

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
#1 State FIPS Code	4	
#2 Report Date ___(mo) ___(year)	4	
#3 Local Agency FIPS Code	4	
#4 Record Number	4	
<p>#5 Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable)</p> <p>___(mo) ___(day)___(year)</p> <p>This element certifies that the date in the system is current and up to date.</p>	<p>3 2</p>	<p>Frequency Report: n = 4,492. There are 481 records reported with a review date prior to 2002.</p> <p>There are three places where this data can be entered: the court order (which gives the hearing outcome), the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) screen and the old court hearing screen.</p> <p>There is an edit that will not allow the caseworker to enter future dates. The State will review the edit to ensure it is working correctly.</p> <p>There are two possible causes for the old dates: 1) no parameter to prevent review dates from prior removal episodes from being extracted, and 2) caseworkers are not entering the dates in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State team indicated that when the court module was revised, a new pick-list was created. There were problems converting old information to the new codes.</p> <p>There is no parameter in the program code to prevent dates of periodic review from prior removal episodes from being extracted.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> Of the 69 cases analyzed, 32 records (46%) reported to AFCARS did not have a correct date for the periodic review. The most significant finding indicated that 20 records had a date reported to AFCARS that was prior to the current report period, and the children were still in care.</p> <p>Additionally, two records had no information reported to AFCARS, but the children had been in care since 1993 and 1994. The reviewers did find current review dates in the files.</p>
#6 Child Birth Date ___(mo) ___(day)___(year)	4	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
#7 Child Sex  1 = Male 2 = Female	4	
#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	State has a "primary race" field and a selection list for other races.  Missing data are incorrectly mapped to "unable to determine."
#9 Child's Hispanic/Latino Origin  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	Frequency Report: (n=4492) Yes = 51; No = 3560; Unable to determine = 644; Not Reported = 237  The screen has three options, "yes," "no," and "not yet determined."  The program code is initialized to zero.
#10 Has the child been clinically diagnosed as having a disability(ies)?  1=Yes 2=No 3=Not yet Determined	2	Frequency Report: (n=4492) Yes = 0; No = 1; Not yet determined = 4491  This information is derived from elements #11 – 15. It is not a separate question on the screen for the caseworker to answer. The response to this question is based on the caseworker selecting one of the disabilities on the screen. If none of the conditions are checked, then the program code incorrectly maps blank information to "no."  During the review, the State staff identified a problem in the program code. According to the selection logic each of the conditions contains "and" consequently, it ignores all of the information in elements #11-15. This is supported by the frequencies and the case file review (see case file review findings.) The State staff corrected the error during the site-visit. State will submit corrected code for Federal review.  <i>Post site-visit analysis:</i> According to the frequencies on the data submitted for the report period ending March 31, 2003 (2003A) there are 1,145 responses for "yes" and 3,347 for

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>#11 – 15</p> <p>[0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies</p>		<p>“not yet determined.”</p> <p>#11 – 15: The State has a very extensive list of medical conditions, disabilities and psychological conditions in the selection list for these elements. The State also had listed several codes that should not be mapped to AFCARS and several that are mapped incorrectly.</p> <p>The State agrees that the list needs to be revised. The State and Federal teams explored different options. Also, the State may want to contact the NRC-ITCW for suggestions on how other States have addressed the collection of this information.</p> <p>FACTS also has a “disability” screen. The State team will explore whether it is possible to combine the screens.</p> <p>Data on disability and medical conditions are stored permanently in the case record and are accessible if the case closes and then later re-opens. If a case re-opens, prior information will be extracted to AFCARS. Once a caseworker receives a current medical/psychological evaluation, the caseworker starts a new medical/psychological screen. The caseworker is to enter all currently diagnosed conditions, even if the condition previously existed. The State should consider refresher training, and supervisory oversight, to ensure that this data is entered into the system in a timely manner. Also, the State may want to consider modifying the system to “carry forward” medical information into the new removal episode and have the workers update the information as appropriate.</p> <p>State team discussed adding a “transaction capture” to the information for elements #11 – 15.</p>
#11 Mental Retardation	2	
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	2	
#13 Physically Disabled	2	
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	2	
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	2	
#16 Has this child ever been adopted?	2	The caseworker can get old case information for the State agency’s adopted children that

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine		re-enter foster care. The state ward record case cannot be merged with the original family record. The child will be entered into the system as a new record with the new family composition.  Missing data is incorrectly mapped to “unable to determine.”  The data entry screen lists “unknown.”
