



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
1250 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

October 5, 2015

Mr. Ted Dallas
Secretary
Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 2675
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-2675

Dear Mr. Dallas:

The Children's Bureau, in collaboration with the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (DHS), Office of Children, Youth, and Families (OCYF), completed a review of the State's Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data during the week of June 23, 2014. The final report on the AFCARS Assessment Review (AAR) is enclosed, which includes the State AFCARS Improvement Plan (AIP).

We appreciate the amount of time and effort that your staff committed to the planning and implementation of the AFCARS Review. Every member of the State team was fully engaged during the review and ensured that the week went smoothly. The State team included not only representatives from the State's Central Office but staff from the counties with lead responsibility for the system used by the respective counties.

The AAR evaluates two areas: the AFCARS general requirements (reporting populations and technical standards) and the data elements (foster care and adoption). While the standard AAR methodology was used to assess the State's AFCARS data collection and reporting, the process was modified for the State's unique situation. As you are aware, there is not a single electronic case management/case file used by all counties; instead there are eight discrete information systems in use across the State. For the purpose of analyzing the State's data collection, the Federal review included all eight of the systems. The team analyzed the method of collecting and recording information as well as the technical documentation (extraction code) used by each of these systems.

The enclosed report does not include the detailed findings for each individual system. Instead, the findings are summarized in the General Requirements and Element matrices in Tab A of the Report. Each general requirements item and each data element is given a rating factor. The rating factors are: "1," the information is not collected and/or is not transmitted to ACF; "2," technical corrections are required; "3," improvement in data quality is needed; and "4," the State fully meets the AFCARS standards. The enclosed report provides a more detailed explanation of each of the rating factors. If any one system received a rating of "2" or "3," the summary assessment of the general requirement or element was rated accordingly. Below are the State's ratings:

General Requirements (21)

Rating Factor	Foster Care (8)	Adoption (3)	Technical (9)	Data Quality (1)
4	5	2	5	0
3	1	0	2	1
2	2	1	2	0
1	0	0	0	0

Data Elements (103)

Rating Factor	Foster Care (66)	Adoption (37)	Total (103)
4	7 (10.6%)	6 (16.2%)	13 (12.6%)
3	18 (27.3%)	0	18 (17.5%)
2	41 (62.1%)	29 (78.4%)	70 (67.9%)
1	0	2 (5.4%)	2 (2%)

The absence of a single, statewide database was a significant issue identified as part of the AAR because it affects the reporting population, data elements, and the overall consistency and quality of the State’s data. The process for entering information, the scope of information in these systems, as well as the extraction of information varies across the State. This approach to data collection affects the quality and completeness of the State’s AFCARS submissions. One key finding is the child’s removal history may be incomplete. The AFCARS requirement is for title IV-E agencies to report the date of the child’s first ever removal from home, the total number of removals, and the discharge date from a prior episode. With the State’s current approach, the record for a child who entered and discharged from foster care in one county agency and who reentered foster care in a different county will not include the earlier foster care episode. In this example, the AFCARS file will incorrectly reflect one removal episode instead of two. This issue extends to counties using the same system, as they do not share the same database.

A related issue that may occur is if a case is transferred from the jurisdiction of one county to another county jurisdiction. It is possible the first county may enter the record as a discharge. The county that is assuming the care and placement responsibility may report this as a new removal; when, in fact, the child has experienced one continuous removal episode.

Not only is information not shared electronically between the counties, the staff of OCYF does not have direct access to the information in the individual county systems. Some reports and the six-month AFCARS extract files are available to the central office staff, but the amount of information is limited. Therefore, monitoring of performance by the State is incomplete and most likely a cumbersome process. There are many areas where the quality of the AFCARS data needs to improve. We encourage the agency to incorporate a review of its AFCARS data, as well as other data, as part of the periodic reviews conducted for children in foster care. The agency should also incorporate a review and analysis of the data as part of its quality assurance process. It is important that the information being used, not only for AFCARS reporting, but for the agency’s own performance measurement and other program evaluations, be reliable, consistent, and accurate.

The AAR identified several errors with the extraction of the AFCARS data across all eight systems. As noted in the summary chart above, a substantial number of data elements require technical corrections. This includes corrections to fields within several of the systems for the accurate collection of information. Due to these corrections, the State will have to resubmit AFCARS data for past report periods. The existing methodology the State uses is likely to result in problems in submitting prior report period data. It was noted, as part of the AAR, that many of the systems do not maintain history tables for the information (for instance case plans, dates of termination of parental rights, reasons for removal, etc.) and so information is “overwritten.” The AFCARS file for prior report periods is to reflect information on the child’s circumstances for that time period.

We recognize the State is in the process of implementing the Child Welfare Information Solution (CWIS). The CWIS will allow for an automated solution to exchange information among the 67 County Children and Youth Agencies and the central office of OCYF. The State is beginning development of the second phase, which includes case information on the child and family. It is this phase that will have an impact on the information that is used by the State for its AFCARS reporting. It is imperative that the State implement the second phase as soon as possible. Not only is the information required for AFCARS, but it is important to the work of the State in ensuring quality services and positive outcomes for children and their families. We understand that, while the State will be implementing CWIS as a centralized database, there will still be the eight systems in operation. Therefore, the issues identified in the element findings related to the collection of information will still need to be addressed by each of the counties.

While the AAR Report does not include the findings matrices or an AIP for each of the eight systems, it is CB's expectation that DHS/OCYF will oversee and monitor each system's progress. The Federal team will work with the OCYF staff during the AIP phase in its monitoring of identified corrections to each of the systems. Additionally, the State's plan for implementing the changes to the system and for caseworker training must be included in the State's title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan and Annual Progress and Services Report as part of the information required by 45 CFR 1357.15(t) and 45 CFR 1357.16(a)(5).

In closing, I would again like to thank the staff who participated in the review for their hard work and their commitment to collecting accurate and reliable AFCARS data. It is important to note that the above issues also have implications for the accuracy of the State's Child and Family Services Data Profile. The information provided by this AAR will enable the State to bring its data collection and AFCARS reporting into compliance with the AFCARS standards. If you have any questions regarding the report, please contact Angelina Palmiero at (202) 205-7240.

Sincerely,

/s/

Rafael López
Commissioner
Administration on Children, Youth and Families

Enclosures

cc: Brendan Harris, Executive Deputy Secretary, PADHS
Cathy Utz, Director, Office of Children, Youth, and Families, PADHS
Susan Stockwell, Director, Systems and Data Management Section; PADHS/OCYF
Joseph Bock, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Children's Bureau
Lisa Pearson, Regional Program Manager, Children's Bureau Region 3
Gail Collins, Director, Division of Program Implementation, Children's Bureau
Terry Watt, Director, Division of State/Tribal Systems, Children's Bureau
Angelina Palmiero, Child Welfare Program Specialist/AFCARS, Children's Bureau

**Pennsylvania
AFCARS
Assessment Review
Report**

September 2015

**Children's Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	1
Rating Factors	2
Findings	4
Information System	5
General Requirements	6
Data Elements	8
Conclusion	10
Tab A	Detailed Findings
	Section 1: General Requirements
	Section 2: Foster Care and Adoption Elements
	Section 3: Case File Review
Tab B	AFCARS Improvement Plan
	Section 1: General Requirements
	Section 2: Foster Care and Adoption Elements

BACKGROUND

Federal law and regulations require title IV-E agencies operating programs under title IV-E of the Social Security Act (the Act) to submit data to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS). The data are to be collected on children in foster care and those who have been adopted with title IV-E agency involvement. Title IV-E agencies that fail to meet any of the standards set forth in 45 CFR 1355.40(a-d) are considered to be in substantial noncompliance with the requirements of the title IV-E Plan.¹ Additionally, title IV-E agencies that received funding to develop, implement, and operate a Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) or a Tribal Automated Child Welfare Information System (TACWIS) under Federal regulations at 45 CFR 1355.53 are to produce a comprehensive, effective, and efficient system to improve the program management and administration of titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. At a minimum, the system must provide for effective management, tracking, and reporting by providing automated procedures and processes to, among other things, meet the adoption and foster care reporting requirements through the collection, maintenance, integrity checking, and electronic transmission of the data elements specified by the AFCARS requirements.

The Children's Bureau is committed to assisting title IV-E agencies to develop child welfare information systems and to collect quality data. To this end, SACWIS/TACWIS and AFCARS Assessment Reviews were developed to assure that the systems support the management of the programs under titles IV-B and IV-E and can produce accurate and reliable foster care and adoption data. All title IV-E agencies will undergo an AFCARS Assessment Review (AAR) regardless of whether an agency operates a SACWIS/TACWIS. The title IV-E agency's information system is assessed against the AFCARS requirements in the Federal regulations, policy issuances, and the AFCARS Technical Bulletins. The AAR evaluates the agency's information system's capability to collect, extract, and transmit the AFCARS data accurately to the Children's Bureau. A second focus of the AAR is to assess the accuracy of the collection and documentation of information related to the foster care and/or adoption case of a child.

The review process goes beyond the edit checks that must be met by a title IV-E agency in order to pass the AFCARS compliance error standards. The review also ascertains the extent to which a title IV-E agency meets all of the AFCARS requirements and examines the quality of its data. Additionally, while the review is an assessment of the title IV-E agency's collection and reporting of AFCARS data, it is also an opportunity for Federal staff to provide substantive technical assistance to agency staff.

Each AAR consists of a thorough analysis of the title IV-E agency's system technical documentation for the collection, extraction and reporting of the AFCARS data. In addition to this review of documentation, the Federal AFCARS team reviews each data element with the agency's team to gain a better understanding of the agency's child welfare practice and policy and agency staff's understanding of the data elements. The data are also compared against a small, randomly selected number of hard copy case files. Through this exercise, the accuracy of the agency's data conversion process (if applicable) and understanding of the information reported to AFCARS is tested.

¹ 45 CFR 1355.40(e)

RATING FACTORS

Two major areas are evaluated during an AFCARS assessment review: the AFCARS general requirements and the data elements. The general requirements include the population that is to be reported to AFCARS and the technical requirements for constructing a data file. The data elements are assessed for overall data quality, to determine whether the title IV-E agency is meeting the AFCARS definitions for the information required, and to determine whether the correct data are being entered and extracted.

AFCARS data submissions are subject to a minimal number of edit checks, as listed in Appendix E of 45 CFR Part 1355. Based on these edit checks, substantial compliance can be determined for the timely submission of the data files, the timely entry of certain data elements, and for whether the data meets a 90 percent level of tolerance for missing data and internal consistency checks. However, substantial compliance does not mean a title IV-E agency has fully implemented the requirements in the regulations. This explains why an agency formerly may have been “penalty-free,” and yet does not have accurate and reliable quality data. For example, edit checks of the data cannot determine whether the title IV-E agency submitted the correct foster care population required by the Federal regulations.

Information collected from each component of the assessment review is used to rate each data element. The general requirements are assessed and rated separately using the same scale. A scale of zero (the system is not collecting the AFCARS data elements and the data are not transmitted) to four (fully meets the AFCARS standards) is used to assign a rating factor. Exhibit 1 is a chart that lists the factors that were used for the analysis of the title IV-E agency’s AFCARS.

For data elements and general requirements that do not meet existing AFCARS standards (rating factors 0 through 3), the agency is required to make the corrections identified by the review team. It is possible that the problem with a data element is due both to system issues and to caseworker data entry issues. In such instances, the element will be rated a “2” to denote the need for modification to the system. Once the corrections are made to the system, the data will be re-analyzed. If problems related to caseworker training or data entry still exist, then a “3” will be assigned to the requirement. A rating factor of “4” (compliant) will not be given to the element until all system issues and/or data quality issues have been addressed.

The agency is required to make the changes to the information system and/or data entry in order to be compliant with the applicable requirements and standards. Since the AFCARS data are used for several significant activities at the Federal and State/Tribal levels, the title IV-E agency must implement the AFCARS Improvement Plan, under Tab B of this report, as a way to improve the quality of its data. While elements may have a rating of a “4” either as a result of the AAR or work completed in an AIP, the closing of the AIP is dependent on the overall accuracy and completeness of all data. In addition, the agency must address items under the General Data Quality item of the General Requirements. This item as noted in the Guide to an AFCARS Assessment Review relates to overall data accuracy, how the agency uses information that is reported to AFCARS, and a formal process that is carried out on an ongoing basis to review and monitor data completeness.

AFCARS Rating Factors

RATING FACTOR	DEFINITION
4	<p>All of the AFCARS requirements have been met and the agency has sustained a high level of quality data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency’s methodology for collecting the AFCARS information meets the technical and definitional requirements. • The agency’s information system contains the necessary fields to collect the AFCARS data. • The information is being accurately collected and extracted. • There are quality assurance processes in place that are used on a regular basis to ensure the data are accurately entered into the system or on the data collection form. • The agency has a process in place to identify and resolve data quality issues and makes necessary corrections in a timely manner.
3	<p>There are data quality issues. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data are underreported due to inconsistent data entry. • The system/form is capable of collecting data but the data are not being entered into the system or recorded on a form. • Data entry is unreliable due to incorrect or ambiguous instructions, definitions, and/or data entry screens or forms. • There are no supervisory controls for ensuring timely data entry, or accurate data entry. • There is incorrect data entry due to training or design issues. • There is missing or incomplete data due to conversion errors. • There are inconsistencies in the numbers between related data elements. • Fundamental data elements have missing data. These include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dates of removal from home, placement, and discharge (if applicable). ○ Placement location. ○ Removal and placement counts
2	<p>The technical requirements for AFCARS reporting are not fully met. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title IV-E agency’s data collection method/information system has the capability to collect the data, but the program logic used to construct the AFCARS file has errors. • The title IV-E agency uses defaults for blank information. • Information is coming from the wrong module or field in the system. • Information is located in the wrong place on the system, e.g., it should be in foster care screens, not adoption screens. • The information system needs modification to encompass more information and/or conditions, e.g., disability information along with start/end dates. • The extraction code for the AFCARS report selects and reports incorrect data.
1	<p>An AFCARS requirement(s) has not been implemented in the methodology used to collect the data and/or in the information system. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title IV-E agency’s data collection method/information system does not have the capability to collect the correct information (i.e., there is no data field on the screens or form). • There is no program logic to extract the information. • There is 100% missing data according to the frequency report or DCU/DQU reports.
0	<p>Title IV-E agencies operating an information system for which it received SACWIS/ TACWIS-level FFP were found to be using an external information system, or a tool (such as Excel or Access), and are not collecting and reporting the AFCARS data from the SACWIS/ TACWIS system.</p>

FINDINGS

The Pennsylvania AAR was held the week of June 23, 2014. Pennsylvania is a county administered State. The Department of Human Services (DHS), formerly Department of Public Welfare, is the designated title IV-B/IV-E State agency, which includes the Office of Children, Youth, and Families (OCYF). The OCYF includes Child Welfare Services (CWS) as well as Juvenile Justice Services (BJJS). CWS is responsible for monitoring the delivery of services by county and private children and youth social service agencies throughout the commonwealth. BJJS is responsible for all the youth development center/youth forestry camp facilities for youth adjudicated delinquent by their county judicial system. CWS and BJJS are organized, managed, and delivered by 67 County Children and Youth Agencies (CCYA) and County Juvenile Probation Offices (JPO). County agencies are the sole authorities that maintain placement and care responsibility for children. They are also the sole authorities for certifying a child's eligibility for title IV-E maintenance/assistance.

This report contains a summary of the significant reporting and data quality issues found during the AAR. As part of the post-site visit analysis, the State's documents, data, case file review findings, and the onsite notes were assessed to make the final determination of findings. This section of the report is not meant to provide a detailed description of the agency's findings. The State should carefully review all the findings in each document as there have been changes from the preliminary findings shared while we were onsite. For additional information on specific issues for the general requirements and the data elements, please see the findings documents in Tab A.

There are several areas in which the State is in non-compliance with the AFCARS standards. The charts below summarize the rating factors for the General Requirements and the Data Elements. The remainder of this section contains a summary of the significant reporting and data quality issues found during the AAR.

General Requirements (21)

Rating Factor	Foster Care (8)	Adoption (3)	Technical (9)	Data Quality (1)
4	5	2	5	0
3	1	0	2	1
2	2	1	2	0
1	0	0	0	0

Data Elements (103)

Rating Factor	Foster Care (66)	Adoption (37)	Total (103)
4	7 (10.6%)	6 (16.2%)	13 (12.6%)
3	18 (27.3%)	0	18 (17.5%)
2	41 (62.1%)	29 (78.4%)	70 (67.9%)
1	0	2 (5.4%)	2 (2%)

Information System

There are eight discrete information systems in use across the state. For systems that are shared by multiple counties, there is one county that has the lead responsibility for maintenance of the system (including changes to the application) and of the extraction code used to create the AFCARS file. The State team for the AAR included representatives from six of the lead counties as well as staff from the OCYF Central and Regional Offices. In preparation for the onsite review, the Federal team analyzed the methodology used by each of the eight systems for recording information, as well as, the program code used by each system to extract the AFCARS data that is sent to the State office. The eight systems and the number of counties represented are noted in the following table.

Table 1: County Systems

System Name	Number of Counties Using	Lead County
ACYS	2	Venango
Berks	1	Berks
CAPS	56	Crawford
FACTS	1	Philadelphia
lhSIS	1	Lehigh
JCIS	4	Lycoming
KIDS	1	Allegheny
LUIS	1	Lancaster

The county systems are not connected to one another (including the one used by 56 of the counties). Consequently, information is not being shared electronically among counties or with the Central Office. The process for entering information, the scope of information in these systems, as well as the extraction of information varies across the State. For instance, some counties have forms that caseworkers complete and then the data is entered by administrative staff into a system that contains only the AFCARS fields that are listed in the Federal regulation.

The staff of DHS/OCYF does not have access to the individual county information systems. Each county extracts its AFCARS file every six months and submits it to the OCYF Central Office. The OCYF central office staff takes each of the extracts submitted by the counties and creates one single AFCARS file for transmission. This process is time consuming and very laborious for the OCYF Central Office staff.

The State is in the process of implementing the Child Welfare Information Solution (CWIS). The CWIS will allow for an automated solution to exchange information among the 67 CCYAs and the central office of OCYF. Each of the counties will continue to maintain and use its own case management system. The first phase of CWIS implementation focused on the intake, investigation and assessment of protective service cases. The second phase implements the child and family's case file for cases accepted for services. The third phase will include providers and the fourth will include the financial component.

General Requirements

The General Requirements refer to AFCARS standards related to the foster care and adoption reporting populations, the technical requirements of the AFCARS file, and data accuracy and integrity.

Foster Care Reporting Population

The State's foster care file contains most of the records of children who are to be included in the AFCARS reporting population. However, there is no county/system that is correctly addressing all of the foster care population requirements. Most of the errors result in submission of records in the file that should be excluded. These areas are:

- Records of children whose only placement is a locked facility or a hospital. Four of the systems (representing approximately 51%² of the population) incorrectly include these records. The State will need to verify and ensure that all the counties are entering these cases into their system in order to track and monitor activities related to children, but are excluding the records when extracting the AFCARS file.
- Records of children whose removal episode is 24 hours or less in duration. Five (50% of the population) of the systems are not correctly identifying removal episodes based on 24 hours. While the approach used may have a minimal impact for the current removal episode, the issue is if the child re-enters foster care the number of removals may incorrectly reflect a minimum of two removals instead of one.
- Records of children whose initial placement is "runaway" and the youth is still on a runaway status as of the end of the report period are incorrectly excluded by three of the systems (46% of the population). These records are to be included from the point in time the agency obtains responsibility for placement and care and the current placement location (foster care element 41) is "runaway." Additional information is included in the findings for General Requirements item 1 and foster care elements 23 (date of placement) and 24 (number of placements).

Since the onsite review, the State's title IV-E plan amendments were approved by the Children's Bureau effective July 1, 2012. The change in the definition of a child under title IV-E also affects the reporting population for AFCARS. Guidance and tasks for implementing changes to the AFCARS reporting of youth 18 up to the age of 21 who are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds are included in the findings documents. These tasks are not part of the State's formal AIP. Instead, the Children's Bureau will track the completion of these tasks in a separate work plan that is being provided to the State.

Adoption Reporting Population

The State is correctly including records of children adopted from the State's foster care system. Not all counties are correctly identifying (or entering) all private agency adoptions. The

² The percentage reflects the number of cases reported in AFCARS for the affected counties in the 2014A file.

AFCARS adoption reporting population is to include all adoptions in which there was State agency involvement. DHS needs to ensure that each of the counties understands that adoptions made through private agencies are entered into the system and reported to AFCARS in those instances in which the State enters into adoption assistance agreements with families adopting the children. This includes private agencies in Pennsylvania or in another State. Some of the systems do not have the capacity to record these cases. All of the data required for the AFCARS adoption file is to be entered for private agency cases.

Technical Requirements

Our review found the State is complying with all but two of the AFCARS technical requirements. Data reported to AFCARS is to reflect the circumstances for the child as they were during the period reported, or, if the child discharged, as of that date. When a prior report period is submitted (a subsequent file), the selection and reporting of information is to be for that report period. Some of the county/systems identified that they save the extract that is sent to the OCYF Central Office. If corrections are needed, they make them to this extract file and then resend it. It is not clear for how long these extracts are kept. If this is the means of maintaining the history of AFCARS information, then these extracts must be kept until the youngest child in the period reaches the age of majority or the maximum age of eligibility under the State's title IV-E foster care program.

For those counties in which the child's information is maintained in the system's database, the county will need to modify the extraction code to identify information that is associated with the prior report period being extracted. In most instances, correctly setting the report period date parameters will address the issue. However, logic will need to be added to each foster care and adoption element to check for information that is prior to the last day of the report period being extracted; or if the child discharged in the report period, as of the child's discharge date. This will prevent current information being reported in submissions of prior report periods. There were also a few systems that the staff noted they do not maintain history tables for the information (for example case plan goals and diagnosed conditions). These systems will need to be modified to include a history table for those areas identified in the preliminary findings provided to the counties.

The second technical correction is for the adoption file. There were at least three systems in which the extraction code selects the adoption records based on the adoption legalized dates within the report period being processed. Consequently, if the record is entered after the AFCARS file has been extracted and reported, the adoption record will never be reported. The agencies must identify a way to identify adoptions that have been not been reported. This could impact the number of adoptions being considered for the Adoption Incentive Program.

Data Quality

As noted by the findings above and the Data Element section below information in the State's AFCARS file is incomplete. For some data elements there is a need for improved oversight to ensure that all applicable information is entered into the system in a timely manner. Through the case file review conducted as part of the AAR, we identified elements that were underreported

(e.g. circumstances associated with the child's removal from home and child' diagnosed conditions) or there was inconsistent use of some fields and dates. The system and extraction code's technical issues may be masking further data quality issues related to data entry. Once technical corrections are made, the State will need to evaluate the data to determine the need for any additional training needs. Also, the State will need to develop and implement a method to ensure accurate and timely entry of data into the systems. We encourage the agency to continue its work in ensuring that caseworkers understand the importance of entering this information, not only for federal reporting, but for OCYF's own use for program evaluation, individual case reviews, and for assuring successful outcomes for children.

It is not clear that there are adequate reports generated by local offices and provided to supervisors and line workers regarding missing or inconsistent information. Additional reports are needed to facilitate improvement in data quality. These should be incorporated into the State's quality assurance (QA) process. Supervisors should also be an integral component of the QA process as they are reviewing cases of the caseworkers. We encourage the agency to incorporate a review of its AFCARS data, as well as other data, as part of the periodic reviews conducted for children in foster care. Also, the agency should incorporate a review and analysis of the data as part of its quality assurance process. It is important that the information being used, not only for AFCARS reporting, but for the agency's own performance measures and other program evaluation, is reliable, consistent, and accurate.

The Children's Bureau's Information Memorandum (IM) on Continuous Quality Improvement in title IV-B and IV-E programs (ACYF-CB-IM-12-07) issued August 27, 2012, addressed the importance of quality data. While the purpose of that IM was to provide State title IV-B and IV-E child welfare agencies with information on Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) systems, the data quality component is applicable to all title IV-E and IV-B agencies. In order to demonstrate quality data collection, the agency needs to ensure it has accurate, complete, and timely data that is consistent in definition and usage across the agency. The State must describe how it intends to ensure accurate AFCARS data quality on an ongoing basis in the General Requirements Improvement Plan under item #21.

Data Elements

The enclosed element matrices reflect a summary of the results across all eight systems. If there was at least one county system that required a technical modification (either the system or the extraction code), the element was rated a "2." There were 43 foster care elements and 31 adoption elements rated a "2." The more significant issues are noted below.

- General Issues Affecting Multiple Elements

As noted in the General Requirements findings, there were several systems that do not have history tables for several fields in the system. Another issue affecting many systems and many elements is the use of default values. A default is when the system does not have the information (worker has not entered it) and the extraction logic sets the missing information to a valid AFCARS value. This can provide misleading data; for instance if there is no diagnosed condition entered, the program code defaults to the AFCARS field "not yet determined." If the

information does not get entered, then the agency's data is interpreted to mean the child has not received a health assessment. While this could be true, OCYF's policy is for a child to receive an assessment within 60 days of entering foster care and it is likely most children would have been seen by the end of the report period.

- Removal Episodes

One very significant issue the State has with its AFCARS reporting is that the removal history is incomplete because each county maintains its own database and records of the children served. If the family moves to another county, and if the child reenters foster care in the new county, when the information is reported to AFCARS it contains only the current removal history in the new county. This means if the child had two prior removals in county A and one removal in county B, the number of removals reported to AFCARS will only be one (1) and not three (3). This lack of a complete removal history could impact the findings for the State's Child and Family Services Review, as well as other performance measurement and data analysis

At the time conversion occurs for CWIS, the State and county will need to ensure reconciliation of all records. The State will need to develop a process to consolidate the child's full service history under the same MCI number. Additionally, as part of conversion, DHS/OCYF will need to ensure that the complete removal history is included in CWIS. The Children's Bureau will continue to have conversations with the State regarding conversion of the AFCARS data as Phase II is implemented.

Other issues were identified with removal episodes. First, as previously noted, the foster care reporting population incorrectly includes episodes that are 24 hours or less in duration. In addition to the current removal, the reporting of information in foster care elements 18 - 20 (date of first removal, number of removals, and date of discharge from a prior episode) is to exclude information on episodes that are less than 24 hours in duration. The second issue is the accurate reporting of the beginning of an AFCARS removal episode if the child's first placement location is a hospital or locked facility. In these instances, the date reported to AFCARS (foster care element 21) as the date of removal for the current episode is the date the child entered a foster care setting as defined by title IV-E. A third issue is related to the item in the foster care population related to inclusion of records of children whose only placement location as of the end of the report period is "runaway." The date the agency received placement and care responsibility of the child is to be reported for element 21. The last issue also affects elements 18 - 20 and is in regard to children who exited foster care with an outcome of adoption. If this child later reenters foster care, the removal episodes that the child experienced prior to the finalized adoption are to be included in the removal history. Not all counties are reporting this information correctly.

- Placements

There are instances of both over-counting and under-counting of placements. One example of an over-count is when a child is moved from one setting to another similar setting that is on the same "campus." These might be cottages or group home types of facilities that may differ due to need or level of care. If the settings are all physically located together on one campus, then the

move from one to another is not considered a placement move for AFCARS reporting purposes. An example of under-counting of placements is when the child is in a hospital for more than a short-term stay. The State team and Federal team will need to discuss how many days the State will use to define the length of these stays for AFCARS reporting purposes.

- Determination of special needs for adoption assistance

In the adoption file there are three elements related to adoption assistance. One element asks if the title IV-E agency determined that the child has special needs. If the response is “yes,” then the agency is to report the primary basis the agency had for determining special needs (i.e., what the agency identified as the biggest barrier to adoption). There are systems that instead of the worker entering the information, there is a hierarchy written into the program code and this determines the response to the element. The case file review findings revealed the value reported to AFCARS was not reflective of the condition that was the most significant for the child. The last area in this group is the element regarding whether the child is receiving an adoption subsidy. The number of records reported as “yes” for this element indicates there are more children receiving an adoption subsidy than there are children who were determined to be eligible and have a special need.

- Private adoptions

As noted in the adoption reporting population section, the State is not correctly reporting all adoptions in which there was State agency involvement. In regard to the adoption data elements, there are a few systems rated a 1 for not having the capacity to collect whether the child was placed from another State or another county. Additionally, they are not able to indicate the individual or agency that placed the child for adoption (public agency, private agency, tribal agency, independent person, or birth parent). These elements are instead hard-coded to “in-State” and “public agency” respectively. The systems must be modified to include these fields and the extraction code modified to check the fields.

Conclusion

As noted in the Background section of this report, the AAR ascertains the extent to which a title IV-E agency meets all of the AFCARS requirements and examines the quality of its data, as well as, the accuracy of the data related to the foster care and/or adoption case of a child. Title IV-E agencies that fail to meet any of the standards set forth in 45 CFR 1355.40(a-d) are considered to be in substantial noncompliance with the requirements of the title IV-E Plan³.

This report identifies the most significant areas the State needs to address in order to meet the AFCARS requirements. While there were several issues identified as a result of the AAR, the absence of a single statewide database is a significant issue. This affects the overall quality of the State’s data. It is important for the agency to incorporate all of the findings of this report as it moves forward in the development and implementation of a single statewide database.

³ 45 CFR 1355.40(e)

The State needs to build upon its work on a continuous quality improvement process that includes all areas of information including the AFCARS data elements. The State currently runs some reports on a regular basis to assess the accuracy of the data. We encourage the State and county offices to continue with this process and to develop other reports at the local level for supervisors to use when reviewing a case. The State may want to consider incorporating into its case file reviews a process similar to the one used for the AFCARS Assessment Review.

While the AAR Report does not include the findings matrices of each system, it is CB's expectation that DHS/OCYF will oversee and monitor the required changes to the individual systems and related extraction code. As part of the post-site visit phase the State was to begin its own evaluation of the preliminary findings and determine what actions are needed to correct the identified problems and the time it will take to complete the tasks. The federal team will work with the State office during the improvement plan phase in its monitoring of identified corrections to each of the systems. The State central office staff will provide information on the progress of improvements to the individual systems in the State's AIP updates.

Additionally, the State's plan for implementing the changes to the system and for caseworker training must be included in the State's title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan and Annual Progress and Services Report as part of the information required by 45 CFR 1357.15(t) and 45 CFR 1357.16(a)(5).

Corrections needed for the foster care and adoption data elements require the State to resubmit AFCARS data for past report periods. The State and the Children's Bureau will discuss which reports will be required for resubmission.

Tab A

Detailed Findings

Section 1: General Requirements

Section 2: Foster Care and Adoption Elements

Section 3: Case File Review

INSTRUCTIONS

This section includes the final findings of the State's AFCARS Assessment Review. These findings include post-site visit analysis of the AFCARS general requirements, the foster care and adoption elements, and the case file review. The tables include the AFCARS data elements, the findings, and the rating factors. Some rating factors may differ from the factors given on the draft on-site findings matrices.

The findings include all notes and comments that the Federal review team received during the review. Not all comments address non-compliance issues. Some comments are notes on how the State conducts child welfare practice and are for reference purposes only. Frequency numbers are also provided in the "findings/notes" column for some elements.

It is possible that the problem with the data element and data are due to both system issues and case worker data entry issues. In this case, the element will be given a "2" to denote the need for technical changes. Once the technical corrections are made and approved, the data needs to be re-analyzed. If it appears problems related to caseworker training or data entry still exist, then a "3" will be assigned to the requirement. A finding of full compliance (a factor of "4") will not be given to the element until all system issues and/or data quality issues have been addressed.

When assessing the general requirements, all specifications for the requirement must be met in order for the requirement to be found in full compliance. If the issue is a programming logic problem, then a "2" will be assigned. If it appears the problem is due to data entry, then a "3" will be assigned to the requirement.

Some data elements have a direct relationship with each other. When this occurs, all related elements are given the same rating factor. This is because incorrect programming logic could affect the answers to all of the related data elements.

The State is required to make the changes to the information system and/or data entry in order to be found in compliance with applicable requirements and standards.

