



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

Minnesota Family Investment Program Management Indicators Report

April - June 2016

Published September 2016
Minnesota Department of Human Services
Economic Assistance and Employment Supports Division
P.O. Box 64951
St. Paul, MN 55164-0951



For accessible formats of this publication and additional equal access to human services, write to DHS.Info@state.mn.us, call 651-431-4000, or use your preferred relay service. (ADA1 [9-15])

This report is published on the [MFIP Reports](#) page on the Minnesota Department of Human Services website at <http://mn.gov/dhs/>.

For information on this report, contact:
Erika Martin
Research, Planning and Evaluation Unit
Economic Assistance and Employment Supports Division
651-431-3978
erika.martin@state.mn.us

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Indicator 1. MFIP closings	2
Indicator 2. MFIP and DWP median placement wage	5
Indicator 3. TANF work participation rate (WPR)	9
Indicator 4. MFIP counted months	15
Indicator 5. MFIP employment services enrollments, closures and exit reasons	19
Indicator 6. MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (S-SI) and range of expected performance.....	23
Indicator 7. MFIP exits and returns	29
Indicator 8. MFIP unaccounted for cases	33
Notes	37

Abbreviations

AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
CM	Combined Manual
DEED	Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development
DHS	Minnesota Department of Human Services (department)
DRA	Deficit Reduction Act of 2005
DVHHS	Des Moines Valley Health and Human Services
DWP	Diversions Work Program
FSS	Family Stabilization Services
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
MAXIS	DHS eligibility system
MFIP	Minnesota Family Investment Program
MN Prairie	Minnesota Prairie County Alliance
MOE	TANF Maintenance of Effort
PRWORA	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996
RSDI	Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance
S-SI	MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index
SNAP	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
SWHHS	Southwest Health and Human Services
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
WEI	TANF Work-eligible Individual
WF1	Workforce One – DEED Workforce Data Entry System
WPR	TANF Work Participation Rate

Introduction

The Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) “Management Indicators Report” was developed to report on eight measures: MFIP closings; MFIP/DWP placement wages; TANF work participation rate; MFIP counted months; MFIP employment services enrollments; closures and exit reasons; the MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index; MFIP exits and returns; and MFIP unaccounted for cases. The report is available to human service directors, employment services providers and other interested parties quarterly in compliance with statutory requirements for a quarterly comparison report. [Minn. Stat. 256J.751, subd. 2] This report and other MFIP reports are posted to the Minnesota Department of Human Services (department) [Web page \(http://mn.gov/dhs\)](http://mn.gov/dhs): Select Partners and Providers/Economic Supports/MFIP/Reports. **As part of an effort to improve the performance measurement system, department staff are reviewing the measures included in this report and invite input. Direct questions and suggestions regarding this report, the usefulness of existing measures and ideas for additional measures, to the contact on the inside cover.**

A large drop in the TANF work participation rate was observed in December 2014 upon suspension of the Work Benefit program. In 2015, the statewide WPR and the average caseload size were smaller than before this policy change.

In July 2015, the MFIP housing grant went into effect. Starting with the third quarter of 2015, the Self-Support Index was updated to include receipt of the housing grant in the definition of cash assistance. Participants who receive cash, including only the housing grant, will not be included in the numerator of the measure unless they are working the required number of hours for success on the Self-Support Index for MFIP participants with a cash grant. This change resulted in a slight decrease in the index.

The requirement that a case remain active in the second month after the reporting quarter has been dropped for Indicator 8, MFIP unaccounted for cases. This change aligns the measure with others in the report and results in a slight increase in MFIP unaccounted for cases. Note that DEED’s person-level report on unaccounted for cases will continue to drop cases no longer active.

For more information on this report, see the Notes section at the end of the report.

Indicator 1

MFIP closings

What are MFIP closings? An MFIP case is considered closed for this quarterly measure when it was eligible (active) in any month during the quarter previous to the measurement quarter, and ineligible during the entire measurement quarter.

Background. This measure helps a service area to examine its point-in-time closings – cases moving off active MFIP assistance in a quarter. Information on the number of closed cases staying off or returning to active MFIP is in Indicator 7.

Formula. Number of MFIP case closings as defined above, **divided by** the count of active MFIP cases in the quarter previous to the measurement quarter.

Details. The number of active MFIP cases is unduplicated (counted only once per quarter). Case counts and closing counts include all types of active MFIP cases, both child-only cases (no eligible adults) and cases with eligible adults. Counts and rates are reported for each service area, each region and statewide, with a closing being credited to a case's service area in the exit month. Each service area rate is compared to its region and the state to gauge performance of the service area relative to its neighbors and the state.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [DHS website](#).

MFIP closings – Part 1

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
State	4,259	34,090	12.5%		
Fillmore	6	49	12.2%	-4.0%	-0.3%
Freeborn	35	195	17.9%	1.7%	5.4%
Goodhue	23	138	16.7%	0.5%	4.2%
Houston	6	52	11.5%	-4.7%	-1.0%
MN Prairie	57	391	14.6%	-1.6%	2.1%
Mower	45	281	16.0%	-0.2%	3.5%
Olmsted	126	822	15.3%	-0.9%	2.8%
Rice	50	270	18.5%	2.3%	6.0%
Wabasha	15	65	23.1%	6.9%	10.6%
Winona	33	187	17.6%	1.4%	5.1%
Southeast	396	2,450	16.2%		3.7%

MFIP closings – Part 2

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Aitkin	7	64	10.9%	-1.0%	-1.6%
Carlton	30	163	18.4%	6.5%	5.9%
Cook	4	25	16.0%	4.1%	3.5%
Itasca	34	314	10.8%	-1.1%	-1.7%
Koochiching	5	66	7.6%	-4.3%	-4.9%
Lake	4	20	20.0%	8.1%	7.5%
St. Louis	175	1,518	11.5%	-0.4%	-1.0%
Northeast	259	2,170	11.9%		-0.6%
Big Stone	1	10	10.0%	-6.5%	-2.5%
Chippewa	7	62	11.3%	-5.2%	-1.2%
DVHHS	23	102	22.5%	6.0%	10.0%
Lac qui Parle	5	18	27.8%	11.3%	15.3%
Nobles	23	158	14.6%	-1.9%	2.1%
SWHHS	46	299	15.4%	-1.1%	2.9%
Swift	11	50	22.0%	5.5%	9.5%
Yellow Medicine	7	46	15.2%	-1.3%	2.7%
Southwest	123	745	16.5%		4.0%
Blue Earth	44	256	17.2%	2.5%	4.7%
Brown	17	76	22.4%	7.7%	9.9%
Faribault-Martin	17	123	13.8%	-0.9%	1.3%
Le Sueur	15	114	13.2%	-1.5%	0.7%
Nicollet	20	196	10.2%	-4.5%	-2.3%
Sibley	6	42	14.3%	-0.4%	1.8%
Watonwan	7	51	13.7%	-1.0%	1.2%
South Central	126	858	14.7%		2.2%
Anoka	205	1,691	12.1%	-1.4%	-0.4%
Carver	22	128	17.2%	3.7%	4.7%
Dakota	209	1,465	14.3%	0.8%	1.8%
Scott	42	285	14.7%	1.2%	2.2%
Washington	82	592	13.9%	0.4%	1.4%
Suburban Metro	560	4,161	13.5%		1.0%
Hennepin	1,152	10,243	11.2%	0.5%	-1.3%
Ramsey	671	6,740	10.0%	-0.7%	-2.5%
Core Metro	1,823	16,983	10.7%		-1.8%

