



Kevin S. 2019-2020 Report: Quantitative Monitoring Outcomes

Overview

This report has been written to meet the commitment of providing a quantitative report as mentioned in the Kevin S. settlement agreement. The specific language used in the agreement is quoted for reference below.

Reports: By August 1, 2021, and every twelve months thereafter, Defendants shall provide to Plaintiffs and the Co-Neutrals a written report of their progress with respect to the Target Outcomes and Implementation Targets. The period of assessment for each annual report shall be the previous calendar year—for example, the report due by May 1, 2021 shall describe Defendants’ performance from January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020.

Kevin S. v. Blalock et. al., 1 :18-cv-00896 : Page 8

This document will detail the 2019/2020 work done and performance related to the settlement commitments.

The document first outlines commitments, definitions, considerations for the 2019 and 2020 cohorts, and then it walks through the metrics and target outcomes that began examination in 2019 and/or 2020. As new processes are actualized and new procedures are achieved, additional metrics will be included in subsequent reports.

Quantitative Commitments

For commitments identified as containing quantitative metrics, the following information will be provided per metric:

1. **Calculation Type:** The metrics outlined below include both primary and secondary metrics. Calculation details will be noted.
2. **Results:** The results are also included with the calculation type. Any specific considerations for the calculation as outlined in the DVP or as motivated by data gathering and logic determination processes will be mentioned.

A separate data transfer process has been set up to provide the Co-Neutrals and Plaintiffs all underlying data referenced.

The metrics outlined in this report are representative of the areas where the State had processes and systems in 2019 and/or 2020 that allowed for metric calculations. If a metric below does not include information for 2019, that should be taken as an indication that there was no relevant data for that metric in 2019.

Any metrics not outlined in this report will be included in subsequent annual reports, according to the State’s implementation of additional systems, processes, and information gathering methods that will permit gathering of relevant data and the calculation of additional metrics

using said data. As process and system improvements are made, more metrics will be included in subsequent reports.

It should be noted that the numbers for the below metrics were generated to the best of the State's and its data partners' ability, however, there is the possibility of minor errors in the calculations due to data quality and potential human error. It should be kept in mind that the goal of the report is to show overall trends in improvement and changes to the metrics, data distribution and entry, and systems implementation from the beginning of this process to the present.

The analyses and measurement procedures are continuing to be analyzed and may be adjusted in coming weeks and years according to ongoing conversations between the State, its data partners, and the Co-Neutrals. Therefore, these metrics should be taken as point-in-time snapshots that may later be modified according to new information or further specification and clarification of the DVP language.

Baseline Definitions

Episodes of Custody (EOCs)

An episode of custody is a continuous period spent in State Protective Services custody. The episode of custody begins when the child is removed from home and ends when the child is discharged from Protective Services custody. Our definition aligns with the federal definition noted in §1355.42(a) under Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations¹ used to define the scope of the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS). Using this definition, the State includes any child in out-of-home care for more than 24 hours.

Of note is that, to be consistent with the federal definitions, time a child has spent as a runaway, whose whereabouts is unknown, or in a trial at-home visit, is included in an Episode of Custody.

There are two places where our definition is different from AFCARS in order to align it with Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) methodology:²

The first relates to filtering on age. This aligns with the fact that most CFSR Measures have exclusions for children 18 and over. Any child who is under 18 at the beginning of the reporting year is included in the Kevin S Cohort. This aligns with risk adjustments based on age in CFSR measures. It should be assumed that all calculations will filter out children who are 18 and over. We will note in the calculation details on the metric if there is a deviation from this assumption.

Placements

¹ [Federal Register Notice \(81 FR 90569\), December 2016](#)

² [Federal Register Notice \(79 FR 61241\), October 2014](#)

Stays at any facilities licensed or approved for the purpose of providing foster care are counted as a “placement” when and where a child is present at 3:00 a.m. FACTS tracks start date and end date of placements but does not include time. As such, if the end date is greater than the start date, the placement will be tracked. If a placement is not entered into FACTS, it will not be included as a placement.

The logic used to calculate the number of days in a placement is based on discussions had when the DVP was being finalized and is inclusive. For example, if a child’s episode of custody takes place January 1-January 2 of the reporting year, the child is considered as being in a placement for 2 days.

