

# Human Services Performance Management System

Human Services Performance Council  
December 2015

**For more information contact:**

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Human Services Performance Management Team  
P.O. Box 64997  
St. Paul, MN 55164-0997  
(651) 431-5780



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

## Legislative Report

This information is available in accessible formats to individuals with disabilities by calling the Human Services Performance Management Team 651-431-5780,

or by using your preferred relay service.

For other information on disability rights and protections, contact the agency's ADA coordinator.

Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 3.197, requires the disclosure of the cost to prepare this report. The estimated cost of preparing this report is \$3395.80. This figure does not include the considerable time that Human Services Performance Council members and workgroup participants spent developing the report's content and that the Human Services Performance Management team spent implementing the work.

*Printed with a minimum of 10 percent post-consumer material. Please recycle.*



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

## **Legislative Report**

## Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary .....	2
II.	Legislation.....	5
III.	History and Context .....	6
	A. Overview .....	6
	B. Outcomes and Measures .....	7
	C. Remedies Process.....	8
IV.	Minnesota Performance .....	9
	A. Thresholds.....	9
	B. 2015 Performance Improvement Plans .....	11
	C. PIP Implementation .....	12
	D. Performance Overview .....	13
V.	Technical Assistance.....	16
	A. Technical Assistance Survey and Planning .....	16
	B. Relationship-Building and Communications .....	16
	C. Technical Assistance Provided in 2015 .....	17
VI.	Challenges.....	19
VII.	Report Recommendations.....	21
	A. Response to 2014 Report Recommendations .....	21
	B. 2015 Report Recommendations.....	21
VIII.	Commissioner Response.....	22
IX.	Appendix A – Performance Maps by Outcome and Measure .....	23
X.	Appendix B – Technical Assistance Survey Results .....	53
XI.	Appendix C – Steering Committee on Performance and Outcome Reforms .....	55
XII.	Appendix D – Vision, Mission, Values, and Strategies Statements .....	56
XIII.	Appendix E – Human Services Performance Council.....	58

## **I. Executive Summary**

### **Overview of Report**

This report describes the work of the Human Services Performance Management system (Performance Management system), which monitors county performance and supports efforts toward continuous improvement in delivering essential human services to Minnesotans. Essential human services include an array of programs that provide protections and safety nets to low income and vulnerable populations within our state.

This report includes:

- An overview of the Performance Management system;
- Information on current county performance in providing essential human services;
- A description of technical assistance being provided to counties;
- Recommendations for legislative changes and improvements to the system;
- Comments from the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS).

### **History and Purpose**

The Performance Management system was established in accordance with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 402A in response to counties' desire to be proactive in improving service delivery and outcomes for human services program recipients. The system is composed of the Human Services Performance Management Council (the Council), the Performance Management team, and the DHS Commissioner. Each year the Council is required to report to the legislature on the work of the Performance Management System. Appendix E contains a list of current Council members.

The focus of the Performance Management system is performance improvement across all mandated essential human services in Minnesota. The system encourages collaboration between counties and DHS, and supports counties in their efforts to take a proactive approach to continuous improvement in service delivery. This system provides an opportunity to work toward the outcomes desired for all Minnesotans, breaking down silos and identifying systems that may have created barriers to improvement. This is a very different model for assessing county performance than used in the past. Because complex change does not happen overnight, the system has evolved with thoughtful input and collaboration from county and community partners, service providers, advocates, and DHS staff.

### **Outcomes, Measures and Performance**

The Performance Management system has identified six desired outcomes for human services programs, and currently has ten measures for reporting county performance in reaching those outcomes. Each measure has a minimum performance threshold, i.e., a numeric level against which each county's performance is reported. Counties that fall below the threshold are required to develop a Performance

Improvement Plan (PIP) that will help them reach or exceed the threshold. Below is a list of outcomes and the measures discussed in this report.

***Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure***

- Measure: Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months
- Measure: Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months

***Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation***

- Measure: Percent of current child support paid
- Measure: Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months

***Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential***

- Measure: Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home
- Measure: Percent of child support cases with paternity established

***Outcome 4: People are economically secure***

- Measure: Percent of expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications processed within one business day
- Measure: Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely
- Measure: Percent of open child support cases with an order established
- Measure: Minnesota Family Investment Program(MFIP)/Diversionary Work Program (DWP) Self-Support Index

***Outcome 5: Vulnerable adults experience a quality of life***

***Outcome 6: People have access to health care and receive effective services***

Measures and thresholds for outcomes five and six are currently under development.

In 2015, counties received reports on their performance for the ten measures. While performance on the ten measures varies across the state, counties are overall doing very well on Performance Management system measures. The system also introduced PIPs for six of the ten measures. Although there was potential for more than 480 PIPs, only 20 were required. A chart summarizing overall performance is on page 11. Data tables for each measure are in the *Human Services Performance Management System – Data Supplement* (<https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Public/DHS-7600A-ENG.>)

Individually, no one county was doing poorly on all or even a majority of measures in comparison to the minimum performance thresholds, and many counties were above the high performance standard. All counties had room for improvement in at least one area. Appendix A includes county performance maps and further information for each measure.

### Technical Assistance

The Performance Management system team surveyed counties about their technical assistance needs and used the survey results to develop technical assistance narratives and offerings, including:

- *Performance Improvement Collaboratives:* This approach provides an opportunity for counties of similar size or demographic make-up to come together to address improvement around a particular measure.
- *Individualized Technical Assistance:* Under this approach, the team conducts a needs assessment, and develops targeted assistance when counties request help to solve a particular problem or address a unique need.
- *Improvement Strategies Briefs:* This approach involves identifying counties with successful performance or significant improvement, interviewing them, and sharing their strategies.
- *Data Access:* The Performance Management system partnered with various DHS business areas to launch a Web Intelligence (WebI) tool to provide counties with more dynamic access to data on cash and food assistance programs.

The Performance Management team will also be working with the DHS Office of Indian Policy and others to help counties that have a significant number of American Indian clients.

### Challenges to Improved Performance

While overall county performance is very good, there remain challenges to improving county performance in providing services for Minnesotans from communities of color and American Indians, and in addressing disparate outcomes for those communities. The Council recommends legislative changes to the current language used to identify disparities. This will make it easier for counties to measure and address their responses to disparate outcomes in communities of color and American Indian communities.

Another challenge faced by the Performance Management system is not only the difficulty in getting timely and accurate data in order to assess counties' performance, but also in providing timely access directly to counties so that they can make the day-to-day decisions necessary for improving performance. In some cases, data is not available because antiquated information systems make it difficult if not impossible to collect it. In some instances, as in race and ethnicity data, some programs simply have not historically collected the data. In other instances, there is no uniformity in how certain data is collected. While the WebI tool has proven popular for use with one measure, additional resources are required to expand its use to other areas.

The Performance Management system team will continue to work with counties and DHS program staff to address procedural changes that may help with data collection. Ultimately, new/updated, integrated information systems will provide the best overall solutions to ongoing data challenges.

## **II. Legislation**

This Legislative Report is mandated by Minnesota Statutes, section 402A.16, subdivision 2 (10):

MINN. STAT. 402A.16 (2013); Subd. 2. Duties.

The Human Services Performance Council shall:

(10) submit an annual report to the legislature and the commissioner, which includes a comprehensive report on the performance of individual counties or service delivery authorities as it relates to system measures; a list of counties or service delivery authorities that have been required to create performance improvement plans and the areas identified for improvement as part of the remedies process; a summary of performance improvement training and technical assistance activities offered to the county personnel by the department; recommendations on administrative rules or state statutes that could be repealed in order to improve service delivery; recommendations for system improvements, including updates to system outcomes, measures, and standards; and a response from the commissioner.

This report was prepared in response to a mandate under Minnesota Statutes, section 402A.16, subdivision 2(10). This report includes background information to familiarize the reader with the Human Services Performance Management system along with information on Performance Management system outcomes, measures, and thresholds. The report also shows the results of the county performance data requested by statute.

The Human Services Performance Management team at the Department of Human Services, on behalf of the Human Services Performance Council, submits the report.

### **III. History and Context**

#### **A. Overview**

Minnesota's human services delivery system provides programs and services to meet the basic health, welfare, and safety needs of all Minnesotans, particularly the poor, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Counties, tribal governments, and lead agencies, deliver these services in partnership with the DHS.

The Performance Management system was established in accordance with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 402A in response to counties' desire to be proactive in improving service delivery and outcomes for human services program recipients. The system monitors county performance and supports efforts toward continuous improvement in delivering essential human services to Minnesotans. Essential human services include an array of programs that provide protections and safety nets to low income and vulnerable populations within our state. In 2013, the state legislature authorized the DHS commissioner to implement a Human Services Performance Management system for essential human services as described in Minnesota State Statute.

The system includes:

- The Council, which is made up of representatives from the counties, DHS program experts, tribal governments and communities of color, and providers and advocates;
- The Performance Management team, composed of DHS professional staff who support the Council in its work; and
- The DHS Commissioner, who has overall responsibility for the Performance Management system.

The work of the Council is to advise the DHS commissioner on the implementation and operation of the human services performance management system. Each year the Council is required to report to the legislature on the work of the Performance Management System. Appendix E contains a list of current Council members.

The Performance Management team supports the work of the Council and assists the counties by providing technical assistance to help counties proactively engage in continuous improvement efforts, respond to challenges, and develop effective Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) when they fail to meet minimum performance thresholds.

The DHS Commissioner reviews, approves, or waives PIPs, provides a response to the Council's legislative report, and is responsible for the imposition of more stringent remedies as required by Chapter 402A.

The focus of the Performance Management system is improvement across all mandated essential human services in Minnesota. The system encourages collaboration between counties and DHS, and supports counties in their efforts to take a proactive approach to continuous improvement in service delivery. This system provides an opportunity to work toward the outcomes desired for all Minnesotans, breaking down silos and identifying systems that may have created barriers to improvement. This is a very different model for assessing county performance than used in the past. Because complex change does not happen overnight, the system has evolved with thoughtful input and collaboration from county and community partners, service providers, advocates, and DHS.

### B. Outcomes and Measures

The following are current system outcomes and measures:

#### ***Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure***

- Measure: Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months
- Measure: Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months

#### ***Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation***

- Measure: Percent of current child support paid
- Measure: Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months

#### ***Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential***

- Measure: Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home
- Measure: Percent of child support cases with paternity established

#### ***Outcome 4: People are economically secure***

- Measure: Percent of expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications processed within one business day
- Measure: Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely
- Measure: Percent of open child support cases with an order established
- Measure: MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index

#### ***Outcome 5: Vulnerable adults experience a quality of life***

#### ***Outcome 6: People have access to health care and receive effective services***

Measures do not currently exist for outcomes five and six. Although the Steering Committee on Performance and Outcome Reform initially recommended measures for these outcomes, the Council did not move forward with those recommendations because either data were not available or responsibility for service delivery had shifted from the counties to DHS.

## Human Services Performance Management System

Performance Management system staff are currently working with various stakeholders to develop additional system measures. Following the addition of any new measure to the Performance Management system, counties will first receive individual reports with baseline performance data. Counties will not be subject to PIPs on those measures until the following year.

Each measure presented above has a *threshold*, a numeric level against which each county's performance is reported. Thresholds for all measures were developed with input from the Council, county staff, DHS programmatic experts, community members, and other stakeholders. Following the 2014 recommendations of the Council, the Legislature amended the language of the Performance Management system from the term "standard" to "threshold" because some system measures already have a state or federally mandated standard, which defines a desired level of high performance, and the similar terminology was creating confusion.

### C. Remedies Process

The remedies process is described in legislation as the method for holding counties/SDAs accountable for performance while also providing them support for improvement. It includes:

- Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs)
- Technical assistance
- Possibility for fiscal penalties or transfer of responsibility to another county/SDA or to DHS

While Minnesota State Statute outlines much of the remedies process, the Performance Management team and the Council worked to make the process operational in 2015. This work included developing a uniform process for implementing PIPs, creating the tools and forms needed to manage the PIP process, and providing technical assistance to aid counties in developing PIPs and improving performance.

Counties that do not meet the threshold for a particular measure are required to develop a PIP indicating the steps they will take to improve performance on that measure. Counties/SDAs that experienced an extraordinary, unforeseen event that they believe prevented them from meeting a threshold had the opportunity to file a claim for extenuating circumstances. The essential nature of an extenuating circumstance is that it is sudden, unforeseeable and beyond the county/SDA's control.

Fiscal penalties and transfer of responsibility for services to another county or DHS can occur only after several years of repeated unsuccessful attempts at improvement.

## IV. Minnesota Performance

In February, April, and July of 2015, the Performance Management team sent each county/Service Delivery Authority (SDA) a report that detailed outcomes and measures, and discussed each measure's importance. The reports provided data specific to each county/SDA, including current and past performance as well as performance compared to other counties in the same Minnesota Association of County Social Service Administrators (MACSSA) region.

### A. Thresholds

The following thresholds define when a PIP is required:

Measure	Threshold	Standard
<b>Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure</b>		
Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months.....	94.7%	94.7%
Percent of vulnerable adults with a substantiated or inconclusive maltreatment allegation who do not experience a subsequent substantiated or inconclusive maltreatment allegation within six months.....	80%	95%
<b>Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation</b>		
Percent of current child support paid.....	Historical	80%
Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified with 12 months.....	75.2%	75.2%
<b>Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential</b>		
Percent of children in family foster care that were placed with relatives.....	20.9%	45.0%
Percent of open child support cases with paternity.....	90%	90%
<b>Outcome 4: People are economically secure</b>		
Percent of expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications processed within one business day.....	55%	83%
Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely.....	75%	90%
Percent of open child support cases with an order established.....	80%	80%
Minnesota Family Investment Program/Diversionary Work Program Self-Support Index.....	Within Range of Expected Performance	Above

### Small Numbers

A number of counties have denominators too small for a meaningful assessment of performance. The Council convened a workgroup in November of 2014 to develop a methodology for assessing performance where numbers are small and can cause wide performance fluctuation. The workgroup consisted of representatives from the DHS divisions of Economic Assistance and Employment Supports, Adult Protection, and Child Safety and Permanency, and representatives from Grant, Clearwater, Traverse, Cook, and Beltrami Counties.

The workgroup determined that being below the threshold on a single measure due to one or two people not having the desired outcome should not necessarily indicate that a county is performing poorly. The workgroup recommended assessing performance by looking at related measures, as described below:

If a county has no people in a measure, it is considered to be meeting the threshold. If a county has a denominator of 20 or less and:

- . Is meeting the threshold for a measure, the county is performing to expectations and no further assessment will take place.
- . Is not meeting the threshold for a measure, performance will be reviewed across a combination of measures. For 2015, we will group measures as follows.
  - o Meeting the threshold on two of the three Child Safety and Permanency measures;
  - o Meeting the threshold on both of the cash and food application timeliness measures; and
  - o Meeting the threshold on two of the three Child Support measures.

As new measures are added to the system, workgroups recommending the thresholds for the measure will also make recommendations on the assessment of performance where denominators are small.

## B. 2015 Performance Improvement Plans

While performance on the ten measures varies across the state, counties are overall doing well on the measures assessed through the Performance Management system. With the 2015 introduction of PIPs to the system for six of the ten measures in the system, there was potential for more than 480 PIPs, yet there are only 20.

Measure	Minimum Performance Threshold	High Performance Standard	Counties Requiring PIPs	Counties Above Threshold	Counties Above High Standard
Percent of Expedited SNAP Applications Processed within One Business Day	55%	83%	7 Counties	72 Counties	6 Counties
Percent of Cash Assistance and SNAP Applications Processed Timely	75%	90%	1 County	79 Counties	21 Counties
Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months	94.7%	94.7%	2 Counties	65 Counties	65 Counties
Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified with 12 months	75.2%	75.2%	4 Counties	70 Counties	70 Counties
Percent of children in family foster care that were placed with relatives	20.9%	45.0%	0 Counties	76 Counties	37 Counties
Minnesota Family Investment Program/Diversionary Work Program Self-Support Index	Range of Expected Performance	Above Range of Expected Performance	6 Counties Below Expected Range	57 Counties Within Expected Range	19 Counties Above Expected Range

No one county was doing poorly on all or a majority of measures compared to the minimum performance thresholds, and many counties were above the high performance standard. However, all counties had room for improvement in at least one area. Appendix A includes measure narratives and performance maps. The [Human Services Performance Management System – Data Supplement](#) contains data tables for each measure.

## C. PIP Implementation

Data for measures are available at different times throughout the year depending on program area. In an effort to provide counties/SDAs with ample time to implement improvement strategies, data for each measure is shared as it becomes available and counties/SDAs will be notified immediately if a PIP is required. Below is an implementation schedule for PIPs.