MFIP closings – Part 3

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Kittson	2	14	14.3%	0.0%	1.8%
Marshall	1	16	6.2%	-8.1%	-6.3%
Norman	7	34	20.6%	6.3%	8.1%
Pennington	5	45	11.1%	-3.2%	-1.4%
Polk	37	254	14.6%	0.3%	2.1%
Red Lake	3	12	25.0%	10.7%	12.5%
Roseau	4	38	10.5%	-3.8%	-2.0%
Northwest	59	413	14.3%		1.8%
Becker	21	147	14.3%	0.8%	1.8%
Beltrami	82	682	12.0%	-1.5%	-0.5%
Cass	52	463	11.2%	-2.3%	-1.3%
Clay	74	395	18.7%	5.2%	6.2%
Clearwater	8	59	13.6%	0.1%	1.1%
Crow Wing	32	234	13.7%	0.2%	1.2%
Douglas	15	119	12.6%	-0.9%	0.1%
Grant	3	33	9.1%	-4.4%	-3.4%
Hubbard	12	149	8.1%	-5.4%	-4.4%
Lake of the Woods	2	12	16.7%	3.2%	4.2%
Mahnomen	6	50	12.0%	-1.5%	-0.5%
Morrison	24	135	17.8%	4.3%	5.3%
Otter Tail	26	210	12.4%	-1.1%	-0.1%
Pope	11	42	26.2%	12.7%	13.7%
Stevens	5	25	20.0%	6.5%	7.5%
Todd	10	73	13.7%	0.2%	1.2%
Traverse	2	35	5.7%	-7.8%	-6.8%
Wadena	11	101	10.9%	-2.6%	-1.6%
White Earth Nation	58	381	15.2%	1.7%	2.7%
Wilkin	1	25	4.0%	-9.5%	-8.5%
West Central	455	3,370	13.5%		1.0%
Benton	45	258	17.4%	1.8%	4.9%
Chisago	19	125	15.2%	-0.4%	2.7%
Isanti	27	155	17.4%	1.8%	4.9%
Kanabec	17	94	18.1%	2.5%	5.6%
Kandiyohi	74	362	20.4%	4.8%	7.9%
McLeod	16	72	22.2%	6.6%	9.7%
Meeker	17	79	21.5%	5.9%	9.0%
Mille Lacs	27	166	16.3%	0.7%	3.8%
Pine	29	196	14.8%	-0.8%	2.3%
Renville	6	55	10.9%	-4.7%	-1.6%
Sherburne	27	237	11.4%	-4.2%	-1.1%
Stearns	126	910	13.8%	-1.8%	1.3%
Wright	28	231	12.1%	-3.5%	-0.4%
Central	458	2,940	15.6%		3.1%

Indicator 2

MFIP and DWP median placement wage

What is the median placement wage? A median is the midpoint of a sorted list of values. A median is used as an average wage to avoid the bias of extreme wages skewing the mean (the arithmetic average). This measure gives the service area's median wage for the first job MFIP participants started after enrolling in employment services, as recorded in Workforce One (WF1).

Background. Job placement and wage data are collected by the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED). The servicing county or county consortium categories are from MAXIS, the department's eligibility system.

Formula. The median is the placement wage in the middle of the sorted list of wages (when there is an odd number of new workers with a recorded hourly placement wage), or the midpoint between the two middle values (if there is an even number of new workers).

Details. This indicator gives the number of MFIP and DWP Employment Services (ES) participants newly enrolled in the quarter who obtained employment in that quarter, and the median placement (starting) wage by service area at the start of the job. It includes all first jobs as coded in WF1 for either part-time or full-time employment. Blanks indicate that no newly enrolled persons in that service area got a job.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [DHS website](#).

MFIP and DWP median placement wage – Part 1

Service area	MFIP		DWP	
	Number of job placements	Median placement wage	Number of job placements	Median placement wage
State	1,246	\$11.00	1,082	\$11.00
Fillmore	1	\$9.50	3	\$10.50
Freeborn	6	\$12.45	5	\$12.00
Goodhue	6	\$11.13	7	\$11.95
Houston	5	\$11.50	4	\$9.00
MN Prairie	19	\$11.00	35	\$10.00
Mower	19	\$11.16	16	\$11.00
Olmsted	70	\$10.90	50	\$11.20
Rice	17	\$10.00	17	\$11.00
Wabasha	3	\$11.00	5	\$10.00
Winona	5	\$13.08	6	\$10.75
Southeast	151	\$11.00	148	\$11.00
Aitkin	2	\$17.00	3	\$12.60
Carlton	2	\$9.71	11	\$10.00
Cook	2	\$13.47	0	
Itasca	12	\$11.00	4	\$9.50
Koochiching	2	\$9.95	7	\$9.50
Lake	0		0	
St. Louis	44	\$10.00	27	\$10.00
Northeast	64	\$10.00	52	\$10.00
Big Stone	0		0	
Chippewa	4	\$10.51	2	\$9.50
DVHHS	7	\$10.69	7	\$10.50
Lac qui Parle	0		1	\$8.50
Nobles	4	\$10.58	3	\$9.25
SWHHS	26	\$10.00	16	\$10.00
Swift	0		1	\$7.25
Yellow Medicine	3	\$9.50	2	\$11.00
Southwest	44	\$10.31	32	\$10.00
Blue Earth	11	\$10.50	14	\$10.50
Brown	6	\$14.15	6	\$12.09
Faribault-Martin	7	\$10.00	5	\$11.25
Le Sueur	15	\$10.10	5	\$12.00
Nicollet	8	\$10.25	3	\$10.00
Sibley	6	\$10.88	9	\$13.00
Watonwan	1	\$9.00	5	\$11.95
South Central	54	\$10.18	47	\$11.60

MFIP and DWP median placement wage – Part 2

Service area	MFIP		DWP	
	Number of job placements	Median placement wage	Number of job placements	Median placement wage
Anoka	95	\$11.00	69	\$12.00
Carver	11	\$12.00	5	\$12.00
Dakota	88	\$11.00	78	\$12.00
Scott	24	\$11.00	23	\$11.55
Washington	20	\$12.48	12	\$10.75
Suburban Metro	238	\$11.00	187	\$12.00
Hennepin	238	\$11.50	231	\$11.50
Ramsey	150	\$11.00	163	\$11.58
Core Metro	388	\$11.00	394	\$11.50
Kittson	0		0	
Marshall	0		0	
Norman	3	\$10.00	0	
Pennington	3	\$11.00	2	\$15.47
Polk	6	\$11.10	4	\$9.50
Red Lake	4	\$10.00	2	\$9.75
Roseau	3	\$11.00	7	\$10.75
Northwest	19	\$11.00	15	\$10.00
Becker	5	\$10.00	10	\$11.00
Beltrami	20	\$10.38	14	\$10.93
Cass	19	\$10.25	7	\$9.50
Clay	22	\$10.25	26	\$11.50
Clearwater	2	\$10.78	1	\$10.50
Crow Wing	17	\$10.50	4	\$9.50
Douglas	8	\$11.13	7	\$10.75
Grant	0		1	\$9.50
Hubbard	13	\$10.00	2	\$12.73
Lake of the Woods	1	\$11.00	1	\$11.50
Mahnomen	2	\$10.00	1	\$10.44
Morrison	10	\$11.00	7	\$10.00
Otter Tail	11	\$10.50	8	\$10.00
Pope	1	\$9.00	0	
Stevens	1	\$9.00	0	
Todd	4	\$11.43	3	\$10.00
Traverse	1	\$15.00	2	\$8.81
Wadena	9	\$10.00	6	\$10.00
White Earth Nation	5	\$12.00	5	\$15.12
Wilkin	7	\$12.00	2	\$9.13
West Central	158	\$10.50	107	\$10.75

MFIP and DWP median placement wage – Part 3

Service area	MFIP		DWP	
	Number of job placements	Median placement wage	Number of job placements	Median placement wage
Benton	10	\$10.53	8	\$11.25
Chisago	1	\$10.00	2	\$12.63
Isanti	9	\$10.25	7	\$10.00
Kanabec	10	\$9.58	2	\$16.00
Kandiyohi	11	\$11.00	9	\$11.70
McLeod	8	\$11.13	10	\$11.38
Meeker	6	\$10.50	1	\$12.50
Mille Lacs	4	\$9.50	2	\$10.75
Pine	11	\$10.00	11	\$10.00
Renville	4	\$12.25	5	\$10.11
Sherburne	8	\$10.00	8	\$11.75
Stearns	37	\$11.50	26	\$11.00
Wright	12	\$10.05	15	\$12.50
Central	131	\$10.25	106	\$11.00

Indicator 3

TANF work participation rate (WPR)

What is the work participation rate? The WPR is the percentage of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) cases whose adults are required to participate in work or specified work-directed activities who participate for the required number of hours in a month. The annual WPR is the average of the monthly WPRs in a 12-month period.

Background. The TANF work participation rate is the federal performance measure for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. The federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005, which reauthorized TANF, specifies the definition and reporting requirements of this measure. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) computes an annual statewide rate from person-level data that the state reports to HHS. The latest published TANF WPR report listing Minnesota's WPR for federal fiscal year 2012 was 45.3 percent, published in May 2015.¹ Approximately one-quarter of all MFIP cases are included in the WPR denominator (e.g., 22.6 percent in June 2014).

Department estimates of the statewide WPR come very close to the official rate reported much later. To give counties, consortia and tribes more timely information on their WPR performance, the department also computes monthly estimates at the local level, published in this quarterly report. The department's annual WPR estimates for counties, consortia and tribes are the average of the monthly values in a 12-month period. (The department uses the statewide federal methods to compute the local monthly and annual values, but uses an April to March period – rather than the federal fiscal year starting in October – so the latest possible data is available for writing Biennial Service Agreements.)

Formula. Number of participating cases – those required to participate with the prescribed number of documented hours in activities that count – **divided by** the number of cases required to participate.