Temporary absences, where the child returns to the same setting as prior to the absence, will be considered as a continuation of the prior placement. Any change to the physical placement of a child for at least one day overnight will trigger a new placement being recorded. This aligns with current federal reporting on placement stability performance.

FACTS does not track runaways and trial at home visits as placements, and although AFCARS does, they are often excluded in CFSR measurements. Aligning with CFSR methodology, runaways and trial at home visits will not be tracked as placements in FACTS, but have been added to the processed “Sandbox data” as pseudo-placements to allow for easier reporting.

Process and Logic Items

Several process considerations and factors were taken into account for the purpose of this submission. Below is a list of process changes, influences, and notes.

The State and its data partners continued to meet on a weekly basis to go over any lingering logic questions, the status of the report and metric calculations, and to discuss any State process changes (e.g., changes to the FACTS user interface, anticipated implementations, etc.) that may affect the way data were displayed or pulled. This ensured as much alignment as possible between the State and its data partners and drove continued calibration between the two parties for the duration of the report and metric calculations.

Additionally, quality assurance checks were performed to ensure accuracy and consistency for the metrics. To ensure precision, the State and its data partners worked together to identify and rectify overlapping episodes of custody, gaps in placement, duplicate entries, and others. The quality assurance documents were submitted along with other data sources in the data submission and were incorporated as appropriate into the cohort data for the reporting year.

With the finalization of the Data Validation Plan (DVP) in February 2022, and taking into consideration correspondences between the Co-Neutrals and the State, there have been adjustments to the previous 2019/2020 submissions’ data gathering and calculation processes as appropriate.

Furthermore, it was discovered that the County Averages Spreadsheets didn’t present the necessary formatting for the State’s data partners to ingest the spreadsheets in an efficient,

effective manner. Once this discovery was made, the State and its data partners discussed possible remedies, and it was concluded that, for this submission, it would be the most time efficient option to have the State calculate the relevant metric directly from existing County Average Reports, rather than Sandbox data. Once the calculation was complete, the State sent the data it used and information about the calculation methods to the data partners for inclusion in this report.

Finally, Supervised Independent Living and Extended Foster Care were added to non-placement (pseudo-placement) types for this report, which affects 56 records total across 2019 (19 and 0 respectively) and 2020 (26 and 8 respectively). There are rare instances where youth 16-17 are placed under Early Independent Living arrangements as described above.

Any changes to calculation processes were in accordance with the updated version of the DVP and were discussed with stakeholders to ensure alignment.

Metrics below that are percentages include the numerator and denominator used to do the calculation.

Data Changes and Logic Decisions

Data changes

Any additional or modified data sources have been included in this report submission. Specifically, additional data sources that were obtained after the data submission for the purposes of this report are SHARE data and holiday calendars for both reporting years are included in this submission (unique staff titles WORK.xlsx, 2019_EmployeeCalendar.pdf, and 2020_EmployeeCalendar.pdf). The SHARE data document outlines information received from the state regarding which titles are considered caseworkers and which leave reasons are considered voluntary. The holiday calendars were obtained to calculate metrics dealing with timeliness so the holidays would not be counted as business days.

Additionally, Active Provider batch reports for 2018 is included in this submission for the purposes of metric BTO-6.2i, which examines the past 365 days. Previously, 2018 data had not been included in submissions, but when investigating calculation methodology, it was discovered that this was a gap in data. Therefore, it has also been included with this report.

Moreover, additional High Fidelity Wraparound (HFW) codes for encounters are included for analysis, which weren't included in previous submissions, as they were only recently located. Said codes are: H2022 and G9003. These appended codes were discussed by the State and its data partners and approved by the Co-Neutrals.

Logic decisions

Regarding the additional HFW codes mentioned above, a conclusion was reached, after discussions between the State, its data partners, and the Co-Neutrals, to count any child who has

a HFW encounter reported *either* in manual files sent by the State or in the Medicaid data itself, using the service codes previously mentioned.

CongregateCare and CongregateDate, which are fields found in FACTS, also came up during logic discussions between the State, its data partners, and the Co-Neutrals: It was concluded these fields would be used to track the approval date for extraordinary circumstance placements, and to determine whether the determination of medical necessity, best interest, or extraordinary circumstance was made prior to the placement begin date.

While calculating metrics, it was discovered that BTO-2.2i Secondary displayed ambiguous wording in the DVP and could have been interpreted one of two ways. After consulting with the Co-Neutrals, it was concluded that the appropriate reading should have the denominator reflect required visits rather than required visits that occurred, and the logic for the metric calculation should be in-person visits that occurred on time out of the total number of required visits.

