

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#1 State	4	The FIPS code for the State of Wisconsin (55) is hard-coded in the program code.
#2 Report Date	4	
#3 Local Agency (County or Equivalent Jurisdiction)	4	
#4 Record Number	4	
#5 Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable)  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	3	<p><u>Screen:</u> Permanency Plan Review or Hearing Results</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are ten records with a year of 2002; 66 for 2003; 251 for 2004; and, 4,541 (40%) reported as blank.</p> <p>The screen has a field to record “type” and “method” under the general information section of the screen. On the “Basic” tab, there is a field for “date of hearing/review.”</p> <p>In regard to data entry, the State requested assistance on ways they could improve on the collection of information. Currently, there are ticklers in the system to remind workers to enter this data. The State and Federal teams discussed ways to encourage workers to record that the hearing occurred. One suggestion is to implement a system edit that would require case workers to enter the review date, if not done already, before a new permanency plan is created. The State should contact the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data for technical assistance on which States are successfully reporting this information. This is also a question that the State can post on the SACWIS list serve.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The majority of the errors were related to reviewers finding a later review date than the one reported to AFCARS.</p>
#6 Child Birth Date  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	3	<p><u>Screen:</u> Person Management; Basic tab</p> <p><u>Program Code:</u> LN 6140-6143</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are years of birth preceding 1984 (age 21 in 2005). 1941 = 1; 1955 = 1; 1958 = 1; 1961 = 1; 1970 = 1; 1974 = 1; 1977 = 1; 1979 =1; 1983 = 2; 1985 = 5; 1986 = 49 (age of 19); 1987 = 298 (age of 18)</p> <p>The State appears to have several edits to ensure that there is a valid date of birth. However, based on the frequency report, there are still some years being reported that represent individuals over the age of 40. The State and counties need to ensure that workers do not enter a date of birth of a child that is before that of the child’s parents’ date of birth. The State may need to consider an integrity check for the field at the time the worker enters a date of birth.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State is modifying the system so that if a child’s mother or father’s date of birth is later than that of the child’s the following message is displayed: “An age discrepancy has potentially been identified. This child appears to be older than the identified caretaker(s). Please verify all birth dates.”</i></p>
<p>#7 Child Sex</p> <p>1 = Male 2 = Female</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p><u>Screen</u>: Person Management; Basic tab</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 align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Screen</u>: Person Management; Basic tab <u>Program code</u>: LNs. 6121; 8240-8251;8856-8884;8890-8902;</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): No missing data for elements a – f. There are 403 (4%) records reported with two or more races and 99 (.86%) records with “unable to determine” plus a race.</p> <p>eWiSACWIS has the capacity to record only three races for this element. The State must revise the screen to account for all five of the races required in AFCARS and instruct workers to check all that apply. One solution the</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>State may want to consider is to list all the races with a radio button and have case workers select all that apply.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her race.</p> <p>The State may want to incorporate an edit check to guard against identification of a race along with “unable to determine.”</p> <p>The State may want to consider removing the option of “unable to determine” and replace it with “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the race of the child.</p>
<p>#9 Hispanic/Latino Origin</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Yes = 843 (7%); No = 7,942 (69%); Unable to determine = 2,294 (20%); Not Reported = 371 (3%)</p> <p>The Basic tab on the person management screen has a field “ethnicity” that includes several ethnicities/nationalities, including those that would be mapped to AFCARS “Hispanic/Latino Origin.” There also is another field “Hispanic/Latino Origin” with the options of “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine.” The State made a change to the system in June 2005 so that the system will populate the response in this field based on whether or not one of the “Hispanic/Latino” nationalities is selected in the ethnicity field.</p> <p>The State’s values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to consider changing the option of “unable to determine” to “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the ethnicity of the child.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the AFCARS information was “unable to determine,” and in each case the reviewer was able to determine the child was not of Hispanic/Latino origin.</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 align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Person Management, Kinship/ AFCARS Tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Yes = 1,948 (17%); No = 8,387 (73%); Not Yet Determined = 628 (6%); Not Reported = 487 (4%)</p> <p>The system contains this question on the screen with the same responses as in AFCARS. There also is a “Medical Profile” section that records exam dates and diagnosis. The medical profile page documents medications, Axis I and II Diagnoses and other medical information.</p> <p>Case workers are required to complete both sections of the system. The medical profile section of eWiSACWIS is a fairly robust module that captures the dates of a health exam, the provider, diagnoses, and Axis I – IV fields. However, the diagnoses fields are text boxes. This appears to be a good section to record a child’s health conditions and extract the AFCARS data. The text fields for diagnosed conditions must be made into database fields.</p> <p>The State and Federal team discussed various approaches to capturing and reporting the information required for foster care elements #10 – 15. One interim solution is to add program code to check each of the “axis” fields. This would capture information that some workers may be recording. The State suggested checking the “rate setting” section since rates have to be updated every six months.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>The State’s response to the SACWIS Assessment Report dated March 2006, indicates: “Incident number 9530: The 'Child's Disability Information' will be moved from Person Management to the Medical Profile page. This will eliminate entering duplicate data. This is being analyzed for the June, 2006 release.” The State staff indicated they realized this correction would not resolve all of the issues related to collecting health and disability information needed by the State and for AFCARS reporting purposes. Based on the AFCARS assessment review, the State will incorporate the AFCARS review findings into their analysis. The State recognizes a need to reevaluate the screen design in order to provide accurate data to AFCARS.</p> <p>The State’s values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values. The program code maps missing data to blank.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all of the error cases, the AFCARS data indicated “no,” but the reviewer found that the child did have a disability.</p>
<p>#11 Mental Retardation</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>The data is extracted from the person table.</p> <p>The State’s Access database includes codes for several diagnosed conditions (code groups 27, 29, 120, etc.). If the State is using these in the system, many of them could be mapped to AFCARS. See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p> <p>The State may want to add a “help” function that provides information to case workers on what diagnoses would be appropriate for this field.</p>
<p>#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>The data is extracted from the person table.</p> <p>The State’s Access database includes codes for several diagnosed conditions (code groups 27, 29, 120, etc.). If the State is using these in the system, many of them could be mapped to AFCARS. See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		The State may want to add a “help” function that provides information to case workers on what diagnoses would be appropriate for this field.
