

Bulletin

August 18, 2010

Minnesota Department of Human Services □ P.O. Box 64964, St. Paul, MN 55164-0962

OF INTEREST TO

- County directors
- Social service supervisors
- Tribal directors
- Social service organizations

ACTION/DUE DATE

County directors and social services supervisors to review data to understand county performance on CCSA measures.

EXPIRATION DATE

August 18, 2012

CCSA Annual Performance Report: CY 2009 Data

TOPIC

The Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Annual Performance Report as required by Minnesota Statutes, Section 256M.80, subdivision 2.

PURPOSE

The CCSA report provides a numeric picture and informs county directors and social services supervisors of their county performance on CCSA measures. These annual reports complement ongoing efforts of the department and counties/tribes in advancing the overall goal of keeping Minnesota's children safe and improving their well-being. In the 2010-11 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreements, counties narrated issues, strategies and tools being used to improve CCSA outcomes. These are summarized and included as a resource under each CCSA measure.

CONTACT

The department encourages feedback and comments on issues relating to this bulletin. Phone or e-mail:

Paul H. Ramcharit
(651) 431-3877, or paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us
Minnesota Department of Human Services
PO Box 64962
St. Paul, MN 55164-0962

SIGNED

ERIN SULLIVAN SUTTON
Assistant Commissioner
Children and Family Services Administration

Bulletin #10-69-04
August 18, 2010
Page 2

The "CCSA Annual Performance Report: Calendar Year 2009 Data" can be accessed using the link below:

<https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/Public/DHS-6241-ENG>

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Advisory

This information is available in alternative formats to individuals with disabilities by calling (651) 431-4671 (voice). TTY users can call through Minnesota Relay at (800) 627-3529. For Speech-to-Speech, call (877) 627-3848. For additional assistance with legal rights and protections for equal access to human services programs, contact your agency's ADA coordinator.



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Annual Performance Report

Calendar Year 2009 Data

August 2010

Questions or feedback on this report should be submitted to:

Paul H. Ramcharit

(651) 431-3877, or paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us

Minnesota Department of Human Services

P.O. Box 64962

St. Paul, MN 55164-0962

TOC

Table of Contents

	Page
Section 1: Introduction	
Background	3
Changes to children's mental health measure	3
Revised CCSA baseline	3
Federal measures	4
State measures	4
Interpreting performance data	5
Issues and strategies identified by counties	5
Technical notes	6
Section II: Performance Summary	
Overall performance	7
Outstanding performance by counties and regions	8
Performance by racial/ethnic groups	8
Section III: Performance Score Card	
County performance score card in meeting standards/showing improvement across measures	10
County performance score card within economic development regions	11
Section IV: Detailed Tables	
Non-recurrence of child abuse within six months	14
Re-entered foster care within 12 months	18
Reunified within 12 months	23
Adopted within 24 months of last removal from home	27
Two or fewer placement settings	31
Non-recurrence of child abuse within 12 months	35
Health examination within one year	38
Received mental health screening	42
Section V: Performance by Racial/Ethnic Groups	
Re-entered foster care within 12 months	45
Reunified within 12 months	48
Two or fewer placement settings	52
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Advisory	58

SECTION 1

Section 1: Introduction

Background

Legislation enacted in 2003 created the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and the Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) consolidated funds. The Minnesota Department of Human Services administers these consolidated funds in a combined Biennial Service Agreement with counties. A service agreement includes MFIP and CCSA measures and statistics for counties to monitor their performance and set targets to improve outcomes for children and families.

MFIP outcomes and measures are defined in legislation and include the three-year MFIP Self-support Index, MFIP Work Participation Rate, and Promoting Equity in MFIP Outcomes. The department issues quarterly Management Indicators reports that provide statistics on MFIP outcome measures.

CCSA outcomes and measures are not defined in legislation. After consolidation in 2003, the department, county staff and other key stakeholders, adopted 10 federal and state measures to assess outcomes for children in four program areas: (1) children's mental health, (2) child safety, (3) child permanency, and (4) child well-being. Six of these 10 measures mirror federal measures.

The six federal measures were part of the federal regulations that set forth requirements of the Child and Family Service Reviews (CFSRs), and applied as performance standards during the first round of CFSRs conducted in all 50 states from 2001-04.

Prior to the second round of CFSRs, the federal Administration for Children and Families announced new and revised federal standards to assess each state's performance. The Minnesota Department of Human Services [department] transitioned the state and counties to these 17 new and revised federal child welfare measures in 2008-09. Beginning in CY 2008, five of the new and revised federal measures were adopted into CCSA, replacing the previous six.

Changes to children's mental health measure

Starting this reporting period, the department's Children's Mental Health division is changing one of the CCSA performance measures. The current *showed improved mental health* measure has encountered barriers in serving as an accurate and robust children's mental health performance measure. The division is withdrawing this measure and more information on a new measure will be forthcoming.

Revised CCSA baseline

Statutes require that the Commissioner of Human Services establish baselines and desired improvements under the four program areas of mental health, safety, permanency and well-being. Given the adoption of revised federal measures in the second round of Child and Family Services Review (CFSRs), CY 2008 data was designated as the revised baseline to gauge and track future CCSA performance.

The CCSA Annual Performance Report uses a consistent methodology to gauge county performance for federal and state standards and the way improvements are tracked across CCSA measures. While meeting federal and state standards is the paramount expectation of performance, showing improvement is also important. In the CCSA report, the department highlights performances that reflect improvement whether or not such performances are meeting the federal and state standards.

As a note of clarification in the last CCSA publication, the department's Children's Mental Health Division has set progressively higher standards for subsequent years for the MH screening measure with expectation of higher performance and within the context of the 2010-11 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreements. However, for consistency in CCSA baseline reporting and tracking improvement in performance, the MH screening standard for CCSA reporting is set at the CY 2008 75th percentile performance which equals 62.6 percent.

The new and revised CCSA performance measures including outcomes and standards are described below:

Federal measures

Reduced recurrence of maltreatment

Of all children who were victims of substantiated child abuse/neglect during the last six months of the prior calendar year, what percentage did not have another substantiated/determined report *within six months*? *This standard is met if 94.6 percent or more children did not have another determined report within six months.*

Reduced return to out-of-home placement

Of all children who were discharged (discharged to live with parents, primary caretakers or other relatives) from foster care to reunification in the 12-month period prior to the target year, what percent re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge? *This standard is met if 9.9 percent or fewer children did not re-enter foster care within 12 months.*

Timeliness to reunification

Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the target year, and who had been in foster care for eight days or longer, what percent were reunified (reunification with parents, primary caretakers or other relatives) in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home? *This standard is met if 75.2 percent or more children were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

Timeliness to adoption

Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption during the target year, what percent were discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the latest removal from home? *This standard is met if 36.6 percent or more children exited out-of-home placement to adoption in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

Placement stability

Of all children who were served in foster care during the target year, and who were in foster care for at least eight days, but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? *This standard is met if 86.0 percent or more children had two or fewer placement settings.*

State measures

Reduced recurrence of maltreatment

Of all children who were victims of substantiated child abuse/neglect during the last six months of the prior calendar year, what percentage did not have another substantiated/determined report *within 12 months*? *This standard is met if 91.5 percent of children did not have another determined report within 12 months.* The standard of 91.5 percent was the statewide average performance in CY 2008, revised as a result of county feedback.

Received adequate services to meet physical needs

What percentage of children in out-of-home placement longer than 30 days during the reporting period received a health exam within one year? *This standard is met if 63.5 percent or more children received a health exam.*

Received adequate services to meet mental health needs

What percentage of eligible children in child protective services or out-of-home placement during the reporting period received a mental health screening? *This standard is met if 62.6 percent or more children received a mental health screening.*

Interpreting performance data

While federal standards were designed to measure performance at the state level, they were adapted to be used at the county level on measures adopted into CCSA. Given the great fluctuation in numbers for some measures, especially among smaller counties, county performance rates can be less stable. For example, in some measures like repeat maltreatment, small numbers like one or two children can make a dramatic difference in the recurrence rate. Keeping in mind that data on these measures reflects a part of the broader range of efforts of counties, caution and a balanced approach should be used when interpreting and using these performance data.

Counties also reported that while a particular measure is intended to measure specific activities in fulfillment of a performance outcome, a judge or other key stakeholders may make a decision deemed contrary to the particular measure as a result of a child's unique situation. As such, counties report that their activities and priorities are first and foremost driven by the best interests of a child even if at odds with performance measures. While counties work to affect change to increase positive outcomes for children, some activities are outside of their control. This is understandable given the many key partners and stakeholders involved in decision making in the life of a child in the child welfare system.

Counties play a key leadership role in these efforts, and engaging others in a cooperative partnership is crucial to achieving better outcomes for children. The department continues to encourage and support county leadership and engagement with key decision-makers in a child's life, sharing common goals. It is advised that a balanced approach be taken when interpreting performance statistics as agency staff work with other key providers and decision makers to keep Minnesota's children safe and improve their well-being.

Issues and strategies identified by counties

At the bottom of each detailed table in Section IV is a summary of issues and strategies. These issues and strategies were noted by counties in their MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement submitted to the department. They are summarized in this report for information-sharing.

While most of these strategies are not new, they will serve as a checklist reminder of activities that could potentially lead to better outcomes for children and families. Some strategies are more innovative, as some counties work to address the more persistent barriers and challenges they encounter working with families and other key stakeholders in the child welfare system.

The names of counties were removed from the summaries. However, if a specific strategy is of particular interest, contact the department and the name of the county (ies) and contact information for that strategy will be provided for follow-up. The department encourages county social service supervisors to review and discuss these issues and strategies with staff, and use this report as a tool to produce better results for the children and families served.

Technical notes

While CCSA legislation covers activities by counties, performance data by the two tribes from the American Indian Child Welfare Initiative—Leech Lake and White Earth—are included to correctly reflect the statewide aggregate performance.

Racial/ethnic performance is published for three measures, re-entry, reunification and two or fewer placement settings.

SECTION 2

Section II: Performance Summary

Overall performance

Overall, counties are performing well on CCSA measures. Of the five federal measures currently used in CCSA, the state met the federal standard on four. While the state continues to struggle to meet the federal standard on the foster care re-entry measure, the data shows that more than half of the counties are making improvements on this measure. Overall, counties are doing well; nearly all counties showed improvement from the previous year in at least one measure.

Reduce repeat maltreatment within six months (standard is 94.6 percent or higher)

Minnesota met this federal standard in 2009 with a performance of 95.3 percent, an improvement of nearly half a percent from 2008. The majority of counties (71.2 percent) also met this standard, and one fifth (19.5 percent) showed improvement from 2008. Most of the counties that showed improvement were already meeting the standard.

Reduce re-entry into foster care (standard is 9.9 percent or lower)

Minnesota's 2009 performance of 24.0 percent is still far from achieving the federal standard of 9.9 percent or lower. However, while just 11.5 percent of counties met the standard, more than half (56.3 percent) showed improvement from the previous year, giving the state an overall improvement of 2.1 percent from 2008.

Increase reunification within 12 months (standard is 75.2 percent or higher)

Minnesota met this standard with a performance of 83.7 percent. While this performance declined by 2.4 percent from the previous year, the vast majority of counties (87.3 percent) met this standard, and nearly half (47.1 percent) showed improvement.

Increase adoption within 24 months (standard is 36.6 percent or higher)

Minnesota met this standard with a performance of 47.0 percent, slightly down from 50.3 percent in 2008. Nearly half of the counties (47.1 percent) also met this standard, and close to a quarter (22.9 percent) showed improvement from 2008. Five fewer counties met the standard in 2009 than 2008, which is reflected in the slight drop in the annual rate.

Increase the number of two or fewer placement settings (standard is 86.0 percent or higher)

This standard was met evenly with a performance of 86.0 percent; performance in 2009 remained relatively unchanged from 2008. Seventy percent (70.1 percent) of counties met the standard (7 percent, or six more counties than 2008); 47 percent showed improvement from 2008.

Increase health examinations (standard is 63.5 percent or higher)

The statewide performance on this measure was 57.4 percent, an improvement of 1.7 percent from 2008. Twenty-nine counties (33.3 percent) met the standard in 2009 compared to 21 (24.1 percent) in 2008. Fifty-five percent of counties showed improvement on this measure from the previous year. Counties report in the 2010-11 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement that health exams are being conducted, but are not entered into the Social Service Information System (SSIS), data used for this report. The majority of counties stated that they will work with staff to ensure data entries are completed.

Increase mental health screening (standard is 62.6 percent or higher)

Statewide performance was 55.3 percent in 2009, an improvement of 11.7 percent from 2008; seven more counties were meeting the standard in 2009 than in 2008.

Outstanding performance by counties and regions

While virtually all counties performed well or showed improvement in one or more measures, some regions and counties are highlighted below for overall outstanding performance. A summary of all county performance across CCSA measures is presented in the tables in Section III:

Counties within the following regions met federal and state standards on most CCSA measures:

- Southwest (Region 8)
- Upper Southwest (Region 6W)
- Southwest Central (Region 6E)

Counties within the following regions achieved highest performance in 2008 and 2009 and/or showed improvement on most measures:

- Southwest (Region 8)
- North Central (Region 5)

The following counties met federal and state standards on all but one of the measures:

- Chippewa
- Jackson
- Olmsted
- Yellow Medicine
- Grant
- Marshall
- Scott

Also note worthy, the following counties met federal and state standards on all but two of the measures: Becker, Clearwater, Cottonwood, Dakota, Faribault/Martin, Freeborn, Isanti, Itasca, Lake of the Woods, McLeod, Meeker, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Nobles, Pipestone, Red Lake, Sibley and Swift.

Performance by racial/ethnic groups

A county is said to have a gap when the difference between the performance of whites and each of the other racial/ethnic groups is five percentage points or more. Performance data by racial/ethnic groups are published for three measures, re-entry, reunification and two or fewer placements. Data at the county level are published for racial/ethnic groups when the numerator for a measure is 10 or more, and there are at least two racial/ethnic groups in a county.

Reduce re-entry into foster care (standard is 9.9 percent or lower)

In general, re-entry rates are high across the state; none of the racial/ethnic groups, including whites, met the federal re-entry standard. Statewide, no racial/ethnic groups had a performance gap of five percentage points or more in 2009. Statewide, in 2008, the American Indian group underperformed whites by 8.9 percent. This was reduced to 4.1 percent in 2009.

However, at the county level, performance gaps of five percentage points or more continue to exist for the American Indian group in Hennepin and St. Louis counties; for blacks in Hennepin County, and two or more races in Ramsey County. It should also be noted that Hispanics in Ramsey County showed the best percentage improvement, reducing re-entry rate from 24.1 percent in 2008 to 16.3 percent in 2009.

Re-entry rates by racial/ethnic groups and percentage difference from performance of whites

Description	2008		2009	
	Re-entry rate	Diff. from whites	Re-entry rate	Diff. from whites
State	26.1%	-0.1%	24.0%	0.1%
Asian	28.6%	2.4%	21.5%	-2.4%
Black	25.2%	-1.0%	24.4%	0.5%
American Indian	35.1%	8.9%	28.1%	4.2%
White	26.2%	-	24.0%	-
Hispanic	22.4%	-3.8%	19.9%	-4.0%
Two or more races	27.7%	5.3%	25.3%	1.4%

Increase reunification within 12 months (standard is 75.2 percent or higher)

All racial/ethnic groups in the table below met the reunification standard of 75.2 percent or more. The Asian group performed the best with 86.0 percent, and American Indians the lowest at 77.9 percent, a gap of -6.3 percent from whites. Over the past two years, Hennepin County continued to have gaps of more than 5 percentage points for the American Indian group.

Reunification rates by racial/ethnic groups and percentage difference from performance of whites

Description	2008		2009	
	Reunification rate	Diff. from whites	Reunification rate	Diff. from whites
State	86.1%	-0.2%	83.7%	-0.5%
Asian	88.9%	2.6%	86.0%	1.8%
Black	88.0%	1.7%	83.7%	-0.5%
American Indian	81.6%	-4.7%	77.9%	-6.3%
White	86.3%	-	84.2%	-
Hispanic	84.8%	-1.5%	85.2%	1.0%
Two or more races	82.4%	-3.9%	83.9%	-0.3%

Increase the number of two or fewer placement settings (standard is 86.0 percent or higher)

Statewide, whites had the highest rate for two or fewer placement settings at 88.0 percent, 2 percent higher than the overall state performance. All groups, except whites and Asians did not meet the performance standard, but they were all short by just a few percentage points.