Section 1

General Requirements

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
Foster Care Reporting Population			
1	<p>For the purpose of foster care reporting, each data transmission must include all children in foster care for whom the title IV-E agency has responsibility for placement, care, or supervision. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(2)).</p> <p>The [foster care] population to be included in this reporting system includes all children in foster care under the responsibility of the title IV-E agency administering or supervising the administration of the title IV-B Child and Family Services State plan and the title IV-E plan; that is, all children who are required to be provided the assurances of section 422(b)(8) of the Social Security Act. (Appendix A to Part 1355--Foster Care Data Elements, Section II--Definitions).</p>	<p><u>Overview of Organizational Structure and Policies</u></p> <p>Pennsylvania is a county administered State. The Department of Human Services (formerly Department of Public Welfare) is the designated title IV-B/IV-E State agency. There are seven program offices that administer services. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Medical Assistance; • Office of Developmental Programs (services for people with cognitive disabilities); • Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services; • Office of Children, Youth, and Families (OCYF) (services children and families through a nationally recognized child support enforcement program, oversees adoption and foster care services, <i>and works with counties on child abuse prevention and juvenile justice issues</i>); • Office of Income Maintenance; • Office of Child Development and Early Learning; and • Office of Long-term Living. <p>Within OCYF is the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Budget and Program Support, • Bureau of Child Welfare Services (CWS), • Bureau of Juvenile Justice Services (BJJS), and, • Bureau of Policy, Programs, and Operations. <p>CWS is responsible for monitoring the delivery services by county and private children and youth social service agencies throughout the commonwealth. The Bureau conducts these functions through the four OCYF Regional Offices and its Division of Licensing</p> <p>BJJS is responsible for all the youth development center/youth forestry camp facilities for youth adjudicated delinquent by their county judicial system.</p> <p>CWS and BJJS are organized, managed, and delivered by 67 County Children and Youth Agencies (CCYA) and County Juvenile Probation Offices (JPO).</p> <p>County agencies are the sole authorities that maintain placement and care responsibility for children. They are also the sole authorities for certifying a child's eligibility for title IV-E placement maintenance. (SOURCES: Title 55, Pa.Code, §3140.111 and 3130.12)</p> <p>Many CCYAs use private providers for in-home and out-of-home/foster care case management and services. Philadelphia County has recently begun a transformation to contract out case management for all foster care and in-home services. They are in the last year of phasing it in.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>The title IV-E agency includes children in the foster care population who are under the responsibility for placement, care, or supervision of the agency even if there are no foster care payments (CWPM 1.3 #4).</p> <p>Children in foster care who are under the joint placement and care responsibility of the juvenile justice and child welfare systems are to be reported to AFCARS (CWPM 1.3 #13).</p> <p>Children in foster care who are under the joint placement and care responsibility of the mental health and child welfare systems are to be reported to AFCARS (CWPM 1.3 #13).</p> <p>Children who are under the agency's responsibility for care, placement, or supervision and whose only placement is a locked facility or a hospital are to be excluded from the AFCARS population (CWPM 1.3 #12).</p>	<p><u>Systems Summary</u> In general, the State's foster care reporting population includes the records of children for whom the agency has responsibility for placement and care who are in an out-of-home setting. However, nearly every system has some errors in identifying the correct foster care population. Additional notes are included below.</p> <p>There was one system (KIDS) that incorrectly included the test cases for private agency adoptions in the foster care reporting population. The agency staff indicated they believe there is an error in identifying cases that are private adoptions. The agency needs to confirm whether the private adoptions were actually entered as a foster care case. The State needs to follow up with the county to ensure that if there is a private agency adoption in which the local office is involved with that it is not included in the foster care file. The State and each county needs to ensure that records are being properly identified for the reporting population.</p> <p>Joint placement and care responsibility: There are cases referred to as "shared case responsibility (SCR)." When a child is delinquent, or delinquent and dependent, court orders may state that case management is to be shared between the JPO and CCYA. Each CCYA may have a different organizational structure. In terms of mental health, we are aware that Allegheny County Dept. of Human Services includes both child welfare and mental health services.</p> <p>In general, it appears these cases are being identified and included in the AFCARS reporting population. There were issues with cases entered into CAPS that the State needs to investigate further and ensure that counties using this system are correctly reporting shared cases.</p> <p>Locked facility or a hospital as the only placement for a child in the agency's responsibility for placement and care: There were four systems (FACTS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS) that did not include the test case of a child whose only placement was a hospital. However, the agencies need to ensure that all records are entered into the system regardless of whether or not the agency is making payments for the placement. If the test case was not entered, then it is possible that the program code for these systems must be modified to ensure that children in the agency's care and placement responsibly whose only placement is a locked facility are excluded from the AFCARS reporting population. There are issues in FACTS related to locked facilities so the agency needs to verify the selection logic is correctly identifying records per this standard.</p> <p>Four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and lhSIS) incorrectly included the case. In ACYS and Berks the program code does not include selection logic and there is no logic in the extract code to exclude records (which should be entered into the system to ensure tracking) of children whose</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>Children whose only placement during the report period is “runaway” are included in the reporting population (CWPM, 1.2B.7 #24).</p> <p>Children of minor parents: If a child/youth in foster care is a parent, and their child lives with them, the minor’s child is to be excluded from the foster care reporting population.</p>	<p>only placement is either a hospital or a locked facility.</p> <p>In order to avoid human error in selecting the correct reporting population per the AFCARS rules (for those systems not using the program code to do this), there should be a routine in the extract code that selects the foster care reporting population and also include a check of the screen that includes hospitalization for the start date of an initial placement in the hospital against the start date of the agency’s care and placement responsibility. Each agency will need to verify that they are correctly addressing this standard and excluding the records of children in their responsibility for placement and care whose only placement is a hospital or a locked facility.</p> <p>Runaway as only placement as of end of the report period: There was one system (Berks) that correctly reported the test case related to a child on a runaway status. In two systems (ACYS and CAPS) the test case was included for the report period but appears to have been incorrectly entered as the child being in a foster home instead of on a runaway status as of the end of the first test report period. The agency needs to ensure these cases are entered and extracted correctly. The remaining systems did not include the scenario in the test reporting population. All agencies need to verify and make corrections to ensure these cases are entered and modify the extraction code to correctly report this situation.</p> <p>Minor Parent and child in same setting: It appears that this requirement is being addressed correctly. Each county needs to assess their process for how a child of a minor parent, who both are in foster care and residing together in the same foster care placement, are being entered into the system. If the infant is with the teen parent, the infant is not included in the foster care population. This is an item that needs to be further investigated by the State as to whether each county is doing it correctly.</p>	
2	[The AFCARS foster care reporting population] includes American Indian children covered under the assurances in section 422(b)(8) of the Act on the same basis as any other child. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(2)).	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
3	For children in out-of-State/Tribal Service area placement, the title IV-E agency placing the child and making the foster care payment submits and continually updates the data. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(2)).	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
4	[The foster care] population includes all children supervised by or under the responsibility of another public agency with which the title IV-E agency has an agreement under title IV-E and on whose behalf the title IV-E agency makes title IV-E foster care maintenance payments (Appendix A to Part 1355--Foster Care Data Elements,	Shared case management with juvenile justice is reported in AFCARS. See notes in GR1.	4

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>Section II--Definitions). Indicate if the title IV-E agency has an agreement with other public agencies to provide foster care maintenance payments to eligible children per the requirements in section 472(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act).</p>		
5	<p>The reporting system includes all children who have or had been in foster care at least 24 hours. (Appendix A to Part 1355--Foster Care Data Elements, Section II--Definitions).</p>	<p>All the systems are not correctly meeting this standard. The systems do not have a means to identify the length of time of a removal episode. Either a time field associated with removal and discharge needs to be added to the removal/discharge date fields, or the agencies could add a checkbox that the worker would select if the child's removal episode is 24 hours or less in duration.</p> <p>CAPS and KIDS appear to have time fields associated with the start and end of a placement. These agencies should evaluate whether these fields will be sufficient to determine the length of a removal episode.</p> <p>All systems must modify the extraction code once the system has been changed to accurately capture if a removal episode is 24 hours or less in duration.</p>	2
6	<p>Foster care does not include children who are in their own homes under the responsibility of the title IV-E agency. (Appendix A to Part 1355--Foster Care Data Elements, Section II--Definitions).</p> <p>A removal is either the physical act of a child being taken from his or her normal place of residence, by court order or a voluntary placement agreement and placed in a substitute care setting, or the removal of custody from the parent or relative guardian pursuant to a court order or voluntary placement agreement which permits the child to remain in a substitute care setting. (CWPM, 1.2B.3 Question #4).</p> <p>Are children who are in the title IV-E agency's responsibility for placement and care who were first placed with a non-custodial parent excluded from the reporting population?</p>	<p>There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.</p>	4
7	<p>[The foster care population] includes youth over the age of 18 if a payment is being made on behalf of the child (CWPM, 1.3).</p> <p>A title IV-E agency that exercises the option to extend</p>	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=)</i>: There were 34 records with a year of birth of 1996.</p> <p>The age of majority in Pennsylvania is 18. The state provides foster care services for youth over the age of 18 up to the age of 21. Pennsylvania policy dictates the collection of data for youth in care who may be between 18 and 21 years of age. The state has been incorrectly including these</p>	3

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>assistance to youth age 18 or older must collect and report data to AFCARS on all youth receiving a title IV-E foster care maintenance payment. (ACYF-CB-PI-10-11, Issued July 9, 2010).</p> <p>What is the title IV-E agency's legal age of majority?</p> <p>What is the definition of child under the agency's title IV-E plan?</p> <p>Is the title IV-E agency claiming title IV-E funds for youth over 18?</p> <p>See foster care elements #56 and #58 for additional information.</p>	<p>youth in the AFCARS files. The state does claim title IV-E foster care funds on youth who meet the criteria up to age 19.</p> <p>As noted in the AFCARS requirements, only youth who are 18 or older and receiving title IV-E funds are included in the reporting population. If the youth turns 18 and is not eligible/receiving title IV-E funds, then the child is reported as discharged from the AFCARS population (FC56). The reason for discharge (FC58) is "emancipation."</p> <p>Youth 18 and older who are not receiving title IV-E funds are to be excluded from the reporting population once reported as discharged under FC56/58. The state will need to modify the code to correctly identify and report these records.</p> <p>The State has an approved amendment to the definition of a "child" under title IV-E. The agency now defines a child up to the age of 21. The effective date of the amendment is July 1, 2012 (2012B).</p> <p>This element is rated a 3 even though individual agencies will need to ensure the selection logic does not include youth over the age of 18 who are not receiving title IV-E funds. The state's AFCARS Improvement Plan will have included within it the steps needed to address this item as well as the individual data elements.</p> <p>- Data files for report periods prior to 2012B (prior to April 1, 2012): The reporting population is to always reflect the program rules effective at the time - only youth who are 18 and receiving title IV-E funds are included in the reporting population.</p> <p>- For the 2012B report period timeframe of April 1 through June 30, 2012, the agency will have to determine if the youth turned 18 or 19 during this time.</p> <p>a) Youth who are 18 and eligible for title IV-E during this time frame and who remained in the program after July 1, 2012 will continue to be included in the AFCARS file.</p> <p>b) Youth who were 18 (and receiving title IV-E) and exited foster care, or who turn 19 and are no longer eligible, during this time frame are to be reported as discharged in the foster care file as of their exit date (FC56/58)</p> <p>c) 18 year old (up to 19) youth who return to foster care during this time frame are only included if they are receiving title IV-E under the program rules in effect during this time.</p> <p>d) Youth who are 19 or older who return or remained in foster care during this timeframe are not to be included in AFCARS for these three months.</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
		<p>- For the timeframe of July 1 through September 30, 2012, the agency will include youth eligible for title IV-E who are over the age of 18. See the foster care elements matrix for additional tasks related to specific instructions for youth who are 19 or older returning to foster care during the second quarter or who were in the State's program and now are eligible under the new program rules.</p> <p>- For the 2013A report period timeframe (October 1 to April 30, 2013) forward, the agency will include only those youth eligible for title IV-E who are over the age of 18. See the foster care elements matrix for additional tasks.</p>	
8	<p>Include all children who are in the placement, care, or supervision responsibility of the title IV-B/E agency that are on "trial home visits" (CWPM 1.3).</p>	<p>Trial home visits are utilized by some counties in Pennsylvania, but not statewide. A trial home visit cannot exceed six months unless there is a court order extending the trial home placement beyond six months. (SOURCE: OCYF Bulletin 3140-01-01 Section 2.4.1B)</p> <p>Pennsylvania has Permanency Review Hearings in court within 6 months of: 1) the date of the child's removal from the child's guardian for placement or pursuant to a transfer of legal custody or other disposition; or 2) each previous permanency review hearing until the child is returned to the child's guardian or removed from the jurisdiction of the court. (SOURCES: The Juvenile Act Chapter 16 Rule 1607 and 42 Pa. C.S. §6351(f).)</p> <p>Systems that staff indicated include "trial home visit" are ACYS, Berks, CAPS (State will need to confirm if all counties using CAPS have children who are placed back in the home of removal and remain in the agency's care and placement responsibility), IhsIS, JCIS, and LUIS.</p>	4
Adoption Reporting Population			
9	<p>For the purposes of adoption reporting, data are required to be transmitted by the title IV-E agency on all adopted children who were placed by the title IV-E agency. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(3)).</p> <p>The title IV-E agency must report on all children who are adopted in the State or Tribal service area during the reporting period and in whose adoption the title IV-E agency has had any involvement.</p> <p>...reports on the following are mandated:</p> <p>(a) All children adopted who had been <u>in foster care</u> under the responsibility and care of the child welfare agency and who were subsequently adopted whether special needs or not and whether subsidies are provided or not; (Appendix B to Part 1355--Adoption Data Elements, Section II - Definitions).</p>	<p>There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement. This requirement pertains to children who were in foster care and had an outcome of adoption.</p>	4

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
10	For a child adopted out-of-State, the title IV-E agency which placed the child submits the data. Similarly, the Tribal title IV-E agency which placed the child outside of the Tribal service area for adoption submits the data.(45 CFR 1355.40(a)(3) I - Definitions).	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
11	<p>For the purposes of adoption reporting, data are required to be transmitted by the title IV-E agency ... on all adopted children for whom the agency is providing adoption assistance (either ongoing or for nonrecurring expenses), care or services directly or by contract or agreement with other private or public agencies. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(3)).</p> <p>The title IV-E agency must report on all children who are adopted in the State or Tribal service area during the reporting period and in whose adoption the title IV-E agency has had any involvement. ...reports on the following are mandated: (b) All special needs children who were adopted in the State or Tribal service area, whether or not they were in the public foster care system prior to their adoption and for whom non-recurring expenses were reimbursed; and (c) All children adopted for whom an adoption assistance payment or service is being provided based on arrangements made by or through the title IV-E agency. (Appendix B to Part 1355--Adoption Data Elements, Section I).</p>	<p>This requirement pertains to children not in foster care who were adopted through a private agency. Cases in which the agreement is only for the non-recurring costs are to be reported to AFCARS as well. The Pennsylvania Adoption Opportunities Act and enabling regulations specify that children who meet the child eligibility criteria and who are in either public or private agency custody are eligible to receive adoption assistance.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Test Deck:</i> There were two of the systems represented (ACYS and Berks) that did include the private agency adoption test cases. There was one system (CAPS) that included two of the three private agency adoption cases. The test case for non-recurring expenses was not included. In two of the systems (FACTS and KIDS) the cases were included (entered) as a foster care case. FACTS only included one of the three test cases. Three systems (IhSIS, JCIS, and LUIS) did not include any of the private agency adoption cases.</p> <p>Based on notes provided by the agencies in the test cases there is an issue of local agency staff not having a clear understanding of the private adoptions (both in and out-of-state agencies). Based on comments from the state team members many of the systems do not have the capacity to collect information on private agency adoptions and/or cases for which only the non-recurring costs are paid by the State. Some staff indicated they would have to enter them as a foster care case. This is incorrect as the children are not in the State's responsibility or foster care system. Systems will need to be modified to allow the entry of these cases. This is supported as well by the findings for adoption elements 33 and 34. For AD34, child was placed by, there are systems that are defaulting the response (the code sets the value) to "public agency." So, even if the population selection logic did identify private agency adoptions, they would incorrectly be reported as "public agency." If the family residing in Pennsylvania adopts a child being placed by a private agency in another state, and the Pennsylvania agency determines the child is eligible for an adoption subsidy, then the record is to be recorded and included in the reporting population. These cases are reported in AD33 as "another State." These same three systems are hard-coding the element as placed within the State.</p> <p>Each system team must verify that records of children being adopted through a private agency, whether the child was in-state or from another state are entered into the system as non-foster care cases. Also, see findings for AD4 regarding forms and screens.</p>	2
Technical Requirements			

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
12	<p>The data must be extracted from the data system as of the last day of the reporting period (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)):</p> <p><u>For foster care information [regular files]</u>, the child-specific data to be transmitted must reflect the data in the information system when the data are extracted. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(2)).</p> <p>Report the status of all children in foster care as of the last day of the reporting period.</p> <p>Also, provide data for all children who were discharged from foster care at any time during the reporting period, or in the previous reporting period, if not previously reported. (Appendix D, 45 CFR 1355 Foster Care and Adoption Record Layouts Section A.1.b(5)); (AFCARS Technical Bulletin #6, Data Extraction).</p> <p><u>For Regular Files:</u> The file should not include information or dates that occur after the end of a regular report period.</p> <p>The data must be reflective of the child's circumstances for the report period being submitted.</p> <p>If data are missing, the extraction code does not insert a valid value into the file.</p> <p>The information system stores all historical information. (Example: The system stores all case plan goals with its associated date.)</p>	<p><u>For Regular Files</u> It is not clear that regular files are correctly extracted by all systems. In one county, there was no discharge data reported in the test cases. See notes for GR13.</p> <p>Agencies should verify that information for the regular report period being extracted does not contain "future" dates or occurrences.</p> <p>There were a few systems that noted they do not have history tables in the database for certain elements. This item is rated a three but the relevant elements contains the finding regarding the history tables.</p>	3
13	<p>The data must be extracted from the data system as of the last day of the reporting period (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)):</p> <p><u>For foster care information [subsequent files]</u>, the child-specific data to be transmitted must reflect the data in the information system when the data are extracted. (45 CFR</p>	<p><u>For subsequent files</u> There are errors in how files are reported as a subsequent file. Data are "overwritten" (e.g., for most of the systems, there are no dates for diagnoses so subsequent files reflect the current condition and not the diagnosis for the period being submitted). Also, there were "future" dates reported in the test deck.</p> <p>While the systems identify the report period for the purposes of foster care and adoption element</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>1355.40(b)(2)).</p> <p>Report the status of all children in foster care as of the last day of the reporting period. (AFCARS Technical Bulletin #6, Data Extraction)</p> <p><u>For Subsequent Files:</u> How does the title IV-E agency extract subsequent files?</p> <p>The data must be reflective of the child's circumstances for the report period being submitted. Example: The title IV-E agency is extracting the 2011B report period on June 8, 2012 for submission to the Children's Bureau. Data in the 2011B file must reflect the child's circumstances as of September 30, 2011. If a diagnosis has changed or a case plan goal since September 30, 2011, the new information is not to be included in the 2011B file.</p> <p>Does the information system store all historical information, or is information overwritten with the most recent event? (Example: Are diagnosed conditions overwritten or deleted when they change?)</p>	<p>on the report period, the extraction logic does not specifically address the proper parameters for a extracting a prior report period. Also, as noted in GR11 some of the systems do not store a history of the information entered. There are additional notes in the data element findings but this element is rated a two as well due to the files not properly identifying a prior report period.</p>	
14	<p>The data must be extracted from the data system as of the last day of the reporting period. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)):</p> <p><u>Adoption data</u> are to be reported during the reporting period in which the adoption is legalized or, at the title IV-E agency's option, in the following reporting period if the adoption is legalized within the last 60 days of the reporting period. For a semi-annual period in which no adoptions have been legalized, the title IV-E agency must report such an occurrence.(45 CFR 1355.40(b)(3)). What controls exist to ensure that an individual adoption record is extracted and reported to AFCARS only once?</p> <p>How does the title IV-E agency extract subsequent files? Does the data in the subsequent submission reflect activities for that report period? Or, are current data</p>	<p><u>Regular Files</u> There were three systems (CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS) that the extraction code selects the adoption records based on the adoption legalized dates within the report period being processed. Consequently, if the record is entered late (after the AFCARS file has been extracted), then the adoption record would not be reported. The agencies must identify a way to identify adoptions that have been reported from those that have not.</p> <p>The program code for LUIS does not reference the end date of the report period to qualify the selection of any of the adoption data.</p> <p>The other systems (ACYS, Berks, IhsIS, and JCIS) need to verify that if an adoption finalization date is entered after the file is submitted for the regular report period that it is included during the next "regular" transmission.</p> <p><u>Subsequent Files</u> Since most systems are identifying records by checking if the adoption finalization date is within the report period being extracted, a subsequent file most likely will include all adoptions for that period.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>extracted instead? For example: if there was a change in the amount of the adoption subsidy, is the amount that was in the adoption agreement at the time of the adoption the amount that is included in the subsequent submission?</p>		
15	<p>The title IV-E agency extracts all records based on the transaction date of discharge (foster care element #57) or the date of latest removal (foster care element #21), if the child has not been discharged. (ACYF-PI-CB-95-09, Reissued May 23, 1995 and Technical Bulletin #6, AFCARS Data Extraction)</p> <p>The data submitted to AFCARS should be extracted based on removal episodes and not on placement information.</p> <p>Does the selection logic check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a transaction date of discharge for a record that occurs during the reporting period. • If the transaction date of discharge is after the last day of the reporting period, but the same day or prior to the date the Title IV-E agency extracts the data for submission, AND the date of latest removal is equal or prior to the last day of the reporting period, then the record must be included. • If the transaction date of discharge is absent AND the date of latest removal is equal or prior to the last day of the reporting period, then the record must be included. <p>If the transaction date of discharge is present, but does not fall within the dates of the reporting period AND the date of latest removal is after the last day of the reporting period, the record must be excluded.</p> <p>Does the title IV-E agency have a number of “dropped”</p>	<p>There were five systems (ACYS, CAPS FACTS, KIDS, JCIS, and LUIS) where no issues were identified with the inclusion of the transaction date. The agencies should check AFCARS Technical Bulletin #6 to ensure proper identification of the foster care file.</p> <p>There was one system (Berks) that appears to have issues with the transaction date (also see FC findings for FC22 and 57).</p> <p>For IhsIS, the code was not verified by the federal team and the state will need to follow up with these agencies.</p>	3

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>records?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the cause because the transaction date is not used to extract the file? • Is there another cause for records being dropped from the file? 		
16	<p>A summary file of the semi-annual data transmission must be submitted and will be used to verify the completeness of the title IV-E agency's detailed submission for the reporting period. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(4)).</p> <p>The values for these data elements are generated by processing all records in the semi-annual detailed data transmission and computing the summary values for Elements #1 and #3-22. Element #2 is the semi-annual report period ending date. In calculating the age range for the child, the last day of the reporting period is to be used. (Appendix D, 45 CFR 1355 Foster Care and Adoption Record Layouts Sections A.2 and B.2).</p>	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
17	<p>[Files] must be submitted in electronic form as described in appendix C to Part 1355 and in record layouts as delineated in appendix D to Part 135545 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)</p> <p>Records must be written using ASCII standard character format. (Appendix C, 45 CFR 1355 Electronic Data Transmission Format).</p>	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
18	<p>[Files] must be submitted in electronic form as described in appendix C to Part 1355 and in record layouts as delineated in appendix D to Part 135545 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)</p> <p>(2) All elements must be comprised of integer (numeric) value(s) (Appendix C, 45 CFR 1355 Electronic Data Transmission Format).</p>	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
19	<p>[Files] must be submitted in electronic form as described in appendix C to Part 1355 and in record layouts as delineated in appendix D to Part 1355.(45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)).</p> <p>All records must be a fixed length. The Foster Care</p>	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	Detailed Data Elements Record is 150 characters long and the Adoption Detailed Data Elements Record is 72 characters long. The Foster Care Summary Data Elements Record and the Adoption Summary Data Elements Record are each 172 characters long. (Appendix C, 45 CFR 1355 Electronic Data Transmission Format).		
NR	<p>[Files] must be submitted in electronic form as described in appendix C to Part 1355 and in record layouts as delineated in appendix D to Part 1355. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1))</p> <p>All title IV-E agencies must inform the Department, in writing, of the method of transfer they intend to use. (Appendix C, 45 CFR 1355 Electronic Data Transmission Format).</p> <p>Has the title IV-E agency submitted the AFCARS File Registration Form?</p>		
20	The title IV-E agency must use correct file name for transmission. (Technical Bulletin #2, File Format).	There were no issues identified in the AFCARS review with this requirement.	4
Data Quality			
21	<p>General Data Quality</p> <p>For data to be considered “quality” it must be accurate, complete, timely, and consistent in definition and usage across the entire IV-E agency and State/Tribal service area. The quality of the AFCARS data is assessed by the agency on a regular and continuous basis in order to sustain a high level of quality data.</p> <p>The agency incorporates AFCARS data into its quality assurance/continuous quality improvement plan. The agency involves staff from every level of the organization, and other stakeholders from outside of the agency.</p>	<p>There were 71 (69%) data elements rated a 2 and 2 (2%) elements rated a 1. These technical issues mask further data quality issues that may be due to lack of timely data entry or inaccurate data entry. One example is missing information is masked by the use of a valid value in AFCARS (defaults) instead of reporting the field as blank.</p> <p>In addition to the total number of elements rated with technical errors, there were 18 (18%) elements rated a 3 for data quality issues. While there were 12 (12%) of the elements rated a 4, these two must be addressed in the State’s Data Quality Plan to ensure ongoing data accuracy.</p> <p>See notes in GR22 regarding the State’s current data collection process and noted issues. Many of the data quality issues identified throughout the General Requirements and Data Elements relate to how information is collected (design of the systems and extraction of information). The absence of a statewide database affects the child’s removal history. The information is county specific, therefore, the number of removals for a child can be underreported. The length of time from a prior removal episode to the current one is another area that may be incorrectly assessed in performance measures.</p> <p>The State staff indicated they run the frequency utility monthly; the reports are run for each county. On a quarterly basis the agency runs the data compliance and quality utilities on the data. Reports</p>	3

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings

State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
		<p>are also generated based on the Child and Family Service Review indicators used in the State Data Profile. Other reports utilizing the AFCARS data are limited as the State office staff do not have access to each individual system in order to run data reports; or monitor the recording of information.</p> <p>It is not clear that there are adequate reports generated by local offices and provided to supervisors and line workers regarding missing or inconsistent information. There needs to be additional reports to facilitate improvement in data quality. These should be incorporated into the state's quality assurance (QA) process. Supervisors should also be an integral component of the QA process as they are reviewing cases of the caseworkers.</p> <p>The State has been working on processes for Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and has developed an ongoing phased-in implementation of a statewide CQI system. A main component of the CQI system is a QA process using the Quality Service Reviews (QSR). As part of the CQI process, Pennsylvania uses QSR data to analyze a county's performance and development of a county improvement plan. In addition, in Pennsylvania's own analysis on their CQI system, they recognized that they need to improve the use of data to systematically drive decision making and making relevant connections across multiple data sources. This gap area of needing to coordinate and analyze their various data sources has been discussed in the 2015-2019 CFSP as well as in preparation for the CFSR Round 3.</p> <p>As noted in the element findings, there are data elements identified where there is a need for improved oversight to ensure that all applicable information is entered into the system in a timely manner. Through the case file review conducted as part of the AAR, elements were identified as underreported (e.g. circumstances associated with the child's removal from home and child' diagnosed conditions) or there was inconsistent use of some fields and dates. The system and extraction code's technical issues may be masking further data quality issues related to data entry.</p> <p>Once technical corrections are made, the state will need to evaluate the data to determine the need for any additional training needs and monitoring of the data.</p> <p>The state and federal team will need to discuss resubmitting prior report periods to address data accuracy based on corrections to the reporting population as well as corrections to the data elements.</p>	
22	<p>Data Conversion</p> <p>The information system has the capability of recording historical information, as applicable. This primarily applies to closed cases, if the agency did not convert all cases</p>	<p>The State is in the process of implementing the Child Welfare Information Solution (CWIS). Item 22 addresses accuracy of data quality as part of a conversion process. This section is used to describe the State's current system architecture as well as address concerns for data conversion.</p> <p><u>Systems</u></p>	NA

AFCARS Assessment Review General Requirements Findings
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement/Checklist Items	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>(open and closed), that re-open after conversion, and these cases must be entered into the system.</p> <p>The title IV-E agency transfers historical information on open cases. Specifically, it includes information on: date of first removal, total number of removals, and whether the child's mother was married at the time of the child's birth. If the case was open at the time of conversion, information on the number of placement settings is included.</p>	<p>At the time of the AAR, there were eight independent systems in use across the state. Some of the agencies are using a system that is or is close to a case management system; others are using an AFCARS only tracking system. Consequently, there is no single consistent manner of how data are collected. The federal team found that the type of information, when it is entered, and by whom varies from county to county. For instance, some counties have forms that caseworkers complete and then the data is entered from these forms into the system by administrative staff.</p> <p>There is no electronic sharing of case information between counties or with the State Central Office. Consequently, there is no electronic means to identify and share a child's information across the state/systems. While there are counties who are using the same application, there is not a shared database associated with the application. Each county is operating independent databases. One of the consequences is the AFCARS file may include inaccurate removal information being reported in the AFCARS files.</p> <p><u>Data Extraction/File Construction</u> Each of the counties extracts and sends their data files to the State office. This means there are a minimum of eight different extraction routines used across the State and there are inconsistencies in how these routines are written.</p> <p>The State office combines the individual files into one AFCARS file.</p> <p><u>CWIS</u> The CWIS will allow for an automated solution to exchange information among the 67 CCYAs and the central office of OCYF. Each of the counties will continue to maintain and use its own case management system. The first phase of CWIS implementation focused on the intake, investigation and assessment of protective service cases. The second phase implements the child and family's case file for cases accepted for services. The third phase will include providers and the fourth will include the financial component.</p> <p>As the State and local offices move forward on the development of CWIS, it is important the State has a strong conversion plan. This plan should address issues noted in the findings and ensure the proper conversion statewide of data that is used for AFCARS reporting. The agency should review the checklist items in Appendices B and C of the Guide to an AFCARS Assessment Review to ensure the system(s) are correctly addressing historical information. One example of an area that must be addressed as part of the AFCARS Improvement Plan and conversion is the complete removal history for each child who is in foster care or who re-enters foster. The agency will need to develop a means to determine if the child had prior removal experiences in any county other than the one that has the current care and placement responsibility of the child.</p>	

Section 2

Foster Care and Adoption Elements

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
1. Title IV-E Agency	All systems hard coded the State's code of "42" in the program.	4
2. Report Period Ending Date	See the findings for General Requirements (GR)12 and 13 regarding correct extraction of information reflective of the report period being transmitted.	4
3. Local Agency (FIPS Code)	No issues identified.	4
4. Record Number	See additional notes in foster care (FC) element 18 related to the history of a child's foster care experience.	4
5. Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable)	<p>State policy is to conduct periodic reviews every six months at a minimum. However, some counties do them every three months.</p> <p>Pennsylvania has Permanency Review Hearings in court within 6 months of: 1) the date of the child's removal from the child's guardian for placement or pursuant to a transfer of legal custody or other disposition; or 2) each previous permanency review hearing until the child is returned to the child's guardian or removed from the jurisdiction of the court. SOURCES: The Juvenile Act Chapter 16 Rule 1607 and 42 Pa. C.S. §6351(f)</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533)¹</i>: There are 32 (<1%) records with a periodic review date prior to 2013. <i>Case File Findings (n=77)</i>: 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, LUIS) where the extraction logic does not account for the report period and/or the report period for prior periods. As noted in the test deck findings, there were "future dates" reported in several of the report periods. See findings in GR12 and 13 for additional information on how this affects the accuracy of the data. For these systems, the program code must be modified to check for the most recent periodic review prior or equal to the end of the report period being extracted.</p> <p>In two systems (Berks, KIDS) the agency conducts its reviews in court but there is nothing in the extraction logic to identify a hearing that is for a periodic review from one that is not.</p> <p>There were two systems (FACTS, LUIS) that the program code determines if the child has been in foster care for more than seven months. There should be no restriction on this element and if a periodic review date is present, it is to be extracted.</p> <p>There was one system (FACTS) that was not restricting the extraction of the periodic review date to the current removal. This could be part of the cause for the older review dates in the AFCARS file. The program code must be modified to check for the most recent periodic review for the <i>current removal episode</i> prior to the end of the report period.</p>	2

¹ The data used for the frequency findings are from the 2014A period by the State.

