

## Chris Steller

---

**From:** Dellwo, Amy A (DHS) <amy.dellwo@state.mn.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 20, 2017 1:22 PM  
**Subject:** Human Services - Legislatively Mandated reports  
**Attachments:** MN Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report (2016).pdf; MN Child Maltreatment Report (2016).pdf

**MN Child Maltreatment Report:** This report has been a single report on all of the child welfare system in previous years. Beginning this year, we are reporting on the front end child protection system in one report, titled Minnesota's Child Maltreatment Report, and on children in out-of-home care and in adoptions in a second report. The child maltreatment report will include information on child maltreatment intake, screening, child protection response path assignment, the assessment and investigation process, and the outcomes of child protection assessments and investigations. This report is less focused on recommendations and is focused more on reporting what is happening to children in Minnesota who may have been maltreated.

**MN Out of Home Care and Permanency:** Previously, the division has published a single report on the entire child welfare system. Beginning with last year's report (i.e., report year 2015), we began reporting on the front end child protection system in one report, titled Minnesota's Child Maltreatment Report, and on children in out-of-home care and in adoptions in a second report titled, 'Minnesota's Out-of-Home Care and Permanency Report. These reports should be published around the same time. This report includes information on the characteristics of children in out-of-home care, where they are while in out-of-home care, the length of time spent in out-of-home care and information on their permanency outcomes including reunification, transfer of permanent, legal and physical custody, and adoption. This report does not include recommendations but is focused more on reporting what is happening to children in Minnesota who have experienced out-of-home care, guardianship, and adoption.

### Amy Dellwo

Government Relations Director | External Relations

### Minnesota Department of Human Services

540 Cedar Street  
St. Paul, MN  
O: 651-431-2585  
C: 651-295-6974  
[mn.gov/dhs](http://mn.gov/dhs)



Caution: This e-mail and attached documents, if any, may contain information that is protected by state or federal law. E-mail containing private or protected information should not be sent over a public (nonsecure) Internet unless it is encrypted pursuant to DHS standards. This e-mail should be forwarded only on a strictly need-to-know basis. If you are not the intended recipient, please: (1) notify the sender immediately, (2) do not forward the message, (3) do not print the message and (4) erase the message from your system.

# Minnesota's Out-of-Home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

## Children and Family Services

---

October 2017

**For more information contact:**

Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Child Safety and Permanency Division  
P.O. Box 64943  
St. Paul, MN 55155

651-431-4660

---

This report was prepared by the Minnesota Department of Human Services, Children and Family Services Administration, Child Safety and Permanency Division, for the Minnesota Legislature in response to a legislative directive in Minn. Stat., section 257.0725. This report also fulfills reporting requirements under the Vulnerable Children and Adults Act, [Minn. Stat., section 256M.80, subd. 2] and the Minnesota Indian Family Preservation Act. [Minn. Stat., section 260.775]

This information is available in accessible formats to individuals with disabilities by calling 651-431-4671 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 \$10,667.30.

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

---

651-431-4670

Attention. If you need free help interpreting this document, call the above number.

ያስተውሉ፡ ካለምንም ክፍያ ይህንን ዶክመንት የሚተረጎም ለአስተርጓሚ ከፈለጉ ከላይ ወደተጻፈው የስልክ ቁጥር ይደውሉ።

ملاحظة: إذا أردت مساعدة مجانية لترجمة هذه الوثيقة، اتصل على الرقم أعلاه.

သတိ။ ဤစာရွက်စာတမ်းအားအခမဲ့ဘာသာပြန်ပေးခြင်း အကူအညီလိုအပ်ပါက၊ အထက်ပါဖုန်းနံပါတ်ကိုခေါ်ဆိုပါ။

අဓိကအချက်မှာ ၂ ပေါ်ရှိအချက်အလက်များကိုအသုံးပြု၍ အခြားဘာသာစကားဖြင့် ပြန်လည်ဖော်ပြနိုင်ရန် နှင့် ပိုမိုသိရှိလိုပါက ၂

請注意，如果您需要免費協助傳譯這份文件，請撥打上面的電話號碼。

Attention. Si vous avez besoin d'une aide gratuite pour interpréter le présent document, veuillez appeler au numéro ci-dessus.

Thov ua twb zoo nyeem. Yog hais tias koj xav tau kev pab txhais lus rau tsab ntaub ntawv no pub dawb, ces hu rau tus najnpawb xov tooj saum toj no.

ဟ်သုတ်ဝ်သးဘဉ်တက့ၢ်. ဖဲနမ့ၢ်လိၣ်ဘဉ်တၢ်မၤစၢၤကလိလၢတၢ်ကကျိးထံဝဲဒၣ်လံာ် တိလံာ်မိတခါအံၤန့ၣ်, ကိးဘဉ်လိဝဲစိနီၢ်ဂံၢ်လၢထးအံၤန့ၣ်တက့ၢ်.

알려드립니다. 이 문서에 대한 이해를 돕기 위해 무료로 제공되는 도움을 받으시려면 위의 전화번호로 연락하십시오.

ໂປຣຕຊາບ. ຖ້າຫາກ ທ່ານຕ້ອງການການຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອໃນການແປເອກະສານນີ້ພຣີ, ຈົ່ງໂທໂປທີ່ໝາຍເລກຂ້າງເທິງນີ້.

Hubachiisa. Dokumentiin kun bilisa akka siif hiikamu gargaarsa hoo feete, lakkoobsa gubbatti kenname bibili.

Внимание: если вам нужна бесплатная помощь в устном переводе данного документа, позвоните по указанному выше телефону.

Digniin. Haddii aad u baahantahay caawimaad lacag-la'aan ah ee tarjumaadda qoraalkan, lambarka kore wac.

Atención. Si desea recibir asistencia gratuita para interpretar este documento, llame al número indicado arriba.

Chú ý. Nếu quý vị cần được giúp đỡ dịch tài liệu này miễn phí, xin gọi số bên trên.

LB2 (8-16)



For accessible formats of this publication or additional equal access to human services, write to [dhs.info@state.mn.us](mailto:dhs.info@state.mn.us), call 651-431-4670, or use your preferred relay service. (ADA1 [9-15])

## Contents

<b>Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report Summary, 2016 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Purpose .....	3
Findings .....	3
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Minnesota children .....	5
What is out-of-home care? .....	5
Minnesota's out-of-home care system.....	6
Pathway from out-of-home care to permanency.....	6
<b>Placement in out-of-home care .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Children and placements: Enterers and continuers .....	7
Characteristics of children in out-of-home care .....	9
Sidebar: A closer look at the two or more race category .....	10
Sidebar: High numbers of children in care under two age 2 .....	13
Reasons for entering care .....	14
Sidebar: More children removed due to parental drug abuse .....	17
<b>Supervision and case management.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Supervising agency.....	18
Case management services.....	19
Caseworker visits with children in out-of-home care.....	20
Placement experiences .....	21
Placement moves.....	22
<b>Leaving out-of-home care .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Length of time in care .....	23
Reasons for leaving out-of-home care.....	25
<b>Adoptions .....</b>	<b>26</b>
Children and state guardianship: Enterers and continuers .....	27
Characteristics of children under state guardianship .....	27
Characteristics of children who were adopted.....	30
Children who aged out of guardianship.....	32
Time to adoption.....	32
Adoption of siblings .....	33

Tribal customary adoptions .....	34
<b>Post placement services and outcomes.....</b>	<b>35</b>
Post reunification services .....	35
Post adoption or kinship services .....	36
Re-entry.....	36
<b>The out-of-home care and permanency appendix .....</b>	<b>37</b>
Table 6. Number of children in out-of-home care by sex and agency with U.S. Census child population estimate and rate per 1,000, 2016 .....	38
Table 7. Number of children in out-of-home care by age and agency, 2016 .....	41
Table 8. Number of children in out-of-home care by race, ethnicity, and agency, 2016 .....	43
Table 9. Number of new placement episodes by primary reason for removal from the home and agency, 2016 .....	46
Table 10. Number of children who experienced out-of-home care by location setting type and agency, 2016 .....	50
Table 11. Number of foster care families who cared for children by race/ethnicity and agency, 2016 .....	54
Table 12. American Indian children in out-of-home care by tribe, 2016 .....	57
Table 13. Number of placement episodes ending by length of stay in care and agency, 2016 .....	59
Table 14. Number of children under state guardianship by agency, 2016.....	62
<b>References.....</b>	<b>64</b>

## Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report Summary, 2016

### Purpose

The purpose of this annual report is to provide information on children placed in out-of-home care in Minnesota, and to highlight the work that happens across the state to ensure and promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children who experience out-of-home care. For the purpose of this report, the terms out-of-home care, out-of-home placement, foster care, and in care will be used interchangeably to refer to any instance in which a child is removed from their home of origin and placed in the care of the responsible social service agency. For information about performance on all state and federal performance measures, see the [Minnesota Child Welfare Data Dashboard](#).

### Findings

Placement data for out-of-home care in 2016 is as follows:

- There were 15,004 children who experienced 15,654 placement episodes during 2016.<sup>1</sup>
- From 2015 to 2016, there was a 10.2 percent increase in the overall number of children who experienced out-of-home care.
- Of the 15,004 children who experienced care in 2016:
  - 7,441 children in 7,843 placement episodes began a placement in 2016 (these children are referred to as enterers).
  - 7,811 children in placement episodes continued in care in 2016 (that is, their episode began in a prior year and extended into 2016; these children are referred to as continuers).
- White children remain the largest group, both entering care (48.7 percent) and continuing in care (42.1 percent) in 2016. However, disproportionality remains a significant concern for children in out-of-home placement.
- Compared to white children, based on child population estimates:
  - American Indian children were 17.6 times more likely to experience care.
  - Children identified as two or more races were 4.8 times more likely to experience care.
  - African-American children were over 3.1 times more likely to experience care.
- Children under age 2 and children between 15 and 17 years of age were more likely to experience out-of-home care.
- While most children who experienced care in 2016 did *not* have an identified disability, a substantial portion of enterers (23.4 percent) and continuers (39.8 percent) had a documented disability.
- Parental drug abuse surpassed alleged neglect as the most common primary reason for new out-of-home care episodes beginning in 2016. Parental drug abuse was the primary reason for 27.1 percent of new episodes, and alleged neglect accounted for 24.5 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note, sometimes this report will include a count of episodes of out-of-home care and sometimes it will use a count of children who experienced out-of-home care.

### Supervision and case management data is as follows:

- Of all out-of-home care placements, most are supervised by county social services (85.5 percent of enterers and 80.6 percent of continuers). The rest were overseen by corrections (7.1 percent of enterers, 4.5 percent of continuers), and tribal social services (7.4 percent of enterers, 14.9 percent of continuers).
- The most common settings experienced by children were family foster homes. Almost half (48.5 percent) of all children who entered care in 2016 spent time in a *non-relative* family foster setting; 43.2 percent spent time in a *relative* family foster setting.

### Leaving out-of-home care data reveals:

- There were 6,023 unique children in 6,246 placement episodes that ended in 2016.
- Of the placement episodes that ended, 41.8 percent lasted six months or less.
- Most (63.0 percent) placements that ended in 2016 did so because a child was able to safely return home to their parents or other primary caregivers.
- More than one-in-five (21.3 percent) continuous placement episodes ended with children being adopted, or a transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative.
- In 2016, there were 1,993 children who spent at least one day under the guardianship of the commissioner.
- In 2016, 868 children under guardianship of the commissioner were adopted.
- For American Indian children under jurisdiction of tribal court, 43 had a customary tribal adoption in 2016.

### Post placement services and outcomes data reveals:

- More than one-third (34.5 percent) of all children who reunified with their caregivers continued to receive case management services from a social service agency for six months or longer after leaving care.
- Using the federal performance measure, re-entry into foster care in 2016 was 18.3 percent. Minnesota's re-entry rate is much higher than the federal performance standard of 8.3 percent.



