

Case File Summary Report
State: Oklahoma

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 | 80 |
| Number of Cases Reviewed | |
| Child Welfare | 64 |
| Tribal | 7 |
| Number of Cases in Analysis | 70 |
| Child Welfare | 64 |
| Tribal | 6 |

In regard to element #5, it appears the most significant issue relates to timely data entry. Generally, in instances where the child had been in care for six months or more, the reviewers did find a date for a periodic review, it just had not been entered into the system. The same issue was found with the Tribal cases.

The errors for element #10 were primarily due to the AFCARS data indicating "no," but the reviewers did find a diagnosed condition that should be mapped to AFCARS. There were also several errors where the AFCARS data indicated "not yet determined." In most of these cases, the reviewers found that the child did not have a diagnosed condition that would be mapped to AFCARS. In one case, the child did have a disability and the child had been in care for a year and a half.

In one of the error cases for elements #26 – 40, all of the elements were blank.

One case was marked questionable for elements #19 – 20, and #24. The AFCARS data indicated five removal episodes (foster care #19), and the reviewer only noted three. Based on the reviewer's notes, there may have been only two removals. The reviewer could not verify the date in element #20, date of discharge from the prior removal episode. In regard to element #24, the AFCARS file indicates 13 placements, but based on what appears to be the latest removal date, there could be fewer placements. Contact ACF for the record number.

In one case, the AFCARS data indicated the child had been previously adopted between the ages of 6 to 12. However, the reviewer found that the child had never been adopted. The reviewer's notes on placements indicate the child had been in a pre-adoptive home when he was seven.

Case File Summary Report
State: Oklahoma

Based on the data reported to AFCARS, the date of the first removal from home and the date of the latest removal from home are the same, July 12, 1994. This information contradicts then what is reported for previous adoption; based on the removal dates the child was four when he entered foster care. Also, based on the reviewer's notes, this child had two removal episodes and not one as reported to AFCARS. Based on the placement list in the reviewer's notes, the child returned home 11/1/1994 and was there three months before being removed again on 1/6/1995. There is no indication that this was a "trial home visit." The number of placements reported was wrong even if the child had only one removal as reported. There were three emergency placements that appear not to have been included in the placement count. Even if the child has had two removal episodes, the number of placements is still incorrect because two of the emergency placements occurred after the second removal from home. The placement date was also wrong for this case because the State reported the date the child went to the Wentworth Military Academy as a new placement. The foster parents for the child remained the same while the child was at the school. The child returned to the same home during breaks, therefore, the information reported was incorrect for the date and current placement setting. The placement date should be the date the child was first placed in this foster home and the placement setting should be "foster home, non-relative." This was discussed with the State during the post site-visit period.

Adoption

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Number of Cases in Sample | 30 |
| Number of Cases Reviewed | 30 |
| Number of Cases in Analysis | 30 |