For the metric BTO-5.2i Secondary, logic was implemented to take a distinct count of client IDs which, during the reporting year, had any placement that was either a) foster care but not licensed nor treatment foster care (TFC), or b) was not foster care nor TFC.

BTO-6.2i logic was also discussed by the State, its data partners, and the Co-Neutrals in order to ensure alignment on filtering provider license types. It was determined that the following license types would be included: Foster Care and Specialized Foster Care. It was concluded that Relative Home would be excluded from the filtering.

An additional point to be aware of is, during the calculation process, it was discovered fictive kin were incorrectly coded as non-relative in raw source data. To ensure fictive kin placements were counted toward relative placements in order to align with the intent of the DVP, and placement with service codes 10789-10791 are being flagged as fictive kin, and thus as a relative foster care placement.

Please note that, for this submission, three children were identified with duplicate Person IDs (one child had three IDs): 2826898 to 2104190, 3080519 to 2858671, 3373018 to 2848671, and 1983535 to 2465687. The State, its data partners, and the CNs agreed that merging children needed to happen in the source system (FACTS) rather than post facto, and so are not corrected in this dataset. This error has negligible impact on the on the metric calculations. Going forward, all records will be merged in FACTS rather than manually.

Appendix A: Trauma-Responsive System of Care

Appendix A: Target Outcome 1.c

Follow-up assessment indicated by the CANS or CAT screenings, and/or any other information available to CYFD or HSD, including assessment for intellectual and developmental disabilities and/or sexual exploitation, will be conducted immediately where possible and within 10 days of indication otherwise. Any child discharged from CYFD’s legal custody before these assessments are conducted will be provided a referral.

Metric i: Timely follow-up assessments

For all episodes where a child’s initial CANS or CAT screenings indicated a need for follow-up assessment(s) (as determined by the staffing team), the percent for which all appropriate follow-up assessments were conducted within 10 days of the completion of the initial screening. The metric will exclude children discharged from care within 10 days of the initial screening who did not receive follow-up assessment(s) prior to discharge.

Secondary Metric

The State will provide, as a secondary metric, information on the assessments CISCs receive.

Secondary Metric Language

The percent of episodes of custody which included at least one assessment, as defined under “Follow-up Assessments” above.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

50.95% of episodes of custody included at least one assessment (431/846)

2020 Results:

49.94% of episodes of custody included at least one assessment (422/845)

Appendix A: Target Outcome 2.2

HSD and CYFD will expand and offer community-based, evidence-based, well-supported and promising trauma-responsive services.

Metric i: New Mexican children’s access to specific trauma-responsive services

The sum number of children in cohort who received either High Fidelity Wraparound services, Mobile Crisis Response (MCR), DBT, MST, Trauma-Focused-CBT, FFT, or EMDR during the reporting year.

Note: Medicaid and STAR does not currently have service codes to denote DBT, TF-CBT, or

EMDR.

Secondary Metric

The State will provide, as a secondary metric, information on MST, FFT, MCR, and HFW, which has been historically tracked. Metric language and calculation details follow.

Secondary Metric Language

The sum number of children in cohort who received either High Fidelity Wraparound services, MST, MCR or FFT during the reporting year.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

175 children in the cohort received either High Fidelity Wraparound services, MST, MCR, or FFT during the reporting year

2020 Results:

196 children in the cohort received either High Fidelity Wraparound services, MST, MCR, or FFT during the reporting year

Trauma-responsive services available for 2019 are MST, FFT, and HFW

- H2033 (MST) - Medicaid and STAR data files
- 90846 with HK modifier (FFT) - Medicaid and STAR data files
- 90847 with HK modifier (FFT) - Medicaid and STAR data files
- H2011 U3 (MCR) - Medicaid and STAR data files
- High Fidelity Wraparound - from manually created file
- G9002 – Medicaid and STAR data files
- H2022 – Medicaid and STAR data files

These codes will be reviewed and updated annually, any changes to these codes will be noted in subsequent annual reports.

Appendix B: Least Restrictive and Appropriate Placements

Appendix B: Target Outcome 1.1

No child under 18 will be placed in any hotel, motel, out-of-state provider, office of a contractor, or state agency office unless in extraordinary circumstances necessary to protect the safety and security of the child as documented in the child's record and approved by the Secretary or the Protective Services Director of CYFD and with proper notice as described.