Details. TANF cases are a subset of MFIP cases. TANF cases that have caregivers who are Work-eligible Individuals (WEIs) are required to participate. MFIP cash grants for most of these cases are federal TANF funds; most parents or relative caregivers on these cases are personally eligible for MFIP. Cases with teen or non-citizen caregivers that are state-funded with Maintenance of Effort (MOE) funds are also included. Cases with two MFIP-eligible parents,

¹ From October 2009 through November 2014, Minnesota had a Work Benefit program that provided a monthly cash benefit for families that had exited MFIP or the Diversionary Work Program and were working a required number of hours with income below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Guideline. These cases were included in the WPR numerator and denominator during that time. Without the Work Benefit program, the 2012 TANF rate would have been lower.

cases in Family Stabilization Services (a service track of MFIP), and most child-only cases (those with no MFIP-eligible caregiver), are NOT included.

Work is paid employment verified by employer documents. Work activities are divided into core (types of work and vocational training) and non-core (basic skills training and high school completion or its equivalent). While the department can only count up to 30 percent of WEIs in education or training in the numerator, this limit was suspended at the local level as of July 1, 2014, for service areas (counties, consortia and tribes).

Cases with the following activities meet the monthly hours requirement:

- Eighty-seven hours (in work or other specified core activities) for families with a child under age 6 and only one caregiver in the household
- One hundred and thirty hours, of which 87 must be core, for all other families.

Teen caregivers with at least three monthly hours in the high school completion or GED activity categories also meet their requirement.

TANF cases that are enrolled with a tribal employment services provider are included in their tribal provider's measure and not in their county's measure. A tribal provider WPR is computed following the same rules as for counties. Three tribal providers do not operate a separate tribal TANF program and are reported here.²

A blank indicates that the service area had no work eligible individuals that month; annual averages exclude these months.

To learn more: The following are links to reports on [annualized WPR](#), [WPR background in Minnesota](#), the [WPR documentation review](#) and the [U.S. HHS TANF website](#).

² The tribal providers are Leech Lake, Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and White Earth Nation (White Earth Nation's totals also include tribal cases for whom White Earth Nation administers MFIP in a three-county area). Mille Lacs Band and Red Lake Nation operate tribal TANF programs and are not included here.

TANF Work Participation Rates (WPR) – Part 1

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17
State	7,371	39.8%	37.4%	37.1%									
Fillmore	13	21.4%	25.0%	28.6%									
Freeborn	44	43.6%	27.9%	36.7%									
Goodhue	29	37.0%	32.3%	48.3%									
Houston	10	62.5%	42.9%	28.6%									
MN Prairie	81	46.2%	39.0%	32.5%									
Mower	64	35.6%	34.9%	41.4%									
Olmsted	202	42.6%	37.3%	47.8%									
Rice	59	36.4%	31.6%	27.3%									
Wabasha	9	44.4%	37.5%	33.3%									
Winona	30	48.3%	46.7%	50.0%									
Southeast	540	41.6%	35.9%	40.4%									
Aitkin	10	12.5%	36.4%	33.3%									
Carlton	23	37.5%	56.0%	47.6%									
Cook	4	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%									
Itasca	37	57.6%	36.1%	52.4%									
Koochiching	17	27.8%	22.2%	33.3%									
Lake	5	33.3%	40.0%	14.3%									
St. Louis	292	38.2%	37.3%	32.1%									
Northeast	389	38.5%	37.3%	34.7%									
Big Stone	2	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%									
Chippewa	16	33.3%	53.3%	43.8%									
DVHHS	15	41.2%	46.7%	46.2%									
Lac qui Parle	2	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%									
Nobles	20	60.0%	27.8%	47.8%									
SWHHS	67	41.2%	38.7%	40.0%									
Swift	13	30.0%	33.3%	50.0%									
Yellow Medicine	7	12.5%	28.6%	33.3%									
Southwest	142	40.0%	38.3%	44.6%									

TANF Work Participation Rates – Part 2

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17
Blue Earth	56	53.7%	27.8%	33.9%									
Brown	21	23.5%	22.7%	33.3%									
Faribault-Martin	24	60.9%	48.0%	36.0%									
Le Sueur	20	47.6%	68.8%	50.0%									
Nicollet	62	24.1%	16.1%	17.1%									
Sibley	7	25.0%	16.7%	25.0%									
Watonwan	11	33.3%	54.5%	36.4%									
South Central	201	40.2%	30.6%	30.1%									
Anoka	344	42.8%	40.9%	40.6%									
Carver	29	46.7%	58.6%	44.4%									
Dakota	351	51.0%	43.9%	46.2%									
Scott	57	48.1%	55.4%	62.3%									
Washington	125	53.5%	49.6%	49.2%									
Suburban Metro	906	47.9%	44.8%	45.5%									
Hennepin	2,437	38.6%	37.9%	35.8%									
Ramsey	1,636	36.9%	33.7%	35.0%									
Core Metro	4,073	37.9%	36.2%	35.5%									
Kittson	5	40.0%	40.0%	33.3%									
Marshall	1	50.0%	0.0%										
Norman	8	42.9%	33.3%	33.3%									
Pennington	12	16.7%	33.3%	41.7%									
Polk	39	27.0%	25.6%	25.0%									
Red Lake	3	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%									
Roseau	6	20.0%	62.5%	60.0%									
Northwest	74	27.8%	32.9%	30.7%									

TANF Work Participation Rates – Part 3

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17
Becker	32	40.6%	38.7%	30.3%									
Beltrami	99	34.3%	30.9%	35.3%									
Cass	36	36.1%	32.4%	30.8%									
Clay	67	37.3%	26.2%	26.5%									
Clearwater	8	33.3%	50.0%	66.7%									
Crow Wing	44	51.1%	51.2%	44.4%									
Douglas	23	59.1%	54.2%	47.8%									
Grant	6	57.1%	50.0%	100.0%									
Hubbard	18	33.3%	38.9%	31.3%									
Lake of the Woods	3	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%									
Mahnomen	4	33.3%	25.0%	40.0%									
Morrison	34	25.0%	31.3%	25.7%									
Otter Tail	57	27.6%	27.6%	22.2%									
Pope	4	50.0%	66.7%	100.0%									
Stevens	4	50.0%	75.0%	0.0%									
Todd	15	46.7%	50.0%	26.7%									
Traverse	5	50.0%	33.3%	20.0%									
Wadena	15	33.3%	28.6%	50.0%									
Wilkin	2	33.3%	100.0%	50.0%									
West Central	477	37.8%	36.1%	34.1%									

TANF Work Participation Rates – Part 4

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17
Benton	67	40.9%	36.4%	39.1%									
Chisago	21	52.9%	56.5%	54.5%									
Isanti	35	61.8%	58.8%	57.9%									
Kanabec	12	69.2%	66.7%	66.7%									
Kandiyohi	60	52.3%	54.1%	34.5%									
McLeod	14	40.0%	33.3%	23.5%									
Meeker	12	50.0%	18.2%	35.7%									
Mille Lacs	25	61.9%	50.0%	40.0%									
Pine	39	20.5%	22.5%	24.3%									
Renville	10	33.3%	25.0%	40.0%									
Sherburne	30	43.8%	27.6%	41.4%									
Stearns	197	40.3%	35.7%	35.4%									
Wright	42	34.9%	40.5%	40.0%									
Central	565	43.5%	39.6%	38.5%									

Tribal TANF Work Participation Rates

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17
Leech Lake Band	70	24.3%	18.5%	18.4%									
MN Chippewa Tribe	29	25.0%	16.7%	22.6%									
White Earth Nation	42	14.6%	17.1%	20.0%									
Total Tribal	47	21.7%	17.7%	19.7%									

Indicator 4

MFIP counted months

What are counted months? MFIP counted months are those in which an MFIP caregiver is personally eligible for an MFIP cash grant and not excepted from the 60-month time limit. In Minnesota, these months began counting in July 1997. Total counted months include any months counted in other states or U.S. territories. People acquire counted months; cases do not. A two-caregiver case reaches the time limit when either adult reaches 60 months.

Background. The federal government passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 creating Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. The legislation allowed states to create their own TANF programs within certain guidelines, within which Minnesota implemented the Minnesota Family Investment Program in early 1998. Among other requirements, PRWORA mandated a lifetime limit of 60 months for receipt of cash assistance, with limited extensions for hardship. States could start counting months anytime between September 1996 and July 1997; those months also count if a person moves to another state. Family assistance months counted before the start of TANF were under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

States are also allowed to provide TANF-funded extensions for up to 20 percent of caseloads for documented hardships. Most extended cases in Minnesota are state-funded, meaning these cases are not counted toward the 20 percent limit. Minnesota provides extensions for:

- People experiencing barriers to work, such as:
 - Illness lasting more than 30 days
 - Caring for an ill or incapacitated relative for more than 30 days
 - IQ lower than 80
 - Certain mental illnesses.
- Working families not earning enough to exit MFIP, although working the required number of hours.

