AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

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)	59	13	0	0	In one error case the date reported was not the date the review occurred. In nine error cases, the date reported to AFCARS was for a review that was not a periodic review that meets the requirements of the Social Security Act. In three error cases, the AFCARS field was blank but a periodic review had been conducted. In one case, the child had been in foster care for eight months. One record the child was in care since 2004 and in another 2005.
6. Date of Birth	72	0	0	0	
7. Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	72	0	0	0	
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	60	12	0	0	There were three cases reported as blank. The reviewers found information supporting an identified race. In nine error cases, the reviewers found that an additional race should have been reported. The categories were: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, and White.
9. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity	68	4	0	0	In one error case the response should have been "no" instead of being reported as a blank.

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

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					In three 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	29	43	0	0	In 16 error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "not yet determined." Of these cases, there were six in which the child had been in foster care for a year or more (up to eight years). Also, there were three cases in which the information was found and the child had been in foster care for three or less months. Also, in four cases, the child had diagnosed conditions that fit into three separate categories (#11 - 15). In 16 error cases, the response should have been "no" instead of "not yet determined." In these cases, similar findings to above were made regarding the length of time the child had been in foster care. In seven cases the child had been in care for a year or longer (up to seven years). There were six cases where the child had been in foster care for six months. In 11 error cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no." In one case, the child had diagnosed conditions that fit into three separate categories (#11 1- 15).
11. Mental Retardation 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	61	11	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
12. Visually or Hearing Impaired	70	2	0	0	In one error case, the response should have been

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies					"condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply." In one error case, the response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies." This was a mapping error.
13. Physically Disabled (Child) 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	68	4	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
14. Emotionally Disturbed 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	48	24	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
15. Other Medically Diagnosed Conditions Requiring Special Care 0 = Condition Does Not Apply 1 = Condition Applies	63	9	0	0	In eight of the 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." This was a mapping error.
16. Has this Child Ever Been Adopted? 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	71	1	0	0	The response should have been "yes" instead of "no."
17. If Yes, How Old was the Child when Adoption was Legalized? 0 = Not Applicable	0	72	0	0	The response to element #16 was "no" and this element was incorrectly reported as blank instead of "not applicable." In one error case the reviewer found that the child

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
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					had been previously adopted and so an age group would have been reported in this element.
18. Date of First Removal from Home	66	5	1	0	In one error case, the date reported for this element was when the agency received responsibility of a child who was placed in a hospital. The child did enter foster care. In one error case reflects an incorrect date because at the time the child was born his mother was in foster care and the child was placed with the mother. The child did not enter foster care until he was much older. The date of first removal was incorrect and was 15 years later. Another error case was incorrect because the date reported for this element reflected the start of what appears to be an episode that crossed two days but was less than 24 hours in duration. The child had a removal episode that does meet the AFCARS requirements, so this date would have been later than the one reported. In two of the error cases an earlier date should have been reported.
19. Total Number of Removals from Home To Date	69	2	1	0	One error case is incorrect because at the time the child was born his mother was in foster care but the child was placed with the mother. The child did enter foster care at age 15. The record reflects two

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					removal episodes instead of one. Another error case was incorrect because an episode appears to be one that was less than 24 hours in duration and was incorrectly included in the count of the number of episodes (the response should have been one instead of two). In one error case the child appears to have had one continuous episode and not two removal episodes. It appears that a placement in detention was reported as a discharge.
20. Date Child was Discharged from Last Foster Care Episode	68	3	1	0	One error case reflects an incorrect date because at the time the child was born his mother was in foster care but the child did not enter foster care. The child did not enter foster care until he was much older. There was no prior removal episode and this element should be blank. Another error case was incorrect because the date reported for this element reflected the end of what appears to be an episode that was less than 24 hours in duration. In one error case an incorrect date was reported for this element. Based on the reviewer's findings, the child's current removal episode began prior to the date that was reported in this element. In one error case the child appears to have had one continuous episode and not two removal episodes. It appears that a placement in detention was

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					reported as a discharge.
21. Date of Latest Removal from Home	68	3	1	0	In one error case, the date reported for this element was when the agency received responsibility of a child who was placed in a hospital. The child did enter foster care. In one error case reflects an incorrect date because at the time the child was born his mother was in foster care but the child did not enter foster care. The child did not enter foster care until he was much older. The record reflects two removal episodes instead of one, the date of first removal was incorrect and was 15 years later. In one error case, the reviewer found that the current removal episode began earlier than the date reported for this element. In one error case the child appears to have had one continuous episode and not two removal episodes. It appears that a placement in detention was reported as a discharge. Consequently, this date should have been later.
23. Date of Placement in Current Foster Care Setting	67	4	1	0	In one error case, the date reported for element #23 was the date the child was placed with a non-custodial parent. This should have been reported as a discharge date in element #56. The other errors reflected errors based on the incorrect placement counts.
24. Number of Previous Placement	59	11	1	1	The questionable case is because the reviewer did

