AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#3 Local FIPS Code	58	0	0	0	
#5 Most Recent Periodic Review Date	50	8	0	0	There were eight error cases in which the reviewer found a later review data. There were three error cases in which the reviewer found an earlier review date.
#6 Child Birth Date	57	1	0	0	
#7 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	58	0	0	0	
#8 Child Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	57	1	0	0	The reviewer found "American Indian" as an additional race to the one reported.
b. Asian	58	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	56	2	0	0	The reviewers found "African American or black" as an additional race to the one reported.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	58	0	0	0	
e. White	55	3	0	0	The reviewers found "white" as an additional race to the one reported.
f. Unable to Determine	58	0	0	0	
#9 Child Hispanic Origin	57	1	0	0	The response in the error case should have been "yes" instead of "no."

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine					
#10 Has the child been clinically diagnosed as having a disability(ies)?	33	25	0	0	In six of the error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "not yet determined." In five of the error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "yes." In eleven of the error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "not yet determined." In two of the error cases, the response should have been "not yet determined" instead of "no."
#11 Mental Retardation	58	0	0	0	
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	58	0	0	0	
#13 Physically Disabled	58	0	0	0	

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	48	10	0	0	In nine of the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	53	5	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#16 Has Child Ever Been Adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	56	2	0	0	In one of the error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine."
#17 Age at Previous Adoption 0 = Not Applicable 1 = less than 2 years old 2 = 2-5 years old 3 = 6-12 years old 4 = 13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine	0	58	0	0	In one error case, the reviewer found the age of the child's previous adoption. In the remaining error cases, the response should have been "not applicable" instead of being left blank. The response to element #16 was "no."
#18 Date of First Removal	52	5	0	0	In two error cases, the actual date of removal was a few days earlier than

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
from Home					the date reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the actual date of removal was a month later than the date reported in AFCARS. The case was a Juvenile Justice case and the child was in his own home on the date the AFCARS indicated as his first and current removal date. He was placed in detention then went to foster care. The date the foster care placement began should have been the removal date. In one error case, the actual date of removal was a day later than the date reported in AFCARS because the child was first placed in a hospital. The hospital date was incorrectly reported as the removal date. In one of the Juvenile Justice records, elements #18 through 21 were incorrect. Based on the reviewer's notes, the child first entered a locked facility (July 23, 2005) then went home. At a later date the child was again placed in a locked facility

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					(February 4, 2004) then was moved to foster care. On February 27, 2006 the child was sent home. Two days later the child ran away and was picked-up and placed in jail on December 27, 2006, and on February 5, 2007 was released from the Juvenile Justice Agency's custody (the child turned 18). The data reported to AFCARS indicated this all as one removal episode. The child did have only one removal episode, but it was the period between 6/8/2004 through February 27, 2006.
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	54	3	0	0	In one error case, there were fewer removal episodes than what was reported in AFCARS. In one of the error cases, there were more removals than what was reported (two instead of one). In one of the Juvenile Justice record, elements #18 through 21 were incorrect. Based on the reviewer's notes, the child first entered a locked facility (July 23, 2005) then went home. At a later date the child was

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					again placed in a locked facility (February 4, 2004) then was moved to foster care. On February 27, 2006 the child was sent home. Two days later the child ran away and was picked-up and placed in jail on December 27, 2006, and on February 5, 2007 was released from the Juvenile Justice Agency's custody (the child turned 18). The data reported to AFCARS indicated this all as one removal episode. The child did have only one removal episode, but it was the period between 6/8/2004 through February 27, 2006.
#20 Date Child was Discharged from last foster care episode (if applicable)	52	6	0	0	In one error case, the child actually had only one removal episode, but a date was reported for this element. The date was after the date reported for the current removal date (element #21).

In one error case, the reviewer found a discharge date and a subsequent removal from home.

In one error case, the AFCARS data indicates there were two removals for |

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					element #19, and the dates reported for elements #18 and #21 do indicate different removal dates. However, element #20 was reported as blank. The reviewer's notes indicate the child had been in SRS custody, which was suspended and custody was given to the Juvenile Justice agency. In two error cases this field was reported as blank. The AFCARS data indicates two removals, and different dates were reported for elements #18 and #21. The reviewer confirmed this information is correct and found the discharge dates from the prior removal episodes. In one of the Juvenile Justice record, elements #18 through 21 were incorrect. Based on the reviewer's notes, the child first entered a locked facility (July 23, 2005) then went home. At a later date the child was again placed in a locked facility (February 4, 2004) then was moved to foster care. On February 27, 2006 the child was sent home. Two days later

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					the child ran away and was picked-up and placed in jail on December 27, 2006, and on February 5, 2007 was released from the Juvenile Justice Agency's custody (the child turned 18). The data reported to AFCARS indicated this all as one removal episode. The child did have only one removal episode, but it was the period between 6/8/2004 through February 27, 2006.
#21 Date of Latest Removal	50	7	0	0	In two error cases, the actual date of removal was a few days earlier than the date reported in AFCARS.

