recent case plan goal	~~2~~	Screen: Case Program/Plan Directory and Child Welfare Permanency Goals

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Nevada
AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 - September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
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	3	Frequency Report (n=7,241): Reunify = 2,102 (29%); Live with Relative(s) = 477 (7%); Adoption = 1,100 (15%); Long Term Foster Care = 107 (1%); Emancipation = 328 (5%); Guardianship = 24 (.33%); Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established = 743 (10%); Not reported = 2,360 (33%) The frequency report shows a significant amount of missing information. The State staff indicated they have been performing data cleanup on this element. *The 2006A indicates fewer cases with missing data and fewer records reported as "case plan goal not yet established."* The program code defaults missing data to "case plan goal not yet established." The program code does check for how long the child has been in care. If a record is found in which the child has been in care for 30 days, it marks it as an error case. The State may want to add a condition that if the child has been in foster care for more than 60 days, and the case plan goal is still blank, then it would be mapped to blank. There were several records in the case file review sample that had "not yet established" as a goal and the child had been in care for more than a year. The State's goal "live permanently with the non-custodial parent other than the one from whom the child was removed" is incorrectly mapped to "live with other relative." It should be mapped to "reunification." If the individual is not a legal parent of the child, then the goal would be mapped to another appropriate goal. "Living with other relatives" would only be accurate if the child was released to a legal relative by blood or marriage. There are goals listed on the drop down selection list that are not mapped into AFCARS. For those children placed back in his/her own home, under the agency's responsibility for care and placement, the goals "maintain at home" and "remain at home" should be mapped to "reunification." The State should provide training on updating case plan goals in a timely manner. Case file review findings: 28 (44%) of the records analyzed did not match what was

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		reported in AFCARS. The majority of error cases had a case plan goal of "not yet established." The children had been in care for more than a year and some had been in care for up to 10 years. There were three records reported as blank, and in two of the records the child had been in care for at least three years. *Post site-visit findings: The code "MCAH" (maintain at home), "RMAN" (remain at home), "LWMP" (live permanently with non-custodial parent) are mapped to "reunification." The program code was modified to map missing data on records of children in care for more than 60 days to blank (LNs 1397 thru 1505).*
#44 Caretaker Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	2	Screen: Person Detail Fields: Marital Information - Effective Date and Status Frequency Report (n=7,241): Married Couple = 265 (4%); Unmarried Couple = 73 (1%); Single Female = 1,243 (17%); Single Male = 40 (.55%); Unable to determine = 5,620 (78%); Not reported = 0 *2006A frequency report (n=7,011): Married Couple = 1,535 (22%); Unmarried Couple = 459 (7%); Single Female = 4,044 (58%); Single Male = 279 (4%); Unable to determine = 0; Not reported = 694 (10%)* In the program code, this element is initialized to "unable to determine." Remove this default setting from the program code. If the child is removed from a man or woman who is married, but separated, this element should be mapped to "married." Case file review findings: 49 (82%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The initialization to "unable to determine" was removed. It is now set to blank. Also, the program code was modified that if element #44 is a couple, dates of birth must be reported for elements # 45 and 46. If it is a single individual, only*

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		element #45 will be reported.
#45 1st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report: There are 5,667 (78%) records reported with missing year of birth. If element #44 indicates a couple, there must be a date of birth entered for data elements #45 and #46. If a date of birth is unknown when the case is opened, the system sets a default year of birth to 1960. This is then extracted in the program code. If a date of birth is unknown, the case worker should enter an estimated year of birth. *Post site-visit findings: If the date of birth is estimated, elements #44 and 45 will be mapped to blank. The State should train workers that a date of birth can be estimated if the age of the mother is known. The program code should extract this estimated date. If the case workers do not know the date of birth or age, this element should be left blank and mapped as a blank in the program code.* Case file review findings: 40 (75%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#46 2nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year (if applicable) ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report: There are 338 records reported in element #44 as either "married couple" or "unmarried couple." There are 907 records reported for this element with a year of birth. Case file review findings: 25 (53%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: If the date of birth is estimated elements #44 and 45 will be mapped to blank. The State should train workers that a date of birth can be estimated if the age of the mother is known. The program code should extract this estimated date. If the case workers do not know the date of birth or age, this element should be left blank*

