



**Minnesota
Department of Human Services**

**Initial Report on Human Services Performance
Selected County Measures**

January 2008

Published by:
Minnesota Department of Human Services
Planning and Performance Measures
PO Box 64996
St. Paul, MN 55164-0996
(651) 431-4318
Contact – John Patterson (john.patterson@state.mn.us)

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Measure 1: Percentage of Cash and Food Support Applications that Have an Initial Action within 30 Days	12
Measure 2: MFIP / DWP Three-Year Self-Support Index	16
Measure 3: MFIP Work Participation Rate	22
Measure 4: Percentage of Children in Child Support Cases with Paternity Established	26
Measure 5: Percentage of Child Support Cases with a Child Support Order Established	30
Measure 6: Percentage of Current Child Support Collected	34
Measure 7: Percentage of Arrears Cases with Arrears Collections	38
Measure 8: Child Support Collections per Dollar of Program Spending	42
Measure 9: Percentage of BSF Child Care Assistance Allocation Spent	46
Measure 10: Percentage of Child Protection Assessments or Investigations that Are Initiated within Statutory Timeframes	50
Measure 11: Percentage of Children Experiencing a Recurrence of Maltreatment within 12 Months	54
Measure 12: Percentage of Children in Foster Care for Less than 12 Months with No More than Two Placement Settings	58
Measure 13: Percentage of Children in Foster Care who are Reunified with their Parents within 12 Months	62
Measure 14: Percentage of Children Adopted within 24 Months	66
Measure 15: Percentage of Clients Remaining in the Community 180 Days Following Discharge from an Inpatient Psychiatric Setting	70

Table of Contents Continued

Measure 16: Number of Children Receiving County-Administered Mental Health Services per 10,000 Children in the County	74
Measure 17: Percentage of Children Involved in the Child Welfare System who Received a Mental Health Screening	78
Measure 18: Percentage of Elderly Receiving Publicly-Funded Long-Term Care who Live in a Community Setting	82
Measure 19: Percentage of People with Disabilities Receiving Publicly-Funded Long-Term Care who Live in a Community Setting	88
Measure 20: Percentage of Health Care Applications that Have an Initial Action within 45 Days	92
Measures 21 – 23: Human Service Spending per Capita	96
External Factors	106
Future Reports	114

Introduction

To better serve the residents of Minnesota, the Department of Human Services (DHS) and counties need to continuously track performance data and use this information to improve their policies and operations. If performance data reveal a strength, DHS and counties should build upon that strength. For example, if most counties are achieving successful outcomes in a program area but some counties are struggling, DHS should work with counties to assess the differences between the successful and struggling counties and determine if there are any lessons to learn or best practices to share. Similarly, if performance data reveal a consistent weakness across most counties, DHS and the counties should correct or overcome the weakness.

To assist DHS and counties in this effort, DHS has developed this initial performance report. In the past, the department has provided counties with performance data on a program-by-program basis. This report provides information about county performance across a broad spectrum of human services. While the report is limited to performance measures for which the state currently has county-by-county data and is not based on a fully-developed performance measurement model (such as a *Balanced Scorecard* or *Logic Model*), it provides valuable information. As this report is further developed in future years, DHS will work with county human services staff and county commissioners to improve it. DHS expects to issue this report annually.

During the development of this report, counties expressed concerns about issuing a performance report before a more comprehensive performance measurement system has been developed. However, DHS believes that it should actively use its existing performance data while developing better measures and a more comprehensive performance measurement system. Developing a comprehensive and fully-developed performance measurement system could take several years, due to the complexity and magnitude of creating such a system. Thus, the department is taking an incremental approach to developing such a system.

Having a county performance report is important with Minnesota's state-supervised, county-administered human services system. Under this structure, DHS develops program policies, sets standards, issues policy guidelines and manuals, maintains statewide case management and information systems, provides policy and technical support (through helpdesks and other means), trains county staff, and provides oversight. Minnesota's 87 counties administer the programs and work most directly with program clients. Because each county administers its own programs, DHS needs to track performance in each county.

Purpose

This report will provide DHS, county human services departments, and county boards with performance information so that they can make informed and strategic decisions and

improve program operations and outcomes. The report contains information and data for 23 performance measures that cover most major human service program areas (including cash and food support, child support, child care, child welfare, children’s mental health, adult mental health, aging services, disability services, and health care eligibility). The measures also cover several types of performance (including effectiveness, efficiency, access/availability, and cost).

The measures in the report provide important performance information. Over half of the 23 measures were established by the federal government or reflect requirements in state statute. In addition, the measures are not new to county officials. DHS regularly reports most of the measures to the counties, and only a few have never been reported before. However, this report is the first time that DHS has consolidated the measures into one report.

Finally, the Office of the Legislative Auditor recommended in its 2007 report on *Human Services Administration* that DHS periodically provide county performance information to county human services agencies, their governing boards, and the Legislature.¹ This report is DHS’ initial effort to implement the recommendation.

Report Structure

The report provides background information and county-by-county data for the 23 performance measures. For each measure, the background information includes (1) a description of the measure, (2) a discussion of its strengths and limitations, and (3) information about how county, state, and federal policies and actions affect performance. If available, each measure has five years of data and information about each county’s performance relative to performance benchmarks or standards that have been established. All this information is important for putting county performance into the proper context.

If available, the report provides data for each of the state’s 87 counties. However, two sets of counties have consolidated their human services administrations – Faribault and Martin counties and Lincoln, Lyon, and Murray counties. If separate data are available for these five counties, they are reported separately. However, the data are sometimes collected jointly and cannot be easily broken out by the individual counties. The report also provides data on a state-fiscal year, federal-fiscal year, and calendar year basis depending on how the data are most frequently reported to counties for a given measure. This is done to ensure that the performance data reported here are consistent with the same data reported in other publications.

The report also identifies which of the 23 measures DHS has included in its *Priority Plans*. To guide and focus DHS’ efforts over the next two years, the department has developed plans around six priorities, which include: (1) at-risk adults, (2) at-risk children, (3) reducing disparities, (4) health care access, quality, and affordability, (5)

¹ Office of the Legislative Auditor, *Human Services Administration* (St. Paul, January 2007), 45.

chemical health and mental health systems, and (6) home and community-based services. Each of these plans has performance measures built into them.²

After the discussion of the 23 performance measures, the report provides data on 11 external factors that may affect county performance but over which counties have limited control. This information is needed to understand the environment in which each county is operating. These factors include such things as poverty and unemployment rates and the percentage of adults in a county who have limited English skills.

Methodology

DHS' goal is to report a balanced portfolio of measures that assesses performance for a wide range of human services and captures different aspects of performance. The different types of performance include effectiveness, efficiency, access/availability, and cost. An effective program provides high quality services and improves the lives of its clients. An efficient program makes the best use of its resources and provides services in a timely and cost-effective manner. Program services are accessible and available if eligible residents are able to enroll and participate without difficulty. Finally, the report includes cost measures. These cost data provide information on the amount of money counties have spent to achieve the program benefits measured in the effectiveness, efficiency, and access/availability measures.

To develop this initial portfolio:

- DHS staff identified 66 performance measures for which the department had county data. An additional 27 performance measures identified in the Office of the Legislature Auditor's report on *Human Service Administration* were added to the list of measures.
- From the initial list of 93 measures, a team of DHS staff (with representatives from each program area) created a short list of 26 measures. To create the short list, each team member identified the 20 measures that he or she felt represented the best portfolio of measures and captured overall county performance. The 26 measures that received the most support among DHS staff were included in the department's short list.
- DHS also sent the full list of 93 measures to a group of 14 county representatives for comment. Based on this county input, a county list of 26 measures was created. This selection process was similar to the one used by the team of DHS staff to shorten the full list of 93 measures.
- Based on the short lists from DHS staff and county representatives and the goal of creating a balanced portfolio of measures, DHS selected 18 measures for the report. In the 18 measures, DHS tried to include one to three measures from each program area and at least three or four measures for each type of performance.

² An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* can be accessed at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

- In reaction to DHS’ 18 measures, the Executive Committee of the Minnesota Association of County Social Services Administrators (MACSSA) suggested that DHS add additional child support enforcement and child welfare measures to the portfolio. These additional measures are well accepted, already reported to counties, and have performance benchmarks or standards. The addition of these measures provides a more complete picture of performance in those two program areas. In response to MACSSA’s suggestion, DHS added three additional child support measures and two additional child welfare measures to the portfolio.

The following table breaks out the portfolio of measures in this report by program area and type of performance.

Portfolio of Measures by Program Area and Type of Measure

	Number of Measures in Portfolio				Total
	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Access / Availability	Cost	
DHS’ Original Portfolio					
Cash and Food Support	2	1			3
Child Support Enforcement	2				2
Child Care			1		1
Child Welfare	2	1			3
Children’s Mental Health			2		2
Adult Mental Health	1				1
Chemical Health					0
Aging Services	1				1
Disability Services	1				1
Health Care Eligibility		1			1
Licensing					0
All Program Areas				3	3
Sub-Total	9	3	3	3	18
Added Measures					
Child Support Enforcement	2	1			3
Child Welfare	2				2
Final Total	13	4	3	3	23

DHS used a similar process of incorporating DHS staff and county input when selecting the 11 external factors, which are discussed on page 106 of this report.

Readers’ Guide

The reader should consider the following when interpreting the information contained in this report:

- Because this report is limited to performance data that is currently available and is not based on a fully-developed performance model (such as a *Balance Scorecard* or *Logic Model*), it is not a comprehensive and complete assessment of county performance. While the reader can use the report to assess a county's performance for a range of human service operations, the reader should not make conclusions about a county's overall performance without additional information.
- The reader should use caution when comparing counties. Two counties may operate under very different circumstances. Among other things, the counties may have very different unemployment and poverty rates and percentage of adults with limited English skills. To make appropriate comparisons, the reader may want to use the external factor data to create peer groups of counties that operate under similar circumstances and then make comparisons within those groups.
- The performance of small counties can vary widely from one year to the next because of random fluctuations in their caseloads. If a county only serves two children in a program, one bad outcome can reduce that county's performance by 50 percent. In contrast, if another county serves 1,000 children in that same program, one bad outcome only reduces its performance by one-tenth of one percent. To help the reader understand the relative size of each county's caseload, the last column of each performance table shows the number of individuals, cases, or dollars involved in each performance calculation. If a small county has widely fluctuating performance over time, it is best to examine its performance over several years.
- To show improvements or declines in performance over time for each county, the report also shows the percentage change in the performance during the reporting period. For a performance measure that is expressed as a percentage, the change is calculated as the percentage change in the percentage, not as a percentage point change. Furthermore, in the report, DHS typically rounds performance data to the nearest whole number. Consequently, this rounding may cause some reporting differences between the yearly performance data and percentage changes.

Performance Summary

The following table summarizes statewide performance on each of the measures. The main body of the report provides more detailed information, including a description of each measure, up to five years of performance data for each county, and information about performance benchmarks or standards (if they exist).

Overall, county performance varies. On some measures, the counties perform well compared with established performance standards; but on other measures, there is clearly room for improvement.

Summary of Statewide Performance

	Statewide Performance in Most Recent Year	Number of Counties Achieving Performance Benchmark or Standard in Most Recent Year	Number of Counties Showing Improved Performance
Percentage of Cash and Food Support Applications that Have an Initial Action within 30 Days	83%	No benchmark or standard established	34 of 87
MFIP / DWP Three-Year Self-Support Index	0.725 out of 1.000	47 of 87 within expectations 30 of 87 above expectations	77 of 87
MFIP Work Participation Rate	37%	20 of 84 reached 50% standard or 5 percentage point increase	56 of 84
Percentage of Children in Child Support Cases with Paternity Established	96%	84 of 84 reached 50% threshold 84 of 84 reached 80% threshold	78 of 84
Percentage of Child Support Cases with a Child Support Order Established	82%	84 of 84 reached 50% threshold 75 of 84 reached 80% threshold	72 of 84
Percentage of Current Child Support Collected	68%	84 of 84 reached 40% threshold 2 of 84 reached 80% threshold	7 of 84
Percentage of Arrears Cases with Arrears Collections	66%	84 of 84 reached 40% threshold 1 of 84 reached 80% threshold	68 of 84
Child Support Collections per Dollar of Program Spending	\$4.04	83 of 84 reached \$2.00 threshold 57 of 84 reached \$5.00 threshold	28 of 84
Percentage of BSF Child Care Assistance Allocation Spent (in relation to the size of the program waiting list)	89%	77 of 84 spend 90% of funds or did not have a waiting list	N/A
Percentage of Child Protection Assessments or Investigations that are Initiated within Statutory Timeframes	63%	No benchmark or standard established	Only one year of data
Percentage of Children Experiencing a Recurrence of Maltreatment within 12 Months	7.5%	55 of 82 reached 7.5% standard ¹	33 of 82
Percentage of Children in Foster Care for Less than 12 Months with No More than Two Placement Settings	89.2%	67 of 84 reached 86.7% standard	39 of 84
Percentage of Children in Foster Care who are Reunified with their Parents within 12 Months	90.4%	78 of 84 reached 76.2% standard	38 of 84
Percentage of Children Adopted within 24 Months	48.8%	40 of 57 reached 32.0 standard ²	N/A
Percentage of Clients Remaining in the Community 180 Days Following Discharge from an Inpatient Psychiatric Setting	65%	No benchmark or standard established	44 of 85 ³

Summary of Statewide Performance

	Statewide Performance in Most Recent Year	Number of Counties Achieving Performance Benchmark or Standard in Most Recent Year	Number of Counties Showing Improved Performance
Number of Children Receiving County-Administered Mental Health Services per 10,000 Children in the County	187	No benchmark or standard established	65 of 87
Percentage of Children Involved in the Child Welfare System who Received a Mental Health Screening	32%	No benchmark or standard established	45 of 83 ⁴
Percentage of Elderly Receiving Publicly-Funded Long-Term Care who Live in a Community Setting	56.7%	No benchmark or standard established	72 of 87
Percentage of People with Disabilities Receiving Publicly-Funded Long-Term Care who Live in a Community Setting	89.1%	No benchmark or standard established	76 of 87
Percentage of Health Care Applications that Have an Initial Action within 45 Days	73%	No benchmark or standard established	23 of 87
Total Human Service Spending per Capita (state and county spending of federal, state, county, and miscellaneous funds)	\$1,532	No benchmark or standard established	N/A
County Human Service Spending per Capita (county spending of federal, state, county, and miscellaneous funds)	\$290	No benchmark or standard established	N/A
County Funds Devoted to Human Services per Capita (county spending of county funds)	\$122	No benchmark or standard established	N/A
Note: "N/A" means not applicable.			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Two counties did not have any children who were determined to be the victims of maltreatment during the measurement period. Twenty seven counties did not have any adoptions in calendar year 2006. Two counties did not have anyone discharged from an inpatient setting in state fiscal year 2002. One county did not have any children needing an assessment in calendar year 2005. 			

Measure 1: Percentage of Cash and Food Support Applications that Have an Initial Action within 30 Days

Program Area: Cash and Food Support

Type of Measure: Efficiency

Measure Description: This measure assesses whether counties are processing cash and food support applications within the required 30 day timeframe.³ The cash support programs include Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP), Diversionary Work Program (DWP), Minnesota Supplemental Assistance, Refugee Cash Assistance, Group Residential Housing, General Assistance, and Emergency Assistance.

Strengths of the Measure: For individuals and families experiencing financial difficulties, receiving cash and food support as quickly as possible is important. While individuals and families with an approved application will eventually receive retroactive support for the period that their application was being processed, delayed applications can cause individuals and families continued financial stress.

Limitations of the Measure: Not all applications that take more than 30 days to process are caused by county inaction. If an applicant has an incomplete application and has not submitted all the required verifications after 30 days, a county worker may keep the application open in “pending” status to allow the applicant time to submit the correct paperwork. Under current policy, in most cases, county workers are supposed to deny an application if it is incomplete after 30 days and require the applicant to complete a new

³ The requirement is in the Department of Human Services’ *Combined Manual*, “Application Processing Standards,” 0005.12.15.

This measure is calculated by first drawing from DHS’ MAXIS Data Warehouse new applications in a given month for all cash and food programs (except adoption assistance under Part IV-E of the Social Security Act) and recording the application date. Next, the date of the county’s initial action on the application is identified. This initial action is identified regardless of the of the eligibility result. The measure only includes new applications, limiting the initial actions to denials, initial openings, openings with a break greater than four months, breaks less than four months, and expedited Food Support. This eliminates applications that are auto-denied by MAXIS or reinstatements. Finally, the number of days between the date of the initial action and the application date are calculated.

All of the cash and food programs included in this measure have an application processing standard of 30 days except for disabled applicants for the Group Residential Housing and Minnesota Supplemental Aid. These applications have a processing standard of 60 days. DHS was unable to account for this different processing standard when calculating this measure.

application when all the required information is available.⁴ However, county workers may keep cases open when the delay in completing the application is not due to the client's failure or refusal to provide the information.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Processing cash and food support applications is a county responsibility. Consequently, county funding, staffing levels, management decisions, and internal processes may affect performance.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: State policies and requirements determine the level of effort required to process an application. For example, if a new policy requires additional verifications, it may take applicants longer to have a complete application. As another example, a complex new policy that requires extra processing steps may reduce the number of applications a county worker can process. Either of these examples would ultimately affect the length of time required to complete and process an application.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: No performance standard has been established.

Because there are justifiable reasons why a county might be unable to process an application within 30 days, a county may accept a performance level below 100 percent. However, the failure of applicants to provide missing application information is not always a valid reason for counties to take more than 30 days to process an application. For example, if a county case worker holds an application for 28 days before telling the applicant that the application is incomplete, the applicant's inability to complete the application in the next two days should not be a justification for the case worker's failure to process the application within 30 days.

Other Reporting of this Measure: This performance report is the first time that DHS has provided counties with performance data for this specific measure, which covers a range of cash and food support programs. However, DHS regularly examines a sample of Food Support applications for timely processing through its Quality Control and Management Evaluation reviews.⁵

Performance Summary: Statewide, case workers take initial action on 83 percent of their applications within the 30 day timeframe. However, 53 of the state's 87 counties had a lower level of performance in state fiscal year 2007 than in 2003.

⁴ Department of Human Services, *Combined Manual*, "Application Processing Standards," 0005.12.15.

⁵ Department of Human Services, *Minnesota Food Support Program: Quality Control Accuracy Report – October 2006 through July 2007* (St. Paul, December 2007) –

http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/county_access/documents/pub/dhs_id_052952.pdf. Also, Department of Human Services, *FFY 2006 Food Support Program Management Evaluation (ME) Results Reported* (Bulletin #07-03-02, St. Paul, April 2007) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_138081.pdf.

Measure 1: Timely Cash and Food Support Application Processing

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	2007 Applications Received
Aitkin	96%	96%	94%	93%	93%	N/A	-3%	727
Anoka	86%	87%	89%	87%	86%	N/A	0%	10,855
Becker	97%	96%	96%	95%	94%	N/A	-3%	1,911
Beltrami	92%	92%	92%	91%	90%	N/A	-2%	4,906
Benton	91%	92%	92%	91%	88%	N/A	-3%	1,582
Big Stone	91%	75%	84%	86%	89%	N/A	-3%	156
Blue Earth	87%	88%	91%	87%	87%	N/A	-1%	2,254
Brown	90%	91%	91%	90%	90%	N/A	0%	875
Carlton	89%	90%	87%	87%	86%	N/A	-3%	1,339
Carver	85%	86%	85%	84%	81%	N/A	-5%	1,108
Cass	91%	93%	89%	88%	90%	N/A	-1%	1,916
Chippewa	73%	78%	90%	92%	86%	N/A	17%	427
Chisago	92%	89%	89%	89%	90%	N/A	-2%	1,430
Clay	95%	97%	96%	95%	95%	N/A	-1%	2,861
Clearwater	91%	90%	91%	91%	88%	N/A	-4%	756
Cook	90%	82%	74%	84%	80%	N/A	-12%	98
Cottonwood	90%	93%	95%	95%	96%	N/A	7%	434
Crow Wing	92%	92%	92%	89%	89%	N/A	-2%	2,632
Dakota	87%	87%	88%	87%	87%	N/A	0%	10,644
Dodge	95%	89%	88%	85%	82%	N/A	-14%	522
Douglas	73%	69%	85%	88%	87%	N/A	20%	1,238
Faribault	87%	90%	93%	91%	88%	N/A	1%	561
Fillmore	95%	95%	89%	90%	89%	N/A	-7%	579
Freeborn	89%	91%	90%	89%	89%	N/A	0%	1,134
Goodhue	87%	88%	91%	90%	90%	N/A	3%	1,179
Grant	82%	84%	82%	84%	87%	N/A	5%	171
Hennepin	80%	78%	78%	81%	82%	N/A	3%	74,608
Houston	87%	87%	89%	92%	88%	N/A	1%	450
Hubbard	92%	94%	92%	89%	89%	N/A	-4%	805
Isanti	84%	85%	90%	90%	87%	N/A	4%	1,229
Itasca	91%	89%	92%	88%	88%	N/A	-3%	1,917
Jackson	90%	89%	90%	93%	94%	N/A	4%	348
Kanabec	90%	89%	90%	88%	86%	N/A	-4%	738
Kandiyohi	92%	93%	92%	94%	96%	N/A	4%	2,467
Kittson	98%	98%	96%	90%	92%	N/A	-6%	83
Koochiching	90%	90%	88%	89%	88%	N/A	-3%	666
Lac Qui Parle	91%	96%	96%	98%	97%	N/A	6%	158
Lake	86%	87%	88%	84%	79%	N/A	-8%	335
Lake of the Woods	84%	83%	87%	87%	89%	N/A	7%	91
Le Sueur	85%	87%	85%	87%	88%	N/A	3%	763
Lincoln	86%	77%	83%	75%	74%	N/A	-14%	130
Lyon	89%	89%	90%	91%	84%	N/A	-6%	1,073
McLeod	91%	93%	92%	89%	87%	N/A	-4%	1,370
Mahnomen	96%	95%	95%	95%	94%	N/A	-2%	747
Marshall	89%	92%	85%	87%	90%	N/A	2%	260
Martin	86%	90%	89%	87%	87%	N/A	1%	933
Meeker	93%	94%	93%	92%	91%	N/A	-2%	874

Measure 1: Timely Cash and Food Support Application Processing

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	2007 Applications Received
Mille Lacs	94%	90%	88%	91%	89%	N/A	-5%	942
Morrison	90%	85%	91%	90%	91%	N/A	0%	1,007
Mower	87%	88%	90%	89%	88%	N/A	1%	1,709
Murray	93%	92%	93%	93%	91%	N/A	-2%	188
Nicollet	90%	90%	90%	86%	86%	N/A	-5%	1,002
Nobles	88%	88%	89%	87%	91%	N/A	4%	902
Norman	92%	96%	96%	97%	93%	N/A	1%	255
Olmsted	89%	90%	90%	89%	89%	N/A	0%	5,858
Otter Tail	87%	87%	89%	91%	88%	N/A	2%	1,993
Pennington	90%	90%	92%	92%	93%	N/A	3%	640
Pine	97%	96%	96%	94%	93%	N/A	-3%	1,346
Pipestone	89%	93%	91%	94%	95%	N/A	6%	355
Polk	91%	93%	94%	93%	94%	N/A	3%	1,831
Pope	89%	87%	90%	87%	87%	N/A	-3%	302
Ramsey	77%	73%	75%	73%	68%	N/A	-12%	30,132
Red Lake	95%	96%	96%	95%	94%	N/A	-1%	177
Redwood	84%	85%	87%	83%	85%	N/A	0%	591
Renville	90%	88%	89%	89%	88%	N/A	-1%	928
Rice	83%	81%	80%	78%	78%	N/A	-6%	1,775
Rock	93%	90%	90%	86%	87%	N/A	-6%	191
Roseau	85%	89%	82%	77%	82%	N/A	-4%	251
St. Louis	90%	90%	89%	89%	87%	N/A	-3%	11,721
Scott	83%	87%	87%	87%	87%	N/A	5%	1,707
Sherburne	90%	91%	89%	90%	90%	N/A	0%	2,012
Sibley	93%	91%	95%	94%	92%	N/A	-1%	457
Stearns	87%	86%	88%	87%	83%	N/A	-4%	4,818
Steele	85%	88%	87%	87%	88%	N/A	3%	1,372
Stevens	88%	90%	81%	80%	75%	N/A	-14%	212
Swift	93%	94%	95%	96%	95%	N/A	2%	316
Todd	84%	85%	88%	84%	81%	N/A	-4%	908
Traverse	96%	94%	96%	97%	98%	N/A	2%	178
Wabasha	91%	91%	90%	88%	89%	N/A	-2%	563
Wadena	88%	91%	89%	91%	94%	N/A	7%	1,008
Waseca	97%	98%	97%	97%	96%	N/A	-2%	727
Washington	87%	87%	85%	85%	80%	N/A	-8%	3,592
Watsonwan	91%	93%	95%	92%	88%	N/A	-3%	486
Wilkin	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%	N/A	0%	333
Winona	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	N/A	-1%	1,570
Wright	80%	81%	84%	85%	82%	N/A	3%	2,954
Yellow Medicine	88%	91%	87%	93%	88%	N/A	0%	241
Statewide	85%	83%	84%	84%	83%		-1%	230,298
County Minimum	73%	69%	74%	73%	68%			
County Median	90%	90%	90%	89%	88%			
County Maximum	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%			

Measure 2: MFIP/DWP Three-Year Self-Support Index

Program Area: Cash and Food Support

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: The Self-Support Index measures county success in helping Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and Diversionary Work Program (DWP) clients become self sufficient. Besides cash and food support, MFIP provides low income families with employment and other services so that they can become self sufficient and move off the program. Most families applying for cash assistance who have not been on MFIP for at least 12 months first enter an intensive four-month employment program (DWP). After four months on DWP, they can apply for MFIP if needed.

To be considered successful under this measure, an adult who has participated in MFIP or DWP must work an average of 30 or more hours per week or no longer receive cash assistance under MFIP or DWP. Specifically, the Self-Support Index tracks a cohort of MFIP and DWP adults over a three year period. An MFIP/DWP adult is part of the cohort if he or she was eligible for MFIP or DWP in one or more months of the baseline quarter (the initial three month period). The measure then examines the client's employment and program status three years later during a measurement quarter.⁶ For each county, the Self-Support Index captures the percentage of MFIP/DWP adults who are becoming self sufficient according to this operational definition.⁷

Strengths and Limitations of the Measure: Self sufficiency is a primary goal of the MFIP and DWP programs, and this measure gauges the success of program participants statewide and in each county. Counties are responsible for helping clients become self sufficient by providing employment services and other supports through their own staff or contracts with outside service providers.

⁶ Adults in their first 60 months of MFIP are counted as successful if they were either (1) working 30 hours or more per week or (2) no longer receiving an MFIP or DWP cash payment during each month of the measurement quarter. Adults who were no longer eligible to receive MFIP cash assistance because they had reached MFIP's 60-month time limit are counted as successful only if they worked 30 hours or more per week or had converted to Supplemental Security Income (SSI) during the last month for which reliable income information was available. Adults who were sanctioned off MFIP or DWP in at least one month of the measurement quarter are counted as successful only if they worked 30 hours or more per week or had converted to SSI during the last month for which reliable income information was available.

⁷ Specifically, the index is computed by dividing the number of successful MFIP/DWP adults in a measurement quarter by the total number of MFIP/DWP adults in the baseline quarter. The data for the Self-Support Index come from DHS' MAXIS Data Warehouse and the Department of Employment and Economic Development's WorkForce One system.

The Self-Support Index provides a valid and objective way to assess county performance. DHS sets performance expectations for each county by using a statistical model that accounts for differences in the caseload, demographic, and economic characteristics across counties. Counties with a strong economy and less challenging caseload are expected to achieve a higher Self-Support Index value than counties with a weaker economy and more challenging caseload. Counties contend that demographic and economic factors that are outside their control have a large impact on performance. However, the Self-Support Index is intended to incorporate these factors into the analysis when county performance expectations are set.

The measure was developed through county, tribal, provider, and state collaboration, which is a strength of this measure. In addition, the measure has since been written into state statute.⁸

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: As mentioned, counties are responsible for providing MFIP and DWP clients with employment services and other support services. Many factors influence success on this measure, including county actions and policies that promote employment or exit from MFIP.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The majority of funding for the MFIP and DWP programs comes from the federal government. In state fiscal year 2007, it provided 83 percent of the MFIP Consolidated Fund. The state and counties respectively provided the remaining 6 and 11 percent. Consequently, federal funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which can affect program performance.

In addition, federal and state laws and policies establish the overall design and operation of the MFIP and DWP programs. These laws and policies try to encourage clients to become self sufficient. For example, earned income disregards and subsidized child care provide an incentive for clients to seek employment and pursue self sufficiency.

Performance Benchmarks or Standards: As described earlier, each county has its own performance benchmark/standard. Using a statistical model, DHS establishes an expected range of performance for each county based on its caseload, demographic, and economic characteristics.

A small portion of each county's MFIP funding from the state is contingent upon it meeting this performance standard. A county earns 2.5 percent of its MFIP Consolidated Fund allocation if its Self-Support Index is within or above its expected range or the county submits a performance improvement plan that DHS approves. If a county performs above its expected level, it receives the 2.5 percent plus an additional 5 percent bonus. The Legislature established these provisions.⁹

⁸ Minnesota Special Session Laws 2001, First Special Session, Chapter 9, Article 10.

⁹ Ibid.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS reports this measure quarterly and annually in its *MFIP Management Indicators Report* and *Annualized Self-Support Index and Work Participation Rate*.¹⁰

DHS also features the measure on its Department Results website and has incorporated it into its *Priority Plan for At-Risk Children*.¹¹

Performance Summary: Overall, counties are performing relatively well on this measure. As the following table shows, 30 counties exceeded performance expectations by performing above their upper performance bound, 47 counties performed within their expected performance range, and 10 counties performed below their lower bound. Furthermore, in the most recent year, 77 counties had a higher Self-Support Index than two years earlier. The other ten counties had a decline in performance.

¹⁰ Minnesota Department of Human Services, *MFIP Management Indicators Report* (St. Paul, MN) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/Legacy/DHS-4042e-ENG>; and Minnesota Department of Human Services, *Annualized Self-support Index and Work Participation Rate for 2007* (St. Paul, MN) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/Legacy/DHS-4651-ENG>.

¹¹ The website is available at <http://www.departmentresults.state.mn.us/hs/index.html>. An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* is available at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Page left intentionally blank

Measure 2: MFIP/DWP Three-Year Self-Support Index

	April 2004 - March 2005	April 2005 - March 2006	April 2006 - March 2007	2006/07 Lower Performance Bound	2006/07 Upper Performance Bound	2006/07 Perform- ance Level	2005-07 Percentage Change in Index	2006/07 Average Number of Adults
Aitkin	0.826	0.857	0.854	0.781	0.844	Exceed	3%	178
Anoka	0.719	0.729	0.743	0.725	0.770	Within	3%	2,472
Becker	0.752	0.775	0.796	0.760	0.796	Exceed	6%	346
Beltrami	0.735	0.727	0.704	0.638	0.692	Exceed	-4%	680
Benton	0.754	0.776	0.740	0.761	0.808	Below	-2%	294
Big Stone	0.738	0.765	0.845	0.833	0.887	Within	15%	55
Blue Earth	0.731	0.749	0.791	0.781	0.838	Within	8%	552
Brown	0.883	0.850	0.835	0.841	0.886	Below	-5%	174
Carlton	0.761	0.768	0.783	0.767	0.809	Within	3%	308
Carver	0.772	0.785	0.796	0.741	0.793	Exceed	3%	210
Cass	0.750	0.754	0.785	0.699	0.765	Exceed	5%	287
Chippewa	0.761	0.885	0.873	0.804	0.859	Exceed	15%	90
Chisago	0.705	0.754	0.797	0.766	0.798	Within	13%	342
Clay	0.807	0.846	0.826	0.784	0.819	Exceed	2%	686
Clearwater	0.764	0.830	0.842	0.707	0.801	Exceed	10%	101
Cook	0.748	0.785	0.750	0.722	0.889	Within	0%	13
Cottonwood	0.847	0.853	0.855	0.805	0.861	Within	1%	114
Crow Wing	0.778	0.815	0.804	0.767	0.816	Within	3%	551
Dakota	0.706	0.706	0.746	0.720	0.772	Within	6%	1,978
Dodge	0.861	0.893	0.905	0.822	0.871	Exceed	5%	87
Douglas	0.831	0.868	0.860	0.802	0.869	Within	3%	198
Faribault	0.792	0.804	0.841	0.806	0.863	Within	6%	104
Fillmore	0.839	0.845	0.812	0.837	0.903	Below	-3%	97
Freeborn	0.812	0.819	0.861	0.828	0.866	Within	6%	336
Goodhue	0.771	0.783	0.826	0.790	0.850	Within	7%	247
Grant	0.843	0.851	0.894	0.796	0.886	Exceed	6%	43
Hennepin	0.639	0.654	0.676	0.653	0.679	Within	6%	13,004
Houston	0.818	0.789	0.806	0.818	0.860	Below	-1%	120
Hubbard	0.775	0.801	0.802	0.771	0.824	Within	4%	218
Isanti	0.800	0.824	0.837	0.731	0.775	Exceed	5%	269
Itasca	0.792	0.825	0.836	0.794	0.833	Exceed	6%	401
Jackson	0.821	0.810	0.866	0.830	0.899	Within	6%	62
Kanabec	0.767	0.787	0.797	0.790	0.834	Within	4%	174
Kandiyohi	0.804	0.838	0.842	0.787	0.836	Exceed	5%	505
Kittson	0.977	0.989	0.918	0.821	0.924	Within	-6%	21
Koochiching	0.736	0.710	0.789	0.783	0.834	Within	7%	156
Lac Qui Parle	0.788	0.858	0.839	0.828	0.918	Within	6%	31
Lake	0.801	0.869	0.869	0.843	0.888	Within	8%	72
Lake of the Woods	0.907	0.918	0.926	0.764	0.901	Exceed	2%	24
Le Sueur	0.848	0.904	0.879	0.839	0.876	Exceed	4%	172
Lincoln	0.913	0.922	0.896	0.820	0.918	Within	-2%	27
Lyon	0.840	0.857	0.849	0.827	0.873	Within	1%	186
McLeod	0.858	0.886	0.891	0.853	0.893	Within	4%	255
Mahnomen	0.631	0.644	0.667	0.560	0.669	Within	6%	70
Marshall	0.786	0.777	0.799	0.833	0.896	Below	2%	52
Martin	0.785	0.865	0.829	0.799	0.844	Within	6%	207
Meeker	0.799	0.857	0.851	0.850	0.883	Within	7%	188
Mille Lacs	0.777	0.798	0.789	0.797	0.838	Below	2%	228

Measure 2: MFIP/DWP Three-Year Self-Support Index

	April 2004 - March 2005	April 2005 - March 2006	April 2006 - March 2007	2006/07 Lower Performance Bound	2006/07 Upper Performance Bound	2006/07 Perform- ance Level	2005-07 Percentage Change in Index	2006/07 Average Number of Adults
Morrison	0.802	0.829	0.856	0.810	0.849	Exceed	7%	221
Mower	0.808	0.808	0.822	0.781	0.828	Within	2%	370
Murray	0.924	0.970	0.952	0.839	0.908	Exceed	3%	47
Nicollet	0.770	0.782	0.804	0.799	0.850	Within	4%	256
Nobles	0.778	0.802	0.833	0.837	0.885	Below	7%	175
Norman	0.826	0.854	0.852	0.833	0.892	Within	3%	73
Olmsted	0.777	0.784	0.822	0.820	0.858	Within	6%	1,164
Otter Tail	0.805	0.828	0.847	0.805	0.844	Exceed	5%	401
Pennington	0.771	0.848	0.846	0.798	0.864	Within	10%	148
Pine	0.774	0.814	0.839	0.788	0.827	Exceed	8%	385
Pipestone	0.866	0.865	0.897	0.822	0.883	Exceed	4%	87
Polk	0.807	0.834	0.856	0.765	0.812	Exceed	6%	454
Pope	0.794	0.791	0.819	0.789	0.898	Within	3%	73
Ramsey	0.607	0.602	0.612	0.627	0.652	Below	1%	8,364
Red Lake	0.799	0.845	0.876	0.799	0.898	Within	10%	34
Redwood	0.736	0.818	0.834	0.769	0.839	Within	13%	130
Renville	0.764	0.840	0.865	0.810	0.871	Within	13%	180
Rice	0.754	0.786	0.774	0.800	0.857	Below	3%	394
Rock	0.870	0.877	0.951	0.856	0.912	Exceed	9%	56
Roseau	0.935	0.880	0.863	0.792	0.881	Within	-8%	59
St. Louis	0.687	0.737	0.757	0.741	0.781	Within	10%	2,609
Scott	0.753	0.754	0.773	0.725	0.784	Within	3%	381
Sherburne	0.775	0.816	0.826	0.741	0.792	Exceed	7%	353
Sibley	0.842	0.814	0.847	0.843	0.912	Within	1%	87
Stearns	0.753	0.772	0.783	0.775	0.814	Within	4%	944
Steele	0.769	0.829	0.835	0.807	0.851	Within	9%	330
Stevens	0.909	0.899	0.926	0.763	0.894	Exceed	2%	31
Swift	0.759	0.797	0.846	0.801	0.883	Within	11%	63
Todd	0.811	0.849	0.891	0.811	0.844	Exceed	10%	222
Traverse	0.909	0.868	0.881	0.744	0.852	Exceed	-3%	32
Wabasha	0.820	0.848	0.863	0.794	0.854	Exceed	5%	104
Wadena	0.792	0.811	0.776	0.760	0.810	Within	-2%	198
Waseca	0.820	0.813	0.825	0.831	0.872	Below	1%	220
Washington	0.701	0.728	0.754	0.713	0.781	Within	8%	993
Watsonwan	0.886	0.880	0.903	0.815	0.883	Exceed	2%	93
Wilkin	0.854	0.937	0.960	0.853	0.905	Exceed	12%	56
Winona	0.751	0.806	0.820	0.793	0.844	Within	9%	307
Wright	0.776	0.829	0.852	0.770	0.803	Exceed	10%	525
Yellow Medicine	0.815	0.866	0.848	0.791	0.886	Within	4%	45
Statewide	0.694	0.710	0.725				5%	
County Minimum	0.607	0.602	0.612					
County Median	0.792	0.819	0.837					
County Maximum	0.977	0.989	0.960					

Measure 3: MFIP Work Participation Rate

Program Area: Cash and Food Support

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: The MFIP Work Participation Rate measures the percentage of MFIP cases that are fully engaged in employment or employment-related activities (such as education or job search) each year. Certain MFIP caregivers are required to participate in employment services.¹²

Strengths of the Measure: Employment, which is a means to self sufficiency, is a goal of MFIP. This measure gauges the success of each county in getting their clients engaged in either employment or employment-related activities for a specified number of hours per week. Under MFIP, counties are responsible for providing clients employment services and other supports through county staff or contracts with outside service providers.

