Dorian Dodson, Secretary
New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department
P.O. Box 5160
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502-5160

Dear Secretary Dodson:

During the week of May 7, 2007, the Children’s Bureau’s (CB) staff, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), and New Mexico Protective Services State staff conducted a Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) in New Mexico. During CFSRs, States are assessed for substantial conformity with certain Federal requirements for child protection, foster care, adoption, family preservation, family support and independent living services. The goal of the CFSR is to help States improve child welfare services and achieve positive outcomes for children and families receiving services, including safety, permanency and well-being.

On August 16, 2007, CB’s Regional Office forwarded a courtesy copy of the New Mexico Final Report and Executive Summary to you for review. We made this report available prior to the official release of these documents to provide an opportunity for New Mexico’s Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD) to review it for factual errors, noting that lack of agreement with a finding does not constitute a factual error.

New Mexico’s written response to this courtesy report was timely received by the CB Regional Office. We have reviewed your response and have made the following corrections and clarifications to the final report:

- **Final Report, Section A, item 2 (page 9):** The number of cases in the narrative was corrected to 18.

- **Final Report, Section A, item 4 (page 17):** A change was made under item 4, Stakeholder Interview Information, to correct the priority of foster home investigations to an emergency response time frame.

- **Executive Summary, (pages 3 and 4):** A change was made to clarify that concerns regarding youth who are receiving funds under CYFD’s semi-independent living program were based on two of the cases reviewed.
- **Final Report, Section A, item 6 (page 25):** The last bullet, referencing the difference in foster parent reimbursement between CYFD homes and private agency and therapeutic foster homes, has been deleted.

- **Final Report, Section A, item 9 (page 32):** A change was made to clarify delays scheduling court hearings to finalize adoptions.

- **Final Report, Section A, item 10 (page 34):** A change was made in the Stakeholder section of item 10, to state that "some youth" may not receive independent living services until age 17. This change was made as three different groups of stakeholders shared this information.

- **Final Report, Section A, Well Being Outcome 1 (page 48):** Further clarification was provided in this summary to note that there were "no case review findings" to indicate that the agency was not sufficiently attending to sexual abuse or domestic violence concerns.

- **Final Report Section B, item 28 (page 74):** The second to last bullet, referencing delays in filing TPRs occasioned by parents being able to appeal adjudications, has been deleted.

- **Final Report Section B, item 33 (page 80):** The second to last sentence in the last paragraph, referencing supervisors not tracking non-licensed staff training hours, has been deleted.

- **Final Report Section B, item 35 (page 85):** A change was made to clarify the stakeholders' concerns regarding insufficient community-based or in-home services in place to meet the needs of children who require more intensive behavioral and mental health services.

In addition, we made necessary corrections to the final report and executive summary to reflect that 37.5 percent instead of 35 percent of the cases for Permanency Outcome 1 were rated as substantially achieved and that 81.2 percent instead of 82.8 percent of the cases for Well-Being Outcome 3 were rated as substantially achieved. These changes were necessary because over rides during the onsite review of an item rating on one case for Permanency Outcome 1 and one case for Well-Being Outcome 3 were not appropriately included in the computation of the outcome ratings due to a technical issue.

In regard to the questions about the rating of systemic factors, please reference chapter 5, section B (page 80) and Appendix H "CFSRs: Pathway to Substantial Conformity" of the CFSR Procedures Manual for information regarding the determination of substantial conformity with each of the systemic factors. Using information from the Statewide Assessment and from the onsite review, CB makes the following determinations regarding each systemic factor:
• whether the CFSP requirements and other program requirements attached to the systemic factor are actually in place in the State; and,

• whether the CFSP requirements and other program requirements attached to the systemic factor are functioning as described in the applicable regulation or statute.

Enclosed please find the New Mexico Report and Executive Summary, with these changes, which will be posted on the CB website. New Mexico’s Program Improvement Plan (PIP) is due November 15, 2007, which is 90 days from the date the courtesy copy of the report was forwarded electronically to the CYFD. Questions you may have regarding this process may be directed to Regional Program Manager June Lloyd at 214-767-8466, or your staff may reach Program Specialist John Disque at 214-767-8611.

Sincerely,

Joseph Bock
Acting Associate Commissioner
Children's Bureau

Enclosures:
Final Report
Executive Summary

cc:
Angela Adams, Director of Protective Services; CYFD; Santa Fe, NM
Jerry Milner, Director; CB, CFSR; Washington, DC
ACFR has set very high standards of performance for the CFR Review. The standards are based on the belief that because child

improvement Plan (IP) to address the areas of concern is within the outcome.

scored the outcome. A State that is not in substantial conformity with a particular outcome must develop and implement a Program

performance on seven outcomes is evaluated in substantial conformity achieved, partially achieved, and not achieved. In order for a

improvement in at least five of the applicable categories was rated as a strength. These

scores are assessed in an overall rating of strengths or areas needing improvement is assessed to each of the 23 items. An

Outcome: Section of the report, an overall rating of strengths or areas needing improvement is assessed to each of the 23 items. An

The CFSR assesses the performance on 23 items relevant to outcomes and 22 items pertaining to 7 systemic factors. In the

Background Information

Information from each resource is presented for all of the items reviewed.

Children, Parents, Foster Parents, all levels of child welfare agencies, service providers,

measures of focus groups (conducted at three sites and at the state level) with stakeholders including, but not limited to,

San Francisco County:

reviews of 55 cases at three sites through site visits: 31 cases in Benicia County, 17 cases in Fairfield County, and 17 cases in

12-month period ending March 31, 2006.

The State Data Profile, prepared by CB, which provides State child welfare data for fiscal year (FY) 2004, FY 2005, and the CFSR

The statewide assessment, prepared by the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD),

5/07. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

The New Mexico CFSR was conducted the week of May 7, 2007. The period under review for the case reviews was from 4/1/06 to 10/31/06.

August 2007

Final Report: New Mexico Child and Family Services Review

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The CSFR follows the standards for National data indicators, including the absence of maltreatment, the presence of maltreatment in foster care, the characteristics of foster children, and the prevalence of maltreatment. The CSFR also addresses areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. The State did not meet the

- close proximity to their parents (item 1), and meeting children's physical health needs (item 2).

For the individual indicators pertaining to the absence of maltreatment (item 1), foster care re-entry (item 5), planning children in the absence of maltreatment involving the presence of maltreatment and the absence of maltreatment in foster care, the State did not meet the

Mexico meets the National standards for two of the National data indicators—Femarment Compromise, 2: Improvement of adoption, and

The 2011 CSFR identified several areas of high performance in New Mexico with regard to achieving outcomes for children, New Mexico.

**CSFR Findings Regarding Outcomes**

- Changes in outcomes for specific items to increase consistency and to ensure an assessment of critical areas, such as child wellbeing.

- Case status for specific outcomes and items.

- Standardization of the sample to ensure a minimum number of cases in key program areas, resulting in variations in the number of cases.

- An increase in the sample size from 50 to 65 cases.

- Difficult to compare performance across counties due to the following:
  - Performance in the first round, particularly with regard to cases of permanency, is not directly comparable to their
  - Feedback from the child welfare field, a State’s performance in the second round of the CSFR is not directly comparable in how
  - Because many changes have been made in the overall CSFR process, these are not measured during the first round, and in response to

and with the changes in the PP.

In cases in which the State still needs to improve, the goal is to ensure that program improvements are continuously improving the process for the child and their families. This is intended to serve as a basis for continuous planning and improvement.

The second round of the CSFR assesses a State’s current level of functioning with regard to child outcomes by using more applicable

Performance at the 95th percentile (for outcomes) or 90 percent (for indicators) level is required by the CSFR.
VIEWS to ensure that the living arrangements selected by the young are safe and will provide for their needs on a long-term basis.

Always aware of where the young are living and how they are being supported, the support needs of young people with learning disabilities who are living independently are not infrequently felt to be in conflict with the needs of others. However, when the young are living in their own homes, their support needs are often higher than those of other young people. This focus on the young's needs is not always easy to achieve as their needs can be different from those of others.

Case reviews, which are concerned about the young person's needs and how they are being supported, provide a useful way of assessing the young person's needs and how they are being supported. By reviewing the young person's needs and how they are being supported, the young person's needs can be better understood and their needs can be met in ways that are most suitable for them.

Case reviews also give the young person a voice about the support they need, which can help them to feel more in control of their life.

Children in care are often at risk of abuse and neglect, and they may not receive the care and support they need. This can lead to a lack of confidence and independence, which can have long-term effects on their life. However, when children are provided with the support they need, they can develop the skills and confidence they need to live independently.

In addition, the lack of services appears to affect the young person's performance, which is reflected in the performance of their foster carers. The following are the benefits of receiving support from foster care:

- Improved performance and well-being
- Improved self-esteem
- Improved relationships
- Improved academic performance
- Improved social skills
- Improved well-being

The young person's needs must be at the forefront of the planning of support services. This is important to ensure that the young person receives the support they need to live independently and to improve their quality of life.

In conclusion, the provision of support services for children in care is crucial for their development and well-being. The provision of support services must be tailored to meet the individual needs of each young person, and the support services must be provided in a way that is accessible and affordable to all young people.
1. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

In the following section, key findings are summarized for each of the seven systemic factors assessed through the CFSR. The findings regarding well-being outcomes are presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents the state’s performance on the seven systemic factors, including the key systemic factors identified by stakeholders and case reviewers present in the case review system. The key concern was New Mexico’s weak performance on the systemic factors—Case Review System Training, Service Array, and Foster and Adoptive Parent Learning, Retention, and Reunion.

The Annual Progress and Services Report, an improvement in all systemic factors, and Family Services Plan implementation were found to be in substantial conformity with the seven systemic factors. New Mexico was also found to be in substantial conformity with the seven systemic factors. The report focuses on continuous quality improvement and on reviewing possible outcomes of children and families. The findings are based on continuous quality improvement and on reviewing possible outcomes of children and families. The report focuses on continuous quality improvement and on reviewing possible outcomes of children and families. The report focuses on continuous quality improvement and on reviewing possible outcomes of children and families. The report focuses on continuous quality improvement and on reviewing possible outcomes of children and families. The report focuses on continuous quality improvement and on reviewing possible outcomes of children and families.

Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect (Items 1 and 2) and the other factors in the presence of substantiated or indicated maltreatment. (Item 3).
There were safety-related concerns regarding the adequacy of child maltreatment reports involving the family, particularly when

New Mexico did not achieve substantial compliance with the Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate

Although, in many cases, children and families were receiving services to prevent the child’s entry into foster care, these efforts

Additional key findings pertinent to this outcome were the following:

New Mexico did not achieve substantial compliance with the Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate
remain in place even when there is no evidence they are attainable (item 7).

The agency was not consistent in referring to establishing appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner, and some goals

were unattainable in children's behaviors (item 6).

Placement stability appears to be a considerable challenge for the State, with placement changes often attributed to foster parents

The time of reunification into foster care was found to be a strength for the State (item 5).

Additional key findings pertaining to this outcome were the following:

Although New Mexico's performance on this outcome was fairly low in all areas, there was variation across states. The outcome was

addressed in the State's PPR. The State met its target goals for this outcome by the end of the PIP implementation period.

Composite 3: Permanency for children in foster care for extended time periods.

However, the State did not meet the National Standard for Permanency Composite 2: Timelessness of adoptions, and Permanency

Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and permanency of reunification and Permanency Composite 4: Placement stability.

The State's data profile indicated that for the CFR 12-month target period, the State did not meet the National Standards for

placement stability. The outcome was substantially achieved in 37.5 percent of the cases, which is less than the 95 percent required for an overall

New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1. This determination was based on the following

Permanency Outcome 2: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Any placements interviews during the child CFR expressed concern about child reunification in unstable or high-risk home

residences.

There are six indicators incorporated in the assessment of permanency outcomes; although not all of them are relevant for all

situations and ambiguities, this probably to a lack of services in the State to meet the needs of these children and families.

Dependency on the child's permanency goal, the reunification indicators focus the child's welfare efforts to prevent foster care (item 7),

encourage placement stability.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have foster care for extended time periods.
Additional findings pertaining to performance on this outcome were the following:

- Performance on this outcome in the 2001 CFSR exceeded the outcome in this PIP. The state met its target goals for this outcome by the end of the compliance period.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with 70 percent of its CFSR cases and 60 percent of its CFSR cases, New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with 75 percent of its CFSR cases, which is less than the 95 percent of higher required for substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome has not been substantially achieved in New Mexico.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 1.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 2.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 3.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 4.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 5.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 6.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 7.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 8.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 9.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 10.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 11.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 12.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 13.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 14.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 15.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 16.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 17.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 18.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 19.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 20.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 21.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 22.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 23.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 24.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 25.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 26.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 27.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 28.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 29.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 30.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 31.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 32.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 33.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 34.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 35.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 36.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 37.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 38.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 39.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 40.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 41.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 42.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 43.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 44.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 45.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 46.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 47.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 48.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 49.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 50.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 51.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 52.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 53.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 54.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 55.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 56.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 57.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 58.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 59.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 60.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 61.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 62.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 63.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 64.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 65.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 66.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 67.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 68.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 69.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 70.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 71.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 72.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 73.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 74.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 75.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 76.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 77.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 78.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 79.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 80.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 81.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 82.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 83.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 84.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 85.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 86.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 87.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 88.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 89.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 90.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 91.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 92.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 93.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 94.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 95.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 96.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 97.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 98.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 99.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 100.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 101.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 102.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 103.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 104.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 105.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 106.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 107.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 108.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 109.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 110.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 111.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 112.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 113.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 114.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 115.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 116.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 117.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 118.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 119.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 120.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 121.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 122.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 123.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 124.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 125.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 126.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 127.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 128.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 129.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 130.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 131.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 132.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 133.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 134.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 135.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 136.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 137.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 138.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 139.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 140.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 141.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 142.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 143.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 144.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 145.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 146.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 147.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 148.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 149.
- New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with Performance Outcome 150.
There was a lack of sufficient contact with fathers.

The policy was inconsistent in involving parents and child in case planning.

There was a lack of consistency with regard to adequately assessing and matching the needs of parents, particularly fathers.

The agency has made concerted efforts to ensure that parents are able to maintain connections with their children, who are incarcerated. These needs were noted to be of substantial frequency and intensity to meet the needs of the child.

Although the ranking for the item assessing caseworker contact with children (28 percent rated as a strength) did not meet the 90 percent standard, for the most part, contacts were noted to be of substantial frequency and intensity to meet the needs of the child.

Additional key findings of the 2007 CPSR were the following:

New Mexico did not achieve substantial variance with well-being outcomes for the majority of the cases reviewed. This outcome is less than the 95 percent or higher required for substantial variance achieved in 80 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 95 percent of higher required for substantial variance.

New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformance with well-being outcomes. However, the outcome was determined that the outcome was non-existent for only one indicator for well-being outcomes. If parents in the child welfare agency's efforts to address and meet the educational needs of children in both foster care and in-home services cases (item 21).

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

There was a lack of significant variance with respect to the lack of sufficient contact with fathers.

The agency was inconsistent in involving parents and child in case planning.

There was a lack of consistency with regard to adequately assessing and matching the needs of parents, particularly fathers.

The agency has made concerted efforts to ensure that parents are able to maintain connections with their children, who are incarcerated. These needs were noted to be of substantial frequency and intensity to meet the needs of the child.

Although the ranking for the item assessing caseworker contact with children (28 percent rated as a strength) did not meet the 90 percent standard, for the most part, contacts were noted to be of substantial frequency and intensity to meet the needs of the child.

Additional key findings of the 2007 CPSR were the following:

New Mexico did not achieve substantial variance with well-being outcomes for the majority of the cases reviewed. This outcome is less than the 95 percent or higher required for substantial variance achieved in 80 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 95 percent of higher required for substantial variance.

New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformance with well-being outcomes. However, the outcome was determined that the outcome was non-existent for only one indicator for well-being outcomes. If parents in the child welfare agency's efforts to address and meet the educational needs of children in both foster care and in-home services cases (item 21).

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

There was a lack of significant variance with respect to the lack of sufficient contact with fathers.

The agency was inconsistent in involving parents and child in case planning.

There was a lack of consistency with regard to adequately assessing and matching the needs of parents, particularly fathers.

The agency has made concerted efforts to ensure that parents are able to maintain connections with their children, who are incarcerated. These needs were noted to be of substantial frequency and intensity to meet the needs of the child.

Although the ranking for the item assessing caseworker contact with children (28 percent rated as a strength) did not meet the 90 percent standard, for the most part, contacts were noted to be of substantial frequency and intensity to meet the needs of the child.

Additional key findings of the 2007 CPSR were the following:

New Mexico did not achieve substantial variance with well-being outcomes for the majority of the cases reviewed. This outcome is less than the 95 percent or higher required for substantial variance achieved in 80 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 95 percent of higher required for substantial variance.

New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformance with well-being outcomes. However, the outcome was determined that the outcome was non-existent for only one indicator for well-being outcomes. If parents in the child welfare agency's efforts to address and meet the educational needs of children in both foster care and in-home services cases (item 21).
II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

Consultation in cases in which children are present in psychological mediation.

Consultation is not consistently effective in meeting children's mental health needs.

Consultation was not consistently effective in meeting children's mental health needs. Additional findings of the 2007 CFSR were the following:

- The goal was to ensure the health and mental health (Item 22)


Outcome was not included in the case plan (2 foster care cases).

Additional findings were included in the case plan (2 foster care cases).

Additional findings were included in the case plan (2 foster care cases).

- Educational needs were identified and noted in the case record. In some cases, services were provided to address those needs and

- Educational needs were identified and noted in the case record. In some cases, services were provided to address those needs and

- Reduced problems. This included children who were failing courses and children who were not attending school regularly.

- There was a lack of assessment of educational needs even when there was evidence that the child was experiencing school-related problems. This included children who were failing courses and children who were not attending school regularly.

Outcome by the end of the PIP implementation period.