## Introduction

Entering out-of-home care can cause significant trauma for many children. Those in out-of-home care have been found more likely to have difficulties in school and exhibit emotional and behavioral problems. [Kortenkamp & Ehrle, 2002] Placement in out-of-home care, especially during particularly important developmental periods, can be problematic for a child's attachment with their primary caregiver(s). Additional negative impacts on emotional development are associated with multiple moves, and with re-re-entry into foster care. [American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Early Childhood, Adoption and Dependent Care, 2000]

Placement in out-of-home care is sometimes necessary. Foster care, especially family foster care settings, can mediate the negative effects of maltreatment and/or neglect, providing children with supports that are essential for healthy development. [Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2012] It is imperative that the Minnesota Department of Human Services (department) monitor and assess information on children placed in out-of-home care, ranging from conditions that resulted in a child's removal from their home to how effective the system is at helping children find safe, permanent homes.



## Minnesota children

According to the National Kids Count Data Book, Minnesota has fewer children entering out-of-home care than many other states. [Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2016] However, recent increases in children involved in child protection and a growing drug epidemic are contributing to more children entering care and staying in care longer. Minnesota has seen a 10.2 percent increase in children experiencing out-of-home care in 2016 from 2015.

Minnesota has significant racial disparities in out-of-home care; African-American and American Indian children are disproportionately likely to experience out-of-home care. [Minnesota Department of Human Services, 2013 and 2014]

## What is out-of-home care?

Minnesota Statutes provide a detailed description of what constitutes out-of-home care or foster care. [[Minn. Stat., 260C.007, subd. 18](#)] Out-of-home care or foster care is any 24-hour substitute care for children placed away from their parents or guardians and for whom a responsible social services agency has placement and care responsibility. Foster care includes, but is not limited to, placement in foster family homes (relative and non-relative), group homes, emergency shelters, residential facilities, child care institutions, and pre-adoptive homes. In Minnesota, children can enter out-of-home care for a variety of reasons: Child protection, specialized treatment for mental health concerns or developmental disabilities, and juvenile corrections.


## Minnesota's out-of-home care system

Minnesota is a state supervised, locally administered child welfare system. This means that local social service agencies (87 counties and two American Indian tribes participating in the American Indian Child Welfare Initiative) are responsible for the care and protection of children in out-of-home placement. The Minnesota Department of Human Services, Child Safety and Permanency Division, provides oversight, guidance, training, technical assistance, and quality assurance monitoring of local agencies in support of



that work. The purpose of this annual report is to provide information on children affected, and the work that happens, across the state to ensure and promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children who have experienced out-of-home care. There is an additional annual report that provides information on children who may have been maltreated, "Minnesota's Child Maltreatment Report, 2016." For information about performance on all state and federal child welfare performance measures, see the [Minnesota Child Welfare Data Dashboard](#).

## Pathway from out-of-home care to permanency



## Placement in out-of-home care

Children are placed in out-of-home care for a variety of reasons: Juvenile delinquency, developmental disabilities, to access needed mental health or other specialized treatment, or as a result of child protection involvement.

There are three ways children can be placed into care (see [Minn. Stat., Chapter 260C](#) and [Minn. Stat., Chapter 260D](#)):

1. Voluntary placement agreement,
2. Court order of a placement (involuntary), or
3. A 72-hour hold by law enforcement (involuntary).

A voluntary placement occurs when the parents or custodians of a child agree to allow the local social service agency to temporarily take responsibility for care of a child. A court-ordered placement occurs because a family is unable or unwilling to meet the safety or specialized needs of a child in their home. A 72-hour hold occurs when a child is found in surroundings or conditions which endanger their health or

welfare; law enforcement has authority to remove a child from the home and place them in foster care. For a child to remain in care longer than 72 hours, the child welfare agency must have court-approved placement, or a parent must sign a voluntary agreement.

When a child enters out-of-home care, one of three different types of agencies assumes, or is delegated by the court, responsibility for supervision of that out-of-home care placement episode: County social services, corrections, or tribal social services.


There were 15,004 children who experienced 15,654 placements during 2016.<sup>2</sup> Of these placement episodes, 12.6 percent began as a voluntary or court-reviewed voluntary hold (N = 1,970), and 87.2 percent began as a court-ordered or protective involuntary hold (N = 13,645). There were 47 episodes that did not have placement authority data entered.

### Children and placements: Enterers and continuers

This report distinguishes between two groups of children who experience out-of-home care in a year: Enterers and continuers. Enterers are those children who had a placement episode which began in 2016, and continuers are those who were in a placement episode that began prior to 2016 and continued into 2016. As mentioned earlier, the number of placement episodes is higher than the number of children as a child could have been in multiple episodes.

- Of the 15,004 children who experienced 15,654 episodes of out-of-home care in 2016, there were 7,441 children in 7,843 placement episodes who were enterers, and 7,811 in placement episodes who were continuers.
- There were 248 children who were continuers and, after returning home in 2016, had a new entry into out-of-home care in 2016 and were subsequently categorized as enterers, as well. See Figure 1 for a diagram that shows the overlap in children.

**Figure 1. The overlapping nature of enterers and continuers**




Note: Each person represents approximately 100 children/young adults

<sup>2</sup> Note, sometimes this report will include a count of episodes of out-of-home care and sometimes a count of children.

- As seen in Figure 2, for the first time in the past 10 years, the number of children continuing in care from the previous year surpassed the number of children who entered care at some point during the year.

**Figure 2. Number of children experiencing care by continuers, enterers and all children, 2006 – 2016**



- From 2015 to 2016, there has been a 10.2 percent increase in the overall number of children who experienced out-of-home care, a 1.5 percent increase in the number of children who entered care, and an 18.8 percent increase in continuers.
- There are likely several reasons why more children are continuing in care in 2016, including:
  - Families are facing multiple, complex challenges, often including the co-occurrence of chemical health and mental health issues, which often require long periods of treatment and recovery for caregivers. The opiate crisis in Minnesota is impacting families; there is a corresponding increase in children entering care as a result of parental drug abuse (see Figure 8 for more information on reasons for entry). [Collins, 2016]
  - When children cannot reunify with their parents (and a smaller percentage of children were reunified in 2016 compared to previous years), alternative pathways to permanency are pursued (e.g., adoption and transfer of custody). These pathways have additional court and programmatic actions, which result in longer overall stays in out-of-home care. For example, Northstar Kinship assistance, which is financial assistance that began being provided by the department in 2015 to kin who accept legal and physical


custody of a child in care, requires that a child must reside with that family for a minimum of six months before transfer of custody can be finalized. This may be causing delays in reaching permanency and increasing the length of time in care.

## Characteristics of children in out-of-home care

This section provides data on the race, age, and disability status of children who entered care and continued in care in 2016. Data shows:

- White children remain the largest group of children both entering and continuing in care in 2016 (see Figure 3 for the number and percentage of children in care in 2016)
- Disproportionality remains a significant concern for children in out-of-home placement.

**Figure 3. Number and percentage by race/ethnicity of children in care in 2016**



- American Indian children were 17.6 times more likely, African-American children were more than 3.1 times more likely, and those identified as two or more races were 4.8 times more likely than white children to experience care based on Minnesota population estimates from 2015.


Number and percentages of children entering care by race are shown in Figure 3; rates of entry per 1,000 children in the population by race are shown in Figure 4.

- Disproportionality among children experiencing out-of-home care remains an ongoing challenge for the child welfare system, paralleling opportunity gaps experienced by children and families of color and American Indian children and families across the state.





**Figure 4. Rate per 1,000 for **children** in care in 2016**



- As seen in Figure 5, both American Indian children and those who identify as two or more races have seen increases in the rate of children experiencing out-of-home care.
- In 2016, the department awarded \$1.5 million per year for two-year grants to tribal, county and community agencies to reduce disparities in the state's child welfare system. The Minnesota Legislature appropriated these funds to develop, implement, and evaluate activities to address disparities and disproportionality in the child welfare system.


### Sidebar: A closer look at the two or more race category

Minnesota is becoming more diverse, with many children and families identifying with more than one race. The rate of children identified as more than one race has been steadily increasing since 2010. Of those children who experienced care in 2016 and were identified as more than one race:

- **86.6** percent identified at least one race as White
- **59.2** percent identified at least one race as African-American/Black
- **56.0** percent identified at least one race as American Indian
- **5.1** percent identified at least one race as Asian, and less than **1.3** percent identified as Pacific Islander.





**Figure 5. Rate per 1,000 children in out-of-home care by race/ethnicity, 2007 - 2016**



- Figure 6 shows the distribution of children experiencing out-of-home care by enterers and continuers by age. (Age here is calculated at either Jan. 1, 2016 (for continuers) or the date of entry into care for those whose first out-of-home care episode began in 2016.)
- Children under age 2 and those between 15 and 17 years of age were more likely to experience out-of-home care.


**Figure 6. Number of children by age experiencing care in 2016**





- Minnesota law allows youth in foster care on their 18th birthday to receive extended foster care services through age 20, if they meet certain criteria. There were 847 children/young adults who experienced extended foster care during 2016. The most common criteria were: Completing high school/GED (56.4 percent), employed at least 80 hours per month (30.1 percent), and enrolled in post-secondary or vocational education (24.3 percent).

**Figure 7. Number and percentage of children by disability status for enterers and continuers in 2016**



Note: "Other" category includes hearing or visual impairment, physical disability, brain injury, HIV/AIDS.




## Sidebar: High numbers of children in care under two age 2

- There were 2,673 children under age 2 who experienced out-of-home care in 2016.
- Of those children, 1,171 (43.8 percent) entered care because of parental drug abuse; 844 (31.6 percent) entered because of alleged neglect.
- There were 1,889 (70.7 percent) children under 2 who entered placement on a 72-hour police hold.
- Of the 2,673 children under age 2, there were 620 (23.2 percent) identified as American Indian; 305 entered care prior to 2016.
- American Indian children under age 2 experienced care in 2016 at very high rates relative to their population estimates:
  - Approximately 252 of every 1,000\* American Indian children under age 2 in Minnesota experienced care.
  - Of children with an identified primary removal reason, 354 (57.3 percent) entered care primarily due to parental drug abuse, and 186 (30.1 percent) entered due to alleged neglect.

### Rate per 1,000 experiencing out-of-home care in 2016

Shown by race/ethnicity and age



\* Note: This calculation includes only children who were identified as American Indian only, and does not include children identified as American Indian and one or more additional race.

Note: Age is calculated at either Jan. 1, 2016 (for continuers), or the date of entry into care for those whose first out-of-home care episode began in 2016.



- Some children who experienced out-of-home care have disabilities and may need additional support while in out-of-home placement. These range from learning disabilities to physical disabilities, and from emotional disturbances to Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders. Data show that 23.4 percent of children who entered care in 2016 had an identified disability, while 39.8 percent who continued in care into 2016 did (see Figure 7).
- For those children who entered or continued in care in 2016 with an identified disability, the most

common disability was severe emotional disturbance (13.7 percent for enterers and 21.3 percent for continuers).

- Despite the difficulty in defining disability across disciplines, a review of relevant research suggests children with disabilities experience out-of-home care at higher rates than those without identified disabilities, which may, in part, be attributed to higher rates of child maltreatment for this population. [Lightfoot & LaLiberte, 2013]
- Children who have been in care for some time have likely come into contact with more child-serving professionals who often have training and experience in identifying red flags for developmental delays. Another possibility is that children who have greater needs may require specialized care, and subsequently remain in care longer.


## Reasons for entering care

During 2016, children entered out-of-home care for many different reasons. Some reasons were related to a parent or caregiver, whereas others were more about a child's functioning and ability to remain safe and keep others safe. Generally, removal due to a parental reason is a result of some factor that compromises the ability of that parent or caregiver to provide safety for a child. This may include parental drug use, alleged abuse or neglect of a child, incarceration, or parental mental health needs. On the other hand, a removal due to a child reason is typically a result of factors that affect the ability of a child to remain safe while in their home, or jeopardizes the safety of community members. Usually, a child has special needs, such as mental health and/or substance abuse that require specialized treatment.