#17 If yes, how old was the child when the adoption was legalized?  [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	2	If the response is “no” or “unable to determine” for element #16, this element is mapped to “zero, not applicable.” If foster care element #16 is “unable to determine,” then “unable to determine” should be reported for element #17.
#18 Date of First Removal from Home  ____ (mo) ____ (day) ____ (year)	3	The State’s conversion of data to their new system focused primarily on cases that were open at the time. Cases that were closed at the time of conversion to FACTS, that later re-opened, were to be converted to FACTS at the time the case opened.  State asked for clarification of the following situations: 1) What is the date of removal for adjudicated delinquent children that are ordered into the care, placement or supervision of the State agency, but the first placement is a locked juvenile justice facility? 2) Children are placed on probation and the court orders that if the child does not abide by the conditions of probation they will be placed in the care of the State agency. How should the caseworker enter these cases? What is considered the date of entry into foster care? The State team has found that caseworkers are “re-opening” the previous removal episode case (if one exist) and not creating a NEW removal episode. 3) How to enter cases in which the child is adjudicated delinquent while in foster care and the child is placed in a juvenile justice facility then returns to a foster care setting. Is this a “discharge” with subsequent removal or a placement change? The State team shared that caseworkers are entering a discharge date when the child enters the juvenile

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>justice facility.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> 1) The State is not to consider the child in the AFCARS population if the child’s first placement is a juvenile justice placement. The date that the child is placed into a “community-based foster care setting” is the date of removal for the child for AFCARS purposes.</p> <p>2) Caseworkers should NEVER delete a discharge date that has previously been entered that reflects a discharge from state agency care placement or supervision. Caseworkers should always start a new removal episode when a child enters foster care. In the second question, caseworkers are to consider these entries as new removals.</p> <p>3) In the first situation, it is incorrect for caseworkers to enter this as a “discharge from care, placement or supervision.” If the State agency retains responsibility for care, placement or supervision, or shares custody with the juvenile justice agency, then the child is still considered to be a “foster care child” for AFCARS reporting. There should not be a date of “discharge.” Instead, a new placement should be opened, which would be mapped to “institution.” When the child leaves the juvenile justice placement for a new placement setting, then this would be considered as another placement, not a new removal episode.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 18 (26%) of the 69 cases analyzed were incorrect. Eight of eighteen incorrect cases had older dates of first removal than what was submitted to AFCARS.</p>
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	3	<p>Frequency Report: (n = 4492) 1 = 3913; 2 = 499; 3 = 71; 4 = 6; 5 = 1; 6 = 2</p> <p>The Federal team observed that the number of records indicating only one removal seemed high and asked the State staff if this seemed true to them.</p> <p>The State identified problems with this element last year and has made some corrections. The current program code and system edits reflect these changes. It was identified that sometimes caseworker reopen the case by “undoing” the end date of a prior removal episode rather than start a new removal episode. The State team has been doing ongoing analysis of the data to identify if there are other system issues. There is considerable data clean up that needs to be completed in order to have the data and information in FACTS reflect the child’s current situation.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>The State’s conversion primarily focused on cases that were open at the time. Cases that were closed at the time of conversion to FACTS, that later re-opened, were to be converted to FACTS at the time the case opened. As a result of the case file review, it was identified that there still needs to be attention given to data clean up. See the findings in the case file review findings for specific information.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 10 out of the 67 (15%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>
<p>#20 Date Child was Discharged from previous foster care episode (if applicable)</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>The State’s conversion primarily focused on cases that were open at the time of conversion. Cases that were closed at the time of conversion to FACTS, that later re-opened, were to be converted to FACTS at the time the case opened.</p> <p>See State’s question and Federal team’s response for element #18. The entry of data by the caseworker will affect the accuracy of this data element.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 12 out of the 67 (18%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Reviewers identified that additional attention needs to be given to data clean-up. See the case file review findings for specific information.</p>
<p>#21 Date of Latest Removal</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>The State’s conversion primarily focused on cases that were open at the time. Cases that were closed at the time of conversion to FACTS, that later re-opened, were to be converted to FACTS at the time the case opened.</p> <p>See State’s question and Federal team’s response for element #18. The entry of data by the caseworker will affect the accuracy of this data element.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 16 out of the 68 (24%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were eight incorrect records because the date reported in AFCARS reflected the court/petition date and not the actual date the child was placed in out of home care.</p> <p>Four records had dates of removal that were later than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>Three records indicated two different dates in AFCARS for elements #18 and 21. In two</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		of these records the number of removals was correct (one). The date of the latest removal was incorrect.