Substantial consultation with this outcome in the 2001 CFSR and it was addressed in the PIP. The same was not in 84 percent of the applicable foster care cases and 71 percent of the applicable in-home services cases. The state was not in 79 percent of the applicable foster care cases and 71 percent of the applicable in-home services cases. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 87 percent of the Bernalillo County cases, 79 percent of the Bernalillo County cases, and 79 percent of the Bernalillo County cases.
Although foster parents and relative caregivers are provided notice of court hearings as well as CRP reviews, they are not identified as adoptive family for a child (Item 20).

Despite these areas of strength, the following concerns were noted:

- Although CRP policies and State Specific CRP process not prescribed, they are not clearly defined in the CRP process, and in some cases the State, leading to cumulative parental rights not being held if there is no delay in the CRP process, and remaining issues, the State is left to ensure the State's placement and family involvement in case planning.
- Indicators that case plans were reported to be developed for all children and many efforts (such as the Team Decision Making model) have been implemented in the State to increase engagement of families in the case planning process, information from stakeholder interests, the Stakeholder Assessment, and the case planning process, indicators that child and family involvement in case planning.

New Mexico was found to exceed the periodic reviews of the status of each child in foster care and are held at least every 6 months and

- New Mexico was found to maintain contact with the system, an indicator of Case Review System.
- New Mexico was found to be in substantial conformity with the system, a factor of the Case Review System.
- Adoptive parents and relative caregivers in case reviews and hearings (Item 20).
- The indicators are used to assess the State's performance with regard to the systematic factor of the Case Review System.

 reminders of upcoming events and dates.

New Mexico achieved substantial conformity with the systematic factor of the Case Review System.
The assessment of the systemic factor of service array addresses three questions:

1. Does the State have in place an array of services available to all children and families in all areas of the State (item 30)?
2. Are these services accessible to families (item 31)?
3. Can services be individualized to meet the unique needs of the child and family (item 32)?

Despite this, strategies, the CFSR determined that CORF Level II, as defined in the Statewide Assessment and Review, is not sufficient to prevent new cases. Workers who will not be trained for child welfare agency staff (item 33), and training for foster and adoptive parents (item 34),

Training

System received very high praise from all stakeholders (item 31).

System that evaluates the quality and effectiveness of services, and measures program strengths and areas needing improvement (item 31).
New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification, and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

The assessment of this subsystem letter focused on the data standards for foster homes and child care institutions (Items 41 and 42).

Twenty percent of the foster care placements were with related foster parents, and sixty percent of the placements were with unrelated kin.

New Mexico is not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.

New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with the system of factors of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recertification and Retention.
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Despite these concerns, the CFR found that the State has clear standards for foster family homes and child care institutions, and these standards were implemented in a uniform manner (Items 41 and 42). In particular, the State standards are applied to both non-relatives and relatives foster homes. In addition, there was clear evidence that the State complies with Federal requirements for criminal background clearances (Item 43).

New Mexico and the 2001 CFRPD does not have a process in place to ensure that out-of-State inquiries are appropriately considered. Although process are in place to facilitate in-State, cross-jurisdictional placements, concerns about the State's use of cross-jurisdictional resources for American, Hispanic and African American children. Concerns also were noted about the State's use of cross-jurisdictional resources...
**Items may be read as a strength or an area needing improvement (ANI). For an overall rating of Strength, 90 percent or more of the cases must be read as a Strength.**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
<th>Substantial Conformity with the outcome (7.5)</th>
<th>Substantial Conformity with the Standard (8.5)</th>
<th>Substantial Achievement of the Outcome (9.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. New Mexico CFSR Ratings for Safety and Permanency Outcomes and Items**
**Outcome 2:** The requirement of a 95 percent strength rating applies.

Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95 percent strength rating, applies.

Because item 21 is the only item for WELL Being

Table 2. New Mexico CPSR Ratings for Child and Family WELL Being Outcomes and Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Substantially Achieved</th>
<th>Substantially In Conformity</th>
<th>Substantially Substantially Achieved</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 25: Nutritional health of child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26: Physical health of child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27: Physical and mental health needs met through services to meet their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL Being Outcome 3 - Child/children receive services to meet their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28: Educational needs met through services to meet their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29: Worker visits with child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30: Worker visits with child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31: Child/family involvement in case planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32: Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33: Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL Being Outcome 1 - Families have enhanced capability to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** New Mexico CPSR Ratings for Child and Family WELL Being Outcomes and Items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Confirmation</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Systemic Factors and Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: The State is operating a scientific and meaningful system that supports foster care,</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: The State has developed and implemented standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect the safety and health of children.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Assurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: The State is operating an effective and meaningful system that is in place in the services provided under titles 16-P and 16-E, and provides initial screening for all children who deliver these services.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: The State provides for ongoing training for staff that addresses the skills and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: The State provides ongoing training for staff that addresses the skills and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Substantially Non-Compliant</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 43</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State complies with Federal requirements for criminal background checks. Institutions are reasonably in accord with recommended National standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 44</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has implemented standards for foster family homes and child care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 45</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruiting, and retention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has implemented the provisions of the CFSR. The State has engaged in ongoing consultation with those represented in annual reports of the CFSR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 38</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has engaged in ongoing consultation with those represented in annual reports of the CFSR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has provided training for current or prospective foster parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Array**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has a demonstration project that addresses the needs and characteristics of children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has a demonstration project that addresses the needs and characteristics of children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has a demonstration project that addresses the needs and characteristics of children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The State has a demonstration project that addresses the needs and characteristics of children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency Responsibilities to the Community**

- Item 36: The services in Item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children in foster care.
- Item 37: The services in Item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children in foster care.
- Item 38: The services in Item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children in foster care.
- Item 39: The services in Item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children in foster care.

**Systemic Factors and Items**

- Item 40: The State is responsible for implementing the provisions of the CFSR. The State has engaged in ongoing consultation with those represented in annual reports of the CFSR. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The State has in place a process for the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely and effective placements for waiting children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The State has in place a process for ensuring the differential recruitment of foster care and adoptive placements for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The State has in place a process for addressing the safety of children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY REASON FOR OPENING CASE</th>
<th>CASE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>Hostile environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence in child's home</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse by parent</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical neglect</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (or all races)</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and older</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 13, 14, or younger than 16</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 10, 11, or younger than 13</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's age at start of period under review</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child entered foster care during the period under review</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open during the period under review</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open prior to the period under review</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When case was opened/child entered foster care</td>
<td>Neglect (not including medical neglect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Characteristics</th>
<th>In-Home Care Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information on these characteristics for in-home services cases is not provided because all children in the family are considered in those cases.*
The goal is to ensure that program improvement is an ongoing process and does not end with the closing of a PIF. Program Improvement Plans (PIFs) address specific areas in which a State still needs to improve. Even though PIF requirements may have been achieved, the goals of improving practice and a consistent, comprehensive, case-review methodology. The results of this effort are intended to serve as the base for continued improvement and to support the ongoing improvement efforts in collaborative practice.

The second round of the CSFR is intended to assess a State's current level of performance by once more applying the high standards of the CSFR. Levels established for the CSFR.

Therefore, a State can meet the requirements of their PIF and still not perform at the 95 percent level for outcomes or at the 90 percent level for

The following are requirements for the second round of the CSFR:

1. How much improvement the State will demonstrate (working in conjunction with the Children's Bureau).
2. The extent to which the goals of the CSFR are being achieved.
3. The extent to which the CSFR is being used to improve the quality of services provided to children and families.

In performance review, the CSFR is designed to promote continuous improvement. Goals are set high to ensure ongoing attention to achieving positive outcomes for children and families. The standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to achieving positive outcomes for children and families. The standards are based on the belief that these goals are not yet fully achieved.

ACF has established a very high standard of performance for the CSFR. The standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to achieving positive outcomes for children and families.

In the Outcomes Section of the CSFR Final Report, an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement is assigned to each of the 22 indicators (Iems) reviewed. An item is assessed an overall rating of Strength if 90 percent of the applicable cases receive a Strength rating. If 90 percent of the applicable cases receive a Standard rating, an Overall Rating of Standard is assigned to each of the 22 indicators.
### Safety Outcome I

#### 1. Safety

Agency efforts to involve non-custodial parents in planning for their children

- Changes in criteria for specific items to enhance consistency and ensure an assessment of critical areas and skills of child welfare
- Quantification of the sample to ensure a minimum number of cases in key program areas, resulting in variations in the number of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Not Applicable Cases</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Substantially Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome SI: Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect

Because many changes have been made in the current CFSR process based on lessons learned during the first round and in response to
The State met its target goals for this outcome by the end of the PIP Implementation Period.

Key Findings of the 2007 CSSR

To address these concerns, the agency implemented the following strategies in the PIP:

- There were a number of cases involving maltreatment recurrence.
- Some caseworkers were not clear about the state's definition of "maltreatment of investigation".
- In some cases, delays in initiating investigations were due to difficulties locating families.
- Revised policy to clarify definition of "maltreatment of investigation".
- Improved intake and screening procedures for social service referrals.
- Established a safety committee to address screening practices at statewide central intake (SCI) and to review the new training.
- Published a safety committee to address screening practices at statewide central intake (SCI) and to review the new training.
- Other local investigations.
- Maintained a worker vacancy rate of 9.5 percent or less to reduce the number of pending investigations.
- Improved intake and screening procedures for social service referrals.
- Improved intake and screening procedures for social service referrals.
- Established a safety committee to address screening practices at statewide central intake (SCI) and to review the new training.

Key Concerns from the 2001 CSSR Revisited: The outcome was addressed in this outcome were the following:

- PIP. During the 2001 CSSR, both of these items included in this outcome were noted as areas needing improvement.
- New Mexico was not in substantial compliance with this outcome for its 2001 CSSR and was required to address this outcome in its

Key Concerns from the 2001 CSSR

Status of Safety Outcome 1

New Mexico also did not meet the national standards for the two data indicators relevant for Safety Outcome 1. These indicators included the percentage of maltreatment recurrence and absence of maltreatment of children by foster care by foster parents or relatives.

New Mexico also did not meet the national standards for the two data indicators relevant for Safety Outcome 1.

Status of Safety Outcome 1
The results of the assessment of this item are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applicable Cases</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Lea</th>
<th>Berenillo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Priority Two Report is initiated within 5 calendar days from receipt of the report by SCF.
A Priority One Report is initiated within 24 hours from receipt of the report by SCF.
An Enhanced Report is initiated within 3 hours from receipt of report by Statewide Central Intake (SCI).

Both intake and investigation policies define three priority levels with investigation improvements as follows:

- New Mexico policy states that Intake is defined as face-to-face contact by the investigation caseworker with the alleged victim.

Police requirements:

In accordance with the New Mexico policy the Period under Review has been initiated in accordance with the State Child Welfare Agency and Intake Report Compliance during the Period under Review. In assessing Item 1, reviews were performed to determine whether the response to a

**Case Review Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Lea</th>
<th>Berenillo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Timeliness of Initial Investigations of Reports of Child maltreatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Safety Outcome I are presented below.

Many stakeholders expressed the opinion that the State is making concerted efforts to reduce maltreatment recurrences, but that many of maltreatment recurrences.

Recurrence in maltreatment recurrences within a 6-month period, as evidenced primarily by their national data for the measure of absenteism of absenteism from 2001 to 2007 in the area of timeliness of initial investigations, the State continued to experience challenges with

- Improvement in 2007, and there were no delays in Initial Investigations due to difficulties in Locating Families. Although performance

Investigations,“ and there were no delays in Initial Investigations due to difficulties in Locating Families. Although performance

Investigations,“ and there were no delays in Initial Investigations due to difficulties in Locating Families. Although performance

investigations had been identified in 2007, in comparison to the 2001 CFR, caseworkers clearly understood the definition of „Investigation of an

in contrast to the 2001 CFR, item 1 (timeliness of Initial Investigations) was rated as a Strength in the 2007 CFR. The case

in contrast to the 2001 CFR, item 1 (timeliness of Initial Investigations) was rated as a Strength in the 2007 CFR. The case
The result is that once the report is
CYPD County Office. This person is responsible for
making sure that the case is a new report in which the SC report goes to a contact person in the local

Bermellino County Stakesholders pointed out that the local CYPD has addressed the problem of delays in investigations due to

...agency representatives these stakeholders report.

...be truthful. However, a few stakeholders expressed the opinion that better communication is needed between the Times and the

...behind the Times and the lack of intervention in situations in which the Times does not

...and times when more urgent reports are received.

...and another instance in which the report is an emergency, SC makes a

...SCF), on call 24/7 and cases are

...was assigned an overall rating of Strength. In 94 percent of the applicable cases, reviewed determined that the agency had

...rating of Strength. This item was rated as an Area Needing Improvement in the State’s 2001 CFR.

...required an overall rating of Strenght. This item was rated as an Area Needing Improvement in the State’s 2001 CFR.

...the required improvement in the required improvement, but face-to-face contact with the other child in the family was not within

...the investigation was made within the required timeframe, but face-to-face contact with the other child in the family was not within

...Performance on this item did not vary substantially across sites.
Variance in performance across the three sites are not meaningful because of the small number of applicable cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>31</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Applicable Cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Needing Improvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings indicate the areas requiring most attention. The findings show a trend toward improvement in the period reviewed. For the sites reviewed, there were no significant changes in the number of cases reviewed. The assessment of Item 2 was applicable for 18 (28 percent) of the 65 cases. Cases were not applicable for this item if there was no report available.

### Case Review Findings

- **Item 2: Report maltreatment**
- **Item 3: Report non-maltreatment**

The St. Michael's Assessment also reports that data from Quality Assurance Reviews conducted in 2006 and 2005 show improvement in the 65 percent of cases reviewed. The findings in 2006 show a 6 percent improvement in cases reviewed in 2006 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005.

The findings of the investigation of investigations was rated as a strength in 63 percent. The findings in 2006 and 2005 show improvement in the 65 percent of cases reviewed. The findings in 2006 show a 6 percent improvement in cases reviewed in 2006 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005.

The St. Michael's Assessment also reports that a lack of documentation of child abuse or neglect, and deficiencies in the investigation procedures for the initiation of investigations, including the investigation of reports received, was an area of concern. The St. Michael's Assessment reports that investigations of reports received in the period reviewed revealed deficiencies in the investigation of reports received. The findings of the investigation of investigations was rated as a strength in 63 percent. The findings in 2006 and 2005 show improvement in the 65 percent of cases reviewed. The findings in 2006 show a 6 percent improvement in cases reviewed in 2006 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005.

According to the St. Michael's Assessment, policy regarding the definition of “maltreatment” is based on a review of investigative reports of suspected child abuse or neglect. The findings in 2006 and 2005 show improvement in the 65 percent of cases reviewed. The findings in 2006 show a 6 percent improvement in cases reviewed in 2006 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005 and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2005.

For documented different efforts to establish face-to-face contact with the victim.
Based on small numbers, however, 89.5 percent of the 29 county offices had rates of 94.6 percent or higher, which meets the national standard for child maltreatment. The services assessed for the current period of time met the state's assessment criteria. The state's assessment criteria included a variety of measures, including the number of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment. The state's assessment criteria also included a review of the frequency of substantiated reports of child maltreatment during the period and the number of cases in which there were two or more substantiated reports of child maltreatment.
New Mexico was in substantial compliance with this outcome for the 2001 CRSP. Therefore, the outcome was not addressed in the State's Final Report.

**Key Concerns of the 2001 CRSP**

- New Mexico's proposal to address 67 percent of the caseload was compared to 77 percent of Canada's caseload.
- The performance on this item varied across counties. The outcome was substantially achieved in 82 percent of Santa Fe County, 70.8 percent of Tularosa County, and 50 percent of Guadalupe County.

**Safety Outcome 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>63</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Addressed</td>
<td>Partially Addressed</td>
<td>Substantially Addressed</td>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Outcome 2**

Children are safely maintained in their homes when ever possible and appropriate.

**Safe Home Outcome 2**

Data from quality assurance reviews conducted in 2002 and 2005 show little change in item strength. Absence of repeal

**Maternal Mortality**

A review of maternal mortality and the absence of characteristics associated with high risk families, as well as the number of cases reviewed, indicates that the case load is not as high as the previous years. The presence of maternal mortality issues and resources to address these problems as described in New Mexico, the Supreme Assessment also addresses the typical profile of maternal anxiety in many counties where maternal health and supportive services are not available. However, the Safe Home Assessment does note that resources for families are not sufficient. As indicated in the Supreme Assessment, increased use of contact services (e.g., mid-level family preservation services) and increased focus on collaborative working relationships with community partners in many counties address these needs.
The findings are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Care Review Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>The findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Safety Outcome 2 are presented below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal</td>
<td>Area Needing Improvement</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many stakeholders interviewed during the course of the review expressed concern about children remaining in unsafe or high-risk homes and situations and attributed this primarily to a lack of services in the State to meet the needs of these children and families. Appropriate decisions were not always made in these cases, and there appeared to be little monitoring of this process and that the agency was not always making appropriate decisions with regard to safe placement of children. Case reviewers also identified concerns regarding the agency’s practice of giving money directly to some foster care young who were not appropriate. Case reviewers also identified concerns regarding the agency’s practice of giving money directly to some foster care young who were not appropriate.

Case reviewers also identified concerns regarding the agency’s practice of giving money directly to some foster care young who were not appropriate.
child maltreatment issues, perpetrating domestic violence and child endangerment (e.g., driving while intoxicated with children in the home). This issue was referred as a strength in the 2001 CPR.

When 2 percent is less than the 90 percent required for a finding of Child and Family Determination (CFD), and child removed at risk, no requests were provided after reunification efforts to provide services to ensure the child’s ongoing safety and prevent recurrence (1 case).

In the home (2 cases), services were provided but they did not adequately address the safety issues for the child and the remaining at-risk child remained in the home (4 cases).

Item 3 was noted as an area needing improvement for this item, the case was closed without all of the services provided. The CFD caseworker reported that the removal was due to law enforcement removal over the child’s safety (1 case), which was due to law enforcement removal over the child’s safety (1 case).

The child was placed in foster care without court-ordered removal of the child and services to promote the child’s ongoing safety and prevent recurrence (1 case).

No service was provided after reunification efforts to ensure the child’s ongoing safety and prevent recurrence (1 case).