### July 2015 – Child welfare and Public Assistance measures

- Repeat determination of maltreatment
- Timely establishment of permanency
- Percent of children placed with relatives
- Self-Support Index
- Expedited SNAP application timeliness
- SNAP and Cash assistance application timeliness

### January 2016 – Child support measures (baseline data was provided in February of 2015)

- Child support paid
- Child support orders established
- Paternity established

### July 2016 – Adult protection measure (baseline data was provided in July of 2015)

- Repeat maltreatment

In 2014, the Performance Management system provided baseline performance data to counties. Though PIPs were not implemented until mid-2015, there has already been improvement in many areas.

The Performance Management team notified counties requiring PIPs for the child welfare and public assistance measures in July of 2015. Counties were notified via email and certified letter, and through a call to the county social services director.

The Performance Management team and the Human Services Performance Council each reviewed the extenuating circumstance claims and made recommendations to the commissioner to approve or deny the claims. Of the 23 original PIP notifications issued, there were eight claims filed for extenuating circumstances. Of the eight claims, three were approved and the county/SDA no longer had to develop a PIP.

Counties submitted PIPs for the child welfare and public assistance measures in late September, and the team worked with counties to finalize and approve all PIPs by mid-October. Technical assistance to counties began in September.

## D. Performance Overview

### *Public Assistance (cash and SNAP)*

Measure(s) in this area include:

- Percent of expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications processed within one business day
- Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely

County performance has improved on both measures in this area. In 2013, 62.3 percent of expedited SNAP cases were processed within one business day, while in 2014, 64.0 percent of cases were processed within one business day. The average county/SDA increase was 2.2 percentage points, and there were 13 counties with increases of more than 10 percentage points. Compared to the threshold of 55 percent for this measure, seven counties needed to complete PIPs. Had the threshold been in place in 2013, there would have been 15 PIPs required.

There was also improvement statewide on the percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely. In 2013, 75.8 percent of applications were processed in a timely manner statewide, compared to 81.2 percent in 2014. The average increase was 4.5 percentage points, and there were eleven counties that improved more than 10 percentage points. Only one county fell below the 75.2 percent threshold in 2014; in comparison, there were fifteen counties below the threshold in 2013.

### *Child Safety and Permanency*

Measure(s) in this area include:

- Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months
- Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months
- Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home

Statewide average performance was down slightly on two and up on one of these measures. In 2014, 96.5 percent of children with a maltreatment determination did not experience a repeat within six months. This is down slightly from 97.0 percent in 2013. Assessed against the threshold of 94.7 percent, there were two counties falling below (by 1.7 and 1.2 percentage points), compared to six counties below the threshold in 2013.

In 2014, 86.3 percent of children statewide who were discharged from out-of-home-placement to reunification were reunified in less than 12 months. This is down slightly from 87.1 percent in 2013. There were four counties in 2014 who fell below the threshold of 75.2 percent. Performance on this measure varied widely statewide, from 45.4 percent to 100 percent, often impacted by small numbers, or

## Human Services Performance Management System

the ability of families to make adequate progress toward reunification goals. The number of children under tribal jurisdiction can also impact this measure.

With a statewide average of 43.1 percent in 2014 of children in family foster care who were placed in a relative's home, there were no counties below the threshold of 20.9 percent. Performance on this measure has been improving over the past five years, up 12.9 percentage points from the statewide average of 30.2 percent in 2010.

The Performance Management system will be reviewing these measures in the coming year to determine if changes are warranted as a result of the recommendations from the Governor's Task Force on the Protection of Children.

### *Self-Support Index*

Measure(s) in this area include:

- Minnesota Family Investment Program/Diversionary Work Program Self-Support Index

On the Self-Support Index, there were six counties performing below their Expected Range of Performance. This is up slightly from baseline performance data provided in 2014. The vast majority of counties (57) fell into their Expected Range of Performance, and 19 counties were above.

### *Child Support – PIPs begin in 2016*

Measure(s) in this area include:

- Percent of child support cases with paternity established
- Percent of open child support cases with an order established
- Percent of current child support paid

Reports were issued to counties in February 2015. Performance on the child support measures was generally high, with most counties earning the maximum federal bonus based on their performance. For example, all counties had paternity established for more than 90 percent (the federal standard) of their open Child Support cases, which is consistent with past performance. Nearly all counties (97.5 percent) were meeting the federal standard of 80% with a child support order established for their open child support cases.

Counties continue to struggle with the percent of child support paid where only 10 percent of counties are meeting the federal standard. Performance on this measure is often complicated by the size of the interstate caseload and the ability to collect support across state lines. Out-dated technology can also hamper collection efforts. While most counties are not meeting the federal standard, the vast majority (62) are within ten percentage points. Performance data provided in 2015 was baseline. Counties will be held accountable to performance thresholds in 2016.

## Human Services Performance Management System

### *Adult Protection – PIPs begin in 2016*

Measure(s) in this area include:

- Measure: Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months

This measure was added to the system in 2015, and the Performance Management team issued baseline performance to counties in July. The statewide average for this measure is 95.2 percent, just above the high performance standard. In 2014 there were no counties that fell below the minimum performance threshold of 80 percent. Performance on this measure can fluctuate quite a bit, as the number of vulnerable adults included in this measure is small.

Counties will not be held accountable to performance thresholds until 2016. Assessing performance against thresholds for this measure is complicated due to the small number of adult maltreatment reports. Work is ongoing to develop an appropriate process for assessing performance where numbers are small.

## V. Technical Assistance

The Performance Management system offers counties and DHS the opportunity to collaborate on strategic and targeted technical assistance and support, promoting improvement in performance and outcomes.

### A. Technical Assistance Survey and Planning

In late 2014, the Performance Management team began working with a key group of stakeholders to develop a survey to assess county technical assistance needs, and to set priorities for future development. Counties were surveyed in late January, with 86% of counties responding. Key findings pointed to barriers around lack of access to accurate, real-time data, and policies that impede performance, and indicated a strong interest in collaboration and sharing of best practices. A report of findings was published in April of 2015. Key survey findings are detailed in Appendix B.

The primary objective of the survey was to collect feedback from Minnesota counties about their technical assistance needs specific to the Performance Management system so that the Performance Management team could develop useful technical assistance, including:

- *Performance Improvement Collaboratives:* This approach provides an opportunity for counties of similar size or demographic make-up to come together to address improvement around a particular measure.
- *Individualized Technical Assistance:* Under this approach, the team conducts a needs assessment, and develops targeted assistance when counties request help in solving a particular problem or addressing a unique need. This may include:
  - Techniques, tools, and training on data-driven decision-making;
  - Training or implementation of Results-Based Accountability or other continuous improvement tools and strategies or other non-programmatic training;
  - Collection and distribution of best practices for peer-to-peer learning; or
  - Additional, detailed data analysis.
- *Improvement Strategies Briefs:* This approach involves analyzing data to identify counties with successful performance or significant improvement and interviewing them to discover strategies for improvement. The team will share these briefs with all counties.

### B. Relationship-Building and Communications

The Performance Management team recognizes that key components of improvement efforts are building relationships and trust. In order to foster those relationships, the team has focused on transparency and frequent communication with counties and other partners. In addition to meeting monthly with the MACSSA Policy Committee, the team presented updates on the Performance Management system at the MACSSA Spring and Fall Conferences, the Minnesota Social Service

Association (MSSA) Conference, the Governor's Task Force on the Protection of Children, the Cultural and Ethnic Communities Leadership Council and the Minnesota Inter-County Association (MICA.)

The team developed a CountyLink site for the system will introduce a regular newsletter in 2016. In addition to written communication and formal presentations, the team intends to begin more frequent, face-to-face meetings with counties across the state.

### C. Technical Assistance Provided in 2015

Technical assistance began in February of 2015, when DHS launched a Web Intelligence (WebI) tool. This reporting tool allows dynamic querying of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and cash assistance timeliness data by counties. Using this tool, county financial assistance managers and supervisors are able to:

- Monitor performance on these measures on a monthly basis;
- Target performance by individual worker or team; and
- Analyze trends over time, by program type, or by worker/team.

Performance Management staff, working with DHS staff from the SNAP Management Evaluation Review Team, conducted 20 trainings in every region of the state, training more than 150 individuals. Training and on-going technical assistance is available from the SNAP Management Evaluation Review Team. DHS is in the process of creating other WebI universes, or data sets, that will provide daily loads of SNAP and cash assistance applications that are pending and how long they have been pending, as well as an eligibility universe that will allow for easier caseload management.

For counties with PIPs around the expedited SNAP measure, the team:

- Conducted statewide research on strategies used by successful counties on the expedited SNAP measure, reviewed data and worked with the SNAP program area at DHS to identify counties who made strong progress; Performance Management staff then interviewed those counties to understand their success. The resulting Improvement Strategies Brief was shared with all counties.
- Identified potential issues by researching Management Evaluations Reviews from 2013 to learn more about the steps needed to process expedited SNAP applications. The team used this information to guide a discussion with multiple counties to learn more about current processes and barriers and to help them develop action steps.
- Facilitated discussions between several counties with PIPs, providing an opportunity for them to learn from each other.

For counties with PIPs for the Self-Support Index, the Performance Management team is planning to pull together several counties who have fallen below the range of expected performance in order to

## Human Services Performance Management System

facilitate a meeting between them and the main employment provider in the region. The team is also working closely with the MFIP program and research areas to roll out a web intelligence tool for the Self-Support Index and to coordinate training for interested counties.

In 2016, the Performance Management team will also be working with the Office of Indian Policy to develop a team from across DHS to suggest and lead activities to help counties with significant populations of American Indian clients.

The Performance Management team will continue to develop other technical assistance offerings, including briefs on improvement strategies. Work is also underway to develop improved technology and tools that provide counties with more timely access to data.

## **VI. Challenges**

### **Racial and Ethnic Disparities**

There remain challenges to measuring county performance in providing services for Minnesotans from communities of color and American Indians communities, and in addressing disparate outcomes for those communities. Failure to measure performance in providing services to these communities and to address disparities in outcomes has devastating impacts for our entire state. A quick review of demographic data may help to reveal the urgency of addressing this challenge.

While Minnesotans of color and American Indians make up just under 19% of the state's population, they are disproportionally represented in those who receive public benefits and services. For example, among communities of color, Black Minnesotans comprise only about 6% (approximately 274,000) of the total state population, but more than 65% of this community (approximately 204,000 people) received food or economic assistance in 2014. Comparatively, just 8.5% of white Minnesotans were recipients of food or economic assistance. Further, the population of Minnesotans of color and American Indians is expected to grow by more than 50% in the next 20 years to more than 1,600,000 people. Most of that change will occur in the Twin Cities metro area, where the population of color is projected to increase to more than a fourth of the population. With the anticipation of such dramatic changes in the state's demographic makeup, the need to accurately measure county performance in addressing disparate outcomes becomes even more critical.

As currently written, the Performance Management system legislation does not adequately address racial and ethnic disparities; the methodology that it prescribes for measuring counties' performance in this area is simply too limiting. In fact, it currently results in no counties having requirements to improve their performance in addressing disparities.

Minnesota Statute 402A.18, Subd. 3(2) states that a PIP is required when:

The county or service delivery authority does not meet the minimum performance standard for one or more racial or ethnic subgroup for which there is a statistically valid population size for three or more measures, even if the county or service delivery authority met the standard for the overall population.

Under the methodology current in statute, there were no PIPs for racial and ethnic disparities. This does not accurately reflect the overarching disparities that exist within the human services system for American Indians and other racial or ethnic subgroups in Minnesota. In addition, even when performance is above the threshold overall for a racial or ethnic group, current legislation does not allow the system to address significant disparities that may still exist between outcomes for those communities and the majority community.

The Council recommends editing the statutory language to require that disparities be addressed while not dictating the methodology used. This will provide the Performance Management system with the flexibility needed to not only address disparities where they exist today, but also as they change over time. Providing an effective mechanism for addressing disparities will result in improved outcomes for all Minnesotans, not just those of color. The Performance Management team will be reconvening the disparities workgroup that met in late 2014 to define exactly how the system will assess disparities.

### **Outdated Technology Systems**

Another challenge to statewide improvement in human services outcomes is the lack of adequate technology. Current data systems are decades old, and often don't have the capability necessary for extracting or analyzing data in order to target improvement efforts.

There is often difficulty in getting timely and accurate data in order to assess counties' performance, or data is not available because antiquated information systems make it difficult or impossible to collect. In some instances, as in race and ethnicity data, some programs have not historically collected the data; and in other, there is no uniformity in how data is collected. There is limited ability to get real-time data to counties so that they can make day-to-day decisions to improve performance. Ultimately, new and integrated electronic information systems will be necessary to develop a more cohesive approach to performance improvement.

## **VII. Report Recommendations**

### **A. Response to 2014 Report Recommendations**

The Council made several recommendations in its 2014 Report to the Legislature. Below is a summary of the activities taken in 2015 to address them.

- Amended the legislative language to change the term “standard” to “threshold.” (passed during the 2015 Legislative Session);
- Introduced a new measure on vulnerable adult maltreatment;
- Developed a structure for providing technical assistance and training to counties;

The team convened a workgroup consisting of representatives from DHS, counties, American Indian communities, and communities of color to discuss the development of measures to address disparities in outcomes in those communities. The workgroup suggested that the legislative language, as written, would not adequately meet the intent, and proposed further investigation, culminating in recommendations from the Council that are included in this legislative report.

The 2014 Report also made a recommendation to adopt a measure around mental health. This proved challenging due to current data collection practices and multiple information systems that do not share data. Performance management staff are working with business area staff to inventory available data.

### **B. 2015 Report Recommendations**

The Council is pleased with the development of the system. Council recommendations for 2016 include:

- Pursue legislative changes to remove the prescriptive language around the assessment of disparities in order to develop a more useful methodology;
- Reconvene the disparities workgroup to establish the methodology for defining disparities and assessing performance;
- Review existing child protection measures in light of changes resulting from the Governor’s Task for on Child Protection;
- Continue work toward adopting new measures in the areas of mental health, health care, and long-term care;
- Continue to support ongoing efforts to simplify eligibility rules;
- Provide input into information technology systems modernization efforts;
- Establish a regular process for reviewing system outcomes, measures, and thresholds as part of a long-term strategic plan; and
- Continue outreach efforts by visiting at least 20 counties per year.



## Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

---

Co-Chairs Toni Carter and Charles Johnson  
Human Services Performance Council  
C/O Minnesota Department of Human Services  
P.O. Box 64997  
St. Paul, MN 55164-0997

Dear Co-Chairs, Council Members and Human Services Performance Management Team:

Thank you for the opportunity to read and review this report. I appreciate the time, effort and commitment you have demonstrated in the on-going development of the Human Services Performance Management System, which measures and supports counties' efforts to improve outcomes for Minnesota's human services program recipients.

I agree with all of the recommendations of this report and in particular with the recommendation to pursue legislative changes that will allow counties to more effectively address disparities in outcomes for people of color and American Indians.

I am impressed by the work you have accomplished and by your commitment to continuous improvement. Through on-going partnership and outreach, technical assistance, and thoughtful implementation of measures, thresholds, and remedies, you have supported counties in their efforts to improve their delivery of human services programs. I am also gratified that you have engaged representatives from the communities we serve and other stakeholders to help develop the means by which counties' performance will be measured.

As the system matures, I will be supportive of seeing it grow and strengthen through additional resources to help build upon your successes. These resources could include plans for providing additional technical assistance to counties, resources to help improve or replace outdated data systems to assure accurate and timely information concerning county performance, and resources to expand communications with counties, stakeholders, and the communities we serve.

In the meantime, all of your efforts will assure that our human services delivery system is truly person-centered and guided by measureable outcomes. Thank you again for your excellent work.

Sincerely,

Lucinda E. Jesson  
Commissioner

## IX. Appendix A – Performance Maps by Outcome and Measure

Appendix A provides information on system measures, grouped by system outcome. The following is included for each measure:

- Measure definition
- Why the measure is important
- Factors influencing the measure
- The performance threshold for the measure
- How the state of Minnesota is doing
- Map depicting county performance across the state

On the maps, counties with denominators less than 20 have been marked with an asterisk (\*) before and after the county name. These data should be interpreted carefully as those counties had very small numbers, which resulted in widely varying percentages. Data for counties is grouped by quintiles.

Appendix A is organized as follows:

<b><i>Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months</li> <li>• Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months</li> </ul>	Page 25
<b><i>Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of current child support paid</li> <li>• Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months</li> </ul>	Page 31
<b><i>Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home</li> <li>• Percent of child support cases with paternity established</li> </ul>	Page 37
<b><i>Outcome 4: People are economically secure</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of SNAP applications processed within one business day</li> <li>• Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely</li> <li>• Percent of open child support cases with an order established</li> <li>• MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index</li> </ul>	Page 43

### Data Supplement

Tables in the [Human Services Performance Management System – Data Supplement](#) provide the most recent three years of data for all measures with the most recent year's denominator.