Metric i: Extraordinary circumstances for hotel, motel, office, or out-of-state residential placements

Percentage of children who had a placement in hotel/motel/office settings, or with out-of-state providers, that include required finding and approval of “extraordinary circumstances” and meet all notification requirements. For out-of-state RTC care settings, metric will include appropriate triage meetings.

Calculation Results

2020 results:

0.00% of children who had a placement in hotel/motel/office settings, or with out-of-state providers, included required finding and approval of “extraordinary circumstances” and met all notification requirements (0/127)

Secondary Metric

The State will provide, as a secondary metric, the percentage of children with non-traditional placements. This will offer a sense of the extent to which State personnel have relied on nontraditional placements in the past.

Secondary Metric Language

The percent of children with any office, hotel/motel, or out-of-state RTC/group placements in the cohort during reporting year.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

3.63% of children had office, hotel/motel, or out-of-state RTC/group placements during the reporting year (141/3881)

2020 Results:

3.80% of children had office, hotel/motel, or out-of-state RTC/group placements during the reporting year (127/3344)

Note that for Metric BTO1.1i-secondary, the State and CN team agreed to use only extraordinary circumstances approvals that were captured in FACTS. Note this excludes 1 approval that was manually documented, approved on 12/3/2020 for a placement to PersonID 2633309.

Appendix B: Target Outcome 2.2

A CYFD caseworker known to the child will conduct in-person visits every month.

Metric i: Known caseworker in-person visits for children placed out-of-state

For all of the in-person visits to any child in an out-of-state placement that is not part of the child's permanency plan required during the reporting year, the percent that were conducted timely.

Secondary Metric

Visitation data has been collected for years but CYFD has not historically tracked the specific worker who made visits or their relationship (if any) with the child. CYFD currently sends weekly reminders to caseworkers to complete this field. Thus, a secondary metric of the percentage of months in which a child was in out-of-state congregate or non-family placement and received in-person visits for each child can be reported.

Secondary Metric Language

For all of the in-person visits to any child in an out-of-state placement that is not part of a child's permanency plan required during the reporting year, the percent that were conducted timely.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

88.8% of in-person visits to children in out-of-state placements during the reporting year were conducted timely (551/620)

2020 Results:

99.00% of in-person visits to children in out-of-state placements during the reporting year were conducted timely (397/401)

Appendix B: Target Outcome 5.1

Every child in out-of-home care will be in a licensed foster home placement unless a current finding of medical necessity requires otherwise, or an Individualized Planning Process team determines that a non-clinical setting is in the child's best interest.

Note: In agreement with the CNs, non-placements (trial home visits, runaways, etc.) are included in the denominator, but filtered out from the numerator.

Metric i: CISC with any unapproved or suboptimal placements

Of all children in state custody during a reporting year, the percent that had any placement which was neither a licensed foster home, nor a congregate care setting with an appropriate determination (medical necessity, best interest, or extraordinary circumstance).

Secondary Metric

The State can provide as a secondary metric the share of children with placements in setting that were not licensed foster homes during the reporting year.

Secondary Metric Language

Of all children in state custody during a reporting year, the percent that had any placement which was not a licensed foster home.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

18.50% of children in state custody that had a placement not in a licensed foster home during the reporting year (718/3881)

2020 Results:

18.15% of children in state custody that had a placement not in a licensed foster home during the reporting year (607/3344)

Appendix B: Target Outcome 6.2

CYFD to approve the number of new culturally reflective foster homes specified in collaboration with the Co-Neutrals for the reporting period.

Metric i: Culturally Reflective Foster Home Recruitment Target

Percent of yearly target reached statewide for newly licensed foster homes by race/ethnicity.

Secondary Metric

The State can provide as a secondary metric the number of foster care resource homes newly licensed during the reporting year.

Secondary Metric Language

The sum number of foster care resource homes which were newly licensed during the reporting period.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

115 foster care resource homes were newly licensed during the reporting year

2020 Results:

70 foster care resource homes were newly licensed during the reporting year

Appendix B: Target Outcome 7.1

At least 40% of children in out-of-home care will be placed with kin; CYFD will use Seneca Family Finding software to attempt to identify and locate family members for every Child in State Custody within 48 hours of entering State custody.

