BBC SEARLY

State Fiscal Year 2016

New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department

Protective Services



WELCOME TO 360 YEARLY

About 360 YEARLY

360 YEARLY is published yearly to provide CYFD management, staff, and external partners with data on:

- Reports of child abuse and neglect
- Investigations of child abuse and neglect
- Substantiated cases
- Permanency plans for youth in custody
- Plans for reunifications
- Number of youth in foster care

These data can be used to inform New Mexicans of trends in a particular area and where support may be needed. Data can also indicate positive outcomes in an aspect of the system in a particular county or region. 360 YEARLY is a tool that helps bring data to inform the prevention and treatment process.

About the Data

Data for the County Profiles is prepared through the collaborative efforts of the Data Evaluation Unit and FACTS Unit within the Research, Assessment and Data Bureau and Information Technology Services, with the assistance and guidance of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration For Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau.

About Protective Services

Protective Services strives to enhance the safety, permanency and wellbeing of children and families in New Mexico. Protective Services workers investigate reports of child maltreatment and intervene to keep New Mexico's children safe. We provide foster care to thousands of children and work with families to enable parents to safely care for their children. When that cannot be accomplished, Protective Services workers find safe, permanent families for children through adoption or permanent guardianship. Protective Services also works with youth emancipating from the foster care system to assist them in successfully transitioning into adulthood.

PS Director's Office

Jared Rounsville, Director Vacant, Field Deputy Director Annamarie Luna, Program Deputy Director Valerie Sandoval, Administrative Deputy Director

Santa Fe, New Mexico (505) 827-8400 www.cyfd.org

About the Regional Offices

CYFD is divided into five regions, each one with their own central staff. The Regional Offices are responsible for ensuring that the counties they oversee are supported effectively.

Regional Managers

NW Region 1 Sarah Blackwell (505) 865-8634

NE Region 2 Joy Weathers (505) 425-9335

Metro Region 3 Delphine Trujillo (505) 841-7887

SE Region 4 Virginia Villarreal (575) 624-6071

SW Region 5 Cecilia Rosales (575) 373-6410

Reaching CYFD PS Staff

To contact state or local CYFD staff please refer to the following link: http://cyfd.org/pef intenet_phone_directory.pdf

Data: John C. Barela, Sarah Meadows

CONTENTS

SAFETY......5

PERMANENCY.....12

MAPPED DATA16


REGIONS R-1 R-2 R-3 R-5 R-4

Region 1 Region 2

Region 3

Region 4

Region 5



Note: Map is a graphic representation and does not show precise county boundaries.

STATEWIDE SUMMARY

A SNAPSHOT OF OUR CHILDREN

All of New Mexico's children are our priority. We work to make sure that every child is safe from abuse and neglect. We also work to strengthen families so that they are safe, healthy and resilient.

For children in CYFD care, we track their progress through our FACTS data system. This report focuses on children in CYFD care and their parents and guardians.

The pages to follow will focus on the levels of reports of abuse and neglect, the unsubstantiated and substantiated investigations, permanency planning, and children in care awaiting adoption.

360 YEARLY is published to support our entire workforce, including external and internal partners, in viewing trends and progress made toward measurable objectives in each county office. The report is designed to be used by many populations:

- CYFD Workforce
- Community Partners
- Policymakers
- General public interested in child welfare and the safety of our children

TRENDS & COMPARISONS

Learning from Trends

360 YEARLY provides all New Mexico residents with data to better understand the status of child abuse and neglect, as well as the response from Protective Services. The data illustrate trends over time to provide a way to view progress and to assess challenges.

Comparing and Contrasting

The report also breaks the data down by regions so that the reader may compare and contrast the data between regions and compare regions to state.

The goals are to generate dialogue, assess the needs of counties and regions, and learn from each region.

Using this Guide

The RAD (Research, Assessment and Data) Bureau designs this publication to be used by community partners and in county office progress meetings so that every office staff member knows how local work is progressing and what form of continuous quality improvement can address challenges.