In one error case, the actual date of removal was a month later than the date reported in AFCARS. The case was a Juvenile Justice case and the child was in his own home on the date the AFCARS indicated as his first and current removal date. He was placed in detention then went to foster care. The date the foster care placement began should have been the removal date.

In one error case, the actual date of |

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					removal was a day later than the date reported in AFCARS because the child was first placed in a hospital. The hospital date was incorrectly reported as the removal date. In one error case, the reviewer found that the child only had one removal episode not two as reported. The date of latest removal from home was the same date as the date of first removal from home. In one error case, the reviewer found an additional removal episode. In one of the Juvenile Justice record, elements #18 through 21 were incorrect. Based on the reviewer's notes, the child first entered a locked facility (July 23, 2005) then went home. At a later date the child was again placed in a locked facility (February 4, 2004) then was moved to foster care. On February 27, 2006 the child was sent home. Two days later the child ran away and was picked-up and placed in jail on December 27,

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					2006, and on February 5, 2007 was released from the Juvenile Justice Agency's custody (the child turned 18). The data reported to AFCARS indicated this all as one removal episode. The child did have only one removal episode, but it was the period between 6/8/2004 through February 27, 2006.
#23 Date of Placement in Current Setting	53	5	0	0	In one error case the date reported reflected a placement move that occurred after the end of the report period.\n\nIn one error case the wrong month was entered.\n\nIn two error cases, the date reported was incorrect because it did not reflect the date the child ran away.\n\nIn one error case the date was incorrect because what was extracted as a removal episode was not really a removal for AFCARS reporting.
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	41	17	0	0	In six error cases, the reviewers found more placement moves than what was reported.

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					In nine error cases, the reviewers found fewer placement moves than what was reported. In two error cases the AFCARS field was blank. The reviewers were able to find placement information. In one instance, the child ran away at the time of removal and was still on runaway status as of the end of the reporting period. The removal count should have indicated zero.
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for This Episode 1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	58	0	0	0	
#26 Physical Abuse	58	0	0	0	
#27 Sexual Abuse	58	0	0	0	
#28 Neglect	58	0	0	0	
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	56	2	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	55	3	0	0	In the error cases the response should

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	55	3	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#32 Child Drug Abuse	53	5	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#33 Child Disability	57	1	0	0	In the error case the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	56	2	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply.
#35 Death of Parent	58	0	0	0	
#36 Incarceration of Parent	56	2	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply.
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope	57	1	0	0	In the error case the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply.
#38 Abandonment	55	3	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply.
#39 Relinquishment	56	2	0	1	In the error cases the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies." In one of the cases,

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					"abandonment" and "relinquishment" were marked as "applies." However, the relinquishment was actually a court termination of parental rights and it occurred after the child was placed into foster care.
#40 Inadequate Housing	57	1	0	0	In the error case 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 8 = Trial Home Visit	55	3	0	1	In one error case, the response should have been "runaway" instead of "institution." In one error case, the response should have been "pre-adoptive home" instead of "foster home (non-relative)." In one error case the AFCARS field was blank. The reviewer found that the child was placed in a "group home."
#42 Out of State Placement	58	0	0	0	
#43 Most Recent Case Plan Goal	55	3	0	2	In one error case the child had been in care for more than 60 days, but the AFCARS indicated "case plan goal

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established					not yet established." The reviewer found a goal, which was established in a timely manner. In two error cases, the goal was reported as "reunification" instead of "adoption."
#44 Caretaker Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	49	9	0	0	In five of the error cases, the response should have been "married couple" instead of "single female." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "unmarried couple" instead of "single female." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "single male" instead of "single female." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "unmarried couple" instead of "unable to determine." In one of the error cases, the response should have been "single female"

