



# Minnesota's Child Maltreatment Report, 2022

08/01/2024

---

Minnesota Department of Children, Youth, and Families  
Child Safety and Permanency Administration  
P.O. Box 64943  
St. Paul, MN 55155  
651-431-4660  
[dcyf.csp.research@state.mn.us](mailto:dcyf.csp.research@state.mn.us)

[Child protection webpage](#)

As requested by Minnesota Statutes 3.197: This report cost approximately \$10,667.30 to prepare, including staff time, printing and mailing expenses.

*Upon request, this material will be made available in an alternative format such as large print, Braille or audio recording. Printed on recycled paper.*

# Contents

Minnesota’s Child Maltreatment Report, 2022.....	1
Contents .....	3
Child Maltreatment Report summary, 2022 .....	4
Purpose .....	4
Findings .....	4
Statewide screening review.....	5
Legislation.....	8
Introduction.....	10
What is child maltreatment? .....	10
Minnesota’s child protection system.....	10
The intake process .....	10
The screening process.....	10
Screened-out maltreatment reports.....	13
Referral source of child maltreatment reports.....	13
Completed assessments and investigations.....	15
Characteristics of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations .....	15
Prior screened-out reports .....	26
Alleged maltreatment type.....	26
Child protection response path assignment.....	29
Mandatory and discretionary reasons for child protection response paths .....	33
Assessment of safety, risk and service need .....	34
Timeliness of face-to-face contact with alleged victims of child maltreatment.....	34
Assessment of safety and risk.....	37
Assessing need for ongoing child protection services post-assessment or investigation phase.....	43
Determining maltreatment.....	46
Social service agency referrals to early intervention for infants and toddlers.....	48
Relationship of alleged offenders to alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by determination of maltreatment.....	50
Child fatalities and near fatalities due to maltreatment.....	52
Outcomes after child maltreatment assessments/investigations concluded .....	54
Rereporting of alleged maltreatment and recurrence of maltreatment determinations.....	54

# Child Maltreatment Report summary, 2022

## Purpose

This annual report provides information on children involved in maltreatment reports and the work happening across Minnesota to ensure and promote safety, permanency and well-being of children who may have experienced maltreatment. This report includes information on child maltreatment reports received and screened by local social service agencies, characteristics of the children involved in screened in child protection reports, information on the assessment or investigation process that occurs following a screened-in report and the outcomes of those child protection reports. For information on all state and federal performance measures, see the [Minnesota Child Welfare Data Dashboard](#).

The Minnesota Department of Human Services produces an annual report on child welfare statistics to document and understand Minnesota's child welfare trends. Historically, the department included American Indian/Alaska Native children in these reports using county data from the Social Service Information System (SSIS), Minnesota's child welfare data system. When White Earth Nation and the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe assumed sovereignty over their child welfare system as Initiative Tribes, the department began including their data in annual reports. In 2021, Red Lake Nation officially began as an Initiative Tribe and requested data sovereignty. Therefore, their data is available in an independent report developed by Red Lake Nation (see [Red Lake Tribal Nation Report to the Legislator on Tribal Child Welfare](#)). The following two paragraphs were prepared by Red Lake Nation to provide additional context related to the decision to submit an independent annual report:

“Red Lake is committed to track the effectiveness of its American Indian Child Welfare Initiative work with their tribal citizens. Red Lake chose not to report all standard child welfare data elements in SSIS, so it is not possible to accurately compare their data to Minnesota's counties. The tribal report is best done through looking at data through a community context and the lens of Red Lake's indigenous values and practices. The annual review for year two of the American Indian Child Welfare Initiative, FY 2022, will assist in program development and outcomes based on organizational changes and using culturally centered practices. Annual reports help the tribe to continue to identify strengths and gaps in practice so that they may effectively target interventions to restore their communities to wellbeing and health.

When Red Lake Nation assumed full jurisdiction of the child welfare system, they built a new narrative through relationship development and shifting practice to a relative approach - Ombimindwaa Gidanawemaaganidog “Uplifting Our Relatives”. Using a collaborative and inclusive process, they developed institutional capacity through infrastructure development, data collection, adding and realigning staff, practice model development, and training for staff and relative care providers. Because Red Lake Nation's child welfare practice is so different from county-based practice, the annual report is developed by Red Lake to reflect the paradigm shift centered to family preservation, not child removal. The report reflects the inherent interconnectedness between the child and their family, extended family, culture, community, and tribal nation.”

## Findings

Following a relatively large decline in the number of child maltreatment reports received during the first year of the pandemic, there was a small increase in the number of reports that were received by Child Protective Services across the state in 2022.

Number of intakes in 2022:

- Local social service agencies screened 76,203 intakes, representing no significant change from the prior year.

The screening process found:

- American Indian/Alaska Native children and children who identify as two or more races were about four times as likely to be reported to child protection compared to white children; African American/Black children and Hispanic/Latinx children were about two times as likely, and Asian/Pacific Islander were about 0.5 times as likely.
- Once reported to child protection, between 46-50% of all Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, children who identify as two or more races and children identified as Hispanic/Latinx were screened in for further assessment compared to 39% of white children.
- Overall, 40% of all reports of maltreatment received by local agencies were screened in for further assessment.
- Mandated reporters made the majority of reports of maltreatment (80%).

## Statewide screening review

The Child Safety and Permanency Administration conducts a statewide screening review process every year to ensure consistent statewide screening practices with the Minnesota Child Maltreatment Intake, Screening and Response Path Guidelines. This process involves review of a random selection of approximately 5% of screened out reports each month. Each review is completed by a team and is appraised for both screening decisions and quality of information in the reports. The review team requested additional consultation with local agencies regarding screening decisions in 14 of 2,499 reports that were reviewed (0.6%) in 2022. Of the 14 cases, consultations resulted in agencies screening in reports four times, and in an agency providing additional information to support a screen out 10 times.

Following the data on the number of child maltreatment reports received and intakes completed, the remaining portion of the maltreatment report provides information using data on children involved in completed reports during the year.

- There were 32,047 alleged victims involved in 24,489 completed assessments or investigations following screened in child maltreatment reports in 2022.
- Children ages 8 and younger represented the majority of children involved in completed maltreatment assessments/investigations (56.7%).
- One in five children involved in completed child maltreatment assessments and investigations were under the age of 3.

Figure 1 shows the decrease in reports over the last few years, which leveled off in 2022. Despite the overall reductions, American Indian/Alaska Native and African American/Black children, children who identify as two or more races or as Hispanic/Latinx continue to disproportionately be represented in completed maltreatment assessments and investigations. Specifically, American Indian/Alaska Native children, children who identify as two or more races, African American/Black children, and children who identify as Hispanic/Latinx are 5.2, 4.8, 2.3 and 1.9 times more likely, respectively, to be involved in completed maltreatment assessments/investigations than white children.

**Figure 1. Number of alleged victims and completed assessments and investigations, 2018 – 2022**



Alleged victims with allegations of neglect comprised the largest group of children, approximately 61% of all children in 2022. There are some variations in the pattern of allegation types when examined by age. Of all children who allegedly experience threatened injury, nearly one in three were under the age of 3. Threatened injury means a statement, overt act, condition or status that represents a substantial risk of physical abuse, sexual abuse or mental injury. Threatened injury includes, but is not limited to, exposing a child to a person responsible for their care, who has caused harm. ([Minnesota Statutes 260E.03, subd. 23.](#)) Threatened injury includes Birth Match reports, which are reports that occur when at the time of the child’s birth a parent was identified as having parental rights terminated for other children. It could also include issues related to domestic violence. Youths ages 12 through 17 had the highest percentages of all children allegedly experiencing mental injury, accounting for just over half of all reports alleging mental injury.

The number and proportion of reports assigned to Family Assessment (Minnesota’s alternative response path) remained relatively consistent for a fifth year, with 65% of the total 24,489 cases. The rest received either a Family or Facility Investigation. In statute, there are certain allegation types or allegation details that require a Family Investigation, including allegations of sexual abuse or any allegation that, if true, would indicate substantial child endangerment. ([Minnesota Statutes 260E.03, subd. 22.](#))

Local agencies have the discretion to do a Family Investigation or to switch from one response path to another upon learning new information. Discretionary reasons are most common among African American/Black children, American Indian/Alaska Native children and children of two or more races. The key difference between a Family Assessment and an Investigation is that it is only when doing an investigation that there is a determination made as to whether maltreatment occurred and if so, by whom. Otherwise, all assessments and investigations result in face-to-face contact with alleged victims; assessments of safety and risk, and the need for services outside of the child welfare system, and for ongoing child protective services; as well as efforts to understand the context and situation surrounding the alleged maltreatment.

Agency improvements on the timeliness of the first face-to-face contact with alleged victims is critical to ensure the safety of the alleged victims. Only 85% of victims were seen within the time frame established in statute.

Structured Decision Making Tools are used to assess safety and risk of future maltreatment. Safety is continually monitored throughout each case, but a formal assessment is completed upon first working with the family. The tool results in three possible ratings: safe, conditionally safe and unsafe. Most cases are rated as safe (61%), meaning there appears to be little needed to keep the child safely with their caregivers. Around 7% of cases resulted in a rating of unsafe; a rating of unsafe indicates that the child may need to be removed temporarily while the family addresses the safety concerns. Although that pattern remains the same across Family Assessment and Family Investigation pathways, a relatively higher percentage of Family Assessment cases are rated as safe while a relatively higher percentage of Family Investigations are rated as unsafe. Around 9% of screened in and completed assessments and investigations resulted in a child being placed into out-of-home care in 2022.