Formula. Active MFIP cases with one or two eligible caregivers in the last month of the measurement quarter are divided into categories based on the number of months the caregiver with the higher count of months has accumulated toward the 60-month limit; percentages of all cases are reported in service area, region or state.

Details. Those with zero months have been exempt from the time limit for all their active months. Extended cases have been allowed to remain active due to documented hardships, as listed below.

Time limit exception reasons – for an MFIP month not to count – include:

- Living on a reservation with a “not employed” rate of at least 50 percent
- Having a family violence waiver while complying with an employment plan
- Age 60 or older
- Minor caregiver complying with an education plan
- Age 18 or 19
- Emancipated caregiver complying with education requirements in an employment plan.

There are two other situations in which months are not counted toward the time limit:

- Child-only cases where no caregiver is eligible and a cash grant is issued for MFIP-eligible children
- Food-only cases where the cash part of the grant is down to zero (due to other income sources or opting out of cash) and only food assistance is issued.

MFIP combines family cash assistance with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), as permitted by federal waiver.

The most common reasons for caregiver ineligibility are receipt of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for a disability and relative care. Cases cannot become child-only solely because a caregiver reached 60 counted months; caregivers must meet other criteria to be eligible for a child-only case.

To learn more: The [Combined Manual](#) (CM) gives the rules for determining eligibility for the cash and food assistance programs.

MFIP counted months – Part 1

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 Months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
State	21,354	2.9%	27.5%	19.7%	14.0%	10.8%	9.1%	16.2%
Fillmore	35	0.0%	25.7%	28.6%	28.6%	11.4%	5.7%	0.0%
Freeborn	117	3.4%	29.1%	22.2%	15.4%	19.7%	5.1%	5.1%
Goodhue	90	2.2%	28.9%	21.1%	14.4%	10.0%	10.0%	13.3%
Houston	39	7.7%	38.5%	7.7%	15.4%	10.3%	2.6%	18.0%
MN Prairie	248	2.4%	35.9%	21.0%	14.9%	11.7%	7.3%	6.9%
Mower	179	7.3%	38.0%	19.6%	11.2%	11.7%	7.8%	4.5%
Olmsted	555	2.7%	34.8%	20.7%	13.5%	11.7%	7.8%	8.8%
Rice	162	3.7%	37.0%	25.3%	12.4%	8.6%	5.6%	7.4%
Wabasha	31	3.2%	38.7%	16.1%	3.2%	22.6%	9.7%	6.5%
Winona	116	2.6%	30.2%	17.2%	22.4%	12.1%	4.3%	11.2%
Southeast	1,572	3.4%	34.4%	20.7%	14.4%	12.1%	7.0%	8.0%

MFIP counted months – Part 2

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 Months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Aitkin	33	0.0%	36.4%	27.3%	21.2%	6.1%	6.1%	3.0%
Carlton	70	2.9%	27.1%	27.1%	17.1%	11.4%	7.1%	7.1%
Cook	22	0.0%	31.8%	27.3%	9.1%	13.6%	9.1%	9.1%
Itasca	191	4.2%	22.5%	22.0%	12.6%	13.1%	8.9%	16.8%
Koochiching	50	0.0%	34.0%	26.0%	18.0%	8.0%	6.0%	8.0%
Lake	15	6.7%	46.7%	20.0%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%
St. Louis	947	2.9%	25.3%	17.2%	13.1%	13.1%	8.6%	19.9%
Northeast	1,328	2.9%	26.0%	19.2%	13.5%	12.6%	8.4%	17.6%
Big Stone	4	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chippewa	37	5.4%	18.9%	29.7%	21.6%	13.5%	2.7%	8.1%
DVHHS	49	4.1%	32.7%	18.4%	16.3%	6.1%	12.2%	10.2%
Lac qui Parle	12	0.0%	8.3%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
Nobles	56	1.8%	50.0%	23.2%	14.3%	5.4%	3.6%	1.8%
SWHHS	196	1.5%	42.4%	23.0%	12.8%	8.7%	4.1%	7.7%
Swift	30	0.0%	26.7%	33.3%	20.0%	13.3%	6.7%	0.0%
Yellow Medicine	22	0.0%	27.3%	18.2%	4.6%	22.7%	13.6%	13.6%
Southwest	406	2.0%	37.0%	24.1%	14.5%	9.1%	6.2%	7.1%
Blue Earth	185	1.6%	31.9%	17.8%	11.4%	16.8%	10.8%	10.8%
Brown	52	5.8%	42.3%	23.1%	5.8%	13.5%	3.9%	5.8%
Faribault-Martin	72	4.2%	37.5%	19.4%	13.9%	9.7%	9.7%	5.6%
Le Sueur	62	3.2%	29.0%	21.0%	22.6%	8.1%	6.5%	11.3%
Nicollet	161	5.0%	33.5%	23.6%	14.9%	10.6%	8.1%	5.0%
Sibley	19	0.0%	36.8%	42.1%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%
Watonwan	31	19.4%	29.0%	12.9%	12.9%	9.7%	6.5%	9.7%
South Central	582	4.3%	33.7%	21.0%	13.4%	12.0%	8.3%	8.1%
Anoka	1,090	1.9%	25.7%	18.6%	15.7%	9.5%	8.9%	19.7%
Carver	79	2.5%	43.0%	11.4%	7.6%	17.7%	5.1%	12.7%
Dakota	904	2.3%	29.2%	21.7%	14.7%	10.8%	6.8%	14.6%
Scott	165	3.6%	36.4%	18.8%	13.3%	9.7%	7.9%	10.3%
Washington	343	4.7%	29.2%	16.6%	14.0%	9.0%	10.8%	15.7%
Suburban Metro	2,581	2.6%	28.6%	19.2%	14.7%	10.2%	8.2%	16.6%
Hennepin	6,510	2.8%	24.2%	19.0%	13.7%	10.6%	10.3%	19.4%
Ramsey	4,441	2.1%	24.1%	17.7%	13.6%	10.9%	10.2%	21.6%
Core Metro	10,951	2.5%	24.2%	18.5%	13.7%	10.7%	10.3%	20.3%

MFIP counted months – Part 3

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 Months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Kittson	8	0.0%	50.0%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%
Marshall	7	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Norman	24	4.2%	20.8%	45.8%	12.5%	8.3%	4.2%	4.2%
Pennington	36	2.8%	47.2%	27.8%	8.3%	8.3%	5.6%	0.0%
Polk	181	2.8%	39.2%	17.7%	14.4%	9.4%	6.6%	9.9%
Red Lake	8	12.5%	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Roseau	24	0.0%	54.2%	16.7%	12.5%	8.3%	4.2%	4.2%
Northwest	288	3.5%	39.6%	20.8%	13.9%	9.4%	5.9%	6.9%
Becker	88	6.8%	31.8%	17.1%	15.9%	8.0%	11.4%	9.1%
Beltrami	315	10.5%	21.0%	19.4%	14.6%	14.0%	10.8%	9.8%
Cass	253	4.0%	21.0%	15.8%	13.4%	15.8%	15.0%	15.0%
Clay	258	2.3%	34.9%	22.5%	14.7%	5.8%	9.7%	10.1%
Clearwater	28	3.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	7.1%	10.7%	7.1%
Crow Wing	127	4.7%	29.1%	18.9%	17.3%	10.2%	9.5%	11.0%
Douglas	68	2.9%	32.4%	20.6%	13.2%	13.2%	4.4%	13.2%
Grant	18	0.0%	38.9%	44.4%	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Hubbard	74	4.1%	27.0%	23.0%	18.9%	10.8%	5.4%	10.8%
Lake of the Woods	8	12.5%	62.5%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mahnomen	17	0.0%	5.9%	23.5%	11.8%	35.3%	5.9%	17.7%
Morrison	83	4.8%	26.5%	28.9%	21.7%	8.4%	7.2%	2.4%
Otter Tail	151	2.7%	28.5%	25.8%	17.9%	10.6%	6.6%	8.0%
Pope	21	0.0%	52.4%	14.3%	14.3%	9.5%	4.8%	4.8%
Stevens	17	0.0%	29.4%	29.4%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%	11.8%
Todd	40	2.5%	35.0%	15.0%	15.0%	10.0%	12.5%	10.0%
Traverse	20	0.0%	45.0%	15.0%	20.0%	5.0%	15.0%	0.0%
Wadena	65	0.0%	24.6%	16.9%	18.5%	7.7%	18.5%	13.9%
White Earth Nation	189	4.2%	20.6%	23.3%	14.8%	10.1%	8.5%	18.5%
Wilkin	21	9.5%	33.3%	28.6%	14.3%	9.5%	4.8%	0.0%
West Central	1,861	4.7%	27.2%	20.8%	15.5%	10.9%	10.0%	11.0%
Benton	177	1.1%	30.5%	25.4%	13.6%	9.6%	10.2%	9.6%
Chisago	64	1.6%	46.9%	26.6%	4.7%	12.5%	3.1%	4.7%
Isanti	87	4.6%	34.5%	26.4%	13.8%	13.8%	1.2%	5.8%
Kanabec	46	4.4%	47.8%	21.7%	10.9%	10.9%	4.4%	0.0%
Kandiyohi	195	6.7%	37.4%	19.5%	14.4%	8.7%	4.1%	9.7%
McLeod	47	0.0%	42.6%	27.7%	14.9%	6.4%	8.5%	0.0%
Meeker	40	5.0%	30.0%	17.5%	20.0%	12.5%	7.5%	7.5%
Mille Lacs	82	0.0%	30.5%	18.3%	20.7%	13.4%	6.1%	11.0%
Pine	113	3.5%	32.7%	22.1%	19.5%	11.5%	6.2%	4.4%
Renville	31	3.2%	45.2%	22.6%	19.4%	3.2%	0.0%	6.5%
Sherburne	136	2.2%	31.6%	25.0%	13.2%	5.9%	4.4%	17.7%
Stearns	627	1.8%	37.6%	25.2%	12.9%	9.6%	6.2%	6.9%
Wright	140	2.9%	28.6%	27.9%	13.6%	11.4%	5.7%	10.0%
Central	1,785	2.6%	35.6%	24.2%	14.0%	9.9%	5.8%	8.1%