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					instead of being reported as blank.
#45 1st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	56	2	0	0	
#46 2nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	52	6	0	0	The error cases were due to element #44 being found to be incorrect by the reviewers, and a date was found for this element.
#47 Mother's Date of TPR	56	2	0	0	In one error case the actual date was a month earlier.\n\nIn one error case, the mother's and father's dates were reversed.
#48 Father's Date of TPR	55	3	0	0	In one error case, the reviewer found a date but the AFCARS field was blank.\n\nIn one error case the date reported was the date the order was filed in court, not the date of the hearing.\n\nIn one error case, the mother's and father's dates were reversed.
#49 Foster Family Structure\n\n0 = Not Applicable\n1 = Married Couple\n2 = Unmarried Couple	52	5	0	1	In three error cases, the response should have been "married couple" instead of "single female."\n\nIn one error case the response should have been "single female" instead of

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male					"married couple." In one error case the AFCARS field was blank and it should have indicated "not applicable" (element #41 was reported as a "group home).
#50 1st Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	56	2	0	4	
#51 2nd Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	54	4	0	3	In three of the error cases, element #49 was incorrect so this was reported as blank, and the reviewers found a year of birth.
#52 1st Foster Caretaker's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	51	3	0	4	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting.
b. Asian	51	3	0	4	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting.
c. Black or African American	50	4	0	4	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. In one error case, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no."

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	51	3	0	4	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting.
e. White	48	6	0	4	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. In two error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In one error case, the response should have been "no" instead of "yes."
f. Unable to Determine	49	5	0	4	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. In two error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "yes."
#53 1st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	40	14	0	4	In one error case the response should have been "no" instead of "yes." In ten error cases, the AFCARS field was blank, but it should have been "not applicable" because the child was in a non-foster home setting.

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#54 2nd Foster Caretaker's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	50	5	0	3	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. Two error cases were due to element #49 being incorrect. The reviewer did find race information for the second foster parent.
b. Asian	50	5	0	3	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. Two error cases were due to element #49 being incorrect. The reviewer did find race information for the second foster parent.
c. Black or African American	49	6	0	3	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. In one error case, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." Two error cases were due to element #49 being incorrect. The reviewer did

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					find race information for the second foster parent.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	50	5	0	3	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. Two error cases were due to element #49 being incorrect. The reviewer did find race information for the second foster parent.
e. White	47	8	0	3	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. . In two error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In one error case, the response should have been "no" instead of "yes." Two error cases were due to element #49 being incorrect. The reviewer did find race information for the second foster parent.
f. Unable to Determine	48	7	0	3	In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "no," and it should have

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					been left blank because the child was in a non-foster home setting. In two error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "yes." Two error cases were due to element #49 being incorrect. The reviewer did find race information for the second foster parent.
#55 2nd Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	27	28	0	3	In twenty-seven error cases, the AFCARS field was blank, but it should have been "not applicable" because the child was in a non-foster home setting. In one error case the response should have been "yes" instead of no."
#56 Date of Discharge	55	2	0	0	One error case was due to incorrect extraction of the case. The actual date of discharge occurred in a prior report period. In one error case, a date was found.
#58 Reason for Discharge 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with	55	3	0	0	One error case was due to incorrect extraction of the case. The discharge reason indicated "runaway," however; this was for a current Juvenile Justice

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
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					episode in which the child was never in a title IV-E placement. The discharge reason should have been "reunification." In one error case, the response should have been "adoption" instead of "not applicable." In one error case, the response should have been "emancipation" instead of "reunification."
#59 Title IV-E Foster Care	55	2	0	1	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#60 Title IV-E Adoption	55	2	0	1	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#61 Title IV-A AFDC	57	0	0	1	
#62 Title IV-D Child Support	57	0	0	1	
#63 Title XIX Medicaid	55	2	0	1	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
#64 SSI	55	2	0	1	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#65 None of the Above	57	0	0	1	
#66 Monthly Amount	57	0	0	1	

Number of cases in sample: 59
Number of cases reviewed: 58
Number of cases analyzed: 58

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#4 State Agency Involvement 1 = Yes 2 = No	19	0	0	0	
#5 Child Date of Birth	19	0	0	0	
#6 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	19	0	0	0	
#7 Child Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	19	0	0	0	
b. Asian	18	1	0	0	The reviewer found "Asian" as an additional race.
c. Black or African American	19	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	19	0	0	0	
e. White	19	0	0	0	
f. Unable to Determine	19	0	0	0	
#8 Child Hispanic Origin 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	19	0	0	0	