Limitations of the Measure: To align with the federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, DHS will report a different Work Participation Rate starting in April 2007. The new measure will only include federally-funded cases (rather than also including state-funded cases) and follow new federal rules that define work-eligible individuals, determine whether activities may be counted as work activities, and specify how to document and verify reported hours of activity. Consequently, there will be no continuity between the work participation rate reported here and future reporting.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: As mentioned, counties are responsible for providing MFIP clients with employment and other support services. The assumption is that county actions and policies that succeed in getting clients engaged in employment-related activities result in improved performance.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The majority of funding for the MFIP and DWP programs comes from the federal government. In state fiscal year 2007, it provided 83 percent of the MFIP Consolidated Fund. The state and counties respectively provided the remaining 6 and 11 percent. Consequently, federal

¹² For each county, the numerator of the measurement ratio is the sum across 12 months of the number of cases in each month that had an MFIP-eligible adult or a minor head-of-household meeting MFIP's work requirements. The denominator is the sum across 12 months of the number of MFIP cases in each month that had an eligible adult or minor head-of-household. The source of the data is DHS' MAXIS Data Warehouse, which includes data provided by the Department of Employment and Economic Development.

funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which can affect program performance.

In addition, federal and state laws and policies establish the overall design and operation of MFIP. These laws and policies try to encourage clients to pursue employment or employment-related activities. For example, earned income disregards and subsidized child care provide incentives for clients to pursue employment and participate in employment-related activities.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: Under the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (under which MFIP operates), the federal government expects Minnesota to achieve at least a 50 percent Work Participation Rate (less a caseload reduction factor). Minnesota then expects each of its counties to achieve a 50 percent Work Participation Rate. If a county does not achieve the 50 percent standard, the state expects it to improve its Work Participation Rate by 5 percentage points from the previous year as an alternative.

A small portion of each county's MFIP funding from the state is contingent upon it meeting this performance standard. A county earns 2.5 percent of its MFIP Consolidated Fund allocation by achieving the 50 percent standard or increasing its rate by 5 percentage points. The Legislature established this provision.¹³

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS reports this measure quarterly and annually in its *MFIP Management Indicators Report* and *Annualized Self-Support Index and Work Participation Rate*.¹⁴

Performance Summary: Compared with their performance on the MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (measure 2), counties are struggling to meet the performance standard for this measure. In the most recent year, only 20 of the state's 84 county human service administrations met the performance standard of a 50 percent Work Participation Rate or a 5 percentage point improvement. However, 56 of the 84 county administrations have a higher Work Participation Rate than three years earlier.

¹³ Minnesota Special Session Laws 2001, First Special Session, Chapter 9, Article 10.

¹⁴ Minnesota Department of Human Services, *MFIP Management Indicators Report* (St. Paul, MN) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/legacy/DHS-4042e-ENG>; and Minnesota Department of Human Services, *Annualized Self-support Index and Work Participation Rate for 2007* (St. Paul, MN) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/legacy/DHS-4651-ENG>.

Measure 3: MFIP Work Participation Rate

	July 2003 - June 2004	July 2004 - June 2005	April 2005 - March 2006	April 2006 - March 2007	2006/07 Eligible for Performance Funds	2004-07 Percentage Change	2006/07 Number of Cases with an Eligible Adult or Minor Head-of-Household (monthly total summed over 12 months)
Aitkin	40%	49%	52%	53%	Yes	33%	480
Anoka	35%	48%	41%	44%	No	25%	11,216
Becker	35%	50%	40%	44%	No	26%	1,181
Beltrami	37%	47%	40%	39%	No	7%	4,240
Benton	37%	50%	46%	50%	Yes	35%	1,184
Big Stone	33%	43%	44%	39%	No	18%	125
Blue Earth	46%	63%	54%	56%	Yes	22%	2,015
Brown	55%	63%	58%	57%	Yes	3%	530
Carlton	35%	46%	39%	38%	No	9%	970
Carver	57%	58%	42%	36%	No	-37%	545
Cass	32%	51%	43%	40%	No	26%	1,287
Chippewa	30%	50%	48%	39%	No	28%	281
Chisago	46%	54%	47%	50%	Yes	8%	1,050
Clay	42%	56%	47%	45%	No	5%	2,223
Clearwater	41%	50%	42%	46%	No	14%	414
Cook	40%	49%	33%	53%	Yes	34%	58
Cottonwood	36%	47%	36%	42%	Yes	14%	290
Crow Wing	36%	48%	38%	38%	No	4%	1,906
Dakota	34%	38%	37%	35%	No	3%	8,404
Dodge	41%	48%	50%	40%	No	-2%	245
Douglas	32%	45%	42%	43%	No	34%	642
Faribault/Martin	44%	54%	51%	52%	Yes	19%	861
Fillmore	40%	54%	43%	43%	No	8%	391
Freeborn	45%	53%	52%	48%	No	9%	1,062
Goodhue	36%	45%	35%	28%	No	-21%	1,017
Grant	36%	46%	18%	16%	No	-55%	112
Hennepin	35%	42%	37%	35%	No	1%	68,800
Houston	42%	60%	53%	48%	No	14%	727
Hubbard	34%	46%	42%	48%	Yes	41%	507
Isanti	41%	54%	43%	45%	No	10%	801
Itasca	36%	46%	34%	33%	No	-8%	1,327
Jackson	43%	53%	46%	42%	No	-1%	186
Kanabec	35%	40%	39%	35%	No	1%	528
Kandiyohi	37%	50%	46%	39%	No	5%	1,660
Kittson	53%	73%	25%	27%	No	-50%	60
Koochiching	37%	62%	56%	52%	Yes	43%	634
Lac Qui Parle	42%	47%	39%	37%	No	-10%	83
Lake	46%	72%	48%	31%	No	-33%	103
Lake of the Woods	50%	76%	51%	54%	Yes	7%	71
Le Sueur	49%	56%	54%	54%	Yes	9%	594
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	48%	59%	54%	45%	No	-6%	728
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray						
McLeod	41%	53%	42%	44%	No	7%	503
Mahnomen	36%	34%	27%	25%	No	-30%	459
Marshall	38%	45%	42%	34%	No	-9%	111
Martin	See Faribault/Martin						
Meeker	38%	50%	38%	42%	No	11%	438

Measure 3: MFIP Work Participation Rate

	July 2003 - June 2004	July 2004 - June 2005	April 2005 - March 2006	April 2006 - March 2007	2006/07 Eligible for Performance Funds	2004-07 Percentage Change	2006/07 Number of Cases with an Eligible Adult or Minor Head-of-Household (monthly total summed over 12 months)
Mille Lacs	55%	63%	51%	44%	No	-19%	785
Morrison	34%	43%	37%	43%	Yes	28%	558
Mower	43%	55%	48%	50%	Yes	17%	1,191
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray						
Nicollet	60%	68%	62%	63%	Yes	5%	1,330
Nobles	41%	60%	44%	39%	No	-5%	600
Norman	40%	46%	42%	37%	No	-6%	142
Olmsted	41%	52%	45%	45%	No	8%	4,100
Otter Tail	40%	49%	46%	40%	No	-1%	1,155
Pennington	45%	58%	49%	35%	No	-22%	315
Pine	46%	51%	43%	41%	No	-12%	1,025
Pipestone	46%	60%	52%	46%	No	1%	179
Polk	44%	57%	38%	38%	No	-15%	1,308
Pope	39%	43%	24%	28%	No	-30%	198
Ramsey	26%	33%	29%	30%	No	12%	60,335
Red Lake	45%	57%	43%	26%	No	-42%	108
Redwood	44%	59%	45%	46%	No	4%	301
Renville	27%	39%	39%	34%	No	28%	366
Rice	38%	47%	44%	40%	No	6%	1,586
Rock	55%	55%	44%	49%	Yes	-12%	216
Roseau	44%	60%	48%	34%	No	-22%	137
St. Louis	31%	45%	39%	40%	No	31%	9,219
Scott	38%	47%	37%	39%	No	3%	1,474
Sherburne	30%	43%	35%	32%	No	7%	1,101
Sibley	49%	65%	56%	53%	Yes	9%	318
Stearns	35%	42%	38%	45%	Yes	29%	4,290
Steele	37%	51%	43%	40%	No	8%	877
Stevens	46%	58%	44%	50%	Yes	10%	32
Swift	28%	62%	45%	41%	No	47%	167
Todd	40%	45%	41%	45%	No	12%	461
Traverse	54%	64%	43%	37%	No	-31%	81
Wabasha	37%	46%	51%	45%	No	23%	244
Wadena	36%	61%	41%	33%	No	-8%	770
Waseca	47%	50%	52%	61%	Yes	31%	647
Washington	30%	45%	40%	41%	No	38%	4,073
Watsonwan	52%	58%	49%	39%	No	-25%	223
Wilkin	33%	46%	27%	27%	No	-17%	159
Winona	38%	49%	41%	42%	No	13%	1,112
Wright	26%	35%	36%	40%	No	52%	1,386
Yellow Medicine	37%	54%	47%	33%	No	-12%	125
Statewide	34%	42%	37%	37%	No	7%	231,947
County Minimum	26%	33%	18%	16%			
County Median	40%	50%	43%	41%			
County Maximum	60%	76%	62%	63%			

Measure 4: Percentage of Children in Child Support Cases with Paternity Established

Program Area: Child Support Enforcement

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure indicates whether counties are successfully establishing paternity for their child support cases.¹⁵ Before a court can order a father to pay child support, the state must establish that he is the child's legal father. The state presumes that a husband is the father of any children born within marriage. A father of a child born outside of marriage can voluntarily sign a "recognition of parentage" form to establish paternity. If paternity is uncertain or contested, genetic testing is done.

Strengths of the Measure: Establishing paternity is a critical step in collecting child support, which is needed to ensure that custodial parents have sufficient financial resources to raise their children.

In addition, the federal government created this measure, and it is used across the country. If a state meets federal performance thresholds on this measure, it receives federal financial incentives. The better Minnesota performs on this measure compared with other states, the more incentive funds it receives. The state then passes these incentive funds onto the counties based on each county's individual performance.

Limitations of the Measure: The primary objective of the child support enforcement program is not to establish paternity but to collect child support so that custodial parents have sufficient financial resources to raise their children. While establishing paternity is critical for collecting child support, it is just one step in the process.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that are interstate cases, where one of the parents lives in another state. Counties do not have complete control over these cases.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties administer the child support enforcement program. County child support officers open new cases, locate parents, and established paternity when needed. Because paternity establishment can

¹⁵ The numerator in this calculation is the number of children in open child support cases who were born outside of marriage and had paternity established by the end of a federal fiscal year. The denominator is the number of children in open child support cases who were born outside of marriage at the end of the preceding federal fiscal year. The percentage of cases with paternity established can exceed 100 percent because of how the ratio is constructed. Open cases refer to cases that are open under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act. The data come from DHS' PRISM system.

involve the courts, county attorneys provide legal advice and services to the county child support officers. The strategies and resources that counties use to locate parents and establish paternity can affect performance on this measure.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The federal government determines the overall direction of state child support enforcement programs under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act. DHS supervises county administration of the program by establishing policies, maintaining an automated case management computer system (PRISM), creating tools for counties to locate parents, providing training, and monitoring county performance. How well DHS performs these tasks can affect the counties' ability to establish paternity.

The child support enforcement program receives funding from several sources. In state fiscal year 2006, the federal government provided 75 percent of the funding, while the state and counties respectively provided the remaining 11 and 14 percent. Consequently, federal and state funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which can affect program performance. For example, many in the child support enforcement community contend that recent reductions in the federal funding for child support enforcement could negatively affect Minnesota's and the counties' ability to serve families.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: The performance standards that Minnesota has created for counties for this measure are based on standards that the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement established for states. To receive incentive payments from the federal government, each state must establish paternity for at least 50 percent of the children in child support cases. The size of the federal incentive payment increases until a state establishes paternity for at least 80 percent of the children, at which point the incentive payment is maximized. Minnesota then distributes its federal incentive payments to the counties using the same methodology and performance thresholds.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS publishes performance data for this measure in three documents – (1) monthly CPAT activity reports, (2) quarterly CPAT summary reports, and (3) the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report*.¹⁶

Performance Summary: Counties have performed well on this measure. All 84 county administrations exceeded the upper performance threshold of 80 percent. Furthermore, the state's overall performance increased by 17 percent between federal fiscal years 2002 and 2006.

¹⁶ Monthly CPAT reports are available to county staff in the PRISM system's InfoPac Reports – QW260201 – QW260216 and QW290101- QW290102; quarterly CPAT reports are available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&Redirected=true&dDocName=id_017654; and the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report* is available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=id_008804.

Measure 4: Percentage of Children with Paternity Established

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 50% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Children in Support Cases who Were not Born in Marriage in FFY 2005 (for FFY 2006 calculation)
Aitkin	91%	94%	116%	105%	109%	Yes	Yes	20%	523
Anoka	88%	89%	102%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	14%	8,767
Becker	91%	95%	113%	102%	99%	Yes	Yes	9%	1,421
Beltrami	80%	80%	107%	101%	92%	Yes	Yes	15%	2,339
Benton	94%	101%	122%	109%	109%	Yes	Yes	16%	1,173
Big Stone	92%	91%	104%	100%	99%	Yes	Yes	8%	116
Blue Earth	91%	96%	106%	98%	100%	Yes	Yes	10%	1,477
Brown	95%	98%	103%	104%	104%	Yes	Yes	9%	711
Carlton	92%	92%	106%	101%	103%	Yes	Yes	12%	1,127
Carver	90%	89%	105%	103%	102%	Yes	Yes	13%	1,174
Cass	90%	80%	103%	101%	97%	Yes	Yes	8%	1,249
Chippewa	99%	95%	115%	109%	107%	Yes	Yes	8%	350
Chisago	95%	98%	111%	106%	106%	Yes	Yes	11%	1,315
Clay	88%	89%	105%	101%	101%	Yes	Yes	15%	1,987
Clearwater	91%	88%	102%	94%	92%	Yes	Yes	1%	456
Cook	73%	93%	103%	101%	107%	Yes	Yes	47%	90
Cottonwood	90%	101%	111%	101%	100%	Yes	Yes	11%	332
Crow Wing	92%	95%	105%	104%	102%	Yes	Yes	11%	1,984
Dakota	92%	92%	102%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	9%	9,938
Dodge	91%	87%	107%	99%	110%	Yes	Yes	21%	403
Douglas	98%	95%	109%	106%	101%	Yes	Yes	3%	823
Faribault/Martin	93%	97%	115%	107%	106%	Yes	Yes	14%	1,082
Fillmore	92%	99%	106%	102%	100%	Yes	Yes	9%	375
Freeborn	93%	93%	108%	105%	105%	Yes	Yes	13%	1,223
Goodhue	97%	95%	113%	108%	105%	Yes	Yes	8%	1,287
Grant	96%	93%	101%	103%	96%	Yes	Yes	0%	134
Hennepin	73%	77%	94%	92%	92%	Yes	Yes	25%	43,232
Houston	92%	87%	98%	90%	96%	Yes	Yes	4%	498
Hubbard	87%	95%	109%	102%	103%	Yes	Yes	18%	651
Isanti	103%	96%	112%	107%	108%	Yes	Yes	5%	1,027
Itasca	91%	95%	106%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	10%	1,673
Jackson	104%	98%	124%	106%	114%	Yes	Yes	10%	291
Kanabec	82%	84%	105%	97%	107%	Yes	Yes	30%	502
Kandiyohi	85%	88%	103%	99%	98%	Yes	Yes	15%	1,595
Kittson	103%	103%	125%	102%	104%	Yes	Yes	1%	91
Koochiching	90%	93%	115%	103%	111%	Yes	Yes	23%	476
Lac Qui Parle	89%	84%	87%	99%	101%	Yes	Yes	13%	125
Lake	100%	98%	118%	102%	107%	Yes	Yes	7%	247
Lake of the Woods	107%	111%	114%	104%	108%	Yes	Yes	1%	108
Le Sueur	79%	86%	104%	110%	106%	Yes	Yes	34%	629
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	95%	91%	105%	103%	102%	Yes	Yes	7%	1,077
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
McLeod	92%	94%	111%	99%	102%	Yes	Yes	11%	926
Mahnomen	89%	92%	109%	106%	108%	Yes	Yes	21%	437
Marshall	96%	89%	106%	97%	101%	Yes	Yes	5%	179
Martin	See Faribault/Martin								

Measure 4: Percentage of Children with Paternity Established

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 50% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Children in Support Cases who Were not Born in Marriage in FFY 2005 (for FFY 2006 calculation)
Meeker	89%	91%	105%	101%	102%	Yes	Yes	14%	596
Mille Lacs	88%	93%	105%	100%	101%	Yes	Yes	15%	1,031
Morrison	100%	96%	108%	98%	100%	Yes	Yes	0%	1,126
Mower	88%	83%	91%	89%	91%	Yes	Yes	3%	1,711
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
Nicollet	94%	96%	110%	104%	102%	Yes	Yes	8%	969
Nobles	79%	85%	90%	94%	93%	Yes	Yes	18%	762
Norman	88%	77%	100%	105%	99%	Yes	Yes	13%	168
Olmsted	94%	93%	102%	102%	101%	Yes	Yes	7%	3,580
Otter Tail	90%	92%	98%	99%	103%	Yes	Yes	14%	1,356
Pennington	87%	82%	85%	83%	86%	Yes	Yes	-1%	567
Pine	96%	92%	106%	97%	102%	Yes	Yes	6%	1,199
Pipestone	88%	101%	111%	107%	110%	Yes	Yes	25%	326
Polk	87%	97%	110%	108%	107%	Yes	Yes	23%	1,192
Pope	86%	105%	113%	111%	97%	Yes	Yes	12%	207
Ramsey	72%	73%	85%	83%	84%	Yes	Yes	17%	27,362
Red Lake	88%	111%	122%	100%	103%	Yes	Yes	17%	96
Redwood	93%	103%	108%	103%	102%	Yes	Yes	9%	536
Renville	92%	82%	106%	98%	105%	Yes	Yes	14%	420
Rice	83%	88%	95%	92%	94%	Yes	Yes	13%	1,380
Rock	90%	98%	122%	113%	113%	Yes	Yes	25%	201
Roseau	96%	89%	98%	95%	91%	Yes	Yes	-6%	414
St. Louis	92%	95%	107%	102%	102%	Yes	Yes	10%	7,246
Scott	83%	86%	101%	95%	99%	Yes	Yes	19%	1,759
Sherburne	98%	95%	109%	106%	104%	Yes	Yes	6%	1,639
Sibley	85%	88%	104%	102%	106%	Yes	Yes	24%	390
Stearns	86%	85%	102%	101%	101%	Yes	Yes	17%	2,874
Steele	89%	94%	111%	106%	102%	Yes	Yes	14%	1,027
Stevens	102%	92%	110%	106%	96%	Yes	Yes	-6%	177
Swift	90%	91%	114%	107%	105%	Yes	Yes	16%	264
Todd	95%	95%	110%	100%	107%	Yes	Yes	12%	729
Traverse	73%	97%	130%	115%	113%	Yes	Yes	55%	107
Wabasha	87%	86%	97%	95%	99%	Yes	Yes	14%	422
Wadena	98%	97%	109%	102%	100%	Yes	Yes	2%	565
Waseca	100%	92%	106%	98%	100%	Yes	Yes	0%	636
Washington	87%	93%	105%	102%	102%	Yes	Yes	17%	3,954
Watsonwan	90%	82%	97%	100%	96%	Yes	Yes	6%	522
Wilkin	79%	94%	117%	108%	108%	Yes	Yes	37%	179
Winona	91%	92%	104%	98%	96%	Yes	Yes	5%	1,254
Wright	92%	95%	109%	106%	106%	Yes	Yes	15%	2,251
Yellow Medicine	87%	88%	90%	96%	109%	Yes	Yes	25%	204
Statewide	82%	84%	98%	96%	96%	Yes	Yes	17%	167,018
County Minimum	72%	73%	85%	83%	84%				
County Median	91%	93%	106%	102%	102%				
County Maximum	107%	111%	130%	115%	114%				

Measure 5: Percentage of Child Support Cases with a Child Support Order Established

Program Area: Child Support Enforcement

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses each county's success in establishing child support orders for their child support cases.¹⁷ Child support orders are legally-binding documents that require non-custodial parents to pay child support.

Strengths of the Measure: Establishing a child support order is a critical step in collecting child support, which is needed to ensure that custodial parents have sufficient financial resources to raise their children.

In addition, the federal government created this measure, and it is used across the country. If a state meets federal performance thresholds on this measure, it receives federal financial incentives. The better Minnesota performs on this measure compared with other states, the more incentive funds it receives. The state then passes these incentive funds onto the counties based on each county's individual performance.

Limitations of the Measure: The primary objective of the child support enforcement program is not to establish child support orders but to collect child support so that custodial parents have sufficient financial resources to raise their children. While establishing a support order is critical for collecting child support, it is just one step in the process.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that are interstate cases, where one of the parents lives in another state. Counties do not have complete control over these cases.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties administer the child support enforcement program. County child support officers open new cases, locate parents, collect financial and other information, propose child support obligations, draft legal documents, and appear in court as witnesses. County attorneys provide legal advice and services to the county child support officers.

¹⁷ The measure is calculated by dividing (1) the number of child support cases that are open under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act and have a child support order established at the end of the federal fiscal year by (2) the number of child support cases that are open under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act at the end of the federal fiscal year. The data come from DHS' PRISM system.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The federal government determines the overall direction of state child support enforcement programs under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act. DHS supervises county administration of the program by establishing policies, maintaining an automated case management computer system (PRISM), providing training, and monitoring county performance. How well DHS performs these tasks can affect the counties' ability to establish child support orders.

The child support enforcement program receives funding from several sources. In state fiscal year 2006, the federal government provided 75 percent of the funding, while the state and counties respectively provided the remaining 11 and 14 percent. Consequently, federal and state funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which can affect program performance. For example, many in the child support enforcement community contend that recent reductions in the federal funding for child support enforcement could negatively affect Minnesota's and the counties' ability to serve families.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: The performance standards that Minnesota has created for counties for this measure are based on standards that the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement established for states. To receive incentive payments from the federal government, each state must have a support order established for at least 50 percent of its child support cases or have a 5 percent improvement over the previous year. The size of the federal incentive payment increases until a state establishes support orders for at least 80 percent of its cases, at which point the incentive payment is maximized. Minnesota then distributes its federal incentive payments to the counties using the same methodology and performance thresholds.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS publishes performance data for this measure in three documents – (1) monthly CPAT activity reports, (2) quarterly CPAT summary reports, and (3) the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report*.¹⁸

Performance Summary: With respect to the federal performance thresholds for this measure, Minnesota counties perform quite well. In federal fiscal year 2006, all 84 county human service administrations exceeded the lower performance standard of 50 percent, and 75 met or exceeded the upper threshold of 80 percent. Furthermore, 72 county administrations performed better in federal fiscal year 2006 than they did in 2002.

¹⁸ Monthly CPAT reports are available to county staff in the PRISM system's InfoPac Reports – QW260201 – QW260216 and QW290101- QW290102; quarterly CPAT reports are available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&Redirected=true&dDocName=id_017654; and the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report* is available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=id_008804.

Measure 5: Percentage of Child Support Cases with an Order

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 50% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Open Child Support Cases in FFY 2006
Aitkin	82%	87%	88%	88%	87%	Yes	Yes	6%	924
Anoka	83%	83%	83%	85%	86%	Yes	Yes	4%	15,084
Becker	82%	84%	82%	83%	84%	Yes	Yes	2%	2,200
Beltrami	65%	70%	75%	72%	72%	Yes	No	11%	3,482
Benton	88%	90%	89%	90%	90%	Yes	Yes	2%	1,786
Big Stone	83%	81%	88%	92%	92%	Yes	Yes	11%	222
Blue Earth	89%	87%	86%	87%	88%	Yes	Yes	-2%	2,417
Brown	86%	85%	88%	88%	83%	Yes	Yes	-4%	1,229
Carlton	90%	89%	90%	91%	93%	Yes	Yes	4%	2,144
Carver	85%	87%	91%	91%	91%	Yes	Yes	7%	1,984
Cass	65%	71%	71%	70%	73%	Yes	No	12%	1,731
Chippewa	86%	88%	84%	87%	87%	Yes	Yes	1%	606
Chisago	87%	89%	91%	92%	92%	Yes	Yes	5%	2,138
Clay	82%	82%	86%	87%	86%	Yes	Yes	4%	3,242
Clearwater	74%	75%	75%	77%	82%	Yes	Yes	11%	691
Cook	73%	78%	77%	79%	89%	Yes	Yes	22%	166
Cottonwood	90%	82%	82%	86%	89%	Yes	Yes	-1%	574
Crow Wing	83%	82%	88%	89%	88%	Yes	Yes	6%	3,386
Dakota	84%	84%	85%	85%	85%	Yes	Yes	1%	14,792
Dodge	86%	88%	89%	90%	90%	Yes	Yes	5%	774
Douglas	86%	86%	86%	86%	88%	Yes	Yes	3%	1,436
Faribault/Martin	89%	89%	90%	91%	92%	Yes	Yes	3%	1,859
Fillmore	89%	90%	90%	90%	92%	Yes	Yes	3%	617
Freeborn	88%	89%	90%	91%	91%	Yes	Yes	3%	1,914
Goodhue	90%	90%	89%	90%	89%	Yes	Yes	-1%	2,074
Grant	80%	79%	80%	88%	92%	Yes	Yes	15%	244
Hennepin	72%	74%	77%	78%	79%	Yes	No	10%	57,606
Houston	87%	85%	85%	84%	86%	Yes	Yes	-1%	778
Hubbard	75%	78%	85%	85%	86%	Yes	Yes	14%	1,112
Isanti	82%	82%	85%	89%	88%	Yes	Yes	7%	1,716
Itasca	85%	87%	87%	89%	89%	Yes	Yes	5%	2,835
Jackson	93%	92%	94%	95%	94%	Yes	Yes	2%	592
Kanabec	76%	79%	81%	85%	88%	Yes	Yes	16%	820
Kandiyohi	83%	83%	84%	84%	83%	Yes	Yes	0%	2,311
Kittson	94%	91%	94%	97%	91%	Yes	Yes	-3%	118
Koochiching	85%	89%	84%	86%	90%	Yes	Yes	6%	766
Lac Qui Parle	71%	68%	86%	88%	92%	Yes	Yes	30%	207
Lake	89%	89%	85%	88%	93%	Yes	Yes	5%	473
Lake of the Woods	87%	88%	92%	94%	97%	Yes	Yes	12%	170
Le Sueur	83%	86%	91%	91%	90%	Yes	Yes	9%	947
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	83%	88%	90%	90%	90%	Yes	Yes	8%	1,855
Lyon						See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray			
McLeod	86%	85%	86%	86%	85%	Yes	Yes	-1%	1,615
Mahnomen	53%	52%	61%	70%	68%	Yes	No	28%	562
Marshall	85%	88%	90%	90%	88%	Yes	Yes	3%	331
Martin						See Faribault Martin			
Meeker	86%	87%	90%	90%	90%	Yes	Yes	5%	976
Mille Lacs	82%	82%	85%	87%	88%	Yes	Yes	7%	1,591

Measure 5: Percentage of Child Support Cases with an Order

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 50% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Open Child Support Cases in FFY 2006
Morrison	88%	87%	89%	87%	89%	Yes	Yes	1%	1,797
Mower	79%	79%	79%	80%	82%	Yes	Yes	4%	2,565
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
Nicollet	88%	90%	89%	92%	91%	Yes	Yes	3%	1,524
Nobles	75%	73%	78%	77%	82%	Yes	Yes	9%	1,062
Norman	72%	76%	77%	76%	77%	Yes	No	7%	252
Olmsted	82%	81%	83%	83%	83%	Yes	Yes	1%	5,578
Otter Tail	85%	83%	83%	85%	89%	Yes	Yes	5%	2,408
Pennington	69%	66%	68%	72%	74%	Yes	No	7%	863
Pine	86%	84%	80%	87%	92%	Yes	Yes	7%	2,108
Pipestone	91%	90%	92%	89%	87%	Yes	Yes	-4%	598
Polk	86%	87%	91%	91%	91%	Yes	Yes	6%	1,905
Pope	90%	84%	92%	90%	94%	Yes	Yes	4%	350
Ramsey	66%	67%	67%	69%	67%	Yes	No	1%	36,056
Red Lake	88%	87%	83%	87%	92%	Yes	Yes	4%	158
Redwood	87%	83%	87%	90%	91%	Yes	Yes	5%	843
Renville	77%	76%	76%	77%	77%	Yes	No	0%	664
Rice	79%	79%	77%	77%	75%	Yes	No	-5%	2,152
Rock	87%	89%	89%	90%	89%	Yes	Yes	2%	366
Roseau	86%	82%	83%	83%	84%	Yes	Yes	-3%	746
St. Louis	84%	84%	85%	85%	86%	Yes	Yes	2%	11,155
Scott	82%	82%	82%	81%	81%	Yes	Yes	-1%	2,988
Sherburne	89%	91%	91%	91%	90%	Yes	Yes	2%	2,733
Sibley	78%	78%	83%	89%	87%	Yes	Yes	12%	660
Stearns	79%	77%	79%	83%	84%	Yes	Yes	6%	4,892
Steele	80%	86%	87%	88%	89%	Yes	Yes	11%	1,662
Stevens	87%	88%	91%	86%	89%	Yes	Yes	3%	291
Swift	90%	87%	93%	92%	90%	Yes	Yes	0%	452
Todd	87%	91%	91%	94%	92%	Yes	Yes	5%	1,250
Traverse	86%	80%	91%	93%	89%	Yes	Yes	3%	149
Wabasha	83%	86%	83%	83%	85%	Yes	Yes	2%	718
Wadena	90%	88%	88%	90%	91%	Yes	Yes	1%	929
Waseca	81%	83%	86%	88%	90%	Yes	Yes	11%	936
Washington	86%	87%	87%	89%	89%	Yes	Yes	3%	6,520
Watonwan	84%	84%	87%	86%	86%	Yes	Yes	2%	749
Wilkin	80%	86%	89%	92%	93%	Yes	Yes	17%	318
Winona	87%	87%	86%	87%	89%	Yes	Yes	2%	2,121
Wright	88%	88%	89%	91%	91%	Yes	Yes	4%	3,924
Yellow Medicine	86%	79%	85%	88%	85%	Yes	Yes	-1%	405
Statewide	78%	79%	81%	82%	82%	Yes	Yes	5%	249,944
County Minimum	53%	52%	61%	69%	67%				
County Median	85%	85%	86%	88%	89%				
County Maximum	94%	92%	94%	97%	97%				

Measure 6: Percentage of Current Child Support Collected

Program Area: Child Support Enforcement

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure gauges whether counties are timely and effective in collecting current child support obligations.¹⁹

Strengths of the Measure: The primary objective of the child support enforcement program is to collect and distribute child support as it becomes due so that custodial parents have the financial resources to raise their children. This measure assesses counties' performance in achieving this objective.

