

Human Services Performance Management System

Human Services Performance Council
December 2016

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 \$3,904.00. 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.



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. 2016 Performance Improvement Plans	11
	C. PIP Implementation	12
	D. Performance Overview	13
	E. Challenges.....	15
V.	Technical Assistance.....	18
	A. Relationship-Building and Communications.....	18
	B. Technical Assistance Provided in 2016	18
VI.	Report Recommendations	21
	A. Response to 2015 Report Recommendations	21
	B. 2016 Report Recommendations for Calendar Year 2017	21
VII.	Commissioner Response.....	22
VIII.	Appendix A – Performance Maps by Outcome and Measure	23
IX.	Appendix B – Steering Committee on Performance and Outcome Reforms	54
X.	Appendix C –Vision, Mission, Values, and Strategies Statements	55
XI.	Appendix D – Human Services Performance Council	57

I. Executive Summary

Overview of Report

This report describes the work of the Human Services Performance Management system (Performance Management system), which monitors county/service delivery authority (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; and
- Comments from the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS).

History and Purpose

Established in 2013 in accordance with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 402A, the Performance Management system was created 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 Department of Human Services (DHS) Commissioner. Each year the Council is required to report to the legislature on the work of the Performance Management System. Appendix D contains a list of current Council members.

The focus of the Performance Management system is improvement across all mandated essential human services in Minnesota. The system encourages collaboration between counties/Service Delivery Authorities (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 identifies six desired outcomes for human services programs, and there are currently ten measures used to report county performance in reaching those outcomes. Each measure has a minimum performance threshold – a numeric level against which each county's

performance is reported. Counties falling below a threshold are required to develop a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) that will help them reach or exceed the threshold. The outcomes and measures discussed in this report are:

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 do not currently exist for outcomes five and six. Performance Management system staff are currently working with various stakeholders to develop additional system measures in the areas of children's and adult mental health and equity.

In 2016, counties received reports on their performance for the ten measures. While performance varies across the state, counties are overall doing very well on Performance Management system measures. The system also introduced PIPs for three more of the system measures in 2016, bringing the total number of measures requiring PIPs to nine. Although there was potential for more than 720 PIPs, only 39 were required. A chart summarizing overall performance is on page 11. Data tables for each measure are in the *Human Services Performance Management System – 2016 Data Supplement* (<https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrserver/Public/DHS-7425-ENG.>)

Individually, no one county was doing poorly on all or even a majority of measures in comparison to 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.

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. Legislative language changes passed in 2016 are creating the flexibility necessary to develop appropriate measures and methodology for addressing disparities statewide.

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 to improve 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. The Performance Management team will continue to work with counties and DHS program staff to address procedural changes that may help with data access.

Counties, not just those in Greater Minnesota, are also facing issues with finding appropriate staffing. Changing demographics in Minnesota will only increase this challenge, as the working age population shrinks and becomes more urban.

Technical Assistance

The Performance Management team expanded the scope of technical assistance in 2016 to include the following:

- *Facilitated Discussions:* Under this approach, the team works with program teams and county agencies to bring together various community partners or counties to identify areas of opportunity, generate solution sharing, and co-create plans to improve performance.
- *Process Improvement Consultation:* This approach involves partnering with a county to review existing processes in order to identify inefficiencies or areas where processes are not being followed and to develop recommendations for counties.
- *Measurement Development:* This area of technical assistance was developed to help counties establish the tools and process needed to create a "Culture of Data." Assistance provided may include developing outcomes, conducting a measurement inventory and gaps analysis, new measure development, reviewing the use of data in the organization to better integrate data into decision-making, developing reports, facilitating meetings, and developing dashboards.

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 DHS.

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 Statutes Chapter 402A. The Performance Management system was established 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.

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 Performance Management system. Each year the Council is required to report to the legislature. Appendix D 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 do not 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. 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. Performance Management system staff are currently working with various stakeholders to develop additional system measures in the areas of children's and adult mental health and equity. 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 new measures until the following year.

C. Remedies Process

The remedies process is described in legislation as the method for holding counties 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 or to DHS

Each measure in the system 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.

Counties that do not meet the threshold for a particular measure are required to develop a PIP that indicates the steps they will take to improve performance on that measure. Counties experiencing an extraordinary, unforeseen event that they believe prevented them from meeting a threshold have 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’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, September, and December of 2016, the Performance Management team sent each county a report that detailed outcomes and measures, and discussed each measure's importance. The reports provided data specific to each county, 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
Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure		
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%
Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation		
Percent of current child support paid.....	Unique Historical	80%
Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified with 12 months.....	75.2%	75.2%
Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential		
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%
Outcome 4: People are economically secure		
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 Unique 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. Currently, measures are grouped as follows.
 - Meeting the threshold on two of the three Child Safety and Permanency measures;
 - Meeting the threshold on both of the cash and food application timeliness measures; and
 - 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. 2016 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 PIPs implemented for nine of the ten measures in 2016, there was potential for more than 720 PIPs, yet there are currently only 39.

Measure	Minimum Performance Threshold	High Performance Standard	Counties Requiring PIPs	Above Threshold/ Below Standard	Above High Standard
Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure					
Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months	94.7%	94.7%	0 Counties	57 Counties	57 Counties
Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months	80.0%	95.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation					
Percent of current child support paid	Unique to each County	80%	15 Counties	56 Counties	7 Counties
Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months	75.2%	75.2%	3 Counties	68 Counties	68 Counties
Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential					
Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home	20.9%	45.0%	1 County	25 Counties	50 Counties
Percent of open child support cases with paternity established	90%	90%	0 Counties	78 Counties	78 Counties
Outcome 4: People are economically secure					
Percent of Expedited SNAP applications processed within one business day	55%	83%	10 Counties	60 Counties	8 Counties
Percent of cash assistance and SNAP applications processed timely	75%	90%	2 Counties	54 Counties	21 Counties
Percent of open child support cases with an order established	80%	80%	1 County	77 Counties	77 Counties
Minnesota Family Investment Program/ Diversionary Work Program Self-Support Index	Range of Expected Performance	Above Range of Expected Performance	7 Counties Below Expected Range	55 Counties Within Expected Range	20 Counties Above Expected Range

No one county was doing poorly on all or a majority of measures compared to minimum performance thresholds, and many counties were above high performance standards. However, all counties had room for improvement. Appendix A includes measure narratives and performance maps. The *Human Services Performance Management System – 2016 Data Supplement* contains data tables for each measure.

C. PIP Implementation

Data for measures are available at different times throughout the year depending on the program area. In an effort to provide counties with ample time to implement improvement strategies, data for each measure is shared as it becomes available and counties are notified immediately if a PIP is required. Below is the release schedule for data in 2016.

February 2016 – Child Support

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

April 2016 –Public Assistance

- Expedited SNAP application timeliness
- SNAP and Cash assistance application timeliness

September 2016 – Child Welfare and Self-Support Index

- Repeat determination of maltreatment (children)
- Timely establishment of permanency
- Percent of children placed with relatives
- Self-Support Index

December 2016 – Adult Protection and Child Support (data on child support measures will be released twice in 2016 in order to align the data release more closely with the Federal Fiscal Year)

- Repeat determination of maltreatment (vulnerable adults)
- Child support paid
- Child support orders established
- Paternity established

Counties requiring PIPs are notified via email, certified letter, and a call to the county social services director. Counties have the right to file claims if they believe there are extenuating circumstances impacting performance. The Performance Management team and the Human Services Performance Council each review extenuating circumstance claims and make recommendations to the commissioner to approve or deny claims. Of the 40 original PIP notifications issued, there were five claims filed for extenuating circumstances. Of the five claims, one was approved and the county no longer had to develop a PIP.

D. Performance Overview

Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure

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 vulnerable adults with a substantiated or inconclusive maltreatment allegation who do not experience a subsequent substantiated or inconclusive maltreatment allegation of the same type within six months

Statewide average performance improved on the repeat child maltreatment measure. In 2015, 96.8 percent of children with a maltreatment determination did not experience a repeat within six months. This is up slightly from 96.5 percent 2014. There were no counties falling below the threshold of 94.7 percent, compared to two counties below in 2014, and six counties below the threshold in 2013. The Performance Management system will be reviewing this measure, as well as the other two child welfare measures, in 2017 to determine if changes are warranted due to required changes in federal reporting and impacts resulting from recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on the Protection of Children.

The vulnerable adult maltreatment measure was added to the system in 2015, and the Performance Management team issued baseline performance to counties in July of that year. The intention was to introduce PIPs in 2016. However, the launch of MAARC – the Minnesota Adult Abuse Reporting Center – has led to changes in how data is collected and reported. The Performance Management team reissued baseline data to counties in December 2016, and PIPs will start in 2017.

Baseline data for 2015 shows that the statewide average for this measure is 92.9 percent, just below the high performance standard of 95.0 percent. Performance on this measure can fluctuate quite a bit, as the number of vulnerable adults included in this measure is small.

Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation

Measure(s) in this area include:

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

Statewide, Minnesota ranks in the top five states in the nation for percent of child support paid. Though only seven counties are meeting the federal standard, the vast majority (69) are within ten percentage points. 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.

PIPs were introduced in 2015, with each county having a unique threshold based on historical performance. There were 15 counties requiring PIPs. The Performance Management team will be reviewing the threshold methodology in 2017.

In 2015, 84.3 percent of children statewide who were discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification were reunified in less than 12 months. This is down 2.0 percentage points from 2014, and 2.8 percentage points from 2013. There are three counties in 2015 who were below the threshold of 75.2 percent and completed PIPs. Performance on this measure varied widely statewide, from 45 percent to 100 percent, and is often impacted by small numbers, or the ability of families to make adequate progress toward reunification goals. The number of children under tribal jurisdiction can also impact this measure.

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

Measure(s) in this area include:

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

With a statewide average of 50.6 percent in 2015 of children in family foster care who were placed in a relative's home, there was only one county below the threshold of 20.9 percent. Performance on this measure has been improving steadily over the past five years, currently up 20.4 percentage points from the statewide average of 30.2 percent in 2010.

Performance on the child support measure related to the establishment of paternity is high. 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. The statewide average is 99 percent, and no county had a PIP.

Outcome 4: People are economically secure

Measure(s) in this area include:

- Percent of expedited SNAP applications processed within one business day
- Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely
- Percent of open child support cases with an order established
- Minnesota Family Investment Program/Diversions Work Program Self-Support Index

County performance statewide is down for the expedited SNAP measure. In 2014, 64.0 percent of expedited SNAP cases were processed within one business day, while in 2015, 59.4 percent of cases were processed within one business day. Though statewide performance was down, some counties saw significant increases as large as 30 percentage points, with eleven counties experiencing double-digit increases. For counties with improvement in 2015, the average increase was 7.7 percentage points,

while for those decreasing, the average was 6.4 percentage points. Compared to the threshold of 55 percent for this measure, ten counties needed to complete PIPs.

The decrease in expedited SNAP performance impacted the statewide percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely. In 2015, 80.6 percent of applications were processed in a timely manner statewide, down slightly from the 81.2 percent reported in 2014. Though down, performance in 2015 was still 4.8 percentage points above 2013 performance. The average increase was 3.0 percentage points, and there were eight counties that improved more than five percentage points. Only two counties fell below the 75.2 percent threshold in 2015; in comparison, there were fifteen counties below the threshold in 2013, and one in 2014.