Family Investigations completed in 2022 were more likely to be indicated as high risk for future maltreatment (24%) compared to Family Assessments (12.4%). Families at moderate or high risk of future maltreatment likely need additional services and supports to prevent future maltreatment.

- 12,799 children experienced a Family or Facility Investigation, with 40% having a determination of maltreatment made at the conclusion of the investigation, a slight decrease from 2021.
- 1,059 children were in the care of a provider licensed by the department where an allegation of maltreatment resulted in a Facility Investigation; 29.1% of children had a determination of maltreatment, an increase from 2021.
- Younger children experience higher incidents of recurrence (6.9% of children ages birth through 5) compared to older youth (4.1% of youth ages 12 through 14, and 2.7% of youth ages 15 through 17).
- There were 31 child deaths and 33 life-threatening injuries determined to be a result of maltreatment. In 14 of the cases that resulted in a child fatality, the victim had previously been involved in a screened-in child protection case.
- Minnesota met the federal maltreatment recurrence standard in 2022, with 5.8% of all children having a recurrence of maltreatment within 12 months of their first determination.

Local social service agencies and department staff take the work of protecting children seriously and implement a trauma-informed, robust and scientific Systemic Critical Incident Review process for child fatalities and near fatalities due to maltreatment. The review process is designed to systemically analyze the child welfare system to identify opportunities for improvement, as well as to address barriers to providing the best possible services to children and families. The model utilizes components from the same science used by other safety-critical industries, including aviation and health care; it moves away from blame and toward a system of accountability, focusing on identifying underlying systemic issues to improve Minnesota's child welfare system.

Between summer 2019 and fall 2021, the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Case Review Team reviewed 85 fatality/near fatalities cases using the Systemic Critical Incident Review process developed in 2017. Following these reviews, the CQI section completed scoring and coding of these cases which resulted in three prioritized considerations for improving Minnesota's child welfare system:

- Administrative burden: The documentation requirements for child protection cases in Minnesota's Social Service Information System (SSIS) are extensive. This system encompasses layers of requirements for documentation including federal law, state statutes, state/Tribal child welfare agency policy and local policy. Child protection workloads are impacted by the number of administrative tasks required for each case.

- Coordination with county attorneys: In Minnesota, each of the 87 counties elect a county attorney to a four-year term to oversee court cases including Child in Need of Protection or Services (CHIPS) petitions. The county attorney provides legal guidance to county boards, county official and county departments. Case reviews showed that county attorney practice standards, statutory interpretation and limited access disrupted child protection activities.
- Coordination with law enforcement: Minnesota has over 400 law enforcement agencies without a single agency overseeing all the law enforcement practices, including child protection cases. Case reviews completed indicated that law enforcement activities, requirements and limited access disrupted child protection activities.

Exploration of ongoing and newly developed activities will occur in 2023 and reported out in the 2023 Minnesota Child Maltreatment Report.

## Legislation

This report was prepared by the Minnesota Department of Children, Youth, and Families, Child Safety and Permanency Administration, for the Minnesota Legislature in response to a directive in [Minnesota Statutes 257.0725](#). This report also fulfills reporting requirements under the Vulnerable Children and Adults Act ([Minnesota Statutes 256M.80, subd. 2](#)), the Minnesota Indian Family Preservation Act ([Minnesota Statutes 260.775](#)), required referrals to early intervention services ([Minnesota Statutes 260E.24, subd. 6](#)) and commissioner's duty to provide oversight, quality assurance reviews and annual summary of reviews ([Minnesota Statutes 260E.38](#)).

[Minnesota Statutes 257.0725](#): The commissioner of human services shall publish an annual report on child maltreatment and children in out-of-home placement. The commissioner shall confer with counties, child welfare organizations, child advocacy organizations, courts, and other groups on how to improve the content and utility of the department's annual report. For the child maltreatment report, it shall include the number and kinds of maltreatment reports received, and other data that the commissioner determines appropriate in a child maltreatment report.

[Minnesota Statutes 256M.80, subd. 2](#): Statewide evaluation. Six months after the end of the first full calendar year and annually thereafter, the commissioner shall make public counties' progress in improving outcomes of vulnerable children and adults related to safety, permanency and well-being.

[Minnesota Statutes 260.775](#); Placement of records (a) The commissioner of human services shall publish annually an inventory of all Indian children in residential facilities. The inventory shall include, by county and statewide, information on legal status, living arrangement, age, sex, tribe in which the child is a member or eligible for membership, accumulated length of time in foster care, and other demographic information deemed appropriate concerning all Indian children in residential facilities. The report must also state the extent to which authorized child-placing agencies comply with the order of preference described in United States Code, title 25, section 1901, et seq. The commissioner shall include the information required under this paragraph in the annual report on child maltreatment and on children in out-of-home placement under section [257.0725](#).

[Minnesota Statutes 260E.24, subd. 6](#): A child under age 3 who is involved in a substantiated case of maltreatment shall be referred for screening under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, part C. Parents must be informed that evaluation and acceptance of services are voluntary. The commissioner of human services shall monitor referral rates by county and annually report that information to the legislature. Refusal to have a child screened is not a basis for a child in need of protection or services petition under chapter 260C.

[Minnesota Statutes 260E.38](#): Audit. Subd. 2 states: The commissioner shall develop a plan to perform quality assurance reviews of local welfare agency screening practices and decisions. The commissioner shall provide oversight and

guidance to county agencies to ensure consistent application of screening guidelines, thorough and appropriate screening decisions, and correct documentation and maintenance of reports. Subd. 3 states: The commissioner shall produce an annual report of the summary results of reviews. The report must only include aggregate data and may not include any data that could be used to personally identify any subject whose data is included in the report. The report is public information and must be provided to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees having jurisdiction over child protection issues.

# Introduction

## What is child maltreatment?

Minnesota Statutes provide a detailed description of what constitutes child maltreatment (see [Minnesota Statutes 260E](#)). Minnesota Statutes recognize six types of maltreatment: Neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, mental injury, emotional harm and threatened injury.

## Minnesota's child protection system

Minnesota is a state-supervised, locally administered child protection system. This means that local social service agencies (87 counties and three American Indian Initiative Tribes) are responsible for screening reports, assessing allegations of maltreatment and providing protective services for children and families. The department's Child Safety and Permanency Administration provides oversight, guidance, training, technical assistance and quality assurance monitoring of local agencies in support of that work. This annual report provides information on children affected and work happening across Minnesota to ensure and promote safety, permanency and well-being of children who may have experienced maltreatment. For information about performance on all state and federal performance measures, see the [Minnesota Child Welfare Data Dashboard](#).

## The intake process

When community members have concerns that children are being maltreated, they can (or must if they are a mandated reporter; see [Minnesota Statutes 260E.06, subd. 1](#), for information about who is a mandated reporter) call their local child protection agency to report concerns. Local agencies document reports of maltreatment, including information about reporters, children involved, alleged offenders and specifics of alleged maltreatment.

The annual child maltreatment report begins with information on the number of child maltreatment reports received and screening rates for these reports at the time of intake. **All other information included in the report is based on assessments/investigations completed during the calendar year because it includes information not known until an assessment/investigation closes.** Although these two groups of reports are related, they are not identical populations of reports or corresponding children. Some reports made to child protection in the year (i.e., reports at the intake phase) will not have an assessment or investigation of allegations completed until the following year and will be included in that year's annual report (e.g., reports received in December). Likewise, some assessments/investigations completed during the reporting year were based on maltreatment reports received later in the prior year.

## The screening process

Upon receipt of a report of maltreatment, local agency staff reviews information and determines if the allegation/s meet the statutory threshold for child maltreatment. If it does and allegations have not been previously assessed/investigated, staff screen in reports for further assessment or investigation. Local agencies cross-report all allegations of maltreatment to law enforcement, regardless of screening decision. Table 1 provides information on the child maltreatment reports received by local agencies during the year and the screening disposition of those reports. Table 2 provides that same information statewide by race/ethnicity.

**Table 1. Screening decisions of maltreatment reports received by agency, 2022**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Screened out reports (N)</b>	<b>Screened out reports (%)</b>	<b>Screened in reports (N)</b>	<b>Screened in reports (%)</b>	<b>Total reports received</b>
Aitkin	175	58.3	125	41.7	300
Anoka	2,473	69.7	1,075	30.3	3,548
Becker	422	69.3	187	30.7	609
Beltrami	431	62.2	262	37.8	693
Benton	547	73.5	197	26.5	744
Big Stone	15	34.1	29	65.9	44
Blue Earth	776	68.6	356	31.4	1,132
Brown	277	62.1	169	37.9	446
Carlton	630	54.2	532	45.8	1,162
Carver	517	60	345	40	862
Cass	175	57.9	127	42.1	302
Chippewa	191	50.8	185	49.2	376
Chisago	550	73.6	197	26.4	747
Clay	1,300	78.9	347	21.1	1,647
Clearwater	135	59.5	92	40.5	227
Cook	63	65.6	33	34.4	96
Crow Wing	1,297	82.1	282	17.9	1,579
Dakota	3,011	64.7	1,642	35.3	4,653
Des Moines Valley HHS	331	73.1	122	26.9	453
Douglas	382	51.3	363	48.7	745
Faribault-Martin	442	66.8	220	33.2	662
Fillmore	154	77.4	45	22.6	199
Freeborn	175	51.9	162	48.1	337
Goodhue	476	64.2	266	35.8	742
Hennepin	6,008	51	5,782	49	11,790
Houston	114	60.3	75	39.7	189
Hubbard	307	65.7	160	34.3	467
Isanti	684	83.1	139	16.9	823
Itasca	289	46.2	336	53.8	625
Kanabec	201	65.7	105	34.3	306
Kandiyohi	550	55	450	45	1,000
Kittson	23	69.7	10	30.3	33
Koochiching	172	64.4	95	35.6	267
Lac qui Parle	82	59.9	55	40.1	137
Lake	47	46.1	55	53.9	102
Lake of the Woods	13	38.2	21	61.8	34
Le Sueur	360	73.8	128	26.2	488
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	154	35.4	281	64.6	435
MN Prairie	580	51.1	555	48.9	1,135