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>There were no technical issue with IhsIS or JCIS; nor did they have older review dates in their files.</p> <p>In each county, the State needs to ensure that the periodic review is held in a timely manner and is entered into the county information system timely.</p>	
6. Date of Birth	<p>As of the AFCARS Assessment Review the agency's title IV-E plan only covered youth up to the age of 19 if they met eligibility requirements (see GR7 and FC56/58).</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are 404 (2%) records reflecting youth older than 19. There were 519 (3%) records with a year of 1994. Some of these records may be youth who turned 19 in 2014A period that were receiving title IV-E. There may have been some though that should not have been included.</p> <p>The counties using JCIS had no records of youth over the age of 18 in the 2014A file. All others did have older youth.</p>	3
7. Sex	There were no issues identified for this element.	4
8. Child's Race 0=No 1=Yes 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><u>Data Quality</u> Use of the AFCARS administrative value "unable to determine:" Options should be reflective of the actual information related to why information on race was not collected. For instance, infants who enter under Safe Haven, the child who was abandoned or the parents were incapacitated and no one was initially available to provide race information; or, the parents declined to provide the information. If the information was not asked or not recorded, the race fields should be left blank and reported as blank. The agencies should consider add more specific options to their forms and system screens to comprehensively collect all possible reasons.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There were three systems (ACYS, CAPS, and JCIS) with no identified technical issues. Since there were errors in the test cases for <i>all</i> systems that reflected an entered race when one should not have been selected, the State needs to ensure that the workers are asking for the person's race and entering what was provided by the family/youth.</p> <p>There was one system (Berks,) where the extraction code is initialized to "no" instead of blank. So, if no information is entered, then this element is reported as no for the races. Also, the code has logic that will set the race fields to blank if all are set to "no." However, the logic is never executed because prior to it there is logic that if none of the races are set to "yes," then "unable to determine" is set to "yes."</p> <p>There is one system (FACTS) that race is initialized to "unable to determine." If no information is entered, then this element is incorrectly reported as "unable to determine" instead of blank.</p> <p>There are two systems (KIDS, LUIS) that correctly initializes the race fields to blank but if no race is entered</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>into the system, the program code sets “unable to determine” to “yes.” It should be left blank.</p> <p>There were mapping errors in four systems (FACTS, IHSIS, KIDS, LUIS). There is an additional issue with KIDS. It has other nationalities listed in the system but the program code does not check them and map to the appropriate AFCARS race value.</p> <p>One system, IHSIS, does not have the capacity to collect more than one race. The data also reflects that there were no records where the child had 2 or more races. The form used by the workers to document client information contains the options White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian/Eskimo. There are no selections for Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, or Alaskan Native. The form used to make changes/updates includes White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, and Other. The agency needs to remove “other” as an option and to better list the race options.</p> <p><u>NYTD</u> The same demographic fields should also be used to extract and report the information in the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD). There are additional options for NYTD that are not in the AFCARS data collection. Almost no systems have all the options that are in NYTD. The NYTD values include “declined” (which is to be mapped to the AFCARS value “unable to determine”) and “unknown.” The NYTD definition of “unknown” encompasses two situations in which it can be used. One situation would be mapped to AFCARS and the other would not. In order to make the response option of “unknown” more meaningful to the worker, the State may want to consider alternate terminology. One example might be “incapacitated” and “multi-racial-other race not known.” These would then map in NYTD to “unknown.” For AFCARS reporting purposes: -- If a child, youth, or parent is incapacitated and unable to provide the worker with race information, the worker would select “incapacitated/unknown.” This value would be mapped to the AFCARS value “unable to determine.” -- If a person is multi-racial, but does not know the other race(s), the worker would select “multi-racial-other race not known/unknown.” This value would then be mapped to blank and only the known race would be reported in AFCARS.</p>	
<p>9. Child’s Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Yes = 2,559 (13%); No = 15,867 (81%); Unable to determine = 1,107 (6%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=78):</i> 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the response should have been “no” instead of “unable to determine.”</p> <p>See previous note regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of “unable to determine” and the NYTD administrative values.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>There was one system (CAPS) with no identified technical issues. Since there were errors in the test cases for <i>all</i> systems, the State needs to ensure that the workers are asking for the person’s ethnicity and entering what was provided by the family/youth.</p> <p>For two systems (ACYS, FACTS) the only values mapped are “yes” and “no.” If these are not found, the extraction logic sets FC9 to “unable to determine.” The element should be set to blank.</p> <p>In three systems (Berks, IhsIS, JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved. If the worker has not collected the information, the fields on the screen and in AFCARS are to be left blank.</p> <p>Additionally, as noted in FC8 the system IhsIS includes Hispanic with each race and is not a separate field. Since there are identified issues with the collection of race information, this element also needs to be modified and made into a separate data field.</p> <p>In two systems (KIDS, LUIS) there were mapping errors.</p>	
<p>10. Has the Child Been Clinically Diagnosed with a Disability(ies)?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Not Yet Determined</p>	<p>The State policy is for a child to receive a health exam within 60 days of entering foster care. If the child is initially placed in a residential facility an exam is to be done within 15 days. Some agencies have a practice of ensuring the exam is done earlier and within 30 days of the removal from home.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Yes = 4,505; No = 8,358 (43%); Not Yet Determined = 6,670 (34%); Not Reported = 0 Given the State’s policy for when a child is to receive an exam after entering foster care, the number of records reported as “not yet determined” seem high.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 40 (52%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In 11 error cases, the response should have been “yes” instead of “no.” In two error cases, the response should have been “not yet determined” instead of “no.” There were 26 records reported as “not yet determined.” Many of these children had been in care for a few years and all had been in care longer than 60 days. In 19 of these records, the response is assumed to be “no.” The reviewers did not always find information in the file relating to the child’s health status. In seven cases the response should have been “yes.”</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The systems have no way of determining when a diagnosis began or ended. KIDS has date fields for some diagnoses (on Axis 1 and 2). Also, most of the systems do not tie the child’s health information to an examination date and there does not appear to be a link to the case plan for the child.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>Additionally, one system (ACYS) the program code defaults this element to “no” when there is no diagnosis. The provides a false no response because it could be the child had not yet been to a health care professional or that the worker has not received a report from the health care professional. It is also possible the caseworker has the information but has not entered it into the system.</p> <p>There were other systems (FACTS, KIDS, LUIS) that the program code defaults this element to “not yet determined” and there is no logic to set the element to blank after a set period of time from when the child the entered foster care. Since the state policy is for an exam no later than 60 days, the agencies could use 90 days to allow time for receipt of a report.</p> <p>In the other systems, there is no allowance for missing data. If the person entering the AFCARS information does not have the child’s health information, it is likely they are selecting “no” or the field is defaulted to “no.”</p> <p>Once modifications are made to the systems to include the start and end dates of a diagnosis, the program code must be modified to determine if there are any active diagnoses for the report period being extracted.</p> <p>The end date of the report period needs to be included in the extraction logic.</p> <p>There needs to be logic added to the extraction that if the child has been in care for a specified time and this field has not been completed, the element is set to blank. Since the State policy is for children to have an exam within 60 days of entering foster care, this time frame plus 30 days is an example of a specified time the agency may want to use.</p>	
<p>FC 11 - 15 General Information</p> <p>0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies</p>	<p>See the notes in FC10. The same issues of no dates and defaults applies to these elements as well.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> Four of the systems only use the categories from the AFCARS regulation instead of recording the child’s actual diagnosed condition.</p> <p>The other four system (KIDS, Berks, FACTS, LUIS) either have the AFCARS fields as a heading and then within the category individual diagnosed conditions or just conditions are recorded. KIDS as a comprehensive case management system has a health module where information related to a child’s exam, diagnoses, and other medical information is recorded. There were errors in mapping of diagnosed conditions in KIDS extraction logic. The Berks system has check boxes reflecting those in the AFCARS regulation plus fields for individual diagnoses. However, the program code extracts only the information from the checkbox fields. These fields are also not linked to the individual diagnosis fields. It is possible that there may be diagnoses not getting reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>A history of diagnosed conditions should be kept by the systems.</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	Once modifications are made to the systems to include the start and end dates of a diagnosis, the program code must be modified to determine if the diagnoses is active as of the end of the report period being extracted. The end date of the report period needs to be included in the extraction logic.	
11. Mental Retardation	For elements 11 - 15 see the previous notes. There also are mapping issues with some of the systems. <u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=75):</i> 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”	2
12. Visually or Hearing Impaired	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 1 of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.	2
13. Physically Disabled	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=75):</i> 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”	2
14. Emotionally Disturbed (DSM- IV)	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 18 (23%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in 17 error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”	2
15. Other Medically Diagnosed Conditions Requiring Special Care	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 6 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In five error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”	2
16. Has this Child Ever Been Adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Yes = 738 (4%); No = 14,361 (74%); Unable to Determine = 4,434 (23%); Not Reported = 0 The number of records reported as “unable to determine” is high. Additionally, there are discrepancies between the responses in this element and FC17. <i>Case File Findings (n=78):</i> 17 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “no” instead of “unable to determine.” In 13 cases, the response in FC17 was reported as “not applicable” (correct). See notes regarding discrepancy between FC16 and FC17 responses. The previous discussion about the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine” applies to this element as well. In this instance, the only two situations where “unable to determine” would be appropriate is if the infant entered foster care under the Safe Haven program or if at the time of the removal, the parent was incapacitated or the child had been abandoned. In the later situations, the caseworker may still be able to determine this information as they complete their assessment and talk to other family members. These two descriptors would be better selections for the worker to choose from than “unable to determine.” If the worker has not gathered the information through a family assessment, then the fields are	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>to be left blank.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are three systems that the program code will default missing data to either “unable to determine” (ACYS, KIDS) or “no” (CAPS). In one system (FACTS) this field is initialized to “unable to determine” so if no information is entered, this remains the response. As noted by the data submitted from FACTS, there are more records reported as “unable to determine” in this element than there are reported for the same value in FC17. One system (LUIS) the element is initialized to “no” and so if no information is entered, this is the reported response.</p> <p>In at least two systems there did not appear to be an option to account for a Safe Haven infant or if the parent was unable to provide information.</p> <p>In many of the systems, it was not clear if the fields on the screens were pre-filled with a value when a new case is created. Many of the extraction code programs did not account for missing data. If fields are pre-populated, then the system must be modified to be set to blank when a new case is created. Additionally, supervisors must ensure that the correct data are being recorded on each case.</p>	
<p>17. If Yes, How Old was the Child when Adoption was Legalized?</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1=less than 2 years old 2=2-5 years old 3=6 to 12 years old 4=13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not applicable = 18,789 (96%); Age categories = 641 (3%); Unable to Determine = 103 (1%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>The number of records reported as “not applicable” and “unable to determine” do not match the number of responses for “no” and “unable to determine” in FC16. Note that the number of records reported with an age is fewer than the number of responses for “yes” in FC16. It is likely, that these fields were blank and incorrectly mapped to a value or the caseworker selected the wrong option in the system.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=78):</i> 4 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “not applicable” instead of “unable to determine.”</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There was an issue with one of the system’s fields. If the response to whether the child had been previously adopted was “no,” the age field was not disabled. At a minimum, the only option that should be available for selection is “not applicable.”</p> <p>For six systems, the data reported for the categories in this element did not match the respective option in FC16. If the response in FC16 is “no,” then there are to be the same number of responses for “not applicable” in this element. The same is true for “unable to determine,” total of the age categories, and blank.</p> <p>In two systems (Berks, CAPS) the number of records reported in this element as “unable to determine” was</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>greater than the number reported for the same value in FC16. Generally, there were fewer records reported in the age categories. If the parent does not know how old the child was at the time of the adoption, or is unable to estimate the age, then FC17 is to be left blank. In one system (CAPS) the number of records reported in this element as “not applicable” did not match the number in FC16 for “no.”</p> <p>In two systems (CAPS, FACTS) if no data are found, this element is incorrectly set to “not applicable.”</p> <p>There were errors as well in the extraction of information from KIDS. If the child was ever adopted and element #17 is “not applicable” or blank, the logic will change element #17 to 5 “unable to determine.” If element #16 is “no” or “unable to determine” then element #17 is set to blank. The program code must be modified. If the age field is blank, then this element is to be set to blank. If FC16 is “no,” then this element is to be “not applicable.” If FC16 is “unable to determine,” then this element is to be unable to determine.”</p> <p>There were four systems rated a 3 for this element. However, there were some that have inconsistencies between what is reported in FC16 and 17.</p>	
Removal Episodes - General	<p>As previously noted in the General Requirements and FC4 regarding removal histories, there is no ability to identify a child’s removal history across the state. Consequently, the AFCARS removal history for a child can be underreported.</p> <p>In the 2013 title IV-E Review, it was noted that the child retained the same MCI number through pre-adoption process. However, in two cases when the adoption dissolved, the child was given a new MCI number upon re-entering foster care. This contributes to the possibility that the removal history for the child will not be accurately reported. The requirement is for the State to report a child’s complete removal history. Additional findings are included for FC18 - 20.</p> <p>When the State implements CWIS, the database must include historical information prior to conversion from the existing multiple databases to the central database. This includes both open and closed cases.</p>	
18. Date of First Removal from Home	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were errors of missing a missing removal episode and incorrect dates of first removal. There were two error cases in which the reviewers found a removal episode that preceded the one reported to AFCARS. There were 10 cases with the incorrect date of first removal due to the child’s first placement in either a hospital or locked facility, the child’s first episode was less than 24 hours, or the actual removal date was earlier than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> As previously noted, the dates reported for this element are county specific and not necessarily the child’s first ever removal from home date. The data collection system must include dates of removal that occurred in another county within the State, if applicable.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>Also, if a child exits foster care as a result of an adoption but re-enters foster care at a later time, the date for this element is to reflect the first ever removal not the first removal episode after the adoption.</p> <p>None of the systems met all of the standards for this element. The extraction logic sets this element to the date of the <i>very first placement</i> found regardless of the type of setting.</p> <p>Requirement related to date of removal when the child is on runaway status at the time the agency receives responsibility for placement and care: There was one system (Berks) that correctly included the test scenario and the correct date for FC21. It is presumed that if the child re-enters foster care, the correct date will be entered for this element as well. The remaining systems incorrectly either excludes the records or enters the case with a placement setting. Consequently, there is no logic to check if the child's first ever removal was one that began with a runaway and uses the date the agency received placement and care of the child, or the date the agency removed the child from home if applicable. (See GR1 for additional notes related to this standard.)</p> <p>Requirement related to date of removal when the child's first-ever removal from home is an episode that was 24-hours or less in duration, the date of that episode is never included as a first removal date. (See GR5 for additional information.) There was only one of the county systems (IhSIS) that correctly excluded the removal episode that was 24 hours or less in the test cases. While the agency correctly did not include the case in the 2012B report period, the information for that episode was incorrectly reported in FC18-20 for the report periods 2013A and B. The records also incorrectly indicated the child had two removal episodes instead of one.</p> <p>Requirement related to if in the first-ever removal the child's only placement was a hospital or a locked facility, this episode date is never to be selected as the first removal date. As noted in GR1, the counties are incorrectly identifying and including records of children whose only placement is a hospital. Consequently, FC18 incorrectly reflects this episode if the child re-enters foster care.</p> <p>Requirement related to if in the first-ever removal the child's first placement was a detention facility or a hospital and the child subsequently enters a foster care setting within the scope of title IV-E, the date of the foster care placement is to always be the first removal from home date. Similar to the previous standard, if the child's first ever removal from home began with a placement in a hospital or a locked facility, the counties are incorrectly setting FC18 to the date of custody and not the date the child entered a foster care placement. There were two systems (JCIS, LUIS) that correctly identified and reported this situation in FC21. They need to ensure that FC18 is correctly reported if the child exits and re-enters foster care.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds.</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	For 18 plus year olds who re-enter foster care on or after 7/1/2012 who had been discharged (due to leaving the program or reported discharged in AFCARS) prior to 6/30/2012, the program code is to report the youth's first removal episode date per all AFCARS requirements.	
<p>19. Total Number of Removals from Home To Date</p> <p><u>Requirements</u> The number of times the child was removed from home, including the current removal.</p> <p><u>Checklist</u> The data collection system must include historical information prior to a conversion from a legacy system to a new information system.</p> <p>Removal episodes that are less than 24-hours are never included in the removal count.</p> <p>In instances where the child's only living arrangement is a hospital or detention (locked facility) at the time the title IV-B/IV-E agency obtains responsibility for placement and care, the program code is to exclude these records from the number of removal episodes.</p> <p>The data collection system must include removal episodes that occurred in another county within the State, if applicable.</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=73):</i> 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were three error cases in which the number of removals was more than the number reported to AFCARS. There were two error cases in which the number of removals reported was less than the number found by the reviewer. In one case this was due the child was actually in the same continuous episode. In the other, the first episode was less than 24 hours. In five of the cases reviewed, the reviewer was not able to verify the number of removals. One of the cases was reported to have only 2 removals but based on notes in the case there appears to have been additional episodes.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> As noted in the findings for the foster care population in GR1 and 5 and FC18/21, counties will need to make corrections to the extraction in order to correctly identify the number of removals. See the items listed in the Data Element/Requirements Checklist. All systems need to address these requirements.</p> <p>There is an issue with manual edits being done to data in JCIS system. The system should allow the worker to enter events and the extraction code be programmed with the AFCARS rules. This maintains accuracy and consistency in reporting the data.</p> <p>The program code is to report a count of all the removal episodes - whether the child had been in foster care in another county previously or if the child had been adopted then re-entered foster care.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. For youth noted in FC21 as having a new removal episode, the number of removals is incremented by 1.</p> <p>Note: Youth who are 18 (not yet 19) and receiving title IV-E as of 7/1/2012 and continue in care will be reported with the same removal episode count.</p>	2
<p>20. Date Child was Discharged from Last Foster Care Episode</p> <p><u>Requirements</u> For children with prior removals, enter the month, day and year they were discharged from care for the episode immediately prior to the current episode.</p> <p>For children with no prior removals, leave this field blank.</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=73):</i> 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. As previously noted, there were cases with missing removal episode(s) and a date should have been reported for this element. There were two cases in which the AFCARS data reflected a date but the reviewer found that there was only one removal episode for the child (an episode less than 24 hours and another that was one continuous episode. In two error cases, the date of discharge from the prior episode was a day later than what was reported to AFCARS. In one error case, the date should have been a later date than the one reported to AFCARS. There were an additional four cases in which the reviewer could not verify the information and one case that was marked in question. Based on the reviewers notes, it was not clear if the initial setting was a detention center and then the child entered foster care or if the child returned</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
<p>If foster care element #19 is ≥ 2, then this field must not be blank.</p> <p>If this field is not blank, it must be a date prior to foster care element #21 (Date of Latest Removal From Home).</p> <p><u>Checklist</u> The date of discharge must reflect the date the agency no longer has care, placement, or supervision of the child.</p> <p>Must not include the date the child entered a "trial home visit."</p> <p>If a child re-enters care from a "trial home visit" that was for a non-specified period of time, and a discharge date is entered that equals six months from the date of placement, then that date must be entered for element #20.</p> <p>The data collection system must include historical information prior to a conversion from a legacy system (or paper files) to a new information system.</p> <p>If there was a prior removal episode that was 24-hours or less, and the child later re-enters foster care, the end date of the previous 24-hour episode is not to be reported for this element.</p> <p>If the child's prior removal episode only contained a placement that was a hospital or detention (locked) facility, the end date of this episode is not to be reported for this element.</p>	<p>to the relative home that they had been living in. If it was the later, then this would not have been a removal episode. This case was listed as in question for all elements from FC20 through 66.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> As noted in the findings for the foster care population in GR1 and 5 and FC18/21, there are corrections the counties will need to make to correctly identify the date of discharge from an AFCARS defined removal episode.</p> <p>See the items listed in the Data Element/Requirements Checklist.</p> <p>The system/extraction code must include a discharge from foster care that occurred in another county.</p> <p>The system/extraction code must include a previous episode that the discharge from foster care was an adoption.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. For 18 plus year olds who enter/re-enter foster care on or after July 1, 2012 who had been reported as discharged prior to this date, or no longer included in the AFCARS reporting population, ensure that the new removal is reported and this element reflects the discharge from the prior removal episode reported in AFCARS FC56.</p> <p>Youth who received title IV-E and turned 19 between April 1 and June 30, 2012 are reported to AFCARS as discharged for that time frame (FC56). - If the youth remained in foster care under the State's program and are determined eligible under the new title IV-E amendment, report the discharge date that reflects title IV-E ended and would have been the date in FC56 prior or equal to 6/30/2012.</p>	
<p>21. Date of Latest Removal from Home</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were six cases with the incorrect date of removal due to the child's first placement in either a hospital or locked facility. In four error cases, the actual removal date was earlier than the one reported to AFCARS (one had been in one continuous removal episode).</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
 State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> None of the systems met all of the standards for this element. In general, all of the county systems are initializing this field to blank or zeroes. Then the logic sets this element to the date of the very first placement found regardless of the type of setting.</p> <p>The agency enters the information on children who are on runaway status at the time the agency obtained responsibility for placement and care and who are still on runaway status at the end of the report period. There was one system (Berks) that correctly included the test scenario and the correct date for FC21. See the notes in FC18. These agencies/counties must ensure that if they have responsibility for placement and care, and either the child is on runaway status at the time of custody or runs before being placed, the date of removal is the date placement and care began. It is not the day the child is picked up and placed in a foster care setting.</p> <p>If the child's first placement was a detention (locked) facility or a hospital and then the child enters a foster care setting within the scope of title IV-E, the date of removal is the start date of this placement. There were two systems (JCIS, LUIS) that correctly identify and report this situation.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. 1) For 18 plus year olds who enter/re-enter foster care on or after July 1, 2012 (the date IV-E claiming for youth up to age 21 began) who had been discharged, or reported as discharged, prior to that date, report the youth's removal date that reflects either the court order or voluntary service/placement agreement date for the new entry into foster care.</p> <p>2) For youth 19 or older who were reported as discharged in AFCARS prior or equal to 6/30/12, who as of 7/1/2012 are now receiving title IV-E funds: 2a) If the youth continued to be in foster care and receiving State funds, the date of removal is 7/1/2012. 2b) For all other youth, report the actual start date of the removal episode per the court order or voluntary placement agreement.</p> <p>Note: Youth who turned 18 in the third quarter of FY2012(April through June, 2012) who remain eligible for title IV-E foster care will be reported under the existing open removal episode.</p>	
22. Removal Transaction Date	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There is one system (FACTS) that needs corrections in order to have a system generated, non-modifiable date and to correctly use this date for element 22.</p>	2
23. Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting	<p>There were no systems/counties that correctly identify the placement date in accordance with the AFCARS standards. Listed below is each standard with the results. Since some of these are dependent on how the</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>information is entered, as the extraction code reports what is entered, it is important that each county and the State periodically assess the accuracy and develop oversight by supervisors to ensure proper date entry.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. A couple of the errors were due to the same errors noted in FC21 (child's initial placement was a hospital or locked facility and the date reported for this element should have been the date the child entered the foster care setting as the child only had the one placement). There were three cases that the date reported did not reflect the physical placement of the child (which was a day earlier).</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are systems that it was not clear that the agency is documenting where the child is located at all times while in the agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p>The date must not change when there is a change in the status of the same placement setting (e.g., a foster home that becomes a pre-adoptive home) (CWPM, 1.2B.7, Question #1, #17, and #19). In the test case where there was a change in status of the foster home to a pre-adoptive home, ACYS, CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS reported the date correctly. However, it is not clear either from the screen design and the way the program code is written that all of these systems are designed to capture all changes and for the program to not report a change in status of a foster care setting. The agencies need to verify and confirm if this is the case or not. In one system (Berks), the program code does not check if there is a status change in the placement. If there is a change in the status of the placement, it is likely this system are incorrectly reporting the change in status date.</p> <p>The agency must indicate the date the child was returned home while still in the agency's responsibility for placement and care (CWPM, 1.2B.7, Question #23). There are two systems (FACTS, KIDS) in which this requirement is not applicable; the agency's placement and care responsibility is dismissed when the child returns home. There were four systems (Berks, IhsIS, JCIS, LUIS) that correctly reported the date in the test cases. However as noted above, it appears there is no logic to check for certain conditions in the extraction code. These agencies need to review and verify how they are correctly identifying and reporting the start of a "trial home visit." There was one system (ACYS) where the program code does not include logic to check for the start date of a "trial home visit." The agency also did not report the date correctly in the test cases. It appears that the program code for CAPS will include the start date but the agency needs to confirm if this is correct.</p> <p>The agency must indicate the date the child ran away from a placement (CWPM, 1.2B.7, Question #23). There were three systems (Berks, JCIS, and LUIS) that correctly reported this date in the test cases. The agencies need to confirm how these are entered and identified in the extraction code. There were three</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>systems (ACYS, lhSIS, KIDS) identified from the test case results that are not reporting the date the child ran away from the foster care setting. It does not appear that there is logic in the extraction code to identify the start date of a runaway status. For the FACTS system, there were several issues with the logic used to identify the placement date. Also, the date reported in the test cases was one date later than when the child actually ran away from the foster care setting. The program code for CAPS does not assess whether there is a runaway status and so the date would not be reported.</p> <p>If a child’s only “placement” in the removal episode is as a “runaway,” then the date of removal and placement date will be the same (CWPM, 1.2B.7, Question #24).</p> <p>As noted in GR1 there were three systems (ACYS, Berks, and CAPS) that correctly included the test case in the reporting population for the period the child’s only placement was a runaway status. However, only two systems (ACYS, Berks) reported the date of placement correctly to match the date of the removal episode. CAPS included the scenario but in the period in which the only placement was the runaway status, the agency reported the date the child was placed in the foster home. This was a date that occurred in the next report period. There were five systems (FACTS, lhSIS, JCIS, KIDS, LUIS) identified from the test case results, that did not include the scenario in the period in which the only setting was a runaway status and the date reported in the following periods reflected the date the child was picked up and placed in the foster home not the date the episode began.</p> <p>If a child returns to the same foster care setting after being on a runaway status or a “trial home visit,” the program code must set the date of placement to the initial date the foster care setting placement began. As noted in the findings above, it is likely all the systems will need to make corrections to report this correctly. In situations where the initial placement was a runaway status and if the child only has one placement after that, then the date of placement is to remain the same date as the date of removal.</p> <p>In regard to institutions with several cottages on their campus, the agency is not to change the date when a child moves from one cottage to another. Only report a change in the date of placement if the site is at a different address (CWPM, 1.2B.7, Question #25). It does not appear that there are any systems correctly doing this requirement. Many of the systems extract the current placement without making any further checks as to the type. Depending on how these situations are entered in some systems, there may not be a problem. The agencies and the State will have to evaluate and determine what changes will be required.</p> <p>Additionally, the date a hospitalization starts is to be reported if the stay is not short-term. The State and the Federal team will need to discuss further and define the length of a hospital stay.</p> <p>There are some systems that will need to ensure that relative placements, whether in-state or out-of-state, are entered into the system and the date of placement reported to AFCARS.</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	It appears that the program code for some of the systems are not checking the date against the end of the report period. This causes “future” dates to be reported and incorrect dates when a subsequent file is submitted. Two systems specifically determined as having an issue are CAPS and JCIS.	
24. Number of Previous Placement Settings During this Removal Episode	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There were three records with a placement count of zero. These should be those records identified as the child’s only placement as “runaway” as of the end of the report period.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=74):</i> 18 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were 11 cases in which the reviewers found additional placements that were not included in the count reported to AFCARS. The other seven cases had fewer placements than what was reported to AFCARS. In one case the child had been hospitalized for four days and this should not have been counted. In four cases, the initial placement of the child in a hospital/locked facility was counted.</p> <p>Since the accuracy of this data is dependent on how the information is entered into certain systems (the extraction code directly extracts what is entered into the system), it is important that each county and the State periodically assess the accuracy and develop oversight by supervisors to ensure proper date entry.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are errors for every system related to how placements are counted. Since many of the systems are incorrectly identifying the beginning of a removal from home, this impacts the number of placements counted as well. If the child’s first placement was a hospital or a locked facility, this setting would never be included in the placement count.</p> <p>There were errors as noted in FC23 when a placement setting changes status but the child did not move from the placement (see notes in FC23 and 41). Based on the results of the test cases, there are systems (ACYS, CAPS, and IhsIS) that are incrementing the count even though the date did not change. Since there are several of the systems that count every placement, each agency should verify that this requirement is being properly met, either in the code or how it is entered in the system.</p> <p>In regard to “temporary living conditions” that are not to be included in the AFCARS placement count, with the exception of hospital stays, most of the agencies are correctly excluding them. As previously noted, the federal team and State need to discuss how many days will be used to determine when a hospital stay is excluded. There is an issue though of the systems counting the return to the same setting following a child’s placement of “runaway” or “trial home visit.”</p> <p>Also, this field should be initialized to blank and zero only used if the child’s only living arrangement in the removal episode, and as of the end of the report period, is “runaway.” There were some agencies that if a placement count was not found, it this element is defaulted 1.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	There are systems that are also counting the move from one cottage to another on the same campus.	
<p>25. Manner of Removal from Home for Current Removal Episode</p> <p>1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined</p>	<p>Court order to remove children (per IV-E Review Response by PA): protective custody, emergency, adjudication, dispositional, & shelter orders. Children may sometime come into care on permanency review hearings and pick-up (copias) orders. The agency's timeframe to obtain a court order is 72 hours from initial removal to court removal/hearing.</p> <p>This element is rated a 4 but the counties and the state staff need to verify that if a child is in care for 72 hours or less, whether "not yet determined" is a valid value per the State's laws and policies. If so, then modifications will need to be made to some of the systems. There were errors as well in the case file review. The agencies need to ensure that if the initial removal was due to a voluntary agreement that becomes a court order for placement and care that the original removal manner of voluntary continues to be reported.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been "voluntary" instead of "court ordered."</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. 1) Ensure that the program code correctly extracts the manner of removal of 18 plus year olds who enter or re-enter foster care on or after 7/1/2012.</p> <p>2) Youth who were reported as discharged to AFCARS in the third quarter of fiscal year 2012 (April 1 – June 30, 2012) because they turned 19, or title IV-E ended, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who remained in foster care under the State program, and • for whom the new program applies and the State claims title IV-E funds. <p>Modify the program code to report the manner of removal as 7/1/2012.</p>	4
<p>Actions or Conditions Associated With Child's Removal</p> <p>0=Does not Apply 1=Applies</p>	<p>The State and local agencies may want to re-evaluate reasons associated with a child's entry into foster care for more detailed reasons. These can then be mapped to the appropriate AFCARS category. For instance, the agency may want to add domestic violence, child drug exposed in-utero, etc. Additionally, the agency may want to assess the reasons youth who are over the age of 18 re-enter foster care and add those to the selection list.</p> <p>In the test case results for KIDS, the reasons for removal were incorrect for the child's second removal. The agency needs to verify the findings and determine if there is a system error of if the case was incorrectly entered.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. For youth who are 18 prior to 12/31/11 receiving title IV-E funds and remain in the program, the information for these elements does not change.</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>For youth who were reported as discharged to AFCARS because they turned 19 and/or title IV-E ended per the rules prior to approval of the amendment, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who remained in foster care under the State program and • for whom the new program applies and the State claimed title IV-E funds: <p>If the youth turned 19 prior to 7/1/2012 and were reported to AFCARS in a prior report period as discharged; report the reasons for “removal” as of 7/1/2012.</p> <p>For 18 plus year olds who enter or re-enter foster care on or after 7/1/2012 who had been discharged (or no longer included in the AFCARS reporting population) prior to 7/1/2012, the program code is to report the circumstances that brought the youth back to foster care.</p>	
26. Physical Abuse (alleged/reported)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> One of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.” There was abuse in a prior episode for a different child in the family.</p>	3
27. Sexual Abuse (alleged/reported)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> Two of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
28. Neglect (alleged/reported)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 10 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
29. Alcohol Abuse (parent)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
30. Drug Abuse (parent)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=75):</i> 11 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
31. Alcohol Abuse (child)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> One of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>This element should include infants addicted at birth.</p>	3
32. Drug Abuse (child)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=73):</i> 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “apply.” In four error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one case, an infant was born with drugs in their system.</p> <p>This element should include infants addicted at birth.</p>	3
33. Child's Disability		3