Performance on the child support measures continues to be high, with most counties earning the maximum federal bonus based on their performance. Nearly all counties (98.6 percent) were meeting the federal standard of 80% with a child support order established for their open child support cases, with only one county requiring a PIP.

On the Self-Support Index, there were seven counties who performance was below their Expected Range of Performance and were required to complete a PIP. The vast majority of counties (55) performed within their Expected Range of Performance, and 20 counties had performance that was above their expected range.

E. Challenges

Racial and Ethnic Disparities

The Performance System is legislatively mandated to assess performance around disparities. Under the methodology originally in statute, there were no PIPs for racial and ethnic disparities. This did 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 was above the threshold overall for a racial or ethnic group, the previous legislation did not allow the system to address significant disparities that might still exist between outcomes for those communities and the majority community.

Therefore, in 2015, the Council recommended editing the statutory language to require that disparities be addressed while not dictating the methodology used in order to 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. This legislation was passed during the 2016 session, and the language now reads:

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

The county or service delivery authority has a performance disparity for a racial or ethnic subgroup, even if the county or service delivery authority met the threshold for the overall population. The Council shall make recommendations on performance disparities and the commissioner shall make the final determination.

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.

In April 2016, the Performance Management team reconvened the disparities workgroup that met in late 2014 to begin to define how the system will assess disparities. In late 2016, the team began interviewing counties already addressing disparities in order to develop best practices and strategies that can be shared statewide. The team will convene additional workgroups in 2017 to develop methodology for assessing and addressing disparities, with the intention of introducing baseline measure/measures in late 2017.

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.

Human Services Performance Management System

Ultimately, new and integrated electronic information systems will be necessary to develop a more cohesive approach to performance improvement. DHS is currently in the midst of a multi-year initiative to not only modernize, but also to integrate its systems to better serve the people of Minnesota.

DHS is currently in the process of launching an agency-wide data visualization tool that will provide counties with secure access to more data, allowing them to make more timely decisions.

Staffing

As the team visited counties in Greater Minnesota and attended regional meetings, a common theme appeared. Counties in outstate Minnesota are having a harder time finding and keeping a certain staff positions filled. Difficulties were impacted by the availability of individuals with the right skill set in certain geographic regions, and the loss of staff to other counties with higher pay grades. While shrinking populations are not an issue faced by urban counties, they, too, report increased difficulty finding and keeping workers with the right skill set. Given the changes facing Minnesota with an aging and increasingly urban demographic and a shrinking workforce, finding skilled staff throughout the state will continue to be an issue into the foreseeable future.

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. 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 Conference, and the Cultural and Ethnic Communities Leadership Council.

In addition, the team travelled throughout the state to meet with county leaders and team members presented regularly at regional and supervisory meetings. Team members also met with counties individually to provide information on the system and solicit feedback. With the hire of a Communications Coordinator in late 2016, newsletters and other tools will be introduced in 2017.

B. Technical Assistance Provided in 2016

In 2016, the Performance Management Team continued the work started in 2015 to assist counties in improving their performance on the measures in the Performance Management system. The types of technical assistance provided in 2015 included:

- *Performance Improvement Collaborative:* 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.

The Performance Management team expanded the scope of technical assistance in 2016 to include the following:

- *Facilitated Discussions:* Under this approach, the team works with program teams and county agencies to bring together various community partners or counties to identify areas of opportunity, generate solution sharing, and co-create plans to improve performance.
- *Process Improvement Consultation:* This approach involves partnering with a county to review existing processes in order to identify inefficiencies or areas where processes are not being followed and to develop recommendations for counties.
- *Measurement Development:* This area of technical assistance was developed to help counties establish the tools and process needed to create a “Culture of Data.” Assistance provided may include:
 - Working with counties to develop Population Outcomes by conducting a Results Based Accountability session, conducting a Measurement Inventory and Gap Analysis to develop a measurement roadmap, and assisting in new measures development and implementation.
 - Reviewing the use of data in the organization and consulting on the development of process to better integrate data into decision-making, which could include the development of reports, facilitating meetings, developing dashboards.

Throughout the year, the Performance Management team partnered with DHS program areas and counties to provide technical assistance to help improve statewide performance.

Child Support

Focusing on child support, the team:

- Conducted statewide research on strategies used by successful counties on the Current Child Support Paid measure, reviewed data and worked with the Child Support Division at DHS to identify counties who made strong progress; and interviewed those counties to understand their success. The resulting Improvement Strategies Brief was shared with all counties as part of the February Child Support Report.
- Partnered with Blue Earth County to facilitate a workgroup with the County Attorney’s Office and the Child Support Team identify potential opportunities and jointly develop an action plan to increase collections.
- Applied for and was selected to receive an Executive Pathway intern for the summer of 2017. This resource will research data as well as the factors influence impacting Child Support collections. The information gathered will be used to develop stronger reporting, potentially enhancing the existing Child Support Paid measure.

- Began planning a joint session between the Child Support Division at DHS and the Blue Earth Child Support Team to develop customized reports to help the agency monitor their progress and better allocate resources toward improving collection performance.

Disparities Measurement

In the area of disparities measurement, the team:

- Reconvened the disparities workgroup of November 2014 to develop next steps.
- Developed a long-range plan for developing disparities measures.
- Interviewed seven counties to better understand the work they are doing and the progress they have made in addressing disparate outcomes for people served, and contacted additional counties for interviews to ensure a state-wide perspective. This information will be used to develop some best practices and tools to be shared with all counties, which could include case studies, training materials, or the development of communities of practice to help counties in their work on addressing disparities.

Learning Network

Early in 2016, the Performance Management Team began working with the University Of Minnesota Humphrey School Of Public Policy to develop a concept that would work to break down programmatic and operational barriers between counties and DHS to improve human service performance. Launched in the Spring, this initiative is called The Learning Network, and it brings together representatives from state, county, and tribal governments to learn together and co-create human services that are increasingly effective, innovative, and change lives. Throughout the year, the Performance Management team provided direction for the initiative as key members of the scoping team, and participated in two multi-day Management Learning Communities where key County, DHS, and Tribal leaders came together to identify key areas where the Learning Network could help provide assistance. Currently, these areas are being developed from there targeted research and assistance will be applied.

VI. Report Recommendations

A. Response to 2015 Report Recommendations

The Council made several recommendations in its 2015 Report to the Legislature. Below is a summary of the activities taken in 2016 to address the recommendations:

- Amended the legislative language to remove the prescriptive language around the assessment of disparities (passed during the 2016 Legislative Session);
- Reconvened the disparities workgroup and created a strategic plan for developing a methodology for assessing equity in county performance;
- Convened a workgroup of DHS, counties, and stakeholders to explore adding measures in the areas of adult and children's mental health;
- Adjusted existing child welfare measures to match changes in federal reporting requirements;
- Researched, wrote, and distributed briefs on Improvement Strategies for key program areas, including Expedited SNAP and child support;
- Established regular county outreach, including attendance at multiple regional meetings, and visiting more than a dozen counties; and
- Launched the Learning Network.

B. 2016 Report Recommendations for Calendar Year 2017

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

- Introduce a measure and/or a methodology for assessing disparities at the county level;
- Continue work toward adopting new measures in the areas of mental health, health care, long-term care and disability services;
- Support ongoing efforts to simplify eligibility rules;
- Provide input into information technology systems modernization efforts;
- Launch both an internal (DHS-focused) and an external (county-focused) system newsletter;
- Introduce a visualization and analysis tool providing counties with secure data access;
- Establish a regular process for reviewing and updating system outcomes, measures, and thresholds as part of a long-term strategic plan; and
- Continue engagement efforts by visiting at least 20 counties per year.

VII. Commissioner Response

Co-Chairs Toni Carter and Charles Johnson
Human Services Performance Council
C/O Minnesota Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 65997
Saint Paul, MN 55164-0997

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

Thank you for your continued work and achievements with the Human Services Performance Management System and its mission to improve outcomes across all mandated essential human services in Minnesota. I have had the opportunity to review your report; you continue to meet the intent of state law defining your responsibility while going above and beyond to ensure Minnesota's human service delivery is meeting the needs of Minnesota's children and adults.

I agree with all of the recommendations in the report and am particularly interested in your continued focus on measures of equity. I appreciate your candor in explaining the difficulties with these measures and their importance. Minnesota continues to have challenges with providing services to communities of color and in addressing disparate outcomes for those communities. I was pleased to support 2016 legislative changes creating the flexibility necessary to develop statewide disparity measures. This is a challenging area of performance management for all state agencies; I think you are taking the right partners and approach to developing meaningful measures.

I am encouraged by the direction of this work to provide more and easier access to data to counties in 2017. Counties need resources to learn from their work and to make informed decisions; this effort to standardize and share data will improve county performance and support our partnerships.

The expansion of technical assistance by the Human Services Performance Management Team is exciting; I look forward to seeing results in 2017. Process improvement consultation and county measurement development are valuable resources. I also look forward to seeing more results from the measures regarding vulnerable adults and quality of life factors.

Thank you for your continued service to the Human Services Performance Council, to counties, and most importantly to Minnesotans. I look forward to our continue work together.

Sincerely,

Emily Johnson Piper,

Commissioner

VIII. 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:

<i>Outcome 1: Adults and children are safe and secure</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months • Percent of vulnerable adults with a maltreatment determination with no subsequent determination within six months 	Page 26
<i>Outcome 2: Children have stability in their living situation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of current child support paid • Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified in less than 12 months 	Page 32
<i>Outcome 3: Children have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of children in family foster care that were placed in a relative home • Percent of child support cases with paternity established 	Page 38
<i>Outcome 4: People are economically secure</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of SNAP applications processed within one business day • Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely • Percent of open child support cases with an order established • MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index 	Page 44

Data Supplement

Tables in the *Human Services Performance Management System – 2016 Data Supplement* provide the most recent three years of data for all measures with the most recent year's denominator.

2016 Performance Improvement Plans

Performance Improvement Plans have been implemented for nine of the ten measures in the system. While performance on the measures varies across the state, counties are overall doing well: there was potential for more than 720 PIPs, yet there were only 39.