Indicator 5

MFIP employment services enrollments, closures and exit reasons

What are MFIP employment services? Services are introduced to participants in an overview and include assessment of ability to obtain and maintain employment, assistance in developing an employment plan, intensive job search and coordination, and provision of services needed to fulfill an employment plan. Service areas are responsible for either providing these services directly or contracting with another agency. All caregivers receiving MFIP, including those in the Family Stabilization Services (FSS) track, and those with a fraud disqualification must be engaged in MFIP employment services, except limited exemptions allowed for those caring for a child less than 12 months old.

Background. Closures are divided into three categories. Those with the exit reason “Entered Unsubsidized Employment” are in the first group. Attaining unsubsidized employment, a goal of the program, is an important step toward self-sufficiency. This exit reason is defined in the Employment Services Manual as “Participant is working and the case is closed due to earnings, or a combination of unearned income (such as child support) and earnings.” Agencies instruct staff how to interpret this definition.

Formula. Unduplicated counts of all persons enrolled in employment services any time during the quarter, as well as the number closed during the quarter, are listed. Percentage closed for each reason is the number closed for that reason divided by the number closed.

Details. The reasons for closure are split into three groups: Unsubsidized employment, moved from the area (to MFIP in another county or out of Minnesota) and other. The “other” category is comprised of administrative separation, voluntary separation, closed due to sanction or 60 months limit, and an “other” category that includes reasons such as no eligible child on the case, person no longer in the case’s household, failure to file paperwork and receipt of SSI/RSDI. There is wide variability in how exit reasons are used across service areas. Employment services records are entered into the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development Workforce One system, from which the employment and wage data for this indicator are drawn. The service area is the one as of the most recent MFIP exit.

To learn more: See the [MFIP and DWP Employment Services Manual](#).

MFIP Employment Services enrollments, closures and exit reasons – Part 1

Service area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by reason		
				Unsubsidized employment	Moved from area	Other
State	27,272	4,948	18.1%	30.3%	17.1%	52.7%
Fillmore	47	7	14.9%	57.1%	14.3%	28.6%
Freeborn	143	33	23.1%	30.3%	9.1%	60.6%
Goodhue	90	22	24.4%	31.8%	27.3%	40.9%
Houston	48	10	20.8%	40.0%	10.0%	50.0%
MN Prairie	313	82	26.2%	32.9%	30.5%	36.6%
Mower	197	47	23.9%	38.3%	8.5%	53.2%
Olmsted	656	113	17.2%	61.9%	11.5%	26.5%
Rice	198	55	27.8%	40.0%	12.7%	47.3%
Wabasha	34	9	26.5%	44.4%	11.1%	44.4%
Winona	132	32	24.2%	6.3%	25.0%	68.8%
Southeast	1,858	410	22.1%	41.0%	16.8%	42.2%
Aitkin	35	5	14.3%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%
Carlton	84	10	11.9%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Cook	24	2	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Itasca	229	37	16.2%	18.9%	24.3%	56.8%
Koochiching	61	6	9.8%	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%
Lake	16	0				
St. Louis	1,095	188	17.2%	16.5%	11.2%	72.3%
Northeast	1,544	248	16.1%	17.3%	12.9%	69.8%
Big Stone	8	2	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Chippewa	50	9	18.0%	0.0%	22.2%	77.8%
DVHHS	66	22	33.3%	27.3%	13.6%	59.1%
Lac qui Parle	16	3	18.8%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
Nobles	70	20	28.6%	20.0%	10.0%	70.0%
SWHHS	223	70	31.4%	32.9%	24.3%	42.9%
Swift	22	3	13.6%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
Yellow Medicine	27	4	14.8%	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%
Southwest	482	133	27.6%	26.3%	20.3%	53.4%
Blue Earth	227	45	19.8%	24.4%	24.4%	51.1%
Brown	64	16	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Faribault-Martin	94	29	30.9%	34.5%	13.8%	51.7%
Le Sueur	85	11	12.9%	9.1%	27.3%	63.6%
Nicollet	197	45	22.8%	51.1%	17.8%	31.1%
Sibley	23	7	30.4%	14.3%	14.3%	71.4%
Watonwan	35	7	20.0%	28.6%	0.0%	71.4%
South Central	725	160	22.1%	35.0%	16.9%	48.1%

MFIP Employment Services enrollments, closures and exit reasons – Part 2

Service area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by reason		
				Unsubsidized employment	Moved from area	Other
Anoka	1,428	250	17.5%	32.0%	24.0%	44.0%
Carver	84	29	34.5%	24.1%	20.7%	55.2%
Dakota	1,141	259	22.7%	47.5%	11.2%	41.3%
Scott	190	51	26.8%	41.2%	19.6%	39.2%
Washington	463	118	25.5%	23.7%	22.0%	54.2%
Suburban Metro	3,306	707	21.4%	36.6%	18.5%	44.8%
Hennepin	8,683	1,258	14.5%	25.4%	19.8%	54.8%
Ramsey	5,750	941	16.4%	26.9%	14.1%	59.0%
Core Metro	14,433	2,199	15.2%	26.1%	17.4%	56.6%
Kittson	8					
Marshall	11	4	36.4%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Norman	34	13	38.2%	53.8%	30.8%	15.4%
Pennington	35	8	22.9%	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%
Polk	201	48	23.9%	14.6%	22.9%	62.5%
Red Lake	12	2	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Roseau	25	7	28.0%	28.6%	0.0%	71.4%
Northwest	326	82	25.2%	20.7%	24.4%	54.9%
Becker	106	26	24.5%	57.7%	11.5%	30.8%
Beltrami	494	72	14.6%	26.4%	8.3%	65.3%
Cass	325	63	19.4%	14.3%	15.9%	69.8%
Clay	286	64	22.4%	53.1%	12.5%	34.4%
Clearwater	43	11	25.6%	18.2%	45.5%	36.4%
Crow Wing	142	34	23.9%	47.1%	11.8%	41.2%
Douglas	71	20	28.2%	45.0%	5.0%	50.0%
Grant	21	8	38.1%	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%
Hubbard	92	20	21.7%	30.0%	35.0%	35.0%
Lake of the Woods	10	4	40.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Mahnomen	33	7	21.2%	14.3%	14.3%	71.4%
Morrison	90	24	26.7%	41.7%	4.2%	54.2%
Otter Tail	186	36	19.4%	47.2%	19.4%	33.3%
Pope	24	8	33.3%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Stevens	23	7	30.4%	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%
Todd	51	9	17.6%	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%
Traverse	22	3	13.6%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%
Wadena	82	17	20.7%	23.5%	35.3%	41.2%
White Earth Nation	213	41	19.2%	2.4%	9.8%	87.8%
Wilkin	32	12	37.5%	58.3%	16.7%	25.0%
West Central	2,346	486	20.7%	35.0%	14.6%	50.4%

MFIP Employment Services enrollments, closures and exit reasons – Part 3

Service area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by reason		
				Unsubsidized employment	Moved from area	Other
Benton	218	47	21.6%	38.3%	23.4%	38.3%
Chisago	79	23	29.1%	21.7%	26.1%	52.2%
Isanti	89	32	36.0%	21.9%	25.0%	53.1%
Kanabec	58	16	27.6%	25.0%	6.3%	68.8%
Kandiyohi	247	63	25.5%	30.2%	6.3%	63.5%
McLeod	51	19	37.3%	31.6%	26.3%	42.1%
Meeker	47	12	25.5%	25.0%	8.3%	66.7%
Mille Lacs	98	19	19.4%	5.3%	26.3%	68.4%
Pine	152	33	21.7%	24.2%	9.1%	66.7%
Renville	43	18	41.9%	22.2%	27.8%	50.0%
Sherburne	151	34	22.5%	55.9%	23.5%	20.6%
Stearns	867	172	19.8%	41.9%	14.0%	44.2%
Wright	152	35	23.0%	28.6%	11.4%	60.0%
Central	2,252	523	23.2%	33.7%	16.3%	50.1%

Indicator 6

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (S-SI) and range of expected performance

What is the S-SI? The Self-Support Index is an outcome measure that quantifies goals of the Minnesota Family Investment Program to help participants find and maintain employment, increase earnings and decrease use of cash assistance.