Case review information indicates that a range of services was offered or provided to families. These included services provided by:

- Assistance, and early childhood development services.
- Early intervention services, parent support services, insulin-dependent diabetes education, educational services, community services, family preservation services, medical services, transportation services, substance abuse services, and domestic violence services.
- CFD staff and also the following behavior management, emotional wellness, family life skills, and comprehensive family services.

Following:

- Services were provided to the parent(s) and the child to prevent removal (17 cases).
- The child was placed voluntarily with relatives and services were provided to the relatives, parents, and child (5 cases).
- The child was removed voluntarily with relatives and services were provided to the relatives, parents, and child (9 cases).
- Services were provided to the parent(s) and the child to prevent removal (6 cases).
- The child’s safety was referred as a strength in the performance on this item across sites. Item 3 was noted as an area needing improvement for this item.
According to the Interstate Infant Abduction Protocol (IIPA), a child's removal from the home is a serious matter. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) requires that children's rights be respected and that the best interests of the child are considered.

In cases where a child is removed from the home, family court orders are necessary. The child's safety and well-being are the primary concerns. The family court will determine whether the child's removal is justified and in the child's best interest.

liaison case managers who are trained to work with children and families to develop and implement plans for positive outcomes. They also provide services to prevent the removal of children from their homes and to support the family to reunify the child.

Several factors are considered when deciding to removing a child from the home. These factors include the child's safety, the quality of the child's relationships with family members, and the availability of resources to support the family and the child.

In cases where a child is removed from the home, the family court will determine whether the removal is justified and in the child's best interest. The court will consider factors such as the child's safety, the quality of the child's relationships with family members, and the availability of resources to support the family and the child.

In cases where a child is removed from the home, the family court will determine whether the removal is justified and in the child's best interest. The court will consider factors such as the child's safety, the quality of the child's relationships with family members, and the availability of resources to support the family and the child.
An assessment of item 4 was applicable for all 65 cases. The results of this assessment are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Review Findings

**Area Needing Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sana Pe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>BeaMarillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**

- Item 4: Risk of Harm to Child

Provided in-home or community-based services.

Children (over 40 percent) are removed in less than 8 days of entry as a result of a CYPD decision not to file a petition, but rather to

New Mexico follows the system of child protective services by law enforcement, and a significant number of

Children are removed to their families unless the agency feels a petition will the court within two days. The minority of children in the

children are returned to their families unless the agency feels a petition will the court within two days. The minority of children in the

Agency was concerned about the agency’s ability to provide children directly in custody on the State’s performance on the CSFR items. In New Mexico, law

The Statewide assessment notes that some questions were raised by stakeholders regarding the impact of law enforcement having the

Some concerns arise to keep families engaged in services.

The Statewide assessment also notes that the Statewide assessment team expressed concerns that CYPD does not remain engaged

Some services have become more difficult to access.

The Statewide assessment notes that the agency’s ability to engage in reimbursement practices and

Health Purchasing Collaborative and the single entity provider (New Mexico’s Child Protective Services) have made changes to provider networks.

Strength in the State’s 2001 CSFR is indicated in this review, the Statewide assessment notes that the behavioral

Strength in the State’s 2004 CSFR is indicated in this review, the Statewide assessment notes that the agency’s ability to engage in reimbursement practices and

The Statewide assessment notes that the agency’s ability to engage in reimbursement practices and

The Statewide assessment also reports, however, that Quality Assurance Reviews conducted in 2004, 2005 and 2006 indicate that
The Family Determination

Securing that the agency should have filed a petition in court to manage services when the family was not cooperating.

Corrective processes may have been established and reviewed. However, expressed the opinion that in some of these cases the review was not sufficient, the risk of harm was not assessed.

The review process noted that because in-home services were generally considered "voluntary" cases, there is little that the caseworker can do if the closing of in-home services case when a clear risk of harm is the child remains.

Concerns pertaining to risk of harm issues also were identified with regard to the lack of sufficient service provision and in particular,

appears to be residing in geographically accessible environments with regard to the care of children. Although the caseworkers can conduct background and safety checks, the youth often do not make these contacts in a timely manner and when the caseworkers can conduct background and safety checks, the youth often do not make these contacts in a timely manner and when they are living so close to cases,

The primary concern regarding these youth is the ability of them to consult their caseworkers and tell them where they are living so close to cases.

The problem with these youth is the ability of them to consult their caseworkers and tell them where they are living so close to cases.

Concerns pertaining to risk of harm issues were raised regarding the agency's practice of providing some youth in foster care who are

addressing these risks (5 cases),

- There was risk of harm and safety issues during visitation with family, particularly in close proximity, and the agency did not

- There was risk of harm and safety issues during visitation with family, particularly in close proximity, and the agency did not

- There was risk of harm and safety issues during visitation with family, particularly in close proximity, and the agency did not

- The case was closed prematurely before safety issues were fully addressed. Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- The case was closed prematurely before safety issues were fully addressed. Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- The case was closed prematurely before safety issues were fully addressed. Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,

- Learning children at risk of harm (4 cases). In one case,
The child's best interest.

Monitoring parental views on limiting the parents' contact with the child when the agency believes that those limitations are in

Some stakeholders expressed the opinion that these may be more safety-related concerns when children are placed in foster homes

- Insufficient numbers of foster parents.
- Insufficient training and other supports.
- Lack of communication and team work with foster parents.
- The high caseloads of CYPD case workers.

Concerns in the caseworkers. However, stakeholders also attributed multi-mixture of child in foster care to the following.

Stakeholders also noted that CYPD volunteers in the home and see the children and foster parents and are expected to report

which the situation could have been avoided. In addition, any allegations involving a foster home are treated as emergency reports.

which time has likely been missed. In their foster homes. However, when stakeholders reviewed the incident reports are assessed for foster cases where abuses and

Some stakeholders expressed concern about the safety of children in foster family homes. They noted that youth often indulge

have expressed concern about allocation of the behavioral health services are not necessary or appropriate. Several stakeholders

When services are court-ordered, they may not be able to provide them if the family is unable (which is the single

known to the family and CYPD caseworkers had been dismissed. Some stakeholders noted that the family's perceptions of the importance of

The child's best interest.

In the foster homes, CYPD case workers often have trouble in assessing the risk and safety, and when the agency's

Many stakeholders commented on the other roles of case workers (including placement case workers).

Stakeholder Interview Information

in overall ranking of strengths. This item was ranked a strength in the State's 2001 CSFP.

an overall ranking of strengths. This item was ranked a strength in the State's 2001 CSFP.
The child-specific placement agreements are made at the time of placement. According to the statewide Assessment of Risk, assessment and safety management are addressed in several areas of policy and practice. The SDM tools are completed on all cases at investigation, prior to reunification, and prior to case closure. A thorough procedure is required with children in out-of-home placement to ensure safety. In-home services during a child’s family reunification Planning Services also include provisions for periodic risk and safety assessment and family treatment plans. Parental visitation is re-established with children in out-of-home placement or reunified. In-home services during a child’s family reunification Planning Services also include provisions for periodic risk and safety assessment and family treatment plans. The statewide Assessment of Risk, assessment and safety management are addressed in several areas of policy and practice.
The status of permanency outcome 1

|--------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| YES    | 122.6           | +                 | 122.6          | Time of substantively achieved. The outcome was substantively achieved in 7.3 percent of the cases, which is less than the 95 percent required for an overall
| YES    | 122.4           | +                 | 122.4          |                                                                                   |
| NO     | 122.0           | +                 | 122.0          |                                                                                   |

New Mexico did not achieve substantively achieved with permanency outcome 1. This determination was based on the following.

II. PERMANENCY
Agreements with the Indian Pueblo to recruit more Native American foster and adoptive parents.

Established a Joint Native American Children's Protection Fund.

Collaboration with Indian tribes to develop a comprehensive child welfare system.

Overseen by federal and tribal officials, the Adoption Across Borders Project.

Promoted the Adoption Across Borders Program.

Achieved the goal of placing children with a relative through adoption.

Developed a plan to coordinate adoption services in a timely manner.

Achieved the goal of placing children with a relative through adoption.

Achieved the goal of placing children with a relative through adoption.

Increased the number of children placed in permanent homes.

New Mexico implemented the following strategies in its PIP to address these concerns:

- New Mexico implemented the following strategies in its PIP to address these concerns:
- New Mexico implemented the following strategies in its PIP to address these concerns:
- New Mexico implemented the following strategies in its PIP to address these concerns:

Key concerns identified during the 2001 CFPR with regard to permanency outcomes were the following:

- Need for improved adoption outcomes.
- Need for increased adoption placements.
- Need for improved compliance with adoption standards.
- Need for improved compliance with adoption standards.
- Need for improved compliance with adoption standards.

Key concerns from the 2001 CFPR:

- Need for improved adoption outcomes.
- Need for increased adoption placements.
- Need for improved compliance with adoption standards.
- Need for improved compliance with adoption standards.
- Need for improved compliance with adoption standards.

New Mexico did not achieve substantial compliance with this outcome during the 2001 CFPR. In the 2001 CFPR, Item 7 (pertaining to establishing permanency goals for children in a timely manner) and Item 9 (pertaining to timely adoptions) were each ranked as an area of improvement.

Although New Mexico's performance on this outcome was fairly low in all sites, there was variation across sites.
There are not enough adoptive homes for the child, and there is a lack of independent living arrangements for the child's age.  

Key concerns expressed by stakeholders with regard to permanency were the following:

- **Permanency until the child reached the age of majority (item 10).**
- In two cases, the agency did not make concerted efforts to ensure that the child was in a living arrangement that would be permanent until the child reached the age of majority (item 7)
- The agency was not consistent with regard to making concerted efforts to achieve adoption in a timely manner.  
- The agency was not consistent with regard to ensuring that the child is in a timely manner (item 6)
- The agency was not consistent with regard to making concerted efforts to achieve reunification, guardianship, or permanency in a timely manner (item 5)
- The agency was not consistent with regard to ensuring that the child is in a timely manner (item 4)
- The agency was not consistent with regard to ensuring that the child is in a timely manner (item 3)
- The agency was not consistent with regard to ensuring that the child is in a timely manner (item 2)
- The agency was not consistent with regard to ensuring that the child is in a timely manner (item 1)

Additional findings of the 2007 CFRS case reviews include the following:

Regarding the lack of sufficient adoptive homes, or required adoption subsidy levels, there are significant concerns raised.  

Key findings of the 2007 CFRS:

- The State met its targeted goals for this outcome by the end of thePIP implementation period.
- The State met its targeted goals for this outcome by the end of thePIP implementation period.
- System for foster care, which increased adoption subsidy rates for children with higher level needs.
- System for foster care, which increased adoption subsidy rates for children with higher level needs.
- System for foster care, which increased adoption subsidy rates for children with higher level needs.
- System for foster care, which increased adoption subsidy rates for children with higher level needs.
- System for foster care, which increased adoption subsidy rates for children with higher level needs.
- System for foster care, which increased adoption subsidy rates for children with higher level needs.
Stakeholder Interview Information

This item also was rated as a strength for 90 percent of the cases, which exceeds the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure. The item was rated as a strength in 91 percent of the cases, which is over the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure. The item was rated as a strength in 91 percent of the cases, which is over the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure. The item was rated as a strength in 91 percent of the cases, which is over the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure.

Rating Determination

One of the key measures of the period under review occurred within 12 months of the child’s discharge from a prior foster care episode. The key measure was an Area Needing Improvement in one case, which is over the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure. The item was rated as a strength in 91 percent of the cases, which is over the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure. The item was rated as a strength in 91 percent of the cases, which is over the 90 percent level of performance expected for this measure.

Performance was better than the median but was not among the 75 percent best performing states. Performance was better than the median but was not among the 75 percent best performing states. Performance was better than the median but was not among the 75 percent best performing states. Performance was better than the median but was not among the 75 percent best performing states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percent N</th>
<th>Total Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Not Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of Individual Cases of Foster Care

The results of this foster care during the period under review occurred within 12 months of discharge from a prior foster care episode. The results of this foster care during the period under review occurred within 12 months of discharge from a prior foster care episode. The results of this foster care during the period under review occurred within 12 months of discharge from a prior foster care episode.

Case Review Findings

FINDINGS

Item 5, Foster care re-enters.

Findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Permanent Outcome 1 are presented below.
New Mexico’s performance on the individual measures included in Composite 4: Placement Stability is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Total Not Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Santa Fe 40</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rio Rancho 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>La Plata 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernalillo 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Valencia 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lea 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

Percent re-entered more than 12 months after a prior episode. Show that 26.6 percent of childrean entered care for the first time; 13.5 percent re-entered within 12 months of a prior episode; and 3.8 percent re-entered more than 12 months after a prior episode. Show that 26.6 percent of children entered care for the first time; 13.5 percent re-entered within 12 months of a prior episode; and 3.8 percent re-entered more than 12 months after a prior episode.

Assessment also notes that data from the PACTS system for September 2010 through August 31, 2011 indicate that for cases reviewed in 2010, 2011, and 2012, 90 percent of caregivers were available for caregiver reviews. Some stakeholders suggested that the agency prevented multiple entries into foster care and sometimes made it too easy for parents to regain custody of their children.

According to the Statewide Assessment, data available for calendar years 2010 through 2012 show some improvement. Foster care rate re-entry for children placed in foster care and re-entered within 12 months of a prior episode was 13.5 percent. Some stakeholders suggested that the agency prevented multiple entries into foster care and sometimes made it too easy for parents to regain custody of their children.
Poster parents do not have sufficient information about the child’s behavioral problems at the time of placement.

- Search of foster families
- Children are not being placed in appropriate placements that match their needs at the time of placement, due primarily to a lack of foster resources.

Stockholders communicated that they determined the overall CFSR score was not a strong one in the state’s 2001 CFSR.

- When the 90 percent or higher required for a ranking of strength to be received, in the best interests of the child. This parent is less than 90 percent experienced placement stability or changes in placements were in the best interests of the child. However, 75 percent of the applicable cases, review comments determined in the period were not reviewed.

- An overall ranking of area need: Improving. In 75 percent of the applicable cases, review comments determined in the period were not reviewed.

**Rating Determination**

- Children in 10 cases experienced 0 or more placements during the period under review.
- Children in 8 cases experienced 2 placements during the period under review.
- Children in 2 cases experienced 1 placement during the period under review.

Additional findings of the case review were the following:

- Children whose placements were in unlicensed homes or in institutions with other people, and were highly unstable.
- In two of the cases, review comments determined that the multiple placement changes were due to the adolescents’ self-selecting their own placements, with victimization.

The child’s current placement setting (at the time of the case file) CFSR) was not stable (3 cases).

- By the agency to further attain the child’s permanency goal (11 cases).
- The child was in multiple placement settings during the period under review, and at least one placement change was not planned.

Item 6 was rated a strong one in the state’s 2001 CFSR.

- The child’s case was closed in foster care during the period under review (23 cases).
- The child did not experience a placement change during the period under review, and either the current placement was stable or the placement changes experienced were, in the child’s best interest, and were necessary either to promote the child’s placement stability or to improve the child’s permanence.

- The placement changes experienced were in the child’s best interest and were needed either to further the child’s permanence or to improve the child’s placement stability (3 cases).

- The data indicate that New Mexico performed below the national median on all three measures of placement stability.

For this measure was 33.9 percent.

21.5 percent of the children in foster care for at least 24 months experienced two or fewer placements settings (the national median was 43 percent).
Making placements are held with each placement change and if the placements are being used and with the foster parents and with the parents.

Foster parents are more extensively involved in preplacement settings. There is somewhat more extensive communication and support of foster homes. CFDP is providing additional support with respect to monitoring placement arrangements and further discussion.

The strategic assessment moves that CFDP has continued to expand and improve its recruitment, training, home study, development, and placement services reviewed in both years.

The child assessment is enhanced by the (child) assessment. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.

Strategic assessment reports that FACS data for September 1, 2005 through April 30, 2006 indicate that 46.1 percent and show that placements assessment options for that child and placement services options for the child's needs. The strategic assessment is also reviewed for calendar years 2000 and 2005 show that there was a trend where 49 percent reported that there was an available. The strategic assessment also shows that the children have two or fewer placements and that 34.7 percent of the children have four or more. These data refer to all placements.
New Mexico meets the national standard for performance composite 3: Achieving permanency for children in foster care for extended permanency cases compared to 70 percent of Texas County cases, and 45 percent of Bemidji County cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Fe</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Bemidji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable Foster Care Cases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Needing Improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7, Permanency goal for child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Interview Information

than in the other two sites included in the 2007 CFPR. Establishing applicable goals for children in foster care in a timely manner appears to be a greater challenge in Penampillo County or higher required for a finding of Steadfast. This item was raised in an Area Needing Improvement in the State's 2007 CFPR.

The agency has established an applicable permanency goal for the child in every manner. This percent is less than 90 percent of the applicable cases, i.e., PPA is in a living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, living with other relatives, or guardianship that involves the child remaining in State custody until reaching age of majority.

The child's permanency goal was not established in a timely manner (5 cases).

The child's permanency goal was not applicable given the case situation and the needs of the child (5 cases).

A reason for not filing for TPR was noted in 6 of the 11 cases in which TPR had not been filed, despite the 15-month criterion.

At the time of the on-site review, 25 of the 40 children in the foster care case had been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months. 25 of the 40 children in the foster care case had been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months. 25 of the 40 children in the foster care case had been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months.

Case Review Findings Pertaining to Elimination of Parental Rights (TPR) were as follows:

1. Child had concurrent goals of reunification and PPA only.

2. Child had concurrent goals of adoption and reunification.

2. Child had a goal of Guardianship only.

15 children had a goal of reunification only (including living with other relatives).

1 child had a goal of Guardianship only (including living with other relatives).

1 child had concurrent goals of adoption and reunification and PPA.

1 child had concurrent goals of adoption and Guardianship.

The age of majority.

7 children had a goal of Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (PPA only). PPA is a living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, living with other relatives, or guardianship that involves the child remaining in State custody until reaching age of majority.

12 children had a goal of Adoption only.