## 2015 Performance Improvement Plans

Performance Improvement Plans were implemented for six of the ten measures in the system in 2015. While performance on the ten measures varies across the state, counties are overall doing well on the measures assessed through the Performance Management system. With the 2015 introduction of PIPs to the system, there was potential for more than 480 PIPs, yet there were only 20.

Measure	Minimum Performance Threshold	Counties	2014 Performance	2014 Denominator
Percent of Expedited SNAP Applications Processed within One Business Day	55%	Carver	47.4%	276
		Chippewa	54.1%	96
		Dakota	45.0%	2,562
		Mille Lacs	53.0%	245
		Otter Tail	50.8%	405
		Sibley	53.4%	86
		Washington	42.6%	901
Percent of Cash Assistance and SNAP Applications Processed Timely	75%	Washington	68.0%	2,281
Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months	94.7%	Clay	93.0%	43
		Douglas	93.5%	31
Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified with 12 months	75.2%	Beltrami	57.0%	121
		Hubbard	72.4%	29
		Pennington	45.4%	22
		Pine	59.3%	24
Percent of children in family foster care that were placed with relatives	20.9%	-	-	-
Minnesota Family Investment Program/Diversionary Work Program Self-Support Index	Within Range of Expected Performance	Big Stone	70.55	26
		Hennepin	61.2%	10,486
		Itasca	71.8%	347
		Morrison	71.1%	152
		Olmsted	77.8%	983
		Wadena	70.3%	125

## **OUTCOME 1: ADULTS AND CHILDREN ARE SAFE AND SECURE**

### **Measure 1A: Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months**

#### ***What is this measure?***

This measure is the percentage of all children who were victims of determined maltreatment during the last six months of the prior calendar year who did not have another determined report within six months.

#### ***Why is this measure important?***

County social services should increase the likelihood that children are safe from abuse and neglect. When a maltreatment determination is made, there is a heightened responsibility of the county to mitigate the threat of future harm to children. A repeat maltreatment determination indicates that the risk for the child has not been fully mitigated.

#### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that affect success include:

- Service factors that influence this measure are the availability of the service array within the community; funding sources for services; support for the agency service plan by public partners, partnerships with schools, law enforcement, courts and county attorneys; the culture of the agency; and clear support and guidance from the Department of Human Services (DHS).
- Staff factors that influence this measure are the maturity, experience, and training of staff; the availability of experienced supervisors with sufficient time/workloads to mentor staff; adequate staffing capacity; turnover; and sufficient cultural competency for diverse populations.
- Participant factors that influence this measure are poverty; chemical use; economic stability; cultural perception of minimally adequate parenting as compared to ideal parenting; and the availability of safety net support for the parents from family, friends, and the community.
- Environmental or external factors that influence this measure are community understanding of cultural differences in child rearing, the diversity of new immigrant populations, existing cultural biases, and the availability of transportation and available housing.

#### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***


The threshold for this measure is 94.7 percent, which is identical to the high performance standard. Separate thresholds were not developed for this measure due to ongoing changes resulting from the Governor's Task Force on the Protection of Children. In addition, federal reporting measures will be changing in the coming months. Both the measures and associated thresholds will be reviewed in 2016.

***How is Minnesota doing?***

Statewide in 2014, 96.5 percent of children were not the subject of a repeat determination within six months. This is down slightly from 97.0 percent in 2013. Assessed against the threshold of 94.7 percent, there were two counties falling below (by 1.7 and 1.2 percentage points.) Comparatively, there were six counties below the threshold in 2013. About 74 percent of counties had no children with subsequent maltreatment determinations within six months of the first each year, up from 70 percent in 2013, indicating excellent performance overall.

Figure 1A shows statewide performance on this measure. Counties with denominators less than 20 have been indicated on the map with an asterisk (\*) before and after the county name, and denominators have been removed from the table. These data should be interpreted carefully as many counties had very small numbers of children with maltreatment determinations, resulting in widely varying percentages.

Percent of Children with a Maltreatment Determination Who Do Not Experience a Repeat Maltreatment Determination within Six Months



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
County data grouped by quintiles  
Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Human Services Performance Management

**Measure 1B: Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months**

***What is this measure?***

The percent of vulnerable adults where a maltreatment allegation is found to be substantiated or inconclusive where there is not a substantiated or inconclusive allegation (and protective services were provided) of the same maltreatment type within six months and the county is the lead agency.

***Why is this measure important?***

County social services have the responsibility to safeguard the welfare and prevent further maltreatment of vulnerable adults who are the subject of reports of suspected maltreatment under the state's vulnerable adult reporting statute.

***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that affect success include:

- Service factors that influence this measure are the number of maltreatment reports received service options and trained providers in the community, the type of allegation, funding for services, eligibility criteria of other programs and services, and oversight of service providers.
- Staff factors that influence this measure include staff training and knowledge, burnout, the level of supervision available, staff having multiple responsibilities and roles within the organization, interpretation of policies, individual beliefs, and the number of staff available.
- Participant factors that influence this measure include the safety of their living environment; cultural perceptions of safety, aging, and abuse; self-determination and right to refuse services; complex situations where both the perpetrator and victim have service needs; traumatic brain injury and dementia; ability to pay for services not covered by Medical Assistance; mental illness; lack of social support; physical isolation; and the needs of undocumented vulnerable adults.
- Environmental or external factors that influence this measure include the increasing size of the elderly population, community support and awareness of abuse; the role of law enforcement and the courts, how care facilities view safety and risk, service provider payment policies, relationship with county attorney's office, and the impact of the Olmstead Act on service provision.

***What is the threshold for this measure?***

In April 2015, Performance Management staff convened an Adult Protection Thresholds Workgroup (Workgroup) to recommend a threshold and high performance standard for this measure as well as a process for assessing counties with 20 or fewer people in the measure. The Workgroup consisted of representatives from DHS Adult Protection staff and management, seven county representatives, and advocates and service providers from other state agencies and the community. The group made a recommendation of a threshold of 80 percent and a high performance standard of 95 percent. The Council approved these recommendations in September. Work is still being done on the process for

assessing counties with 20 or fewer allegations in the measure, which is the case for the majority of counties.


### ***How is Minnesota doing?***

The statewide average for this measure is 95.2 percent, just above the high performance standard. In 2014, there were no counties that fell below the minimum performance threshold of 80 percent. The number of vulnerable adults included in this measure can be quite small, with nearly 50 counties having denominators less than 20.

This report provides counties with baseline data for that measure compared to the preliminary threshold, but counties will not be held accountable through the PIP process until June 2016.

Figure 1B shows statewide performance on this measure. Counties with denominators less than 20 have been indicated on the map with an asterisk (\*) before and after the county name, and denominators have been removed from the table. These data should be interpreted carefully as those counties had very small numbers, which can result in widely varying percentages from year to year.

# Percent of Vulnerable Adult Maltreatment Alegations with No Subsequent Alegations within Six Months



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

## **OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN HAVE STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATION**

### **Measure 2A: Percent of current child support paid**

#### ***What is this measure?***

This measure is the total amount of support distributed as current during the federal fiscal year as a percent of total amount of current support due during that fiscal year. The numerator and denominator are dollar amounts, rather than children, families, or people.

#### ***Why is this measure important?***

Children need both parents contributing to their financial security; child support is one means of accomplishing that. Counties, through their role in the child support program, help ensure that parents contribute to their children's economic support through securing enforceable orders, monitoring payments, providing enforcement activities, and modifying orders when necessary.

#### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

- Service factors that may influence this measure include the size of the interstate caseload and ability to collect support across state boundaries, relationships with other counties and tribes, court processes, coordination with other county services, and technology that is sometimes out-of-date. For example, technology limitations do not allow non-custodial parents to pay by credit card.
- Staff factors that may influence this measure include caseload size, legacy planning and training of new staff as staff retires, and challenges attracting and retaining new staff.
- Participant factors that may influence this measure include parent initiative or interest in pursuing a modification of their order, non-cooperation by non-custodial parents, visitation schedules, employment rate, self-employment, and homelessness.
- Environmental or external factors that may influence this measure include the local economy, resources of the county attorney, the availability of community resources to help parents find and keep employment and address issues leading to unemployment, and the increased state minimum wage.

#### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***

In September of 2014, Performance Management staff convened a Child Support Thresholds Workgroup to recommend a threshold and high performance standard for this. The Workgroup consisted of four DHS representatives, nine county child support representatives, four community-based advocates, and two members of the Council.

The group had a discussion on the merits of using a historical threshold, which derives a threshold for each county based on past performance, and Adjusted Performance Measure (APM), which uses statistical regression analyses to predict what a county's performance should be based on participant and community factors. Workgroup participants noted that while some factors affecting performance are

clearly within county control, success on some of the measures is driven by external factors, such as the economy and wages, which affect the non-custodial parent's ability to pay child support. The external environment and participant demographics vary by county and counties with a poor economy, a high rate of non-marital births, or high rates of parental incarceration have more performance challenges to overcome.

The workgroup recommended that a historical threshold be used for current support paid. The Council recommended using the historically-based threshold for two years while exploring ways to create an APM for the current support paid measure to replace the historical threshold. The development of an APM is resource and time intensive. Therefore, the decision was made to use the historical measure while researching what would be necessary to develop an APM.

Of the Performance Management system measures, Child Support is unique in its interaction with federal standards. Federal standards are a bonus funding formula where states reach a maximum bonus for performance at or above:

- 90 percent for percent of paternities established;
- 80 percent for percent of open child support cases with orders established; and
- 80 percent of percent of current support paid.

The bonus is paid to each state, and Minnesota passes the state's bonus onto counties based upon each county's performance level. Therefore, even with a lower bound threshold, counties continue to have monetary incentive to increase performance, although it may be very small for some counties. Counties with performance above the federal funding standard are considered to have met the minimum performance threshold.

### ***How is Minnesota doing?***


Overall, in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014, 72.46 percent of current child support was paid. Performance varied from 64.43 percent of support paid to 86.87 percent.

Counties were provided with baseline data in 2015, and will be held accountable to minimum performance thresholds in February 2016.

Figure 2A shows statewide performance on this measure.

# Human Services Performance Management System

## Percent of Open Child Support Cases Paid



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
County data grouped by quintiles  
Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Human Services Performance Management

**Measure 2B: Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months**

***What is this measure?***

This measure looks at the number of children exiting an out-of-home placement to reunification or living with relatives with a length of stay of at least eight days that entered that placement within the last 12 months, which means that they were reunified within 12 months.

***Why is this measure important?***

For children removed from their birth family, the timely establishment of permanency is an important indicator of county efforts to ensure children have permanent families. Return to their family is one indicator of permanency and continuity.

***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that affect success include:

- Service factors that may influence this measure are: the availability of the service array within the community; funding sources for services; support for the agency service plan by public partners, partnerships with schools, law enforcement, courts, and county attorneys; the culture of the agency; clear support and guidance from DHS; and the willingness of courts and county attorneys to engage in planning for families rather than waiting for perfection.
- Staff factors that may influence this measure are the maturity, experience, and training of staff; the availability of experienced supervisors with sufficient time/workloads to mentor staff; adequate staffing capacity; turnover; and sufficient cultural competency for diverse populations.
- Participant factors that may influence this measure are: a family history of maltreatment; poverty; chemical use; economic stability; cultural perceptions of minimally adequate parenting as compared to ideal parenting; safety net support for the parents from family, friends, and the community; the availability of affordable housing options; and accessible transportation.
- Environmental or external factors that may influence this measure are economic conditions that support low-income families, “blame and punish” societal attitude toward parents who have failed, and the economy.

***What is the threshold for this measure?***

The threshold for this measure is 75.2 percent, which is identical to the high performance/federal standard. Separate thresholds were not developed for this measure due to ongoing changes resulting from the Governor’s Task Force on the Protection of Children. In addition, federal reporting measures are currently changing. Both the measures and associated thresholds will be reviewed in 2016.

***How is Minnesota doing?***


In 2014, the majority of counties were above the high performance standard of 75.2 percent, while four counties fell below the threshold and were required to develop PIPs. Overall, about 86 percent of children are reunified within 12 months.

## Human Services Performance Management System

Small numbers of children in out-of-home placement make for widely varying percentages. Minnesota has done well on this measure, out-performing other states, but there are concerns that high performance on this measure has resulted in higher rates of return to protective services. Future Performance Management system measures need to consider this and provide balance between the need for returning children to families in a timely manner and the time needed to ensure safety.

Figure 2B shows statewide performance on this measure. Counties with denominators less than 20 have been indicated on the map with an asterisk (\*) before and after the county name, and denominators have been removed from the table. These data should be interpreted carefully as those counties had very small numbers, which can result in widely varying percentages from year to year.

Percent of Children Discharged From Out-of-Home Placement to Reunification Who Were Reunified in less than 12 Months



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY 2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

### **OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP TO THEIR FULLEST POTENTIAL**

#### **Measure 3A: Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home**

##### ***What is this measure?***

This measure compares the total number of children in foster care and pre-adoptive settings to the number that were placed with relatives. Counties with less than 10 children in the denominator were not included.

##### ***Why is this measure important?***

Relationships with relatives are a source of continuity for children whose lives have been disrupted by abuse or neglect. An indicator of social service emphasis on establishing and supporting important relationships in children's lives is through placement with relatives. This may not always be possible or desirable and to reflect that the current statewide goal for this measure is 45 percent of children.

##### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that affect success include:

- Service factors that may influence this measure are the cultural appreciation of the importance of relatives as compared to professional parenting; systems to help identify and find family members; economic support for relative caretakers; accommodations in licensing standards for relatives; the culture of the agency; clear support and guidance from DHS; and the conflict between relative placement and the stability of remaining in the same neighborhood and school.
- Staff factors that may influence this measure are the maturity, experience, and training of staff; the availability of experienced supervisors with sufficient time/workloads to mentor staff; adequate staffing capacity; turnover; and the ability of staff to engage relatives in the government process.
- Participant factors that may influence this measure are a family history of maltreatment; disqualifying factors; hostile family relationships; distrust of the system; poverty; chemical use; economic stability; and the availability of safety net support for the parents from family, friends, and the community.
- Environmental or external factors that may influence this measure are timeliness of locating relatives; cultural norms that blame parents; community understanding of cultural differences in child rearing; the diversity of new immigrant populations; existing cultural biases; and the availability of transportation and available housing.

##### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***


The threshold for this measure is 20.9%, set at one standard deviation below the 2013 average in recognition of the challenges counties face when determining the best placement for children. The high performance standard is 43.5%, which is a state standard.

***How is Minnesota doing?***

In 2014, 35 counties were at or above the state standard, in comparison to just 16 counties in 2012. Statewide 43.1 percent of children were placed with relatives, up 3.6 percentage points over last year. There were no counties below the minimum performance threshold in 2014.

Figure 3A shows statewide performance on this measure. Counties with denominators less than 20 have been indicated on the map with an asterisk (\*) before and after the county name, and denominators have been removed from the table. These data should be interpreted carefully as those counties had very small numbers, which can result in widely varying percentages from year to year. Counties achieving the current statewide goal are indicated in bold.

Percent of Children in Family Foster Care that were Placed in a Relative Home



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY 2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

### **Measure 3B: Percent of open child support cases with paternity established**

#### ***What is this measure?***

This measure divides the number of children in open child support cases that were not born in marriage in the previous federal fiscal year by the number of children in open child support cases that had paternities established in the report year. The paternities established by child support workers during the federal fiscal year may not necessarily be for the same children born of non-marital births in the previous year. This is why percentages often exceed 100 percent.

#### ***Why is this measure important?***

Establishing parentage gives a child born outside of marriage a legal father and the same legal rights as a child born to married parents. Parentage must be established before an order for support can be established. Within the child support program, counties are responsible for connecting parents and their children by locating parents and establishing paternity. The counties initiate court actions to adjudicate parentage. Paternity is important not only for collection of child support, but also for other legal matters like inheritance and survivor benefits.

#### ***What factors affect performance on this measure?***

Minnesota overall and all counties perform very well on this measure. Factors that affect success include:

- Service factors that may influence this measure are staff availability, the hours a county office is open, the location of the agency in relation to people needing services, and the age of technology and computer systems.
- Staff factors that may influence this measure are staff training levels, staff-to-client ratios, and business continuity planning as older, more experienced workers retire.
- Participant factors that may influence this measure are demographics, trust or mistrust of government, housing stability, and immigration status.
- Environmental factors that may influence this measure are cooperation between law enforcement, counties, courts, and hospitals; working across state and American Indian reservation borders; and clients' ability to obtain transportation.

#### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***

In September of 2014, Performance Management staff convened a Child Support Thresholds Workgroup to recommend a threshold and high performance standard for this measure. The Workgroup consisted of four DHS representatives, nine county child support representatives, four community-based advocates, and two members of the Council. The workgroup recommended using the existing federal standard of 90 percent as the minimum performance threshold. This was approved by the Council.

## Human Services Performance Management System

Of the Performance Management system measures, Child Support is unique in its interaction with federal standards. Federal standards are a bonus funding formula where states reach a maximum bonus for performance at or above:

- 90 percent for percent of paternities established;
- 80 percent for percent of open child support cases with orders established; and
- 80 percent of percent of current support paid.

The bonus is paid to each state, and Minnesota passes the state's bonus onto counties based upon each county's performance level. Therefore, even with a lower bound threshold, counties continue to have monetary incentive to increase performance, although it may be very small for some counties.


### *How is Minnesota doing?*

All counties in the state are at or above the 90 percent federal standard for receiving maximum federal bonus money. The average statewide performance on this measure has been at or above 100 since 2010 and just below that in 2008 and 2009.

Counties were provided with baseline data in 2015, and will be held accountable to minimum performance thresholds in February 2016.

Figure 3B shows statewide performance on this measure.

# Percent of Child Support Cases with Paternity Established



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

## **OUTCOME 4: PEOPLE ARE ECONOMICALLY SECURE**

### **Measure 4A: Percent of expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications processed within one business day**

#### ***What is this measure?***

This measure looks at the difference between the application date and the date the first benefit payment is issued for expedited SNAP applications. It compares total expedited SNAP applications in a month to those made within one business day. Applications made on a Friday or the day before a state recognized holiday are considered timely if payment was issued on the first working day following the weekend or holiday. It does not include denied applications.

#### ***Why is this measure important?***

SNAP applicants are given expedited service when they have little to no other resources available to pay for food and, therefore, need basic safety net programs to meet a crisis. Efficient and timely processing of these applications help ensure that people's basic need for food is met.

#### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that affect success include:

- Service factors that may influence this measure include program complexity and changing policy, a complicated application, challenges associated with online ApplyMN applications, an increase in phone interviews resulting in waits for documentation to arrive via the mail, and MNsure application backlog.
- Staff factors that may influence this measure include staff training levels, staff-to-participant ratios, staff knowledge of policies, high turnover, and competition for resources between programs.
- Participant factors that may influence this measure include participant completion of the mandatory interview, the number of migrant and seasonal farm workers making applications, delays due to incomplete applications, availability of advocates to assist with completing applications, and difficulty obtaining required documentation.
- Environmental or external factors that may influence this measure include balancing error reduction with timeliness, emphasis on fraud that results in conflicts with access and timeliness of service, increased applications during economic downturns, availability of community resources such as food shelves, and natural disasters that result in increased applications.

#### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***

The minimum performance threshold for this measure is 55 percent and the high performance standard is 83percent.


***How is Minnesota doing?***

State law changed in July 2011 from requiring processing of expedited SNAP applications in 24 hours to five business days. Prior to that, county performance was increasing despite historically high caseloads and numbers of applications. The county average increased each year from 2008 to 2010 -from 68.5 percent in 2008, to 72.6 percent in 2010.

After state law changed, counties began working toward the five business day requirement and performance on processing within 24 hours decreased. However, the majority of expedited SNAP applications are still processed within one business day. In 2014, 64.0 percent of all Expedited SNAP applications statewide were processed within one business day, up from 62.3 percent in 2013. This shows a continued commitment to one business day processing. Seven counties fell below the minimum performance threshold, compared to the 14 that

Figure 4A shows statewide performance on this measure.

# Percent of Expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Applications Processed within One Business Day



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
County data grouped by quintiles  
Source: Dept of Human Services data CY 2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Human Services Performance Management

## **Measure 4B: Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely**

### ***What is this measure?***

This measure looks at the difference between the application date and the date of the first issuance made for each program approved on the application. The included programs are expedited SNAP, regular SNAP, Minnesota Family Investment Program, Diversionary Work Program, Refugee Cash Assistance, Minnesota Supplemental Aid, General Assistance, and Group Residential Housing. Applications made the day before a weekend or state-recognized holiday take into account the non-working days. Denials are not included.

### ***Why is this important?***

Cash and food assistance are ways to help people meet their basic needs. Timely processing of applications is one measure of how well counties are able to help people meet their basic needs.

### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that influence performance on this measure include:

- Service factors that influence this measure include the complexity of eligibility requirements, streamlining of eligibility requirements across all cash programs, county processes such as case banking, an aging database, ability to share information between programs like employment services and Child Support, having a universal release of information, and location of offices and number of offices.
- Staff factors that influence this measure include staff training, the number of staff, agency culture, staffing structure, availability of translators, and staff to participant ratios.
- Participant factors that influence this measure include literacy levels, availability to participate in an interview, access to a telephone, housing stability, ability to provide documentation, access to transportation, and complicated reporting requirements.
- Environmental or external factors that influence this measure include the local economy and increased applications during economic downturns.

### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***


The threshold for this measure is 75 percent with a high performance standard of 90 percent. The threshold is at the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile of performance in 2011. The high performance standard is one standard deviation above the county average in 2010, a year with historically high caseloads and performance.

### ***How is Minnesota doing?***

Statewide in 2014, 81.2 percent of cash and SNAP applications were processed timely, up from 75.8 in 2013 and 75.9 percent in 2012. Only one county fell below the performance threshold, and 21 counties were above the high performance standard. Performance varied from 68.0 percent to 96.7 percent.

Figure 4B shows statewide performance on this measure.

## Percent of SNAP and Cash Assistance Applications Processed Timely



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data FFY 2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

## **Measure 4C: Percent of open child support cases with an order established**

### ***What is this measure?***

This measure is the number of cases open at the end of the FFY with support orders established divided by the number of total cases open at the end of the FFY.

### ***Why is this important?***

Through their role in the child support program, counties help ensure that parents contribute to their children's economic support through securing enforceable orders, monitoring payments, providing enforcement activities, and modifying orders when necessary. This is a measure of counties' work toward ensuring children receive financial support from both parents.

### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that may influence this measure include:

- Service factors: relationship with the county attorney; ability to schedule court hearings timely; information sharing between courts, tribal nations, and Child Support; and relationships with other states that affect the ability to collect support across state boundaries.
- Staff factors: the number of staff dedicated to Child Support, training and education; and legacy planning and hiring of new staff as staff retire.
- Participant factors: family size; the separation or divorce rate and whether children are born in marriage; custody arrangements; and incarceration of non-custodial parents.
- Environmental or external factors influencing this measure may include local economy and ability of non-custodial parents to find employment, employer response time to paperwork, parents that work for cash, and level of trust in the government to provide service.

### ***What is the threshold for this measure?***


The minimum performance threshold for this measure is equal to the federal standard of 80 percent, the point at which counties receive maximum federal bonus money. Because this measure is calculated on a Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) basis, counties were provided with baseline performance data in January 2015. Counties with performance below the threshold when FFY 2015 data is released in January 2016 will be required to complete a PIP.

### ***How is Minnesota doing?***

Minnesota has had strong performance on this measure, with nearly all counties meeting the 80 percent federal standard. In FFY 2014, all but two counties met the 80 percent federal goal. Statewide performance over the past three years has averaged from 86 to 88 percent. As shown in Figure 8, there was little variation across counties in performance on this measure. Performance in FFY 2014 varied from 76 percent to 98 percent.

Figure 4C shows statewide performance on this measure.

Percent of Open Child Support Cases with an Order Established



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

## **Measure 4D: MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index**

### ***What is this measure?***

The MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (S-SI) is the percent of adults eligible for MFIP or DWP that are off cash assistance or are on and working at least 30 hours per week three years after a baseline quarter. The Range of Expected Performance (REP) is a target range individual to each county that controls for variables beyond the control of the county, including caseload characteristics and economic variables.

### ***Why is this measure important?***

Providing support that allows families the opportunity to attain and maintain employment is an essential role of county government. Counties contribute to and support employment through providing employment services and coordinating other resources such as housing, childcare, and health care that support a person's ability to get and keep a job.

### ***What affects performance on this measure?***

Factors that may influence this measure include:

- Service factors: quality of the employment plan; communication between county financial workers and employment service agencies; lack of an interface between DHS administrative and the Department of Employment and Economic Development's (DEED) administrative databases; availability and convenience of work supports such as child care assistance and transportation; work activity requirements of the federal Work Participation Rate (WPR) performance measure; recruitment of employers and relationships with employers; and complexity of program rules for both participants and staff.
- Staff factors: staff education, training, and experience; caseload size; understanding of program policies; turnover; and time needed for program documentation.
- Participant factors: the number and age of children in the household; the caregiver's physical, mental, and chemical health; disability status; housing mobility and homelessness; the number of adults in the household; immigration status; incarceration of an absent parent; motivation; education and skill levels; access to transportation; beliefs about child care and work; cultural background, preferences, and beliefs; and English-language proficiency.
- Environmental or external factors: the economic environment, including unemployment rate and child poverty level; population density; number and type of employers in a region; prevailing wages; availability of affordable childcare; and attitudes of employers regarding hiring people receiving cash assistance.

Note that while all these factors and others could influence performance and therefore affect the S-SI, the REP predicts the S-SI using only participant and environmental factors that are recorded in state administrative data. This means that service and staff factors are the factors that can change performance levels of a servicing agency.

***What is the threshold for this measure?***

There is no set threshold for this measure. Instead, each county has a Range of Expected Performance individual to each county that controls for variables beyond the control of the county, including caseload characteristics and economic variables.

***How is Minnesota doing?***


Statewide for the annualized 2014/2015 S-SI, 68.8 percent of MFIP/DWP participants were off the program and/or working at least 30 hours a week.

Performance on the S-SI has been improving over the past five years. Compared with the ten counties that fell below their Range of Expected performance for 2010/2011, there were seven counties below their range of expected performance during the most recent performance cycle. None of the counties needing to complete at PIP were more than 4.2 percentage points below their expected range of performance.

Figure 4D maps statewide performance on this measure. Counties with denominators less than 20 have been indicated on the map with an asterisk (\*) before and after the county name. These data should be interpreted carefully as those counties had very small numbers, which can result in widely varying percentages from year to year.

# Human Services Performance Management System

## MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index



\* = Number of cases less than 20  
 County data grouped by quintiles  
 Source: Dept of Human Services data April 2013 - March 2014

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
 Human Services Performance Management

## **X. Appendix B – Technical Assistance Survey Results**

### **Technical Assistance Survey**

In late 2014, the Performance Management team began working with a key group of stakeholders to develop a survey to assess county technical assistance needs, and to set priorities for future development. Counties were surveyed in late January. There were 71 respondents to the survey (an 86% response rate) and a report was published in April 2015. Key findings were:

- Survey responses were compared based on county agency size. Significant differences were found by county agency size in the barriers, exposure to performance improvement strategies, and interests around technical assistance. Note: *small county agencies* = 50 or less human services staff members (n=27), *medium county agencies* = between 51 and 100 human services staff members (n=18) and *large county agencies* = 101+ human services staff members (n=26).
- County agency directors are very aware of the Performance Management system and legislation but other levels of staff within county agencies are less aware, especially line staff (i.e. social workers, caseworkers). Small county agencies were more likely to report that their line staff, supervisors and managers were aware than large county agencies. Small and medium county agencies were also more likely to have shared the April 2014 report with county commissioners.
- County agencies were most likely to identify barriers to the performance of their county agency's human services in the areas of the lack of access to accurate, real-time data, DHS policies or procedures or MN State laws, and lack of access to program-specific training.
- County agencies continue to have a very strong interest in future opportunities around collaboration and relationship building. County agencies are particularly interested in learning about the best practices of other county agencies and connecting with other counties that have solved a specific issue.
- Within county agencies, leadership tended to have more familiarity around various performance improvement strategies (i.e. Continuous Improvement (CI), Results Based Accountability (RBA), Lean) than line staff. Both leadership and line staff were least familiar with RBA. Small county agencies were less likely to have leadership and line staff familiar with these strategies.
- County agencies have had the most exposure to training around Lean and the least exposure to training around RBA. Small county agencies have had the least exposure to training on the various performance measurement strategies. Medium county agencies have had the most exposure to training on RBA whereas large county agencies have had the most exposure to training around Lean, CI tools and data driven decision-making.
- County agencies are most interested in future training on data driven decision-making and RBA. Small county agencies tend to be more interested in Lean than medium and large county agencies. Large county agencies tend to be more interested in data driven decision-making.

- When it comes to interest in receiving technical assistance from the Performance Measurement system team to address a specific barrier or challenge in their county agency, county agencies are most interested in direct consultation from the Performance Measurement system team with their county agency, CI tools or processes and RBA. County agencies were more divided around their interest in training on Lean, with small county agencies having the greatest interest in this area.

The primary objective of the survey was to collect feedback from Minnesota counties about their technical assistance needs specific to the Performance Management system. The results are being used by the Performance Management team to develop and plan for technical assistance. The team is currently developing plans for the following types of technical assistance:

- *Performance Improvement Collaboratives:* This approach will provide an opportunity for counties of similar size or demographic make-up to come together to address improvement around a particular measure. The groups would be ongoing and be facilitated using an RBA-style methodology.
- *Individualized Technical Assistance:* This approach will be used when counties request assistance to solve a particular problem or address a unique need. Under this approach, the team would conduct a needs assessment, and develop targeted assistance, which may include:
  - *Data-driven decision-making techniques, tools, and training:* The performance management team is researching, collecting, and organizing various data-driven decision-making strategies and techniques that can be used by counties to improve performance around a particular measure. There will be potential for counties to work with the team or participate in collaborative efforts with other counties to implement these strategies. Tools and training will be made available to counties.
  - *RBA, CI, or other improvement tools and strategies:* The Performance Management staff will be available to counties to facilitate continuous improvement efforts. Staff will use specific tools and resources to engage counties in these efforts.
  - *Non-programmatic training:* The team will provide learning opportunities on data-driving decision-making and other improvement methodologies like RBA or CI.
  - *Best Practice collection:* the team will research, collect, share best practices across counties, and provide ways for counties to easily access this information for peer-to-peer learning.
  - *Detailed data:* The team will work with DHS business areas to provide detailed performance and program data to help plan improvement efforts and manage the impact of those efforts.

## **XI. Appendix C – Steering Committee on Performance and Outcome Reforms**

The 2009 Legislature passed the State-County Results, Accountability and Service Delivery Reform Act (Act) (Minnesota Statutes Chapter 402A), which established the Steering Committee on Performance and Outcome Reforms (steering committee). The steering committee's purpose was to define a list of essential human services (mandated by federal or state government), to establish minimum outcome thresholds for those services, and to develop a uniform data collection and review process.

The steering committee presented recommendations to the legislature in December 2012, which were authorized by the legislature during the 2013 session. Minnesota Statutes, Section 402A.14 establishes "a performance management system for essential human services...that includes initial performance measures and thresholds consistent with the recommendations of the steering committee."

The steering committee defined "essential human services" as those mandated by federal or state law. These essential services are:

- Child welfare, including protection, truancy, minor parent, guardianship, and adoption;
- Children's mental health;
- Children's disability services;
- Public economic assistance;
- Child support;
- Chemical dependency;
- Adult disability services;
- Adult mental health;
- Adult services such as long-term care; and
- Adult protection. (MN Statute 402A.10 Subd. 4a)

The human services delivery system includes the following entities:

- County human services and other service delivery authorities;
- The Minnesota Department of Human Services;
- Tribal governments;
- The Human Services Performance Council;
- Human services community partners;
- Agencies that deliver human services; and
- Individuals and families who access and receive human services.

## **XII. Appendix D –Vision, Mission, Values, and Strategies Statements**

The Human Services Performance Council and the Performance Management team developed the vision, mission, and values statements below to define the Performance Management system's purpose, direction, and drivers of success.

### **Vision**

The vision of the Performance Management system is to create an equitable human services system, which ensures effective services and positive outcomes for Minnesota residents through accountability, continuous improvement, cultural responsiveness, and partnership.

### **Mission**

The mission of the Performance Management system is to improve outcomes for people through creativity, flexibility, accountability, collaboration, and performance management.

### **Values**

The values of the Performance Management system are:

#### ***Collaboration***

- DHS, counties, service delivery authorities, and community partners are working together to improve the lives of people served.

#### ***Continuous improvement***

- Performance is continuously improved, and success is gauged by results for people served.

#### ***Reliance on data***

- Reliable and tested data, measures, and thresholds are developed and used.