Note: Children in the following settings are not considered in out of home placements: Trial Home Visit, Protective Supervision, Detention, Runaway, Temporary Absence, Acute hospitalizations (i.e., Any placement with "Institution Daily Rate" service code for children under age 6, any placements with IDR service code that is shorter than 30 days for children 6+)

Metric i: Placements with Kin

Percent of children in state custody (CISC) in out-of-home care on December 31st of the reporting year who are placed with kin, including fictive kin.

As a note, this metric has an exclusion of any child that has been in CYFD legal custody for less than 8 days.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

29.33% of children in state custody in out-of-home care on December 31st of the reporting year were placed with kin, including fictive kin (576/1964)

2020 Results:

34.78% of children in state custody in out-of-home care on December 31st of the reporting year were placed with kin, including fictive kin (635/1826)

Supplemental Information

As supplemental information, the State will provide a count and percentage, using the same sampling parameters listed above, of CISC for whom the current placement is both a kinship placement and the first placement within the episode of custody.

2019 Results:

Count: 166

Percentage: 8.45% (166/1964)

2020 Results:

Count: 249

Percentage: 13.64% (249/1826)

Appendix B: Target Outcome 8.1

For children under 18 in out-of-home care, the rate of moves from a placement setting shall not exceed three moves per 1,000 days in care. The educational consequences of a change in placement must be considered in all placement change determinations and must be discussed at Individualized Planning Process meeting and any change in placement that impacts the child's education must be accompanied by a written plan to ensure continuity in the child's education.

Metric i: Placement moves

Of all children in state custody during the reporting year, the rate of placement moves per 1,000 person-days in foster care within said reporting year.

As a note, the DVP mentions the following exclusion: “Children will be excluded from placement counts and days in care upon turning 18.”

Note: Following logic for the federal metric this was modeled after, the number of days in custody (not just in placement) were counted. Note that per the DVP, children in care less than 8 days and any care days after the child's 18th birthday were excluded.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

3.12 moves per 1,000 person-days (3356/1075188)

2020 Results:

2.69 moves per 1,000 person-days (2408/894860)

Appendix B: Target Outcome 9.1

Of all children in care for 12-23 months at the start of a 12-month period, 40% will achieve permanency within 12 months of the start of that period.

Metric i: Children achieving permanency

Of all children in care on the first day of a 12-month period who had been in care (in that episode) between 12 and 23 months, the percentage that are discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

37.32% of children in care on the first day of the 12 month period, who had been in care between 12 and 23 months, were discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day (231/619)

2020 Results:

42.53% of children in care on the first day of the 12 month period, who had been in care between 12 and 23 months, were discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day (222/522)

Appendix B: Target Outcome 10.2

CYFD will fully implement the CYFD Workforce Development Plan.

Metric i: Compliance with caseload standards

Of all casework staff, the share who have primary caseloads consistent with the established caseload standards.

Secondary Metric

The State can provide as a secondary metric the average number of cases carried by casework staff, by county by quarter.

Secondary Metric Language

In all counties, the average caseload per case-carrying worker by worker type, during a reporting period. **Note: This metric was calculated by the State (Sarah Meadows)**

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

County	Average Investigations Caseloads			
	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19
Bernalillo	101.0	62.5	68.6	57.8
Chaves	22.6	14.6	14.7	17.3
Cibola	17.0	9.0	15.5	11.0
Colfax	45.0	30.0	40.0	51.0
Curry	12.5	10.8	9.6	8.0
Dona Ana	37.3	28.9	17.7	20.9
Eddy	41.5	17.0	11.4	22.0
Grant	11.8	10.8	17.3	23.0
Lea	15.8	11.3	15.5	17.0
Lincoln	13.0	4.7	8.8	12.3
Luna	28.5	16.0	17.7	25.5
McKinley	11.0	7.8	11.8	10.7
Otero	28.3	18.0	22.8	40.7
Quay	4.7	5.7	7.7	0.7
Rio Arriba	37.0	38.5	34.0	43.3
Roosevelt	6.5	8.0	9.0	5.0
San Juan	31.1	27.1	28.7	22.4
San Miguel	13.0	24.0	26.0	55.5
Sandoval	54.3	16.8	22.8	34.0
Santa Fe	25.8	16.4	28.8	23.2
Sierra	8.0	3.5	9.5	3.5
Socorro	10.5	6.0	11.3	8.0
Taos	40.5	29.0	30.3	34.3
Torrance	21.0	26.0	23.0	13.5
Valencia	50.7	37.0	15.2	28.8