Case Review Findings Pertaining to Case Goals were as follows:

The child's permanency goal was not established in a timely manner (9 cases).

The child's permanency goal was not applicable given the case situation and the needs of the child (5 cases).
contactual planning has been implemented elsewhere, permanency plans are set early in the case, and the court reviews and approves
do days of every two weeks, and that a contactual plan be developed when indicated. The Staircase Assessment also note that
compliance reasons for not filing. In addition, policy requires that each child be assessed for a contactual permanency plan within 30
ability to modify permanency plans. If a child has been in substitute care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, unless there are
certification of a new or modified permanency plan. If a child has been in substitute care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, unless there are
referred and individual review and prior to any contactual permanency planning. CYPD must file a motion to terminate permanent legal ties and
assessment notes that CYPD is required to assess the child's permanency planning at every CYPD conference. The Staircase
established by each child at the Assessment Planning Conference, which is held prior to the custody (10-day) hearing. The Staircase
According to the Staircase Assessment, agency policy identifies five allowable permanency plans and requires that a plan be
Staircase Assessment Information

parties to find potential adoptive parents, said that some older youth are now asking for their permanency goals to be changed to adoption and they are participating in adoption
regarding the possible consequences of adoption, and the goal of adoption is no longer pursued with the child. Several stakeholders
stakeholders said that once a child makes that decision, there is no follow up with the child.
mental capacity to make that decision. Stakeholders said that once a child makes that decision, there is no follow up with the child.
New Mexico Children's Code requires that a child age 14 years or older must consent to adoption unless the child does not have the
Stakeholders noted, however, that when children are given goals of PFA because they will not consent to an adoption, the New
who are 16 and older
the goals is established. The purpose of these new procedures is to prevent the automatic designation of a goal of PFA for children
the goals are established. The purpose of these new procedures is to prevent the automatic designation of a goal of PFA for children
aged 16. In addition, stakeholders reported that for children age 16 and older, the agency requests the justification for the goal prior to any social worker's
were a goal of PFA. One requirement is that administrative approval is needed for the assessment of the goal to any young person who
Stakeholders reported that new requirements have been put in place to minimize the number of children younger than age 16 who
speaking positions. The decision is difficult to make timely decisions regarding placement goals. Follow the same procedures as required by ASPA. Also, because placement services for high-needs children are difficult to access,
A few stakeholders also noted that treatment for parental substance abuse problems, particularly substance use disorders, is also difficult to access.
subsidized guardianship to parents that are willing to assume this role, but who might need financial supports to make it work.
Stakeholders also noted that the permanency option of guardianship is not always available because of insufficient funds to provide
Sensorite, however, stakeholders noted that the agency has made noteworthy improvements in short-term care as well. In addition, some stakeholders
personnel have been able to make better decisions since permanency goals than less experienced case workers. Other stakeholders expressed concern that staff turnover has a negative effect on timely permanency planning.
judges, although not all, work closely with CYPD in establishing permanency goals.
use of TM meetings, the Drug Court, and mediation programs. There also was general agreement among stakeholders that most
### Table: Total Foster Case Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>40</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>Total Foster Case Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Applicable Foster Case Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Applicable Foster Case Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Area Needing Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strength: limegreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Item 8: Total N 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this assessment are shown in the table below.

### Case Review Findings

- Strength: limegreen
- Area Needing Improvement

Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement with Relatives

2002. Item 7 was read as a strength in 88 percent of the cases reviewed and in 1 percent of the cases reviewed in 2002. In 2004, 8 percent of the cases reviewed in 2002, and in 2 percent of the cases reviewed in 2005, Item 7 was read as a strength in 88 percent of the cases reviewed. The child's safety was a concern in 99 percent of the cases reviewed. The Adoption and Placement Review Teams are reviewing the case of children with adoption plans and all plans for older youth. The Adoption and Placement Review Teams are reviewing the case of children with adoption plans and all plans for

(continued)
Shareholders communicating on this item during the onsite CSR identified the following barriers to timely reunification and

placements for children,

noted that the agency makes concerted efforts to locate relatives early on in the case and evaluate them as potential placement

placements for children. The

noted that the agency makes concerted efforts to locate relatives early on in the case and evaluate them as potential placement.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.

placements for children.
measures included in this composite were as follows:

New Mexico met the national standard for the following Composite: Timelessness of adoption. Performance on the individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Not Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Berrien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are shown in the table below.

Different criteria have been used to achieve finalized adoptions in a timely manner. The results are shown in the table.

Item 9 was applicable for 14 (35 percent) of the 40 foster care cases. In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether

Case Review Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Item 9: Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Area Needing Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Performance data (with regard to placement) was included in 70 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 67 percent of cases

available for cases reviewed in 2006 and 2005 show an increase in the percentage of cases.

The Strategic Assessment also notes that Quality Assurance data

less than 48 months, and 4.6 percent in 12 months or more. The Strategic Assessment also notes that Quality Assurance data

least 12 months but less than 24 months, 3.1 percent in at least 24 months but less than 36 months, 0.6 percent in at least 36 months but

in cases of foster care. The data indicates that 8.7 percent of foster care children were returned in less than 12 months, 4.5 percent in at least

according to the Strategic Assessment, FACTS data for September 1, 2005 through August 31, 2006 include 1,446 cases of children

Strategic Assessment Information

• A lack of sufficient resources to meet the service needs of parents.
• A lack of adequate services, resulting in delays in court proceedings.
— (Financial, medical, other needed).

Both the funds and services were available during the state's Title 1-F waiver demonstration project concerning subsidized

A lack of funds for Subsidizing Guardianship and a lack of access to resources for children, particularly Medicaid.

Parents responding to date use other means.
adoption placement, longer than 24 months at the time of the finalized adoption. Of the remaining 1 children, only two were determined to be in a pre-

In these cases, the adoption was finalized during the period under review. In all these cases, the child had been in foster care for

Relocating placements. In four cases, the child had been in foster care for longer than 3 years, and in one case longer than 5 years.

All of the children in the 14 cases with a goal of adoption were in foster care for considerablely longer than 24 months without

- Days caused by the ICPC process (1 case).
- Days due to the need to make a decision regarding the placement of children as a result of adoption (1 case).
- Lack of concerted efforts on the part of the agency to seek an adoptive family for a child (2 cases).
- Days due to the agency not having a TPR in a timely manner to remove the case from the scheduling of court hearings to initiate an adoption (4 cases).
- Days in scheduling court hearings or court delays related to continuances or postponements (4 cases).

Improve measures: The adoption was placed in the top 75th percentile of the nation with regard to achieving either a TPR or a finalized adoption for children in foster care for 17 months or longer on the first day of the 12-month target period.

These data suggest that the data performed in the top 75th percentile of the nation on all measures pertaining to timeliness of adoption.

The median length of stay in foster care for children in adoption were discharged in less than 24 months from the time of entry into foster care.

34.0 percent of the children exiting adoption were discharged in less than 24 months without
Case Review Findings

**Strengths**

Item 10. Permanent goal of other planned permanent living arrangement

The performance goal was achieved in the number of cases reviewed in 2006 and 2007.

**Area Needing Improvement**

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

According to the Statewide Assessment ofFACTS data for September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007, excluding 146 cases and showing a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007, the service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

According to the Statewide Assessment ofFACTS data for September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007, excluding 146 cases and showing a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007, the service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.

The service provider also notes that quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2007.
position of Independent Living Coordinator in order to attract more skilled staff.

provided to children in younger ages. One stakeholder noted that the agency has increased the educational requirements for the Independent Living service until they are 17 years old. They suggested that by age 17 years old, Independent Living services should be made accessible to children prior to care for Independent Living. Stakeholders also said that some youth do not receive education services effectively in praising children

although Independent Living services are available in the State, they are insufficient to meet the need.

Several stakeholders noted that although Independent Living services are available in the State, they are insufficient to meet the need.

Shareholder Interview Information

or higher required for a range of strengths. The item was revised as a strength in the State’s 2011 CFR.

that the goal of other planned living arrangements was being addressed in an applicable way. This percent is less than the 90 percent

Imagery Improvement. In 75 percent of the applicable cases, reviewers determined

Rationale Determination

was consistent with the applicable level of Area Needing Improvement. In 75 percent of the applicable cases, reviewers determined

Placement, but there was no evidence that this placement was intended to be permanent.

For it, as a result, she has lived in multiple residences, usually with friends. In the other case, the youth was in a new foster home

16 years old young man (who resided in an inner city) was allowed to choose her placement and given funds by the agency to pay

16 years old young man (who resided in an inner city) was allowed to choose her placement and given funds by the agency to pay

item was revised as an Area Needing Improvement in two cases because the child was not in a stable placement in one case, the child was not in a stable placement in one case, the child was not in a stable placement in one case, the child was not in a stable placement in one case.

out of foster care.

was a foster home, there were formal agreements on the part of foster parents to continue caring for the child until the child aged

item was revised as a strength when reviewers determined that the agency had made concerted efforts to ensure a long-term

were formal agreements on the part of foster parents to continue caring for the child until the child aged

item was revised as a strength when reviewers determined that the agency had made concerted efforts to ensure a long-term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>No Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bernieville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imagination. The results are presented in the table below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure had made or was making different efforts to assist children in achieving their goals related to other planned permanent living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In assessing these cases, reviewers were to determine if the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imagery Improvement. In 75 percent of the applicable cases, reviewers determined

Placement, but there was no evidence that this placement was intended to be permanent.

For it, as a result, she has lived in multiple residences, usually with friends. In the other case, the youth was in a new foster home

16 years old young man (who resided in an inner city) was allowed to choose her placement and given funds by the agency to pay

16 years old young man (who resided in an inner city) was allowed to choose her placement and given funds by the agency to pay

item was revised as an Area Needing Improvement in two cases because the child was not in a stable placement in one case, the child was not in a stable placement in one case, the child was not in a stable placement in one case, the child was not in a stable placement in one case.

out of foster care.

was a foster home, there were formal agreements on the part of foster parents to continue caring for the child until the child aged

item was revised as a strength when reviewers determined that the agency had made concerted efforts to ensure a long-term
Permanency Outcome 2

Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Substantially Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

Permanency Outcome 2

Although Item 10 was rated as a strength in 25 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 36 percent in 2005, show a decrease in Item 10 was rated as a strength in 75 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 70 percent in 2005.

The Statewide Assessment Reports trend cautionary assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2005 show a decrease in Item 10 was rated as a strength in 25 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 36 percent in 2005, show a decrease in Item 10 was rated as a strength in 75 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 70 percent in 2005.

The Statewide Assessment also reports that independent living services are provided to all children with PPLA plans in order to help the child achieve the goal of permanency. The PPLA plan for a child.

- The child’s court advocate is required to provide the court with documentation of the child’s progress on the agreed-upon plan.
- The court reviews and approves PPLA plans for children at risk of age 16.
- The court must review the plan and consider the child with a PPLA plan regularly to determine if the plan is still in the child’s best interest.

As per the requirements, the department must review the plan and consider the child with a PPLA plan regularly to determine if the plan is still in the child’s best interest.

In addition, the department must review the plan and consider the child with a PPLA plan regularly to determine if the plan is still in the child’s best interest.

The department must review the plan and consider the child with a PPLA plan regularly to determine if the plan is still in the child’s best interest.

Where were not enough independent living services to meet the needs of older children in foster care, Peralta County stakeholders reported that in their county they have adopted youth decision making mechanisms to address the unique needs of older children in foster care. Peralta County stakeholders also praised the quality of independent living services available in their county and indicated that youth are benefiting from the services. However, even in this county, stakeholders indicated that there were not enough independent living services to meet the needs of older children in foster care.
The State met its larger goals for this outcome by the end of the PF implementation period.

- Permanent foster care
- Improved foster care
- Behavioral training

- Increased visibility for children with parents and siblings
- Increased access to resources
- Develop additional training

To address these concerns, New Mexico implemented the following strategies in its Program Improvement Plan.

**Key concerns from the 2001 CRS**

70 percent of LA cases and 60 percent of Santa Fe County cases, compared to

75.0 percent of the cases, which is less than the 95 percent of higher-remanded for substantial compliance. Performance on this outcome was ranked as substantially achieved in New Mexico did not achieve substantial compliance with permanency Outcome 2.
### Key Findings from the 2007 CSFR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Applicable Foster Care Cases</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Needing Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item II</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case Review Findings**

**Item II, Proximity of Foster care placement**

The findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Permanency Outcome 2 are presented and discussed below.

1. A lack of consistency in seeking and evaluating relatives as potential placement resources (Item 15).
2. A lack of consistency in promoting visibility or numbers of siblings in foster care (Item 16).
3. A lack of consistency with regard to efforts to maintain the child's connection with extended family, culture, and community (Item 17).
4. A lack of consistency in promoting participation of other siblings in foster care (Item 18).

Although these concerns appear to have been resolved to some extent by the time of the 2007 CSFR, new concerns emerge in the Permanency to Permanency Outcome 2 that were identified in the 2007 CSFR (as indicated above) were not apparent in the 2007 CSFR. However, the concerns similar to the 2007 CSFR, Items 13 and 16 were raised as areas needing improvement in the 2007 CSFR. However, the concerns

---

**Assessment are presented in the table below:**

- The child's most current foster care setting was in close proximity to the child's parents or close relatives. The results of this assessment are presented in the table below:
- (1) The score was an average prior to the period under review.
- (2) Contact with parents was not considered to be in the child's best interest; and/or (3) parties were deceased or whereabouts were unknown. In assessing Item I, referrals were determined to be in the child's best interest, and/or (4) parties were deceased or whereabouts were unknown.

**item II was applicable for 27 (75.7%) of the 40 foster care cases.**

The findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Permanency Outcome 2 are presented and discussed below.

1. A lack of consistency in seeking and evaluating relatives as potential placement resources (Item 15).
2. A lack of consistency in promoting visibility or numbers of siblings in foster care (Item 16).
3. A lack of consistency with regard to efforts to maintain the child's connection with extended family, culture, and community (Item 17).
4. A lack of consistency in promoting participation of other siblings in foster care (Item 18).

Although these concerns appear to have been resolved to some extent by the time of the 2007 CSFR, new concerns emerge in the Permanency to Permanency Outcome 2 that were identified in the 2007 CSFR (as indicated above) were not apparent in the 2007 CSFR. However, the concerns similar to the 2007 CSFR, Items 13 and 16 were raised as areas needing improvement in the 2007 CSFR. However, the concerns...
The results of this assessment are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Placement with siblings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strength**

- Area Needing Improvement

**Item 12, Placement with siblings**

In 2005, 86 percent of cases reviewed in 2006 and 84 percent of cases reviewed in 2005.

**Strength**

- 1) Proximity of foster care placement was rated as a concern.
- 2) A stability of foster care placement is not placed close to the child's home because of special needs, the worker must document why the placement is not possible.

**Placement Assessment Information**

- Percentage of placements for children in close proximity to their homes. When a child has a plan of placement with a family, a plan of placement with a relative, or a plan of placement with a foster care agency.

**Stakeholder Incentives**

- As a strength in the State's 2001 CFSA.

**Risk Determination**

- Needs of the child and support arrangements of the permanency goal.
Despite the focus of the agency on placing siblings together, stakeholders noted that youth usually report that they have not been placed with siblings throughout their time in foster care.

Needs for group foster homes. Needs for group foster homes arise when the child needs a higher level of care than can be provided in a single family home. Stakeholders reported that siblings usually are separated because one of them needs a higher level of care than the other.

Several stakeholders expressed the opinion that CPD makes concerted efforts to place siblings together. However, stakeholders also acknowledged the challenges of placing siblings in one family home, especially when there are not enough foster family homes to house them. In cases where siblings cannot be placed together, they noted that group foster homes are preferred because they can accommodate families with multiple children.

Item 12 was assigned an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement. In 65 percent of the applicable cases, reviewers determined that the agency was not successful in addressing the needs of the children. This rating is based on the agency's performance in meeting the needs of children in group foster homes.

The separation was due to the special needs of one of the siblings or to the fact that placement with siblings was not in the child's best interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Total Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Item 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 13 was rated as an Area Needing Improvement when reviewers determined one or more of the following:

- Promote vision (3 cases).
- The needs of the child or children (16 cases) or when vision did not meet the child's needs, but the agency made concerted efforts to meet the needs of the child or children (6 cases).
- When vision was determined that the frequency and quality of vision with parents and siblings met or exceeded the needs of the child or children (6 cases) and 62.5 percent of Santa Fe County cases. Performance on this item varied across sites. The item was rated as a Strength in 66 percent of Pemamillo County cases and 62.5 percent of Santa Fe County cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total Poster Case</th>
<th>Not Applicable Poster Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 13, Vision with Parents and Siblings in Foster care**

- Cases referred in 2005:
  - Strength. Item 6 (Participation with siblings) was rated as a Good example of the needs of the child or children being met or exceeded in 64 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 68 percent of the cases reviewed in 2005.
  - Improvement. As indicated in the Statewide Assessment Quality Assurance Data available for calendar years 2006 and 2005, show a decrease in the number of cases reviewed in 2006 that did not meet the needs of the child or children.

- Caseworker must also document how contact between the siblings will be accomplished.
and 2005. As indicated in the Statewide Assessment/Quality Assurance data available for calendar years 2000 and 2005, show increased item 14, Preserving connections with grandparents and siblings in foster care was rated as a strength in 43 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006.

With increased parent involvement, a challenge is that only a few institutions allow physical contact. The Statewide Assessment also notes that 

**Statewide Assessment Information**

Visits with grandparents present no challenge in the majority of cases; however, some institutions reported that only in-person visits are allowed. They noted that agency caseworkers often work hard to facilitate visits, particularly in rural areas where transportation can be a challenge. Many caseworkers commented on the importance of preserving these connections.

**Stakeholder Interview Information**

A concern identified in six cases is that the 26 percent of children in foster care who are siblings was a key

Based on the 90 percent required for a rating of Strengthen, some efforts to promote visitation with siblings was a key

**Rationale for Determination**

- The agency did not make concerted efforts to promote visitation with the parent (3 cases).
- The agency did not make concerted efforts to promote visitation with siblings (6 cases).
- The agency did not make concerted efforts to promote visitation with the other (2 cases).
The 90 percent required for a rating of Strengthen was not reached as a Strengthen in New Mexico's 2000 CSK.

