

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
#1 State	4	The State FIPS code for Colorado (“08”) is hard-coded in the program code.
#2 Report Date ____(mo) ____ (year)	4	Entered by the user when the data file generation program code is executed.
#3 Local Agency(County or Equivalent Jurisdiction)	4	The program code sets this element to the county code of the most recent primary worker assigned to this case.
#4 Record Number	4	<p>The General Information screen includes a State ID button. The State assigns a State ID number that is linked with other public agencies. The State ID is used to pull financial sources through interfaces.</p> <p>The program code uses the earliest State ID on record for the child. The “Birth State-ID” described in the program code is the ID originally assigned; if the child is going to be adopted he/she will have a new ID plus a “birth” ID.</p>
#5 Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable) ____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)	2 3	<p>Screens: FSP Part 5B: CWSA Requirements/Special Reviews; Administrative Review Instrument; and Hearings</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=7,307); 2003 = 137 (1.08%); 2004 = 786 (6.19%); 2005 = 6,302 (49.65%); and Not Reported = 5,386 (42.43%)</p> <p>The State conducts both administrative reviews and court reviews. In some areas across the State, periodic reviews are held every three months. A separate Division, the Administrative Review Division (ARD), conducts the administrative reviews and provides a report to the county. The ARD has access only to the “Administrative Review” screen on Trails, and read-only access to the other parts of the system. The reviews conducted by the ARD are: “CW Admin,” “DYC in-home,” “DYC Admin,” and the “CW QA Review.”</p> <p>The screen “FSP Part 5B: CWSA Requirements/Special Reviews” is where the case workers document exceptions for extenuating circumstances (ASFA). There is a set of questions the case worker must complete at the initial review, the 12-month review, the 18-month review. There are also two other choices of “long</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>term” and “Special County.”</p> <p>The “FSP Part 5B” screen is also where court reports are recorded. The hearing dates are recorded on the court screen. This is not a mandatory field so these dates are not being recorded consistently. The courts are developing a system that will interface with Trails. This will allow for better data collection and more timely exchange of information between the two agencies.</p> <p>In regard to the dates in the frequency report that precede 2005, the State staff indicated there could be several reasons. There were several cases that were still open after conversion that should have been closed (the removal episode had ended). The State has been addressing data clean-up and getting these cases closed on the system. Also, these old dates and missing dates could possibly reflect DYC cases.</p> <p>Also, there is an issue related to ARD’s timeliness of conducting the reviews. The staff indicated the State has been in catch-up mode and reviews have built up exponentially. They brought in outside resources to help and the State will continue to work on improving this information.</p> <p>The program code correctly checks for the most recent case review or court review held prior to the end of the reporting period, and after the latest removal date.</p> <p>The program code checks for “review hearings” and “dispositional hearings.” Dispositional hearings do not meet the requirements for a periodic review. The State staff indicated in some areas the judges will also conduct proceedings during a dispositional hearing that does meet the requirements of a periodic review. There is not a separate option on the selection list for the workers to select a “dispositional/periodic review” hearing. The State staff indicated that workers are probably selecting permanency review instead when this occurs. The value</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>“dispositional” should not be mapped to this element and must be removed from the program code. <i>Post site-visit: The State updated the program code by removing "DISPOSITION" as a court hearing type. The program code now checks for the most recent case review or court hearing with hearing type "REVIEWHRG" that was held before the end of the reporting period.</i></p> <p>If there are a significant number of reviews held in this manner, the State may want to consider adding “dispositional/periodic review” as an option for case workers to select.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 19 (32%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the cases, the reviewers found a later date than the one reported to AFCARS. In two instances, the AFCARS did not include a date, but the reviewers found a review date. There were four cases with dates of a periodic review prior to 2005.</p>
<p>#6 Child Birth Date</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Screen: General Information</p> <p>The program code copies the birth date directly from the client table into this data element.</p> <p>In instances in which the date of birth is not known, case workers enter an estimated date of birth. They are instructed to use the first day of the first month. The State must instruct workers to use the 15th day of the month.</p>
<p>#7 Child Sex</p> <p>1 = Male 2 = Female</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p>Screen: General Information</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the State’s values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing it is mapped to blank.</p>
<p>#8 Child’s Race</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: General Information</p> <p>The State indicated the “ethnicity” field becomes mandatory once a child is removed from his/her home and placed in out-of-home care. The staff indicated</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine</p>		<p>that if a child is abandoned, the worker makes the determination of the child's race.</p> <p>The screen does not contain an option for "unable to determine." The program code always sets "unable to determine" to "does not apply."</p> <p>"Unable to determine" must be added as an option for the workers to select in the event a child is abandoned. The State may want to make the selection on the screen "abandoned" so that it is clear when it is a suitable option.</p> <p>Also, the State may want to add the option "refused" or "declined" for those situations where a parent or the child refuses to provide the information. This would allow the State to track the information separately from other responses.</p> <p>The State must train workers that if a child is abandoned, they are not to determine the child's race and are to record the race as "unable to determine."</p> <p>If the worker does not know the information because he/she has not asked the individual for their race affiliation, this element must be blank.</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the each race to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by adding the values "Abandoned" and "Decline to Disclose." These values are mapped to "unable to determine." The default of mapping "does not apply" for "unable to determine" has been removed from the program code.</i></p>
<p>#9 Hispanic/Latino Origin</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p>Screen: General Information</p> <p>The program code correctly maps and extracts the State's values to the AFCARS value. Missing information is mapped to blank.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
3 = Unable to Determine		<p>The State may want to add the option “refused” or “declined” for those situations where a parent or the child refuses to provide the information. This would allow the State to track the information separately from other responses.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code to map the new choice "Declined-to-provide" to AFCARS value "Unable to determine."</i></p>
<p>#10 Has the child been clinically diagnosed as having a disability(ies)?</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No 3=Not yet Determined</p>	2	<p>Screen: Characteristics</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Yes = 1,944 (15.32%); No = 10,749 (84.68%); Not yet Determined = 0; Not Reported = 0</p> <p>There is not a field on the screen to record whether or not a child has been diagnosed with a disability. Instead, the answer to this question is derived from whether an AFCARS appropriate diagnosed condition is entered into the system. See the notes for elements #11 – 15 for additional information.</p> <p>The State staff indicated this is not a mandatory field.</p> <p>In the program code, if a medical or psychological condition is selected, then this element is set to “yes.” Otherwise, it is set to “no.” The program code never sets this element to a value of “not yet determined.” Missing data are incorrectly mapped to “no.”</p> <p>This is creating a false “no” in the reported data and makes it appear that the State’s children have no medical or emotional problems. The AFCARS definition for “no” indicates that a qualified professional has conducted a clinical assessment of the child and has determined that the child has no disabilities. “Not yet determined” indicates that a clinical assessment of the child by a qualified professional has not been conducted. A question should be added to the screen in order to capture accurately whether the child has been examined by a physician and diagnosed with a disability or not. The best location is where all information</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>regarding a child’s health is located. The program code must be modified to map missing data in elements #11-15 to a blank for element #10.</p> <p>As an internal edit, the State should consider linking the child’s placement setting to the health conditions of a child. If a child is placed in a treatment placement, which means there is a diagnosed condition of some type, the worker should receive an error that no diagnosed conditions have been entered into the system.</p> <p>Also, the State may want to add a tickler, or some type of reminder to the worker, that this information needs to be entered and updated.</p> <p>The State needs to address additional training and supervisory oversight. The State staff indicated case workers are trained that a child has a disability when she/he tells the worker she/he has a disability. This is incorrect. The information must be based on a licensed professional in the State (a medical doctor or a psychiatrist) making the diagnosis.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 15 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all of the error cases, the AFCARS response was “no,” but the reviewers found diagnosed information that should be reported to AFCARS.</p>
#11-15		<p>Screen: Characteristics</p> <p>There are two selection boxes on the screen: “physical/medical/developmental” and “behavioral/psychological/emotional.” There is an extensive list of characteristics on each selection list. The worker can select all that apply.</p> <p>There are many conditions that are not included in the extraction code that should be included (e.g., “Touretts” or “Spina bifida”). The State staff indicated that at the time of conversion, diagnosed conditions were entered into narrative fields and not in the database. The pick lists have not been updated.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		Tab C contains the State’s list of medical and psychological conditions and whether they should be mapped to AFCARS, and if so, to which element.