Background. In 2002, at the direction of the Minnesota Legislature, Minnesota Department of Human Services staff met with local partners, staff from service areas and employment services providers, and representatives from the Minnesota Department of Employment Security (that later became part of the Department of Employment and Economic Development), to develop a performance measure of the goals for MFIP. The result of this collaboration was the Self-Support Index and range of expected performance, an outcome measure with customized targets for local partners.

Statewide Self-Support Index values have ranged between a low of 64.8 percent in fourth quarter 2010, to a high of 73.1 percent in second quarter 2006.

Formula. The number of participants off cash assistance or working at least 30 hours per week during a measurement quarter who were eligible for MFIP or the Diversionary Work Program (DWP) in the baseline quarter **divided by** the total number of active participants in the baseline quarter. There are three measures for cohorts of active participants in baseline quarters one year, two, or three years previous. **Note that the three baseline cohorts are different – although overlapping – groups of people.** The table also gives the range of expected performance for the three-year S-SI and how a service area's S-SI compares with its range.

Details. The Self-Support Index is the percentage of caregivers (usually parents, sometimes other relatives) personally eligible for MFIP or DWP in a baseline quarter who are either no longer receiving MFIP or DWP cash assistance, or are working an average of 30 or more hours per week during each month of the measurement quarter three years later. For example, the three-year Self-Support Index for the second quarter of 2014 reported outcomes during that quarter for the cohort eligible during the second quarter of 2011.

Those who left MFIP after reaching 60 counted MFIP months (the time limit in Minnesota), and those who left due to 100 percent sanction, are only counted as a success if they worked an average of 30 hours per week in their last month of program eligibility, or began receiving Supplemental Security Income after MFIP or DWP cash ended.

Participants are included with the service area or tribal provider that last provided services as of the end of the reporting quarter.

The three-year Self-Support Index has a related standard called the **range of expected performance** that is used to make more fair comparisons across service areas and tribal providers. Performance is assessed as above, within or below the range of expected performance, an interval based on caseload characteristics and economic conditions in each service area. More challenging situations lower the expected range. **Providers cannot influence the size or location of the range of expected performance** because this interval is calculated from regressions predicting success on the S-SI based on demographic and economic characteristics beyond the control of service areas and providers. No measures of the service or provider characteristics are predictors in the regression. **Providers can, however, influence the Self-Support Index through services that help MFIP and DWP participants increase their employment and earnings.**

To help county agencies, consortia and tribal providers understand progress toward the three-year measure, the Self-Support Index is also calculated for one- and two-year cohorts. For reporting the second quarter of 2014, for example, the one- and two-year indices reported outcomes for the cohorts personally eligible for MFIP or DWP during the second quarters of 2013 and 2012, respectively. A range of expected performance is not calculated for the one- and two-year measures.

Red Lake Nation remains included in this measure because the Self-Support Index difficulty factor, used to adjust MFIP funding levels, continues to be relevant during the transition to a Tribal TANF program.

To learn more: See the [Self-Support Index](#) and [Range of Expected Performance](#) links.

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (S-SI) and Range of Expected Performance – Part 1

Service area	One-year		Two-year		Three-year		Range of Expected Performance		Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Lower limit	Upper limit		
State	31,102	48.1%	33,730	60.8%	36,564	66.5%				
Fillmore	44	47.7%	60	78.3%	71	85.9%	74.1%	80.8%	5.2%	Above
Freeborn	210	55.7%	199	68.3%	212	73.6%	72.7%	78.0%		Within
Goodhue	134	51.5%	147	68.7%	194	70.6%	71.1%	77.5%		Within
Houston	62	45.2%	83	68.7%	81	67.9%	74.5%	81.0%	-6.6%	Below
MN Prairie	350	53.4%	399	66.2%	455	71.4%	67.4%	74.2%		Within
Mower	253	53.4%	288	70.1%	326	76.4%	74.7%	79.5%		Within
Olmsted	782	52.6%	793	65.4%	907	71.7%	75.8%	78.9%	-4.1%	Below
Rice	239	58.6%	294	77.6%	324	76.5%	75.2%	79.9%		Within
Wabasha	66	56.1%	72	79.2%	78	73.1%	67.0%	75.4%		Within
Winona	168	52.4%	208	74.5%	188	74.5%	70.7%	76.7%		Within
Southeast	2308	53.4%	2543	69.4%	2836	73.3%				
Aitkin	34	58.8%	71	85.9%	80	86.3%	75.8%	83.7%	2.5%	Above
Carlton	117	59.8%	162	74.1%	126	82.5%	68.3%	74.9%	7.6%	Above
Cook	21	61.9%	15	73.3%	23	87.0%	57.4%	74.6%	12.4%	Above
Itasca	224	48.7%	271	66.8%	310	72.6%	76.4%	82.2%	-3.8%	Below
Koochiching	76	52.6%	90	70.0%	95	71.6%	75.3%	82.4%	-3.7%	Below
Lake	22	77.3%	21	76.2%	26	88.5%	73.1%	85.3%	3.2%	Above
St. Louis	1,169	41.8%	1,294	56.0%	1,398	64.2%	62.3%	67.1%		Within
Northeast	1663	45.6%	1924	61.1%	2058	68.3%				

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance – Part 2

Service area	One-year		Two-year		Three-year		Range of Expected Performance		Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Lower limit	Upper limit		
Big Stone	10	70.0%	14	78.6%	25	80.0%	64.8%	81.6%		Within
Chippewa	70	57.1%	48	77.1%	60	75.0%	70.8%	79.3%		Within
DVHHS	86	64.0%	119	73.9%	132	78.0%	75.9%	82.4%		Within
Lac qui Parle	19	31.6%	20	60.0%	29	58.6%	69.0%	81.6%	-10.4%	Below
Nobles	90	72.2%	122	80.3%	154	79.2%	81.1%	85.9%	-1.9%	Below
SWHHS	307	57.98%	287	76.0%	329	82.7%	75.9%	80.4%	2.3%	Above
Swift	45	57.8%	57	75.4%	60	81.7%	69.9%	79.3%	2.3%	Above
Yellow Medicine	24	37.5%	34	64.7%	40	67.5%	62.0%	75.6%		Within
Southwest	651	59.3%	701	75.5%	829	79.0%				
Blue Earth	273	57.1%	321	67.3%	375	73.6%	66.9%	71.5%	2.1%	Above
Brown	74	70.3%	88	77.3%	89	79.8%	75.0%	82.4%		Within
Faribault-Martin	127	58.3%	130	67.7%	156	71.2%	70.0%	75.9%		Within
Le Sueur	90	54.4%	100	68.0%	124	76.6%	65.8%	72.1%	4.5%	Above
Nicollet	218	50.9%	195	60.5%	208	66.8%	67.6%	72.8%	-0.7%	Below
Sibley	39	61.5%	37	83.8%	61	85.2%	68.3%	76.0%	9.3%	Above
Watonwan	33	63.6%	37	78.4%	51	84.3%	78.3%	84.7%		Within
South Central	854	57.0%	908	68.1%	1064	74.0%				
Anoka	1,577	46.4%	1,792	60.9%	1,964	67.9%	67.9%	70.2%		Within
Carver	121	62.8%	124	71.0%	154	76.6%	71.3%	77.3%		Within
Dakota	1,353	52.3%	1,525	63.5%	1,672	71.1%	67.6%	69.9%	1.2%	Above
Scott	272	55.9%	322	73.0%	318	77.7%	68.0%	72.3%	5.3%	Above
Washington	546	50.7%	640	63.0%	669	69.5%	65.8%	69.3%	0.2%	Above
Suburban Metro	3,869	50.2%	4,403	63.3%	4,777	70.2%				
Hennepin	9,230	45.3%	9,311	54.8%	9,998	59.4%	62.0%	63.5%	-2.6%	Below
Ramsey	6,073	43.3%	6,815	56.4%	7,355	62.1%	59.1%	61.1%	1.0%	Above
Core Metro	15,303	44.5%	16,126	55.5%	17,353	60.6%				