- The agency did not make concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections to school or community (2 cases).
- The agency did not make concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections to extended family (4 cases).
- The agency did not make concerted efforts to maintain the child's connection to extended family (4 cases).
- Item 14 was rated as an Area Needing Improvement in 78 percent of the cases; reviewers determined that the agency had made concerted efforts to maintain the child's connection with extended family and school, while the child was not rated as a Strengthen in New Mexico's 2000 CSK.

Item 14 was rated as an Area Needing Improvement when reviewers determined one or more of the following:

- That do not require a change of school, jobs, friends, etc. (15 cases).
- The agency made concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections to school and community (3 cases).
- The agency made concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections to extended family members (1 case).
- The agency made concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections with extended family members (e.g., through phone contact) (28 cases).

Performance on this item varied across sites. The item was rated as a Strengthen in 23 percent of Bernalillo County cases, 18 percent of Denver County cases, and only 66 percent of Lake County cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Same Pe</th>
<th>Same Pe County</th>
<th>Bernalillo County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the assessment are provided in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
<th>Relative Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Case Review Findings**

- **Strengths**
  - Area Needing Improvement
  - Item 15 was applicable for 4 (65 percent) of the 60 foster care cases. Cases were not applicable if relative placement was not an option during the period under review because: (1) the child was in an adoptive placement at the start of the time period or (2) the child entered foster care needing specialized services that could not be provided in a relative placement.

**Case Review Findings**

- **Strengths**
  - Area Needing Improvement
  - Item 15 was applicable for 4 (65 percent) of the 60 foster care cases. Cases were not applicable if relative placement was not an option during the period under review because: (1) the child was in an adoptive placement at the start of the time period or (2) the child entered foster care needing specialized services that could not be provided in a relative placement.

**Case Review Findings**

- **Strengths**
  - Area Needing Improvement
  - Item 15 was applicable for 4 (65 percent) of the 60 foster care cases. Cases were not applicable if relative placement was not an option during the period under review because: (1) the child was in an adoptive placement at the start of the time period or (2) the child entered foster care needing specialized services that could not be provided in a relative placement.
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Statewide Assessment Information

Home where the child is already bonded and relations who may be unfamiliar to the child.

One concern expressed by stakeholders is that relations sometimes suffice in the case where the child has already established a bond with foster parents. This complicated decision-making regarding placement decisions since the agency has to choose between a foster

when a relative indicates that they would be willing to assume care for a child.

viewed as “family” to the child. The County Stakeholder reported that they have a relative assessment tool that they use immediately

familiarity with foster and personal relations and that “family” KHI are included in the search for placement resources because they are

not included in the search for placement resources. A few Stakeholders indicated that the agency searches

exposed to abuse and neglect; children who are developmentally delayed or have a chronic illness; and children who have been

the investigation phase of a case; and is expected to continue informing the board of the case. Stakeholders also noted that the courts

search for relatives and evaluate relatives as placement resources for the child. Stakeholders reported that this search begins during

Most Stakeholders commented on this item during the online CSR, expressing the opinion that the analysis makes a concerted effort to

higher required for a ranking of strength. This item was rated as a strength in the State's 2001 CSR.

has made different efforts to locate and assess relatives as potential placement resources. This practice is less than the 90 percent of

item 15 was rated as an overall ranking of area needing improvement. In 65 percent of cases, reviewers determined that the agency

The agency has made efforts to search for personal relations, but not maternal relatives (4 cases).

The agency has made efforts to search for maternal relatives, but not personal relatives (4 cases).

The agency has not made different efforts to search for either maternal or personal relatives during the period under review (4 cases).

item 15 was rated as an area needing improvement when reviewers determined the following:

criminal record or history of substance abused child maltreatment.

relatives who were located were unable or unwilling to care for the child. This led to the child not being placed with the relatives.

relatives could not be found or because the child was not placed with relatives but the agency made different efforts to search for both maternal and personal relations.

The child was placed with relatives (6 cases).

The child was placed with relatives (6 cases).

The child was placed with relatives (6 cases).

For this item, compared to 78 percent of California County cases and 67 percent of the County.

Performance on this measure varied somewhat across states. Only 29 percent of the cases in San Francisco County were rated as a strength.
**Item 16 was rated as an area needing improvement when reviewers determined the following:**

- Encouraging foster parents to mentor biological parents and serve as parenting role models for them (9 cases).
- Providing opportunities for family therapeutic sessions (19 cases).
- Providing transportation so that parents can participate in these events (10 cases).
- Encouraging more involvement of parents and children through one or more of the following activities: bonding between parents and children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Total Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Total Applicable Foster Care Cases</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 16 was rated as a strength when reviewers determined that the agency made concerted efforts to support and strengthen the:**

- Bond between parents and children through one or more of the following activities:
- Providing opportunities for family therapeutic sessions.
- Providing transportation so that parents can participate in these events.
- Encouraging more involvement of parents and children through one or more of the following activities: bonding between parents and children.

**Case Review Findings**

**Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care with Parents**

In both 2006 and 2005, and 2002 show identical Area Strength results. Item 15 (Teacher Placement) was rated a strength in 65 percent of the cases reviewed.

According to the Stakeholder Assessment, Placement Planning and Foster Parenting policies and Locating Standards for Foster Care periodically assess children in relation to foster care placements. Preference is given to adults residing over a non-relevent care giver if the relative needs living standards. As noted in the Stakeholder Assessment, Quality Assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show identical Area Strength results. Item 15 (Teacher Placement) was rated a strength in 65 percent of the cases reviewed.
providing invitations to parties, and offering video and audio connections in some areas and with some incarcerated parents.

using calendars to document child’s schedule for parents, making exercise classes to get parents to need and education events, and asset in identifying opportunities and in promoting the relationship. CPFF is developing strategies to promote involvement such as cultural activities, medical care, therapy appointments, etc. The statewide assessment notes that the Team Decision Making in an effort to develop the family plan is a strength. Item 16 (Relationship of child in foster care) was added in 2004, and 25% of the cases reviewed in 2006 show a decrease in the percentage of cases reviewed in 2005.

Stakeholder Assessment Information

- Using “story books” (in Santa Fe County) that are recordings made for parents, particularly incarcerated parents.
- Providing family therapy.
- Using a training coach (in Lee County) who was reported to be effective in strengthening the parent-child relationship.
- Relationships with parents who are incarcerated.
- Enabling the Blue Ribbon Commission on the Welfare of Children of Jailed and Incarcerated Parents to improve children’s outcomes.
- County/State listing of children in foster care.
- The following stakeholders are conducting the assessment:

Stakeholder Interview Information

- Community Child Protective Services (CCPS).
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There was a lack of consistency with regard to caseworker contacts with fathers and incarcerated parents.

There was no written policy regarding caseworker visits with parents.

There was some confusion regarding the role of CYFD in cases involving emergency shelter care, which is contracted out.

There was an inaccuracy with regard to caseworker contacts with children and parents and the quality of those contacts.

Children and parents were not actively involved in case planning on a consistent basis.

There was inadequate attention to parental substance abuse concerns, domestic violence, and sexual abuse in many cases.

Service needs were not assessed accurately or were not sufficiently addressed in many cases.

Key concerns identified in the 2010 review were the following:

- The percentage of children living with inadequate family environments.
- The number of children living with substance abuse problems.
- The percentage of children living with domestic violence.
- The percentage of children living with sexual abuse.

Key concerns from the 2010 CFSR:

- The percentage of children living with emotional and behavioral disorders.
- The percentage of children living with learning disabilities.
- The percentage of children living with physical disabilities.

New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with this outcome during the 2010 CFSR. All four items were not met.

The following table shows the status of Well-Being Outcome 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Substantially Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Adequately Achieved</th>
<th>Not Applicable Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debrief Outcome 1: Well Being Outcome 1

Well Being Outcome 1

III. CHILD AND FAMILY WELL-BEING
The findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Well-Becoming Outcome 1 are presented and discussed below.

Although some concerns appear to have been resolved, the 2007 CSPR continued to find a lack of consistency with regard to the needs and services of child, parents, foster parents, and referrals. Concerns have been made to establish contacts with incarcerated parents. However, concerns have been raised about the needs of parents, particularly those who are struggling with alcohol and substance abuse, and about the need for adequate addressing practices, substance abuse problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assessing cases. Substances abused problems, involving parents and children in case planning, and adequately assessing and adequating assess
Item 17: Table of Needs Assessment and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Evaluation Results</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Area: Needing Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Santa Fe: Total of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beramallo: Total of 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 17 was applied for all 65 cases. In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether there was evidence that the agency was using effective case review findings for item 17, as shown in the table below. The data in the table suggest that the agency is less effective in assessing and meeting service needs for children than it is for mothers. Foster parents and/or Biological parents of the 70 percent (28 cases) of the 25 in-home services cases needed additional Case Review determinations. This item was not a strength in 70 percent (28 cases) of the 40 foster care cases, compared to 65 percent (14 cases) of the 25 in-home services cases. The item was a strength in 77 percent of Beramallo County cases, compared to 55 percent of Santa Fe County cases. Performance also varied somewhat based on the type of case. Item 17 was not a strength in 70 percent of 27 percent of Santa Fe County cases, compared to 55 percent of Beramallo County cases, and foster parents had been adequately addressed in 70 percent of the cases. The item was a strength in 70 percent of 28 cases of the 40 foster care cases, compared to 65 percent (14 cases) of the 25 in-home services cases. The item was not a strength in 70 percent (28 cases) of the 40 foster care cases, compared to 65 percent (14 cases) of the 25 in-home services cases. The item was not a strength in 70 percent (28 cases) of the 40 foster care cases, compared to 65 percent (14 cases) of the 25 in-home services cases.
as indicated in the statewide assessment, quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2005 show for both in-home and foster care cases a slight decrease in item strengths. Item 17 (needs of foster parents and foster children) was rated as a strength in 35% of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 40% of the cases reviewed in 2005. In general, performance was needs are identified. Thus is done through assessment, planning, treatment planning, and initial reviews.

A few stakeholders suggested that sometimes service providers are not involved in the case early enough to be effective. They noted that there is not always availability of hours to address foster parents’ needs. A few stakeholders expressed concern that caseworkers are not always accessible to address foster parents’ needs. Stakeholders stated that when the needs of foster parents are not addressed, they noted that they are not addressed properly. Although they indicated that the TDA meeting are effective in identifying service needs, they noted that when other services are not available, they are not effective in meeting the service needs of parents.

Many stakeholders also reported that the agency usually is effective in assessing and meeting the service needs of parents.

Events.

Several stakeholders reported that it is difficult to meet service needs for children who are unaccompanied immigrants. In addition, no services were available in most independent living services and services such as clothing vouchers and funds for special

There was general consensus among stakeholders that services to meet the needs of youth in foster care are insufficient. Particular needs for services were identified in the area of independent living resources and services such as clothing vouchers and funds for

provided in the discussion of Item 27 and in the discussion of the systematic factor of service array.

Several stakeholders noted that the agency has been somewhat effective in identifying the needs of children and making sure that those needs are met. However, these stakeholders suggested that it is becoming more

No stakeholders commented on this item expressed the opinion that the agency has been somewhat effective in identifying the

Statewide Assessment Information

When stakeholders were asked whether the TDA meetings are effective in identifying service needs, they noted that TDA meetings are not consistently effective in assessing and meeting the service needs of parents.

Stakeholder Interview Information
determined that the agency made concerted efforts to involve children in case planning in 46 (82 percent) of those cases. 

These were 25 cases in which involvement of the children in the case planning process was applicable for assessment. Reviewers determined that the agency made concerted efforts to involve children in 16 (64 percent) of these cases.

These were 42 cases in which involvement of the children in the case planning process was applicable for assessment. Reviewers determined that the agency made concerted efforts to involve children in 17 (40 percent) of these cases.

These were 47 cases in which involvement of the children in the case planning process was applicable for assessment. Reviewers determined that the agency made concerted efforts to involve children in 17 (36 percent) of these cases.

Based on the above information, the following conclusions were reached:

The 25 in-home services cases where child (age-appropriate) in the case planning process;

Key findings with regard to this item were the following:

- Item 18 was rec'd as a Strength when reviewers determined that all applicable parties had actively participated in the case planning process.

### Item 18 Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Not Applicable Cases</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Strengthen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 18**

The assessment produced the following conclusions:

- Item 18 was applicable for 64 (99 percent) of the 65 cases. A case was not applicable if parental rights had been terminated prior to the point under review and parents were not involved with the child. The point under review was the point where the child was age 18, and the child was age 18. A case was not applicable if parental rights had been terminated prior to the point under review and parents were not involved with the child. The point under review was the point where the child was age 18, and the child was age 18.

**Case Review Findings**

**Item 18 Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning**

**X** Area Needing Improvement
assessments are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Review Findings</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 19</strong> Worker views with child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the cases reviewed in 2005, 18 (Child and Family involvement in case Planning) was rated as a strength in 45 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 45 percent of the cases reviewed in 2007. A slight increase in area strength in 2006 data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 for both birth and foster care cases. The Stewardship assessment notes the Quality Assurance and the sub-theme Care provides in the development of the Reenement plan, The Stewardship assessment notes that Quality Assurance and the sub-theme Care provides in the development of the Reenement plan. The Stewardship assessment notes that Quality Assurance and the sub-theme Care provides in the development of the Reenement plan.

According to the Stewardship assessment, there are numerous references to child and family involvement in the plans reviewed in the State’s Systematic Information.

Additional comments regarding the case planning process are provided in the Systematic Factors section under Item 2.

Families in Worthington on their plans:

Parents in case planning. However, a few stakeholders indicated that in some cases CYP is not made sufficient efforts to engage

Many stakeholders commented on this theme during the course. CRF expressed the opinion that involving parents and children in case planning has improved over the past few years. They attributed this improvement to the TDs involvement and other recommendations.

Stakeholder Interview Information

90 percent of stakeholders indicated that the agency has made different efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. This percent is less than the

Raising Determination

There are no noteworthy differences in performance with regard to involving families compared to involving mothers and children.
The frequency of caseworker visits with child was not sufficient to meet the needs of the child. Although when visits did occur, they were substantial (1 case), the frequency of caseworker visits with children was not sufficient to meet the needs of the child and the visits did not focus on issues pertinent to case planning service (2 cases).

There were long periods of time during the period under review in which the agency caseworker did not visit the child (2 cases).

Item 19 was rated as a strength when reviewers determined that the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and children were sufficient to ensure adequate monitoring of the child’s safety and well-being and promote placement of case goals.

Item 19 was rated as a strength in 40 percent of foster care cases and 90 percent of in-home services cases.

The item was rated as a strength in 94 percent of Berneillo County cases and 36 percent of Sanita Re County cases, compared to 16 percent of Leon County cases. However, performance on the item did not vary substantially based on the type of case. The item was rated as a strength in 0 percent of Sanita Re County cases, compared to 0 percent of Leon County cases.
The results of this assessment are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 20: Worker visits with parents

50 percent of cases reviewed in 2005, 65 percent of cases reviewed in 2006, and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2007. Parent visits were not applicable for 54 cases (87 percent of the 65 cases reviewed in 2007, 3 percent of the 75 cases reviewed in 2008). Cases were not applicable for this assessment if parental rights had been terminated prior to the period under review, and parents were not longer involved in the lives of the children. All cases that were not terminated prior to the period under review and parents were involved in the lives of the children were not removed from this report. Evidence of parental rights had been terminated prior to the period under review and parents were not longer involved in the lives of the children. All cases that were not terminated prior to the period under review and parents were involved in the lives of the children were not removed from this report.

Case Review Findings

Item 20: Worker visits with parents

50 percent of cases reviewed in 2005, 65 percent of cases reviewed in 2006, and 55 percent of cases reviewed in 2007. Parent visits were not applicable for 54 cases (87 percent of the 65 cases reviewed in 2007, 3 percent of the 75 cases reviewed in 2008). Cases were not applicable for this assessment if parental rights had been terminated prior to the period under review, and parents were not longer involved in the lives of the children. All cases that were not terminated prior to the period under review and parents were involved in the lives of the children were not removed from this report.

Stakeholder Information

Many stakeholders commented on this item during the course of the 2007 CFSR.

Item 19 was assessed in overall ranking of Area Needing Improvement in the State's CFSR.
was rated as an Area Needs Improvement in the Child's 2011 CPS.

Promote achievement of case goals. This percent is less than the 90 percent of higher required for a rating of Strength. This item also

strengthens or quality of caseworker visits with parents were sufficient in number and type of the child. Item 20 was assessed on an overall rating of Area Needs Improvement. In 70 percent of the applicable cases, caseworkers determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Applicable Cases

There were no visits during the period under review.
Visits occurred less than once a month.
Visits occurred less than twice a month, but at least once a month.
Visits occurred less than weekly, but at least twice a month.
Visits occurred at least weekly.

In-Home Services Cases

FatherMotherFatherMother

Ratings Determination

LpF: Frequency of Caseworker Visits With Parents

Additional information from the case reviews is provided below.

- There were no visits with no visits with mother (5 cases).
- There were no visits with no visits with father (8 cases).
- Visits with the father were of sufficient frequency or quality (2 cases).
- Visits with the mother were of sufficient frequency, but not quality (4 cases).
- Visits with the father were of sufficient frequency, but not quality (1 case).
- Visits with the mother were of sufficient frequency, but not quality (5 cases).
- Visits with the mother were not of sufficient frequency or quality (1 case).

Area Needs Improvement when reviewers determined one or more of the following:

- The parent was unable to improve in one or more of the following:
- The child had a history of abuse or neglect.
- There were concerns about the child's safety and well-being.
- The child was at risk of removal from the home.

For Item 20 was rated as a Strength when reviewers determined that visits were occurred with sufficient frequency to meet the needs of parents.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Applicable Cases

Not Applicable Cases
Key Concerns of the 2001 CSPR:

In-home services cases.