Measure	Minimum Performance Threshold	Counties with PIPs	2015 Performance	2015 Denominator	2014 Performance
Percent of children with a maltreatment determination who do not experience a repeat maltreatment determination within six months	94.7%	-	-	-	-
Percent of children discharged from out-of-home placement to reunification who were reunified with 12 months	75.2%	Beltrami	59.0%	188	57.0%
		Hubbard	66.7%	30	72.4%
		Wright	72.7%	44	89.2%
Percent of children in family foster care that were placed with relatives	20.9%	Des Moines Valley	14.8%	27	31.0%
Percent of Cash Assistance and SNAP Applications Processed Timely	75.0%	Hennepin	74.2%	35,450	79.4%
		Washington	72.2%	2,418	67.9%
Percent of Expedited SNAP Applications Processed within One Business Day	55.0%	Benton	52.0%	430	61.6%
		Blue Earth	52.8%	522	56.0%
		Carver	52.6%	241	47.4%
		Dakota	49.1%	2,263	45.0%
		Fillmore	45.0%	102	60.9%
		Hennepin	50.9%	15,946	66.4%
		Nobles	42.1%	228	61.8%
		Otter Tail	54.2%	431	50.8%
		Washington	45.1%	967	42.6%
		Watonwan	52.4%	82	69.5%
Minnesota Family Investment Program/Diversionsary Work Program Self-Support Index	Within Range of Expected Performance	Anoka	68.6%	2,027	70.0%
		Hennepin	60.4%	10,250	61.2%
		Hubbard	68.3%	100	78.5%
		Itasca	74.6%	314	71.8%
		Kandiyohi	75.3%	338	79.5%
		Olmsted	76.4%	940	77.8%
		Wadena	67.1%	105	70.3%
Percent of vulnerable adults who do not experience repeat maltreatment of the same type within six months	80.0%	-	-	-	-

Human Services Performance Management System

Measure	Minimum Performance Threshold	Counties with PIPs	2015 Threshold	2015 Performance	2014 Performance
Percent of Child Support Cases with Paternity Established	90.0%	-	-	-	-
Percent of Open Child Support Cases with an Order Established	80.0%	Beltrami	80.0%	76.98%	76.00%
Percent of Current Child Support that is Paid	Custom Historical Threshold Unique to Each County	Benton	76.58%	75.39%	75.93%
		Cook	67.87%	64.86%	64.87%
		Crow Wing	72.83%	72.05%	72.37%
		Dakota	71.99%	71.92%	71.56%
		Kanabec	76.75%	74.84%	75.34%
		Kandiyohi	76.56%	75.73%	76.36%
		Lake	75.54%	74.43%	74.27%
		Le Sueur	75.21%	74.91%	75.12%
		Mahnomen	65.85%	61.81%	65.85%
		Pine	74.88%	74.48%	73.74%
		Rice	76.19%	75.79%	75.45%
		Stevens	76.30%	72.10%	75.74%
		Swift	76.90%	73.86%	76.59%
		Traverse	74.76%	71.68%	74.76%
		Winona	75.94%	74.94%	75.64%

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 have recently changed. Both the measures and associated thresholds will be reviewed in 2017.


How is Minnesota doing?

Statewide in 2015, 96.8 percent of children were not the subject of a repeat determination within six months. This is up slightly from 96.5 percent in 2014. Assessed against the threshold of 94.7 percent, there were no counties falling the threshold. Comparatively, there were two counties below the threshold in 2014 and six counties below in 2013. About 65 percent of counties had no children with subsequent maltreatment determinations within six months of the first each year, 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.

FIGURE 1A

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 quartiles
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2015

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?

The threshold for this measure is 80.0 percent and the high performance standard is 95.0 percent. Work is still being conducted on the process for assessing counties with 20 or fewer allegations in the measure, which is the case for the majority of counties. This process will be established prior to the requirement for PIPs in November 2017.

How is Minnesota doing?


The statewide average for this measure is 92.9 percent, just below the high performance standard of 95.0 percent. The number of vulnerable adults included in this measure can be quite small, with nearly half of

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 November 2017.

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.

FIGURE 1B

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



* = Number of cases less than 20
 County data grouped by quartiles
 Source: Dept of Human Services data CY2015

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, availability of community resources to help parents find/keep employment and address issues leading to unemployment, and the state minimum wage.

What is the threshold for this measure?

The current threshold for this measure is a historical threshold that is unique to each county. This threshold was developed by a state-county-advocate workgroup. This workgroup 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. Performance for each county is compared against their unique historical threshold, and those counties with performance both below their individual threshold and the state median are required to complete at PIP. The Performance Management team will be reviewing this methodology in 2017.

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. 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) 2015, 73.43 percent of current child support was paid, up from 72.46 percent in FFY 2014. Performance varied from 61.81 percent of support paid to 85.84 percent. Fifteen counties were below both their historical threshold and the state median, and were required to develop PIPs.

Figure 2A shows statewide performance on this measure.

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 2015, the majority of counties were above the high performance standard of 75.2 percent, while five counties fell below the threshold and were required to develop PIPs. Overall, about 84 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.

FIGURE 2B

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 2015

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, 51 counties were at or above the state standard of 43.5%, in comparison with 35 in 2014 and just 16 counties in 2012. Statewide 50.6 percent of children were placed with relatives, up 7.5 percentage points over last year. Only one county fell below the minimum performance threshold in 2015.

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.

FIGURE 3A

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 2015

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?

The threshold for this measure is 90 percent, which is tied to the federal standard used for a bonus funding formula. 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 99 percent since 2010 and just below that in 2008 and 2009. No counties were required to complete a PIP.

Figure 3B shows statewide performance on this measure.

FIGURE 3B

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 FFY2014

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?

The majority of counties (68) are above the minimum performance threshold for this meeting, and nearly half of counties are above 70 percent. In 2015, 59.4 percent of all Expedited SNAP applications statewide were processed within one business day, down from 64.0 percent in 2014. Ten counties fell below the minimum performance threshold.

Figure 4A shows statewide performance on this measure.

FIGURE 4A

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 2015

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 10th 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 2015, 80.6 percent of cash and SNAP applications were processed timely, down from 81.2 in 2014 and up from 75.8 in 2013. Three counties fell below the performance threshold and 21 counties were above the high performance standard. Performance varied from 72.2 percent to 98.2 percent.

Figure 4B shows statewide performance on this measure.

FIGURE 4B

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 CY 2015

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 performance data in January 2016.



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 one county met the 80 percent federal goal and was required to complete a PIP. Statewide performance over the past three years has averaged from 86 to 89 percent.

Figure 4C shows statewide performance on this measure.

FIGURE 4C

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 FFY2014

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, 68.0 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 2.8 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.

FIGURE 4D

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index



* = Number of cases less than 20
 County data grouped by quintiles
 Source: Dept of Human Services data April 2015 - March 2016

Minnesota Department of Human Services
 Human Services Performance Management

IX. Appendix B – 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.

X. Appendix C –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.

XI. Appendix D – 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
- Vacant

Representing AMC:

- Toni Carter, county commissioner, Ramsey County
- Linda Higgins, county commissioner, Hennepin County
- Genny Reynolds, county commissioner, Mille Lacs County

Representing DHS:

- Charles Johnson, deputy commissioner
- Robert Meyer, performance management director, Continuing Care Administration
- Wendy Underwood, director of county relations

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:

- Ben Bement, director of human services, White Earth Tribal Council
- Dr. Arnoldo Curiel, vice president, racial equity & public policy, YWCA Minneapolis
- Vacant

Human Services Performance Management System – Data Supplement

Human Services Performance Council

December 2016

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

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 2016.)

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 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	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			97.00%	96.50%	96.80%	2050
Aitkin	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Anoka	94.70%	94.70%	95.70%	97.40%	100.00%	95
Becker	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	46
Beltrami	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	95.00%	40
Benton	94.70%	94.70%	92.50%	100.00%	100.00%	26
Big Stone	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	-	0
Blue Earth	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	21
Brown	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	93.30%	<20
Carlton	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Carver	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Cass	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Chippewa	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	-	100.00%	<20
Chisago	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	92.90%	<20
Clay	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	<20
Clearwater	94.70%	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Cook	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	-	0
Crow Wing	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	76.90%	100.00%	<20
Dakota	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	98.70%	96.20%	104
Des Moines Valley	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Douglas	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	93.50%	96.60%	29
Faribault Martin	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	92.60%	100.00%	43
Fillmore	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Freeborn	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	93.30%	100.00%	<20
Goodhue	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	85.70%	100.00%	<20
Grant	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Hennepin	94.70%	94.70%	94.00%	95.10%	95.60%	631
Houston	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	-	0
Hubbard	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Isanti	94.70%	94.70%	95.20%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Itasca	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	22

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	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			97.00%	96.50%	96.80%	2050
Kanabec	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	-	100.00%	<20
Kandiyohi	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	96.90%	92.30%	<20
Kittson	94.70%	94.70%	-	-	100.00%	<20
Koochiching	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Lac Qui Parle	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	-	0
Lake	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	-	100.00%	<20
Lake Of The Woods	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	-	0
Le Sueur	94.70%	94.70%	85.70%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Mahnomen	94.70%	94.70%	-	-	-	0
Marshall	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	-	100.00%	<20
McLeod	94.70%	94.70%	94.10%	100.00%	96.40%	28
Meeker	94.70%	94.70%	50.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Mille Lacs	94.70%	94.70%	97.20%	100.00%	100.00%	23
MnPrairie	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	100.00%	23
Morrison	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Mower	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	90.00%	20
Nicollet	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Nobles	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Norman	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Olmsted	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	95.60%	100.00%	<20
Otter Tail	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	20
Pennington	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	-	0
Pine	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%	<20
Polk	94.70%	94.70%	90.90%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Pope	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Ramsey	94.70%	94.70%	99.50%	96.50%	99.60%	228
Red Lake	94.70%	94.70%	-	-	100.00%	<20
Renville	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	95.20%	21
Rice	94.70%	94.70%	91.60%	100.00%	95.00%	20
Rock	94.70%	94.70%	-	-	-	0

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		2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals				97.00%	96.50%	96.80%	2050
Renville	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	95.20%	21	
Rice	94.70%	94.70%	91.60%	100.00%	95.00%	20	
Rock	94.70%	94.70%	-	-	-	0	
Roseau	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20	
Scott	94.70%	94.70%	85.00%	95.40%	92.90%	<20	
Sherburne	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	96.60%	93.80%	<20	
Sibley	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	88.90%	<20	
Southwest HHS	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	90.00%	<20	
St Louis	94.70%	94.70%	98.60%	95.80%	97.10%	137	
Stearns	94.70%	94.70%	94.40%	97.50%	96.80%	62	
Steele	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	-	0	
Stevens	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	-	-	0	
Swift	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	71.40%	90.00%	<20	
Todd	94.70%	94.70%	-	100.00%	100.00%	<20	
Traverse	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	50.00%	<20	
Wabasha	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20	
Wadena	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20	
Washington	94.70%	94.70%	98.20%	97.60%	96.60%	29	
Watonwan	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20	
White Earth Band	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	-	0	
Wilkin	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20	
Winona	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	20	
Wright	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%	97.50%	40	
Yellow Medicine	94.70%	94.70%		100.00%		0	
(Jackson)	94.70%	94.70%				0	
(Dodge)	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%		0	
(Cottonwood)	94.70%	94.70%				0	
(Pipestone)	94.70%	94.70%				0	
(Redwood)	94.70%	94.70%				0	
(Waseca)	94.70%	94.70%	100.00%	100.00%		0	