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Screened out reports (N)</b>	<b>Screened out reports (%)</b>	<b>Screened in reports (N)</b>	<b>Screened in reports (%)</b>	<b>Total reports received</b>
Mahnomen	29	58	21	42	50
Marshall	74	63.2	43	36.8	117
McLeod	378	67.6	181	32.4	559
Meeker	296	66.5	149	33.5	445
Mille Lacs	587	65	316	35	903
Morrison	711	84	135	16	846
Mower	590	71.4	236	28.6	826
Nicollet	338	59	235	41	573
Nobles	150	47	169	53	319
Norman	75	55.6	60	44.4	135
Olmsted	1,428	78.9	382	21.1	1,810
Otter Tail	582	61.5	365	38.5	947
Pennington	82	55.8	65	44.2	147
Pine	466	66.1	239	33.9	705
Polk	343	63.9	194	36.1	537
Ramsey	2,564	45.4	3,085	54.6	5,649
Red Lake County	8	24.2	25	75.8	33
Renville	143	53.6	124	46.4	267
Rice	570	57.2	427	42.8	997
Roseau	134	64.7	73	35.3	207
Scott	725	53.5	629	46.5	1,354
Sherburne	870	62.6	519	37.4	1,389
Sibley	81	39.1	126	60.9	207
Southwest HHS	945	63.8	537	36.2	1,482
St. Louis	2,214	45.4	2,658	54.6	4,872
Stearns	1,343	61.5	841	38.5	2,184
Stevens	108	46.4	125	53.6	233
Swift	181	78.4	50	21.6	231
Todd	345	69.6	151	30.4	496
Traverse	56	52.3	51	47.7	107
Wabasha	206	66.9	102	33.1	308
Wadena	325	66.7	162	33.3	487
Washington	1,361	67.4	658	32.6	2,019
Watonwan	154	52.6	139	47.4	293
Western Prairie Human Services	240	51.5	226	48.5	466
White Earth Nation	158	58.1	114	41.9	272
Wilkin	110	66.7	55	33.3	165
Winona	453	59	315	41	768
Wright	1,639	66.6	822	33.4	2,461

Agency	Screened out reports (N)	Screened out reports (%)	Screened in reports (N)	Screened in reports (%)	Total reports received
Yellow Medicine	126	62.7	75	37.3	201
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>45,717</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>30,486</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>76,203</b>

**Table 2. Screening decisions of maltreatment reports received by race/ethnicity (alone, no other race value), 2022**

Race/ethnicity	Screened in reports (N)	Screened in reports (%)	Screened out reports (N)	Screened out reports (%)	Total reports received
African American/Black	5,125	49.5	5,226	50.5	10,351
American Indian/Alaska Native	2,560	51.3	2,429	48.7	4,989
Asian/Pacific Islander	684	50.9	660	49.1	1,344
Two or more races	6,616	47.4	7,337	52.6	13,953
Unknown/declined	2,659	22.0	9,433	78.0	12,092
White	14,981	39.1	23,293	60.9	38,274
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,486</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>45,717</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>76,203</b>
Hispanic/Latinx (any race)	3,725	46.4	4,307	53.6	8,032

Note on race and ethnicity categories: This breakdown relies on exclusive racial categories, except Hispanic/Latinx (any race). A client is only counted in a single row or column, based on their identification with a single race value. If a client identified with more than one race value, they will be counted in the multi-racial “two or more races” category. ‘Hispanic/Latinx (any race)’ shows clients who identified with that ethnicity regardless of exclusive race category.

### Screened-out maltreatment reports

There are several reasons reports of maltreatment received by local agencies may be screened out. The most common reason is that the report did not meet the statutory threshold for maltreatment. Other reasons include the report did not include enough identifying information, allegations referred to an unborn child or alleged victims were not in a family unit or covered entity and were referred to the appropriate investigative agency. Table 3 provides information on the reasons for screened-out maltreatment reports statewide.

**Table 3. Reasons for screened-out child maltreatment reports, 2022**

Screen out reason	Number	Percent
Did not meet statutory threshold	41,411	90.6
Alleged victims not in covered entity	2,268	5.0
Allegations referred to an unborn child	1,347	2.9
Not enough identifying information	691	1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>45,717</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Referral source of child maltreatment reports

Mandated reporters make the vast majority of reports of maltreatment to local agencies. Mandated reporters include those in health care, law enforcement, mental health, social services, education and childcare, among others working

with children. Table 4 provides information on the number and percent of reports made and the percent screened in and out by source of reporter.

**Table 4. Screening decisions of maltreatment reports received by report source, 2022**

Reporter type	Reporter source	Screened-out reports (N)	Screened-out reports (%)	Screened-in reports (N)	Screened-in reports (%)	Total reports received
Mandated	Chemical dependency practitioner	314	77.5	91	22.5	405
Mandated	Child care provider	469	71.0	192	29.0	661
Mandated	Clergy	67	80.7	16	19.3	83
Mandated	Coroner/medical examiner	36	67.9	17	32.1	53
Mandated	Court/court services	831	51.6	781	48.4	1,612
Mandated	DHS Birth Match	18	9.7	167	90.3	185
Mandated	Facility staff	343	63.4	198	36.6	541
Mandated	Foster parent	191	61.2	121	38.8	312
Mandated	Hospital/clinic	3,665	51.1	3,503	48.9	7,168
Mandated	Human/social services staff (county or other)	3,098	49.5	3,164	50.5	6,262
Mandated	Law enforcement	7,592	57.9	5,522	42.1	13,114
Mandated	Mental health practitioner	4,894	68.3	2,268	31.7	7,162
Mandated	Other health practitioner	247	71.8	97	28.2	344
Mandated	Other mandated	3,555	65.7	1,854	34.3	5,409
Mandated	Other school personnel	7,344	57.2	5,505	42.8	12,849
Mandated	Private physician	25	61.0	16	39.0	41
Mandated	Public health nurse	172	71.7	68	28.3	240
Mandated	School nurse	244	60.7	158	39.3	402
Mandated	Teacher	2,731	67.9	1,292	32.1	4,023
Mandated	Tribal social services	92	56.1	72	43.9	164
Non-mandated	Alleged offender	24	57.1	18	42.9	42
Non-mandated	Alleged victim	126	56.5	97	43.5	223
Non-mandated	Anonymous	2,523	61.5	1,578	38.5	4,101
Non-mandated	Babysitter	15	78.9	4	21.1	19
Non-mandated	Friend/acquaintance/neighbor	1,143	59.2	788	40.8	1,931

Reporter type	Reporter source	Screened-out reports (N)	Screened-out reports (%)	Screened-in reports (N)	Screened-in reports (%)	Total reports received
Non-mandated	Other non-mandated	627	63.8	356	36.2	983
Non-mandated	Other relative in home	208	63.6	119	36.4	327
Non-mandated	Other relative out of home	1,766	62.4	1,065	37.6	2,831
Non-mandated	Parent in home	946	67.9	448	32.1	1,394
Non-mandated	Parent out of home	2,407	72.6	910	27.4	3,317
Unknown	Unknown	4	80.0	1	20.0	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>45,717</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>30,486</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>76,203</b>

## Completed assessments and investigations

As mentioned previously, for the prior intake and screening process sections, data provided are based on reports initially made to child welfare agencies in the report calendar year. Beginning in this section, and for all subsequent sections, information provided is based on maltreatment reports with completed assessments/ investigations during the report year.

### Characteristics of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations

Minnesota children involved in allegations of maltreatment live with all types of families in all parts of the state. The following section provides demographic information on children with at least one completed child protection assessment or investigation, including:

- Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations, and rate per 1,000 in population, by gender and agency, 2022 (Table 5)
- Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by race/ethnicity alone and agency, 2022 (Table 6)
- Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by race/ethnicity alone or combined and agency, 2022 (Table 7)
- Number, percent and per 1,000 rate of alleged victims in population by race/ethnicity alone, 2022 (Table 8)
- Number and (percent) of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by age groups and agency, 2022 (Table 9)
- Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by disability status, 2022 (Table 10).