The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 84 percent of the applicable foster care cases and 71 percent of the applicable total cases. The percent of the Bernalillo County cases, 77 percent of the Santa Fe County cases, and 71 percent of the Las Cruces County cases. The percent of the Las Cruces County cases was determined to be substantially achieved in 87.5 percent.

There were significant differences in performance on this outcome across sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved by 95 percent of the cases reviewed. This outcome is less than the 95 percent or higher required for substantial achievement. There were reviewed substantially achieved this outcome. This is less than the 95 percent or higher required for substantial achievement. There were 95 percent of the cases reviewed.

New Mexico did not achieve substantial achievement with Well-Being Outcome 2. Reviewers determined that 80.8 percent of the cases reviewed by the team according to the degree of outcome achievement:

| Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs. |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Percentage                      | 65                  | 17                  | 17                  | 31                  |
| Total Cases                     | 65                  | 17                  | 17                  | 31                  |
| Not Applicable Cases            | 65                  | 17                  | 17                  | 31                  |
| Partially Achieved              | 65                  | 17                  | 17                  | 31                  |
| Substantially Achieved          | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |

Well-Being Outcome 2:

Strengths in 46 percent of the cases reviewed in 2006 and 39 percent of the cases reviewed in 2005.

Less child case cases for calendar years 2006 and 2005 show an increase in lien strengths. Caseworker visits with parents were reduced as a result of a child in CFDP custody. As indicated in the Strategic Assessment, Quality Assurance data for home services and services provided to in-home services. Performance Planning Policy requires CFDP to have at least monthly face-to-face contact with each parent of a child in CFDP custody. According to the Strategic Assessment, in-home services policy and procedures require weekly visits with parents during the

Stakeholder Interview Information:

to contact parents, including working around the parent's schedule, and visiting parents who are incarcerated.

Stakeholder correspondence on this item during the course of the CSPR reported that caseworkers generally meet requirements in terms of
services were provided to meet those needs. The results of this assessment are provided below.

assessing the likelihood of a child being identified for special education needs. The following are children were not of school age or did not have service needs related to education-related issues. In

Item 2. Educational needs of the child

as indicated in the discussion for Item 21 below, the findings of the 2007 CFRP suggest that the concerns found in the 2001 review continue to be present in the 2007 CFRP.

Key Findings of the 2007 CFRP

The State met its interim goals for this outcome by the end of the PP implementation period.


To address these concerns, the State developed training for staff and foster parents to assess children's educational needs, document

- There was a lack of adequate documentation pertaining to children's educational needs.
- There was a lack of adequate assessment of children's educational needs at the time of their entry into foster care, especially for children who were receiving special education services.
- There was a lack of adequate attention to children's educational needs, especially for children who were identified with special education needs.
- There were instances in which a child's chronic absences were not addressed.
- There were inconsistencies with regard to the agency's following up on children's identified educational needs.

The State was not in substantial conformity with this outcome in the 2007 CFRP.
Most stakeholders agreed that although there is a high need for informing services, there is a lack of these services and there is a lack of

appropriated by the schools as appropriate parents when the biological parents are not available.

disseminated. In contract, Santa Cruz County stakeholders noted that in their county, the foster parents or the grandparents do not always know

children’s needs because the foster parents do not always know about the child's needs or the foster parents' knowledge of the child is

difficult to acquire. In foster care, the role of the foster parents is more effective in meeting

schools for children in foster care, rather than appointing the foster parents. They noted that this practice is not effective in meeting

and the Department of Education. The County stakeholders noted that in their county, insufficient parent involvement with the

needs and outlining those needs are addressed. They raised questions regarding the strength of the relationship between CPPD

4Childhood Interagency Information

Stakeholders commented on the issue during the onsite CFP express different opinions regarding CPPD’s effectiveness in

for this item to be rated as a strength. A 95 percent standard is set for this item because if the only item assessed for the outcome.

Item 21 was assigned an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement. In 81 percent of the applicable cases, variables determined

- Educational needs were identified and met in the case plan. In 2 foster care cases.

- Educational needs were identified and met in the case plan. In 2 foster care cases, but services were provided to address those needs and

- Referred problems (i.e. foster care and in-home services cases). This included children who were falling behind and children who

- There was lack of assessment of educational needs even when there was clear evidence that the child was not meeting school-

Item 21 was rated as a strength when reviewers determined that the child’s educational needs were appropriately assessed and

following:

- Educational needs were identified and met in the case plan. In 2 foster care cases.

- Referred problems (i.e. foster care and in-home services cases). This included children who were falling behind and children who

- There was lack of assessment of educational needs even when there was clear evidence that the child was not meeting school-

Item 21 was rated as a strength when reviewers determined that the child’s educational needs were appropriately assessed and

following:
### Key Concerns from the 2001 CRSP

Of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 79 percent (19 cases) of the 24 applicable in-home services cases, substantially fewer of the former were determined to be substantially achieved in 87 percent (33 cases) substantially fewer of the latter were determined to be substantially achieved in 97 percent (18 cases). However, performance did not vary and 80 percent of Santa Fe County cases, compared to 62.5 percent of Lea County cases. However, performance on those outcome varied across sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 87 percent of Bernalillo County cases achieved in 87 percent of the applicable cases, which is less than the 95 percent required for substantial achievement. Performance on those outcome did not achieve substantial achievement with Well-Being Outcome 3. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 87 percent of the applicable cases.

### Status of Well-Being Outcome 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Total Applicable Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Lea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome V3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

### Well-Being Outcome 3

Well being outcomes are not sufficiently integrated. And child welfare systems are not sufficiently integrated. Navigating the education system, especially when a child or youth is participating in special education, and services that the education system provides to the education system, especially when a child or youth is participating in special education, and services that the education system provides to the child. The Special Education assessment notes how these difficult issues have not been addressed in 2006 and in 7 percent of the cases reviewed in 2005. The Special Education assessment notes how these difficult issues have not been addressed in 2006 and in 7 percent of the cases reviewed in 2005. The Special Education assessment notes how these difficult issues have not been addressed in 2006 and in 7 percent of the cases reviewed in 2005.

### Facts

- Including educational services, permanency planning and planning procedures detail the educational information which must be documented in accordance with the Special Education assessment. In-home services procedures require the consideration of educational history for the child.

### Strategic Assessment Information
Findings pertaining to the specific items assessed under Well-Being Outcome 2 are presented and discussed below.

CFSR also revealed key concerns in the 2007 CFSR primarily with regard to the lack of mental health services in the community.

Concerns pertaining to the agency’s effectiveness in assessing and meeting children’s mental health needs that were noted in the 2001 CFSR in the 2007 CFSR, concerns pertaining to dental health services and lack or provision of medical records to foster parents were not found to be relevant.

In contrast to the findings during the 2001 CFSR, item 22 (physical health of child) was rated as a strength in the 2007 CFSR.

Key Findings of the 2007 CFSR

The State met its targeted goals for this outcome by the end of the PIP implementation period.

Understanding of the needs of the children placed in their care, including their physical and mental health needs,

Developed care plans to address health needs in the physical and mental health services.

Established foster parent liaison to track medical/dental history and mental health services.

Documenting this information in the case record.

Trained agency staff and foster parents in the importance of obtaining children’s physical and mental health histories and on

The health Department to address medical and dental services in the final areas of the State.

Systematic medical and mental health services for children as well as case-specific concerns and the implementation of a “coordinated path” by

Health caregivers for children in foster care and in the families and children in the in-home services cases. These meetings focused on addressing

To address these concerns, CYPD implemented the following strategies in its PIP:

- There was a lack of medical health services in the community, which affected the agency’s ability to meet the health needs of

- CYPD was not consistent with regard to providing children’s medical records to foster parents.

- The State did not achieve substantial conformity with this outcome in its 2001 CFSR and was required to address the outcome in

New Mexico did not achieve substantial conformity with this outcome in its 2001 CFSR.
Routine Determination

For all cases rated as an Area Needing Improvement for this item, four foster care cases and two were-in-home services cases:

- There were delays in providing health care services to a child because of difficulties obtaining a Medicaid Card (1 case).
- The foster care child did not receive timely medical care during the period under review (1 case).
- Medical needs were assessed and identified, but no services were provided (1 case).
- There were no reassessments of physical or dental health needs in the case (1 case).
- Dental care services were not provided until a year after the need for the service was determined (1 case).
- Medical-related concerns (1 case).
- There was no indication in the case record of any medical assessments or services even when a case came to the agency because of item 22 was rated as a Strength when reviewers determined that the children's health needs (medical and dental) were routinely assessed and services provided as needed. Items 22 was rated as an Area Needing Improvement when reviewers determined the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 22</th>
<th>Santa Fe Total</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Strengthen</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
<th>Total Applicable Cases</th>
<th>Not Applicable Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 22, Physical Health of the Child.
or provided. The findings of this assessment are presented in the table below:

Item 2.3. Mental health of the child

The Sheriwide Assessment notes that Quality Assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2005 show a decrease in the mental health status of children in need of mental health services. In 2006, 70% of the cases reviewed showed a decrease in the mental health status of children. This decrease is attributed to the implementation of new policies and procedures that have improved mental health services and supported the provision of these services to children in need.

The Sheriwide Assessment notes that the percentage of children who required mental health services and were referred to mental health professionals in 2006 decreased from 80% in 2005 to 60% in 2006. This decrease is attributed to the implementation of new policies and procedures that have improved mental health services and supported the provision of these services to children in need.

Some children referred to mental health services were later determined to be in need of other services, such as social services or educational services. This indicates the need for a more comprehensive approach to identifying and addressing the needs of children in need of mental health services.
Service for young children.

Despite the scarcity of services and the fact that Valuable options often will not endeavor higher levels of services. There was General consensus that there are not enough mental health providers in the State and that there is a particular large gap in mental health services.

Although stakeholders communicating on this item expressed some differences opinions regarding the agency's effectiveness in meeting the mental health needs of children, there were some common themes that emerged. One common theme was that when the agency is

### Stakeholder Interview Information

Higher ranked for a province of strength. This item was ranked an area needing improvement in New Mexico's 2001 CPR.

### Factors Determination

- Mental health needs were being addressed through psychotropic drugs without a proper diagnosis (2 cases).
- Mental health needs were assessed but not met (2 cases).
- Mental health needs were not assessed or met (4 cases).

### Item 23 was assigned an area ranking of area needing improvement.

### Breakdown:

- 65 Total Cases
- 8 Not Applicable Cases
- 57 Total Applicable Cases
- 17 Area Needing Improvement
- 9 Santa Fe
- 16 Bernalillo

However, there was no substantial variation in performance based on the type of case. The item was ranked as a strength in 86 percent of County cases and 93 percent of applicable Santa Fe County cases. In 27 percent of applicable Bernalillo County cases, there was variation in performance. On this item across sites. The item was ranked as a strength in 97 percent of applicable Bernalillo County cases.
child was noted as a strength in 2006 and 2007, and as a concern in 2008. Mental health also showed a decrease in 2006 and 2007, and an increase in 2009.

Quality assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2007 show a decrease in mental health in the years after 2006.

The Stewardship Assessment indicates that the biggest issue referred to this item is the lack of services for behavioral health. Some

According to the Stewardship Assessment, the Stewardship Assessment Program, Planning Policy requires CFAP to provide or arrange services for the child.

Benelli County shareholders indicated that the community, there is access to a program called Healthy Beginnings, which

Foster parents must take child out of home to receive treatment.

A second common theme among shareholders referred to their opinions regarding the use of psychoactive drugs in addressing

While on the medication and reaction to the child.

A third common theme referred to the lack of mental health resources in rural areas of the state. Several shareholders reported that
not yet been realized. The expected increases in service array and system capacity have not occurred because of disruptions in the provision of services. The transition to Behavioral Health Purchasing Collaborative and single or dual service entity for providing and accessing services is still in its early stages. The off-reservation Native American families and District Courts make it difficult for Native American families to access services. Additionally, Tribal stakeholders expressed the opinion that there is a lack of access to traditional healing services. The latter is a challenge (especially on the border) in accessing services from community providers.
has met the one standard for the SACWIS requirements and provides staff with an efficient, automated, case-management tool. Each

current status of children in foster care and management reports to lead outcome measures and prioritize client information. FACTS

Item 24 is listed as a Strength because the statewide information system, known as FACTS, provides demographic client information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

months has been in foster care.

characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is or within the immediately proceeding 12

Item 24. The State is operating a statewide information system that at a minimum, can readily identify the status, demographic

substantial conformity with this item during the first CFSR. Findings for the item assessed for this factor are presented below.

New Mexico is in substantial conformity with the statewide factor of statewide information system. The State was found to be in

STATES OF STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X 4</td>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not in Substantial Conformity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

the State's second CFSR. In the PP and the standards for assessing those concerns would be noted, as well as any changes in ratings that occurred as a result of

for the State's first CFSR. If the statewide factor was part of the State's Program Improvement Plan (PIP), the key concerns addressed

and from interactions with stakeholders conducted with the State's CFSR, a score for substantial conformity is established for each

This section of the CFSR Final Report provides information regarding the State's statewide conformity with the seven systemic

SECTION B: SYSTEMIC FACTORS
FACTS is responsible for collecting information about children, including their location, demographic information, and case goals.

The Statewide Assessment identified the following issues:

- FACTS reports are challenging to read.
- Data entry in FACTS is time-consuming, and there is insufficient support staff to assist case workers with this task.
- There should be more training on FACTS provided to case workers.
- FACTS should have more easy-to-use features consistent with the case management function.

The Statewide Assessment also identified the following areas where the system could be improved:

- FACTS periodically provides management reminders to case workers, and these are insufficient.
- FACTS automatically generates reminders to allocate time to case management tasks.
- FACTS promotes accountability with CYPD by requiring critical data information to be entered before other case management functions can be performed.
- FACTS supports an enhanced approach to daily activities of case workers.
- FACTS eliminates routine paperwork allowing case workers to spend more time with clients.
- FACTS provides immediate access to case histories and detailed records, as well as a central registry about past referrals, allegations.

The Statewide Assessment identified the following weaknesses in the system:

- FACTS has a restricted ability to electronically manage case loads and receive reminders of overlapping events and due dates.
- Worker has a difficulty in electronically managing case loads, access Simultaneous decision making tools and receive reminders of upcoming occasions.

For the most part, data are entered in a timely manner and are accurate. Defects in data entry generally pertain to demographics and not

2006, New Mexico achieved Tier One Status for FACTS from the Administration for Children and Families.
Strength

Aera Needing Improvement

parent(s) that includes the required provisions.

Item 25. Provides a process that ensures that each child has a written case plan to be developed jointly with the child’s

Specific findings for each item included in this systemic factor and the reasons for item ratings are presented below.

Improvement Plan (IP).

substantial conformity with this factor during its first CSPR. Therefore, it was not required to address this factor in the Program

New Mexico is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. New Mexico was ranked as being in

STATUS OF CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
<td>Not in Substantial Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity

II. CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

the office. Stakeholders also recognized that the times have access to FACTS so they can benefit from the system.

Stakeholders suggested that the system could be improved by making it accessible to caseworkers when they are working outside of

Stakeholders expressed concern that errors in spelling can cause problems in identifying closed or open cases.

Despite these strengths, a few stakeholders suggested that FACTS could be improved by including the in-home services form on the

- Information is available about children in in-home cases as well as children in foster care.
- When the child has been in foster care for 15 or 22 months.
- FACTS has automated reminders to alert agencies and to update important events, such as permanency hearings or the point at
- The community level.
- Data reports are shared with all levels of the agency and used for quality assurance, particularly with regard to assessing trends at
Despite these efforts, the Stakeholder Assessment also reports that Quality Assurance data available for calendar years 2006 and 2005 centered and begins at age 14.

The Stakeholder Assessment identified the Casey Decision-Making model (used for 48-hour holds, changes in plans, discharges, and discharges in progress) in accordance with the Breakthrough Board Hazardous as noted in the Stakeholder Assessment.

The New Mexico Children’s Code requires a mandatory meeting of all parties prior to the permanency hearing. Always, an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes. Stated is an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes. Stated is an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes.

The Stakeholder Assessment also notes that the New Mexico Children’s Code requires a mandatory meeting of all parties prior to the permanency hearing. Always, an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes. Stated is an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes. Stated is an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes.

The Stakeholder Assessment also notes that the New Mexico Children’s Code requires a mandatory meeting of all parties prior to the permanency hearing. Always, an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes. Stated is an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes.

The Stakeholder Assessment also notes that the New Mexico Children’s Code requires a mandatory meeting of all parties prior to the permanency hearing. Always, an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes. Stated is an assessment of safety, gathering of risk on the permanency plan, the Child Abuse, Family, Services, steps taken, and outcomes.
Area Needing Improvement

Either by a court or by administrative review.

Item 2. Provides a process for the periodic review of the status of each child no less frequently than once every 6 months.

From here on, independent living plans are not well developed with regard to relevant transition issues. These independent living plans are not always comprehensive and are developed with limited input from the youth, particularly the transition planning group. The youth participation in writing these plans is not always effective. The involvement of youth in case planning, which was noted to be sporadic, is not always effective. These stakeholders were asked what plans developed for older youth in foster care and the quality of case plans developed for older youth in foster care. Another concern voiced by some stakeholders pertained to the quality of case plans developed for older youth in foster care and the quality of case plans developed for older youth in foster care. Another concern voiced by some stakeholders pertained to the quality of case plans developed for older youth in foster care.

There are considerable challenges, particularly in the current, with regard to involving incarcerated fathers and mothers.

Some TDCs can be highly effective in involving parents in the case-planning process. Sometimes a TDC is held because it is an important component of parenting, and sometimes a TDC is held because it is not a consistent practice across the state, with some areas of the state making greater efforts to involve parents than others.

Despite the many positive opinions expressed about the benefits of involving parents and youth in case planning, many stakeholders highlighted the following:

- Improving the non-traditional work schedules for case workers to accommodate parents' schedules.
- Concerning case meetings in the parents' home or at a location of the parents' choice.
- Holding a monthly meeting with the parents and/or guardians.
- Improving different efforts to locate absent parents. The case workers reported that the agency in their location requires that these efforts be made.
- Re-evaluating the evaluation process in the case-planning process.
- Improving youth decision-making in the planning process.
- Improving youth decision-making in the planning process.
- Improving youth decision-making in the planning process.
- Improving youth decision-making in the planning process.