SAFETY

CPS Reports of Abuse and Neglect

CPS Allegations

CPS Investigations

Statewide Central Intake Reports of Abuse and Neglect

Figure 1. Statewide Central Intake Reports of Abuse and Neglect-July 2015-June 2016: This chart illustrates the total number of accepted (screened-in) and not-accepted (screened-out) reports of abuse and neglect in NM. source: sm01a10

Notes:

- 1. An Unknown county report is a report that did not contain a zip code at the time the report was entered into the Family And Child Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2. Accepted Reports are comprised of reports of alleged child maltreatment with sufficient basis to receive a subsequent investigation by CYFD staff.
- 3. Not-Accepted Reports are comprised of reports of alleged child maltreatment with insufficient basis to receive a subsequent investigation by CYFD staff and may include duplicate reports.

	Accept	ted Reports ²	Not Accep	ted Reports ³	Total Reports Received			
County	#	% of County	#	% of County		% of State Total		
Bernalillo	6,837	53.5%	5,949	46.5%	12,786	33.1%		
Catron	26	48.1%	28	51.9%	54	0.1%		
Chaves	761	59.7%	513	40.3%	1,274	3.3%		
Cibola	211	46.4%	244	53.6%	455	1.2%		
Colfax	186	56.2%	145	43.8%	331	0.9%		
Curry	532	59.4%	364	40.6%	896	2.3%		
De Baca	21	60.0%	14	40.0%	35	0.1%		
Doña Ana	2,539	54.5%	2,119	45.5%	4,658	12.1%		
Eddy	621	60.6%	403	39.4%	1,024	2.7%		
Grant	360	57.6%	265	42.4%	625	1.6%		
Guadalupe	72	50.7%	70	49.3%	142	0.4%		
Harding	10	66.7%	5	33.3%	15	0.0%		
Hidalgo	97	53.9%	83	46.1%	180	0.5%		
Lea	615	61.3%	388	38.7%	1,003	2.6%		
Lincoln	219	61.2%	139	38.8%	358	0.9%		
Los Alamos	84	51.5%	79	48.5%	163	0.4%		
Luna	296	54.7%	245	45.3%	541	1.4%		
McKinley	482	44.8%	594	55.2%	1,076	2.8%		
Mora	34	53.1%	30	46.9%	64	0.2%		
Otero	574	53.4%	501	46.6%	1,075	2.8%		
Quay	146	52.9%	130	47.1%	276	0.7%		
Rio Arriba	418	54.3%	352	45.7%	770	2.0%		
Roosevelt	212	63.1%	124	36.9%	336	0.9%		
San Juan	1,192	56.0%	938	44.0%	2,130	5.5%		
San Miguel	317	54.5%	265	45.5%	582	1.5%		
Sandoval	985	52.0%	911	48.0%	1,896	4.9%		
Santa Fe	1,047	48.4%	1,118	51.6%	2,165	5.6%		
Sierra	182	54.5%	1,118	45.5%	334	0.9%		
Socorro	241	55.5%	193	44.5%	434	1.1%		
Faos	373	51.4%	353	48.6%	726	1.9%		
Torrance	194	56.9%	147	43.1%	341	0.9%		
Union	42	54.5%	35	45.5%	77	0.9%		
Unknown ¹	54	14.9%	308	85.1%	362	0.2%		
Valencia	786	54.6%	653	45.4%	1,439	3.7%		
State Totals	20,766	53.8%	17,857	46.2%	38,623	100.00%		

Statewide Central Intake Reports of Abuse and Neglect

Figure 1. Total Reports: This graph illustrates the total number of reports of abuse and neglect from FY09 through FY16 in NM. Source Sm01a10


Figure 2. Accepted Reports/Screened-In: This graph illustrates the total number of accepted reports from FY09 through FY16 in NM. Source: Sm01a10


Note: A screening determination on an incoming report is made by State Central Intake (SCI). Once accepted, the PS report is assigned to the appropriate county office for investigation.