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		and mapped as a blank in the program code.
#47 Mother's Date of TPR ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	3	Screen: Legal Status Case workers should be recording a date for the most recent mom's TPR. Case file review findings: 8 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#48 Legal or Putative Father's TPR ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	~~2~~ 3	Frequency Report: There are 148 records with a father's TPR date, but there are 273 records reported with an outcome of "adoption." The State staff indicated that there were jurisdictions that were end dating the termination. This has been addressed and should be reflected in the next data submission. One section of the program code (LN 1377-1381) maps the mother's TPR date to the father's. This is incorrect. If the father has a different TPR date this is what should be reported. The program code checks for a deceased date, if one is found it is used as the TPR date. Case file review findings: 16 (25%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The program code setting the mother's TPR date to the father's has been removed. The program code is modified to look for the father's TPR date independently from the mothers (LN1810).*
#49 Foster Family Structure 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	~~2~~ 3	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Not applicable = 1,839 (25%); Married Couple = 1,046 (14%); Unmarried Couple = 45 (.62%); Single Female = 1,076 (15%); Single Male = 226 (3%); Not reported = 3009 (42%)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		The Placement Detail screen has a field for relative placements; the field is "relationship to child." There were 2,048 records reported in element #41 as being a non-foster home setting. The number reported for this element's value "not applicable" should be the same as non-foster homes in element #41. The program code initializes this element to zero. It should be initialized to blanks and the program code should set all placements of non-foster homes to zero. Case file review findings: 13 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The program code was modified to initialize this element to blank. If a child is in a non-foster home setting, this element is set to "not applicable." The 2006A data reflect the change for "not applicable." However, there should only be 2,295 not 2,388 records reported for "not applicable."*
#50 1st Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	3	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Not reported = 5,266 (73%) Case file review findings: 11 (19%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#51 2nd Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	3	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): There is one 13-year old foster parent. Reported = 794 (11%); Not reported = 6,447 (89%) Case file review findings: 9 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		reported in AFCARS.
#52 1st Foster Caretaker's Race	~~2~~ 3	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Reported = 4,232 (58%); Not reported = 3,009 (42%) Elements #52a – 52f are each initialized to a default value of zero. Change the program code to initialize the default value of spaces. These elements should remain blank if the child is in a non-foster home setting. The program code incorrectly sets the value "unable to determine" as "applies" if no race information is entered. The program code must be modified to map missing data to blanks not "unable to determine." *Post site-visit findings: The State added the option "Declined to Answer" on the screen. The person demographic information is now consolidated into a separate program code (CFS728_SET_PERSONAL_INFO) that is used to populate all race information. The program code was correctly modified to map missing information to blank and "declined" to "unable to determine."*
#53 1st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic or Latino Origin 0 = Not applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Not applicable = 0; Yes = 341 (5%); No = 1,634 (23%); Unable to Determine = 0; Not reported = 5,266 (73%) The program code only checks for a "yes." If this respone is not found, the program code is set to a "no." The program code needs to check for each response and map accordingly to AFCARS. If the child is placed in a setting other than a family foster home, this element should be set to "not applicable."

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Post site-visit finding: The State modified the selections for this field on its screen. "Unable to determine" was changed to "declined to answer." A new subroutine was written to consolidate the person demographic information. The program code correctly maps the option "Hispanic/Latino" to "yes." The program code correctly maps "declined to answer" to "unable to determine." However, the program code is still incorrect. It does not directly map "non-Hispanic" to "no." The program code must extract each selection option on the screen. The State has also updated this field for children placed in non-family foster homes to map to "not applicable"(LN 2129).
#54 2nd Foster Caretaker's Race (if applicable)	~~2~~ 3	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Reported = 4,232 (58%); Not reported = 3,009 (42%) Elements #54a – 54f are each initialized to a default value of "does not apply." Change the program code to initialize this field to spaces. There are a high percentage of records reported with missing data. The State indicated that licensing workers should be entering this info into the system. Private agency homes are licensed by the state, so this information is collected as well. *Post site-visit findings: The State added the option "Declined to Answer" on the screen. The person demographic information is now consolidated into a separate program code (CFS728_SET_PERSONAL_INFO) that is used to populate all race information. The program code was correctly modified to map missing information to blank and "declined" to "unable to determine."*
#55 2nd Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin [0 = Not Applicable] 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	Screens: Facility Maintenance Household; Placement/Location Directory; Placement/Location Detail; Person Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Not applicable = 0; Yes = 117 (2%); No = 677 (9%); Unable to Determine = 0; Not reported = 6,447 (89%); Reported = 794