#11 Mental Retardation [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State maps “fragile” to this element. It should not be included in the AFCARS mapping of foster care disabilities. Case file review findings: 5 (.08%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State currently includes “visually impaired” and “hearing impaired.” The State needs to provide the definition it uses for these conditions and how workers are instructed to use them.
#13 Physically Disabled [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State maps “other orthopedic conditions” to this element. It should not be included. The State needs to provide ACF with the definition for this value.
#14 Emotionally Disturbed [0 = Does not apply] 1 = Applies	2	The State’s program code references “12290 - emotional disturbance,” but it is not listed in the code table. This value is vague. The State needs to provide the definition it uses for these conditions and how workers are instructed to use them. The State maps “Emotional Disturbance – Mild,” “Emotional Disturbance – Moderate,” and “Emotional Disturbance – Severe,” to this element. The State needs to provide the definition it uses for these conditions and how workers are instructed to use them. Case file review findings: 15 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The error cases should have been reported as “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In some instances, the error reflects either an error in the mapping or the worker selecting “other diagnosed condition.”
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition [0 = Does not apply]	2	Case file review findings: 2 (.03%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>1 = Applies</p> <p>#16 Has this child ever been adopted?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Yes = 481 (3.79%); No = 11,500 (90.6%); Unable to Determine = 712 (5.61%)</p> <p>On the “general” tab, there is a field “Ever previously adopted?” There also is a field “Year adopted.”</p> <p>This is a mandatory field. Workers are trained not to include the current adoption. The State does an exhaustive investigation to find out this information, if for some reason the parent refuses to provide it, or is not available.</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the State’s values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing it is mapped to blank.</p> <p>There is a change request in place for Trails to track the inter-country adoption act requirements.</p> <p>Note: While the number of error cases for this element was below 10% in the case file review, all of the cases found in error were reported as “unable to determine.” In all of the cases the reviewers were able to determine whether the child had been previously adopted. The State may want to review all cases reported as “unable to determine” to verify, and make appropriate corrections, if the child had actually been abandoned or if the information was not converted to the new system.</p>
<p>#17 If yes, how old was the child when the adoption was legalized?</p> <p>[0 = Not Applicable] 1 = less than 2 years old</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>The rating factor for this element is based on the case file review.</p> <p>The program code correctly subtracts the calendar year of the child’s birth from the calendar year of the adoption to determine the age of the child at adoption.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>2 = 2-5 years old 3 = 6-12 years old 4 = 13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine</p>		<p>The program code correctly maps this element to a value “not applicable” when the value of element #16 is “no.”</p> <p>The program code correctly maps this element to a value “unable to determine” when the value for element #16 is “unable to determine.”</p> <p>There is a line in the program code that sets this element to “unable to determine” if element #16 is “yes,” and the age is other than the specific age range checks performed. This line appears to never be executed, because all the possible ages are accounted for in the program code. <i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by removing an unnecessary "else" statement that set the element value to 5 - "Unable to determine" if the age fell outside the age ranges handled by the remaining code statements.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 6 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Five of the error cases were the ones noted in element #16 where the AFCARS data indicated “unable to determine,” but the reviewers were able to determine if the child had been previously adopted. In two of the cases, ages were found. In three of the cases, the response should have been “not applicable.” There was one case in which the wrong age was entered into the system. The State may want to review all cases reported as “unable to determine” to verify, and make appropriate corrections, if the child had actually been abandoned or if the information was not converted to the new system.</p>
<p>#18 Date of First Removal from Home</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>The removal screen contains a removal history at the top of the screen. There are three tabs under “removal detail.” These tabs are: “General,” “Caretaker A,” and “Caretaker B.” The removal start date, removal end date, manner of removal, family structure, child previously adopted/year of adoption, and removal reasons are located on the General tab.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>The program code sets this element to the date of the earliest removal obtained from the client child removal table.</p> <p>The rating for this element is based on the issues in element #21. Since this element is based on what is entered into the system and reported for the removal date, it is dependent on element #21 being entered and reported accurately.</p> <p>Note: While the number of error cases for this element was below 10%, there were cases in which an earlier date of first removal was found by the reviewers.</p> <p>Note: The State currently does not account for removal episodes that a child had prior to being adopted in Colorado. The State should consider correcting the program code at some future time. <i>Post site-visit: The State updated the program code to replace the statement that selects the earliest date of removal from home with one that requires the client ID to be in the set identified as "v_cl_ids." This will have the impact of including in the determination of the date of the first removal from home, the dates of removal associated with a child with a "birth ID" in addition to current ID. This situation would occur, for example, when a child was previously in foster care, adopted, and then re-entered foster care.</i></p>
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	3	<p>The rating for this element is based on the issues in element #21. Since this element is based on what is entered into the system and reported for the removal date, it is dependent on element #21 being entered and reported accurately.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State updated the program code to replace the statement that selects the earliest date of removal from home with one that requires the client ID to be in the set identified as "v_cl_ids." This will have the impact of including in the determination of the date of the first removal from home, the dates of removal associated with a child with a "birth ID" in addition to current ID. This situation would occur, for example, when a child was previously in foster care, adopted, and then re-entered foster care.</i></p>
#20 Date Child was Discharged from last foster	3	<p>The rating for this element is based on the issues in element #56. Since this</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
care episode (if applicable) ____ (mo) ____ (day) ____ (year)		element is based on what is entered into the system and reported for the discharge date, it is dependent on element #56 being entered and reported accurately. The program code correctly sets this element to the date the most recent removal episode ended, which was prior to the start of the current removal episode. If there was no prior removal, the program code sets this element to blank.