<p>#13 Physically Disabled</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>	2	<p>The data is extracted from the person table.</p> <p>The State’s Access database includes codes for several diagnosed conditions (code groups 27, 29, 120, etc.). If the State is using these in the system, many of them could be mapped to AFCARS. See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p> <p>The State may want to add a “help” function that provides information to case workers on what diagnoses would be appropriate for this field.</p>
<p>#14 Emotionally Disturbed</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>	2	<p>The data is extracted from the person table.</p> <p>The State’s Access database includes codes for several diagnosed conditions (code groups 27, 29, 120, etc.). If the State is using these in the system, many of them could be mapped to AFCARS. See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p> <p>The State may want to add a “help” function that provides information to case workers on what diagnoses would be appropriate for this field.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 14 (19%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the 13 of the error cases, the response should have been “applies,” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply,” instead of “applies.”</p>
<p>#15 Other Medically</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>	2	<p>The data is extracted from the person table.</p> <p>The State’s Access database includes codes for several diagnosed conditions (code groups 27, 29, 120, etc.). If the State is using these in the system, many of them could be mapped to AFCARS. See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
<p>#16 Has this child ever been adopted?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center"><del>2</del> 3</p>	<p>The State may want to also a “help” function that provides information to case workers on what diagnoses would be appropriate for this field.</p> <p><u>Screen:</u> Person Management; Additional tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Yes = 399 (3%); No = 11,041 (96%); Unable to determine = 10 (.09%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>The data from the 2006A frequency report is not consistent between elements #16 and 17.</p> <p>This is a required field on the State’s system.</p> <p>The field incorrectly pre-fills the screen to “no.” The State must modify the screen so that the field is blank upon first opening a case. <i>Post site-visit findings: The State modified the screen by adding an option “not determined,” which is now the field default. The field remains a required field and “not determined” will appear in red on the AFCARS screen, tab II, indicating it is an error. The worker will then correct the field from the AFCARS screen. The program code maps responses other than “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine” to blank. Therefore, “not determined” will get reported to AFCARS as a blank response.</i></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 align="center"><del>2</del> 3</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not applicable = 11,051 (97%); Reported in age categories = 285; Unable to determine = 114 (1%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>The program code correctly maps this element to “not applicable” for cases where element #16 is “no.”</p> <p>If the age field is left blank, the program code correctly maps a blank to this element.</p> <p>The program code incorrectly maps this element to “not applicable” for cases where element #16 is “Unable to determine.” It should be mapped to “unable</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>to determine.” <i>Post site-visit findings: The program code was correctly modified to map this element to “unable to determine” if element #16 is “unable to determine.”</i></p> <p>This is another field where the State may want to substitute “abandoned” for “unable to determine.”</p>
<p>#18 Date of First Removal from Home</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p><u>2</u> 3</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Placements and Services, Service tab <u>Program Code:</u> LN 4367-4521;4801-4949</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not Reported = 404 (4%)</p> <p>The rating factor was changed because this element is based on what is entered into the system and reported for the removal date (element #21).</p> <p>Removals and discharges are set by flags associated with placement end or start dates recorded in the system.</p> <p>The missing information is related to conversion. The State staff indicated they are using the history screen to clean up data. The State will need to continue to address data clean-up on conversion cases.</p> <p>The program code correctly does not include a removal for which the only placement setting associated with that removal is “Kinship Care – Voluntary,” “Youth Correctional Facility,” or “Adult Corrections.”</p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (19%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of error cases, the reviewers found dates that were earlier than those reported in AFCARS. Many of the dates were several years earlier and all were pre-conversion.</p>
<p>#19 Total Number of Removals from Home</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><u>Program Code:</u> LN 4162-4286, 8345; REMOVAL_CSR: LN 1861-1882 Frequency Report (n=11,450): Zero removals = 228 (2%)</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>The program code correctly does not count a removal for which the only placement setting associated with that removal is “Kinship Care – Voluntary,” “Youth Correctional Facility,” or “Adult Corrections.”</p> <p>“Voluntary kinship care” refers to those situations where family members arrange for the child to be with a relative and there is no agency responsibility for care and placement.</p> <p>The program code correctly does not count removals for which the placement has an ending reason of “placement made in error.”</p> <p>Case file review findings: 10 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In six of the error cases, the reviewers found more removals than what was reported to AFCARS. In general, the AFCARS data indicated only one removal, but the child actually had two. These were all pre-conversion cases. There were four cases in which the reviewer found fewer removals.</p>
<p>#20 Date Child was Discharged from last foster care episode (if applicable)</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Case file review findings: 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The error cases were due to prior removal episodes not entered into the system.</p>
<p>#21 Date of Latest Removal</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Placements and Services, Service tab <u>Program Code:</u> LN 4367-4521;4801-4949;</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not reported = 349</p> <p>The program code correctly does not include a removal for which the only placement setting associated with that removal is “Kinship Care – Voluntary,” “Youth Correctional Facility,” or “Adult Corrections.”</p> <p>“Voluntary kinship care” refers to those situations where family members arrange for the child to be with a relative and there is no agency</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>responsibility for care and placement.</p> <p>The State must modify the program code to account for if the first placement is a locked facility or a hospital setting. For instances in which the child's first placement is a hospital or locked facility, the date of removal is the actual date the child is placed in a community placement.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 16 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In nine error cases, the reviewer found an earlier date than what was reported to AFCARS (pre-conversion). In six error cases, the reviewers had found either more or less removal episodes, which affected the actual removal date for this element.</p>
<p>#22 Date of Latest Removal Transaction Date</p> <p>___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not reported = 349</p> <p>The number of cases missing transaction dates is related to conversion. As these children discharge from the State's responsibility for care and placement, the number of missing cases should become zero. ACF will continue to monitor this data to ensure that the number does decrease over time.</p>
<p>#23 Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting</p> <p>___(mo) ___ (day)___(year)</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Placements and Services, Service tab</p> <p>The program code does not report the date a child went on a runaway status if that is the "living arrangement" as of the end of the report period. The State must report the date a runaway status starts if the child is on runaway as of the end of the report period. When the State implements its "trial reunification," the date the "trial reunification" (trial home visit) starts should be used for this element.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (18%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of cases, the reviewers found dates that were earlier than the ones reported to AFCARS.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	2	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Zero placements = 349 (3%)</p> <p>The State incorrectly excludes detention placements and all hospital stays from the count of placement settings. The State must modify the program code to always count detention placements, and other locked facility placements. In regard to hospital stays, the count must include those hospital stays that extend beyond a brief period. (See 45 CFR 1355.40 and CWPM 1.2B.7 and 1.3.) The State allows a bed to be kept open in a home for up to two weeks. This period is what the State could use as its determination of a short term hospital stay.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 21 (30%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, there were more placements for the current removal episode than what was reported to AFCARS. In general, the placements occurred prior to conversion.</p>
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for Current placement Episode  1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	4	<p><u>Screen:</u> Placements and Services, Service tab</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the State's values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing, it is mapped to blank.</p>
<p>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 align="center">Screen:</p>	<p>_____ Remove Reasons</p> <p>Each of the removal actions or conditions in elements #26-40 is available as a check-box selection for the worker. The State uses the same text for the check-box labels as the AFCARS names of the data elements. The program code correctly maps each of the selections checked on the screen to the applicable AFCARS value as "applies."</p> <p>The data appear to be underreported based on the case file review findings. All of these elements had errors. The majority of them were due to the reviewers finding that the condition was present and the basis for a child's</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>removal.</p> <p>The State needs to reaffirm worker understanding of the importance for indicating all conditions associated with a child’s removal.</p> <p>Case file review findings: Overall, the quality of this data needs to improve. There were errors in all of the data elements. One finding indicated that several records had all (except child’s disability) marked as “applies.” This is more than likely related to how the State converted open cases.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State added “Check All That Apply” to the screen.</i></p>
#26 Physical Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In seven error cases, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”
#27 Sexual Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 13 (18%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In seven error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In six error cases, the response should have been “does not apply,” instead of “applies.”