#### ***Sustainability***

- Improvement methods are sustainable, effective, efficient, and continuous.

#### ***Flexibility***

- Flexibility and creativity are used to adapt to the changing needs of those served.

#### ***Transparency***

- Transparency and accountability are central to the design, implementation, and monitoring of essential services being delivered.

#### ***Inclusiveness***

- People of all backgrounds are included in the process, and cultural responsiveness is embedded in the work.

#### ***Equity***

- Equity across populations will be a deliberate and intentional focus so that people will have access to services that are effective for them as individuals.

### **Strategies**

There are four primary components of the Performance Management system, which support a larger performance framework. These components are: 1) outcomes and measures; 2) thresholds; 3) technical assistance and training; and 4) the remedies process.

To implement system activities within these components, the Council and Performance Management team are employing the following strategies:

#### ***Oversee performance framework***

- Develop, analyze, and update shared outcomes, measures, and thresholds for counties.

#### ***Measure performance***

- Use data to measure, evaluate, and communicate county performance.

#### ***Improve performance***

- Identify and implement technical assistance needed to support county performance improvement efforts.

#### ***Assure performance thresholds are met***

- Monitor county progress in meeting performance goals and thresholds.

#### ***Remain committed to cultural responsiveness***

- Maintain an inclusive process, which is considerate of diverse perspectives and is respectful of cultural conditions in all aspects of the work.

### **XIII. Appendix E – Human Services Performance Council**

The Human Services Performance Council (Council) was authorized by the 2013 Legislature as part of the establishment of a performance management system for human services. The work of the Council is to advise the DHS commissioner on the implementation and operation of the human services performance management system, including county performance management and departmental procedures, and to provide annual reviews and reports to the Minnesota Legislature related to human services performance management. (Minnesota Statutes, Section 402A.15).

The commissioner appoints council members representing DHS, service providers/advocates, and tribal governments/communities of color; the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) and the Minnesota Association of County Social Service Administrators (MACSSA) each appoint their representative members. Appointments are for a minimum of two years.

Current Council membership is as follows:

#### ***Representing advocates/services providers:***

- Arnie Anderson, executive director, Minnesota Community Action Partnership
- Julie Manworren, president & ceo, Living Well Disability Services
- Jeri Schettler, executive director, Client Community Services, Inc.

#### ***Representing AMC:***

- Toni Carter, county commissioner, Ramsey County
- Rob Ecklund, county commissioner, Koochiching County
- Linda Higgins, county commissioner, Hennepin County

#### ***Representing DHS:***

- Charles Johnson, deputy commissioner for policy and operations
- Kate Lerner, director of country relations
- Robert Meyer, performance management director, Continuing Care Administration

#### ***Representing MACSSA:***

- Linda Bixby, economic support division manager, Washington County
- Tom Henderson, family services director, Brown County
- Stacy Hennen, social services director, Grant County

#### ***Representing tribal governments/communities of color:***

- Alfred Babington-Johnson, ceo, Stairstep Foundation
- Ben Bement, director of human services, White Earth Tribal Council
- Dr. Arnolando Curiel, vice president, racial equity & public policy, YWCA Minneapolis

# **Human Services Performance Management System – Data Supplement**

## **Human Services Performance Council**

December 2015

**For more information contact:**

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Human Services Performance Management Team  
P.O. Box 64997  
St. Paul, MN 55164-0997



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

## **Legislative Report**

This information is available in accessible formats for individuals with disabilities by calling 651-431-5780 or by using your preferred relay service. For other information on disability rights and protections, contact the agency's ADA coordinator. 12-12

## Performance Data

This data supplement provides the performance data associated with the Human Services Performance Management system, as described in the Human Services Performance Council report: *Human Services Performance Management System* (December 2015.)

Performance data are grouped by system outcome, as follows:

### **Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure**

- Measure: Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months (Table 1)
- Measure: Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months (Table 2)

### **Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation**

- Measure: Percent of current child support paid (Table 3)
- Measure: Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months (Table 4)

### **Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential**

- Measure: Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home (Table 5)
- Measure: Percent of child support cases with paternity established (Table 6)

### **Outcome 4: People are economically secure**

- Measure: Percent of expedited Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications processed within one business day (Table 7)
- Measure: Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely (Table 8)
- Measure: Percent of open child support cases with an order established (Table 9)
- Measure: MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (Table 10)

Most of these data have been published in various locations, but never in a single document. Tables in this Supplement provide the most recent three years of data for all measures for all counties and SDAs with the most recent year's denominator.

Minnesota gives its counties and political subdivisions broad authority to work cooperatively. Two or more Minnesota “governmental units” may create a new and distinct governmental entity whenever the existing governing boards determine that a new entity offers a better way to meet a duty or obligation. For example, Faribault and Martin Counties are reported together, and counties in the Southwest Health and Human Services (SWHHS) consortium are reported as a group. As counties joined the consortium, their numbers were included in the group. Dodge, Steele, and Waseca recently became MNPrairie.

## Human Services Performance Management System – Data Supplement

In these cases, past year data where those counties were not members reports those counties separately. Where measure data precede their membership, data for these counties is provided at the bottom of the table. This varies by measure as some are calculated for calendar year, while Child Support measures are by federal fiscal year and the MFIP/DWP Annualized Self-Support Index is for April to March of each year.

Where counties have fewer than 20 people in the denominator, percentages are listed in the tables, but the actual denominator is not provided. These data should be interpreted carefully as those counties had very small numbers, which can result in widely varying percentages from year to year.

**Table 1. Percent of Children with a Maltreatment Determination Who Do Not Experience a Repeat Maltreatment Determination within Six Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			97.4%	97.0%	96.5%	2,112
Aitkin	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Anoka	94.7%	94.7%	97.4%	95.7%	97.4%	79
Becker	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	53
Beltrami	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	40
Benton	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	92.5%	100.0%	24
Big Stone	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Blue Earth	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Brown	94.7%	94.7%	88.8%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Carlton	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Carver	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Cass	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Chippewa	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	-	0
Chisago	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Clay	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	93.0%	43
Clearwater	94.7%	94.7%	85.7%	94.7%	100.0%	< 20
Cook	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Crow Wing	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	76.9%	< 20
Dakota	94.7%	94.7%	97.1%	100.0%	98.7%	82
Douglas	94.7%	94.7%	85.0%	100.0%	93.5%	31
DVHHS	94.7%	94.7%		100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Faribault-Martin	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	92.6%	41
Fillmore	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Freeborn	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	93.3%	< 20
Goodhue	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	< 20
Grant	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Hennepin	94.7%	94.7%	96.4%	94.0%	95.1%	640
Houston	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Hubbard	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Isanti	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	95.2%	100.0%	< 20
Itasca	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 1, page 2. Percent of Children with a Maltreatment Determination Who Do Not Experience a Repeat Maltreatment Determination within Six Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			97.4%	97.0%	96.5%	2,112
Kanabec	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	-	0
Kandiyohi	94.7%	94.7%	97.4%	100.0%	96.9%	66
Kittson	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	-	0
Koochiching	94.7%	94.7%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Lac Qui Parle	94.7%	94.7%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Lake	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	-	0
Lake Of The Woods	94.7%	94.7%	-	-	100.0%	< 20
Le Sueur	94.7%	94.7%	93.7%	85.7%	100.0%	< 20
Mahnomen	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	-	0
Marshall	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	-	0
McLeod	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	94.1%	100.0%	< 20
Meeker	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	< 20
Mille Lacs	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	97.2%	100.0%	32
Mn Prairie	94.7%	94.7%			100.0%	31
Morrison	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Mower	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Nicollet	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Nobles	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Norman	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Olmsted	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	95.6%	23
Otter Tail	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	26
Pennington	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Pine	94.7%	94.7%	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Polk	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	90.9%	100.0%	< 20
Pope	94.7%	94.7%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Ramsey	94.7%	94.7%	99.5%	99.5%	96.5%	175
Red Lake	94.7%	94.7%	-	-	-	0
Renville	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Rice	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	91.6%	100.0%	< 20
Roseau	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 1, page 3. Percent of Children with a Maltreatment Determination Who Do Not Experience a Repeat Maltreatment Determination within Six Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			97.4%	97.0%	96.5%	2,112
Scott	94.7%	94.7%	90.9%	85.0%	95.4%	22
Sherburne	94.7%	94.7%	94.1%	100.0%	96.6%	30
Sibley	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
St. Louis	94.7%	94.7%	98.2%	98.6%	95.8%	168
Stearns	94.7%	94.7%	91.4%	94.4%	97.5%	82
Stevens	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	-	0
SWHHS	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Swift	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	71.4%	< 20
Todd	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Traverse	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Wabasha	94.7%	94.7%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Wadena	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Washington	94.7%	94.7%	97.7%	98.2%	97.6%	43
Watonwan	94.7%	94.7%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Wilkin	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Winona	94.7%	94.7%	90.9%	100.0%	90.0%	< 20
Wright	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	40
Yellow Medicine	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
(Cottonwood)	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	-	-
(Dodge)	94.7%	94.7%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
(Jackson)	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	-	-
(Pipestone)	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	-	-
(Redwood)	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	-	-	-
(Waseca)	94.7%	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 2. Percent of Vulnerable Adults with a Maltreatment Determination with No Subsequent Determination within Six Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			96.1%	94.6%	95.2%	3,196
Aitkin	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Anoka	80.0%	95.0%	98.3%	92.7%	92.7%	318
Becker	80.0%	95.0%	94.4%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Beltrami	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Benton	80.0%	95.0%	-	95.6%	95.4%	44
Big Stone	80.0%	95.0%	-	100.0%	-	< 20
Blue Earth	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Brown	80.0%	95.0%	92.3%	91.6%	80.0%	< 20
Carlton	80.0%	95.0%	97.3%	95.1%	86.6%	30
Carver	80.0%	95.0%	94.1%	90.9%	94.7%	57
Cass	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	96.4%	96.4%	28
Chippewa	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Chisago	80.0%	95.0%	94.8%	96.0%	84.2%	57
Clay	80.0%	95.0%	93.6%	92.7%	97.4%	78
Clearwater	80.0%	95.0%	78.5%	91.3%	85.7%	< 20
Cook	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Crow Wing	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	28
Dakota	80.0%	95.0%	96.9%	100.0%	96.4%	85
Douglas	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
DVHHS	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Faribault-Martin	80.0%	95.0%	93.4%	95.6%	93.2%	59
Fillmore	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	90.9%	96.2%	27
Freeborn	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	< 20
Goodhue	80.0%	95.0%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Grant	80.0%	95.0%	83.3%	90.0%	90.0%	< 20
Hennepin	80.0%	95.0%	97.4%	95.3%	96.2%	744
Houston	80.0%	95.0%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Hubbard	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	23
Isanti	80.0%	95.0%	87.8%	98.4%	100.0%	39
Itasca	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 2, page 2. Percent of Vulnerable Adults with a Maltreatment Determination with No Subsequent Determination within Six Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			96.1%	94.6%	95.2%	3,196
Kanabec	80.0%	95.0%	94.4%	77.4%	88.4%	52
Kandiyohi	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	97.2%	97.5%	40
Kittson	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-	-
Koochiching	80.0%	95.0%	-	-	-	-
Lac Qui Parle	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Lake	80.0%	95.0%	-	100.0%	-	-
Lake Of The Woods	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-	-
Le Sueur	80.0%	95.0%	80.0%	100.0%	90.0%	20
Mahnomen	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Marshall	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
McLeod	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Meeker	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	94.7%	95.0%	20
Mille Lacs	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
MN Prairie	80.0%	95.0%			95.0%	20
Morrison	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Mower	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	94.5%	95.8%	48
Nicollet	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	< 20
Nobles	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Norman	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Olmsted	80.0%	95.0%	94.8%	96.8%	91.8%	49
Otter Tail	80.0%	95.0%	96.4%	48.7%	91.5%	95
Pennington	80.0%	95.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Pine	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.7%	< 20
Polk	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	22
Pope	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	89.6%	29
Ramsey	80.0%	95.0%	95.6%	99.1%	100.0%	87
Red Lake	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Renville	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Rice	80.0%	95.0%	88.8%	96.0%	91.5%	59
Roseau	80.0%	95.0%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 2, page 3. Percent of Vulnerable Adults with a Maltreatment Determination with No Subsequent Determination within Six Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			96.1%	94.6%	95.2%	3,196
Scott	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	21
Sherburne	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Sibley	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	< 20
St. Louis	80.0%	95.0%	89.4%	94.0%	95.9%	122
Stearns	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	90.2%	96.9%	133
Stevens	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	68.1%	94.1%	< 20
SWHHS	80.0%	95.0%	93.1%	100.0%	98.7%	77
Swift	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	77.7%	100.0%	< 20
Todd	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Traverse	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-	-
Wabasha	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	75.0%	92.3%	< 20
Wadena	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Washington	80.0%	95.0%	96.2%	95.5%	98.1%	54
Watonwan	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Wilkin	80.0%	95.0%	92.3%	100.0%	88.8%	< 20
Winona	80.0%	95.0%	98.3%	92.7%	88.8%	45
Wright	80.0%	95.0%	95.5%	91.4%	94.0%	202
Yellow Medicine	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
(Dodge)	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
(Pipestone)	80.0%	95.0%	-	-	-	-
(Redwood)	80.0%	95.0%	-	-	-	-
(Steele)	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
(Waseca)	80.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 3. Percent of Current Child Support Paid**

County	2012	2013	2014	2014	Threshold 2015
				Denominator	
Statewide	71.34%	71.83%	72.46%	\$631,142,337	72.91%
Aitkin	70.74%	71.27%	74.16%	\$1,748,917	75.27%
Anoka	71.54%	72.34%	73.39%	\$45,865,857	73.89%
Becker	68.85%	68.21%	68.23%	\$4,150,139	68.23%
Beltrami	64.13%	63.73%	64.69%	\$5,108,051	64.69%
Benton	75.19%	74.94%	75.83%	\$5,502,438	76.58%
Big Stone	81.81%	81.23%	78.89%	\$600,501	80.00%
Blue Earth	67.31%	68.79%	69.02%	\$8,296,424	69.70%
Brown	81.60%	83.29%	83.45%	\$3,619,971	80.00%
Carlton	73.88%	72.18%	73.73%	\$5,105,433	73.73%
Carver	77.38%	78.92%	78.72%	\$8,267,478	79.72%
Cass	61.94%	64.12%	64.45%	\$2,823,492	65.01%
Chippewa	76.84%	76.65%	75.94%	\$1,684,267	76.58%
Chisago	77.77%	78.79%	78.25%	\$7,452,492	79.04%
Clay	73.85%	73.64%	74.13%	\$8,566,491	74.44%
Clearwater	68.80%	69.18%	71.57%	\$1,295,954	71.57%
Cook	67.14%	69.15%	64.87%	\$452,351	64.87%
Crow Wing	71.14%	72.42%	72.37%	\$8,632,400	72.83%
Dakota	69.84%	70.81%	71.56%	\$48,287,729	71.99%
Douglas	75.39%	75.59%	75.48%	\$4,470,655	75.76%
DVHHS	76.98%	74.53%	75.97%	\$3,130,842	75.97%
Faribault/Martin	75.31%	74.54%	72.91%	\$5,792,387	72.91%
Fillmore	80.98%	79.76%	78.15%	\$2,346,648	78.15%
Freeborn	70.01%	71.69%	70.50%	\$5,224,222	71.18%
Goodhue	75.38%	74.33%	75.93%	\$5,996,067	75.99%
Grant	76.57%	81.17%	80.00%	\$881,785	80.00%
Hennepin	66.74%	67.28%	68.26%	\$111,236,472	68.70%
Houston	77.43%	78.09%	76.47%	\$2,098,840	76.65%
Hubbard	65.17%	64.46%	64.43%	\$2,635,891	64.95%
Isanti	71.93%	74.48%	76.00%	\$6,491,954	77.61%
Itasca	72.20%	71.39%	71.72%	\$6,104,440	71.72%