#21 Date of Latest Removal ____ (mo) ____ (day) ____ (year)	2	Screen: Removals The removal screen contains a removal history at the top of the screen. There are three tabs under “removal detail.” These tabs are: “General,” “Caretaker A,” and “Caretaker B.” The removal start date, removal end date, manner of removal, family structure, child previously adopted/year of adoption, and removal reasons are located on the General tab. A child’s initial placement can be entered into the system without entering the removal information. However, once the case worker tries to save the placement information, a system edit asks the worker if this represents a removal from home and if so, directs them to complete the removal information. The program code correctly sets this element to the date the most recent removal episode began. In instances where the child’s first living arrangement is a hospital or a locked facility at the time the agency obtains responsibility for care and placement, the program code extracts the date the child entered the hospital or locked facility as the removal date. The program code must be modified to extract the date the child is placed in a foster care setting. For AFCARS reporting purposes, the removal episode does not begin until the child is placed in a “foster care setting.” Trails has separate fields for the date of the legal status and for the removal date. The legal custody status code shows what type of custody exists. This allows the

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>State to record when they have custody of child but the child was never removed from his/her home (child is receiving in-home services). Once a child is removed from home, the worker enters a removal start date. The removal end date and the legal custody status end date will both be the same. The State could use these fields, and possibly the living arrangement field, to determine the “AFCARS episode” start date.</p> <p>Colorado’s Department of Human Services (CDHS) is the title IV-B/E single State agency, which includes the State’s juvenile corrections system and child and family services. In situations where a child in foster care is ordered into a detention facility, case management activities are carried out by the youth corrections staff. The youth corrections staff also uses Trails. However, due to the way Trails was designed, the child welfare case worker ends the removal status. (Trails was designed with an edit requiring the case to be closed.) A “new” removal is entered by the youth corrections worker with the exact same day of removal that previously was entered, even though there was never a break in the Department’s responsibility for care and placement of the child. Once the child has completed his/her time at the detention center, and the child moves into another foster care setting, the child welfare staff would then resume case management activities. The State has a project request order in to modify Trails so that the child welfare worker does not have to end the removal episode. The current process could potentially over-count the number of removal episodes. Additionally, it is duplicative data entry. This is also a SACWIS issue. At this time, the State has been addressing the problem through training. The State does not have a projected completion date for the modifications. The State must include a projected completion date when they submit the initial AFCARS Improvement Plan’s estimated due dates. This date will be reviewed and approved/disapproved by the AFCARS review team and the Division of State System’s Analyst for the State.</p>
#22 Date of Latest Removal Transaction Date	3	<p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Invalid Data (20060429) = 5 (0.04%). 2006A Frequency report (n=12,470): No invalid data reported.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>		<p>The program code sets this element to the system-generated, non-modifiable date that the date of latest removal was entered into the system.</p> <p>Since the entry of this information is dependent on when element #21 is entered, a three was given as the rating factor for this element. See the issues identified for element #21 regarding when the child is moved into a detention facility and first placements in a locked facility or a hospital. Once the State has made the corrections for element #21, this element will also be re-evaluated.</p>
<p>#23 Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Screens: Services Authorized and Trial Home Visit</p> <p>The screen contains fields for the “start date” and the “end date.”</p> <p>On the “trial home visit” screen, there are fields for the start and end dates, and the outcome.</p> <p>There is a separate screen (accessed from the “absent” button on the services authorized screen) to enter absences from “foster care.” The options are: Detention; Hospital; Kidnapped; Respite; Runaway; Trial Home Visit; and, Trial Home Provider. The State needs to provide ACF with a copy of this screen.</p> <p>For “trial home visits,” the case worker enters the end date of the setting where the child had been living prior to the “trial home visit,” and enters “trial home visit” as the “end placement” reason. That end date is used as the start date of a “trial home visit.” The State indicated that workers can enter more details on the “trial home visits” screen, including the start and end dates of the trial home visit.</p> <p>The program code uses the “placement end reason” for the mapping of “trial home visit” and the date to report the start date of a “trial home visit.”</p> <p>SACWIS related issue: Since there are multiple places to indicate an absence from the ongoing foster home (“absent” button, trial home visit screen, and end</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>placement reasons), the worker should only need to complete one area and the other screens should be populated by this information.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 8 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	<p align="center">3 2¹</p>	<p>Screen: Services Authorized</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): There are 340 records with “00” placements. There is 1 record with 41 placements, and 1 record with 42 placements.</p> <p>The program code incorrectly initializes this element to zero. It should be initialized to blank. The only acceptable reason for a zero in the placement count, is if the child’s <u>only</u> placement was “runaway” as of the end of the report period.</p> <p>The program code excludes “runaway,” “respite,” “trial home visits,” and short-term hospital stays (less than a week or so) from the count of placements. The State indicated that in certain instances a placement in a hospital up to 30 days would be considered a short term (acute care) stay. This is related to their Medicaid waiver. The State provided a copy of its policy indicating acute care is defined as 30 days.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 11 (21%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In three of the error cases, the reviewers found more placement moves than what was reported to AFCARS. In eight of the error cases, the reviewers found fewer placement moves than what was reported to AFCARS.</p>
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for Current placement Episode 1 = Voluntary	<p align="center">2 4</p>	<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>The “manner of removal” field is located on the General tab.</p>

¹ This element was incorrectly rated during the on-site review. The findings are the same.

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined</p>		<p>The program code correctly maps the State’s values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing it is mapped to blank. The State has a value “emergency,” which is correctly mapped to “not yet determined.”</p> <p>During the debriefing of the case file review, reviewers identified a problem with voluntary placement agreements being reported as a court order. The State staff indicated a modification was implemented approximately a year and a half ago (in 2004). The change prevents the manner of removal information from being changed after 30 days from the date of the child’s removal. Previously, case workers could, and were, updating the field if the removal episode was continued with a court order.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 6 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated “not yet determined” (the child had been in care since July 2005). The reviewer found it should have been reported as “court ordered.” The case file review findings pertaining to changes from “voluntary” to court order were not recent cases. The rating factor was changed based on this finding.</p>
<p>Actions or Conditions Associated With Child’s Removal (Indicate all that apply with a “1”.)</p> <p>[0-Does not Apply] 1-Applies</p>		<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>The removal reasons are located on the General tab.</p> <p>In general, these elements are under reported; more conditions exist at the time of removal than what is being recorded in the system. Collectively, elements #26-40 had several errors in the case file review. Only four elements did not have errors.</p>
#26 Physical Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 4 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#27 Sexual Abuse	3	
#28 Neglect	3	Case file review findings: 8 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 4 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		reported in AFCARS.
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 3 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#32 Child Drug Abuse	3	Case file review findings: 3 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#33 Child Disability	3	Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	3	Case file review findings: 5 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#35 Death of Parent	3	
#36 Incarceration of Parent	3	Case file review findings: 1 (2%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reasons	3	Case file review findings: 5 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#38 Abandonment	3	Case file review findings: 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.
#39 Relinquishment	3	
#40 Inadequate Housing	3	
#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	TBD 2	Screens: Services Provided: Services Authorized, History, and Trial Home Visits Frequency Report (n=12,693): Pre-Adoptive Home = 821(6.47%); Foster Family Home (Relative) = 2,068 (16.29%); Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) = 5335 (42.03%); Group Home = 370 (2.91%); Institution = 3364 (26.5%); Supervised Independent Living = 147 (1.16%); Runaway = 162 (1.28%); Trial Home Visit = 179 (1.41%) There are four tabs on the "services authorized" screen: "general," "comments," "details," and, "absence." The tab for absences is a read-only screen. On the