**Table 5. Number and percent of alleged and determined victims in completed assessments/investigations, and rate per 1,000 in population, by gender and agency, 2022**

Agency	Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Alleged victims	Child population	Rate per 1,000
Aitkin	81	55.1	66	44.9	147	2,550	57.6

Agency	Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Alleged victims	Child population	Rate per 1,000
Anoka	609	52.9	542	47.1	1,151	86,424	13.3
Becker	131	55.5	105	44.5	236	8,371	28.2
Beltrami	82	50.3	81	49.7	163	11,498	14.2
Benton	125	47	141	53	266	10,504	25.3
Big Stone	19	50	19	50	38	1,116	34.1
Blue Earth	196	50.1	195	49.9	391	13,608	28.7
Brown	100	51.8	93	48.2	193	5,691	33.9
Carlton	190	52.2	174	47.8	364	7,991	45.6
Carver	211	53	187	47	398	27,627	14.4
Cass	58	41.7	81	58.3	139	6,258	22.2
Chippewa	91	48.1	98	51.9	189	3,018	62.6
Chisago	116	55.2	94	44.8	210	12,866	16.3
Clay	194	51.1	186	48.9	380	16,259	23.4
Clearwater	32	41	46	59	78	2,178	35.8
Cook	13	54.2	11	45.8	24	825	29.1
Crow Wing	152	49.4	156	50.6	308	13,913	22.1
Dakota	859	52.2	788	47.8	1,647	105,526	15.6
Des Moines Valley HHS	80	52.3	73	47.7	153	5,074	30.2
Douglas	200	50.3	198	49.7	398	8,371	47.5
Faribault-Martin	137	45.1	167	54.9	304	7,475	40.7
Fillmore	30	55.6	24	44.4	54	5,197	10.4
Freeborn	106	44.9	130	55.1	236	6,712	35.2
Goodhue	149	51.7	139	48.3	288	10,531	27.3
Hennepin	2,973	52.5	2,690	47.5	5,664	272,511	20.8
Houston	59	56.2	46	43.8	105	4,077	25.8
Hubbard	127	53.1	112	46.9	239	4,585	52.1
Isanti	86	48	93	52	179	9,699	18.5
Itasca	204	49.4	209	50.6	413	9,086	45.5
Kanabec	59	54.1	50	45.9	109	3,443	31.7
Kandiyohi	276	52	255	48	531	10,627	50
Kittson	6	54.5	5	45.5	11	928	11.9
Koochiching	53	46.9	60	53.1	113	2,086	54.2
Lac qui Parle	23	42.6	31	57.4	54	1,417	38.1
Lake	27	50.9	26	49.1	53	2,112	25.1
Lake of the Woods	14	53.8	12	46.2	26	745	34.9
Le Sueur	61	50.4	60	49.6	121	6,683	18.1
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	155	52.7	139	47.3	294	2,233	131.7
MN Prairie	327	50.5	320	49.5	647	18,705	34.6
Mahnomen	10	50	10	50	20	1,686	11.9
Marshall	27	42.2	37	57.8	64	2,065	31
McLeod	134	54.9	110	45.1	244	8,112	30.1
Meeker	78	50.6	76	49.4	154	5,544	27.8
Mille Lacs	176	51.9	163	48.1	339	6,240	54.3

Agency	Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Alleged victims	Child population	Rate per 1,000
Morrison	53	52.5	48	47.5	101	7,785	13
Mower	134	52.1	123	47.9	257	10,076	25.5
Nicollet	116	50	116	50	232	7,435	31.2
Nobles	114	55.1	93	44.9	207	6,159	33.6
Norman	26	44.8	32	55.2	58	1,530	37.9
Olmsted	333	53.8	286	46.2	619	39,204	15.8
Otter Tail	208	51	200	49	408	12,981	31.4
Pennington	42	49.4	43	50.6	85	3,094	27.5
Pine	152	55.5	122	44.5	274	5,625	48.7
Polk	106	52	98	48	204	7,542	27
Ramsey	1,752	52.3	1,598	47.7	3,350	124,879	26.8
Red Lake County	15	42.9	20	57.1	35	946	37
Renville	53	47.3	59	52.7	112	3,369	33.2
Rice	229	55.3	185	44.7	414	14,308	28.9
Roseau	54	51.4	51	48.6	105	3,589	29.3
Scott	327	51.1	313	48.9	640	39,998	16
Sherburne	261	50	261	50	522	25,488	20.5
Sibley	68	52.7	61	47.3	129	3,369	38.3
Southwest HHS	320	55	262	45	582	18,349	31.7
St. Louis	1,160	50.6	1,134	49.4	2,294	37,024	62
Stearns	498	49.3	512	50.7	1,010	36,938	27.3
Stevens	57	51.4	54	48.6	111	2,154	51.5
Swift	30	48.4	32	51.6	62	2,201	28.2
Todd	75	46.3	87	53.7	162	6,025	26.9
Traverse	17	45.9	20	54.1	37	703	52.6
Wabasha	61	51.7	57	48.3	118	4,691	25.2
Wadena	94	52.5	85	47.5	179	3,754	47.7
Washington	356	47.7	391	52.3	747	65,278	11.4
Watonwan	95	59.4	65	40.6	160	2,776	57.6
Western Prairie Human Services	77	46.1	90	53.9	167	3,888	43
White Earth Nation	79	51.6	74	48.4	153	2,079	73.6
Wilkin	28	50.9	27	49.1	55	1,439	38.2
Winona	156	48	169	52	325	8,767	37.1
Wright	433	48.1	468	51.9	901	39,493	22.8
Yellow Medicine	48	49.5	49	50.5	97	2,182	44.5
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>16,463</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>15,583</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>32,047</b>	<b>1,302,973</b>	<b>24.6</b>

†Note: Hennepin had one additional alleged victim with 'Unknown' entered as their gender.

‡Note: Child population information comes from US Census Bureau population estimates, table CC-EST2022-AGESEX, <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2020-2022/counties/asrh/>. Child population information for American Indian Child Welfare Initiative Tribes comes from the 2020 US Census and represents children residing on reservations who indicated American Indian alone or as one of two or more races. There are no intercensal child population estimates for these groups.

**Table 6. Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by race/ethnicity (alone, no other race value) and agency, 2022**

Agency	African American/Black (N)	African American/Black (%)	American Indian/Alaska Native (N)	American Indian/Alaska Native (%)	Asian or Pacific Islander (N)	Asian or Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (N)	Two or more races (%)	Unknown/declined (N)	Unknown/declined (%)	White (N)	White (%)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (N)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (%)
Aitkin	*	*	25	16.9	*	*	25	16.9	*	*	92	62.2	*	*
Anoka	240	20.8	35	3	22	1.9	205	17.8	49	4.2	601	52.2	104	9
Becker	*	*	48	20.3	*	*	78	32.9	*	*	105	44.3	19	8
Beltrami	*	*	59	36.2	*	*	49	30.1	*	*	53	32.5	*	*
Benton	35	13.2	*	*	*	*	63	23.7	*	*	162	60.9	13	4.9
Big Stone	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	32	84.2	*	*
Blue Earth	72	18.4	12	3.1	*	*	57	14.5	*	*	240	61.2	36	9.2
Brown	8	4.1	*	*	*	*	11	5.7	*	*	167	86.1	23	11.9
Carlton	*	*	121	33.2	7	1.9	81	22.2	*	*	148	40.5	*	*
Carver	26	6.5	10	2.5	8	2	62	15.6	16	4	276	69.3	77	19.3
Cass	*	*	22	15.8	*	*	11	7.9	*	*	100	71.9	*	*
Chippewa	7	3.7	8	4.2	7	3.7	53	28	*	*	111	58.7	43	22.8
Chisago	*	*	8	3.8	*	*	40	19	13	6.2	145	69	12	5.7
Clay	49	12.9	47	12.3	*	*	87	22.8	*	*	195	51.2	68	17.8
Clearwater	*	*	15	19.2	*	*	16	20.5	*	*	46	59	*	*
Cook	*	*	14	58.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Crow Wing	*	*	28	9.1	*	*	54	17.5	*	*	219	71.1	8	2.6
Dakota	300	18.2	56	3.4	19	1.2	295	17.9	337	20.4	641	38.9	292	17.7
Des Moines Valley HHS	*	*	*	*	*	*	10	6.5	11	7.2	122	79.7	29	19
Douglas	15	3.8	24	6	*	*	92	23.1	*	*	250	62.8	31	7.8
Faribault-Martin	*	*	8	2.6	*	*	52	17.1	8	2.6	232	76.3	57	18.8
Fillmore	*	*	*	*	*	*	8	14.8	*	*	43	79.6	*	*
Freeborn	22	9.3	*	*	7	3	37	15.7	*	*	165	69.9	70	29.7
Goodhue	37	12.8	11	3.8	*	*	54	18.7	*	*	168	58.1	11	3.8
Hennepin	2,355	41.6	332	5.9	141	2.5	1,251	22.1	117	2	1,469	25.9	749	13.2
Houston	9	8.6	*	*	*	*	11	10.5	7	6.7	77	73.3	*	*
Hubbard	*	*	37	15.5	*	*	30	12.6	7	2.9	165	69	14	5.9
Isanti	7	3.9	*	*	*	*	21	11.7	19	10.6	131	73.2	*	*
Itasca	*	*	45	10.9	*	*	120	29.1	8	1.9	240	58.1	9	2.2
Kanabec	*	*	*	*	*	*	16	14.7	9	8.3	76	69.7	*	*
Kandiyohi	23	4.3	8	1.5	*	*	47	8.8	*	*	412	77.4	251	47.2
Kittson	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9	81.8	*	*
Koochiching	*	*	9	8	*	*	10	8.8	*	*	86	76.1	*	*
Lac qui Parle	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	46	85.2	*	*