#28 Neglect	3	Case file review findings: 9 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	3	<p>Case file review findings: 15 (21%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State changed the language to “Caretaker’s Alcohol Abuse.”</i></p>
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 8 (11%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In five error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In three error cases, the response

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State changed the language to “Caretaker’s Drug Abuse.”</i></p>
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	3	<p>The screen lists this value above the options for the parent and is labeled “alcohol abuse – child.” The State should consider either changing the name of the label or reversing the order.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 15 (21%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State changed the language to “Child’s Alcohol Abuse.”</i></p>
#32 Child Drug Abuse	3	<p>The screen, lists this value above the options for the parent and is labeled “drug abuse – child.” The State should consider either changing the name of the label or reversing the order.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State changed the language to “Child’s Drug Abuse.”</i></p>
#33 Child Disability	3	<p>Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p>
#34 Child’s Behavior Problem	3	<p>Case file review findings: 11 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#35 Death of Parent	3	Case file review findings: 6 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”
#36 Incarceration of Parent	3	Case file review findings: 13 (18%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In eight error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In five error cases, the response should have been “does not apply,” and not “applies.”
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reasons	3	Case file review findings: 10 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#38 Abandonment	3	Case file review findings: 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In three error cases, the response should have been “does not apply,” and not “applies.”
#39 Relinquishment	3	Case file review findings: 8 (11%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In four error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In four error cases, the response should have been “does not apply,” and not “applies.”
#40 Inadequate Housing	3	Case file review findings: 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In three error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does 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	2	<u>Screen:</u> Placements and Services, Service tab  Frequency Report (n=11,450): Pre-Adoptive Home = 289 (3%); Foster Family Home (Relative) = 3,243 (28%); Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) = 5,430 (47%); Group Home = 1,103 (10%); Institution = 1,143 (10%); Supervised Independent Living = 0; Runaway = 103 (0.90%); Trial Home Visit = 18 (0.16%); Not reported = 121  The State indicated it does not have supervised independent living

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
8 = Trial Home Visit		<p>arrangements as defined in AFCARS.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that if the child is living with the individuals that intend to adopt him/her, element #41 is reported as a “pre-adopt” home.</p> <p>The program code maps “Kinship care – court ordered” to “Foster family home – relative.” The State indicated “kinship” includes individuals not related to the child by blood or marriage. A law was also recently passed that broadly defines “kinship.” For AFCARS reporting purposes, the State is not to include individuals that are not related to the child by blood or marriage to “relative” care.</p> <p>The State maps treatment foster homes to “non-relative.” The State needs to also account for instances in which the treatment foster home may also be that of a relative to the child and report it as a relative setting.</p> <p>The State staff indicated a recent change was made to the program code and mapping (May, 2006). The State has a value “shelter,” which was not included in the program code. As of July 14, 2006, shelter placements will be included in AFCARS reporting. The State indicated this is probably why there are records with no placement setting. The modified program code sent to ACF after the site-visit included the revisions that were made to this element after the initial documentation was sent to ACF for the AFCARS review. The State needs to provide the value for codes 100 – 103.</p>
#42 Is Current Placement Out-of-State?  1=Yes (Out of State placement) 2=No (In-State placement)	4	
#43 Most recent case plan goal  1 = Reunify With Parent(s) Or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live With Relative(s)	2 3	<p><u>Screen:</u> Permanency Plan</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Reunify = 5,384 (47%); Live With Other Relative(s) = 563 (5%); Adoption = 1,566 (14%); Long-Term Foster Care</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
<p>3 = Adoption                      4 = Long Term Foster Care                      5 = Emancipation                      6 = Guardianship                      7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established</p>		<p>1,171 (10%); Emancipation = 268 (2%); Guardianship = 521 (5%); Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established = 1,977 (17%); Not reported = 0</p> <p>The Permanency Plan screen, Basic tab contains a drop-down selection box for the child’s current permanence goal of record, and a different drop-down selection box for the child’s proposed permanence goal.</p> <p>The program code correctly checks for the most recent permanency plan goal that began after the date of latest removal. However, it incorrectly includes 30 days after the last day of the reporting period. The State must modify the program code to select a permanency goal that occurs on or prior to the last day of the report period. <i>Post site-visit findings: The program code was updated to select permanency goals that occur prior to the last day of the report period.</i></p> <p>If the current goal is “N/A First out of home placement,” the program code selects the “proposed” goal as the value for this element. Otherwise, the program code selects the current goal. The State must modify the program code to map “N/A First out of home placement” to “case plan goal not yet determined.” If after 60 days there is no case plan goal, the program code should report this element as blank. <i>Post site-visit findings: The program code has been updated to correctly map “N/A First out of home placement” to “case plan goal not yet determined.” Program code has been added (lines 9052–9089) to set this element value to blank if the case plan goal has not yet been established and the report period end date is more than 60 days after the date of latest removal.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 12 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the reviewers found:</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes																			
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Reported as:</b></td> <td><b>Reviewer found:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not yet determined (2)</td> <td>Reunification</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-term FC</td> <td>Reunification</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reunification (2)</td> <td>Adoption</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long term FC (2)</td> <td>Guardianship</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reunify</td> <td>Long term FC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Guardianship (2)</td> <td>Live with relative</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Live with relative</td> <td>Long-term FC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Guardianship</td> <td>Long-term FC</td> </tr> </table>	<b>Reported as:</b>	<b>Reviewer found:</b>	Not yet determined (2)	Reunification	Long-term FC	Reunification	Reunification (2)	Adoption	Long term FC (2)	Guardianship	Reunify	Long term FC	Guardianship (2)	Live with relative	Live with relative	Long-term FC	Guardianship	Long-term FC	
<b>Reported as:</b>	<b>Reviewer found:</b>																				
Not yet determined (2)	Reunification																				