- Although children may enter care for multiple reasons, more than three of every four placements (77.6 percent) had an indicated *primary* removal reason attributed to parents.




**Figure 8: Number and percentage of placement episodes with parental and child reasons beginning in 2016**



Note: At the time of data analysis, there were 132 continuous placement episodes in which the local agency had not selected any reason for removal from the home.


- More than one-quarter (27.1 percent) of placement episodes had a primary removal reason of parental drug abuse, whereas just less than one-quarter (24.5 percent) had a primary removal reason of alleged neglect. See Figure 10.
- Compared to parental reasons, removal from the home due to child reasons tended to occur at lower rates. Of the placement episodes where a child reason was identified as the primary reason for removal, almost all (1,576 of 1,732 or 91.0 percent) had either child delinquency, child mental health, or child family conflict listed as the primary removal reason.

**Figure 9: Number of placement episodes by age and primary removal reason beginning in 2016**



Note: Age here is calculated at either Jan. 1, 2016 (for continuers) or the date of entry into care for those whose first out-of-home care episode began in 2016. This methodology has been updated since the previous report.


**Figure 10: Number and percentage of placement episodes by primary removal reason beginning in 2016**



- Although most placement episodes that began in 2016 were supported by at least one parental reason, child reasons were substantially more common in placements with older children. Figure 9 shows the number of placement episodes beginning in 2016 by parental and child reasons for each age group. Generally, children age 11 and younger were removed from their home due to parental reasons. For older children, increasingly higher proportions of new placement episodes began due to child reasons.
- There are several reasons that may explain why older children are removed for child reasons. For example:
  - Older children may be more likely to become involved in delinquent activity and be placed in a juvenile detention facility. Some child welfare agencies in Minnesota have an agreement with juvenile corrections to help place and provide funding for placement of these children.
  - Older children are more likely to have diagnosed mental health needs. Previous research has shown a relationship between children with complex mental health/behavioral needs and an increased likelihood of out-of-home placement. [Bhatti-Sinclair & Sutcliffe, 2012]

**Sidebar: More children removed due to parental drug abuse**

- Drug addiction is a serious problem that can be difficult to treat and can compromise the ability of guardians to provide quality care, increasing the likelihood that a child will need to enter out-of-home care to remain safe. Opioid-related deaths and hospital stays are increasing across the country. [Katz, 2017; Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2017] Minnesota opioid-related deaths have increased 15.8 percent from 2014 to 2015. [Rudd, Seth, David, & Scholl, 2016] The state also shows relatively high rates of opioid-related in-patient treatment for people under age 24 and those over age 65 compared to other states. [Weiss, et al., 2017]
- In 2016, parental drug abuse became the most common primary reason for removal from the home (27 percent of episodes). The occurrence of this removal reason has increased over the past few years both in the proportion, and in actual number, of new episodes.
- Increases in removals for parental drug/alcohol use are consistent with, though not entirely explained by, the general economic and social trends in Minnesota. For example: From 2000 to 2014, the percentage of children in Minnesota living in poverty has increased from 9.0 percent to 14.9 percent. [U.S. Census Bureau, 2015] Poverty is a well-known risk factor both for drug addiction and maltreatment. When a family has both, the challenges of providing a stable and safe home increase greatly.



Note: Less common reasons for placement (<10 percent) are not shown in this graph.

## Supervision and case management

The next section of the report provides information about what happens to children once they are placed in out-of-home care. It will include information on supervising agencies, placement locations where children are during their episode, and other information regarding what happens when children are in out-of-home care.

### Supervising agency

There are three different agencies that assume, or are delegated by a county or tribal court, responsibility for the placement of a child into out-of-home care: County social services, tribal social services, or corrections. These agencies ensure that state and federal laws are appropriately followed.

- Not surprisingly, a high proportion of American Indian children who entered care in 2016 were placed under supervision of tribal social services (44.2 percent), and an even higher proportion of American Indian children who continued in care in 2016 (60.5 percent) were under supervision of tribal social services.
- The proportion of children under supervision of corrections also varies by race, with African-American/Black children entering and continuing in care at a higher rate than other racial groups (18.3 percent for enterers and 11.8 percent for continuers).

**Table 1. Number and percentage of placement episodes by race/ethnicity for three types of supervising agencies in 2016**

	Enterers				Continuers			
	County Social Services	Corrections	Tribal Social Services		County Social Services	Corrections	Tribal Social Services	
African-American / Black	<b>1,021</b> (81.7%)	<b>229</b> (18.3%)		<b>1,250</b> (100.0%)	<b>1,146</b> (88.2%)	<b>154</b> (11.8%)		<b>1,300</b> (100.0%)
American Indian	<b>651</b> (52.5%)	<b>42</b> (3.4%)	<b>548</b> (44.2%)	<b>1,241</b> (100.0%)	<b>682</b> (37.7%)	<b>32</b> (1.8%)	<b>1,094</b> (60.5%)	<b>1,808</b> (100.0%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	<b>184</b> (91.1%)	<b>18</b> (8.9%)		<b>202</b> (100.0%)	<b>126</b> (97.7%)	<b>3</b> (2.3%)		<b>129</b> (100.0%)
Two or more races	<b>1,064</b> (90.9%)	<b>78</b> (6.7%)	<b>29</b> (2.5%)	<b>1,171</b> (100.0%)	<b>1,108</b> (90.0%)	<b>60</b> (4.9%)	<b>63</b> (5.1%)	<b>1,231</b> (100.0%)
Unknown / declined	<b>176</b> (94.6%)	<b>10</b> (5.4%)		<b>186</b> (100.0%)	<b>51</b> (89.5%)	<b>3</b> (5.3%)	<b>3</b> (5.3%)	<b>57</b> (100.0%)
White	<b>3,610</b> (95.2%)	<b>183</b> (4.8%)		<b>3,793</b> (100.0%)	<b>3,186</b> (97.0%)	<b>100</b> (3.0%)		<b>3,286</b> (100.0%)
<b>All races</b>	<b>6,706</b> (85.5%)	<b>560</b> (7.1%)	<b>577</b> (7.4%)	<b>7,843</b> (100.0%)	<b>6,299</b> (80.6%)	<b>352</b> (4.5%)	<b>1,160</b> (14.9%)	<b>7,811</b> (100.0%)
Hispanic (any race)	<b>699</b> (88.5%)	<b>59</b> (7.5%)	<b>32</b> (4.1%)	<b>790</b> (100.0%)	<b>613</b> (88.2%)	<b>34</b> (4.9%)	<b>48</b> (6.9%)	<b>695</b> (100.0%)



## Case management services

Case management services are provided for families with children in out-of-home care for more than 30 days. Services are customized based on the reasons for placement, including: child protection, specialized treatment for mental health concerns or developmental disabilities, and juvenile corrections.

While children are in care, county and tribal agency staff work with the child, their family, and providers to develop a comprehensive Out-of-home Placement Plan (OHPP). The OHPP is the case plan that drives the services that a child and family receive; it outlines all specific provisions that must be met for a child to safely return home. Often, there are certain safety requirements that a family must meet or exceed for a child to return home.



Out-of-home Placement Plans are completed:

- Within 30 days of a child's initial placement,
- Jointly with parents,
- Jointly with a child, when of appropriate age, and
- In consultation with the guardian ad litem, foster parent, and tribe, if a child is American Indian.

For placements that have court involvement, OHPPs receive court approval and are reviewed every 90 days while a child remains in care to ensure that adequate and appropriate services are being provided.

An independent living skills (ILS) plan for children age 14 or older is also required. This plan is developed with the youth, the case worker, the caretaker(s), and other supportive adults in the youth's life to encourage continued development of independent living skills, and life-long connections for a youth with family, community, and their tribe. Specific independent living skills include, but are not limited to, the following areas: Educational, vocational or employment planning, transportation, money management, health care and medical coverage, housing, and social and/or recreation. It does not conflict with, or replace the goal of achieving permanency for youth [see [Minnesota Statute Section 260C.212, subd. 1\(c\)\(11\)](#)].

Additional services available to youth in out-of-home care, based on eligibility, include:

- Support for Emancipation and Living Functionally (SELF) program: Helps youth working with a county or tribal social worker prepare for a successful transition to adulthood, including independent living skills training, housing, transportation, permanent connections, education, and employment services to youth ages 14 through age 20
- Minnesota Education and Training Voucher (ETV) Program: Current and former foster youth can get up to \$5,000 per school year for post-secondary education at college, university, vocational, technical or trade schools

- Extended foster care (EFC) services and payments: Youth can stay in their foster care setting longer, live on their own with additional support, or request to return to foster care through age 20
- Healthy Transition and Homeless Prevention program: Partnership with non-profit agencies throughout the state to provide independent living skills services to youth currently or previously experiencing out-of-home care through age 21


## Caseworker visits with children in out-of-home care

Caseworkers are required to meet monthly with children in out-of-home placement. Monthly visits are critical to a child remaining safe, achieving successful and timely reunification, or reaching alternative means of permanency. Visits provide an opportunity for caseworkers to monitor a child's safety, stability of placement, progress on services provided to a child and family, and well-being while in care. Often, children are seen more frequently than monthly, depending on the needs of a child, family, or placement provider.



- In 2016, of the *enterers*, for the months where face-to-face visits were required, workers saw children monthly 84.8 percent of the time. Of the *continuers*, for the months where face-to-face visits were required, workers saw children monthly 77.3 percent of the time (see Figure 11).
- Minnesota's child welfare agencies continue to work on improving the frequency with which children are seen by looking for opportunities to expand the child welfare workforce, as well as reduce caseload sizes. A small increase was seen in 2016 after the Minnesota Legislature appropriated additional funds to increase the number of child welfare workers.

**Figure 11: Percentage of months in which children received a required monthly caseworker visit (enterers vs. continuers) in 2016**



Note: Caseworker visit calculations include only children under 18 years old



## Placement experiences

Once a child has been removed from the home or even prior to their removal, whenever possible, child welfare agencies work diligently to locate a safe and stable placement. There are a variety of out-of-home care settings that vary on their overall level of restrictiveness, as well as the types of services provided. These settings range from family-type settings, including foster homes to more intensive settings like residential treatment centers. Children may experience multiple placement setting types during a single placement episode, depending on their unique needs.

Minnesota Statutes dictate that when placing a child, an agency must first consider placing them with a suitable individual who is related to them, then consider any individuals who a child may have significant contact with (see [Minn. Stat., 260C.212, subd. 2 \(a\)](#) for details). Numerous factors related to a child's overall well-being, such as their educational, medical, developmental, religious, and cultural needs, as well as their personal preference if old enough, are considered.




- Table 2 provides information about the racial diversity of individuals who provide family foster care in Minnesota; the number who cared for a child for at least one day in 2016 and had at least one adult listed on the license who identified as the specified race.

**Table 2: Number and percentage of foster care homes where at least one caregiver identifies as the specified race/ethnicity in 2016**

	Number	Percent
African American/Black	958	12.7%
American Indian	1,004	13.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	127	1.7%
Two or more races	333	4.4%
Unknown/Declined	323	4.3%
White	5,360	71.2%
Hispanic	318	4.2%

- Children were most often placed in home-like settings (see Figure 12). Of the 7,441 children who entered care in 2016, about three-quarters (77.3 percent) spent some time in either a relative or non-relative foster home setting. About half (48.5 percent) spent time in a non-relative foster family care setting, and 43.2 percent spent at least some time in relative family foster care.
- Family foster care settings are preferred. These settings provide care for children in a minimally restrictive environment and often allow a child to remain connected with other positive supports in their community, such as friends and school.
- Other types of settings such as group homes, residential treatment centers and correctional facilities are more restrictive for a child and are less common than family foster care.
- The remaining settings prepare a child for adoption or other permanent placement, i.e., pre-adoptive or pre-kinship homes and independent living centers.

**Figure 12: Number and percentage of children by location setting in 2016**




Note: This graph shows only children who entered out-of-home care in 2016. ICF-DD stands for Intermediate Care Facilities for persons with developmental disabilities

## Placement moves

During a placement episode, children may move from one location to another to better meet their particular needs. Although moves can create further trauma for a child in out-of-home care, some moves are necessary to better ensure safety of a child, provide needed services and/or a less restrictive environment, or achieve permanency.