Agency	African American/Black (N)	African American/Black (%)	American Indian/Alaska Native (N)	American Indian/Alaska Native (%)	Asian or Pacific Islander (N)	Asian or Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (N)	Two or more races (%)	Unknown/declined (N)	Unknown/declined (%)	White (N)	White (%)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (N)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (%)
Lake	*	*	*	*	*	*	7	13.2	*	*	46	86.8	*	*
Lake of the Woods	*	*	7	26.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	17	65.4	*	*
Le Sueur	*	*	*	*	*	*	18	14.9	8	6.6	89	73.6	23	19
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	*	*	278	94.6	*	*	10	3.4	*	*	*	*	*	*
MN Prairie	49	7.6	*	*	*	*	53	8.2	20	3.1	517	79.9	84	13
Mahnomen	*	*	18	90	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Marshall	*	*	*	*	*	*	19	29.7	*	*	45	70.3	8	12.5
McLeod	*	*	*	*	*	*	30	12.2	10	3.7	197	80.4	47	19.2
Meeker	*	*	*	*	*	*	13	8.4	*	*	134	87	24	15.6
Mille Lacs	*	*	107	31.5	*	*	41	12.1	*	*	185	54.4	10	2.9
Morrison	*	*	*	*	*	*	17	16.8	*	*	80	79.2	*	*
Mower	39	15.2	*	*	7	2.7	28	10.9	*	*	173	67.3	52	20.2
Nicollet	19	8.2	*	*	*	*	58	25	15	6.5	134	57.8	38	16.4
Nobles	10	4.8	*	*	20	9.6	12	5.8	*	*	119	57.2	117	56.3
Norman	*	*	7	12.1	*	*	15	25.9	*	*	35	60.3	7	12.1
Olmsted	97	15.6	8	1.3	16	2.6	182	29.4	7	1	310	50	76	12.3
Otter Tail	*	*	22	5.4	*	*	69	16.9	35	8.6	271	66.4	21	5.1
Pennington	*	*	*	*	*	*	13	15.3	*	*	66	77.6	*	*
Pine	*	*	36	13.1	*	*	23	8.4	*	*	207	75.5	*	*
Polk	*	*	19	9.3	*	*	51	25	*	*	125	61.3	48	23.5
Ramsey	1,126	33.6	110	3.3	441	13.2	646	19.3	110	3.3	918	27.4	433	12.9
Red Lake County	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	32	91.4	*	*
Renville	*	*	*	*	*	*	16	14.3	8	7.1	82	73.2	26	23.2
Rice	32	7.7	*	*	7	1.7	34	8.2	*	*	294	70.8	101	24.3
Roseau	*	*	17	16.2	*	*	10	9.5	8	7.6	66	62.9	*	*
Scott	84	13.1	22	3.4	31	4.8	136	21.2	55	8.4	313	48.8	89	13.9
Sherburne	52	10	10	1.9	11	2.1	99	19	45	8.6	305	58.4	29	5.6
Sibley	*	*	*	*	*	*	14	10.8	*	*	107	82.3	35	26.9
Southwest HHS	29	5	62	10.7	13	2.2	76	13.1	30	5.2	372	63.9	103	17.7
St. Louis	120	5.2	303	13.2	10	0.4	751	32.7	74	3.2	1,037	45.2	85	3.7
Stearns	214	21.2	22	2.2	12	1.2	202	20	39	3.8	522	51.6	94	9.3
Stevens	10	9	10	9	*	*	18	16.2	*	*	67	60.4	17	15.3
Swift	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	57	91.9	22	35.5
Todd	*	*	*	*	*	*	19	11.7	*	*	134	82.7	17	10.5

Agency	African American/Black (N)	African American/Black (%)	American Indian/Alaska Native (N)	American Indian/Alaska Native (%)	Asian or Pacific Islander (N)	Asian or Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (N)	Two or more races (%)	Unknown/declined (N)	Unknown/declined (%)	White (N)	White (%)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (N)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (%)
Traverse	*	*	11	29.7	*	*	13	35.1	*	*	12	32.4	*	*
Wabasha	9	7.6	*	*	*	*	13	11	*	*	84	71.2	*	*
Wadena	9	5	*	*	*	*	31	17.3	10	5.6	126	70.4	*	*
Washington	107	14.3	14	1.9	41	5.5	156	20.9	183	24.3	247	33	53	7.1
Watonwan	*	*	*	*	10	6.3	11	6.9	*	*	130	81.3	73	45.6
Western Prairie Human Services	*	*	*	*	*	*	30	18	*	*	128	76.6	*	*
White Earth Nation	*	*	140	90.9	*	*	12	7.8	*	*	*	*	*	*
Wilkin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	44	80	*	*
Winona	53	16.3	*	*	*	*	32	9.8	19	5.5	215	66	28	8.6
Wright	72	8	13	1.4	15	1.7	109	12.1	140	15.4	553	61.3	46	5.1
Yellow Medicine	*	*	19	19.6	*	*	20	20.6	7	7.2	47	48.5	14	14.4
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>5,408</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>2,313</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>6,080</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1,703</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>15,673</b>	<b>48.9</b>	<b>3,801</b>	<b>11.9</b>

\* Note: If the number of children is less than seven when data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and agency, it is not shown to prevent identification of individuals. Note on race and ethnicity categories: This breakdown relies on exclusive racial categories, except Hispanic/Latinx (any race). A client is only counted in a single row or column, based on their identification with a single race value. If a client identified with more than one race value, they will be counted in the multi-racial “two or more races” category. ‘Hispanic/Latinx (any race)’ shows clients who identified with that ethnicity regardless of exclusive race category.

**Table 7. Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by race/ethnicity (alone or in combination with other race values) and agency, 2022**

Agency	African American/Black (N)	African American/Black (%)	American Indian/Alaska Native (N)	American Indian/Alaska Native (%)	Asian/Pacific Islander (N)	Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	Unknown/declined (N)	Unknown/declined (%)	White (N)	White (%)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (N)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (%)
Aitkin	8	5.4	46	31.1	*	*	*	*	117	79.1	*	*
Anoka	372	32.3	147	12.8	30	2.6	48	4.2	783	68	104	9
Becker	21	8.9	116	48.9	*	*	*	*	178	75.1	19	8
Beltrami	11	6.7	103	63.2	*	*	*	*	96	58.9	*	*
Benton	68	25.6	41	15.4	7	2.6	*	*	215	80.8	13	4.9
Big Stone	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	36	94.7	*	*
Blue Earth	117	29.8	36	9.2	*	*	8	2	288	73.5	36	9.2
Brown	8	4.1	10	5.2	*	*	*	*	178	91.8	23	11.9
Carlton	21	5.8	190	52.1	11	3	*	*	221	60.5	*	*
Carver	54	13.6	50	12.6	14	3.5	16	4	333	83.7	77	19.3
Cass	11	7.9	27	19.4	*	*	*	*	110	79.1	*	*

Agency	African American/Black (N)	African American/Black (%)	American Indian/Alaska Native (N)	American Indian/Alaska Native (%)	Asian/Pacific Islander (N)	Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	Unknown/declined (N)	Unknown/declined (%)	White (N)	White (%)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (N)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (%)
Chippewa	26	13.8	48	25.4	11	5.8	*	*	160	84.7	43	22.8
Chisago	*	*	44	21	*	*	13	6.2	185	88.1	12	5.7
Clay	77	20.2	121	31.8	*	*	*	*	276	72.4	68	17.8
Clearwater	*	*	29	37.2	*	*	*	*	62	79.5	*	*
Cook	*	*	19	79.2	*	*	*	*	8	33.3	*	*
Crow Wing	26	8.4	65	21.1	*	*	*	*	272	88.3	8	2.6
Dakota	496	30.1	204	12.4	41	2.5	336	20.4	888	53.9	292	17.7
Des Moines Valley HHS	8	5.2	*	*	10	6.5	11	7.2	132	86.3	29	19
Douglas	34	8.5	105	26.4	*	*	15	3.8	339	85.2	31	7.8
Faribault-Martin	12	3.9	50	16.4	*	*	8	2.6	284	93.4	57	18.8
Fillmore	7	13	*	*	*	*	*	*	51	94.4	*	*
Freeborn	40	16.9	22	9.3	8	3.4	*	*	202	85.6	70	29.7
Goodhue	69	23.9	41	14.2	7	2.4	15	5.2	216	74.7	11	3.8
Hennepin	3,327	58.7	1,029	18.2	218	3.8	116	2	2,365	41.7	749	13.2
Houston	18	17.1	7	6.7	*	*	7	6.7	86	81.9	*	*
Hubbard	*	*	65	27.2	*	*	7	2.9	191	79.9	14	5.9
Isanti	16	8.9	10	5.6	*	*	19	10.6	152	84.9	*	*
Itasca	25	6.1	147	35.6	*	*	8	1.9	357	86.4	9	2.2
Kanabec	8	7.3	17	15.6	*	*	9	8.3	91	83.5	*	*
Kandiyohi	30	5.6	51	9.6	*	*	37	7	458	86.1	251	47.2
Kittson	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9	81.8	*	*
Koochiching	*	*	15	13.3	*	*	*	*	96	85	*	*
Lac qui Parle	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	92.6	*	*
Lake	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	53	100	*	*
Lake of the Woods	*	*	7	26.9	*	*	*	*	19	73.1	*	*
Le Sueur	12	9.9	13	10.7	*	*	8	6.6	107	88.4	23	19
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	*	*	288	98	*	*	*	*	10	3.4	*	*
MN Prairie	75	11.6	38	5.9	*	*	20	3.1	567	87.6	84	13
Mahnomen	*	*	19	95	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Marshall	*	*	19	29.7	*	*	*	*	64	100	8	12.5
McLeod	10	4.1	30	12.2	*	*	9	3.7	223	91	47	19.2
Meeker	10	6.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	147	95.5	24	15.6
Mille Lacs	10	2.9	141	41.5	*	*	*	*	224	65.9	10	2.9
Morrison	8	7.9	13	12.9	*	*	*	*	95	94.1	*	*
Mower	61	23.7	10	3.9	10	3.9	9	3.5	197	76.7	52	20.2
Nicollet	57	24.6	33	14.2	*	*	15	6.5	190	81.9	38	16.4

