



New Mexico Family Advocacy Program

Child and Family Services
Review

Round 2 Report

August 2023

Summary of Round 1 and Round 2 Reviews

Summary of Round 1 and Round 2 Review Plans					
Round	Case Review	Supplemental Participant Parent Interview	Stakeholder Feedback	Longitudinal Case Review	Parent Feedback
Round One	30 Cases Sampled from 5 Counties	30 Parent Interviews	Stakeholder Group Interviews (6 Groups)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Round Two	15 Cases Sampled from 6 Counties	15 Parent Interviews	Stakeholder Surveys Individual Stakeholder Interviews	Record Reviews of the 30 cases reviewed in Round One	Parent interviews with parents who opt in



Case Review

NMFAP Rating Summary (Round 2)

NMFAP Rating Summary			
	N=15		
	Performance Item Ratings		
Performance Item	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	Not Applicable
Item 4: Stability of Foster Care Placement	40% (n=6)	60% (n=9)	n=0
Item 5: Permanency Goal for the Child	66.67% (n=10)	33.33% (n=5)	n=0
Item 6: Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, Or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	33.33% (n=5)	66.67% (n=10)	n=0
Item 7: Placement with Siblings	88.89% (n=8)	11.11% (n=1)	n=6
Item 8: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	60% (n=9)	40% (n=6)	n=0
Item 10: Relative Placement	73.33% (n=11)	26.67% (n=4)	n=0
Item 12B: Needs and Services to Parents	14.29% (n=2)	85.71% (n=12)	n=1
Item 13: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	53.33% (n=8)	46.67% (n=7)	n=0
Item 15: Caseworker visits with parents	42.86% (n=6)	57.14% (n=8)	n=1

NMFAP & CYFD Rating Comparisons

NMFAP and CYFD Reviews Rating Comparisons					
	Performance Item Ratings				
Performance Item	Round 1		Round 2		
	NMFAP Strength (n=30)	CYFD Strength (n=56)	NMFAP Strength (n=15)	CYFD Strength (n=40)	Difference
Item 4: Stability of Foster Care Placement	60%	82.14%	40%	85%	-45%
Item 5: Permanency Goal for the Child	70%	67.31%	66.67%	68.42%	-1.75%
Item 6: Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, Or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	60%	30.36%	33.33%	22.5%	10.83%
Item 7: Placement with Siblings	81.25%	86.49%	88.89%	82.76%	6.13%
Item 8: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	63.33%	68.75%	60%	60%	0%
Item 10: Relative Placement	66.67%	73.21%	73.33%	65%	8.33%
Item 12B: Needs and Services to Parents	46.67%	58.97%	14.29%	57.14%	-42.85%
Item 13: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	56.67%	78.43%	53.33%	73.53%	-20.2%
Item 15: Caseworker visits with parents	36.67%	48.72%	42.86%	50%	-7.14%

NMFAP & NMFAP Client Only Rating Comparison

NMFAP and NMFAP Client Only Rating Comparisons					
Performance Item Ratings					
Performance Item	Round 1		Round 2		
	NMFAP Client Only Strength	Overall NMFAP Strength	NMFAP Client Only Strength	Overall NMFAP Strength	Difference
Item 8: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	75.86%	63.33%	60%	60%	0%
Item 12B: Needs and Services to Parents	56.66%	46.67%	21.42%	14.29%	7.13%
Item 13: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	73.33%	56.67%	53.33%	53.33%	0%
Item 15: Caseworker visits with parents	50%	36.67%	57.14%	42.86%	14.28%



Parent Interviews

Frequency Between Parent and NMFAP


Typical Frequency Between the Parent and NMFAP			
	NMFAP Attorney (n=15)	NMFAP Social Worker (n=15)	NMFAP Parent Mentor (n=2) *
None	0%	0%	0%
Less than Monthly	60% (9)	6.67% (1)	0%
Monthly	6.67% (1)	26.67% (4)	100% (2)
Twice per Month	6.67% (1)	26.67% (4)	0%
Weekly	20% (3)	26.67% (4)	0%
More than Weekly	6.67% (1)	13.33% (2)	0%