- When taking into account the entire length of an out-of-home care episode for all episodes occurring in 2016 (both enterers and continuers), the vast majority of placement episodes had between zero and three moves (89.2 percent). Children who were in care for longer periods of time experience more moves. See Figure 13.
- The department is currently exploring information about the cases where children have had five (or more) moves during their continuous placement episode to identify patterns and reasons for moving children.

**Figure 13: Number of total moves children experienced while in a placement episode (through 2016)**



## Leaving out-of-home care

This section will focus on children who left out-of-home care in 2016. The designation of exiters will be used for children who were in out-of-home placement and exited during 2016. Although children are able to stay in care to age 21 through extended foster care services, most children discharge prior to their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday.


### Length of time in care

There were 6,023 unique children in 6,246 placement episodes that ended in 2016 (e.g., some children experienced more than one placement episode that ended during the year). Some children were in care for only a few days while others had been in care for multiple years.

- About four of every 10 placement episodes (41.8 percent) that ended had been open for six months or less (see Figure 14). The length of time that a child spends in care is highly variable and may be influenced by the following, among many other factors:
  - Needs of child and family,
  - Safety concerns,
  - Availability of resources to help families reach goals in their case plan,
  - Overall permanency goal(s),
  - Administrative requirements/barriers, and
  - Legal responsibilities/court decisions.



**Figure 14: Length of stay for placement episodes ending in 2016**



- Length of time in care also varies by race and ethnicity categories. Table 3 shows the number and percentage of placement episodes broken down by length of stay and shown for each race and ethnicity.
- American Indian children have high proportions who stay in care for two years or longer compared to other racial and ethnic groups.

**Table 3: Number and percentage of placement episodes ending in 2016 by length of time in care and race/ethnicity**

	African-American / Black	American Indian	Asian / Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown / declined	White	All races	Hispanic (any race)
<b>1 to 7 days</b>	236 (20.6%)	68 (8.6%)	18 (13.6%)	113 (11.5%)	43 (37.4%)	348 (11.3%)	826 (13.2%)	100 (16.1%)
<b>8 to 30 days</b>	87 (7.6%)	43 (5.5%)	17 (12.9%)	69 (7.0%)	14 (12.2%)	230 (7.5%)	460 (7.4%)	59 (9.5%)
<b>1 to 3 months</b>	127 (11.1%)	68 (8.6%)	19 (14.4%)	99 (10.1%)	12 (10.4%)	350 (11.4%)	675 (10.8%)	70 (11.3%)
<b>3 to 6 months</b>	140 (12.2%)	71 (9.0%)	21 (15.9%)	100 (10.2%)	9 (7.8%)	310 (10.1%)	651 (10.4%)	65 (10.5%)
<b>6 to 12 months</b>	228 (19.9%)	145 (18.4%)	16 (12.1%)	211 (21.5%)	22 (19.1%)	691 (22.4%)	1,313 (21.0%)	128 (20.6%)
<b>12 to 24 months</b>	183 (15.9%)	189 (24.0%)	26 (19.7%)	231 (23.5%)	13 (11.3%)	759 (24.6%)	1,401 (22.4%)	117 (18.9%)
<b>24 to 36 months</b>	69 (6.0%)	113 (14.3%)	8 (6.1%)	100 (10.2%)	2 (1.7%)	221 (7.2%)	513 (8.2%)	40 (6.5%)
<b>36 months or more</b>	78 (6.8%)	91 (11.5%)	7 (5.3%)	58 (5.9%)		173 (5.6%)	407 (6.5%)	41 (6.6%)
<b>Total</b>	1,148 (100.0%)	788 (100.0%)	132 (100.0%)	981 (100.0%)	115 (100.0%)	3,082 (100.0%)	6,246 (100.0%)	620 (100.0%)


## Reasons for leaving out-of-home care

The following section provides information about the reasons why children were discharged from their out-of-home placement episode.

- For placement episodes that ended in 2016 (see Figure 15), most (63.0 percent) ended because children were able to safely return home to their parents or other primary caregivers.
- More than one-quarter (27.4 percent) of placement episodes ended with children being adopted, living with relatives (including a non-custodial father), or had transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative.
- A small proportion of placements ended because children turned 18, ran away, or transferred to a different agency.
- Of special importance are the seven cases where continuous placement episodes ended because of the death of children. Six instances were due to accidental or natural causes; one was due to child maltreatment.



**Figure 15: Number and percentage of placement episodes by discharge reason for placements ending in 2016**





## Adoptions

As mentioned above, some children exited out-of-home care in 2016 due to adoption. The following section provides details about children who exited to adoption, as well as the process through which a child goes from being in out-of-home care to being adopted. Adoption is the preferred permanency option in Minnesota if reunification with parents or primary caregivers cannot be achieved in a safe and/or timely fashion. Children may ultimately be adopted by their foster parents, relatives, or other individuals




who have developed a relationship with the child; all pre-adoptive parents must meet the necessary state requirements for adoption. When reunification is not possible and adoption is determined to be the appropriate permanency option for a child, the court must order a termination of parental rights (TPR), which severs the legal parent-child relationship, or accept a parent's consent to adoption. The court must also order guardianship of a child to the commissioner of the department.

Children under guardianship of the commissioner are referred to as "state wards" in this section. The commissioner is the temporary guardian of these children until they are adopted. Adoption is the only permanency option for children under guardianship of the commissioner.<sup>3</sup> As designated agents of the commissioner, county and tribal social service agencies are responsible for safety, placement, and well-being of these children, including identifying appropriate adoptive parents and working with adoptive parents, courts, and others to facilitate the adoption process. This process may be lengthy. Children may remain under guardianship of the commissioner for months, years, or until they turn age 18 and either age out of the foster care system or continue in extended foster care. Once a child turns 18, they are no longer under guardianship of the commissioner.

Northstar Care for Children, implemented in 2015, is a benefit program for children in foster care and those finding permanency through adoption or transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative (TPLPC). It equalizes benefits for children in foster care, kinship care or adoption, thereby reducing the possibility that children's permanency options are based on competing financial incentives. However, children achieving permanency through adoption or transfer of legal and physical custody who are under age 6 receive approximately half of a child's foster care reimbursement rate. This is referred to as the "pre-school entry rate." Data may be best understood within the context of this new program, for examples programmatic changes may have impacted numbers of adoptions, length of time to permanency, etc. [see [Minn. Stat., 256N](#)]

<sup>3</sup> The exception is when a court determines that re-establishing parental rights is the most appropriate permanency option. There are specific eligibility criteria that must be met prior to making this determination, including age of a child, length of time in care post-termination of parental rights, and whether a parent has corrected the conditions that led to the termination of parental rights. See [Minn. Stat., 260C.329](#) for more information.



## Children and state guardianship: Enterers and continuers

The remainder of this report uses county data from the department's Adoption Information System, and includes data from court, county, and tribal social services documents entered at the department. As was done in the section about children who experienced out-of-home placement, this section will distinguish between two groups of children who are under guardianship of the commissioner in a year: Enterers and continuers.


Enterers are those children where the commissioner became their legal guardian in 2016 due to a termination of parental rights or court's acceptance of a parent's consent to adoption. Continuers are those children who became wards of the state prior to 2016 and remained under state guardianship into 2016. During 2016, there were 1,993 children who spent at least one day under guardianship of the commissioner. There were 868 children who entered guardianship and 1,125 children who continued guardianship.

## Characteristics of children under state guardianship


This section focuses on the age and race of children who entered guardianship and continued to be under state guardianship in 2016.

- White children remain the largest group, both entering and continuing in guardianship in 2016 (see Figure 16 for the number and percentage of children under guardianship in 2016).

**Figure 16: Number and percentage of **children** under guardianship by race/ethnicity in 2016**




**Figure 17: Rate per 1,000 for **children** under guardianship in 2016**



- With the exception of Asian or Pacific Islander children, rates for children of color and American Indian children range from between three to more than five times more likely to come under state guardianship compared to white children (see Figure 17).
- Figure 18 shows the over/under representation of children of color and American Indian children who entered guardianship over time.




**Figure 18: Rate per 1,000 of **children** entering guardianship by race/ethnicity, 2010 – 2016**



- Figure 19 shows the distribution of children entering and continuing guardianship by age.
- Children entering guardianship tended to be younger, whereas children continuing under guardianship were more evenly distributed across age groups.

**Figure 19. Number of **children** by age experiencing state guardianship in 2016**




## Characteristics of children who were adopted

The following section provides information on the characteristics of children who had been state wards in 2016 and who had finalized adoptions during the year.

- During 2016, 868 children had finalized adoptions. Of these, 242 became state wards during the same year, and 626 were state wards prior to the beginning of 2016.
- In total, approximately 43.6 percent of all children under state guardianship in 2016 were adopted.
- White children comprised the largest proportion who were adopted. The racial and ethnic breakdown of all children adopted during 2016 is shown in Figure 20.




**Figure 20. Number and percentage of children adopted by race/ethnicity in 2016**




- Children, birth to age 5, comprise the largest proportion of adopted children. This pattern is more pronounced for children who entered guardianship in 2016 than for those who were already under guardianship on the first of the year.


**Figure 21. Number and percentage of children adopted by age group in 2016**



- As displayed in the next two graphs (Figures 22 and 23), over the past six years, young white children continue to comprise the largest group of adopted children; white children comprised 52.6 percent of children under guardianship in 2016 and 77.7 percent of the child population in Minnesota.
- There was a sharp increase from 2013 to 2014 in children birth to age 5 who were adopted, with numbers decreasing substantially in 2015, back to 2013 levels. This may, in part, be due to implementation of Northstar Care for Children in January 2015. There was a subsequent increase in 2016 for this age group, which mirrored an increase for those in the 6 through 11 years old age group.

**Figure 22. Number of children adopted by age group, 2010 – 2016**



**Figure 23. Number of children adopted by race/ethnicity, 2010 – 2016**

### Children who aged out of guardianship


Not all children who become state wards eventually get adopted. Some children turn age 18 and “age out” of the foster care system.

- During 2016, 51 children who had been state wards aged out before becoming adopted, which is very similar to the number who aged out in 2015.
- Twelve of these 51 children (23.5 percent) continued in care after turning 18 through the extended foster care program.
- Children who aged out of state ward status may still be adopted after turning 18, although this information is not monitored by the department.

### Time to adoption

The average time from being placed under state guardianship to adoption has improved over the past several years. Younger children are typically adopted faster than older children, with children birth through age 3 remaining in care for 291 days on average. Every age group saw a decrease in the time to adoption from 2015 to 2016. See Figure 24 for long-term trends for each age group.

- The following figure provides information about how long it takes from the date of entering state guardianship to adoption for children who were adopted between 2010 and 2016.
- Children in younger age groups are consistently adopted faster than older children.

**Figure 24. Days from entering guardianship to adoption by age, 2010 – 2016**

### Adoption of siblings<sup>4</sup>

Keeping siblings together contributes to maintaining family relationships and cultural connections. Separating siblings in foster care and adoption may add to the trauma experienced by separation from birth parents and other family members. Both state and federal laws require siblings to be placed together for foster care and adoption at the earliest possible time, unless it is determined not to be in the best interest of a child, or is not possible after reasonable efforts by an agency.

<sup>4</sup> Currently, the Social Service Information System categorizes siblings based on the biological mother, so siblings placed with, or separated from paternal siblings, are not included in the data. In addition, siblings who are 18 years or older, who were previously adopted, or who were never under guardianship of the commissioner, are also not counted as part of a sibling group in this data table. Because percentages of sibling groups preserved are calculated for adoption within a calendar year, some intact adoptions may not be counted if adoptions of individual children took place over the span of more than one year. Note that the percentages for sibling group preservations are smaller than those reported in previous years due to increased accuracy in determining sibling groups. The current method includes all sibling groups available for adoption during a given year in which one or more siblings were adopted.