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance – Part 3

Service area	One-year		Two-year		Three-year		Range of Expected Performance		Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Lower limit	Upper limit		
Kittson	8	62.5%	13	69.2%	13	84.6%	76.0%	89.4%		Within
Marshall	17	64.7%	17	76.5%	23	91.3%	81.2%	91.7%		Within
Norman	46	56.5%	46	65.2%	46	69.6%	78.2%	87.5%	-8.6%	Below
Pennington	37	54.1%	39	69.2%	52	76.9%	72.3%	81.8%		Within
Polk	214	49.5%	229	67.2%	261	75.5%	67.4%	72.5%	3.0%	Above
Red Lake	19	57.9%	11	81.8%	15	80.0%	71.7%	88.3%		Within
Roseau	34	58.8%	54	70.4%	57	70.2%	73.5%	82.5%	-3.3%	Below
Northwest	375	53.1%	409	68.5%	467	75.6%				
Becker	131	56.5%	131	63.4%	174	74.1%	70.8%	77.0%		Within
Beltrami	375	46.7%	443	62.1%	510	71.2%	63.8%	68.7%	2.5%	Above
Cass	179	42.5%	197	57.9%	170	66.5%	59.2%	68.6%		Within
Clay	398	57.5%	413	70.9%	399	74.4%	70.1%	74.4%	0.0%	Above
Clearwater	48	56.3%	50	70.0%	44	75.0%	74.2%	85.1%		Within
Crow Wing	195	61.0%	271	76.0%	297	80.8%	74.1%	78.9%	1.9%	Above
Douglas	95	48.4%	123	69.9%	133	73.7%	69.7%	76.9%		Within
Grant	28	50.0%	25	64.0%	35	85.7%	66.7%	80.0%	5.7%	Above
Hubbard	104	51.9%	76	69.7%	75	68.0%	69.1%	76.8%	-1.1%	Below
Lake of the Woods	8	62.5%	12	66.7%	15	86.7%	65.6%	77.2%	9.5%	Above
Mahnomen	33	54.5%	46	65.2%	71	74.6%	63.3%	74.1%	0.6%	Above
Morrison	115	56.5%	141	68.1%	152	76.3%	70.7%	76.7%		Within
Otter Tail	211	48.3%	214	60.3%	225	71.6%	71.9%	77.4%	-0.3%	Below
Pope	33	48.5%	31	64.5%	30	73.3%	71.6%	85.3%		Within
Stevens	23	47.8%	36	75.0%	33	75.8%	66.3%	77.9%		Within
Todd	74	62.2%	87	70.1%	108	81.5%	71.5%	78.2%	3.3%	Above
Traverse	19	52.6%	23	65.2%	17	76.5%	57.8%	75.2%	1.3%	Above
Wadena	95	46.3%	129	60.5%	118	62.7%	69.1%	75.8%	-6.4%	Below
Wilkin	15	53.3%	27	70.4%	24	91.7%	74.9%	88.4%	3.3%	Above
West Central	2179	52.3%	2475	66.4%	2630	73.8%				

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance – Part 4

Service area	One-year		Two-year		Three-year		Range of Expected Performance		Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Eligible adults	S-SI	Lower limit	Upper limit		
Benton	275	51.6%	288	63.9%	301	72.8%	65.5%	70.7%	2.1%	Above
Chisago	111	59.5%	116	75.0%	154	83.8%	71.1%	76.5%	7.2%	Above
Isanti	133	63.2%	182	78.0%	204	82.8%	67.4%	72.4%	10.5%	Above
Kanabec	72	58.3%	95	71.6%	102	80.4%	73.9%	80.6%		Within
Kandiyohi	361	65.1%	318	74.2%	361	77.6%	74.7%	79.5%		Within
McLeod	77	66.2%	111	75.7%	122	81.1%	77.9%	83.6%		Within
Meeker	71	59.2%	65	64.6%	76	81.6%	76.7%	83.8%		Within
Mille Lacs	126	52.4%	143	63.6%	166	75.3%	61.7%	67.3%	8.0%	Above
Pine	176	56.8%	199	71.9%	253	79.8%	72.3%	77.2%	2.6%	Above
Renville	57	64.9%	62	75.8%	54	79.6%	78.4%	87.3%		Within
Sherburne	209	55.0%	263	72.6%	266	75.9%	67.8%	72.2%	3.7%	Above
Stearns	918	56.6%	961	71.0%	954	74.7%	73.0%	76.3%		Within
Wright	213	50.2%	281	74.0%	305	78.4%	69.8%	74.0%	4.4%	Above
Central	2799	57.4%	3084	71.5%	3318	77.3%				
Leech Lake Band Minnesota	227	31.7%	217	39.2%	246	53.7%	58.0%	64.6%	-4.4%	Below
Chippewa Tribe	175	38.3%	188	47.3%	186	54.8%	54.2%	61.0%		Within
Red Lake Nation	436	32.6%	501	45.5%	545	51.9%	50.6%	55.4%		Within
White Earth Nation	263	43.3%	251	54.2%	255	59.6%	50.0%	57.5%	2.1%	Above
Total Tribal	1101	35.9%	1157	46.5%	1232	54.3%				

Indicator 7

MFIP exits and returns

What is an MFIP exit? What does returning to MFIP mean? An MFIP case is considered to have exited once it has been ineligible for two consecutive months following an active eligible month. The last eligible month is the exit month. A case returns to MFIP by becoming eligible again by re-applying, being determined eligible for the program, and receiving a grant.

Background. MFIP is a temporary assistance program designed to support parents or relative caregivers as they seek economic stability through work. The goal is for families to exit MFIP because they become self-sufficient and no longer need a grant. Three-quarters of MFIP cases that exit the program stay off MFIP for at least one year.

Formula. This measure gives the unduplicated count of MFIP cases with an eligible adult that exited from a service area during the quarter one year previous to the measurement quarter. The number of exiting cases staying off at least 12 months after an exit and the number that returned to MFIP within that 12-month period are each **divided by** the above number of exiting cases. These two percentages total 100 percent. The last column gives the subset of returning cases that were on at least six of the 12 subsequent months as a percent of exiting cases.

Details. Only cases with an eligible adult in the last month of assistance are included in this indicator.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [DHS website](#).

MFIP exits and returns – Part 1

Service area	Exiting cases	Percent Off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
State	5,068	72.7%	27.3%	11.6%
Fillmore	10	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Freeborn	25	92.0%	8.0%	4.0%
Goodhue	24	66.7%	33.3%	20.8%
Houston	7	42.9%	57.1%	28.6%
MN Prairie	69	68.1%	31.9%	11.6%
Mower	55	87.3%	12.7%	7.3%
Olmsted	146	66.4%	33.6%	17.1%
Rice	50	74.0%	26.0%	12.0%
Wabasha	13	84.6%	15.4%	7.7%
Winona	31	71.0%	29.0%	6.5%
Southeast	430	72.6%	27.4%	12.6%
Aitkin	11	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carlton	26	76.9%	23.1%	11.5%
Cook	11	63.6%	36.4%	9.1%
Itasca	50	80.0%	20.0%	12.0%
Koochiching	19	79.0%	21.1%	15.8%
Lake	9	88.9%	11.1%	11.1%
St. Louis	195	66.7%	33.3%	12.3%
Northeast	321	72.0%	28.0%	11.8%
Big Stone	2	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Chippewa	9	66.7%	33.3%	11.1%
DVHHS	26	61.5%	38.5%	23.1%
Lac qui Parle	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nobles	22	81.8%	18.2%	9.1%
SWHHS	54	79.6%	20.4%	7.4%
Swift	13	84.6%	15.4%	7.7%
Yellow Medicine	4	75.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Southwest	135	76.3%	23.7%	11.9%
Blue Earth	49	65.3%	34.7%	12.2%
Brown	15	86.7%	13.3%	0.0%
Faribault-Martin	25	64.0%	36.0%	12.0%
Le Sueur	24	83.3%	16.7%	4.2%
Nicollet	22	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%
Sibley	11	81.8%	18.2%	9.1%
Watonwan	12	58.3%	41.7%	16.7%
South Central	158	72.8%	27.2%	8.2%