Figure 3. Not-Accepted/Screened-Out: This graph illustrates the total number of not accepted reports from FY09 through FY16 in NM. Source: Sm01a10

Note: Reasons for non-acceptance of a report may include:

- No specific allegation/risk of abuse/neglect,
- Insufficient information to investigate,
- Referral to another agency,
- Does not meet sufficiency screening criteria,
- Perpetrator is non-caretaker/out-of-home,
- Referral to law enforcement, and/or
- Duplicate reports.







Investigations

Figure 1. Investigations July 2015-June 2016: This

table illustrates the number of accepted reports, substantiated, and unsubstantiated investigations, and child victims. The data is displayed by county. Source: Sm06a01c

Notes:

 Not all "accepted reports" result in Investigations that are completed during the same period in which the corresponding report was accepted; therefore, completed investigations will <u>not</u> match the number of accepted reports in any given year.

County	Accepted Reports	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total #	County % of State Total Investigations	Number of Substantiated Child Victims	Victim Rate per 1,000	
Bernalillo	6,837	1,746	30.8%	3,927	69.2%	5,673	29.6%	2,773	15.6	
Catron	26	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0.0%	0	0.0	
Chaves	761	188	26.4%	525	73.6%	713	3.7%	313	15.1	
Cibola	211	72	32.6%	149	67.4%	221	1.2%	119	15.7	
Colfax	186	114	49.6%	116	50.4%	230	1.2%	186	59.0	
Curry	532	166	30.5%	379	69.5%	545	2.8%	297	19.6	
De Baca	21	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	0.0%	0	0.0	
Dona Ana	2,539	532	23.3%	1,755	76.7%	2,287	11.9%	948	14.7	
Eddy	621	134	21.9%	478	78.1%	612	3.2%	211	13.6	
Grant	360	131	35.9%	234	64.1%	365	1.9%	280	38.9	
Guadalupe	72	17	37.8%	28	62.2%	45	0.2%	27	24.0	
Harding	10	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0.0%	0	0.0	
Hidalgo	97	10	41.7%	14	58.3%	24	0.1%	19	13.6	
Lea	615	176	31.0%	392	69.0%	568	3.0%	351	16.7	
Lincoln	219	51	24.2%	160	75.8%	211	1.1%	77	18.0	
Los Alamos	84	12	29.3%	29	70.7%	41	0.2%	14	3.0	
Luna	296	107	29.7%	253	70.3%	360	1.9%	165	22.4	
McKinley	482	163	35.1%	302	64.9%	465	2.4%	300	12.0	
Mora	34	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0.0%	0	0.0	
Otero	574	170	27.4%	451	72.6%	621	3.2%	295	16.7	
Quay	146	29	15.9%	153	84.1%	182	1.0%	38	17.3	
Rio Arriba	418	171	38.4%	274	61.6%	445	2.3%	310	28.1	
Roosevelt	212	75	36.1%	133	63.9%	208	1.1%	143	22.8	
San Juan	1,192	323	28.0%	832	72.0%	1,155	6.0%	544	13.1	
San Miguel	317	189	46.0%	222	54.0%	411	2.1%	338	44.4	
Sandoval	985	205	21.9%	731	78.1%	936	4.9%	354	9.2	
Santa Fe	1,047	344	31.9%	733	68.1%	1,077	5.6%	570	17.1	
Sierra	182	64	33.3%	128	66.7%	192	1.0%	109	51.2	
Socorro	241	82	27.9%	212	72.1%	294	1.5%	121	24.1	
Taos	373	142	41.0%	204	59.0%	346	1.8%	244	32.7	
Torrance	194	58	25.1%	173	74.9%	231	1.2%	110	25.2	
Union	42	7	50.0%	7	50.0%	14	0.1%	9	8.7	
Unknown	0	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0	
Valencia	786	241	36.6%	418	63.4%	659	3.4%	419	18.7	
State Totals	20,712	5,719	29.9%	13,422	70.1%	19,141	100.0%	9,684	16.7	