In addition, the federal government created this measure, and it is used across the country. If a state meets federal performance thresholds on this measure, it receives federal financial incentives. The better Minnesota performs on this measure compared with other states, the more incentive funds it receives. The state then passes these incentive funds onto the counties based on each county's individual performance.

Limitations of the Measure: Minnesota's child support system is a complex program involving a wide range of federal, state, and county policies and procedures. The program involves establishing and maintaining relationships across all three levels of government and the private sector. The complexity and organizational structure of the program could have an impact on overall performance.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that are interstate cases, where one of the parents lives in another state. Counties do not have complete control over these cases.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties administer the child support enforcement program. County child support officers open new cases, locate parents, collect financial and other information, propose child support obligations, draft legal documents, appear in court as witnesses, monitor child support payments, and initiate enforcement remedies when payments are not made. County attorneys provide legal advice and services to the county child support officers.

¹⁹ It is calculated by dividing (1) the total amount child support collected and distributed as current support by (2) the total amount of current support obligations due for the year. A child support collection, distribution, or obligation is classified as "current" if it is currently due and not classified as an arrear or overdue. The data come from DHS' PRISM system.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The federal government determines the overall direction of state child support enforcement programs under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act. DHS supervises county administration of the program by establishing policies, maintaining an automated case management computer system (PRISM), operating the state's Child Support Payment Center, training, and monitoring county performance. How well DHS performs these tasks can affect the counties' ability to collect current child support obligations.

The child support enforcement program receives funding from several sources. In state fiscal year 2006, the federal government provided 75 percent of the funding, while state and counties respectively provided the remaining 11 and 14 percent. Consequently, federal and state funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which can affect program performance. For example, many in the child support enforcement community contend that recent reductions in the federal funding for child support enforcement could negatively affect Minnesota's and the counties' ability to serve families.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: The performance standards that Minnesota has created for counties for this measure are based on standards that the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement established for states. To receive incentive payments from the federal government, each state must collect at least 40 percent of its current support. The size of the federal incentive payment increases until a state collects 80 percent of its current support, at which point the incentive payment is maximized. Minnesota then distributes its federal incentive payments to the counties using the same methodology and performance thresholds.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS publishes performance data for this measure in three documents – (1) monthly CPAT activity reports, (2) quarterly CPAT summary reports, and (3) the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report*.²⁰

Performance Summary: Although all 84 county human services administrations exceeded the lower performance threshold of 40 percent in federal fiscal year 2006, Minnesota and its counties have struggled to meet the upper threshold of 80 percent. Only two county administrations achieved the upper performance threshold in 2006. In addition, 77 of the 84 administrations performed at a lower level in 2006 than they did in 2002. However, all states have struggled to perform well on this measure. In fact, in 2006, Minnesota had the sixth highest collection rate in the country, and no state achieved the upper performance threshold.

²⁰ Monthly CPAT reports are available to county staff in the PRISM system's InfoPac Reports – QW260201 – QW260216 and QW290101- QW290102; quarterly CPAT reports are available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&Redirected=true&dDocName=id_017654; and the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report* is available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=id_008804.

Measure 6: Percentage of Current Child Support Collected

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 40% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Current Support Due in FFY 2006
Aitkin	68%	66%	67%	64%	65%	Yes	No	-5%	\$1,781,235
Anoka	76%	72%	72%	72%	71%	Yes	No	-7%	\$54,475,008
Becker	66%	62%	63%	63%	63%	Yes	No	-5%	\$4,026,505
Beltrami	68%	64%	61%	61%	60%	Yes	No	-12%	\$5,364,927
Benton	74%	72%	71%	69%	70%	Yes	No	-6%	\$4,934,545
Big Stone	80%	73%	77%	77%	75%	Yes	No	-7%	\$641,521
Blue Earth	72%	67%	67%	69%	68%	Yes	No	-6%	\$6,487,203
Brown	80%	77%	78%	78%	78%	Yes	No	-3%	\$4,078,513
Carlton	74%	71%	72%	70%	70%	Yes	No	-5%	\$5,452,864
Carver	78%	75%	75%	74%	73%	Yes	No	-6%	\$8,532,296
Cass	63%	60%	59%	56%	55%	Yes	No	-12%	\$2,719,005
Chippewa	80%	79%	79%	79%	78%	Yes	No	-3%	\$1,764,270
Chisago	75%	70%	70%	70%	72%	Yes	No	-4%	\$7,953,578
Clay	74%	70%	70%	71%	72%	Yes	No	-2%	\$7,818,044
Clearwater	69%	66%	67%	68%	67%	Yes	No	-3%	\$1,099,766
Cook	72%	71%	62%	61%	65%	Yes	No	-10%	\$471,918
Cottonwood	74%	72%	75%	76%	75%	Yes	No	2%	\$1,405,613
Crow Wing	71%	68%	68%	66%	66%	Yes	No	-7%	\$7,725,107
Dakota	74%	71%	70%	69%	68%	Yes	No	-8%	\$54,026,409
Dodge	76%	74%	74%	77%	77%	Yes	No	2%	\$2,760,717
Douglas	76%	73%	72%	73%	71%	Yes	No	-7%	\$4,031,214
Faribault/Martin	76%	73%	73%	73%	74%	Yes	No	-3%	\$5,119,396
Fillmore	79%	77%	77%	77%	77%	Yes	No	-3%	\$2,140,824
Freeborn	75%	70%	68%	69%	70%	Yes	No	-7%	\$5,062,136
Goodhue	75%	72%	71%	71%	71%	Yes	No	-6%	\$6,155,570
Grant	72%	69%	71%	72%	70%	Yes	No	-3%	\$731,595
Hennepin	71%	66%	66%	66%	64%	Yes	No	-9%	\$132,447,407
Houston	82%	79%	76%	76%	77%	Yes	No	-7%	\$2,308,127
Hubbard	68%	64%	63%	61%	61%	Yes	No	-10%	\$2,450,515
Isanti	72%	69%	68%	65%	64%	Yes	No	-11%	\$6,051,534
Itasca	71%	67%	66%	66%	67%	Yes	No	-6%	\$6,701,715
Jackson	76%	74%	75%	75%	76%	Yes	No	0%	\$1,393,976
Kanabec	71%	69%	68%	64%	65%	Yes	No	-9%	\$2,302,836
Kandiyohi	73%	70%	71%	71%	73%	Yes	No	0%	\$5,049,620
Kittson	75%	78%	76%	72%	79%	Yes	No	6%	\$346,852
Koochiching	75%	74%	74%	73%	74%	Yes	No	-1%	\$2,115,644
Lac Qui Parle	80%	75%	75%	79%	74%	Yes	No	-7%	\$642,481
Lake	74%	72%	69%	70%	68%	Yes	No	-8%	\$1,358,840
Lake of the Woods	85%	82%	80%	82%	81%	Yes	Yes	-5%	\$526,483
Le Sueur	79%	75%	77%	76%	75%	Yes	No	-5%	\$3,645,438
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	75%	71%	74%	75%	73%	Yes	No	-2%	\$5,062,571
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
McLeod	78%	76%	76%	76%	76%	Yes	No	-2%	\$4,886,490
Mahnomen	61%	55%	58%	59%	59%	Yes	No	-4%	\$556,415
Marshall	78%	75%	74%	77%	78%	Yes	No	1%	\$1,020,296
Martin	See Faribault/Martin								
Meeker	75%	71%	70%	70%	69%	Yes	No	-8%	\$2,977,299

Measure 6: Percentage of Current Child Support Collected

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 40% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Current Support Due in FFY 2006
Mille Lacs	69%	63%	61%	59%	58%	Yes	No	-15%	\$4,075,079
Morrison	73%	71%	69%	68%	68%	Yes	No	-7%	\$4,597,624
Mower	72%	70%	70%	70%	70%	Yes	No	-2%	\$6,373,185
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
Nicollet	77%	72%	71%	71%	71%	Yes	No	-8%	\$4,780,577
Nobles	73%	70%	70%	72%	70%	Yes	No	-4%	\$2,512,405
Norman	78%	72%	74%	73%	74%	Yes	No	-5%	\$726,811
Olmsted	79%	75%	75%	76%	75%	Yes	No	-5%	\$17,522,896
Otter Tail	76%	71%	70%	70%	70%	Yes	No	-7%	\$6,256,136
Pennington	73%	73%	74%	75%	76%	Yes	No	5%	\$1,953,538
Pine	64%	61%	60%	59%	58%	Yes	No	-9%	\$5,171,703
Pipestone	72%	69%	72%	74%	76%	Yes	No	5%	\$1,439,648
Polk	76%	72%	71%	73%	73%	Yes	No	-4%	\$4,815,325
Pope	77%	75%	74%	74%	74%	Yes	No	-4%	\$1,074,907
Ramsey	64%	60%	60%	60%	59%	Yes	No	-8%	\$72,030,290
Red Lake	77%	75%	78%	77%	75%	Yes	No	-3%	\$511,547
Redwood	80%	76%	76%	75%	74%	Yes	No	-7%	\$2,654,991
Renville	77%	75%	75%	79%	78%	Yes	No	1%	\$1,660,901
Rice	78%	75%	74%	72%	73%	Yes	No	-7%	\$6,668,891
Rock	82%	79%	77%	76%	74%	Yes	No	-10%	\$1,141,877
Roseau	82%	78%	80%	80%	80%	Yes	Yes	-2%	\$2,233,138
St. Louis	74%	71%	70%	69%	69%	Yes	No	-7%	\$28,410,723
Scott	79%	76%	76%	75%	74%	Yes	No	-6%	\$11,922,940
Sherburne	75%	71%	72%	72%	72%	Yes	No	-4%	\$10,562,632
Sibley	75%	70%	70%	70%	71%	Yes	No	-5%	\$1,871,342
Stearns	78%	75%	75%	74%	73%	Yes	No	-6%	\$15,249,367
Steele	79%	74%	73%	73%	74%	Yes	No	-6%	\$5,135,659
Stevens	74%	67%	68%	66%	69%	Yes	No	-6%	\$813,462
Swift	68%	67%	68%	66%	67%	Yes	No	-2%	\$1,155,559
Todd	76%	71%	72%	72%	72%	Yes	No	-5%	\$3,071,266
Traverse	74%	69%	75%	71%	71%	Yes	No	-4%	\$405,444
Wabasha	81%	77%	75%	73%	77%	Yes	No	-5%	\$2,254,385
Wadena	74%	72%	69%	68%	69%	Yes	No	-6%	\$2,335,900
Waseca	77%	72%	70%	71%	70%	Yes	No	-9%	\$3,072,549
Washington	78%	74%	74%	74%	74%	Yes	No	-5%	\$27,544,399
Watsonwan	73%	71%	74%	72%	72%	Yes	No	-1%	\$1,937,584
Wilkin	79%	76%	71%	74%	76%	Yes	No	-3%	\$912,104
Winona	77%	75%	73%	74%	73%	Yes	No	-5%	\$5,502,097
Wright	78%	74%	73%	73%	72%	Yes	No	-7%	\$14,771,175
Yellow Medicine	78%	73%	74%	77%	77%	Yes	No	-1%	\$1,219,285
Statewide	72%	69%	69%	69%	68%	Yes	No	-5%	\$674,953,658
County Minimum	61%	55%	58%	56%	55%				
County Median	75%	72%	72%	72%	72%				
County Maximum	85%	82%	80%	82%	81%				

Measure 7: Percentage of Arrears Cases with Arrears Collections

Program Area: Child Support Enforcement

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses the ability of counties to collect overdue child support payments (arrears).²¹ Successful counties collect arrears for a large proportion of their child support cases with arrears.

Strengths of the Measure: Collecting arrears is an important function of child support enforcement. While a county's primary responsibility is to collect child support when it is current (not overdue), some non-custodial parents get behind in their payments. In these situations, counties need to collect the arrears as quickly as possible. Custodial parents can experience significant financial stress when child support payments are late. Alleviating this financial stress and ensuring that custodial parents have adequate financial resources to raise their children is critical.

In addition, the federal government created this measure, and it is used across the country. If a state meets federal performance thresholds on this measure, it receives federal financial incentives. The better Minnesota performs on this measure compared with other states, the more incentive funds it receives. The state then passes these incentive funds onto the counties based on each county's individual performance.

Limitations of the Measure: Ideally, counties should collect child support as it becomes due and have no need to collect arrears. Thus, success on this measure is important but reflects a less than ideal situation. In addition, some arrears occur not because of negligence by the non-custodial parent but because the child support obligation was too large considering the non-custodial parent's financial situation. Aggressively pursuing arrears from a non-custodial parent who cannot legitimately pay is problematic.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that are interstate cases, where one of the parents lives in another state. Counties do not have complete control over these cases.

²¹ The numerator in this calculation is number of child support cases with an arrear payment collected and distributed during the federal fiscal year. The denominator is the number of cases with an arrear payment due during the federal fiscal year. The data come from DHS' PRISM system. The measure applies to cases that are open under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties administer the child support enforcement program. To collect arrears, county child support officers locate parents, monitor child support payments, and initiate enforcement remedies (such as seizing financial assets or pursuing contempt of court charges) when payments are not made. How well the child support officers carry out these activities affect their county's performance on this measure.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The federal government determines the overall direction of state child support enforcement programs (including many of the enforcement remedies) under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act. DHS supervises county administration of the program, maintains an automated program case management computer system (PRISM), and plays an important role in the collection of arrears. PRISM automatically carries out several of the enforcement remedies (including the interception of state tax refunds) without the involvement of counties. The success of these state activities affects county performance.

The child support enforcement program receives funding from several sources. In state fiscal year 2006, the federal government provided 75 percent of the funding, while the state and county respectively provided the remaining 11 and 14 percent. Consequently, federal and state funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which can affect program performance.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: The performance standards that Minnesota has created for counties for this measure are based on standards that the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement established for states. To receive incentive payments from the federal government, each state must collect arrear payments from at least 40 percent of its cases that have arrears. The size of the federal incentive payment increases until a state collects arrear payments from 80 percent of the cases, at which point the incentive payment is maximized. Minnesota then distributes its federal incentive payments to the counties using the same methodology and performance thresholds.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS publishes performance data for this measure in three documents – (1) monthly CPAT activity reports, (2) quarterly CPAT summary reports, and (3) the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report*.²²

Performance Summary: There is room for more improvement on this measure. While all county administrations exceeded the lower 40 percent performance threshold, only one exceeded the upper 80 percent threshold. Yet, 68 of the 84 county administrations improved their performance between federal fiscal years 2002 and 2006.

²² Monthly CPAT reports are available to county staff in the PRISM system's InfoPac Reports – QW260201 – QW260216 and QW290101- QW290102; quarterly CPAT reports are available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&Redirected=true&dDocName=id_017654; and the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report* is available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=id_008804.

Measure 7: Percentage of Arrears Cases with Arrears Collections

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 40% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Arrear Cases in FFY 2006
Aitkin	66%	69%	66%	66%	67%	Yes	No	1%	754
Anoka	66%	69%	67%	66%	67%	Yes	No	1%	12,555
Becker	61%	62%	60%	61%	59%	Yes	No	-3%	1,739
Beltrami	62%	61%	59%	59%	57%	Yes	No	-9%	2,499
Benton	69%	75%	72%	75%	74%	Yes	No	7%	1,497
Big Stone	64%	72%	70%	76%	74%	Yes	No	16%	201
Blue Earth	65%	69%	67%	68%	68%	Yes	No	5%	2,130
Brown	69%	77%	75%	76%	77%	Yes	No	11%	983
Carlton	68%	70%	67%	65%	68%	Yes	No	-1%	1,874
Carver	68%	74%	71%	74%	73%	Yes	No	7%	1,817
Cass	57%	59%	56%	58%	55%	Yes	No	-3%	1,231
Chippewa	73%	69%	73%	72%	77%	Yes	No	6%	484
Chisago	71%	72%	71%	70%	73%	Yes	No	2%	1,937
Clay	58%	61%	60%	62%	62%	Yes	No	7%	2,839
Clearwater	63%	63%	61%	60%	60%	Yes	No	-5%	561
Cook	69%	69%	73%	61%	61%	Yes	No	-12%	131
Cottonwood	69%	69%	69%	70%	70%	Yes	No	2%	471
Crow Wing	66%	68%	68%	70%	70%	Yes	No	6%	2,856
Dakota	66%	69%	66%	66%	66%	Yes	No	0%	12,455
Dodge	71%	79%	75%	77%	76%	Yes	No	8%	671
Douglas	69%	74%	72%	73%	71%	Yes	No	2%	1,177
Faribault/Martin	71%	75%	73%	73%	75%	Yes	No	5%	1,677
Fillmore	74%	77%	72%	71%	74%	Yes	No	0%	565
Freeborn	68%	71%	69%	70%	71%	Yes	No	5%	1,676
Goodhue	69%	73%	70%	71%	71%	Yes	No	3%	1,855
Grant	68%	68%	71%	71%	71%	Yes	No	4%	199
Hennepin	60%	63%	61%	60%	60%	Yes	No	-1%	42,982
Houston	71%	74%	73%	73%	72%	Yes	No	1%	699
Hubbard	69%	70%	67%	66%	67%	Yes	No	-3%	992
Isanti	71%	73%	71%	70%	69%	Yes	No	-2%	1,482
Itasca	64%	64%	63%	64%	64%	Yes	No	1%	2,408
Jackson	69%	71%	70%	74%	72%	Yes	No	5%	515
Kanabec	70%	71%	70%	68%	72%	Yes	No	3%	664
Kandiyohi	67%	71%	68%	69%	74%	Yes	No	10%	1,799
Kittson	68%	66%	62%	68%	75%	Yes	No	11%	113
Koochiching	68%	72%	76%	76%	75%	Yes	No	10%	712
Lac Qui Parle	68%	75%	74%	82%	83%	Yes	Yes	22%	189
Lake	71%	74%	73%	74%	75%	Yes	No	5%	447
Lake of the Woods	78%	80%	77%	72%	77%	Yes	No	-1%	176
Le Sueur	70%	73%	75%	76%	78%	Yes	No	12%	862
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	70%	74%	73%	77%	73%	Yes	No	4%	1,509
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
McLeod	69%	75%	73%	74%	76%	Yes	No	10%	1,347
Mahnomen	51%	54%	52%	55%	56%	Yes	No	10%	256
Marshall	72%	75%	76%	78%	78%	Yes	No	8%	277
Martin	See Faribault/Martin								
Meeker	67%	75%	75%	73%	73%	Yes	No	9%	810

Measure 7: Percentage of Arrears Cases with Arrears Collections

	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded 40% Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded 80% Threshold in FFY 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Arrear Cases in FFY 2006
Mille Lacs	72%	74%	67%	67%	67%	Yes	No	-7%	1,391
Morrison	71%	73%	68%	71%	72%	Yes	No	2%	1,569
Mower	68%	70%	69%	70%	72%	Yes	No	6%	2,049
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
Nicollet	67%	73%	71%	70%	73%	Yes	No	8%	1,325
Nobles	62%	71%	71%	70%	72%	Yes	No	16%	848
Norman	65%	68%	74%	69%	72%	Yes	No	10%	191
Olmsted	71%	73%	71%	71%	71%	Yes	No	1%	4,449
Otter Tail	72%	72%	69%	71%	73%	Yes	No	1%	2,047
Pennington	67%	70%	64%	68%	69%	Yes	No	3%	601
Pine	67%	67%	66%	62%	66%	Yes	No	-2%	1,813
Pipestone	68%	69%	73%	74%	71%	Yes	No	4%	513
Polk	65%	66%	67%	68%	69%	Yes	No	7%	1,667
Pope	71%	73%	73%	72%	79%	Yes	No	12%	322
Ramsey	61%	62%	59%	58%	58%	Yes	No	-5%	23,394
Red Lake	77%	79%	76%	74%	79%	Yes	No	2%	151
Redwood	78%	79%	75%	74%	72%	Yes	No	-8%	727
Renville	65%	68%	67%	69%	73%	Yes	No	12%	488
Rice	68%	73%	71%	72%	72%	Yes	No	6%	1,571
Rock	63%	72%	71%	77%	72%	Yes	No	15%	315
Roseau	72%	77%	71%	75%	73%	Yes	No	2%	592
St. Louis	66%	68%	66%	66%	66%	Yes	No	0%	9,184
Scott	68%	71%	70%	71%	70%	Yes	No	2%	2,340
Sherburne	69%	74%	71%	73%	74%	Yes	No	7%	2,335
Sibley	69%	67%	69%	69%	71%	Yes	No	3%	531
Stearns	68%	71%	70%	70%	70%	Yes	No	3%	3,821
Steele	71%	75%	73%	74%	74%	Yes	No	4%	1,476
Stevens	69%	76%	73%	69%	74%	Yes	No	7%	249
Swift	72%	71%	72%	74%	78%	Yes	No	8%	373
Todd	73%	76%	75%	77%	78%	Yes	No	6%	1,087
Traverse	64%	60%	69%	73%	68%	Yes	No	7%	141
Wabasha	70%	74%	72%	72%	74%	Yes	No	6%	609
Wadena	70%	70%	68%	67%	65%	Yes	No	-7%	814
Waseca	71%	74%	74%	73%	75%	Yes	No	6%	827
Washington	67%	71%	67%	66%	67%	Yes	No	1%	5,397
Watsonwan	69%	75%	70%	72%	71%	Yes	No	3%	634
Wilkin	66%	67%	71%	70%	72%	Yes	No	10%	309
Winona	69%	69%	68%	71%	70%	Yes	No	1%	1,789
Wright	71%	74%	73%	73%	72%	Yes	No	1%	3,434
Yellow Medicine	73%	74%	71%	71%	73%	Yes	No	0%	323
Statewide	65%	68%	66%	66%	66%	Yes	No	1%	196,769
County Minimum	51%	54%	52%	55%	55%				
County Median	69%	71%	71%	71%	72%				
County Maximum	78%	80%	77%	82%	83%				

Measure 8: Child Support Collections per Dollar of Program Spending

Program Area: Child Support Enforcement

Type of Measure: Efficiency

Measure Description: This measure gauges how efficiently and effectively a county is using its child support resources. For each program dollar that a county spends, how much is the county collecting in child support?²³

Strengths of the Measure: Taxpayers want a high rate of return on their investments. The return produced by a child support enforcement program is child support collections, while the investment is program spending.

In addition, the federal government created this measure, and it is used across the country. If a state meets federal performance thresholds on this measure, it receives federal financial incentives. The better Minnesota performs on this measure compared with other states, the more incentive funds it receives. The state then passes these incentive funds onto the counties based on each county's individual performance.

Limitations of the Measure: The measure does not account for the varying levels of difficulty that each county faces in collecting its child support obligations. One county may have non-custodial parents with stable and high paying jobs, higher child support obligations, and a relatively easy time paying their obligations. Another county may have non-custodial parents with unstable and low income jobs, relatively small child support obligations, and a difficult time paying their obligations. The first county would have a much easier time performing well on this measure than the second county.

In addition, having a very high collection-spending ratio may not always be desirable. If a county is collecting \$9 in child support for each dollar of program spending (which is a high return on its investment), it may want to invest additional resources into the program to capitalize on the program's success and improve its performance on the other child support measures. However, additional investments in the program would likely reduce the collection-spending ratio. If a county pursues the most cost-effective strategies first and then pursues less cost-effective strategies as it devotes additional resources to the program, the collection-spending ratio will decline.

²³ The numerator of this ratio is the sum of: (1) total collections forwarded to other states, (2) total collections distributed, and (3) total fees retained by other states. The denominator is total program funds expended. The data come from DHS' PRISM system. The measure applies to cases that are open under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties administer the child support enforcement program. The strategies and resources they use to locate parents, establish paternity, establish child support orders, and initiate enforcement remedies when payments are not made affect performance on this measure.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The federal government determines the overall direction of state child support enforcement programs under Part IV-D of the Social Security Act. In Minnesota, DHS supervises and supports county administration of the program. Counties have to operate within the program parameters and supports created by the state and federal government.

The child enforcement program receives funding from several different sources. In state fiscal year 2006, the federal government provided 75 percent of the funding, while the state and counties respectively provided the remaining 11 and 14 percent. Consequently, federal and state funding decisions influence program resources and staffing levels, which affects both the collection of child support and spending of program funds.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: The performance standards that Minnesota has created for counties for this measure are based on standards that the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement established for states. To receive incentive payments from the federal government, each state must collect \$2 in child support per dollar of program spending. The size of the federal incentive payment increases until a state collects \$5 per dollar of program spending, at which point the incentive payment is maximized. Minnesota then distributes its federal incentive payments to the counties using the same methodology and performance thresholds.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS publishes performance data for this measure in three documents – (1) monthly CPAT activity reports, (2) quarterly CPAT summary reports, and (3) the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report*.²⁴

Performance Summary: Of the 84 county administrations, 83 exceeded the lower \$2.00 performance threshold, and 57 exceeded the higher \$5.00 threshold. However, only 28 administrations showed improvement on the measure between federal fiscal year 2002 and 2006.

²⁴ Monthly CPAT reports are available to county staff in the PRISM system's InfoPac Reports – QW260201 – QW260216 and QW290101- QW290102; quarterly CPAT reports are available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&Redirected=true&dDocName=id_017654; and the annual *Minnesota Child Support Performance Report* is available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&RevisionSelectio nMethod=LatestReleased&dDocName=id_008804.

Measure 8: Child Support Collections per Dollar of Program Spending

						Exceeded		2002-06 Percentage Change	Program Spending in FFY 2006
	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded \$2.00 Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded \$5.00 Threshold in FFY 2006		
Aitkin	\$3.63	\$3.75	\$3.51	\$3.32	\$3.45	Yes	No	-5%	\$513,780
Anoka	\$7.30	\$7.21	\$6.97	\$7.49	\$6.88	Yes	Yes	-6%	\$7,003,020
Becker	\$3.77	\$3.86	\$3.78	\$3.31	\$3.49	Yes	No	-7%	\$1,038,171
Beltrami	\$4.10	\$3.91	\$4.03	\$4.64	\$4.22	Yes	No	3%	\$1,077,553
Benton	\$4.60	\$4.98	\$5.46	\$5.40	\$5.19	Yes	Yes	13%	\$872,942
Big Stone	\$5.89	\$5.41	\$6.67	\$6.59	\$5.84	Yes	Yes	-1%	\$103,458
Blue Earth	\$5.47	\$5.07	\$5.11	\$5.20	\$5.19	Yes	Yes	-5%	\$1,159,712
Brown	\$8.68	\$6.96	\$8.14	\$7.68	\$7.91	Yes	Yes	-9%	\$502,928
Carlton	\$4.40	\$4.55	\$4.75	\$4.15	\$4.16	Yes	No	-6%	\$1,226,264
Carver	\$6.23	\$7.13	\$6.86	\$6.30	\$5.62	Yes	Yes	-10%	\$1,420,752
Cass	\$3.29	\$3.36	\$3.33	\$3.28	\$3.02	Yes	No	-8%	\$713,768
Chippewa	\$5.75	\$7.00	\$6.13	\$5.46	\$5.94	Yes	Yes	3%	\$286,306
Chisago	\$9.34	\$9.43	\$8.67	\$7.51	\$6.34	Yes	Yes	-32%	\$1,141,497
Clay	\$7.05	\$6.93	\$6.91	\$7.02	\$7.08	Yes	Yes	0%	\$1,072,400
Clearwater	\$3.60	\$3.63	\$3.51	\$3.15	\$3.12	Yes	No	-13%	\$342,986
Cook	\$2.47	\$2.40	\$2.15	\$2.15	\$2.68	Yes	No	8%	\$143,984
Cottonwood	\$4.78	\$4.94	\$4.98	\$5.41	\$5.22	Yes	Yes	9%	\$252,894
Crow Wing	\$6.04	\$6.13	\$6.08	\$5.84	\$4.93	Yes	No	-18%	\$1,464,772
Dakota	\$5.89	\$5.20	\$4.89	\$5.09	\$4.90	Yes	No	-17%	\$9,565,368
Dodge	\$6.02	\$6.02	\$5.96	\$6.50	\$6.31	Yes	Yes	5%	\$427,710
Douglas	\$6.61	\$5.74	\$5.75	\$5.45	\$4.92	Yes	No	-26%	\$766,177
Faribault/Martin	\$6.47	\$6.48	\$7.08	\$6.38	\$6.44	Yes	Yes	-1%	\$770,604
Fillmore	\$8.47	\$8.73	\$8.73	\$8.47	\$7.45	Yes	Yes	-12%	\$274,852
Freeborn	\$6.92	\$6.64	\$6.91	\$7.57	\$7.19	Yes	Yes	4%	\$638,932
Goodhue	\$6.78	\$6.48	\$5.93	\$6.07	\$5.63	Yes	Yes	-17%	\$1,021,948
Grant	\$3.96	\$4.31	\$4.29	\$4.25	\$4.54	Yes	No	15%	\$139,666
Hennepin	\$3.96	\$3.76	\$4.13	\$4.74	\$4.42	Yes	No	12%	\$25,384,846
Houston	\$8.87	\$9.57	\$9.02	\$9.69	\$7.82	Yes	Yes	-12%	\$286,973
Hubbard	\$7.56	\$6.36	\$7.05	\$6.65	\$6.78	Yes	Yes	-10%	\$316,726
Isanti	\$6.70	\$6.29	\$5.80	\$5.62	\$5.55	Yes	Yes	-17%	\$939,494
Itasca	\$6.28	\$4.79	\$5.45	\$5.25	\$5.09	Yes	Yes	-19%	\$1,207,845
Jackson	\$5.18	\$5.13	\$5.24	\$4.57	\$4.71	Yes	No	-9%	\$297,604
Kanabec	\$4.96	\$4.96	\$4.54	\$4.37	\$4.66	Yes	No	-6%	\$450,781
Kandiyohi	\$6.50	\$6.47	\$6.28	\$5.88	\$5.38	Yes	Yes	-17%	\$924,766
Kittson	\$5.12	\$3.66	\$3.82	\$3.85	\$3.85	Yes	No	-25%	\$88,397
Koochiching	\$7.35	\$6.97	\$6.32	\$4.55	\$4.37	Yes	No	-41%	\$492,755
Lac Qui Parle	\$3.78	\$3.85	\$4.44	\$5.98	\$5.45	Yes	Yes	44%	\$112,332
Lake	\$5.97	\$5.25	\$5.12	\$4.72	\$4.72	Yes	No	-21%	\$274,172
Lake of the Woods	\$3.71	\$3.94	\$3.88	\$3.96	\$4.07	Yes	No	10%	\$133,545
Le Sueur	\$7.48	\$6.93	\$7.26	\$7.07	\$6.85	Yes	Yes	-8%	\$522,104
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	\$6.78	\$6.95	\$7.49	\$6.65	\$7.13	Yes	Yes	5%	\$675,312
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
McLeod	\$7.91	\$8.13	\$8.82	\$8.95	\$7.87	Yes	Yes	-1%	\$597,883
Mahnomen	\$2.75	\$1.76	\$1.66	\$1.74	\$1.63	No	No	-41%	\$275,564
Marshall	\$4.55	\$4.90	\$4.58	\$5.60	\$5.26	Yes	Yes	16%	\$192,601
Martin	See Faribault/Martin								
Meeker	\$6.52	\$6.81	\$7.17	\$7.14	\$6.34	Yes	Yes	-3%	\$431,647
Mille Lacs	\$9.44	\$8.67	\$8.06	\$7.58	\$6.87	Yes	Yes	-27%	\$508,534
Morrison	\$8.40	\$7.47	\$6.46	\$5.54	\$5.45	Yes	Yes	-35%	\$807,213
Mower	\$7.18	\$6.89	\$7.37	\$7.50	\$7.37	Yes	Yes	3%	\$822,245

Measure 8: Child Support Collections per Dollar of Program Spending

	Exceeded					Exceeded		2002-06 Percentage Change	Program Spending in FFY 2006
	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	Exceeded \$2.00 Threshold in FFY 2006	Exceeded \$5.00 Threshold in FFY 2006		
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray								
Nicollet	\$6.98	\$6.17	\$5.90	\$5.62	\$5.12	Yes	Yes	-27%	\$869,956
Nobles	\$4.50	\$5.26	\$6.01	\$5.58	\$5.53	Yes	Yes	23%	\$432,002
Norman	\$10.48	\$8.59	\$9.04	\$9.03	\$10.07	Yes	Yes	-4%	\$66,209
Olmsted	\$5.57	\$5.28	\$5.40	\$5.53	\$5.58	Yes	Yes	0%	\$2,943,529
Otter Tail	\$5.59	\$5.02	\$5.44	\$4.50	\$4.13	Yes	No	-26%	\$1,421,861
Pennington	\$4.37	\$4.21	\$4.27	\$4.34	\$4.82	Yes	No	10%	\$398,786
Pine	\$6.99	\$7.37	\$6.72	\$6.71	\$6.76	Yes	Yes	-3%	\$659,349
Pipestone	\$8.12	\$6.45	\$8.48	\$7.33	\$7.62	Yes	Yes	-6%	\$182,878
Polk	\$5.52	\$5.93	\$6.63	\$6.38	\$5.55	Yes	Yes	1%	\$831,011
Pope	\$4.85	\$4.53	\$5.54	\$5.62	\$5.89	Yes	Yes	22%	\$175,981
Ramsey	\$5.50	\$5.60	\$4.72	\$4.77	\$4.56	Yes	No	-17%	\$13,115,352
Red Lake	\$4.98	\$4.63	\$5.01	\$5.19	\$6.08	Yes	Yes	22%	\$83,223
Redwood	\$5.76	\$6.08	\$5.48	\$4.86	\$4.73	Yes	No	-18%	\$545,888
Renville	\$4.84	\$4.90	\$6.01	\$6.30	\$6.27	Yes	Yes	30%	\$260,020
Rice	\$6.45	\$6.72	\$6.14	\$6.55	\$6.11	Yes	Yes	-5%	\$1,061,218
Rock	\$5.76	\$5.73	\$5.94	\$6.03	\$5.76	Yes	Yes	0%	\$180,477
Roseau	\$7.67	\$7.24	\$7.28	\$7.76	\$6.63	Yes	Yes	-14%	\$337,442
St. Louis	\$5.58	\$5.80	\$5.61	\$5.94	\$5.72	Yes	Yes	3%	\$4,482,620
Scott	\$7.29	\$6.85	\$6.40	\$6.33	\$5.42	Yes	Yes	-26%	\$2,054,059
Sherburne	\$8.51	\$7.78	\$8.11	\$7.73	\$7.46	Yes	Yes	-12%	\$1,291,348
Sibley	\$6.21	\$5.85	\$6.12	\$5.66	\$6.39	Yes	Yes	3%	\$274,256
Stearns	\$7.71	\$7.33	\$6.94	\$6.88	\$6.79	Yes	Yes	-12%	\$2,131,636
Steele	\$7.07	\$6.48	\$6.93	\$6.80	\$6.93	Yes	Yes	-2%	\$680,808
Stevens	\$7.86	\$7.29	\$7.03	\$5.53	\$6.88	Yes	Yes	-12%	\$113,258
Swift	\$3.59	\$3.76	\$3.93	\$4.13	\$4.15	Yes	No	16%	\$254,514
Todd	\$5.88	\$6.85	\$6.00	\$5.53	\$5.73	Yes	Yes	-2%	\$544,347
Traverse	\$6.38	\$5.57	\$3.74	\$3.79	\$3.84	Yes	No	-40%	\$94,014
Wabasha	\$7.63	\$7.53	\$7.79	\$7.17	\$7.56	Yes	Yes	-1%	\$291,675
Wadena	\$5.53	\$5.99	\$5.75	\$5.29	\$5.21	Yes	Yes	-6%	\$404,622
Waseca	\$8.53	\$8.42	\$7.73	\$6.83	\$5.74	Yes	Yes	-33%	\$484,730
Washington	\$8.75	\$8.13	\$8.24	\$8.32	\$8.30	Yes	Yes	-5%	\$2,978,405
Watsonwan	\$5.72	\$7.14	\$8.51	\$6.94	\$6.94	Yes	Yes	21%	\$265,172
Wilkin	\$3.88	\$4.31	\$3.53	\$3.75	\$3.99	Yes	No	3%	\$232,153
Winona	\$6.65	\$6.16	\$5.66	\$6.26	\$5.40	Yes	Yes	-19%	\$985,367
Wright	\$8.29	\$8.02	\$7.98	\$7.52	\$8.26	Yes	Yes	0%	\$1,640,726
Yellow Medicine	\$4.67	\$4.03	\$4.33	\$4.35	\$4.09	Yes	No	-12%	\$287,017
All Counties	\$5.60	\$5.44	\$5.44	\$5.61	\$5.36	N/A	N/A	-4%	\$112,741,692
Statewide*	\$4.05	\$4.04	\$4.10	\$4.21	\$4.04	Yes	No	0%	
County Minimum	\$2.47	\$1.76	\$1.66	\$1.74	\$1.63				
County Median	\$6.03	\$6.05	\$5.98	\$5.64	\$5.57				
County Maximum	\$10.48	\$9.57	\$9.04	\$9.69	\$10.07				

* Includes collections and spending by DHS that are not included in the county figures

Measure 9: Percentage of BSF Child Care Assistance Allocation Spent

Program Area: Child Care Assistance

Type of Measure: Access / Availability

Measure Description: The Basic Sliding Fee (BSF) measure identifies the percentage of each county's BSF funding allocation that is spent during a calendar year. It also identifies the size of the program waiting list in each county at the close of the calendar year.²⁵

The BSF Child Care Assistance Program provides child care subsidies to low-income working families who are not participating in MFIP/DWP. Families make co-payments based on family income and family size. The program has a capped funding allocation, which limits the number of families served and can result in a waiting list.