Long-term FC	Reunification																				
Reunification (2)	Adoption																				
Long term FC (2)	Guardianship																				
Reunify	Long term FC																				
Guardianship (2)	Live with relative																				
Live with relative	Long-term FC																				
Guardianship	Long-term FC																				
<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 align="center">3</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Placements and Services, Service tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Married Couple = 2,389 (21%); Unmarried Couple= 1,027 (9%); Single Female = 6,795 (59%); Single Male = 694 (6%); Unable to Determine = 171 (2%); Not reported = 374 (3%)</p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were several records reported as “unable to determine,” but the reviewers found the information.</p>																			
<p>#45 1<sup>st</sup> Primary Caretaker’s Birth Year</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are years reported from 1996 (age 10) and later (29 records).</p> <p>There are 520 records missing dates of birth. This is higher than the number of missing records for element #44. There are three records with dates of birth of 1870 and 1875, these would no longer be valid years of birth. There are 10,905 records reported in element #44 that should have a date of birth for this element.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the AFCARS data reflected the child’s date of birth and not the mom’s. In one, the date reported to AFCARS was the child’s date of birth. In this case, the parent</p>																			

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>had relinquished her rights in 1998, prior to conversion.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State is modifying the system by checking if the associated "PERSON.dt_brth is &lt; qt_age = 15 or &gt; qt_age = 75" when a "primary caretaker" and/or "secondary caretaker" is selected from the Service tab of the Out of Home Placement window. If one of the two conditions is met the following message will be displayed: "An age discrepancy has potentially been identified. Please verify the caretaker's date of birth on the Person Management window."</i></p>
<p>#46 2<sup>nd</sup> Primary Caretaker's Birth Year (if applicable)</p> <p>___(mo) ___(day)___(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are 3,416 records that should have a date of birth for this element.</p> <p>There were only 3,140 records reported with a valid year of birth, a difference of 276 records. There are years reported from 1996 (age 10) and later (29 records). There is one record with a year of birth of 1875; this is not a valid year.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In general, the errors were due to the AFCARS field reported as blank, but the reviewer either found a date of birth and/or the family structure for element #44 was "married couple."</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State is modifying the system by checking if the associated "PERSON.dt_brth is &lt; qt_age = 15 or &gt; qt_age = 75" when a "primary caretaker" and/or "secondary caretaker" is selected from the Service tab of the Out of Home Placement window. If one of the two conditions is met the following message will be displayed: "An age discrepancy has potentially been identified. Please verify the caretaker's date of birth on the Person Management window."</i></p>
<p>#47 Mother's Date of TPR</p> <p>___(mo) ___(day)___(year)</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Legal Status</p> <p>The findings for the TPR dates in the adoption file also apply to this element.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>The legal status screen contains three date fields, “hearing date/date legal status changed,” “date filed/served,” and “date ordered entered.” These legal status fields are for several court related activities. However, there appears to be some discrepancy regarding what the intention was for each of the date fields. There is some confusion regarding what is to be entered in each of the fields and two of the fields may be duplicative of one another. The State staff indicated they need to meet and discuss the use of these date fields and perhaps revise them to be more clear and to ensure that dates that are needed for various legal actions is captured. Based on decisions made by the State to address the fields, the system and program code may need to be modified.</p> <p>For reporting TPR dates, the program code uses the date field “date order entered.” The State team seemed to think that this field and the “hearing date/date legal status changed” are to be the same date. However, workers may be entering the date they entered the TPR date into the system for the “date ordered entered” field, or something else.</p> <p>The program code checks for a date without regard to the end of the report period. The program code needs to be modified to only report TPR dates that occur prior to the end of the report period. <i>Post site-visit findings: The State modified the program code to ensure that the mother’s TPR date will be reported only if it occurs prior to the end of the reporting period.</i></p>
<p>#48 Legal or Putative Father’s TPR</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Legal Status</p> <p>The findings for the TPR dates in the adoption file also apply to this element.</p> <p>The legal status screen contains three date fields, “hearing date/date legal status changed,” “date filed/served,” and “date ordered entered.” These legal status fields are for several court related activities. However, there appears to be some discrepancy regarding what the intention was for each of the date fields. There is some confusion regarding what is to be entered in each of the fields and two of the fields may be duplicative of one another. The State staff</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>indicated they need to meet and discuss the use of these date fields and perhaps revise them to be more clear and to ensure that dates that are needed for various legal actions is captured. Based on decisions made by the State to address the fields, the system and program code may need to be modified.</p> <p>For reporting TPR dates, the program code uses the date field “date order entered.” The State team seemed to think that this field and the “hearing date/date legal status changed” are to be the same date. However, workers may be entering the date they entered the TPR date into the system for the “date ordered entered” field, or something else.</p> <p>The program code checks for a date without regard to end of the report period. The program code needs to be modified to only report TPR dates that occur prior to the end of the report period. <i>Post site-visit findings: The State modified the program code to ensure that the father’s TPR date will be reported only if it occurs prior to the end of the reporting period.</i></p>
<p>#49 Foster Family Structure</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable                      1 = Married Couple                      2 = Unmarried Couple                      3 = Single Female                      4 = Single Male</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Home Provider</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not Applicable = 2,548 (22%); Married Couple = 5,039 (44%); Unmarried Couple = 310 (3%); Single Female = 3,160 (28%); Single Male = 260 (2%); Not reported = 133</p> <p>There are 193 records missing a marital status according to the number of records reported as the child living in a foster home for element #41. There are more records reported as “not applicable” for this element than there are records reported in element #41 for non-foster home settings (including runaway and trial home visit).</p> <p>The program code checks if the “FL-HOME” in the Provider Organization table is “N.” If it is, this element is set to “not applicable.” Otherwise, it correctly maps the State’s values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing it is mapped to blank.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		Based on the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology’s technical assistance report (8/2004), the same finding was made and the State indicated they believe it was related to conversion. Given that it is now two years later, these records should no longer be missing marital information. The State must update the records for its providers.