- Table 4 shows the number and percentages of sibling groups that were adopted fully intact, and either partially or fully intact for the years 2010–2016.
- In 2016, 72.6 percent of sibling groups were adopted together.
- About 84.0 percent of sibling groups were adopted either partially or fully intact in 2016. These percentages have had only minor fluctuations between 2010 and 2016.



**Table 4. Sibling group preservation in adoptions, 2010 - 2016**

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Sibling groups available for adoption with at least one child adopted</b>	153	133	135	135	184	169	237
<b>Sibling groups adopted fully intact</b>	111	90	97	97	130	118	172
<b>Sibling groups adopted partially intact</b>	18	14	13	16	22	23	27
<b>Percent of sibling groups adopted fully intact</b>	72.5%	67.7%	71.9%	71.9%	70.7%	69.8%	72.6%
<b>Percent of sibling groups adopted partially or fully intact</b>	84.3%	78.2%	81.5%	83.7%	82.6%	83.4%	84.0%

### Tribal customary adoptions

Most tribes in Minnesota offer culturally appropriate permanency options through tribal court. Some tribes utilize customary adoption as a permanency option, which occurs after suspension of parental rights rather than a termination of parental rights.

- Table 5 includes American Indian children who were under tribal court jurisdiction and were adopted through customary adoption from 2010 – 2016 by age group. Although there are minor fluctuations in numbers by age group across years, the relatively small number of tribal court children within each group limits interpretation of these trends.





**Table 5. Number and percentage of American Indian children adopted through customary adoption by age group, 2010 - 2016**

	Birth through 5 yrs.		6 yrs. or older		Total Number
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
<b>2010</b>	14	60.9%	9	39.1%	23
<b>2011</b>	23	60.5%	15	39.5%	38
<b>2012</b>	22	73.3%	8	26.7%	30
<b>2013</b>	10	47.6%	11	52.4%	21
<b>2014</b>	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	22
<b>2015</b>	37	43.5%	48	56.5%	85
<b>2016</b>	24	55.8%	19	44.2%	43

## Post placement services and outcomes

After achieving permanency, either through reunification, adoption, or transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative, the local social services agency or the department may provide services to support families. Some children who have achieved permanency may continue to have challenges and re-enter out-of-home care. The following section provides information about the services received post placement and on re-entry into out-of-home care.


### Post reunification services

Children and their families may continue receiving support after their out-of-home placement has ended through provision of case management services by the local social services agency. The following section provides information about how many children received this type of service and for how long.

- For episodes that ended in reunification with parents/caretakers and children/families receiving case management, nearly two thirds of episodes remained open for three months or more after a child was reunified. See Figure 25 for information on episodes that ended with reunification and ongoing case management services.



**Figure 25. Number and percentage of episodes that closed to reunification where ongoing services were provided by length of time in 2016**



### Post adoption or kinship services

A child and family may receive ongoing support in the form of Northstar adoption assistance or Northstar kinship assistance if they meet eligibility criteria. For more information about eligibility criteria and the process, see [Northstar Adoption Assistance Program](#). While adoption assistance has been an option available to many adoptive families over the past few decades, Northstar kinship assistance is a new program that began in 2015 to support relatives permanently caring for the children in their care.


- There were 8,751 children who received payments for Northstar or legacy adoption assistance in 2016.
- Of the 8,751 children, 907 were adopted or had a customary tribal adoption in 2016.
- There were 1,040 children who received payments for Northstar kinship assistance in 2016.

### Re-entry

Despite the best efforts of county and tribal agency staff, some children who experience out-of-home care and achieve permanency will re-enter the foster care system due to either safety concerns or the need for specialized treatment.

- Using the CFSR Round 3 performance measure for re-entry into foster care, Minnesota's re-entry rate is much higher than the federal performance standard of 8.3 percent.

Note: The methodology used for the re-entry measure calculation was updated since the 2015 annual report.





## The out-of-home care and permanency appendix

Table 6. Number of children in out-of-home care by sex and agency with U.S. Census child population estimate and rate per 1,000, in 2016

	Under 18 (female)	Under 18 (male)	18 or older (female)	18 or older (male)	Total	2015 child population estimate	Child rate per 1,000
Aitkin	27	33	1	0	61	2,725	22.0
Anoka	221	231	10	16	478	83,424	5.4
Becker	98	81	1	2	182	8,227	21.8
Beltrami	464	491	10	4	969	11,516	82.9
Benton	42	70	1	0	113	9,729	11.5
Big Stone	13	6	0	0	19	1,028	18.5
Blue Earth	84	89	1	0	174	13,012	13.3
Brown	24	29	1	1	55	5,476	9.7
Carlton	60	74	1	4	139	8,059	16.6
Carver	83	63	2	3	151	27,222	5.4
Cass	69	65	2	1	137	6,102	22.0
Chippewa	3	3	0	0	6	2,800	2.1
Chisago	56	67	2	1	126	12,577	9.8
Clay	123	150	2	3	278	14,629	18.7
Clearwater	11	12	1	0	24	2,196	10.5
Cook	2	12	0	0	14	793	17.7
Crow Wing	122	126	0	2	250	13,940	17.8
Dakota	167	187	2	5	361	102,866	3.4
Douglas	37	39	5	2	83	7,878	9.6
Fillmore	11	7	0	0	18	4,998	3.6
Freeborn	47	42	0	0	89	6,685	13.3
Goodhue	48	50	5	0	103	10,438	9.4
Grant	4	9	0	0	13	1,298	10.0
Hennepin	1,275	1,398	62	79	2,814	271,399	9.8
Houston	18	25	1	0	44	4,041	10.6
Hubbard	44	57	0	2	103	4,392	23.0
Isanti	51	61	1	2	115	9,259	12.1
Itasca	129	146	6	5	286	9,650	28.5
Kanabec	19	25	2	0	46	3,452	12.7
Kandiyohi	56	56	3	0	115	10,207	11.0
Kittson	5	8	0	1	14	968	13.4
Koochiching	19	38	0	2	59	2,474	23.0
Lac qui Parle	9	5	1	1	16	1,374	10.2
Lake	12	15	2	0	29	1,986	13.6
Lake of the Woods	5	8	0	0	13	732	17.8
Le Sueur	27	28	1	0	56	6,731	8.2

Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	<b>Under 18 (female)</b>	<b>Under 18 (male)</b>	<b>18 or older (female)</b>	<b>18 or older (male)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2015 child population estimate</b>	<b>Child rate per 1,000</b>
McLeod	53	60	1	0	114	8,479	13.3
Mahnomen	9	13	1	0	23	1,661	13.2
Marshall	11	5	0	0	16	2,177	7.3
Meeker	26	10	0	0	36	5,705	6.3
Mille Lacs	128	141	2	2	273	6,154	43.7
Morrison	42	40	0	3	85	7,707	10.6
Mower	43	54	0	1	98	9,633	10.1
Nicollet	28	40	2	0	70	7,265	9.4
Nobles	29	44	4	2	79	5,841	12.5
Norman	12	10	0	0	22	1,541	14.3
Olmsted	92	114	8	8	222	37,346	5.5
Otter Tail	48	75	1	0	124	12,383	9.9
Pennington	22	27	0	1	50	3,318	14.8
Pine	63	49	0	1	113	5,972	18.8
Polk	47	53	1	0	101	7,421	13.5
Pope	18	22	0	4	44	2,291	17.5
Ramsey	721	830	34	36	1,621	125,750	12.3
Red Lake	5	9	0	0	14	1,013	13.8
Renville	24	30	1	0	55	3,320	16.3
Rice	93	119	6	0	218	14,471	14.6
Roseau	15	15	1	0	31	3,892	7.7
St. Louis	543	560	15	17	1,135	38,344	28.8
Scott	78	56	0	1	135	40,341	3.3
Sherburne	72	81	2	1	156	24,829	6.2
Sibley	11	14	0	0	25	3,563	7.0
Stearns	178	211	9	11	409	35,283	11.0
Stevens	11	12	1	0	24	2,085	11.0
Swift	18	21	0	1	40	2,048	19.0
Todd	50	56	1	4	111	5,817	18.2
Traverse	5	5	1	2	13	700	14.3
Wabasha	18	27	0	2	47	4,698	9.6
Wadena	26	27	0	1	54	3,401	15.6
Washington	134	120	6	7	267	62,864	4.0
Watonwan	7	6	1	1	15	2,648	4.9
Wilkin	1	7	1	1	10	1,452	5.5
Winona	40	43	3	1	87	9,338	8.9
Wright	112	113	1	1	227	37,511	6.0
Yellow Medicine	18	16	0	0	34	2,270	15.0
Southwest HHS	113	120	13	7	253	18,009	12.9

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	<b>Under 18 (female)</b>	<b>Under 18 (male)</b>	<b>18 or older (female)</b>	<b>18 or older (male)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2015 child population estimate</b>	<b>Child rate per 1,000</b>
Des Moines Valley HHS	25	36	3	2	66	4,984	12.2
Faribault-Martin	87	80	3	2	172	7,384	22.6
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe <sup>†</sup>	85	100	0	0	185	1,975 <sup>†</sup>	93.7
White Earth Nation <sup>†</sup>	204	203	3	1	411	1,981 <sup>†</sup>	205.5
MN Prairie	78	84	1	3	166	19,195	8.4
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>6,928</b>	<b>7,564</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>15,004</b>	<b>1,284,387</b>	<b>11.3</b>

<sup>†</sup>Note: The data for these two groups are 2010 Census numbers which represent children residing on the Leech Lake and White Earth reservations who indicated American Indian alone or as one of two or more races. There are no intercensal child population estimates for these groups. The Leech Lake reservation overlaps Cass, Itasca, Beltrami and Hubbard counties. The White Earth reservation overlaps Mahnommen, Becker, and Clearwater counties.

Note: Child rate per 1,000 only includes children under 18. Age was calculated either on the first of the year for those who were in care on Jan. 1, 2016 or on the day an out-of-home care placement episode began in 2016 for all others.

Table 7. Number of children in out-of-home care by age and agency, 2016

	Birth - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 8 years	9 - 11 years	12 - 14 years	15 - 17 years	18 or older	Total children
Aitkin	9	5	9	8	15	14	1	61
Anoka	102	66	59	67	76	82	26	478
Becker	41	29	34	17	27	31	3	182
Beltrami	268	162	167	127	117	114	14	969
Benton	22	17	14	19	9	31	1	113
Big Stone	5	2	4	3	2	3	0	19
Blue Earth	47	39	36	23	17	11	1	174
Brown	8	8	10	5	12	10	2	55
Carlton	28	20	13	16	28	29	5	139
Carver	20	16	19	19	21	51	5	151
Cass	25	17	22	22	23	25	3	137
Chippewa	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	6
Chisago	38	22	13	13	15	22	3	126
Clay	58	41	34	25	51	64	5	278
Clearwater	4	1	3	3	4	8	1	24
Cook	3	1	2	2	0	6	0	14
Crow Wing	74	38	38	36	29	33	2	250
Dakota	83	66	60	43	50	52	7	361
Douglas	20	12	12	8	11	13	7	83
Fillmore	6	3	2	1	3	3	0	18
Freeborn	25	15	8	9	16	16	0	89
Goodhue	19	17	16	9	16	21	5	103
Grant	3	1	0	0	6	3	0	13
Hennepin	738	412	346	290	352	535	141	2,814
Houston	14	5	6	9	5	4	1	44
Hubbard	20	22	8	14	18	19	2	103
Isanti	29	20	16	12	19	16	3	115
Itasca	46	38	33	34	50	74	11	286
Kanabec	7	7	7	6	3	14	2	46
Kandiyohi	34	11	17	12	14	24	3	115
Kittson	0	1	1	1	3	7	1	14
Koochiching	9	5	2	7	14	20	2	59
Lac qui Parle	1	1	2	3	4	3	2	16
Lake	5	3	6	7	3	3	2	29
Lake of the Woods	3	3	1	2	3	1	0	13
Le Sueur	7	10	7	7	14	10	1	56
McLeod	23	16	20	13	17	24	1	114
Mahnomen	1	6	1	0	4	10	1	23
Marshall	2	1	0	1	6	6	0	16
Meeker	4	1	2	8	7	14	0	36
Mille Lacs	83	46	34	36	33	37	4	273
Morrison	20	13	11	10	18	10	3	85
Mower	17	14	22	26	9	9	1	98