County	Average PPW Caseloads			
	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19
Bernalillo	18.8	17.4	16.8	13.5
Chaves	27.3	28.0	18.0	18.5
Cibola	38.0	19.5	10.0	10.8
Colfax	16.0	16.0	14.0	18.0
Curry	45.5	33.0	19.0	16.8
Dona Ana	17.0	13.1	11.7	11.5
Eddy	23.3	21.3	21.0	20.0
Grant	10.5	10.5	11.5	10.0
Lea	24.4	28.0	37.3	24.0
Lincoln/Otero	27.7	27.7	14.6	19.3
Luna	7.0	8.0	18.0	9.5
McKinley	10.5	7.0	5.3	4.7
Quay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rio Arriba	n/a	35.0	23.0	20.7
Roosevelt	13.0	7.0	n/a	9.0
San Juan	12.9	12.9	13.7	14.9
San Miguel	34.5	25.0	24.3	26.7
Sandoval	21.5	8.5	15.0	12.0
Santa Fe	84.0	29.3	46.5	47.5
Sierra/Socorro	27.0	17.0	20.0	23.0
Taos	30.0	15.0	21.5	44.0
Torrance	12.3	12.0	8.0	10.3
Valencia	10.9	10.1	9.4	8.8

Average Placement Caseloads				
County	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19
Bernalillo	25.5	20.7	17.7	18.8
Chaves	19.5	12.3	18.5	20.0
Cibola	18.0	18.0	17.0	18.0
Colfax	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.0
Curry	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.7
Dona Ana	25.8	17.0	17.2	13.7
Eddy	14.0	16.5	14.5	16.0
Grant	26.0	23.0	10.5	11.5
Lea	44.0	23.0	25.0	25.5
Lincoln	7.0	6.0	n/a	6.0
Luna	18.0	18.0	17.0	16.0
McKinley	16.0	16.5	16.0	14.5
Otero	n/a	13.0	11.0	13.0
Quay	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rio Arriba	47.0	21.5	n/a	n/a
Roosevelt	17.0	14.0	11.0	9.0
San Juan	13.0	12.8	17.0	15.7
San Miguel	20.5	21.0	21.0	20.0
Sandoval	27.7	27.0	27.3	26.3
Santa Fe	66.0	35.5	n/a	n/a
Sierra/Soco	n/a	n/a	25.0	23.0
Taos	31.0	12.5	14.0	n/a
Torrance	10.0	13.0	11.0	11.0
Valencia	34.5	33.0	14.5	12.8

Average I-HS Caseloads				
County	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19
Bernalillo	12.2	5.5	5.2	5.5
Chaves	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.0
Cibola	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Colfax	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Curry	4.0	4.0	6.0	4.0
Dona Ana	9.0	3.9	5.4	10.0
Eddy	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Grant	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lea	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lincoln	2.0	2.0	n/a	n/a
Luna	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McKinley	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Otero	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0
Quay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rio Arriba	n/a	n/a	1.0	2.0
Roosevelt	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
San Juan	7.0	2.5	3.0	1.0
San Miguel	9.0	2.0	2.0	2.5
Sandoval	1.5	4.5	7.0	n/a
Santa Fe	4.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
Sierra	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Socorro	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Taos	8.0	7.0	6.5	7.0
Torrance	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Valencia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

2020 Results:

Average Investigations Caseloads				
County	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20
Bernalillo	43.6	17.0	16.5	11.7
Chaves	24.2	8.3	9.1	6.1
Cibola	10.0	8.5	17.0	5.0
Colfax	54.0	8.5	11.5	7.3
Curry	9.8	5.0	14.3	6.6
Dona Ana	22.8	11.0	15.2	11.5
Eddy	25.0	15.2	14.2	14.4
Grant	13.3	13.0	31.0	14.0
Lea	12.7	6.2	8.5	11.0
Lincoln	5.3	4.3	11.0	4.0
Luna	12.7	4.3	11.7	9.0
McKinley	11.5	10.5	14.7	10.3
Otero	36.0	10.5	25.5	15.8
Quay	4.5	4.0	9.0	1.7
Rio Arriba	179.0	146.0	53.0	17.0
Roosevelt	3.0	1.5	7.5	14.5
San Juan	23.1	10.6	15.8	13.9
San Miguel	30.3	11.0	17.0	9.5
Sandoval	66.0	30.0	21.3	13.0
Santa Fe	14.0	8.0	15.0	18.0
Sierra	10.0	6.5	9.0	10.0
Socorro	11.5	7.5	13.5	19.0
Taos	36.0	7.0	10.7	13.0
Torrance	41.0	16.0	24.0	7.5
Valencia	23.3	6.5	19.8	17.8