#22 Date of Latest Removal Transaction Date  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	4	This is system generated and non-modifiable.
#23 Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	2	<p>Frequency Report: There were 29 records with no placement date.</p> <p>The program code is not checking for placement dates within the removal episode. Instead it looks for dates within the report period.</p> <p>Missing dates are mapped to zero.</p> <p>The data from the extract of the test case scenario indicated the date the foster home became a pre-adoptive home and not the actual date the child was first placed in this home. The State staff indicated that a change has been made and this change was indicated in a re-extraction of the test case. State reports that they have corrected the program code.</p> <p>The State is changing the program code to reflect “runaway” and “trial home visit” dates. The change will be reflected in the data submitted for the 2003A report period.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 13 out of the 65 (20%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Dates were entered incorrectly and did not reflect the current placement setting. Some of these were private provider placements. Also, many of the records had incorrect placement counts.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit analysis:</i> There were six records reported that were missing a placement date. No records were reported as zero placements.</p>
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in this Episode	2	The data from the extract of the test case scenario indicated the child had three placements. There should have only been one placement. One problem is that the program code is counting the change from a foster home to a pre-adoptive home as a change. The State staff indicated that a change has been made and this change was indicated in a re-extraction of the test case.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>There are some placements that are not included in the count because they were not entered at the time of conversion.</p> <p>The State team requested clarification regarding counting hospital stays.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The State is required to count a placement that lasts more than 24 hours while the child is in foster care under the placement, care or supervision responsibility of the State agency. See 45 CFR 1355.40 and CWPM 1.2B.7 and 1.3. This includes moves that may be made on an emergency or unplanned basis, such as shelter care placements, treatment facility placements, and certain placements for juvenile justice purposes. See CWPM 1.3. However, there are certain temporary living conditions that are not placements, but rather represent a temporary absence from the child's ongoing foster care placement. As such, the State must exclude the following temporary absences from the calculation of the number of previous placement settings for foster care element 24.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitation with a sibling, relative, or other caretaker (i.e., preplacement visits with a subsequent foster care provider or pre-adoptive parents)</li> <li>• Hospitalization for medical treatment, acute psychiatric episodes or diagnosis</li> <li>• Respite care</li> <li>• Day or summer camps</li> <li>• Trial home visits</li> <li>• Runaway episodes</li> </ul> <p>In the test case scenario, the initial placement in the hospital should not have been counted.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 25 out of the 67 (37%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. In twenty-three records, the number of placements was higher than what was reported to AFCARS.</p>
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for Current placement Episode	2	<p>State has voluntary placement agreements.</p> <p>The State maps “other” to “not yet determined.”</p>



**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined		“Other” is not on the selection list for the caseworker to choose.  “Voluntary relinquishment” is incorrectly mapped to “voluntary placement agreement.” State policy/practice is to obtain court ratification of the voluntary relinquishment within 90 days of the parent signing a relinquishment order.