#50 1 <sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker’s Birth Year	3	<p><u>Screen:</u> Home Provider, Members tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are 12 minors as foster parents. There are only 8,764 records with a year of birth (as opposed to 8,962 records of children living in foster homes).</p> <p>Additionally, the findings regarding missing data in element #49 apply to this element.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State modified the system with an edit checking if the foster provider is less than 18 years old. The edit message will read: “A person that is under 18 years of age has been selected as Parent 1 or Parent 2. Do you wish to continue? &lt;Yes&gt; &lt;No&gt;”</i></p>
#51 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker’s Birth Year	3	<p><u>Screen:</u> Home Provider, Members tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are 5,349 records reported in element #49 as being either a married or unmarried couple and only 5,259 records with a year of birth reported for the second foster parent.</p> <p>Additionally, the findings regarding missing data in element #49 apply to this element.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State modified the system with an edit checking if the foster provider is less than 18 years old. The edit message will read: “A person that is under 18 years of age has been selected as Parent 1 or Parent 2. Do you wish to continue? &lt;Yes&gt; &lt;No&gt;”</i></p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
<p>#52 1<sup>st</sup> 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 align="center">2</p>	<p>Blank data is incorrectly mapped to "no." This was supported by the case file review findings. The program code must be modified to map blanks if the child is in a non-foster home setting, or if the worker does not know the information.</p> <p>eWiSACWIS has the capacity to record only three races for this element instead of having the ability to check all races that apply. The State must revise the screen to account for all five of the races required in AFCARS. One solution the State may want to consider is to list all the races with a radio button and have case workers to select all that apply.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to incorporate an edit check to guard against identification of a race along with "unable to determine."</p> <p>The State may want to consider removing the option of "unable to determine" and replace it with "declined" or "refused" to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide his/her race.</p>
<p>#53 1<sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Hispanic or Latino Origin</p> <p>0 = Not applicable                      1 = Yes                      2 = No                      3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not applicable = 0; Yes = 241 (2%); No = 7,769 (68%); Unable to determine = 528 (5%); Not reported = 2,912.</p> <p>The State's values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>There is no logic in the program code to set the value to "Not applicable" if foster care element #41 has a value = 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8. The State must modify the program code to set this element to "not applicable" when a child is placed in a non-foster home setting.</p> <p>The Basic tab on the person management screen has a field "ethnicity" that</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
		<p>includes several ethnicities/nationalities, including those that would be mapped to AFCARS “Hispanic/Latino Origin.” There also is another field “Hispanic/Latino Origin” with the options of “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine.” The State made a change to the system in June 2005 so that the system will populate the response in this field based on whether or not one of the “Hispanic/Latino” nationalities is selected in the ethnicity field.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to consider changing the option of “unable to determine” to “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the ethnicity of the child.</p>
<p>#54 2<sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker’s Race (if applicable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. American Indian or Alaska Native</li> <li>b. Asian</li> <li>c. Black or African American</li> <li>d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</li> <li>e. White</li> <li>f. Unable to Determine</li> </ul>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Blank data is incorrectly mapped to “no.” This was supported by the case file review findings. The program code must be modified to map blanks if the child is in a non-foster home setting, or if the worker does not know the information.</p> <p>eWiSACWIS has the capacity to record only three races for this element instead of having the ability to check all races that apply. The State must revise the screen to account for all five of the races required in AFCARS. One solution the State may want to consider is to list all the races with a radio button and have case workers to select all that apply.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to incorporate an edit check to guard against identification of a race along with “unable to determine.”</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
<p>#55 2<sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin</p> <p>[0 = Not Applicable]                      1 = Yes                      2 = No                      3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>The State may want to consider removing the option of “unable to determine” and replace it with “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide his/her race.</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not applicable = 0; Yes = 154 (1%); No = 4,698 (41%); Unable to determine = 244 (2%); Not reported = 6,354.</p> <p>The Basic tab on the person management screen has a field “ethnicity” that includes several ethnicities/nationalities, including those that would be mapped to AFCARS “Hispanic/Latino Origin.” There also is another field “Hispanic/Latino Origin” with the options of “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine.” The State made a change to the system in June 2005 so that the system will populate the response in this field based on whether or not one of the “Hispanic/Latino” nationalities is selected in the ethnicity field.</p> <p>The State’s values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to consider changing the option of “unable to determine” to “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the ethnicity of the child.</p> <p>There is no logic in the program code to set the value to “Not applicable” if foster care element #41 has a value = 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, and #49 is a married or unmarried couple. The State must modify the program code to set this element to “not applicable” when a child is placed in a non-foster home setting.</p>
<p>#56 Date of Discharge from foster care</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>The date of discharge is extracted from the Episode table if the placement discharge flag is “Yes.”</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)		The State identified the reason for why there were more dates of discharge than transaction dates. By State policy, a supervisor must approve the discharge information prior to it being approved. This is when it would be reported to AFCARS as a discharge. The program code does not check for “approved” cases. The State needs to modify the program code to check for “approved” cases for reporting a discharge.