Agency	African American/Black (N)	African American/Black (%)	American Indian/Alaska Native (N)	American Indian/Alaska Native (%)	Asian/Pacific Islander (N)	Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	Unknown/declined (N)	Unknown/declined (%)	White (N)	White (%)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (N)	Hispanic/Latinx (any race) (%)
Nobles	13	6.3	11	5.3	29	13.9	42	20.2	128	61.5	117	56.3
Norman	*	*	22	37.9	*	*	*	*	50	86.2	7	12.1
Olmsted	217	35	101	16.3	34	5.5	*	*	472	76.1	76	12.3
Otter Tail	34	8.3	80	19.6	*	*	35	8.6	336	82.4	21	5.1
Pennington	*	*	12	14.1	*	*	*	*	79	92.9	*	*
Pine	13	4.7	51	18.6	*	*	*	*	227	82.8	*	*
Polk	17	8.3	61	29.9	*	*	*	*	174	85.3	48	23.5
Ramsey	1,592	47.5	480	14.3	493	14.7	109	3.3	1,389	41.5	433	12.9
Red Lake County	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	35	100	*	*
Renville	*	*	15	13.4	*	*	8	7.1	98	87.5	26	23.2
Rice	47	11.3	24	5.8	9	2.2	44	10.6	328	79	101	24.3
Roseau	*	*	26	24.8	*	*	8	7.6	76	72.4	*	*
Scott	146	22.8	114	17.8	46	7.2	54	8.4	436	68	89	13.9
Sherburne	101	19.3	84	16.1	17	3.3	45	8.6	388	74.3	29	5.6
Sibley	*	*	19	14.6	*	*	*	*	120	92.3	35	26.9
Southwest HHS	50	8.6	121	20.8	16	2.7	30	5.2	444	76.3	103	17.7
St. Louis	383	16.7	944	41.1	35	1.5	73	3.2	1,710	74.5	85	3.7
Stearns	332	32.8	129	12.8	35	3.5	38	3.8	699	69.1	94	9.3
Stevens	17	15.3	24	21.6	*	*	*	*	84	75.7	17	15.3
Swift	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	59	95.2	22	35.5
Todd	*	*	17	10.5	*	*	*	*	152	93.8	17	10.5
Traverse	*	*	24	64.9	*	*	*	*	23	62.2	*	*
Wabasha	11	9.3	14	11.9	*	*	*	*	97	82.2	*	*
Wadena	18	10.1	30	16.8	*	*	10	5.6	157	87.7	*	*
Washington	204	27.3	113	15.1	54	7.2	182	24.3	373	49.9	53	7.1
Watonwan	*	*	11	6.9	10	6.3	*	*	141	88.1	73	45.6
Western Prairie Human Services	10	6	26	15.6	*	*	*	*	158	94.6	*	*
White Earth Nation	*	*	152	98.7	*	*	*	*	12	7.8	*	*
Wilkin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	49	89.1	*	*
Winona	78	23.9	10	3.1	7	2.1	18	5.5	244	74.8	28	8.6
Wright	131	14.5	70	7.8	34	3.8	139	15.4	658	72.9	46	5.1
Yellow Medicine	9	9.3	35	36.1	*	*	7	7.2	66	68	14	14.4
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>8,639</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>6,324</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>1,277</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1,678</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>20,845</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>3,801</b>	<b>11.9</b>

\*Note: If the number of children is less than seven when data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and agency, it is not shown to prevent identification of individuals. Children may be counted in multiple race/ethnicity categories; therefore, rows may total to more than total shown.

Note on race and ethnicity categories: This breakdown includes overlapping racial categories. A client may be counted in any row or column for any racial or ethnicity value they identified with. If a client identified with multiple race or ethnicity values, they will be counted in each relevant racial/ethnic category.

**Table 8. Number, percent and per 1,000 rate of alleged victims in population by race/ethnicity (alone, no other race value), 2022**

	African American/ Black	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Two or more races	White	Total	Hispanic/ Latinx (any race)
Alleged victims (N)	5,408	2,313	895	6,080	15,673	32,047	3,801
Alleged victim (%)	16.9	7.2	2.8	19	48.9	100	11.9
Population (N)	145,435	27,152	88,660	78,273	963,453	1,302,973	121,470
Population (%)	11.2	2.1	6.8	6	73.9	100	9.3
Per 1,000 rate	37.2	85.2	10.1	77.7	16.3	24.6	31.3

Note on race and ethnicity categories: This breakdown relies on exclusive racial categories, except Hispanic/Latinx (any race). A client is only counted in a single row or column, based on their identification with a single race value. If a client identified with more than one race value, they will be counted in the multi-racial “two or more races” category. ‘Hispanic/Latinx (any race)’ shows clients who identified with that ethnicity regardless of exclusive race category.

Note: Child population information comes from US Census Bureau population estimates, table SC-EST2022-ALLDATA6, <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2020-2022/state/asrh/>

**Table 9. Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by age groups and agency, 2022**

Agency	Under 3 years (N)	Under 3 years (%)	3 to 5 years (N)	3 to 5 years (%)	6 to 8 years (N)	6 to 8 years (%)	9 to 11 years (N)	9 to 11 years (%)	12 to 14 years (N)	12 to 14 years (%)	15 to 17 years (N)	15 to 17 years (%)
Aitkin	27	18.4	22	15	21	14.3	29	19.7	27	18.4	21	14.3
Anoka	232	20.2	209	18.2	214	18.6	191	16.6	188	16.3	117	10.2
Becker	50	21.2	40	16.9	35	14.8	44	18.6	34	14.4	33	14
Beltrami	43	26.4	27	16.6	28	17.2	24	14.7	24	14.7	17	10.4
Benton	61	22.9	42	15.8	52	19.5	51	19.2	33	12.4	27	10.2
Big Stone	7	18.4	7	18.4	7	18.4	6	15.8	6	15.8	5	13.2
Blue Earth	116	29.7	65	16.6	72	18.4	50	12.8	46	11.8	42	10.7
Brown	33	17.1	41	21.2	42	21.8	38	19.7	26	13.5	13	6.7
Carlton	58	15.9	58	15.9	67	18.4	61	16.8	68	18.7	52	14.3
Carver	48	12.1	46	11.6	83	20.9	70	17.6	69	17.3	82	20.6
Cass	38	27.3	24	17.3	28	20.1	15	10.8	16	11.5	18	12.9
Chippewa	24	12.7	33	17.5	37	19.6	37	19.6	25	13.2	33	17.5
Chisago	29	13.8	42	20	42	20	35	16.7	29	13.8	33	15.7
Clay	86	22.7	71	18.7	78	20.6	56	14.8	49	12.9	39	10.3
Clearwater	14	17.9	22	28.2	13	16.7	15	19.2	9	11.5	5	6.4
Cook	4	16.7	4	16.7	2	8.3	9	37.5	2	8.3	3	12.5
Crow Wing	74	24	62	20.1	63	20.5	46	14.9	43	14	20	6.5
Dakota	304	18.5	249	15.1	340	20.7	300	18.2	242	14.7	211	12.8
Des Moines Valley HHS	27	17.6	29	19	24	15.7	34	22.2	22	14.4	17	11.1
Douglas	86	21.6	64	16.1	73	18.3	59	14.8	68	17.1	48	12.1
Faribault-Martin	69	22.8	49	16.2	71	23.4	43	14.2	36	11.9	35	11.6