Involvement in case planning:

- Using video conferences and teleconferencing to involve parents who may not be able to attend in person.
- Involvement in case planning:

Various stakeholders identified the following additional strategies as promoting parent and youth involvement in case planning:

- Improving parent and youth involvement in case planning.

- Improving parent and youth involvement in case planning.

- Improving parent and youth involvement in case planning.

- Improving parent and youth involvement in case planning.

- Improving parent and youth involvement in case planning.
Several stakeholders, however, noted that reviews often significantly delayed the practice of confinement and

Although the CRB is required to provide feedback in reports and recommendations in their reviews, although it was acknowledged that the CRB does not

Stakeholder Interview Information

There was consensus among stakeholders interviewed during the course of the CRB that cases are being reviewed and that, in general, case

The stakeholder assessment notes that in addition to the court reviews, external reviews are conducted by the CRB, which reviews

The stakeholder assessment notes that at least 12 months of the initial judicial review, the decision, the court reviews the case at least every 6 months, and that the initial dispositional hearing is held within 60 days of the presiding judge's decision. Most of the

The stakeholder assessment notes that a strength of periodic reviews of the child is that in foster care are held at least every 6 months and

Review Board (CRB) are held prior to the court's first permanency hearing.

According to the stakeholder interview, periodic case reviews occur at least every 6 months, but often more frequently, and include

According to the stakeholder interview, periodic case reviews occur at least every 6 months, but often more frequently, and include

Justice Assurance reviews are conducted to ensure that periodic reviews

Quality Assurance reviews are conducted to ensure that periodic reviews

Initial reviews as well as internal and external reviews. Quality Assurance reviews are conducted to ensure that periodic reviews

The stakeholder assessment notes that a strength of periodic reviews of the child is that in foster care are held at least every 6 months and
applied promotion of permanency planning. can still be held in a timely manner because they can be effective even without a

attribute in large part to the guidance of continuing, or the child protective role. However, the evidence is less clear for other

factors. Other factors include the child’s age, the stability of the placement, and the family’s ability to provide a

home. The delays were

stated that the placement readiness is happening in a timely manner and that delays are effective in moving a case

The opinions of stakeholders involved in the current CPSR differ with regard to the timeliness of the permanency planning.

Stakeholder Information

reports that the timeliness of permanency planning is tracked through Quarterly Assurance Reviews. The stakeholder assessment also

examination of these hearings, best practice guidelines have been issued on advance communication and early intervention.

timeliness of these hearings. Although this is not required by the Code, the stakeholder assessment notes that, in 12 months, all

conducted an assessment process, although this is not required by the Code. The stakeholder assessment notes that, in fact, all

required by the Code. The stakeholder assessment notes that, in fact, all subregional initial reviews are

Stakeholder Information

According to the stakeholder assessment, under the Children’s Code, a permanency hearing is held 12 months after the abuse/abduction.

by New Mexico’s Children’s Code. Item 27 also was rated as a strength in the State’s 2001 CPSR.

item 27 is rated as a strength because permanency hearings are established

Item 27 is rated as a strength because permanency hearings are established

Item 27 is rated as a strength because permanency hearings are established

are needed improvement.

Item 27. Provides a process that ensures that each child in foster care under the supervision of the State has a permanency

hearing in a qualified court or administrative body no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster

care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

hearing in a qualified court or administrative body no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care under the supervision of the State has a permanency

Despite these concerns, several stakeholders, particularly those in the field, reported that changes are being made to enhance

the use of continuances and that some judges have reviewed "no tolerance" measures regarding compliance and continue practice.

completed, some questions were raised about the timeliness and frequency of these reviews of the child’s permanency hearing has not been completed.

completed, some questions were raised about the timeliness and frequency of these reviews of the child’s permanency hearing has not been completed.

Although these concerns are not unique to New Mexico, this issue was raised to highlight the need to ensure that the practice is most

longer a specific focus of the court, the practice is becoming more common. Some stakeholders suggested that the practice is most

noted that the permanency and continue practice declined in recent years due to state changes in how the practice is no
that is consistent with the language in the Code.

report in the Strategic Assessment, there is a need to train caseworkers to identify and document the compelling reasons in a way

However, as

to pursue TRPs, it is usually when parents show substantial compliance, and children are likely to be going home. The Strategic Assessment indicates that when there are compelling reasons not

to remove child welfare issues within the community. The Strategic Assessment indicates that when there are compelling reasons not

scheduled on the court docket with sufficient time. Other, these needs are to collaborate on additional documentation and a

also according to the Strategic Assessment, in some counties, meetings are held by CYPD with judges to ensure that TRPs are

information and compliance with requirements across the state, these data could be used more extensively to improve practice.

trafficking (ticketed at 13 months). The Strategic Assessment notes that although a variety of FACTS reports show rates of

is consistent with the provisions of the Adoption and Safe Families Act. These are standardized forms and lack of data is in accordance with the

the State’s 2001 CPSR.

determined that there were delays in termination of parental rights that resulted in delays in achieving adoptions in a timely manner.

which the child has a permanent home of adoption. Rules of

relief when the child has a permanent home of adoption. The

substantial delay in terminating parental rights may not bring forth if there is no substantive delay in the process of termination of parental rights

been calculated at each permanent placement. There are court-referred delays in the termination of parental rights process

Item 28 was placed as an area needing improvement because although it was an area needing improvement for the next revision.

and Safe Families Act

that was provision a process for termination of parental rights procedures in accordance with the provisions of the adoption

and Safe Families Act, an area needing improvement.

GETTING NEGATIVELY IMPACTED TO THE COURT TO THE COURTHOUSE.

authors and caseworkers. Other reasons for continuance were parents appearing without proper representation, and difficulties in

permanency hearings. These stakeholders expressed concern about the efficiency of the permanency hearing in these situations.

completed adjudication hearing. Other stakeholders suggested that even though permanency hearings can still be held without a

complicated adjudication hearing.
Statewide Assessment Information

2001 CFR.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Child Protective Services in New Mexico are included in the state's CSR. Foster parents are not informed as to how to provide input at court hearings as well as CRF reviews, when are not reasonably given the opportunity to be heard in court hearings. Foster parents and relative caregivers are provided notice of court hearings as well as CRF reviews, when are not reasonably given the opportunity to be heard in court hearings.

This issue was raised as an area needing improvement because although foster parents and relative caregivers are provided notice of court hearings as well as CRF reviews, when are not reasonably given the opportunity to be heard in court hearings.

Issues 24. Provides a process for foster parents, pre-adoption parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care to be notified of, and have an opportunity to be heard in, any review of hearing hold with respect to the child.

The issue 24. Provides a process for foster parents, pre-adoption parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care to be notified of, and have an opportunity to be heard in, any review of hearing hold with respect to the child.

The appeals process for TPR is lengthy and can take from 12 to 18 months. Even if a case is "fast tracked" for the appeals process, it may take 6 months to get a decision.

The appeals process for TPR is lengthy and can take from 12 to 18 months. Even if a case is "fast tracked" for the appeals process, it may take 6 months to get a decision.

Note: The general consensus of most stakeholders interviewed during the onsite CSR is that the agency is inline for improvement of parental rights.
### III. QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Substantial Conformity</th>
<th>Not in Substantial Conformity</th>
<th>Substantially Subordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Quality Assurance System is designed to ensure that the opinions of foster parents are represented by the Guardians ad Litem. Some states require County Suckholders to send information to the Court regarding the Guardian ad Litem or provide a letter to the Court. Because the Guardians ad Litem also play a significant role in the foster care process, sending a message with the Guardian ad Litem or providing a letter to the Court is important.

- **Some states adopt the guardians ad litem for foster parents, while others specifically request input from foster parents during the hearing.**
- **Foster parents in some states present their opinions to the court, while others specifically request input from foster parents during the hearing.**

In some states, the ability of foster parents to be heard in court hearings is suggested by this practice. However, this is a challenge in some areas of the state.

In some states, foster parents are notified of hearings or reviews held for children in their care and that notification is provided in a timely manner.

### Stakeholder Interviews

- **Parties to the CRB and the CRB issues these interested parties to the upcoming review.**

The assessor provides a list of interested parties to the child receiving the foster care. The CRB issues the CRB issues these interested parties to the upcoming review. The assessor provides a list of interested parties to the child receiving the foster care.
Area Needing Improvement

System provides relevant reports and evaluates program improvement measures implemented.

Items 3. The State is operating an identifiable quality assurance system that is in place in the jurisdictions where the services

Issues may be present in a case:

needs that are specific to the jurisdiction

CFSR VA, which was created in 2000, is now under the new Bureau. It is now under the new Bureau. It was... to

Stockholders commenting on this item during the only CFSR noted that a Quality Assurance (QA) bureau was created in October

Shareholder Information

Care and other professional that follow the FSPD:

in the Investigations section. Medical assistance in the Permanent Planning section, requiring a screening within 30 days of

CFSR

According to the Eligibility Assessment, the State's Quality Assurance System includes the following standards:

Strengths in Assessment Information

CFSR

month to discuss their placement and to assess safety issues in the placement. This item was rated as a Strength in the State's 2001

item 30 is rated as a Strength because the State has developed and implemented licensing standards and other provisions to ensure the

Services that protect the safety and health of the children.

Item 30. The State has developed and implemented standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality

is PIP. Findings with regard to the specific items assessed for this factor are presented below.

New Mexico was found to be in substantial conformity with this specific factor and therefore was not required to address the factor in

New Mexico is in substantial conformity with the specific factor of Quality Assurance System.
IV. TRAINING

Understanding of desired outcomes and desired practice.

Stakeholders at the agency level expressed the opinion that their practices have improved and that there has been a lot of positive growth in the system since the implementation of the QA reviews. They noted that everyone in the agency now has a clear understanding of the commission on the welfare of children of jails and incarcerated parents as an example of a system response to QA.

Results.

Stakeholders reported that QA results have resulted in practice and policy changes, as well as systemic changes. A few stakeholders noted {}

Federative stakeholders reported that QA audits are thorough and comprehensive in assessment of practice and systemic factors.

All stakeholders involved during the onsite review praised the State’s QA system, which was described as a replication of the

Stakeholder Interview Information

The implementation of the QA is working closely with County Office Managers to implement multi-program improvement plans.

The stakeholders have noted the existence of the QA team, which is responsible for tracking the services of a CRSP program manager, who, upon developing strategies to eliminate systemic barriers to achieve better outcomes for children and families served. The QA team endeavors to provide the program with feedback, guidance, and support to improve their services.

The QA team consists of representatives from various agencies, including Child Protective Services (CPS), Department of Education (DOE), and Department of Health (DOH). The QA team meets regularly to discuss the QA process and make recommendations for improvements.

Stakeholder Interview Information

This item was noted as a strength in the State’s 2001 CRSP.

The QA Division also conducts specialized studies to inform practice and improve service delivery.

The QA Division is responsible for developing and implementing improvement plans and evaluating the quality of services and needs of the service delivery system. The QA Division provides regular reports to the QA committee, which meets monthly to review and discuss the findings. The QA Division is also responsible for ensuring that all CFSR’s are completed on time and that all required improvement plans are developed and implemented.

The QA Division also conducts specialized studies to inform practice and improve service delivery.

The QA Division is responsible for developing and implementing improvement plans and evaluating the quality of services and needs of the service delivery system. The QA Division provides regular reports to the QA committee, which meets monthly to review and discuss the findings. The QA Division is also responsible for ensuring that all CFSR’s are completed on time and that all required improvement plans are developed and implemented.
According to the Statewide Assessment, CYPF Policy and Procedures require that all new child welfare staff begin attending CPS Statewide Assessment Information starting in the State's 2001 CFSP.

The State has taken steps to improve the job training and development of new child welfare workers. This includes the early training of new employees in all areas of the agency and the development of skills necessary to perform their jobs.

New Mexico is not in substantial conformity with the system factor of training. The State was rated as in substantial conformity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Substantial Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength: Area Needing Improvement

Services: Address services provided under lies 1-B and 1-E, and provide initial training for all staff who deliver these services.
improve training in supervision within 3 months of the start of their employment as a supervisor or manager and must receive follow-up training in supervision within 12 months. 15 hours are required to maintain a social work license in New Mexico. In addition, all supervisors and County Child Welfare Managers must receive a minimum of 15 hours of continuing education annually. The Statewide Assessment Information

Strengthen in the State's 2001 CSFP

The program's Social Work License/Training (SWLT) to expand training availability throughout the State. This item was rated as a

Strength

Area Needing Improvement

Item 33 is related to an area Needing Improvement because there is insufficient ongoing training available to staff in all areas of the

their duties with regard to the services included in the CSFP.

Item 34. The State provides for ongoing training for staff that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out

supervisor initial training.

Intended when they come into court. Stakeholders also noted that supervisors must take a CORE refresher course and participate in

residual social workers and legal stakeholders interviewed during the course. CORE documented that staff are well prepared and

Despite these concerns, stakeholders indicated that the legal training component of CORE has gotten good reviews and is effective. In

understanding of the law and the Tribal communities.

Stakeholders also expressed some concern that, although there is no significant overlap or confusion, some families are not receiving training.

Stakeholders also expressed some concern that, although there is no significant overlap or confusion, some families are not receiving training.

Stakeholders also expressed some concern that, although there is no significant overlap or confusion, some families are not receiving training.

Stakeholder Interview Information

Stakeholders expressed that, although there are many positive things about the CORE training, it is not

The opinions expressed by stakeholders interviewed during the course of the

Stakeholder Interview Information

Stakeholders interviewed during the course of the

using coaching, shadowing, and mentoring. The Statewide Assessment reports that revisions to the CORE training will be part of the

Stakeholder Interview Information

Stakeholders interviewed during the course of the

using coaching, shadowing, and mentoring. The Statewide Assessment reports that revisions to the CORE training will be part of the
Area Needing Improvement

the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

Approved Facilitators that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under the IV-E plan address

Item 3.1. The State provides training for current and prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of State agencies.

The field was that CYPD would provide more training for these new workers, but this has not materialized.

Discussing the discussion in the discussion, one stakeholder reported that when CYPD started their "Teaching, Learning, and Development" (TLD) program, it was initially advertised that every person who meets a threshold for adoption training would receive training. However, although the agency policy requires all caseworkers and supervisors to receive training, the threshold for offering training was not clearly defined.

Stakeholders noted that their current training program in recruitment of caseworkers who were licensed social workers was inadequate.

A primary issue of concern regarding ongoing training pertains to the differences between licensed and unlicensed caseworkers.

Responsibilities

Caseworkers are being in their work for the training is specific to an area that is different than the caseworker's assigned

training often requires 5 to 6 hours of travel. Some social workers noted that training was also sometimes conducted

because training is scarce. Training time was not considered in the current year, nor for the County caseworkers' access to

training or the CYPD was not available or required. In the opinion of the caseworkers at the State, there were different training opportunities. Caseworkers in the three sites included in the CSR expressed the opinion that the CYPD should consider the different training opportunities.

Stakeholders differed in their opinions regarding the availability of training opportunities. While State-level stakeholders suggested

CyPD should conduct training each year. Stakeholders also remarked that the State is providing their university training program for

Stakeholder Interview Information

The CSR assessed each interview, stakeholder's comments on this item during the on-site CSR noted that caseworkers were required to complete 15 hours of

Additional information needed to address the training

CYPD and supervisors have access to training offered by the Childcare Law Institute and numerous other specialized

CYPD also noted that supervisory feedback is offered to improve the skills-based training provided by the Childcare Law Institute, and numerous other specialized training programs.

The Statewide Assessment reports that New Mexico State University (NMU) provides state-of-the-art training in

The training is intended to make decisions regarding topics for ongoing training. In addition, the training provided by the CYPD

information is used to make decisions regarding topics for ongoing training. In addition to the training provided by the CYPD,
The implementation of training into the local and statewide foster parent network.

- The use of experienced foster parents as trainers for the pre-service PRIDE training.

(At the annual conference)

The involvement of youth in the PRIDE training for foster parents. Every year they provide at least one or two workshops.

Specific components of the training that were cited as particularly prioritized were the following:

- Psycho-educational mediation and the sharing of plans to address this concern.
- Preplanning for information provided by youth during the on-site review and from the statewide assessment regarding the use of placement homes for foster care children.
- The training of foster parents regarding the use of adaptive equipment and the promotion of accessible homes to foster care placement.
- The training of foster parents regarding the use of adaptive equipment and the promotion of accessible homes to foster care placement.
- The training of foster parents regarding the use of adaptive equipment and the promotion of accessible homes to foster care placement.

Stakeholder Interview Information

- Training for staff of state-licensed or state-approved agencies is required by the licensing agency and monitored by CYFP.

- Foster home staff are not CYFP foster homes.

- Agency contracts with Treatment Foster Care (TFC) require that the same training and standards for home studies apply for TFC.

The statewide assessment also noted the following:

- A need for more specialized training for TFC.

The statewide assessment notes the importance of addressing the needs of foster parents received PRIDE training. These needs were broken into two different areas. The statewide assessment notes the need for on-site review, referrals, and documentation required by the licensing agency and monitored by CYFP.

- Foster home staff are not CYFP foster homes.

The statewide assessment notes the need for specialized training for TFC.

- Agency contracts with Treatment Foster Care (TFC) require that the same training and standards for home studies apply for TFC.

The statewide assessment notes the need for more specialized training for TFC. This need was raised in the area of need for improved training for foster parents, with much of the available training offered as part of the PRIDE curriculum.

Concluding remarks also raised the importance of recognizing the role of foster parent agencies as well as the need for more specialized training for TFC. The statewide assessment notes the need for specialized training for TFC. This need was raised in the area of need for improved training for foster parents, with much of the available training offered as part of the PRIDE curriculum.
Incorporated the Casey Team decision making case practice model to engage families and better identify services needs.