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
Settings During this Removal Episode					not have the complete placement history and the number of placements identified by the reviewer was less than what was reported to AFCARS. However, the reviewer noted the child did go in and out of the hospital. Without knowing how long the child was hospitalized, a complete count could not be made. In six error cases, the reviewers identified fewer placements than what was reported to AFCARS. In five error cases, the reviewers identified more placements than what was reported to AFCARS.
25. Manner of Removal from Home for Current Removal Episode 1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	67	5	0	0	In four error cases, the response should have been "voluntary" instead of "court ordered." In one error case, the response should have been "court ordered" instead of "not yet determined."
Actions or Conditions Associated With Child's Removal (#26 -40) 0=Does not Apply 1=Applies 26. Physical Abuse (alleged/reported)	68	4	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
27. Sexual Abuse (alleged/reported)	70	2	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
28. Neglect (alleged/reported)	64	8	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
29. Alcohol Abuse (parent)	71	1	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
30. Drug Abuse (parent)	64	8	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
31. Alcohol Abuse (child)	68	4	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
32. Drug Abuse (child)	70	2	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
33. Child's Disability	70	2	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
34. Child's Behavior Problem	67	5	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
35. Death of Parent(s)	72	0	0	0	
36. Incarceration of Parent(s)	69	3	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
37. Caretaker's Inability to Cope Due to Illness or Other Reason	66	6	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply."
38. Abandonment	72	0	0	0	
39. Relinquishment	72	0	0	0	
40. Inadequate Housing	67	5	0	0	In four 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."
41. Current Placement Setting 1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative) 3 = Foster Family Home (Non-	67	3	0	2	In one error case, the child was living with a relative prior to being placed (and discharged) with a non-custodial parent. The information reported to AFCARS was "trial home visit."

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit					In one error case, the living arrangement was "pre-adoptive home" instead of "non-relative foster home." In one error case, the living arrangement was "group home" instead of "non-relative foster home."
42. Is Current Placement Setting Outside of the State or Tribal Service Area? 1 = yes 2 = no	72	0	0	0	
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	6	6	0	2	In one of the cases listed as questionable is because the child had been in foster care for more than 60 days but it does not appear that a case plan goal was established. The AFCARS file reflected a blank for this child, which would be correct if no goal had been established. Based on the reviewer's notes, the safety plan indicated to keep the mom out of the home. The child was placed with a relative. The other case was marked as questionable because it could not be ascertained if the youth had a permanent connection to an adult. This would affect which AFCARS goal (long-term foster care or emancipation) would be reported. In two error cases, the case plan goal should have been "emancipation" instead of "long-term foster care."

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

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 "long-term foster care" instead of "emancipation."
					In one error case, the response should have been "reunification" instead of "case plan goal not yet established."
					In one error case, the case plan goal should have been "emancipation" instead of being reported as blank. The youth had been in foster care for eight years.
					In one error case, the response should have been "reunification" instead of being reported as blank.
44. Caretaker Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	66	6	0	0	In three error cases, the reviewer found that the family structure was "single female." The response in AFCARS was "unable to determine." In one of the cases, a year of birth was reported in the AFCARS file for element #45. In one error case, the reviewer found a family structure of "single female" instead of "married couple." In one error case, the response was "married couple" instead of "single female." In one case, a year of birth was reported in the AFCARS file for element #46. In one error case, the reviewer found that the family structure was "married couple" instead of "unmarried couple."

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
45. Year of Birth (1st Principal Caretaker)	68	3	0	0	In two error cases the AFCARS data reflected "1994," which was the child's year of birth.
46. Year of Birth (2nd Principal Caretaker - if applicable)	70	2	0	0	In the error cases the response should have been blank.
47. Date of Mother's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	70	2	0	0	In one error case the reviewer found an earlier date that should have been reported. In one error case, a date was reported but the element should have been blank.
48. Date of Legal or Putative Father's Parental Rights Termination (if applicable)	70	2	0	0	In one error case the reviewer found an earlier date that should have been reported. In one error case, a date was reported but the element should have been blank.
49. Foster Family Structure 0=Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	68	4	0	0	The error cases do not include those in which the response was left blank instead of indicating "not applicable" because the child's living arrangement was not a foster home (28 records). This error is noted in the findings of the extraction code in the foster care findings matrix. In three error cases, the child was placed with a relative and this element was left blank. In one, the foster parents were a married couple. In the other two cases the response should have been "single female." (In one of these cases the reviewer wrote that this element did not apply but did note correct/incorrect information for the remainder of the demographic elements.)