#57 Date of Discharge Transaction Date  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	2 3	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): There are six records with a transaction date in 2004. There are more dates of discharge than transaction dates (3140 versus 3117).</p> <p>The State investigated the cause of the transaction dates that were from 2004 found an error in the adoption section of the program code. The State will modify the program code. <i>Post site-visit findings: The State made corrections to the program code to refine the reporting of the date of discharge and the corresponding transaction date (to blanks) for cases ending in adoption after the report period end date. Confirmation of this correction will be determined after analyzing the frequency report for the next data file submission from the State.</i></p>
#58 Reason for Discharge  [0 = Not Applicable] 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child	4	<p>Frequency Report (n=11,450): Not Applicable = 8,310; Reunification = 1,990 (17%); Living with Other Relative(s) = 85 (.74%); Adoption = 446 (4%); Emancipation = 188 (2%); Guardianship = 291 (3%); Transfer to Another Agency = 95 (.83%); Runaway = 42 (.37%); Death of Child = 3; Not reported = 0</p> <p>The program code correctly sets this element to “Not applicable” if element #56 (Date of discharge from foster care) is blank.</p>
#59 Title IV-E (Foster Care)	4	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
0-Does not apply 1-Applies		
#60 Title IV-E (Adoption Subsidy)  0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	
#61 Title IV-A (Aid to Families with Dependent Children)  0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	The State does use TANF funds for relatives that are foster care parents, and are not licensed (TANF kinship care - court ordered and voluntary). Only the court ordered cases are reported to AFCSARS.
#62 Title IV-D (Child Support)  0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	
#63 Title XIX (Medicaid)  0-Does not apply 1-Applies	3	<p>The frequency for this element is low and should be higher. The State indicated there was a correction implemented about 6 months ago, related to the MMSS interface. However, it wasn't fully accurate and a new enhancement was made. It is scheduled for implementation in September of this year.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The program code was updated to check the MEDICAID_CERT table, which is linked to the MEDICAID_ELIGIBILITY table, for the dates defining the beginning and end of certification for a given eligibility ID. The code ensures that the certification date range includes at least some time within the reporting period before setting the value of this element to "applies."</i></p> <p><i>Ask the State to explain the condition "CD_MMIS_STAT = 3" when selecting records from the MEDICAID_CERT table in line #3412. ACF: Is this the mapping code required for the interface to the Medicaid information system?</i></p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings/Notes
#64 SSI or other Social Security Act Benefits  0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	
#65 None of the Above  0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2 3	The State must modify the program code to also check for other assets even if one of element #59 – 65 is also “applies.”  <i>Post site-visit findings: The program code was updated to also check if a payment was made for the reporting period, excluding any payment that could be considered as corresponding to the types associated with elements 59 through 64. This change allows for the possibility that element #65 “applies” and one or more of elements #59-64 also “applies.” In that case, the source of the payment(s) for #65 is different than the source for #59-64.</i>
#66 Amount Of Monthly Foster Care Payment (regardless of source)	4	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
#1 State FIPS Code	4	The FIPS code for the State of Wisconsin (55) is hard-coded in the program code.
#2 Report Period End Date	4	
#3 Record Number	4	
#4 State Agency Involvement  1 = Yes 2 = No	4	
#5 Child Date of Birth	4	
#6 Child Sex  1 = Male 2 = Female	4	
#7 Child's Race	2	<p><u>Screen:</u> Person Management; Basic tab <u>Program code:</u> LNs. 6121; 8240-8251;8856-8884;8890-8902;</p> <p>eWiSACWIS has the capacity to record only three races for this element. The State must revise the screen to account for all five of the races required in AFCARS and instruct workers to check all that apply. One solution the State may want to consider is to list all the races with a radio button and have case workers to select all that apply.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her race.</p> <p>The State may want to incorporate an edit check to guard against identification of a race along with “unable to determine.”</p> <p>The State may want to consider removing the option of “unable to determine” and replace it with “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
<p>#8 Child Hispanic Origin</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>3 4</p>	<p>situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the race of the child.</p> <p><u>Screen:</u> Person Management, Basic tab <u>Program code:</u> LNs 2442-2514; 3277-3278; 3626-3638; 3279</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=472): Yes = 48 (10%); No = 391 (83%); Unable to determine = 32 (7%); Not reported = 1</p> <p>The Basic tab on the person management screen has a field “ethnicity” that includes several ethnicities/nationalities, including those that would be mapped to AFCARS “Hispanic/Latino Origin.” There also is another field “Hispanic/Latino Origin” with the options of “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine.” The State made a change to the system in June 2005 so that the system will populate the response in this field based on whether or not one of the “Hispanic/Latino” nationalities is selected in the ethnicity field.</p> <p>The State’s values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to consider changing the option of “unable to determine” to “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the ethnicity of the child.</p>
<p>#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Certification of Special Needs window (and Adoption Eligibility window) <u>Program code:</u> LNs 2933-2976; 3284-3346</p>
<p>#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Racial/Original Background</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Screen:</u> Certification of Special Needs <u>Program code:</u> LNs 2933-2976; 3290-3346</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=472): Not applicable = 0; Race/Original Background =</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Rating Factor</b>	<b>Notes/Findings</b>
<p>2 = Age                      3 = Membership in a Sibling Group                      4 = Medical Conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities                      5 = Other State Defined Special Need</p>		<p>20 (4%); Age = 50 (11%); Sibling group = 52 (11%); Medical, etc. = 263 (56%); Other = 87 (18%)</p> <p>The program code incorrectly reports elements #11 – 15 regardless of the response to element #10. It should only extract information for elements #11 – 15 if the response to element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p> <p>There are two fields on the screen for recording special needs information. One is for the “primary basis” and it is a selection list. The other is a field listing all of the same conditions and the workers can select all others that apply. The options in the two fields are: “Age,” “Member of a sibling group,” “Member of a minority group,” “Serious emotional maladjustment,” “Physical disability,” “Mental disability &amp;/or Learn. Disability,” “Medically fragile,” “Visually/hearing impaired,” and “Developmental delay (CFS-40).”</p> <p>The Federal team asked for clarification regarding the option “other med. diagnosed condition/at-risk.” The staff indicated it is intended to reflect a situation where the child is at-risk of a health/mental health condition as determined by a medical professional. The Federal team indicated this may be a misleading label as it contains both the words “at-risk” and “diagnosed” and there is no other category for diagnosed medical, mental, physical, or emotional disability. Workers may be selecting this item instead and not using it only for “at-risk” children. Also, the State is mapping this option to the AFCARS value “4.” Children determined to be special needs due to being at-risk of a future health/mental health condition is to be mapped to “5, other State defined.” The State needs to separate these two, or clarify the current terminology and add another category that will capture the diagnosed health conditions.</p> <p>The program code maps “medically fragile” to “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” If this is not a specific diagnosed</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