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		The program code only checks for a "yes." If this respone is not found, the program code sets a "no." The program code needs to check for each response and map accordingly to AFCARS. If the child is placed in a setting other than a family foster home, this element should be set to "not applicable." *Post site-visit finding: The State modified the selections for this field on its screen. "Unable to determine" was changed to "declined to answer." A new subroutine was written to consolidate the person demographic information. The program code correctly maps the option "Hispanic/Latino" to "yes." The program code correctly maps "declined to answer" to "unable to determine." However, the program code is still incorrect. It does not directly map "non-Hispanic" to "no." The program code must extract each selection option on the screen. The State has also updated this field for children placed in non-family foster homes to map to "not applicable."*
#56 Date of Discharge from foster care ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	4	Screen: Legal Status *Post site-visit findings: The State implemented three new legal status codes to account for the voluntary status of youth over the age of 18. The caseworker enters a discharge date and reason, and then opens the case for voluntary services.*
#57 Date of Discharge Transaction Date ___(mo) ___ (day)____(year)	4	Program code sets this date to spaces for non-discharged cases. This may result in unintentional modification of the computer-generated date.
#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	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Legal Status Frequency Report (n=7,241): Not Applicable = 4,756 (66%); Reunification = 964 (13%); Living with Other Relative(s) = 1,046 (14%); Adoption = 273 (4%); Emancipation = 70 (1%); Guardianship = 60 (1%); Transfer to Another Agency = 43 (.59%); Runaway = 19 (.26%); Death of child = 10 (.14%) *2006A frequency report indicates there are seven records missing a discharge reason.*

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child		There is an edit check in the program code that if the outcome is "adoption" it checks for a TPR date for the mother and father. If a child is discharged to a relative who has legal guardianship, this element is currently mapped to "living with other relative." Guardianship to relatives is to be mapped to "guardianship." The State should footnote the number of guardianships that were to relatives. The State incorrectly maps "return to non-custodial parent" to "live with other relative." If a child is discharged to a non-custodial parent, the outcome should be "reunification." If the individual was not a legal parent of the child, then the actual legal status would be mapped, adoption or guardianship. "Living with other relatives" would only be accurate if the child was released to a legal relative by blood or marriage. *Post site-visit findings: The State value for relative guardianship is now correctly mapped to "guardianship." The State indicated they will footnote the number of guardianships that are with relatives. The program code was corrected to map the discharge reason of "return to non-custodial parent" to "reunification."*
#59 Title IV-E (Foster Care) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2	Screen: Claim Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Applies = 1,743 (24%); Does not apply = 5,498 (76%) The program code checks for "Claim=payment," which is made out of UNITY. It looks at the payments made and the service dates of those payments. If the payment was made in October, but the service occurred in September, this element would be correctly reported as "applies." Some facility placements bill Medicaid, but then Medicaid bills the State for children who are IV-E eligible. These cases should be mapped to "applies." The code is looking within court order effective dates (the removal episode). The

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		program code should check if a payment was made on behalf of the child for the current report period. *Post site-visit finding: The extract code was modified to check for whether this is a source of income to the child for the report period only.*
#60 Title IV- E (Adoption Subsidy) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	Frequency Report (n=7,241): Applies = 0; Does not apply = 7,241 The State does not claim adoption subsidy while the child is still in foster care.
#61 Title IV-A (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	1	Screen: Resource Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Applies = 5; Does not apply = 7,236 There is no interface between Unity and the TANF system. The program code checks for a type of payment "TANF." It also maps "TEAF" (emergency TANF) incorrectly to this element. Emergency TANF should be mapped to element #65. The State staff indicated they do not believe this field is being used correctly. It is probably selected for families who were receiving TANF at the time of removal. There are children placed with relatives in which the relatives are receiving TANF. The option on the screen just lists TANF. The State could change it to TANF/kinship to make clear it is for those children placed with relatives and TANF is a source of income. The code is looking within court order effective dates (the removal episode). The program code should check if a payment was made on behalf of the child for the current report period. *Post site-visit finding: The extract code was modified to check for whether this is a*

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		source of income to the child for the report period only.
#62 Title IV-D (Child Support) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	1	Screen: Receivable Account Frequency Report (n=7,241): Applies = 0; Does not apply = 7,241 There is not an interface between Unity and the Child Support Program information system. The program code checks the "receivable account" table then checks for a type code of "CHSP." If one is found, this element is set to "applies." The staff indicated that the Department of Welfare sends a check stub to DCFS. The agency is not able to identify which amount is associated with which child. If the finance office could have the check broken down by child, they could enter it into the system. The code is looking within court order effective dates (the removal episode). The program code should check if a payment was made on behalf of the child for the current report period. *Post site-visit finding: The extract code was modified to check for whether this is a source of income to the child for the report period only.*
#63 Title XIX (Medicaid) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	~~2~~ 4	Screen: Eligibility XIX Frequency Report (n=7,241): Applies = 4,443 (61%); Does not apply = 278 (61%) Test Cases: #I - The answer should have been "applies." The State incorrectly reported this element as "does not apply." The code is looking within court order effective dates (the removal episode). The program code should check if a payment was made on behalf of the child for the current report period.