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>“general” tab there are fields for “service category,” “service type,” “start date,” “end date,” “pre-adoptive home,” “permanent placement,” and “whole family placement.” The State staff clarified that “permanent placement” is when the court has made a foster care provider a permanent home for that child. “Whole family placement” came out of a pilot program where they placed a mother with her children in the same placement, for example.</p> <p>There is a separate screen (accessed from the “absent” button on the services authorized screen) to enter absences from “foster care.” The options are: Detention, Hospital, Kidnapped, Respite, Runaway, Trial Home Visit, and Trial Home Provider. The State needs to provide ACF with a copy of this screen.</p> <p>Also, there is a “trial home visit” screen. The State indicated that case workers enter a “trial home visit” on the service authorization screen as an “end placement reason.” This then becomes the new placement setting. The State indicated that workers can enter more details on the “trial home visits” screen. The program code only uses the “placement end reason” for the mapping of “trial home visit.”</p> <p>The State staff indicated that a “trial home visit” cannot exceed six months per State statute.</p> <p>SACWIS related issue: Since there are multiple places to indicate an absence from the ongoing foster home (“absent” button, trial home visit screen, and end placement reasons), the worker should only need to complete one area and the other screens should be populated by this information.</p> <p>There is an “initial placement” check box on the placement summary screen. The staff indicated that if this box is checked, then there are certain fields that the case worker must complete. This is a field the State may also be able to use in situations where the first placement is a locked facility or a hospital for element #21. The State needs to provide ACF with a copy of the screen that indicates the</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>initial placement checkbox.</p> <p>The State is updating the program code to reflect the changes regarding residential treatment centers (RTC). The RTCs are being replaced by Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities (PRTF) and Therapeutic Residential Child Care Facilities (TRCCF) effective July 1, 2006. The program code will be changed as of June 30th when the settings become effective. <i>Post site-visit: The change was made to the program code. Both of the new State codes are mapped to the AFCARS value "Institution."</i></p> <p>The program code maps "KNSHP" (kinship care) and "KFSTR" (kinship foster care) to "foster family home-relative." The State's definition of "kinship" includes non-relatives. For AFCARS reporting, only individuals related to a child by blood or marriage are to be considered relatives. The State must not include "fictive kin" as relatives in AFCARS.</p> <p>Youth that are returned home on parole are to be discharged from the AFCARS reporting population. This is not a "trial home visit."</p> <p>Case file review findings: 7 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In four error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "foster family home, non-relative," but the reviewer found the child was living with a relative. In two error cases, the AFCARS data indicated "foster family home, relative," but the reviewers noted the child was not placed with a relative. It appears this is related to the State's use of "kinship care."</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: 1) The State maps "SHLTR" (shelter care) to "group homes." Clarify if all shelter care settings are between seven and twelve beds. 2) Clarify what are "DD Regional Centers" (DDRC). 3) Clarify the service type code "Community Corrections under DYC" (COCOR).</i></p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>4) Clarify the service type codes “Transition Program – Phase I,” “Transition Program – Phase II,” and “Transition Program – Phase III.”</p> <p>5) Clarify what the State is including in the second “lc_cur_placement := ‘2’” at the end of the section for element #41.</p>
<p>#42 Is Current Placement Out-of-State?</p> <p>1=Yes (Out of State placement) 2=No (In-State placement)</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p>The program code correctly checks the resource address to see if it is “in-State” or “out-of-State.”</p>
<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>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: FSP: Family Information – Participant Details tab</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Reunify = 5,536 (43.61%); Live With Other Relative(s) = 1,286 (10.13%); Adoption = 1,664 (13.11%); Long Term Foster Care = 219 (1.73%); Emancipation = 1,059 (8.34%); Guardianship = 45 (0.35%); Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established = 178 (1.40%); Not Reported = 2,706 (21.32%)</p> <p>The tab “participant details” includes the “current permanency goal” and the “alternative permanency goal” fields. Each has start and target dates. There is an additional button labeled “perm goal history” on the family information screen.</p> <p>The State staff indicated the number of records with missing data is more than likely due to the program code not mapping “remain home” to “reunification.” Currently it is mapped to blank. The goal “remain home” should be mapped to “reunification” for those children in out-of-home care that have a current living arrangement of “trial home visit.”</p> <p>There were a significant number of error cases in the case file review for this element. The State acknowledged that concurrent planning is an area for ongoing training; case workers need to update the primary goal.</p> <p>The State staff indicated that before removal information can be entered a</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>“permanency goal” must be entered first. The staff referred to this as the “AFCARS information.”</p> <p>The program code extracts the “primary” goal.</p> <p>The program code appropriately maps missing permanency goal information to “case plan goal not yet established” only if the child is in care for 30 days or less. If the child is in care for more than 30 days, the program code appropriately maps it to blank.</p> <p>The State is incorrectly mapping the value “other planned permanent living arrangement/non-relative LTFC” to the AFCARS value “live with relative.” It is to be mapped to long-term foster care. Relatives are only those individuals related to a child by blood or marriage. <i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code to correctly map the State code "other planned permanent living arrangement/non-relative LTFC" to AFCARS value "long term foster care" and the State code "remain home" to AFCARS value "reunify with parent(s) or principal caretaker(s)."</i></p> <p>On the screen for recording placements (Service Provision: Services Authorized) “Permanent Home” indicates a foster home where other goals are not a current option; the child does not want to be adopted, and/or the foster parents do not want guardianship or to adopt a child, but are willing to be a permanent family for the child. The judges order that the child is to be placed in this “permanent foster home.” This may also be a child with significant disabilities. Based on the State’s description related to case planning and that the placement is identified as a “permanent home,” these situations should be mapped to “emancipation.” The program code should be modified to only map this as “emancipation” if the “permanent home” box is checked on the placement screen. If the case does not demonstrate that these activities are occurring, and the “permanent home” box is not selected, these records are to be mapped to “long-term foster care.” If the</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>permanent home is that of a relative (by blood or marriage), then the goal would be mapped to “live with relative.”</p> <p>The State value “institution” is an inactive code. It is listed in the program code in order to account for the conversion cases.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 20 (33%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. See the case file review findings document for additional notes on the error cases.</p>
<p>#44 Caretaker Family Structure</p> <p>1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Married Couple = 3,151 (24.82%); Unmarried Couple = 1,629 (12.83%); Single Female = 6,301(49.64%); Single Male = 899 (7.08%); Unable to Determine = 713 (5.62%); Not Reported = 0.</p> <p>There are three tabs under “removal detail.” These are: General; Caretaker A; and, Caretaker B. The family structure information is located on the “General” tab. Based on the response entered for “family structure,” the worker has to complete the “Caretaker A” and/or “Caretaker B” tab(s).</p> <p>The start and end dates of a relationship can be entered into the system.</p> <p>The State may want to consider changing the value on the screen from “unable to determine” to “abandoned” in order to provide clarity of its proper use. <i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code for caretaker family structure by adding a new State code, "Abandon," which maps to AFCARS value "unable to determine."</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 14 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In ten of the error cases, the AFCARS information indicated “unable to determine.” In four cases the reviewers were able to find the</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>#45 1st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>information. In six cases, there was no indication that the child had been abandoned.</p> <p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): 6 records with birth year = 1,901 (0.05%); 30 records with birth year during or later than 2000 (with 11 records having birth year of 2005); 28 records with Invalid Data (0.22%); Not Reported = 722 (5.69%).</p> <p>There are three tabs under "removal detail." These are: General; Caretaker A; and, Caretaker B. Based on the response entered for "family structure," the worker has to complete the "Caretaker A" and/or "Caretaker B" tab(s). The fields on the caretaker tabs includes date of birth, ethnicity.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 10 (17%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Most of the error cases were due to missing information. See the findings for element #44.</p>
<p>#46 2nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year (if applicable)</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): 3 records with birth year = 1,900 (0.02%); 17 records with birth year during or later than 2000 (with 1 record having birth year of 2005); 10 records with Invalid Data (0.07%); Not Reported = 7,924 (62.43%).</p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. Most of the error cases were due to missing information. See the findings for element #44.</p>