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Birth - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 8 years	9 - 11 years	12 - 14 years	15 - 17 years	18 or older	Total children
Nicollet	15	4	13	13	11	12	2	70
Nobles	10	12	11	9	12	19	6	79
Norman	5	3	1	3	4	6	0	22
Olmsted	42	25	25	24	34	56	16	222
Otter Tail	33	18	19	14	24	15	1	124
Pennington	17	11	1	3	5	12	1	50
Pine	38	17	13	12	12	20	1	113
Polk	19	9	16	9	13	34	1	101
Pope	9	6	3	7	8	7	4	44
Ramsey	350	202	193	158	219	429	70	1,621
Red Lake	6	2	0	0	3	3	0	14
Renville	8	14	8	7	5	12	1	55
Rice	51	35	26	34	33	33	6	218
Roseau	4	0	1	4	7	14	1	31
St. Louis	305	187	194	120	162	135	32	1,135
Scott	22	23	16	14	21	38	1	135
Sherburne	27	23	23	26	24	30	3	156
Sibley	3	5	5	2	4	6	0	25
Stearns	94	59	48	31	60	97	20	409
Stevens	4	0	2	2	4	11	1	24
Swift	13	7	1	6	6	6	1	40
Todd	26	22	18	15	11	14	5	111
Traverse	2	3	0	1	2	2	3	13
Wabasha	9	4	5	4	7	16	2	47
Wadena	9	8	10	9	9	8	1	54
Washington	48	27	24	24	43	88	13	267
Watsonwan	3	2	0	1	1	6	2	15
Wilkin	4	0	1	0	0	3	2	10
Winona	20	8	9	9	23	14	4	87
Wright	37	39	28	39	39	43	2	227
Yellow Medicine	4	4	6	5	5	10	0	34
Southwest HHS	60	36	31	29	38	39	20	253
Des Moines Valley HHS	11	6	5	10	15	14	5	66
Faribault-Martin	35	34	25	23	23	27	5	172
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	57	43	31	25	17	12	0	185
White Earth Nation	125	84	56	48	48	46	4	411
MN Prairie	47	28	28	17	20	22	4	166
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>3,545</b>	<b>2,245</b>	<b>2,014</b>	<b>1,730</b>	<b>2,116</b>	<b>2,842</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>15,004</b>



Table 8. Number of children in out-of-home care by race, ethnicity, and agency, 2016

	African-American/Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown /declined	White	Total children	Hispanic (any race)
Aitkin	*	15	*	9	*	32	61	*
Anoka	68	21	*	86	*	287	478	40
Becker	7	71	*	25	*	78	182	7
Beltrami	7	833	*	40	*	86	969	23
Benton	11	*	*	14	*	81	113	8
Big Stone	*	*	*	*	*	16	19	*
Blue Earth	12	*	*	27	10	118	174	20
Brown	*	*	*	*	*	53	55	9
Carlton	*	56	*	24	*	56	139	*
Carver	11	*	*	21	*	114	151	21
Cass	*	38	*	10	*	84	137	*
Chippewa	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	*
Chisago	*	*	*	9	9	102	126	8
Clay	17	38	*	56	*	165	278	60
Clearwater	*	13	*	*	*	*	24	*
Cook	*	*	*	*	*	10	14	*
Crow Wing	16	12	*	20	*	202	250	*
Dakota	75	*	8	75	*	198	361	48
Douglas	7	*	*	10	*	59	83	*
Fillmore	*	*	*	*	*	18	18	*
Freeborn	*	*	*	14	*	71	89	15
Goodhue	*	*	*	13	*	78	103	14
Grant	*	*	*	*	*	8	13	*
Hennepin	1,108	409	70	686	40	501	2,814	355
Houston	7	*	*	*	*	29	44	*
Hubbard	10	23	*	10	*	60	103	10
Isanti	*	*	*	19	*	93	115	*
Itasca	*	38	*	30	*	211	286	*
Kanabec	*	*	*	*	*	41	46	*
Kandiyohi	*	*	*	*	*	97	115	55

Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	African-American/Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown /declined	White	Total children	Hispanic (any race)
Kittson	*	*	*	*	*	11	14	*
Koochiching	*	12	*	*	*	43	59	*
Lac qui Parle	*	*	*	*	*	14	16	*
Lake	*	*	*	*	*	23	29	*
Lake of the Woods	*	*	*	*	*	11	13	*
Le Sueur	*	*	*	*	*	49	56	12
McLeod	*	*	*	10	*	99	114	20
Mahnomen	*	17	*	*	*	*	23	*
Marshall	*	*	*	*	*	13	16	*
Meeker	*	*	*	*	*	28	36	*
Mille Lacs	*	178	*	18	*	72	273	*
Morrison	*	*	*	21	*	63	85	*
Mower	11	*	9	13	*	65	98	16
Nicollet	*	*	*	12	*	51	70	8
Nobles	8	*	10	*	*	49	79	27
Norman	*	*	*	*	*	20	22	*
Olmsted	33	*	*	53	*	129	222	17
Otter Tail	7	11	*	14	*	89	124	*
Pennington	*	*	*	*	*	39	50	*
Pine	*	41	*	16	*	52	113	*
Polk	9	9	*	25	*	58	101	21
Pope	*	*	*	9	*	34	44	*
Ramsey	624	122	167	276	20	412	1,621	164
Red Lake	*	*	*	*	*	13	14	*
Renville	*	*	*	*	*	42	55	10
Rice	24	*	*	16	19	157	218	36
Roseau	*	*	*	*	*	25	31	*
St. Louis	95	246	*	180	*	593	1,135	25
Scott	8	*	*	25	*	88	135	17
Sherburne	14	*	*	33	8	98	156	*
Sibley	*	*	*	*	*	24	25	9
Stearns	84	*	*	67	*	248	409	34

Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	African-American/Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown /declined	White	Total children	Hispanic (any race)
Stevens	*	*	*	*	*	18	24	8
Swift	*	*	*	10	*	28	40	9
Todd	*	*	*	19	*	82	111	7
Traverse	*	*	*	*	*	*	13	*
Wabasha	*	*	*	*	*	42	47	10
Wadena	*	*	*	12	*	33	54	*
Washington	38	11	*	31	*	151	267	38
Watonwan	*	*	*	*	*	12	15	9
Wilkin	*	*	*	*	*	10	10	*
Winona	10	*	*	12	*	65	87	10
Wright	13	*	*	22	*	182	227	20
Yellow Medicine	*	12	*	*	*	19	34	*
Southwest HHS	*	53	*	41	*	146	253	43
Des Moines Valley HHS	*	*	*	*	*	62	66	9
Faribault-Martin	*	*	*	15	*	149	172	24
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	*	182	*	*	*	*	185	*
White Earth Nation	*	382	*	29	*	*	411	12
MN Prairie	8	*	*	20	*	134	166	22
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>2,423</b>	<b>2,946</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>2,277</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>6,810</b>	<b>15,004</b>	<b>1,426</b>

\*The number of children is less than seven and is omitted to prevent identification of individuals. Totals include the omitted data.

Table 9. Number of new placement episodes by primary reason for removal from the home and agency, 2016

	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical Abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical Health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total episodes
Aitkin	5	1	5	0	0	8	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Anoka	82	59	4	32	21	19	11	16	12	9	5	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	278
Becker	25	27	5	15	4	0	0	0	5	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	88
Beltrami	106	194	23	2	7	1	2	8	0	0	8	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	361
Benton	27	8	7	10	3	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Big Stone	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Blue Earth	24	31	1	11	0	1	1	2	1	6	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	84
Brown	8	5	3	1	3	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	31
Carlton	18	13	2	4	17	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	63
Carver	20	22	1	7	1	20	3	1	0	0	2	3	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	85
Cass	23	10	3	7	5	4	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	60
Chippewa	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chisago	27	16	1	6	0	6	1	2	2	3	1	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	72
Clay	22	15	47	0	8	28	7	0	1	9	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	144
Clearwater	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Cook	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Crow Wing	41	41	4	12	0	6	6	1	0	8	0	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	129
Dakota	56	98	0	16	1	15	1	10	4	2	10	3	2	1	7	8	0	0	0	234
Douglas	7	11	4	3	4	2	6	2	1	7	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	51
Fillmore	9	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Freeborn	5	17	2	4	6	4	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	48
Goodhue	8	19	5	5	1	1	1	3	0	3	5	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	56
Grant	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Hennepin	319	407	136	173	53	25	48	53	50	31	20	7	5	20	8	7	5	0	1	1,368

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical Abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical Health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total episodes
Houston	7	10	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Hubbard	12	14	3	3	2	0	1	0	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	44
Isanti	22	12	0	2	2	3	2	0	1	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Itasca	39	19	22	3	37	6	8	0	9	2	7	7	7	1	1	1	0	2	0	171
Kanabec	1	8	3	9	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	32
Kandiyohi	16	15	3	3	4	6	6	2	1	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	63
Kittson	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Koochiching	3	0	10	0	2	3	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	32
Lac qui Parle	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Lake	3	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Lake of the Woods	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Le Sueur	5	7	1	8	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	30
McLeod	35	11	2	5	4	2	2	3	0	3	1	5	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	78
Mahnomen	2	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Marshall	2	3	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
Meeker	4	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	14
Mille Lacs	44	34	6	5	8	6	5	3	1	4	3	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	124
Morrison	20	8	3	0	4	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	45
Mower	17	7	0	7	2	3	2	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Nicollet	9	11	2	4	6	2	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	43
Nobles	14	1	6	10	8	2	2	0	1	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Norman	3	4	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	17
Olmsted	32	19	8	4	19	3	1	8	4	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	104
Otter Tail	21	15	4	4	7	0	7	3	1	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	71
Pennington	5	8	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical Abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical Health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total episodes
Pine	20	17	6	4	4	0	3	2	4	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	65
Polk	6	6	8	3	5	10	8	2	1	1	0	0	4	0	4	3	0	0	0	61
Pope	5	7	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Ramsey	80	263	255	108	17	20	17	10	46	2	15	8	6	7	1	0	5	1	1	862
Red Lake	3	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Renville	8	2	3	2	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Rice	40	34	5	12	6	0	2	4	5	4	4	3	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	124
Roseau	5	2	14	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	26
St. Louis	254	67	11	47	59	12	40	9	10	19	9	6	0	7	2	2	0	0	0	554
Scott	23	21	5	9	8	18	4	5	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	101
Sherburne	28	6	14	15	10	3	5	2	4	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	95
Sibley	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Stearns	33	50	41	35	10	9	10	5	1	4	2	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	2	214
Stevens	0	10	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Swift	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Todd	27	8	1	4	1	3	3	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	58
Traverse	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Wabasha	2	14	4	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Wadena	7	11	3	3	3	0	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	38
Washington	21	35	12	18	28	26	10	10	0	2	4	0	6	0	2	1	4	0	0	179
Watonwan	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Wilkin	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Winona	14	15	2	5	5	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Wright	47	16	5	16	18	6	3	4	5	0	7	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	135
Yellow Medicine	13	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18



# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical Abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical Health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total episodes
Southwest HHS	34	30	4	8	7	9	4	2	2	4	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	109
Des Moines Valley HHS	11	0	2	5	5	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	33
Faribault-Martin	23	28	0	13	6	0	1	1	0	3	1	2	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	91
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	41	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
White Earth Nation	125	15	2	4	1	2	9	1	0	4	15	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	187
MN Prairie	33	8	1	9	7	0	5	2	0	0	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>2,091</b>	<b>1,894</b>	<b>744</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7,722</b>

Note: At the time of data analysis, there were 132 continuous placement episodes in which the local agency had not selected any reason for removal from the home.