At the county level, the two or more races group had performance gaps for 2008 and 2009 in Hennepin and Ramsey counties, for blacks in Blue Earth and Stearns counties, for American Indians in Becker and Hennepin counties, and for Hispanics in Anoka and Hennepin counties.

Two or fewer placement setting rates by racial/ethnic groups and percentage difference from performance of whites

Description	2008		2009	
	Two or fewer placement rate	Diff. from whites	Two or fewer placement rate	Diff. from whites
State	86.1%	-1.9%	86.0%	-2.0%
Asian	91.9%	3.9%	87.7%	-0.3%
Black	81.7%	-6.3%	83.5%	-4.5%
American Indian	83.5%	-4.5%	83.5%	-4.5%
White	88.0%	-	88.0%	-
Hispanic	85.4%	-2.6%	84.6%	-3.4%
Two or more races	79.8%	-5.6%	84.7%	-3.3%

SECTION 3

Section III: Performance Score Card

County performance score card in meeting standards/showing improvement across measures

Performance status	No repeat maltreatment		Re-entry	Re-unification	Adoption	Two or fewer placements	Health exam	MH screening
	< 6 mths	< 12 mths						
Standard and state performance								
Standard	94.6% ↑	91.5% ↑	9.9% ↓	75.2% ↑	36.6% ↑	86.0% ↑	63.5% ↑	62.6% ↑
CY 2008 performance	94.9%✓	91.5%✓	26.1%✗	86.1%✓	50.3%✓	86.1%✓	55.7%✗	43.6%✗
CY 2009 performance	95.3%✓	93.0%✓	24.0%✗	83.7%✓	47.0%✓	86.0%✓	57.4%✗	55.3%✗
2009 performance status of counties (number and percent of counties)								
Standard met—perfect perform. in 2008 and 2009	39	30	6	3	6	6	0	1
	44.8%	34.5%	6.9%	3.4%	6.9%	6.9%	0.0%	1.1%
Standard met and showed improvement from 2008	16	24	4	41	17	35	21	25
	18.4%	27.6%	4.6%	47.1%	19.5%	40.2%	24.1%	28.7%
Standard met	7	10	0	32	18	20	8	5
	8.0%	11.5%	0.0%	36.8%	20.7%	23.0%	9.2%	5.7%
Standard not met but showed improvement from 2008	1	2	45	0	3	6	27	29
	1.1%	2.3%	51.7%	0.0%	3.4%	6.9%	31.0%	33.3%
Standard not met	16	13	32	11	26	20	31	27
	18.4%	14.9%	36.8%	12.6%	29.9%	23.0%	35.6%	31.0%
No data in 2009	8	8	0	0	17	0	0	0
	9.2%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	19.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total counties	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2009 performance summary of counties (duplicated)								
Counties that met standard	62	64	10	76	41	61	29	31
	71.2%	73.6%	11.5%	87.3%	47.1%	70.1%	33.3%	35.5%
Counties that showed improvement	17	26	49	41	20	41	48	54
	19.5%	29.9%	56.3%	47.1%	22.9%	47.1%	55.1%	62.0%

↓ = or lower; ↑ = or higher; ✓ = standard met; ✗ = standard not met

County performance score card within economic development regions

Table key

Key	Description
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008
✓	Standard met
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008
X	Standard not met
-	No data in 2009

County performance score card within economic development regions

State/county/tribe	Repeat maltreatment		Foster-care re-entry	Reunification	Adoption	Two or fewer placements	Health exam	MH screening
	6 Months	12 Months						
STATE	✓+	✓+	X+	✓	✓	✓	X+	X+
NORTHWEST (1)								
Kittson	✓	✓	✓+	X	-	✓+	X	X
Marshall	✓✓	✓✓	✓+	X	✓	✓+	✓+	✓+
Norman	-	-	X+	X	✓+	X	X	✓+
Pennington	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	✓+	✓+	X	X+
Polk	X	✓	X+	✓	X	X	✓+	✓+
Red Lake	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓+	-	✓✓	X	X+
Roseau	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	X	X	X	X
HEADWATERS (2)								
Beltrami	✓✓	✓+	X	✓	X	✓+	X	X+
Clearwater	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	-	✓+	✓+	X
Hubbard	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	X	✓	X+	X
Lake of the Woods	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	-	✓✓	✓	X
Mahnomen	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	-	X+	✓+	X+
NORTHEAST (3)								
Aitkin	✓✓	X	X+	✓	✓✓	X	✓+	✓+
Carlton	✓✓	✓✓	X+	X	X	✓+	X	✓+
Cook	-	-	X+	✓+	✓	✓✓	X+	X+
Itasca	✓+	✓+	X	✓	-	✓	X+	✓+
Koochiching	X	X	X+	✓	-	X	X	X
Lake	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	X+	✓+	✓+	X+
St. Louis	✓+	✓+	X	✓	X	X	X+	X+
WEST CENTRAL (4)								
Becker	✓	✓+	X+	✓+	✓	X+	✓	✓+
Clay	✓	✓+	X	X	✓	X	X+	X+
Douglas	X	X	X+	✓+	✓+	✓+	X+	X+
Grant	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓+	✓	✓	✓	X
Otter Tail	✓+	✓+	X	✓	✓	✓+	X	X+
Pope	✓+	✓+	X+	✓	X	X	X	X+
Stevens	X	X	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	X+	X+
Traverse	-	-	X	✓✓	-	✓✓	X	✓+
Wilkin	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	-	✓	X+	X

State/county/tribe	Repeat maltreatment		Foster-care re-entry	Reunification	Adoption	Two or fewer placements	Health exam	MH screening
	6 Months	12 Months						
STATE	✓+	✓+	X+	✓	✓	✓	X+	X+
NORTH CENTRAL (5)								
Cass	X	X	X+	✓+	X	✓+	X+	X+
Crow Wing	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	✓+	✓+	X+	X+
Morrison	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	X	✓	✓+	✓+
Todd	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	✓	✓+	X	X
Wadena	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	✓	✓+	X	X
SOUTHWEST CENTRAL (6E)								
Kandiyohi	X	✓+	X	✓	✓	✓	X+	X+
McLeod	✓+	✓+	X	✓	✓+	✓+	✓+	X
Meeker	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	✓	✓+	X	✓+
Renville	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	-	✓	X	X
UPPER SOUTHWEST (6W)								
Big Stone	✓✓	✓+	X	X	-	X	✓+	X+
Chippewa	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓+	X	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Lac qui Parle	-	-	✓✓	✓+	-	✓	X+	X
Swift	✓+	✓+	X+	✓+	✓✓	X+	✓+	✓
Yellow Medicine	-	-	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	✓+	✓
EAST CENTRAL (7E)								
Chisago	X	X	X	✓	X	X	✓+	X
Isanti	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	✓✓	✓+	X	✓+
Kanabec	-	-	X	✓	-	✓+	X	X+
Mille Lacs	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	✓	✓	X	✓
Pine	✓✓	✓+	X	X	✓+	X	X	X
CENTRAL (7W)								
Benton	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓+	X+	✓+
Sherburne	X	X	✓+	✓	X	X	✓+	✓+
Stearns	✓✓	✓	X+	✓	X	✓	✓+	X
Wright	✓+	✓	X+	X	X+	X+	X+	X+
SOUTHWEST (8)								
Cottonwood	✓+	✓+	X+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	X
Jackson	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+
Nobles	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓	✓✓	✓	✓+	X
Pipestone	✓✓	✓✓	✓+	✓+	-	✓+	X	X+
Redwood	✓+	✓+	X+	✓+	X	✓	X	✓+
Rock	-	-	X+	✓+	-	✓	X+	X
Lincoln-Lyon-Murray	✓✓	✓	X+	✓+	X	✓+	X+	✓+
SOUTH CENTRAL (9)								
Blue Earth	X	X	X	✓+	X	✓	X	X+
Brown	X	X	X+	✓+	✓	X+	X+	X+
Le Sueur	X	X	X+	✓	✓+	✓+	X	X+
Nicollet	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	✓✓	✓+	X	X
Sibley	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓	-	✓+	✓+	X
Waseca	X	X	X+	✓+	✓+	✓✓	X+	X+
Watsonwan	✓✓	✓+	X	✓+	X	X+	X+	X+
Faribault-Martin	✓+	✓+	X	✓	✓	✓+	✓	X

State/county/tribe	Repeat maltreatment		Foster-care re-entry	Reunification	Adoption	Two or fewer placements	Health exam	MH screening
	6 Months	12 Months						
STATE	✓+	✓+	X+	✓	✓	✓	X+	X+
SOUTHEAST (10)								
Dodge	X	✓	X	✓	✓✓	X	X	X
Fillmore	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	X	✓	X	✓+
Freeborn	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓+	✓+	✓+	X	✓+
Goodhue	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓+	✓+	X	X	X+
Houston	-	-	X	✓+	✓+	✓	X	X
Mower	✓+	✓+	X+	✓+	X	✓+	X+	✓+
Olmsted	✓✓	✓✓	X+	✓	✓	✓+	✓+	✓
Rice	X	X	X	✓+	✓	✓+	✓+	✓+
Steele	X	✓+	X+	✓+	✓+	✓	X+	✓+
Wabasha	✓	✓	X+	✓+	-	X	✓+	X
Winona	X	X	X+	✓+	X	X	X	✓+
TWIN CITIES METRO (11)								
Anoka	✓+	✓+	X+	✓	✓+	✓+	X+	X+
Carver	✓	X+	X+	✓+	X	X	X+	X
Dakota	✓+	✓+	X+	✓+	✓+	✓	X+	✓
Hennepin	X+	X+	X+	✓	✓	X	✓	X+
Ramsey	✓+	✓+	X+	✓	X+	✓	X+	X+
Scott	✓	✓+	X	✓	✓+	✓	✓	✓+
Washington	✓+	✓+	X	X	✓	X	X	X+

Section IV: Detailed Tables

Non-recurrence of child abuse within six months

Of all children who were victims of substantiated child abuse/neglect during the last six months of the prior calendar year (CY 2008), what percentage did not have another substantiated/determined report within six months? (CY 2009) *This standard is met if 94.6 percent or more children did not have another determined report within six months.*

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	39	44.8%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	16	18.4%
✓	Standard met	7	8.0%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	1	1.1%
X	Standard not met	16	18.4%
-	No data in 2009	8	9.2%

State/county/tribe	Determined victims		Repeat maltreatment within six months?				Non-recurrence rate		Performance score card
	Jul-Dec '07	Jul-Dec '08			No				
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	2,938	2,523	151	119	2,787	2,404	94.9%	95.3%	✓+
Aitkin	18	9			18	9	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Anoka	170	112	3	1	167	111	98.2%	99.1%	✓+
Becker	51	23	4		47	23	92.2%	100.0%	✓
Beltrami	41	36			41	36	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Benton	17	26		1	17	25	100.0%	96.2%	✓
Big Stone	3	7			3	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Blue Earth	57	41	2	3	55	38	96.5%	92.7%	x
Brown	39	29	1	5	38	24	97.4%	82.8%	x
Carlton	8	13			8	13	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Carver	27	20	3		24	20	88.9%	100.0%	✓
Cass	2	4		1	2	3	100.0%	75.0%	x
Chippewa	2	1			2	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Chisago	6	13		1	6	12	100.0%	92.3%	x
Clay	29	29	1	1	28	28	96.6%	96.6%	✓
Clearwater	5	10			5	10	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Cook	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Cottonwood	4	7	1		3	7	75.0%	100.0%	✓+
Crow Wing	12	12			12	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Dakota	167	182	14	7	153	175	91.6%	96.2%	✓+
Dodge	8	12		1	8	11	100.0%	91.7%	x
Douglas	26	17		5	26	12	100.0%	70.6%	x
Fillmore	2	6			2	6	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Freeborn	28	4			28	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓

State/county/tribe	Determined victims		Repeat maltreatment within six months?				Non-recurrence rate		Performance score card
	Jul-Dec '07	Jul-Dec '08			No				
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	2,938	2,523	151	119	2,787	2,404	94.9%	95.3%	✓+
Goodhue	10	6			10	6	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Grant	2	2			2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Hennepin	883	866	71	58	812	808	92.0%	93.3%	x+
Houston	5	0			5		100.0%		-
Hubbard	7	10			7	10	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Isanti	22	12			22	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Itasca	28	23	1		27	23	96.4%	100.0%	✓+
Jackson	5	2			5	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Kanabec	6	0			6		100.0%		-
Kandiyohi	44	33	2	2	42	31	95.5%	93.9%	x
Kittson	0	3			0	3		100.0%	✓
Koochiching	3	2		2	3	0	100.0%	0.0%	x
Lac qui Parle	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Lake	3	5			3	5	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Lake of the Woods	4	4			4	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Le Sueur	13	17		2	13	15	100.0%	88.2%	x
McLeod	28	9	4		24	9	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Mahnomen	2	2			2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Marshall	4	3			4	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Meeker	4	7			4	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Mille Lacs	30	24			30	24	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Morrison	14	12			14	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Mower	20	10	1		19	10	95.0%	100.0%	✓+
Nicollet	16	11			16	11	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Nobles	6	8			6	8	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Norman	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Olmsted	22	5			22	5	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Otter Tail	53	22	3	1	50	21	94.3%	95.5%	✓+
Pennington	7	1			7	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Pine	18	26			18	26	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Pipestone	6	3			6	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Polk	24	28	1	2	23	26	95.8%	92.9%	x
Pope	7	5	1		6	5	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Ramsey	277	216	11	6	266	210	96.0%	97.2%	✓+
Red Lake	2	2			2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Redwood	9	7	1		8	7	88.9%	100.0%	✓+
Renville	2	8			2	8	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Rice	32	21		2	32	19	100.0%	90.5%	x
Rock	1	0			1		100.0%		-
Roseau	1	1			1	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
St. Louis	125	117	11	1	114	116	91.2%	99.1%	✓+
Scott	89	25		1	89	24	100.0%	96.0%	✓
Sherburne	54	20	2	2	52	18	96.3%	90.0%	x

State/county/tribe	Determined victims		Repeat maltreatment within six months?				Non-recurrence rate		Performance score card
	Jul-Dec '07	Jul-Dec '08			No				
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	2,938	2,523	151	119	2,787	2,404	94.9%	95.3%	✓+
Sibley	9	4			9	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Stearns	33	40			33	40	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Steele	10	12		1	10	11	100.0%	91.7%	×
Stevens	2	2		1	2	1	100.0%	50.0%	×
Swift	6	14	1		5	14	83.3%	100.0%	✓+
Todd	2	7			2	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Traverse	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Wabasha	0	1			0	1		100.0%	✓
Wadena	5	12			5	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Waseca	8	8		1	8	7	100.0%	87.5%	×
Washington	78	72	4	2	74	70	94.9%	97.2%	✓+
Watonwan	9	1			9	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Wilkin	2	3			2	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Winona	29	19		9	29	10	100.0%	52.6%	×
Wright	53	37	2		51	37	96.2%	100.0%	✓+
Yellow Medicine	1	0			1		100.0%		-
Lincoln-Lyon-Murray	6	5			6	5	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Faribault-Martin	64	39	6		58	39	90.6%	100.0%	✓+
Leech Lake tribe		22				22		100.0%	
White Earth band		34				34		100.0%	

County responses to reducing repeat maltreatment

Issues

- Over confidence in the new safety planning approach.
- Confusion about past harm, current and future danger, and agency responsibilities to ensure safety for children.
- Some families are very isolated particularly if they have moved to Minnesota from out-of-state, and those that are cut off from extended families.
- Challenged by increased violence in society, together with lowering of family income and quality of life.
- Societal factors that are beyond the agency's ability to control, or successfully influence behavior.
- Historically, local law enforcement often chose to be involved in reports that do not require a traditional investigation. Law enforcement are now more open to having social services initiate an assessment without their involvement, and social workers are open to completing a Family Assessment even if law enforcement is also completing an investigation.