#26 – 40		This information is entered on the screens where removal information is recorded.  The data is not “frozen” once it is entered. However, the caseworker have no need to return to these screens. It is unlikely the data is updated or changed at a later date. The State is considering modifying the system to ensure that after a reasonable timeframe caseworkers cannot add information that may be learned about the family at a later date.  Note the results of the case file review in the case file findings section. While there was no one element that had a ten percent error rate, all the elements had errors identified by the reviewer.
#26 Physical Abuse	3	The State identified problems with this element last year and has made some corrections. The current program code and system edits reflect these changes. It was identified that sometimes caseworkers reopen the case by “undoing” the end date of a prior removal episode rather than start a new removal episode. The State team has been doing on going analysis of the data to identify if there are other system issues. There is considerable data clean-up that needs to be completed in order to have the data and information in FACTS reflect the child’s current situation.  <i>Case File Analysis: 7 out of the 70 (10%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</i>
#27 Sexual Abuse	3	See notes in element #26.
#28 Neglect	3	See notes in element #26.
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	3	See notes in element #26.
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	3	See notes in element #26.
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	3	See notes in element #26.
#32 Child Drug Abuse	3	See notes in element #26.
#33 Child Disability	3	See notes in element #26.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Rating Factor</b>	<b>Comments/Notes</b>
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	3	See notes in element #26.
#25 Death of Parent	3	See notes in element #26.
#36 Incarceration of Parent	3	See notes in element #26.
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reasons	3	See notes in element #26.
#38 Abandonment	3	See notes in element #26.
#39 Relinquishment	3	See notes in element #26.
#40 Inadequate Housing	3	See notes in element #26.
#41 Current Placement Setting  1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home-Relative 3 = Foster Family Home-Non-Relative 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit	2	<p>Frequency Report: (n = 4492) Pre-Adoptive Home = 267; Foster Family Home-Relative = 168; Family Foster Home-Non-Relative = 2129; Group Home = 1548; Institution = 142; Supervised Independent Living = 79; Runaway = 55; Trial Home Visit = 104</p> <p>Screen contains a “placement history.”</p> <p>Placement and discharge information are recorded on the “placement” screen. If there is a change in placements the worker enters a “temporary” exit reason. This indicates why the child left the placement setting.</p> <p>State responded that “respite” is no longer a placement and they have made it an inactive code. Workers no longer enter respite placements.</p> <p>The State has “emergency shelters” that are both less than and more than 12 beds. Program code incorrectly maps all emergency shelters to “group home.” “Group homes” are defined in AFCARS as having between seven and twelve beds.</p> <p>State code of “other” is mapped to “trial home visit.” Also, the program code looks for an “exit reason” of “trial home visit.”</p> <p>When a foster parent becomes a “pre-adopt” parent to a child, the caseworker has to enter the information as another placement.</p> <p>There is no program code or placement option of “runaway.” The number for “runaway” in the frequency report probably represents those children with a discharge reason of</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>“runaway.”</p> <p>Private provider agencies have not been systematically providing updates to the State regarding placement moves. The private providers do not have access to FACTS. They do have an intranet access in order to allow the provider to review information and to see if it is accurate.</p>
<p>#42 Is Current Placement Out-of-State?</p> <p>1=Yes (Out of State placement) 2=No (In-State placement)</p>	4	
<p>#43 Most recent case plan goal</p> <p>1 = Reunify With Parent(S) Or Principal Caretaker(S) 2 = Live With Relative(S) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established</p>	2	<p>State records a permanency plan and a concurrent plan.</p> <p>Missing data is mapped to blanks.</p> <p>The State has a policy that case plan goals must be established within 60 days of a child’s removal from home.</p> <p>The program code contains “6147, maintain in own home.” It is not an option on the selection list for the caseworker.</p> <p>The State’s code of “independence” is incorrectly mapped to “long term foster care” and not “emancipation.”</p> <p>“Other” is incorrectly mapped to “not yet determined.”</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 15 out of the 67 (22%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Of the 14 incorrect files, six records had a goal of long-term foster care in the AFCARS file. The reviewers indicated a goal of independent living.</p>
<p>#44 Caretaker Family Structure</p> <p>1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male</p>	2	<p>State incorrectly maps separated males and females to single male/female respectively.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 10 out of the 68 (15%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
5 = Unable to Determine		
#45 1st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	4 3	Due to the analysis of the case file findings, there is a significant amount of missing and incorrect data reported for this element.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 11 out of the 64 (17%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the cases, dates of birth were not reported to AFCARS.