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Post site-visit finding: The extract code was modified to check for whether this is a source of income to the child for the report period only.
#64 SSI or other Social Security Act Benefits 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	~~2~~ 4	Screen: Resource Detail Frequency Report (n=7,241): Applies = 190 (3%); Does not apply = 7,051 (97%) The code is looking within court order effective dates (the removal episode). The program code should check if a payment was made on behalf of the child for the current report period. *Post site-visit finding: The extract code was modified to check for whether this is a source of income to the child for the report period only.*
#65 None of the Above 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2	This element is initialized to zero. If elements #59-64 are "does not apply," this element is set to "applies." The program code should also check for any other sources of income, State, Federal or private. Such as: emergency assistance, title IV-B, trust fund, railroad retirement, life insurance, etc. The program code should also check the Resource Detail screen for "assets." The code also needs to check for paid claims. Emergency TANF should be mapped to this element. *Post site-visit finding: The extract code was modified to check for whether this is a source of income to the child for the report period only.*
#66 Amount Of Monthly Foster Care Payment (regardless of source)	~~2~~ 4	Screen: Claim Detail The code is checking for the dollar amount that was paid, then starts adding amounts (transmittal record amounts). The amount being reported is actually for the entire report

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		period, which is incorrect. Frequently residential care bills Medicaid directly and is showing clothing allowance, which shouldn't be included. The code needs to exclude incidental expenses. The program code checks for a bed check on a claim and the last full month of payment. The code should check that the child was in the same setting for the whole month. If the child moved into a group home from a foster home at the end of the report period, the setting and the amount wouldn't match. Report it as all zeroes in this instance. *Post site-visit finding: The program code has been modified to only look for placement costs, not incidental expenses. It was also changed to look for the amount spent during the last whole month for the child in the child's current setting. If the child changed placement types, it will be reported as blanks. See line number 2337.*

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements
State: Nevada
AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 - September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#1 State FIPS Code	4	
#2 Report Period End Date	4	
#3 Record Number	4	
#4 State Agency Involvement 1 = Yes 2 = No	~~2~~ 3	Frequency Report (n=215): Yes = 214; No = 1 The program code checks three adoption elements (#31, #34, and #35) in order to determine the response for this element. If the person adopting the child was a foster parent, or if the public agency placed the child, or if the child is receiving a monthly subsidy, then the program code sets this element to "yes." If this element is still blank after checking the above, the program code defaults to "no" (LN 239 of CFS728C_AFCARS_EXT). If after checking adoption elements #31, #34, and #35 no information is found, this element should be set to blank. If there are blanks reported for this element, the State can investigate why information is missing. *Post site-visit findings: The program code CFS728C_AFCARS_EXT has been modified and the default was removed from this program. The program code CFS728S2_AFCARS_EXT_ADPT was modified so that after checking the responses for elements #31, #34, and #35 and the indicator is a "yes" or a "1," then this element is "yes." Otherwise it is "no" (LN1222).*
#5 Child Date of Birth	4	Screen: Person Detail
#6 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	4	Screen: Person Detail
#7 Child Race a = American Indian or Native b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail The Person Detail screen contains the option "child abandoned." The State correctly maps this option to "unable to determine." The program code incorrectly sets the value "unable to determine" as "applies" if no race

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
e = White f = Unable to Determine		information is entered. The program code must be modified to map missing data to blanks not "unable to determine." The staff believe multiple races are being underreported. This was somewhat supported by the case file review. While the number of cases found in error was very low, they did reflect instances in which more than one race did apply. Workers are correctly trained to use "child abandoned" if the parent refuses or declines to give this information. A better way to collect this information may be to add an option of declines/refuses for internal tracking purposes. *Post site-visit findings: The State added the option "Declined to Answer" on the screen. The person demographic information is now consolidated into a separate program code (CFS728_SET_PERSONAL_INFO) that is used to populate all race information. The program code was correctly modified to map missing information to blank and "declined" to "unable to determine." The frequency report for the 2006A data indicate there are two records missing race information.*
#8 Child Hispanic Origin 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	Screen: Person Detail The program code only checks for a "yes" response in this field. If a response is not found, the program code sets this element to "no." The program code needs to check for each response and map accordingly to AFCARS. The selection list contains "child abandoned" and "unable to determine." The State needs to remove one of the options, or rename "unable to determine" to "decline." *Post site-visit finding: The State modified the selections for this field on the screen. "Unable to determine" was changed to "declined to answer." A new subroutine was written to consolidate the person demographic information. The program code correctly maps the option "Hispanic/Latino" to "yes." The program code correctly maps "declined to answer" to "unable to determine." However, the program code is still*