Strategies

- Utilize wraparound teams, appropriate services and agreed upon safety plans to develop safety networks for families. Support families in establishing and maintaining safe environments for children.
- Increase services to families, and for out-of-home placements, extend placement until stability of home by parents is demonstrated before reunification.
- Provide services to families at the onset of the child protection process, and upon child's return home. Agency will assess, monitor and provide services to parents to meet their physical, mental and chemical health issues. Set up a safety plan with the family upon reunification.

- Engage fathers more quickly during the case management process. The method of intervention is based on partnering with families rather than litigating with them. The focus of intervention is safety for the children and support for families. There has been extensive and intensive training of staff in this methodology.
- Have unit consultations prior to closing traditional investigation case management workgroups to better ensure that closing is an appropriate action.
- Keep cases open for monitoring and support for at least four to six months after the child returns home to help ensure the parent(s) continue to maintain stability. Thus, able to utilize additional resources if needed, with the goal of prevention.
- Partner with several neighborhood-based early interventions, collaborative programs. Engage community-based agencies to provide an array of early intervention services to families at high risk of entering the child protection system. Connect families to community-based resources to prevent families from entering or re-entering the child protection system; families tend to be more engaged with community-based resources as they are geographically closer and more culturally and linguistically specific.

Tools

- Conduct a thorough assessment of family needs prior to case closing; longer term treatment services will be provided when needed. Staff involved in open protection cases is expected to complete risk and safety assessments every three months, as well as conduct a Strengths and Needs assessment, incorporating the results of those assessments into the case plan.
- Use Structured Decision Making (SDM) tool to effectively assess and respond to safety and risk.
- Use Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) tool to assist families in building long-term support systems to reduce future risk of abuse and neglect.
- Use Family Assessment strategies to identify strengths, supports and services for families, and adherence to screening criteria.
- Expand use of family group conference upon reunification to develop safety plans that will allow parents and immediate and extended family to increase capacity to provide for needs of their children.
- Integrate Signs of Safety or safety-oriented practice approach in casework with families. Other counties have used this approach and have seen a decrease in families coming back for services. Increase use of the Family Assessment approach with reports screened in for assessment or investigation. This approach offers the ability to make more effective service and safety plans for children.
- Have short-term case management with voluntary participants to help strengthen families and connect them to resources and supports, and involve them in safety planning for their children.

Re-entered foster care within 12 months

Of all children who were discharged from foster care to reunification (discharged to live with parents, primary caretakers or other relatives) in the 12-month period prior to the target year, what percent re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge? *This standard is met if 9.9 percent or fewer children did not re-enter foster care within 12 months.*

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	6	6.9%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	4	4.6%
✓	Standard met	0	0.0%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	45	51.7%
X	Standard not met	32	36.8%
-	No data in 2009	0	0.0%

State/county/tribe	Discharged prior to target year		Re-entry rate		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	5,892	5,505	1,536	1,323	26.1%	24.0%	X+
Aitkin	34	13	14	3	41.2%	23.1%	X+
Anoka	542	445	186	102	34.3%	22.9%	X+
Becker	100	75	22	11	22.0%	14.7%	X+
Beltrami	90	81	9	20	10.0%	24.7%	X
Benton	29	29	7	14	24.1%	48.3%	X
Big Stone	5	5	-	1	0.0%	20.0%	X
Blue Earth	96	93	27	31	28.1%	33.3%	X
Brown	52	26	17	8	32.7%	30.8%	X+
Carlton	43	33	16	7	37.2%	21.2%	X+
Carver	95	65	32	19	33.7%	29.2%	X+
Cass	80	56	23	12	28.8%	21.4%	X+
Chippewa	8	4	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	✓✓
Chisago	62	39	9	8	14.5%	20.5%	X
Clay	41	48	10	12	24.4%	25.0%	X
Clearwater	10	6	5	3	50.0%	50.0%	X
Cook	4	4	3	1	75.0%	25.0%	X+
Cottonwood	19	22	10	11	52.6%	50.0%	X+
Crow Wing	54	68	13	23	24.1%	33.8%	X
Dakota	189	213	39	36	20.6%	16.9%	X+
Dodge	11	10	3	3	27.3%	30.0%	X
Douglas	29	26	10	6	34.5%	23.1%	X+
Fillmore	16	13	3	2	18.8%	15.4%	X+
Freeborn	40	59	15	12	37.5%	20.3%	X+

State/county/tribe	Discharged prior to target year		Re-entry rate		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	5,892	5,505	1,536	1,323	26.1%	24.0%	X+
Goodhue	35	42	6	9	17.1%	21.4%	X
Grant	6	1	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	✓✓
Hennepin	1,137	1,116	227	207	20.0%	18.5%	X+
Houston	15	7	2	1	13.3%	14.3%	X
Hubbard	23	23	6	4	26.1%	17.4%	X+
Isanti	58	30	5	3	8.6%	10.0%	X
Itasca	111	92	37	40	33.3%	43.5%	X
Jackson	21	17	4	2	19.0%	11.8%	X+
Kanabec	26	13	6	3	23.1%	23.1%	X
Kandiyohi	63	53	14	12	22.2%	22.6%	X
Kittson	10	2	1	-	10.0%	0.0%	✓+
Koochiching	32	41	15	8	46.9%	19.5%	X+
Lac qui Parle	3	4	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	✓✓
Lake	12	8	1	1	8.3%	12.5%	X
Lake of the Woods	2	4	1	1	50.0%	25.0%	X+
Le Sueur	20	14	9	6	45.0%	42.9%	X+
McLeod	34	61	6	12	17.6%	19.7%	X
Mahnomen	24	20	7	5	29.2%	25.0%	X+
Marshall	6	3	1	-	16.7%	0.0%	✓+
Meeker	19	8	3	1	15.8%	12.5%	X+
Mille Lacs	34	26	10	4	29.4%	15.4%	X+
Morrison	41	32	11	8	26.8%	25.0%	X+
Mower	35	43	10	8	28.6%	18.6%	X+
Nicollet	38	19	9	6	23.7%	31.6%	X
Nobles	33	44	6	14	18.2%	31.8%	X
Norman	5	8	3	2	60.0%	25.0%	X+
Olmsted	61	46	18	10	29.5%	21.7%	X+
Otter Tail	55	53	10	11	18.2%	20.8%	X
Pennington	32	15	9	2	28.1%	13.3%	X+
Pine	37	26	8	7	21.6%	26.9%	X
Pipestone	14	6	2	-	14.3%	0.0%	✓+
Polk	37	57	12	16	32.4%	28.1%	X+
Pope	18	7	4	1	22.2%	14.3%	X+
Ramsey	931	867	262	222	28.1%	25.6%	X+
Red Lake	7	9	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	✓✓
Redwood	25	35	9	11	36.0%	31.4%	X+
Renville	14	14	4	3	28.6%	21.4%	X+
Rice	47	46	9	17	19.1%	37.0%	X
Rock	15	12	8	6	53.3%	50.0%	X+

State/county/tribe	Discharged prior to target year		Re-entry rate		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	5,892	5,505	1,536	1,323	26.1%	24.0%	X+
Roseau	20	11	5	4	25.0%	36.4%	X
St. Louis	188	262	56	94	29.8%	35.9%	X
Scott	107	96	27	25	25.2%	26.0%	X
Sherburne	54	45	13	2	24.1%	4.4%	✓+
Sibley	15	12	2	2	13.3%	16.7%	X
Stearns	144	125	32	26	22.2%	20.8%	X+
Steele	35	28	13	6	37.1%	21.4%	X+
Stevens	2	2	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	✓✓
Swift	10	11	6	3	60.0%	27.3%	X+
Todd	22	24	4	3	18.2%	12.5%	X+
Traverse	6	2	1	1	16.7%	50.0%	X
Wabasha	27	21	12	7	44.4%	33.3%	X+
Wadena	28	16	12	3	42.9%	18.8%	X+
Waseca	19	15	8	5	42.1%	33.3%	X+
Washington	153	119	40	31	26.1%	26.1%	X
Watonwan	14	16	2	3	14.3%	18.8%	X
Wilkin	10	9	2	3	20.0%	33.3%	X
Winona	49	63	26	31	53.1%	49.2%	X+
Wright	88	146	19	21	21.6%	14.4%	X+
Yellow Medicine	10	14	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	✓✓
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	54	32	20	10	37.0%	31.3%	X+
Faribault/Martin	50	40	8	23	16.0%	57.5%	X
Leech Lake tribe	2	24	-	6	0.0%	25.0%	
White Earth band	-	15	-	6		40.0%	

County responses to reducing re-entry into foster care

Issues

- Many professionals besides the county social services agency play a role in influencing the outcome of this measure; the judge, county attorney, defense attorney, guardian ad litem, foster parents, teachers, parents, relatives and community corrections. Sometimes, tribal courts or tribal social services are making placement decisions that become the financial and documentation responsibility of the county agency. Sometimes, these professionals and courts make recommendations about children's living arrangements that are contrary to the recommendations of the county agency. Some push for reunification too quickly and the return home placement fails, necessitating another placement into foster care.
- Supervisors have recognized that staff must understand and communicate to all stakeholders in the CHIPS process about the impact of re-entry on children; it appears there is sometimes a perception in the court process that the greatest risk to children is remaining with their parents, rather than facing instability in returning to out-of-home care.
- Trial home visits have been utilized more frequently to help reduce the re-entry rate into foster care, and are currently under review to determine if it is helping to significantly reduce re-entry. Public defenders argue against trial home visits as they would rather have the children return home under protective supervision. Juvenile agents provide placements for a child as necessary, but then use community-based *step-downs* to assist

the child and his/her family to change behavior and seek help for underlying issues. This action may sometimes result in more than one short-term placement, as opposed to a placement lasting many months.

- Continue to discourage the use of law enforcement holds and short-term delinquency placements by other stakeholders in the system. The number of 72-hour holds due to parent/child conflict or runaways, historically, impacted the re-entry rate for child protection placements. Agency will work closely with law enforcement and county attorney staff, and utilize the new statute allowing social service staff to drop holds when appropriate to reduce the number of children who are placed due to holds. Data regarding 72-hour holds is being monitored as part of CFSR Program Improvement Plan. The juvenile justice coordinating committee is currently taking a closer look at this issue, and is exploring alternatives. The agency has also started providing limited case management to some of the adolescents placed on 72-hour holds, and will consider a short-term voluntary placement, if indicated. The intent would be to complete a more thorough assessment, to coordinate services in an effort to address the issues or source of the conflict, and to hopefully prevent re-entry.
- Part of the reason for re-entry into foster care is due to current practice of trying the least restrictive setting first, due to now counting some hospital stays as *placements*, and due to the nature of emotional disturbance, which tend to cycle.
- This challenge exists for specific reasons. Our agency and county consider *short-term* placements as one *least restrictive* option for children, and have developed program partnerships to afford that option (i.e., weekend truancy program). Therefore, a child may enter such a placement, exit, and re-enter to a more restrictive setting because they were unable to capitalize on the first, short-term, placement. These sorts of placements are used to intervene on truancy, delinquency and other behavioral issues. There is a need to explore and develop other behavioral programming that does not involve a short-term, least-restrictive placement.
- Agency data indicated that one third of children who re-entered foster care did so as a result of child protection issues. There seems to be tension between trying to reunify children with their families as quickly as possible (i.e., reduce length of stay in foster care), and prevent re-entry from occurring. While stakeholders want to reduce the re-entry rate, they also do not want to have children *languish* in foster care for any longer than necessary, and as a result, some amount of re-entry is inevitable.
- Besides child protection issues, many children enter placements as a result of mental health issues or juvenile delinquency issues. Agency data shows that these populations constitute the majority of re-entries occurring in the county. For children's mental health, the agency works under a philosophy that recognizes that a child sometimes needs to be placed in a treatment or other setting in order to stabilize the current mental health symptoms and alleviate the crisis. At the same time, the goal is to return a child to their home and community as quickly as possible, and continue treatment using community resources and services. Should symptoms occur again making it difficult to maintain safety or treat symptoms within the child's own home, staff could again use a placement to stabilize behaviors for a time before returning home. While this option may contribute to a higher re-entry rate, it does allow the child to reside in their own home and community to the greatest extent possible.
- The children's mental health staff has made changes in service delivery to reduce the re-entry rate for children receiving mental health services. Past practice placed children upon a parent's request. Now if a placement is requested, first community resources are utilized extensively. More community resources are currently available than have been in the past, and children's mental health case managers are better able to match resources to children/family needs. Also, managed care organizations are now fully involved in discussions regarding potential placements. If a child needs placement for mental health reasons, the discharge planning begins at the time of placement, and families are more highly involved therapeutically during placement to better enable them to meet their child's needs when the placement ends.
- Many re-entries are due to an on-going chronic mental health issue of a child or a relapse of a parent on meth, precipitating another dangerous situation. The agency tries to return children in a timely manner that matches the parent's progress in their goals, and a child's needs and best interests. However, parents/caretakers with substance abuse issues continue to be prevalent in the county.

Strategies

- Strong philosophy of fostering family connections and reunification with the family of origin.
- Use family support specialist (mentors who have been through the children's mental health system with their own children) in an attempt to be more supportive for families. For any child at risk of re-entry, the family

would be a priority to receive intensive in-home counseling, child welfare case management, and any other service (children's mental health, school programs, and parenting programs) that would keep the family unit intact.

- Supervisors review the safety/support plans that are in place before children start trial home visits or return home, and will assist social workers as needed to improve these plans so reunification efforts are consistently successful. Because of the challenges of substance abuse in recurrence and re-entry, the county will continue to examine options to support development of sober housing options for parents and children, allowing parents to live in an environment that supports their recovery while parenting.
- Implement a Quality Improvement Team on foster care stability and re-entry with a volunteer social worker from each unit in the agency that will identify, plan, and review ideas to reduce foster care re-entry. The team will meet once a month, at a minimum, to review re-entries and identify ideas to improve work so reunification plans are successful.
- Utilize community partners as part of the plan to reduce re-entry into placement. Coordinate with CMH providers and probation to strengthen family stability goal. Working in collaboration with other agencies to improve CMH system of care, and are partners in a federal multi-county *System of Care* grant. Improved services to children and their families will prevent children from returning to placement, as additional supports will be in place to maintain children in their homes. Use wrap-around process, strive toward family driven, youth guided services. Collaborate and work with corrections and the local mental health center to strengthen resources for families to reduce re-entry.
- Clearly define what constitutes a placement. Educate staff on what should and should not be entered into SSIS as a placement.

Tools

- Request, when appropriate, a 35-day diagnostic assessment so that the first placement for a child is the most appropriate for meeting their needs. Implement more formal, structured Placement Screening Team for all voluntary placements, which includes a new diagnostic assessment which evaluate the medical necessity for placement.
- Utilize the Juvenile Screening Team to address issues related to current cases; make referrals to help children stay in their home longer, and also utilize a tracking program for community integration and support services for both the family and the youth. Screen all potential placements that may exceed 30 days by utilizing the Juvenile Treatment Screening Team (JTST). The JTST will meet every week to review potential placements, and current placements will be reviewed every 30 days. Conduct formal pre-placement screenings for all children at imminent risk of out-of-home placement.
- Complete safety and risk re-assessment SDM tools for all children prior to returning home. Consult at staff meetings for all children returning home prior to their return home. Provide services to family upon children's return home, and set up a safety plan with family.
- Analyze ending placement decisions—use of decision-making tools to consider appropriateness of plan.
- Collectively re-calibrate and re-evaluate the team's rating system of family's strengths and weaknesses through the CJI Team process. The tool will help decision makers evaluate the risks to safety, and the dangers of premature reunification with inadequate or nonexistent family supports.
- Use Signs of Safety methods to support and strengthen families in their ability to reunite.
- Enhanced treatment program is helping to address relapses of substance abuse parents.
- Social workers are required to keep a case open for monitoring and support for at least four to six months after a child returns home. This ensures early intervention support for parents, and utilizes needed resources for stability and a safe home environment.
- Use FGDM as a preventive measure to identify and address broader family supports.
- Utilize Children's Justice Initiative and Supervisors' Team to share Charting and Analysis data about re-entry rates, and to develop strategies for reducing re-entry, particularly in the areas of children's mental health and juvenile probation.
- Use concurrent planning and relative searches in situations where reunification seems unlikely; permanency options will be identified and pursued to meet the needs of a child.