Strengths of the Measure: The objective of this program is to financially support as many eligible families as possible. If a county has a waiting list and is not able to spend at least 90 percent of its funding allocation, the state has concerns about that county's ability to manage its funding allocation and give clients access to assistance.

To give counties the incentive to add families to their program and spend their allocation, the state only allows counties that spend at least 90 percent of their allocation to keep their carryover funds from one calendar year to the next. In addition, the 90 percent benchmark gives counties some flexibility in managing their funds. As will be described in the limitations section, counties receive a capped funding allocation, and it can be difficult to manage the caseload in order to spend as close to 100 percent of the allocation as possible.²⁶ Thus, the state only expects counties to spend at least 90 percent of their allocation.

Limitations of the Measure: Many unpredictable factors that are outside the control of counties affect program spending at the county level and make it difficult for the counties to manage their caseload and achieve the 90 percent spending benchmark. These factors include the amount that individual families pay in co-payments, changes in the amount of

²⁵ The expenditure data for this measure come from two sources. If counties use MEC² (the state's case management system for child care assistance), the data come from MEC². Counties that do not use MEC² complete the *Child Care Fund Fiscal and Statistical Report - Monthly Direct Service Expenditure and Program Participation Summary* for the BSF program.

²⁶ If a county spends more than 100 percent of its allocation, it may be responsible for the additional expenditures. If a county spends less than 90 percent of its allocation, it loses its unspent funds. These unspent funds are reallocated to counties that spent more than 100 percent of their allocation.

care that individual families need, changes in the rates that providers charge, policy changes, and funding changes.

In addition, the number of families on the waiting lists is from one point in time. The waiting list at that time may not adequately represent the waiting list at other times during the year.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: To administer the BSF program, counties: (1) process applications and determine eligibility, (2) manage caseload changes, (3) process provider billings, and (4) manage the BSF funding allocation by monitoring expenditures and managing their waiting list. The decisions that counties make in managing their programs have an impact on whether they meet the 90 percent benchmark.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: Most of the BSF program funding comes from the federal and state governments. In calendar year 2006, the BSF program had \$76.4 million in funding, with \$2.9 million coming from the counties and the rest from the federal and state governments.

Recently, state budget reductions resulted in mid-year allocation reductions for counties totaling \$12 million in calendar years 2003 and 2005.²⁷ Because of these reductions, some counties are cautious about putting eligible families on the program. This cautious approach could lead to more unspent funds.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: DHS considers the 90 percent spending benchmark a minimum expectation when a county has a waiting list. To provide counties with an incentive to add families to their program and spend at least 90 percent of their allocation, the state allows counties that meet the 90 percent benchmark to keep carryover funds from one calendar year to the next.²⁸

Other Reporting of this Measure: Beginning in April of each year, DHS sends all counties monthly updates about the level of each county's spending and statewide spending. DHS also posts county-by-county waiting list information on its website and updates the information monthly.²⁹

Performance Summary: In calendar year 2006, counties performed relatively well on this measure. Of the state's 84 county human services administrations, 77 met the performance standard. While 43 of the county administrations spent less than 90 percent of their allocation, 36 of these county administrations did not have a waiting list at the end of calendar year 2006. Thus, only 7 county administrations failed to achieve the performance standard.

²⁷ This reduction does not reflect the total amount of state funding reductions in SFY 2003 and 2005. It only reflects the portion of the reduction that led to a mid-calendar year allocation change.

²⁸ The 90 percent carryover language is in Minnesota Statutes (2007) section 119B.03.

²⁹ The waiting list can be accessed at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/economic_support/documents/pub/dhs_id_057782.pdf.

Measure 9: Percentage of BSF Child Care Allocation Spent

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Number of Families on Waiting List on Dec. 31 2006	Achieving Performance Standard in 2006	2006 Funding Allocation
Aitkin	57.3%	102.5%	68.6%	96.0%	134.4%	20	Yes	\$125,343
Anoka	107.9%	76.6%	93.0%	104.0%	95.5%	153	Yes	\$4,104,652
Becker	72.4%	88.6%	65.6%	80.0%	106.3%	5	Yes	\$477,837
Beltrami	58.4%	83.9%	68.3%	89.1%	93.6%	0	Yes	\$907,795
Benton	65.4%	61.5%	62.8%	76.5%	85.4%	0	Yes	\$572,979
Big Stone	69.8%	85.7%	93.7%	73.0%	66.8%	0	Yes	\$63,226
Blue Earth	83.5%	91.7%	88.7%	107.8%	100.1%	66	Yes	\$815,875
Brown	69.2%	83.0%	67.1%	86.8%	90.5%	0	Yes	\$343,059
Carlton	81.3%	103.0%	66.0%	79.5%	94.1%	68	Yes	\$383,893
Carver	111.1%	93.6%	91.7%	112.6%	91.4%	0	Yes	\$586,262
Cass	78.4%	78.6%	86.6%	100.0%	87.7%	13	No	\$430,671
Chippewa	85.9%	100.1%	40.0%	73.7%	84.0%	0	Yes	\$104,817
Chisago	91.0%	93.8%	74.8%	113.5%	105.5%	9	Yes	\$317,854
Clay	100.1%	101.4%	58.3%	88.3%	105.9%	124	Yes	\$888,128
Clearwater	79.6%	91.1%	73.7%	66.6%	70.1%	0	Yes	\$153,160
Cook	63.0%	77.7%	103.8%	67.0%	41.2%	3	No	\$26,837
Cottonwood	63.1%	110.0%	53.9%	67.0%	78.2%	0	Yes	\$159,888
Crow Wing	98.1%	124.2%	82.8%	99.0%	80.1%	168	No	\$1,117,017
Dakota	86.0%	100.4%	94.3%	97.3%	99.9%	393	Yes	\$5,803,643
Dodge	75.5%	73.5%	60.4%	96.7%	92.0%	11	Yes	\$182,510
Douglas	97.6%	120.3%	109.9%	136.7%	112.5%	76	Yes	\$435,708
Faribault/Martin	92.1%	98.4%	87.8%	78.1%	73.2%	0	Yes	\$512,623
Fillmore	80.1%	76.0%	107.0%	92.0%	52.2%	0	Yes	\$219,554
Freeborn	97.3%	96.0%	73.1%	101.6%	92.8%	35	Yes	\$297,430
Goodhue	101.4%	100.8%	82.4%	94.3%	95.1%	18	Yes	\$399,350
Grant	98.1%	55.7%	44.6%	60.6%	92.3%	0	Yes	\$49,696
Hennepin	105.9%	103.8%	90.0%	99.3%	83.5%	494	No	\$21,636,450
Houston	95.2%	84.6%	57.6%	92.1%	83.8%	1	No	\$208,869
Hubbard	90.8%	98.8%	86.1%	100.5%	96.7%	55	Yes	\$312,583
Isanti	93.6%	96.0%	42.1%	60.5%	117.4%	41	Yes	\$224,220
Itasca	107.1%	108.2%	63.6%	97.2%	78.2%	0	Yes	\$451,372
Jackson	75.7%	100.6%	81.8%	118.9%	103.7%	27	Yes	\$157,150
Kanabec	56.5%	74.2%	62.2%	80.3%	90.1%	11	Yes	\$152,670
Kandiyohi	93.0%	93.2%	65.5%	95.4%	97.8%	0	Yes	\$464,673
Kittson	61.2%	80.8%	57.1%	64.7%	61.4%	0	Yes	\$44,716
Koochiching	70.9%	109.0%	98.8%	99.3%	109.7%	29	Yes	\$133,854
Lac Qui Parle	84.0%	81.6%	47.0%	50.9%	68.4%	0	Yes	\$52,410
Lake	75.6%	98.1%	100.3%	106.1%	99.8%	0	Yes	\$107,719
Lake of the Woods	61.4%	96.9%	73.7%	85.4%	80.7%	0	Yes	\$39,795
Le Sueur	82.5%	110.6%	70.9%	41.4%	31.8%	0	Yes	\$299,920
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	91.0%	102.8%	77.8%	88.8%	89.5%	0	Yes	\$433,188
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
McLeod	74.1%	74.0%	61.9%	75.1%	104.0%	23	Yes	\$261,836
Mahnomen	76.8%	68.7%	59.5%	84.1%	85.1%	0	Yes	\$76,615
Marshall	82.9%	108.4%	56.0%	58.7%	69.3%	0	Yes	\$91,998
Martin	See Faribault/Martin							
Meeker	89.3%	72.2%	66.3%	81.8%	102.3%	0	Yes	\$201,305

Measure 9: Percentage of BSF Child Care Allocation Spent

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Number of Families on Waiting List on Dec. 31 2006	Achieving Performance Standard in 2006	2006 Funding Allocation
Mille Lacs	49.3%	81.1%	52.4%	47.2%	55.1%	0	Yes	\$387,921
Morrison	66.4%	86.0%	86.6%	97.6%	85.2%	0	Yes	\$233,725
Mower	105.2%	141.3%	77.8%	114.4%	90.9%	65	Yes	\$528,946
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
Nicollet	72.7%	102.5%	87.5%	90.8%	88.2%	0	Yes	\$398,126
Nobles	45.8%	61.4%	50.1%	70.7%	71.7%	0	Yes	\$262,540
Norman	87.8%	97.4%	75.8%	94.8%	118.6%	13	Yes	\$102,909
Olmsted	73.6%	91.1%	74.2%	94.9%	90.2%	0	Yes	\$4,071,358
Otter Tail	92.7%	94.8%	81.5%	89.6%	83.8%	0	Yes	\$637,245
Pennington	61.2%	74.2%	45.5%	58.8%	77.0%	0	Yes	\$185,364
Pine	93.1%	82.1%	70.7%	54.4%	57.0%	23	No	\$476,560
Pipestone	72.4%	84.6%	70.3%	85.8%	74.0%	0	Yes	\$161,556
Polk	91.7%	86.9%	85.2%	104.9%	72.4%	0	Yes	\$377,110
Pope	66.4%	89.1%	82.0%	95.8%	89.0%	0	Yes	\$98,741
Ramsey	103.2%	89.9%	78.9%	90.3%	85.0%	97	No	\$10,796,269
Red Lake	64.0%	72.7%	63.3%	68.4%	100.9%	3	Yes	\$53,415
Redwood	65.1%	67.7%	74.8%	79.5%	127.7%	28	Yes	\$144,673
Renville	54.4%	90.2%	73.2%	114.9%	59.9%	0	Yes	\$126,701
Rice	44.4%	31.9%	35.6%	63.9%	77.6%	0	Yes	\$476,439
Rock	83.8%	89.8%	59.9%	75.5%	79.1%	0	Yes	\$97,089
Roseau	57.1%	66.0%	51.3%	59.3%	61.8%	0	Yes	\$186,950
St. Louis	91.9%	97.0%	93.7%	92.4%	105.0%	291	Yes	\$2,906,400
Scott	82.1%	89.5%	99.6%	102.3%	75.0%	0	Yes	\$1,471,955
Sherburne	95.9%	110.3%	66.3%	104.6%	91.2%	0	Yes	\$603,460
Sibley	87.5%	80.3%	60.1%	106.7%	96.9%	38	Yes	\$140,917
Stearns	95.4%	95.9%	84.1%	98.1%	109.3%	89	Yes	\$1,040,627
Steele	87.7%	112.0%	75.1%	88.8%	90.6%	43	Yes	\$536,888
Stevens	118.7%	108.5%	91.3%	109.9%	128.9%	25	Yes	\$89,924
Swift	65.3%	80.9%	78.8%	104.5%	92.0%	6	Yes	\$94,131
Todd	79.2%	88.3%	65.4%	70.3%	68.1%	0	Yes	\$228,773
Traverse	72.4%	60.7%	33.8%	35.1%	45.1%	0	Yes	\$55,959
Wabasha	80.4%	99.8%	82.3%	88.0%	99.2%	10	Yes	\$127,276
Wadena	82.9%	90.0%	67.6%	88.7%	72.0%	0	Yes	\$192,142
Waseca	93.5%	84.8%	74.3%	71.0%	82.9%	0	Yes	\$326,038
Washington	75.5%	70.0%	78.2%	101.1%	91.6%	95	Yes	\$2,315,063
Watsonwan	72.6%	103.5%	68.5%	72.2%	69.0%	0	Yes	\$122,422
Wilkin	84.6%	84.9%	105.3%	88.4%	84.9%	0	Yes	\$66,540
Winona	94.9%	116.9%	84.7%	126.9%	114.2%	127	Yes	\$511,711
Wright	70.7%	71.9%	72.6%	98.1%	122.7%	0	Yes	\$818,571
Yellow Medicine	95.9%	93.3%	57.8%	56.3%	84.3%	0	Yes	\$98,833
Statewide	93.7%	94.5%	81.2%	95.2%	88.9%	2,796		\$76,382,417
Count Minimum	44.4%	31.9%	33.8%	35.1%	31.8%	0		
County Median	82.3%	90.1%	73.4%	89.0%	89.3%	0		
County Maximum	118.7%	141.3%	109.9%	136.7%	134.4%	494		

Measure 10: Percentage of Child Protection Assessments or Investigations that are Initiated within Statutory Timeframes

Program Area: Child Welfare – Child Protection

Type of Measure: Efficiency

Measure Description: This measure gauges whether counties are initiating child protection assessments and investigations within statutorily defined timeframes. Minnesota Statutes (2007) section 626.556 has two timeliness requirements:

- Reports that allege substantial child endangerment require face-to-face contact with the child immediately, which is defined as, “as soon as possible but no longer than 24 hours.”
- Reports that allege a lower level of risk require a face-to-face contact with the child within 5 calendar days.³⁰

Strengths of the Measure: Protecting children from abuse or neglect is a critical government function, and completing timely face-to-face assessments is an essential activity for protecting children. State statute clearly requires and defines timely initiation of assessments.

Limitations of the Measure: A number of legitimate factors can impact a county’s ability to achieve a face-to-face contact with children. Sometimes county staff cannot locate the child/family. At other times, a county must prioritize responses to maltreatment reports. To respond to more serious reports, counties may not always initiate contact with a child within the statutory timeframes if the maltreatment report indicates a low level of risk. This measure does not take any of these variables into consideration.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: A county’s staffing levels and caseload sizes can affect its ability to respond to reports of child maltreatment in a timely fashion. If county workers have large caseloads, they may have difficulty responding to allegations of maltreatment in a timely fashion. In addition, county

³⁰ Timeframes are calculated from the time that a report of maltreatment is received by the county agency until the county completes or attempts its first face-to-face contact with the child. The calculation is based on the “intake start date” and the “time activity record” that contains a completed or attempted face-to-face contact with the child as recorded in DHS’ Social Service Information System (SSIS).

policies and actions regarding the initial screening of reports can affect performance. For example, if a maltreatment report is not screened in and assigned for assessment in a timely manner, counties will have difficulty meeting the statutory timeframes.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: On average, about half of county child welfare funding in Minnesota comes from the federal and state governments. They respectively provide 36 and 16 percent of the funding. The remaining 48 percent are county funds. While federal and state funding plays an important role in program operation, county funding also plays an important role, especially compared with other program areas.

In addition, the state amended the statutory timeliness requirements in 2005.³¹ The amendments shortened the response timelines, and county staffing levels may not be adequate to meet the new requirements.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: No performance benchmarks or standards have been established for this measure. Nevertheless, state law requires timely assessments. For a core safety practice, such as timely assessments, the expectation should be that assessments are timely 100 percent of the time, except for those cases where the child is not in imminent danger and a good reason exists for a delay.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS first developed this measure in the first half of 2007 and distributed it to county human service directors and supervisors. The measure has not been reported elsewhere. In the future, DHS plans to issue a report with this measure to counties on a quarterly basis.

Performance Summary: County performance varies widely on this measure, ranging from 25 percent to 96 percent of assessments and investigations being initiated in a timely fashion. Statewide, counties initiated assessments and investigations within statutory timeframes 63 percent of the time.

³¹ Minnesota Session Law 2005, Chapter 159.

Measure 10: Timely Initiation of Child Protection Assessments

	CY 2006	Benchmark or Standard	Number of Children who Were the Subject of a Maltreatment Report in 2006*
Aitkin	43%	N/A	95
Anoka	57%	N/A	1,176
Becker	62%	N/A	462
Beltrami	46%	N/A	229
Benton	66%	N/A	135
Big Stone	77%	N/A	39
Blue Earth	48%	N/A	296
Brown	84%	N/A	174
Carlton	87%	N/A	91
Carver	78%	N/A	297
Cass	46%	N/A	158
Chippewa	93%	N/A	30
Chisago	69%	N/A	326
Clay	79%	N/A	333
Clearwater	57%	N/A	84
Cook	72%	N/A	18
Cottonwood	65%	N/A	95
Crow Wing	53%	N/A	247
Dakota	67%	N/A	1,795
Dodge	62%	N/A	92
Douglas	62%	N/A	203
Faribault/Martin	74%	N/A	400
Fillmore	50%	N/A	133
Freeborn	36%	N/A	258
Goodhue	63%	N/A	131
Grant	33%	N/A	10 or less
Hennepin	65%	N/A	7,652
Houston	36%	N/A	78
Hubbard	80%	N/A	100
Isanti	44%	N/A	163
Itasca	25%	N/A	166
Jackson	56%	N/A	94
Kanabec	64%	N/A	86
Kandiyohi	71%	N/A	283
Kittson	90%	N/A	10 or less
Koochiching	81%	N/A	36
Lac Qui Parle	96%	N/A	25
Lake	70%	N/A	57
Lake Of The Woods	89%	N/A	19
Le Sueur	73%	N/A	132
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	78%	N/A	162
Lyon		See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	
McLeod	51%	N/A	279
Mahnomen	72%	N/A	39
Marshall	85%	N/A	74
Martin		See Faribault/Martin	
Meeker	57%	N/A	49
Mille Lacs	69%	N/A	199
Morrison	68%	N/A	133

Measure 10: Timely Initiation of Child Protection Assessments

	CY 2006	Benchmark or Standard	Number of Children who Were the Subject of a Maltreatment Report in 2006*
Mower	46%	N/A	198
Murray		See Lincoln, Lyon/Murray	
Nicollet	75%	N/A	114
Nobles	87%	N/A	46
Norman	35%	N/A	17
Olmsted	73%	N/A	946
Otter Tail	62%	N/A	332
Pennington	74%	N/A	34
Pine	50%	N/A	213
Pipestone	57%	N/A	49
Polk	81%	N/A	342
Pope	67%	N/A	61
Ramsey	54%	N/A	2,195
Red Lake	83%	N/A	12
Redwood	77%	N/A	84
Renville	84%	N/A	32
Rice	73%	N/A	297
Rock	55%	N/A	47
Roseau	84%	N/A	19
St. Louis	57%	N/A	1,148
Scott	58%	N/A	394
Sherburne	66%	N/A	204
Sibley	85%	N/A	61
Stearns	68%	N/A	302
Steele	79%	N/A	152
Stevens	82%	N/A	22
Swift	95%	N/A	59
Todd	58%	N/A	132
Traverse	70%	N/A	33
Wabasha	82%	N/A	51
Wadena	47%	N/A	129
Waseca	76%	N/A	111
Washington	54%	N/A	711
Watsonwan	36%	N/A	59
Wilkin	57%	N/A	21
Winona	75%	N/A	198
Wright	66%	N/A	490
Yellow Medicine	96%	N/A	47
Statewide	63%		26,504
County Minimum	25%		
County Median	67%		
County Maximum	96%		

* If a child is the subject of more than one maltreatment report in a year, he or she is counted more than once.

Measure 11: Percentage of Children Experiencing a Recurrence of Maltreatment within 12 Months

Program Area: Child Welfare – Child Protection

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses how effectively counties are preventing repeat maltreatment of children who are or have previously been in the child welfare system because of maltreatment.³²

Strengths of the Measure: Protecting children from abuse or neglect is a critical government function, and the importance of this function is heightened when there has already been a child protection intervention. While no child should be the victim of maltreatment, repeated maltreatment is particularly troubling. This 12-month recurrence measure is an enhanced version of a measure established by the federal government that examines the recurrence of maltreatment over a 6-month period. The state’s decision to track recurrences over a longer period of time demonstrates its commitment to protecting the most at-risk children from further abuse and neglect.

Limitations of the Measure: This measure applies only to cases that are assigned to Traditional Investigation, which represents about 40 percent of the overall child protection caseload. The other 60 percent of the cases are assigned to Family Assessment Response (FAR). In FAR, no determination of maltreatment is made because FAR focuses on assessing child safety and family strengths rather than conducting fault-finding investigations. Because an initial determination of maltreatment is not made in FAR, a later finding of maltreatment is not classified as a “repeat.” Consequently, recurrence calculations cannot be made for FAR cases.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that involve American Indian children under Tribal Court jurisdiction. Counties do not have complete control over cases subject to Tribal Court jurisdiction.

There are also concerns about the consistency of county practices in recording data. Some counties may not screen in and record new reports of maltreatment on cases that are already open for services. If this is the county’s policy, repeat maltreatment would not be recorded.

³² The measure is calculated by examining the records of children who have been determined to be victims of maltreatment in the last six months of a given year and then computing the percentage who are again victims of maltreatment within the next 12 months. The data come from DHS’ SSIS.

Finally, in small counties, the calculation of this measure is based on the experience of very few children, which can lead to wide variations in performance from year to year. In these counties, one case of repeat maltreatment can have a dramatic impact on the counties' measured performance.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: The quality and effectiveness of county interventions affect performance on this measure. After a county receives a report of maltreatment, county staff conduct a risk assessment to determine the likelihood of future maltreatment and determine if protective services are needed. Services are provided to mitigate the risk of future harm. When service interventions are appropriate and adequate, future maltreatment is less likely to occur.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: On average, about half of county child welfare funding in Minnesota comes from the federal and state governments. They respectively provide 36 and 16 percent of the funding. The remaining 48 percent are county funds. While federal and state funding plays an important role in program operation, county funding also plays an important role, especially compared with other program areas.

Performance is also affected by state policy, which supports FAR as a preferred response to reports of child maltreatment.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: In each county, no more than 7.5 percent of children in child protection should experience repeat maltreatment within 12 months. This performance standard is from the *Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Performance Measures Report*. Each year, DHS sets the standard at the statewide average level of performance. If counties do not meet the standard, the state requires them to develop a program improvement plan, including targets for improvement, as part of their CCSA plan.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS annually reports this measure in its *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report* and *CCSA Performance Measures Report*.³³ DHS also features this measure on its Department Results website and has incorporated it into its *Priority Plan for At-Risk Children*.³⁴

Performance Summary: Minnesota counties perform relatively well on this measure. In 2006, 55 county human service administrations achieved the 7.5 percent performance standard. In addition, the percentage of children subject to a recurrence of maltreatment dropped by 19 percent statewide between 2002 and 2006.

³³ Department of Human Services, *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report, 2006* (Bulletin, 07-68-13) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139595.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf.

³⁴ The website can be accessed at <http://www.departmentresults.state.mn.us/hs/index.html>. An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* can be accessed at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Measure 11: Recurrence of Maltreatment within 12 Months

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving the 7.5% Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Determined Victims (7/1/2005- 12/31/2005) for 2006 Calculation
Aitkin	16.1%	13.3%	0.0%	14.8%	9.5%	No	-41%	21
Anoka	8.0%	3.2%	7.1%	10.1%	6.4%	Yes	-20%	220
Becker	9.1%	12.5%	15.3%	9.9%	12.2%	No	35%	49
Beltrami	13.1%	12.9%	9.1%	4.4%	11.1%	No	-15%	45
Benton	2.2%	20.0%	11.1%	11.5%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	19
Big Stone	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%	14.3%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Blue Earth	5.3%	2.0%	18.3%	2.4%	17.5%	No	233%	57
Brown	7.7%	12.5%	20.0%	10.5%	14.8%	No	93%	27
Carlton	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Carver	2.0%	13.4%	1.9%	6.7%	7.6%	No	279%	66
Cass	5.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Chippewa	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Chisago	9.2%	0.0%	4.2%	7.1%	10.0%	No	8%	20
Clay	6.1%	4.3%	13.3%	2.5%	12.2%	No	100%	41
Clearwater	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Cook	83.3%	20.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Cottonwood	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	9.4%	12.5%	No	N/A	10 or less
Crow Wing	6.8%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	28
Dakota	9.5%	5.6%	9.3%	5.6%	9.1%	No	-5%	232
Dodge	4.0%	4.8%	15.4%	17.6%	10.0%	No	150%	10 or less
Douglas	2.4%	10.2%	19.6%	16.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	37
Faribault-Martin	16.7%	10.0%	4.3%	16.7%	18.7%	No	12%	91
Fillmore	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Freeborn	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	5.6%	1.8%	Yes	N/A	56
Goodhue	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	Yes	N/A	16
Grant	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Hennepin	10.8%	11.2%	10.3%	12.2%	7.7%	No	-28%	1,099
Houston	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	No	300%	10 or less
Hubbard	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	No	N/A	22
Isanti	13.0%	2.1%	3.8%	0.0%	6.1%	Yes	-53%	49
Itasca	0.0%	5.3%	9.1%	10.7%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	48
Jackson	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	6.7%	Yes	N/A	15
Kanabec	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Kandiyohi	2.6%	5.0%	9.1%	10.2%	5.8%	Yes	119%	52
Kittson	0.0%						N/A	10 or less
Koochiching	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Lac qui Parle	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Lake	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	50.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	14
Lake of the Woods	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Le Sueur	20.0%	3.3%	7.4%	2.9%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	25
Lincoln-Lyon-Murray	6.5%	0.0%	9.1%	14.3%	20.0%	No	210%	10 or less
Lyon						See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray		
McLeod	25.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	23.3%	No	-10%	30
Mahnomen	5.3%	15.4%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	11
Marshall	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%		0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Martin						See Faribault/Martin		
Meeker	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less

Measure 11: Recurrence of Maltreatment within 12 Months

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving the 7.5% Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Determined Victims (7/1/2005- 12/31/2005) for 2006 Calculation
Mille Lacs	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	No	79%	14
Morrison	5.0%	12.5%	15.4%	4.5%	2.5%	Yes	-50%	40
Mower	8.1%	15.6%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	27
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
Nicollet	5.0%	7.7%	4.8%	5.9%	3.4%	Yes	-31%	29
Nobles	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Norman	37.5%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Olmsted	17.9%	16.2%	11.7%	9.3%	3.8%	Yes	-79%	26
Otter Tail	7.5%	7.8%	6.8%	6.1%	11.8%	No	56%	34
Pennington	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Pine	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	2.9%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	43
Pipestone	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	No	-65%	10 or less
Polk	20.0%	7.3%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Pope	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Ramsey	6.1%	9.6%	3.2%	6.1%	5.2%	Yes	-15%	464
Red Lake	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Redwood	0.0%	11.1%	20.0%	5.9%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Renville	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Rice	15.0%	13.0%	14.9%	14.3%	10.8%	No	-28%	83
Rock	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Roseau	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
St. Louis	6.8%	9.2%	9.8%	7.8%	6.1%	Yes	-10%	214
Scott	7.1%	15.2%	4.2%	6.7%	18.5%	No	159%	81
Sherburne	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	6.8%	Yes	N/A	44
Sibley	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Stearns	11.8%	5.2%	4.8%	10.3%	6.5%	Yes	-45%	77
Steele	33.3%	18.2%	8.3%	10.5%	8.1%	No	-76%	37
Stevens	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Swift	32.4%	11.1%	5.6%	6.7%	12.5%	No	-61%	16
Todd	11.5%	4.2%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Traverse	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Wabasha	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Wadena	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Waseca	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	Yes	-22%	18
Washington	2.3%	6.1%	3.4%	4.9%	7.5%	No	222%	93
Watsonwan	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Wilkin	7.7%						N/A	10 or less
Winona	18.8%	20.0%	5.0%	6.7%	13.8%	No	-26%	29
Wright	4.2%	2.3%	12.9%	1.8%	5.7%	Yes	38%	87
Yellow Medicine	12.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	-100%	10 or less
Statewide	9.2%	8.9%	8.4%	9.2%	7.5%		-19%	4,019
County Minimum	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
County Median	4.6%	4.2%	4.2%	4.4%	2.1%			
County Maximum	83.3%	33.3%	20.0%	50.0%	23.3%			

Note: Missing values occur when a county did not have any adoptions in the specified year.

Measure 12: Percentage of Children in Foster Care for Less than 12 Months with No More than Two Placement Settings

Program Area: Child Welfare – Foster Care

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses how effectively counties are ensuring stability for children in foster care by preventing moves from one placement setting to another.³⁵

Strengths of the Measure: Stability while in foster care is important for child well-being. When children are in stable foster care placements, their school and community connections are not disrupted by repeated moves. To achieve stability, county agencies assess the needs of children and foster care providers and provide the services and supports necessary to maintain a stable placement.

Limitations of the Measure: This measure reflects the number of moves during a child's placement in foster care and does not consider that some moves in care are necessary and appropriate for meeting a child's needs.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that involve American Indian children under Tribal Court jurisdiction. Counties do not have complete control over cases subject to Tribal Court jurisdiction.

In small counties, the calculation of this measure is based on the experience of very few children, which can lead to wide variations in performance from year to year. In these counties, one additional placement setting can have a dramatic impact on the counties' measured performance.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Administering the state's child welfare system is a county responsibility. An important part of this responsibility is ensuring stability for children in foster care. The quality of a county's child and provider assessments, services, and supports affect county performance. Routine use of temporary shelter care facilities as a first placement setting for all children also affects performance.

³⁵ The measure is calculated by examining the records of children who have been in foster care for less than 12 months, then computing the percentage of children who had no more than two placement settings. The data come from DHS' Social Service Information System (SSIS).

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: On average, about half of county child welfare funding in Minnesota comes from the federal and state governments. They respectively provide 36 and 16 percent of the funding. The remaining 48 percent are county funds. While federal and state funding plays an important role in program operation, county funding also plays an important role, especially compared with other program areas.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: In each county, 86.7 percent of children in foster care less than 12 months should have no more than two placement settings. This performance standard is used in the *Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Performance Measures Report* and the *Minnesota Child and Family Service Review*, which is a child welfare quality assurance review.³⁶

The federal Administration for Children and Families established this standard. It was a national performance standard for the first round of Child and Family Service Reviews and represents the 75th percentile of performance using data from across the country.

If counties do not meet the standard, the state requires them to develop a program improvement plan, including targets for improvement, as part of their CCSA plan. In addition, they must write a program improvement plan as a result of their quality assurance review.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS annually reports this measure in its *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report* and *CCSA Performance Measures Report*.³⁷

Performance Summary: Minnesota counties performed relatively well on this measure. In 2006, 67 county human service administrations achieved the performance standard. Statewide performance on this measure has remained mostly stable, meeting or exceeding the standard in four out of the last five years.

³⁶ Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Minnesota Child and Family Services Review, Statewide Assessment, Initial Draft Version* (St. Paul, June 28, 2007).

³⁷ Department of Human Service, *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report, 2006* (Bulletin, 07-68-13) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139595.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf.