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		incorrect. It does not directly map "child abandoned" to "unable to determine," nor does it directly map "non-Hispanic" to "no." The program code must extract each selection option on the screen.
#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs? 1 = Yes 2 = No	3	Frequency Report (n=215): Yes = 196 (91%); No = 19 (9%) This element is based on the response to element #10 and as such, the quality of this data needs to improve. Case file review findings: 5 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Some of the errors were cases in which it was clear that the child had special needs but the response to AFCARS was "no."
#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 State Defined Special Need	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics; Field: Special Need Adoption The field "Special Need Adoption" has the options: Race/Origin; Age; Sibling Group; and, Conditions. Each is a check box. There is a second row below each of the options of check boxes and the worker is to check the one that is the primary basis for special needs. There is no option for "other State defined special need." The Adoption Subsidy Application screen also contains a field "special needs." This list is more comprehensive. The State staff indicated they do determine special needs based on other factors, such as a drug exposed child who does not currently have medical issues, but may in the future. Modify the screen to include an option to collect information on "Other State Defined Special Needs." The "other" information can be collected on the subsidy screen. Because this will be determined by looking at two different screens, the State will need to determine how to differentiate what the worker has indicated as the primary basis. If this element is set to "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities," the program code correctly checks for and maps medical conditions for

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		elements #11-15. Otherwise, disability information is not reported correctly. Case file review findings: 12 (44%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In most of the cases marked in error for the primary basis for special needs, the errors were because the reviewers found another reason that was the biggest barrier to the child being adopted. In many instance the reason reported was medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities. In some instances, the conditions being reported for this reason and mapped to elements #11-15 were not conditions that would be mapped to these values but instead, would be mapped to "other State defined reason" for the primary basis. *Post site-visit findings: The State modified the Adoption Characteristics screen with an additional check box in the Special Needs area for "other State Defined." The program code was correctly modified to check for this value (LN 240, CFS728S2).*
#11 Mental Retardation	2	Screen: Medical/Dental Condition Detail The State maps developmental disability (MENT) to this element. Since this can mean either a cognitive or physical developmental disability, the State needs to further distinguish the area of developmental disability and map accordingly.
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	2	Screen: Medical/Dental Condition Detail The State's value "hearing or visually impaired" is vague. If this includes a need for glasses, then it should not be mapped to AFCARS.
#13 Physically Disabled	2	Screen: Medical/Dental Condition Detail The State maps "cleft palate" to this element. It should be mapped to "other diagnosed condition." The State has a value "medical equipment/procedure required." This is a vague description and is not a medical diagnosis. It should be removed from the mapping and the actual diagnosis needs to be mapped to AFCARS.

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	2	Screen: Medical/Dental Condition Detail The code checks to make sure that the condition didn't have an end date within the report period. The State maps autism to this element. It should be mapped to element #15, "other diagnosed condition." The State includes "other DSM condition." This should be removed as there are many DSM conditions that are not mapped to AFCARS, or may not be mapped to this element. "Unable to bond" is not a diagnosed condition. Remove it from the program code.
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	2	Screen: Medical/Dental Condition Detail Cerebral Palsy is incorrectly mapped to this element. It should be mapped to element #13, physically disabled." The State has a value for HIV positive and it is not mapped to AFCARS. The State should include it. The State's mapping in the program code includes the following: apnea monitor, dialysis, drug affected, head trauma, and other medical diagnosis. These should be removed from the program code and only the actual diagnosed condition should be mapped.
#16 Mother's Birth Year	3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics Frequency report: 15 records were reported as missing and 1 record had an invalid date. The State indicated it has made changes to how this information is entered and the data should continue to improve. The State is currently using 1960 as a default date if the date of birth is blank; thereby giving a false count for the number of mother's born in 1960. If a date of birth is blank it