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			94.60%	95.20%	92.90%	5,238
Aitkin	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Anoka	80.00%	95.00%	92.70%	92.70%	97.06%	376
Becker	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Beltrami	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.33%	44
Benton	80.00%	95.00%	95.60%	95.40%	100.00%	40
Big Stone	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	<20
Blue Earth	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	37
Brown	80.00%	95.00%	91.60%	80.00%	100.00%	<20
Carlton	80.00%	95.00%	95.10%	86.60%	82.98%	71
Carver	80.00%	95.00%	90.90%	94.70%	91.67%	59
Cass	80.00%	95.00%	96.40%	96.40%	96.43%	48
Chippewa	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	92.86%	24
Chisago	80.00%	95.00%	96.00%	84.20%	83.33%	54
Clay	80.00%	95.00%	92.70%	97.40%	95.78%	298
Clearwater	80.00%	95.00%	91.30%	85.70%	88.00%	42
Cook	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Crow Wing	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	90.48%	41
Dakota	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	96.40%	96.99%	225
Douglas	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
DVHHS	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Faribault/Martin	80.00%	95.00%	95.60%	93.20%	86.05%	75
Fillmore	80.00%	95.00%	90.90%	96.20%	100.00%	<20
Freeborn	80.00%	95.00%	85.70%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Goodhue	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	23
Grant	80.00%	95.00%	90.00%	90.00%	75.00%	<20
Hennepin	80.00%	95.00%	95.30%	96.20%	96.32%	1389
Houston	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Hubbard	80.00%	95.00%	90.00%	100.00%	100.00%	20
Isanti	80.00%	95.00%	98.40%	100.00%	92.31%	44
Itasca	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<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	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			94.60%	95.20%	92.90%	5,238
Kanabec	80.00%	95.00%	77.40%	88.40%	100.00%	34
Kandiyohi	80.00%	95.00%	97.20%	97.50%	100.00%	26
Kittson	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	<20
Koochiching	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	<20
Lac qui Parle	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	85.71%	<20
Lake of the Woods	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	0.00%	-	0
Le Sueur	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	90.00%	84.62%	37
Mahnomen	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
McLeod	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Meeker	80.00%	95.00%	94.70%	95.00%	100.00%	<20
Mille Lacs	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
MN Prairie	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	95.00%	90.00%	50
Morrison	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Mower	80.00%	95.00%	94.50%	95.80%	91.11%	70
Nicollet	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Nobles	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	90.91%	<20
Norman	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Olmsted	80.00%	95.00%	96.80%	91.80%	96.55%	58
Otter Tail	80.00%	95.00%	48.70%	91.50%	91.71%	344
Pennington	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Pine	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	93.70%	86.79%	90
Polk	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	21
Pope	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	89.60%	90.91%	32
Ramsey	80.00%	95.00%	99.10%	100.00%	98.37%	232
Red Lake	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Renville	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Rice	80.00%	95.00%	96.00%	91.50%	76.67%	59
Roseau	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Scott	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.75%	28
Sherburne	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	95.45%	32

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			94.60%	95.20%	92.90%	5,238
Sibley	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	87.50%	100.00%	<20
St. Louis	80.00%	95.00%	94.00%	95.90%	89.57%	161
Stearns	80.00%	95.00%	90.20%	96.90%	87.78%	422
Stevens	80.00%	95.00%	68.10%	94.10%	100.00%	<20
SWHHS	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	98.70%	97.87%	85
Swift	80.00%	95.00%	77.70%	100.00%	87.50%	<20
Todd	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Traverse	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	<20
Wabasha	80.00%	95.00%	75.00%	92.30%	100.00%	21
Wadena	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Washington	80.00%	95.00%	95.50%	98.10%	88.64%	79
Watonwan	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<20
Wilkin	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	88.80%	100.00%	<20
Winona	80.00%	95.00%	92.70%	88.80%	92.31%	46
Wright	80.00%	95.00%	91.40%	94.00%	94.23%	99
Yellow Medicine	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	90.00%	20
(Dodge)	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%		
(Cottonwood)	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
(Faribault)	80.00%	95.00%	95.60%			
(Jackson)	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
(Martin)	80.00%	95.00%				
(Lincoln)	80.00%	95.00%				
(Lyon)	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%			
(Murray)	80.00%	95.00%				
(Pipestone)	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
(Redwood)	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
(Rock)	80.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
(Steele)	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%		
(Waseca)	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%		

Table 3. Percent of Current Child Support Paid

County	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator	2016 Threshold
Statewide	71.83%	72.46%	73.43%	\$618,447,004	74.13%
Aitkin	71.27%	74.16%	77.13%	\$1,794,110	79.26%
Anoka	72.34%	73.39%	74.43%	\$44,516,829	75.39%
Becker	68.21%	68.23%	69.68%	\$4,028,269	69.96%
Beltrami	63.73%	64.69%	66.35%	\$4,989,346	67.09%
Benton	74.94%	75.83%	75.39%	\$5,594,521	75.46%
Big Stone	81.23%	78.89%	82.28%	\$599,780	80.00%
Blue Earth	68.79%	69.02%	71.12%	\$8,208,087	72.39%
Brown	83.29%	83.45%	82.48%	\$3,631,035	80.00%
Carlton	72.18%	73.73%	74.74%	\$5,090,063	75.03%
Carver	78.92%	78.72%	79.45%	\$8,060,905	80.00%
Cass	64.12%	64.45%	66.32%	\$2,735,274	67.78%
Chippewa	76.65%	75.94%	76.30%	\$1,618,129	76.30%
Chisago	78.79%	78.25%	79.00%	\$7,431,770	79.41%
Clay	73.64%	74.13%	74.44%	\$8,457,664	74.64%
Clearwater	69.18%	71.57%	73.85%	\$1,282,636	75.53%
Cook	69.15%	64.87%	64.86%	\$391,758	64.86%
Crow Wing	72.42%	72.37%	72.05%	\$8,565,504	72.35%
Dakota	70.81%	71.56%	71.92%	\$46,775,001	72.61%
Douglas	75.59%	75.48%	76.42%	\$4,350,648	76.76%
DVHHS	74.53%	75.97%	76.80%	\$3,178,268	76.80%
Faribault/Martin	74.54%	72.91%	74.40%	\$5,827,969	74.40%
Fillmore	79.76%	78.15%	78.38%	\$2,320,604	78.38%
Freeborn	71.69%	70.50%	73.04%	\$5,225,153	74.05%
Goodhue	74.33%	75.93%	76.64%	\$5,928,923	77.06%
Grant	81.17%	80.00%	79.87%	\$881,607	80.00%
Hennepin	67.28%	68.26%	69.41%	\$107,853,415	70.30%
Houston	78.09%	76.47%	77.69%	\$2,077,376	77.78%
Hubbard	64.46%	64.43%	69.53%	\$2,250,883	70.98%
Isanti	74.48%	76.00%	78.05%	\$6,519,073	80.00%
Itasca	71.39%	71.72%	74.55%	\$5,942,013	75.33%

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

County	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator	2016 Threshold
Statewide	71.83%	72.46%	73.43%	\$618,447,004	74.13%
Kanabec	74.70%	75.34%	74.84%	\$2,511,615	75.42%
Kandiyohi	75.95%	76.36%	75.73%	\$5,772,281	75.73%
Kittson	85.69%	86.87%	85.84%	\$370,008	80.00%
Koochiching	81.21%	82.05%	81.85%	\$1,850,504	80.00%
Lac Qui Parle	80.94%	80.99%	80.18%	\$769,795	80.00%
Lake	71.67%	74.27%	74.43%	\$1,256,032	76.23%
Lake of the Woods	79.20%	76.46%	76.95%	\$386,902	76.95%
Le Sueur	75.97%	75.12%	74.91%	\$4,045,173	74.91%
Mahnomen	64.52%	65.85%	61.81%	\$515,543	61.81%
Marshall	81.46%	85.26%	81.93%	\$1,190,245	80.00%
McLeod	78.78%	79.08%	79.39%	\$4,786,712	79.93%
Meeker	74.90%	76.81%	76.38%	\$2,914,260	77.70%
Mille Lacs	70.90%	73.44%	75.35%	\$3,274,112	77.14%
MN Prairie	76.23%	76.85%	77.86%	\$11,348,942	78.34%
Morrison	68.11%	66.89%	68.09%	\$4,656,573	68.09%
Mower	71.82%	71.80%	73.69%	\$6,212,363	73.94%
Nicollet	71.23%	72.13%	73.47%	\$4,890,234	74.22%
Nobles	73.41%	73.98%	74.90%	\$3,040,789	75.96%
Norman	74.25%	73.76%	73.86%	\$813,711	73.86%
Olmsted	78.40%	78.27%	78.16%	\$17,813,236	78.16%
Otter Tail	71.70%	71.88%	73.08%	\$6,637,701	73.20%
Pennington	75.80%	75.62%	76.02%	\$2,171,388	76.07%
Pine	72.71%	73.74%	74.48%	\$4,533,155	75.46%
Polk	79.13%	80.04%	78.94%	\$4,747,318	78.94%
Pope	74.25%	78.29%	78.35%	\$1,056,696	79.16%
Ramsey	63.54%	64.61%	66.64%	\$54,682,409	67.87%
Red Lake	82.88%	79.56%	78.79%	\$574,608	78.79%
Renville	75.81%	78.88%	79.60%	\$1,986,851	80.00%
Rice	75.47%	75.45%	75.79%	\$6,663,680	76.15%
Roseau	77.67%	78.04%	78.60%	\$2,087,897	79.28%

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

County	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator	2016 Threshold
Statewide	71.83%	72.46%	73.43%	\$618,447,004	74.13%
Scott	77.92%	78.41%	79.08%	\$12,751,799	79.40%
Sherburne	78.62%	79.18%	80.17%	\$11,893,865	80.00%
Sibley	79.13%	77.30%	77.62%	\$1,758,117	77.90%
St. Louis	70.62%	70.70%	71.09%	\$26,766,064	71.37%
Stearns	76.42%	77.22%	77.53%	\$15,225,993	77.96%
Stevens	77.60%	75.74%	72.10%	\$828,589	72.10%
SWHHS	75.97%	77.72%	78.91%	\$10,123,955	80.00%
Swift	73.36%	76.59%	73.86%	\$1,351,632	73.86%
Todd	76.22%	75.11%	77.44%	\$2,854,484	77.63%
Traverse	73.21%	74.76%	71.68%	\$364,504	71.68%
Wabasha	79.65%	78.87%	79.75%	\$2,320,377	79.75%
Wadena	69.67%	69.05%	71.87%	\$2,688,911	72.06%
Washington	73.57%	73.86%	74.67%	\$24,915,119	75.07%
Watsonwan	77.84%	75.53%	78.18%	\$2,147,483	78.31%
Wilkin	81.43%	79.93%	79.19%	\$988,868	79.19%
Winona	75.17%	75.64%	74.94%	\$4,942,839	74.94%
Wright	76.18%	77.23%	78.59%	\$15,562,071	79.60%
Yellow Medicine	78.89%	77.21%	78.54%	\$1,216,764	78.64%
(Cottonwood)	72.00%	-	-	-	-
(Dodge)	79.27%	80.29%	-	\$2,992,959	-
(Jackson)	77.11%	-	-	-	-
(Pipestone)	-	-	-	-	-
(Redwood)	-	-	-	-	-
(Steele)	73.45%	73.87%	-	\$5,535,736	-
(Waseca)	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	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide	80.00%	95.00%	87.10%	86.30%	84.30%	3486
Aitkin	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	57.10%	< 20
Anoka	80.00%	95.00%	94.50%	94.30%	82.40%	119
Becker	80.00%	95.00%	92.70%	94.20%	93.80%	32
Beltrami	80.00%	95.00%	65.50%	57.00%	59.00%	188
Benton	80.00%	95.00%	93.10%	97.00%	85.30%	34
Big Stone	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Blue Earth	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	86.30%	76.90%	26
Brown	80.00%	95.00%	77.80%	90.00%	88.20%	< 20
Carlton	80.00%	95.00%	71.90%	89.40%	87.10%	31
Carver	80.00%	95.00%	62.50%	87.80%	100.00%	33
Cass	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	83.30%	92.10%	38
Chippewa	80.00%	95.00%	66.70%	100.00%	0.00%	0
Chisago	80.00%	95.00%	95.70%	88.00%	91.40%	35
Clay	80.00%	95.00%	86.50%	90.90%	98.00%	51
Clearwater	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	93.30%	64.30%	< 20
Cook	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	66.60%	60.00%	< 20
Crow Wing	80.00%	95.00%	78.80%	94.50%	80.80%	26
Dakota	80.00%	95.00%	97.30%	86.70%	91.60%	95
Des Moines Valley	80.00%	95.00%	76.50%	70.50%	100.00%	< 20
Douglas	80.00%	95.00%	90.00%	91.60%	94.10%	< 20
Faribault Martin	80.00%	95.00%	91.10%	80.80%	96.80%	62
Fillmore	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	88.80%	62.50%	< 20
Freeborn	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	85.70%	97.20%	36
Goodhue	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	78.60%	28
Grant	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	66.60%	100.00%	< 20
Hennepin	80.00%	95.00%	86.40%	84.60%	77.50%	533
Houston	80.00%	95.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Hubbard	80.00%	95.00%	83.30%	72.40%	66.70%	30
Isanti	80.00%	95.00%	85.70%	94.70%	77.80%	< 20
Itasca	80.00%	95.00%	93.70%	93.90%	96.80%	93