Reunified within 12 months

Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the target year, who had been in foster care for eight days or longer, what percent were reunified (reunification with parents, primary caretakers or other relatives) in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home? *This standard is met if 75.2 percent or more children were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	3	3.4%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	41	47.1%
✓	Standard met	32	36.8%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	0	0.0%
X	Standard not met	11	12.6%
-	No data in 2009	0	0.0%

State/county/tribe	Discharged to reunification in target year		Within 12 months		Reunification rate within 12 months		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	4,106	3,366	571	547	3,535	2,819	86.1%	83.7%	✓
Aitkin	13	20		4	13	16	100.0%	80.0%	✓
Anoka	209	136	28	33	181	103	86.6%	75.7%	✓
Becker	71	39	12	6	59	33	83.1%	84.6%	✓+
Beltrami	82	42	13	7	69	35	84.1%	83.3%	✓
Benton	24	37	3	5	21	32	87.5%	86.5%	✓
Big Stone	6	7	1	2	5	5	83.3%	71.4%	×
Blue Earth	75	53	7	4	68	49	90.7%	92.5%	✓+
Brown	30	18	3	1	27	17	90.0%	94.4%	✓+
Carlton	41	28	9	7	32	21	78.0%	75.0%	×
Carver	55	44	9	5	46	39	83.6%	88.6%	✓+
Cass	34	36	3	1	31	35	91.2%	97.2%	✓+
Chippewa	4	11	3	0	1	11	25.0%	100.0%	✓+
Chisago	27	26	1	4	26	22	96.3%	84.6%	✓
Clay	48	35	4	9	44	26	91.7%	74.3%	×
Clearwater	6	7	1	1	5	6	83.3%	85.7%	✓+
Cook	8	7	3	0	5	7	62.5%	100.0%	✓+
Cottonwood	22	22	2	1	20	21	90.9%	95.5%	✓+
Crow Wing	64	57	11	8	53	49	82.8%	86.0%	✓+
Dakota	120	103	9	7	111	96	92.5%	93.2%	✓+
Dodge	9	10		1	9	9	100.0%	90.0%	✓
Douglas	30	18	7	2	23	16	76.7%	88.9%	✓+
Fillmore	12	4	2	0	10	4	83.3%	100.0%	✓+

State/county/tribe	Discharged to reunification in target year				Within 12 months		Reunification rate within 12 months		Performance score card
	2008	2009			2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	4,106	3,366	571	547	3,535	2,819	86.1%	83.7%	✓
Freeborn	60	10	11	0	49	10	81.7%	100.0%	✓+
Goodhue	32	11	6	1	26	10	81.3%	90.9%	✓+
Grant	1	5	1	1	0	4	0.0%	80.0%	✓+
Hennepin	854	718	148	156	706	562	82.7%	78.3%	✓
Houston	6	16	2	3	4	13	66.7%	81.3%	✓+
Hubbard	26	27	2	4	24	23	92.3%	85.2%	✓
Isanti	28	23	4	1	24	22	85.7%	95.7%	✓+
Itasca	77	58	4	7	73	51	94.8%	87.9%	✓
Jackson	12	13	1	1	11	12	91.7%	92.3%	✓+
Kanabec	10	14	1	2	9	12	90.0%	85.7%	✓
Kandiyohi	51	38	3	7	48	31	94.1%	81.6%	✓
Kittson	0	4		1	0	3		75.0%	×
Koochiching	31	24	2	2	29	22	93.5%	91.7%	✓
Lac qui Parle	4	3	2	0	2	3	50.0%	100.0%	✓+
Lake	7	9	1	3	6	6	85.7%	66.7%	×
Lake of the Woods	5	6		1	5	5	100.0%	83.3%	✓
Le Sueur	13	13		2	13	11	100.0%	84.6%	✓
McLeod	43	23	7	5	36	18	83.7%	78.3%	✓
Mahnomen	18	6	2	0	16	6	88.9%	100.0%	✓+
Marshall	4	3	1	1	3	2	75.0%	66.7%	×
Meeker	9	5		1	9	4	100.0%	80.0%	✓
Mille Lacs	31	19	3	1	28	18	90.3%	94.7%	✓+
Morrison	30	14	2	1	28	13	93.3%	92.9%	✓
Mower	29	10	4	0	25	10	86.2%	100.0%	✓+
Nicollet	20	14	1	0	19	14	95.0%	100.0%	✓+
Nobles	25	28		1	25	27	100.0%	96.4%	✓
Norman	7	3		2	7	1	100.0%	33.3%	×
Olmsted	45	42	5	6	40	36	88.9%	85.7%	✓
Otter Tail	43	41	6	9	37	32	86.0%	78.0%	✓
Pennington	20	10	4	1	16	9	80.0%	90.0%	✓+
Pine	18	25	4	7	14	18	77.8%	72.0%	×
Pipestone	5	7	1	1	4	6	80.0%	85.7%	✓+
Polk	60	44	10	8	50	36	83.3%	81.8%	✓
Pope	10	6		1	10	5	100.0%	83.3%	✓
Ramsey	458	439	62	72	396	367	86.5%	83.6%	✓
Red Lake	9	3	3	0	6	3	66.7%	100.0%	✓+
Redwood	30	28	2	1	28	27	93.3%	96.4%	✓+
Renville	14	8	1	1	13	7	92.9%	87.5%	✓
Rice	37	20	8	2	29	18	78.4%	90.0%	✓+

State/county/tribe	Discharged to reunification in target year		Within 12 months		Reunification rate within 12 months		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	4,106	3,366	571	547	3,535	2,819	86.1%	83.7%	✓
Rock	7	5	1	0	6	5	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Roseau	12	14	1	0	11	14	91.7%	100.0%	✓+
St. Louis	225	198	41	37	184	161	81.8%	81.3%	✓
Scott	58	26	6	5	52	21	89.7%	80.8%	✓
Sherburne	48	29	6	7	42	22	87.5%	75.9%	✓
Sibley	14	17	1	2	13	15	92.9%	88.2%	✓
Stearns	98	94	12	13	86	81	87.8%	86.2%	✓
Steele	25	19	2	1	23	18	92.0%	94.7%	✓+
Stevens	3	1		0	3	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Swift	11	16	1	1	10	15	90.9%	93.8%	✓+
Todd	25	10	6	1	19	9	76.0%	90.0%	✓+
Traverse	1	2		0	1	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Wabasha	14	2	2	0	12	2	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Wadena	13	9	2	2	11	7	84.6%	77.8%	✓
Waseca	10	3	1	0	9	3	90.0%	100.0%	✓+
Washington	80	54	9	15	71	39	88.8%	72.2%	×
Watonwan	17	12	3	0	14	12	82.4%	100.0%	✓+
Wilkin	8	12		5	8	7	100.0%	58.3%	×
Winona	53	56	6	2	47	54	88.7%	96.4%	✓+
Wright	99	81	18	21	81	60	81.8%	74.1%	×
Yellow Medicine	17	3		0	17	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	25	22	3	1	22	21	88.0%	95.5%	✓+
Faribault/Martin	42	55	5	8	37	47	88.1%	85.5%	✓
Leech Lake tribe	20	33		3	20	30	100.0%	90.9%	✓
White Earth tribe	9	43		2	9	41	100.0%	95.3%	✓

County responses to increasing reunification within 12 months

Strategies

- Implemented a Pre-placement Team that assesses every child in placement in conjunction with the county attorney's office and probation. Permanency guidelines are reviewed with all the children in placement, and a plan is implemented and checked every month to ensure compliance with permanency standards. Participation of the county attorney's office, which assists in the court process, can sometimes be an issue in permanency.
- The CJI team meets quarterly to review timelines and the new initiative that only one 90-day extension will be granted, instead of the possibility of two 90-day extensions. Agency has invited new resources to assist in determining a parent's readiness for change. Utilize community partners to help determine what goals need to be set for parents, and utilize realistic timelines to ensure that reunification decisions are made appropriately.
- The Recovery Specialist program continues to assist social workers and families in achieving reunification. Program staff provide mentoring and monitoring with parents who have alcohol and other drug issues. Results continue to show faster, more stable reunification.

- The county works with its partners on the Children's Justice Initiative Team to expedite the prompt return of children to their family home or the home of a relative within 12 months. Difficult cases that fall under court supervision require social workers to engage the county attorney's office well in advance of the time limit so judicial review of CHIPs cases is scheduled timely.
- The agency focuses its energies/efforts on enhanced prevention and step-down services within the community, comprehensive assessment of family/child needs prior to placement, and other elements needed to ensure safety, permanency and well-being.
- Placement cases are reviewed by the Placement Review Team to ensure all permanency options are explored prior to making a permanency recommendation. This process assists staff in exploring all options, including what it would take to safely reunite a child with their family, and, when out-of-home placement is necessary, determine what is needed for the child to return home safely.

Adopted within 24 months of last removal from home

Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption during the target year, what percent were discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the latest removal from home? *This standard is met if 36.6 percent or more children exited out-of-home placement to adoption in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	6	6.9%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	17	19.5%
✓	Standard met	18	20.7%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	3	3.4%
X	Standard not met	26	29.9%
-	No data in 2009	17	19.5%

State/county/tribe	Discharged to finalized adoption in target year		Discharged to finalized adoption within 24 months		Adoption rate within 24 months		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	763	674	379	357	384	317	50.3%	47.0%	✓
Aitkin	3	4	0	0	3	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Anoka	53	58	25	22	28	36	52.8%	62.1%	✓+
Becker	4	7	0	3	4	4	100.0%	57.1%	✓
Beltrami	6	4	4	3	2	1	33.3%	25.0%	×
Benton	10	3	4	3	6	0	60.0%	0.0%	×
Big Stone	2	0	2	0	0	0	0.0%		-
Blue Earth	9	15	3	10	6	5	66.7%	33.3%	×
Brown	2	3	0	1	2	2	100.0%	66.7%	✓
Carlton	5	2	3	2	2	0	40.0%	0.0%	×
Carver	5	1	2	1	3	0	60.0%	0.0%	×
Cass	0	2	0	2	0	0		0.0%	×
Chippewa	1	1	0	1	1	0	100.0%	0.0%	×
Chisago	1	4	1	4	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	×
Clay	21	10	8	6	13	4	61.9%	40.0%	✓
Clearwater	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Cook	0	3	0	0	0	3		100.0%	✓
Cottonwood	3	1	2	0	1	1	33.3%	100.0%	✓+
Crow Wing	16	24	8	8	8	16	50.0%	66.7%	✓+
Dakota	36	15	7	1	29	14	80.6%	93.3%	✓+
Dodge	2	4	0	0	2	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Douglas	3	4	3	2	0	2	0.0%	50.0%	✓+
Fillmore	3	1	3	1	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	×

State/county/tribe	Discharged to finalized adoption in target year				Discharged to finalized adoption within 24 months		Adoption rate within 24 months		Performance score card
	2008	2009			2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	763	674	379	357	384	317	50.3%	47.0%	✓
Freeborn	3	5	2	3	1	2	33.3%	40.0%	✓+
Goodhue	20	9	7	1	13	8	65.0%	88.9%	✓+
Grant	0	3	0	0	0	3		100.0%	✓
Hennepin	220	169	118	96	102	73	46.4%	43.2%	✓
Houston	4	1	3	0	1	1	25.0%	100.0%	✓+
Hubbard	6	1	6	1	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	x
Isanti	2	2	0	0	2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Itasca	11	0	3	0	8	0	72.7%		-
Jackson	3	1	2	0	1	1	33.3%	100.0%	✓+
Kanabec	2	0	0	0	2	0	100.0%		-
Kandiyohi	4	6	0	1	4	5	100.0%	83.3%	✓
Kittson	1	0	0	0	1	0	100.0%		-
Koochiching	4	0	3	0	1	0	25.0%		-
Lac qui Parle	3	0	0	0	3	0	100.0%		-
Lake	3	6	3	5	0	1	0.0%	16.7%	x+
Lake of the Woods	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Le Sueur	3	5	2	3	1	2	33.3%	40.0%	✓+
McLeod	7	8	3	2	4	6	57.1%	75.0%	✓+
Mahnomen	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Marshall	0	2	0	1	0	1		50.0%	✓
Meeker	0	2	0	0	0	2		100.0%	✓
Mille Lacs	1	2	0	1	1	1	100.0%	50.0%	✓
Morrison	9	6	4	6	5	0	55.6%	0.0%	x
Mower	3	8	2	6	1	2	33.3%	25.0%	x
Nicollet	5	7	0	0	5	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Nobles	1	4	0	0	1	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Norman	2	3	2	0	0	3	0.0%	100.0%	✓+
Olmsted	24	30	6	13	18	17	75.0%	56.7%	✓
Otter Tail	7	5	1	3	6	2	85.7%	40.0%	✓
Pennington	3	5	3	3	0	2	0.0%	40.0%	✓+
Pine	6	8	3	3	3	5	50.0%	62.5%	✓+
Pipestone	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Polk	2	1	2	1	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	x
Pope	0	3	0	3	0	0		0.0%	x
Ramsey	59	89	48	70	11	19	18.6%	21.3%	x+
Red Lake	1	0	0	0	1	0	100.0%		-
Redwood	0	1	0	1	0	0		0.0%	x
Renville	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Rice	7	9	0	4	7	5	100.0%	55.6%	✓

State/county/tribe	Discharged to finalized adoption in target year		Discharged to finalized adoption within 24 months		Adoption rate within 24 months		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	763	674	379	357	384	317	50.3%	47.0%	✓
Rock	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0%		-
Roseau	5	1	0	1	5	0	100.0%	0.0%	×
St. Louis	34	21	20	15	14	6	41.2%	28.6%	×
Scott	14	8	10	0	4	8	28.6%	100.0%	✓+
Sherburne	8	1	3	1	5	0	62.5%	0.0%	×
Sibley	2	0	0	0	2	0	100.0%		-
Stearns	27	15	24	15	3	0	11.1%	0.0%	×
Steele	3	3	1	0	2	3	66.7%	100.0%	✓+
Stevens	0	1	0	1	0	0		0.0%	×
Swift	1	1	0	0	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Todd	13	3	4	1	9	2	69.2%	66.7%	✓
Traverse	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Wabasha	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Wadena	5	8	0	3	5	5	100.0%	62.5%	✓
Waseca	1	2	1	0	0	2	0.0%	100.0%	✓+
Washington	5	10	1	4	4	6	80.0%	60.0%	✓
Watonwan	1	3	0	3	1	0	100.0%	0.0%	×
Wilkin	0	0	0	0	0	0			-
Winona	3	2	2	2	1	0	33.3%	0.0%	×
Wright	11	6	9	4	2	2	18.2%	33.3%	×+
Yellow Medicine	0	3	0	3	0	0		0.0%	×
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	6	4	3	3	3	1	50.0%	25.0%	×
Faribault/Martin	6	6	0	1	6	5	100.0%	83.3%	✓
Leech Lake tribe	0	1	0	1	0	0		0.0%	
White Earth band	6	8	2	2	4	6	66.7%	75.0%	

County responses to increasing adoption within 24 months

Issues

- The issue has been the difficulty of foster homes willing to adopt children with serious and persistent mental illness. An adoptive home changed three times before one was found that would go through with the adoption.
- County had some unusual adoption situations that required interstate compact arrangements, which severely slowed down the process. Use of Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) has increased recently, which does not always lead to quick results. Agency will continue to work on adoption paperwork issues to ensure it is done to perfection, and to ensure it is expedited.
- The barriers to achieving this goal are delays within the county attorney's office and within the court system. The agency will monitor the timelines and bring data before the Child Placement Review Team on a regular basis. Continue to send documentation to the county attorney and the court with reminders of time frames and the length of time a child has been in placement.

Strategies

- Agency has a dedicated staff with primary responsibility surrounding facilitation of adoption responsibilities. Work with private adoption agencies to complete specialized recruitment efforts for adoption placements.