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		should be reported as missing. If the worker knows the approximate age of the mother, then he/she may enter an estimated date of birth. Case file review findings: 4 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Three cases were reported as blank, but the reviewer found the information. *Post site-visit findings: The State indicated it has cleaned up the data regarding the default year. It will now be reported as blanks (LN 974, CFS728S2). The State should train workers that a date of birth can be estimated if the age of the mother is known. The program code should extract this estimated date. If the case workers do not know the date of birth or age, this element should be left blank and mapped as a blank in the program code. There was an increase in the number of records reported as missing data (25).*
#17 Father's Birth Year	3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics The State is currently using 1960 as a default date if the date of birth is blank; thereby giving a false count for the number of father's born in 1960. If a date of birth is blank it should be reported as missing. If the worker knows the approximate age of the father, then he/she may enter an estimated date of birth. Case file review findings: 12 (43%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Eight cases were reported as blank, but the reviewer found the information. In the other cases either invalid data or the default year was reported instead of a blank for an unknown father. *Post site-visit findings: The State indicated it has cleaned up the data regarding the default year. It will now be reported as blank (LN 974, CFS728S2). The State should train workers that a date of birth can be estimated if the age of the mother is known. The program code should extract this estimated date. If the case workers do not know the date of birth or age, this element should be left blank and mapped as blank in the*

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		program code.
#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics This information is entered on the participant detail screen and is carried forward to the adoption characteristics screen. Case file review findings: 6 (23%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were two error cases reported as missing data, but the reviewer found the information. In one case the answer should have been "yes," in the other two cases the answer should have been "no." In two error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," but the reviewer found that the mother was married at the time of the child's birth. In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated "yes," but the reviewer found that the mother was not married at the time of the child's birth. The quality of this data needs to improve.
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics Frequency report: There are 14 records without a TPR date. *In the 2006A file, the number of records without a TPR date was six.* The program code correctly checks for a deceased date. The State staff indicated changes were made to how this information is entered for the adoption file and the quality should improve. Case file review findings: 6 (23%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were three error cases in which the AFCARS report was blank but the reviewer found the information. In the remaining errors, there appears to be an inconsistency of which date the workers should be entering: the hearing date, the date the order is signed, or the filed date.
#20 Date of Father's TPR	3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Frequency report: There are 15 records without a TPR date. *In the 2006A file, the number of records without a TPR date was 10.* The program code correctly checks for a deceased date. The State staff indicated changes were made to how this information is entered for the adoption file and the quality should improve. Case file review findings: 6 (23%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were three error cases in which the AFCARS report was blank, but the reviewer found the information. In the remaining errors, there appears to be an inconsistency of which date the workers should be entering: the hearing date, the date the order is signed, or the filed date.
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Legal Status and Adoption Characteristics In Nevada, there are different dates that could potentially be entered and reported for this element. After an adoption is legalized, the State then terminates the State's legal custody of the child in a separate hearing. This may be a matter of days or weeks after the finalization, or the worker may wait until the next six-month review. Either date - the legalization date or the date of the subsequent hearing - may be entered. Also, for children placed out-of-State for an adoption it may take several months to receive the adoption decree from that State. The agency's custody isn't dismissed until there is a hearing in Nevada. The State indicated that its workers are no longer carrying out case management activities; the worker is essentially waiting for the paperwork so that the case can be closed. The State indicated this is an area it will bring to the attention of its Court Improvement group. For AFCARS reporting purposes, the State should report the actual date of the hearing granting the adoption. This date should also be reported as the foster care discharge date (foster care element #56). In the program code, if the adoption finalization date is known (from the adoption

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		characteristics screen), the value is used for this element. Otherwise, the code uses the legal status date (legal status screen). The State staff indicated changes were made to the system to populate the finalization date (adoption characteristics screen) with the effective date on the legal status screen to avoid there being two different dates. Since the adoption characteristics screen is now pre-filled with the legal effective date, the second part of the code (LNs 568 - 571 of CFS728S2_AFCARS_EXT_ADPT) could be commented out. Case review: There were foster care cases reviewed in which the children were placed out-of-State and the legalization of the adoption occurred in that State. These adoptions are being finalized in other states because the adoptive parents need to be residents of the State according to Nevada state law. The State needs to verify that these adoptions were reported by them in the adoption file.
#22 Adoptive Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report (n=215): Married couple = 139 (65%); Unmarried couple = 7 (3%); Single female = 57 (27%); Single male = 10 (5%); Not reported = 2 "CARE" stands for care provider and is no longer used. However, there are 7,000 records with this indicator, so it needs to stay in the program code. When the program code checks for single female/male, it only checks for the provider role type of "CARE" and not of "CGVR," which stands for caregiver. The code should be checking for both values. State law does not allow for an unmarried couple to be the adoptive parents. Only one of the individuals is the legal parent. The State staff indicated that there should never be any records reported as "unmarried couple." Case file review findings: 6 (20%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There was incorrect reporting across all values.