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	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide	80.00%	95.00%	87.10%	86.30%	84.30%	3486
Kanabec	80.00%	95.00%	75.00%	87.50%	88.90%	< 20
Kandiyohi	80.00%	95.00%	88.10%	90.90%	78.90%	38
Kittson	80.00%	95.00%	80.00%	83.30%	66.70%	< 20
Koochiching	80.00%	95.00%	88.20%	92.30%	100.00%	< 20
Lac Qui Parle	80.00%	95.00%	-	85.70%	100.00%	< 20
Lake	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	77.80%	< 20
Lake Of The Woods	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Le Sueur	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	83.30%	78.60%	< 20
Mahnomen	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Marshall	80.00%	95.00%	85.70%	100.00%	87.50%	< 20
McLeod	80.00%	95.00%	96.30%	94.70%	100.00%	34
Meeker	80.00%	95.00%	72.70%	62.50%	88.90%	< 20
Mille Lacs	80.00%	95.00%	87.00%	95.70%	86.60%	67
Mn Prairie	80.00%	95.00%	-	91.60%	91.30%	46
Morrison	80.00%	95.00%	72.70%	66.60%	50.00%	< 20
Mower	80.00%	95.00%	94.40%	85.70%	97.50%	40
Nicollet	80.00%	95.00%	91.70%	86.30%	78.60%	< 20
Nobles	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	83.30%	85.70%	28
Norman	80.00%	95.00%	71.40%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Olmsted	80.00%	95.00%	88.40%	88.40%	82.90%	41
Otter Tail	80.00%	95.00%	64.30%	95.20%	88.90%	27
Pennington	80.00%	95.00%	90.90%	45.40%	93.30%	< 20
Pine	80.00%	95.00%	95.80%	58.30%	93.50%	31
Polk	80.00%	95.00%	95.10%	100.00%	80.60%	31
Pope	80.00%	95.00%	90.00%	87.50%	91.70%	< 20
Ramsey	80.00%	95.00%	89.50%	88.20%	83.10%	485
Red Lake	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Renville	80.00%	95.00%	85.70%	91.30%	100.00%	29
Rice	80.00%	95.00%	95.50%	80.00%	94.30%	53
Roseau	80.00%	95.00%	88.20%	100.00%	100.00%	< 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	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide	80.00%	95.00%	87.10%	86.30%	84.30%	3486
Scott	80.00%	95.00%	78.60%	88.00%	96.00%	25
Sherburne	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	97.70%	43
Sibley	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	87.50%	100.00%	< 20
Southwest HHS	80.00%	95.00%	79.50%	90.30%	84.80%	46
St Louis	80.00%	95.00%	77.60%	82.00%	81.60%	282
Stearns	80.00%	95.00%	89.00%	92.20%	91.40%	163
Stevens	80.00%	95.00%	66.70%	66.60%	100.00%	< 20
Swift	80.00%	95.00%	91.70%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Todd	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	77.70%	88.20%	< 20
Traverse	80.00%	95.00%	66.70%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Wabasha	80.00%	95.00%	92.30%	100.00%	76.50%	< 20
Wadena	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	94.10%	100.00%	< 20
Washington	80.00%	95.00%	87.90%	83.90%	92.70%	55
Watonwan	80.00%	95.00%	58.30%	75.00%	100.00%	< 20
White Earth Band	80.00%	95.00%	85.70%	83.30%	72.30%	47
Wilkin	80.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
Winona	80.00%	95.00%	96.00%	88.20%	100.00%	< 20
Wright	80.00%	95.00%	77.40%	89.20%	72.70%	44
Yellow Medicine	80.00%	95.00%	91.70%	100.00%	100.00%	< 20
(Cottonwood)	80.00%	95.00%	-	-	-	-
(Dodge)	80.00%	95.00%	93.30%	100.00%	-	-
(Jackson)	80.00%	95.00%	-	-	-	-
(Pipestone)	80.00%	95.00%	-	-	-	-
(Redwood)	80.00%	95.00%	-	-	-	-
(Rock)	80.00%	95.00%	-	-	-	-
(Steele)	80.00%	95.00%	96.20%	88.40%	-	-
(Waseca)	80.00%	95.00%	88.20%	100.00%	-	-

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			39.50%	43.10%	50.60%	10730
Aitkin	20.90%	43.50%	40.50%	37.50%	62.00%	50
Anoka	20.90%	43.50%	31.60%	29.90%	37.80%	399
Becker	20.90%	43.50%	46.20%	48.20%	62.20%	156
Beltrami	20.90%	43.50%	32.80%	47.10%	56.90%	794
Benton	20.90%	43.50%	40.30%	38.80%	32.90%	85
Big Stone	20.90%	43.50%	25.00%	33.30%	70.60%	< 20
Blue Earth	20.90%	43.50%	36.30%	51.60%	56.80%	148
Brown	20.90%	43.50%	38.80%	37.10%	39.00%	41
Carlton	20.90%	43.50%	51.90%	35.90%	56.70%	90
Carver	20.90%	43.50%	42.30%	51.80%	67.80%	90
Cass	20.90%	43.50%	50.00%	57.40%	52.60%	114
Chippewa	20.90%	43.50%	100.00%	0.00%	25.00%	< 20
Chisago	20.90%	43.50%	36.00%	46.90%	52.30%	86
Clay	20.90%	43.50%	15.30%	25.70%	28.10%	185
Clearwater	20.90%	43.50%	54.10%	56.20%	59.10%	22
Cook	20.90%	43.50%	66.60%	85.70%	70.60%	< 20
Crow Wing	20.90%	43.50%	36.10%	39.30%	43.20%	162
Dakota	20.90%	43.50%	37.00%	46.00%	55.90%	245
Des Moines Valley	20.90%	43.50%	42.30%	31.00%	14.80%	27
Douglas	20.90%	43.50%	21.00%	30.30%	39.00%	59
Faribault Martin	20.90%	43.50%	56.80%	63.90%	71.50%	137
Fillmore	20.90%	43.50%	16.00%	26.30%	33.30%	< 20
Freeborn	20.90%	43.50%	35.70%	35.80%	50.60%	83
Goodhue	20.90%	43.50%	41.50%	32.70%	46.50%	71
Grant	20.90%	43.50%	21.40%	20.00%	0.00%	< 20
Hennepin	20.90%	43.50%	41.60%	41.50%	48.30%	1864
Houston	20.90%	43.50%	15.30%	38.80%	30.60%	36
Hubbard	20.90%	43.50%	36.70%	46.50%	48.20%	85
Isanti	20.90%	43.50%	55.30%	48.70%	54.80%	84
Itasca	20.90%	43.50%	44.80%	38.00%	36.80%	163

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			39.50%	43.10%	50.60%	10730
Kanabec	20.90%	43.50%	26.30%	45.00%	46.40%	28
Kandiyohi	20.90%	43.50%	34.20%	42.30%	51.10%	88
Kittson	20.90%	43.50%	50.00%	40.00%	40.00%	< 20
Koochiching	20.90%	43.50%	41.60%	37.50%	50.00%	36
Lac Qui Parle	20.90%	43.50%	0.00%	16.60%	30.80%	< 20
Lake	20.90%	43.50%	64.70%	34.60%	37.50%	24
Lake Of The Woods	20.90%	43.50%	-	50.00%	80.00%	< 20
Le Sueur	20.90%	43.50%	29.40%	52.00%	70.00%	30
Mahnomen	20.90%	43.50%	33.30%	66.60%	23.10%	< 20
Marshall	20.90%	43.50%	75.00%	57.10%	25.00%	< 20
McLeod	20.90%	43.50%	50.00%	57.70%	60.60%	71
Meeker	20.90%	43.50%	51.50%	22.70%	61.90%	21
Mille Lacs	20.90%	43.50%	39.00%	57.20%	59.50%	200
Mn Prairie	20.90%	43.50%	-	46.20%	54.10%	133
Morrison	20.90%	43.50%	29.00%	29.40%	55.20%	58
Mower	20.90%	43.50%	40.50%	47.30%	70.40%	98
Nicollet	20.90%	43.50%	33.30%	34.10%	22.90%	35
Nobles	20.90%	43.50%	36.10%	55.50%	51.50%	33
Norman	20.90%	43.50%	71.40%	66.60%	66.70%	< 20
Olmsted	20.90%	43.50%	35.90%	33.90%	47.10%	172
Otter Tail	20.90%	43.50%	21.50%	27.50%	39.20%	74
Pennington	20.90%	43.50%	42.10%	50.00%	66.70%	36
Pine	20.90%	43.50%	47.80%	40.90%	44.40%	81
Polk	20.90%	43.50%	15.80%	20.80%	31.40%	51
Pope	20.90%	43.50%	63.10%	26.00%	33.30%	36
Ramsey	20.90%	43.50%	39.80%	38.30%	53.90%	1155
Red Lake	20.90%	43.50%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	< 20
Renville	20.90%	43.50%	64.00%	79.40%	60.30%	58
Rice	20.90%	43.50%	38.00%	43.80%	51.40%	177
Roseau	20.90%	43.50%	18.10%	100.00%	63.60%	< 20

