Case File Summary Report
State: Kansas

The purpose of the case file review is to ensure that information that is submitted to AFCARS accurately reflects what is in the hard copy case records. This process generally does not identify new problems, but usually confirms the findings of the test case scenarios and the review of the State's AFCARS system documentation. The case file review involved all members of the State and Federal teams, technical and program.

This summary report provides information on the number of cases selected in the sample, the number of cases reviewed, and any relevant general information regarding the analysis of the results. The matrix that follows provides information on the number of records that had matching information and the number of records that had information that did not match what was submitted to AFCARS. The chart below provides information on how many cases were in the sample and how many were reviewed on-site.

Foster Care

Number of Cases in Sample	59
Number of Cases Reviewed	58
(Child Welfare)	(56)
(Juvenile Justice)	(2)
Number of Cases in Analysis	58

Adoption

Number of Cases in Sample	20
Number of Cases Reviewed	19
Number of Cases in Analysis	19

Foster Care

Element #10, Has the child been clinically diagnosed as having a disability(ies)?

Of the 25 errors found during the review, 11 (44%) of the records should have indicated the child had a diagnosed disability. In six of these cases, the AFCARS response was "not yet determined." There were also 12 (48%) cases in which the reviewers found that the response should have been "no." In 11 of these, the response reported to AFCARS was "not yet determined." The response "not yet determined" in AFCARS means the child has not been seen by a health care professional, or that the State has not received the report from the health care professional. In many of these cases, the child had been in care for six or more months, and some up to two years. In some instances, the reviewers noted that the child had a diagnosed condition when the child entered foster care and often were on medications. These situations should be entered in the child's record as "yes" for a diagnosed condition.

Reviewers had a difficult time finding actual reports from medical providers in the paper case files. The State needs to work with providers to ensure that the health reports are placed into the paper file. The State needs to incorporate into their quality assurance process a review of this information. The State staff indicated they have just instituted a new error report that is

generated monthly for these elements. The State needs to ensure that it includes a check for children that have been in care for some determined amount of time (for instance, six months), and whether the response in FACTS is "not yet determined." If so, then the SRS worker or the HSA should contact the provider caseworker.

Element #20, Date Child was Discharged from last foster care episode (if applicable)

Based on the findings, there may be an error in the extraction code. In one error case, the AFCARS file indicated the child had only one removal episode (verified by the reviewer), but a date was reported for this element. The date was after the date reported for the current removal date (element #21).

In three of the error cases, this element was reported as blank, however, elements #18, 19, and 21 indicated more than one removal episode. In one case, the reviewer's notes indicate the child had been in SRS custody, which was suspended and custody was given to the Juvenile Justice Agency (JJA). If SRS still has care and placement responsibility at the same time as JJA, but JJA is the primary case manager, this record is to be reported as one continuous removal episode. In this case, it could be that element #20 was correct, but the programming for extracting elements #18 and #21 is incorrect. Or, it could be that the worker entering the information into the system used the wrong plan type codes.   In the other two cases, the reviewers did confirm that the child had two removals.

In one error case, there were fewer removal episodes than what was reported. The child only had one removal. The AFCARS data indicated a second removal date that was four days later than the date reported for the first ever removal, *and the date of discharge from the prior removal episode (element #20) was a date that was after the date of the current removal date*.   The reviewer did not find any information that indicated the child has ever been discharged from foster care. The date of placement and the number of placements were correct.

Adoption

There were four error cases for both elements #9 and #10 (determining special needs). In each case, the child's record indicated he/she had not been determined to be special needs when in fact each child had special needs. In two cases the reviewers found that the primary reason was due to "membership in a sibling group," and in two because of "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." Also, elements #35 - 37 indicated the children were receiving a subsidy.

In elements #23 and #24 (adoptive mother's and adoptive father's year of birth), there were three errors that appear to be due to entering an estimated year of birth. For the adoptive mother, one error case had the year in AFCARS as 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. For the adoptive father, the reported years were the same as those for the adoptive mother and the reviewer found actual years of birth for the adoptive father.