Average PPW Caseloads				
County	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20
Bernalillo	12.8	13.8	12.5	11.5
Chaves	15.3	19.7	24.4	29.8
Cibola	19.5	19.5	27.0	15.7
Colfax	18.0	19.0	8.5	7.5
Curry	14.6	13.0	10.7	10.5
Dona Ana	12.1	10.8	11.2	12.4
Eddy	17.2	18.2	20.2	32.7
Grant	16.5	15.0	16.0	28.0
Lea	23.5	31.0	19.2	17.2
Lincoln/Otero	17.2	13.3	14.8	10.8
Luna	9.5	4.5	3.0	4.5
McKinley	5.3	4.7	5.2	5.3
Quay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rio Arriba	14.8	14.2	11.3	15.3
Roosevelt	16.0	14.0	16.0	16.0
San Juan	12.3	13.3	13.4	12.6
San Miguel	31.3	22.3	18.8	18.4
Sandoval	21.3	16.3	18.0	24.5
Santa Fe	31.0	30.0	21.3	24.7
Sierra/Socorro	n/a	n/a	13.0	10.0
Taos	20.0	22.0	14.3	22.0
Torrance	11.3	11.3	10.3	8.0
Valencia	9.6	8.9	10.0	9.2

County	Average Placement Caseloads			
	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20
Bernalillo	19.4	19.4	18.7	15.9
Chaves	21.5	24.0	52.0	16.7
Cibola	17.0	16.0	18.0	n/a
Colfax	10.0	11.0	11.0	13.0
Curry	8.7	8.7	7.0	8.0
Dona Ana	13.4	13.6	16.2	16.1
Eddy	16.0	11.0	12.0	13.0
Grant	13.5	14.5	14.0	14.5
Lea	19.3	18.3	19.3	16.7
Lincoln	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0
Luna	18.0	16.0	12.0	11.0
McKinley	15.5	14.0	14.0	12.0
Otero	13.5	27.0	n/a	15.5
Quay	6.0	7.0	8.0	11.0
Rio Arriba	54.0	25.0	46.0	24.5
Roosevelt	9.0	n/a	n/a	6.0
San Juan	16.0	25.5	26.0	30.0
San Miguel	21.0	19.5	22.5	19.0
Sandoval	39.0	38.0	22.3	20.0
Santa Fe	69.0	32.5	31.5	21.3
Sierra/Socorro	24.0	24.0	22.0	21.0
Taos	27.0	29.0	14.5	15.0
Torrance	12.0	11.0	10.0	10.0
Valencia	17.5	13.2	12.4	16.0

County	Average I-HS Caseloads			
	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20
Bernalillo	5.9	7.2	4.8	5.7
Chaves	2.0	2.0	4.0	6.0
Cibola	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Colfax	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Curry	5.0	5.0	n/a	n/a
Dona Ana	5.0	4.4	4.8	3.3
Eddy	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Grant	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lea	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lincoln	n/a	2.0	1.0	2.0
Luna	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McKinley	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Otero	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Quay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rio Arriba	2.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Roosevelt	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
San Juan	4.0	4.0	6.0	4.0
San Miguel	3.0	5.0	4.5	4.0
Sandoval	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Santa Fe	n/a	3.0	1.5	5.0
Sierra	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Socorro	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Taos	7.0	6.5	9.0	4.5
Torrance	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Valencia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Note: Investigation cases are defined as families with an open case as of the last day of the quarter; permanency cases are children in state custody on the last day of the quarter; placement cases are resource families with an active relative or non-relative license on the last day of the quarter; and I-HS cases are families with an open Voluntary Services Intake on the last day of the quarter. Many counties do not have I-HS services provided by CYFD staff, hence the “n/a” values. At times, a county may create a VSI for services provided by a contractor in the community for case documentation purposes.

Numerators and denominators for all quarters, as well as average caseload calculations, are uploaded as a separate document for verification purposes.