Note: This table counts unique continuous placement episodes; children may have been placed in care on multiple occasions during the year.

Table 10. Number of children who experienced out-of-home care by location setting type and agency, 2016

	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Group home	Pre-kinship home – relative	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Foster home – corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD*	Total children
Aitkin	21	25	11	0	10	1	2	6	7	0	0	7	0	61
Anoka	270	135	35	14	36	23	33	4	46	12	12	6	1	478
Becker	78	50	9	5	39	4	21	4	1	2	3	18	0	182
Beltrami	482	494	56	66	54	28	12	15	23	10	9	12	0	969
Benton	62	18	11	15	2	15	4	2	3	8	0	4	0	113
Big Stone	3	6	3	2	2	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	19
Blue Earth	73	87	6	2	12	11	17	0	0	1	0	1	2	174
Brown	24	5	9	2	5	4	4	0	2	12	1	0	0	55
Carlton	52	35	40	26	29	5	4	3	1	9	3	0	0	139
Carver	54	52	16	9	26	2	7	3	17	6	7	0	0	151
Cass	58	37	14	18	20	23	9	1	6	4	3	6	0	137
Chippewa	3	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Chisago	59	44	13	4	2	9	18	1	2	4	2	0	0	126
Clay	119	37	15	23	11	36	15	4	89	4	2	0	0	278
Clearwater	6	7	3	4	4	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	24
Cook	6	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	14
Crow Wing	145	70	9	25	10	28	27	2	5	3	1	1	0	250
Dakota	160	135	38	7	24	32	30	4	2	9	4	0	3	361
Douglas	47	21	11	4	7	6	1	1	3	2	4	1	0	83
Fillmore	6	6	0	2	0	5	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	18
Freeborn	41	34	16	7	8	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	89
Goodhue	54	39	22	3	5	3	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	103

Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Group home	Pre-kinship home – relative	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Foster home – corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD*	Total children
Grant	8	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	13
Hennepin	1,234	1,032	540	301	151	156	117	180	8	71	100	7	2	2,814
Houston	27	11	3	1	5	3	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	44
Hubbard	57	36	6	3	9	7	4	5	3	0	3	1	1	103
Isanti	46	32	16	4	6	17	15	1	3	4	1	0	0	115
Itasca	105	70	71	10	20	17	16	30	9	23	10	12	0	286
Kanabec	19	15	10	3	3	0	5	3	1	1	1	1	0	46
Kandiyohi	39	46	14	11	2	5	20	7	9	3	4	9	0	115
Kittson	6	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	14
Koochiching	19	14	11	2	5	8	6	1	7	0	0	4	0	59
Lac qui Parle	5	4	1	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	16
Lake	14	12	3	2	2	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	29
Lake of the Woods	1	9	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Le Sueur	18	19	11	2	3	7	4	0	2	1	1	2	0	56
McLeod	45	61	10	3	0	4	10	1	0	1	2	0	0	114
Mahnomen	11	4	3	4	2	1	0	2	6	0	3	1	0	23
Marshall	4	4	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	4	0	16
Meeker	10	13	7	5	2	1	3	1	1	5	0	0	0	36
Mille Lacs	130	100	15	22	47	13	9	10	9	5	2	2	0	273
Morrison	37	21	6	1	0	14	14	0	1	8	3	0	0	85
Mower	52	26	12	5	13	8	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	98
Nicollet	27	13	11	6	0	6	6	1	2	6	2	0	1	70
Nobles	29	12	16	2	1	7	5	7	5	7	3	1	0	79
Norman	4	9	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	22

Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Group home	Pre-kinship home – relative	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Foster home – corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD*	Total children
Olmsted	72	64	18	9	19	26	26	5	14	9	11	15	1	222
Otter Tail	54	43	21	3	19	6	4	1	5	5	1	7	0	124
Pennington	23	19	8	1	7	0	6	1	3	0	4	0	0	50
Pine	75	39	10	4	9	9	6	2	4	1	2	0	0	113
Polk	39	9	23	3	6	6	9	2	8	3	1	19	0	101
Pope	18	14	7	2	3	3	5	0	0	2	2	0	0	44
Ramsey	589	581	234	214	57	59	113	212	6	49	49	1	0	1,621
Red Lake	2	7	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	14
Renville	13	15	3	11	12	4	2	0	3	1	1	0	0	55
Rice	92	93	12	9	22	14	12	3	8	4	4	0	1	218
Roseau	7	6	8	0	1	2	0	3	14	1	0	6	0	31
St. Louis	492	393	123	183	135	75	69	21	8	26	23	0	0	1,135
Scott	40	56	14	2	10	7	5	1	16	1	5	20	0	135
Sherburne	68	39	21	13	20	9	14	4	5	10	4	6	0	156
Sibley	10	12	4	1	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	25
Stearns	190	109	28	40	13	41	38	38	12	14	15	5	0	409
Stevens	9	8	7	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	24
Swift	17	6	4	4	7	6	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	40
Todd	71	25	12	9	1	16	6	1	0	2	4	2	0	111
Traverse	8	3	3	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	13
Wabasha	26	12	6	6	1	8	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	47
Wadena	17	20	12	6	4	4	0	4	4	2	1	0	0	54
Washington	74	81	63	24	14	14	11	2	15	12	11	6	0	267
Watonwan	5	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	15

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Group home	Pre-kinship home – relative	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Foster home – corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD*	Total children
Wilkin	7	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Winona	27	22	10	24	1	5	4	3	2	1	3	0	1	87
Wright	120	78	20	10	16	23	11	1	4	7	2	1	0	227
Yellow Medicine	1	18	1	8	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Southwest HHS	83	90	22	27	15	28	16	9	7	9	20	0	3	253
Des Moines Valley HHS	26	10	8	11	8	8	3	3	6	8	4	0	0	66
Faribault-Martin	52	61	25	8	20	9	17	0	0	4	3	0	2	172
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	85	83	6	3	17	14	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	185
White Earth Nation	194	150	18	16	40	28	31	0	11	1	1	21	0	411
MN Prairie	65	59	20	3	3	23	26	3	2	3	3	1	0	166
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>6,441</b>	<b>5,138</b>	<b>1,905</b>	<b>1,290</b>	<b>1,073</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15,004</b>

\*ICF-DD: Intermediate Care Facilities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities

Note: Children may have spent time in multiple settings during their time in out-of-home care. Subsequently, adding the numbers up within a county will not equal the “Total children” column on the right of this table.

Table 11. Number of foster care families who cared for children by race/ethnicity and agency, 2016

	African-American/Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/declined	White	Hispanic (any race)	Total families
Aitkin	*	*	*	*	*	29	*	36
Anoka	25	*	*	*	*	195	7	229
Becker	*	17	*	*	*	86	*	103
Beltrami	*	303	*	17	*	184	*	480
Benton	*	*	*	*	*	62	*	66
Big Stone	*	*	*	*	*	13	*	13
Blue Earth	*	*	*	*	*	117	*	122
Brown	*	*	*	*	*	26	*	26
Carlton	*	21	*	7	*	39	*	57
Carver	*	*	*	*	16	76	10	94
Cass	*	16	*	*	17	60	*	88
Chippewa	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chisago	*	*	*	*	*	67	*	70
Clay	*	10	*	*	*	108	9	117
Clearwater	*	*	*	*	*	10	*	12
Cook	*	*	*	*	*	10	*	10
Crow Wing	*	*	*	*	*	163	*	168
Dakota	23	*	*	8	13	193	9	228
Douglas	*	*	*	*	*	47	*	51
Fillmore	*	*	*	*	*	11	*	11
Freeborn	*	*	*	*	*	48	*	50
Goodhue	*	*	*	*	*	52	*	58
Grant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5
Hennepin	541	171	36	86	34	734	96	1,474
Houston	*	*	*	*	*	25	*	28
Hubbard	*	*	*	*	*	55	*	62
Isanti	*	*	*	*	*	62	*	63
Itasca	*	13	*	*	*	101	*	114



Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	African-American/Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/declined	White	Hispanic (any race)	Total families
Kanabec	*	*	*	*	*	25	*	26
Kandiyohi	*	*	*	*	*	64	13	67
Kittson	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5
Koochiching	*	*	*	*	*	23	*	27
Lac qui Parle	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Lake	*	*	*	*	*	22	*	22
Lake of the Woods	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Le Sueur	*	*	*	*	*	23	*	23
McLeod	*	*	*	*	*	65	*	69
Mahnomen	*	*	*	*	*	9	*	15
Marshall	*	*	*	*	*	10	*	10
Meeker	*	*	*	*	*	21	*	22
Mille Lacs	*	61	*	16	*	80	*	135
Morrison	*	*	*	*	*	58	*	59
Mower	*	*	*	*	*	57	7	59
Nicollet	*	*	*	*	*	27	*	27
Nobles	*	*	*	*	*	25	*	26
Norman	*	*	*	*	*	9	*	9
Olmsted	10	*	*	*	*	127	*	138
Otter Tail	*	*	*	*	*	62	*	64
Pennington	*	*	*	*	*	26	*	26
Pine	*	20	*	*	*	64	*	85
Polk	*	*	*	*	*	38	*	42
Pope	*	*	*	*	*	25	*	27
Ramsey	274	29	59	52	29	352	58	743
Red Lake	*	*	*	*	*	8	*	8
Renville	*	*	*	*	*	29	*	30
Rice	*	*	*	*	7	109	8	117
Roseau	*	*	*	*	*	12	*	12
St. Louis	*	110	*	34	70	497	7	682

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	African-American/Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/declined	White	Hispanic (any race)	Total families
Scott	*	*	*	*	16	54	*	79
Sherburne	*	*	*	*	11	59	*	74
Sibley	*	*	*	*	*	17	*	17
Stearns	10	*	*	7	*	188	*	203
Stevens	*	*	*	*	*	10	*	10
Swift	*	*	*	*	*	21	*	21
Todd	*	*	*	*	*	71	*	75
Traverse	*	*	*	*	*	9	*	10
Wabasha	*	*	*	*	*	23	*	24
Wadena	*	*	*	*	*	33	*	34
Washington	15	*	*	*	30	88	7	129
Watsonwan	*	*	*	*	*	8	*	8
Wilkin	*	*	*	*	*	7	*	7
Winona	*	*	*	*	*	42	*	46
Wright	*	*	*	*	*	117	*	121
Yellow Medicine	*	*	*	*	*	10	*	12
Southwest HHS	*	23	*	*	*	112	*	132
Des Moines Valley HHS	*	*	*	*	*	32	*	32
Faribault-Martin	*	*	*	*	*	98	*	103
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	*	54	*	10	*	43	*	98
White Earth Nation	*	117	*	31	*	67	*	174
MN Prairie	*	*	*	*	*	116	*	120
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>1,004</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>5,360</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>7,530</b>

\*The number of families is less than seven and is not shown to prevent identification of individuals. Totals include omitted data.

Note: This table shows the number of foster care families who provided a home to children who experienced care during 2016.

Note: Cells will not sum to the column or row totals, as provider homes will be counted across both race/ethnicity groupings and child welfare agencies. Row and column totals show unduplicated counts of individual homes.