Investigations Trends

Figure 1. Protective Services Investigations FY 2009-


2016: The graph illustrates the number of investigations result (substantiated and unsubstantiated) from FY09 through FY16. Source: Sm06a01c


Figure 2. Protective Services Investigations Percentages FY 2009-2016: The graph illustrates the number of investiga-

tions result (substantiated and unsubstantiated) displayed as percentage from FY09 through FY16. Source: Sm06a01c

"Substantiated" in a child abuse and/or neglect investigation means the victim(s) is under the age of 18, a parent/caretaker has been identified as the perpetrator and/or identified as failing to protect, and credible evidence exists to support the conclusion by the investigation worker that the child has been abused and/or neglected as defined by the New Mexico Children's Code.

"*Unsubstantiated*" means that the information collected during the investigation does not support a finding that the child was abused and/or neglected as defined by the New Mexico Children's Code.





Allegation Types by County July 2015-June 2016

Figure 1.	Physical Abuse					Sexual Abuse					Physical Neglect					Total Allegation Types				
	Subst	antiated	Unsubs	tantiated		Subs	stantiated	iated Unsubstantiate		d	Subs	tantiated	Unsubstantiated		1	Substantiated		Uns	ubstantia	iated
County	#	%	#	%	Total	#	%	#	%	Total	#	%	#	%	Total	#	%	#	%	Total
Bernalillo E	342	18.6%	1,493	81.4%	1,835	15	14.7%	87	85.3%	102	1,037	25.4%	3,051	74.6%	4,088	1,394	23.1%	4,631	76.9%	6,025
Bernalillo W	490	23.4%	1,602	76.6%	2,092	33	22.6%	113	77.4%	146	1,241	27.4%	3,281	72.6%	4,522	1,764	26.1%	4,996	73.9%	6,760
Catron	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
Chaves	79	19.8%	320	80.2%	399	8	21.6%	29	78.4%	37	316	26.3%	887	73.7%	1,203	403	24.6%	1,236	75.4%	1,639
Cibola	37	22.0%	131	78.0%	168	9	56.3%	7	43.8%	16	102	26.4%	284	73.6%	386	148	26.0%	422	74.0%	570
Colfax	58	46.4%	67	53.6%	125	4	33.3%	8	66.7%	12	159	40.3%	236	59.7%	395	221	41.5%	311	58.5%	532
Curry	59	16.4%	301	83.6%	360	1	5.6%	17	94.4%	18	267	29.0%	654	71.0%	921	327	25.2%	972	74.8%	1,299
De Baca	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	11
Doña Ana	232	15.6%	1,255	84.4%	1,487	24	18.5%	106	81.5%	130	708	20.2%	2,799	79.8%	3,507	964	18.8%	4,160	81.2%	5,124
Eddy	31	7.9%	361	92.1%	392	3	8.1%	34	91.9%	37	268	25.5%	783	74.5%	1,051	302	20.4%	1,178	79.6%	1,480
Grant	56	24.9%	169	75.1%	225	1	5.6%	17	94.4%	18	180	28.8%	444	71.2%	624	237	27.3%	630	72.7%	867
Guadalupe	9	23.7%	29	76.3%	38	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	38	43.2%	50	56.8%	88	48	37.5%	80	62.5%	128
Harding	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
Hidalgo	6	50.0%	6	50.0%	12	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	7	20.6%	27	79.4%	34	13	27.7%	34	72.3%	47
Lea	84	24.2%	263	75.8%	347	6	25.0%	18	75.0%	24	338	33.1%	683	66.9%	1,021	428	30.7%	964	69.3%	1,392