<p>#47 Mother's Date of TPR</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p align="center">3 2</p>	<p>Screen: Hearings and Orders</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): 1 record with year of TPR = 1947</p> <p>There is section at the top of the "case/hearing orders" screen to show the history of hearings. There are three tabbed sections below: "order information," parental information," and "ICON." On the order information tab there are fields for the</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>hearing type, hearing date, order type, order date, and from the court system.</p> <p>The program code checks for the latest date of a court order or hearing held for the termination of parental rights for the mother. If the mother has died, the program code sets this element to the date of death of the mother. It selects a date that is prior to the end of the report period. The rating factor was changed because the program code should only extract the hearing date.</p> <p>Of all the dates found, including a deceased date, the code selects the most recent one.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 8 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were seven error cases reported as blanks, but the reviewer found TPR dates. In all but one the case had been open since prior to conversion to Trails.</p> <p>This information was not included during conversion to Trails. The State must do manual data cleanup. The case file review revealed a significant issue related to the accuracy and completeness of the data.</p>
<p>#48 Legal or Putative Father's TPR</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p>3 2</p>	<p>Screen: Hearings and Orders</p> <p>There is section at the top of the "case/hearing orders" screen to show the history of hearings. There are three tabbed sections below: "order information," parental information," and "ICON." On the order information tab there are fields for the hearing type, hearing date, order type, order date, and from the court's information system (ICON).</p> <p>The program code checks for the latest date of a court order or hearing held for the termination of parental rights for the father. If the father has died, the program code sets this element to the date of death of the father. The rating factor was changed because the program code should only extract the hearing date.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>Of all the dates found, including a deceased date, the code selects the most recent one.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 9 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were seven error cases reported as blanks, but the reviewer found TPR dates. In all but one the case had been open since prior to conversion to Trails. In one error case the reviewer found a deceased date.</p> <p>This information was not included during conversion to Trails. The State must do manual data cleanup. The case file review revealed a significant issue related to the accuracy and completeness of the data.</p>
<p>#49 Foster Family Structure</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Not applicable = 4,378 (35%); Married couple = 5,342 (42%); Unmarried couple = 302 (2%); Single female = 2,466 (19%); Single Male = 205 (2%); Not reported = 0</p> <p>The number of cases reported for “Not Applicable” (4378) is not equal to the number of cases in non-foster home settings in element #41 (4222). Also, there were more dates of births reported for the second foster caretaker than what is reported for couples in this element.</p> <p>If the current placement setting is not in a foster family or pre-adoptive home, the program code sets this element to “Not applicable.” The state staff indicated that perhaps information on relative foster parents is not being entered or extracted and that is why there were higher numbers for “not applicable.” The program code only checks the resources fields and relatives are not entered as resources. (State needs to confirm.)</p> <p>If a child is a runaway or on a trial home visit, this information should be reported as “not applicable.”</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>Note: While the number of error cases for this element was below 10%, all of the records could not be verified because of incomplete files. In the cases with errors, the reviewers found: the child’s living arrangement was reported as “runaway” and information on a foster family was also reported; the child’s living arrangement was reported as a “trial home visit” and information on a foster family was also reported; and, the family structure was reported as “married couple,” but the reviewer found it was an “unmarried couple.”</p> <p>The DYC questionable case is due to no information reported or found for the current living arrangement.</p>
#50 1 st Foster Caretaker’s Birth Year	<p align="center">3 2</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): 1900 = 6 (0.05%); 2001 = 21 (0.17%); 2004 = 5 (0.04%); 2005 = 7 (0.06%); Not Reported = 4,884 (38.48%); There was Invalid Data for 39 cases (0.31%).</p> <p>Case file review findings: 5 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the child’s living arrangement was reported as a “trial home visit,” and foster family information was also reported. In two error cases, the child’s living arrangement was reported as “run away,” and foster family information was also reported. 10 of the records could not be verified because of incomplete files.</p> <p>The rating factor was changed based on the case file finding of information reported when the child is on a “trial home visit” or is a runaway.</p>
#51 2 nd Foster Caretaker’s Birth Year	<p align="center">3 2</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): 1900 = 1 (0.01%); 2001 = 22 (0.17%); 2002 = 2 (0.02%); 2003 = 2 (0.02%); 2004 = 4 (0.03%); 2005 = 6 (0.05%); Not Reported = 6,824 (53.76%); There was Invalid Data for 9 cases (0.07%).</p> <p>There were more dates of birth reported for the second foster caretaker’s date of birth than the total number of couples reported in element #49.</p> <p>Note: While the number of error cases for this element was below 10%, (2 (5%))</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>all of the records could not be verified because of incomplete data.</p> <p>The rating factor was changed based on the case file finding of information reported in other foster caretaker elements when the child is on a “trial home visit” or is a runaway.</p>
<p>#52 1st Foster Caretaker’s Race</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members – Ethnicity tab</p> <p>The screen does not contain an option for “unable to determine.” “Unable to determine” must be added as an option for the workers to select in the event an individual refuses to provide the information. The State may want to make the selection on the screen “refused” or “declined” instead to make it more clear the correct use of the option.</p> <p>If the worker does not know the information because he/she has not asked the individual for their race affiliation, this element must be blank.</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the each race to the appropriate AFCARS value. The program code always sets “unable to determine” to “does not apply.” <i>Post site-visit: The default of mapping “does not apply” for “unable to determine” has been removed from the program code.</i></p> <p>Modify the program code that when the child is on a “trial home visit” or is a runaway these elements are blank.</p> <p>Note: While the number of error cases for this element was below 10%, (4 (9%)) all of the records could not be verified because of incomplete files. The error cases were primarily due to the extraction of foster parent information when the child was a runaway or on a “trial home visit.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by adding the values "Decline to Disclose." This value is mapped to "unable to determine."</i></p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>#53 1st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic or Latino Origin</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">4 2</p>	<p>Screen: Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members – Ethnicity tab</p> <p>Based on the finding regarding the reporting of foster parent information while a child is on runaway status or on a trial home visit, the rating factor was changed.</p> <p>Modify the program code that when the child is on a “trial home visit” or is a runaway these elements are blank.</p> <p>While the number of error cases for this element was below 10%, (4 (9%)) all of the records could not be verified because of incomplete files. The error cases were primarily due to the extraction of foster parent information when the child was a runaway or on a “trial home visit.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State updated the program code to add a new State code "Decline," which is mapped to AFCARS value "unable to determine."</i></p>
<p>#54 2nd Foster Caretaker's Race (if applicable)</p> <p>a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members – Ethnicity tab</p> <p>The screen does not contain an option for “unable to determine.” “Unable to determine” must be added as an option for the workers to select in the event an individual refuses to provide the information. The State may want to make the selection on the screen “refused” or “declined” instead to make it more clear the correct use of the option.</p> <p>If the worker does not know the information because he/she has not asked the individual for their race affiliation, this element must be blank.</p> <p>The program code correctly maps each race to the appropriate AFCARS value. The program code always sets “unable to determine” to “does not apply.” <i>Post site-visit: The default of mapping “does not apply” for “unable to determine” has been removed from the program code.</i></p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>Modify the program code that when the child is on a “trial home visit” or is a runaway these elements are blank.</p> <p>Note: While the number of error cases for this element was below 10%, (4 (9%) all of the records could not be verified because of incomplete files (18 of the child welfare cases). The error cases were primarily due to the extraction of foster parent information when the child was a runaway or on a “trial home visit.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by adding the values "Decline to Disclose." This value is mapped to "unable to determine."</i></p>
<p>#55 2nd Foster Caretaker’s Hispanic Origin</p> <p>[0 = Not Applicable] 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>4 2</p>	<p>Screen: Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members – Ethnicity tab</p> <p>Based on the finding regarding the reporting of foster parent information while a child is on runaway status or on a trial home visit, the rating factor was changed.</p> <p>Modify the program code that when the child is on a “trial home visit” or is a runaway these elements are blank.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code to add a new State code "Decline," which is mapped to AFCARS value "unable to determine."</i></p>
<p>#56 Date of Discharge from foster care</p> <p>____(mo) ____ (day)____(year)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>The program code sets this element to the date of discharge from foster care, or to blank if the child was not discharged during the reporting period.</p> <p>The program code picks up the date that legal custody ends (the removal end date.) In Colorado, the legal custody end date and the removal end date will always be the same.</p> <p>This element has a rating factor of “2” due to the issue related to the opening and closing of removal episodes for child entering a detention center. See the findings</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		for element #21.