#46 2nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year (if applicable)  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	4 3	Due to the analysis of the case file findings, there is a significant amount of missing and incorrect data reported for this element.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 12 out of the 59 (20%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Several were reported as blanks to AFCARS and the family status in element #44 was a “married” or “unmarried couple.”
#47 Mother’s TPR  ____(mo) __ (day)____(year)	3	There are four different dates that can be entered by the caseworkers. These are: the bench order date, the date the judge signed the court order, the date the caseworker received the order and the date the order is filed. The State’s attorney has said that the “bench date” is an acceptable date and the one caseworkers should use. However, in the case file review and during the case review debriefing, it was identified that there is no consistency in the use of these dates.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 15 out of the 69 (22%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.
#48 Legal or Putative Father  ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	3	See notes in foster care element #47.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 20 out of the 68 (29%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.
#49 Foster Family Structure  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	2	Frequency Report: (n = 4492) Not Applicable = 1928; Married Couple = 1380; Unmarried Couple = 8; Single Female = 190; Single Male = 19; Not Reported = 967  The number of cases in the frequency report that are “not applicable” and blank is higher than the number of records reported in element #41 for foster home settings. There should be consistency between these numbers.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>State explained that the missing data in the frequency report is probably due to the private providers that the agency contracts with for foster home/group home services.</p> <p>State incorrectly maps separated males and females to single male/female respectively.</p> <p>The selection list includes an option of “unknown” for marital status. This is mapped to “not applicable.” State cannot remove “unknown” from selection because this list used for client and resource providers.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 27 out of the 68 (40%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. The significant finding indicated that most of the records indicated a blank in AFCARS but the child’s living arrangement was a family foster home. Reviewers indicated that most of the missing data was on cases managed by private providers.</p>
#50 1st Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	3	<p>In the frequency report there were several records that were missing dates of birth that did not match the number of records reported for non-foster home settings.</p> <p>Elements #50 – 55: For foster parents, the screen has options of “head of household 1” and “head of household 2.” The caseworker must select one in order for the program code to identify information for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> foster care provider. If the caseworker does not select either of these options, information is not extracted.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 4 out of the 41 (10%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were an additional 30 records that could not be fully analyzed. This is due to the missing data on the marital structure of the foster caretaker.</p>
#51 2nd Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	3	<p>See element #50.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 9 out of the 41 (22%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were an additional 30 records that could not be fully analyzed. This is due to the missing data on the marital structure of the foster caretaker.</p>
#52 1st Foster Caretaker's Race	2	<p>The number of cases in the frequency report that are “not applicable” is higher than the number of records reported as “not applicable” for “foster family structure” in element #49. There should be consistency between these numbers.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>State has a “primary race” field and a selection list for other races.</p> <p>Missing data are incorrectly mapped to “unable to determine.”</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 4 out of the 41 (10%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were an additional 30 records that could not be fully analyzed. This is because the AFCARS information indicated a blank, but the child’s living arrangement was a family foster home. Reviewers indicated that most of the missing data was on cases with private providers.</p>
#53 1st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic or Latino Origin	2	<p>Frequency Report: (n=4492) Yes = 3; No = 1576; Unable to determine = 21; Not Reported = 34; Not Applicable = 2858</p> <p>The number of cases in the frequency report that are “not applicable” is higher than the number of records reported as “not applicable” for “foster family structure” in element #49. There should be consistency between these numbers.</p> <p>The screen has three options, “yes,” “no,” and “not yet determined.”</p> <p>The program code is initialized to zero.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 4 out of the 41 (10%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were an additional 30 records that could not be fully analyzed. This is because the AFCARS information indicated a blank, but the child’s living arrangement was a family foster home. Reviewers indicated that most of the missing data was on cases with private providers.</p>