Lincoln	14	11.0%	113	89.0%	127	2	15.4%	11	84.6%	13	76	22.7%	259	77.3%	335	92	19.4%	383	80.6%	475
Los Alamos	5	20.8%	19	79.2%	24	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6	18	28.6%	45	71.4%	63	24	25.8%	69	74.2%	93
Luna	48	23.5%	156	76.5%	204	7	46.7%	8	53.3%	15	127	22.1%	447	77.9%	574	182	23.0%	611	77.0%	793
McKinley	85	25.5%	248	74.5%	333	5	29.4%	12	70.6%	17	198	27.3%	528	72.7%	726	288	26.8%	788	73.2%	1,076
Mora	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
Otero	39	10.7%	325	89.3%	364	6	20.0%	24	80.0%	30	266	25.7%	768	74.3%	1,034	311	21.8%	1,117	78.2%	1,428
Quay	4	3.4%	112	96.6%	116	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	66	20.1%	262	79.9%	328	70	15.6%	379	84.4%	449
Rio Arriba	70	29.3%	169	70.7%	239	2	11.1%	16	88.9%	18	399	40.8%	578	59.2%	977	471	38.2%	763	61.8%	1,234
Roosevelt	34	24.3%	106	75.7%	140	5	50.0%	5	50.0%	10	89	26.6%	246	73.4%	335	128	26.4%	357	73.6%	485
San Juan	205	25.6%	596	74.4%	801	16	21.3%	59	78.7%	75	416	21.6%	1,510	78.4%	1,926	637	22.7%	2,165	77.3%	2,802
San Miguel	124	44.1%	157	55.9%	281	9	45.0%	11	55.0%	20	289	40.4%	426	59.6%	715	422	41.5%	594	58.5%	1,016
Sandoval	114	16.3%	586	83.7%	700	4	12.1%	29	87.9%	33	263	19.3%	1,100	80.7%	1,363	381	18.2%	1,715	81.8%	2,096
Santa Fe	153	20.4%	596	79.6%	749	3	7.7%	36	92.3%	39	542	32.1%	1,146	67.9%	1,688	698	28.2%	1,778	71.8%	2,476
Sierra	15	13.8%	94	86.2%	109	2	13.3%	13	86.7%	15	84	25.3%	248	74.7%	332	101	22.1%	355	77.9%	456
Socorro	34	16.1%	177	83.9%	211	5	17.9%	23	82.1%	28	114	21.9%	406	78.1%	520	153	20.2%	606	79.8%	759
Taos	50	18.3%	223	81.7%	273	3	13.0%	20	87.0%	23	208	34.0%	404	66.0%	612	261	28.7%	647	71.3%	908
Torrance	25	18.8%	108	81.2%	133	1	12.5%	7	87.5%	8	99	22.8%	336	77.2%	435	125	21.7%	451	78.3%	576
Union	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	6	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	8	28.6%	20	71.4%	28	8	22.9%	27	77.1%	35
Valencia	127	30.0%	297	70.0%	424	8	19.5%	33	80.5%	41	405	36.0%	719	64.0%	1,124	540	34.0%	1,049	66.0%	1,589
State Totals	2,629	20.7%	10,092	79.3%	12,721	184	19.6%	756	80.4%	940	8,328	26.9%	22,631	73.1%	30,959	11,141	25.0%	33,479	75.0%	44,620

Allegation Types by July 2015-June 2016

(Previous table)

Figure 1. Allegation Types by County July 2014-June 2016:


This chart illustrates the different types of allegations (physical abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect) broken out by investigation results (substantiated or unsubstantiated). The data is displayed by county. Source: Sm06a01c


(Graphs on this page)


Figure 2. Total Allegations: This graph illustrates the different types of allegations (physical abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect), from FY09 to FY16. Source: Sm06a01c

Figure 3. Unsubstantiated Allegations: This graph illustrates the different types of allegations (physical abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect). Data is only shown for unsubstantiated allegations. Source: Sm06a01c