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
34. Child's Behavior Problem	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 7 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In six error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p>	3
35. Death of Parent(s)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 3 (2%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p>	3
36. Incarceration of Parent(s)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
37. Caretaker's Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reason	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 6 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
38. Abandonment		3
39. Relinquishment	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> One of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error case the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “apply.” The reviewer found no indication that the parent relinquished their rights as the reason for the child entering foster care.</p> <p>If a child enters under the Safe Haven program, indicate “applies” for this element.</p>	3
40. Inadequate Housing	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=77):</i> 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>	3
<p>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</p> <p>Multi-service agencies should not be coded as “Institution;” the actual setting should be used (CWPM, 1.2B.7 Question #25).</p>	<p>The following systems are counties that do have instances in which the agency maintains responsibility for placement and care of a child who is placed in the home of removal (i.e., trial home visit): ACYS (Venango), Berks, CAPS (All counties?), IhSIS, JCIS, LUIS.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Pre-adoptive Home = 605 (3%); Foster Family Home (Relative) = 5,324 (27%); Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) = 8,067 (41%); Group Home (2,322 (12%); Institution = 2,145 (11%); Supervised Independent Living = 409 (2%); Runaway = 250 (1%); Trial Home Visit = 411 (2%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>During the onsite review, there were several of the county representatives who indicated the number of records reported as “pre-adoptive” home is under-reported. All counties need to review how they are recording a home where the foster parents indicate a desire to adopt the child, or the child is placed in the home of the family who are adopting the child.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
<p>Foster homes are included whether or not they are licensed; this includes placement with relatives (CWPM, 1.2B.7 Question #15).</p> <p>If at the time the agency obtains responsibility for care and placement of the child, and the child is on runaway status and remains a runaway as of the end of the report period, then report "runaway" for this element (CWPM, 1.2B.7 Question #24).</p> <p><u>Checklist</u> The system must have the capacity to include all living arrangements of the child from the time the child enters the title IV-E agency's responsibility for placement and care, including a placement where a payment is not made to the foster family or the a facility.</p>	<p><i>Case File Findings (n=76): 7 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. See the case file findings for information on the errors.</i></p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are five systems (Berks, CAPS, JCIS, KIDS, LUIS) that appear to be correctly mapping and reporting the child's living arrangement. Most of these systems have the same values on their screens as the AFCARS values and the extraction code directly maps the value to AFCARS. There were issues identified in the case file review and the test cases. Additionally, these systems will still need to address the reporting of hospitalizations. Also, supervisors in these counties will need to ensure that the correct setting for the correct time frames are entered accurately.</p> <p>There was one system (FACTS) that has errors in how placement setting are mapped to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>The federal team was not able to completely evaluate the extraction code used by ACYS or lHsis for this element. We may need to have a follow-up discussion with the staff.</p> <p>In one system (ACYS) there is no clear indication from the screens and/or the code how the size of group home and institution settings are determined. This will have to be addressed to ensure that the setting is mapped to the correct AFCARS value.</p> <p>The counties need to ensure that this information is reflective of the report period being extracted/reported. Once the federal team and the State discuss the length of hospital stays, all systems will need to modify the way hospital stays are recorded and extracted.</p> <p>Also, as noted in the checklist column the systems should have the capacity to record every location/living arrangement of a child while under the agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p>	
<p>42. Is Current Placement Setting Outside of the State or Tribal Service Area?</p> <p>1 = yes 2 = no</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533): Yes = 188 (1%); No = 19,345 (99%); Not Reported = 0</i></p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and JCIS) that check the provider's address and if the address is other than PA, the element is set to "yes."</p> <p>There are two systems (CAPS, lHsis) that checks the provider's address but if there is no information, the program code incorrectly sets this element to "no." If no information is entered, the element is to be set to blank.</p> <p>The program code for KIDS is hard coded to set this element to "no." The program code must be modified</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>to check the address of the provider.</p> <p>There are three systems (Berks, CAPS, LUIS) that have a field on the screen for “out-of-state” and the user must select yes or no. While this method is acceptable, to be more accurate, the program code should check the placement provider’s address of the child’s current living arrangement. This would reduce the amount of extra data entry as well as ensure accuracy.</p>	
<p>43. Most Recent Case Plan Goal</p> <p>1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long-term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Reunification = 14,536 (74%); Live with Other Relative(s) = 334 (2%); Adoption = 2,609 (13%); Long-term Foster Care = 392 (2%); Emancipation = 891 (5%); Guardianship = 592 (3%); Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established = 179 (1%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 7 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. See the case file findings for information on the errors.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> Goals should be child-specific and not reported to AFCARS until established in the case planning process. The system and extraction logic should not preset a goal at the time the child enters care. The goal should be entered by the caseworker.</p> <p>If the youth will be in foster care until the age of 18 and no other goal is currently applicable, and the youth has a permanent connection with an adult, use the goal “emancipation.” If there is no adult with a permanent connection to the child, use “long-term foster care.” All of the counties will need to make corrections in the system/extraction code or in the manner that the information is recorded.</p> <p>The federal team was not able to fully evaluate the extraction code for ACYS as there were several values in the routine that we do not have what the number represents.</p> <p>The extraction code for all systems is not checking how long the child has been in foster care. If the program code does not find a goal, this element is set to “not yet established.” The program code needs to set this element to blank if the child has been in foster care for more 60 or more days and there is no goal.</p> <p>In seven systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, LUIS) there is no comparison of the date of the goal against the report period being extracted. This means the current goal and not the goal for the report period being reported when subsequent files are transmitted.</p> <p>There were at least four systems (ACYS, FACTS, JCIS, LUIS) in which there is no history maintained of the case plan goal. The current plan goal overwrites the previous goal. If the State has to resubmit a prior report period, the current plan and not the plan goal that was effective for the prior report period will be reported in AFCARS. These agencies must develop a history table to store prior case plan goals.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>There were issues with how some of the systems (ACYS, FACTS, IhsIS, and KIDS) are recording and reporting a goal for a relative to receive guardianship. These systems have no means to distinguish a goal of guardianship by a relative from a person not related to the child. If the goal is for the relative to receive guardianship of the child, the case plan goal is to be mapped to the AFCARS value “live with other relative.”</p> <p>Additionally, there were errors in the mapping of the options in the KIDS system from the agency’s goals to the AFCARS values. The value “Placement with a ready, willing and able parent who was not previously identified by the County Agency” is incorrectly mapped to “long-term foster care.” This value is to be mapped to “reunification” as it is the goal to place the child with a parent. There is an option “Emancipation,” which is set to “emancipation.” See the note above regarding youth who will be in foster care until the age of majority. The agency will need to determine a means to identify whether the youth has a permanent connection to an adult.</p> <p>For agencies using the AFCARS options as the case plan goal (IhsIS, JCIS, LUIS), the agency needs to ensure that “live with relative” is selected when the goal is to facilitate the relative to obtain guardianship of the child.</p>	
<p>Principal Caretaker(s) Information - Provide information on the person(s) from whom the child was removed. This may include biological parents, grandparents, other family members, legal parents, or others.</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><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Married Couple = 4,000 (21%); Unmarried Couple = 2,297 (12%); Single Female = 6,754 (35%); Single Male = 929 (5%); Unable to Determine = 5,553 (28%); Not Reported = 0 The number of records reported for “unable to determine” is high. This number would primarily represent infants who entered foster care as Safe Haven Infants.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=73):</i> 22 (30%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In 18 error of the cases (from one system), the response in AFCARS was “unable to determine.” Reviewers were able to find a marital status for all cases except for two.</p> <p>See previous comments regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” The user and the program code is to set this element to “unable to determine” if the child was a Safe Haven Infant. If the child was abandoned, and the worker has not yet obtained the information, “unable to determine” can be used. However, it is expected that the worker will obtain this information and update the field in the system.</p> <p>There are three systems rated a 3 (Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, and JCIS) and one (LUIS) rated a 4.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The options for the field Caretaker Family Structure in ACYS includes “not applicable.” For caretaker family structure, “not applicable” is not a valid choice. This option should be removed from the list. There are three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and KIDS) that the program code defaults missing information to “unable to determine.” If the information was not entered, this element is to be set to blank. (The screen</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>fields should not be pre-filled either.)</p> <p>The options in FACTS includes “unknown.” The agency is incorrectly mapping this to “unable to determine” instead of blank. The agency’s value could be used by the worker because they did not gather the information as opposed to the child having been abandoned or was a Safe Haven infant. Also, the agency’s value “separated” is incorrectly mapped to “single.” It should be mapped to “married couple.”</p> <p>KIDS has a field for the caretaker’s family structure and the program code extracts the information from this field. However, if there is no information, the program code then then checks for the biological parent(s). This second routine needs to be removed. The child may not have been removed from his/her parents.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. The caretaker marital status on youth who are for 18 or older entering or re-entering foster care is that of the youth. The systems need to allow caseworkers to enter caretaker information on youth re-entering foster care as the youth being the caretaker.</p> <p>For youth who were reported as discharged in AFCARS because they turned 19, or title IV-E ended per the rules prior to 7/1/2012, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who remained in foster care under the State program and • for whom the new program applies and the State claimed title IV-E funds: <p>report the current marital status of the youth.</p> <p>For youth who turned 19 after 7/1/12, report the youth in the same removal episode and report the youth’s caretaker marital status at time of removal for that episode.</p>	
45. Year of Birth (1st Principal Caretaker)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 13,971; Not Reported = 5,562 In FC44 there were 5,553 records reported for “unable to determine” but there are 5,562 records reported in FC45 as blank.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=68):</i> 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the wrong year was reported. In six error cases, no date of birth was reported but the reviewer found the date in the file. There were four cases in which the reviewers were not able to verify the year of birth, but were able to determine a marital status for FC44. The records were reported as blank for FC45.</p> <p>Most of the systems did not have technical issues with the reporting of this data and were rated a 3 to address data quality. There were two systems that do have technical issues. LUIS was rated a 4.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>There were some issues with how the dates of birth are collected in FACTS and the agency had already begun work on making modifications to the system.</p> <p>See the findings for KIDS in FC44. The same issue occurs for this element as well. If the caretaker family structure is blank, the program code looks for the birthdate of the first "mother" found on the client file with a role type of "1659" (biological), "24073" (teen), "1661" (legal), "1662" (step) or "2265" (adoptive). If the caretaker structure is not blank, it uses the biological mother's date of birth. If the first caretaker's year of birth is still blank, the program moves the second principal caretaker's year of birth to the first principal caretaker's field and sets the second principal caretaker's year of birth to spaces.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. See the notes in FC44.</p>	
46. Year of Birth (2nd Principal Caretaker - if applicable)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 6,299; Not Reported = 13,234 In FC44 there are 6,297 records reported as married and unmarried couple.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=70):</i> 6 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the reviewer noted the marital status was "unmarried couple" and there should be a second caretaker year of birth. In five error cases, no date of birth was reported but the reviewer found the date in the file.</p> <p>There was two cases in which the reviewers were able to determine the caretakers were a couple but could not find the year of birth.</p> <p>Most of the systems did not have technical issues with the reporting of this data and were rated a 3 to address data quality. There were two systems that do have technical issues. LUIS was rated a 4.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There were some issues with how the dates of birth are collected in FACTS and the agency had already begun work on making modifications to the system.</p> <p>See the findings for KIDS in FC44/45. The same issue occurs for this element as well.</p> <p>Youth who are 18 and older and are eligible for title IV-E foster care funds. See the notes in FC44.</p>	2
47. Date of Mother's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=78):</i> One of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> All the systems' extraction code does not include logic to check the date against the report period being</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>extracted.</p> <p>There are six systems (ACYS, Berks, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, LUIS) that do not maintain a history of the TPR dates. Consequently if a prior report period is submitted, it is possible that an invalid date will be reported (the date may have occurred after the report period being extracted). If the field were to be left blank, this would be incorrect as well since there may have been a termination of parental rights that did occur for a parent.</p> <p>There is one system (CAPS) that is incorrectly extracting the earliest parental rights terminated date of Mother-Biological, Mother-Legal, Mother-Adoptive, or, Mother-Step. The FACTS extraction code is only reporting a TPR date if the case plan goal is adoption. The program code is to report the TPR date when it occurs regardless of the current case plan goal.</p> <p>The extraction code for IhsIS, JCIS, and LUIS is only pulling what was entered in the system AFCARS field. If there are multiple TPR dates that need to be recorded for mothers, then the code may not be reporting the correct one.</p> <p>If a parent is deceased, the agency can use the deceased date for this field. There was one system (KIDS) that are doing this in the current extraction of data.</p>	
48. Date of Legal or Putative Father's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> All the systems' extraction code does not include logic to check the date against the report period being extracted.</p> <p>There are six systems (ACYS, Berks, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, LUIS) that do not maintain a history of the TPR dates.</p> <p>There is one system (CAPS) that is incorrectly extracting the earliest parental rights terminated date of father-biological, father-legal, father-adoptive or, father-step.</p> <p>The FACTS extraction code is only reporting a TPR date if the case plan goal is adoption. The program code is to report the TPR date when it occurs regardless of the current case plan goal.</p> <p>The extraction code for IhsIS, JCIS, and LUIS is only pulling what was entered in the system AFCARS field. If there are multiple TPR dates that need to be recorded for fathers, then the code may not be reporting the correct one.</p> <p>If a parent is deceased, the agency can use the deceased date for this field. There was one system (KIDS) that are doing this in the current extraction of data.</p>	2
49. Foster Family Structure	<u>Data Quality</u>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
<p>0=Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male</p>	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not Applicable = 5,707 (29%); Married Couple = 7,287 (37%); Unmarried Couple = 1,113 (6%); Single Female = 5,018 (26%); Single Male = 401 (2%); Not Reported = 7</p> <p>There are 5,537 records reported in FC41 as being a non-foster home setting. There are more records reported as “not applicable” and this is likely a default for missing data.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=65):</i> 3 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There were several record that the reviewers were not able to verify the information because the information was not provided for the case file review.</p> <p>There are four systems rated as “3” - ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and LUIS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There is an option in the FACTS system of “other” that needs to be removed from the screen. The screen options for foster family structure in IhsIS and JCIS are the same as those in FC44. The option “unable to determine” needs to be removed from the list.</p> <p>The extraction code for KIDS is not correctly setting the value “not applicable.” There were additional errors as well. While the field is the same for both the foster parent and the adoptive parent, the extraction of this information is done different in the extraction for foster care and adoption. There are issues that the federal team and state need to clarify.</p>	
50. Year of Birth (1st Foster Caretaker)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 13,810; Not Reported = 5,723 There are years of birth missing per the frequency findings in FC49.</p> <p>There are six systems rated as “3.”</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are issues with the system as well as the extraction code for LUIS. The logic is only correct when the child’s foster parent is a single female. The program code does not contain logic to first check the marital status and then to check the appropriate caretaker field in the system. If the foster family structure is “single male” then the program code is reporting his date of birth in FC51 instead of in this element.</p> <p>The program code for KIDS appears to not check for the information based on the report period being extracted.</p>	2
51. Year of Birth (2nd Foster Caretaker)	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 8,234; Not Reported = 11,299 There are years of birth missing per the frequency findings in FC49. There are 8,400 records reported as married and unmarried couple. In addition to the 5,537 records reported in FC41 as a non-foster home, there should be 5,419 records reported as blank because the foster parent is single and another seven</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>records reported as blank due to missing information in FC49. The total of blank records then for FC51 should be 10,963.</p> <p>There are three systems rated as “3” - ACYS, Berks, CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are issues with the system as well as the extraction code for LUIS. See note in FC51.</p> <p>The program code for KIDS appears to not check for the information based on the report period being extracted.</p>	
52. Race of 1st Foster Caretaker	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are not the same number of records reported as blank (Not Reported) for each of the race categories. The number of records with no information should be the same. This means there is an issue in how “applies” and “does not apply” is being entered/extracted. Also note prior discussions regarding cases reported as a non-foster home setting in FC41. Those records are to be reported as blanks for this element.</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the foster parents’ race fields, there should be an option of “declined” and another to account for situations where the person identifies as being more than one race, but does not know all races. For foster parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the foster parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There are two systems, ACYS and Berks, rated a “3.”</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> One system, IhsIS, does not have the capacity to collect more than one race. The data also reflects that there were no records where the foster parent had two or more races.</p> <p>As noted in FC8, child’s race, there are mapping errors in four systems (FACTS, IhsIS, KIDS, LUIS).</p> <p>There is an issue with the extraction code for CAPS based on the frequency report and case file review. The code has the condition to check for only foster home placements, but there is more data reported than should be for this element. The case file findings indicate these fields were not left blank when the child was in a non-foster home setting for one of the counties. It appears this is not consistently extracted across all the counties using CAPS. The agency needs to check the code and ensure that if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting as of the end of the report period, these fields are left blank. Also, note that the number of records reported as blank is not consistent across the race fields. In one of the counties using CAPS the case file review findings indicated the selected race was reported and the races that were not</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>applicable were incorrectly reported as blank.</p> <p>Also, the FACTS, IhsIS, and JCIS extraction code sets the race categories to zeroes if there is no provider or if the information was not entered. If race was not entered, or if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting, then these fields are to be left blank.</p> <p>There are an additional issues with KIDS. The agency needs to re-evaluate the extraction code in light of findings in the test cases and the case file review. It appears there is logic that is suppose to set the race fields to blank if the child is not in a foster home setting but there were no records reported as blank. The case file review findings also indicate that for those races not selected by the user as applying are not set to no by the program code. Additionally, the system contains information for other nationalities but the program code does not check them and map to the appropriate AFCARS race value.</p> <p>There was an issue in the LUIS extraction logic as well that was an issue for all elements 52 - 55. The logic and the system are gender specific and so the wrong information is reported for first foster caretaker when the foster parent is single.</p>	
<p>53. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 1st Foster Caretaker</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not Applicable = 5,718; Yes = 981 (5%); No = 12,782 (65%); Unable to determine = 52 (.27%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>As previously noted, the number of records reported in FC41 as a non-foster home setting is 5,537; the number that should be reported here for “not applicable.”</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the foster parents’ Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, there should be an option of “declined.” For foster parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the foster parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There are three systems rated a “3” - ACYS, Berks, and CAPS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> As noted in FC9, there are two systems (IhsIS and JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved. If the worker has not collected the information, the fields on the screen and in AFCARS are to be left blank.</p> <p>The extraction code for FACTS is initialized to “not applicable.” If the data are missing, this element will incorrectly be reported as “not applicable.”</p> <p>It appears that the logic for IhsIS is checking the wrong variable. The agency needs to confirm if there is an</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>error.</p> <p>In two systems (KIDS and LUIS) there were mapping errors. Also, the logic in the KIDS extraction code will set missing information to spaces. A subsequent check will set it to “not applicable” if all the values for the first foster caretaker are blank. If the child is placed in a non-foster home setting, then this element is to be set to “not applicable.” Otherwise, if the information is missing, then this element is to be set to blank.</p> <p>There are issues in the LUIS extraction logic that is the same issue for elements 52-55.</p>	
<p>54. Race of 2nd Foster Caretaker (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><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are not the same number of records reported as blank (Not Reported) for each of the race categories. The number of records with no information should be the same. This means there is an issue in how “applies” and “does not apply” is being entered/extracted. Also note prior discussions regarding cases reported as a non-foster home setting in FC41. Those records are to be reported as blanks for this element. Additionally, if the foster parent is single, these elements are to be reported as blank.</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the foster parents’ race fields, there should be an option of “declined” and another to account for situations where the person identifies as being more than one race, but does not know all races. For foster parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the foster parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There are two systems, ACYS and Berks, rated a “3.”</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There also is the same issue with the extraction code for CAPS with inconsistent numbers reported to AFCARS for these categories from what the extraction code appears to be extracting (see note in FC52).</p> <p>As noted in FC8, child’s race, there are mapping errors in four systems (FACTS, lhSIS, KIDS, LUIS). There is an additional issue with KIDS. It has other nationalities listed in the system but the program code does not check them and map to the appropriate AFCARS race value. Also, the FACTS and JCIS extraction code sets the race categories to zeroes if there is no provider or if the information was not entered. If race was not entered, or if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting or the foster parent is single, then these fields are to be left blank.</p> <p>One system, lhSIS, does not have the capacity to collect more than one race. The data also reflects that there were no records where the child had 2 or more races.</p> <p>There is an additional error in the KIDS extraction logic that was noted in the frequency report and the test</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>cases. For those races that were not selected by the user are not set to no by the program code. Also, if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting or the foster parent is single, these categories are to be reported as blank.</p> <p>There was an issue in the LUIS extraction logic as well that was an issue for all elements 49 -55.</p>	
<p>55. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 2nd Foster Caretaker (if applicable)</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not Applicable = 11,130 (57%); Yes = 609 (3%); No = 7,775 (40%); Unable to determine = 19 (.10%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>As previously noted, the number of records reported in FC41 as a non-foster home setting is 5,537 and the number of records reported as a single female and male is 5,419. The total response then for “not applicable” should be 10,956.</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the foster parents’ Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, there should be an option of “declined.” For foster parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the foster parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There are three systems rated as “3” - ACYS, Berks, and CAPS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> As noted in FC9, there are two systems (IhSIS and JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved. If the worker has not collected the information, the fields on the screen and in AFCARS are to be left blank.</p> <p>The extraction code for FACTS is initialized to “not applicable.” If the data are missing, this element will incorrectly be reported as “not applicable.”</p> <p>It appears that the logic for IhSIS is checking the wrong variable. The agency needs to confirm if there is an error.</p> <p>In two systems (KIDS and LUIS) there were mapping errors. Also, the logic in the KIDS extraction code will set missing information to spaces. A subsequent check will set it to “not applicable” if all the race values for the first foster caretaker are blank. If the child is placed in a non-foster home setting, then this element is to be set to “not applicable.” Otherwise, if the information is missing, then this element is to be set to blank.</p> <p>There was an issue in the LUIS extraction logic as well that was an issue for all elements 52-55.</p>	2
<p>56. Date of Discharge from Foster Care</p>	<p>As noted in GR8 and FC41, there are two systems (FACTS and KIDS) that when a child is placed in the home of removal, the agency’s responsibility for placement and care is dismissed. For other systems that</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>represent multiple counties, the State will need to ensure that all counties are correctly identifying the end of the AFCARS removal episode.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are 4,706 records reported with a discharge data and 14,827 reported as blank. There were several older dates (prior to 2013). There were counties that identified cases that had not been closed and these were included in this report period. The agency needs to ensure that cases that have been discharged from foster care are entered into the system in a timely manner.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between FC56 and 58. The number of records reported with a date of discharge is less than the number of records reported with a discharge reason.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> All of the systems are to be modified to correctly reflect youth who are 18 and not receiving title IV-E as discharged as of the youth's 18th birthday.</p> <p>If the youth is 18 years old and eligible for IV-E, once they are no longer eligible/receiving title IV-E funds, use the date the child is no longer eligible/receiving title IV-E funds as the discharge date. See GR7 for additional information.</p> <p>Youth who turn 19 or who lose their eligibility status between 4/1/2012 and 6/30/2012, are to be reported as discharged at the time the eligibility ended.</p> <p>For those systems in which the end of a placement is also used as a discharge date, the county and state must ensure that the discharge date reflects when the agency no longer has responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p>The agencies need to ensure the extraction code is setting this element with a discharge date that is within the report period being extracted. There are four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, and JCIS) in which it appears the extraction code is not limited to the report period. Modify the program code to add logic to check for dates based on the report period being extracted.</p> <p>There were issues in the FACTS collection and extraction of discharge dates. The agency had identified issues and has a plan for correcting the extraction of the information.</p>	
57. Foster Care Discharge Transaction Date	There were no identified issues with the selection of this information. See additional findings in GR15. The state and federal team will need to discuss this element due to changes needed for FC56.	4
58. Reason for Discharge	As noted in GR8 and FC41, there are two systems (FACTS and KIDS) that when a child is placed in the home of removal, the agency's responsibility for placement and care is dismissed. For those systems that	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
<p>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</p>	<p>represent multiple counties, the State will need to ensure that all counties are correctly identifying the end of the AFCARS removal episode.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not applicable = 14,694 (75%); Reunification = 2,425 (12%); Living with Other Relative(s) = 269 (1%); Adoption = 951 (5%); Emancipation = 440 (2%); Guardianship = 302 (2%); Transfer to Another Agency = 324 (2%); Runaway = 123 (1%); Death of Child = 5 (.03%); Not reported = 0 There is a discrepancy between FC56 and 58. The number of records reported with a date of discharge is less than the number of records reported with a discharge reason.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> All of the systems are to be modified to correctly reflect youth who are 18 and not receiving title IV-E as discharged as of the youth's 18th birthday. If the youth is 18 years old and eligible for IV-E, once they are no longer IV-E, use the last date receive IV-E as discharge date and discharge reason as emancipation. See GR7 for additional information.</p> <p>Youth who turn 19 or who lose their eligibility status between 4/1/2012 and 6/30/2012, report a discharge reason at the time the eligibility ended.</p> <p>The agencies need to ensure the extraction code is setting this element with a discharge reason that is within the report period being extracted (for subsequent files). There are four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and JCIS) in which it appears the extraction code is not limited to the report period. Modify the program code to add logic to check for dates based on the report period being extracted.</p> <p>For those systems (Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, and LUIS) that use the same values as are in the AFCARS regulation, ensure the outcome of a relative obtaining guardianship is entered as "guardianship" and not "live with relative."</p> <p>There are three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and KIDS) that have errors in the mapping of the agency's values to AFCARS. The agency also needs to provide definitions/clarifications to the Federal team for some of the options.</p> <p>There are additional questions the federal team has regarding the option list in ACYS. There are options listed, and mapped to AFCARS, that are not clear and may not reflect an actual discharge from the agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p>In one system (CAPS) the caseworker has to select "not applicable." This should be set with logic in the extraction code.</p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	The federal team has questions regarding the selection of this information in the JCIS system.	
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 59. Title IV-E (Foster Care) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=71):</i> 4 (6%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in three error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>As of the onsite review, the State’s title IV-E plan only included youth up to their 19th birthday if they meet certain eligibility criteria for title IV-E.</p> <p>The State’s title IV-E plan amendment has been approved effective July 1, 2012. - For the 2012B report period of April 1 through June 30, 2012: > records of youth 19 up to the age of 21 are excluded from the reporting population ((see GR7). > records of youth who are eligible and receiving title IV-E up to the age of 19, will be set to “applies.” > records of youth who turn 18 in this time frame who are not eligible for title IV-E will be set to “does not apply.”</p> <p>There appear to be no technical issues for all the systems except for ACYS. Based on onsite discussion, there may be issues with the selection of this information in the extract code of ACYS. If the child is eligible for title IV-E, but spends the full six months in a hospital or locked facility, this element is to be set to “does not apply.”</p> <p>The agencies should verify that the numbers reported for this element are accurate.</p> <p>There were issues identified with the test cases. For instance, a child who enters foster care under the Safe Haven program is not eligible for title IV-E foster care payments. Also, if a child is in a facility for the full six month period that is not reimbursable, this field is to be updated to indicate “does not apply.”</p>	2
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 60. Title IV-E (Adoption Assistance) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	<p>There are technical issues for FACTS and IhsIS. The agencies may have a small number of cases where adoption assistance funds are paid prior to finalization. However, the logic to set the value for adoption assistance has been commented out in FACTS and this element is always reported as “does not apply.” The program code for IhsIS is initialized to “does not apply” and there is no code to actually set this field to “applies.”</p> <p>The program code needs to check if there are any records in which the agency used IV-E AA for the foster care maintenance payment prior to the finalization of the adoption.</p>	2
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 61. Title IV-A 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	<p>The agencies need to ensure that it is not recording/reporting the title IV-A (TANF) payment the family from whom the child was removed may have received. This element is to reflect a child in foster care and can only be paid to a relative.</p> <p>The IhsIS, including the system used by the county JPO, incorrectly indicates on the screen “Prior to removal child received IV-A Y/N.” This field is to reflect if a child in foster care is receiving title IV-E (placed</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	<p>with a relative).</p> <p>The extraction logic for KIDS must be modified to check for this information after the child's removal date in the period the child entered foster care.</p>	
<p>Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 62. Title IV-D (Child Support)</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."</p> <p>One system, FACTS, must modify the program code to include logic to set this element.</p>	2
<p>Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 63. Title XIX (Medicaid)</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 10 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."</p> <p>The agencies are encouraged to monitor the data to ensure accuracy.</p>	3
<p>Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 64. SSI or Other Social Security Benefits</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 4 (6%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in three error cases should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."</p> <p>The agencies are encouraged to monitor the data to ensure accuracy.</p>	3
<p>Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 65. None of the Above</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In seven of the error cases this element indicated "applies" but the reviewers found that one, or more, of the above items did apply and that there were no other sources of income found for the child. In one error case the reviewer found other sources of income in addition to those selected in 59 -64. This element should have been reported as applying as well.</p> <p>The program code and system should allow for this to be applies in addition to one of elements 59-64 also applying.</p>	2
<p>66. Amount of Monthly Foster Care Payment</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=20):</i> The majority of cases were not analyzed because the reviewers were not able to find the information. Of the 20 records analyzed, there were two in error. In both cases the amount reported to AFCARS did not match what was in the paper documentation.</p> <p>There are two systems (ACYS and JCIS) that were rated a 3.</p> <p>There are several systems that are adding together payments that may be to multiple providers in one month. If the child has not been in the same setting for the calendar month, the program code should check for the prior month (etc.) to check for a month with a full payment to the same provider. Note that this method may not reflect the current living arrangement reported in FC41. To make the data in this element</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings/Notes	Rating Factor
	more consistent, if the child has not been in the same level of a care setting for the full month, set this element to zeroes. Additionally, the program code for Berks is only using the last month of the report period.	