#54 2nd Foster Caretaker's Race (if applicable)	2	<p>The number of cases in the frequency report that are “not applicable” is higher than the number of records reported as “not applicable” for “foster family structure” in element #49. There should be consistency between these numbers.</p> <p>State has a “primary race” field and a selection list for other races.</p> <p>Missing data are incorrectly mapped to “unable to determine.”</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 5 out of the 36 (14%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were an additional 35 records that could not be fully analyzed. This is because the AFCARS information indicated a blank, but the child’s living arrangement was a family foster home. Reviewers indicated that most of the missing data was on cases with private providers.</p>
<p>#55 2nd 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>Frequency Report: (n=4492) Yes = 3; No = 1114; Unable to determine = 9; Not Reported = 34; Not Applicable = 3317</p> <p>The screen has three options, “yes,” “no,” and “not yet determined.”</p> <p>The program code is initialized to zero.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 5 out of the 36 (14%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. There were an additional 30 records that could not be fully analyzed. This is because the AFCARS information indicated a blank, but the child’s living arrangement was a family foster home. Reviewers indicated that most of the missing data was on cases with private providers.</p>
<p>#56 Date of Discharge from foster care ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>There were 1,475 records with a discharge date in 2002. However, in element #58 there are only 556 records with a discharge reason. These numbers should match exactly.</p> <p>The discharge information is recorded on the “placement” screen. Caseworkers select whether this exit is a “permanent” exit from all placements and is a discharge from care and placement. If the worker selects “permanent exit” a specific list pops up with discharge reasons.</p> <p>The State identified problems with this element. There are circumstances where caseworkers reopen the case by “undoing” the end date of a prior removal episode rather than start a new removal episode. Also, prior to latest changes to the system, temporary and permanent exits from placements could not be distinguished from one another. Everything appeared to be a discharge from a foster care episode. The State did not convert the information after the changes because it didn’t make sense. There was a high percentage of records that were not discharges from care but exits from a placement.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>Cases need data clean-up.</p> <p>Program code is initialized to spaces.</p> <p>Program code extracts the date directly from the screen.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 7 out of the 66 (11%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Reviewers indicated in four records that the child was still in the responsibility of the State agency for care and placement. Another incorrect date was actually the date of a new placement, not a discharge from care.</p>
<p>#57 Date of Discharge Transaction Date</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	
<p>#58 Reason for Discharge</p> <p>[0 = Not Applicable]</p> <p>1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s)</p> <p>2 = Living with Other Relative(s)</p> <p>3 = Adoption</p> <p>4 = Emancipation</p> <p>5 = Guardianship</p> <p>6 = Transfer to Another Agency</p> <p>7 = Runaway</p> <p>8 = Death of Child</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>For element #56 there were 1,475 records with a discharge date in 2002. Element #58 indicates only 556 records with a discharge reason. These numbers should match exactly.</p> <p>The discharge information is recorded on the “placement” screen. Caseworkers select whether this exit is a “permanent” exit from all placements and is a discharge from care and placement. If the worker selects “permanent exit,” a specific list pops up with discharge reasons.</p> <p>The State indicated that there had been a problem with the timely entry of discharges to adoption. There is a new mandatory rule requiring caseworkers to enter the information the next day and to close the placement and removal episode.</p> <p>State team suspects that if a child is in care under a voluntary placement agreement and runs away from care, caseworkers are entering them as discharged due to “reunification.” This is incorrect.</p> <p>State has an option of “other” on the selection list that caseworkers can select. “Other” is incorrectly mapped to zero in the extraction code.</p>