Types of Contact Between Parent and NMFAP

Typical Types of Contact Between the Parent and NMFAP*			
	NMFAP Attorney (n=15)	NMFAP Social Worker (n=15)	NMFAP Parent Mentor (n=2)
In Person	53.33% (8)	66.67% (10)	6.67* (1)
Video Conference/Zoom	60% (9)	26.67% (4)	0%
Phone	66.67% (10)	86.67% (13)	13.33% (2)
Text	6.67% (1)	66.67% (10)	0%
Email	26.67% (4)	20% (3)	0%
No Contact	0%	0%	0%

Activities Supported by NMFAP

Activities Supported by the NMFAP Team*	
Helping me communicate with my CYFD worker.	100% (15)
Explaining and helping me understand court proceedings	100% (15)
Helping me access the services I Need/	100% (15)
Other	100% (15)
Attending meetings with CYFD	93.33% (14)
Helping me to have input into my case plan	73.33% (11)
Ensuring I have visitation with my child	53.33% (8)
Helping me access visitation with my child	53.33% (8)
Helping me advocate for relative placement	53.33% (8)
Helping me identify relatives who are potential supports	33.33% (5)
Transporting me to assessments and services	20% (3)
None	0%



Stakeholder Survey and Interviews



Stakeholder Roles

Stakeholder Role in the Child Welfare System (n=76)	
Judge or Hearing Officer	5.26% (4)
Guardian ad Litem or Youth Attorney	11.84% (9)
CYFD Permanency Worker	18.42% (14)
CYFD Supervisor	13.16% (10)
CYFD Manager or Director	7.89% (6)
CYFD Children's Court Attorney or CYFD Managing Attorney	9.21% (7)
NMFAP Respondent Attorney	15.79% (12)
NMFAP Social Worker	7.89% (6)
NMFAP Parent Mentor	2.63% (2)
NMFAP Administrator	2.63% (2)
Other (please specify)	13.16% (10)

NMFAP Impact on Child Welfare Domains

NMFAP Impact on Child Welfare Domains						
NMFAP Improves...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Skipped Question
Parent engagement in visitation (n=70)	27.14% (19)	37.14% (26)	31.43% (22)	2.86% (2)	1.43% (1)	6
The outcome of placement of children with relatives (n=70)	17.14% (12)	31.43% (22)	38.57% (27)	11.43% (8)	1.43% (1)	6
Parent engagement in services (n=70)	30% (21)	37.14% (26)	28.57% (20)	4.29% (3)	0%	6
Parent engagement in case planning (n=70)	25.71% (18)	41.43% (29)	30% (21)	2.86% (2)	0%	6
Parent engagement in court hearings (n=70)	27.14% (19)	44.29% (31)	25.71% (18)	2.86% (2)	0%	6
Time to permanency (n=70)	20% (14)	31.43% (22)	35.71% (25)	11.43% (8)	1.43% (1)	6

NMFAP Impact on Practice

NMFAP Impact on Practice (n=66) *	
More frequent communication with the parent or other parties	66.67% (44)
Improved quality of communication with the parent or other parties	56.06% (37)
Improved quality of documentation of case plans, court reports, or other documents	22.73% (15)
Improved preparedness and engagement in court hearings	36.36% (24)
Improved awareness of ASFA Timelines (Time to Permanency)	10.61% (7)
Increased attention to relative placement	22.73% (15)
Increased attention to frequent quality parent/child visitation	45.45% (30)
I have not observed or experienced any impact on practice	24.24% (16)
Other	9.09% (6)



Longitudinal Case Review

NMFAP Rating Summary (Round 1)