- Increased availability and access of foster parents to respite care services.
- Violence and substance abuse.
- Significant collaboration with other agencies at both the State and local levels to coordinate services addressing domestic

To address these concerns, the agency implemented the following strategies in its Program Improvement Plan:

managed care health system.

During the 2001 CFSP, stakeholders attributed many of the concerns regarding services availability in the State's transition to a

- Respite care for foster parents.
- Domestic violence counseling and treatment services.
- Substance abuse treatment services.
- Dental services, especially in rural areas of the State.
- Mental health services;

urban areas. The 2001 CFSP identified significant gaps in the following services:

The 2001 CFSP identified variations in service availability across the State, with rural areas having fewer services than the more

New Mexico is not in substantial conformity with this systemic factor in the 2001 CFSP and addressed this factor in its Program Improvement Plan.

STATUS OF SERVICE ARRAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantial Conformity</th>
<th>Not in Substantial Conformity</th>
<th>Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. SERVICE ARRAY

- The availability of PRIDE in Spanish in Bernalillo County and in other parts of the State as well.
- The agency's provision of day care in some locations to respite foster parents, access to ongoing training.
- The availability of a PRIDE program designed especially for relatives in Bernalillo County.
- The availability of a foster parent mentor in Bernalillo County.
and time-limited reunification services provided by Department of Children, Youth, and Families under Title IV Part B Funds; and physical and/or emotional abuse.

Family. These services may include in-home services provided by the Department; family support and medical family preservation. The Statewide Assessment notes that the State utilizes services from the available array to meet the needs of children and their families. The Statewide Assessment notes that the State utilizes services from the available array to meet the needs of children and their families.

Treatment plan and are to be updated every 6 months.

According to the Statewide Assessment, service array in New Mexico is not adequate and the State’s larger challenge is in their caseloads. The Statewide Assessment notes that Section 13 of General Policy requires that the assessment be based upon the assessment of services provided through the child welfare system. Key services gaps were noted to be in the areas of behavioral health, substance abuse treatment, and domestic violence.

High risk children and families served by the child welfare system. The array of services is not sufficient to address the needs of children and families served by the child welfare system. Services for children and families served by the child welfare system are noted to be an area of need addressed in the Statewide Assessment.

The Statewide Assessment identifies a need for an area needing improvement. Although there are many preventative services available in the State, such as family preservation, family reunification, and adoption, there are no services for children in foster care to return home. Services provided to remain stable with their parents when reasonable, and help children in foster and other service needs, address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment.

Additional concerns regarding service array emerged during the 2007 CFRK and are described below along with findings for the Behavioral Health Managed Care Services System, which is operated by a private, for-profit agency called VyveGroup.

2007 Review, Stakeholders interviewed during the 2007 Review identified many of the service array problems primarily to the State’s CFRK expressed concerns regarding the lack of behavioral and mental health services in most parts of the State. The Statewide Assessment and in Stakeholder Interviews, identified the lack of behavioral and mental health services in most parts of the State.
Although all stakeholders commented on this item, said that the service array in New Mexico is not adequate to meet the needs of the children and families served by the Child Welfare Agency. Although there were a number of services that received high praise from stakeholders, expressed the opinion that the lock of services had reached a crisis point.

Many stakeholders identified a variety of services that were general consensus that the supply in all service areas is not sufficient to meet the need. A variety of stakeholders expressed the opinion that the lock of services had reached a crisis point.

The Stakeholder Interview Information

Stakeholders identified an issue raised in availability of services for transitioning youth and services available to Native American children identified as being served related to availability of services for transitioning youth and services available to Native American children. These are the clients of the child welfare system and focus on prevention, including education, and other early intervention programs. Also identified are areas of need that are not being served related to availability of services for transitioning youth and services available to Native American children. These are areas that are not being served related to availability of services for transitioning youth and services available to Native American children. These areas include non-clinical services such as housing, employment, and basic family needs. These are areas that are not being served related to availability of services for transitioning youth and services available to Native American children.
According to stakeholders, the overall result of many Valuation Options decisions is a critical gap in services, particularly for children in in-home services cases and the parents of children in the foster care case.

Judges requirements that the agency provide the services.

Providers have been expressing difficulties in obtaining services that meet the needs of children, particularly those with serious emotional and behavioral needs, which does not seem to be a barrier for developing alternatives to residential care.

The number and quality of providers is declining because the reimbursement offered by Valuation Options is low and because providers have been expressing difficulties in obtaining services that meet the needs of children, particularly those with serious emotional and behavioral needs, which does not seem to be a barrier for developing alternatives to residential care.

Even when services are available, they are not always easily accessed within the agency becoming involved in lengthy case reviews more than a year later.

There has been a considerable loss of services in many local sites and a reduction in the availability and quality of all levels of mental and behavioral health services across the state.

Valuation Options:

There is concern that the current period of transition from the current period of transition to Valuation Options.
Item 37. The services in Item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

Strengths:

- Families who do not reside in major urban areas must travel long distances to access services.
- Several stakeholders noted that some areas of the state had few or no available or accessible services. Stakeholders also noted that rural areas have already seen a decline in services since the provider expression was held.
- Although there is a large array of services available in the larger urban areas such as Albuquerque, Santa Fe, and Las Cruces, there is a dearth of services in the rural areas. Stakeholders noted that these are many rural children now without

Stakeholder Interview Information:

- Areas of the State

These were general comments among stakeholders that availability of key services varies considerably across the state. An interview with a state official from the state's Department of Children, Youth, and Families indicated that services are available and accessible to all children and families. Although the services

Strategic Assessment Information:

- CFSP

Identified needs of families involved with CFSP. This item also was placed as an Area Needing Improvement in New Mexico's 2001

Item 36. The services in Item 35 are accessible to families and children in all political jurisdictions covered in the state's

- Limited resources for concrete needs such as food.
Agency Responsibility to the Community

Stockholders also noted that it often is difficult to find services for monolingual Spanish-speaking families.

"Many times, it is difficult to find services that meet the needs of the family," said one participant.

And unusually the community will come up with the monies for funds to meet the need. The community is meeting special needs and although the child welfare agency does not have the ability to fund these initiatives, they are very effective in fulfilling these needs.

In a survey conducted by the Parenting Coach and the local youth court, parents and the community expressed the opinion that caseworkers are highly effective in meeting the individual needs of children and families. Although several noted that this sometimes varied depending on the caseworker, they noted that the agency is meeting its goals.

In conclusion, Stockholders in all areas of the community included in the casefile expressed the opinion that caseworkers are highly effective in meeting the needs of children and families.

The perception that the agency is not consistently effective in individualizing services to meet the unique needs of children and families was noted. Several noted that the agency is not organizing and planning services to meet the unique needs of children and families.

The Stockholders Interagency Information

According to the Stockholders Assessment, the State selects services from the available array in order to meet the unique needs of the child and family. These services may include in-home services provided by the Department, family support, and needed health and rehabilitative services supported through a combination of Federal funding, Title XX, and State General funding.

The Stockholders Assessment indicates a concern that the agency is not consistently effective in individualizing services to meet the unique needs of children and families.

There was a need for the agency to develop and implement a strategic assessment that takes into account the unique needs of children and families. This is an area where the agency needs to improve.
Agencies serving youth, youth advocates, and CYFIP stakeholders regularly develop and provide policy recommendations to the State.

Team comprised of youth involved with protective services and/or juvenile justice services, individuals from public and private liaison in the Office of the Secretary. Foster Parent Liaisons are provided in the majority of county offices. The Youth Advisory Council meets regularly to discuss issues relevant to children and youth in New Mexico.

According to the Strategic Assessment, New Mexico administrative Code requires and provides for a public comment and hearing process as a part of the adoption of any policies, regulations, and State plan. The agency maintains a consultation mechanism to receive feedback from stakeholders.

Statewide Assessment Information

The public. This item was rated as a Strength in the State’s 2001 CSP.

Item 38 is rated as a Strength because the agency collects information regarding the CSP through its involvement on a number of statewide committees. In addition, the State plan is posted on the agency’s website, which allows for comments and feedback from stakeholders.

CSP.

Family-serving agencies include the major concerns of these representatives in the goals and objectives of the CSP.

Item 38, in implementing the provisions of the CSP, the State focuses in on-going consultation with Tribal Representatives.

Items for this factor are presented below:

New Mexico is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsibility to the Community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
<td>Not in Substantial Conformity</td>
<td>Ranking of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States of Agency Responsiveness to the Community
Services that are developed by the agency.

Both the Strategic Assessment and Stakeholder Assessment provide input into the annual reports of progress and

Strategic Assessment and Stakeholder Assessment Information

Item 39. The agency develops, in consultation with those represented, annual reports of progress and services delivered

Item 39. The agency develops, in consultation with those represented, annual reports of progress and services delivered

Suggested that there is minimal consultation with the agencies with respect to the agency's strategic plan. However, although the CFSR Strategic Plan emphasizes numerous examples of stakeholder engagement, the agency indicated that there was no formal process in place for the agency to obtain feedback from stakeholders regarding specific aspects of the state plan. Stakeholders indicated that the CFSR Strategic Plan contains significant gaps and that there are

Stakeholder Feedback

Some stakeholders indicated that there is a formal process in which the agency publishes the CFSR and the Annual Reports and then

Stakeholder Interagency Information

Quarterly meetings with tribes, and the meetings of the CFSR Stakeholder Assessment team,

Quarterly meetings with tribes, and the meetings of the CFSR Stakeholder Assessment team,

The Department uses other opportunities to collect input on the state plan, such as the Annual Poster Parent Conference.

The Department uses other opportunities to collect input on the state plan, such as the Annual Poster Parent Conference.

As indicated in the Stakeholder Assessment, the Department holds public hearings on the development of state plans. Notice of public

Stakeholder Interagency Information

The Stakeholder Assessment also notes that the State collects information regarding the CFSR through its involvement on a number of

Stakeholder Interagency Information

The Stakeholder Assessment also notes that the State collects information regarding the CFSR through its involvement on a number of
There are weekly meetings with participation from the Department of Health; Human Services; AFSC; AzCHS; and other agencies across agencies, making sure that different services are available and accessible. If a barrier is identified, specialists from the department work together to find solutions for barriers identified.

Strategic partnerships are identified for collaboration with other agencies to coordinate services and benefits available across agencies. These partnerships have been successful in providing effective and efficient services.

Vehicle: Workforce Competency, and others

- The co-location in some counties of transitional services with Social Security, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Motor Employment Programs, and the Behavioral Health Purchasing Collaborative, and various transition groups addressing Federal and State housing and the implementation of collaborative processes with Education, Social Security, the Arizona and Long Term Services Department.

- The implementation of collaborative processes to provide training on-go that is collaborative and collaborative, within schools.

- The co-location of Juvenile Justice, Department, Protective Services, and child care offices, and the practice of coordinating staff and numerous positive outcomes.

- The Court Improvement Project (CIP), which was described as the "principle of multi-stakeholder collaboration" producing programs that were reported in the Strategic Assessment.

- The following agencies and their partners are examples of efforts to coordinate services or benefits with other Federal or Federally-assisted programs:

Strategic Assessment Information

- Includes a variety of State agencies.

- Area Needing Improvement

- Programs serving the same population

- Item 40. The State's services under the CSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other Federal or Federally-assisted programs.
The Statewide Assessment notes that licensing standards for foster care create uniform standards for licensing of foster care providers in foster care. This item was rated as a strength because these are licensing standards for foster care. (d) No child is placed in foster care by a foster care provider at risk for abuse or neglect.

Area: Need for Improvement

Not in substantial conformity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Reason for Review, area needing improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not in substantial conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not in substantial conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Substantial Conformity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Regularly review and consider possible licensing for coordinating services and programs.

Benjamin County stakeholders, in particular, reported that CPDF staff are assigned to school liaison to area schools and make

the following observations:

- At the request of parents, access to benefits and services. Other stakeholders also noted that the State has coordinated services in partnership with

Child, Youth, and Family Education and Indian Affairs. The focus is on the coordination of use of benefits and elimination

VIII. FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Regularly review and consider possible licensing for coordinating services and programs.

Benjamin County stakeholders, in particular, reported that CPDF staff are assigned to school liaison to area schools and make

the following observations:

- At the request of parents, access to benefits and services. Other stakeholders also noted that the State has coordinated services in partnership with

Child, Youth, and Family Education and Indian Affairs. The focus is on the coordination of use of benefits and elimination
and appropriate care to a child and is expected to provide an environment and comprehensive home study process for foster and adoptive


to the strengths and challenges that impact an applicant’s ability to provide safe and resourceful families, and comprehensive planning families. The Stakeholder Assessment identifies that SAFE is designed to result in a

The Stakeholder Assessment also notes that CFDP is implementing a new home study process, called SAFE, in February 2007. SAFE

...
considered on a case-by-case basis. Approved in 2001, the requirement that may be waived for a Relative Home is the space requirement, and that is

applicants are required to complete the activities and components of the home study process in order to be deemed as a foster home or

their set of standards for foster home licensing and adoption approved for relative caregivers and non-relative caregivers. All

homes' receipt of either the 1-A or 1-B Funds. The Standards Assessment also notes that New Mexico has a

According to the Standards Assessment, the licensing standards for Foster Care apply to all licensed or approved Foster Family

Strategic Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews

protections, this item was rated as a strength because New Mexico has specific licensing standards for a variety of child care institutions and

Area Needing Improvement

Item 42. The standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving Title I-A.

Item 42. The standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving Title I-A.

make the improvements, particularly if it is a relative family. This tends to be done in other areas of the state as well.

example, that it is unknown needs to be improved to meet the standards, the agency works with the family to give them the opportunity to

Lena County stakeholders reported that the agency makes concerted efforts to help families become foster families. They noted, for

it is not done in a timely manner.

noted that foster homes are receiving yearly. Although re-licensing is done every year, many stakeholders expressed the opinion that

Stakeholders reported that there is a lack in FACS that does licensing even when a foster parent needs to be re-licensed. They

was noted to be critical because the process of relocating a foster parent's license is the State is enduring. This was

involved a comprehensive assessment that the State has used previously, and is expected to prevent inappropriate licensing. This will be needed to conduct assessments of foster family homes. They noted that SAGE is a nationally recognized program that

potential problems. Other stakeholders, however, indicated that the State recently implemented a new home study tool called SAGE,
The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children

Item 43: Licensure Requirements for Foster Care, Adoption, and Other Agencies, Prior to Approval of the Criminal Background Checks.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an

Item 42: The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an

Item 43: The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an

Item 42: The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an

Item 42: The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an

Item 43: The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an

Item 42: The State Composite with Federal Requirements for Criminal Background Clearances as Required to Licensure or Certification for Child Care, Foster Care, and Adoptive Placement for Children.

Licensure requirements for foster care, adoption, and other agencies, prior to approval of the criminal background checks, those placements are not eligible for Title IV-E funds until the

Relative foster parents complete all of the licensing requirements.

The Statewide Assessment Reports, however, that emergency foster care placements may be made with a relative by completing an
Most shareholders voiced concern that recruitment efforts were not sufficient. Shareholders noted that there is a foster parent most appropriate to meet their needs.

Shareholders noted that prior to placement of foster parents, results in children being placed where there is a bed rather than where it is needed. Significant need for foster homes for Native American, Hispanic, and African American children is also noted. They also noted that the agency is short on placements.

The majority of shareholders commended the IFSR during the course of the IFSR expressed the opinion that there is a need for foster parents.

According to the Stakeholder Assessment, Foster Parenting Policy requires that CFRD recruit foster parents in all parts of the State.

The Stakeholder Assessment also noted that the New Mexico CFRD Stakeholder Assessment Team indicated that there is need of the State.

Hispanic and African American children. This item was rated as a significant in the State’s 2001 CFRD.

CFRD has implemented new efforts to enhance recruitment. Although, as indicated in the Stakeholder Assessment and in shareholder interviews, item 44 is rated as an area needing improvement. Applicant assessment of children for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.

Item 44. The State has in place a process for ensuring the different recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families that check can take about 2 weeks. Shareholders also noted that documentation is in place. Shareholders noted that there are two criminal history checks. One is the State and the other is the FBI. Which includes fingerprinting. The final FBI

Involving about 2 weeks, while others noted that a criminal history check can be completed in about 2 days. Shareholders expressed the opinion that this was a lengthy process.

Shareholders commended on this item during the course of the IFSR indicated that the State will not place children with anyone without a current background check. However, some shareholders expressed the opinion that this was a lengthy process.
Stakeholder Interview Information

For children, according to the Stakeholder Assessment, CYFD policies and procedures related to processes for accessing out-of-school placement resources

Stakeholder Interview Information

Mexico’s 2001 CRSP.

In addition to out-of-school adaptations, where common concerns described in “unmet needs” are in “unmet needs” with this area

Although processes are in place to facilitate in-school and cross-functional placement, stakeholders knowledgeable and familiar with this area

Item 45 is found in an Area Needing Improvement. This item was not effectively addressed in the Stakeholder Assessment. Although

- Area Needing Improvement
- Strength

Item 46. The State has in place a process for the effective use of cross-functional resources to facilitate timely adoption of

- Able to place Zhuang children in those homes.

Stakeholders reported, however, that the Zhuang adoption is too slow and that agencies have been

- They noted that childless parents are placed away from their tribes and communities because of the lack of Native American homes.

Stakeholders also noted that there is a need to retrain Native American families so that they are readily available options for Native

- Case planning

When the agency puts unrealistic demands on the foster parents, fails to pay them in a timely manner, and does not include them in

- They noted that CYFD did not only loses foster parents when they adopt or when they become therapeutic foster parents, but also

Stakeholders noted that foster parents make the bestrecruiters and, therefore, it is important to ensure that foster parents’ needs are

- Legal services offered per year.

Recruitment for adoptive parents involves several activities, including the Heart Gallery, web sites, fairs, special events each year, and

that there was a State Recruitment with they were not aware of any recruitment efforts being conducted by the unit

specifi cally designed to conduct recruitment efforts in that county. Lea County stakeholders reported that although they were aware

community to recruit foster and adoptive homes. Bennella County stakeholders, however, reported that there is only one person