		<p>condition, it should be mapped to the category “other State defined.”</p> <p>The program code includes “other,” which is mapped to “other State defined.” The State indicated it is used if something new is being used and it has not been added. If the State implements new conditions that determine a child to be special needs, the system should be changed to reflect the change once it begins to be used in practice.</p> <p>The Federal and State team discussed possible revisions that could be made for the collection of this information in order to improve its accuracy and to simplify the meanings of the various categories to the workers. One suggestion is to include as the primary basis those categories used in AFCARS and then have a more detailed list, as used currently, for the workers to specify other reasons for special needs and to provide more detail.</p>
#11 Mental Retardation	2	<p>The State incorrectly maps “learning disability” to this element. It is to be mapped to “other diagnosed condition.”</p> <p>Based on the findings for foster care, there may be additional diagnosed conditions the State uses that could be mapped to this element. The State needs to review diagnosed conditions that are used and map accordingly to this element if the response to element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p>
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	4 2	<p>The rating for this element was changed based on the findings for foster care. There may be additional diagnosed conditions the State uses that could be mapped to this element. The State needs to review diagnosed conditions that are used and map accordingly to this element if the response to element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p>
#13 Physically Disabled	4 2	<p>The rating for this element was changed based on the findings for foster care. There may be additional diagnosed conditions the State uses that could be mapped to this element. The State needs to review diagnosed conditions that</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
		are used and map accordingly to this element if the response to element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	2	<p>The State maps “emotional maladjustment” to this element. This is not a diagnosis, and as such is too broad and could include behaviors that would not be mapped to this element.</p> <p>Based on the findings for foster care, there may be additional diagnosed conditions the State uses that could be mapped to this element. The State needs to review diagnosed conditions that are used and map accordingly to this element if the response to element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Two of the error cases were due to this element being marked as “applies” when the response to #10 was not the value 4. In one error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	2	<p>The State maps “developmental delay” to this element. This is probably not the appropriate category. Depending on whether the delay is cognitive, emotional, or physical, it would go into one of the other elements.</p> <p>Based on the findings for foster care, there may be additional diagnosed conditions the State uses that could be mapped to this element. The State needs to review diagnosed conditions that are used and map accordingly to this element if the response to element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” See the Disability resource list on the Children’s Bureau’s AFCARS web page.</p>
#16 Mother's Birth Year	4	<u>Screen</u> : Person Management

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
#17 Father's Birth Year	3	<p><u>Screen</u>: Person Management  <u>Program code</u>: LNs 2683-2722; 2748-2782; 2723; 3351-3361</p> <p>The program code copies the father's year of birth from the Person table into the AFCARS value.</p> <p>An edit check in the program code indicates an error for this element if the value equals space.</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, a date had not been entered into the system, but the reviewers did find dates of birth for the fathers.</p>
<p>#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth</p> <p>1 = Yes                  2 = No                  3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p><u>2</u> 3</p>	<p><u>Screen</u>: Adoption Referral window, Birth Parents tab.  <u>Program code</u>: LNs 2887-2927; 3351-3355</p> <p>This information is being collected on one of the adoption screens and is not on the case management screens. This would contribute to unreliability of the data. The State needs to modify the screen to collect this information on one of the screens used during an early period of time after the case opening, such as on the person management screen.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit findings: The State modified the system by adding the question "Mother Married at Child's Birth: &lt;Yes&gt; &lt;No&gt; &lt;Unable to Determine&gt;" to the "Person Management" page. The response then is automatically carried over to the "Adoption Referral" page.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the AFCARS response was "unable to determine," but the reviewer found that the mother was married at the time of the child's birth. In the other error case, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no."</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	2	<p><u>Screen</u>: Legal status for legal action or Person management for date of death.  <u>Program code</u>: LNs: 2683-2710; 2788-2839; 2711-2742</p> <p>The legal status screen contains three date fields, “hearing date/date legal status changed,” “date filed/served,” and “date ordered entered.” These legal status fields are for several court related activities. However, there appears to be some discrepancy regarding what the intention was for each of the date fields. There is some confusion regarding what is to be entered in each of the fields and two of the fields may be duplicative of one another. The State staff indicated they need to meet and discuss the use of these date fields and perhaps revise them to be more clear and to ensure that dates that are needed for various legal actions are captured. Based on decisions made by the State to address the fields, the system and program code may need to be modified.</p> <p>For reporting TPR dates, the program code uses the date field “date order entered.” This is to be the same date as “hearing date/date legal status changed.” However, workers may be entering the date they entered the TPR date into the system, or something else. There were several errors in the case file review preliminary findings. The reviewers indicated they found hearing dates, signature dates, and filed dates all being reported to AFCARS. The date reported to AFCARS regarding TPR should be the date the hearing occurred. The State needs to modify the program code to use the “hearing date/date legal status changed.” The State needs to provide additional training regarding which date should be entered into each field and pursue further discussions on how to improve the data entry screen.</p> <p>If the mother is deceased, the program code sets the value of this element to the date of death.</p> <p>If the mother is not deceased, then the value of this element is the most recent date entered from the “court-disp” table where the following conditions are met: The legal action is “Request for Termination of parental rights” or</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
		<p>“TPR petition Invol.” or “TPR petition Vol.” The result is “Petition granted” or “Motion granted” or “Request granted.”</p> <p>The action applies to “Child,” “Adoptive parents,” “Parents,” “Mother birth,” “Mother adoptive,” “TPR-birth mother-Vol.,” or “TPR-birth mother-Invol.”</p> <p>The program code should not consider the conditions related to a petition as this is the date a request for TPR was made and may not reflect the date a TPR occurred.</p> <p>In one error case, it appears the file date and not the actual court date was reported to AFCARS.</p>