NMFAP Rating Summary (Round 1)			
	N=30		
	Performance Item Ratings		
Performance Item	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	Not Applicable
Item 4: Stability of Foster Care Placement	60% (n=18)	40% (n=12)	n=0
Item 5: Permanency Goal for the Child	70% (n=21)	30% (n=9)	n=0
Item 6: Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, Or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	60% (n=18)	40% (n=12)	n=0
Item 7: Placement with Siblings	81.25% (n=13)	18.75% (n=3)	n=14
Item 8: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	63.33% (n=19)	36.67% (n=11)	n=0
Item 10: Relative Placement	73.33% (n=11)	26.67% (n=4)	n=0
Item 12B: Needs and Services to Parents	46.67% (n=14)	53.33% (n=16)	n=0
Item 13: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	56.67% (n=17)	43.33% (n=13)	n=0
Item 15: Caseworker visits with parents	36.67% (n=11)	63.33% (n=19)	n=0



Legal Status of Target Child

Legal Status of the Target Child (n=30)		
Legal Status	Round 1 Review (2022)	Round 2 Review (2023)
Legal/Physical Custody CYFD	76.66% (23)	43.33% (13)
Trial Home Visit (CYFD Custody)	0	3.33% (1)
Dismissed Home	23.33 % (7)	43.33 % (13)
Dismissed Permanent Guardianship	0	3.33% (1)
Dismissed Tribal Jurisdiction	0	3.33% (1)
Emancipation	0	3.33% (1)



Repeat Maltreatment

- Seven of the families reviewed in Round 1 received at least one subsequent maltreatment report since the first round review,
- Twelve maltreatment reports were investigated.
- Three of the maltreatment reports were substantiated for abuse or neglect.
- Two of the substantiated reports were within 12 months of a prior substantiated maltreatment. Both investigations were concerning similar circumstances as the prior substantiated investigation.
- The percentage of recurrence of maltreatment within 12 months for the NMFAP cases reviewed in Round 1 was 16.66%. This exceeds the national standard for this performance measure (less than 9.1%).
- None of the substantiated reports were received within six months of a prior substantiated investigation. The percentage of recurrence of maltreatment within 6 months for the NMFAP cases reviewed in Round 1 was 0%.
- It cannot be concluded that that NMFAP services resulted impacted repeat maltreatment. Note that the data related to the national standard is aggregate data and NMFAP data relates only to the small number of cases reviewed in Round 1 of the NMFAP review.



Re-entry into Foster Care

- Of the 30 children reviewed in Round 1, 16 were dismissed from CYFD custody.
- One of those children was dismissed to the jurisdiction of the Tribe.
- Of the remaining 15 children who were dismissed, two re-entered foster care.
- One of the children re-entered care in less than one month of dismissal and the other re-entered two months after dismissal.
- In both instances, the re-entry was concerning similar circumstances.
- One of the re-entries was a short-term emergency hold and the other was a new legal filing.
- The re-entry percentage for the NMFAP cases was 13%. This exceeds the national standard.
- It cannot be concluded that that NMFAP services resulted impacted re-entry into foster care. Note that the data related to the national standard is aggregate data and NMFAP data relates only to the small number of cases reviewed in Round 1 of the NMFAP review.



Service Provision

- ▶ Based upon the record review and parent interviews, 13 of the 30 parents remained actively engaged in services after the Round 1 Review or at the time of CYFD case closure.
- ▶ In four of the cases reviewed it was documented that the parent was not involved and was refusing services.
- ▶ The documentation in the electronic case record (FACTS) was often very limited. In the remaining 13 cases it was undetermined if the parent or family was engaged in ongoing services.



Conclusion



Conclusion

- ▶ It is broadly acknowledged that families involved in the child welfare system are faced with navigating complex agencies, service arrays, and court systems all while experiencing multiple traumas and needs.
- ▶ The NMFAP has partnered with parents during this most difficult time and provided advocacy, support, and education.
- ▶ These roles are uniquely suited to an interdisciplinary team. The addition of master's level social worker and parent mentors with lived experience to the team offers parents a bridge to meaningful change that can ultimately improve outcomes for children.