**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>There is not an option of “runaway” as a permanent exit reason on the selection list.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 14 out of the 66 (21%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit analysis:</i> The frequency report for the 2003A file indicates a closer match between the records reported in element #56 and #58. There was a difference of 62 records that did not have a reason for discharge.</p>
#59 Title IV-E (Foster Care)	<p align="center">3 2</p>	<p>The program code checks for dates within the report period.</p> <p>Program code incorrectly checks for eligibility.</p> <p>Defaults incorrectly to zero.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 5 out of the 42 (12%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>
#60 Title IV-E (Adoption Subsidy)	<p align="center">4</p>	<p>If the State chooses to start claiming title IV-E adoption subsidy, the program code needs to be modified to include the extraction of this data. State indicated that they generally do not sign adoption agreements until time for the finalization of the adoption.</p>
#61 Title IV-A	<p align="center">3 2</p>	<p>The program code looks for a child in a relative AFDC paid placement.</p> <p>The program code checks for a date before the end of report period and not prior to the report period.</p> <p>Incorrectly defaults to zero.</p>
#62 Title IVD (Child Support)	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Frequency Report: (n = 4492) Does not apply = 4455; Applies = 37</p> <p>Once a child is removed from home, a referral goes to the child support office to start the process of collection and to check if there is an order in effect. The child support office is to re-direct the payment to the department or go after payments.</p> <p>FACTS and OSCAR are able to support the electronic collection and electronic notification of any child support monies.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

**State: West Virginia**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)**

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>The interface with the title IV-D System (OSCAR) is designed to update a child's client account in FACTS. The OSCAR Child Support sub-ledger is updated with support monies collected by OCSE from parents during the month. A batch file interface is run at regular intervals during the month. This batch run brings data from OSCAR to FACTS. However, the Bureau of Child Support Enforcement and their system (OSCAR) have not been sending the information back to the agency.</p> <p>At this time, the agency has not received collections from the child support office. The department has been trying to untangle the problem for several years. There is a work group taking on the task of untangling the problem. Each side has sent files to the work group and they are figuring out how much has been received and how much should be sent to foster care.</p> <p>The program code incorrectly defaults to zero.</p> <p>The program code does not check for payments made within the report period.</p> <p>This is required information for AFCARS. The State must address a method to obtain this information regardless of the interface with CSE in order to appropriately report for AFCARS.</p>
#63 Title XIX (Medicaid)	2	<p>Correctly looks for eligibility for Medicaid.</p> <p>The program code checks for dates within the report period.</p> <p>The State team shared that the mapping needs to be corrected. The coding looks for a file in the title IV-A system (RAPIDS) that no longer exists. The program code needs to check the eligibility determination in FACTS.</p>
#64 SSI or other Social Security Act Benefits	3 2	<p>The program code checks for dates within the report period.</p> <p>Incorrectly defaults to zero.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 5 out of the 42 (12%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>
#65 None of the Above	4	<p>This element is derived based on the responses to #59 – 64.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS - FOSTER CARE ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 – September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
	3	<p>Based on the results of the case file review, there appears to be enough of a discrepancy to warrant additional attention to the accuracy of the data entered in elements #59 - 64. Also, since this element is derived from elements #59 - 64, the quality of the data is questionable based on the incorrect program code for these elements.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 7 out of the 42 (17%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>
#66 Amount of monthly foster care payment (regardless of source)	4	<p>Based on type of provider days by rates, there are four different payment areas. Program code looks for the last full monthly payment and reports that amount to AFCARS</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS – ADOPTION ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 - September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
#1 State FIPS Code	4	
#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  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	State has a "primary race" field and a selection list for other races.  Missing data are incorrectly mapped to "unable to determine."
#8 Child's Hispanic Origin  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	The screen has three options, "yes," "no," and "not yet determined."  The program code is initialized to zero.
#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs?  1 = Yes 2 = No	4	This information is derived from the information provided in element #10.