- Agency has two full-time social workers who work with adoptions and relative searches in order to have adoptions occur on a timely basis. In addition, the CJI Team has developed clear court timelines to inform families and other professionals that are adhered to by the county attorney and court system to ensure adoptions are timely.
- Review all county placements of children in foster care for more than 12 continuous months, who have not achieved permanency, with CJI Team and/or Pre-placement Screening Team.
- At the initial removal of a child, every effort is made to find a foster family that can keep the child long term, if needed. This effort helps in decisions for adoption, if viable family members are not appropriate.
- Increase relative search efforts in an attempt to identify permanent placement resources for children early-on in the placement. The agency will utilize resources, when possible, to bring relatives from other states to the community for increased visits and participation in the case plan. In-home family-based therapy as a strategy with kin placements provides better supports to relatives who have children placed with them. The agency will offer waivers to traditional licensing rules as another way to allow better use of relatives as providers.
- Locating adoptive homes quickly and working with provider agencies to provide training and support to adoptive parents. Work closely with the court system to speed up court dates and timelines.
- The agency's CJI designed a parallel protection process (PPP) that incorporates a structured family case planning conference in the court process to seek settlement agreements on contested petitions. More than 100 conferences have achieved settlement agreements, reducing time in the court process, reducing the adversarial process, and resulting in early engagement in concurrent permanency planning. Early reunification with family and timely adoptions has resulted in positive outcomes.
- The use of family involvement strategies has increased family engagement, resulting in improved family assessments and enhanced case planning. FGDM, family case planning conferences, and wraparound provide the voice of the family in agency decision-making processes. Building on the willingness, confidence and capacity of the extended family system to resolve challenges and provide for the safety of family members is transforming practice in a positive direction.
- The agency has developed a structured framework to guide social work practice in child welfare. The process is embedded in a group supervision model that enhances the practice of social workers. Partnership-based work with families, coupled with collaborative work with professionals, builds safety for children and families.
- If the permanency goal for a child is adoption, the agency will work closely with the county court to accomplish adoption finalization for a child. The court administration and assigned social worker will make use of tools to track permanency timelines. The social worker will work closely with the identified adoptive family to move forward with steps to permanency for a child.

Two or fewer placement settings

Of all children who were served in foster care during the target year, and who were in foster care for at least eight days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? *This standard is met if 86.0 percent or more children had two or fewer placement settings.*

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	6	6.9%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	35	40.2%
✓	Standard met	20	23.0%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	6	6.9%
X	Standard not met	20	23.0%
-	No data in 2009	0	0.0%

State/county/tribe	Served in FC > 8 days and < 12 mths		Two or fewer placement settings		Rate for two or fewer settings		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	6,828	5,713	948	797	5,880	4,916	86.1%	86.0%	✓
Aitkin	36	30	4	8	32	22	88.9%	73.3%	×
Anoka	353	247	53	30	300	217	85.0%	87.9%	✓+
Becker	121	73	24	11	97	62	80.2%	84.9%	×
Beltrami	133	122	25	12	108	110	81.2%	90.2%	✓+
Benton	40	52	7	4	33	48	82.5%	92.3%	✓+
Big Stone	6	18	0	4	6	14	100.0%	77.8%	×
Blue Earth	112	99	14	13	98	86	87.5%	86.9%	✓
Brown	48	25	12	5	36	20	75.0%	80.0%	×
Carlton	80	67	11	9	69	58	86.3%	86.6%	✓+
Carver	88	58	10	9	78	49	88.6%	84.5%	×
Cass	70	55	8	3	62	52	88.6%	94.5%	✓+
Chippewa	7	12	0	0	7	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Chisago	37	29	5	7	32	22	86.5%	75.9%	×
Clay	92	55	13	14	79	41	85.9%	74.5%	×
Clearwater	12	11	2	0	10	11	83.3%	100.0%	✓+
Cook	10	9	0	0	10	9	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Cottonwood	28	30	3	3	25	27	89.3%	90.0%	✓+
Crow Wing	127	124	18	17	109	107	85.8%	86.3%	✓+
Dakota	235	209	23	22	212	187	90.2%	89.5%	✓
Dodge	20	22	3	5	17	17	85.0%	77.3%	×
Douglas	38	52	5	3	33	49	86.8%	94.2%	✓+
Fillmore	15	10	0	1	15	9	100.0%	90.0%	✓
Freeborn	67	19	7	1	60	18	89.6%	94.7%	✓+

State/county/tribe	Served in FC > 8 days and < 12 mths		Two or fewer placement settings		Rate for two or fewer settings		Performance score/card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	6,828	5,713	948	797	5,880	4,916	86.1%	86.0%	✓
Goodhue	48	25	7	4	41	21	85.4%	84.0%	×
Grant	4	9	0	1	4	8	100.0%	88.9%	✓
Hennepin	1,430	1,125	269	231	1,161	894	81.2%	79.5%	×
Houston	21	25	1	2	20	23	95.2%	92.0%	✓
Hubbard	49	31	1	1	48	30	98.0%	96.8%	✓
Isanti	38	46	5	1	33	45	86.8%	97.8%	✓+
Itasca	112	82	11	9	101	73	90.2%	89.0%	✓
Jackson	18	19	4	2	14	17	77.8%	89.5%	✓+
Kanabec	18	15	2	1	16	14	88.9%	93.3%	✓+
Kandiyohi	63	72	1	4	62	68	98.4%	94.4%	✓
Kittson	2	4	1	0	1	4	50.0%	100.0%	✓+
Koochiching	42	29	4	5	38	24	90.5%	82.8%	×
Lac qui Parle	5	12	0	1	5	11	100.0%	91.7%	✓
Lake	13	15	1	1	12	14	92.3%	93.3%	✓+
Lake of the Woods	7	7	0	0	7	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Le Sueur	22	25	2	1	20	24	90.9%	96.0%	✓+
McLeod	49	41	4	2	45	39	91.8%	95.1%	✓+
Mahnomen	33	15	11	3	22	12	66.7%	80.0%	×
Marshall	3	6	1	0	2	6	66.7%	100.0%	✓+
Meeker	21	11	3	0	18	11	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Mille Lacs	51	33	1	2	50	31	98.0%	93.9%	✓
Morrison	52	36	5	5	47	31	90.4%	86.1%	✓
Mower	54	20	4	1	50	19	92.6%	95.0%	✓+
Nicollet	35	27	6	2	29	25	82.9%	92.6%	✓+
Nobles	48	42	2	3	46	39	95.8%	92.9%	✓
Norman	11	3	2	1	9	2	81.8%	66.7%	×
Olmsted	85	81	8	6	77	75	90.6%	92.6%	✓+
Otter Tail	69	60	5	4	64	56	92.8%	93.3%	✓+
Pennington	32	24	1	0	31	24	96.9%	100.0%	✓+
Pine	50	39	4	6	46	33	92.0%	84.6%	×
Pipestone	11	9	2	1	9	8	81.8%	88.9%	✓+
Polk	88	59	13	9	75	50	85.2%	84.7%	×
Pope	16	16	0	3	16	13	100.0%	81.3%	×
Ramsey	685	598	82	76	603	522	88.0%	87.3%	✓
Red Lake	10	8	0	0	10	8	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Redwood	52	45	4	5	48	40	92.3%	88.9%	✓
Renville	23	17	0	2	23	15	100.0%	88.2%	✓
Rice	48	50	10	7	38	43	79.2%	86.0%	✓+
Rock	7	9	0	1	7	8	100.0%	88.9%	✓
Roseau	17	20	1	3	16	17	94.1%	85.0%	×

State/county/tribe	Served in FC > 8 days and < 12 mths		Two or fewer placement settings		Rate for two or fewer settings		Performance score card		
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009			
State	6,828	5,713	948	797	5,880	4,916	86.1%	86.0%	✓
St. Louis	404	425	69	86	335	339	82.9%	79.8%	×
Scott	77	37	3	5	74	32	96.1%	86.5%	✓
Sherburne	85	55	4	13	81	42	95.3%	76.4%	×
Sibley	22	32	6	4	16	28	72.7%	87.5%	✓+
Stearns	159	121	16	14	143	107	89.9%	88.4%	✓
Steele	37	33	3	4	34	29	91.9%	87.9%	✓
Stevens	6	6	0	1	6	5	100.0%	83.3%	×
Swift	19	19	6	3	13	16	68.4%	84.2%	×+
Todd	22	27	3	0	19	27	86.4%	100.0%	✓+
Traverse	2	2	0	0	2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Wabasha	23	12	5	5	18	7	78.3%	58.3%	×
Wadena	17	17	3	0	14	17	82.4%	100.0%	✓+
Waseca	18	15	0	0	18	15	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Washington	129	85	12	15	117	70	90.7%	82.4%	×
Watonwan	23	21	4	3	19	18	82.6%	85.7%	×+
Wilkin	15	8	0	1	15	7	100.0%	87.5%	✓
Winona	69	67	9	12	60	55	87.0%	82.1%	×
Wright	155	98	37	14	118	84	76.1%	85.7%	×+
Yellow Medicine	22	4	4	0	18	4	81.8%	100.0%	✓+
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	63	50	15	7	48	43	76.2%	86.0%	✓+
Faribault/Martin	65	101	6	8	59	93	90.8%	92.1%	✓+
Leech Lake tribe	97	101	10	9	87	92	89.7%	91.1%	✓+
White Earth band	82	139	8	6	74	133	90.2%	95.7%	✓+

County responses to increasing placement stability (two or fewer placement settings)

Issues

- In some cases, children are unnecessarily removed from their home, which results in a high rate of placements for less than eight days. Once a child is placed in an emergency placement, there is need for at least one more placement, in a long-term setting. Children experiencing multiple placements typically have more challenging mental health issues and related behavioral difficulties.
- Alleged neglect and parent drug abuse continue to be the major reasons a child in the county enters out-of-home placement. The agency particularly struggles with effects of parental use of methamphetamine. While use of the drug is declining, it is declining more slowly in some counties.
- There are contrary forces in the initial placement of children: one in keeping children with family members so they are not as seriously disturbed in placement; but if relatives are not ultimately licensable, this results in exceeding the expectation of two or fewer placement settings. Though relatives are extensively sought and used for good reason, they often are not as stable of a setting as established foster homes, and placement disruption occurs. The county has developed procedures for support of foster homes to lower foster care disruptions.

Strategies

- Examine the use of shelter placements, and if there is opportunity, look for a permanency placement before a child is placed. Staff will look for creative supports and solutions to maintaining placements (especially with relatives), including enhancement of foster parent training and therapeutic support to foster care providers.

- Increase number of foster care homes, especially those flexible to provide both shelter and ongoing child placements.
- Child foster care works collaboratively with child protection to find the best possible placement for children. Best practice involves consideration of multiple factors: licensing of relatives or significant others for kinship care, placing sibling groups together, maintaining a child's ability to attend their current school, maintaining proximity to family for visitation, providing a culturally sensitive environment, and providing concurrent planning. The ongoing case manager and the foster care social worker work collaboratively to support the provider by offering home visits, regular phone contact, and training materials from the agency's resource library specific to a child's behaviors and/or diagnoses. Less experienced foster providers are linked to an experienced provider for mentoring.
- Training staff on the use of Bureau of Criminal Apprehension and Minnesota Court Information System to screen relatives for informal placements made by parents, with the expectation of reducing the number of emergency placements. Educating law enforcement on new after-hours services and alternative forms of family arrangements. Expanding use of family group conferencing on the front end, prior to placement, to avoid placement and increase the use of family/kin at the time of intake. Work toward a non-shelter placement, with increased use of relative/kin whenever possible to avoid initial multiple placements (shelter placement followed by ongoing placement).
- Increase involvement of non-custodial parents, and expand use of respite care in placement cases, support and training of foster care providers, and earlier involvement of staff at initial maltreatment call to assess the necessity of shelter placement, or to evaluate ongoing placement options prior to shelter placement. Focus on matching the needs of children with providers. Evaluate the needs of foster parents, and offer support and services as identified to prevent disruptions. Recruitment of providers to care for older youth and for children with emotional and behavioral needs.
- For children with mental health and behavioral issues, the Therapeutic Foster Care program with dedicated staff provides intensive support to foster parents to minimize or prevent placement disruptions. Some children have move more than twice due to their behaviors.
- A few corrections placements, which are out of the agency's control, led to a decreased percentage; aggressive behavior by one child led to multiple placements. The agency will work with probation to try to help locate stable placement settings. Trying to locate the least restrictive settings sometimes causes multiple placement settings to occur.
- Needs of a child as well as those of a provider will be assessed and supports implemented as needed to avoid placement disruptions. Plan to staff placement cases on a quarterly basis to identify themes or patterns for potential disruptions.
- The Enhanced Treatment Program began in 2006 as a grant-funded program to provide additional support and education services, as well as monitoring, for mothers abusing meth who were also involved with child protection and/or corrections. This intensive, year-long program has had success with many mothers, enabling them to reunify with their children.

Tools

- Training staff on the Signs of Safety approach is expected to facilitate identification of alternate approaches to working with a family, thus preventing more emergency holds.
- Incorporating FGDM services at intake to identify family and community resources as alternatives to foster care placement. Instituted a Foster Family Support Program, with relative caregivers receiving first priority for services. Foster families are provided access to FGDM, family-based therapy, family resource workers, respite child care, foster care and assistance with transportation.
- Foster parent needs will be assessed on an ongoing basis, and provided therapeutic supportive services or crisis services when needed.
- Agency will conduct thorough assessment of a child to assist in locating a good match between a child and foster parent.

Non-recurrence of child abuse within 12 months

Of all children who were victims of substantiated child abuse/neglect during the last six months of the prior calendar year, what percentage did not have another substantiated/determined report *within 12 months*? *This standard is met if 91.5 percent of children did not have another determined report within 12 months.*

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	30	34.5%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	24	27.6%
✓	Standard met	10	11.5%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	2	2.3%
X	Standard not met	13	14.9%
-	No data in 2009	8	9.2%

State/county/tribe	Unique determined victims		Repeat maltreatment within 12 months?		Non-recurrence rate				Performance score card
	Jul-Dec '07	Jul-Dec '08			No				
	2008	2009			2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	2,935	2,523	249	177	2,686	2,346	91.5%	93.0%	✓+
Aitkin	18	9		1	18	8	100.0%	88.9%	X
Anoka	170	112	5	1	165	111	97.1%	99.1%	✓+
Becker	51	23	11		40	23	78.4%	100.0%	✓+
Beltrami	41	36	4		37	36	90.2%	100.0%	✓+
Benton	17	26		1	17	25	100.0%	96.2%	✓
Big Stone	3	7	1		2	7	66.7%	100.0%	✓+
Blue Earth	57	41	4	5	53	36	93.0%	87.8%	X
Brown	39	29	1	5	38	24	97.4%	82.8%	X
Carlton	8	13			8	13	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Carver	27	20	4	2	23	18	85.2%	90.0%	x+
Cass	2	4		1	2	3	100.0%	75.0%	X
Chippewa	2	1			2	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Chisago	6	13		2	6	11	100.0%	84.6%	X
Clay	29	29	2	1	27	28	93.1%	96.6%	✓+
Clearwater	5	10			5	10	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Cook	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Cottonwood	4	7	1		3	7	75.0%	100.0%	✓+
Crow Wing	12	12			12	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Dakota	167	182	16	12	151	170	90.4%	93.4%	✓+
Dodge	8	12		1	8	11	100.0%	91.7%	✓
Douglas	26	17	1	7	25	10	96.2%	58.8%	X
Fillmore	2	6			2	6	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Freeborn	28	4			28	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Goodhue	10	6			10	6	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Grant	2	2			2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Hennepin	883	866	107	86	776	780	87.9%	90.1%	x+
Houston	5	0			5		100.0%		-