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified and both "CARE" and "CGVR" are checked. The program code checks the provider location only when the adoptive parent information is not found by first checking the provider person identified as the legal custodian of the child.
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency report: There are 209 records reported with a year of birth. According to the frequencies in element #22, there should only be 203. The program code checks the provider person role table. The program code checks for provider information rather than the adoptive parents. When the program code checks for single female/male, it only checks for the provider role type of "CARE" and not of "CGVR," which stands for caregiver. The code should be checking for both values. Case file review findings: 6 (20%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified and both "CARE" and "CGVR" are checked. The program code checks the provider location only when the adoptive parent information is not found by first checking the provider person identified as the legal custodian of the child.*
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report: There are 166 records with a year of birth. According to the frequencies in element #22 there should be 156. The program code checks the provider person role table. The program code checks for provider information rather than the adoptive parents.

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		When the program code checks for single female/male, it only checks for the provider role type of "CARE" and not of "CGVR," which stands for caregiver. The code should be checking for both values. Case file review findings: 8 (27%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified and both "CARE" and "CGVR" are checked. The program code checks the provider location only when the adoptive parent information is not found by first checking the provider person identified as the legal custodian of the child.*
#25 Adoptive Mother's Race a = American Indian or Alaskan Native b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander e = White f = Unable to Determine	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report: There are six records reported as blank. According to the frequencies in element #22 there should be 10. This is probably due to the issues noted above; the code is looking at provider information rather than adoptive parent information. Elements 25a – 25f are each initialized to a default value of "does not apply." Change the program code to initialize the default values to spaces. *Post site-visit findings: The State added the option "Declined to Answer" on the screen. The person demographic information is now consolidated into a separate program code (CFS728_SET_PERSONAL_INFO) that is used to populate all race information. The program code was correctly modified to map missing information to blank and "declined" to "unable to determine."*
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No	2	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report: There are six records reported as blank. According to the frequencies in element #22 there should be 10.

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
3 = Unable to Determine		The selection list contains the options Hispanic/Latino, non-Hispanic, child abandoned, and unable to determine. The State needs to remove one of the options (unable to determine or child abandoned), or rename "unable to determine" to "decline." The program code only checks for a "yes" response in this field. If a response is not found, the program code sets this element to "no" (LN #497-501 of code_728_foster.doc). The program code needs to check for each response and map accordingly to AFCARS. *Post site-visit finding: The State modified the selections for this field on its screen. "Unable to determine" was changed to "declined to answer." A new subroutine was written to consolidate the person demographic information. The program code correctly maps the option "Hispanic/Latino" to "yes." The program code correctly maps "declined to answer" to "unable to determine." However, the program code is still incorrect. It does not directly map "non-Hispanic" to "no." The program code must extract each selection option on the screen.*
#27 Adoptive Father's Race	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Person Detail Frequency Report: There are 49 records reported as blank. According to the frequencies in element #22 there should be 57. Elements 27a – 27f are each initialized to a default value of "does not apply." Change the program code to initialize the default values to spaces. *Post site-visit findings: The State added the option "Declined to Answer" on the screen. The person demographic information is now consolidated into a separate program code (CFS728_SET_PERSONAL_INFO) that is used to populate all race information. The program code was correctly modified to map missing information to blank and "declined" to "unable to determine."*
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin	2	Screen: Person Detail

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Frequency Report: There are 49 records reported as blank. According to the frequencies in element #22 there should be 57. The selection list contains the options "Hispanic/Latino," "non-Hispanic," "child abandoned," and "unable to determine." The State needs to remove one of the options ("unable to determine" or "child abandoned"), or rename "unable to determine" to "decline." The program code only checks for a "yes" response in this field. If a response is not found, the program code sets this element to "no" (LN #497-501 of code_728_foster.doc). The program code needs to check for each response and map accordingly to AFCARS. *Post site-visit finding: The State modified the selections for this field on its screen. "Unable to determine" was changed to "declined to answer." A new subroutine was written to consolidate the person demographic information. The program code correctly maps the option "Hispanic/Latino" to "yes." The program code correctly maps "declined to answer" to "unable to determine." However, the program code is still incorrect. It does not directly map "non-Hispanic" to "no." The program code must extract each selection option on the screen.*
#29 –32 0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies		Screen: Adoption Characteristics; Field: Relationship of Adoptive parent to Child. Elements #29-32 are initialized to "does not apply." These fields should initialize to blank. This field was recently modified to allow workers to select all relationships that apply. However, the program code was not updated. The State needs to modify the program code to report all relationships that apply. The State also needs to provide training to workers on selecting all that apply. *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified to report all the*