MFIP exits and returns – Part 2

Service area	Exiting cases	Percent Off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Anoka	240	72.1%	27.9%	10.4%
Carver	26	73.1%	26.9%	7.7%
Dakota	290	76.6%	23.5%	10.0%
Scott	66	74.2%	25.8%	6.1%
Washington	99	70.7%	29.3%	14.1%
Suburban Metro	721	73.9%	26.1%	10.3%
Hennepin	1,324	72.4%	27.6%	11.5%
Ramsey	829	73.3%	26.7%	12.6%
Core Metro	2,153	72.8%	27.2%	11.9%
Kittson	3	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%
Marshall	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Norman	5	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Pennington	8	62.5%	37.5%	12.5%
Polk	37	73.0%	27.0%	10.8%
Red Lake	9	77.8%	22.2%	0.0%
Roseau	10	90.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Northwest	74	74.3%	25.7%	9.5%
Becker	28	75.0%	25.0%	10.7%
Beltrami	116	62.1%	37.9%	19.8%
Cass	53	67.9%	32.1%	15.1%
Clay	70	68.6%	31.4%	11.4%
Clearwater	7	71.4%	28.6%	14.3%
Crow Wing	49	77.6%	22.5%	10.2%
Douglas	23	56.5%	43.5%	26.1%
Grant	10	40.0%	60.0%	20.0%
Hubbard	24	70.8%	29.2%	8.3%
Lake of the Woods	0			
Mahnomen	7	28.6%	71.4%	28.6%
Morrison	34	79.4%	20.6%	8.8%
Otter Tail	51	74.5%	25.5%	9.8%
Pope	5	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%
Stevens	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Todd	17	76.5%	23.5%	5.9%
Traverse	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wadena	16	81.3%	18.8%	6.3%
White Earth Nation	51	68.6%	31.4%	7.8%
Wilkin	3	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%
West Central	569	68.9%	31.1%	13.2%

MFIP exits and returns – Part 3

Service area	Exiting cases	Percent Off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Benton	39	69.2%	30.8%	10.3%
Chisago	24	66.7%	33.3%	8.3%
Isanti	29	69.0%	31.0%	6.9%
Kanabec	13	76.9%	23.1%	15.4%
Kandiyohi	62	66.1%	33.9%	22.6%
McLeod	16	81.3%	18.8%	12.5%
Meeker	13	84.6%	15.4%	0.0%
Mille Lacs	29	96.6%	3.5%	3.5%
Pine	32	62.5%	37.5%	6.3%
Renville	17	88.2%	11.8%	0.0%
Sherburne	42	78.6%	21.4%	4.8%
Stearns	138	72.5%	27.5%	15.2%
Wright	53	81.1%	18.9%	5.7%
Central	507	74.4%	25.6%	10.9%

Indicator 8

MFIP unaccounted for cases

How is unaccounted for defined? A case is unaccounted for if it meets all the following conditions in each of the three months of the reporting quarter:

- Includes an eligible caregiver required to participate in employment services (i.e., not exempt)
- Reports no earnings or activity hours
- Not attached to Family Stabilization Services
- Not in sanction.

Background. This indicator is intended to be used as a management tool to determine how well the service areas and the employment services providers are doing in engaging families and helping them move toward self-sufficiency. The immediate goal is to minimize unaccounted-for cases by reconnecting them to the program.

Formula. The number of MFIP cases unaccounted for as defined above **divided by** the unduplicated MFIP caseload in the reporting quarter.

Details. A case is attributed to the service area in the last month of the reporting quarter. MFIP caseloads in the service area include all cases with an eligible caregiver in any month of the quarter, with every case counted only once.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [DHS website](#). The Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development provides lists of unaccounted for cases that authorized program staff can access at the [DEED website](#).

MFIP unaccounted for cases – Part 1

Service area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
State	23,969	868	3.6%
Fillmore	35	0	0.0%
Freeborn	135	2	1.5%
Goodhue	96	1	1.0%
Houston	48	1	2.1%
MN Prairie	279	1	0.4%
Mower	197	1	0.5%
Olmsted	633	26	4.1%
Rice	187	2	1.1%
Wabasha	37	0	0.0%
Winona	130	5	3.8%
Southeast	1,777	39	2.2%
Aitkin	35	0	0.0%
Carlton	81	0	0.0%
Cook	22	0	0.0%
Itasca	201	7	3.5%
Koochiching	56	1	1.8%
Lake	15	0	0.0%
St. Louis	1,052	46	4.4%
Northeast	1,462	54	3.7%
Big Stone	7	0	0.0%
Chippewa	42	0	0.0%
DVHHS	64	3	4.7%
Lac qui Parle	13	0	0.0%
Nobles	68	0	0.0%
SWHHS	225	2	0.9%
Swift	30	0	0.0%
Yellow Medicine	25	0	0.0%
Southwest	474	5	1.1%
Blue Earth	204	6	2.9%
Brown	58	4	6.9%
Faribault-Martin	88	0	0.0%
Le Sueur	71	0	0.0%
Nicollet	177	6	3.4%
Sibley	25	0	0.0%
Watonwan	36	0	0.0%
South Central	659	16	2.4%

MFIP unaccounted for cases – Part 2

Service area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Anoka	1,232	35	2.8%
Carver	102	3	2.9%
Dakota	1,033	38	3.7%
Scott	193	0	0.0%
Washington	413	8	1.9%
Suburban Metro	2,973	84	2.8%
Hennepin	7,184	360	5.0%
Ramsey	4,918	112	2.3%
Core Metro	12,102	472	3.9%
Kittson	9	0	0.0%
Marshall	11	0	0.0%
Norman	29	0	0.0%
Pennington	43	0	0.0%
Polk	208	7	3.4%
Red Lake	9	0	0.0%
Roseau	27	0	0.0%
Northwest	336	7	2.1%
Becker	104	3	2.9%
Beltrami	358	51	14.2%
Cass	284	34	12.0%
Clay	301	13	4.3%
Clearwater	32	2	6.3%
Crow Wing	149	3	2.0%
Douglas	84	2	2.4%
Grant	24	0	0.0%
Hubbard	84	3	3.6%
Lake of the Woods	10	2	20.0%
Mahnomen	19	1	5.3%
Morrison	93	3	3.2%
Otter Tail	172	18	10.5%
Pope	28	0	0.0%
Stevens	20	0	0.0%
Todd	46	1	2.2%
Traverse	22	0	0.0%
Wadena	73	1	1.4%
White Earth Nation	214	10	4.7%
Wilkin	27	1	3.7%
West Central	2,144	148	6.9%

MFIP unaccounted for cases – Part 3

Service area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Benton	200	7	3.5%
Chisago	76	0	0.0%
Isanti	101	0	0.0%
Kanabec	55	0	0.0%
Kandiyohi	231	4	1.7%
McLeod	54	0	0.0%
Meeker	49	1	2.0%
Mille Lacs	88	1	1.1%
Pine	133	1	0.8%
Renville	40	2	5.0%
Sherburne	156	1	0.6%
Stearns	703	23	3.3%
Wright	156	3	1.9%
Central	2,042	43	2.1%

Notes

County consortia. A county consortium is the legal merger of county human services agencies of multiple counties that consolidate administrative activities for human services programs. Such a county consortium is viewed as one entity by the department. Therefore, measures in this report are reported for the county consortium and not for its individual counties. County consortia's member counties include the following:

- Faribault/Martin: Faribault and Martin
- Southwest Health and Human Services: Lincoln, Lyon, Murray, Pipestone, Redwood and Rock
- Des Moines Valley Health and Human Services: Cottonwood and Jackson
- Minnesota Prairie County Alliance (MNPrairie): Dodge, Steele and Waseca (Waseca, formerly in the South Central region, is now included with MNPrairie in the Southeast region).

Minnesota Statute. The [statute](#) on county performance management referenced in the introduction requires a quarterly report to all counties on each county's performance on seven measures. Five of the measures named were operationalized as Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 in this quarterly report. The other two measures named (rates of paid employment and receiving the MFIP food portion but not the cash grant) are currently reported in the "MFIP Monthly Report" (statewide data), "MFIP County Specific Report" (county breakdown), and "MFIP Trends Report" (25 months of statewide data). Additional measures are included in each of the reports. Data for counties that have formed a consortium are aggregated.

Tribal nations. White Earth Nation assumed administrative responsibility for human services programs for tribal members residing in Becker, Clearwater and Mahnommen counties, with cases transferred starting in 2014; for performance reporting purposes, White Earth Nation caseloads are reported with the counties and county consortia for six of the measures. For the two high-stakes performance measures, the MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and the Work Participation Rate, people served by a tribal employment services provider are taken out of the county numbers and reported by provider, including the Leech Lake Band, Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Red Lake Nation and White Earth Nation employment services providers.

Note that the Mille Lacs Band operates a tribal TANF program that is independent of the state TANF/MFIP program so is not included in state-level MFIP reporting. Red Lake Nation transitioned to a tribal TANF program from September 2015 to January 2016, but continues to be included in the report during the transition time.

Service areas. Counties, county consortia and tribes are referred to as service areas in this report.

Data source. Except as otherwise noted, all data are recorded in the department's MAXIS eligibility system; all data are extracted from the DHS Data Warehouse.