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
1. Title IV-E Agency		4
2. Report Period Ending Date		4
3. Record number		4
4. Did the title IV-E Agency have any involvement in this adoption? 1=Yes 2=No	<p>This item is linked to the General Requirements items #9 and 11. As noted in the General Requirements Findings, the State has elected not to voluntarily report other adoptions in which the agency has no involvement.</p> <p>There are three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and IhsIS) that were rated a 4 for this element. Each of these systems hardcoded the response to “yes.”</p> <p>There are three systems (Berks, CAPS, and JCIS) that are rated a 3. For these three systems there is a field in the system that the user checks “yes” or “no.” Berks also uses a form which includes this field with a yes/no response. Since the State is only reporting adoptions in which they are involved there does not seem to be a need for the worker to enter this information. If the worker is entering information on an adoption case, then the agency must have involvement with that adoption.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The program code for both KIDS and LUIS is checking responses to certain fields and are not accurately checking all the relevant fields. Also, see GR11 for findings related to the reporting population.</p>	2
5. Child’s Date of Birth	There were no issues identified for this element.	4
6. Sex 1=Male 2=Female	There were no issues identified for this element.	4
7. Child’s Race 0=No 1=Yes 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><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> There was one error case where the reviewer found an additional race that was not reported.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The following systems use a single client screen to record demographics: CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS. The remaining systems are designed in way that requires this information to be reentered; it is possible that it could differ from what was reported in the foster care file. The agencies need to ensure that the two fields match and are reflective of what the child (if age appropriate) or parent had identified as the race for the child.</p> <p>In FACTS, IhsIS, KIDS, and LUIS technical issues found for FC8 apply to this element. In two systems (ACYS and Berks) the program code will default to “unable to determine” if no race information was entered.</p> <p>Use of AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine:” Options should be reflective of the actual</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	information related to why information on race was not collected. The infant entered under Safe Haven, the child was abandoned or the parents were incapacitated and no one was available to provide race information; or, the parents declined to provide the information. If the information was not asked or not recorded, the race fields should be left blank and reported as blank.	
8. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 120 (13%); No = 779 (86%); Unable to determine = 9 (1%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been "yes" instead of "unable to determine."</p> <p>There was one system (CAPS) with no identified technical issues. Since there were errors in the test cases for <i>all</i> systems, the State needs to ensure that the workers are asking for the person's ethnicity and entering what was provided by the family/youth.</p> <p>See the note in AD7 regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of "unable to determine."</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The following systems use a single client screen to record demographics: CAPS, FACTS, IhsSIS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS. The remaining systems are designed in way that requires this information to be reentered; it is possible that it could differ from what was reported in the foster care file. The agencies need to ensure that the two fields match and are reflective of what the child (if age appropriate) or parent had identified the race of the child to be.</p> <p>Additionally, see the findings for FC8 and 9 for IhsSIS.</p> <p>In two systems (KIDS, LUIS) there were mapping errors.</p> <p>For two systems (ACYS, FACTS) the only values mapped are "yes" and "no." If these are not found, the extraction logic sets FC9 to "unable to determine." The element should be set to blank.</p>	2
9. Has the title IV-E agency determined that the child has special needs? 1=Yes 2=No	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 794 (87%); No = 114 (13%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>There are a couple issues with the data reported for element 9. First, there are fewer records reported as "no" than there are reported as "not applicable" in element #10. Secondly, there is an inconsistency between this element and AD35. The data in element 35 indicates there are more children receiving an adoption subsidy than there are children who were determined to be eligible and have a special need.</p> <p>The response of "yes" in AD9 can be greater than the number of records reported as "yes" (child is receiving a subsidy) in element 35 but not fewer.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p><i>Case File Findings (n=27):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “yes” instead of “no.” The child was “at-risk” for future health issues. Note that the AFCARS file indicated “yes” for AD35. There were two records that the response was questionable. One had AD35 as “yes,” AD36 had an amount, and AD37 was “yes.” The reviewer indicated the child did not have special needs and was not able to verify the amount in AD36 or if the child is receiving funds from IV-E AA. The other case indicated no for AD9 and not applicable for AD10 as well as AD35 and 37 as “no,” and AD36 had a zero amount. However, the reviewer indicated AD35 and AD37 as “yes” and an amount for AD36.</p> <p>There is one system (Berks) that this information is first completed by the caseworker on a form and then submitted to Fiscal/Clerical staff to enter into the system. There were no technical issues identified with the extraction of the information. For FACTS, there is a form for determining eligibility and this information is then entered into the system.</p> <p>There are four systems (ACYS, CAPS, JCIS, LUIS) that this information is entered into the system and there does not appear to be forms that are completed by the caseworkers.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The program code for LUIS always sets this element to “yes.” If the agency’s policy/practice is to determine all children eligible for adoption assistance, then this is fine. The agency needs to investigate and provide feedback to the federal team.</p> <p>There are issues with the extraction of this information and the information in AD10 for FACTS and KIDS. The information extracted from FACTS is based on what is extracted in AD10. See issues noted for AD 10. For KIDS, it is possible that not all criteria are being included in the evaluation for this element.</p>	
<p>10. Primary Factor or Condition for Special Needs</p> <p>0=Not applicable 1=Racial/Ethnic Background 2=Age 3=Membership in a Sibling Group 4=Medical conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5=Other</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Not Applicable = 107 (12%); Racial/Ethnic Background = 311 (34%); Age = 103 (11%); Sibling Group =238 (26%); Medical, etc. = 120 (13%); Other = 29 (3%); Not reported = 0</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=27):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response should have been “other” instead of “not applicable.”</p> <p>Additionally, see the notes in AD9.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> As noted in AD9, there are issues with the FACTS and KIDS systems on how this data is collected/extracted. The FACTS system does not contain all the same characteristics as noted on the eligibility form and is instead only checking a couple of characteristics from within the system. There is no indication that the caseworker has identified the primary basis (biggest barrier to adoption) for special needs.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	The program code for KIDS is incorrectly setting this element based on a hierarchy and is not child specific. There also does not appear to be a means to identify what the caseworker has determined to be the primary basis of special needs.	
Elements #11 – 15 0=Does not Apply 1=Yes, applies	<p>Unlike the foster care file, this data is not dependent on the dates since this file is a point in time file and the conditions had to be active in order for AD10 to be selected as “medical.”</p> <p>There was one system (JCIS) that did not appear to have any technical issues and was rated a 3.</p> <p>There are three systems (ACYS, Berks, FACTS) that the federal and state team need to discuss further.</p> <p>There are four systems (CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, and LUIS) that if a child has a diagnosed condition this information is reported regardless of what is reported in AD10. The logic must be changed to only report diagnosed conditions if AD10 is set to the AFCARS value “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.” It is not clear that the extraction code for ACYS and KIDS is correct in regard to this standard. The agency will need to verify and respond to the federal team.</p> <p>As noted in AD9 and 10 there are issues with FACTS. In addition to the prior notes, it is not clear from which of the systems FACTS or FACTS2 these elements are extracted from and how the information in the two systems are synced. Also, it appears that if there is more than one diagnosed condition category, only one is reported.</p> <p>The extraction logic for KIDS uses the medical section of the system. There are conditions not being mapped and others that are incorrectly mapped. The extraction code for KIDS also contains logic to default AD13 to applies if the response to AD10 is “4” but all of 11 - 15 are set to “does not apply.”</p> <p>Also, see notes in FC11 - 15 for any mapping issues.</p>	
11. Type of Disability-Mental Retardation		2
12. Type of Disability-Visually or Hearing Impaired	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”	2
13. Type of Disability-Physically Disabled		2
14. Type of Disability-Emotionally Disturbed	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.” The child’s primary basis for special needs was “age” not medical. In the other case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” The wrong category was marked as applying.	2
15. Type of Disability-Other Medically Diagnosed Condition Requiring Special Care	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 7 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.” In each case the child’s primary	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	basis for special needs was not medical.	
16. Mother's Year of Birth	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: There are 11 records reported as blank. <i>Case File Findings (n=29)</i>: 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The year that was reported to AFCARS was 1900.</p> <p>There are two systems (ACYS and lhSIS) rated a 3.</p> <p>All agencies need to ensure that the information entered for this element reflects the last legal parent of the child.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> In two systems (Berks and JCIS) the screen used is labeled "birth parent." The language on the screen needs to be changed so that it is clear the information is on the most recent legal parent of the child. The same is true for LUIS and FACTS but there are other screens where the parent's year of birth is entered. The data appear to be reentered for the parents on the adoption screen. This could also cause additional errors. It is not clear for FACTS or LUIS that the extraction logic is reporting the date of birth for the most recent legal parent.</p> <p>In one system (CAPS) the program code is only checking for a biological mother. If the child had been previously adopted, it is possible that the prior legal mother's year of birth is not correctly reported. The program code must check for the prior parent's year of birth.</p> <p>The extraction logic for KIDS is incorrectly setting this element to zeroes if no year of birth is found. The field is to be set to blank. Also, it is not clear that the code will correctly pick up the legal mom's year of birth.</p>	2
17. Father's Year of Birth	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: There are 253 records reported as blank.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29)</i>: 4 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In three of the error cases the AFCARS field was blank but the reviewer found the year of birth in the file.</p> <p>See the findings for AD16. The same issues apply to this element.</p>	2
18. Was the Mother married at the time of the child's birth?	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: Yes = 132 (15%); No = 638 (70%); Unable to determine = 138 (15%); Not Reported = 0 The number of records reported as "unable to determine" is high.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=28)</i>: 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>one error case the response should have been “yes” instead of “no.” In the other error case, the response should have been “no” instead of “unable to determine.”</p> <p>There is one system (Berks) rated a 3.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> In three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and KIDS) the program code defaults missing information to “unable to determine.” If the information is missing, this element is to be set to blank.</p> <p>In three systems (CAPS, JCIS, LUIS) the field that collects this information is in the adoption module and so is not entered until the time the child is adopted, or in the process of being adopted. The field needs to be moved to the section of the system recording assessment information on the child/family or possibly on a demographics screen.</p> <p>In one system (IhSIS) there is no logic to report “unable to determine.” How does the agency account for infants that enter under Safe Haven? Are they always certain the mother was not married? The system should have a field indicating if the child was a Safe Haven Infant and the extraction code check for this indicator.</p> <p>Also, all local agencies need to ensure that the value “unable to determine” is being used correctly - reflect infants entering foster care under Safe Haven.</p>	
19. Date of Mother’s Termination of Parental Rights	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 3 records reported as blank.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=28):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The date found by the reviewer was the hearing date and this was not the date reported in AFCARS. In other cases, it appears the hearing date is reported.</p> <p>There are three systems (FACTS, JCIS, and KIDS) that are using the same field for foster care and adoption, using different fields but the data are brought forward to an adoption screen, or the program code checks both fields. These systems were given a rating of a 3 for this element.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> For two systems (ACYS and Berks) there is a field in an adoption module where this data is directly extracted from into the AFCARS field. What is not clear about these systems is whether the date is being brought forward from the foster care component of the system or if it is being re-entered. There are issues noted in FC47 that may need to be addressed as well for this element.</p> <p>In the system CAPS the program code only checks the relationship of “biological.” If the last parent to the</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>child was a legal parent (in the case of a prior adoption), then the program code may very well be reporting the wrong individual.</p> <p>The systems lhSIS and LUIS appear to be extracting the data from the same field as was used in foster care but it is not checking for the latest TPR date as of the date of the adoption.</p> <p>See findings for FC47.</p>	
20. Date of Father's Termination of Parental Rights	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: There are 16 records reported as blank.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=28)</i>: 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The date found by the reviewer was the hearing date and this was not the date reported in AFCARS. In other cases, it appears the hearing date is reported.</p> <p>See the findings for AD19 as well as FC48.</p>	2
21. Date Adoption Legalized	<p>There are three systems (lhSIS, JCIS, and LUIS) that are rated a 4 for this element.</p> <p>There are four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and FACTS) that have a field for the adoption finalization date in the adoption component of their system. The date is not being brought forward from the foster care field nor is it being populated by the date of discharge field. While these systems were not rated a 2 due to their data entry process, they should be addressing this in regard to a quality assurance process and revising the system and extraction code to use the date of discharge.</p> <p>There are multiple fields in KIDS that this date could be entered and it is not clear if it is entered once and then populates the other fields, or if it has to be entered multiple times. Also, the program code is checking two different dates, legalization and finalization dates, and it is not clear why. The agency needs to clarify and ensure that the actual date the judge orders the adoption final is what gets reported for this element. The date should also be the same date reported in FC56.</p>	2
Adoptive Parent Information (Elements #22 – 28)	<p>There are systems that have a separate field for the adoptive parent's information. The information is re-entered even if the adoptive parents were the child's foster parents. The information should be the same and carried forward if the adoptive parents were also the foster parents, and not re-entered. At a minimum, this needs to be incorporated into the QA process.</p>	
22. Adoptive Parents' Family Structure 1=Married couple 2=Unmarried couple 3=Single female 4=Single male	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: Married Couple = 600 (66%); Unmarried Couple = 52 (6%); Single Female = 242 (27%); Single Male = 14 (2%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>There are five systems (ACYS, Berks, lhSIS, JCIS, and LUIS) rated a 4.</p> <p>In FACTS, the field used are the same as those noted in FC49. The adoption element was rated a 3 for this reason and issues noted in FC49 for corrections would be carried over to the extraction of this element.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> In CAPS, the extraction code includes mapping of “unable to determine.” This was not an option on the screen and needs to be removed from the logic to ensure it is not incorrectly reported for this element (invalid data).</p> <p>The program code in KIDS is incorrectly mapping separated to single instead of married. Also, if nothing is found it sets this element to single male. The program code should have logic to specifically check if the adoptive parent is a single male and if no information is entered, set the element to blank.</p>	
23. Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 14 records reported as blank (same as the number reported for single male in AD22).</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case the year reported was 1990 but the reviewer found an actual year of 1980. In the other case a wrong year of birth was reported.</p> <p>There are three systems (CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS) using the same fields to record/extract this data that are used for the foster parents. The agencies need to verify that this data is the same if the foster parents are adopting the child and that there are no discrepancies. The fields appear to be gender neutral and the agencies need to ensure that information on same-sex couples is reported correctly. FACTS received a rating of 3 for this element. See below for findings on CAPS and KIDS.</p> <p>There are two systems (Berks, IhsIS) rated a 3. For those adoptive parents who were foster parents, the systems do not carry forward the person’s demographic information. Instead the user has to re-enter the information. It is not clear that the system or the extraction is correctly reporting a same-sex couple’s information. The rating may be changed after the federal team receives information from the state.</p> <p>JCIS was rated a 3 as well. However, it is not clear if information is re-entered or carried forward from the same fields used for foster parents.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> In ACYS there is an issue related to reporting information on single adoptive parents for elements 23 - 28. If the child’s adoptive parent is a single male, this element is to be left blank.</p> <p>CAPS is using the same vendor fields used for the foster parents. However, it is not clear that there is not the same issue in the extraction code as was found in ACYS. The agency needs to review and provide information to the federal team.</p> <p>As noted in AD22 for KIDS there is an issue with how the program code is identifying the adoptive parents.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	The code needs to be re-examined and simplified to check for the individuals who adopted the child. Also, since the field is the same one used for foster parents, the logic should be similar except that it must check gender if the adoptive parent is single.	
24. Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: There are 240 records reported as blank. There are 242 records reported as single female in AD22.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29)</i>: 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. A wrong year of birth was reported.</p> <p>See the notes in AD23 for Berks, FACTS, IhsIS, and JCIS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> In ACYS if the child is adopted by a single male, this element is incorrectly left blank. His date of birth is to be reported for this element.</p> <p>CAPS is using the same vendor fields used for the foster parents. However, it is not clear that there is not the same issue in the extraction code as was found in ACYS. The agency needs to review and provide information to the federal team.</p> <p>As noted in AD22 for KIDS there is an issue with how the program code is identifying the adoptive parents. The code needs to be re-examined and simplified to check for the individuals who adopted the child. Also, since the field is the same one used for foster parents, the logic should be similar except that it must check gender if the adoptive parent is single.</p>	2
25. Adoptive Mother's Race	<p><u>Data Quality</u> See previous note in the foster parent elements regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of "unable to determine." For adoptive parents, the options should be the races, decline, and multi-racial/additional race(s) not known.</p> <p><i>Frequency Report (n=908)</i>: There are six records reported as blank but there are 14 records reported as single male in AD22.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29)</i>: 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the adoptive parent was a single male and the race categories had a response of "no" instead of being left blank.</p> <p>There are two systems (Berks and JCIS) rated a 3. See previous notes concerning accurate data.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p>For ACYS, see notes in AD23 as this issues affects all of the elements for the adoptive parent. If the child's adoptive parent is a single male, the race categories are to be left blank for AD25.</p> <p>The program code for CAPS, FACTS, KIDS is incorrectly setting these fields to "no" if the child's adoptive parent is a single male. These fields are to be set to blank. Additionally, there are mapping errors for KIDS.</p> <p>The programming logic for FACTS needs to be simplified; see prior notes.</p> <p>The system lhSIS only collects one race. The agency must be able to collect and report all applicable races a person identifies. Also, there is no value to collect Asian.</p> <p>As noted in prior race elements there is an issue with the mapping for LUIS.</p>	
<p>26. Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin</p> <p>0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Not Applicable = 10; Yes = 67 (7%); No = 828 (91%); Unable to determine = 3 (.33%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>There are 14 records reported as single male in AD22. There should be 14 records reported in this element as "not applicable."</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value "unable to determine." For the adoptive parents' Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, there should be an option of "declined." For adoptive parents, records reported as "unable to determine" should only be those in which the adoptive parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There is one system (JCIS) rated a 3.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> For ACYS, the program code sets this field to "unable to determine" if a value of "yes" or "no" is not found. Also, see notes in AD23 as this issues affects all of the elements for the adoptive parent. If the child's adoptive parent is a single male, the program code is to set this element to "not applicable."</p> <p>There are four additional system (Berks, FACTS, KIDS, LUIS) that must modify the program code to set this element to "not applicable" if the child is adopted by a single male.</p> <p>If there is no information entered, the program code for CAPS and LUIS defaults this element to "not applicable."</p> <p>See prior issues related to the collection and reporting of race and Hispanic ethnicity in the foster parent elements for lhSIS. The same issues apply to the adoptive parents.</p>	2
<p>27. Adoptive Father's Race</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u></p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
<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>See previous note in the foster parent elements regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of “unable to determine.” For adoptive parents, the options should be the races, decline, and multi-racial/additional race(s) not known.</p> <p><i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 182 records reported as blank but there are 242 records reported as single female in AD22.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The adoptive parent was a single female and the race categories had a response of “no” instead of being left blank.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> For ACYS, see notes in AD23 as this issues affects all of the elements for the adoptive parent. If the child is adopted by a single female, these fields are to be reported as blank (ACYS and KIDS).</p> <p>While it appears that there were errors in AD25 (CAPS and FACTS) if the child was adopted by a single male, these fields seem to be reported correctly (blank) if the child was adopted by a single female. The agency will need to verify the code is correct.</p> <p>There are mapping errors for KIDS.</p> <p>The programming logic for FACTS needs to be simplified; see prior notes.</p> <p>The system lHsIS only collects one race. The agency must be able to collect and report all applicable races a person identifies. Also, there is no value to collect Asian.</p> <p>As noted in prior race elements there is an issue with the mapping for LUIS.</p>	
<p>28. Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin</p> <p>0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine</p>	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Not Applicable = 240 (26%); Yes = 41 (5%); No = 620 (68%); Unable to determine = 7 (1%); Not Reported = 0 There are 242 records reported as single female in AD22. There should be 242 records reported in this element as “not applicable.”</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the adoptive parents’ Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, there should be an option of “declined.” For adoptive parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the adoptive parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There is one system (JCIS) rated a 3.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There are five system (ACYS, Berks, FACTS, KIDS, LUIS) that must modify the program code to set this element to “not applicable” if the child is adopted by a single female. ACYS must be modified in instances where the child is adopted by a single male; report the adoptive father’s Hispanic Origin to this element.</p> <p>If there is no information entered, the program code for CAPS and LUIS defaults this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>See prior issues related to the collection and reporting of race and Hispanic ethnicity in the foster parent elements for lhSIS. The same issues apply to the adoptive parents.</p>	
<p>Elements #29 – 32</p> <p>0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies</p>	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> For elements 29 - 32, there are 964 response reflecting those agencies that are indicating all relationships that apply between the child and the adoptive parent(s).</p> <p>Systems that more than one option can be selected - ACYS, Berks, CAPS, lhSIS, and LUIS.</p> <p>Systems that the extraction code is extracting all that apply - ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and LUIS.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p> <p>In one system (FACTS), there is no clear method of recording or reporting all applicable relationships. The system needs to be modified to accurately collect all possible combination of relationships between the child and the adoptive parents and the program code map each that applies.</p> <p>While lhSIS has the capacity to collect all the information needed for these elements, the program code is not correctly extracting the information. Other non- relative (AD32) is reported if nothing is reported for #29 – 31.</p> <p>The collection of this information in KIDS and JCIS also is not multi-select. The system and related extraction code must be modified.</p>	
29. Relationship to Adoptive Parent-Stepparent	Note that even though this element is rated a 4 if a child in foster care is adopted by a step-parent then this would need to be recorded and reported as applying.	4
30. Relationship to Adoptive Parent -Other Relative	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> 141 (16%) reported as “applies.”</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=27):</i> 4 (15%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “yes” instead of does not apply. The adoptive parent also was a foster parent (correctly reported).</p>	2
31. Relationship to Adoptive Parent -Foster Parent	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> 531 (59%) reported as “applies.”</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 6 (21%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
	The responses should have been “yes” instead of does not apply. The adoptive parent also was a relative (correctly reported).	
32. Relationship to Adoptive Parent -Other Non-relative	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> 292 (32%) reported as “applies.”</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=27):</i> 15 (56%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The responses should have been “yes” instead of does not apply. The adoptive parent also was a foster parent (correctly reported).</p> <p>The program code for IhsIS checks the values mapped for elements #29 – 31 and if none are “applies,” the value of element #32 defaults to “yes, applies.” The code needs to check if the response for each question and map accordingly.</p>	2
33. Child was placed from 1=Within State or Tribal Service Area 2=Another State or Tribal Service Area 3=Another Country	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Within State = 906; Another State or Tribal Service Area = 2; Another Country = 0</p> <p>There are two systems (FACTS and LUIS) that upon re-evaluation during the postsite were determined to have a rating of 1 because the system does not have the capacity to collect this information. The program code is instead automatically setting all adoption records to the AFCARS value of 1, Within State.</p> <p>The KIDS system does not have a value for “another country.” The agency must add and modify the program code to check for it in the event this situation occurs.</p> <p>The agency (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, JCIS) needs to ensure that if a family in PA is adopting a special needs child through a private agency located in another state that the option “another state” was entered into the system.</p>	1
34. Child was placed by 1=Public agency 2=Private agency 3=Tribal Agency 4=Independent person 5=Birth parent	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Public agency = 907; Private agency = 0; Tribal Agency = 0; Independent person = 0; Birth parent = 1; Not reported = 0</p> <p>The agencies need to ensure that if a family in PA is adopting a special needs child through a private agency located in-State or in another state that the option “private agency” was entered into the system.</p> <p>In two systems (FACTS and LUIS) upon re-evaluation during the postsite was determined to have a rating of 1 because the system does not have the capacity to collect this information. The program code is instead automatically setting all adoption records to the AFCARS value of 1, Public Agency.</p> <p>IhsIS was rated a 4 and all other systems were rated a 3.</p>	1
35. Is the Child Receiving a Monthly Subsidy?	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 854 (94%); No = 54 (6%); Not Reported = 0</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
1=Yes 2=No	<p>There is an issue with the data reported for this element versus what is reported in AD9. There were only 794 (87%) children determined eligible as a special needs child.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings:</i> There were four cases marked as questionable.</p> <p>The program code for FACTS, lhSIS, and LUIS checks if there is a payment greater than zero. There was no screen field to collect this information. The systems were rated a 2 but a field may need to be added to determine if Medicaid is the only subsidy noted in the adoption subsidy agreement.</p> <p>KIDS is only capturing a payment and not if the only subsidy is Medicaid. The system and/or extraction logic will need to be modified. There is a field to indicate Medical coverage. The code should check if this is checked if there is no payment amount.</p> <p>The current screens used for Berks will be replaced. The element is rated a 2 at this point. The agency needs to provide information how this will be collected in the new screens.</p> <p>All other systems were rated a 3. For ACYS, CAPS, JCIS there is a field that the worker indicates if the child is receiving a subsidy. This is a training issue to ensure workers know to enter “yes” if Medicaid is the only subsidy in the adoption agreement.</p>	
36. Monthly Amount	<p><i>Case File Findings:</i> There were two cases marked as questionable.</p> <p>There are two systems (ACYS, JCIS) rated a 3. Agencies need to ensure this is the amount that is in the adoption agreement. lhSIS is rated a 3 but the federal team needs the screen field where this is recorded. The rating may be re-evaluated.</p> <p>Berks forms and system reflect a per diem amount. The agency needs to confirm if that is the amount written into the adoption agreement or if there is a full monthly amount in the agreement. The element is rated a 2 at this time.</p> <p>There is no field in LUIS to record the amount from the adoption agreement. The extraction code is using a maintenance payment or a service payment. There should be a field for the amount in the adoption agreement. The federal and state team need to discuss to determine if this should be rated a 2 or a 1.</p> <p>There are three systems (CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS) that are using a sum function to add together payments instead of reporting the amount from the adoption agreement.</p>	2
37. Is the Child receiving a title IV-E adoption subsidy? 1=Yes	<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 732 (81%); No = 176 (19%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=26):</i> 3 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In two error cases, the response should have been “no” instead of “yes.” In one error case, this element</p>	2

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Findings	Rating Factor
2=No	<p>was reported as “yes” but there was a zero amount reported in AD36.</p> <p>For those systems (Berks, KIDS) not checking if the only subsidy is Medicaid, the program code for this element is to be set to “no.”</p> <p>The logic in the extraction code for FACTS is not checking if the child is receiving title IV-E; it sets this element based on the amount of payment.</p> <p>The logic and system for LUIS needs re-evaluated by the agency. It is not clear that the program code is correctly setting this element.</p> <p>For other systems, ensure that if the only subsidy is Medicaid the user correctly enters “no” for this element.</p>	

Section 3

Case File Review

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
5. Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable)	65	12	1	0	<p>There were four error cases in which the reviewer found a later date than the one reported to AFCARS. In one instance, it appears the date of the discharge hearing was reported and that a periodic review did not occur at that hearing. There had been one earlier review. In another instance, the date reported was a year before the one the reviewer found.</p> <p>In two error cases, the reviewers found an earlier date than what was reported to AFCARS. There was a month difference.</p> <p>In one error case, the AFCARS field was blank but the reviewer found a periodic review had been held.</p> <p>In one error case, the youth was 18 and not receiving title IV-E. The record should have been reported as a discharge in the prior report period and the review date should have been the last one prior to the youth's 18th birthday.</p>
6. Date of Birth	78	0	0	0	
7. Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	78	0	0	0	
8. Child's Race 0=No 1=Yes a. American Indian or Alaska Native	75	0	2	1	

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine					
9. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	76	2	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine."
10. Has the Child Been Clinically Diagnosed with a Disability(ies)? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Not Yet Determined	38	39	1	0	In 11 error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In two error cases, the response should have been "not yet determined" instead of "no." In two systems all the error cases were reported as "not yet determined (total of 26 records). In 19 of the records, the response is assumed to be "no." The reviewers did not always find information in the file relating to the child's health status. In seven of the cases the response should have been "yes." Many of these children had been in foster care for several years and two had entered foster care in early 2014.
11. Mental Retardation 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	75	2	1	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
12. Visually or Hearing Impaired 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	76	1	1	0	
13. Physically Disabled (Child) 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	75	2	1	0	In the error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
14. Emotionally Disturbed (DSM-IV) 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	59	18	1	0	In 14 error cases the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply." In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
15. Other Medically Diagnosed Conditions Requiring Special Care 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	71	6	1	0	In one error case the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies." In five error cases the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
16. Has this Child Ever Been Adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	61	17	0	0	In 13 error cases the response was "unable to determine." However, the response in FC17 was "not applicable." The response in FC16 should have been "no." In four error cases, the response reported to AFCARS was "unable to determine" but the reviewers found the children had never been adopted.
17. If Yes, How Old was the Child when Adoption was Legalized?	74	4	0	0	The responses should have been "not applicable" instead of "unable to determine."

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
0 = Not Applicable 1=less than 2 years old 2=2-5 years old 3=6 to 12 years old 4=13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine					
18. Date of First Removal from Home	64	12	2	0	<p>In two error cases, the reviewers found a removal episode that preceded the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In three error cases, the date of first removal was incorrect because the child's initial placement was in a hospital. The date reported to AFCARS was the date the agency received responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p>In two error cases, the date was incorrect because the child's first placement was a detention center.</p> <p>In four error cases, the reviewer found the date of first removal was actually earlier than what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case, the first removal episode was less than 24 hours. The start date of the second episode should have been reported instead.</p>
19. Total Number of Removals from Home To Date	68	5	5	0	<p>There were three error cases in which the number of removals was more than the number reported to AFCARS. In two of the cases a previous removal episode was identified that was not included in the AFCARS report. In the other case there were two additional removals that were not included due to</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					<p>the agency not correctly identifying a removal episode. The child had been removed from a custodial parent and placed with the non-custodial parent and then again removed and placed into foster care.</p> <p>There were two error cases in which the number of removals reported was less than the number found by the reviewer. In one case this was due the child was actually in the same continuous episode. In the other, the first episode was less than 24 hours.</p> <p>In five of the cases reviewed, the reviewer was not able to find and verify the number of removals. One of the cases was reported to have only 2 removals but based on notes in the case there appears to have been additional episodes.</p>
20. Date Child was Discharged from Last Foster Care Episode	66	7	4	1	<p>In two error cases the reviewer found a removal episode that preceded the one reported for this element. A date should have been reported for this element.</p> <p>In two error cases, the AFCARS had a date and should have been blank. In one case, the child was reported as having two removal episodes but the reviewer found the child was in the same continuous episode. In the other case, the first episode was less than 24 hours.</p> <p>In two error cases, the date of discharge from the prior episode was a day later than what was reported to AFCARS.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					<p>In one error case, the date should have been a later date than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In the questionable case it was not clear if the initial setting was a detention center and then the child entered foster care or if the child returned to the relative home that they had been living in. If it was the later, then this would not have been a removal episode.</p>
21. Date of Latest Removal from Home	65	12	0	1	<p>In three error cases the date of removal was incorrect because the child's initial placement was in a hospital.</p> <p>In five error cases, the date was incorrect because the child's first placement was a detention center.</p> <p>In four error case, the actual date of removal was earlier than what was reported. In one case the reviewer found the child had been in one continuous removal episode; AFCARS reflected more than one removal episode. In one situation, it appears that the first placement setting was not included as foster care.</p> <p>The case listed as questionable was because it was not clear if the initial setting was a detention center and then entered foster care or if the child returned to the relative home that they had been living in.</p>
23. Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting	64	12	1	1	<p>In two error cases the date is incorrect because the reviewers were able to only identify one placement that the child had while in foster care.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					<p>In one error case, the date of placement was incorrect and was a later date than the one reported to AFCARS because the reviewer found a second placement.</p> <p>In one error case, the date was incorrect because the initial setting in the removal episode was a hospital and this was the date reported. The date should have been the date the child entered the foster care setting (which was the same date as in FC21) and the child only had the one placement.</p> <p>In six error cases, the date was incorrect and was an earlier date than the one reported. In one instance it was because the reviewer noted the child was in the same placement setting, and in three cases the date reported to AFCARS was after the actual physical move of the child.</p> <p>In one error case, the actual date of placement was later than the date reported (it was not clear what the reported date represented).</p>
24. Number of Previous Placement Settings During this Removal Episode	56	18	3	1	<p>In seven error cases, the number of placements were found to be fewer than what was reported to AFCARS. In one case (shared case), the child was placed in a hospital for four days and the stay should not have been included in the count. In two cases, the reviewers were able to identify only one placement that the child had while in foster care. In four cases, the count incorrectly included the child's initial placement of a hospital/locked facility.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					In 11 error cases, there were more placements than what was reported because the reviewer found additional placement(s). For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
25. Manner of Removal from Home for Current Removal Episode 1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	75	2	0	1	FACTS: In the two error cases "voluntary" was reported to AFCARS but the reviewers noted "court order." For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
26. Physical Abuse (alleged/reported)	76	1	0	1	The response should have been "does not apply" instead of "apply." There was abuse in a prior episode for a different child in the family. For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
27. Sexual Abuse (alleged/reported)	75	2	0	1	The response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
28. Neglect (alleged/reported)	67	10	0	1	The responses should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
29. Alcohol Abuse (parent)	72	5	0	1	The responses should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
30. Drug Abuse (parent)	64	11	2	1	The responses should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
31. Alcohol Abuse (child)	76	1	0	1	The response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
32. Drug Abuse (child)	68	5	0	5	In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "apply." In four error case, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." In one case, an infant was born with drugs in their system.
33. Child's Disability	77	0	0	1	
34. Child's Behavior Problem	69	7	1	1	In six error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
35. Death of Parent(s)	74	3	0	1	In two error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
36. Incarceration of Parent(s)	72	5	0	1	The responses should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
37. Caretaker's Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reason	71	6	0	1	The responses should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
38. Abandonment	77	0	0	1	
39. Relinquishment	76	1	0	1	In the error case the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "apply." The reviewer found no indication that the parent relinquished

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					their rights as the reason for the child entering foster care.
40. Inadequate Housing	65	12	0	1	The responses should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
41. Current Placement Setting 1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative) 3 = Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit	69	7	1	1	In one error case, the response should have been a relative foster home instead of a non-relative. In one error case, the response should have been "group home" instead of "trial home visit." This was an 18 year old who as of their 18 th birthday left foster care - signed himself out. In one error case, the response should have been "pre-adoptive home" instead of "foster family home (non-relative)." In two error cases, the response should have been "group home" instead of "institution." In one error case, the response should have been a foster home-relative instead of group home. In one error case, the response should have been a foster home - non-relative instead of foster home-relative. For the questionable case see the note in FC21.
42. Is Current Placement Setting Outside of the State or Tribal Service Area? 1 = yes	77	0	0	1	For the questionable case see the note in FC21.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
2 = no					
43. Most Recent Case Plan Goal 1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long-term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established	67	5	1	1	<p>In two error cases, the response should have been "live w/other relative" instead of "guardianship."</p> <p>In four error cases, the response should have been "emancipation" instead of "reunification."</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been "emancipation" instead of "long-term foster care."</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been "adoption" instead of "reunification."</p> <p>In one error case, the reviewer found that the case plan goal should have been reported as long-term foster care instead of reunification.</p>
44. Caretaker Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	51	22	2	3	<p>In 18 error cases (from one system), the response in AFCARS was "unable to determine." In two of the cases, the reviewers were not able to identify the marital status of the person from whom the child was removed. In three cases the response should have been "married couple;" in two "unmarried couple;" nine were "single female"; and, in two cases the reviewer could not determine if the parents were married or not. In one error case, the response should have been "unmarried couple" instead of "single female."</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been "single female" instead of "married couple."</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					In one error case, the response should have been "unmarried couple" instead of "single male." In one error case, the response should have been "single female" instead of "single male."
45. Year of Birth (1 st Principal Caretaker)	61	7	8	2	In one error case, the wrong year was reported. In six error cases, no date of birth was reported but the reviewer found the date in the file. In four cases, the reviewers were able to determine the marital status (FC44) but could not find the year of birth in the file.
46. Year of Birth (2 nd Principal Caretaker - if applicable)	64	6	5	3	In one error case, the reviewer noted the marital status was "unmarried couple" and there should be a second caretaker year of birth. In five error cases, no date of birth was reported but the reviewer found the date in the file. In two cases, the reviewers were able to determine the caretakers were a couple but could not find the year of birth.
47. Date of Mother's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	77	1	0	0	In the error case, a date should have been reported.
48. Date of Legal or Putative Father's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	78	0	0	0	
49. Foster Family Structure 0=Not Applicable	62	3	12	1	In one error case, the reviewer found the status was "married couple" instead of "single female." The child was placed with relatives (an aunt and

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male					uncle) who are married. In one error case, the response should have been single female instead of not applicable. In one error case, the response should have been single female instead of unmarried couple.
50. Year of Birth (1 st Foster Caretaker)	51	2	24	1	In one error case the date was incorrect. In one error case a date should have been reported instead of a blank.
51. Year of Birth (2 nd Foster Caretaker)	56	3	18	1	In one error case a date should have been reported instead of a blank. The reviewer found the child was placed with relatives (an aunt and uncle) and a date of birth for the uncle. In two error cases the wrong year was reported.
52. Race of 1 st Foster Caretaker 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	42	8	27	1	In one error case only one race had a response and the other race fields were incorrectly reported as blank instead of "no." In one error case the wrong race was entered. In one error case, the child's living arrangement was not a foster home and "no" was reported for the races. They should have been reported as blank. In five error cases the child was not in a foster home and the race fields were all reported as "no" instead of blank.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
53. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 1 st Foster Caretaker 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	49	1	27	1	The response should have been "no" instead of "not applicable."
54. Race of 2 nd Foster Caretaker (if applicable) 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	35	25	17	1	<p>In one error case a race (Black of African American) should have been reported instead of blanks. The reviewer found the child was placed with relatives (an aunt and uncle) and found information on the uncle.</p> <p>In one error case only one race had a response and the other race fields were incorrectly reported as blank instead of "no."</p> <p>In one case, the wrong race was entered.</p> <p>In 16 cases the foster parent was single and the race categories indicated "no" instead of being blank.</p> <p>In six error case, the child's living arrangement was not a foster home and "no" was reported for the races. They should have been reported as blank.</p>
55. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 2 nd Foster Caretaker (if applicable) 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No	61	1	15	1	In the error case the response should have been "no" instead of "not applicable." The reviewer found the child was placed with relatives (an aunt and uncle) and found information on the uncle.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
3 = Unable to Determine					
56. Date of Discharge from Foster Care	67	7	1	3	<p>In three error cases, the child was 18 during the report period. In two cases, the youth was not receiving title IV-E funds and in the third case, the youth signed themselves out as of their 18th birthday.</p> <p>In one error case, the youth was 19 years and 11 months old as of the end of the report period. The record should have been reported as discharged either on the youth's 18th birthday or if the youth had been receiving IV-E then the date IV-E stopped.</p> <p>In two error cases, there were discharges that were not reported. In one case, the youth should have been reported as of their 18th birthday.</p> <p>In one error case, the actual discharge date was a day later than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In one questionable case, a date was reported in AFCARS but the reviewer found no court order dismissing the agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p>
58. Reason for Discharge	68	7	0	3	<p>For five error cases see the findings in FC56 for youth 18 and older. The outcome should have been "emancipation."</p> <p>In two cases, the child had been discharged. Instead of "not applicable," one case should have been "reunification" and the other "emancipation."</p>
0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption					

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child					For one questionable case, see the note in FC21. In one questionable case, a date was reported in AFCARS but the reviewer found no court order dismissing the agency's responsibility for placement and care.
59. Title IV-E (Foster Care) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	67	4	6	1	It appears in one error case that the child was not determined eligible for title IV-E but this element indicated "applies." In three error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." For the questionable case, see the note in FC21.
60. Title IV-E (Adoption Assistance) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	72	0	5	1	
61. Title IV-A 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	73	0	5	0	
62. Title IV-D (Child Support) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	70	2	5	1	In two error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
63. Title XIX (Medicaid) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	62	10	5	1	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
64. SSI or Other Social Security Benefits	68	4	5	1	In three error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
0-Does not apply 1-Applies					In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
65. None of the Above 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	63	9	5	1	<p>In five error cases, the response was reported as "applies" because no other income was reported in FC59-65. However, the reviewers did find that Medicaid applied and found no other sources of income.</p> <p>In two error cases, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies." (FC 63 and 64 were identified as actually applying; no additional sources were identified.)</p> <p>In one error case the reviewer found other sources of income in addition to those selected in 59 -64. This element should have been reported as applying as well.</p> <p>In one error case the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."</p>
66. Amount of Monthly Foster Care Payment	18	2	57	1	In the error cases, the reviewer noted the wrong amount was reported.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
4. State Agency Involvement	29	0	0	0	
5. Child's Date of Birth	29	0	0	0	
6. Sex 1=Male 2=Female	29	0	0	0	
7. Child's Race 0=No 1=Yes 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	28	1	0	0	In the error case an additional race was found.
8. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine	27	2	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been "yes" instead of "unable to determine."
9. Has the title IV-E agency determined that the child has special needs? 1=Yes 2=No	26	1	0	2	In the error case, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." The child was "at-risk" for future health issues. Note that the AFCARS file indicated "yes" for AD35. One case marked as questionable had AD35 as "yes," AD36 had an amount, and AD37 was "yes." The reviewer indicated the child did not have

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					<p>special needs and was not able to verify the amount in AD36 or if the child is receiving funds from IV-E AA.</p> <p>In the other case marked as questionable, the response indicated for AD9 was "no" and "not applicable" for AD10. AD35 and 37 also were reported as "no" and AD36 had a zero amount. However, the reviewer indicated AD35 and AD37 as "yes" and an amount for AD36.</p>
<p>10. Primary Factor or Condition for Special Needs</p> <p>0=Not applicable 1=Racial/Ethnic Background 2=Age 3=Membership in a Sibling Group 4=Medical conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5=Other</p>	26	1	0	2	<p>In the error case, the response should have been "other" instead of "not applicable." The child was "at-risk" for future health issues. Note that the AFCARS file indicated "yes" for AD35.</p> <p>In one case marked as questionable AD35 was "yes," AD36 had an amount, and AD37 was "yes." The reviewer indicated the child did not have special needs and was not able to verify the amount in AD36 or if the child is receiving funds from IV-E AA.</p> <p>The other case marked as questionable indicated "no" for AD9 and "not applicable" for AD10. AD35 and 37 as "no" and AD36 had a zero amount. However, the reviewer indicated AD35 and AD37 as "yes" and an amount for AD36. (FACTS)</p>
11. Type of Disability-Mental Retardation	29	0	0	0	
12. Type of Disability-Visually or Hearing Impaired	28	1	0	0	The response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
13. Type of Disability-Physically Disabled	29	0	0	0	
14. Type of Disability-Emotionally Disturbed	27	2	0	0	In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies." The child's primary basis for special needs was "age" not medical. In one error case, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." The wrong category was marked as applying.
15. Type of Disability-Other Medically Diagnosed Condition Requiring Special Care	22	7	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies." In each case the child's primary basis for special needs was not medical.
16. Mother's Year of Birth	26	3	0	0	The date reported to AFCARS was 1990.
17. Father's Year of Birth	25	4	0	0	In three cases, the AFCARS field was blank but the reviewer found the actual year of birth. In one error cases, the wrong year of birth was reported.
18. Was the Mother married at the time of the child's birth? 1=Yes 2=No 3-Unable to determine	26	2	1	0	In one error case the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In the other error case, the response should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine."
19. Date of Mother's Termination of Parental Rights	27	1	0	1	The date found by the reviewer was the hearing date and this was not the date reported in AFCARS. In other cases, it appears the hearing date is reported.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
20. Date of Father's Termination of Parental Rights	26	2	0	1	In the error cases the date found by the reviewer was the hearing date and this was not the date reported in AFCARS. In other cases, it appears the hearing date is reported.
21. Date Adoption Legalized	29	0	0	0	
22. Adoptive Parents' Family Structure 1=Married couple 2=Unmarried couple 3=Single female 4=Single male	29	0	0	0	
23. Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	27	2	0	0	In one error case the year reported was 1990 but the reviewer found an actual year of 1980. In the other case a wrong year of birth was reported.
24. Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	28	1	0	0	A wrong year of birth was reported.
25. Adoptive Mother's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine	27	2	0	0	In the error cases, the adoptive parent was a single male and the race categories had a response of "no" instead of being left blank.
26. Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin 0=Not Applicable	29	0	0	0	

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine					
27. Adoptive Father's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine	28	1	0	0	The adoptive parent was a single female and the race categories had a response of "no" instead of being left blank.
28. Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin 0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine	29	0	0	0	
29. Relationship to Adoptive Parent-Stepparent 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	29	0	0	0	
30. Relationship to Adoptive Parent - Other Relative 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	23	4	0	2	The responses should have been "yes" instead of does not apply. The adoptive parent also was a foster parent (correctly reported). In the two questionable cases the reviewer only indicated the adoptive parents were foster parents and did not indicate if they were related or not to the child.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
31. Relationship to Adoptive Parent - Foster Parent 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	23	6	0	0	The response should have been "yes" instead of does not apply. The adoptive parent also was a relative (correctly reported).
32. Relationship to Adoptive Parent - Other Non-relative 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	12	15	0	2	In 14 error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of does not apply. The adoptive parent also was a foster parent (correctly reported). In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "yes".
33. Child was placed from 1=Within State or Tribal Service Area 2=Another State or Tribal Service Area 3=Another Country	29	0	0	0	
34. Child was placed by 1=Public agency 2=Private agency 3=Tribal Agency 4=Independent person 5=Birth parent	29	0	0	0	
35. Is the Child Receiving a Monthly Subsidy? 1=Yes 2=No	24	0	1	4	The 1 case marked as questionable had AD35 as "yes," AD36 had an amount, and AD37 was "yes." The reviewer indicated the child did not have special needs and was not able to verify the amount in AD36 or if the child is receiving funds from IV-E AA.