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			39.50%	43.10%	50.60%	10730
Scott	20.90%	43.50%	43.10%	53.80%	65.10%	63
Sherburne	20.90%	43.50%	36.60%	31.40%	51.00%	100
Sibley	20.90%	43.50%	76.90%	70.50%	64.70%	< 20
Southwest HHS	20.90%	43.50%	25.90%	45.00%	51.60%	159
St Louis	20.90%	43.50%	39.20%	46.10%	50.50%	882
Stearns	20.90%	43.50%	41.30%	43.70%	50.40%	357
Stevens	20.90%	43.50%	28.50%	40.00%	57.10%	< 20
Swift	20.90%	43.50%	63.10%	29.00%	42.10%	38
Todd	20.90%	43.50%	31.00%	48.50%	33.80%	71
Traverse	20.90%	43.50%	0.00%	50.00%	30.00%	< 20
Wabasha	20.90%	43.50%	50.00%	29.40%	29.30%	41
Wadena	20.90%	43.50%	75.00%	60.00%	53.30%	< 20
Washington	20.90%	43.50%	46.40%	37.70%	49.20%	128
Watonwan	20.90%	43.50%	22.20%	31.20%	16.70%	< 20
White Earth Band	20.90%	43.50%	58.20%	62.40%	59.20%	331
Wilkin	20.90%	43.50%	0.00%	0.00%	16.70%	< 20
Winona	20.90%	43.50%	40.60%	46.60%	50.00%	42
Wright	20.90%	43.50%	47.20%	48.90%	46.60%	163
Yellow Medicine	20.90%	43.50%	22.20%	27.70%	84.20%	< 20
(Cottonwood)	20.90%	43.50%	-	-	-	-
(Dodge)	20.90%	43.50%	38.00%	52.00%	-	-
(Jackson)	20.90%	43.50%	-	-	-	-
(Pipestone)	20.90%	43.50%	-	-	-	-
(Redwood)	20.90%	43.50%	-	-	-	-
(Rock)	20.90%	43.50%	-	-	-	-
(Steele)	20.90%	43.50%	16.60%	31.10%	-	-
(Waseca)	20.90%	43.50%	48.00%	60.50%	-	-

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			102%	100%	99%	180,564
Aitkin	90.0%	90.0%	106%	105%	102%	579
Anoka	90.0%	90.0%	107%	104%	103%	9,300
Becker	90.0%	90.0%	104%	98%	97%	1,512
Beltrami	90.0%	90.0%	90%	91%	93%	2,390
Benton	90.0%	90.0%	108%	104%	106%	1,521
Big Stone	90.0%	90.0%	103%	97%	98%	129
Blue Earth	90.0%	90.0%	103%	104%	101%	1,867
Brown	90.0%	90.0%	106%	107%	103%	806
Carlton	90.0%	90.0%	102%	101%	100%	1,417
Carver	90.0%	90.0%	107%	105%	104%	1,233
Cass	90.0%	90.0%	102%	102%	100%	1,540
Chippewa	90.0%	90.0%	110%	106%	108%	423
Chisago	90.0%	90.0%	110%	108%	105%	1,556
Clay	90.0%	90.0%	103%	104%	102%	2,206
Clearwater	90.0%	90.0%	110%	105%	105%	465
Cook	90.0%	90.0%	100%	97%	95%	132
Crow Wing	90.0%	90.0%	108%	102%	102%	2,524
Dakota	90.0%	90.0%	102%	99%	97%	10,623
Douglas	90.0%	90.0%	105%	102%	103%	1,014
DVHHS	90.0%	90.0%		108%	106%	791
Faribault/Martin	90.0%	90.0%	106%	107%	108%	1,253
Fillmore	90.0%	90.0%	103%	106%	105%	474
Freeborn	90.0%	90.0%	105%	102%	103%	1,336
Goodhue	90.0%	90.0%	106%	104%	102%	1,435
Grant	90.0%	90.0%	105%	100%	97%	189
Hennepin	90.0%	90.0%	100%	98%	98%	42,554
Houston	90.0%	90.0%	109%	105%	107%	490
Hubbard	90.0%	90.0%	103%	104%	104%	828
Isanti	90.0%	90.0%	107%	102%	102%	1,429
Itasca	90.0%	90.0%	99%	100%	103%	1,754

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			102%	100%	99%	180,564
Kanabec	90.0%	90.0%	107%	104%	103%	625
Kandiyohi	90.0%	90.0%	101%	99%	103%	1,736
Kittson	90.0%	90.0%	112%	106%	106%	72
Koochiching	90.0%	90.0%	111%	110%	109%	498
Lac Qui Parle	90.0%	90.0%	104%	104%	99%	158
Lake	90.0%	90.0%	102%	103%	99%	298
Lake of the Woods	90.0%	90.0%	109%	104%	111%	100
Le Sueur	90.0%	90.0%	110%	105%	103%	788
Mahnomen	90.0%	90.0%	118%	100%	114%	422
Marshall	90.0%	90.0%	105%	108%	110%	206
McLeod	90.0%	90.0%	105%	103%	104%	1,109
Meeker	90.0%	90.0%	105%	101%	101%	580
Mille Lacs	90.0%	90.0%	105%	104%	106%	1,134
MN Prairie	-	-	-	-	105%	2,850
Morrison	90.0%	90.0%	104%	102%	100%	1,290
Mower	90.0%	90.0%	101%	96%	104%	1,858
Nicollet	90.0%	90.0%	101%	102%	103%	1,096
Nobles	90.0%	90.0%	104%	105%	101%	876
Norman	90.0%	90.0%	109%	105%	107%	196
Olmsted	90.0%	90.0%	102%	100%	101%	4,610
Otter Tail	90.0%	90.0%	108%	102%	101%	1,611
Pennington	90.0%	90.0%	99%	99%	98%	606
Pine	90.0%	90.0%	103%	101%	102%	1,353
Polk	90.0%	90.0%	107%	103%	109%	1,320
Pope	90.0%	90.0%	105%	101%	106%	267
Ramsey	90.0%	90.0%	95%	94%	95%	25,611
Red Lake	90.0%	90.0%	113%	104%	116%	107
Renville	90.0%	90.0%	107%	103%	105%	481
Rice	90.0%	90.0%	108%	104%	99%	1,557
Roseau	90.0%	90.0%	99%	98%	100%	430

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			102%	100%	99%	180,564
Scott	90.0%	90.0%	110%	107%	108%	2,168
Sherburne	90.0%	90.0%	104%	102%	101%	2,280
Sibley	90.0%	90.0%	109%	106%	103%	428
St. Louis	90.0%	90.0%	104%	102%	102%	8,504
Stearns	90.0%	90.0%	106%	104%	103%	3,981
Stevens	90.0%	90.0%	107%	111%	105%	185
SWHHS	90.0%	90.0%	104%	102%	101%	2,512
Swift	90.0%	90.0%	108%	106%	103%	350
Todd	90.0%	90.0%	106%	102%	102%	720
Traverse	90.0%	90.0%	132%	113%	99%	92
Wabasha	90.0%	90.0%	103%	95%	100%	492
Wadena	90.0%	90.0%	107%	108%	106%	602
Washington	90.0%	90.0%	104%	102%	104%	4,799
Watonwan	90.0%	90.0%	102%	103%	100%	562
Wilkin	90.0%	90.0%	105%	109%	103%	209
Winona	90.0%	90.0%	102%	99%	100%	1,437
Wright	90.0%	90.0%	107%	105%	104%	2,903
Yellow Medicine	90.0%	90.0%	103%	104%	105%	246
(Cottonwood)	90.0%	90.0%	105%	-	-	-
(Jackson)	90.0%	90.0%	106%	-	-	-
(Pipestone)	90.0%	90.0%	-	-	-	-
(Redwood)	90.0%	90.0%	-	-	-	-
(Dodge)	90.0%	90.0%	115%	106%	-	-
(Steele)	90.0%	90.0%	110%	108%	-	-
(Waseca)	90.0%	90.0%	106%	106%	-	-

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			62.3%	64.0%	59.4%	52,171
Aitkin	55.0%	83.0%	59.4%	61.7%	64.1%	131
Anoka	55.0%	83.0%	57.1%	57.6%	65.7%	2,748
Becker	55.0%	83.0%	72.4%	76.7%	78.2%	276
Beltrami	55.0%	83.0%	67.4%	72.8%	65.3%	1,064
Benton	55.0%	83.0%	49.3%	61.6%	52.0%	430
Big Stone	55.0%	83.0%	61.3%	57.6%	63.6%	33
Blue Earth	55.0%	83.0%	54.7%	56.0%	52.8%	522
Brown	55.0%	83.0%	71.7%	64.9%	75.9%	154
Carlton	55.0%	83.0%	75.6%	80.6%	78.6%	361
Carver	55.0%	83.0%	36.3%	47.4%	52.6%	241
Cass	55.0%	83.0%	62.9%	61.9%	71.2%	494
Chippewa	55.0%	83.0%	36.3%	54.1%	87.6%	89
Chisago	55.0%	83.0%	75.5%	77.9%	70.0%	301
Clay	55.0%	83.0%	61.8%	61.2%	58.0%	832
Clearwater	55.0%	83.0%	77.8%	86.0%	67.5%	77
Cook	55.0%	83.0%	51.7%	72.0%	75.0%	36
Crow Wing	55.0%	83.0%	60.8%	69.7%	68.4%	599
Dakota	55.0%	83.0%	49.1%	45.0%	49.1%	2,263
Des Moines Valley	55.0%	83.0%	74.0%	80.2%	78.4%	158
Douglas	55.0%	83.0%	68.0%	66.0%	55.8%	238
Faribault Martin	55.0%	83.0%	78.8%	82.3%	85.1%	290
Fillmore	55.0%	83.0%	62.4%	60.9%	45.0%	102
Freeborn	55.0%	83.0%	73.3%	73.3%	70.7%	246
Goodhue	55.0%	83.0%	71.2%	68.4%	70.6%	273
Grant	55.0%	83.0%	48.8%	87.2%	84.2%	38
Hennepin	55.0%	83.0%	67.3%	66.4%	50.9%	15,946
Houston	55.0%	83.0%	70.1%	71.7%	71.4%	91
Hubbard	55.0%	83.0%	76.7%	73.7%	65.6%	189
Isanti	55.0%	83.0%	52.3%	67.2%	63.7%	279
Itasca	55.0%	83.0%	81.6%	84.6%	79.1%	734

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			62.3%	64.0%	59.4%	52,171
Kanabec	55.0%	83.0%	66.7%	76.8%	75.2%	190
Kandiyohi	55.0%	83.0%	70.6%	63.8%	64.6%	492
Kittson	55.0%	83.0%	83.3%	66.6%	78.9%	19
Koochiching	55.0%	83.0%	53.0%	58.1%	64.9%	137
Lac Qui Parle	55.0%	83.0%	85.4%	66.6%	84.6%	26
Lake	55.0%	83.0%	55.4%	71.6%	66.6%	54
Lake Of The Woods	55.0%	83.0%	70.8%	81.4%	72.0%	25
Le Sueur	55.0%	83.0%	50.8%	59.5%	82.5%	183
Mahnomen	55.0%	83.0%	66.1%	79.3%	80.3%	61
Marshall	55.0%	83.0%	84.9%	75.0%	69.6%	33
McLeod	55.0%	83.0%	40.8%	64.0%	74.3%	300
Meeker	55.0%	83.0%	65.5%	73.6%	61.4%	140
Mille Lacs	55.0%	83.0%	63.7%	53.0%	55.0%	227
MN Prairie	55.0%	83.0%	.	.	69.3%	696
Morrison	55.0%	83.0%	70.9%	58.3%	57.5%	231
Mower	55.0%	83.0%	65.8%	69.4%	61.2%	413
Nicollet	55.0%	83.0%	72.5%	72.6%	68.4%	187
Nobles	55.0%	83.0%	68.2%	61.8%	42.1%	228
Norman	55.0%	83.0%	84.6%	80.5%	75.0%	40
Olmsted	55.0%	83.0%	44.8%	67.0%	67.0%	1,326
Otter Tail	55.0%	83.0%	49.8%	50.8%	54.2%	431
Pennington	55.0%	83.0%	78.5%	81.0%	81.3%	145
Pine	55.0%	83.0%	81.0%	79.7%	73.7%	289
Polk	55.0%	83.0%	86.2%	86.0%	77.8%	428
Pope	55.0%	83.0%	57.7%	58.6%	75.3%	65
Ramsey	55.0%	83.0%	53.7%	57.0%	57.8%	7,061
Red Lake	55.0%	83.0%	76.0%	64.0%	84.3%	32
Renville	55.0%	83.0%	65.0%	72.2%	66.4%	134
Rice	55.0%	83.0%	64.5%	71.8%	63.4%	457
Roseau	55.0%	83.0%	84.4%	81.0%	76.4%	85