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs	15	4	0	0	In the error cases, the response in AFCARS is "no." The reviewers found that the response should be "yes." Also, elements #35 - 37 indicated the children were receiving a subsidy.
#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Racial/Original Background 2 = Age 3 = Membership in a Sibling Group 4 = Medical Conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5 = Other	15	4	0	0	In two error cases, the response in AFCARS is "not applicable." The reviewers found that the response should be "membership in a sibling group." Also, elements #35 - 37 indicated the children were receiving a subsidy. In two error cases, the response in AFCARS is "not applicable." The reviewers found that the response should be "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." Also, elements #35 - 37 indicated the children were receiving a subsidy.
#11 Mental Retardation	17	2	0	0	The error cases were reported as blank and should have been "does not apply" because element #10 was "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities."
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	17	2	0	0	The error cases were reported as blank and should have been "does not apply" because element #10 was

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					"medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities."
#13 Physically Disabled	16	3	0	0	In one error case, this element was reported as "applies," and it should have been "does not apply." Two error cases were reported as blank, and should have been "does not apply" because element #10 was "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities."
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	16	2	1	0	Two error cases were reported as blank, and should have been "does not apply" because element #10 was "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." In one case it was questionable what the response should have been. The AFCARS data indicated "applies," but the reviewer noted "does not apply" and did not mark any other categories as "applies." The response for element #10, and verified by the reviewer, is "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." There were no additional notes to determine the actual response for this element.
#15 Other Diagnosed	16	3	0	0	In one error case, this element was

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Condition					reported as "does not apply," and it should have been "applies." The child had been determined special needs due to being at risk for fetal alcohol syndrome. Two error cases were reported as blank, and should have been "does not apply" because element #10 was "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities."
#16 Mother's Birth Year	19	0	0	0	
#17 Father's Birth Year	18	1	0	0	A wrong year was entered into the system.
#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	17	2	0	0	In the two error cases, the data in AFCARS indicated "no," but the reviewer found that the response should have been "yes."
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	18	1	0	0	
#20 Date of Father's TPR	18	1	0	0	
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	19	0	0	0	
#22 Adoptive Family Structure 1 = Married Couple	17	2	0	0	In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated "unmarried couple," but the reviewer noted "married couple." The adoptive parents were also foster

US DHHS/ACF/ACYF/Children's Bureau
March 2008

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male					parents. In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated "single female," but the reviewer noted "married couple." The adoptive parents were also foster parents.
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	15	4	0	0	In one error case, the wrong year was entered into the system. In one error case, the year reported in AFCARS is 1960, but the reviewer found the year of birth to be 1948. In two error cases, the year reported in AFCARS is 1950. In one case, the reviewer found the year of birth to be 1954, and 1957 in the other.
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	15	4	0	0	One error case was due to element #22 being incorrect and this element was blank. The reviewer found a date of birth. In one error case, the year reported in AFCARS is 1960, but the reviewer found the year of birth to be 1947. In two error cases, the year reported in AFCARS is 1950. In one case, the

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					reviewer found the year of birth to be 1955, and 1954 in the other.
#25 Adoptive Mother's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	19	0	0	0	
b. Asian	19	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	19	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	19	0	0	0	
e. White	17	0	2	0	There were two records reported as "unable to determine," but in both the reviewer noted "white." It is not clear if perhaps the people actually refused to provide their race information.
f. Unable to Determine	17	0	2	0	There were two records reported as "unable to determine," but in both the reviewer noted "white." It is not clear if perhaps the people actually refused to provide their race information.
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin	19	0	0	0	
#27 Adoptive Father's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	18	1	0	0	Races were reported as blank because element #22 was incorrect. Reviewer found the individual's race as "white."
b. Asian	18	1	0	0	

US DHHS/ACF/ACYF/Children's Bureau
March 2008

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
c. Black or African American	18	1	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	18	1	0	0	
e. White	17	1	1	0	There was one record reported as "unable to determine," but the reviewer noted "white." It is not clear if perhaps the person actually refused to provide his race information.
f. Unable to Determine	17	1	1	0	There was one record reported as "unable to determine," but the reviewer noted "white." It is not clear if perhaps the person actually refused to provide his race information.
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin	19	0	0	0	
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent	19	0	0	0	
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative	19	0	0	0	
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent	19	0	0	0	
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	19	0	0	0	

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements
State: Kansas
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 (2007A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#33 Child Was Placed from 1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country	19	0	0	0	
#34 Child Was Placed by 1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	19	0	0	0	
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy	19	0	0	0	
#36 Monthly Amount	19	0	0	0	
#37 Adoption Assistance	16	3	0	0	The three error cases indicated a "yes" in AFCARS, but the reviewers noted "no."

Number of cases in sample: 19
Number of cases reviewed: 19
Number of cases analyzed: 19