Figure 4. Substantiated Allegations: This graph illustrates the different types of allegations (physical abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect). Data is only shown for substantiated allegations. Source: Sm06a01c







PERMANENCY

Foster Care Reunification Re-entry Placement Stability Adoptions Emancipations


Children in Foster Care


Figure 1. Average Number of Children in Care: This table illustrates the average number of children in care by type from FY11 through FY16. The numbers displayed are 12-month averages. Source: Desktop Report Charts

Figure 2. Children in Care by Month FY12-FY16: This chart shows children in care by month from FY12-FY16. Note: The colors correspond with the fiscal years noted on the lower left. Source: Desktop Report Charts

Figure 3. Children in Care by Month (Snapshot): This chart shows children in care by month in FY16. Source: Desktop Report Charts

Average Number of Children in Care											
	SFY11	SFY12	SFY13	SFY14	FY15	FY16					
Foster Care	776.1	840.7	887.6	947.0	1069.5	1167.6					
Foster Care Relative	327.5	334.1	381.9	464.3	468.7	472.5					
Pre-Adoption	111.3	112.5	83.3	96.7	78.8	81.3					
Pre-Adoption Relative	66.9	44.7	36.4	36.7	35.0	35.3					
Special Arranged/DD	32.8	32.3	46	56.1	57.8	58.3					
Treatment Foster Care	233.6	237.6	218.5	224.2	269.7	270.3					
Treatment Foster Care Relative	13.7	16.6	13	11.3	17.8	16.6					
Institutional Care	37.9	34.7	38.6	45.8	46.8	44.5					
Group Home	19.9	21.0	25.2	34.3	33.5	30.7					
Residential Treatment Care	57.9	30.3	35.3	47.0	66.4	76.8					
SIL under 18	19.0	11.6	13.3	13.4	12.2	10.6					
Total	1696.6	1715.9	1779.2	1872.5	2156.2	2264.4					





Reunification

Figure 1. Percent of children reunified with their natural families in

less than 12 months of entry into care: This line graph illustrates a strategic planning measure: Continue to develop and utilize program strategies which identify factors which contribute to the timely and appropriate return of children to their homes.


Re-entry


Figure 2. Percent of re-entering foster care in less than 12


months: This line graph illustrates a strategic planning measure: Continue to develop and utilize program strategies which identify factors which contribute to the timely and appropriate return of children to their homes without increasing reentry into foster care.

Placement Stability

Figure 3. Percent of children in foster care for up to 12 months with no more than two placement settings: This line graph illustrates a strategic planning measure: Continue to develop, upgrade and utilize program strategies that identify and address factors that contribute to the stability of children in out-of-home placements.








Adoptions & Emancipations


Figure 1. Finalized Adoptions: Trends: This line chart shows the number of children with adoptions finalized during the last seven fiscal years. Source: sm16a07

Figure 2. Finalized Adoptions by Age Groups: Trends: This line chart and accompanying table display the number of children with adoptions finalized by age group. Source: Sm16a07


Figure 3. Youth Aging Out of Foster Care: Trends: This line chart shows the number of youth emancipating from foster care at age 18. Young adults emancipating from foster care are provided with independent living skills and transitional services both before and after emancipation. Source: rp0813

Figure 1. Finalized Adoptions: Trends SFY 2009 SFY 2010 SFY 2011 SFY 2012 SFY 2013 SFY 2014 SFY 2015 SFY 2016






Victim Rates per 1,000 Children Age 0-17 July 2015-June 2016



Victims

Accepted SCI (Statewide Central Intake) Reports July 2015-June 2016



17

AcceptedReports


10 - 296

297 - 621

622 - 1192

1193 - 2539 2540 - 6837

Not Accepted SCI (Statewide Central Intake) Reports July 2015-June 2016



360 YEARLY

State Fiscal Year 2014 New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department Protective Services