Measure 12: Percentage of Children with No More than Two Placements

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving 86.7% National Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Children in Care less than 12 Months in CY 2006
Aitkin	83.1%	75.0%	77.3%	75.0%	81.4%	No	-2%	43
Anoka	91.9%	88.7%	92.4%	90.4%	91.8%	Yes	0%	551
Becker	87.4%	81.2%	91.3%	80.3%	76.9%	No	-12%	160
Beltrami	82.6%	86.8%	89.3%	88.3%	93.4%	Yes	13%	152
Benton	84.8%	91.7%	89.7%	98.0%	96.6%	Yes	14%	59
Big Stone	66.7%	85.7%	94.7%	100.0%	87.5%	Yes	31%	10 or less
Blue Earth	89.1%	87.2%	89.2%	91.7%	96.4%	Yes	8%	111
Brown	93.0%	93.7%	86.7%	96.2%	91.0%	Yes	-2%	67
Carlton	85.3%	81.6%	96.9%	97.6%	96.4%	Yes	13%	84
Carver	93.1%	89.3%	91.5%	94.2%	91.7%	Yes	-1%	133
Cass	88.7%	85.0%	90.6%	94.1%	85.6%	No	-4%	118
Chippewa	100.0%	94.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0%	12
Chisago	87.0%	93.9%	93.2%	86.7%	91.1%	Yes	5%	79
Clay	92.1%	89.1%	95.5%	91.1%	88.5%	Yes	-4%	96
Clearwater	95.2%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	85.7%	No	-10%	14
Cook	90.9%	100.0%	90.0%	92.3%	90.9%	Yes	0%	11
Cottonwood	100.0%	96.4%	95.2%	92.5%	100.0%	Yes	0%	29
Crow Wing	88.6%	79.5%	92.3%	90.7%	88.6%	Yes	0%	114
Dakota	87.9%	88.8%	94.9%	94.3%	91.4%	Yes	4%	336
Dodge	91.5%	85.5%	90.0%	95.2%	100.0%	Yes	9%	16
Douglas	84.7%	92.0%	95.0%	97.2%	94.2%	Yes	11%	69
Faribault/Martin	81.8%	90.7%	97.8%	94.9%	92.8%	Yes	13%	69
Fillmore	100.0%	93.1%	81.3%	90.9%	92.9%	Yes	-7%	14
Freeborn	92.9%	94.3%	98.4%	94.1%	94.8%	Yes	2%	97
Goodhue	91.5%	87.3%	89.7%	96.6%	91.4%	Yes	0%	58
Grant	88.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	13%	10 or less
Hennepin	79.6%	79.5%	86.3%	83.3%	83.4%	No	5%	2,161
Houston	91.1%	94.3%	96.4%	87.5%	100.0%	Yes	10%	25
Hubbard	94.9%	94.4%	98.7%	90.4%	87.3%	Yes	-8%	55
Isanti	90.1%	90.8%	96.9%	93.1%	89.5%	Yes	-1%	86
Itasca	86.2%	81.1%	92.6%	90.7%	90.6%	Yes	5%	149
Jackson	85.7%	94.1%	100.0%	96.3%	82.9%	No	-3%	35
Kanabec	93.8%	92.5%	97.1%	89.3%	74.4%	No	-21%	39
Kandiyohi	92.7%	78.5%	89.0%	95.3%	91.3%	Yes	-1%	115
Kittson	93.3%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%	Yes	-2%	12
Koochiching	93.0%	88.0%	95.7%	88.2%	90.0%	Yes	-3%	60
Lac qui Parle	100.0%	83.3%	90.0%	91.7%	84.6%	No	-15%	13
Lake	97.0%	83.3%	100.0%	78.6%	95.8%	Yes	-1%	24
Lake of the Woods	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0%	10 or less
Le Sueur	79.0%	83.9%	88.9%	92.3%	90.9%	Yes	15%	22
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	90.2%	83.5%	83.9%	87.5%	93.1%	Yes	3%	58
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
McLeod	83.1%	69.1%	100.0%	92.3%	98.8%	Yes	19%	82
Mahnomen	91.1%	89.5%	90.3%	94.3%	94.1%	Yes	3%	51
Marshall	84.6%	90.5%	88.9%	100.0%	92.9%	Yes	10%	14
Martin	See Faribault/Martin							
Meeker	87.2%	81.8%	90.0%	95.0%	82.5%	No	-5%	40

Measure 12: Percentage of Children with No More than Two Placements

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving 86.7% National Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Children in Care less than 12 Months in CY 2006
Mille Lacs	88.1%	78.4%	91.1%	92.9%	95.5%	Yes	8%	66
Morrison	86.7%	87.7%	96.9%	91.3%	85.7%	No	-1%	84
Mower	87.5%	88.3%	91.7%	91.2%	93.2%	Yes	7%	74
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
Nicollet	97.6%	91.7%	93.1%	100.0%	87.2%	Yes	-11%	47
Nobles	92.6%	96.6%	96.6%	94.6%	100.0%	Yes	8%	27
Norman	78.9%	100.0%	94.7%	100.0%	71.4%	No	-10%	14
Olmsted	85.2%	92.5%	96.6%	92.1%	95.0%	Yes	12%	120
Otter Tail	92.6%	93.1%	97.6%	91.2%	82.9%	No	-10%	76
Pennington	93.3%	83.3%	90.5%	100.0%	94.9%	Yes	2%	39
Pine	88.2%	78.6%	93.9%	86.2%	89.4%	Yes	1%	66
Pipestone	95.5%	91.4%	96.3%	96.0%	91.7%	Yes	-4%	24
Polk	91.5%	90.9%	92.1%	88.8%	85.1%	No	-7%	74
Pope	73.3%	100.0%	62.5%	83.3%	82.4%	No	12%	17
Ramsey	92.4%	87.5%	93.8%	92.5%	91.9%	Yes	-1%	1,221
Red Lake	92.3%	83.3%	88.9%	100.0%	92.9%	Yes	1%	14
Redwood	97.1%	95.8%	96.7%	100.0%	95.0%	Yes	-2%	40
Renville	90.0%	94.1%	97.1%	97.2%	100.0%	Yes	11%	22
Rice	95.1%	78.4%	93.0%	87.3%	87.0%	Yes	-9%	46
Rock	94.1%	86.7%	91.7%	85.7%	87.0%	Yes	-8%	23
Roseau	84.6%	86.8%	100.0%	96.8%	94.1%	Yes	11%	34
St. Louis	92.7%	90.9%	95.2%	87.8%	86.3%	No	-7%	424
Scott	94.2%	89.7%	92.1%	95.8%	98.2%	Yes	4%	112
Sherburne	94.8%	94.7%	100.0%	93.5%	89.5%	Yes	-6%	105
Sibley	92.3%	87.5%	100.0%	90.5%	92.0%	Yes	0%	25
Stearns	90.2%	88.1%	89.4%	86.7%	86.4%	No	-4%	228
Steele	91.9%	93.2%	87.0%	100.0%	97.5%	Yes	6%	40
Stevens	94.1%	100.0%	100.0%	93.3%	93.8%	Yes	0%	16
Swift	89.7%	84.6%	71.4%	90.0%	90.0%	Yes	0%	20
Todd	98.4%	88.2%	97.5%	92.6%	98.0%	Yes	0%	49
Traverse	71.4%	66.7%	83.3%	92.9%	100.0%	Yes	40%	10 or less
Wabasha	88.0%	78.8%	83.8%	90.2%	90.7%	Yes	3%	54
Wadena	89.8%	81.8%	89.7%	97.6%	97.8%	Yes	9%	45
Waseca	92.1%	97.8%	94.7%	97.8%	93.0%	Yes	1%	43
Washington	97.1%	94.9%	96.0%	95.3%	95.6%	Yes	-1%	228
Watsonwan	97.0%	100.0%	100.0%	92.3%	91.3%	Yes	-6%	23
Wilkin	95.1%	93.8%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	Yes	5%	10 or less
Winona	83.8%	85.1%	94.6%	95.3%	93.3%	Yes	11%	75
Wright	93.7%	88.7%	95.6%	89.7%	90.1%	Yes	-4%	212
Yellow Medicine	83.3%	87.9%	92.0%	88.9%	76.7%	No	-8%	30
Statewide	87.9%	86.0%	91.6%	89.8%	89.2%	Yes	1%	9,421
County Minimum	66.7%	66.7%	62.5%	75.0%	71.4%			
County Median	91.3%	88.7%	93.5%	92.7%	91.7%			
County Maximum	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Measure 13:

Percentage of Children in Foster Care who are Reunified with their Parents within 12 Months

Program Area: Child Welfare – Foster Care

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses whether counties are able to reunify children in foster care with their parents in a timely fashion.³⁸

Strengths of the Measure: Once children have been removed from their homes, quickly and safely reunifying them with their parents is an important program outcome because permanency and stability are critical for children. This measure represents the state's commitment for preserving families and ensuring permanency.

Limitations of the Measure: Timely reunification is not always possible. County agencies may make every effort to achieve timely reunification, but the parents may be unable to complete the necessary services or treatment within 12 months. When parents are making adequate progress, reunification is still desirable; but the agency may be unable to achieve reunification within the 12 month timeframe.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that involve American Indian children under Tribal Court jurisdiction. Counties do not have complete control over cases subject to Tribal Court jurisdiction.

Finally, in small counties, the calculation of this measure is based on the experience of very few children, which can lead to wide variations in performance from year to year. In these counties, one delayed reunification can have a dramatic impact on the counties' measured performance.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Administering the state's child welfare system is a county responsibility. An important part of this responsibility is quickly reunifying children with their parents whenever it is possible, appropriate, and safe. When a child is removed from his or her home, county staff assess the child's and family's needs, provide services to mitigate the conditions that led to the child's removal, return the child to the home as soon as possible, and support reunification through protective supervision or other services.

³⁸ The measure is calculated by examining the records of all children who are reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care then computing the percentage of children who are reunited within 12 months of their latest removal from home. The data come from DHS' Social Service Information System (SSIS).

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: On average, about half of county child welfare funding in Minnesota comes from the federal and state governments. They respectively provide 36 and 16 percent of the funding. The remaining 48 percent are county funds. While federal and state funding plays an important role in program operation, county funding also plays an important role, especially compared with other program areas.

State policy requires counties to make permanency decisions when a child has been in foster care for 12 months.³⁹ With this timeframe in mind, county agencies work to return children home in a timely manner whenever possible and appropriate, or they plan for a different permanency outcome.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: In each county, at least 76.2 percent of foster children who are reunified with their parents should have the reunification occur within 12 months. This performance standard is used in the *Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Performance Measures Report* and the *Minnesota Child and Family Service Review*, which is a child welfare quality assurance review.⁴⁰

The federal Administration for Children and Families established this standard. It was a national performance standard for the first round of Child and Family Service Reviews and represents the 75th percentile of performance using data from across the country.

If counties do not meet the standard, the state requires them to develop a program improvement plan, including targets for improvement, as part of their CCSA plan. In addition, they must write a program improvement plan as a result of their quality assurance review.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS annually reports this measure in its *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report* and *CCSA Performance Measures Report*.⁴¹ DHS also features the measure on its Department Results website and has incorporated it into its *Priority Plan for At-Risk Children*.⁴²

Performance Summary: Compared with the national performance standard, Minnesota performs well on this measure. Of the 84 county human services administration, 78 met the standard. Statewide, performance on this measure has been quite stable.

³⁹ Minnesota Statutes (2007), section 260C.201, subd. 11.

⁴⁰ Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Minnesota Child and Family Services Review, Statewide Assessment, Initial Draft Version* (St. Paul, June 28, 2007).

⁴¹ Department of Human Service, *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report, 2006* (Bulletin, 07-68-13) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139595.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf.

⁴² The website is available at <http://www.departmentresults.state.mn.us/hs/index.html>. An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* is available at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Measure 13: Percentage of Children Reunified within 12 Months

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving 76.2% National Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Foster Children Reunified with Parents in 2006
Aitkin	88.6%	91.2%	72.4%	84.2%	94.4%	Yes	6.6%	18
Anoka	90.9%	84.5%	92.6%	93.1%	93.5%	Yes	2.9%	370
Becker	81.0%	89.6%	93.3%	95.5%	80.6%	Yes	-0.5%	67
Beltrami	58.5%	85.3%	78.0%	94.9%	81.4%	Yes	39.0%	59
Benton	85.7%	92.9%	93.9%	90.0%	96.8%	Yes	12.9%	31
Big Stone	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	25.0%	10 or less
Blue Earth	94.6%	95.1%	95.5%	90.4%	90.2%	Yes	-4.7%	61
Brown	97.6%	90.9%	87.0%	90.6%	100.0%	Yes	2.5%	34
Carlton	95.7%	85.4%	83.9%	90.2%	84.6%	Yes	-11.5%	39
Carver	95.0%	91.3%	89.5%	97.3%	96.5%	Yes	1.5%	86
Cass	94.2%	89.8%	93.9%	94.1%	85.5%	Yes	-9.3%	55
Chippewa	75.0%	71.4%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	33.3%	10 or less
Chisago	97.6%	92.1%	96.2%	91.4%	97.6%	Yes	0.1%	42
Clay	95.3%	83.7%	83.7%	87.8%	85.4%	Yes	-10.4%	48
Clearwater	100.0%	100.0%	70.0%	87.5%	87.5%	Yes	-12.5%	10 or less
Cook	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	25.0%	10 or less
Cottonwood	80.0%	61.5%	95.7%	87.5%	90.9%	Yes	13.6%	22
Crow Wing	96.9%	88.2%	92.1%	90.5%	81.8%	Yes	-15.6%	44
Dakota	89.9%	93.4%	96.6%	96.8%	94.4%	Yes	5.1%	180
Dodge	97.1%	96.9%	94.4%	72.7%	100.0%	Yes	2.9%	10 or less
Douglas	96.2%	87.0%	96.2%	96.4%	90.7%	Yes	-5.7%	43
Faribault/Martin	95.8%	95.9%	92.5%	93.2%	92.7%	Yes	-3.3%	41
Fillmore	84.6%	94.4%	90.9%	100.0%	50.0%	No	-40.9%	10 or less
Freeborn	90.5%	86.7%	94.1%	90.9%	93.8%	Yes	3.6%	64
Goodhue	94.7%	89.7%	94.4%	93.3%	86.4%	Yes	-8.8%	22
Grant	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Hennepin	90.3%	89.7%	89.5%	89.0%	86.7%	Yes	-4.0%	1,102
Houston	89.7%	94.7%	89.5%	72.2%	92.9%	Yes	3.5%	14
Hubbard	95.1%	96.4%	95.6%	96.6%	88.0%	Yes	-7.4%	25
Isanti	78.1%	95.0%	96.9%	95.7%	79.1%	Yes	1.2%	43
Itasca	89.3%	89.9%	86.2%	92.6%	88.3%	Yes	-1.2%	94
Jackson	100.0%	76.9%	100.0%	100.0%	73.3%	No	-26.7%	15
Kanabec	94.0%	96.0%	95.7%	76.9%	93.8%	Yes	-0.3%	16
Kandiyohi	80.0%	84.6%	94.9%	86.0%	91.5%	Yes	14.4%	59
Kittson	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Koochiching	69.8%	88.9%	100.0%	96.7%	100.0%	Yes	43.3%	25
Lac Qui Parle	100.0%	72.7%	85.7%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Lake	84.0%	100.0%	69.2%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	19.0%	16
Lake of the Woods	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Le Sueur	87.9%	76.9%	88.2%	76.9%	69.2%	No	-21.2%	13
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	100.0%	83.3%	93.5%	94.6%	94.1%	Yes	-5.9%	34
Lyon	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
McLeod	93.8%	95.7%	82.4%	83.3%	93.8%	Yes	0.0%	32
Mahnomen	88.5%	76.5%	100.0%	88.9%	100.0%	Yes	13.0%	24
Marshall	88.2%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	100.0%	Yes	13.3%	10 or less
Martin	See Faribault/Martin							
Meeker	92.9%	94.7%	80.0%	77.8%	92.3%	Yes	-0.6%	13

Measure 13: Percentage of Children Reunified within 12 Months

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving 76.2% National Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Foster Children Reunified with Parents in 2006
Mille Lacs	95.0%	95.0%	98.2%	84.0%	100.0%	Yes	5.3%	30
Morrison	96.1%	97.8%	96.6%	97.3%	88.6%	Yes	-7.8%	35
Mower	98.7%	86.7%	90.4%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	1.3%	49
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray							
Nicollet	100.0%	95.7%	100.0%	90.9%	96.6%	Yes	-3.4%	29
Nobles	86.7%	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%	88.9%	Yes	2.6%	18
Norman	94.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	Yes	-7.4%	10 or less
Olmsted	92.6%	92.6%	84.5%	86.2%	90.0%	Yes	-2.9%	60
Otter Tail	86.9%	91.8%	88.5%	83.3%	85.3%	Yes	-1.8%	34
Pennington	100.0%	93.3%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	Yes	-14.3%	14
Pine	81.0%	93.2%	91.1%	96.1%	75.9%	No	-6.4%	29
Pipestone	88.9%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	78.6%	Yes	-11.6%	14
Polk	99.0%	91.7%	92.0%	96.1%	80.8%	Yes	-18.4%	26
Pope	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	60.0%	90.9%	Yes	-9.1%	11
Ramsey	88.5%	89.1%	92.9%	91.5%	91.4%	Yes	3.3%	755
Red Lake	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Redwood	66.7%	83.3%	75.0%	94.7%	93.8%	Yes	40.6%	16
Renville	92.0%	81.8%	85.0%	91.7%	80.0%	Yes	-13.0%	15
Rice	94.4%	87.5%	92.9%	85.7%	100.0%	Yes	5.9%	16
Rock	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	73.3%	No	10.0%	15
Roseau	87.5%	94.7%	100.0%	90.9%	100.0%	Yes	14.3%	15
St. Louis	90.6%	91.0%	89.4%	92.6%	86.8%	Yes	-4.2%	189
Scott	96.4%	94.7%	98.5%	95.9%	97.1%	Yes	0.7%	69
Sherburne	91.5%	81.5%	98.2%	91.7%	94.5%	Yes	3.3%	55
Sibley	85.0%	81.3%	93.8%	81.3%	100.0%	Yes	17.6%	11
Stearns	94.2%	91.9%	96.9%	92.3%	95.5%	Yes	1.4%	133
Steele	91.8%	96.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	8.9%	12
Stevens	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Swift	95.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.3%	Yes	-2.4%	15
Todd	86.7%	81.8%	83.3%	82.4%	88.9%	Yes	2.6%	18
Traverse	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	81.8%	100.0%	Yes	0.0%	10 or less
Wabasha	100.0%	91.9%	100.0%	86.8%	95.9%	Yes	-4.1%	49
Wadena	82.6%	95.5%	75.0%	100.0%	90.5%	Yes	9.5%	21
Waseca	95.3%	89.7%	95.2%	100.0%	96.0%	Yes	0.7%	25
Washington	97.4%	95.1%	96.5%	89.1%	94.5%	Yes	-3.0%	164
Watsonwan	91.3%	72.7%	100.0%	83.3%	87.5%	Yes	-4.2%	10 or less
Wilkin	100.0%	75.0%	92.9%	25.0%	66.7%	No	-33.3%	10 or less
Winona	86.4%	92.9%	93.8%	98.3%	94.4%	Yes	9.3%	54
Wright	96.2%	94.4%	90.8%	92.2%	92.2%	Yes	-4.1%	129
Yellow Medicine	96.0%	100.0%	91.7%	87.5%	94.4%	Yes	-1.6%	18
Statewide	91.2%	90.3%	91.9%	91.4%	90.4%	Yes	-0.9%	5,085
County Minimum	58.5%	50.0%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%			
County Median	93.9%	91.9%	94.0%	91.7%	93.4%			
County Maximum	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Measure 14: Percentage of Children Adopted within 24 Months

Program Area: Child Welfare – Foster Care

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure gauges whether counties are achieving permanency for children through adoption in a timely manner.⁴³

Strengths of the Measure: When it is not possible or appropriate for children in foster care to be reunified with their families, county agencies try to achieve permanency for these children through the transfer of custody to a relative or through adoption. Permanency promotes stability and well-being for children.

Limitations of the Measure: Adoption is a specialized child welfare program area, and achieving timely adoptions is highly dependent on adequate and efficient court resources and county operations. This measure only reflects adoptions achieved within 24 months of placement. Many other successful adoptions are achieved; but due to unique considerations, they may take longer than 24 months to finalize.

In addition, performance in some counties may be affected by the percentage of their cases that involve American Indian children under Tribal Court jurisdiction. Counties do not have complete control over cases subject to Tribal Court jurisdiction.

Finally, in some counties, the calculation of this measure is based on the experience of very few children, which can lead to wide variations in performance from year to year.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Administering the state's child welfare system is a county responsibility. An important part of this responsibility is achieving permanency for children through adoption in a timely manner. Some counties have implemented well-defined concurrent permanency planning practices and thorough relative searches that support timely adoptions. At the outset of foster care, counties establish concurrent goals that try to simultaneously reunite a child with his or her parents and find adoptive parents (if reunification is not possible). Intensive services are provided to facilitate the achievement of both goals. Obviously, reunification is the primary objective; but if this is not possible, concurrent planning facilitates adoptions.

⁴³ The measure is calculated by examining the records of all children who are discharged from foster care to adoption then computing the percentage of these children who are adopted within 24 months of their latest removal from home. The data come from DHS' Social Service Information System (SSIS).

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: On average, about half of county child welfare funding in Minnesota comes from the federal and state governments. They respectively provide 36 and 16 percent of the funding. The remaining 48 percent are county funds. While federal and state funding plays an important role in program operation, county funding also plays an important role, especially compared with other program areas.

State policy requires counties to make permanency decisions when a child has been in foster care for 12 months. In addition, federal policy requires a petition for termination of parental rights (TPR) to be filed when a child has been in foster care for 15 out of the most recent 22 months.⁴⁴

Performance Benchmark or Standard: In each county, at least 32 percent of children who are adopted should have a finalized adoption within 24 months of their latest entry into foster care. This performance standard is used in the *Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Performance Measures Report* and the *Minnesota Child and Family Service Review*, which is a child welfare quality assurance review.⁴⁵

The federal Administration for Children and Families established this standard. It was a national performance standard for the first round of Child and Family Service Reviews and represents the 75th percentile of performance using data from across the country.

If counties do not meet the standard, the state requires them to develop a program improvement plan, including targets for improvement as part of their CCSA plan. In addition, they must write a program improvement plan as a result of their quality assurance review.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS annually reports this measure in its *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report* and *CCSA Performance Measures Report*.⁴⁶ DHS also features the measure on its Department Results website and has incorporated it into its *Priority Plan for At-Risk Children*.⁴⁷

Performance Summary: Compared with the national performance standard, Minnesota performs well on this measure. Of the 57 county human services administrations with a child adopted in 2006, 40 met the standard.

⁴⁴ When parental rights are terminated by a court, either voluntarily or involuntarily, a child is then legally free for adoption.

⁴⁵ Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Minnesota Child and Family Services Review, Statewide Assessment, Initial Draft Version* (St. Paul, June 28, 2007).

⁴⁶ Department of Human Services, *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report, 2006* (Bulletin, 07-68-13) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139595.pdf; and Department of Human Services, *Calendar Year 2006 Data on CCSA Measures* (Bulletin, 07-68-12) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_139200.pdf.

⁴⁷ The website is available at <http://www.departmentresults.state.mn.us/hs/index.html>. An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* is available at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Measure 14: Percentage of Children Adopted within 24 Months

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving 32.0% National Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Adoptions in CY 2006
Aitkin	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	85.7%	Yes	200%	10 or less
Anoka	21.4%	68.6%	55.6%	50.0%	42.9%	Yes	100%	42
Becker	11.1%	42.9%	100.0%	54.6%	75.0%	Yes	575%	10 or less
Beltrami	0.0%	66.7%	12.5%	0.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Benton	25.0%	16.7%	100.0%	60.0%	25.0%	No	0%	10 or less
Big Stone					100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Blue Earth	30.0%	50.0%	44.4%	50.0%	0.0%	No	-100%	10 or less
Brown	0.0%	100.0%		75.0%	66.7%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Carlton	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	50.0%	0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Carver	50.0%	75.0%	85.7%	75.0%	100.0%	Yes	100%	10 or less
Cass	0.0%	25.0%		0.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Chippewa			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Chisago	12.5%	28.6%	46.2%	40.0%	0.0%	No	-100%	10 or less
Clay	58.3%	84.6%	80.0%	40.0%	78.9%	Yes	35%	19
Clearwater		25.0%				N/A	N/A	10 or less
Cook						N/A	N/A	10 or less
Cottonwood	75.0%	0.0%	50.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Crow Wing	86.7%	83.3%	64.3%	83.3%	86.7%	Yes	0%	15
Dakota	25.8%	44.0%	34.2%	63.6%	33.3%	Yes	29%	24
Dodge			100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Douglas	0.0%	100.0%			33.3%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Faribault/Martin		100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Fillmore	100.0%					N/A	N/A	10 or less
Freeborn	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	57.1%	Yes	243%	10 or less
Goodhue	50.0%	85.7%	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%	Yes	0%	10 or less
Grant		0.0%			0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Hennepin	44.8%	38.5%	40.4%	40.3%	42.7%	Yes	-5%	171
Houston		0.0%	50.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Hubbard	0.0%			0.0%	50.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Isanti	40.0%	71.4%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	No	-100%	10 or less
Itasca	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	Yes	300%	10 or less
Jackson	66.7%			75.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Kanabec		0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Kandiyohi	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	44.4%	0.0%	No	-100%	14
Kittson						N/A	N/A	10 or less
Koochiching				80.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Lac qui Parle			100.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Lake			40.0%	0.0%	100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Lake of the Woods			0.0%	0.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Le Sueur	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	No	-100%	10 or less
Lyon				See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray				
McLeod	100.0%	100.0%	44.4%	50.0%	37.5%	Yes	-63%	16
Mahnomen		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Marshall	100.0%					N/A	N/A	10 or less
Martin				See Faribault/Martin				
Meeker	80.0%	0.0%		100.0%	100.0%	Yes	25%	10 or less

Measure 14: Percentage of Children Adopted within 24 Months

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Achieving 32.0% National Standard in 2006	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Adoptions in CY 2006
Mille Lacs		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Morrison	0.0%	37.5%	16.7%	33.3%	40.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Mower	40.0%	16.7%	100.0%	66.7%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Murray				See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray				
Nicollet	80.0%	50.0%		80.0%	50.0%	Yes	-38%	10 or less
Nobles		100.0%	0.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Norman		100.0%	0.0%		0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Olmsted	90.9%	95.8%	78.6%	77.3%	52.9%	Yes	-42%	17
Otter Tail	0.0%	54.6%	66.7%	33.3%	83.3%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Pennington	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	No	-75%	10 or less
Pine	50.0%	16.7%	40.0%	66.7%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Pipestone	100.0%	0.0%		100.0%	100.0%	Yes	0%	10 or less
Polk	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Pope					100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Ramsey	23.2%	37.9%	16.2%	30.9%	51.7%	Yes	123%	58
Red Lake				0.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Redwood			100.0%		100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Renville						N/A	N/A	10 or less
Rice	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Yes	33%	10 or less
Rock	100.0%		50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	Yes	-50%	10 or less
Roseau	0.0%			100.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
St. Louis	42.9%	72.0%	26.1%	35.1%	45.8%	Yes	7%	24
Scott	20.0%	50.0%	85.7%	54.6%	58.8%	Yes	194%	17
Sherburne	0.0%	40.0%	50.0%	100.0%	57.1%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Sibley	100.0%		100.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Stearns	22.2%	10.5%	0.0%	25.0%	29.4%	No	32%	17
Steele	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	80.0%	75.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Stevens				100.0%	0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Swift	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Todd	69.2%	100.0%	100.0%	10.0%	75.0%	Yes	8%	10 or less
Traverse						N/A	N/A	10 or less
Wabasha			100.0%	66.7%	0.0%	No	N/A	10 or less
Wadena	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Waseca	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%			N/A	N/A	10 or less
Washington	100.0%	41.7%	22.2%	71.4%	80.0%	Yes	-20%	15
Watsonwan		0.0%				N/A	N/A	10 or less
Wilkin		100.0%		0.0%	100.0%	Yes	N/A	10 or less
Winona	85.7%		0.0%		100.0%	Yes	17%	10 or less
Wright	25.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	30.8%	No	23%	13
Yellow Medicine				0.0%		N/A	N/A	10 or less
Statewide	38.7%	45.9%	40.4%	47.0%	48.8%	Yes	26%	607
County Minimum	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
County Median	31.7%	38.5%	45.3%	50.0%	51.7%			
County Maximum	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Note: Missing values occur when a county did not have any adoptions in the specified year.

Measure 15:

Percentage of Clients Remaining in the Community 180 Days Following Discharge from an Inpatient Psychiatric Setting

Program Area: Adult Mental Health

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure gauges the ability of each county's mental health system to provide services so that clients remain in community-based settings after discharge from inpatient psychiatric care.⁴⁸

Strengths of the Measure: A primary mental health responsibility of counties is to provide appropriate and adequate services to their residents with a Serious and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI). People receiving mental health services should be able to pursue a lifestyle no different than the ones pursued by other people. To allow community integration, an array of mental health treatment and ancillary supports need to be available as close to a person's home community as possible.

Limitations of the Measure: In small counties, the calculation of this measure is based on the experience of very few clients, which can lead to wide variations in performance from year to year. In these counties, one additional client being readmitted to an inpatient setting can have a dramatic impact on the counties' measured performance. Thus, it is important to look at a small county's performance over a few years, rather than just one year.

In addition, the availability of mental health service providers in a county can affect performance. If a county has a shortage of high quality providers, performance may suffer.

⁴⁸ The measure uses 180 consecutive days immediately following discharge as the period of community tenure, and the measure is reported as a percentage of all discharges. The numerator of this calculation is the number of discharges that had no hospitalization for psychiatric care within the following 180 days, and the denominator is the total number of discharges. The data for this measure come from records maintained by DHS' State Operated Services division and the department's Medicaid Management Information System.

Inpatient services for this measure include: (1) state-operated inpatient services (both Regional Treatment Centers and Community Behavioral Health Hospitals), (2) state-contracted beds within community hospitals, and (3) general admissions for psychiatric care in community hospitals. However, the measure only includes episodes of care involving DHS-supervised funds (which include federal, state, county, and local dollars and the Minnesota Health Care Programs). In addition, the measure only includes adults (people age 18 and over).

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties are responsible for administering services to people with SPMI. These services include providing (directly or through contracts with outside providers): (1) inpatient and outpatient mental health treatment, (2) community-based rehabilitative mental health services, and (3) additional support services that allow clients to live in the community of their choosing.

There are two primary county policies and actions that affect performance – (1) the array of services that a county uses to serve people with SPMI and (2) the amount of funding a county devotes to social services, especially mental health. For clients to remain in the community after discharge, they need high quality inpatient care before discharge, appropriate and sufficient outpatient services after discharge, and additional support services.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: For over 25 years, both the federal and state governments have emphasized the need to treat people with SPMI in a community setting. The Minnesota Department of Human Services and the federal Center for Mental Health Services advocate that people with SPMI should receive sufficient and adequate treatment so they can remain in a community-based setting (with rare exceptions).

Most publicly-funded mental health services are financed through Minnesota Health Care Programs and county controlled grants, which include federal and state funds. For FY 2006, the federal and state governments respectively contributed 25 percent and 62 percent of the funding. The remaining 14 percent came from the counties.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: There are no formal federal or state performance benchmarks or standards. While achieving a high level of community tenure is very important, having 100 percent of clients remain in the community for least 180 days after discharge is not always desirable. Re-hospitalization is appropriate and should occur for some clients.

Other Reporting of this Measure: DHS reports this performance data to county human services directors and supervisors twice a year. Furthermore, DHS program consultants review these performance data and then work with county officials to develop a plan to improve community tenure. Finally, this measure is included in DHS' current *Priority Plan for Chemical Health and Mental Health Systems*.⁴⁹

Performance Summary: On a statewide basis, county performance on this measure has been steady over the last five years, with about two-thirds of clients who have been discharged from an inpatient setting remaining in the community without being readmitted. Forty-four counties had a higher level of performance in state fiscal year 2006 than in 2002.

⁴⁹ An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* can be accessed at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrserver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Measure 15: Percentage in Community Following Discharge

	SFY 2002	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Discharges from an Inpatient Setting in 2006
Aitkin	56%	68%	80%	51%	63%	N/A	13%	43
Anoka	60%	60%	64%	67%	63%	N/A	5%	826
Becker	72%	76%	64%	73%	66%	N/A	-9%	90
Beltrami	58%	72%	76%	74%	75%	N/A	29%	165
Benton	59%	62%	67%	65%	58%	N/A	-2%	151
Big Stone	78%	83%	71%	57%	26%	N/A	-66%	23
Blue Earth	68%	68%	64%	71%	61%	N/A	-10%	158
Brown	50%	65%	46%	68%	83%	N/A	65%	69
Carlton	42%	57%	49%	55%	57%	N/A	37%	128
Carver	64%	63%	56%	47%	50%	N/A	-22%	138
Cass	64%	64%	82%	75%	76%	N/A	20%	92
Chippewa	55%	52%	59%	85%	86%	N/A	57%	21
Chisago	66%	62%	67%	72%	74%	N/A	12%	119
Clay	70%	62%	71%	68%	64%	N/A	-9%	167
Clearwater	87%	83%	94%	81%	79%	N/A	-8%	34
Cook	29%	62%		86%	64%	N/A	125%	14
Cottonwood	70%	82%	74%	70%	81%	N/A	15%	21
Crow Wing	72%	72%	72%	74%	72%	N/A	0%	213
Dakota	68%	64%	59%	66%	61%	N/A	-10%	754
Dodge	69%	66%	79%	90%	59%	N/A	-15%	34
Douglas	52%	60%	76%	86%	77%	N/A	49%	98
Faribault	58%	83%	62%	81%	84%	N/A	45%	25
Fillmore	51%	79%	89%	80%	69%	N/A	34%	32
Freeborn	63%	36%	64%	63%	64%	N/A	3%	90
Goodhue	70%	70%	55%	61%	73%	N/A	4%	80
Grant	64%	61%	93%	68%	85%	N/A	33%	20
Hennepin	58%	58%	58%	61%	61%	N/A	5%	4,247
Houston	61%	67%	69%	68%	64%	N/A	6%	50
Hubbard	75%	71%	69%	73%	84%	N/A	13%	56
Isanti	60%	82%	56%	63%	60%	N/A	0%	128
Itasca	73%	76%	61%	79%	68%	N/A	-6%	119
Jackson	69%	75%	53%	63%	65%	N/A	-5%	26
Kanabec	78%	71%	60%	69%	65%	N/A	-17%	49
Kandiyohi	69%	66%	70%	65%	61%	N/A	-11%	113
Kittson	88%	88%		57%	89%	N/A	2%	10 or less
Koochiching	54%	63%	86%	69%	65%	N/A	20%	46
Lac Qui Parle	73%	57%	70%	79%	82%	N/A	13%	11
Lake	50%	61%	78%	52%	44%	N/A	-13%	46
Lake of the Woods	78%	73%		78%	70%	N/A	-10%	10 or less
Le Sueur	77%	80%	87%	74%	63%	N/A	-18%	59
Lincoln	77%	55%	29%	44%	47%	N/A	-38%	19
Lyon	65%	74%	78%	67%	79%	N/A	20%	103
McLeod	77%	73%	70%	66%	78%	N/A	2%	124
Mahnomen	90%	80%	82%	65%	84%	N/A	-6%	19
Marshall	80%	84%	78%	91%	58%	N/A	-27%	24
Martin	87%	85%	84%	70%	70%	N/A	-19%	37
Meeker	86%	69%	75%	79%	79%	N/A	-8%	56
Mille Lacs	64%	69%	67%	76%	61%	N/A	-5%	71

Measure 15: Percentage in Community Following Discharge

	SFY 2002	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change	Number of Discharges from an Inpatient Setting in 2006
Morrison	70%	68%	73%	77%	87%	N/A	24%	68
Mower	66%	74%	67%	77%	60%	N/A	-8%	138
Murray	61%	74%	58%	93%	71%	N/A	16%	24
Nicollet	54%	68%	81%	67%	81%	N/A	51%	53
Nobles	62%	66%	64%	70%	66%	N/A	6%	95
Norman		70%	84%	82%	69%	N/A	N/A	16
Olmsted	53%	60%	66%	63%	62%	N/A	16%	478
Otter Tail	75%	72%	65%	74%	69%	N/A	-8%	176
Pennington	85%	85%	68%	79%	79%	N/A	-7%	52
Pine	64%	66%	67%	64%	55%	N/A	-15%	95
Pipestone	81%	84%	89%	82%	93%	N/A	16%	29
Polk	77%	69%	69%	78%	76%	N/A	-1%	94
Pope	87%	75%	65%	81%	84%	N/A	-4%	31
Ramsey	64%	63%	64%	61%	62%	N/A	-4%	2,588
Red Lake	86%	63%	80%	75%	67%	N/A	-22%	10 or less
Redwood	75%	79%	84%	79%	74%	N/A	0%	39
Renville	69%	87%	66%	70%	76%	N/A	9%	37
Rice	67%	71%	73%	76%	73%	N/A	9%	119
Rock	48%	69%	94%	70%	61%	N/A	27%	41
Roseau	84%	80%	92%	74%	87%	N/A	3%	30
St. Louis	59%	59%	60%	59%	57%	N/A	-4%	1,652
Scott	80%	80%	74%	95%	79%	N/A	-1%	150
Sherburne	66%	74%	79%	79%	73%	N/A	11%	143
Sibley	85%	72%	82%	64%	71%	N/A	-17%	31
Stearns	67%	72%	72%	72%	75%	N/A	13%	439
Steele	80%	73%	83%	83%	70%	N/A	-13%	102
Stevens	79%	75%	86%	77%	87%	N/A	10%	30
Swift	96%	72%	67%	69%	76%	N/A	-20%	25
Todd	86%	80%	71%	70%	80%	N/A	-7%	60
Traverse		83%	90%	92%	91%	N/A	N/A	11
Wabasha	53%	76%	70%	83%	89%	N/A	68%	46
Wadena	79%	83%	78%	75%	79%	N/A	0%	63
Waseca	92%	83%	90%	67%	86%	N/A	-7%	55
Washington	79%	65%	72%	77%	78%	N/A	-1%	345
Watsonwan	85%	89%	63%	81%	94%	N/A	12%	18
Wilkin	81%	88%	69%	71%	50%	N/A	-38%	18
Winona	61%	73%	66%	80%	73%	N/A	19%	167
Wright	67%	72%	75%	80%	73%	N/A	10%	210
Yellow Medicine	79%	92%	75%	80%	68%	N/A	-14%	25
Statewide	63%	64%	64%	66%	65%		2%	16,829
County Minimum	29%	36%	29%	44%	26%			
County Median	69%	72%	70%	73%	71%			
County Maximum	96%	92%	94%	95%	94%			

Note: Missing values occur when a county did not have any discharges in the specified year.