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			62.3%	64.0%	59.4%	52,171
Scott	55.0%	83.0%	70.9%	64.6%	66.7%	548
Sherburne	55.0%	83.0%	67.2%	72.3%	70.0%	478
Sibley	55.0%	83.0%	76.8%	53.4%	80.1%	101
Southwest HHS	55.0%	83.0%	78.1%	74.2%	70.4%	501
St Louis	55.0%	83.0%	62.5%	65.5%	64.8%	3,039
Stearns	55.0%	83.0%	46.9%	57.4%	61.8%	1,524
Stevens	55.0%	83.0%	55.6%	62.2%	63.4%	52
Swift	55.0%	83.0%	89.5%	76.4%	94.9%	59
Todd	55.0%	83.0%	60.9%	69.1%	77.0%	148
Traverse	55.0%	83.0%	93.8%	85.0%	84.3%	32
Wabasha	55.0%	83.0%	60.8%	65.1%	65.2%	121
Wadena	55.0%	83.0%	69.0%	74.0%	70.1%	151
Washington	55.0%	83.0%	35.1%	42.6%	45.1%	967
Watonwan	55.0%	83.0%	61.6%	69.5%	52.4%	82
Wilkin	55.0%	83.0%	86.7%	91.7%	83.3%	78
Winona	55.0%	83.0%	69.8%	60.0%	63.4%	339
Wright	55.0%	83.0%	63.4%	62.7%	63.6%	542
Yellow Medicine	55.0%	83.0%	59.0%	58.0%	69.2%	39
(Cottonwood)	55.0%	83.0%	73.0%	.	.	.
(Dodge)	55.0%	83.0%	55.0%	52.5%	.	.
(Jackson)	55.0%	83.0%	76.3%	.	.	.
(Pipestone)	55.0%	83.0%
(Redwood)	55.0%	83.0%
(Rock)	55.0%	83.0%
(Steele)	55.0%	83.0%	77.4%	79.3%	.	.
(Waseca)	55.0%	83.0%	70.0%	72.4%	.	.

Table 8. Percent of Cash and Food Applications Processed Timely

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			75.8%	81.2%	80.6%	125,841
Aitkin	75.0%	90.0%	82.2%	87.2%	84.6%	351
Anoka	75.0%	90.0%	78.9%	80.9%	85.0%	6,375
Becker	75.0%	90.0%	86.8%	90.6%	91.0%	679
Beltrami	75.0%	90.0%	58.2%	76.2%	72.8%	1,966
Benton	75.0%	90.0%	72.3%	81.6%	78.9%	1,051
Big Stone	75.0%	90.0%	82.9%	83.5%	84.1%	82
Blue Earth	75.0%	90.0%	77.6%	81.0%	80.9%	1,379
Brown	75.0%	90.0%	87.4%	84.9%	89.3%	440
Carlton	75.0%	90.0%	83.2%	89.9%	91.5%	900
Carver	75.0%	90.0%	71.0%	76.9%	78.9%	759
Cass	75.0%	90.0%	79.1%	83.0%	84.2%	1,174
Chippewa	75.0%	90.0%	67.7%	77.5%	92.8%	264
Chisago	75.0%	90.0%	82.4%	86.3%	83.3%	770
Clay	75.0%	90.0%	79.2%	82.7%	82.2%	1,818
Clearwater	75.0%	90.0%	89.2%	93.8%	85.5%	200
Cook	75.0%	90.0%	75.6%	83.0%	79.6%	103
Crow Wing	75.0%	90.0%	75.7%	86.9%	84.5%	1,427
Dakota	75.0%	90.0%	74.0%	75.9%	77.1%	5,705
DVHHS	75.0%	90.0%	80.0%	91.3%	90.2%	472
Douglas	75.0%	90.0%	78.7%	82.6%	81.5%	676
Faribault Martin	75.0%	90.0%	89.1%	92.2%	93.1%	881
Fillmore	75.0%	90.0%	84.1%	87.5%	83.6%	300
Freeborn	75.0%	90.0%	88.7%	90.0%	89.2%	726
Goodhue	75.0%	90.0%	82.0%	82.9%	85.7%	637
Grant	75.0%	90.0%	82.2%	93.7%	94.4%	126
Hennepin	75.0%	90.0%	74.0%	79.4%	74.2%	35,450
Houston	75.0%	90.0%	86.1%	90.2%	87.9%	233
Hubbard	75.0%	90.0%	88.3%	91.2%	84.2%	513
Isanti	75.0%	90.0%	74.2%	85.2%	85.1%	807
Itasca	75.0%	90.0%	85.9%	91.1%	88.1%	1,670

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			75.8%	81.2%	80.6%	125,841
Kanabec	75.0%	90.0%	77.3%	86.0%	87.5%	488
Kandiyohi		90.0%	84.0%	86.8%	87.5%	1,430
Kittson	75.0%	90.0%	95.5%	81.6%	88.6%	53
Koochiching	75.0%	90.0%	72.5%	81.9%	84.1%	340
Lac Qui Parle	75.0%	90.0%	93.4%	89.1%	95.9%	99
Lake	75.0%	90.0%	68.4%	87.7%	91.2%	206
Lake Of The Woods	75.0%	90.0%	87.3%	92.6%	84.5%	71
Le Sueur	75.0%	90.0%	68.9%	81.0%	88.9%	469
Mahnomen	75.0%	90.0%	81.7%	88.3%	89.3%	131
Marshall	75.0%	90.0%	92.4%	91.2%	90.9%	122
McLeod	75.0%	90.0%	68.7%	84.1%	86.9%	697
Meeker	75.0%	90.0%	84.0%	89.6%	85.8%	382
Mille Lacs	75.0%	90.0%	80.7%	79.6%	81.9%	616
MN Prairie	75.0%	90.0%	.	.	82.8%	1,793
Morrison	75.0%	90.0%	82.6%	81.7%	82.6%	628
Mower	75.0%	90.0%	79.1%	85.1%	85.7%	1,141
Nicollet	75.0%	90.0%	85.0%	86.8%	86.7%	557
Nobles	75.0%	90.0%	84.2%	83.8%	75.9%	532
Norman	75.0%	90.0%	93.8%	92.2%	91.6%	144
Olmsted	75.0%	90.0%	65.7%	83.6%	86.8%	3,441
Otter Tail	75.0%	90.0%	73.2%	76.0%	79.9%	1,196
Pennington	75.0%	90.0%	91.3%	94.2%	93.0%	387
Pine	75.0%	90.0%	89.7%	90.2%	89.1%	800
Polk	75.0%	90.0%	91.0%	93.2%	90.2%	1,006
Pope	75.0%	90.0%	82.7%	85.4%	92.4%	226
Ramsey	75.0%	90.0%	73.1%	78.0%	79.7%	16,858
Red Lake	75.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.2%	94.1%	103
Renville	75.0%	90.0%	79.5%	87.5%	87.5%	376
Rice	75.0%	90.0%	75.2%	83.2%	82.8%	1,128
Roseau	75.0%	90.0%	91.1%	92.2%	90.5%	233

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
State totals			75.8%	81.2%	80.6%	125,841
Kanabec	75.0%	90.0%	77.3%	86.0%	87.5%	488
Kandiyohi		90.0%	84.0%	86.8%	87.5%	1,430
Kittson	75.0%	90.0%	95.5%	81.6%	88.6%	53
Koochiching	75.0%	90.0%	72.5%	81.9%	84.1%	340
Lac Qui Parle	75.0%	90.0%	93.4%	89.1%	95.9%	99
Lake	75.0%	90.0%	68.4%	87.7%	91.2%	206
Lake Of The Woods	75.0%	90.0%	87.3%	92.6%	84.5%	71
Le Sueur	75.0%	90.0%	68.9%	81.0%	88.9%	469
Mahnomen	75.0%	90.0%	81.7%	88.3%	89.3%	131
Marshall	75.0%	90.0%	92.4%	91.2%	90.9%	122
McLeod	75.0%	90.0%	68.7%	84.1%	86.9%	697
Meeker	75.0%	90.0%	84.0%	89.6%	85.8%	382
Mille Lacs	75.0%	90.0%	80.7%	79.6%	81.9%	616
MN Prairie	75.0%	90.0%	.	.	82.8%	1,793
Morrison	75.0%	90.0%	82.6%	81.7%	82.6%	628
Mower	75.0%	90.0%	79.1%	85.1%	85.7%	1,141
Nicollet	75.0%	90.0%	85.0%	86.8%	86.7%	557
Nobles	75.0%	90.0%	84.2%	83.8%	75.9%	532
Norman	75.0%	90.0%	93.8%	92.2%	91.6%	144
Olmsted	75.0%	90.0%	65.7%	83.6%	86.8%	3,441
Otter Tail	75.0%	90.0%	73.2%	76.0%	79.9%	1,196
Pennington	75.0%	90.0%	91.3%	94.2%	93.0%	387
Pine	75.0%	90.0%	89.7%	90.2%	89.1%	800
Polk	75.0%	90.0%	91.0%	93.2%	90.2%	1,006
Pope	75.0%	90.0%	82.7%	85.4%	92.4%	226
Ramsey	75.0%	90.0%	73.1%	78.0%	79.7%	16,858
Red Lake	75.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.2%	94.1%	103
Renville	75.0%	90.0%	79.5%	87.5%	87.5%	376
Rice	75.0%	90.0%	75.2%	83.2%	82.8%	1,128
Roseau	75.0%	90.0%	91.1%	92.2%	90.5%	233