State/county/tribe	Unique determined victims		Repeat maltreatment within 12 months?				Non-recurrence rate		Performance score card
	Jul-Dec '07	Jul-Dec '08			No				
	2008	2009			2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	2,935	2,523	249	177	2,686	2,346	91.5%	93.0%	✓+
Hubbard	7	10			7	10	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Isanti	22	12			22	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Itasca	28	23	2	1	26	22	92.9%	95.7%	✓+
Jackson	5	2			5	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Kanabec	6	0			6		100.0%		-
Kandiyohi	44	33	3	2	41	31	93.2%	93.9%	✓+
Kittson	0	3				3		100.0%	✓
Koochiching	3	2		2	3	0	100.0%	0.0%	X
Lac qui Parle	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Lake	3	5			3	5	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Lake of the Woods	4	4			4	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Le Sueur	13	17		5	13	12	100.0%	70.6%	X
McLeod	28	9	4		24	9	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Mahnomen	2	2			2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Marshall	4	3			4	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Meeker	4	7			4	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Mille Lacs	30	24			30	24	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Morrison	14	12			14	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Mower	20	10	1		19	10	95.0%	100.0%	✓+
Nicollet	16	11			16	11	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Nobles	6	8			6	8	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Norman	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Olmsted	22	5			22	5	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Otter Tail	53	22	3	1	50	21	94.3%	95.5%	✓+
Pennington	7	1			7	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Pine	18	26	1	1	17	25	94.4%	96.2%	✓+
Pipestone	6	3			6	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Polk	24	28	1	2	23	26	95.8%	92.9%	✓
Pope	7	5	1		6	5	85.7%	100.0%	✓+
Ramsey	277	216	29	9	248	207	89.5%	95.8%	✓+
Red Lake	2	2			2	2	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Redwood	9	7	1		8	7	88.9%	100.0%	✓+
Renville	2	8			2	8	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Rice	32	21	3	2	29	19	90.6%	90.5%	X
Rock	1	0			1		100.0%		-
Roseau	1	1			1	1	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
St. Louis	125	117	15	5	110	112	88.0%	95.7%	✓+
Scott	89	25	4	1	85	24	95.5%	96.0%	✓+
Sherburne	54	20	3	2	51	18	94.4%	90.0%	X
Sibley	9	4			9	4	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Stearns	33	40		1	33	39	100.0%	97.5%	✓
Steele	10	12	1	1	9	11	90.0%	91.7%	✓+
Stevens	2	2	1	2	1	0	50.0%	0.0%	X
Swift	6	14	2		4	14	66.7%	100.0%	✓+

State/county/tribe	Unique determined victims		Repeat maltreatment within 12 months?				Non-recurrence rate		Performance score card
	Jul-Dec '07	Jul-Dec '08			No				
	2008	2009			2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	2,935	2,523	249	177	2,686	2,346	91.5%	93.0%	✓+
Todd	2	7			2	7	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Traverse	2	0			2		100.0%		-
Wabasha	0	1			0	1		100.0%	✓
Wadena	5	12			5	12	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Waseca	8	8		1	8	7	100.0%	87.5%	X
Washington	78	72	5	3	73	69	93.6%	95.8%	✓+
Watonwan	9	1	1		8	1	88.9%	100.0%	✓+
Wilkin	2	3			2	3	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Winona	29	19	1	9	28	10	96.6%	52.6%	X
Wright	53	37	2	2	51	35	96.2%	94.6%	✓
Yellow Medicine	1	0			1		100.0%		-
Lincoln-Lyon-Murray	6	5			6	5	100.0%	100.0%	✓
Faribault-Martin	64	39	8		56	39	87.5%	100.0%	✓+
Leech Lake tribe		22				22		100.0%	✓
White Earth tribe		34				34		100.0%	✓

Health examination within one year

What percentage of children in out-of-home placement longer than 30 days during the reporting period received a health exam within one year? *This standard is met if 63.5 percent or more children received a health exam.* The standard set at 63.5 percent is reflective of the 75th percentile performance of counties in CY 2008. Performance in this and subsequent years will be gauged using this baseline standard.

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	0	0.0%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	21	24.1%
✓	Standard met	8	9.2%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	27	31.0%
X	Standard not met	31	35.6%
-	No data in 2009	0	0.0%

State/county/tribe	Children in placement ≥ 30 days		Had a physical exam within one year?				Health exam rate		Performance score card
	2008	2009	Yes		No		2008	2009	
State	11,073	9,659	4,901	4,113	6,172	5,546	55.7%	57.4%	X+
Aitkin	56	58	21	16	35	42	62.5%	72.4%	✓+
Anoka	579	478	373	312	206	166	35.6%	34.7%	X+
Becker	181	119	33	31	148	88	81.8%	73.9%	✓
Beltrami	226	194	99	103	127	91	56.2%	46.9%	X
Benton	79	73	43	33	36	40	45.6%	54.8%	X+
Big Stone	12	20	4	6	8	14	66.7%	70.0%	✓+
Blue Earth	158	137	69	63	89	74	56.3%	54.0%	X
Brown	59	47	32	21	27	26	45.8%	55.3%	X+
Carlton	127	122	48	53	79	69	62.2%	56.6%	X
Carver	114	96	65	42	49	54	43.0%	56.3%	X+
Cass	102	72	66	45	36	27	35.3%	37.5%	X+
Chippewa	12	17	-	2	12	15	100.0%	88.2%	✓
Chisago	51	44	28	16	23	28	45.1%	63.6%	✓+
Clay	148	121	97	53	51	68	34.5%	56.2%	X+
Clearwater	18	14	12	5	6	9	33.3%	64.3%	✓+
Cook	13	15	11	11	2	4	15.4%	26.7%	X+
Cottonwood	34	36	16	6	18	30	52.9%	83.3%	✓+
Crow Wing	209	206	128	111	81	95	38.8%	46.1%	X+
Dakota	361	280	187	128	174	152	48.2%	54.3%	X+
Dodge	27	37	14	24	13	13	48.1%	35.1%	X
Douglas	78	78	30	29	48	49	61.5%	62.8%	X+
Fillmore	33	21	20	14	13	7	39.4%	33.3%	X
Freeborn	94	58	41	29	53	29	56.4%	50.0%	X

State/county/tribe	Children in placement ≥ 30 days		Had a physical exam within one year?						Performance score card
	2008	2009		Yes		Health exam rate			
				2008	2009	2008	2009		
State	11,073	9,659	4,901	4,113	6,172	5,546	55.7%	57.4%	X+
Goodhue	92	58	43	28	49	30	53.3%	51.7%	X
Grant	11	14	3	4	8	10	72.7%	71.4%	✓
Hennepin	2,589	2,099	686	602	1,903	1,497	73.5%	71.3%	✓
Houston	45	42	12	18	33	24	73.3%	57.1%	X
Hubbard	64	48	38	22	26	26	40.6%	54.2%	X+
Isanti	66	61	39	38	27	23	40.9%	37.7%	X
Itasca	164	125	90	53	74	72	45.1%	57.6%	X+
Jackson	33	29	21	9	12	20	36.4%	69.0%	✓+
Kanabec	30	25	11	14	19	11	63.3%	44.0%	X
Kandiyohi	89	105	68	77	21	28	23.6%	26.7%	X+
Kittson	4	3	3	3	1		25.0%	0.0%	X
Koochiching	68	48	32	25	36	23	52.9%	47.9%	X
Lac qui Parle	13	11	9	5	4	6	30.8%	54.5%	X+
Lake	38	32	15	9	23	23	60.5%	71.9%	✓+
Lake of the Woods	7	8	-	2	7	6	100.0%	75.0%	✓
Le Sueur	45	50	25	28	20	22	44.4%	44.0%	X
McLeod	71	55	27	13	44	42	62.0%	76.4%	✓+
Mahnomen	39	20	23	7	16	13	41.0%	65.0%	✓+
Marshall	15	13	5	4	10	9	66.7%	69.2%	✓+
Meeker	33	30	15	15	18	15	54.5%	50.0%	X
Mille Lacs	68	44	31	28	37	16	54.4%	36.4%	X
Morrison	83	69	39	15	44	54	53.0%	78.3%	✓+
Mower	81	52	56	28	25	24	30.9%	46.2%	X+
Nicollet	51	41	25	23	26	18	51.0%	43.9%	X
Nobles	49	61	13	16	36	45	73.5%	73.8%	✓+
Norman	15	13	6	7	9	6	60.0%	46.2%	X
Olmsted	159	159	40	31	119	128	74.8%	80.5%	✓+
Otter Tail	96	89	33	35	63	54	65.6%	60.7%	X
Pennington	50	47	27	28	23	19	46.0%	40.4%	X
Pine	86	70	39	34	47	36	54.7%	51.4%	X
Pipestone	16	16	9	11	7	5	43.8%	31.3%	X
Polk	123	102	42	25	81	77	65.9%	75.5%	✓+
Pope	24	24	7	12	17	12	70.8%	50.0%	X
Ramsey	1,246	1,074	641	532	605	542	48.6%	50.5%	X+
Red Lake	15	11	3	5	12	6	80.0%	54.5%	X
Redwood	69	65	39	37	30	28	43.5%	43.1%	X
Renville	27	30	14	21	13	9	48.1%	30.0%	X
Rice	90	77	38	23	52	54	57.8%	70.1%	✓+
Rock	19	18	12	8	7	10	36.8%	55.6%	X+
Roseau	28	22	13	12	15	10	53.6%	45.5%	X

State/county/tribe	Children in placement ≥ 30 days		Had a physical exam within one year?						Performance score/card
	2008	2009		Yes		Health exam rate			
				2008	2009	2008	2009		
State	11,073	9,659	4,901	4,113	6,172	5,546	55.7%	57.4%	X+
St. Louis	670	709	409	418	261	291	39.0%	41.0%	X+
Scott	105	70	26	19	79	51	75.2%	72.9%	✓
Sherburne	121	89	38	17	83	72	68.6%	80.9%	✓+
Sibley	27	32	4	6	23	26	85.2%	81.3%	✓+
Stearns	246	227	100	63	146	164	59.3%	72.2%	✓+
Steele	47	44	24	19	23	25	48.9%	56.8%	X+
Stevens	9	10	5	5	4	5	44.4%	50.0%	X+
Swift	26	28	9	5	17	23	65.4%	82.1%	✓+
Todd	55	52	37	45	18	7	32.7%	13.5%	X
Traverse	5	3	2	2	3	1	60.0%	33.3%	X
Wabasha	27	19	10	6	17	13	63.0%	68.4%	✓+
Wadena	45	35	25	24	20	11	44.4%	31.4%	X
Waseca	24	25	16	12	8	13	33.3%	52.0%	X+
Washington	201	155	85	72	116	83	57.7%	53.5%	X
Watonwan	33	31	16	13	17	18	51.5%	58.1%	X+
Wilkin	32	23	24	17	8	6	25.0%	26.1%	X+
Winona	84	72	52	53	32	19	38.1%	26.4%	X
Wright	240	187	147	75	93	112	38.8%	59.9%	X+
Yellow Medicine	19	6	2	-	17	6	89.5%	100.0%	✓+
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	92	93	36	34	56	59	60.9%	63.4%	X+
Faribault/Martin	101	115	22	28	79	87	78.2%	75.7%	✓
Leech Lake tribe	92	154	51	76	41	78	44.6%	50.6%	
White Earth band	90	177	32	44	58	133	64.4%	75.1%	

County responses to increasing health exam rates

Issues

- Results from CFSR reviews indicate that case records tend to have documentation that health exams are completed by counties, even though data from SSIS shows far lower rates of completion. Completion rates are higher, but documentation in the SSIS field is not made. Social workers routinely work with foster parents and the child to have a screening take place as soon as possible after placement, but appropriate documentation of this may not be occurring.
- Agency review disclosed inconsistent documentation of health (medical, dental, vision) exams, omissions due to poor delineation of who was responsible for noting the information into the file or system. Foster care providers have recently moved to monthly logs regarding placements, allowing for timely reporting of accessed health services.
- Children in residential treatment do not always obtain timely health exams. This will be addressed through the case plan with responsibility being shared between the provider and biological parent. In many cases, the documentation of the health exam is not entered into the system, which impacts the numbers.

Strategies

- Review recording practices of social workers regarding medical appointments and provide any needed training to ensure all medical appointments are being entered properly. Designate specific staff to oversee accountability for this item.
- Provide form to foster care provider to complete when attending a physical exam with children in their care.

Enter data into SSIS system upon receipt of the completed exam.

- Agency will have monthly reminders at unit meetings to increase the likelihood that status of the health exam is being checked. One of the case aides is joining with public health to do Child/Teen Check Up outreach, which should improve access.
- Engage with community corrections/juvenile probation to establish a plan to fulfill the expectation associated with health exams for children in out-of-home placement.
- The county licensor will be asked to inform child foster homes, as part of their training, to make sure that when they have children placed with them, a medical exam is provided the child as soon as practical. Additionally, the agency will provide Child and Teen Checkup information packets to foster parents when a child is placed with them as a reminder and encouragement to get children into the clinic for a medical appointment.
- The agency does address health exams at the beginning of each placement. Foster parents work closely with the case worker and biological parent to ensure that a child's health needs are being addressed. When foster parents are unable to take a child to a health exam in a timely manner due to work schedules, the agency provides a family-based provider to attend with the biological parents.

Tools

- Agency will add this item to the case management checklist; supervisor will review checklist when completing quarterly case reviews to ensure children are receiving a health exam within one year.
- Revising the form foster parents bring to the doctor appointment, and will distribute to all foster parents with a letter. Social workers will be trained on the protocol and process for notifying foster parents/relatives/etc. and obtaining resulting documentation for files and be reminded to enter health exam data into SSIS.
- Agency will add health exam check to the file opening checklist at the point of placement by the placing social worker. The social service supervisor will conduct file reviews to ensure compliance.

Received mental health screening

What percentage of eligible children in child protective services or out-of-home placement during the reporting period received a mental health screening? *This standard is met if 62.6 percent or more children received a mental health screening.* In CY 2009, the target child welfare population was 11,976. Of these, 4,235 children were exempted, leaving 7,741 children eligible for a mental health screening.

Table key and performance summary

Key	Description	Counties	
		Number	Percent
✓✓	Standard met—perfect performance in 2008 and 2009	1	1.1%
✓+	Standard met—and showed improvement from 2008	25	28.7%
✓	Standard met	5	5.7%
X+	Standard not met—but showed improvement from 2008	29	33.3%
X	Standard not met	27	31.0%
-	No data in 2009	0	0.0%

State/county/tribe	Children eligible for screening		Screened?		Yes		Screening rate		Performance score card
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
State	9,761	7,741	5,501	3,462	4,260	4,279	43.6%	55.3%	X+
Aitkin	48	49	26	10	22	39	45.8%	79.6%	✓+
Anoka	306	233	189	119	117	114	38.2%	48.9%	X+
Becker	133	97	50	16	83	81	62.4%	83.5%	✓+
Beltrami	171	172	155	138	16	34	9.4%	19.8%	X+
Benton	83	60	28	9	55	51	66.3%	85.0%	✓+
Big Stone	25	27	16	11	9	16	36.0%	59.3%	X+
Blue Earth	104	83	89	34	15	49	14.4%	59.0%	X+
Brown	42	53	24	26	18	27	42.9%	50.9%	X+
Carlton	88	101	41	26	47	75	53.4%	74.3%	✓+
Carver	195	125	73	74	122	51	62.6%	40.8%	X
Cass	59	38	42	15	17	23	28.8%	60.5%	X+
Chippewa	26	27	0	0	26	27	100.0%	100.0%	✓✓
Chisago	72	57	58	48	14	9	19.4%	15.8%	X
Clay	121	47	82	25	39	22	32.2%	46.8%	X+
Clearwater	19	21	8	12	11	9	57.9%	42.9%	X
Cook	12	10	12	9	0	1	0.0%	10.0%	X+
Cottonwood	23	15	8	10	15	5	65.2%	33.3%	X
Crow Wing	128	78	99	41	29	37	22.7%	47.4%	X+
Dakota	312	245	60	37	252	208	80.8%	84.9%	✓
Dodge	23	27	16	21	7	6	30.4%	22.2%	X
Douglas	66	78	44	47	22	31	33.3%	39.7%	X+
Fillmore	12	29	12	10	0	19	0.0%	65.5%	✓+