Metric iii: Turnover rate for protective services workers

In a given reporting year, the rate of voluntary separations among caseworker staff positions per 100 days worked.

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

0.12 separations per 100 work days (81/69700)

2020 Results:

0.10 separations per 100 work days (83/81262)

Appendix C: Indian Child Welfare Act

Appendix C: Target Outcome 4.1

CYFD is committed to having Native Children in ICWA-preferred placements. By December 1, 2020, when a Native Child is in a non-ICWA-preferred placement, the placement will be reviewed every 30 Days.

Note: The state's data system is currently undergoing an upgrade to collect better information about ICWA-preferred placements in accordance with ICWA placement preferences. At this time, the state is using relative or fictive kin placements only as a proxy for ICWA-preferred placements and recognize that some ICWA-preferred placements may be with non-relatives. This proxy measure was approved by CYFD's Office of Tribal Affairs and amounts to a conservative approach to identifying ICWA-preferred placements.

Metric i: Time spent in non-ICWA preferred placements

Length of time Native American children spent in non-ICWA preferred placements.

Calculation Results

2020 Results:

0-30 Days	31-90 Days	91-120 Days	121-150 Days	151-180 Days	180+ Days
94	31	9	13	14	100

Secondary Metric

The State can provide as a secondary metric the length of time Native American Children spent in non-ICWA preferred placements that started on or after December 1, 2020.

Secondary Metric Language

Length of time Native American children spent in non-ICWA preferred placements that started on or after December 1, 2020.

Calculation Results

2020 Results:

0-30 Days	31-90 Days	91-120 Days	121-150 Days	151-180 Days	180+ Days
16	2	0	0	0	0

Supplemental Information

As supplemental information, the State will provide the percentage of placements where a court determination of non-ICWA preferred placement was the same as the CYFD determination. The denominator will include all Native American Children who have received an ICWA placement court determination.

2019 Results:

60.61% (20/33)

2020 Results:

58.96% (158/268)

Further breakdown of 2020 results (first full year that court determinations were available in the data):

	CYFD Det. Non-ICWA	CYFD Det. ICWA	Total Court Det.
Court Det. Non-ICWA	76	2	78
Court Det. ICWA	108	82	190
Total CYFD Det.	184	84	268

Note: The ICWA court determination was not captured in FACTS until summer of 2019.

Metric ii: Timely 30-day reviews of non-ICWA preferred placements

Percent of 30-day reviews for non-ICWA preferred placements conducted on time.

Calculation Results

2020 Results:

0% of 30-day review for non-ICWA preferred placements were conducted on time for the reporting year (0/1496)

Note: This was the expected result, as the Out-of-Preferred Placement 30-day Review process did not begin until March of 2021.

Appendix D: Behavioral Health Services

Appendix D: Target Outcome 4.1

Every Child in State Custody will receive a comprehensive well-child checkup

Metric i: Well-child checkups for CISC within 30 Days of Entering Custody

Of all episodes of custody longer than 30 days that began during the reporting year, the percent that included a well-child checkup within 30 days of the child entering State custody, as recorded by casework staff or reflected in Medicaid billing data.

EPSDT Codes (as of April 2022):

CPT Codes: Preventative Services <i>do not require use of a Z code</i>	Description	Age
99381	New patient	Infant < 1 year
99382	New patient	ages 1-4
99383	New patient	ages 5-11
99384	New patient	ages 12-17
99385	New patient	ages 18-39
99391	Established patient	Under one year
99392	Established patient	ages 1-4
99393	Established patient	ages 5-11
99394	Established patient	ages 12-17
99395	Established patient	ages 18-39
99460	Initial hospital or birthing center for normal newborn infant	
99461	Initial care in other than a hospital or birthing center for normal newborn infant	

CPT Codes: Evaluation and Management Codes <i>must be used in conjunction with at least one of the following Z diagnosis codes: Z00.00-Z00.129, Z00.8, Z02.89, and Z76.1-Z76.2</i>	Description
99202-99205	New patient
99213-99215	Established patient

Calculation Results

2019 Results:

45.74% of all episodes of custody longer than 30 days that began during the reporting year included a well-child checkup within 30 days of the child entering State custody (344/752)

2020 Results:

47.37% of all episodes of custody longer than 30 days that began during the reporting year included a well-child checkup within 30 days of the child entering State custody (369/779)