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					<p>One case marked as questionable indicated no for AD9 and not applicable for AD10 as well as AD35 and 37 as "no," and AD36 had a zero amount. However, the reviewer indicated AD35 and AD37 as "yes" and an amount for AD36.</p> <p>In two cases marked as questionable, the child was reported as a special needs child. The reviewer noted no subsidy but it is possible the agreement was for Medicaid.</p>
36. Monthly Amount	20	0	7	2	<p>The 1 case marked as questionable had AD35 as "yes," AD36 had an amount, and AD37 was "yes." The reviewer indicated the child did not have special needs and was not able to verify the amount in AD36 or if the child is receiving funds from IV-E AA.</p> <p>One case marked as questionable indicated no for AD9 and not applicable for AD10 as well as AD35 and 37 as "no," and AD36 had a zero amount. However, the reviewer indicated AD35 and AD37 as "yes" and an amount for AD36.</p>
37. Is the Child receiving a title IV-E adoption subsidy? 1=Yes 2=No	23	3	1	2	<p>In two error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "yes."</p> <p>In one error case, this element was reported as "yes" but there was a zero amount reported in AD36.</p> <p>In one case marked as questionable had AD35 as "yes," AD36 had an amount, and AD37 was "yes." The reviewer indicated the child did not have special needs and was not able to verify the</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2013 - March 31, 2014 (2014A)

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					<p>amount in AD36 or if the child is receiving funds from IV-E AA.</p> <p>The other case marked as questionable indicated no for AD9 and not applicable for AD10 as well as AD35 and 37 as "no," and AD36 had a zero amount. However, the reviewer indicated AD35 and AD37 as "yes" and an amount for AD36.</p>

Tab B

AFCARS Improvement Plan

Section 1: General Requirements

Section 2: Foster Care and Adoption Elements

IMPROVEMENT PLAN INSTRUCTIONS

The Improvement Plan is the working document for recording progress on each task by the State, comments, and the Children's Bureau's response. It is to reflect the history of the improvement plan phase with all related notes, approvals, questions, etc. An electronic copy of the document will be e-mailed to the State once it has received the hard copy of the report.

The State is to provide its initial estimated completion dates for each task within 30 days of receiving the report. The document is then to be emailed to the Federal review team.

In the foster care and adoption data element matrices, the data elements that received a "4" are not included on the corrective action work plans. However, the State should review the findings document (see Tab A). The data element may contain notes that the State may want to consider in order to more efficiently collect the AFCARS data.

The AIP Updates includes the matrices, the extraction code, screen prints if changes were made (including the relevant drop-down lists), as well as any other supporting documents relevant to the current update.

Each task is numbered. Dates and any comments are to be numbered according to the corresponding task. If a date changes, do not delete it. Instead, use the strike-through function and type in the new date.

The Improvement Plan contains five columns:

Element/Requirement: This column lists every AFCARS adoption and foster care data element, and general requirement with a rating factor of a 1, 2, or 3.

Rating Factor: This is the final rating factor based on the findings for the data element/general requirements.

Findings: This column includes the findings that need corrections.

Tasks: This column includes the actions that must be taken in order to bring the data element/general requirement into compliance with the AFCARS requirements. Some task items may include suggestions for changes and are, therefore, optional items for the State to consider implementing. Each task is numbered.

Date: This column is to be used by the State to list the benchmark dates by which it intends to complete each action item, and is updated by the State to reflect the actual completion date. The corresponding task number should be included with the date. The State should use "strikethrough" of the old dates when updating information. Once the Children's Bureau has reviewed changes made by the State, it will list the approval date in this column. Only use black font in this column. The Children's Bureau will use red font for the sign-off.

Notes: This column may be used either by the State or the Federal staff to record follow-up notes, etc. This column may also contain follow-up questions of the Federal review team based on post-site visit analysis. The corresponding task number should be included with the note.

Sample

Data Element	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
#, element	2	1) Finding	1) Task	1) m/day/yr	1) <u>CB, m/yr</u> : This is a blank example. <u>ST, m/yr</u> : The State made the modifications to the program code at line/section number.

File names. When submitting the update, each document should be named following this convention:

Item AIP_ST CCYY_MM

Examples: Element AIP_PA 2015_12

Screen AIP_PA 2015_13

Section 1

General Requirements

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
Foster Care Reporting Population						
1	<p>For the purpose of foster care reporting, each data transmission must include all children in foster care for whom the title IV-E agency has responsibility for placement, care, or supervision. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(2)).</p> <p>The [foster care] population to be included in this reporting system includes all children in foster care under the responsibility of the title IV-E agency administering or supervising the administration of the title IV-B Child and Family Services State plan and the title IV-E plan; that is, all children who are required to be provided the assurances of section 422(b)(8) of the Social Security Act. (Appendix A to Part 1355--Foster Care Data Elements, Section II--Definitions).</p>	2	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) There was one system (KIDS) that incorrectly included the test cases for private agency adoptions in the foster care reporting population. The agency staff indicated they believe there is an error in identifying cases that are private adoptions.</p> <p>2) <i>Joint placement and care responsibility</i>: In general, it appears these cases are being identified and included in the AFCARS reporting population. There were issues with cases entered into CAPS.</p> <p>3) <i>Locked facility or a hospital as the only placement for a child in the agency's responsibility for placement and care</i>: There were four systems (FACTS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS) that did not include the test case of a child whose only placement was a hospital. There are issues in FACTS related to locked facilities. Four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and IhsIS) incorrectly included the episode with a hospital as the only placement.</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) The agency needs to confirm whether the private adoptions were actually entered as a foster care case.</p> <p>1a)) The State needs to follow up with the county to ensure that if there is a private agency adoption in which the local office is involved with that it is not included in the foster care file.</p> <p>1b) The State and each county needs to ensure that records are being properly identified for the reporting population.</p> <p>2) The State needs to investigate further and ensure that counties using CAPS are correctly reporting shared cases.</p> <p>3a) Agencies are to enter all records are entered into the electronic case file regardless of whether or not the agency is making payments for the placement.</p> <p>3b) The extraction code is to exclude from the reporting population records of children in the agency's care and placement responsibly whose only placement</p>	<u>System</u>	<u>System</u>

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
			<p>In ACYS and Berks the program code does not include selection logic and there is no logic in the extract code to exclude records (which should be entered into the system to ensure tracking) of children whose only placement is either a hospital or a locked facility.</p> <p>4) <i>Runaway as only placement as of end of the report period:</i> Two systems (ACYS and CAPS) incorrectly entered/reported the test case for the report period; entered as the child being in a foster home instead of on a runaway status as of the end of the first test report period. The remaining systems did not include the scenario in the test reporting population. There was one system (Berks) that correctly reported the test case related to a child on a runaway status.</p>	<p>is a locked facility.</p> <p>3c) The extraction code is to exclude from the reporting population records of children in the agency's care and placement responsibly whose only placement is a hospital.</p> <p>3d) Each agency needs to verify the selection logic is correctly identifying records per this standard.</p> <p>4) The agencies needs to ensure these cases are entered and extracted correctly.</p>		
5	The reporting system includes all children who have or had been in foster care at least 24 hours. (Appendix A to Part 1355--Foster Care Data Elements, Section II—Definitions).	2	<p><u>System</u> All the systems are not correctly meeting this standard. The systems do not have a means to identify the length of time of a removal episode. CAPS and KIDS appear to have time fields associated with the start and end of a placement.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Add a field to each system that will determine the length of a removal episode. Two options are: - A time field associated with removal and discharge date; or, - Add a checkbox for workers to select if the child's removal episode is 24 hours or less in duration.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
				<p>2) CAPS and KIDS: Evaluate whether the time fields associated with the start and end of a placement can be used to determine the length of a removal episode that is 24 hours or less – there would only be one placement in these situations.</p> <p><u>Program Code</u> All systems must modify the extraction code once the system has been changed to accurately capture if a removal episode is 24 hours or less in duration.</p>		
7	<p>[The foster care population] includes youth over the age of 18 if a payment is being made on behalf of the child (CWPM, 1.3).</p> <p>A title IV-E agency that exercises the option to extend assistance to youth age 18 or older must collect and report data to AFCARS on all youth receiving a title IV-E foster care maintenance payment. (ACYF-CB-PI-10-11, Issued July 9, 2010).</p>	3	<p><i>Frequency Report (n=)</i>: There were 34 records with a year of birth of 1996.</p> <p>The state has been incorrectly including all youth over the age of 18 in the reporting population. The state does claim title IV-E foster care funds on youth who meet the criteria up to age 19.</p> <p>Youth 18 and older who are not receiving title IV-E funds are to be excluded from the reporting population once reported as discharged under FC56/58. The state will need to modify the code to correctly identify and report these records.</p> <p>The State has an approved amendment to the definition of a “child” under title IV-E. The agency now defines a child up to the age of 21. The effective date of the amendment is</p>	<p>- Data files for report periods prior to 2012B (prior to April 1, 2012): The reporting population is to always reflect the program rules effective at the time - only youth who are 18 and receiving title IV-E funds are included in the reporting population.</p> <p>- For the 2012B report period timeframe of April 1 through June 30, 2012, the agency will have to determine if the youth turned 18 or 19 during this time.</p> <p>a) Youth who are 18 and eligible for title IV-E during this time frame and who remained in the program after July 1, 2012 will continue to be included in the AFCARS file.</p> <p>b) Youth who were 18 (and receiving title IV-E) and exited foster care, or who turn 19 and</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
			<p>July 1, 2012 (2012B).</p>	<p>are no longer eligible, during this time frame are to be reported as discharged in the foster care file as of their exit date (FC56/58)</p> <p>c) 18 year old (up to 19) youth who return to foster care during this time frame are only included if they are receiving title IV-E under the program rules in effect during this time.</p> <p>d) Youth who are 19 or older who return or remained in foster care during this timeframe are not to be included in AFCARS for these three months.</p> <p>- For the timeframe of July 1 through September 30, 2012, the agency will include youth eligible for title IV-E who are over the age of 18. See the foster care elements matrix for additional tasks related to specific instructions for youth who are 19 or older returning to foster care during the second quarter or who were in the State's program and now are eligible under the new program rules.</p> <p>- For the 2013A report period timeframe (October 1 to April 30, 2013) forward, the agency will include only those youth eligible for title IV-E who are over the age of 18. See the foster care elements</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
				matrix for additional tasks.		
Adoption Population						
11	<p>For the purposes of adoption reporting, data are required to be transmitted by the title IV-E agency ... on all adopted children for whom the agency is providing adoption assistance (either ongoing or for nonrecurring expenses), care or services directly or by contract or agreement with other private or public agencies. (45 CFR 1355.40(a)(3)).</p> <p>The title IV-E agency must report on all children who are adopted in the State or Tribal service area during the reporting period and in whose adoption the title IV-E agency has had any involvement. ...reports on the following are mandated:</p> <p>(b) All special needs children who were adopted in the State or Tribal service area, whether or not they were in the public foster care system prior to their adoption and for whom non-recurring expenses were reimbursed; and</p> <p>(c) All children adopted for whom an adoption assistance payment or service is being provided based on</p>	2	<p>Based on notes provided by the agencies in the test cases there is an issue of local agency staff not having a clear understanding of the private adoptions (both in and out-of-state agencies). Based on comments from the state team members many of the systems do not have the capacity to collect information on private agency adoptions and/or cases for which only the non-recurring costs are paid by the State. Some staff indicated they would have to enter them as a foster care case. This is incorrect as the children are not in the State's responsibility or foster care system.</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) Systems need to be modified to allow entry of private agency adoption cases.</p> <p>Each system team must verify that records of children being adopted through a private agency, whether the child was in-state or from another state are entered into the system as non-foster care cases. Also, see findings for AD4 regarding forms and screens.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
	arrangements made by or through the title IV-E agency. (Appendix B to Part 1355--Adoption Data Elements, Section I).					
Technical Requirements						
12	<p>The data must be extracted from the data system as of the last day of the reporting period (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)):</p> <p><u>For foster care information [regular files]</u>, the child-specific data to be transmitted must reflect the data in the information system when the data are extracted. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(2)).</p> <p>Report the status of all children in foster care as of the last day of the reporting period.</p> <p>Also, provide data for all children who were discharged from foster care at any time during the reporting period, or in the previous reporting period, if not previously reported. (Appendix D, 45 CFR 1355 Foster Care and Adoption Record Layouts Section A.1.b(5)); (AFCARS Technical Bulletin #6, Data Extraction).</p>	3	<p><u>For Regular Files</u> It is not clear that regular files are correctly extracted by all systems. In one county, there was no discharge data reported in the test cases. See notes for GR13.</p> <p>There were a few systems that noted they do not have history tables in the database for certain elements. This item is rated a three but the relevant elements contains the finding regarding the history tables.</p>	<p><u>For Regular Files</u> Agencies should verify that information for the regular report period being extracted does not contain "future" dates or occurrences.</p>		
13	The data must be extracted from the data system as of the last day of the reporting period (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)):	2	<p><u>For subsequent files</u> There are errors in how files are reported as a subsequent file. Data are "overwritten" (e.g., for most of the</p>	<p><u>Systems</u> Each system is to contain history tables of information entered into the system.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
	<p><u>For foster care information [subsequent files]</u>, the child-specific data to be transmitted must reflect the data in the information system when the data are extracted. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(2)).</p> <p>Report the status of all children in foster care as of the last day of the reporting period. (AFCARS Technical Bulletin #6, Data Extraction)</p>		<p>systems, there are no dates for diagnoses so subsequent files reflect the current condition and not the diagnosis for the period being submitted). Also, there were “future” dates reported in the test deck.</p> <p>While the systems identify the report period for the purposes of foster care and adoption element on the report period, the extraction logic does not specifically address the proper parameters for a extracting a prior report period. Also, as noted in GR11 some of the systems do not store a history of the information entered. There are additional notes in the data element findings but this element is rated a two as well due to the files not properly identifying a prior report period.</p>	<p><u>For subsequent files</u> In addition to the extraction code including the report period, each data element is to have logic to compare that the information is for the report period being extracted.</p>		
14	<p>The data must be extracted from the data system as of the last day of the reporting period. (45 CFR 1355.40(b)(1)):</p> <p><u>Adoption data [regular or subsequent]</u> are to be reported during the reporting period in which the adoption is legalized or, at the title IV-E agency's option, in the following reporting period if the adoption is legalized within the last 60 days of the reporting period. For a semi-annual period in which no adoptions have been</p>	2	<p><u>Regular Files</u> There were three systems (CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS) that the extraction code selects the adoption records based on the adoption legalized dates within the report period being processed. Consequently, if the record is entered late (after the AFCARS file has been extracted), then the adoption record would not be reported.</p> <p>The program code for LUIS does not reference the end date of the report period to qualify the selection of any of the adoption data.</p>	<p><u>Regular Adoption Files</u> 1) Implement a method that will identify adoption records that were entered and not reported in the regular file for the period in which the adoption occurred in the following reporting period.</p> <p>2) Modify the extraction code for LUIS to include the report period end date.</p> <p>3) The systems ACYS, Berks, IhsIS, and JCIS need to verify that</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
	legalized, the title IV-E agency must report such an occurrence.(45 CFR 1355.40(b)(3)).			if an adoption finalization date is entered after the file is submitted for the regular report period that it is included during the next "regular" transmission.		
15	The title IV-E agency extracts all records based on the transaction date of discharge (foster care element #57) or the date of latest removal (foster care element #21), if the child has not been discharged. (ACYF-PI-CB-95-09, Reissued May 23, 1995 and Technical Bulletin #6, AFCARS Data Extraction)	3	<p>There were five systems (ACY, CAPS, FACTS, KIDS, JCIS, and LUIS) where no issues were identified with the inclusion of the transaction date. The agencies should check AFCARS Technical Bulletin #6 to ensure proper identification of the foster care file.</p> <p>There was one system (Berks) that appears to have issues with the transaction date (also see FC findings for FC22 and 57).</p> <p>For IHSIS, the code was not verified by the federal team and the state will need to follow up with these agencies.</p>			
Data Quality						
21	<p>General Data Quality</p> <p>For data to be considered "quality" it must be accurate, complete, timely, and consistent in definition and usage across the entire IV-E agency and State/Tribal service area. The quality of the AFCARS data is assessed by the agency on a regular and continuous basis in order to sustain a high level of quality data. The agency incorporates AFCARS data into its quality</p>	3	<p>There were 71 (69%) data elements rated a 2 and 2 (2%) elements rated a 1. These technical issues mask further data quality issues that may be due to lack of timely data entry or inaccurate data entry. One example is missing information is masked by the use of a valid value in AFCARS (defaults) instead of reporting the field as blank.</p> <p>In addition to the total number of elements rated with technical errors, there were 18 (18%) elements rated a 3 for data quality issues. While there were 12 (12%) of the elements rated a</p>	<p>1) Describe, develop, and implement a method to ensure the accurate and timely entry of the AFCARS data; including but not limited to supervisory oversight and management reports.</p> <p>1a) In the above plan, address how supervisors ensure accurate data entry.</p> <p>2) Describe how the agency will monitor the accuracy of AFCARS data, including completeness of the data and timely entry of the data,</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
	<p>assurance/continuous quality improvement plan. The agency involves staff from every level of the organization, and other stakeholders from outside of the agency.</p>		<p>4, these two must be addressed in the State's Data Quality Plan to ensure ongoing data accuracy.</p> <p>See notes in GR22 regarding the State's current data collection process and noted issues. Many of the data quality issues identified throughout the General Requirements and Data Elements relate to how information is collected (design of the systems and extraction of information). The absence of a statewide database affects the child's removal history. The information is county specific, therefore, the number of removals for a child can be underreported. The length of time from a prior removal episode to the current one is another area that may be incorrectly assessed in performance measures.</p> <p>The State staff indicated they run the frequency utility monthly; the reports are run for each county. On a quarterly basis the agency runs the data compliance and quality utilities on the data. Reports are also generated based on the Child and Family Service Review indicators used in the State Data Profile. Other reports utilizing the AFCARS data are limited as the State office staff do not have access to each individual system in order to run data reports; or monitor the recording of information.</p>	<p>over time.</p> <p>3) Describe how the title IV-E agency utilizes management reports and the data in its analyses. Provide brief examples.</p> <p>4) Describe how the agency will incorporate the information collected in AFCARS as part of its monitoring and quality assurance process in order to ensure accuracy of the data.</p> <p>5) Include system and importance of data quality training in the agency's training for staff and include in the State's training plan (in the State's title IV-B, Child and Family Services Plan and Annual Progress and Services Report).</p> <p>5a) What ongoing training exists for caseworkers regarding the information system?</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
			<p>It is not clear that there are adequate reports generated by local offices and provided to supervisors and line workers regarding missing or inconsistent information. There needs to be additional reports to facilitate improvement in data quality. These should be incorporated into the state's quality assurance (QA) process. Supervisors should also be an integral component of the QA process as they are reviewing cases of the caseworkers.</p> <p>The State has been working on processes for Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and has developed an ongoing phased-in implementation of a statewide CQI system. A main component of the CQI system is a QA process using the Quality Service Reviews (QSR). As part of the CQI process, Pennsylvania uses QSR data to analyze a county's performance and development of a county improvement plan. In addition, in Pennsylvania's own analysis on their CQI system, they recognized that they need to improve the use of data to systematically drive decision making and making relevant connections across multiple data sources. This gap area of needing to coordinate and analyze their various data sources has been discussed in the 2015-2019 CFSP as well as in preparation for the CFSP Round 3.</p>			

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: General Requirements
State: Pennsylvania

No.	Requirement	Rating Factor	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
			<p>As noted in the element findings, there are data elements identified where there is a need for improved oversight to ensure that all applicable information is entered into the system in a timely manner. Through the case file review conducted as part of the AAR, elements were identified as underreported (e.g. circumstances associated with the child's removal from home and child' diagnosed conditions) or there was inconsistent use of some fields and dates. The system and extraction code's technical issues may be masking further data quality issues related to data entry.</p> <p>Once technical corrections are made, the state will need to evaluate the data to determine the need for any additional training needs and monitoring of the data.</p> <p>The state and federal team will need to discuss resubmitting prior report periods to address data accuracy based on corrections to the reporting population as well as corrections to the data elements.</p>			

Section 2

Foster Care and Adoption Elements

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
5. Date of Most Recent Periodic Review (if applicable)	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) There are four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, LUIS) where the extraction logic does not account for the report period and/or the report period for prior periods.</p> <p>2) In two systems (Berks, KIDS) the agency conducts its reviews in court but there is nothing in the extraction logic to identify a hearing that is for a periodic review from one that is not.</p> <p>3) There were two systems (FACTS, LUIS) that the program code determines if the child has been in foster care for more than seven months and then checks for a periodic review date.</p> <p>4) There was one system (FACTS) that was not restricting the extraction of the periodic review date to the current removal.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533)¹</i>: There are 32 (<1%) records with a periodic review date prior to 2013. <i>Case File Findings (n=77)</i>: 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>There were no technical issue with lhSIS or JCIS; nor did they have older review dates in their files.</p> <p>In each county, the State needs to ensure that the periodic review is held in a timely manner and is entered into the county information system timely.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) The program code must be modified to check for the most recent periodic review prior or equal to the end of the report period being extracted.</p> <p>2) The program code must be modified to check for all periodic reviews that meet the federal requirements.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code by removing any logic that prohibits the extraction of a periodic review that is entered in the system.</p> <p>4) The program code must be modified to check for the most recent periodic review for the <i>current removal episode</i> prior to the end of the report period.</p>	<p><u>Code</u></p> <p>1)</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1)</p>
6. Date of Birth	3	As of the AFCARS Assessment Review, the agency's title IV-E plan only covered youth up to the age of 19 if they met eligibility requirements (see GR7 and FC56/58).	The Children's Bureau (CB) will monitor the data.		

¹ The data used for the frequency findings are from the 2014A period for the State.

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are 404 (2%) records reflecting youth older than 19. There were 519 (3%) records with a year of 1994.</p> <p>The counties using JCIS had no records of youth over the age of 18 in the 2014A file. All others did have older youth.</p>			
<p>8. Child's Race</p> <p>0=No 1=Yes</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>2</p>	<p><u>Form/System</u> 1) One system, IHSIS, does not have the capacity to collect more than one race. The data also reflects that there were no records where the child had 2 or more races. The form used by the workers to make changes/updates includes the option "Other."</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There was one system (Berks,) where the extraction code is initialized to "no" instead of blank. The logic to set the race fields to blank if all are set to "no" does not get executed because prior to it there is logic that if none of the races are set to "yes," then "unable to determine" is set to "yes." There is one system (FACTS) that race is initialized to "unable to determine." There are two systems (KIDS, LUIS) that correctly initializes the race fields to blank but if no race is entered into the system, the program code sets "unable to determine" to "yes." It should be left blank.</p> <p>2) There were mapping errors in four systems (FACTS, IHSIS, KIDS, and LUIS).</p> <p>3) There are additional nationalities listed in KIDS that are not checked by the program code.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> Use of the AFCARS administrative value "unable to determine:" Options should be reflective of the actual information related to why</p>	<p><u>Form/System</u> 1a) The county must modify the system to have the capacity to collect all race categories.</p> <p>1b) The agency needs to remove "other" as an option on the forms.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1a) Initialize these fields to blank.</p> <p>1b) If no information is entered for race, report these fields as blank.</p> <p>2) Correct mapping errors for these systems.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code for KIDS to check the nationalities and if one is selected, map it to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1a) 1b)</p> <p><u>Code</u></p>	