Measure 16:

Number of Children Receiving County-Administered Mental Health Services per 10,000 Children in the County

Program Area: Children's Mental Health

Type of Measure: Access / Availability

Measure Description: The measure assesses counties' efforts to identify children with mental health problems and then provide them with services.⁵⁰

Strengths of the Measure: Identifying children with mental health needs early and providing appropriate services is important for the well-being of children and their families. Research demonstrates that many mental health problems can be identified and treated much earlier than currently done. Furthermore, untreated or under-treated mental health problems get worse over time, and failing to identify and treat children's mental health problems causes growing complications for families, schools, and communities.

Limitations of the Measure: This measure does not capture or count children receiving mental health services when the county is not involved. To the extent that more children in some counties are accessing mental health services through avenues that do not involve the county than children in other counties, the relative performance of some counties will have some inaccuracies. The other avenues through which children receive mental health services include private insurance.

In addition, the measure does not account for potentially small differences in the prevalence of mental health issues among children across counties. Prevalence estimates vary slightly with conditions such as poverty and exposure to trauma but are remarkably consistent in general.

Currently, county variation on this measure is so large that the two limitations discussed above are very unlikely to account for all the differences. The ability of counties to publicize and make mental health services available may play an important role in determining the proportion of their child population that they serve.

⁵⁰ The numerator of this calculation is the number of children who received one or more mental health services directly from a county or a provider under contract with a county; and the denominator is the number of children in the county. This ratio is then multiplied by 10,000. If a county has fewer than 10,000 child residents, the number of children served by the county is less than the number reported in ratio. The data on the number of children served are reported by counties to the DHS' Community Mental Health Reporting System (CMHRS).

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties are responsible for publicizing and making available children’s mental health services. Specifically, the Minnesota Comprehensive Children’s Mental Health Act directs counties to provide information to all children and their families about the location of mental health services available in the county and how to access them.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: Medical Assistance, which is funded by the state and federal governments, is the primary funding source of county-administered children’s mental health services in Minnesota. However, counties also use funding from other sources, such as county funds. Counties with smaller Medical Assistance populations depend on these other funding sources to pay for children’s mental health services.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: Currently, no performance benchmark exists for this measure. However, DHS is concerned about counties that provide county-administered mental health services to a relatively small proportion of its children.

Other Reporting of this Measure: The department annually publishes this measure in its *Mental Health Management Report* and distributes it to counties.⁵¹

Performance Summary: Of the 87 counties, 65 served a higher proportion of their child residents in calendar year 2006 than they had in 2002.

⁵¹ Department of Human Services, *Mental Health Management Report: Service Utilization Tables for Children During Calendar Year 2006* (St. Paul) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/disabilities/documents/pub/dhs16_139704.pdf.

Measure 16: Number of Children Receiving County-Administered Mental Health Services per 10,000 Children

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
Aitkin	166	200	331	351	268	N/A	61%
Anoka	65	67	87	90	87	N/A	34%
Becker	338	397	373	439	463	N/A	37%
Beltrami	356	311	374	416	655	N/A	84%
Benton	177	168	182	174	175	N/A	-1%
Big Stone	388	291	377	597	586	N/A	51%
Blue Earth	272	258	243	259	202	N/A	-26%
Brown	188	222	265	308	264	N/A	41%
Carlton	610	736	192	344	393	N/A	-36%
Carver	192	190	212	219	158	N/A	-17%
Cass	863	791	826	963	927	N/A	7%
Chippewa	1,005	1,748	729	686	731	N/A	-27%
Chisago	239	272	277	259	251	N/A	5%
Clay	354	397	463	476	474	N/A	34%
Clearwater	347	356	506	571	571	N/A	64%
Cook	256	228	297	273	302	N/A	18%
Cottonwood	845	822	596	539	443	N/A	-48%
Crow Wing	120	179	214	264	280	N/A	134%
Dakota	70	61	54	68	70	N/A	0%
Dodge	52	43	62	82	73	N/A	41%
Douglas	433	175	218	344	373	N/A	-14%
Faribault	405	177	372	661	825	N/A	104%
Fillmore	80	116	119	115	101	N/A	26%
Freeborn	339	304	324	394	333	N/A	-2%
Goodhue	166	154	150	153	162	N/A	-2%
Grant	506	519	563	642	735	N/A	45%
Hennepin	131	131	113	118	112	N/A	-15%
Houston	168	175	170	199	169	N/A	0%
Hubbard	431	389	527	514	536	N/A	24%
Isanti	509	504	581	560	564	N/A	11%
Itasca	754	826	940	948	896	N/A	19%
Jackson	757	833	836	769	1,012	N/A	34%
Kanabec	342	347	431	375	362	N/A	6%
Kandiyohi	381	379	422	402	415	N/A	9%
Kittson	196	219	289	287	281	N/A	43%
Koochiching	1,151	1,210	1,156	751	810	N/A	-30%
Lac qui Parle	405	415	458	445	481	N/A	19%
Lake	588	430	344	423	322	N/A	-45%
Lake of the Woods	143	143	92	109	44	N/A	-69%
Le Sueur	168	306	272	275	249	N/A	48%
Lincoln	105	118	143	86	305	N/A	191%
Lyon	189	192	227	242	338	N/A	79%
McLeod	156	125	62	173	119	N/A	-24%
Mahnomen	2,667	554	387	639	610	N/A	-77%
Marshall	287	198	304	364	313	N/A	9%
Martin	392	216	226	360	366	N/A	-7%
Meeker	281	278	293	270	305	N/A	8%

Measure 16: Number of Children Receiving County-Administered Mental Health Services per 10,000 Children

	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
Mille Lacs	221	332	355	338	332	N/A	50%
Morrison	150	191	245	307	385	N/A	156%
Mower	59	47	64	93	109	N/A	84%
Murray	175	175	115	151	184	N/A	5%
Nicollet	105	146	160	220	182	N/A	73%
Nobles	248	274	196	159	189	N/A	-24%
Norman	622	397	525	458	465	N/A	-25%
Olmsted	101	111	111	99	100	N/A	-1%
Otter Tail	367	386	397	437	450	N/A	23%
Pennington	273	505	275	562	448	N/A	64%
Pine	226	303	316	343	369	N/A	63%
Pipestone	223	376	405	289	461	N/A	107%
Polk	409	500	702	670	593	N/A	45%
Pope	413	416	519	528	493	N/A	19%
Ramsey	147	165	185	215	211	N/A	43%
Red Lake	666	374	513	708	647	N/A	-3%
Redwood	260	352	374	343	378	N/A	45%
Renville	378	416	462	579	548	N/A	45%
Rice	114	139	143	130	120	N/A	6%
Rock	231	227	198	197	180	N/A	-22%
Roseau	49	74	82	90	61	N/A	23%
St. Louis	191	230	246	333	329	N/A	72%
Scott	140	135	105	107	115	N/A	-18%
Sherburne	56	63	74	111	116	N/A	106%
Sibley	99	165	239	221	234	N/A	136%
Stearns	67	87	104	118	120	N/A	78%
Steele	130	161	220	241	239	N/A	84%
Stevens	240	336	425	467	414	N/A	73%
Swift	215	291	365	341	425	N/A	98%
Todd	164	214	270	317	319	N/A	94%
Traverse	277	229	232	474	421	N/A	52%
Wabasha	128	109	121	135	160	N/A	25%
Wadena	263	277	322	298	325	N/A	24%
Waseca	177	189	219	266	285	N/A	61%
Washington	95	104	98	101	142	N/A	49%
Watsonwan	180	256	283	348	221	N/A	23%
Wilkin	358	257	457	545	452	N/A	26%
Winona	213	228	277	308	282	N/A	33%
Wright	61	92	113	130	124	N/A	103%
Yellow Medicine	343	385	378	474	644	N/A	88%
Statewide	179	180	181	188	187		4.5%
County Minimum	49	43	54	68	44		
County Median	231	230	277	317	322		
County Maximum	2,667	1,748	1,156	963	1,012		

Measure 17: Percentage of Children Involved in the Child Welfare System who Received a Mental Health Screening

Program Area: Children's Mental Health

Type of Measure: Access / Availability

Measure Description: This measure identifies whether counties are providing required mental health screenings to children in the child welfare system.⁵²

Strengths of the Measure: The measure assesses whether counties are complying with a statutory screening requirement. In 2002, the Minnesota Department of Human Services convened the Children's Mental Health Task Force in response to growing concerns about the children's mental health system. A key recommendation was to identify children with mental health needs early and provide appropriate services, beginning with high risk populations. In response to the recommendations of the task force, the 2003 Legislature required counties to conduct a mental health screening for children in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, effective July 1, 2004.⁵³ The juvenile justice screening measure is not included in this report but will be added once data collection concerns in that system are addressed.

Limitations of the Measure: This measure only captures the extent to which counties conduct screenings. It does not measure the extent to which counties provide services and treatment to children who have a mental health diagnosis. However, screening results are protected data, and the Commissioner of Human Services cannot collect individual screening results. This prevents the department from measuring the percentage of children with a mental health diagnosis in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems who are actually receiving services and treatment. The department is exploring options to collect aggregated diagnostic and treatment service information from

⁵² The measure is calculated by dividing the number of children in the target population who have completed a screening by the total number of children in the target population. The calculation excludes exempted children. From the child welfare system, the target population includes children who are 3 months to 18 years old and: (1) are receiving child protective services (traditional and Family Assessment Response), (2) are from families in which parental rights have been terminated, or (3) are in out-of-home placement for 30 days or more. Children in the target population are exempt from the screening if they meet any of the following exemptions: (1) are under the care of a mental health professional, (2) have been screened within the previous 180 days, (3) have received a diagnostic assessment within the previous 180 days, (4) have a parent or guardian who refused the screening, (5) had their case management closed within 30 days of opening, or (6) were unable to be located. Data for children in child welfare system come from DHS' Social Services Information System (SSIS).

⁵³ Minnesota Statutes (2007) section 245.4874, subd. 1 (14).

counties, not individual-child-level information. Again, the measure for the juvenile justice system will be added at a later date.

Finally, in small counties, the calculation of this measure is based on the experience of very few children, which can lead to wide variations in performance from year to year. In these counties, one missed assessment can have a dramatic impact on the counties' measured performance.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties are responsible for conducting the screenings.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: The state provides counties with an incentive to conduct screenings by providing funds based on the number of completed screenings. In addition, because the screening process is relatively inexpensive, screening funds can be used for diagnostic and treatment services when private insurance and Medical Assistance are not available.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: While no formal performance benchmark or standard has been established, counties are required to provide screenings to all children who are required to receive them under state law.

Other Reporting of this Measure: To date, DHS has not reported this measure elsewhere. However, DHS has recently incorporated this measure into its *Priority Plan for Disparities*.⁵⁴

Performance Summary: Improvement is needed on this measure. In 2006, only 32 percent of children in the child welfare system who needed a mental health screening had one. However, there was some improvement between 2005 and 2006. Forty-five of the county administrations performed better in 2006 than 2005.

⁵⁴ An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* can be accessed at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Measure 17: Percent of Children Involved in the Child Welfare System who Received a Mental Health Screening

	2005	2006	Benchmark or Standard	2005-06 Percentage Change	Number of Children who Should Have Had an Assessment in 2006
Aitkin	34%	71%	N/A	108%	49
Anoka	36%	46%	N/A	27%	335
Becker	25%	34%	N/A	32%	179
Beltrami	12%	11%	N/A	-6%	220
Benton	42%	17%	N/A	-59%	35
Big Stone	29%	45%	N/A	54%	20
Blue Earth	44%	27%	N/A	-39%	120
Brown	63%	54%	N/A	-15%	50
Carlton	40%	42%	N/A	5%	89
Carver	50%	43%	N/A	-15%	203
Cass	29%	17%	N/A	-40%	75
Chippewa	25%	58%	N/A	132%	19
Chisago	19%	22%	N/A	16%	154
Clay	38%	38%	N/A	0%	196
Clearwater	0%	56%	N/A	N/A	10 or less
Cook	13%	50%	N/A	300%	10 or less
Cottonwood	36%	66%	N/A	83%	29
Crow Wing	37%	24%	N/A	-36%	163
Dakota	69%	61%	N/A	-12%	294
Dodge	26%	28%	N/A	9%	53
Douglas	63%	57%	N/A	-10%	81
Faribault/Martin	69%	67%	N/A	-2%	132
Fillmore	0%	8%	N/A	N/A	62
Freeborn	7%	4%	N/A	-39%	71
Goodhue	8%	20%	N/A	153%	50
Grant	20%	17%	N/A	-17%	10 or less
Hennepin	19%	24%	N/A	26%	4,276
Houston	31%	20%	N/A	-35%	50
Hubbard	46%	49%	N/A	7%	87
Isanti	29%	32%	N/A	10%	128
Itasca	21%	16%	N/A	-24%	113
Jackson	32%	30%	N/A	-6%	30
Kanabec	29%	30%	N/A	4%	53
Kandiyohi	52%	66%	N/A	28%	152
Kittson	50%	0%	N/A	-100%	14
Koochiching	6%	0%	N/A	-100%	43
Lac Qui Parle	44%	43%	N/A	-4%	10 or less
Lake	0%	0%	N/A	N/A	46
Lake of The Woods	20%	0%	N/A	-100%	10 or less
Le Sueur	25%	31%	N/A	21%	75
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	58%	79%	N/A	36%	95
Lyon				See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	
McLeod	6%	11%	N/A	97%	96
Mahnomen	5%	25%	N/A	375%	32
Marshall	44%	55%	N/A	23%	11
Martin				See Faribault/Martin	
Meeker	16%	38%	N/A	136%	42

Measure 17: Percent of Children Involved in the Child Welfare System who Received a Mental Health Screening

	2005	2006	Benchmark or Standard	2005-06 Percentage Change	Number of Children who Should Have Had an Assessment in 2006
Mille Lacs	38%	33%	N/A	-13%	107
Morrison	33%	53%	N/A	61%	119
Mower	21%	27%	N/A	27%	64
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray				
Nicollet	53%	31%	N/A	-41%	70
Nobles	50%	31%	N/A	-38%	29
Norman	32%	28%	N/A	-11%	32
Olmsted	27%	26%	N/A	-4%	357
Otter Tail	33%	36%	N/A	7%	134
Pennington	7%	2%	N/A	-72%	49
Pine	19%	16%	N/A	-14%	69
Pipestone	10%	0%	N/A	-100%	22
Polk	57%	74%	N/A	29%	114
Pope	11%	32%	N/A	201%	31
Ramsey	43%	43%	N/A	0%	948
Red Lake		0%	N/A	N/A	12
Redwood	68%	43%	N/A	-37%	30
Renville	11%	63%	N/A	463%	32
Rice	43%	48%	N/A	12%	119
Rock	37%	16%	N/A	-56%	31
Roseau	10%	3%	N/A	-67%	30
St. Louis	12%	26%	N/A	118%	391
Scott	49%	70%	N/A	42%	126
Sherburne	9%	9%	N/A	9%	106
Sibley	63%	55%	N/A	-13%	29
Stearns	11%	21%	N/A	91%	165
Steele	34%	47%	N/A	38%	91
Stevens	0%	29%	N/A	N/A	14
Swift	55%	38%	N/A	-29%	26
Todd	4%	9%	N/A	151%	67
Traverse	21%	30%	N/A	38%	27
Wabasha	8%	33%	N/A	344%	10 or less
Wadena	12%	39%	N/A	233%	54
Waseca	32%	39%	N/A	23%	46
Washington	32%	36%	N/A	11%	153
Watonwan	0%	0%	N/A	N/A	39
Wilkin	0%	0%	N/A	N/A	23
Winona	17%	37%	N/A	121%	68
Wright	6%	21%	N/A	229%	184
Yellow Medicine	92%	88%	N/A	-4%	43
Statewide	28%	32%		11%	12,112
County Minimum	0%	0%			
County Median	29%	31%			
County Maximum	92%	88%			

Measure 18: Percentage of Elderly Receiving Publicly-Funded Long-Term Care who Live in a Community Setting

Program Area: Aging Services

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses the extent to which elders who receive publicly-funded long-term care are being served in community settings versus institutions. Community-based care includes such things as home health aides, personal care assistants, home health care nursing, assisted living, adult day care, home-delivered meals, and transportation. The elderly receive this care through Medical Assistance's regular home care services and the Elderly Waiver program. Community-based care is also provided through the Alternative Care program. Institutional care is nursing home care. This measure applies to people age 65 and older.⁵⁵

Strengths of the Measure: Serving the elderly in the community is an important state goal. Community-based services are preferred by the elderly and are more cost effective than institutional services. If the elderly, regardless of their needs, are offered feasible and viable alternatives to institutional care, counties will perform well on this measure.

Limitations of the Measure: A number of complex factors that are outside the control of a county affect performance on this measure. For example, over time, more and more elderly are receiving their community-based services through managed care plans rather than through fee-for-service care arranged by counties. Consequently, counties will have less control over this measure.

Despite this limitation, DHS decided to include elders who receive community-based waived services through managed-care plans in this measure.⁵⁶ First, these clients are

⁵⁵ Specifically, this measure involves people receiving care through: (1) the Elderly Waiver (both fee-for-service and managed care), (2) regular Medical Assistance (MA) home care services (only fee-for-service and people age 65 and older), (3) Alternative Care, and (4) nursing homes (for people age 65 and older regardless of diagnosis). The numerator of the ratio is the number of people receiving care through the Elderly Waiver, MA's regular home care service, or Alternative Care. The denominator is the number of people receiving care through the Elderly Waiver, MA's regular home care services, Alternative Care, or nursing homes.

⁵⁶ However, the measure does not include all elderly who receive community-based services through managed care plans. While the measure does include people who receive services from managed care plans under the Elderly Waiver, it does not include elderly who receive services from managed care plans under MA's regular home care services. Consequently, this measure understates the percentage of people served in the community. DHS excluded the people who receive services from managed care plans under

needed in the calculation to create a consistent series of data over the five year reporting period. If DHS excluded these clients from the calculation, counties would appear to perform worse than they actually did in the most recent years. This would occur as clients who originally received county arranged waived services through the fee-for-service system (which would be included in the calculation) moved to waived services provided as part of managed care (which would not be included in the calculation). Because the counties would initially get credit for these clients but would not get credit for them after they switched to the managed care plans, performance would appear to decline when it really had not. Second, counties should receive some of the credit for managed care plans' success in serving people in the community. The counties laid the original groundwork and foundation for these clients being served in the community by creating and developing the necessary provider capacities.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties play a major role in the provision of publicly-funded community-based services. Specifically, all counties provide Long-Term Care Consultations. In addition, all counties provide case management services under the fee-for-service system and some provide these services under managed care contracts. These services include conducting individual assessments and screenings, providing information about care options, updating individual care plans, and monitoring service quality. Case managers must be ready and responsive when the needs of program clients change and adjustments in care are needed to avoid more restrictive and expensive care, such as institutionalization. Counties are also responsible for assuring that an array of community-based services is available. This responsibility includes assessing service gaps, requesting proposals, contracting with eligible service providers, and responding to service challenges. Effective service planning by counties creates a system capacity that allows elders with higher needs to remain in the community.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: Under state direction, more and more Elderly Waiver services are being provided through managed care plans rather than being arranged by the counties. This change is affecting county roles and responsibilities around community-based services. Currently, about two-thirds of Elderly Waiver recipients receive their care through managed care plans; and in 2008, 90 percent of waiver recipients will be served in managed care.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: A performance benchmark or standard has not been established for this measure.

Other Reporting of this Measure: As DHS staff have conducted reviews of individual county's Elderly Waiver and Alternative Care programs, they have shared this performance measure with county staff. DHS also reports the measure every other year

MA's regular home care service because of data quality problems. Elderly who receive MA's regular home care services under the fee-for-service system (in contrast to the managed care system) are included in the measure.

in the legislatively mandated report on the *Status of Long-Term Care in Minnesota*.⁵⁷ Finally, DHS reports this measure on its Department Results website and has incorporated it into the department's *Priority Plan for Home and Community-Based Services*.⁵⁸

Performance Summary: Statewide, 56.7 percent of elderly long-term care clients receive their care in a community setting, and the percentage is increasing. Between state fiscal years 2003 and 2007, the percentage increased by 15 percent. In addition, 72 of the state's 87 counties improved their performance during this period.

⁵⁷ Department of Human Services, *Status of Long-Term Care in Minnesota—2005* (St. Paul) – http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&RevisionSelectionMethod=LatestReleased&Rendition=Primary&allowInterrupt=1&noSaveAs=1&dDocName=dhs_id_059536.

⁵⁸ The website can be accessed at <http://www.departmentresults.state.mn.us/hs/index.html>. An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* can be accessed at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfs/legacy/legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Page left intentionally blank

Measure 18: Percentage of Elderly Receiving Long-Term Care in the Community

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	Number of Elderly Receiving Publicly-Funded, Long-Term Care in 2007
Aitkin	57.3%	53.5%	49.8%	51.0%	53.7%	N/A	-6.3%	296
Anoka	49.6%	49.9%	53.8%	57.2%	59.0%	N/A	18.8%	1,500
Becker	51.4%	48.2%	47.1%	49.4%	51.2%	N/A	-0.3%	496
Beltrami	65.4%	66.9%	62.7%	65.8%	66.7%	N/A	1.9%	591
Benton	56.3%	56.2%	55.7%	60.6%	61.6%	N/A	9.5%	469
Big Stone	50.7%	48.2%	47.3%	50.0%	53.6%	N/A	5.7%	168
Blue Earth	55.5%	56.5%	55.1%	63.4%	62.4%	N/A	12.6%	495
Brown	41.0%	38.4%	39.0%	42.4%	42.0%	N/A	2.5%	407
Carlton	55.3%	52.7%	52.4%	54.3%	55.3%	N/A	0.0%	544
Carver	44.5%	44.0%	44.6%	51.3%	53.3%	N/A	19.6%	409
Cass	54.3%	54.1%	56.6%	59.9%	60.1%	N/A	10.8%	311
Chippewa	43.1%	47.1%	51.7%	51.7%	54.5%	N/A	26.2%	292
Chisago	52.6%	54.8%	54.1%	59.9%	62.8%	N/A	19.4%	376
Clay	56.7%	54.8%	55.3%	55.0%	56.2%	N/A	-0.9%	649
Clearwater	53.0%	51.1%	50.0%	52.3%	54.9%	N/A	3.7%	204
Cook	23.2%	18.9%	29.6%	27.5%	26.1%	N/A	12.4%	46
Cottonwood	34.6%	35.5%	42.1%	41.0%	41.0%	N/A	18.3%	188
Crow Wing	63.0%	59.3%	61.5%	62.7%	66.5%	N/A	5.6%	689
Dakota	55.5%	56.0%	59.0%	61.6%	63.9%	N/A	15.1%	1,851
Dodge	57.5%	58.8%	67.8%	66.7%	67.0%	N/A	16.6%	191
Douglas	47.7%	43.7%	43.5%	46.6%	47.8%	N/A	0.3%	500
Faribault	28.7%	27.8%	29.6%	34.1%	36.1%	N/A	26.0%	263
Fillmore	47.3%	44.9%	47.6%	54.4%	53.6%	N/A	13.2%	435
Freeborn	41.7%	42.1%	37.5%	39.8%	41.5%	N/A	-0.6%	441
Goodhue	41.7%	41.9%	44.4%	44.2%	43.7%	N/A	4.9%	471
Grant	40.1%	42.7%	38.1%	40.9%	48.8%	N/A	21.6%	123
Hennepin	30.7%	37.8%	43.4%	49.5%	57.1%	N/A	86.2%	9,130
Houston	44.4%	42.1%	43.0%	48.5%	49.2%	N/A	10.9%	254
Hubbard	61.8%	58.9%	58.6%	63.6%	65.9%	N/A	6.6%	258
Isanti	44.3%	42.2%	36.5%	40.4%	46.5%	N/A	4.9%	282
Itasca	67.6%	66.7%	66.8%	68.4%	69.3%	N/A	2.6%	688
Jackson	38.0%	40.1%	44.9%	42.6%	41.0%	N/A	7.9%	134
Kanabec	59.0%	55.6%	59.4%	55.3%	59.3%	N/A	0.6%	182
Kandiyohi	43.5%	45.2%	43.6%	47.9%	51.4%	N/A	18.2%	560
Kittson	40.4%	38.3%	36.0%	41.0%	42.1%	N/A	4.0%	126
Koochiching	27.1%	27.2%	29.7%	32.9%	38.6%	N/A	42.4%	207
Lac Qui Parle	44.2%	43.9%	45.6%	45.1%	44.6%	N/A	1.0%	195
Lake	60.2%	56.7%	58.0%	60.1%	62.7%	N/A	4.0%	158
Lake of the Woods	50.6%	44.4%	36.0%	44.6%	52.9%	N/A	4.4%	70
Le Sueur	46.6%	44.8%	47.4%	51.5%	54.4%	N/A	16.7%	333
Lincoln	46.9%	43.7%	43.4%	43.8%	45.7%	N/A	-2.5%	151
Lyon	45.7%	49.5%	51.1%	52.9%	55.6%	N/A	21.6%	385
McLeod	46.1%	46.6%	44.9%	48.5%	51.0%	N/A	10.8%	386
Mahnomen	57.7%	57.9%	58.8%	65.4%	67.7%	N/A	17.3%	127
Marshall	50.2%	43.8%	39.8%	47.0%	58.1%	N/A	15.7%	234
Martin	30.7%	37.7%	42.0%	43.8%	43.1%	N/A	40.1%	332
Meeker	43.5%	46.5%	50.3%	57.9%	60.6%	N/A	39.4%	320

Measure 18: Percentage of Elderly Receiving Long-Term Care in the Community

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	Number of Elderly Receiving Publicly-Funded, Long-Term Care in 2007
Mille Lacs	35.1%	38.2%	36.5%	40.9%	49.6%	N/A	41.4%	351
Morrison	55.6%	52.2%	54.1%	57.6%	60.9%	N/A	9.5%	537
Mower	54.3%	56.2%	53.5%	59.9%	64.9%	N/A	19.6%	681
Murray	50.0%	43.2%	37.7%	40.1%	43.9%	N/A	-12.2%	164
Nicollet	49.0%	52.2%	49.8%	59.2%	61.5%	N/A	25.4%	257
Nobles	41.0%	36.7%	39.2%	43.2%	45.1%	N/A	9.9%	273
Norman	47.5%	47.8%	49.7%	52.7%	54.5%	N/A	14.7%	200
Olmsted	55.6%	57.1%	59.7%	61.1%	63.9%	N/A	14.9%	1,064
Otter Tail	44.2%	43.6%	43.5%	42.6%	45.8%	N/A	3.5%	865
Pennington	65.9%	61.9%	61.0%	65.1%	66.2%	N/A	0.4%	296
Pine	48.7%	49.9%	50.8%	54.0%	57.6%	N/A	18.3%	354
Pipestone	36.7%	36.1%	38.0%	37.0%	37.1%	N/A	0.9%	170
Polk	60.8%	63.1%	63.4%	62.5%	65.9%	N/A	8.4%	763
Pope	45.8%	45.9%	44.4%	49.3%	54.6%	N/A	19.2%	207
Ramsey	45.6%	49.8%	52.7%	55.5%	59.3%	N/A	29.9%	4,742
Red Lake	51.2%	51.9%	48.9%	51.6%	61.2%	N/A	19.6%	85
Redwood	34.6%	33.6%	36.9%	38.1%	39.3%	N/A	13.7%	201
Renville	39.2%	39.8%	43.3%	48.5%	55.0%	N/A	40.4%	229
Rice	52.3%	54.9%	58.1%	58.8%	60.7%	N/A	15.9%	516
Rock	45.6%	43.0%	37.9%	45.9%	44.5%	N/A	-2.3%	128
Roseau	49.8%	48.2%	46.7%	47.4%	49.6%	N/A	-0.4%	262
St. Louis	55.7%	55.7%	54.8%	56.0%	58.4%	N/A	4.8%	3,106
Scott	46.1%	46.4%	48.0%	50.3%	57.6%	N/A	24.8%	403
Sherburne	54.4%	57.1%	61.3%	64.2%	65.3%	N/A	20.1%	395
Sibley	54.0%	52.7%	48.5%	53.6%	60.7%	N/A	12.5%	247
Stearns	53.8%	53.5%	53.4%	53.5%	52.6%	N/A	-2.3%	980
Steele	48.1%	47.7%	49.0%	51.9%	55.1%	N/A	14.6%	334
Stevens	61.2%	56.2%	48.5%	49.1%	43.2%	N/A	-29.3%	155
Swift	59.5%	57.2%	53.1%	56.1%	56.0%	N/A	-5.8%	291
Todd	60.5%	58.0%	55.4%	52.5%	56.2%	N/A	-7.2%	452
Traverse	56.0%	53.3%	51.3%	48.8%	47.9%	N/A	-14.5%	121
Wabasha	33.7%	33.3%	34.5%	35.4%	37.4%	N/A	11.0%	227
Wadena	58.7%	59.2%	55.9%	60.2%	62.2%	N/A	5.9%	288
Waseca	38.0%	36.5%	36.5%	39.9%	47.6%	N/A	25.4%	210
Washington	52.3%	55.9%	57.8%	59.1%	60.7%	N/A	16.1%	878
Watsonwan	41.3%	40.7%	41.7%	48.3%	49.5%	N/A	19.9%	186
Wilkin	40.1%	38.1%	40.5%	41.4%	39.4%	N/A	-1.8%	137
Winona	43.3%	46.0%	47.5%	51.3%	51.9%	N/A	20.0%	591
Wright	57.4%	57.7%	60.0%	59.9%	60.9%	N/A	6.1%	690
Yellow Medicine	38.0%	38.3%	39.1%	41.6%	47.4%	N/A	24.8%	209
Statewide	49.2%	50.0%	51.3%	54.0%	56.7%		15.3%	49,252
County Minimum	23.2%	18.9%	29.6%	27.5%	26.1%			
County Median	48.7%	47.8%	48.5%	51.3%	54.5%			
County Maximum	67.6%	66.9%	67.8%	68.4%	69.3%			

Measure 19: Percentage of People with Disabilities Receiving Publicly-Funded Long-Term Care who Live in a Community Setting

Program Area: Disability Services

Type of Measure: Effectiveness

Measure Description: This measure assesses the extent to which people with disabilities who receive publicly-funded long-term care are being served in community settings versus institutions. Community-based care includes such things as supportive living services, independent living services, supportive employment services, respite care, and extended home care services. People with disabilities receive this care through Medical Assistance's regular home care services and four home and community-based waiver programs (Developmental Disability, Community Alternatives for Disabled Individuals, Community Alternative Care, and Traumatic Brain Injury). Institutional care is provided at nursing homes, Intermediate Care Facilities for People with Mental Retardation (ICF/MRs), hospitals, and neurobehavioral hospital units.⁵⁹

Strengths of the Measure: Serving people with disabilities in the community is an important state goal. Community-based services are preferred by people with disabilities and are more cost effective than institutional services. Furthermore, litigation in the 1970s and 1980s spearheaded the movement toward community-based services to assure that people with disabilities live in the least restrictive environment possible. If people with disabilities, regardless of their needs, are offered feasible and viable alternatives to institutional care, counties will perform well on this measure.

Limitations of the Measure: A number of complex factors that are outside the control of a county affect performance on this measure. For example, state limits on the number of people served by a waiver program may limit whom a county can serve.