#57 Date of Discharge Transaction Date	3	<p>The program code sets this element to the computer-generated date on which the date of discharge from foster care was entered into the system. It is a non-modifiable date.</p> <p>A three was given as the rating factor for this element due to the issues with DYC cases because how the system sets a transaction date is determined by when a date is entered for element #56. Once the State has made the corrections for element #56, this element will also be re-evaluated.</p>
#58 Reason for Discharge [0 = Not Applicable] 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child	2	<p>Screen: Removals</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=12,693): Compared to the number of dates of discharge reported in element #56, there are 14 cases with a missing discharge reason (0.11%).</p> <p>The rating for this element is based on the issues related to how the system is designed in regard to entering the DYC youth. For additional notes, see element #21.</p>
Source(s) of Federal financial support/assistance for child (#59 – 65) #59 Title IV-E (Foster Care) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2 4	<p>Screen: Eligibility Determination</p> <p>Frequency report (n=12,693): Applies = 3,780 (30%); Does not apply = 8,913 (70%)</p> <p>The State staff indicated that the number of records reported as “applies” in the frequency report is accurate.</p> <p>The information on child welfare children is obtained through the interface with the County Financial Management System (CFMS). Information on the DYC</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>youth is a manual process. A report is generated by DYC and given to child welfare office.</p> <p>Based on post site-visit analysis, the rating factor for this element was changed.</p> <p>SACWIS related item: Trails interfaces with the CFMS for the financial information on child welfare children only. The DYC children are not entered into CFMS. DYC uses a separate external manual method to track payment information and generates a report for the county office. The program code also checks the same tables used for the child welfare children in case the information for some reason did get entered into Trails. The State is working on ways to automate the process.</p>
<p>#60 Title IVE (Adoption Subsidy)</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p>2 4</p>	<p>The State does make a title IV-E adoption subsidy payment to an adoptive family prior to finalization of the adoption.</p>
<p>#61 Title IV-A (Aid to Families with Dependent Children)</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p>2 4</p>	<p>Frequency report (n=12,693): Applies = 0; Does not apply = 12,693 (100%)</p> <p>The State indicated they do place children with relatives in which the relative would receive a TANF payment on behalf of that child. In Trails, it would be “no-pay kinship care.” The State indicated there would not be many cases.</p> <p>The program code analyzed for the AFCARS review does not map information from the title IV-A system (via an interface). The staff indicated they believed the program code was recently changed. The State is to provide us with the current code after the site visit. <i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by replacing the old COIN interface with the new Colorado Benefits Management System (CBMS) interface. The foster care extract code copies the title IV-A flag directly as received from the CBMS interface to set the AFCARS value, just as the old code used the flag received from the COIN interface.</i></p>
<p>#62 Title IVD (Child Support)</p>	<p>4</p>	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
0-Does not apply 1-Applies		
#63 Title XIX (Medicaid) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	
#64 SSI or other Social Security Act Benefits 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	4	
#65 None of the Above 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2	<p>The program code correctly checks if any of the elements #59-64 are set to “applies,” in which case this element is set to “does not apply.” If none of the elements #59-64 is set to “applies,” this element is set to “applies.”</p> <p>The program code does not check for other sources of income for the child. The program code needs to check for other sources of Federal or non-Federal income.</p>
#66 Amount Of Monthly Foster Care Payment (regardless of source)	2	<p>Screen: Services Authorized; Details Tab</p> <p>The program code incorrectly calculates the sum of all amounts in “tcfms” archive paid for this child during the last full calendar month before the reporting period end date, or the discharge date if the child was discharged during the reporting period.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code for this element in three sections. First, the code now determines the month for which the amount of payment is calculated based on the discharge date instead of the transaction date of discharge. Second, if the discharge has not occurred or the discharge date was after the reporting period end date, the program code now uses the last month of the reporting period for the payment calculation instead of one month before the last month of the reporting period. Third, if the current removal began during the last month of the reporting period, the payment amount is set to zero.</i></p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Foster Care Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Data Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<i>The new program code does not check for the most recent full month for which the amount of the payment during that month is not zero.</i>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
#1 State FIPS Code	4	The State FIPS code for Colorado (“08”) is hard-coded in the program code.
#2 Report Period End Date	4	Entered by the user when the data file generation program code is executed.
#3 Record Number	4	The child’s person number is changed when the child’s case becomes an adoptive case. This number is linked to the birth case.
#4 State Agency Involvement 1 = Yes 2 = No	4	Frequency Report (n=529): There is one record reported as “no” (0.19%). The program code sets this element to a value “yes” if the child was placed by a public agency, was adopted by a foster parent or receives a monthly adoption subsidy. The State only includes adoptions that must be reported to AFCARS.
#5 Child Date of Birth	3 4	The program code sets this element directly from the value of the State’s adoption client birth date, which is populated from the foster care demographics field. In instances in which the date of birth is not known, case workers enter an estimated date of birth. The rating factor was changed because the adoption file does not require the child’s day of birth.
#6 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	4	Screen: General Information The program code correctly maps the State’s values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing it is mapped to blank.
#7 Child Race a = American Indian or Native Alaskan b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander e = White f = Unable to Determine	2	Screen: General Information The State indicated the “ethnicity” field becomes mandatory once a child is removed from his/her home and placed in out-of-home care. The staff indicated that if a child is abandoned, the worker makes the determination of the child’s race. The screen does not contain an option for “unable to determine.” “Unable to determine” must be added as an option for the workers to select in the event

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>a child is abandoned. The State may want to make the selection on the screen “abandoned” instead to make it more clear the correct use of the option.</p> <p>Also, the State may want to add the option “refused” or “declined” for those situations where a parent or the child refuses to provide the information. This would allow the State to track the information separately from other responses.</p> <p>The State must train workers that if a child is abandoned, they are not to determine the child’s race and are to record the race as “unable to determine.”</p> <p>If the worker does not know the information because he/she has not asked the individual for their race affiliation, this element must be blank.</p> <p>The program code maps the each race to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p> <p>The program code always sets “unable to determine” to “does not apply.” <i>Post site-visit: The default of mapping "does not apply" for “unable to determine” has been removed from the program code.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: For the race category “American Indian or Native Alaskan,” 3 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In each case the reviewer found that the child was American Indian and it was not reported as applying.</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by adding the values "Abandoned" and "Decline to Disclose." These values are mapped to "unable to determine."</i></p>
#8 Child Hispanic Origin	4	Screen: General Information

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>		<p>The program code correctly maps and extracts the State's values to the AFCARS value. Missing information is mapped to blank.</p> <p>The State may want to add the option "refused" or "declined" for those situations where a parent or the child refuses to provide the information. This would allow the State to track the information separately from other responses. <i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code to map the new choice "Declined-to-provide" to AFCARS value "Unable to determine."</i></p>
<p>#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No</p>	<p align="center">2 3</p>	<p>Frequency Report (n=529): Yes = 248 (46.88%); No = 281 (53.12%).</p> <p>The data for this element is inconsistent with the data reported for adoption element #35: "monthly subsidy paid" is "Yes" = 382.</p> <p>Currently, the response to this element is derived from the responses to adoption elements #11-15 instead of element #10. If one or more of the elements #11-15 is "applies," this element is set to "yes." If none of elements #11-15 are "applies," then this element is set to "no." This element should check if a primary basis of special needs was entered into the field on the adoption general information screen. If "none" is selected for that field, this element should be mapped to "no." If one of the State's values for a primary special need is entered then this should be mapped to "yes." Adoption elements #11-15 are a subcategory of element #10. A child can be determined to be special needs and not have a diagnosed medical or psychological condition. <i>Post site-visit: The State modified the program code to determine the value of element #9 based on the value of element #10, "primary basis for determining special needs."</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 12 (55%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In all cases, the AFCARS indicated "no," and the reviewer found it should have been "yes." The case file findings support what was found wrong with the program code.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
<p>#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs</p> <p>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 State Defined Special Needs</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: Adoption, General Information</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=529): Not Applicable = 1 (0.19%); Age = 91 (17.2%); Other = 41 (7.75%).</p> <p>There is a mandatory field on the screen for the entry of the primary basis for special needs. There is an additional selection box for other characteristics of the child.</p> <p>The program code correctly extracts the data for this element from the “primary special needs” field.</p> <p>The State’s value “high risk infant” is incorrectly mapped to “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” It must be mapped to “other state defined special need.” This was supported by the case file review findings.</p> <p>The State has a value of “other.” The Federal team asked for clarification of what this means and the State provided a copy of the definition. Post site-visit: The Federal team reviewed the documentation and did not find a category “other.” The State needs to provide additional information and clarification.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the AFCARS report indicated “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities,” but the reviewers found the child was “at-risk.” This should have been reported as “other State defined special need.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit:</i> The State maps “Hereditary Factors Clinically Documented” to “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” It is not clear</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p><i>whether there are existing health conditions or if there are health conditions that the child may develop. The State’s manual did not further define what this value means. The State needs to provide further clarification.</i></p> <p><i>The program code includes “mental disability,” which is mapped to the AFCARS value “4” for this element. According to the State staff the definition is: developmental delay, perceptual or speech disability, or metabolic disorder, or down syndrome. This is the same definition included in the staff manual for “mental retardation.” If these two terms are actually the same, then the program code is correctly mapping the value. The State needs to provide ACF with a copy of the “adoption, general information” screen displaying the drop-down options for the “primary special needs” field. If there is a difference between what is in the staff manual and the selection the options, the State needs to revise the option on the screen to “mental retardation.”</i></p> <p><i>During the onsite review there was discussion regarding “developmental disability,” which is another factor used in determining if a child is “special needs.” The State’s staff manual defines “developmental disability” as “Resulting in educational delays or significant mental processing.” During the post site-visit evaluation of the program code it is not included for this element. It should be included in responding to this element, and would be mapped to “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” Since there is no category in AFCARS for “developmental disability,” the State has to map each component of the “developmental disability” separately. “Educational delays” are to be mapped to element #15. For areas relating to “mental processing,” these would be mapped to element #11.</i></p>