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>information on race was not collected. The agencies should consider adding more specific options to their forms and system screens to comprehensively collect all possible reasons.</p> <p>There were three systems (ACYS, CAPS, and JCIS) with no identified technical issues.</p>			
<p>9. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) For two systems (ACYS, FACTS) the only values mapped are "yes" and "no." If these are not found, the extraction logic sets FC9 to "unable to determine."</p> <p>2) IhsIS includes Hispanic with each race and is not a separate field. Since there are identified issues with the collection of race information, this element also needs to be modified and made into a separate data field.</p> <p>3) In two systems (KIDS, LUIS) there were mapping errors.</p> <p>4) In three systems (Berks, IhsIS, JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u></p> <p>See previous note regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of "unable to determine" and the NYTD administrative values.</p> <p>There was one system (CAPS) with no identified technical issues.</p> <p><i>Frequency Report (n=19,533): Yes = 2,559 (13%); No = 15,867 (81%); Unable to determine = 1,107 (6%); Not Reported = 0</i></p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=78): 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In the error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of</i></p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Modify the program code to set this element to blank if no information is entered into the system.</p> <p>2) Modify the system to include a separate collection of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code to make related corrections to the mapping of information.</p> <p>4) Verify how these systems are designed and if the worker has not collected the information will the fields on the screen be left blank and be reported in AFCARS as blank.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		"unable to determine."			
<p>10. Has the Child Been Clinically Diagnosed with a Disability(ies)?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Not Yet Determined</p>	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Once modifications are made to the systems to include the start and end dates of a diagnosis, the program code must be modified to determine if there are any active diagnoses for the report period being extracted.</p> <p>The data are not reported based on the report period being extracted.</p> <p>2) ACYS defaults this element to "no" when there is no diagnosis. FACTS, KIDS, and LUIS default this element to "not yet determined." In the other systems, there is no allowance for missing data. If the person entering the AFCARS information does not have the child's health information, it is likely they are selecting "no" or the field is defaulted to "no."</p> <p>3) The systems do not check for the length of time the child has been in foster care against the response of "not yet determined."</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> Frequency Report (n=19,533): Yes = 4,505; No = 8,358 (43%); Not Yet Determined = 6,670 (34%); Not Reported = 0 Case File Findings (n=77): 40 (52%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Modify the program code to include logic to verify if there is an active diagnosis reportable to AFCARS as of the end of the report period.</p> <p>1a) If the child's diagnoses are not ones that are reportable to AFCARS, or if all reportable diagnosis have an end date in the report period, add logic to the extraction to set FC10 to "no."</p> <p>1b) Modify the extraction code to check the information per the end date of the period being extracted. The end date of the report period needs to be included in the extraction logic.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code to set this element to blank if no information is entered into the system.</p> <p>3) Add logic to the extraction code to check if the child has been in care for a specified time and this field has not been completed or is set to "not yet determined," to set this element to blank.</p>		
<p>11. Mental Retardation 12. Visually or Hearing Impaired 13. Physically Disabled 14. Emotionally Disturbed</p>	2	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) The systems do not have begin and end dates of a diagnosis. KIDS has date fields for some diagnoses (on Axis 1 and 2). Also, most of the systems do not tie the child's health</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) Modify each system to include the start and end date of a diagnosed condition.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>(DSM- IV) 15. Other Medically Diagnosed Conditions Requiring Special Care</p> <p>0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies</p>		<p>information to an examination date and there does not appear to be a link to the case plan for the child.</p> <p>Four of the systems only use the categories from the AFCARS regulation instead of recording the child's actual diagnosed condition.</p> <p>A history of diagnosed conditions should be kept by the systems.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Once modifications are made to the systems to include the start and end dates of a diagnosis, the program code must be modified to determine if the diagnoses is active as of the end of the report period being extracted. The end date of the report period needs to be included in the extraction logic.</p> <p>2) There were errors in mapping of diagnosed conditions in KIDS extraction logic. It is possible that there may be diagnoses not getting reported to AFCARS from the Berks system.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>FC11 Case File Findings (n=75): 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i> <i>FC12 Case File Findings (n=76): 1 of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i> <i>FC13 Case File Findings (n=75): 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i></p>	<p>2) If a system does not have a history table for this information, one must be created.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to include logic to verify if there is an active diagnosis per each category reportable to AFCARS as of the end of the report period.</p> <p>1a) If the child's diagnoses are not ones that are reportable to AFCARS, or if all reportable diagnosis have an end date in the report period, the corresponding category(ies) is to be set to "condition does not apply."</p> <p>1b) Modify the extraction code to check the information per the end date of the period being extracted.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code to map identified mapping errors to the correct AFCARS category.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p><i>FC14 Case File Findings (n=77): 18 (23%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i></p> <p><i>FC15 Case File Findings (n=77): 6 (8%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i></p>			
<p>16. Has this Child Ever Been Adopted?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) In at least two systems there did not appear to be an option to account for a Safe Haven infant or if the parent was unable to provide information.</p> <p>2) In many of the systems, it was not clear if the fields on the screens were pre-filled with a value when a new case is created. Additionally, supervisors must ensure that the correct data are being recorded on each case.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>There are three systems that the program code will default missing data to either “unable to determine” (ACYS, KIDS) or “no” (CAPS). In one system (FACTS) this field is initialized to “unable to determine” so if no information is entered, this remains the response. One system (LUIS) the element is initialized to “no” and so if no information is entered, this is the reported response. Many of the extraction code programs did not account for missing data.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u></p> <p><i>Frequency Report (n=19,533): Yes = 738 (4%); No = 14,361 (74%); Unable to Determine = 4,434 (23%); Not Reported = 0</i></p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=78): 17 (22%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i></p> <p>The previous discussion about the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine” applies to this element as well. In</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) Establish a method to determine if an infant entered under the Safe Haven program.</p> <p>2) Verify how these systems are designed and if the worker has not collected the information will the fields on the screen be left blank and be reported in AFCARS as blank.</p> <p>2a) If fields are pre-populated, then modify the system to set the fields to blank when a new case is created.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Modify the program code to set this element to blank if no information is entered into the system.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>this instance, the only two situations where “unable to determine” would be appropriate is if the infant entered foster care under the Safe Haven program or if at the time of the removal, the parent was incapacitated or the child had been abandoned. In the later situations, the caseworker may still be able to determine this information as they complete their assessment and talk to other family members. These two descriptors would be better selections for the worker to choose from than “unable to determine.” If the worker has not gathered the information through a family assessment, then the fields are to be left blank.</p>			
<p>17. If Yes, How Old was the Child when Adoption was Legalized?</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1=less than 2 years old 2=2-5 years old 3=6 to 12 years old 4=13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) If the response to whether the child had been previously adopted was “no,” the age field was not disabled. At a minimum, the only option that should be available for selection is “not applicable.” In two systems (Berks, CAPS) the number of records reported in this element as “unable to determine” was greater than the number reported for the same value in FC16.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) In one system (CAPS) the number of records reported in this element as “not applicable” did not match the number in FC16 for “no.” For six systems, the data reported for the categories in this element did not match the respective option in FC16. In the extraction code for KIDS if the child was ever adopted and element #17 is “not applicable” or blank, the logic will change element #17 to 5 “unable to determine.” In two systems (CAPS, FACTS) if no data are found, this element is incorrectly set to “not applicable.”</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> There were four systems that were rated a 3 for this element. However, there were some that</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Ensure that the systems do not allow entry of an age when the response to the question above is “no” or “unable to determine.”</p> <p>1a) If the parent does not know how old the child was at the time of the adoption, or is unable to estimate the age, then the age field is to be left blank.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1a) If the response in FC16 is “no,” then then element #17 is set to “not applicable.”</p> <p>1b) If element #16 is “unable to determine,” then this element is to be “unable to determine.”</p> <p>1c) If no age was entered, then this element is to be set to blank.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>have inconsistencies between what is reported in FC16 and 17. <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not applicable = 18,789 (96%); Age categories = 641 (3%); Unable to Determine = 103 (1%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=78):</i> 4 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>			
<p>Removal Episodes – General and 18. Date of First Removal from Home</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Systems</u> 1) There is not a complete history of a child’s removals. Consequently, the AFCARS removal history for a child can be underreported. The dates reported for FC18 are county specific and not necessarily the child’s first ever removal from home date. 2) If a child exits foster care as a result of an adoption but re-enters foster care at a later time, the date for this element is to reflect the first ever removal not the first removal episode after the adoption. <u>Extraction Code</u> The extraction logic sets this element to the date of the <i>very first placement</i> found regardless of the type of setting. 1) Only or first location is a <u>runaway status</u> in the first removal episode. (See GR1 for additional notes related to this standard.) 2) Child’s first-ever removal from home is an episode that was 24-hours or less in duration (see GR5 for additional information). 3) If the only placement during the first removal episode was a hospital, the date of that episode</p>	<p><u>Systems</u> 1) Counties must include dates of removal that occurred in another county within the State, if applicable. 1a) When the State implements CWIS, the database must include historical information prior to conversion from the existing multiple databases to the central database. This includes both open and closed cases. 2) Modify the systems to have a link between the child’s “bio” file and his/her subsequent adoption files to combine removal histories. <u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The date of first removal is equal to the date of the agency received/obtained care and placement responsibility (not the date the child enters foster care). 2) Modify the extraction logic that if the child has two or more removal episodes and the first episode was only 24 hours in duration, that the record is skipped and the next applicable removal episode is reported with the correct removal date. 3) Modify the program code to ignore the initial removal episode if the only placement</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>is selected as the first removal date. See GR1 findings.</p> <p>3a) If in the first removal the child's initial placement was a hospitalization and the child subsequently enters a foster care setting within the scope of title IV-E, the date of the first removal episode is incorrectly reported as the date of removal in FC18.</p> <p>4) If the only placement during the first removal episode was a locked facility, the date of that episode is incorrectly selected as the first removal date. See findings for GR1.</p> <p>4a) If in the first removal the child's initial placement was a detention facility and the child subsequently enters a foster care setting within the scope of title IV-E, the date of the first removal episode is incorrectly reported as the "custody" date.</p> <p>5) First ever removal date may not always be reported if it occurred in another county.</p> <p>6) If a child exits foster care as a result of an adoption but re-enters foster care at a later time, all removals the child experience in his/her life in the State are not counted.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> Case File Findings (n=76): 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p>was a hospital.</p> <p>3a) Modify the program code to check if the first removal from home began with a hospitalization, and if so, then to report as the date in FC18 the start date of the first foster care placement.</p> <p>4) Modify the program code to ignore the initial removal episode if the only placement was a locked facility.</p> <p>4a) Modify the program code to check if the first removal from home began with a locked facility, and if so, then to report as the date in FC18 the start date of the first foster care placement.</p> <p>5) Report the date of first ever removal from home date regardless if it occurred in the reporting county or another county in the state.</p> <p>6) Modify the program code to ensure the child's first removal from home is reported.</p>		
19. Total Number of Removals from Home To Date	2	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <p>1) There is no means to track the child's removal history statewide. The program code is to report a count of all the removal episodes - whether the child had been in foster care in another county previously or if the child had been adopted then re-entered foster care.</p>	<p><u>Systems</u></p> <p>1) Counties must include removals that occurred in another county within the State, if applicable.</p> <p>1a) When the State implements CWIS, the database must include historical information prior to conversion from the existing multiple</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>2) If a child exits foster care as a result of an adoption but re-enters foster care at a later time, this element is to reflect the total number of removals; not the removal episode that occur after the adoption.</p> <p>3) There is an issue with manual edits being done to data in JCIS system. The system should allow the worker to enter events and the extraction code be programmed with the AFCARS rules. This maintains accuracy and consistency in reporting the data.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) The extraction logic in several systems may be counting all episodes regardless of the type of setting. See findings for GR1.</p> <p>1a) If the only placement in a removal episode was a hospital, these episodes are never included in the number of removal dates.</p> <p>1b) If the only placement in a removal episode was a locked facility, these episodes are never included in the number of removal dates.</p> <p>2) Child's removal from home is an episode that was 24-hours or less in duration (see GR5 for additional information).</p> <p>3) Removals may not always be reported if it occurred in another county.</p> <p>4) If a child exits foster care as a result of an adoption but re-enters foster care at a later time, all removals the child experience in his/her life in the State are not counted.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u></p> <p>Case File Findings (n=73): 5 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was</p>	<p>databases to the central database. This includes both open and closed cases.</p> <p>2) Modify the systems to have a link between the child's "bio" file and his/her subsequent adoption files to combine removal histories.</p> <p>3) Remove the ability for the user to manually edit removal information on the screen.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1a) Modify the program code to exclude removal episodes from the number of removals in which the only placement was a hospital.</p> <p>1b) Modify the program code to exclude removal episodes from the number of removals in which the only placement was a locked facility.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code to exclude from the number of removals episodes that are 24 hours or less in duration.</p> <p>3) Ensure that the program code is counting all applicable removal episodes.</p> <p>4) Modify the extraction code to count all removals experienced by a child prior to and after an adoption.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		reported in AFCARS.			
20. Date Child was Discharged from Last Foster Care Episode	2	<p><u>System</u> As noted in the findings for the foster care population in GR1 and 5 and FC18/21, there are corrections the counties will need to make to correctly identify the date of discharge from an AFCARS defined removal episode.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=73):</i> 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) The system must include a discharge from foster care that occurred in another county. 2) The system must include a previous episode that the discharge from foster care was an adoption.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The extraction code must include a discharge from foster care that occurred in another county. 2) The extraction code must include a previous episode that the discharge from foster care was an adoption. 3) If there was a prior removal episode that was 24-hours or less, and the child later re-enters foster care, the end date of the previous 24-hour episode is not to be reported for this element. 4) If the child's prior removal episode only contained a placement that was a hospital or detention (locked) facility, the end date of this episode is not to be reported for this element.</p>		
21. Date of Latest Removal from Home	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> None of the systems met all of the standards for this element. In general, all of the county systems are initializing this field to blank or zeroes. Then the logic sets this element to the date of the very first placement found regardless of the type of setting.</p> <p>1) Only or first location is a <u>runaway status</u> in the first removal episode. (See GR1 for additional notes related to this standard.) 2) If the child's initial placement was a</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The date of first removal is equal to the date of the agency received/obtained care and placement responsibility (not the date the child enters foster care). 2) Modify the program code to check if the</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>hospitalization and the child subsequently enters a foster care setting within the scope of title IV-E, the date of removal is incorrectly reported.</p> <p>3) If the child's initial placement was a detention facility and the child subsequently enters a foster care setting within the scope of title IV-E, the date of removal episode is incorrectly reported.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> Case File Findings (n=77): 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p>first placement in the episode is a hospitalization, and if so, report the date of removal the date of the first foster care placement.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code to check if the first placement in the episode is a locked facility, and if so, report the date of removal the date of the first foster care placement.</p>		
22. Removal Transaction Date	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There is one system (FACTS) that needs corrections in order to have a system generated, non-modifiable date.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the system to create and store a transaction date that is non-modifiable. 2) Modify the extraction code to use this transaction date for FC22.</p>		
23. Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting	2	<p><u>System</u> There are systems that it was not clear that the agency is documenting where the child is located at all times while in the agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There is a system (Berks) that is incorrectly reporting a status change date for this element.</p> <p>1a) There are systems that the agencies need to confirm how the program code is not reporting a change in status (ACYS, CAPS, FACTS, IhSIS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS)</p> <p>2a) In one system (ACYS) the program code does not include logic to check for the start date of a "trial home visit."</p> <p>2b) There are four systems (Berks, IhSIS, JCIS, LUIS) that the agencies need to review and verify how they are correctly identifying and reporting the start of a "trial home visit."</p> <p>2c) It appears that the program code for CAPS</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) The Federal and State team will need to discuss further during the AIP phase. 2) There are some systems that will need to ensure that relative placements, whether in-state or out-of-state, are entered into the system.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the extraction code to check if the setting is the same and only the status has changed. If there is a change in status, the date the placement began is to be reported not the date the status changed. 1a) The state needs to confirm with the counties and provide a status to the Federal team. 2a) Modify the program code to report the start date of a "trial home visit."</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>will include the start date but the agency needs to confirm if this is correct.</p> <p>3a) There are three systems (ACYS, IhsIS, KIDS) identified from the test case results that are not reporting the date the child ran away from the foster care setting; it does not appear there is logic in the extraction code to identify the start date of a runaway status. The program code for CAPS does not assess whether there is a runaway status and so the date would not be reported.</p> <p>3b) For the FACTS system, the date reported in the test cases was one date later than when the child actually ran away from the foster care setting.</p> <p>4) As noted in GR1 there were three systems (ACYS, Berks, and CAPS) that correctly included the test case in the reporting population for the period the child's only placement was a runaway status. However, only two systems (ACYS, Berks) reported the date of placement correctly to match the date of the removal episode.</p> <p>5) It appears all systems are incorrectly reporting the date of placement when the child returns to the same setting from which he/she ran away from or had been in prior to a "trial home visit."</p> <p>6) Since many of the systems extract the current placement date without making any</p>	<p>2b) The state needs to confirm with the counties and provide a status to the Federal team.</p> <p>2c) The state needs to confirm with the counties and provide a status to the Federal team.</p> <p>3a) Modify the program code to set the date of placement as the start date of a runaway status if the child is on runaway status as of the end of the report period.</p> <p>3b) The system must support the actual physical start and date of a child's placement and the extraction code report the actual start date.</p> <p>3c) There are three systems (Berks, JCIS, and LUIS) that need to confirm how these are entered and identified in the extraction code.</p> <p>4) Modify the program code to report the date of placement in this situation as the same date the agency received placement and care responsibility.</p> <p>4a) If the child has only one foster care placement after being picked-up from runaway status, the placement date is not to change.</p> <p>5) Modify the program code to set the placement date to the initial start date of the foster care setting.</p> <p>6) The agencies and the State will have to evaluate and determine what changes will</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>further checks as to the type, it is likely the date is incorrectly reported if the child moves from one “cottage” to another on the same campus. Depending on how these situations are entered in some systems, there may not be a problem.</p> <p>7) It appears that the program code for some of the systems are not checking the date against the end of the report period. This causes “future” dates to be reported and incorrect dates when a subsequent file is submitted. Two systems specifically determined as having an issue are CAPS and JCIS.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 12 (16%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p>be required.</p> <p>7) Verify and modify the program code, if applicable, to check the date of placement is equal or prior to the last day of a report period.</p> <p>8) The State and the Federal team will need to discuss further and define the length of a hospital stay.</p> <p>9) There are some systems that will need to ensure that relative placements, whether in-state or out-of-state, are entered into the system and the date of placement reported to AFCARS.</p>		
24. Number of Previous Placement Settings During this Removal Episode	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> There are errors for every system related to how placements are counted.</p> <p>1) Systems are incorrectly identifying the beginning of a removal episode.</p> <p>2) Systems are incorrectly counting a change of status in the placement setting as a placement move (ACYS, CAPS, and IHSIS).</p> <p>3) Systems are incorrectly incrementing the placement count following a return from a temporary absence to the same foster care setting.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Modify the extraction code per the changes for the start of an AFCARS removal episode that begins with a placement in a hospital or a locked facility. This setting is to be excluded.</p> <p>2) At a minimum these three systems must modify the program code to ignore a change in status and not increment the placement count.</p> <p>2a) All systems are to verify that this requirement is being properly met, either in the code or how it is entered in the system.</p> <p>3a) Modify the program code to check if the placement after a “trial home visit” or a “runaway” is the same one the child was in prior to the trail home visit or the runaway.</p> <p>3b) the federal team and State need to discuss how many days will be used to determine when a hospital stay is excluded.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>4) Systems are initializing or defaulting this element to 1 instead of blank.</p> <p>5) If the child's only living arrangement in the removal episode, and as of the end of the report period, is "runaway" systems are reporting a count of 1.</p> <p>6) There are systems that are also counting the move from one cottage to another on the same campus.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=74):</i> 18 (24%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Since the accuracy of this data is dependent on how the information is entered into certain systems (the extraction code directly extracts what is entered into the system), it is important that each county and the State periodically assess the accuracy and develop oversight by supervisors to ensure proper data entry.</p>	<p>3c) All systems should verify that they are correctly excluding temporary absences from the placement count.</p> <p>4) Modify the program code to initialize this field to blank and if no placements are found to leave the field blank.</p> <p>5) Modify the program code that if the only living arrangement as of the end of the report period is a "runaway" to report zero.</p> <p>6) Modify the program code to check if the setting is of the same type and on the same campus. If so, do not increment the placement count.</p>		
<p>Actions or Conditions Associated With Child's Removal</p> <p>0=Does not Apply 1=Applies</p> <p>#26 Physical Abuse #27 Sexual Abuse #28 Neglect #29 Parent Alcohol Abuse #30 Parent Drug Abuse #31 Child Alcohol Abuse #32 Child Drug Abuse #33 Child Disability</p>	3	<p>The State and local agencies may want to re-evaluate reasons associated with a child's entry into foster care for more detailed reasons. These can then be mapped to the appropriate AFCARS category. For instance, the agency may want to add domestic violence, child drug exposed in-utero, etc. Additionally, the agency may want to assess the reasons youth who are over the age of 18 re-enter foster care and add those to the selection list.</p> <p>In the test case results for KIDS, the reasons for removal were incorrect for the child's second removal. The agency needs to verify the findings and determine if there is a system error</p>			

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
#34 Child's Behavior Problem #35 Death of Parent #36 Incarceration of Parent #37 Caretaker Inability to Cope #38 Abandonment #39 Relinquishment #40 Inadequate Housing		or if the case was incorrectly entered.			
41. Current Placement Setting 1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative) 3 = Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit	2	<p><u>System</u> 1) The systems should have the capacity to record every location/living arrangement of a child while under the agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There are systems with errors in mapping of the agency's values to the appropriate AFCARS value (FACTS). 2) In one system (ACYS) there is no clear indication from the screens and/or the code how the size of group home and institution settings are determined. 3) The counties need to ensure that this information is reflective of the report period being extracted/reported.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Pre-adoptive Home = 605 (3%); Foster Family Home (Relative) = 5,324 (27%); Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) = 8,067 (41%); Group Home (2,322 (12%); Institution = 2,145 (11%); Supervised Independent Living = 409 (2%); Runaway = 250 (1%); Trial Home Visit = 411 (2%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 7 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. See the case file findings for information on the errors.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Make appropriate revisions to the systems to ensure it is collecting every location of the child while in an agency's responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to map the agency's values per the onsite guidance. 2) Provide information on group home size. 2a) Make modifications to the mapping as appropriate to match the AFCARS definition of group home or institution if larger than 12 beds. 3) Modify the program code to check the placement location is equal or prior to the end of the report period. 4) The federal team needs to discuss the extraction process for ACYS or IHSIS for this element. 5) Once the federal team and the State discuss the length of hospital stays, all systems will need to modify the way hospital stays are recorded and extracted.</p>		
42. Is Current Placement	2	<u>Extraction Code</u>	<u>Extraction Code</u>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
Setting Outside of the State or Tribal Service Area? 1 = yes 2 = no		1) There are two systems (CAPS, IHSIS) that checks the provider's address but if there is no information, the program code incorrectly sets this element to "no." 2) The program code for KIDS is hard coded to set this element to "no." <u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533): Yes = 188 (1%); No = 19,345 (99%); Not Reported = 0</i> There are three systems (Berks, CAPS, LUIS) that have a field on the screen for "out-of-state" and the user must select yes or no. While this method is acceptable, to be more accurate, the program code should check the placement provider's address of the child's current living arrangement. This would reduce the amount of extra data entry as well as ensure accuracy.	1) If no information is entered, the element is to be set to blank. 2) Remove the default and modify the program code to check the address of the provider.		
43. Most Recent Case Plan Goal 1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long-term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established	2	<u>Systems</u> 1) The system and extraction logic for some systems appear to be preset to a goal instead of being based on the case planning process. 2) There were at least four systems (ACYS, FACTS, JCIS, LUIS) in which there is no history maintained of the case plan goal. The current plan goal overwrites the previous goal. 3) There were issues with how some of the systems (ACYS, FACTS, IHSIS, and KIDS) are recording and reporting a goal for a relative to receive guardianship. <u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The system and extraction logic for some systems appear to be preset to a goal instead of being based on the case planning process. 2) Agencies are not correctly mapping the goal	<u>Systems</u> 1) Modify the related systems to not have a preset goal in the field. 2) Develop table storage to maintain the history of case plans. 3) Modify the system to distinguish between a goal of guardianship by a relative from a person not related to the child. If the goal is for the relative to receive guardianship of the child, the case plan goal is to be mapped to the AFCARS value "live with other relative." Identify in the AIP if there is a means to do this with existing fields in the system. <u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to not default to any goal. 2) If a youth will be in foster care until the		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>for youth who will be in foster care until the age of majority and a goal of reunification, adoption, live with relative, or guardianship is not currently applicable.</p> <p>3) There are errors in the mapping of the options in KIDS to the AFCARS values. The value "Placement with a ready, willing, and able parent who was not previously identified by the County Agency" is incorrectly mapped to "long-term foster care."</p> <p>4) The extraction code for all systems is not checking how long the child has been in foster care.</p> <p>5) In seven systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, LUIS) there is no comparison of the date of the goal against the report period being extracted.</p> <p>6) The federal team was not able to fully evaluate the extraction code for ACYS as there were several values in the routine that we do not have what the number represents.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Reunification = 14,536 (74%); Live with Other Relative(s) = 334 (2%); Adoption = 2,609 (13%); Long-term Foster Care = 392 (2%); Emancipation = 891 (5%); Guardianship = 592 (3%); Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established = 179 (1%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=76):</i> 7 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was</p>	<p>age of majority and a permanency goal is not applicable, if the youth has a permanent connection with an adult set this element to "emancipation."</p> <p>2a) If there is no adult with a permanent connection to the child, set this element to "long-term foster care."</p> <p>3) Map the agency's option to "reunification" in AFCARS.</p> <p>4) If the program code does not find a goal, and the child has been in foster care for less than 60 days, set this element to "not yet established."</p> <p>4a) If the child has been in foster care for 60 or more days and a goal has not been entered into the system, set this element to blank.</p> <p>5) Modify the program code to select the most recent goal that has a date prior or equal to the last day of the report period being reported.</p> <p>6) The Federal and state team will need to discuss further and determine if there are any additional issues.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>reported in AFCARS. See the case file findings for information on the errors.</p> <p>For agencies using the AFCARS options as the case plan goal (IhSIS, JCIS, LUIS), the agency needs to ensure that "live with relative" is selected when the goal is to facilitate the relative to obtain guardianship of the child.</p>			
<p>Principal Caretaker(s) Information -</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>2</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) The options for the field Caretaker Family Structure in ACYS includes "not applicable." For caretaker family structure, "not applicable" is not a valid choice.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) There are three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and KIDS) that the program code defaults missing information to "unable to determine."</p> <p>2) The options in FACTS includes "unknown." The agency is incorrectly mapping this to "unable to determine" instead of blank. 2a) The agency's value "separated" is incorrectly mapped to "single." It should be mapped to "married couple."</p> <p>3) If there is no information, the program code for KIDS checks for the biological parent(s) information. The child may not have been removed from his/her parents.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u></p> <p><i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Married Couple = 4,000 (21%); Unmarried Couple = 2,297 (12%); Single Female = 6,754 (35%); Single Male = 929 (5%); Unable to Determine = 5,553 (28%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=73):</i> 22 (30%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>See previous comments regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value "unable to</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) Remove "not applicable" from the options of caretaker family structure.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Map missing data to blank.</p> <p>2) Map the value "unknown" to blank.</p> <p>2a) Map separated to married couple.</p> <p>3) The agency needs to re-evaluate the use of this routine and possibly remove it. The information should be from the identified field in the system.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>determine.” The user and the program code is to set this element to “unable to determine” if the child was a Safe Haven Infant. If the child was abandoned, and the worker has not yet obtained the information, “unable to determine” can be used. However, it is expected that the worker will obtain this information and update the field in the system.</p>			
45. Year of Birth (1 st Principal Caretaker)	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) There were issues with the FACTS extraction code.</p> <p>2) See the findings for KIDS in FC44. The same issue occurs for this element as well. If the caretaker family structure is blank, the program code looks for the birthdate of the first “mother” found on the client file with a role type of “1659” (biological), “24073” (teen), “1661” (legal), “1662” (step) or “2265” (adoptive). If the caretaker structure is not blank, it uses the biological mother’s date of birth. If the first caretaker’s year of birth is still blank, the program moves the second principal caretaker’s year of birth to the first principal caretaker’s field and sets the second principal caretaker’s year of birth to spaces.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 13,971; Not Reported = 5,562 <i>Case File Findings (n=68):</i> 7 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Most of the systems did not have technical issues with the reporting of this data and were rated a 3 to address data quality. There were two systems that do have technical issues. LUIS was rated a 4.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) The agency had identified issues and are making changes.</p> <p>2) The agency needs to re-evaluate the use of this routine and possibly remove it. The information should be from the identified field in the system.</p>		
46. Year of Birth (2 nd Principal Caretaker - if applicable)	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> There were some issues with how the dates of birth are collected in FACTS.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) The agency had identified issues and are making changes.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>2) See the findings for KIDS in FC44/45. The same issue occurs for this element as well.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 6,299; Not Reported = 13,234 <i>Case File Findings (n=70):</i> 6 (9%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Most of the systems did not have technical issues with the reporting of this data and were rated a 3 to address data quality. There were two systems that do have technical issues. LUIS was rated a 4.</p>	<p>2) The agency needs to re-evaluate the use of this routine and possibly remove it. The information should be from the identified field in the system.</p>		
47. Date of Mother's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	2	<p><u>System</u> 1) There are six systems (ACYS, Berks, FACTS, IhSIS, JCIS, LUIS) that do not maintain a history of the TPR dates.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There is one system (CAPS) that is incorrectly extracting the earliest parental rights terminated date of Mother-Biological, Mother-Legal, Mother-Adoptive, or, Mother-Step. The extraction code for IhSIS, JCIS, and LUIS is only pulling what was entered in the system AFCARS field. If there are multiple TPR dates that need to be recorded for mothers, then the code may not be reporting the correct one.</p> <p>2) The FACTS extraction code is only reporting a TPR date if the case plan goal is adoption.</p> <p>3) All the systems' extraction code does not include logic to check the date against the report period being extracted.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=78):</i> One of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Develop table storage to maintain the history of dates of termination of parental rights.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The extraction code must be modified to extract the latest TPR date regardless of the relationship if there is more than one.</p> <p>2) Modify the extraction code to check for a TPR date and if one is present, set it to this element.</p> <p>3) Modify the extraction code to extract the TPR date that is equal or prior to the last day of the report period being submitted.</p> <p>4) Agencies can report a deceased date for this element if one exist.</p>		
48. Date of Legal or Putative	2	<u>System</u>	<u>System</u>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
Father's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)		<p>1) There are six systems (ACYS, Berks, FACTS, lhSIS, JCIS, LUIS) that do not maintain a history of the TPR dates.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There is one system (CAPS) that is incorrectly extracting the earliest parental rights terminated date of father-biological, father-legal, father-adoptive or, father-step. The extraction code for lhSIS, JCIS, and LUIS is only pulling what was entered in the system AFCARS field. If there are multiple TPR dates that need to be recorded for fathers, then the code may not be reporting the correct one.</p> <p>2) FACTS extraction code is only reporting a TPR date if the case plan goal is adoption.</p> <p>3) All the systems' extraction code does not include logic to check the date against the report period being extracted.</p>	<p>1) Develop table storage to maintain the history of dates of termination of parental rights.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The extraction code must be modified to extract the latest TPR date regardless of the relationship if there is more than one.</p> <p>2) Modify the extraction code to check for a TPR date and if one is present, set it to this element.</p> <p>3) Modify the extraction code to extract the TPR date that is equal or prior to the last day of the report period being submitted.</p> <p>4) Agencies can report a deceased date for this element if one exist.</p>		
<p>49. Foster Family Structure</p> <p>0=Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male</p>	2	<p><u>System</u> 1) There is an option in the FACTS system of "other." that needs to be removed from the screen.</p> <p>2) The screen options for foster family structure in lhSIS and JCIS are the same as those in FC44.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The extraction code for KIDS is not correctly setting the value "not applicable." There were additional errors as well. While the field is the same for both the foster parent and the adoptive parent, the extraction of this information is done different in the extraction for foster care and adoption. There are issues that the federal team and state need to clarify.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Modify the screen by removing "other" as an option.</p> <p>2) Remove the option "unable to determine" from the list.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to set this element to "not applicable" if the setting in FC41 is other than 1, 2, or 3.</p> <p>1a) Federal and state team need to discuss the extraction logic for this element.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not Applicable = 5,707 (29%); Married Couple = 7,287 (37%); Unmarried Couple = 1,113 (6%); Single Female = 5,018 (26%); Single Male = 401 (2%); Not Reported = 7 There are 5,537 records reported in FC41 as being a non-foster home setting. There are more records reported as “not applicable” and this is likely a default for missing data. <i>Case File Findings (n=65):</i> 3 (5%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. There are four systems rated as “3” - ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and LUIS.</p>			
50. Year of Birth (1 st Foster Caretaker)	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) There are issues with the system as well as the extraction code for LUIS. The logic is only correct when the child’s foster parent is a single female. If the foster family structure is “single male” then the program code is reporting his date of birth in FC51 instead of in this element. 2) The program code for KIDS appears to not check for the information based on the report period being extracted. <u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth = 13,810; Not Reported = 5,723 There are years of birth missing per the frequency findings in FC49. There are six systems rated as “3.”</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to first check the marital status and then to check the appropriate caretaker field in the system. If the foster parent is single (either male or female), set the date of birth for this element. 2) Modify the program code to check for the foster parent and date of birth that is for the current setting as of the end of the report period being extracted.</p>		
51. Year of Birth (2 nd Foster Caretaker)	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) There are issues with the system as well as the extraction code for LUIS. See note in FC51. 2) The program code for KIDS appears to not check for the information based on the report period being extracted. <u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Years of birth =</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) If the foster parent is single, this element is to be set to blank. 2) Modify the program code to check for the foster parent and date of birth that is for the current setting as of the end of the report period being extracted.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>8,234; Not Reported = 11,299 There are years of birth missing per the frequency findings in FC49. There are 8,400 records reported as married and unmarried couple. In addition to the 5,537 records reported in FC41 as a non-foster home, there should be 5,419 records reported as blank because the foster parent is single and another seven records reported as blank due to missing information in FC49. The total of blank records then for FC51 should be 10,963. There are three systems rated as "3" - ACYS, Berks, CAPS, FACTS, IhsSIS, JCIS</p>			
52. Race of 1 st Foster Caretaker	2	<p><u>System</u> 1) One system, IhsSIS, does not have the capacity to collect more than one race.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) As noted in FC8, child's race, there are mapping errors in four systems (FACTS, IhsSIS, KIDS, LUIS). 2) There is an issue with the extraction code for CAPS and KIDS based on the frequency report and case file review. The case file findings indicate these fields were not left blank when the child was in a non-foster home setting for one of the counties. It appears this is not consistently extracted across all the counties using CAPS. 3) FACTS, IhsSIS, and JCIS extraction code sets the race categories to zeroes if there is no provider or if the information was not entered. 4) The KIDS system contains additional nationalities that the program code does not check.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) The county must modify the system to have the capacity to collect all race categories.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the extraction code to map the races to the correct AFCARS options. 2) The agency needs to check the code and ensure that if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting as of the end of the report period, these fields are set to blank. 2a) For KIDS, modify the program code to set those races not selected by the user as applying to "no." 3) Modify the program code to set these fields to blank if no race information is entered into the system. 3a) Modify the program code to set these fields to blank if the child is in a non-foster home setting. 4) Modify the program code to check the nationality field and if selected, map it to the appropriate AFCARS race field.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>5) There was an issue in the LUIS extraction logic as well that was an issue for all elements 52 - 55. The logic and the system are gender specific and so the wrong information is reported for first foster caretaker when the foster parent is single.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are not the same number of records reported as blank (Not Reported) for each of the race categories. The number of records with no information should be the same. This means there is an issue in how "applies" and "does not apply" is being entered/extracted. Also note prior discussions regarding cases reported as a non-foster home setting in FC41. Those records are to be reported as blanks for this element.</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value "unable to determine." For the foster parents' race fields, there should be an option of "declined" and another to account for situations where the person identifies as being more than one race, but does not know all races. For foster parents, records reported as "unable to determine" should only be those in which the foster parent declined to provide the information.</p> <p>There are two systems, ACYS and Berks, rated a "3."</p>	<p>5) Modify the program code to check the marital status for FC49 and if single, map the person's races to this field.</p>		
<p>53. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 1st Foster Caretaker</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) As noted in FC9, there are two systems (IhSIS and JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved.</p> <p>2) The extraction code for FACTS is initialized to "not applicable." If the data are missing, this element will incorrectly be reported as "not applicable."</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) If the worker has not collected the information, the fields on the screen and in AFCARS are to be left blank.</p> <p>2a) Modify the extraction to initialize to blank.</p> <p>2b) If the child's placement as of the end of the report period is a non-foster home</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>3) It appears that the logic for IHSIS is checking the wrong variable.</p> <p>4) In two systems (KIDS and LUIS) there were mapping errors.</p> <p>5) The logic in the KIDS extraction code will set missing information to spaces. A subsequent check will set it to "not applicable" if all the values for the first foster caretaker are blank.</p> <p>6) The extraction logic for LUIS is gender specific and so the wrong information is reported for first foster caretaker when the foster parent is single.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not Applicable = 5,718; Yes = 981 (5%); No = 12,782 (65%); Unable to determine = 52 (.27%); Not Reported = 0 As previously noted, the number of records reported in FC41 as a non-foster home setting is 5,537; the number that should be reported here for "not applicable."</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value "unable to determine" for foster parents.</p> <p>There are three systems rated a "3" - ACYS, Berks, and CAPS.</p>	<p>setting set this element to "not applicable."</p> <p>2c) If no information on the foster parent is entered into the system, set this element to blank.</p> <p>3) The agency needs to confirm if there is an error.</p> <p>4) Make corrections in the mapping of the agency's values to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>5a) Modify the program code to check if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting.</p> <p>5b) If the child is placed in a non-foster home setting, set this element to "not applicable."</p> <p>5c) If the foster parent's Hispanic ethnicity information is missing, then set this element to blank.</p> <p>6) Modify the program code to check the marital status for FC49 and if single, map the person's ethnicity to this field.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>54. Race of 2nd Foster Caretaker (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>	2	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) One system, IhsIS, does not have the capacity to collect more than one race.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) As noted in FC8, child's race, there are mapping errors in four systems (FACTS, IhsIS, KIDS, LUIS).</p> <p>2) There is an issue with the extraction code for CAPS and KIDS based on the frequency report and case file review. The case file findings indicate these fields were not left blank when the child was in a non-foster home setting for one of the counties. It appears this is not consistently extracted across all the counties using CAPS.</p> <p>3) FACTS, IhsIS, and JCIS extraction code sets the race categories to zeroes if there is no provider or if the information was not entered.</p> <p>4) The KIDS system contains additional nationalities that the program code does not check.</p> <p>5) There was an issue in the LUIS extraction logic as well that was an issue for all elements 52 - 55. The logic and the system are gender specific and so the wrong information is reported for first caretaker when the foster parent is single.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u></p> <p><i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are not the same number of records reported as blank (Not Reported) for each of the race categories. The number of records with no information should be</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) The county must modify the system to have the capacity to collect all race categories.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Modify the extraction code to map the races to the correct AFCARS options.</p> <p>2) The agency needs to check the code and ensure that if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting as of the end of the report period, these fields are set to blank.</p> <p>2a) For KIDS, modify the program code to set those races not selected by the user as applying to "no."</p> <p>3) Modify the program code to set these fields to blank if no race information is entered into the system.</p> <p>3a) Modify the program code to set these fields to blank if the child is in a non-foster home setting.</p> <p>4) Modify the program code to check the nationality field and if selected, map it to the appropriate AFCARS race field.</p> <p>5) Modify the program code to check the marital status for FC49 and if single, set these fields to blank.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>the same. This means there is an issue in how “applies” and “does not apply” is being entered/extracted. Also note prior discussions regarding cases reported as a non-foster home setting in FC41. Those records are to be reported as blanks for this element. Additionally, if the foster parent is single, these elements are to be reported as blank.</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine” for foster parents.</p> <p>There are two systems, ACYS and Berks, rated a “3.”</p>			
<p>55. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 2nd Foster Caretaker (if applicable)</p> <p>0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) As noted in FC9, there are two systems (IhSIS and JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved.</p> <p>2) The extraction code for FACTS is initialized to “not applicable.” If the data are missing, this element will incorrectly be reported as “not applicable.”</p> <p>3) It appears that the logic for IhSIS is checking the wrong variable.</p> <p>4) In two systems (KIDS and LUIS) there were mapping errors.</p> <p>5) The logic in the KIDS extraction code will set missing information to spaces. A subsequent check will set it to “not applicable” if all the values for the first foster caretaker are blank.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) If the worker has not collected the information, the fields on the screen and in AFCARS are to be left blank.</p> <p>2a) Modify the extraction to initialize to blank.</p> <p>2b) If the child’s placement as of the end of the report period is a non-foster home setting, set this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>2c) If no information on the foster parent is entered into the system, set this element to blank.</p> <p>3) The agency needs to confirm if there is an error.</p> <p>4) Make corrections in the mapping of the agency’s values to the AFCARS values.</p> <p>5a) Modify the program code to check if the child is placed in a non-foster home setting.</p> <p>5b) If the child is placed in a non-foster home setting, set this element to “not</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>6) The extraction logic for LUIS is gender specific and so the wrong information is reported for first foster caretaker when the foster parent is single.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not Applicable = 11,130 (57%); Yes = 609 (3%); No = 7,775 (40%); Unable to determine = 19 (.10%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>As previously noted, the number of records reported in FC41 as a non-foster home setting is 5,537 and the number of records reported as a single female and male is 5,419. The total response then for “not applicable” should be 10,956.</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine” for the foster parents.</p> <p>There are three systems rated as “3” - ACYS, Berks, and CAPS.</p>	<p>applicable.”</p> <p>5c) If the foster parent’s Hispanic ethnicity information is missing, then set this element to blank.</p> <p>5d) If the foster parent is single, set this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>6) Modify the program code to check the marital status for FC49 and if single set this element to “not applicable.”</p>		
56. Date of Discharge from Foster Care	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) There are systems that are incorrectly including youth 18 and older who are not receiving title IV-E funds.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1a) If the youth is 18 years old and not eligible/receiving title IV-E funds; enter the youth’s 18th birthday as the date of discharge.</p> <p>1b) For report periods prior to 2012B, for youth who are 18 and receiving title IV-E funds once they turn 19 or if they lose eligibility prior to age 19, report the end date of IV-E for this element.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>2) There may be issues for those systems in which the end of a placement is also used as a discharge date in reporting the correct date.</p> <p>3) There is an issue with the date of discharge being excluded in subsequent files or possibly reporting a "future date." There are at least four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, and JCIS) in which it appears the extraction code is not limited to the report period.</p> <p>4) There were issues in the FACTS collection and extraction of discharge dates.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> There are 4,706 records reported with a discharge data and 14,827 reported as blank. There is a discrepancy between FC56 and 58. The number of records reported with a date of discharge is less than the number of records reported with a discharge reason.</p>	<p>2) The counties and state must ensure that the discharge date reflects when the agency no longer has responsibility for placement and care.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code to add logic to check for dates based on the report period being extracted for subsequent files.</p> <p>4) The agency had identified issues and has a plan for correcting the extraction of the information.</p>		
<p>58. Reason for Discharge</p> <p>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</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) There are systems that are incorrectly including youth 18 and older who are not receiving title IV-E funds.</p> <p>2) There is an issue with the date of discharge being excluded in subsequent files or possibly reporting a "future date." There are at least four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, and JCIS) in which it appears the extraction code is not limited to the report period.</p> <p>3) There are three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and KIDS) that have errors in the mapping of the</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1a) If the youth is 18 years old and not eligible/receiving title IV-E funds; enter "emancipation" (unless there is another applicable discharge) for this element.</p> <p>1b) For report periods prior to 2012B, for youth who are 18 and receiving title IV-E funds once they turn 19 or if they lose eligibility prior to age 19, report "emancipation" for this element.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code to add logic to check for dates based on the report period being extracted for subsequent files.</p> <p>3) The agency also needs to provide definitions/clarifications to the Federal team</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>agency's values to AFCARS. There are additional questions the federal team has regarding the option list in ACYS. There are options listed, and mapped to AFCARS, that are not clear and may not reflect an actual discharge from the agency's responsibility for placement and care. The federal team has questions regarding the selection of this information in the JCIS system.</p> <p>4) In one system (CAPS) the caseworker has to select "not applicable."</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=19,533):</i> Not applicable = 14,694 (75%); Reunification = 2,425 (12%); Living with Other Relative(s) = 269 (1%); Adoption = 951 (5%); Emancipation = 440 (2%); Guardianship = 302 (2%); Transfer to Another Agency = 324 (2%); Runaway = 123 (1%); Death of Child = 5 (.03%); Not reported = 0 There is a discrepancy between FC56 and 58. The number of records reported with a date of discharge is less than the number of records reported with a discharge reason.</p>	<p>for some of the options.</p> <p>3a) Correct mapping errors.</p> <p>4) Consider removing this value from the system and adding logic to the extraction code.</p> <p>5) For those systems (Berks, CAPS, IhsSIS, and LUIS) that use the same values as are in the AFCARS regulation, ensure the outcome of a relative obtaining guardianship is entered as "guardianship" and not "live with relative."</p>		
<p>Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 59. Title IV-E (Foster Care)</p> <p>0-Does not apply 1-Applies</p>	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There may be issues with the selection of this information in the extract code of ACYS. If the child is eligible for title IV-E, but spends the full six months in a hospital or locked facility, this element is to be set to "does not apply."</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=71):</i> 4 (6%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in three error cases should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Review code and provide results of finding to federal team. 2) The agencies should verify that the numbers reported for this element are accurate.</p>		
<p>Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 60. Title IV-E (Adoption Assistance)</p>	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There are technical issues for FACTS and IhsSIS. The agencies may have a small number of cases where adoption assistance funds are paid prior to finalization. However, the logic to</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to check if there are any records in which the agency used IV-E AA for the foster care maintenance payment prior to the finalization of the</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
0-Does not apply 1-Applies		set the value for adoption assistance has been commented out in FACTS and this element is always reported as “does not apply.” The program code for lhSIS is initialized to “does not apply” and there is no code to actually set this field to “applies.”	adoption.		
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 61. Title IV-A 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2	<u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The lhSIS, including the system used by the county JPO, incorrectly indicates on the screen “Prior to removal child received IV-A Y/N.” The extraction logic for KIDS must be modified to check for this information after the child’s removal date in the period the child entered foster care.	<u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The agencies need to ensure that it is not recording/reporting the title IV-A (TANF) payment the family from whom the child was removed may have received. This element is to reflect a child in foster care and can only be paid to a relative.		
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 62. Title IV-D (Child Support) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	2	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 2 (3%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”	<u>Extraction Code</u> 1) FACTS: modify the program code to include logic to set this element.		
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 63. Title XIX (Medicaid) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	3	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 10 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”	The agencies are encouraged to monitor the data to ensure accuracy.		
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 64. SSI or Other Social Security Benefits 0-Does not apply 1-Applies	3	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 4 (6%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in three error cases should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”	The agencies are encouraged to monitor the data to ensure accuracy.		
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child: 65. None of the Above	2	<u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=72):</i> 9 (13%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In seven of the error cases, this element indicated “applies” but the	<u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The program code and system should allow for this to be applies in addition to one of elements 59-64 also applying.		