Table 12. American Indian children in out-of-home care by tribe, 2016

State where tribe is primarily located	Tribe	American Indian children
Minnesota	Bois Forte (Nett Lake) Band of Chippewa Indians	167
	Fond du Lac Band of Chippewa Indians	220
	Grand Portage Band of Chippewa Indians	20
	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	610
	Lower Sioux Indian Community	77
	Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians	370
	Minnesota Chippewa tribe (cannot identify specific band)	9
	Prairie Island Indian Community (Sioux)	13
	Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians	993
	Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	7
	Upper Sioux Community	20
	White Earth Nation	844
Iowa	Sac and Fox Tribe of Mesquakie Indians	1
Michigan	Bay Mills Indian Community	2
	Grand Traverse Band of Chippewa Indians	1
	Hannahville Indian Community	8
	Keweenaw Bay Indian Community	1
	Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe	2
	Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians	4
Nebraska	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska	10
	Santee Sioux Tribe	8
	Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska	17
North Dakota	Spirit Lake Tribe	40
	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	91
	Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation	19
	Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	74
South Dakota	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe	46

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

State where tribe is primarily located	Tribe	American Indian children
	Crow Creek Sioux Tribe	10
	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe	5
	Oglala Sioux Tribe - Pine Ridge	85
	Rosebud Sioux Tribe	54
	Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe	97
	Yankton Sioux Tribe	38
Wisconsin	Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	14
	Forest County Potawatomi Community	4
	Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin	20
	Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Chippewa	39
	Lac du Flambeau Band of Chippewa	13
	Menominee Indian Tribe	21
	Oneida Tribe	13
	Red Cliff Band of Chippewa	24
	Sokaogon Chippewa (Mole Lake) Community	3
	St. Croix Chippewa	26
Other Unknown	Canadian tribe	10
	Other foreign tribe	4
	Other US tribe	173
	Unknown Chippewa	22
	Unknown Sioux	22
	Unknown tribe	316
	<b>Total American Indian children</b>	<b>4,182</b>

Note: Numbers include children identified as American Indian alone or as one of two or more races. More than one tribal affiliation may be indicated for a child. Indication of a tribe does not necessarily mean a child is an enrolled member.

Table 13. Number of placement episodes ending by length of stay in care and agency, 2016

	1 to 7 days	8 to 30 days	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 to 24 months	24 to 36 months	36 months or more	Total placement episodes
Aitkin	0	6	6	2	12	2	0	0	28
Anoka	65	11	27	21	39	53	13	16	245
Becker	2	0	7	5	17	31	9	3	74
Beltrami	1	1	12	23	71	66	19	18	211
Benton	1	8	11	3	19	14	5	3	64
Big Stone	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	7
Blue Earth	12	3	2	6	35	11	14	1	84
Brown	3	6	4	3	6	6	0	3	31
Carlton	2	4	6	10	22	19	7	5	75
Carver	10	5	4	2	7	9	6	2	45
Cass	1	3	9	3	5	9	10	5	45
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4
Chisago	7	3	4	2	18	20	3	2	59
Clay	51	7	13	3	30	16	16	8	144
Clearwater	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	4	10
Cook	0	1	5	0	0	3	0	1	10
Crow Wing	12	2	7	5	23	35	12	1	97
Dakota	36	15	11	17	34	31	9	8	161
Douglas	5	3	4	9	6	4	1	8	40
Fillmore	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	6
Freeborn	0	3	4	2	9	10	3	1	32
Goodhue	8	0	7	1	9	14	2	4	45
Grant	4	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	9
Hennepin	150	71	122	117	249	237	82	66	1,094
Houston	7	1	0	1	6	5	0	2	22
Hubbard	4	3	2	1	13	10	7	1	41
Isanti	3	1	7	3	4	28	1	2	49
Itasca	12	6	22	22	28	42	7	6	145
Kanabec	2	0	4	6	7	3	3	1	26

Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	1 to 7 days	8 to 30 days	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 to 24 months	24 to 36 months	36 months or more	Total placement episodes
Kandiyohi	5	6	3	7	16	23	0	1	61
Kittson	2	0	1	2	0	2	0	1	8
Koochiching	5	3	5	3	8	2	2	2	30
Lac qui Parle	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	4
Lake	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	12
Lake of the Woods	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	10
Le Sueur	0	2	5	1	13	3	4	0	28
McLeod	1	21	1	2	10	9	1	1	46
Mahnomen	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	1	13
Marshall	0	0	4	2	2	1	1	2	12
Meeker	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	0	13
Mille Lacs	12	9	17	4	19	21	15	10	107
Morrison	0	2	1	2	10	14	1	3	33
Mower	7	2	4	12	11	8	0	2	46
Nicollet	0	4	5	2	6	9	1	1	28
Nobles	9	4	5	13	4	2	2	3	42
Norman	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	5
Olmsted	7	6	7	10	18	31	6	7	92
Otter Tail	0	3	3	10	6	9	3	0	34
Pennington	1	1	4	4	17	2	0	5	34
Pine	6	6	13	0	5	5	1	2	38
Polk	2	2	14	9	6	18	4	3	58
Pope	0	1	7	5	1	9	0	1	24
Ramsey	155	69	59	107	123	116	53	63	745
Red Lake	0	4	2	2	2	1	0	0	11
Renville	1	4	5	2	8	6	2	0	28
Rice	27	25	4	9	19	26	16	3	129
Roseau	3	5	4	0	4	3	0	1	20
St. Louis	30	17	56	41	57	126	43	38	408
Scott	16	14	10	7	14	7	4	3	75
Sherburne	7	6	8	15	22	13	3	1	75

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	1 to 7 days	8 to 30 days	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 to 24 months	24 to 36 months	36 months or more	Total placement episodes
Sibley	1	0	1	0	4	1	3	0	10
Stearns	29	20	26	29	61	43	10	9	227
Stevens	0	0	3	3	3	1	0	0	10
Swift	1	4	3	2	9	2	7	1	29
Todd	4	1	4	5	7	12	7	6	46
Traverse	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	0	8
Wabasha	0	2	1	0	3	4	3	0	13
Wadena	0	0	9	2	0	5	0	0	16
Washington	42	12	14	13	26	22	5	5	139
Watonwan	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	6
Wilkin	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	5
Winona	7	7	5	0	2	5	2	2	30
Wright	21	5	13	13	11	23	16	5	107
Yellow Medicine	0	0	4	2	1	6	0	3	16
Southwest HHS	12	7	2	1	24	39	2	12	99
Des Moines Valley HHS	0	3	3	1	10	9	1	5	32
Faribault-Martin	10	11	7	11	26	18	6	7	96
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	1	2	5	5	2	4	4	6	29
White Earth Nation	0	1	8	1	5	10	32	15	72
MN Prairie	3	1	9	8	21	32	8	2	84
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>1,313</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>6,246</b>



Table 14. Number of children under state guardianship by agency, 2016

	Entered guardianship prior to 2016	Entered guardianship in 2016	Total children
Aitkin	1	3	4
Anoka	41	12	53
Becker	13	11	24
Beltrami	12	25	37
Benton	7	13	20
Big Stone	4	4	8
Blue Earth	15	9	24
Brown	0	9	9
Carlton	0	9	9
Carver	3	5	8
Cass	23	8	31
Chippewa	2	2	4
Chisago	9	15	24
Clay	28	35	63
Clearwater	0	0	0
Cook	0	1	1
Crow Wing	31	18	49
Dakota	37	20	57
Douglas	3	3	6
Fillmore	1	2	3
Freeborn	4	3	7
Goodhue	3	1	4
Grant	0	0	0
Hennepin	248	212	460
Houston	3	0	3
Hubbard	4	4	8
Isanti	17	19	36
Itasca	16	14	30
Kanabec	4	6	10
Kandiyohi	11	12	23
Kittson	0	0	0
Koochiching	7	4	11
Lac qui Parle	5	0	5
Lake	4	2	6
Lake of the Woods	0	0	0
Le Sueur	8	3	11
McLeod	9	4	13
Mahnomen	0	0	0
Marshall	0	2	2
Meeker	3	1	4
Mille Lacs	3	17	20

# Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2016

	Entered guardianship prior to 2016	Entered guardianship in 2016	Total children
Morrison	12	18	30
Mower	10	13	23
Nicollet	5	6	11
Nobles	6	4	10
Norman	1	0	1
Olmsted	16	41	57
Otter Tail	8	1	9
Pennington	4	1	5
Pine	5	7	12
Polk	5	10	15
Pope	2	0	2
Ramsey	153	40	193
Red Lake	1	0	1
Renville	0	4	4
Rice	14	9	23
Roseau	0	2	2
St. Louis	93	48	141
Scott	8	2	10
Sherburne	8	12	20
Sibley	0	2	2
Stearns	39	51	90
Stevens	0	0	0
Swift	7	1	8
Todd	20	2	22
Traverse	2	1	3
Wabasha	10	4	14
Wadena	3	0	3
Washington	13	12	25
Watonwan	0	0	0
Wilkin	0	2	2
Winona	4	3	7
Wright	26	6	32
Yellow Medicine	4	1	5
Southwest HHS	25	15	40
Des Moines Valley HHS	6	6	12
Faribault-Martin	13	14	27
MN Prairie	23	22	45
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>1,125</b>	<b>868</b>	<b>1,993</b>

## References

- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2012). Reconnecting Child Development and Child Welfare: Evolving Perspectives on Residential Placement. Baltimore, MD, USA. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-ReconnectingChildDevelopmentandChildWelfare-2013.pdf>
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2016). The 2016 KIDS COUNT Data Book. Baltimore, MD, USA. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/the-2016-kids-count-data-book>
- Bhatti-Sinclair, K., & Sutcliffe, C. (2012). What determines the out-of-home placement of children in the USA? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34, 1749-1755.
- Burns, B. J., Phillips, S. D., Wagner, H. R., Barth, R. P., Kolko, D. J., Campbell, Y., & Landsverk, J. (2004). Medical health needs and access to mental health services by youth involved with child welfare: A national survey. *American Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 43, 960-970. doi:10.1097/01.chi.0000127590.95585.65
- Collins, J. (2016, April 18). *Here's why Minnesota has a big problem with opioid overdoses*. Retrieved from Minnesota Public Radio News: <https://www.mprnews.org/story/2016/04/18/opioid-overdose-epidemic-explained>
- Katz, J. (2017, June 5). Drug deaths in America are rising faster than ever. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/06/05/upshot/opioid-epidemic-drug-overdose-deaths-are-rising-faster-than-ever.html>
- Kortenkamp, K., & Ehrle, J. (2002, January). The well-being of children involved with the child welfare system: A national overview. *New Federalism*, B-43. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/59916/310413-The-Well-Being-of-Children-Involved-with-the-Child-Welfare-System.PDF>
- Lightfoot, E., & LaLiberte, T. (2013). Defining disability and understanding prevalence among children in child welfare. (T. Crudo, & T. LaLiberte, Eds.) *CW 360°: The Intersection of Child Welfare and Disability: Focus on Children*. Retrieved from [https://www.cascw.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Spring2013\\_360\\_web-FINAL.pdf](https://www.cascw.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Spring2013_360_web-FINAL.pdf)
- Minnesota Department of Human Services. (2013). *Minnesota's child welfare report 2013*. Retrieved from <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Public/DHS-5408F-ENG>
- Minnesota Department of Human Services. (2015). *Children's Mental Health: Transforming Services and Supports to Better Meet Children's Needs*. St. Paul, MN. Retrieved from <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Public/DHS-5051-ENG>
- Nowacki, K., & Schoelmerich, A. (2010). Growing up in foster families or institutions: Attachment representation and psychological adjustment of young adults. *Attachment and Human Development*, 12, 551-566. doi:10.1080/14616734.2010.504547
- Rubin, D. M., O'Reilly, A., Luan, X., & Loalio, A. R. (2007). The impact of placement stability on behavioral well-being for children in foster care. *Pediatrics*, 119, 336-344. doi:10.1542/peds.2006-1995

- Rudd, R. A., Seth, P., David, F., & Scholl, L. (2016). Increases in Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths—United States, 2010-2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 65, 1445-1452. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm65051e1>
- Ryan, J. P., & Testa, M. F. (2015). Child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency: Investigating the role of placement and placement instability. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27, 227-249. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2004.05.007
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2016, August 15). Small Area Income and Poverty Estimate. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/data/>
- Weiss, A. J., Bailey, M. K., O'Malley, L., Barrett, M. L., Elixhauser, A., & Steiner, C. A. (2014). *Patient Characteristics of Opioid-Related Inpatient Stays and Emergency Department Visits Nationally and by State, 2014*. Statistical Brief #224, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. Retrieved from <https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/reports/statbriefs/sb224-Patient-Characteristics-Opioid-Hospital-Stays-ED-Visits-by-State.pdf>