In addition, there are significant differences between people with developmental disabilities and people with other disabilities. Combining all people with disabilities into one measure can mask differences in performance that counties may experience among

⁵⁹ Specifically, this measure involves people receiving care through: (1) one of the four home and community-based waivers for people with disabilities (both fee-for-service and Minnesota Disability Health Options), (2) regular Medical Assistance (MA) home care services (only fee-for-service and people under age 65), (3) nursing homes (for people under age 65 regardless of diagnosis), and (4) ICF/MRs. The numerator of the ratio is the number of people receiving care through one of the waivers or MA's regular home care services. The denominator is the number of people serving care through the one of the waivers, MA's regular home care services, nursing homes, or ICF/MRs.

people with different types of disabilities. Furthermore, counties have been rigorous in pursuing community-based services for people with disabilities for many years. Consequently, overall performance on this measure is quite high and does not vary too significantly from county to county.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Counties play a major role in the provision of publicly-funded community-based services. Specifically, counties provide Long Term Care Consultations, developmental disability screenings, Medical Assistance health status assessments, and case management. These services include assessing and reassessing needs, providing information about options, developing and updating individual community support plans, and monitoring service quality. Case managers must be ready and responsive when the needs of individuals change and adjustments in services are needed to avoid more restrictive and expensive care, such as institutionalization. Furthermore, counties manage the budgets of the waiver programs and must maintain waiver allocation criteria and procedures to assure equitable and appropriate services for recipients and those waiting for services. Counties are also responsible for assuring that an array of community-based services is available. This responsibility includes assessing service gaps, requesting proposals, contracting with eligible service providers, monitoring service quality, and responding to service challenges. Effective service planning by counties creates a system capacity that allows people with higher needs to remain in the community.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: Most publicly-funded long-term care in Minnesota is provided through Medical Assistance, which is a joint federal-state program. Consequently, federal and state policies and requirements control the program's operation, and these policies and requirements are becoming increasingly complex, which can affect program performance. For example, the time that case managers spend on the program's large amount of paperwork competes with the time that they could spend with program clients. Furthermore, the waiver programs operate under defined budgets and allocations, which may limit the use of community-based services.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: A performance benchmark or standard has not been established for this measure.

Other Reporting of this Measure: As DHS staff have conducted reviews of individual county's waiver programs, they have shared this performance measure with county staff. Finally, DHS has incorporated this measure into the department's *Priority Plan for Home and Community-Based Services*.⁶⁰

Performance Summary: Statewide, 89.1 percent of long-term care clients with a disability receive their care in a community setting, and the percentage is increasing. Between state fiscal years 2003 and 2007, the percentage increased by 5 percent. In addition, 76 of the state's 87 counties improved their performance during this period.

⁶⁰ An overview of the department's *Priority Plans* can be accessed at <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrver/Legacy/DHS-4694-ENG>.

Measure 19: Percent of People with Disabilities Receiving Care in the Community

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	Number of People With Disabilities Receiving Publicly-Funded, Long-Term Care in 2007
Aitkin	95.6%	96.4%	95.4%	97.1%	96.3%	N/A	0.7%	135
Anoka	85.8%	86.2%	87.2%	87.8%	89.1%	N/A	3.8%	2,139
Becker	85.3%	86.5%	88.8%	89.4%	90.3%	N/A	5.9%	299
Beltrami	78.7%	82.5%	91.8%	91.7%	90.4%	N/A	15.0%	502
Benton	88.2%	93.6%	93.7%	93.5%	93.5%	N/A	6.0%	324
Big Stone	90.2%	89.4%	88.2%	84.3%	88.1%	N/A	-2.3%	84
Blue Earth	76.3%	76.8%	79.3%	82.9%	83.4%	N/A	9.4%	435
Brown	86.8%	86.7%	87.5%	87.2%	90.4%	N/A	4.1%	270
Carlton	95.4%	94.0%	94.8%	94.3%	94.7%	N/A	-0.7%	395
Carver	83.6%	84.3%	85.0%	87.1%	89.5%	N/A	7.1%	400
Cass	89.1%	88.6%	90.5%	93.8%	94.0%	N/A	5.6%	284
Chippewa	86.9%	90.7%	90.4%	87.3%	87.8%	N/A	1.0%	147
Chisago	92.5%	95.1%	92.3%	92.0%	93.6%	N/A	1.2%	374
Clay	91.7%	92.6%	94.2%	94.5%	95.5%	N/A	4.1%	713
Clearwater	72.6%	72.9%	73.0%	76.1%	78.2%	N/A	7.7%	87
Cook	90.5%	96.2%	93.5%	93.8%	93.3%	N/A	3.2%	30
Cottonwood	81.4%	83.3%	81.3%	82.4%	84.8%	N/A	4.3%	132
Crow Wing	91.9%	91.6%	92.2%	92.3%	94.8%	N/A	3.1%	518
Dakota	90.1%	90.3%	90.3%	91.6%	92.1%	N/A	2.2%	2,685
Dodge	90.9%	90.5%	90.4%	90.2%	91.3%	N/A	0.4%	126
Douglas	89.9%	91.7%	92.5%	91.6%	87.5%	N/A	-2.7%	287
Faribault	75.0%	78.5%	78.3%	79.2%	81.1%	N/A	8.2%	143
Fillmore	86.1%	85.3%	85.9%	88.0%	85.5%	N/A	-0.7%	165
Freeborn	77.9%	78.9%	78.0%	82.4%	80.8%	N/A	3.7%	239
Goodhue	83.3%	84.5%	82.8%	82.1%	82.7%	N/A	-0.8%	410
Grant	93.6%	93.3%	94.0%	92.2%	93.3%	N/A	-0.3%	60
Hennepin	80.2%	81.3%	81.9%	84.1%	86.5%	N/A	7.9%	12,125
Houston	85.9%	85.2%	85.3%	84.5%	83.7%	N/A	-2.5%	166
Hubbard	87.9%	88.5%	90.4%	94.3%	89.0%	N/A	1.3%	146
Isanti	90.2%	90.2%	87.9%	90.8%	90.5%	N/A	0.4%	231
Itasca	91.2%	91.5%	93.9%	94.0%	95.1%	N/A	4.3%	452
Jackson	78.6%	78.0%	79.4%	81.5%	81.3%	N/A	3.4%	96
Kanabec	87.2%	92.6%	92.9%	89.7%	90.3%	N/A	3.6%	144
Kandiyohi	92.4%	92.9%	93.1%	93.2%	93.1%	N/A	0.8%	379
Kittson	76.1%	71.1%	79.2%	83.0%	84.1%	N/A	10.5%	44
Koochiching	82.6%	82.0%	85.1%	86.3%	86.9%	N/A	5.2%	145
Lac Qui Parle	84.5%	85.4%	87.1%	86.2%	87.2%	N/A	3.2%	94
Lake	86.1%	90.2%	90.8%	90.3%	92.0%	N/A	6.8%	125
Lake of the Woods	81.5%	92.9%	93.1%	91.4%	94.3%	N/A	15.7%	35
Le Sueur	88.4%	89.3%	91.3%	91.5%	90.1%	N/A	1.9%	222
Lincoln	85.2%	88.9%	93.4%	88.1%	86.4%	N/A	1.4%	59
Lyon	91.2%	93.7%	94.4%	95.1%	94.8%	N/A	3.9%	290
McLeod	89.4%	91.6%	91.8%	93.6%	92.1%	N/A	3.1%	304
Mahnomen	90.3%	93.9%	95.3%	96.9%	95.8%	N/A	6.0%	71
Marshall	84.9%	87.4%	92.9%	94.1%	95.3%	N/A	12.3%	86
Martin	80.0%	82.1%	84.3%	86.5%	88.4%	N/A	10.5%	207
Meeker	85.9%	90.1%	88.8%	94.4%	95.7%	N/A	11.4%	187

Measure 19: Percent of People with Disabilities Receiving Care in the Community

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	Number of People With Disabilities Receiving Publicly-Funded, Long-Term Care in 2007
Mille Lacs	89.7%	88.4%	90.9%	91.3%	93.5%	N/A	4.3%	232
Morrison	86.8%	87.1%	87.5%	86.4%	86.4%	N/A	-0.4%	273
Mower	82.0%	81.7%	83.1%	85.4%	86.6%	N/A	5.6%	336
Murray	88.5%	90.5%	87.5%	88.5%	89.0%	N/A	0.6%	73
Nicollet	87.0%	88.1%	88.1%	89.1%	89.5%	N/A	2.9%	181
Nobles	86.8%	89.6%	89.7%	88.8%	89.1%	N/A	2.6%	201
Norman	92.2%	94.1%	94.2%	95.6%	95.7%	N/A	3.7%	92
Olmsted	91.2%	91.4%	92.1%	92.3%	91.6%	N/A	0.5%	1,173
Otter Tail	87.8%	87.1%	89.6%	91.2%	90.3%	N/A	2.9%	445
Pennington	80.1%	88.0%	93.8%	94.3%	94.5%	N/A	17.9%	163
Pine	85.5%	88.0%	89.5%	90.6%	91.4%	N/A	6.9%	209
Pipestone	72.2%	73.8%	73.2%	74.4%	73.9%	N/A	2.4%	88
Polk	88.8%	90.0%	90.7%	92.5%	89.8%	N/A	1.2%	413
Pope	95.6%	94.9%	93.9%	96.1%	91.8%	N/A	-4.0%	97
Ramsey	82.2%	83.5%	84.3%	85.5%	87.0%	N/A	5.9%	5,945
Red Lake	66.7%	80.0%	76.7%	74.2%	82.1%	N/A	23.2%	28
Redwood	84.1%	85.5%	86.2%	86.6%	86.3%	N/A	2.6%	146
Renville	86.0%	86.1%	88.1%	88.0%	87.8%	N/A	2.1%	188
Rice	90.4%	91.4%	91.6%	92.6%	93.3%	N/A	3.1%	460
Rock	89.0%	92.4%	91.8%	94.9%	94.3%	N/A	5.9%	105
Roseau	88.5%	89.8%	94.4%	93.6%	91.5%	N/A	3.4%	106
St. Louis	85.6%	87.3%	89.2%	89.7%	91.1%	N/A	6.4%	2,248
Scott	83.2%	84.9%	86.1%	87.9%	87.7%	N/A	5.4%	593
Sherburne	87.1%	87.1%	90.4%	90.6%	91.4%	N/A	4.9%	396
Sibley	78.9%	82.9%	82.0%	83.1%	82.8%	N/A	5.0%	128
Stearns	90.6%	90.4%	90.3%	91.9%	92.2%	N/A	1.8%	976
Steele	83.8%	85.2%	85.7%	87.4%	85.2%	N/A	1.8%	271
Stevens	90.5%	88.9%	89.5%	88.9%	85.2%	N/A	-5.9%	88
Swift	85.6%	86.5%	88.8%	89.0%	89.7%	N/A	4.8%	126
Todd	90.5%	91.1%	91.5%	90.1%	91.1%	N/A	0.6%	269
Traverse	58.6%	71.9%	73.3%	81.5%	80.8%	N/A	37.8%	26
Wabasha	90.2%	92.2%	89.0%	92.7%	94.0%	N/A	4.3%	184
Wadena	82.4%	85.6%	91.0%	90.5%	87.4%	N/A	6.1%	175
Waseca	82.3%	83.5%	83.3%	87.0%	87.7%	N/A	6.6%	114
Washington	89.2%	90.4%	90.8%	92.7%	92.9%	N/A	4.1%	1,105
Watsonwan	87.5%	85.4%	83.9%	82.5%	77.9%	N/A	-11.0%	131
Wilkin	83.3%	85.3%	89.5%	88.9%	91.8%	N/A	10.1%	85
Winona	91.6%	91.9%	91.5%	93.2%	92.6%	N/A	1.1%	529
Wright	91.3%	92.8%	92.8%	94.2%	94.8%	N/A	3.9%	654
Yellow Medicine	83.5%	84.3%	88.2%	91.5%	91.2%	N/A	9.2%	125
Statewide	84.8%	85.9%	86.7%	88.0%	89.1%		5.0%	46,168
County Minimum	58.6%	71.1%	73.0%	74.2%	73.9%			
County Median	86.8%	88.4%	89.6%	90.2%	90.3%			
County Maximum	95.6%	96.4%	95.4%	97.1%	96.3%			

Measure 20:

Percentage of Health Care Applications that Have an Initial Action within 45 Days

Program Area: Health Care

Type of Measure: Efficiency

Measure Description: This measure assesses whether counties are processing health care applications within the required 45 day timeframe.⁶¹ However, it applies only to the Minnesota Health Care Programs and client eligibility types that have a 45-day processing requirement. Thus, the measure excludes applications for pregnant women (15-day processing required), persons with disabilities (60-day processing required) and MinnesotaCare (30-day processing required).

Strengths of the Measure: For individuals experiencing financial difficulties and health care problems, receiving health care benefits as quickly as possible is important. While individuals with an approved application will receive retroactive support for the period that their application was being processed, delayed applications can cause individuals continued financial stress while they wait for counties to process their applications.

Limitations of the Measure: Not all cases that go beyond the 45 day standard for a county taking action on an application are due to county inaction. County case workers are instructed to keep an application open beyond the 45 day limit if the client has an incomplete application and is unable to obtain the missing information or verifications after 45 days.

Impact of County Policies and Actions on Performance: Processing health care applications is a county responsibility. Consequently, county funding, staffing levels, management decisions, and internal processes may affect performance.

Impact of Federal and State Policies and Actions on Performance: Medical Assistance, the primary health care program included in this measure, is a joint federal-state program. Consequently, federal and state policies and requirements determine the

⁶¹ Code of Federal Regulations, Title 42, Part 435.911; and Minnesota Rule 9505.0090.

This measure is calculated by (1) drawing from DHS' MAXIS Data Warehouse new applications in a given month for the applicable Minnesota Health Care Programs and client eligibility categories and (2) recording the application date. Then, the date of the county's initial action on the application is identified. This initial action is identified regardless of the eligibility result. The measure only includes new applications, limiting the initial actions to denials and initial openings. This eliminates applications that are auto-denied by MAXIS or reinstatements. Finally, the number of days between the date of the initial action and the application date is calculated.

level of effort required on the part of both workers and applicants to process an application. For example, if a new policy requires additional verifications, it may take applicants longer to have a complete application. As another example, a complex new policy that requires extra application processing steps may reduce the number of applications that a county worker can process. Either of these examples would ultimately affect the length of time required to complete and process an application.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: No standard has been established.

Because there are justifiable reasons why a county might be unable to process an application within 45 days, a county may accept a performance level below 100 percent. However, the failure of applicants to provide missing application information is not always a valid reason for counties to take more than 45 days to process an application. For example, if a county case worker holds an application for 43 days before telling the applicant that the application is incomplete, the applicant's inability to complete the application in the next two days should not be a justification for the case worker's failure to process the application within 45 days.

Other Reporting of this Measure: This performance report is the first time that this measure has been reported.

Performance Summary: Statewide, case workers take initial action on 73 percent of their applications within the 45 day timeframe. However, the state's performance has dropped from 80 percent in state fiscal year 2003 to 73 percent in 2007. During this period, 64 of the state's 87 counties had declining performance.

Measure 20: Timely Health Care Application Processing

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	2007 Applications Received
Aitkin	93%	91%	91%	88%	88%	N/A	-5%	1,640
Anoka	83%	82%	82%	79%	77%	N/A	-8%	22,270
Becker	89%	86%	84%	86%	87%	N/A	-2%	3,492
Beltrami	85%	86%	82%	77%	80%	N/A	-6%	7,351
Benton	82%	83%	79%	78%	68%	N/A	-16%	2,924
Big Stone	82%	69%	84%	78%	74%	N/A	-10%	398
Blue Earth	81%	84%	85%	80%	83%	N/A	2%	4,128
Brown	88%	88%	90%	86%	85%	N/A	-4%	1,783
Carlton	83%	85%	86%	83%	77%	N/A	-8%	2,853
Carver	75%	72%	76%	70%	67%	N/A	-11%	3,088
Cass	87%	88%	88%	86%	86%	N/A	-2%	3,660
Chippewa	72%	71%	88%	88%	82%	N/A	14%	1,228
Chisago	80%	73%	71%	63%	68%	N/A	-15%	3,138
Clay	90%	93%	91%	91%	91%	N/A	0%	4,878
Clearwater	90%	87%	85%	88%	87%	N/A	-4%	1,210
Cook	82%	89%	80%	78%	84%	N/A	3%	241
Cottonwood	87%	92%	91%	92%	94%	N/A	8%	999
Crow Wing	92%	92%	91%	85%	83%	N/A	-9%	6,021
Dakota	82%	80%	77%	70%	58%	N/A	-29%	20,649
Dodge	88%	87%	87%	89%	88%	N/A	0%	1,049
Douglas	70%	70%	72%	77%	73%	N/A	5%	2,202
Faribault	88%	88%	90%	85%	82%	N/A	-7%	1,399
Fillmore	90%	90%	84%	79%	78%	N/A	-13%	1,192
Freeborn	84%	86%	83%	84%	82%	N/A	-2%	2,478
Goodhue	73%	81%	84%	83%	81%	N/A	11%	2,806
Grant	83%	77%	78%	80%	78%	N/A	-5%	481
Hennepin	75%	73%	70%	71%	71%	N/A	-5%	91,685
Houston	83%	76%	84%	86%	80%	N/A	-3%	854
Hubbard	84%	86%	84%	80%	75%	N/A	-11%	1,735
Isanti	78%	79%	79%	78%	75%	N/A	-5%	2,719
Itasca	83%	80%	82%	76%	76%	N/A	-8%	4,083
Jackson	83%	82%	85%	89%	91%	N/A	9%	768
Kanabec	75%	77%	84%	77%	70%	N/A	-7%	1,408
Kandiyohi	92%	94%	94%	92%	91%	N/A	-1%	4,243
Kittson	90%	89%	83%	89%	78%	N/A	-13%	214
Koochiching	86%	83%	78%	80%	83%	N/A	-3%	1,051
Lac Qui Parle	92%	90%	95%	90%	92%	N/A	0%	563
Lake	83%	91%	93%	84%	85%	N/A	2%	746
Lake of the Woods	70%	66%	69%	76%	85%	N/A	22%	287
Le Sueur	85%	85%	82%	80%	77%	N/A	-9%	1,701
Lincoln	87%	85%	90%	82%	74%	N/A	-15%	434
Lyon	88%	91%	86%	82%	77%	N/A	-12%	1,998
McLeod	84%	85%	88%	85%	82%	N/A	-3%	2,918
Mahnomen	93%	93%	92%	89%	84%	N/A	-9%	1,431
Marshall	84%	87%	86%	83%	82%	N/A	-3%	904
Martin	82%	89%	91%	86%	84%	N/A	3%	1,979
Meeker	91%	92%	92%	88%	90%	N/A	-1%	1,606
Mille Lacs	85%	79%	80%	77%	74%	N/A	-13%	2,353

Measure 20: Timely Health Care Application Processing

	SFY 2003	SFY 2004	SFY 2005	SFY 2006	SFY 2007	Benchmark or Standard	2003-07 Percentage Change	2007 Applications Received
Morrison	85%	83%	85%	78%	78%	N/A	-8%	2,740
Mower	87%	86%	84%	80%	79%	N/A	-10%	3,319
Murray	93%	91%	93%	93%	91%	N/A	-3%	521
Nicollet	87%	86%	87%	83%	81%	N/A	-7%	1,596
Nobles	89%	87%	83%	88%	89%	N/A	0%	2,062
Norman	92%	93%	92%	93%	94%	N/A	2%	720
Olmsted	88%	87%	87%	84%	84%	N/A	-5%	9,842
Otter Tail	77%	81%	82%	80%	81%	N/A	5%	4,131
Pennington	86%	90%	86%	87%	89%	N/A	4%	1,115
Pine	87%	86%	83%	84%	84%	N/A	-4%	2,811
Pipestone	86%	91%	88%	89%	88%	N/A	3%	743
Polk	85%	89%	87%	86%	87%	N/A	3%	2,970
Pope	80%	78%	85%	78%	80%	N/A	0%	634
Ramsey	66%	62%	66%	64%	58%	N/A	-13%	39,827
Red Lake	92%	92%	93%	88%	91%	N/A	-1%	409
Redwood	84%	84%	89%	86%	80%	N/A	-4%	1,257
Renville	86%	85%	87%	84%	83%	N/A	-3%	1,888
Rice	81%	81%	80%	73%	70%	N/A	-13%	4,297
Rock	91%	89%	84%	80%	81%	N/A	-11%	662
Roseau	65%	72%	71%	68%	67%	N/A	2%	695
St. Louis	84%	83%	82%	79%	78%	N/A	-8%	17,145
Scott	82%	77%	71%	70%	68%	N/A	-17%	4,778
Sherburne	80%	79%	77%	72%	70%	N/A	-13%	4,934
Sibley	77%	81%	87%	87%	85%	N/A	11%	1,408
Stearns	77%	77%	77%	76%	76%	N/A	-2%	8,255
Steele	81%	83%	84%	81%	84%	N/A	3%	2,338
Stevens	86%	85%	83%	84%	85%	N/A	-1%	432
Swift	94%	95%	94%	92%	92%	N/A	-2%	790
Todd	72%	76%	76%	70%	72%	N/A	0%	2,082
Traverse	87%	94%	90%	96%	97%	N/A	11%	425
Wabasha	90%	88%	87%	77%	85%	N/A	-6%	1,238
Wadena	84%	82%	84%	86%	89%	N/A	6%	1,708
Waseca	97%	96%	92%	94%	91%	N/A	-5%	1,413
Washington	76%	75%	72%	67%	59%	N/A	-23%	7,633
Watsonwan	90%	84%	88%	81%	72%	N/A	-20%	1,252
Wilkin	99%	98%	93%	98%	93%	N/A	-6%	615
Winona	85%	82%	80%	77%	82%	N/A	-3%	2,729
Wright	73%	69%	72%	70%	63%	N/A	-14%	6,373
Yellow Medicine	91%	87%	86%	88%	86%	N/A	-5%	659
Statewide	80%	79%	78%	76%	73%		-8%	378,234
County Minimum	65%	62%	66%	63%	58%			
County Median	85%	85%	84%	83%	82%			
County Maximum	99%	98%	95%	98%	97%			

Measures 21 – 23: Human Service Spending Per Capita

Program Area: All areas

Type of Measure: Cost

Measure Descriptions: This section of the report provides information and data for three different cost measures. The first measure includes DHS and county spending of federal, state, county, and miscellaneous funds in each county; the second measure just includes county spending of federal, state, county, and miscellaneous funds; and the third measure only includes county spending of county funds.⁶² Specifically:

- **Total Human Services Spending per Capita** includes: (1) DHS centralized expenditures (DHS payments to vendors/clients on behalf county residents), (2) county public aid / purchased service costs, (3) county personnel costs, and (4) county non-personnel costs. These expenditures are financed with funds from federal, state, county, and miscellaneous sources. This measure shows total public human services spending in each county. DHS expenditures, especially Medical Assistance payments to health care providers, dominate this spending.
- **County Human Services Spending per Capita** is the same as total human services spending per capita but excludes DHS centralized expenditures (DHS payments to vendors/clients on behalf of county residents). It includes: (1) county public aid / purchased service costs, (2) county personnel costs, and (3) county non-personnel costs. The measure captures all expenditures where the county is “cutting the check,” regardless of the source of the funding. Thus, it excludes payments that DHS is making to vendors/clients on behalf of county residents. In this latter case, DHS is “cutting the check.” This measure identifies the federal, state, county, and miscellaneous funds that counties are responsible for administering.
- **County Funds Devoted to Human Services per Capita** is the same as county human services spending per capita but excludes county spending of federal, state, and miscellaneous funds. It only includes county spending of county

⁶² The data in these measures are compiled from several county reports – (1) Income Maintenance Expense Report, (2) Social Service Fund Report, and (3) Social Service Expenditure and Grant Reconciliation (SEAGR) Report. Total human service spending per capita includes DHS centralized expenditures, which are reported through three data systems – MMIS, MAXIS, and MEC².

funds.⁶³ This measure shows how much counties themselves are devoting human services.

The cost figures in the following tables are adjusted for inflation.⁶⁴

Strengths of the Measures: Government has an obligation to use taxpayer funds as effectively and efficiently as possible. Taxpayers want a high rate of return on their investments. The returns are effective programs that improve the lives of human service clients and make Minnesota a better place to live. While the previous 20 measures provide information on the benefits that counties generate with their human services programs, the three spending measures discussed in this section provide information on the costs that were incurred to generate those benefits.

Limitations of the Measures: While taxpayers want the largest returns with the smallest investment possible, a low level of spending per capita is not necessarily indicative of effective financial management. On the one hand, having a low level of spending per capita is desirable if a county is performing well on the program outcomes measures. The county is getting a high rate of return on its investment. On the other hand, having a low level of spending per capita is potentially a concern if a county is not performing well on the program outcome measures. In this case, the county may not devote enough resources to human service programs. This may occur because the county has a high needs population and lacks financial resources. Minimizing costs is obviously important, but it needs to be understood in the context of a county's program performance, financial capacity, caseload difficulty, and other factors.

In certain circumstances, counties may not be reporting their spending data consistently with each other. For example, for the counties that use MEC² (DHS' automated case management system for child care assistance), DHS makes child care payments to providers. For the counties that do not yet use MEC², the counties make the payments themselves. This payment difference affects what costs are allocated to *county human service spending per capita*. For counties using MEC², these child care costs are not included in *county human services spending per capita*, while for the counties not yet using MEC², the costs are included.

Impact of County, State, and Federal Policies and Actions on Performance:

Counties control how much funding they devote to human services programs. County boards determine county tax rates and allocate these and other local funds among their various programs – human services, transportation, law enforcement, parks and recreation, etc.

⁶³ However, it includes County Program Aid, which is general financial support from the state. Each county decides how to allocate these funds among its various programs, including human services, transportation, parks and recreation, etc.

⁶⁴ Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers – <http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/surveymost>.

However, human services spending is also heavily influenced by federal and state decisions. State and federal policies control many of the programs described in this report. In addition, most human services funding comes from the state and federal governments. In calendar year 2006, the state and federal governments each accounted for about 45 percent of the funding, while counties only accounted for about 8 percent. Furthermore, DHS spends the vast majority of these funds as centralized expenditures (DHS payments to vendors and clients on behalf of county residents – for example, Medical Assistance payments to doctors or MFIP cash assistance payments to program participants). Consequently, the overall level of human services spending in a county is largely outside the control of the county. It is for this reason that this report includes three different types of cost measures. *Total human services spending per capita* provides a picture of all the human services financial resources in a county. *County human service spending per capita* shows the financial resources over which counties have administrative responsibility. *County funds devoted to human services per capita* shows how much of their own resources counties are spending.

Performance Benchmark or Standard: The three cost measures do not have benchmarks or standards because the desirable level of spending cannot be ascertained independently of each county's outcome measures.

Other Reporting of this Measure: All three of these cost measures come from data reported in the *Minnesota County Human Services Cost Report*.⁶⁵

Performance Summary: Over the last five years, total human services spending per capita has remained quite stable after adjusting for inflation. County spending of county funds has also remained relatively stable. Consequently, the counties' share of overall human services funding has remained about the same over the last five years.

⁶⁵ Minnesota Department of Human Services, *Minnesota County Human Services Cost Report for Calendar Year 2006* (St. Paul, September 2007) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DHS-4179d-ENG>.

Page left intentionally blank

Table 21: Total Human Services Spending per Capita

	Inflation Adjusted (2006 Dollars)					Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006		
Aitkin	2,025	1,896	1,922	1,955	1,893	N/A	-7%
Anoka	1,079	1,106	1,166	1,157	1,134	N/A	5%
Becker	1,949	1,973	2,029	2,072	2,069	N/A	6%
Beltrami	2,303	2,443	2,472	2,581	2,673	N/A	16%
Benton	1,261	1,341	1,338	1,353	1,373	N/A	9%
Big Stone	2,115	2,448	2,381	2,542	2,398	N/A	13%
Blue Earth	1,220	1,340	1,384	1,405	1,391	N/A	14%
Brown	1,518	1,594	1,636	1,598	1,594	N/A	5%
Carlton	1,869	1,959	1,959	2,012	1,956	N/A	5%
Carver	793	814	804	794	748	N/A	-6%
Cass	1,918	1,921	2,026	2,128	2,128	N/A	11%
Chippewa	1,825	1,918	1,929	1,919	1,883	N/A	3%
Chisago	1,054	1,128	1,176	1,177	1,223	N/A	16%
Clay	1,733	1,832	1,835	1,818	1,767	N/A	2%
Clearwater	2,319	2,316	2,287	2,345	2,262	N/A	-2%
Cook	1,256	1,229	1,193	1,112	1,175	N/A	-6%
Cottonwood	1,940	2,103	2,051	2,012	2,029	N/A	5%
Crow Wing	1,496	1,532	1,533	1,549	1,533	N/A	2%
Dakota	881	931	939	969	1,017	N/A	15%
Dodge	1,131	1,051	1,060	1,055	1,023	N/A	-10%
Douglas	1,376	1,476	1,560	1,572	1,488	N/A	8%
Faribault/Martin	1,664	1,753	1,706	1,754	1,716	N/A	3%
Fillmore	1,417	1,495	1,495	1,487	1,439	N/A	2%
Freeborn	1,626	1,687	1,647	1,622	1,552	N/A	-5%
Goodhue	1,181	1,247	1,240	1,245	1,237	N/A	5%
Grant	1,686	1,789	1,816	1,852	1,752	N/A	4%
Hennepin	1,970	1,922	1,898	1,915	1,853	N/A	-6%
Houston	1,293	1,335	1,381	1,345	1,355	N/A	5%
Hubbard	1,562	1,497	1,506	1,634	1,527	N/A	-2%
Isanti	1,201	1,212	1,210	1,192	1,163	N/A	-3%
Itasca	1,834	1,931	1,940	1,950	1,881	N/A	3%
Jackson	1,447	1,521	1,520	1,545	1,536	N/A	6%
Kanabec	1,461	1,483	1,557	1,585	1,616	N/A	11%
Kandiyohi	1,740	1,787	1,880	1,855	1,686	N/A	-3%
Kittson	1,693	1,751	1,852	1,762	1,714	N/A	1%
Koochiching	2,029	2,029	2,128	2,106	2,114	N/A	4%
Lac Qui Parle	1,822	1,897	1,961	2,002	1,972	N/A	8%
Lake	1,778	1,743	1,844	1,865	1,843	N/A	4%
Lake of the Woods	1,244	1,524	1,617	1,438	1,344	N/A	8%
Le Sueur	1,319	1,355	1,262	1,419	1,315	N/A	0%
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	1,539	1,684	1,683	1,684	1,680	N/A	9%
Lyon				See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray			
McLeod	1,108	1,184	1,194	1,215	1,261	N/A	14%
Mahnomen	2,993	3,121	3,174	3,336	3,416	N/A	14%
Marshall	1,636	1,758	1,738	1,727	1,693	N/A	4%
Martin				See Faribault/Martin			
Meeker	1,211	1,289	1,298	1,329	1,258	N/A	4%
Mille Lacs	1,776	1,774	1,802	1,807	1,756	N/A	-1%
Morrison	1,525	1,594	1,595	1,654	1,593	N/A	4%

Table 21: Total Human Services Spending per Capita

	Inflation Adjusted (2006 Dollars)					Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006		
Mower	1,568	1,696	1,663	1,787	1,675	N/A	7%
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray						
Nicollet	1,108	1,177	1,184	1,181	1,147	N/A	3%
Nobles	1,514	1,653	1,625	1,614	1,599	N/A	6%
Norman	2,125	2,173	2,214	2,311	2,336	N/A	10%
Olmsted	1,312	1,518	1,551	1,506	1,468	N/A	12%
Otter Tail	1,443	1,529	1,521	1,558	1,511	N/A	5%
Pennington	1,694	1,735	1,854	1,826	1,848	N/A	9%
Pine	1,594	1,617	1,586	1,676	1,678	N/A	5%
Pipestone	1,629	1,807	1,873	1,927	1,837	N/A	13%
Polk	2,068	2,232	2,238	2,435	2,262	N/A	9%
Pope	1,558	1,672	1,675	1,704	1,575	N/A	1%
Ramsey	2,035	2,067	2,083	2,143	2,108	N/A	4%
Red Lake	1,723	1,721	1,686	1,877	1,694	N/A	-2%
Redwood	1,566	1,701	1,671	1,654	1,627	N/A	4%
Renville	1,760	1,661	1,771	1,807	1,783	N/A	1%
Rice	1,090	1,104	1,133	1,118	1,077	N/A	-1%
Rock	1,346	1,388	1,459	1,522	1,414	N/A	5%
Roseau	1,074	1,166	1,187	1,215	1,192	N/A	11%
St. Louis	2,035	2,094	2,094	2,123	2,074	N/A	2%
Scott	722	720	693	705	717	N/A	-1%
Sherburne	762	783	819	798	786	N/A	3%
Sibley	1,376	1,387	1,469	1,519	1,402	N/A	2%
Stearns	1,038	1,075	1,097	1,130	1,113	N/A	7%
Steele	1,218	1,195	1,253	1,340	1,277	N/A	5%
Stevens	1,361	1,431	1,429	1,478	1,441	N/A	6%
Swift	1,740	1,813	1,851	1,872	1,790	N/A	3%
Todd	1,773	1,869	1,881	1,890	1,879	N/A	6%
Traverse	2,118	1,972	2,119	2,307	2,174	N/A	3%
Wabasha	1,181	1,260	1,255	1,253	1,163	N/A	-2%
Wadena	2,264	2,180	2,216	2,295	2,272	N/A	0%
Waseca	1,227	1,285	1,335	1,321	1,272	N/A	4%
Washington	690	735	746	752	735	N/A	7%
Watonwan	1,628	1,680	1,711	1,712	1,728	N/A	6%
Wilkin	1,933	2,074	2,001	2,049	2,092	N/A	8%
Winona	1,236	1,300	1,344	1,356	1,290	N/A	4%
Wright	895	896	912	907	867	N/A	-3%
Yellow Medicine	1,865	1,962	1,991	2,002	1,934	N/A	4%
Statewide	1,521	1,547	1,551	1,567	1,532		1%
County Minimum	690	720	693	705	717		
County Median	1,560	1,657	1,641	1,654	1,608		
County Maximum	2,993	3,121	3,174	3,336	3,416		