#20 Date of Father's TPR	2	<p><u>Screen</u>: Legal status for legal action or Person management for date of death  <u>Program code</u>: LNs: 2683-2710; 2788-2839; 2711-2742.</p> <p>The legal status screen contains three date fields, “hearing date/date legal status changed,” “date filed/served,” and “date ordered entered.” These legal status fields are for several court related activities. However, there appears to be some discrepancy regarding what the intention was for each of the date fields. There is some confusion regarding what is to be entered in each of the fields and two of the fields may be duplicative of one another. The State staff indicated they need to meet and discuss the use of these date fields and perhaps revise them to be more clear and to ensure that dates that are needed for various legal actions are captured.</p> <p>For reporting TPR dates, the program code uses the date field “date order entered.” This is to be the same date as “hearing date/date legal status changed.” However, workers may be entering the date they entered the TPR date into the system, or something else. There were several errors in the case file review preliminary findings. The reviewers indicated that they found hearing dates, signature dates, and filed dates all being reported to AFCARS. The date reported to AFCARS regarding TPR should be the date the hearing</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
		<p>occurred. The State needs to modify the program code to use the “hearing date/date legal status changed.” The State needs to provide additional training regarding which date should be entered into each field and pursue further discussions on how to improve the data entry screen.</p> <p>If the father is deceased, the program code sets the value of this element to the date of death.</p> <p>If the father is not deceased, then the value of this element is the most recent date_order_ entered from the court-disp table where the following conditions are met: The legal action is “Request for Termination of parental rights” or “TPR petition Invol.” or “TPR petition Vol.” The result is “Petition granted,” “Motion granted,” or “Request granted.” The action applies to “Child,” “Adoptive parents,” “Parents,” “Father birth,” “Father adoptive,” “Father adjudicated,” “Father presumptive,” “Father alleged,” “TPR-birth father-Vol.,” or “TPR-birth father-Invol.”</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 a later date than the one reported to AFCARS. In one error case, the reviewer found an earlier date than the one reported to AFCARS. In one case, it appears the file date and not the actual court date was reported to AFCARS.</p>
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	4	<p><u>Screen</u>: Legal status window  <u>Program code</u>: LNs: 2390; 2519-2582; 3351-3361</p> <p>The program code sets the value of this element to the date of the most recently entered record in the court_disp table with a legal status of “Adoption finalized” and a date that is not null.</p> <p>In the case file review, there was an error case where it appears the file date and not the actual court date was reported to AFCARS.</p>
#22 Adoptive Family Structure	4	State law does not allow unmarried couples to both adopt the child.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male		
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	4	Screen: Person management.
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	4	Screen: Person management.
#25 Adoptive Mother'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	Screen: Person Management; Basic tab. Program. code lines 2403; 3075-3108; 3135-3199; 3109-3129; 3403-3406; 3574-3621; 3407-3439  eWiSACWIS has the capacity to record only three races for this element. The State must revise the screen to account for all five of the races required in AFCARS and instruct workers to check all that apply. One solution the State may want to consider is to list all the races with a radio button and have case workers to select all that apply.  The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her race.  The State may want to incorporate an edit check to guard against identification of a race along with “unable to determine.”  The State may want to consider removing the option of “unable to determine” and replace it with “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide his/her race.
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	3 4	The Basic tab on the person management screen has a field “ethnicity” that includes several ethnicities/nationalities, including those that would be mapped to AFCARS “Hispanic/Latino Origin.” There also is another field “Hispanic/Latino Origin” with the options of “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine.” The State made a change to the system in June 2005 so that the system will populate the response in this field based on whether or not

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
		<p>one of the “Hispanic/Latino” nationalities is selected in the ethnicity field. The State’s values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.</p> <p>The State may want to consider changing the option of “unable to determine” to “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the ethnicity of the child.</p>
<p>#27 Adoptive Father's Race</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native</p> <p>b. Asian</p> <p>c. Black or African American</p> <p>d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</p> <p>e. White</p> <p>f. Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: Person Management; Basic tab. Program. code lines 2403; 3075-3108; 3135-3199; 3109-3129; 3452-3455; 3574-3621; 3460-3488.</p> <p>eWiSACWIS has the capacity to record only three races for this element. The State must revise the screen to account for all five of the races required in AFCARS and instruct workers to check all that apply. One solution the State may want to consider is to list all the races with a radio button and have case workers to select all that apply.</p> <p>The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her race.</p> <p>The State may want to incorporate an edit check to guard against identification of a race along with “unable to determine.”</p> <p>The State may want to consider removing the option of “unable to determine” and replace it with “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide his/her race.</p>
<p>#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin</p>	<p align="center">3 4</p>	<p>The Basic tab on the person management screen has a field “ethnicity” that includes several ethnicities/nationalities, including those that would be</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine		mapped to AFCARS “Hispanic/Latino Origin.” There also is another field “Hispanic/Latino Origin” with the options of “yes,” “no,” and “unable to determine.” The State made a change to the system in June 2005 so that the system will populate the response in this field based on whether or not one of the “Hispanic/Latino” nationalities is selected in the ethnicity field.  The State’s values are appropriately mapped to the AFCARS values.  The State needs to ensure that case workers understand this information is based on the client identifying his/her ethnicity.  The State may want to consider changing the option of “unable to determine” to “abandoned.” Another idea the State may want to consider is to include the option “declined” or “refused” to account for those situations in which an individual may refuse to provide the ethnicity of the child.
#29 – 32  0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies		This is only a single select field on the screen. The State needs to modify the data entry to allow more than one selection.
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child – Stepparent	2	
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative	2	
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent	2	Case file review findings: 5 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In each situation, this should have been reported as an additional relationship between the child and the adoptive parents.
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	2	
#33 Child Was Placed from 1 = Within State	2 4	Screen: Maintain case, Participate tab, Site/Region Field. The program code maps the State codes from the site region field to the

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements**

**State: Wisconsin**

**AFCARS Reporting Period: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)**

Data Element	Rating Factor	Notes/Findings
2 = Another State 3 = Another Country		appropriate AFCARS values. The list of counties in this field also includes “out-of-State” and “out-of-country.”  Based on post site-visit analysis, the rating factor for this element was changed. The State should continue to ensure that the data reported does accurately reflect where the child was placed from for adoption.
#34 Child Was Placed by  1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	4	
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy  1 = Yes 2 = No	2	Frequency Report (n=472): Yes = 472 (100%)  The program code incorrectly maps the State codes “MA only – not at risk” to “No.” Modify the program code to map “MA only – not at risk” to “yes.”
#36 Monthly Amount	4	
#37 Adoption Assistance - title IV-E	4	