**Table 3, page 2. Percent of Current Child Support Paid**

County	2012	2013	2014	2014	Threshold 2015
				Denominator	
Statewide	71.34%	71.83%	72.46%	\$631,142,337	72.91%
Kanabec	73.11%	74.70%	75.34%	\$2,460,622	76.75%
Kandiyohi	76.21%	75.95%	76.36%	\$5,732,443	76.56%
Kittson	81.46%	85.69%	86.87%	\$375,584	80.00%
Koochiching	78.81%	81.21%	82.05%	\$2,045,607	80.00%
Lac Qui Parle	77.64%	80.94%	80.99%	\$746,504	80.00%
Lake	69.02%	71.67%	74.27%	\$1,219,811	75.54%
Lake of the Woods	78.60%	79.20%	76.46%	\$399,773	76.46%
Le Sueur	77.75%	75.97%	75.12%	\$3,952,631	75.21%
Mahnomen	68.03%	64.52%	65.85%	\$489,552	65.85%
Marshall	81.39%	81.46%	85.26%	\$1,245,374	80.00%
McLeod	77.76%	78.78%	79.08%	\$4,839,952	80.00%
Meeker	72.42%	74.90%	76.81%	\$3,029,059	77.08%
Mille Lacs	69.99%	70.90%	73.44%	\$3,395,502	74.40%
MN Prairie	76.41%	76.23%	76.85%	\$11,432,949	76.99%
Morrison	69.01%	68.11%	66.89%	\$4,744,987	67.15%
Mower	72.94%	71.82%	71.80%	\$6,207,644	71.91%
Nicollet	71.22%	71.23%	72.13%	\$5,071,140	72.14%
Nobles	71.72%	73.41%	73.98%	\$2,988,498	74.76%
Norman	74.11%	74.25%	73.76%	\$844,316	73.76%
Olmsted	78.45%	78.40%	78.27%	\$18,012,857	78.60%
Otter Tail	72.71%	71.70%	71.88%	\$6,591,106	71.88%
Pennington	75.86%	75.80%	75.62%	\$2,145,095	76.13%
Pine	71.55%	72.71%	73.74%	\$4,626,206	74.88%
Polk	79.83%	79.13%	80.04%	\$4,842,385	80.00%
Pope	75.92%	74.25%	78.29%	\$1,040,787	78.29%
Ramsey	62.96%	63.54%	64.61%	\$56,735,733	65.15%
Red Lake	85.28%	82.88%	79.56%	\$548,449	80.00%
Renville	75.33%	75.81%	78.88%	\$1,966,338	78.91%
Rice	74.71%	75.47%	75.45%	\$6,683,908	76.19%
Roseau	76.57%	77.67%	78.04%	\$2,197,086	78.04%

**Table 3, page 3. Percent of Current Child Support Paid**

County	2012	2013	2014	2014	Threshold 2015
				Denominator	
Statewide	71.34%	71.83%	72.46%	\$631,142,337	72.91%
Scott	78.12%	77.92%	78.41%	\$12,702,725	78.85%
Sherburne	77.80%	78.62%	79.18%	\$11,977,576	80.00%
Sibley	76.78%	79.13%	77.30%	\$1,826,454	78.39%
St. Louis	70.25%	70.62%	70.70%	\$27,472,449	70.91%
Stearns	76.23%	76.42%	77.22%	\$15,148,481	77.39%
Stevens	76.67%	77.60%	75.74%	\$789,970	76.30%
SWHHS	73.99%	75.97%	77.72%	\$10,430,450	78.45%
Swift	74.30%	73.36%	76.59%	\$1,301,970	76.90%
Todd	76.87%	76.22%	75.11%	\$2,866,388	75.43%
Traverse	73.72%	73.21%	74.76%	\$369,706	74.76%
Wabasha	79.88%	79.65%	78.87%	\$2,177,562	78.95%
Wadena	71.31%	69.67%	69.05%	\$2,612,539	69.25%
Washington	73.47%	73.57%	73.86%	\$26,117,515	73.95%
Watsonwan	77.79%	77.84%	75.53%	\$2,276,218	76.59%
Wilkin	82.04%	81.43%	79.93%	\$950,434	80.00%
Winona	75.42%	75.17%	75.64%	\$5,075,490	75.94%
Wright	75.57%	76.18%	77.23%	\$15,399,013	78.25%
Yellow Medicine	78.25%	78.89%	77.21%	\$1,164,912	77.21%
(Cottonwood)	75.48%	72.00%			
(Dodge)	80.79%	79.27%	80.29%	\$2,992,959	
(Jackson)	78.38%	77.11%			
(Pipestone)	78.71%				
(Redwood)	80.03%				
(Steele)	72.10%	73.45%	73.87%	\$5,535,736	
(Waseca)	79.87%	78.36%	78.97%	\$2,904,254	

**Table 4. Percent of Children Discharged from Out-of-Home Placement to Reunification Who Were Reunified in Less than 12 Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			87.7%	87.1%	86.3%	3,214
Aitkin	75.2%	75.5%	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	27
Anoka	75.2%	75.2%	92.4%	94.5%	94.3%	106
Becker	75.2%	75.2%	83.8%	92.7%	94.2%	52
Beltrami	75.2%	75.2%	68.6%	65.5%	57.0%	121
Benton	75.2%	75.2%	88.6%	93.1%	97.0%	34
Big Stone	75.2%	75.2%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Blue Earth	75.2%	75.2%	87.7%	100.0%	86.3%	22
Brown	75.2%	75.2%	80.0%	77.8%	90.0%	20
Carlton	75.2%	75.2%	82.0%	71.9%	89.4%	< 20
Carver	75.2%	75.2%	90.7%	62.5%	87.8%	33
Cass	75.2%	75.2%	81.3%	100.0%	83.3%	30
Chippewa	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	< 20
Chisago	75.2%	75.2%	94.7%	95.7%	88.0%	25
Clay	75.2%	75.2%	87.8%	86.5%	90.9%	55
Clearwater	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	93.3%	< 20
Cook	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	66.6%	< 20
Crow Wing	75.2%	75.2%	74.5%	78.8%	94.5%	37
Dakota	75.2%	75.2%	94.4%	97.3%	86.7%	68
Douglas	75.2%	75.2%	95.0%	90.0%	91.6%	< 20
DVHHS	75.2%	75.2%	93.1%	76.5%	70.5%	< 20
Faribault-Martin	75.2%	75.2%	90.3%	91.1%	80.8%	47
Fillmore	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	88.8%	< 20
Freeborn	75.2%	75.2%	95.0%	100.0%	85.7%	28
Goodhue	75.2%	75.2%	73.3%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Grant	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	66.6%	< 20
Hennepin	75.2%	75.2%	85.4%	86.4%	84.6%	612
Houston	75.2%	75.2%	91.7%	80.0%	100.0%	< 20
Hubbard	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	83.3%	72.4%	29
Isanti	75.2%	75.2%	92.6%	85.7%	94.7%	< 20
Itasca	75.2%	75.2%	91.2%	93.7%	93.9%	66

**Table 4, page 2. Percent of Children Discharged from Out-of-Home Placement to Reunification Who Were Reunified in Less than 12 Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			87.7%	87.1%	86.3%	3,214
Kanabec	75.2%	75.5%	78.6%	75.0%	87.5%	< 20
Kandiyohi	75.2%	75.2%	90.5%	88.1%	90.9%	44
Kittson	75.2%	75.2%	60.0%	80.0%	83.3%	< 20
Koochiching	75.2%	75.2%	92.3%	88.2%	92.3%	< 20
Lac Qui Parle	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	-	85.7%	< 20
Lake	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Lake Of The Woods	75.2%	75.2%	-	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Le Sueur	75.2%	75.2%	86.7%	100.0%	83.3%	< 20
Mahnomen	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Marshall	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	< 20
McLeod	75.2%	75.2%	96.6%	96.3%	94.7%	38
Meeker	75.2%	75.2%	76.5%	72.7%	62.5%	< 20
Mille Lacs	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	87.0%	95.7%	47
MN Prairie	75.2%	75.2%			91.6%	36
Morrison	75.2%	75.2%	62.5%	72.7%	66.6%	< 20
Mower	75.2%	75.2%	93.8%	94.4%	85.7%	< 20
Nicollet	75.2%	75.2%	89.3%	91.7%	86.3%	22
Nobles	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	83.3%	24
Norman	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	71.4%	100.0%	< 20
Olmsted	75.2%	75.2%	89.7%	88.4%	88.4%	52
Otter Tail	75.2%	75.2%	96.9%	64.3%	95.2%	21
Pennington	75.2%	75.2%	84.6%	90.9%	45.4%	22
Pine	75.2%	75.2%	88.0%	95.8%	58.3%	24
Polk	75.2%	75.2%	91.7%	95.1%	100.0%	31
Pope	75.2%	75.2%	85.7%	90.0%	87.5%	< 20
Ramsey	75.2%	75.2%	89.3%	89.5%	88.2%	418
Red Lake	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Renville	75.2%	75.2%	85.7%	85.7%	91.3%	23
Rice	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	95.5%	80.0%	< 20
Roseau	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	88.2%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 4, page 3. Percent of Children Discharged from Out-of-Home Placement to Reunification Who Were Reunified in Less than 12 Months**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			87.7%	87.1%	86.3%	3,214
Scott	75.2%	75.5%	78.8%	78.6%	88.0%	25
Sherburne	75.2%	75.2%	87.0%	100.0%	100.0%	39
Sibley	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	< 20
St. Louis	75.2%	75.2%	83.8%	77.6%	82.0%	256
Stearns	75.2%	75.2%	92.3%	89.0%	92.2%	116
Stevens	75.2%	75.2%	-	66.7%	66.6%	< 20
SWHHS	75.2%	75.2%	96.2%	79.5%	90.3%	62
Swift	75.2%	75.2%	80.0%	91.7%	100.0%	< 20
Todd	75.2%	75.2%	71.4%	100.0%	77.7%	27
Traverse	75.2%	75.2%	75.0%	66.7%	100.0%	< 20
Wabasha	75.2%	75.2%	83.3%	92.3%	100.0%	< 20
Wadena	75.2%	75.2%	85.7%	100.0%	94.1%	< 20
Washington	75.2%	75.2%	98.0%	87.9%	83.9%	56
Watonwan	75.2%	75.2%	71.4%	58.3%	75.0%	< 20
Wilkin	75.2%	75.2%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	< 20
Winona	75.2%	75.2%	86.1%	96.0%	88.2%	< 20
Wright	75.2%	75.2%	78.9%	77.4%	89.2%	28
Yellow Medicine	75.2%	75.2%	100.0%	91.7%	100.0%	< 20
(Dodge)	75.2%	75.2%	88.9%	93.3%	100.0%	< 20
(Steele)	75.2%	75.2%	96.9%	96.2%	88.4%	26
(Waseca)	75.2%	75.2%	90.9%	88.2%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 5. Percent of Children in Family Foster Care Who Were Placed in a Relative Home**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			35.6%	39.5%	43.1%	9,011
Aitkin	20.9%	43.5%	28.6%	40.5%	37.5%	32
Anoka	20.9%	43.5%	28.6%	31.6%	29.9%	377
Becker	20.9%	43.5%	33.6%	46.2%	48.2%	147
Beltrami	20.9%	43.5%	35.6%	32.8%	47.1%	643
Benton	20.9%	43.5%	36.7%	40.3%	38.8%	72
Big Stone	20.9%	43.5%	50.0%	25.0%	33.3%	< 20
Blue Earth	20.9%	43.5%	20.5%	36.3%	51.6%	89
Brown	20.9%	43.5%	23.5%	38.8%	37.1%	35
Carlton	20.9%	43.5%	52.5%	51.9%	35.9%	64
Carver	20.9%	43.5%	38.8%	42.3%	51.8%	79
Cass	20.9%	43.5%	19.5%	50.0%	57.4%	87
Chippewa	20.9%	43.5%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	< 20
Chisago	20.9%	43.5%	28.9%	36.0%	46.9%	83
Clay	20.9%	43.5%	23.6%	15.3%	25.7%	140
Clearwater	20.9%	43.5%	47.4%	54.1%	56.2%	32
Cook	20.9%	43.5%	50.0%	66.6%	85.7%	< 20
Crow Wing	20.9%	43.5%	33.5%	36.1%	39.3%	165
Dakota	20.9%	43.5%	39.3%	37.0%	46.0%	204
Douglas	20.9%	43.5%	30.2%	21.0%	30.3%	33
DVHHS	20.9%	43.5%	29.7%	42.3%	31.0%	29
Faribault-Martin	20.9%	43.5%	50.6%	56.8%	63.9%	122
Fillmore	20.9%	43.5%	11.8%	16.0%	26.3%	< 20
Freeborn	20.9%	43.5%	20.8%	35.7%	35.8%	53
Goodhue	20.9%	43.5%	34.0%	41.5%	32.7%	58
Grant	20.9%	43.5%	57.1%	21.4%	20.0%	< 20
Hennepin	20.9%	43.5%	36.4%	41.6%	41.5%	1,605
Houston	20.9%	43.5%	15.0%	15.3%	38.8%	< 20
Hubbard	20.9%	43.5%	43.2%	36.7%	46.5%	73
Isanti	20.9%	43.5%	48.9%	55.3%	48.7%	82
Itasca	20.9%	43.5%	29.8%	44.8%	38.0%	142

**Table 5 page 2. Percent of Children in Family Foster Care Who Were Placed in a Relative Home**

<b>County</b>	<b>Threshold</b>	<b>High Performance Standard</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2014 Denominator</b>
Statewide			35.6%	39.5%	43.1%	9,011
Kanabec	20.9%	43.5%	55.0%	26.3%	45.0%	20
Kandiyohi	20.9%	43.5%	21.9%	34.2%	42.3%	85
Kittson	20.9%	43.5%	45.5%	50.0%	40.0%	< 20
Koochiching	20.9%	43.5%	37.8%	41.6%	37.5%	32
Lac Qui Parle	20.9%	43.5%	11.1%	0.0%	16.6%	< 20
Lake	20.9%	43.5%	70.0%	64.7%	34.6%	26
Lake Of The Woods	20.9%	43.5%	-	-	50.0%	< 20
Le Sueur	20.9%	43.5%	33.3%	29.4%	52.0%	25
Mahnomen	20.9%	43.5%	25.0%	33.3%	66.6%	< 20
Marshall	20.9%	43.5%	14.3%	75.0%	57.1%	< 20
McLeod	20.9%	43.5%	54.0%	50.0%	57.7%	71
Meeker	20.9%	43.5%	50.0%	51.5%	22.7%	22
Mille Lacs	20.9%	43.5%	36.4%	39.0%	57.2%	145
MN Prairie	20.9%	43.5%			46.2%	108
Morrison	20.9%	43.5%	26.8%	29.0%	29.4%	51
Mower	20.9%	43.5%	36.0%	40.5%	47.3%	95
Nicollet	20.9%	43.5%	31.1%	33.3%	34.1%	41
Nobles	20.9%	43.5%	15.4%	36.1%	55.5%	45
Norman	20.9%	43.5%	27.3%	71.4%	66.6%	< 20
Olmsted	20.9%	43.5%	40.0%	35.9%	33.9%	153
Otter Tail	20.9%	43.5%	27.0%	21.5%	27.5%	58
Pennington	20.9%	43.5%	20.0%	42.1%	50.0%	38
Pine	20.9%	43.5%	39.2%	47.8%	40.9%	83
Polk	20.9%	43.5%	9.5%	15.8%	20.8%	67
Pope	20.9%	43.5%	31.8%	63.1%	26.0%	23
Ramsey	20.9%	43.5%	38.3%	39.8%	38.3%	924
Red Lake	20.9%	43.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	< 20
Renville	20.9%	43.5%	26.7%	64.0%	79.4%	34
Rice	20.9%	43.5%	33.8%	38.0%	43.8%	73
Roseau	20.9%	43.5%	80.0%	18.1%	100.0%	< 20

**Table 5, page 3. Percent of Children in Family Foster Care Who Were Placed in a Relative Home**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			35.6%	39.5%	43.1%	9,011
Scott	20.9%	43.5%	39.0%	43.1%	53.8%	52
Sherburne	20.9%	43.5%	27.8%	36.6%	31.4%	70
Sibley	20.9%	43.5%	33.3%	76.9%	70.5%	< 20
St. Louis	20.9%	43.5%	34.5%	39.2%	46.1%	793
Stearns	20.9%	43.5%	32.5%	41.3%	43.7%	304
Stevens	20.9%	43.5%	0.0%	28.5%	40.0%	< 20
SWHHS	20.9%	43.5%	24.8%	25.9%	45.0%	140
Swift	20.9%	43.5%	47.4%	63.1%	29.0%	31
Todd	20.9%	43.5%	26.2%	31.0%	48.5%	68
Traverse	20.9%	43.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	< 20
Wabasha	20.9%	43.5%	50.0%	50.0%	29.4%	34
Wadena	20.9%	43.5%	75.9%	75.0%	60.0%	20
Washington	20.9%	43.5%	33.6%	46.4%	37.7%	122
Watonwan	20.9%	43.5%	38.9%	22.2%	31.2%	< 20
Wilkin	20.9%	43.5%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	< 20
Winona	20.9%	43.5%	36.8%	40.6%	46.6%	45
Wright	20.9%	43.5%	32.5%	47.2%	48.9%	143
Yellow Medicine	20.9%	43.5%	35.0%	22.2%	27.7%	< 20
(Cottonwood)	20.9%	43.5%	40.0%			-
(Dodge)	20.9%	43.5%	27.8%	38.0%	52.0%	25
(Jackson)	20.9%	43.5%	25.0%			-
(Pipestone)	20.9%	43.5%	50.0%			-
(Redwood)	20.9%	43.5%	25.0%			-
(Steele)	20.9%	43.5%	43.5%	16.6%	31.1%	45
(Waseca)	20.9%	43.5%	36.4%	48.0%	60.5%	38