#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs  0 = Not Applicable	2	Frequency Report: (n=210) Racial/Original Background = 6; Age = 57; Sibling Group = 59; Medical Condition, etc. = 73; Other = 15

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS – ADOPTION ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 - September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
1 = Racial/Original Background 2 = Age 3 = Membership in a Sibling Group 4 = Medical Conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5 = Other		There is not a field on the screen for the adoption specialist to enter the primary basis for determining special needs. Instead, the system determines the primary basis by following a hierarchy written into the program code: medical, emotional, intellectual handicap; age; sibling; race and over age of three; other.
#11 Mental Retardation	2	For elements #11-15: If “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities” is selected as a primary basis in element #10 then the findings for the disability information for foster care apply.
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	2	
#13 Physically Disabled	2	
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	2	
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	2	
#16 Mother's Birth Year	4 3	Based on the results of the case file review, there appears to be enough of a discrepancy to warrant additional attention to the accuracy of the data entered in this element.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 4 out of the 30 (13%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Reviewers were able to identify birth years.
#17 Father's Birth Year	4 3	Based on the results of the case file review, there appears to be enough of a discrepancy to warrant additional attention to the accuracy of the data entered in this element.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 5 out of the 30 (17%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Reviewers were able to identify birth years.
#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	Initializes to “unable to determine” and if data is missing “unable to determine” will be reported in AFCARS.  Selection screen has “unknown,” not “unable to determine.”  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 6 out of the 29 (21%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS. Five records reported “unable to determine” to AFCARS but reviewers found that the mother was married at the time of the child’s birth.
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	3	There are four different dates that can be entered by the caseworkers. These are: the

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS – ADOPTION ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 - September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>bench order date, the date the judged signed the court order, the date the caseworker received the order, and the date the order is filed. The State’s attorney has said that the “bench date” is an acceptable date and the one caseworkers should record. However, in the case file review and during the case review debriefing it was identified that there is no consistency in the recording of these dates by caseworkers.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 16 out of the 30 (53%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>
#20 Date of Father's TPR	3	<p>See findings in element #19.</p> <p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 18 out of the 30 (60%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.</p>
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	4 3	<p><i>Case File Analysis:</i> 4 out of the 30 (13%) cases analyzed had incorrect data entry for this element.</p>
#22 Adoptive Family Structure  1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	2	<p>State incorrectly maps “legally separated” to “unmarried couple.”</p> <p>According to State policy, for non-married couples that adopt, only one individual can be listed as the legal adoptive parent. Response should be in accordance to State policy.</p>
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	4	
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	4	
#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	<p>State has a “primary race” field and a selection list for other races.</p> <p>Missing data are incorrectly mapped to “unable to determine.”</p>
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin	2	<p>The screen has three options, “yes,” “no,” and “not yet determined.”</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS – ADOPTION ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 - September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine		The program code is initialized to zero.
#27 Adoptive Father'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	State has a "primary race" field and a selection list for other races.  Missing data are incorrectly mapped to "unable to determine."
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	The screen has three options, "yes," "no," and "not yet determined."  The program code is initialized to zero.
#29 –32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child  0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies		State's selection option list has single options only. State can make this a multiple selection if they want. AFCARS allows more than one of the relationships to be reported.
#29 Stepparent	4	
#30 Other Relative	4	
#31 Foster Parent	4	
#32 Other Non-Relative	4	
#33 Child Was Placed from  1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country	4	
#34 Child Was Placed by	4	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS – ADOPTION ELEMENTS**

State: West Virginia

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2002 - September 30, 2002 (2002B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent		
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy  1=Yes 2=No	4	
#36 Monthly Amount	4 3	Based on the results of the case file review, there appears to be enough of a discrepancy to warrant additional attention to the accuracy of the data entered in this element.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 14 out of the 30 (47%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.
#37 Adoption Assistance - IV-E  1=Yes 2=No	4 3	Based on the results of the case file review, there appears to be enough of a discrepancy to warrant additional attention to the accuracy of the data entered in this element.  <i>Case File Analysis:</i> 6 out of the 30 (20%) cases analyzed did not match information reported in AFCARS.