Agency	Under 3 years (N)	Under 3 years (%)	3 to 5 years (N)	3 to 5 years (%)	6 to 8 years (N)	6 to 8 years (%)	9 to 11 years (N)	9 to 11 years (%)	12 to 14 years (N)	12 to 14 years (%)	15 to 17 years (N)	15 to 17 years (%)
Fillmore	13	24.1	8	14.8	11	20.4	8	14.8	9	16.7	5	9.3
Freeborn	59	25	44	18.6	45	19.1	32	13.6	36	15.3	20	8.5
Goodhue	43	15.1	66	23.2	60	21.1	40	14	41	14.4	35	12.3
Hennepin	1,265	22.3	905	16	1,006	17.8	886	15.6	854	15.1	747	13.2
Houston	15	14.3	13	12.4	26	24.8	17	16.2	17	16.2	17	16.2
Hubbard	42	17.6	43	18.1	48	20.2	42	17.6	37	15.5	26	10.9
Isanti	36	20.1	21	11.7	23	12.8	35	19.6	33	18.4	31	17.3
Itasca	77	18.6	78	18.9	83	20.1	62	15	70	16.9	43	10.4
Kanabec	18	16.5	20	18.3	21	19.3	19	17.4	22	20.2	9	8.3
Kandiyohi	94	17.7	107	20.2	98	18.5	77	14.5	84	15.8	71	13.4
Kittson	0	0	0	0	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	3	27.3
Koochiching	25	22.1	23	20.4	20	17.7	17	15	18	15.9	10	8.8
Lac qui Parle	11	20.4	6	11.1	6	11.1	18	33.3	7	13	6	11.1
Lake	9	17	8	15.1	10	18.9	15	28.3	6	11.3	5	9.4
Lake of the Woods	6	23.1	5	19.2	5	19.2	3	11.5	5	19.2	2	7.7
Le Sueur	25	20.7	22	18.2	22	18.2	19	15.7	16	13.2	17	14
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	68	23.1	45	15.3	71	24.1	62	21.1	34	11.6	14	4.8
MN Prairie	129	19.9	119	18.4	127	19.6	101	15.6	91	14.1	80	12.4
Mahnomen	6	30	7	35	2	10	2	10	1	5	2	10
Marshall	13	20.3	20	31.3	16	25	7	10.9	5	7.8	3	4.7
McLeod	47	19.3	55	22.5	51	20.9	29	11.9	36	14.8	26	10.7
Meeker	28	18.2	27	17.5	31	20.1	26	16.9	18	11.7	24	15.6
Mille Lacs	71	20.9	59	17.4	53	15.6	48	14.2	58	17.1	50	14.7
Morrison	19	18.8	18	17.8	19	18.8	21	20.8	15	14.9	9	8.9
Mower	61	23.7	44	17.1	50	19.5	48	18.7	31	12.1	23	8.9
Nicollet	45	19.4	32	13.8	47	20.3	51	22	31	13.4	26	11.2
Nobles	30	14.6	39	18.9	40	19.4	36	17.5	32	15.5	29	14.1
Norman	13	22.4	7	12.1	13	22.4	7	12.1	10	17.2	8	13.8
Olmsted	127	20.6	114	18.5	114	18.5	104	16.9	94	15.3	63	10.2
Otter Tail	79	19.4	84	20.6	73	17.9	67	16.5	59	14.5	45	11.1
Pennington	11	12.9	18	21.2	19	22.4	11	12.9	16	18.8	10	11.8
Pine	52	19	44	16.1	49	17.9	48	17.5	55	20.1	26	9.5
Polk	45	22.1	42	20.6	40	19.6	32	15.7	22	10.8	23	11.3
Ramsey	702	21	550	16.4	689	20.6	548	16.4	505	15.1	355	10.6
Red Lake County	5	14.3	7	20	8	22.9	5	14.3	8	22.9	2	5.7
Renville	19	17.3	19	17.3	19	17.3	15	13.6	19	17.3	19	17.3
Rice	68	16.5	67	16.2	66	16	68	16.5	83	20.1	61	14.8
Roseau	20	19.2	15	14.4	21	20.2	26	25	15	14.4	7	6.7
Scott	89	14	124	19.5	130	20.5	112	17.6	92	14.5	88	13.9
Sherburne	73	14	76	14.6	93	17.9	111	21.3	87	16.7	80	15.4
Sibley	22	17.1	25	19.4	19	14.7	21	16.3	25	19.4	17	13.2
Southwest HHS	126	21.6	91	15.6	111	19.1	99	17	95	16.3	60	10.3

Agency	Under 3 years (N)	Under 3 years (%)	3 to 5 years (N)	3 to 5 years (%)	6 to 8 years (N)	6 to 8 years (%)	9 to 11 years (N)	9 to 11 years (%)	12 to 14 years (N)	12 to 14 years (%)	15 to 17 years (N)	15 to 17 years (%)
St. Louis	474	20.8	388	17	415	18.2	388	17	350	15.4	264	11.6
Stearns	247	24.7	164	16.4	181	18.1	166	16.6	124	12.4	118	11.8
Stevens	18	16.2	25	22.5	15	13.5	17	15.3	21	18.9	13	11.7
Swift	11	17.7	12	19.4	11	17.7	13	21	10	16.1	5	8.1
Todd	26	16	33	20.4	23	14.2	33	20.4	30	18.5	17	10.5
Traverse	4	10.8	6	16.2	9	24.3	8	21.6	8	21.6	2	5.4
Wabasha	24	20.3	21	17.8	27	22.9	16	13.6	15	12.7	15	12.7
Wadena	35	19.6	32	17.9	37	20.7	20	11.2	27	15.1	28	15.6
Washington	144	19.4	113	15.2	136	18.3	132	17.7	125	16.8	94	12.6
Watowan	36	22.6	26	16.4	32	20.1	22	13.8	24	15.1	19	11.9
Western Prairie Human Services	26	15.6	22	13.2	41	24.6	30	18	30	18	18	10.8
White Earth Nation	33	21.6	31	20.3	26	17	28	18.3	23	15	12	7.8
Wilkin	7	12.7	15	27.3	14	25.5	8	14.5	8	14.5	3	5.5
Winona	84	25.8	59	18.2	49	15.1	45	13.8	52	16	36	11.1
Wright	139	15.7	150	16.9	170	19.2	149	16.8	171	19.3	108	12.2
Yellow Medicine	18	18.6	16	16.5	17	17.5	15	15.5	15	15.5	16	16.5
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>6,462</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>5,436</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6,052</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>5,301</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>4,890</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>3,836</b>	<b>12</b>

Note: For victims with more than one report during the report year, the age at their first screened-in and completed maltreatment report was used to determine age group. There were two alleged victims who were identified as above 17 years of age.

**Table 10. Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by disability status, 2022**

Disability	Alleged victims	Percent of alleged victims
No known disability	28,407	85.3
Emotional disturbance	2,456	7.4
Other condition	784	2.4
Developmental disability	566	1.7
Behavioral disorder	358	1.1
Speech impairment	215	0.6
Learning disability	173	0.5
Physical disability	102	0.3
Chemical dependency	90	0.3
Hearing impairment	53	0.2
Intellectual disability	55	0.2
Visual impairment	28	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,047</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: Children may be counted in multiple disability categories; therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

## Prior screened-out reports

Minnesota Statutes currently require county and Tribal child welfare agencies to consider children’s prior screened out report histories when making a decision to screen in a new report. The following table examines whether children involved in a screened-out maltreatment report were eventually involved in a screened-in maltreatment report. To conduct this examination, children in screened-out reports during the prior reporting year with no prior child protection history within the past four years were followed to see if they were alleged victims in a screened-in report within 12 months of their initial screened-out report.

**Table 11. Alleged victims with a screened-out maltreatment report in 2021 with a subsequent screened-in and completed assessment/investigation report within 12 months**

Number of reports in previous year	Alleged victims with prior screened-out report(s) in previous year (N)	Alleged victims with a subsequent screened-in report (N)	Alleged victims with a subsequent screened-in report (%)
One report	15,784	2,219	14.1%
Two reports	3,084	632	20.5%
Three reports	838	199	23.7%
Four or more reports	585	209	35.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,291</b>	<b>3,259</b>	<b>16.1%</b>

Note: Only victims in screened-out reports in 2021 with no prior child protection involvement are included.

## Alleged maltreatment type

In any given report of maltreatment, a child may have one or more types of alleged maltreatment identified. The five main categories of maltreatment are:

- **Mental injury:** Behavior of a caregiver that causes emotional or mental injury to child.
- **Neglect:** Not adequately providing for the physical, mental or behavioral needs of child.
- **Physical abuse:** Behavior that is intended to and/or results in physical harm to child.
- **Sexual abuse:** Any behavior towards or exploitation of children by a caregiver that is sexual in manner.
- **Threatened injury:** Attempting or threatening harm to child or placing them in a situation putting them at risk for serious harm.

Refer to the [Minnesota Child Maltreatment Screening Guidelines](#) and [Minnesota Statutes 260E](#), Reporting of Maltreatment of Minors. Table 12 provides information on the number and percent of alleged victims by maltreatment type.

**Table 12. Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by maltreatment type and agency, 2022**

Agency	Neglect (N)	Neglect (%)	Physical abuse (N)	Physical abuse (%)	Threatened injury (N)	Threatened injury (%)	Sexual abuse (N)	Sexual abuse (%)	Mental injury (N)	Mental injury (%)
Aitkin	114	77.6	26	17.7	17	11.6	15	10.2	11	7.5
Anoka	649	56.4	365	31.7	114	9.9	149	12.9	18	1.6