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		relationships that apply. The State's notes indicate there was a conversion program to update this table with the information on the old table (LNs 1052 thru 1083, of CFS728S2). In the 2006A file, the frequency report indicates that multiple relationships were reported. There are also 25 records with missing information.
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent	~~2~~ 3	Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were three records in which every category was marked "does not apply."
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative	~~2~~ 3	Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the response was "does not apply" and it should have been "apply."
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent	~~2~~ 3	Case file review findings: 6 (20%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In five error cases, the response was "does not apply" and it should have been "apply."
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	~~2~~ 3	Case file review findings: 18 (60%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases the response was "does not apply" and it should have been "apply."
#33 Child Was Placed from 1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics Frequency Report: There are 15 records missing this information. *In the 2006A file, there were seven records missing information.* There is an option on the screen "U.S. Territory." If selected, it is not being mapped to AFCARS. It should be mapped to "another country." "Another State" could occur if there is a private agency in another State that has identified a family in Nevada to adopt a special needs child and the family enters into a subsidy agreement with Nevada. The staff indicated that Nevada law indicates that if the child is in the custody of the agency and placed in another State, Nevada is responsible, but this is not always the case. There are 53 cases currently in the system marked "another State" that would have been excluded from the population. Nevada needs to investigate these cases to determine whether they should have been included in the

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		population. The options on the screen could be modified to clarify what "within state" means. System edits can also be added to ensure that the worker enters the appropriate information. Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In three error records, the AFCARS data was missing. The reviewers found in each case the child was placed from within State. *Post site-visit findings: The field on the screen was modified from "Within State" to "Within Nevada." The State noted that a case review was done to review all records with any selection other than "Within Nevada." Please provide ACF with information on the result of the case review. The program code was modified to map "US Territory" to "Another Country" (LNs 1117 - 1125, CFS728S2).*
#34 Child Was Placed by 1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	~~2~~ 3	Screen: Adoption Characteristics Field: Child placed by Frequency Report: There are 14 records missing this information. *In the 2006A file, there are seven records missing information.* See the issue in element #33 regarding cases reported as "another State." These may actually be public agency adoptions. Case file review findings: In the two error records, the AFCARS data was missing. The reviewers found in each case the child was placed by the public agency. *Post site-visit findings: After reviewing the information, it was determined that the program code and screen are correct and that the State needs to address the quality of the data through training and supervisory oversight.*
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy	2	Screen: Adoption Subsidy Application

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
1=Yes 2=No		Frequency Report (n=215): Yes = 49 (23%); No = 166 (77%) *2006A Frequency Report (n=293): Yes = 278 (95%); No = 15 (5%)* The screen contains a field "Subsidy Characteristics" that includes: Non-Recurring; Type - Financial only; Agreement Only; Medical Only; and, Financial and Medical; and Title XIX and Title XX. "Agreement only" means there is an agreement in place, but services or a subsidy are not provided at the time of the adoption. This is for those children that are determined to be special needs due to a risk of developing some later medical or psychological problem. The program code maps "non-recurring" subsidies to "yes." The options "non-recurring" and "agreement only" should be mapped to "no." The program code is not extracting "medical only." The program code must be modified to map "medical only" (code M) to "yes." Case file review findings: 21 (72%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all of the error cases, this element was reported as "no," but the reviewers indicated yes. *Post site-visit findings: The program code was corrected to include "medical only" and no longer checks for a non-recurring payment. However, it still does not check for an "agreement only" (LNs1193 - 1203, CFS728S2).*
#36 Monthly Amount	~~2~~ 4	Screen: Adoption Subsidy Application The program code must extract the amount in the agreement, not the actual paid claim amount. The program code is incorrectly checking for non-recurring costs, such as legal fees. Modify the program code so that the subsidy agreement amount is reported for this

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		element. Non-recurring costs should not be reported in this element. Case file review findings: 21 (72%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all of the error cases, this element was reported as zeros, but the reviewers found an amount. *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified not to look at non-recurring costs. It is now reporting the subsidy amount that has been approved, not what has been paid (LN 1205, CFS728S2).*
#37 Adoption Assistance IV-E 1=Yes 2=No	~~2~~ 4	Screen: Eligibility IV-E Adoption Subsidy Frequency Report: 100% response of "no." *In the 2006A file, there were 70 records reported as "no," and 223 records reported as "yes."* The program code is checking for a relationship between subsidy and eligibility. The State needs to modify the program code so that this element is determined from the Adoption Subsidy Agreement screen. Case file review findings: 20 (69%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The error cases were reported as "no," but the reviewer indicated "yes." *Post site-visit findings: The program code has been modified to look at the relationship from eligibility to child rather than eligibility to adoption subsidy application (LN 1231, CFS728S2).*