**Table 6. Percent of Open Child Support Cases with Paternity Established**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			102%	102%	100%	185,347
Aitkin	90.0%	90.0%	106%	106%	105%	595
Anoka	90.0%	90.0%	106%	107%	104%	9,573
Becker	90.0%	90.0%	105%	104%	98%	1,606
Beltrami	90.0%	90.0%	96%	90%	91%	3,520
Benton	90.0%	90.0%	108%	108%	104%	1,532
Big Stone	90.0%	90.0%	116%	103%	97%	135
Blue Earth	90.0%	90.0%	104%	103%	104%	1,852
Brown	90.0%	90.0%	100%	106%	107%	781
Carlton	90.0%	90.0%	106%	102%	101%	1,448
Carver	90.0%	90.0%	106%	107%	105%	1,264
Cass	90.0%	90.0%	102%	102%	102%	1,487
Chippewa	90.0%	90.0%	102%	110%	106%	421
Chisago	90.0%	90.0%	109%	110%	108%	1,548
Clay	90.0%	90.0%	104%	103%	104%	2,167
Clearwater	90.0%	90.0%	108%	110%	105%	476
Cook	90.0%	90.0%	95%	100%	97%	139
Crow Wing	90.0%	90.0%	107%	108%	102%	2,573
Dakota	90.0%	90.0%	101%	102%	99%	10,903
Dodge	90.0%	90.0%	111%	115%	106%	680
Douglas	90.0%	90.0%	107%	105%	102%	1,023
DVHHS	90.0%	90.0%			108%	773
Faribault/Martin	90.0%	90.0%	109%	106%	107%	1,293
Fillmore	90.0%	90.0%	106%	103%	106%	469
Freeborn	90.0%	90.0%	105%	105%	102%	1,410
Goodhue	90.0%	90.0%	108%	106%	104%	1,474
Grant	90.0%	90.0%	109%	105%	100%	193
Hennepin	90.0%	90.0%	100%	100%	98%	43,442
Houston	90.0%	90.0%	111%	109%	105%	541
Hubbard	90.0%	90.0%	102%	103%	104%	851
Isanti	90.0%	90.0%	106%	107%	102%	1,466

**Table 6, page 2. Percent of Open Child Support Cases with Paternity Established**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			102%	102%	100%	185,347
Itasca	90.0%	90.0%	100%	99%	100%	1,878
Kanabec	90.0%	90.0%	105%	107%	104%	641
Kandiyohi	90.0%	90.0%	103%	101%	99%	1,792
Kittson	90.0%	90.0%	105%	112%	106%	73
Koochiching	90.0%	90.0%	111%	111%	110%	513
Lac Qui Parle	90.0%	90.0%	109%	104%	104%	168
Lake	90.0%	90.0%	107%	102%	103%	309
Lake of the Woods	90.0%	90.0%	102%	109%	104%	110
Le Sueur	90.0%	90.0%	112%	110%	105%	793
Mahnomen	90.0%	90.0%	125%	118%	100%	574
Marshall	90.0%	90.0%	111%	105%	108%	207
McLeod	90.0%	90.0%	106%	105%	103%	1,145
Meeker	90.0%	90.0%	102%	105%	101%	630
Mille Lacs	90.0%	90.0%	102%	105%	104%	1,155
Morrison	90.0%	90.0%	101%	104%	102%	1,279
Mower	90.0%	90.0%	100%	101%	96%	2,065
Nicollet	90.0%	90.0%	106%	101%	102%	1,101
Nobles	90.0%	90.0%	108%	104%	105%	887
Norman	90.0%	90.0%	114%	109%	105%	208
Olmsted	90.0%	90.0%	104%	102%	100%	4,658
Otter Tail	90.0%	90.0%	106%	108%	102%	1,620
Pennington	90.0%	90.0%	94%	99%	99%	630
Pine	90.0%	90.0%	106%	103%	101%	1,410
Polk	90.0%	90.0%	108%	107%	103%	1,426
Pope	90.0%	90.0%	105%	105%	101%	265
Ramsey	90.0%	90.0%	94%	95%	94%	26,199
Red Lake	90.0%	90.0%	112%	113%	104%	117
Renville	90.0%	90.0%	106%	107%	103%	484
Rice	90.0%	90.0%	109%	108%	104%	1,618
Roseau	90.0%	90.0%	95%	99%	98%	458

**Table 6, page 3. Percent of Open Child Support Cases with Paternity Established**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			102%	102%	100%	185,347
Scott	90.0%	90.0%	109%	110%	107%	2,203
Sherburne	90.0%	90.0%	106%	104%	102%	2,338
Sibley	90.0%	90.0%	103%	109%	106%	432
St. Louis	90.0%	90.0%	104%	104%	102%	8,650
Stearns	90.0%	90.0%	104%	106%	104%	3,977
Steele	90.0%	90.0%	111%	110%	108%	1,464
Stevens	90.0%	90.0%	110%	107%	111%	181
SWHHS	90.0%	90.0%	107%	104%	102%	2,556
Swift	90.0%	90.0%	111%	108%	106%	363
Todd	90.0%	90.0%	107%	106%	102%	755
Traverse	90.0%	90.0%	109%	132%	113%	99
Wabasha	90.0%	90.0%	113%	103%	95%	509
Wadena	90.0%	90.0%	104%	107%	108%	609
Waseca	90.0%	90.0%	108%	106%	106%	692
Washington	90.0%	90.0%	105%	104%	102%	5,039
Watonwan	90.0%	90.0%	103%	102%	103%	574
Wilkin	90.0%	90.0%	107%	105%	109%	191
Winona	90.0%	90.0%	103%	102%	99%	1,499
Wright	90.0%	90.0%	107%	107%	105%	2,933
Yellow Medicine	90.0%	90.0%	107%	103%	104%	235
(Cottonwood)	90.0%	90.0%	110%	105%		
(Jackson)	90.0%	90.0%	113%	106%		
(Pipestone)	90.0%	90.0%	106%			
(Redwood)	90.0%	90.0%	104%			

**Table 7. Percent of Expedited SNAP Applications Processed within One Business Day**

<b>County</b>	<b>Threshold</b>	<b>High Performance Standard</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2014 Denominator</b>
Statewide			63.5%	62.3%	64.0%	57,310
Aitkin	55.0%	83.0%	56.6%	59.4%	61.7%	136
Anoka	55.0%	83.0%	59.5%	57.1%	57.6%	2,760
Becker	55.0%	83.0%	73.2%	72.4%	76.7%	378
Beltrami	55.0%	83.0%	58.2%	67.4%	72.8%	1,078
Benton	55.0%	83.0%	57.8%	49.3%	61.6%	446
Big Stone	55.0%	83.0%	57.1%	61.3%	57.6%	26
Blue Earth	55.0%	83.0%	60.4%	54.7%	56.0%	510
Brown	55.0%	83.0%	66.7%	71.7%	64.9%	154
Carlton	55.0%	83.0%	79.3%	75.6%	80.6%	440
Carver	55.0%	83.0%	43.3%	36.3%	47.4%	276
Cass	55.0%	83.0%	63.8%	62.9%	61.9%	484
Chippewa	55.0%	83.0%	58.0%	36.3%	54.1%	96
Chisago	55.0%	83.0%	74.2%	75.5%	77.9%	344
Clay	55.0%	83.0%	58.7%	61.8%	61.2%	799
Clearwater	55.0%	83.0%	73.5%	77.8%	86.0%	86
Cook	55.0%	83.0%	61.9%	51.7%	72.0%	43
Crow Wing	55.0%	83.0%	68.2%	60.8%	69.7%	559
Dakota	55.0%	83.0%	58.5%	49.1%	45.0%	2,562
Dodge	55.0%	83.0%	64.5%	55.0%	52.5%	118
Douglas	55.0%	83.0%	74.4%	68.0%	66.0%	233
DVHHS	55.0%	83.0%			80.2%	177
Faribault/Martin	55.0%	83.0%	79.6%	78.8%	82.3%	346
Fillmore	55.0%	83.0%	60.2%	62.4%	60.9%	123
Freeborn	55.0%	83.0%	63.8%	73.3%	73.3%	270
Goodhue	55.0%	83.0%	63.8%	71.2%	68.4%	345
Grant	55.0%	83.0%	48.6%	48.8%	87.2%	47
Hennepin	55.0%	83.0%	69.0%	67.3%	66.4%	18,896
Houston	55.0%	83.0%	74.8%	70.1%	71.7%	78
Hubbard	55.0%	83.0%	72.6%	76.7%	73.7%	187
Isanti	55.0%	83.0%	45.4%	52.3%	67.2%	324

**Table 7, page 2. Percent of Expedited SNAP Applications Processed within One Business Day**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			63.5%	62.3%	64.0%	57,310
Itasca	55.0%	83.0%	79.1%	81.6%	84.6%	686
Kanabec	55.0%	83.0%	65.9%	66.7%	76.8%	207
Kandiyohi	55.0%	83.0%	75.8%	70.6%	63.8%	506
Kittson	55.0%	83.0%	76.0%	83.3%	66.6%	21
Koochiching	55.0%	83.0%	58.9%	53.0%	58.1%	122
Lac qui Parle	55.0%	83.0%	55.9%	85.4%	66.6%	39
Lake	55.0%	83.0%	55.4%	55.4%	71.6%	60
Lake of the Woods	55.0%	83.0%	81.3%	70.8%	81.4%	27
Le Sueur	55.0%	83.0%	71.2%	50.8%	59.5%	188
Mahnomen	55.0%	83.0%	68.9%	66.1%	79.3%	58
Marshall	55.0%	83.0%	69.0%	84.9%	75.0%	48
McLeod	55.0%	83.0%	47.6%	40.8%	64.0%	275
Meeker	55.0%	83.0%	73.9%	65.5%	73.6%	129
Mille Lacs	55.0%	83.0%	56.0%	63.7%	53.0%	245
Morrison	55.0%	83.0%	65.8%	70.9%	58.3%	240
Mower	55.0%	83.0%	60.9%	65.8%	69.4%	495
Nicollet	55.0%	83.0%	65.7%	72.5%	72.6%	205
Nobles	55.0%	83.0%	73.3%	68.2%	61.8%	254
Norman	55.0%	83.0%	89.1%	84.6%	80.5%	67
Olmsted	55.0%	83.0%	64.4%	44.8%	67.0%	1,658
Otter Tail	55.0%	83.0%	66.1%	49.8%	50.8%	405
Pennington	55.0%	83.0%	66.7%	78.5%	81.0%	153
Pine	55.0%	83.0%	75.7%	81.0%	78.7%	371
Polk	55.0%	83.0%	86.8%	86.2%	86.0%	482
Pope	55.0%	83.0%	78.4%	57.7%	58.6%	87
Ramsey	55.0%	83.0%	52.2%	53.7%	57.0%	7,505
Red Lake	55.0%	83.0%	71.4%	76.0%	64.0%	25
Renville	55.0%	83.0%	72.4%	65.0%	72.2%	137
Rice	55.0%	83.0%	48.8%	64.5%	71.8%	504
Roseau	55.0%	83.0%	64.5%	84.4%	81.0%	116

**Table 7, page 3. Percent of Expedited SNAP Applications Processed within One Business Day**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			63.5%	62.3%	64.0%	57,310
Scott	55.0%	83.0%	63.5%	70.9%	64.6%	524
Sherburne	55.0%	83.0%	77.5%	67.2%	72.3%	503
Sibley	55.0%	83.0%	41.6%	76.8%	53.4%	86
St. Louis	55.0%	83.0%	64.2%	62.5%	65.5%	3,060
Stearns	55.0%	83.0%	52.2%	46.9%	57.4%	1,570
Steele	55.0%	83.0%	74.3%	77.4%	79.3%	470
Stevens	55.0%	83.0%	70.4%	55.6%	62.2%	61
SWHHS	55.0%	83.0%	73.6%	78.1%	74.2%	525
Swift	55.0%	83.0%	87.5%	89.5%	76.4%	68
Todd	55.0%	83.0%	58.2%	60.9%	69.1%	149
Traverse	55.0%	83.0%	86.4%	93.8%	85.0%	40
Wabasha	55.0%	83.0%	77.5%	60.8%	65.1%	129
Wadena	55.0%	83.0%	69.1%	69.0%	74.0%	158
Waseca	55.0%	83.0%	71.1%	70.0%	72.4%	203
Washington	55.0%	83.0%	17.3%	35.1%	42.6%	901
Watonwan	55.0%	83.0%	69.4%	61.6%	69.5%	69
Wilkin	55.0%	83.0%	88.2%	86.7%	91.7%	85
Winona	55.0%	83.0%	70.7%	69.8%	60.0%	455
Wright	55.0%	83.0%	67.2%	63.4%	62.7%	556
Yellow Medicine	55.0%	83.0%	51.2%	59.0%	58.0%	62
(Cottonwood)	55.0%	83.0%	77.3%	73.0%		
(Jackson)	55.0%	83.0%	73.4%	76.3%		
(Pipestone)	55.0%	83.0%	75.9%			
(Redwood)	55.0%	83.0%	70.8%			

**Table 8. Percent of Cash and Food Applications Processed Timely**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			75.9%	75.8%	81.2%	133,499
Aitkin	75.0%	90.0%	81.4%	82.2%	87.2%	430
Anoka	75.0%	90.0%	78.3%	78.9%	80.9%	6,443
Becker	75.0%	90.0%	86.7%	86.8%	90.7%	900
Beltrami	75.0%	90.0%	61.3%	58.2%	76.2%	2,101
Benton	75.0%	90.0%	75.8%	72.3%	81.7%	1,071
Big Stone	75.0%	90.0%	82.4%	82.9%	83.5%	79
Blue Earth	75.0%	90.0%	79.2%	77.6%	81.0%	1,339
Brown	75.0%	90.0%	84.3%	87.4%	84.9%	431
Carlton	75.0%	90.0%	86.7%	83.2%	89.9%	1,050
Carver	75.0%	90.0%	71.6%	71.0%	77.0%	778
Cass	75.0%	90.0%	75.2%	79.1%	83.1%	1,177
Chippewa	75.0%	90.0%	77.3%	67.7%	77.6%	281
Chisago	75.0%	90.0%	81.5%	82.4%	86.4%	843
Clay	75.0%	90.0%	75.6%	79.2%	82.7%	1,778
Clearwater	75.0%	90.0%	89.9%	89.2%	93.8%	226
Cook	75.0%	90.0%	67.8%	75.6%	83.0%	106
Crow Wing	75.0%	90.0%	81.5%	75.7%	86.9%	1,568
Dakota	75.0%	90.0%	77.0%	74.0%	76.0%	6,190
Dodge	75.0%	90.0%	74.6%	76.4%	84.0%	376
Douglas	75.0%	90.0%	81.9%	78.7%	82.7%	721
DVHHS	75.0%	90.0%	-	-	91.4%	498
Faribault/Martin	75.0%	90.0%	88.1%	89.1%	92.2%	951
Fillmore	75.0%	90.0%	86.2%	84.1%	87.6%	370
Freeborn	75.0%	90.0%	81.7%	88.7%	90.1%	774
Goodhue	75.0%	90.0%	74.8%	82.0%	83.0%	764
Grant	75.0%	90.0%	81.2%	82.2%	93.8%	112
Hennepin	75.0%	90.0%	74.7%	74.0%	79.4%	39,404
Houston	75.0%	90.0%	88.0%	86.1%	90.2%	266
Hubbard	75.0%	90.0%	83.3%	88.3%	91.2%	512
Isanti	75.0%	90.0%	66.0%	74.2%	85.2%	840