#11 Mental Retardation	2	<p>“Mental disability” is mapped to this element. The State needs to confirm if this should be “mental retardation” per the staff manual. See element #10 for additional notes.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>Elements #11 – 15 are being incorrectly reported regardless of the primary basis of special needs. The program code must be modified to only extract elements #11 - 15 if the primary basis is a “4” in element #10.</p> <p>Changes made for foster care elements #11 – 15 also apply to adoption elements #11 – 15. The State should be extracting the same diagnosed conditions for adoption elements #11 – 15 if the response to adoption element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p>
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	2	<p>Per the notes in element #10, the State needs to clarify whether “visual” or “hearing” impairment is listed on the selection list for the caseworker to choose. The State is submit a screen print displaying the options.</p> <p>Elements #11 – 15 are being incorrectly reported regardless of the primary basis of special needs. The program code must be modified to only extract elements #11 - 15 if the primary basis is a “4” in element #10.</p> <p>Changes made for foster care elements #11 – 15 also apply to adoption elements #11 – 15. The State should be extracting the same diagnosed conditions for adoption elements #11 – 15 if the response to adoption element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p>
#13 Physically Disabled	2	<p>The staff manual defines “physical disability” as including “hearing,” “vision,” and “heart defects.” If this is the option that the worker selects “physical disability,” then the State may need to revise the definition in the manual. This value is mapped to element #13 and may incorrectly be including conditions that are to be mapped more appropriately to other AFCARS values.</p> <p>Elements #11 – 15 are being incorrectly reported regardless of the primary basis of special needs. The program code must be modified to only extract elements #11 - 15 if the primary basis is a “4” in element #10.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>Changes made for foster care elements #11 – 15 also apply to adoption elements #11 – 15. The State should be extracting the same diagnosed conditions for adoption elements #11 – 15 if the response to adoption element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p>
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	2	<p>The State maps “emotional disturbance” to element #14. There is no definition included in the staff manual. It is not clear that the worker is selecting this because the child has a clinically diagnosed psychological condition. The State needs to provide additional clarification.</p> <p>Elements #11 – 15 are being incorrectly reported regardless of the primary basis of special needs. The program code must be modified to only extract elements #11 - 15 if the primary basis is a “4” in element #10.</p> <p>Changes made for foster care elements #11 – 15 also apply to adoption elements #11 – 15. The State should be extracting the same diagnosed conditions for adoption elements #11 – 15 if the response to adoption element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p> <p>Case file review findings: 8 (36%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the three error cases, the AFCARS report indicated “does not apply,” but the reviewer noted it does “apply.” In all three cases, element #10 was reported and verified as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” In two error cases, this was reported as “does not apply,” but the reviewer found that it did “apply.” Element #15 was marked as “applies,” but the reviewer found that it “does not apply.” In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated “applies.” However, element #10 was not “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p>
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	2	<p>The State maps “other” to this element. However, for element #10 “other” is mapped to “other state defined special need.” It cannot be mapped to both.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>See notes in element #10 regarding “other.” The State needs to define this value and provide the screen shot of the options for element #10.</p> <p>Elements #11 – 15 are being incorrectly reported regardless of the primary basis of special needs. The program code must be modified to only extract elements #11 - 15 if the primary basis is a “4” in element #10.</p> <p>Changes made for foster care elements #11 – 15 also apply to adoption elements #11 – 15. The State should be extracting the same diagnosed conditions for adoption elements #11 – 15 if the response to adoption element #10 is “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p> <p>Case file review findings: 5 (23%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, element #14 was reported as “does not apply,” but the reviewer found that it did “apply.” Element #15 was marked as “applies,” but the reviewer found that it “does not apply.” In three error cases, the AFCARS data indicated “applies.” However, element #10 was not “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p>
#16 Mother's Birth Year	<p align="center">2 3</p>	<p>Screen: Client, General Information</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=529): 2003 = 1 (0.19%)</p> <p>The program code sets the value of this element to the year of birth of the mother, or to blank if the information is not known.</p> <p>The program code extracts the earliest date of birth of the biological or legal mother. This is incorrect. The program code must be modified to extract the date of birth of either the “legal,” “adoptive,” or “biological” mother; whichever is relevant for the current adoption. This is to be the date of birth of the person whose rights were terminated in adoption element #19. <i>Post</i></p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p><i>site-visit: The State revised the program code. It now checks for the birth year of the natural, legal or adoptive mother using the same logic for identifying the mother whose parental rights were terminated in adoption element #19.</i></p> <p>Case file review findings: 2 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The wrong date of birth was either entered or reported.</p>
#17 Father's Birth Year	<p align="center">2 3</p>	<p>Screen: Client, General Information</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=529): 1901 = 1 (0.19%); Not Reported = 162 (30.62%).</p> <p>The program sets the value of this element to the year of birth of the father, or to blank if the information is not known.</p> <p>The program code extracts the earliest date of birth of the biological or legal father. This is incorrect. The program code must be modified to extract the date of birth of either the “legal,” “adoptive,” or “biological” father; whichever is relevant for the current adoption. This is the date of birth of the person whose rights were terminated in adoption element #20. <i>Post site-visit: The State revised the program code for this element. It now checks for the birth year of the natural, legal or adoptive father using the same logic for identifying the father whose parental rights were terminated in adoption element #19.</i></p>
<p>#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Screen: Adoption General Information</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=529): Yes = 115 (22%); No = 299 (57%); Unable to Determine = 115 (22%)</p> <p>The answer to this element must always reflect the biological mother.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>The State has this as a question in its information system. However, it is located on an adoption screen and not a foster care screen. This is information that must be recorded close to the time of the child’s removal from home or during the completion of an initial family assessment. The State could add the question to the foster care removals general tab. The answer would then be populated over to the field on the adoption general information screen at the time the record becomes an adoptive case. Also, the State could explore the use of the relationship history screen because there are Start/End dates to relationships by checking the child’s birth date against start/end dates of the relationship of a spouse of the mother.</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the State’s values to the AFCARS values. If information is missing it is mapped to blank.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 3 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the AFCARS report indicated “unable to determine.” However, in each case, dates of birth were reported for the mother, and verified by the reviewer.</p>
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	3 2	<p>Screen: Hearings and Orders</p> <p>There is a section at the top of the “case/hearing orders” screen to show the history of hearings. There are three tabbed sections below: “order information,” “parental information,” and “ICON.” On the order information tab there are fields for the hearing type, hearing date, order type, order date, and from ICON.</p> <p>The program code extracts the TPR date from the same field used in the foster care file. Therefore, there should be no differences in the two TPR dates.</p> <p>The program code checks for the latest date of a court order or hearing held for the termination of parental rights for the mother. If the mother has died,</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>the program code sets this element to the date of death of the mother. The rating factor was changed because the program code should only extract the hearing date.</p> <p>Of all the dates found, including a deceased date, the code selects the most recent one.</p> <p>Case file review findings: It appears that the reviewers wrote down the date the judge signed the order and not the date that the hearing occurred. There were no issues related to the dates reported for this element based on the case file review findings. The dates in the adoption file for the period under review apparently have undergone data clean-up.</p>
#20 Date of Father's TPR	<p align="center">3 2</p>	<p>Screen: Hearings and Orders</p> <p>There is a section at the top of the “case/hearing orders” screen to show the history of hearings. There are three tabbed sections below: “order information,” “parental information,” and “ICON.” On the order information tab there are fields for the hearing type, hearing date, order type, order date, and from ICON.</p> <p>The program code extracts the TPR date from the same field used in the foster care file. Therefore, there should be no differences in the two TPR dates.</p> <p>The program code checks for the latest date of a court order or hearing held for the termination of parental rights for the father. If the father has died, the program code sets this element to the date of death of the father. The rating factor was changed because the program code should only extract the hearing date.</p> <p>Of all the dates found, including a deceased date, the code selects the most recent one.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		Case file review findings: It appears that the reviewers wrote down the date the judge signed the order and not the date that the hearing occurred. There were no issues related to the dates reported for this element based on the case file review findings. The dates in the adoption file for the period under review apparently have undergone data clean-up.