AFCARS Assessment Review Improvement Plan: Foster Care Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
0-Does not apply 1-Applies		reviewers found that one, or more, of the above items did apply and that there were no other sources of income found for the child. In one error case the reviewer found other sources of income in addition to those selected in 59 -64. This element should have been reported as applying as well.			
66. Amount of Monthly Foster Care Payment	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There are several systems that are adding together payments that may be to multiple providers in one month. Additionally, the program code for Berks is only using the last month of the report period.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=20):</i> The majority of cases were not analyzed because the reviewers were not able to find the information. Of the 20 records analyzed, there were two in error. In both cases, the amount reported to AFCARS did not match what was in the paper documentation.</p> <p>There are two systems (ACYS and JCIS) that were rated a 3.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) If the child has not been in the same setting for the calendar month, the program code should check for the prior month (etc.) to check for a month with a full payment to the same provider. Note that this method may not reflect the current living arrangement reported in FC41. To make the data in this element more consistent, if the child has not been in the same level of a care setting for the full month, set this element to zeroes.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>4. Did the title IV-E Agency have any involvement in this adoption?</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No</p>	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The program code for both KIDS and LUIS is checking responses to certain fields and are not accurately checking all the relevant fields. Also, see GR11 for findings related to the reporting population.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to ensure this element is correctly set to "yes."</p>		
<p>7. Child's Race</p> <p>0=No 1=Yes</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>	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> In FACTS, IhsIS, KIDS, and LUIS technical issues found for FC8 apply to this element. In two systems (ACYS and Berks) the program code will default to "unable to determine" if no race information was entered.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> There was one error case where the reviewer found an additional race that was not reported.</p> <p>The following systems use a single client screen to record demographics: CAPS, FACTS, IhsIS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS.</p> <p>The systems that are designed in way that requires this information to be reentered could have differing information than what was reported in the foster care file. The agencies need to ensure that the two fields match and are reflective of what the child (if age appropriate) or parent had identified as the race for the child.</p> <p>Use of AFCARS administrative value "unable to determine." Options should be reflective of the actual information related to why information on race was not collected. The infant entered under Safe Haven, the child was abandoned or the parents were incapacitated and no one was available to provide race information; or, the parents declined to provide the information. If the information was not asked or not recorded, the race fields should be left blank and reported as blank.</p>	<p><u>Form/System (See FC8)</u> 1a) IhsIS must modify the system to have the capacity to collect all race categories.</p> <p>1b) The agency needs to remove "other" as an option on the forms.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1a) Initialize these fields to blank.</p> <p>1b) If no information is entered for race, report these fields as blank.</p> <p>2) Correct mapping errors for these systems.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code for KIDS to check the nationalities and if one is selected, map it to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> Systems that have two separate screens: The agencies need to ensure that the two fields match and are reflective of what the child (if age appropriate) or parent had identified as the race for the child.</p>		
<p>8. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity</p>	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) For ACYS the only values mapped are "yes" and "no." If these are not found, the extraction</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to set this element to blank if no information is entered</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine</p>		<p>logic sets FC9 to “unable to determine.”</p> <p>2) lhSIS includes Hispanic with each race and is not a separate field. Since there are identified issues with the collection of race information, this element also needs to be modified and made into a separate data field.</p> <p>3) In two systems (KIDS, LUIS) there were mapping errors.</p> <p>4) In three systems (Berks, lhSIS, JCIS) the extraction code does not appear to account for missing or invalid values. These systems may also require data to be entered before the screen/fields can be saved.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 120 (13%); No = 779 (86%); Unable to determine = 9 (1%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The response in the error cases should have been “yes” instead of “unable to determine.”</p> <p>There was one system (CAPS) with no identified technical issues. Since there were errors in the test cases for <i>all</i> systems, the State needs to ensure that the workers are asking for the person’s ethnicity and entering what was provided by the family/youth.</p> <p>The following systems use a single client screen to record demographics: CAPS, FACTS, lhSIS, JCIS, KIDS, and LUIS. The remaining systems are designed in way that requires this information to be reentered; it is possible that it could differ from what was reported in the foster care file. The agencies need to ensure that the two fields match and are reflective of what the child (if age appropriate) or parent had identified</p>	<p>into the system.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code once system corrections are completed to map Hispanic ethnicity to this element.</p> <p>3) Modify the program code to make related corrections to the mapping of information.</p> <p>4) Verify how these systems are designed and if the worker has not collected the information will the fields on the screen be left blank and be reported in AFCARS as blank.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> Systems that have two separate screens: The agencies need to ensure that the two fields match and are reflective of what the child (if age appropriate) or parent had identified as the race for the child.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>the race of the child to be.</p> <p>See the note in AD7 regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of "unable to determine."</p>			
<p>9. Has the title IV-E agency determined that the child has special needs?</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No</p>	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> The program code for LUIS always sets this element to "yes." If the agency's policy/practice is to determine all children eligible for adoption assistance, then this is fine.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 794 (87%); No = 114 (13%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=27):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The agency needs to investigate and provide feedback to the federal team. 2) The information extracted from FACTS is based on what is extracted in AD10. See issues noted for AD 10. 3) For KIDS, it is possible that not all criteria are being included in the evaluation for this element.</p>		
<p>10. Primary Factor or Condition for Special Needs</p> <p>0=Not applicable 1=Racial/Ethnic Background 2=Age 3=Membership in a Sibling Group 4=Medical conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5=Other</p>	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) The FACTS system does not contain all the same characteristics as noted on the eligibility form and is instead only checking a couple of characteristics from within the system. There is no indication that the caseworker has identified the primary basis (biggest barrier to adoption) for special needs.</p> <p>The program code for KIDS is incorrectly setting this element based on a hierarchy and is not child specific. There also does not appear to be a means to identify what the caseworker has determined to be the primary basis of special needs.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Not Applicable = 107 (12%); Racial/Ethnic Background = 311 (34%); Age = 103 (11%); Sibling Group =238 (26%); Medical, etc. = 120 (13%); Other = 29 (3%); Not reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=27):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) Develop and implement a method to collect the primary basis for special needs. 1a) Map the options to the respective AFCARS value.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>Elements #11 – 15</p> <p>11. Type of Disability-Mental Retardation 12. Type of Disability-Visually or Hearing Impaired 13. Type of Disability-Physically Disabled 14. Type of Disability-Emotionally Disturbed 15. Type of Disability-Other Medically Diagnosed Condition Requiring Special Care</p> <p>0=Does not Apply 1=Yes, applies</p>		<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) There are four systems (CAPS, FACTS, IHSIS, and LUIS) that if a child has a diagnosed condition this information is incorrectly reported regardless of what is reported in AD10.</p> <p>2) There are conditions in KIDS not being mapped and others that are incorrectly mapped. The extraction code for KIDS also contains logic to default AD13 to applies if the response to AD10 is “4” but all of 11 - 15 are set to “does not apply.”</p> <p>3) If more than one diagnosed condition category exists in FACTS, only one is reported.</p> <p>4) In addition to the prior notes in AD9 for FACTS, it is not clear which of the systems FACTS or FACTS2 these elements are extracted from and how the information in the two systems are synced. It is not clear that the extraction code for ACYS and KIDS is correct in regard to this standard.</p> <p>Note: Unlike the foster care file, this data is not dependent on dates since this file is a point in time file and the conditions had to be active in order for AD10 to be selected as “medical.”</p> <p><u>Data Quality:</u> There was one system (JCIS) that did not appear to have any technical issues and was rated a 3. See the Case File Findings.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u></p> <p>1) Modify the extraction code to set these elements to “does not apply” when the response in AD10 is not “4.”</p> <p>2) Modify the mapping to ensure all diagnosed conditions are correctly reported to each relevant category.</p> <p>2a) Remove the default logic for AD13.</p> <p>3) Modify the mapping to ensure all diagnosed conditions are correctly reported to each relevant category.</p> <p>4) The federal and state team need to discuss further ACYS, Berks, FACTS, and KIDS.</p> <p>5) Also, see notes in FC11 - 15 for any mapping issues.</p>		
<p>16. Mother’s Year of Birth</p>	2	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) In two systems (Berks and JCIS) the screen used is labeled “birth parent.” It is not clear for FACTS or LUIS that the extraction logic is reporting the date of birth for the most recent legal parent.</p> <p>2) For LUIS and FACTS the adoption screen is labeled “birth parent” but there are other screens where the parent’s year of birth is entered. The data appear to be reentered for</p>	<p><u>System</u></p> <p>1) The agencies should consider changing the language for the field to ensure that the prior legal mother’s year of birth is entered.</p> <p>2) The agencies need to explain what information is being entered and may need to change the language on the screen as well.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>the parents on the adoption screen. This could also cause additional errors.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) In one system (CAPS) the program code is only checking for a biological mother.</p> <p>2) It is not clear for FACTS or LUIS that the extraction logic is reporting the date of birth for the most recent legal parent.</p> <p>2) The extraction logic for KIDS is incorrectly setting this element to zeroes if no year of birth is found. Also, it is not clear that the code will correctly pick up the legal mom's year of birth.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 11 records reported as blank. <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 3 (10%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The year that was reported to AFCARS was 1900.</p> <p>There are two systems (ACYS and lhSIS) rated a 3.</p> <p>All agencies need to ensure that the information entered for this element reflects the last legal parent of the child.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to check for the last legal mother and not just the biological mother.</p> <p>2) The agencies need to provide an explanation to the federal team.</p> <p>3) The field is to be set to blank if no information was entered.</p> <p>3a) Verify who's year of birth the program code checks.</p>		
17. Father's Year of Birth	2	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) See the findings for AD16. The same issues apply to this element.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 253 records reported as blank. <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 4 (14%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) See the findings for AD16. The same issues apply to this element.</p>		
18. Was the Mother married at the time of the child's birth?	2	<p><u>System</u> 1) In three systems (CAPS, JCIS, LUIS) the field that collects this information is in the adoption module and so is not entered until the time the</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Modify the system by moving the field to the section of the system recording assessment information on the child/family</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine</p>		<p>child is adopted, or in the process of being adopted.</p> <p>2) In one system (lhSIS) there is no logic to report “unable to determine.” How does the agency account for infants that enter under Safe Haven? Are they always certain the mother was not married? The system should have a field indicating if the child was a Safe Haven Infant and the extraction code check for this indicator.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) In three systems (ACYS, FACTS, and KIDS) the program code defaults missing information to “unable to determine.”</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 132 (15%); No = 638 (70%); Unable to determine = 138 (15%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=28):</i> 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case, the response should have been “yes” instead of “no.” In the other error case, the response should have been “no” instead of “unable to determine.”</p> <p>There is one system (Berks) rated a 3.</p> <p>Also, all local agencies need to ensure that the value “unable to determine” is being used correctly - reflect infants entering foster care under Safe Haven.</p>	<p>or possibly on a demographics screen.</p> <p>2) The agency needs to respond to the questions and then the federal team will determine if additional tasks are necessary.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the extraction logic to set this element to blank if no information is entered into the system.</p>		
<p>19. Date of Mother’s Termination of Parental Rights</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) For two systems (ACYS and Berks) there is a field in an adoption module where this data is directly extracted from into the AFCARS field. What is not clear about these systems is whether the date is being brought forward from the foster care component of the system or if it is being re-entered. There are issues noted in FC47 that may need to be addressed as well for this element.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Provide an explanation.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) In the system CAPS the program code only checks the relationship of "biological." If the last parent to the child was a legal parent (in the case of a prior adoption), then the program code may very well be reporting the wrong individual.</p> <p>2) The systems lHsIS and LUIS appear to be extracting the data from the same field as was used in foster care but it is not checking for the latest TPR date as of the date of the adoption.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 3 records reported as blank. <i>Case File Findings (n=28):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The date found by the reviewer was the hearing date and this was not the date reported in AFCARS. In other cases, it appears the hearing date is reported.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to check for the last termination of parental rights regardless of prior status.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code to check for the last termination of parental rights regardless of prior status that is prior to the current adoption date.</p> <p>3) See findings for FC47.</p>		
20. Date of Father's Termination of Parental Rights	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) See the findings for AD19 as well as FC48.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> There are 16 records reported as blank.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=28):</i> 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. The date found by the reviewer was the hearing date and this was not the date reported in AFCARS. In other cases, it appears the hearing date is reported.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) See the findings for AD19 as well as FC48.</p>		
21. Date Adoption Legalized	2	<p><u>Program Code</u> 1) There are multiple fields in KIDS that this date could be entered and it is not clear if it is entered once and then populates the other fields, or if it has to be entered multiple times. 1a) Also, the program code is checking two different dates, legalization and finalization dates, and it is not clear why. The agency needs to clarify and ensure that the actual date the judge orders the adoption final is what gets</p>	<p><u>Program Code</u> 1) Agency needs to explain how the system maintains the data.</p> <p>1a) Explain why both of these dates are checked and what the difference is between them.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>reported for this element. The date should also be the same date reported in FC56.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> 1) There are four systems (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, and FACTS) that have a field for the adoption finalization date in the adoption component of their system. The date is not being brought forward from the foster care field nor is it being populated by the date of discharge field. While these systems were not rated a 2 due to their data entry process, they should be addressing this in regard to a quality assurance process and revising the system and extraction code to use the date of discharge.</p>			
Adoptive Parent Information (Elements #22 – 28)		<p>There are systems that have a separate field for the adoptive parent's information. The information is re-entered even if the adoptive parents were the child's foster parents. The information should be the same and carried forward if the adoptive parents were also the foster parents, and not re-entered. At a minimum, this needs to be incorporated into the QA process.</p>			
<p>22. Adoptive Parents' Family Structure</p> <p>1=Married couple 2=Unmarried couple 3=Single female 4=Single male</p>	2	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) In CAPS, the extraction code includes mapping of "unable to determine." This was not an option on the screen.</p> <p>2a) The program code in KIDS is incorrectly mapping separated to single instead of married. 2b) Also, if nothing is found it sets this element to single male.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Married Couple = 600 (66%); Unmarried Couple = 52 (6%); Single Female = 242 (27%); Single Male = 14 (2%); Not Reported = 0</p> <p>In FACTS, the field used are the same as those noted in FC49. The adoption element was rated a 3 for this reason and issues noted in FC49 for corrections would be carried over to the</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code and remove the logic.</p> <p>2a) Modify the program code to map "separated" to "married."</p> <p>2a) Modify the program code to specifically check if the adoptive parent is a single male or single female; set to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p> <p>2c) Modify the program code to set this element to blank if no information is entered into the system.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
23. Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	2	<p>extraction of this element.</p> <p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) In ACYS there is an issue related to reporting information on single adoptive parents for elements 23 - 28.</p> <p>2) CAPS is using the same vendor fields used for the foster parents. However, it is not clear that there is not the same issue in the extraction code as was found in ACYS.</p> <p>3) As noted in AD22 for KIDS there is an issue with how the program code is identifying the adoptive parents.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29): 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. In one error case the year reported was 1990 but the reviewer found an actual year of 1980. In the other case a wrong year of birth was reported.</i></p> <p>There are three systems (CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS) using the same fields to record/extract this data that are used for the foster parents. The agencies need to verify that this data is the same if the foster parents are adopting the child and that there are no discrepancies. The fields appear to be gender neutral and the agencies need to ensure that information on same-sex couples is reported correctly. FACTS received a rating of 3 for this element. See below for findings on CAPS and KIDS.</p> <p>There are two systems (Berks, lhSIS) rated a 3. For those adoptive parents who were foster parents, the systems do not carry forward the person's demographic information. Instead, the user has to re-enter the information. It is not clear that the system or the extraction is correctly reporting a same-sex couple's information. The rating may be changed after the federal team receives information from the</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to set this element to blank if the child's adoptive parent is a single male.</p> <p>2) The agency needs to review and provide information to the federal team.</p> <p>3) Re-examine the code and identify if it can be simplified to check for the individuals who adopted the child.</p> <p>3a) The extraction can be similar to that in foster care for the foster parents, except that gender must be checked. If the child's adoptive parent is single male, leave this element blank.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>state.</p> <p>JCIS was rated a 3 as well. However, it is not clear if information is re-entered or carried forward from the same fields used for foster parents.</p>			
<p>24. Adoptive Father's Year of Birth</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) In ACYS if the child is adopted by a single male, this element is incorrectly left blank.</p> <p>2) CAPS is using the same vendor fields used for the foster parents. However, it is not clear that there is not the same issue in the extraction code as was found in ACYS.</p> <p>3) As noted in AD22 for KIDS there is an issue with how the program code is identifying the adoptive parents.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS. A wrong year of birth was reported.</p> <p>See the notes in AD23 for Berks, FACTS, IhsIS, and JCIS.</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) If the child's adoptive parent is a single male, report the date in this field.</p> <p>1a) If the adoptive parent is a single female, leave this field blank.</p> <p>2) The agency needs to review and provide information to the federal team.</p> <p>3) Re-examine the code and identify if it can be simplified to check for the individuals who adopted the child.</p> <p>3a) The extraction can be similar to that in foster care for the foster parents, except that gender must be checked. If the child's adoptive parent is single female, leave this element blank.</p>		
<p>25. Adoptive Mother's Race</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) The system IhsIS only collects one race.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) For ACYS, see notes in AD23 as this issues affects all of the elements for the adoptive parent. The program code for CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS is incorrectly setting these fields to "no" if the child's adoptive parent is a single male. These fields are to be set to blank.</p> <p>2) As noted in prior race elements, there are mapping errors for KIDS and LUIS</p> <p>3) The programming logic for FACTS needs to</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Modify the system to have fields to collect each race category.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) If the child's adoptive parent is a single male, the race categories are to be left blank for AD25.</p> <p>2) Make mapping corrections as noted in foster care.</p> <p>3) Re-examine the code and identify if it can</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>be simplified; see prior notes.</p> <p>4) IhsIS only reports one race.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> See previous note in the foster parent elements regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of “unable to determine.” For adoptive parents, the options should be the races, decline, and multi-racial/additional race(s) not known.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29): 2 (7%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</i> See previous notes concerning accurate data.</p>	<p>be simplified to check for the individuals who adopted the child.</p> <p>3a) The extraction can be similar to that in foster care for the foster parents, except that gender must be checked. If the child’s adoptive parent is single male, leave this element blank.</p> <p>4) Once changes are made to the system, modify the program code to report all applicable races a person identifies.</p>		
<p>26. Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin</p> <p>0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) For ACYS, the program code sets this field to “unable to determine” if a value of “yes” or “no” is not found. If there is no information entered, the program code for CAPS and LUIS defaults this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>2) See notes in AD23 for ACYS. There are four additional system (Berks, FACTS, KIDS, LUIS) that must modify the program code to set this element to “not applicable” if the child is adopted by a single male.</p> <p>3) See prior issues related to the collection and reporting of race and Hispanic ethnicity in the foster parent elements for IhsIS. The same issues apply to the adoptive parents.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908): Not Applicable =</i></p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) If the person declines to provide their ethnicity, then this element can be set to “unable to determine.”</p> <p>1a) If no information is entered into the system, set this element to blank.</p> <p>2) Modify the program code to check if the child’s adoptive parent is a single male, if so set this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>3) Make changes to the program code as previously noted.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p>10; Yes = 67 (7%); No = 828 (91%); Unable to determine = 3 (.33%); Not Reported = 0 There are 14 records reported as single male in AD22. There should be 14 records reported in this element as “not applicable.”</p> <p>See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the adoptive parents’ Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, there should be an option of “declined.” For adoptive parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the adoptive parent declined to provide the information.</p>			
<p>27. Adoptive Father’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>2</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) The system IhsIS only collects one race. The agency must be able to collect and report all applicable races a person identifies. Also, there is no value to collect Asian.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) For ACYS, see notes in AD23 as this issues affects all of the elements for the adoptive parent.</p> <p>2) While it appears that there were errors in AD25 (CAPS and FACTS) if the child was adopted by a single male, these fields seem to be reported correctly (blank) if the child was adopted by a single female.</p> <p>3) As noted in prior race elements, there are mapping errors for KIDS and LUIS</p> <p>4) The programming logic for FACTS needs to be simplified; see prior notes.</p> <p>5) IhsIS only reports one race.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Modify the system to have fields to collect each race category.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) If the child’s adoptive parent is a single female, the race categories are to be left blank for AD25.</p> <p>2) The agency will need to verify the code is correct.</p> <p>3) Make mapping corrections as noted in foster care.</p> <p>4) Re-examine the code and identify if it can be simplified to check for the individuals who adopted the child. 4a) The extraction can be similar to that in foster care for the foster parents, except that gender must be checked. If the child’s adoptive parent is single male, leave this element blank.</p> <p>5) Once changes are made to the system,</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
		<p><u>Data Quality</u> See previous note in the foster parent elements regarding use of the AFCARS administrative value of “unable to determine.” For adoptive parents, the options should be the races, decline, and multi-racial/additional race(s) not known.</p> <p><i>Case File Findings (n=29):</i> 1 (4%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.</p>	<p>modify the program code to report all applicable races a person identifies.</p>		
<p>28. Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin</p> <p>0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>System and Extraction Code</u> 1) There are five system (ACYS, Berks, FACTS, KIDS, LUIS) that must modify the program code to set this element to “not applicable” if the child is adopted by a single female. ACYS must be modified in instances where the child is adopted by a single male; report the adoptive father's Hispanic Origin to this element.</p> <p>2) If there is no information entered, the program code for CAPS and LUIS defaults this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>3) See prior issues related to the collection and reporting of race and Hispanic ethnicity in the foster parent elements for IHSIS. The same issues apply to the adoptive parents.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> See the previous notes regarding the use of the AFCARS administrative value “unable to determine.” For the adoptive parents' Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, there should be an option of “declined.” For adoptive parents, records reported as “unable to determine” should only be those in which the adoptive parent declined to provide the information.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to check if the child's adoptive parent is a single female, if so set this element to “not applicable.”</p> <p>2) If the person declines to provide their ethnicity, then this element can be set to “unable to determine.”</p> <p>2a) If no information is entered into the system, set this element to blank.</p> <p>3) Make changes to the program code as previously noted.</p>		
<p>Elements #29 – 32 30. Relationship to Adoptive Parent -Other Relative 31. Relationship to Adoptive</p>		<p><u>System</u> 1) In one system (FACTS), there is no clear method of recording all applicable relationships.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) Modify the systems to accurately collect all possible combination of relationships between the child and the adoptive parents.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>Parent -Foster Parent 32. Relationship to Adoptive Parent -Other Non-relative</p> <p>0 = Does not Apply 1 = Applies</p>		<p>The collection of this information in KIDS and JCIS also is not multi-select. The system and related extraction code must be modified.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) In one system (FACTS), the program code does not extract and map each relationship that applies.</p> <p>2) The program code for IhsIS does not correctly extract this information. Other non-relative (AD32) is reported if nothing is reported for #29 – 31. The code needs to check if the response for each question and map accordingly.</p>	<p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to extract all relationships and map it to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p> <p>2) Remove the default setting and if no information is entered, set these elements to blank.</p> <p>2a) Modify the program code to extract all relationships and map it to the appropriate AFCARS value.</p>		
<p>33. Child was placed from</p> <p>1=Within State or Tribal Service Area 2=Another State or Tribal Service Area 3=Another Country</p>	1	<p><u>System</u> 1) There are two systems (FACTS and LUIS) that upon re-evaluation during the postsite were determined to not have the capacity to collect this information. The program code is instead automatically setting all adoption records to the AFCARS value of 1, Within State.</p> <p>2) The KIDS system does not have a value for “another country.” The agency must add and modify the program code to check for it in the event this situation occurs.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) There are two systems (FACTS and LUIS) the program code automatically sets all adoption records to the AFCARS value of 1, Within State.</p>	<p><u>System</u> 1) If there are no fields in the system that can be used for this element, add a field with the appropriate options.</p> <p>2) Add the option “another country.”</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to check fields to determine if the child was placed from within the state, from another country, or from another state (private adoptions).</p> <p>2) Modify the program code for KIDS to check for the value added for “another country.”</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> 1) The agency (ACYS, Berks, CAPS, IhsIS, JCIS) needs to ensure that if a family in PA is adopting a special needs child through a private agency located in another state that</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
<p>34. Child was placed by</p> <p>1=Public agency 2=Private agency 3=Tribal Agency 4=Independent person 5=Birth parent</p>	1	<p><u>System</u> 1) Two systems (FACTS and LUIS) were determined to not have the capacity to collect this information.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The program code for FACTS and LUIS is instead automatically setting all adoption records to the AFCARS value of 1, Public Agency.</p>	<p>the option "another state" was entered into the system.</p> <p><u>System</u> 1) If there are no fields in the system that can be used for this element, add a field with the appropriate options.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Modify the program code to check for each value and map to the appropriate AFCARS value. (Private adoption agencies under contract to the State/local office is considered an agent of the State and are reported as "public agency.")</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> 1) The agencies need to ensure that if a family in PA is adopting a special needs child through a private agency located in-State or in another state that the option "private agency" was entered into the system.</p>		
<p>35. Is the Child Receiving a Monthly Subsidy?</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No</p>	2	<p><u>Screen</u> 1) The current screens used for Berks are being replaced. The element is rated a 2 at this point.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) The program code for FACTS, lHsis, and LUIS checks if there is a payment greater than zero. There was no screen field to collect this information. The systems were rated a 2 but a field may need to be added to determine if Medicaid is the only subsidy noted in the adoption subsidy agreement. <u>KIDS</u> is only capturing a payment and not if the only subsidy is Medicaid. The system and/or extraction logic will need to be modified. There is a field to indicate Medical coverage. The code should check if this is checked if there is no payment amount.</p>	<p><u>Screen</u> 1) The agency needs to provide information how this will be collected in the new screens.</p> <p><u>Extraction Code</u> 1) Indicate if there is a field in the system that the program code can check if the adoption subsidy is only for Medicaid. 1a) Modify the program code to set this element to "yes" if the only subsidy in the agreement is Medicaid.</p> <p><u>Data Quality</u> 1) For ACYS, CAPS, JCIS there is a field that the worker indicates if the child is receiving a subsidy. This is a training issue to ensure workers know to enter "yes" if Medicaid is the only subsidy in the adoption agreement.</p>		

AFCARS Assessment Review Findings: Adoption Elements
State: Pennsylvania

Data Element	Rating	Findings	Tasks	Date	Notes
36. Monthly Amount	2	<u>Form/Screen</u> 1) Berks forms and system reflect a per diem amount. 2) There is no field in LUIS to record the amount from the adoption agreement. The extraction code is using a maintenance payment or a service payment. There should be a field for the amount in the adoption agreement. 3) There are three systems (CAPS, FACTS, and KIDS) that are using a sum function to add together payments instead of reporting the amount from the adoption agreement.	<u>Form/Screen</u> 1) The agency needs to confirm if that is the amount written into the adoption agreement or if there is a full monthly amount in the agreement. 2) The federal and state team need to discuss to determine if this should be rated a 2 or a 1. 3) Federal and State teams need to discuss. <u>Data Quality</u> 1) Agencies need to ensure this is the amount that is in the adoption agreement. lhSIS is rated a 3 but the federal team needs the screen field where this is recorded. The rating may be re-evaluated.		
37. Is the Child receiving a title IV-E adoption subsidy? 1=Yes 2=No	2	<u>Extraction Code</u> 1) See notes in AD35. For other systems, ensure that if the only subsidy is Medicaid the user correctly enters "no" for this element. 2) The logic in the extraction code for FACTS is not checking if the child is receiving title IV-E; it sets this element based on the amount of payment. <u>Data Quality</u> <i>Frequency Report (n=908):</i> Yes = 732 (81%); No = 176 (19%); Not Reported = 0 <i>Case File Findings (n=26):</i> 3 (12%) of the records analyzed did not match what was reported in AFCARS.	<u>Extraction Code</u> 1) For those systems (Berks, KIDS) not checking if the only subsidy is Medicaid, the program code for this element is to be set to "no." 2) Modify the program code to check if the payment/child is eligible for title IV-E AA. 3) The logic and system for LUIS needs re-evaluated by the agency. It is not clear that the program code is correctly setting this element.		