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

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 "married couple" instead of "single male." The child was placed with a relative.
50. Year of Birth (1st Foster Caretaker)	69	3	0	0	In two error cases a date should have been reported instead of this element being blank.
51. Year of Birth (2nd Foster Caretaker)	70	2	0	0	In the error cases, this element was reported as blank. In one case, the response in element #49 was "married couple" and in the other case element #49 indicated "unmarried couple."
52. Race of 1st 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	65	7	0	0	There were four error cases of children who were placed with a relative and the race fields were blank. There was one error case in which the child was placed in a pre-adoptive home with a married couple but no race information was entered for either foster parent. The Hispanic/Latino element for both foster parents was reported as "no." There were two additional records reported as blank that should have this information. In both cases the child was placed in a foster home of a non-relative. The foster parent was a single female and the race fields were blank. The reviewer was not able to record the information because the provider file was not included for review.
53. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 1st Foster Caretaker 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes	65	3	0	0	The error cases do not include those that were reported as blank instead of "not applicable" because the child was not placed in a foster home. In two error cases the child was placed with a

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine					relative but this information was reported as a blank. There was one error case where the child was placed with a foster parent that was not a relative, who was a single female, and this element was reported as blank. The reviewer was not able to record the information because the provider file was not included for review.
54. Race of 2nd 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	66	4	0	0	In one error case the child was placed with a relative and element #49 was reported (and confirmed) as "unmarried couple." However, no information was entered for the second foster parent's race. In one error case, the child was placed with a relative and the marital status was "married couple" as found by the reviewer (element #49 was blank). The race field was blank. The reviewer noted the race should have been "white." In another error case of a child living with a relative, the marital status was found to be "married couple" instead of "single male" and this element was blank. The reviewer noted the race should have been "white." There was one error case in which the child was placed in a pre-adoptive home with a married couple but no race information was entered for either foster parent. The Hispanic/Latino element for both foster parents was reported as "no."

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
55. Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity of 2nd Foster Caretaker (if applicable) 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	68	3	0	0	The error cases do not include those that were reported as blank instead of "not applicable" because the child was not placed in a foster home. In three error cases the child was placed with a relative and this element was reported as blank. In one error case, element #49 was reported (and confirmed) as "unmarried couple." However, no information was entered for the second foster parent's Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. In another error case, the marital status was "married couple" as found by the reviewer (element #49 was blank) and this field was blank. The reviewer noted the response should have been "no." In the third case, the marital status was found to be "married couple" instead of "single male" and this element was blank. The reviewer noted the response should have been "no."
56. Date of Discharge from Foster Care	69	3	0	0	In one error case this element was blank but should have reflected a discharge date. In one error case the child was placed with a non-custodial parent and so the date the child was placed with the parent should be reported as a discharge date. One record was in error because the date should have been the date the child turned 18. Based on the response submitted for foster care element #59, the child was not receiving title IV-E funds during the report period.

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
58. Reason for Discharge 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child	70	2	0	0	The error cases do not include those that were reported as blank instead of "not applicable" because the child was still in foster care. In one error case the child was placed with a non-custodial parent and the discharge reason should be "reunification." It appears in one error case that the actual date that the court discharged the agency from placement and care responsibility was three months after the date reported to AFCARS. The relatives were given physical custody but the agency still had legal custody of the child.
Source(s) of Federal Financial Support/assistance for Child (#59 – 65) 0-Does not apply 1-Applies 59. Title IV-E (Foster Care)	68	4	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
60. Title IV-E (Adoption Assistance)	71	1	0	0	In one error case, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
61. Title IV-A	72	0	0	0	
62. Title IV-D (Child Support)	70	2	0	0	In the error cases, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
63. Title XIX (Medicaid)	71	0	0	1	The reviewer indicated that this should have been "does not apply." Did not mark it incorrect because

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
					it could have been reviewer error.
64. SSI or Other Social Security Benefits	71	1	0	0	In the error case, the response should have been "condition applies" instead of "condition does not apply."
65. None of the Above	71	1	0	0	The response should have been "does not apply" instead of "applies."
66. Amount of Monthly Foster Care Payment	69	3	0	0	The wrong amounts were reported.