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	4	The State extracts the date the adoption was finalized, which is the same date as the discharge date in foster care element #56.
#22 Adoptive Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	4	The States values are correctly mapped to the AFCARS values.
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	3 4	Frequency Report (n=529): There is one case with birth year = 2005, and two cases with invalid data. There were only 514 cases reported with a date, and there should have been 519 cases. Based on the frequency report, the quality of this data needs to improve because this information should never be missing, invalid or inaccurate. The rating was changed because the number of errors in the case file review was approximately 3% of the cases.
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	3 4	Frequency Report (n=529): There is one case with birth year=2004, and 1 case with invalid data. 107 cases (20.23%) were not reported instead of the 102 reflecting single females. Based on the frequency report, the quality of this data needs to improve because this information should never be missing, invalid or inaccurate. The rating was changed because the number of errors from the case file review is approximately 3% of the cases.
#25 Adoptive Mother's Race a = American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	Screen: Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members – Ethnicity tab The screen does not contain an option for “unable to determine.” “Unable to

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander e = White f = Unable to Determine		<p>determine” must be added as an option for the workers to select in the event an individual refuses to provide the information. The State may want to make the selection on the screen “refused” or “declined” instead to make it more clear the correct use of the option.</p> <p>If the worker does not know the information because he/she has not asked the individual for their race affiliation, this element must be blank.</p> <p>The program code sets the value for this element only if element #22 is either a “1,” “2,” or “3.” If there is no adoptive mother, then the program code sets the values of all the race elements a-f to blank.</p> <p>The program code correctly maps the each race to the appropriate AFCARS value. The program code always sets “unable to determine” to “does not apply.” <i>Post site-visit: The default of mapping “does not apply” for “unable to determine” has been removed from the program code.</i></p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by adding the values “Decline to Disclose.” This value is mapped to “unable to determine.”</i></p>
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	<p>The program code sets the value for this element only if element #22 is 1, 2 or 3.</p> <p>The program code never sets the value of this element to “not applicable.” The program code must be modified to set this response to “not applicable” when a single male is the only adoptive parent.</p>
#27 Adoptive Father's Race a = American Indian or Alaskan Native b = Asian c = Black or African American d = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2	<p>Screen: Screen: Resources: Directory: Staff/Members – Ethnicity tab</p> <p>The screen does not contain an option for “unable to determine.” “Unable to determine” must be added as an option for the workers to select in the event an individual refuses to provide the information. The State may want to make the selection on the screen “refused” or “declined” instead to make it</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
e = White f = Unable to Determine		more clear the correct use of the option. If the worker does not know the information because he/she has not asked the individual for their race affiliation, this element must be blank. The program code sets the value for this element only if element #22 is either a “1,” “2,” or “4.” If there is no adoptive father, then the program code sets the values of all the race elements a-f to blank. The program code correctly maps the each race to the appropriate AFCARS value. The program code always sets “unable to determine” to “does not apply.” <i>Post site-visit: The default of mapping “does not apply” for “unable to determine” has been removed from the program code.</i> <i>Post site-visit: The State has updated the program code by adding the values "Decline to Disclose." This value is mapped to "unable to determine."</i>
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	2	The program code sets the value for this element only if element #22 is 1, 2 or 4. The program code never sets the value of this element to “not applicable.” The program code must be modified to set this response to “not applicable” when a single female is the only adoptive parent.
#29 –32 0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies		Screen: Adoption: General; Field: Relationship of adopting family This is an area that needs to be modified. This is a single select field and not multi-select. Case workers must be able to select all relationships that apply. Modify the field on the screen to allow multi-selection of this information. The program code also needs to account for changes to the screen.
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent	2	
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child -	2	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
Other Relative		
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent	2	
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	2	
#33 Child Was Placed from 1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country	4	The program code correctly maps the State codes to the AFCARS values.
#34 Child Was Placed by 1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	4	The program code correctly maps the State codes to AFCARS codes for this element.
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy 1=Yes 2=No	2	<p>Screen: Client: Entitlement</p> <p>Frequency Report (n=529): Yes = 383 (12%); No = 124 (23%).</p> <p>The program code incorrectly sets this element to a value “yes” if it finds a payment made in the “tcfms_archive” table for child maintenance service with a type of adoption. The payment is for the most recent calendar month before the end of the reporting period or the end of service, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>The State needs to modify the program code. This should reflect the type of an adoption assistance agreement. The answer for this element is “no” when either the child is not a special needs child or if the adoption agreement was for services only. The State has the following options on the screen: “Services only agreement” maps to “no,” “Medicaid only agreement” maps</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
		<p>to “yes,” “Payment only agreement” maps to “yes,” “Services/Payment/Medicaid agreement” maps to “yes,” and “Services/Medicaid agreement” maps to “yes.”</p> <p><i>Post site-visit: The State revised the program code. There is an "OR" statement in the section of program code evaluating when to set this element to “no.” It seems that it should be an “AND” statement. The State needs to review and provide ACF with comment.</i></p>
#36 Monthly Amount	2 3	<p>The program code incorrectly sets this element to the amount of payment made using the same criteria for selection as in element #35. This amount must reflect the amount that is entered into the adoption assistance agreement and should not reflect any changes in the amount. It should be reflective of the information known as of the finalization date of the adoption. <i>Post site-visit: The State revised the program code to report the monthly amount specified in the initial adoption subsidy agreement instead of the amount paid during the last month of the reporting period.</i></p> <p>The State staff generally enters a daily rate in the adoption assistance agreement. This can be multiplied by the accounting standard for a “month.”</p> <p>The State staff thought that once a child goes into a pre-adoptive home they could no longer receive title IV-E foster care funds. The Federal team clarified that this is not a Federal rule.</p> <p>Case file review findings: 13 (59%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the majority of the error cases, the AFCARS indicated a lower amount than what was found by the reviewers. In one error case, the AFCARS report was missing information, but the reviewer found an amount in the adoption agreement.</p>
#37 Adoption Assistance IV-E	2	<p>The program code sets this element to a value “yes” if the client is IV-E Sub-Adopt eligible and if a payment is made.</p>

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements

State: Colorado

AFCARS Reporting Period: April 1, 2005 – September 30, 2005 (2005B)

AFCARS Element	Rating Factor	Comments/Notes
1=Yes 2=No		The program code must be modified to check that if the response to adoption element #35 is “yes,” <u>and</u> an amount is reported in element #36, if the child is eligible for title IV-E as of the date of the finalized adoption.