**Table 8, page 2. Percent of Cash and Food Applications Processed Timely**

<b>County</b>	<b>Threshold</b>	<b>High Performance Standard</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2014 Denominator</b>
Statewide			75.9%	75.8%	81.2%	133,499
Itasca	75.0%	90.0%	84.6%	85.9%	91.2%	1,720
Kanabec	75.0%	90.0%	75.1%	77.3%	86.0%	493
Kandiyohi	75.0%	90.0%	88.2%	84.0%	86.9%	1,341
Kittson	75.0%	90.0%	87.8%	95.5%	81.7%	60
Koochiching	75.0%	90.0%	77.7%	72.5%	81.9%	354
Lac qui Parle	75.0%	90.0%	89.1%	93.4%	89.2%	111
Lake	75.0%	90.0%	69.5%	68.4%	87.7%	204
Lake of the Woods	75.0%	90.0%	88.0%	87.3%	92.7%	82
Le Sueur	75.0%	90.0%	79.7%	68.9%	81.1%	518
Mahnomen	75.0%	90.0%	82.8%	81.7%	88.4%	155
Marshall	75.0%	90.0%	87.8%	92.4%	91.2%	137
McLeod	75.0%	90.0%	74.9%	68.7%	84.1%	642
Meeker	75.0%	90.0%	86.1%	84.0%	89.7%	368
Mille Lacs	75.0%	90.0%	73.5%	80.7%	79.7%	674
Morrison	75.0%	90.0%	81.9%	82.6%	81.7%	711
Mower	75.0%	90.0%	79.1%	79.1%	85.2%	1,215
Nicollet	75.0%	90.0%	83.2%	85.0%	86.8%	585
Nobles	75.0%	90.0%	86.4%	84.2%	83.8%	606
Norman	75.0%	90.0%	95.9%	93.8%	92.3%	194
Olmsted	75.0%	90.0%	80.2%	65.7%	83.7%	3,825
Otter Tail	75.0%	90.0%	71.6%	73.2%	76.0%	1,130
Pennington	75.0%	90.0%	86.7%	91.3%	94.2%	364
Pine	75.0%	90.0%	87.9%	89.7%	90.2%	871
Polk	75.0%	90.0%	91.8%	91.0%	93.2%	1,078
Pope	75.0%	90.0%	90.8%	82.7%	85.5%	248
Ramsey	75.0%	90.0%	70.1%	73.1%	78.0%	17,737
Red Lake	75.0%	90.0%	90.1%	90.0%	90.3%	103
Renville	75.0%	90.0%	82.3%	79.5%	87.5%	377
Rice	75.0%	90.0%	63.9%	75.2%	83.2%	1,192
Roseau	75.0%	90.0%	83.9%	91.1%	92.3%	259

**Table 8, page 3. Percent of Cash and Food Applications Processed Timely**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			75.9%	75.8%	81.2%	133,499
Scott	75.0%	90.0%	82.4%	84.6%	85.7%	1,390
Sherburne	75.0%	90.0%	81.9%	78.5%	86.4%	1,239
Sibley	75.0%	90.0%	78.7%	88.1%	83.7%	227
St. Louis	75.0%	90.0%	79.3%	80.1%	82.4%	7,126
Stearns	75.0%	90.0%	65.2%	64.8%	75.3%	3,564
Steele	75.0%	90.0%	80.3%	78.3%	82.7%	1,039
Stevens	75.0%	90.0%	90.6%	72.1%	85.4%	158
SWHHS	75.0%	90.0%	83.1%	86.4%	88.8%	1,512
Swift	75.0%	90.0%	94.2%	95.1%	91.6%	203
Todd	75.0%	90.0%	80.3%	84.7%	88.2%	442
Traverse	75.0%	90.0%	92.3%	94.1%	93.9%	99
Wabasha	75.0%	90.0%	81.4%	79.2%	84.8%	343
Wadena	75.0%	90.0%	86.9%	87.4%	90.6%	509
Waseca	75.0%	90.0%	82.9%	85.7%	89.1%	485
Washington	75.0%	90.0%	50.5%	53.7%	68.0%	2,281
Watonwan	75.0%	90.0%	87.8%	83.9%	88.5%	217
Wilkin	75.0%	90.0%	93.9%	93.4%	96.7%	210
Winona	75.0%	90.0%	78.7%	83.4%	82.7%	1,101
Wright	75.0%	90.0%	77.7%	75.0%	78.7%	1,432
Yellow Medicine	75.0%	90.0%	81.6%	87.7%	89.4%	189
(Cottonwood)	75.0%	90.0%	91.1%	86.0%		
(Jackson)	75.0%	90.0%	86.6%	87.9%		
(Pipestone)	75.0%	90.0%	88.3%			
(Redwood)	75.0%	90.0%	83.9%			

**Table 9. Percent of Open Child Supprt Cases with Orders Established**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			86%	86%	88%	235,691
Aitkin	80.0%	80.0%	92%	91%	92%	842
Anoka	80.0%	80.0%	90%	90%	91%	13,336
Becker	80.0%	80.0%	86%	88%	92%	1,961
Beltrami	80.0%	80.0%	70%	73%	76%	3,171
Benton	80.0%	80.0%	91%	91%	91%	1,936
Big Stone	80.0%	80.0%	91%	89%	89%	182
Blue Earth	80.0%	80.0%	91%	93%	94%	2,609
Brown	80.0%	80.0%	92%	94%	94%	1,101
Carlton	80.0%	80.0%	90%	90%	93%	2,063
Carver	80.0%	80.0%	92%	92%	93%	1,816
Cass	80.0%	80.0%	86%	85%	86%	1,839
Chippewa	80.0%	80.0%	92%	90%	91%	574
Chisago	80.0%	80.0%	93%	93%	94%	2,215
Clay	80.0%	80.0%	87%	86%	85%	2,809
Clearwater	80.0%	80.0%	95%	93%	96%	626
Cook	80.0%	80.0%	82%	86%	89%	171
Crow Wing	80.0%	80.0%	93%	93%	94%	3,713
Dakota	80.0%	80.0%	89%	88%	88%	13,771
Dodge	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	94%	884
Douglas	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	93%	1,579
DVHHS	80.0%	80.0%			95%	1,089
Faribault/Martin	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	96%	1793
Fillmore	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	89%	698
Freeborn	80.0%	80.0%	90%	92%	93%	1,840
Goodhue	80.0%	80.0%	93%	93%	94%	1,930
Grant	80.0%	80.0%	93%	93%	96%	251
Hennepin	80.0%	80.0%	82%	82%	82%	53,099
Houston	80.0%	80.0%	93%	92%	96%	683
Hubbard	80.0%	80.0%	89%	87%	90%	1,154
Isanti	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	94%	2,057

**Table 9, page 2. Percent of Open Child Supprt Cases with Orders Established**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			86%	86%	88%	235,691
Itasca	80.0%	80.0%	89%	88%	92%	2,611
Kanabec	80.0%	80.0%	92%	91%	92%	885
Kandiyohi	80.0%	80.0%	87%	87%	88%	2,349
Kittson	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	98%	109
Koochiching	80.0%	80.0%	97%	98%	98%	684
Lac Qui Parle	80.0%	80.0%	93%	92%	96%	222
Lake	80.0%	80.0%	86%	87%	87%	507
Lake of the Woods	80.0%	80.0%	89%	89%	92%	140
LeSueur	80.0%	80.0%	94%	93%	94%	1,048
Mahnomen	80.0%	80.0%	82%	73%	93%	379
Marshall	80.0%	80.0%	90%	90%	93%	310
McLeod	80.0%	80.0%	91%	91%	92%	1,602
Meeker	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	94%	939
Mille Lacs	80.0%	80.0%	88%	89%	93%	1,592
Morrison	80.0%	80.0%	93%	91%	93%	1,952
Mower	80.0%	80.0%	81%	81%	88%	2,561
Nicollet	80.0%	80.0%	94%	93%	92%	1,477
Nobles	80.0%	80.0%	89%	87%	87%	1,010
Norman	80.0%	80.0%	93%	92%	95%	284
Olmsted	80.0%	80.0%	86%	86%	87%	5,656
Otter Tail	80.0%	80.0%	90%	92%	92%	2,268
Pennington	80.0%	80.0%	85%	86%	89%	778
Pine	80.0%	80.0%	91%	93%	96%	1,915
Polk	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	93%	1,807
Pope	80.0%	80.0%	83%	86%	87%	368
Ramsey	80.0%	80.0%	78%	77%	80%	28,756
Red Lake	80.0%	80.0%	87%	91%	95%	144
Renville	80.0%	80.0%	81%	80%	81%	623
Rice	80.0%	80.0%	79%	81%	84%	2,012
Roseau	80.0%	80.0%	90%	87%	91%	623

**Table 9, page 3. Percent of Open Child Supprt Cases with Orders Established**

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2012	2013	2014	2014 Denominator
Statewide			86%	86%	88%	235,691
Scott	80.0%	80.0%	87%	88%	90%	3,058
Sherburne	80.0%	80.0%	92%	92%	94%	3,391
Sibley	80.0%	80.0%	91%	93%	96%	599
St. Louis	80.0%	80.0%	88%	88%	90%	11,570
Stearns	80.0%	80.0%	86%	87%	89%	5,277
Steele	80.0%	80.0%	92%	92%	93%	1,967
Stevens	80.0%	80.0%	91%	91%	91%	262
SWHHS	80.0%	80.0%	89%	91%	92%	3558
Swift	80.0%	80.0%	90%	90%	92%	483
Todd	80.0%	80.0%	93%	92%	95%	1,070
Traverse	80.0%	80.0%	87%	80%	79%	117
Wabasha	80.0%	80.0%	85%	85%	85%	742
Wadena	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	96%	832
Waseca	80.0%	80.0%	92%	92%	93%	897
Washington	80.0%	80.0%	91%	93%	95%	6,667
Watonwan	80.0%	80.0%	91%	91%	92%	786
Wilkin	80.0%	80.0%	88%	87%	89%	303
Winona	80.0%	80.0%	90%	91%	93%	2,069
Wright	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	93%	4,258
Yellow Medicine	80.0%	80.0%	86%	87%	86%	382
(Cottonwood)	80.0%	80.0%	89%	92%		
(Jackson)	80.0%	80.0%	96%	96%		
(Pipestone)	80.0%	80.0%	92%			
(Redwood)	80.0%	80.0%	92%			

**Table 10. MFIP/DWP Annualized Self-Support Index**

County	Apr 2012 to Mar 2013		Apr 2013 to Mar 2014		2014/2015		Denominator
					Apr 2014 to Mar 2015		
Aitkin	75.8%	Within	86.4%	Within	83.5%	Above	93
Anoka	70.9%	Below	70.3%	Within	70.2%	Within	2,144
Becker	75.3%	Within	75.9%	Within	79.9%	Within	214
Beltrami	68.8%	Within	69.5%	Above	70.4%	Above	669
Benton	74.8%	Within	75.8%	Within	73.5%	Within	291
Big Stone	64.6%	Within	68.4%	Below	70.5%	Below	26
Blue Earth	70.8%	Within	72.1%	Within	77.8%	Within	390
Brown	85.2%	Within	83.5%	Within	81.2%	Within	110
Carlton	79.4%	Within	80.4%	Within	76.6%	Within	162
Carver	82.8%	Above	82.4%	Above	81.9%	Above	180
Cass	76.8%	Above	76.8%	Above	74.1%	Within	213
Chippewa	79.0%	Within	78.5%	Within	79.9%	Within	69
Chisago	84.0%	Above	83.3%	Above	85.0%	Above	178
Clay	75.6%	Above	78.7%	Above	78.6%	Within	446
Clearwater	71.7%	Within	77.3%	Within	77.0%	Within	60
Cook	79.3%	Within	82.2%	Within	76.4%	Within	<20
Crow Wing	78.0%	Within	79.3%	Within	79.0%	Within	363
Dakota	69.3%	Within	70.4%	Within	71.3%	Within	1,706
Dodge	76.1%	Above	83.3%	Within	83.3%	Above	92
Douglas	78.2%	Within	82.1%	Within	79.8%	Within	145
DVHHS					74.9%	Within	596
Faribault-Martin	76.4%	Within	79.3%	Within	81.7%	Above	252
Fillmore	77.7%	Within	83.9%	Within	86.7%	Within	86
Freeborn	75.1%	Within	77.3%	Below	78.1%	Within	237
Goodhue	76.7%	Within	77.9%	Within	74.3%	Within	212
Grant	83.3%	Above	91.2%	Within	91.6%	Above	45
Hennepin	60.4%	Below	61.0%	Within	61.2%	Below	10,486
Houston	77.2%	Below	74.4%	Within	78.9%	Within	94
Hubbard	75.7%	Above	81.1%	Within	78.5%	Within	112
Isanti	80.3%	Above	81.9%	Above	81.6%	Above	239

**Table 10, page 2. MFIP/DWP Annualized Self-Support Index**

County	Apr 2012 to Mar 2013		Apr 2013 to Mar 2014		2014/2015		Denominator
					Apr 2014 to Mar 2015		
Itasca	70.5%	Below	72.1%	Below	71.8%	Below	347
Kanabec	80.2%	Within	79.2%	Within	80.2%	Within	122
Kandiyohi	78.4%	Within	79.0%	Within	79.5%	Within	318
Kittson	91.7%	Above	92.0%	Above	84.0%	Within	<20
Koochiching	76.1%	Within	76.3%	Within	75.7%	Within	76
Lac Qui Parle	78.6%	Within	79.6%	Within	78.3%	Within	28
Lake	83.1%	Within	78.5%	Within	84.2%	Within	26
Lake Of The Woods	76.7%	Within	70.5%	Within	84.5%	Within	<20
Le Sueur	78.1%	Within	78.8%	Within	78.7%	Within	131
Mahnomen	85.1%	Within	61.7%	Within	66.6%	Within	81
Marshall	56.0%	Above	94.5%	Within	90.1%	Within	28
McLeod	83.8%	Within	82.7%	Within	84.0%	Within	171
Meeker	84.7%	Above	84.1%	Above	78.7%	Within	100
Mille Lacs	74.8%	Within	75.0%	Within	76.3%	Above	153
Morrison	78.2%	Within	77.8%	Within	71.1%	Below	152
Mower	74.8%	Within	75.8%	Within	75.9%	Within	295
Nicollet	72.2%	Within	75.2%	Within	72.6%	Within	234
Nobles	81.7%	Within	83.4%	Within	85.4%	Within	164
Norman	81.0%	Within	85.6%	Within	84.6%	Within	73
Olmsted	75.7%	Below	77.6%	Within	77.8%	Below	983
Otter Tail	82.3%	Within	79.8%	Above	77.7%	Within	242
Pennington	85.4%	Above	83.3%	Above	87.9%	Above	68
Pine	78.7%	Within	80.9%	Within	79.0%	Within	270
Polk	70.8%	Above	75.3%	Within	77.4%	Above	295
Pope	70.5%	Within	84.7%	Within	79.8%	Within	37
Ramsey	58.8%	Within	62.8%	Within	64.4%	Above	8,338
Red Lake	77.7%	Above	92.5%	Within	84.1%	Within	27
Renville	79.6%	Above	86.9%	Within	79.4%	Within	66
Rice	76.9%	Within	80.3%	Within	78.5%	Within	326
Roseau	84.8%	Above	84.8%	Above	87.0%	Above	42

**Table 10, page 3. MFIP/DWP Annualized Self-Support Index**

County	Apr 2012 to Mar 2013		Apr 2013 to Mar 2014		2014/2015		Denominator
					Apr 2014 to Mar 2015		
Scott	80.7%	Above	79.1%	Above	82.9%	Above	431
Sherburne	78.6%	Above	80.9%	Above	78.1%	Above	323
Sibley	82.9%	Within	81.8%	Within	86.3%	Within	50
St. Louis	67.3%	Within	67.0%	Within	67.8%	Within	1,578
Stearns	74.7%	Within	75.2%	Within	75.3%	Within	944
Steele	71.6%	Below	74.1%	Within	75.4%	Within	275
Stevens	87.2%	Within	80.0%	Above	85.6%	Above	26
SWHHS	81.4%	Above	82.9%	Above	82.6%	Within	844
Swift	81.2%	Above	84.7%	Within	74.6%	Within	56
Todd	81.5%	Within	79.5%	Above	79.1%	Within	111
Traverse	76.2%	Within	84.0%	Within	89.7%	Above	22
Wabasha	71.5%	Within	73.9%	Within	79.7%	Within	75
Wadena	71.9%	Within	71.5%	Within	70.3%	Below	125
Waseca	76.9%	Within	76.5%	Within	80.5%	Within	94
Washington	73.8%	Within	73.0%	Within	71.8%	Within	724
Watonwan	74.8%	Within	78.6%	Within	82.4%	Within	61
Wilkin	75.0%	Above	89.9%	Below	89.6%	Above	34
Winona	73.0%	Within	75.0%	Within	74.4%	Within	208
Wright	79.1%	Above	82.3%	Above	83.2%	Above	365
Yellow Medicine	73.8%	Below	68.8%	Within	79.5%	Within	40
(Cottonwood)	81.4%	Below	75.7%	Within	70.8%	Below	80
(Jackson)	86.5%	Within	75.7%	Above	81.2%	Within	47
(Pipestone)	86.4%	Within					
(Redwood)	80.0%	Within					