State/county/tribe	Children eligible for screening		Screened?				Screening rate		Performance score card
	2008	2009			Yes		2008	2009	
State	9,761	7,741	5,501	3,462	4,260	4,279	43.6%	55.3%	X+
Freeborn	47	19	29	3	18	16	33.3%	84.2%	✓+
Goodhue	42	26	37	13	5	13	11.9%	50.0%	X+
Grant	12	9	4	4	8	5	66.7%	55.6%	X
Hennepin	2,774	1835	1,629	731	1,145	1104	41.3%	60.2%	X+
Houston	28	49	16	43	12	6	42.9%	12.2%	X
Hubbard	51	61	21	31	30	30	58.8%	49.2%	X
Isanti	76	52	46	17	30	35	39.5%	67.3%	✓+
Itasca	67	74	20	9	47	65	70.1%	87.8%	✓+
Jackson	42	38	15	13	27	25	64.3%	65.8%	✓+
Kanabec	49	35	38	15	11	20	22.4%	57.1%	X+
Kandiyohi	123	106	56	46	67	60	54.5%	56.6%	X+
Kittson	9	1	6	1	3	0	33.3%	0.0%	X
Koochiching	31	23	13	18	18	5	58.1%	21.7%	X
Lac qui Parle	4	10	1	5	3	5	75.0%	50.0%	X
Lake	28	32	26	29	2	3	7.1%	9.4%	X+
Lake of the Woods	16	11	10	8	6	3	37.5%	27.3%	X
Le Sueur	36	47	25	24	11	23	30.6%	48.9%	X+
McLeod	80	83	33	41	47	42	58.8%	50.6%	X
Mahnomen	12	9	11	6	1	3	8.3%	33.3%	X+
Marshall	16	14	5	3	11	11	68.8%	78.6%	✓+
Meeker	29	21	18	5	11	16	37.9%	76.2%	✓+
Mille Lacs	68	41	15	15	53	26	77.9%	63.4%	✓
Morrison	85	84	16	12	69	72	81.2%	85.7%	✓+
Mower	89	41	73	9	16	32	18.0%	78.0%	✓+
Nicollet	37	22	15	10	22	12	59.5%	54.5%	X
Nobles	57	36	22	16	35	20	61.4%	55.6%	X
Norman	27	19	14	2	13	17	48.1%	89.5%	✓+
Olmsted	325	296	79	94	246	202	75.7%	68.2%	✓
Otter Tail	141	83	72	39	69	44	48.9%	53.0%	X+
Pennington	29	33	28	28	1	5	3.4%	15.2%	X+
Pine	102	61	76	47	26	14	25.5%	23.0%	X
Pipestone	25	13	25	11	0	2	0.0%	15.4%	X+
Polk	129	85	36	12	93	73	72.1%	85.9%	✓+
Pope	43	35	32	24	11	11	25.6%	31.4%	X+
Ramsey	902	765	637	465	265	300	29.4%	39.2%	X+
Red Lake	9	16	5	8	4	8	44.4%	50.0%	X+
Redwood	21	27	13	9	8	18	38.1%	66.7%	✓+
Renville	22	11	10	7	12	4	54.5%	36.4%	X
Rice	75	69	15	5	60	64	80.0%	92.8%	✓+
Rock	2	2	1	1	1	1	50.0%	50.0%	X
Roseau	22	16	19	16	3	0	13.6%	0.0%	X

State/county/tribe	Children eligible for screening		Screened?				Screening rate		Performance score card
	2008	2009			Yes		2008	2009	
State	9,761	7,741	5,501	3,462	4,260	4,279	43.6%	55.3%	X+
St. Louis	508	379	375	162	133	217	26.2%	57.3%	X+
Scott	128	97	48	26	80	71	62.5%	73.2%	✓+
Sherburne	76	51	57	7	19	44	25.0%	86.3%	✓+
Sibley	26	27	6	13	20	14	76.9%	51.9%	X
Stearns	115	112	44	63	71	49	61.7%	43.8%	X
Steele	86	69	29	15	57	54	66.3%	78.3%	✓+
Stevens	15	29	13	14	2	15	13.3%	51.7%	X+
Swift	65	54	8	13	57	41	87.7%	75.9%	✓
Todd	20	37	12	25	8	12	40.0%	32.4%	X
Traverse	9	8	3	1	6	7	66.7%	87.5%	✓+
Wabasha	32	21	25	21	7	0	21.9%	0.0%	X
Wadena	68	43	37	27	31	16	45.6%	37.2%	X
Waseca	25	9	14	4	11	5	44.0%	55.6%	X+
Washington	148	120	125	58	23	62	15.5%	51.7%	X+
Watonwan	26	15	26	13	0	2	0.0%	13.3%	X+
Wilkin	27	20	14	12	13	8	48.1%	40.0%	X
Winona	73	33	36	3	37	30	50.7%	90.9%	✓+
Wright	194	133	175	111	19	22	9.8%	16.5%	X+
Yellow Medicine	25	32	2	7	23	25	92.0%	78.1%	✓
Lincoln-Lyon-Murray	87	85	20	13	67	72	77.0%	84.7%	✓+
Faribault-Martin	158	140	38	53	120	87	75.9%	62.1%	X
Leech Lake tribe		120		117		3		2.5%	
White Earth band		125		51		74		59.2%	

County responses to increasing mental health screening

Issues

- Standard is not met primarily because of data entry inaccuracy. In discussion with staff, this appears to be primarily an issue of documentation. Completion of the screening occurs on a regular basis, but social workers fail to document in SSIS.
- Part of the issue has been whether the county or corrections will do screenings for children placed in correctional facilities.

Strategies

- Supervisor will require social workers to make written comment on mental health issues, starting with this screening activity, in court reports during discussion of child well-being needs.
- The manager and supervisors are reviewing protocol for ensuring that this is done, and will re-train staff. Supervisors will be monitoring this quarterly, using the CMH screening tool report in SSIS.
- Supervisor and worker will follow-up monthly on reasons for exemption or screening delay.
- Train all workers on how to correctly enter mental health screening data into SSIS. The agency is now reviewing all MH screenings quarterly, and reviewing the list of clients needing data entered with each social worker and requesting they review and enter data on any identified client showing data is needed. Previously, this was contracted out, and upon receipt of screening results, it was not entered into SSIS.
- Mental Health screenings were being completed by the Public Health Department for the younger population, and by corrections for children under their supervision. Social services will now complete the screenings on all qualifying children.

SECTION 5

Section V: Performance by Racial/Ethnic Groups

To understand inequities in performance across racial/ethnic subgroups, subgroup performances are compared with the performance of whites. A county has an inequity when a subgroup underperforms whites by five percentage points or more. Racial/ethnic data for subgroups are provided only when the numerator equals 10 or more for at least one subgroup **and** whites. Data is published only when the data for a county meets the above criteria. Racial/ethnic data are provided for three measures: Re-entry into foster care, reunification within 12 months, and two or fewer placement settings.

Re-entered foster care within 12 months

Of all children who were discharged from foster care to reunification (discharged to live with parents, primary caretakers or other relatives) in the 12-month period prior to the target year, what percent re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge? *This standard is met if 9.9 percent or fewer children did not re-enter foster care within 12 months.*

Table key

First row of data	Number of children who re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home episode (numerator)
Second row of data	Number of children who entered foster care in 2008 (denominator)
Third row of data	Rate of re-entry
Fourth row of data	Difference in performance of the racial/ethnic groups from the re-entry rates for whites
Grey-shaded/red font	Highlights underperformance gaps of five percentage points or more from performance of whites
Blue font	Performance that was at least five percentage points better than the performance of whites

County	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		County total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Anoka	15	14			32	29	12		119	52	12		186	102
	40	44			98	115	17		364	242	29		542	445
	37.5%	31.8%			32.7%	25.2%	70.6%		32.7%	21.5%	41.4%		34.3%	22.9%
	4.8%	10.3%			0.0%	3.7%	37.9%				8.7%			
Hennepin	38	23			111	107	22	31	43	39	20	33	227	207
	178	162			501	513	95	107	261	247	120	144	1,137	1,116
	21.3%	14.2%			22.2%	20.9%	23.2%	29.0%	16.5%	15.8%	16.7%	22.9%	20.0%	18.5%
	4.9%	-1.6%			5.7%	5.1%	6.7%	13.2%			0.2%	7.1%		

County	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		County total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Itasca							11		25	30			37	40
							26		83	74			111	92
							42.3%		30.1%	40.5%			33.3%	43.5%
							12.2%							
Ramsey	26	26	22	22	97	95	16		89	72	20	13	262	222
	67	62	77	97	352	353	56		311	272	83	80	931	867
	38.8%	41.9%	28.6%	22.7%	27.6%	26.9%	28.6%		28.6%	26.5%	24.1%	16.3%	28.1%	25.6%
	10.2%	15.5%	0.0%	-3.8%	-1.1%	0.4%	0.0%				-4.5%	-10.2%		
St. Louis						10	27	31	17	37			56	94
						29	57	75	100	120			188	262
						34.5%	47.4%	41.3%	17.0%	30.8%			29.8%	35.9%
						3.6%	30.4%	10.5%						
Stearns						10				14				26
						29				73				125
						34.5%				19.2%				20.8%
State	79	113	22	38	240	296	88	156	293	677	52	111	1,536	1,323
	285	446	77	177	951	1,213	251	556	1,119	2,830	232	558	5,892	5,505
	27.7%	25.3%	28.6%	21.5%	25.2%	24.4%	35.1%	28.1%	26.2%	23.9%	22.4%	19.9%	26.1%	24.0%
	1.5%	1.4%	2.4%	-2.5%	-0.9%	0.5%	8.9%	4.1%			-3.8%	-4.0%	-0.1%	

County responses to reducing re-entry into foster care

Issues

- Agency has been working on the issues of disproportionality and disparate outcomes for children of color in the child protection and out-of-home placement systems for five years. Disproportionality and racial disparities developed over years, and it will take years to end them. The root of the disproportionality and disparities is institutional or structural racism within the systems. These systems include mandated reporters, child protection, out-of-home placement services provided by the county, contracted providers and the court system. All of these players must be involved in the work of ending the existing disproportionality and disparities.
- The county is becoming more diverse, it has new challenges as well as new opportunities to find culturally appropriate ways to meet the needs of these subgroups. The agency has added contracts with culturally-specific in-home service providers and with an agency to provide FGDM housed with county staff.
- One of the major reasons for children re-entering foster care within 12 months is parental chemical abuse relapse after the case is closed.

Strategies

- The agency's Multidisciplinary Child Abuse Team has focused on examining what services are being provided to minority families, and have had service providers present information to the group, and incorporated this information into the agency's service delivery.
- Getting timely and adequate chemical health treatment for the parents; designation of one primary assessor allows for this increased focus.
- Agency is hiring culturally specific staff and partnering with diverse groups and agencies. Providing culturally-sensitive and specific services to prevent out-of-home placement and achieve better outcomes for all subgroups.

Reunified within 12 months

Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the target year, who had been in foster care for eight days or longer, what percent were reunified (reunification with parents, primary caretakers or other relatives) in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home? *This standard is met if 75.2 percent or more children were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

Table Key

First row of data	Number of children who were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from their home (numerator)
Second row of data	Number of children who had been in foster care for eight days or longer (denominator)
Third row of data	12-month reunification rate
Fourth row of data	Difference of racial/ethnic subgroups from the reunification rates for whites
Grey-shaded/red font	Highlights underperformance gaps of five percentage points or more from performance of whites
Blue font	Performance that was at least five percentage points better than the performance of whites

County	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		County	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Anoka	23	19			46	16			98	62	10	13	181	103
	27	23			48	21			118	74	12	21	209	136
	85.2%	82.6%			95.8%	76.2%			83.1%	83.8%	83.3%	61.9%	86.6%	75.7%
	2.1%	-1.2%			12.8%	-7.6%					0.3%	-21.9%		
Becker							19	11	34	19			59	33
							25	13	40	23			71	39
							76.0%	84.6%	85.0%	82.6%			83.1%	84.6%
							-9.0%	2.0%						
Beltrami							54	21	10	10			69	35
							64	26	12	12			82	42
							84.4%	80.8%	83.3%	83.3%			84.1%	83.3%
							1.0%	-2.6%						
Blue Earth					13	10			42	32			68	49
					14	10			47	35			75	53
					92.9%	100.0%			89.4%	91.4%			90.7%	92.5%
					3.5%	8.6%								

County	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		County	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Carlton							13		17				32	
							16		22				41	
							81.30%		77.30%				78.00%	
							4.0%							
Cass							13		18				31	
							15		19				34	
							86.7%		94.7%				91.2%	
							-8.1%							
Clay									36		17.0%		44	
									38		18.0%		48	
									94.7%		94.4%		91.7%	
											-0.3%			
Dakota					15	20			73	64	13	15	111	96
					16	22			78	69	15	15	120	103
					93.8%	90.9%			93.6%	92.8%	86.7%	100.0%	92.5%	93.2%
					0.2%	-1.8%					-6.9%	7.2%		
Freeborn									39		10		49	
									48		13		60	
									81.3%		76.9%		81.7%	
											-4.3%			
Hennepin	99	92	11		334	233	58	51	153	136	76	72	706	562
	125	121	11		388	290	87	75	185	167	101	86	854	718
	79.2%	76.0%	100.0%		86.1%	80.3%	66.7%	68.0%	82.7%	81.4%	75.2%	83.7%	82.7%	78.3%
	-3.5%	-5.4%	17.3%		3.4%	-1.1%	-16.0%	-13.4%			-7.5%	2.3%		
Kandiyohi									45	31	15	11	48	31
									47	36	17	12	51	38
									95.7%	86.1%	88.2%	91.7%	94.1%	81.6%
											-7.5%	5.6%		
McLeod									33		13		36	
									40		14		43	
									82.5%		92.9%		83.7%	
											10.4%			

County	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		County	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Mille Lacs							14		14				28	
							16		15				31	
							87.5%		93.3%				90.3%	
							-5.8%							
Polk									41	26	14	14	50	36
									48	33	14	17	60	44
									85.4%	78.8%	100.0%	82.4%	83.3%	81.8%
											14.6%	3.6%		
Ramsey	27	33	65	46	155	174		11	125	89	30	26	396	367
	33	38	72	46	177	204		16	143	120	42	31	458	439
	81.8%	86.8%	90.3%	100.0%	87.6%	85.3%		68.8%	87.4%	74.2%	71.4%	83.9%	86.5%	83.6%
	-5.6%	12.7%	2.9%	25.8%	0.2%	11.1%		-5.4%			-16.0%	9.7%		
Redwood							10		13				28	
							11		13				30	
							90.9%		100.0%					
							-9.1%							
St. Louis	14	10			22	30	57	35	82	72			184	161
	16	12			22	35	70	44	108	92			225	198
	87.5%	83.3%			100.0%	85.7%	81.4%	79.5%	75.9%	78.3%			81.8%	81.3%
	11.6%	5.1%			24.1%	7.5%	5.5%	1.3%						
Stearns					17	24			54	51			86	81
					18	24			64	62			98	94
					94.4%	100.0%			84.4%	82.3%			87.8%	86.2%
					10.1%	17.7%								
Faribault/Martin									36	41		14	37	47
									40	49		14	42	55
									90.0%	83.7%		100.0%	88.1%	85.5%
												10.0%		
State	262	256	104	74	683	576	377	292	1,933	1,471	341	271	3,535	2,819
	318	305	117	86	776	688	462	375	2,239	1,747	402	318	4,106	3,366
	82.4%	83.9%	88.9%	86.0%	88.0%	83.7%	81.6%	77.9%	86.3%	84.2%	84.8%	85.2%	86.1%	83.7%
	-3.9%	-0.3%	2.6%	1.8%	1.7%	-0.5%	-4.7%	-6.3%			-1.5%	1.0%		

County responses to increasing reunification within 12 months

Issues

- Looking case-by-case at the children and families reflecting disparity, staff is not convinced that change in practice is required. Predominant issues impacting these children were very *high need* and, while intensive attempts to build parental capacity were made, relative resources (typically from other states) were ultimately utilized, and children were discharged to that permanency option.
- The agency will continue to experience challenges in serving children and families with mixed immigration legal status (child legal resident...parents facing deportation). There are many complications to finding resources for these children, and they are exacerbated when parental maltreatment has been determined.
- The tribe in the county has exclusive jurisdiction over children who reside or are domiciled on the trust land; therefore, the tribe is responsible for placement decisions. The tribe determines the length of placement, the change in location of placements, and when permanency shall occur. The difference in this outcome is based on data generated outside the authority of the county, but the county continues to work with tribal family services to request time frames be met.