Table 22: County Human Services Spending per Capita

	Inflation Adjusted (2006 Dollars)					Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006		
Aitkin	356	341	309	306	281	N/A	-21%
Anoka	274	239	246	229	224	N/A	-18%
Becker	417	392	374	395	383	N/A	-8%
Beltrami	398	361	298	301	325	N/A	-18%
Benton	247	222	208	224	219	N/A	-11%
Big Stone	357	376	402	378	430	N/A	20%
Blue Earth	292	298	294	294	307	N/A	5%
Brown	282	249	258	246	247	N/A	-12%
Carlton	368	361	325	325	309	N/A	-16%
Carver	243	220	199	201	197	N/A	-19%
Cass	445	352	310	330	313	N/A	-30%
Chippewa	355	348	326	329	323	N/A	-9%
Chisago	263	259	224	219	258	N/A	-2%
Clay	416	398	345	341	297	N/A	-29%
Clearwater	382	375	383	385	391	N/A	2%
Cook	244	260	259	254	291	N/A	19%
Cottonwood	462	463	435	471	510	N/A	10%
Crow Wing	321	315	294	306	310	N/A	-4%
Dakota	269	261	239	235	251	N/A	-7%
Dodge	175	175	188	171	169	N/A	-3%
Douglas	281	259	241	236	212	N/A	-24%
Faribault/Martin	261	273	248	256	247	N/A	-5%
Fillmore	176	163	157	156	145	N/A	-18%
Freeborn	363	373	338	327	306	N/A	-16%
Goodhue	228	192	192	190	192	N/A	-16%
Grant	324	332	359	393	460	N/A	42%
Hennepin	480	470	410	420	387	N/A	-19%
Houston	226	211	208	215	216	N/A	-4%
Hubbard	308	295	281	317	323	N/A	5%
Isanti	318	289	260	238	247	N/A	-22%
Itasca	466	439	403	368	357	N/A	-23%
Jackson	387	358	329	340	350	N/A	-10%
Kanabec	304	271	279	265	277	N/A	-9%
Kandiyohi	400	399	436	386	298	N/A	-26%
Kittson	233	230	232	229	220	N/A	-6%
Koochiching	393	337	315	328	333	N/A	-15%
Lac Qui Parle	255	239	230	219	226	N/A	-11%
Lake	375	364	356	312	329	N/A	-12%
Lake of the Woods	304	328	277	292	277	N/A	-9%
Le Sueur	252	229	209	203	198	N/A	-22%
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	296	294	271	270	261	N/A	-12%
Lyon				See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray			
McLeod	226	227	204	200	203	N/A	-10%
Mahnomen	541	589	438	460	408	N/A	-25%
Marshall	269	260	269	266	257	N/A	-4%
Martin				See Faribault/Martin			
Meeker	237	216	201	181	182	N/A	-23%
Mille Lacs	355	318	296	284	264	N/A	-26%
Morrison	237	240	241	260	253	N/A	7%

Table 22: County Human Services Spending per Capita

	Inflation Adjusted (2006 Dollars)					Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006		
Mower	296	267	231	207	199	N/A	-33%
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray						
Nicollet	246	221	209	214	221	N/A	-10%
Nobles	261	269	238	240	244	N/A	-7%
Norman	282	244	232	256	270	N/A	-4%
Olmsted	396	414	424	399	392	N/A	-1%
Otter Tail	299	290	273	286	277	N/A	-7%
Pennington	341	354	330	326	325	N/A	-5%
Pine	332	290	268	261	251	N/A	-24%
Pipestone	252	241	278	274	269	N/A	6%
Polk	437	439	420	439	406	N/A	-7%
Pope	265	238	216	245	227	N/A	-14%
Ramsey	439	442	407	406	400	N/A	-9%
Red Lake	281	276	240	253	267	N/A	-5%
Redwood	328	325	294	300	272	N/A	-17%
Renville	302	268	274	292	287	N/A	-5%
Rice	167	146	142	140	143	N/A	-14%
Rock	258	230	226	244	231	N/A	-10%
Roseau	170	175	181	180	185	N/A	9%
St. Louis	411	384	312	302	314	N/A	-24%
Scott	177	145	129	135	131	N/A	-26%
Sherburne	193	174	157	158	150	N/A	-22%
Sibley	265	247	224	229	209	N/A	-21%
Stearns	222	199	189	190	187	N/A	-16%
Steele	246	232	201	216	191	N/A	-22%
Stevens	323	276	240	245	244	N/A	-25%
Swift	319	296	283	305	322	N/A	1%
Todd	308	301	285	274	261	N/A	-15%
Traverse	409	371	377	400	283	N/A	-31%
Wabasha	213	215	216	230	183	N/A	-14%
Wadena	397	363	338	346	358	N/A	-10%
Waseca	264	228	217	207	198	N/A	-25%
Washington	165	160	138	141	136	N/A	-17%
Watsonwan	388	339	332	343	340	N/A	-12%
Wilkin	392	362	348	367	359	N/A	-8%
Winona	269	249	226	229	200	N/A	-26%
Wright	183	158	155	150	141	N/A	-23%
Yellow Medicine	347	330	307	320	311	N/A	-10%
Statewide	345	331	301	300	290		-16%
County Minimum	165	145	129	135	131		
County Median	297	276	270	265	265		
County Maximum	541	589	438	471	510		

Table 23: County Funding Devoted to Human Services per Capita

	Inflation Adjusted (2006 Dollars)					Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006		
Aitkin	114	100	122	131	112	N/A	-1%
Anoka	97	67	95	82	95	N/A	-2%
Becker	150	141	161	177	179	N/A	19%
Beltrami	116	86	111	121	154	N/A	33%
Benton	89	70	77	74	75	N/A	-15%
Big Stone	110	112	144	98	165	N/A	50%
Blue Earth	55	55	79	92	59	N/A	7%
Brown	88	62	98	92	100	N/A	15%
Carlton	97	80	115	106	120	N/A	23%
Carver	105	89	84	82	87	N/A	-17%
Cass	185	135	144	170	167	N/A	-10%
Chippewa	154	135	138	141	153	N/A	-1%
Chisago	89	95	94	93	110	N/A	23%
Clay	147	110	136	149	133	N/A	-9%
Clearwater	117	105	146	124	124	N/A	6%
Cook	98	85	98	112	122	N/A	24%
Cottonwood	167	154	158	126	224	N/A	34%
Crow Wing	100	84	96	101	123	N/A	22%
Dakota	105	74	81	79	98	N/A	-7%
Dodge	53	55	77	65	68	N/A	28%
Douglas	120	101	107	109	99	N/A	-17%
Faribault/Martin	71	75	94	106	95	N/A	33%
Fillmore	69	48	56	50	51	N/A	-26%
Freeborn	135	151	154	154	138	N/A	2%
Goodhue	68	42	77	72	75	N/A	11%
Grant	86	106	128	122	83	N/A	-3%
Hennepin	191	172	182	189	170	N/A	-11%
Houston	52	58	66	74	90	N/A	74%
Hubbard	87	82	99	117	132	N/A	50%
Isanti	115	98	88	94	90	N/A	-22%
Itasca	163	165	181	179	182	N/A	12%
Jackson	190	150	156	172	199	N/A	5%
Kanabec	133	87	128	121	136	N/A	3%
Kandiyohi	132	118	129	129	124	N/A	-6%
Kittson	79	79	94	89	87	N/A	10%
Koochiching	129	103	128	138	140	N/A	9%
Lac Qui Parle	76	61	88	84	77	N/A	1%
Lake	141	128	156	125	148	N/A	5%
Lake of the Woods	151	49	90	100	113	N/A	-25%
Le Sueur	95	83	96	84	93	N/A	-2%
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	115	104	122	125	130	N/A	13%
Lyon				See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray			
McLeod	101	97	96	94	101	N/A	0%
Mahnomen	175	53	85	89	127	N/A	-27%
Marshall	81	85	94	98	73	N/A	-10%
Martin				See Faribault/Martin			
Meeker	90	82	92	86	94	N/A	4%
Mille Lacs	164	114	140	140	141	N/A	-14%
Morrison	84	82	89	102	113	N/A	33%

Table 23: County Funding Devoted to Human Services per Capita

	Inflation Adjusted (2006 Dollars)					Benchmark or Standard	2002-06 Percentage Change
	CY 2002	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006		
Mower	112	85	88	64	68	N/A	-39%
Murray	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray						
Nicollet	91	74	91	94	109	N/A	20%
Nobles	66	80	75	71	97	N/A	47%
Norman	90	34	68	74	87	N/A	-3%
Olmsted	113	95	134	146	153	N/A	35%
Otter Tail	106	96	108	110	113	N/A	7%
Pennington	116	123	132	131	145	N/A	25%
Pine	106	94	112	111	112	N/A	5%
Pipestone	121	102	156	159	146	N/A	20%
Polk	107	111	126	141	136	N/A	27%
Pope	123	101	93	115	105	N/A	-14%
Ramsey	121	129	155	145	146	N/A	20%
Red Lake	90	75	67	86	81	N/A	-9%
Redwood	141	136	135	150	131	N/A	-7%
Renville	128	113	129	156	116	N/A	-9%
Rice	61	44	59	54	64	N/A	5%
Rock	95	68	86	105	86	N/A	-9%
Roseau	61	56	77	82	81	N/A	31%
St. Louis	129	144	101	123	141	N/A	10%
Scott	66	44	52	56	52	N/A	-21%
Sherburne	77	55	64	64	65	N/A	-15%
Sibley	121	112	105	118	95	N/A	-22%
Stearns	95	77	85	91	91	N/A	-4%
Steele	69	56	64	79	56	N/A	-18%
Stevens	121	101	107	109	124	N/A	2%
Swift	135	116	127	144	174	N/A	29%
Todd	123	125	139	138	136	N/A	10%
Traverse	158	152	188	187	120	N/A	-24%
Wabasha	81	76	73	90	75	N/A	-8%
Wadena	108	86	113	135	145	N/A	34%
Waseca	86	46	87	87	75	N/A	-14%
Washington	52	49	51	61	67	N/A	29%
Watsonwan	149	129	137	166	155	N/A	4%
Wilkin	211	169	183	199	214	N/A	1%
Winona	80	61	70	87	84	N/A	5%
Wright	44	37	50	53	64	N/A	44%
Yellow Medicine	171	155	152	170	144	N/A	-16%
Statewide	122	107	120	122	122		0%
County Minimum	44	34	50	50	51		
County Median	107	88	98	108	112		
County Maximum	211	172	188	199	224		

External Factors

Numerous factors affect the performance of county human service operations, including: (1) county policies and actions, (2) state and federal policies and actions, and (3) other external factors over which counties have little or no control. This section discusses several of these external factors and provides county-level data. The factors discussed in this section are not a complete list. Rather, they reflect a handful of measures that DHS and county staff indicated were important and for which county-level data were available.

The information in this section is important for interpreting the performance data in the previous sections. Counties operate their human service programs in very different environments. Some counties may have strong economies, residents that are not particularly challenging to serve, and significant financial resources. In contrast, other counties may have struggling economies, residents who are particularly challenging to serve, and very limited financial resources. Thus, it may not be appropriate to compare a sparsely populated rural county that has a struggling economy and an aging population with a fast-growing, economically-thriving suburban county in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Likewise, it may not be appropriate to compare urban counties, which have their own unique challenges, with other types of counties.

One approach for making appropriate comparisons is to create peer groups, which represent similarly situated counties. For example, one peer group could be suburban counties that have low poverty and unemployment rates. Another peer group could be rural counties that have a higher proportion of adults with limited English skills. Variation in performance within these peer groups is more likely to reflect differences in actual performance than differences in external factors.

Acknowledging these external factors is appropriate but also raises concerns. On the one hand, they allow for appropriate assessments and comparisons. If a county with a relatively low level of performance is working in a very challenging environment, those challenges should be acknowledged. On the other hand, the acknowledgement can become an excuse for poor performance. The state and counties should always strive to improve performance. If external factors create barriers to achieving high performance, the state and counties need to work together to overcome these barriers when they can.

Economic Characteristics

The economic characteristics of a county can affect program performance. Later in this section, this report provides data for two economic characteristics –

- Unemployment rate,⁶⁶ and
- Poverty rate.⁶⁷

High unemployment and poverty rates can hinder county performance in several ways. If a county has a high unemployment rate, few employers are likely to be actively looking for employees and able to hire MFIP clients. In addition, an unemployed, non-custodial parent will have difficulty paying his or her child support. If a county has a high poverty rate, it will have more residents and families participating in county-run human service programs. These larger caseloads could put a strain on a county's human services system and hinder program performance. Finally, research indicates that there is an association between poverty and child maltreatment.

Demographic and Caseload Characteristics

The demographic and caseload characteristics of a county can also affect program performance. The tables on pages 110 through 113 provide data for several factors:

- Percentage of residents who are children,⁶⁸
- Percentage of residents who are elderly,⁶⁹
- Percentage of residents who are disabled,⁷⁰
- Percentage of income support participants who have a severe mental health diagnosis,⁷¹ and
- Percentage of adults with limited English skills.⁷²

If a large percentage of a county's population is composed of children, elderly, or people with disabilities, that county will probably have a higher demand for certain services. Children need child support, child care, and child protection services. The elderly and disabled need specialized services (such as home health, adult day care, and transportation) in order to remain in the community rather than being served in an institution. High demand for services can put a strain on a county human services system. Some counties have caseloads that have a relatively high proportion of clients with multiple issues that county workers need to address. For example, some MFIP clients need not only employment services but also mental health services because they have a severe mental health diagnosis. It can be particularly challenging to find

⁶⁶ Minnesota Department of Economic Development, Minnesota Unemployment Statistics: Local Area Unemployment Statistics, accessed from <http://www.deed.state.mn.us/lmi/tools/laus/Default.aspx>, accessed on November 16, 2007.

⁶⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, accessed from <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/saiper/saiper.cgi>, accessed on November 10, 2007.

⁶⁸ Department of Human Services analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

⁶⁹ Department of Human Services analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

⁷⁰ Department of Human Services analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Social Security Administration. People who have a federal disability determination include (1) Supplemental Security Income only, (2) Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance only, and (3) Dual Determination.

⁷¹ Department of Human Services' Data Warehouse (MAXIS and MMIS)

⁷² U.S. Census Bureau, American FactFinder, Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3), Table P19, accessed from http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en, accessed on November 15, 2007.

employment for clients with a mental health diagnosis. Finally, if a county has a relatively high percentage of its citizens who have limited English skills, the county needs to provide additional assistance to these clients so that they can access, navigate, and participate in the county's human services programs. If additional assistance is not provided, language and cultural barriers may hinder program participation and successful outcomes.

Service Delivery Environment

Some people contend that delivering human services in sparsely populated areas can be challenging because there can be a shortage of providers and some clients need to travel considerable distances to receive services. The table on pages 112 and 113 also includes data on each county's:

- Population density.⁷³

Providing services in a large urban environment can also be challenging. In fact, DHS' statistical model for determining a county's expected performance on the MFIP Self-Support Index includes a variable that indicates whether a program participant is a resident of an:

- Urban county (Hennepin and Ramsey) or not.

Financial Resources

Finally, a county's financial resources could potentially affect performance. A county with limited financial capacity may struggle to find the resources to adequately fund an effective human services operation. Counties have several sources of financial resources, including: (1) county taxes, (2) federal, state, and miscellaneous (e.g. foundation) funding targeted to human services, and (3) general program aid from the state that counties can direct to a wide array of programs, including human services. A county's financial resources can be measured by examining:

- County tax capacity per capita,⁷⁴

⁷³ Department of Human Services analysis of: (1) population data from the Office of the State Demographer, accessed from <http://www.lmic.state.mn.us/datanetweb/php/census2000/estimate/report.php>, accessed on November 10, 2007; and (2) land area data from the U.S. Census Bureau, State and County Quick Facts, accessed from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/>, accessed on November 15.

⁷⁴ Minnesota Department of Revenue, Fully Taxable Total Tax Capacity Value for Taxes Payable 2007, 2007 Abstract of Tax List. The data represent the Taxable Net Tax Capacity, which is the taxable market value in each county multiplied by the appropriate class rates for each type of property. The figures also account for the portion of the net tax capacity that is allocated to: (1) Powerline Net Tax Capacity, (2) Fiscal Disparities Contribution Net Tax Capacity, and (3) Tax Increment Financing Net Tax Capacity. The 2006 population data are from the Office of the State Demographer, accessed from <http://www.lmic.state.mn.us/datanetweb/php/census2000/estimate/report.php>, accessed on November 10, 2007.

- Federal, state, and miscellaneous funding of human services per capita,⁷⁵ and
- County Program Aid per capita.⁷⁶

Data

The preceding discussion about external factors is largely based on theory and does not always have research and statistical analyses to confirm that an external factor actually has a significant impact on performance. However, in recent years, DHS has carried out two statistical analyses that have linked external factors with performance in some programs. The department and others have found a county's unemployment rate, poverty rate, and percentage of adults with limited English skills (among others) are associated with program performance for child support enforcement.⁷⁷ In addition, the department has found that a county's unemployment rate, poverty rate, percentage of adult clients needing an interpreter (i.e. having limited English skills), percentage of income support clients having a severe mental health diagnosis, and urban county status (among others) are associated with performance on the MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index.⁷⁸ Finally, national research has shown a correlation between poverty and child maltreatment.⁷⁹

Data in the following tables represent the most recent data that are available for each external factor. This ranges from October 2007 for the unemployment data to the 2000 Census for the data on limited English skills. While the Census data are dated, they are the most recent available.

⁷⁵ Department of Human Services, *Minnesota County Human Services Cost Report for Calendar Year 2006* (St. Paul, September 2007). The 2006 population data are from the Office of the State Demographer, accessed from <http://www.lmic.state.mn.us/datanetweb/php/census2000/estimate/report.php>, accessed on November 10, 2007.

⁷⁶ The County Program Aid data are from the Department of Revenue. The 2006 population data are from the Office of the State Demographer, accessed from <http://www.lmic.state.mn.us/datanetweb/php/census2000/estimate/report.php>, accessed on November 10, 2007.

⁷⁷ Department of Human Services, Child Support Enforcement Division, *The Minnesota Child Support Performance Management Project: Peer Group Performance Report* (St. Paul, undated); John Tapogna, Karen Gardiner, Burt Barnow, Michael Fishman, and Plamen Nikolov, *Study of State Demographic, Economic, and Programmatic Variables and their Impact on the Performance-Based Child Support Enforcement System, Final Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, August 2003); and Minnesota Office of the Legislative Auditor, *Child Support Enforcement* (St. Paul, February 2006).

⁷⁸ Department of Human Services, *Leveling the Playing Field: Measuring County MFIP Performance* (St. Paul, June 2003) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DM-0157I-ENG>; and Department of Human Services, *Updated Information on the MFIP Self-support Index* (St. Paul, June 2006) – <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DHS-4064O-ENG>.

⁷⁹ Andrea J. Sedlak (Ph.D.) and Diane D. Broadhurst (M.L.A.), *Third National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect* (1996) – <http://www.childwelfare.gov/systemwide/statistics/nis.cfm#n3>.

External Factor Data – Part 1

	Nov. 2006 - Oct. 2007 Average Monthly Unemploy- ment Rate	Estimated Poverty Rate in CY 2004	Percentage of Residents who Are Children in CY 2006	Percentage of Residents who Are Elderly (65+) in CY 2006	Number of People who Have Received a Federal Disability Determination per 10,000 People in CY 2006	Percentage of Income Support Program Participants in CY 2006 who Had a Severe Mental Health Diagnosis (in last 3 years)
Aitkin	6.7%	11.3%	18.8%	24.1%	35.4	32.1%
Anoka	4.4%	5.5%	26.5%	8.1%	22.3	32.2%
Becker	5.6%	10.9%	23.2%	16.2%	32.2	32.9%
Beltrami	5.9%	15.8%	25.6%	12.3%	34.7	27.0%
Benton	5.0%	7.3%	24.6%	10.3%	23.9	33.0%
Big Stone	4.6%	9.7%	20.7%	24.5%	32.5	43.9%
Blue Earth	3.6%	10.7%	19.7%	11.8%	25.6	30.4%
Brown	4.8%	7.3%	21.7%	17.8%	22.7	29.3%
Carlton	5.6%	8.2%	22.0%	14.5%	35.9	38.2%
Carver	3.9%	3.9%	27.8%	7.5%	11.4	32.6%
Cass	6.9%	11.6%	21.8%	18.3%	41.3	25.5%
Chippewa	4.2%	8.2%	22.7%	19.0%	21.1	36.4%
Chisago	5.7%	5.5%	25.8%	9.5%	22.7	36.0%
Clay	3.4%	9.7%	22.1%	12.4%	26.4	36.3%
Clearwater	10.4%	12.4%	23.7%	17.7%	35.3	24.6%
Cook	4.8%	7.0%	16.8%	17.6%	27.2	41.7%
Cottonwood	4.1%	9.3%	23.4%	20.7%	30.6	26.6%
Crow Wing	5.5%	9.0%	22.3%	17.3%	33.2	33.7%
Dakota	4.0%	5.0%	26.9%	8.1%	18.8	30.7%
Dodge	4.2%	5.6%	26.8%	11.4%	13.6	30.3%
Douglas	4.4%	7.5%	20.5%	18.5%	29.4	35.4%
Faribault	5.4%	8.7%	21.8%	21.3%	26.9	35.6%
Fillmore	4.9%	8.3%	23.4%	18.3%	14.9	28.0%
Freeborn	5.0%	8.7%	21.9%	19.1%	32.3	33.2%
Goodhue	4.9%	6.0%	23.0%	15.1%	21.2	33.1%
Grant	5.7%	8.5%	20.6%	23.0%	28.5	50.0%
Hennepin	4.0%	9.3%	23.9%	10.9%	28.2	25.0%
Houston	5.1%	6.9%	22.7%	16.2%	19.7	27.7%
Hubbard	6.0%	10.0%	21.1%	19.7%	37.6	36.3%
Isanti	5.9%	6.3%	23.4%	10.1%	24.0	35.6%
Itasca	7.1%	10.0%	21.2%	17.3%	43.0	35.1%
Jackson	3.9%	7.6%	21.1%	19.6%	18.0	33.7%
Kanabec	8.2%	8.9%	22.7%	14.4%	33.8	38.6%
Kandiyohi	4.3%	9.3%	24.3%	15.2%	27.5	21.5%
Kittson	5.5%	8.6%	22.8%	22.6%	23.7	42.9%
Koochiching	7.1%	10.7%	20.8%	19.4%	46.8	39.0%
Lac Qui Parle	4.2%	7.6%	20.9%	22.4%	23.2	27.9%
Lake	4.5%	7.7%	18.4%	20.4%	31.1	47.3%
Lake of the Woods	5.1%	8.2%	20.9%	19.5%	30.5	40.0%
Le Sueur	6.1%	6.6%	23.3%	13.7%	18.6	29.4%
Lincoln	4.4%	8.4%	22.0%	24.7%	21.3	18.5%
Lyon	3.7%	8.7%	23.8%	14.6%	24.3	25.7%
McLeod	4.7%	5.9%	25.4%	13.7%	18.2	31.5%
Mahnomen	6.6%	15.5%	28.1%	17.5%	33.1	34.9%
Marshall	7.5%	8.7%	21.5%	19.1%	18.3	22.7%
Martin	4.6%	9.8%	21.7%	20.7%	32.0	36.4%
Meeker	5.8%	7.3%	23.8%	15.8%	24.0	37.7%
Mille Lacs	7.6%	8.5%	23.1%	15.5%	30.3	40.6%
Morrison	6.2%	9.0%	24.2%	15.2%	27.4	39.4%

External Factor Data – Part 1

	Nov. 2006 - Oct. 2007 Average Monthly Unemploy- ment Rate	Estimated Poverty Rate in CY 2004	Percentage of Residents who Are Children in CY 2006	Percentage of Residents who Are Elderly (65+) in CY 2006	Number of People who Have Received a Federal Disability Determination per 10,000 People in CY 2006	Percentage of Income Support Program Participants in CY 2006 who Had a Severe Mental Health Diagnosis (in last 3 years)
Mower	4.1%	9.3%	24.3%	18.2%	30.1	30.4%
Murray	4.1%	7.5%	21.6%	21.2%	20.7	29.0%
Nicollet	3.5%	7.5%	22.1%	11.8%	19.6	32.5%
Nobles	3.5%	9.7%	26.4%	16.7%	26.8	21.1%
Norman	5.1%	9.7%	22.6%	20.8%	28.2	22.0%
Olmsted	3.7%	6.8%	25.5%	11.6%	21.9	26.6%
Otter Tail	5.3%	9.0%	21.1%	19.4%	27.6	31.3%
Pennington	6.4%	9.1%	22.8%	15.3%	25.4	31.8%
Pine	7.5%	10.5%	21.8%	15.3%	34.4	28.5%
Pipestone	4.0%	8.6%	23.3%	21.4%	23.9	31.1%
Polk	4.6%	10.7%	22.6%	16.8%	29.1	33.5%
Pope	4.2%	8.3%	20.5%	20.8%	22.0	32.9%
Ramsey	4.3%	11.0%	25.1%	12.7%	37.6	25.9%
Red Lake	8.2%	8.8%	21.9%	17.5%	20.9	35.0%
Redwood	4.9%	8.0%	23.7%	19.4%	25.4	25.2%
Renville	5.5%	9.1%	24.1%	18.2%	25.5	22.2%
Rice	4.9%	7.5%	22.4%	11.4%	18.6	27.7%
Rock	3.3%	7.5%	23.9%	19.0%	22.5	19.5%
Roseau	6.2%	5.9%	26.5%	12.3%	20.2	36.2%
St. Louis	5.6%	10.6%	19.9%	15.7%	46.7	41.4%
Scott	4.1%	4.0%	28.7%	6.2%	12.3	33.5%
Sherburne	5.1%	4.7%	26.8%	7.1%	17.5	33.1%
Sibley	5.0%	7.8%	25.2%	15.7%	19.4	21.1%
Stearns	4.5%	8.7%	23.0%	11.7%	23.2	32.3%
Steele	4.3%	7.0%	25.4%	13.1%	21.0	31.1%
Stevens	3.6%	8.7%	18.4%	16.6%	17.9	22.7%
Swift	5.2%	9.2%	21.9%	20.0%	23.2	36.1%
Todd	5.5%	10.8%	23.3%	16.1%	32.9	32.6%
Traverse	4.9%	10.7%	21.3%	27.5%	20.3	23.8%
Wabasha	4.3%	6.2%	23.2%	15.3%	18.5	25.2%
Wadena	7.4%	11.9%	23.3%	20.7%	44.4	34.6%
Waseca	4.6%	8.0%	23.6%	13.7%	20.6	32.8%
Washington	4.0%	4.6%	26.3%	8.4%	16.8	35.1%
Watsonwan	4.9%	8.9%	25.9%	19.1%	22.0	22.0%
Wilkin	4.1%	8.3%	24.3%	16.0%	25.6	11.7%
Winona	4.1%	9.7%	19.9%	13.7%	24.9	36.9%
Wright	5.1%	5.1%	27.6%	8.4%	17.0	34.6%
Yellow Medicine	4.3%	8.1%	22.6%	20.3%	23.3	44.4%
Statewide	4.5%	8.1%	24.3%	12.1%	26.4	28.7%
County Minimum	3.3%	3.9%	16.8%	6.2%	11.4	11.7%
County Median	4.9%	8.6%	23.0%	16.6%	24.3	32.6%
County Maximum	10.4%	15.8%	28.7%	27.5%	46.8	50.0%

External Factor Data – Part 2

	Percentage of Adults who Spoke English "Not Well" or "Not at All" in 2000	2006 Population Density (people per sq. mile)	2007 Taxable Net Tax Capacity per Capita	CY 2006 Federal, State, and Miscellaneous Funding of Human Services Spending per Capita	2007 County Program Aid per Capita
Aitkin	0.4%	8.9	\$1,450	\$1,780	\$36
Anoka	1.0%	775.7	\$1,024	\$1,039	\$42
Becker	0.5%	24.6	\$1,032	\$1,890	\$48
Beltrami	0.8%	17.2	\$603	\$2,519	\$69
Benton	1.2%	95.0	\$731	\$1,298	\$47
Big Stone	0.5%	11.1	\$877	\$2,234	\$103
Blue Earth	0.8%	78.4	\$978	\$1,332	\$45
Brown	0.4%	43.3	\$763	\$1,494	\$52
Carlton	0.3%	39.8	\$713	\$1,836	\$52
Carver	1.3%	241.5	\$1,265	\$661	\$27
Cass	0.4%	14.3	\$1,884	\$1,960	\$27
Chippewa	0.3%	21.9	\$882	\$1,730	\$53
Chisago	0.4%	120.4	\$1,027	\$1,114	\$37
Clay	1.0%	52.5	\$611	\$1,634	\$57
Clearwater	0.4%	8.5	\$745	\$2,139	\$111
Cook	0.4%	3.7	\$2,601	\$1,054	\$49
Cottonwood	0.6%	18.4	\$1,025	\$1,804	\$75
Crow Wing	0.4%	61.2	\$1,629	\$1,410	\$23
Dakota	1.4%	687.5	\$1,219	\$919	\$34
Dodge	1.2%	45.0	\$867	\$955	\$42
Douglas	0.6%	55.9	\$1,248	\$1,389	\$36
Faribault	0.6%	21.5	\$977	See Faribault/Martin	\$50
Fillmore	0.4%	24.7	\$887	\$1,388	\$45
Freeborn	2.3%	44.8	\$820	\$1,415	\$53
Goodhue	0.6%	60.8	\$1,221	\$1,161	\$36
Grant	0.4%	11.1	\$1,100	\$1,669	\$83
Hennepin	3.2%	2,070.5	\$1,438	\$1,683	\$26
Houston	0.2%	35.6	\$695	\$1,266	\$51
Hubbard	0.2%	20.5	\$1,506	\$1,395	\$30
Isanti	0.3%	87.5	\$840	\$1,074	\$40
Itasca	0.2%	16.6	\$1,085	\$1,699	\$41
Jackson	0.7%	15.9	\$1,135	\$1,337	\$63
Kanabec	0.5%	31.0	\$755	\$1,480	\$52
Kandiyohi	2.1%	52.4	\$902	\$1,562	\$49
Kittson	0.3%	4.3	\$1,237	\$1,626	\$75
Koochiching	0.4%	4.4	\$619	\$1,974	\$63
Lac Qui Parle	0.4%	9.8	\$963	\$1,895	\$97
Lake	0.6%	5.3	\$1,238	\$1,695	\$46
Lake of the Woods	0.4%	3.4	\$822	\$1,230	\$106
Le Sueur	1.0%	62.2	\$977	\$1,222	\$37
Lincoln	0.4%	11.2	\$866	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	\$92
Lyon	2.1%	35.0	\$885	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	\$49
McLeod	1.4%	75.3	\$778	\$1,160	\$46
Mahnomen	0.6%	9.1	\$630	\$3,289	\$137
Marshall	0.8%	5.6	\$772	\$1,620	\$103
Martin	0.6%	29.4	\$990	See Faribault/Martin	\$52
Meeker	0.4%	38.5	\$900	\$1,165	\$45
Mille Lacs	0.7%	45.4	\$790	\$1,614	\$50
Morrison	0.4%	29.3	\$821	\$1,481	\$45
Mower	2.1%	54.6	\$706	\$1,607	\$60

External Factor Data – Part 2

	Percentage of Adults who Spoke English "Not Well" or "Not at All" in 2000	2006 Population Density (people per sq. mile)	2007 Taxable Net Tax Capacity per Capita	CY 2006 Federal, State, and Miscellaneous Funding of Human Services Spending per Capita	2007 County Program Aid per Capita
Murray	0.8%	12.5	\$1,232	See Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	\$76
Nicollet	0.9%	70.6	\$834	\$1,038	\$45
Nobles	5.9%	28.6	\$767	\$1,502	\$54
Norman	0.8%	7.9	\$752	\$2,249	\$113
Olmsted	2.0%	211.7	\$932	\$1,315	\$43
Otter Tail	1.0%	29.6	\$1,101	\$1,398	\$40
Pennington	0.9%	22.2	\$462	\$1,703	\$62
Pine	0.4%	20.1	\$947	\$1,566	\$48
Pipestone	0.4%	20.3	\$775	\$1,692	\$124
Polk	0.8%	15.8	\$704	\$2,126	\$59
Pope	0.1%	16.7	\$1,055	\$1,470	\$53
Ramsey	3.8%	3,306.3	\$1,080	\$1,962	\$32
Red Lake	0.3%	9.7	\$566	\$1,612	\$133
Redwood	0.2%	18.2	\$966	\$1,496	\$48
Renville	1.3%	16.9	\$1,193	\$1,667	\$41
Rice	2.7%	125.3	\$907	\$1,013	\$41
Rock	0.5%	19.8	\$1,015	\$1,327	\$94
Roseau	1.2%	9.8	\$521	\$1,111	\$53
St. Louis	0.5%	31.5	\$763	\$1,932	\$59
Scott	1.6%	335.4	\$1,225	\$665	\$29
Sherburne	0.5%	194.9	\$1,061	\$720	\$32
Sibley	2.6%	26.0	\$1,042	\$1,308	\$38
Stearns	0.9%	107.4	\$847	\$1,022	\$47
Steele	1.1%	84.2	\$881	\$1,221	\$46
Stevens	0.3%	17.3	\$892	\$1,317	\$106
Swift	0.5%	15.4	\$942	\$1,616	\$77
Todd	1.1%	26.0	\$692	\$1,743	\$53
Traverse	0.1%	6.6	\$1,660	\$2,054	\$39
Wabasha	1.0%	42.8	\$865	\$1,088	\$43
Wadena	0.6%	25.4	\$598	\$2,127	\$64
Waseca	0.5%	46.3	\$855	\$1,197	\$50
Washington	0.8%	582.3	\$1,312	\$668	\$30
Watonwan	6.2%	26.4	\$833	\$1,573	\$81
Wilkin	0.2%	9.0	\$1,172	\$1,878	\$83
Winona	1.0%	79.7	\$743	\$1,206	\$50
Wright	0.6%	173.8	\$1,100	\$803	\$32
Yellow Medicine	0.5%	13.9	\$950	\$1,790	\$75
Faribault/Martin				\$1,621	
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray				\$1,550	
Statewide	1.8%	65.7	\$1,114	\$1,410	\$39
County Minimum	0.1%	3.4	\$462	\$661	\$23
County Median	0.6%	26.4	\$902	\$1,495	\$50
County Maximum	6.2%	3,306.3	\$2,601	\$3,289	\$137

Future Reports

DHS plans to issue this report annually. With regular monitoring of performance, DHS and the counties can identify strengths and weaknesses in their human services programs, take action to improve performance by building upon successful outcomes and remedying poor outcomes, and track the success of these changes.

However, this report is an initial effort and will be improved over time. The performance measures presented in this report have been limited by the performance data that DHS currently collects on a county-by-county basis. In addition, while DHS provides in this report a balanced portfolio of measures that represent most of the major program areas in county human services and different types of performance (effectiveness, efficiency, access/availability, and cost), the portfolio of measures is not based on a formal or comprehensive performance measurement model (such as a *Balanced Scorecard* or *Logic Model*). As future reports are issued, DHS will continue to work with county human services staff and county commissioners to produce a more comprehensive report.

The report also highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the performance measures that are currently available. On the positive side, child welfare and child support enforcement have a range of performance measures that DHS regularly reports to counties along with performance expectations and standards. On the other hand, other program areas need better and/or a wider range of measures.

During the next several months, DHS will seek the input of counties about how this report can be improved in future years. The department will gather this input through a survey of county human services directors and county boards and through other discussions. While it will take some time to develop a comprehensive performance report, this report is a good start in that effort.