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 72
Number of cases analyzed: 72

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
5. Child's Date of Birth	25	0	0	0	
6. Sex 1=Male 2=Female	25	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	24	1	0	0	In the error case an additional race, white, was found to be applicable.
8. Child's Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine	24	1	0	0	The response in the error case should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine."
9. Has the title IV-E agency determined that the child has special needs? 1=Yes 2=No	0	25	0	0	In all cases, the response should have been "yes" instead of "no."
10. Primary Factor or Condition for Special Needs	21	4	0	0	All of the cases reported in #9 as "no" had a value reported for this element.

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
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					In one error case the response should have been "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities" instead of "other." In one error case, the response should have been "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities" instead of being blank. Note that element #14 was reported as "yes, applies." In one error case, the response should have been "sibling group" instead of "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities." Note that elements 11 – 15 were reported as blank. In one error case, the response should have been "other" instead of "medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities."
11. Type of Disability-Mental Retardation	23	2	0	0	There were 12 records reported as blank for elements 11 – 15. The response in element #10 included all options and there did not appear to be a pattern related to the cause of the blanks. These were not included in the error count as it is presumed it is a technical issue and not a data entry issue. In one error case the response should have been "yes, applies" instead of being "does not apply." The other case should have been "does not apply" instead of blank. (The response reported in element #10 was medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.")

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
12. Type of Disability-Visually or Hearing Impaired	24	1	0	0	The error case should have been "does not apply" instead of blank. (The response reported in element #10 was medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.")
13. Type of Disability-Physically Disabled	24	1	0	0	The error case should have been "does not apply" instead of blank. (The response reported in element #10 was medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.")
14. Type of Disability-Emotionally Disturbed	22	3	0	0	In two error cases the response should have been "yes, applies" instead of being "does not apply." One error case should have been "does not apply" instead of blank. (The response reported in element #10 was medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.")
15. Type of Disability-Other Medically Diagnosed Condition Requiring Special Care	23	2	0	0	One error case should have been "yes, applies" instead of blank. (The response reported in element #10 was medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.") In one error case the response should have been "yes, applies" instead of being "does not apply."
16. Mother's Year of Birth	25	0	0	0	
17. Father's Year of Birth	20	5	0	0	There were two error cases with the wrong date entered/reported. Two error cases should have been reported as blank because the father was unknown. One error case should have been blank instead of the default year of 1900.

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
18. Was the Mother married at the time of the child's birth? 1=Yes 2=No 3-Unable to determine	21	4	0	0	Two error cases should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine." One error case should have been "no" instead of "yes." One error case should have been "no" instead of blank.
19. Date of Mother's Termination of Parental Rights	24	1	0	0	A later date was found.
20. Date of Father's Termination of Parental Rights	24	1	0	0	A later date was found.
21. Date Adoption Legalized	24	1	0	0	An earlier date was found.
22. Adoptive Parents' Family Structure 1=Married couple 2=Unmarried couple 3=Single female 4=Single male	25	0	0	0	
23. Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	25	0	0	0	
24. Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	25	0	0	0	
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	25	0	0	0	

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
26. Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin 0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine	25	0	0	0	
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	25	0	0	0	
28. Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin 0=Not Applicable 1=Yes 2=No 3=Unable to determine	25	0	0	0	
29. Relationship to Adoptive Parent-Stepparent 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	25	0	0	0	Note: There were two records that all of the responses for elements #29 – 32 were "does not apply."
30. Relationship to Adoptive Parent - Other Relative	23	2	0	0	There was one case that should have been reported as "applies" instead of "does not apply."

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25

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=Yes, Applies					There was one record reported as a blank and the reviewer noted it should have been "applies."
31. Relationship to Adoptive Parent - Foster Parent 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	23	2	0	0	The error cases should have been reported as "applies" instead of "does not apply."
32. Relationship to Adoptive Parent - Other Non-relative 0=Does not apply 1=Yes, Applies	20	5	0	0	The error cases should have been reported as "applies" instead of "does not apply."
33. Child was placed from 1=Within State or Tribal Service Area 2=Another State or Tribal Service Area 3=Another Country	25	0	0	0	
34. Child was placed by 1=Public agency 2=Private agency 3=Tribal Agency 4=Independent person 5=Birth parent	25	0	0	0	
35. Is the Child Receiving a Monthly Subsidy? 1=Yes 2=No	25	0	0	0	

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Data Elements
State: Ohio
Report Period Used for Review: October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012

Data Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Not Found	Questionable	Notes
36. Monthly Amount	25	0	0	0	
37. Is the Child receiving a title IV-E adoption subsidy? 1=Yes 2=No	25	0	0	0	

Number of cases reviewed: 25
Number of cases analyzed: 25