Strategies

- The Permanency Screening Team assists workers in achieving timely reunification. The county participates in the American Indian Child Welfare Initiative workgroup meetings to develop and clarify protocols and procedures.
- Increased use of trial home visits as best practice.
- Continued development of culturally-specific resources, implementation of tools/resources, and nurturing of partnerships that meet complex cultural/behavioral needs, and accessing of legal expertise where immigration status is an issue.

Two or fewer placement settings

Of all children who were served in foster care during the target year, who were in foster care for at least eight days, but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? *This standard is met if 86.0 percent or more children had two or fewer placement settings.*

Table key

First row of data	Number of children who had two or fewer placement settings in CY 2008 (numerator)
Second row of data	Number of children who were served in foster care during 2008 who were in foster care for eight days or longer (denominator)
Third row of data	Rate of two or fewer placement settings
Fourth row of data	Difference in performance of racial/ethnic groups from the two or fewer placement settings rates for whites
Grey-shaded/red font	Highlights underperformance gaps of five percentage points or more from performance of whites
Blue font	Performance that was at least five percentage points better than the performance of whites.

State/county/tribe	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		Total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
State	367	482	125	114	940	878	726	665	2,964	2,511	439	463	5,880	4,916
	460	569	136	130	1,150	1,052	869	796	3,368	2,852	514	547	6,828	5,713
	79.8%	84.7%	91.9%	87.7%	81.7%	83.5%	83.5%	83.5%	88.0%	88.0%	85.4%	84.6%	86.1%	86.0%
	-8.2%	-3.3%	3.9%	-0.4%	-6.3%	-4.6%	-4.5%	-4.5%			-2.6%	-3.4%		
Anoka	48	33			53	30	14		167	139	22	18	300	217
	59	36			72	35	18		183	160	28	22	353	247
	81.4%	91.7%			73.6%	85.7%	77.8%		91.3%	86.9%	78.6%	81.8%	85.0%	87.9%
	-9.9%	4.8%			-17.6%	-1.2%	-13.5%				-12.7%	-5.1%		
Becker							44	12	43	38			97	62
							60	18	50	43			121	73
							73.3%	66.7%	86.0%	88.4%			80.2%	84.9%
							-12.7%	-21.7%						
Beltrami							81	71	20	26			108	110
							102	78	24	30			133	122
							79.4%	91.0%	83.3%	86.7%			81.2%	90.2%
							-3.9%	4.4%						
Blue Earth					16	14	11		64	59			98	86
					20	18	12		72	66			112	99
					80.0%	77.8%	91.7%		88.9%	89.4%			87.5%	86.9%
					-8.9%	-11.6%	2.8%							

State/county/tribe	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		Total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
State	367	482	125	114	940	878	726	665	2,964	2,511	439	463	5,880	4,916
	460	569	136	130	1,150	1,052	869	796	3,368	2,852	514	547	6,828	5,713
	79.8%	84.7%	91.9%	87.7%	81.7%	83.5%	83.5%	83.5%	88.0%	88.0%	85.4%	84.6%	86.1%	86.0%
	-8.2%	-3.3%	3.9%	-0.4%	-6.3%	-4.6%	-4.5%	-4.5%			-2.6%	-3.4%		
Carlton							26	22	38	31			69	58
							33	25	40	36			80	67
							78.8%	88.0%	95.0%	86.1%			86.3%	86.6%
							-16.2%	1.9%						
Carver	13					10			60	30			78	49
	14					12			66	36			88	58
	92.9%					83.3%			90.9%	83.3%			88.6%	84.5%
	1.9%					0.0%								
Cass							29	15	31	35			62	52
							35	15	33	38			70	55
							82.9%	100.0%	93.9%	92.1%			88.6%	94.5%
							-11.1%	7.9%						
Clay							13		58	31	22		79	41
							14		65	38	22		92	55
							92.9%		89.2%	81.6%	100.0%		85.9%	74.5%
							3.6%				10.8%			
Cottonwood									24	24	10		25	27
									27	27	11		28	30
									88.9%	88.9%	90.9%		89.3%	90.0%
											2.0%			
Dakota	16	18	10		28	29			127	127	25	24	212	187
	19	20	10		32	35			143	141	28	28	235	209
	84.2%	90.0%	100.0%		87.5%	82.9%			88.8%	90.1%	89.3%	85.7%	90.2%	89.5%
	-4.6%	-0.1%	11.2%		-1.3%	-7.2%					0.5%	-4.4%		
Freeborn									48	13	10		60	18
									54	13	13		67	19
									88.9%	100.0%	76.9%		89.6%	94.7%
											-12.0%			

State/county/tribe	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		Total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
State	367	482	125	114	940	878	726	665	2,964	2,511	439	463	5,880	4,916
	460	569	136	130	1,150	1,052	869	796	3,368	2,852	514	547	6,828	5,713
	79.8%	84.7%	91.9%	87.7%	81.7%	83.5%	83.5%	83.5%	88.0%	88.0%	85.4%	84.6%	86.1%	86.0%
	-8.2%	-3.3%	3.9%	-0.4%	-6.3%	-4.6%	-4.5%	-4.5%			-2.6%	-3.4%		
Hennepin	182	174	24	15	493	363	120	81	261	206	133	103	1,161	894
	232	219	33	17	613	463	150	123	306	237	167	147	1,430	1,125
	78.4%	79.5%	72.7%	88.2%	80.4%	78.4%	80.0%	65.9%	85.3%	86.9%	79.6%	70.1%	81.2%	79.5%
	-6.8%	-7.5%	-12.6%	1.3%	-4.9%	-8.5%	-5.3%	-21.1%			-5.7%	-16.9%		
Hubbard							18		25	25			48	30
							18		26	25			49	31
							100.0%		96.2%	100.0%			98.0%	96.8%
							3.8%							
Itasca							21		75	61			101	73
							23		84	69			112	82
							91.3%		89.3%	88.4%			90.2%	89.0%
							2.0%							
Kandiyohi									55	66	20	29	62	68
									56	70	20	32	63	72
									98.2%	94.3%	100.0%	90.6%	98.4%	94.4%
											1.8%	-3.7%		
McLeod									39	33	14	12	45	39
									42	35	14	12	49	41
									92.9%	94.3%	100.0%	100.0%	91.8%	95.1%
											7.1%	5.7%		
Mille Lacs							22	14	27	17			50	31
							22	15	28	18			51	33
							100.0%	93.3%	96.4%	94.4%			98.0%	93.9%
							3.6%	-1.1%						
Nobles									22	22	26	11	46	39
									23	23	26	11	48	42
									95.7%	95.7%	100.0%	100.0%	95.8%	92.9%
											4.3%	4.3%		

State/county/tribe	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		Total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
State	367	482	125	114	940	878	726	665	2,964	2,511	439	463	5,880	4,916
	460	569	136	130	1,150	1,052	869	796	3,368	2,852	514	547	6,828	5,713
	79.8%	84.7%	91.9%	87.7%	81.7%	83.5%	83.5%	83.5%	88.0%	88.0%	85.4%	84.6%	86.1%	86.0%
	-8.2%	-3.3%	3.9%	-0.4%	-6.3%	-4.6%	-4.5%	-4.5%			-2.6%	-3.4%		
Olmsted	13	16			13				46	49		10	77	75
	13	16			16				51	54		10	85	81
	100.0%	100.0%			81.3%				90.2%	90.7%		100.0%	90.6%	92.6%
	9.8%	9.3%			-8.9%							9.3%		
Otter Tail						10			55	41			64	56
						10			60	45			69	60
						100.0%			91.7%	91.1%			92.8%	93.3%
						8.9%								
Pine							13		21	20			46	33
							15		23	23			50	39
							86.7%		91.3%	87.0%			92.0%	84.6%
							-4.6%							
Ramsey	43	50	91	69	244	235	17	14	179	133	61	44	603	522
	52	63	93	81	286	264	19	15	204	149	65	53	685	598
	82.7%	79.4%	97.8%	85.2%	85.3%	89.0%	89.5%	93.3%	87.7%	89.3%	93.8%	83.0%	88.0%	87.3%
	-5.1%	-9.9%	10.1%	-4.1%	-2.4%	-0.2%	1.7%	4.1%			6.1%	-6.2%		
Redwood							17	19	19	14	10		48	40
							18	22	21	16	11		52	45
							94.4%	86.4%	90.5%	87.5%	90.9%		92.3%	88.9%
							4.0%	-1.1%			0.4%			
Rice									15	17	11	10	38	43
									21	21	14	10	48	50
									71.4%	81.0%	78.6%	100.0%	79.2%	86.0%
										0.0%	7.1%	19.0%		
St. Louis	24	18			43	51	99	92	145	139	15		335	339
	29	23			51	61	119	127	180	164	17		404	425
	82.8%	78.3%			84.3%	83.6%	83.2%	72.4%	80.6%	84.8%	88.2%		82.9%	79.8%
	2.2%	-6.5%			3.8%	-1.1%	2.6%	-12.3%			7.7%			

State/county/tribe	Two or more races		Asian		Black		American Indian		White		Hispanic		Total	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
State	367	482	125	114	940	878	726	665	2,964	2,511	439	463	5,880	4,916
	460	569	136	130	1,150	1,052	869	796	3,368	2,852	514	547	6,828	5,713
	79.8%	84.7%	91.9%	87.7%	81.7%	83.5%	83.5%	83.5%	88.0%	88.0%	85.4%	84.6%	86.1%	86.0%
	-8.2%	-3.3%	3.9%	-0.4%	-6.3%	-4.6%	-4.5%	-4.5%			-2.6%	-3.4%		
Scott	15				16				34	13	10		74	32
	15				17				36	15	10		77	37
	100.0%				94.1%				94.4%	86.7%	100.0%		96.1%	86.5%
	5.6%				-0.3%						5.6%			
Stearns					21	26			95	69			143	107
					29	32			101	75			159	121
					72.4%	81.3%			94.1%	92.0%			89.9%	88.4%
					-21.6%	-10.8%								
Washington	13				13	14			61	37			117	70
	15				14	14			66	46			129	85
	86.7%				92.9%	100.0%			92.4%	80.4%			90.7%	82.4%
	-5.8%				0.4%	19.6%								
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray									44	35	10		48	43
									58	41	15		63	50
									75.9%	85.4%	66.7%		76.2%	86.0%
											-9.2%			
Faribault/Martin									55	67	10	20	59	93
									60	74	10	22	65	101
									91.7%	90.5%	100.0%	90.9%	90.8%	92.1%
											8.3%	0.4%		
Leech Lake tribe							82	83					87	92
							92	92					97	101
							89.1%	90.2%					89.7%	91.1%
White Earth band		10					68	122				16	74	133
		10					75	128				17	82	139
		100.0%					90.7%	95.3%				94.1%	90.2%	95.7%

County responses to increasing placement stability (two or fewer placement settings)

Issues

- The relatively high use of emergency placements in the county has a more adverse affect on minority populations, due to a lack of readily available foster homes able to meet culturally-specific needs. Children can be moved from an emergency placement to a longer-term one while a more culturally-sensitive provider is sought, or a kinship placement is developed.
- As the county is becoming more diverse, though the percentages of the different racial/ethnic groups are still small, there are a limited number of resources to meet the needs of diverse populations. It is difficult to attract culturally-diverse providers. The agency established an African American Disparities advisory group which has helped to establish relationships with four new vendors to provide individual and home-based counseling, as well as FGDM services with the Native American, African American and Latino populations.
- The tribe continues to struggle with developing an adequate pool of trained Native American foster homes. The tribe is attempting to provide placement options not only for children domiciled on the reservation, but also for tribal enrollees from across Minnesota and throughout the country. Many children entering placement have special needs and challenging behaviors. They often enter as part of sibling groups of four to six children. Children frequently experience multiple placement settings due to caregivers' unwillingness or inability to meet the special needs of children in their care.
- Too often, relatives appear to be able to care for children, but later will not accept legal responsibility, or say the children are too difficult to handle. Along with this, build into case plans that relatives obtain further knowledge/skills to address the specific needs of children in their care, increasing their care giving comfort level to achieve permanency, rather than another placement setting.
- In reviewing the county performance, there were two main factors affecting this measure: first, a foster mother became very ill and could no longer care for the child. Additionally, trial home visits were used to help return this child to the parent was subsequently unsuccessful. A TPR was initiated through the court process and the child was adopted.
- In reviewing children that were placed in two or more settings, the county met the national standard for overall placements. The cases where the agency has a significant performance rate below the national average is with Hispanic children. These children, in many cases, come from homes that have chemical dependency issues. The agency continues to work closely with providers to ensure treatment plans are appropriate for families to achieve long-term sobriety. However, for many of the families, their only support system is relatives who many times have their own unresolved chemical dependency issues.
- The county lacks foster homes with American Indian heritage. The agency attempts to recruit more American Indian foster homes and increase efforts to locate relatives for placement. An increase in available American Indian foster homes may reduce the number of moves for children.
- The existing disproportionality begins at intake – African American and American Indian children are reported as victims of child maltreatment at a rate four times higher than the child population. To decrease and eliminate this disproportionality, work needs to be expanded with mandated reporters, and early intervention efforts that connect families with supports and resources to address the issues that make them at high risk of entering the child protection and/or out-of-home placement systems.
- The agency does what is in the best interest of a child, even if it is at odds of meeting he performance standards.

Strategies

- Focus on development of up-front services, including culturally-specific or sensitive services, to prevent placements, as well as more appropriate services to help children reunite successfully with their parents.
- A new plan for recruitment of child foster homes was implemented at the beginning of 2008. Specific locations, placement and diversity needs were identified, including culturally diverse homes and homes willing to work with teens. One foster care licensing social worker was designated as half-time recruitment and retention specialist on a trial basis, to work collaboratively with metro recruiters. As a result of this partnership, new outreach and recruitment efforts were made in the Native American community, and working on recruitment efforts with the African American community. The agency allocated administrative funds to pay for advertising, printing brochures, posters and other outreach materials, as well as staff time of a community relations person to assist in planning efforts.
- Recruited and licensed one Native American foster home off the reservation and will continue to recruit, train and support additional Native American foster/adopt homes off the reservation.
- Request suspension of parental rights to achieve permanency via customary adoptions when tribes oppose termination of parental rights, and families do not want transfer of permanent legal and physical custody.
- Use a number of strategies to assist diverse populations: early intervention services for African American families at-risk of entering into the child welfare system; early intervention access to family support services for families on public assistance; work with at-risk African American children ages 9 – 11 to support social inclusion and avoid youth justice; provide support services to refugee populations and continue to work to increase staff of color. Community agencies have also expanded the number of staff of color.
- Taking a three dimensional approach to decreasing and eliminating existing racial disparities, recognizing it needs to be addressed in a multi-faceted manner.
 - Staff – increasing/enhancing the skills and knowledge of staff across systems to increase their ability to effectively work with people from a variety of racial/ethnic heritages.
 - Institutional – looking at and changing practices and policies that cause or maintain existing racial disparities.
 - Community – working with the African American, American Indian, Hmong and Hispanic/Latino communities to support their efforts in providing support and resources to high risk families so they are able to provide a safe, nurturing environment for their children and not enter the child protection and/or out-of-home placement systems.
- Identified specific units that are working in collaboration with local tribes and American Indian families to reduce or avoid placement. Committing more resources to identify relatives and complete home studies in a timelier manner. One of these resources is FGDM which helps families more quickly identify potential relatives and facilitates transfer of custody to relatives, as needed. Contract with both tribes to provide family intervention and support services. Recently assigned one in-home family-based worker to work exclusively with American Indian clients.
- The largest minority group in the county is American Indian clients. The implications of the Indian Child Welfare Act with required *active efforts* and tribal aversion to termination of parental rights result in more frequent placements and reunifications than in non-ICWA families. The agency has developed an American Indian specialty unit that works to comply with ICWA, and works in a culturally-competent manner to help American Indian families successfully reunite.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Advisory

This information is available in alternative formats to individuals with disabilities by calling (651) 431-4671 (voice). TTY users can call through Minnesota Relay at (800) 627-3529. For Speech-to-Speech, call (877) 627-3848. For additional assistance with legal rights and protections for equal access to human services programs, contact your agency's ADA coordinator.