Table 9. Percent of Open Child Support Cases with Orders Established

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			86%	88%	89%	227,783
Aitkin	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	95%	814
Anoka	80.0%	80.0%	90%	91%	92%	12,710
Becker	80.0%	80.0%	88%	92%	93%	1,762
Beltrami	80.0%	80.0%	73%	76%	77%	3,023
Benton	80.0%	80.0%	91%	91%	94%	1,872
Big Stone	80.0%	80.0%	89%	89%	95%	162
Blue Earth	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	94%	2,530
Brown	80.0%	80.0%	94%	94%	94%	1,068
Carlton	80.0%	80.0%	90%	93%	94%	2,021
Carver	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	94%	1,779
Cass	80.0%	80.0%	85%	86%	87%	1,777
Chippewa	80.0%	80.0%	90%	91%	90%	589
Chisago	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	96%	2,102
Clay	80.0%	80.0%	86%	85%	87%	2,751
Clearwater	80.0%	80.0%	93%	96%	98%	597
Cook	80.0%	80.0%	86%	89%	87%	171
Crow Wing	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	94%	3,551
Dakota	80.0%	80.0%	88%	88%	91%	12,987
Douglas	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	94%	1,523
DVHHS	80.0%	80.0%		95%	97%	1,061
Faribault/Martin	80.0%	80.0%	94%	96%	95%	1773
Fillmore	80.0%	80.0%	94%	89%	92%	680
Freeborn	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	95%	1,731
Goodhue	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	94%	1,851
Grant	80.0%	80.0%	93%	96%	96%	249
Hennepin	80.0%	80.0%	82%	82%	84%	51,010
Houston	80.0%	80.0%	92%	96%	96%	653
Hubbard	80.0%	80.0%	87%	90%	93%	1,053
Isanti	80.0%	80.0%	92%	94%	93%	1,926
Itasca	80.0%	80.0%	88%	92%	93%	2,459

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			86%	88%	89%	227,783
Kanabec	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	95%	854
Kandiyohi	80.0%	80.0%	87%	88%	89%	2,350
Kittson	80.0%	80.0%	94%	98%	93%	107
Koochiching	80.0%	80.0%	98%	98%	96%	665
Lac Qui Parle	80.0%	80.0%	92%	96%	96%	205
Lake	80.0%	80.0%	87%	87%	94%	453
Lake of the Woods	80.0%	80.0%	89%	92%	95%	132
LeSueur	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	96%	1,021
Mahnomen	80.0%	80.0%	73%	93%	89%	380
Marshall	80.0%	80.0%	90%	93%	95%	312
McLeod	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	94%	1,512
Meeker	80.0%	80.0%	93%	94%	93%	911
Mille Lacs	80.0%	80.0%	89%	93%	95%	1,661
MN Prairie	-	-	-	-	94%	3,697
Morrison	80.0%	80.0%	91%	93%	94%	1,922
Mower	80.0%	80.0%	81%	88%	92%	2,399
Nicollet	80.0%	80.0%	93%	92%	94%	1,415
Nobles	80.0%	80.0%	87%	87%	88%	995
Norman	80.0%	80.0%	92%	95%	92%	259
Olmsted	80.0%	80.0%	86%	87%	87%	5,665
Otter Tail	80.0%	80.0%	92%	92%	93%	2,181
Pennington	80.0%	80.0%	86%	89%	92%	725
Pine	80.0%	80.0%	93%	96%	96%	1,762
Polk	80.0%	80.0%	93%	93%	93%	1,734
Pope	80.0%	80.0%	86%	87%	92%	365
Ramsey	80.0%	80.0%	77%	80%	81%	27,756
Red Lake	80.0%	80.0%	91%	95%	94%	138
Renville	80.0%	80.0%	80%	81%	84%	626
Rice	80.0%	80.0%	81%	84%	86%	1,964
Roseau	80.0%	80.0%	87%	91%	90%	589

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

County	Threshold	High Performance Standard	2013	2014	2015	2015 Denominator
Statewide			86%	88%	89%	227,783
Scott	80.0%	80.0%	88%	90%	91%	3,004
Sherburne	80.0%	80.0%	92%	94%	96%	3,339
Sibley	80.0%	80.0%	93%	96%	95%	582
St. Louis	80.0%	80.0%	88%	90%	91%	11,394
Stearns	80.0%	80.0%	87%	89%	91%	5,199
Stevens	80.0%	80.0%	91%	91%	95%	260
SWHHS	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	93%	3358
Swift	80.0%	80.0%	90%	92%	94%	480
Todd	80.0%	80.0%	92%	95%	96%	984
Traverse	80.0%	80.0%	80%	79%	83%	118
Wabasha	80.0%	80.0%	85%	85%	88%	736
Wadena	80.0%	80.0%	94%	96%	96%	838
Washington	80.0%	80.0%	93%	95%	96%	6,384
Watonwan	80.0%	80.0%	91%	92%	93%	752
Wilkin	80.0%	80.0%	87%	89%	86%	315
Winona	80.0%	80.0%	91%	93%	93%	2,057
Wright	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	94%	4,104
Yellow Medicine	80.0%	80.0%	87%	86%	86%	375
(Cottonwood)	80.0%	80.0%	92%	-	-	-
(Jackson)	80.0%	80.0%	96%	-	-	-
(Pipestone)	80.0%	80.0%	-	-	-	-
(Redwood)	80.0%	80.0%	-	-	-	-
(Dodge)	80.0%	80.0%	94%	94%	-	-
(Steele)	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	94%	-
(Waseca)	80.0%	80.0%	92%	93%	-	-

Table 10. MFIP/DWP Annualized Self-Support Index

County	Apr 2013 to Mar 2014		Apr 2014 to Mar 2015		Apr 2015 to Mar 2016		2015/2016 Denominator
Aitkin	86.40%	Within	83.50%	Above	89%	Above	98
Anoka	70.30%	Within	70.20%	Within	69%	Below	2027
Becker	75.90%	Within	79.90%	Within	77%	Within	207
Beltrami	69.50%	Above	70.40%	Above	70%	Within	582
Benton	75.80%	Within	73.50%	Within	72%	Within	294
Big Stone	68.40%	Below	70.50%	Below	73%	Within	20
Blue Earth	72.10%	Within	77.80%	Within	76%	Within	397
Brown	83.50%	Within	81.20%	Within	79%	Within	94
Carlton	80.40%	Within	76.60%	Within	80%	Above	139
Carver	82.40%	Above	81.90%	Above	74%	Within	161
Cass	76.80%	Above	74.10%	Within	73%	Within	192
Chippewa	78.50%	Within	79.90%	Within	74%	Within	60
Chisago	83.30%	Above	85.00%	Above	80%	Above	157
Clay	78.70%	Above	78.60%	Within	76%	Within	411
Clearwater	77.30%	Within	77.00%	Within	77%	Within	53
Cook	82.20%	Within	76.40%	Within	78%	Within	23
Crow Wing	79.30%	Within	79.00%	Within	81%	Within	341
Dakota	70.40%	Within	71.30%	Within	73%	Above	1711
Dodge	83.30%	Within	83.30%	Above	76%	Within	465
Douglas	82.10%	Within	79.80%	Within	73%	Within	127
DVHHS			74.90%	Within	80%	Within	130
Faribault-Martin	79.30%	Within	81.70%	Above	77%	Within	182
Fillmore	83.90%	Within	86.70%	Within	88%	Above	91
Freeborn	77.30%	Below	78.10%	Within	76%	Within	235
Goodhue	77.90%	Within	74.30%	Within	72%	Within	184
Grant	91.20%	Within	91.60%	Above	91%	Above	35
Hennepin	61.00%	Within	61.20%	Below	60%	Below	10250
Houston	74.40%	Within	78.90%	Within	77%	Within	85
Hubbard	81.10%	Within	78.50%	Within	68%	Below	100
Isanti	81.90%	Above	81.60%	Above	86%	Above	219
Itasca	72.10%	Below	71.80%	Below	75%	Below	314

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

County	Apr 2013 to Mar 2014		Apr 2014 to Mar 2015		Apr 2015 to Mar 2016		2015/2016 Denominator
Kanabec	79.20%	Within	80.20%	Within	79%	Within	105
Kandiyohi	79.00%	Within	79.50%	Within	75%	Below	338
Kittson	92.00%	Above	84.00%	Within	83%	Within	9
Koochiching	76.30%	Within	75.70%	Within	76%	Within	79
Lac Qui Parle	79.60%	Within	78.30%	Within	68%	Within	25
Lake	78.50%	Within	84.20%	Within	93%	Above	30
Lake Of The Woods	70.50%	Within	84.50%	Within	84%	Within	21
Le Sueur	78.80%	Within	78.70%	Within	77%	Above	137
Mahnomen	61.70%	Within	66.60%	Within	69%	Within	70
Marshall	94.50%	Within	90.10%	Within	91%	Above	23
McLeod	82.70%	Within	84.00%	Within	86%	Within	148
Meeker	84.10%	Above	78.70%	Within	83%	Within	90
Mille Lacs	75.00%	Within	76.30%	Above	82%	Above	173
Morrison	77.80%	Within	71.10%	Below	75%	Within	144
Mower	75.80%	Within	75.90%	Within	76%	Within	311
Nicollet	75.20%	Within	72.60%	Within	74%	Within	205
Nobles	83.40%	Within	85.40%	Within	85%	Within	149
Norman	85.60%	Within	84.60%	Within	81%	Within	57
Olmsted	77.60%	Within	77.80%	Below	76%	Below	940
Otter Tail	79.80%	Above	77.70%	Within	77%	Within	238
Pennington	83.30%	Above	87.90%	Above	84%	Within	58
Pine	80.90%	Within	79.00%	Within	78%	Within	224
Polk	75.30%	Within	77.40%	Above	78%	Above	290
Pope	84.70%	Within	79.80%	Within	73%	Within	39
Ramsey	62.80%	Within	64.40%	Above	64%	Above	7824
Red Lake	92.50%	Within	84.10%	Within	86%	Within	21
Renville	86.90%	Within	79.40%	Within	78%	Within	54
Rice	80.30%	Within	78.50%	Within	81%	Within	340
Roseau	84.80%	Above	87.00%	Above	82%	Within	49

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

County	Apr 2013 to Mar 2014		Apr 2014 to Mar 2015		Apr 2015 to Mar 2016		2015/2016 Denominator
Scott	79.10%	Above	82.90%	Above	79%	Above	368
Sherburne	80.90%	Above	78.10%	Above	79%	Above	299
Sibley	81.80%	Within	86.30%	Within	85%	Above	50
St. Louis	67.00%	Within	67.80%	Within	66%	Within	1456
Stearns	75.20%	Within	75.30%	Within	74%	Within	912
Steele	74.10%	Within	75.40%	Within	76%	Within	465
Stevens	80.00%	Above	85.60%	Above	86%	Above	30
SWHHS	82.90%	Above	82.60%	Within	81%	Within	348
Swift	84.70%	Within	74.60%	Within	78%	Within	57
Todd	79.50%	Above	79.10%	Within	78%	Within	118
Traverse	84.00%	Within	89.70%	Above	86%	Above	18
Wabasha	73.90%	Within	79.70%	Within	81%	Within	79
Wadena	71.50%	Within	70.30%	Below	67%	Below	105
Waseca	76.50%	Within	80.50%	Within	76%	Within	465
Washington	73.00%	Within	71.80%	Within	70%	Within	713
Watonwan	78.60%	Within	82.40%	Within	80%	Within	48
Wilkin	89.90%	Below	89.60%	Above	88%	Above	27
Winona	75.00%	Within	74.40%	Within	75%	Within	193
Wright	82.30%	Above	83.20%	Above	82%	Above	373
Yellow Medicine	68.80%	Within	79.50%	Within	74%	Within	33
(Cottonwood)	75.70%	Within	70.80%	Below			
(Jackson)	75.70%	Above	81.20%	Within			
(Pipestone)							
(Redwood)							