Agency	Neglect (N)	Neglect (%)	Physical abuse (N)	Physical abuse (%)	Threatened injury (N)	Threatened injury (%)	Sexual abuse (N)	Sexual abuse (%)	Mental injury (N)	Mental injury (%)
Becker	163	69.1	48	20.3	28	11.9	38	16.1	24	10.2
Beltrami	111	68.1	47	28.8	8	4.9	16	9.8	5	3.1
Benton	161	60.5	46	17.3	57	21.4	44	16.5	6	2.3
Big Stone	24	63.2	7	18.4	4	10.5	7	18.4	5	13.2
Blue Earth	261	66.8	79	20.2	36	9.2	56	14.3	3	0.8
Brown	86	44.6	65	33.7	29	15	26	13.5	31	16.1
Carlton	212	58.2	100	27.5	72	19.8	46	12.6	49	13.5
Carver	173	43.5	108	27.1	55	13.8	99	24.9	18	4.5
Cass	96	69.1	25	18	17	12.2	10	7.2	2	1.4
Chippewa	125	66.1	53	28	29	15.3	49	25.9	22	11.6
Chisago	119	56.7	49	23.3	24	11.4	32	15.2	5	2.4
Clay	250	65.8	57	15	47	12.4	67	17.6	9	2.4
Clearwater	52	66.7	11	14.1	24	30.8	0	0	5	6.4
Cook	16	66.7	1	4.2	8	33.3	2	8.3	0	0
Crow Wing	146	47.4	119	38.6	27	8.8	53	17.2	15	4.9
Dakota	1,079	65.5	416	25.3	24	1.5	223	13.5	5	0.3
Des Moines Valley HHS	86	56.2	40	26.1	7	4.6	24	15.7	6	3.9
Douglas	275	69.1	93	23.4	104	26.1	56	14.1	82	20.6
Faribault-Martin	225	74	64	21.1	14	4.6	42	13.8	3	1
Fillmore	35	64.8	17	31.5	1	1.9	4	7.4	1	1.9
Freeborn	170	72	43	18.2	62	26.3	32	13.6	18	7.6
Goodhue	202	70.1	65	22.6	2	0.7	53	18.4	7	2.4
Hennepin	3,119	55.1	1,572	27.8	1,113	19.7	990	17.5	173	3.1
Houston	74	70.5	22	21	9	8.6	9	8.6	17	16.2
Hubbard	147	61.5	87	36.4	37	15.5	45	18.8	46	19.2
Isanti	102	57	33	18.4	18	10.1	43	24	1	0.6
Itasca	258	62.5	70	16.9	73	17.7	52	12.6	21	5.1
Kanabec	85	78	20	18.3	17	15.6	12	11	6	5.5
Kandiyohi	362	68.2	127	23.9	83	15.6	135	25.4	31	5.8
Kittson	7	63.6	3	27.3	2	18.2	1	9.1	0	0
Koochiching	89	78.8	20	17.7	13	11.5	6	5.3	7	6.2
Lac qui Parle	35	64.8	14	25.9	8	14.8	8	14.8	7	13
Lake	42	79.2	7	13.2	0	0	4	7.5	4	7.5
Lake of the Woods	19	73.1	5	19.2	1	3.8	2	7.7	0	0
Le Sueur	65	53.7	20	16.5	26	21.5	28	23.1	3	2.5
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	250	85	32	10.9	25	8.5	13	4.4	5	1.7
MN Prairie	409	63.2	169	26.1	48	7.4	100	15.5	56	8.7
Mahnomen	17	85	4	20	0	0	3	15	0	0
Marshall	33	51.6	14	21.9	11	17.2	11	17.2	5	7.8

Agency	Neglect (N)	Neglect (%)	Physical abuse (N)	Physical abuse (%)	Threatened injury (N)	Threatened injury (%)	Sexual abuse (N)	Sexual abuse (%)	Mental injury (N)	Mental injury (%)
McLeod	150	61.5	42	17.2	53	21.7	41	16.8	10	4.1
Meeker	111	72.1	18	11.7	11	7.1	18	11.7	5	3.2
Mille Lacs	232	68.4	81	23.9	73	21.5	68	20.1	34	10
Morrison	49	48.5	28	27.7	13	12.9	19	18.8	0	0
Mower	155	60.3	57	22.2	26	10.1	50	19.5	2	0.8
Nicollet	136	58.6	59	25.4	55	23.7	26	11.2	10	4.3
Nobles	113	54.6	44	21.3	43	20.8	39	18.8	3	1.4
Norman	43	74.1	15	25.9	5	8.6	6	10.3	11	19
Olmsted	225	36.3	110	17.8	198	32	116	18.7	18	2.9
Otter Tail	249	61	98	24	55	13.5	50	12.3	32	7.8
Pennington	59	69.4	21	24.7	4	4.7	8	9.4	3	3.5
Pine	168	61.3	85	31	5	1.8	58	21.2	4	1.5
Polk	142	69.6	50	24.5	9	4.4	21	10.3	17	8.3
Ramsey	2,044	61	878	26.2	500	14.9	471	14.1	116	3.5
Red Lake County	18	51.4	9	25.7	2	5.7	9	25.7	1	2.9
Renville	69	61.6	28	25	17	15.2	15	13.4	19	17
Rice	233	56.3	115	27.8	47	11.4	100	24.2	15	3.6
Roseau	83	79	10	9.5	11	10.5	9	8.6	2	1.9
Scott	339	53	201	31.4	79	12.3	96	15	29	4.5
Sherburne	306	58.6	167	32	20	3.8	61	11.7	41	7.9
Sibley	71	55	58	45	9	7	21	16.3	11	8.5
Southwest HHS	363	62.4	112	19.2	60	10.3	122	21	15	2.6
St. Louis	1,524	66.4	446	19.4	617	26.9	407	17.7	108	4.7
Stearns	567	56.1	212	21	247	24.5	145	14.4	19	1.9
Stevens	78	70.3	26	23.4	34	30.6	15	13.5	17	15.3
Swift	46	74.2	8	12.9	7	11.3	2	3.2	3	4.8
Todd	104	64.2	30	18.5	31	19.1	21	13	0	0
Traverse	26	70.3	9	24.3	5	13.5	1	2.7	2	5.4
Wabasha	78	66.1	21	17.8	12	10.2	23	19.5	6	5.1
Wadena	117	65.4	33	18.4	26	14.5	28	15.6	25	14
Washington	372	49.8	212	28.4	165	22.1	123	16.5	14	1.9
Watonwan	88	55	37	23.1	12	7.5	30	18.8	16	10
Western Prairie Human Services	114	68.3	33	19.8	45	26.9	22	13.2	24	14.4
White Earth Nation	121	79.1	24	15.7	10	6.5	5	3.3	7	4.6
Wilkin	29	52.7	21	38.2	8	14.5	5	9.1	1	1.8
Winona	244	75.1	71	21.8	29	8.9	28	8.6	43	13.2
Wright	515	57.2	237	26.3	115	12.8	128	14.2	80	8.9
Yellow Medicine	60	61.9	16	16.5	17	17.5	13	13.4	17	17.5
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>19,384</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>7,885</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>4,969</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>5,025</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>4.7</b>

Note: Alleged victims can have more than one allegation type; rows may not total the number of alleged victims.

## Child protection response path assignment

Once a report has been accepted and screened in, local agencies assign a case to one of three child protection responses: Family Assessment, Family Investigation or Facility Investigation. All response paths are mandatory; families must engage with child protection or face the possibility of court action. Information about how cases are assigned to each of the tracks is provided below. (Note: A **case** in this report refers to a completed investigation or assessment.)

By law, cases including allegations of sexual abuse or substantial child endangerment (such as egregious harm, homicide, felony assault, abandonment, neglect due to failure to thrive, and malicious punishment), must be assigned to **Family Investigation**. Maltreatment allegations reported occurring in family foster homes or family childcare homes are assigned to **Facility Investigation**. Maltreatment occurring in state-licensed residential facilities, institutions and child care centers is investigated by the Minnesota Department of Human Services, Licensing Division, and is not included in this report. Cases not alleging substantial child endangerment or sexual abuse can be assigned to **Family Assessment**; or, if complicating factors are associated with a report, such as frequent, similar, or recent history of past reports, or need for legal intervention due to violent activities in a home, a local agency may, at its discretion, assign reports to **Family Investigation** for a response.

In all types of child protection responses to maltreatment reports, the assessment or investigative phase has five shared goals:

- Identify and resolve immediate safety needs of children
- Conduct fact-finding regarding circumstances described in a maltreatment report
- Identify risk of ongoing maltreatment
- Identify needs and circumstances of children (and families)
- Determine whether child protective services focus on providing ongoing safety, permanency and well-being for children.

In investigations (both family and facility), an additional goal is to use evidence gathered through fact-finding to determine if it is maintained that the allegations of maltreatment occurred. If a determination of maltreatment is made, information is maintained for a minimum of 10 years. Tables 13a and 13b show the number and percent of cases, and of alleged victims, respectively, by response path and agency.

**Table 13a. Number and percent of cases by path assignment and agency, 2022**

FA – Family Assessment; FI – Family Investigation; Fac. Inv. – Facility Investigation

Agency	FA cases (N)	FA cases (%)	FI cases (N)	FI cases (%)	Fac. Inv. cases (N)	Fac. Inv. cases (%)	Total cases
Aitkin	75	63	38	31.9	6	5	119
Anoka	553	61.5	322	35.8	24	2.7	899
Becker	95	57.6	64	38.8	6	3.6	165
Beltrami	59	55.7	45	42.5	2	1.9	106
Benton	108	58.1	76	40.9	2	1.1	186
Big Stone	21	77.8	4	14.8	2	7.4	27
Blue Earth	260	79.3	61	18.6	7	2.1	328
Brown	101	72.1	31	22.1	8	5.7	140
Carlton	206	74.1	62	22.3	10	3.6	278

Agency	FA cases (N)	FA cases (%)	FI cases (N)	FI cases (%)	Fac. Inv. cases (N)	Fac. Inv. cases (%)	Total cases
Carver	195	65.2	100	33.4	4	1.3	299
Cass	80	76.2	24	22.9	1	1	105
Chippewa	88	61.5	47	32.9	8	5.6	143
Chisago	94	56	72	42.9	2	1.2	168
Clay	175	68.1	74	28.8	8	3.1	257
Clearwater	30	68.2	14	31.8	0	0	44
Cook	15	71.4	6	28.6	0	0	21
Crow Wing	146	67.9	66	30.7	3	1.4	215
Dakota	886	65.2	433	31.9	40	2.9	1,359
Des Moines Valley HHS	92	82.1	19	17	1	0.9	112
Douglas	166	54.8	129	42.6	8	2.6	303
Faribault-Martin	150	74.3	50	24.8	2	1	202
Fillmore	44	89.8	5	10.2	0	0	49
Freeborn	98	64.5	54	35.5	0	0	152
Goodhue	165	76	48	22.1	4	1.8	217
Hennepin	2,883	65.3	1,433	32.5	100	2.3	4,416
Houston	68	78.2	16	18.4	3	3.4	87
Hubbard	66	50.4	58	44.3	7	5.3	131
Isanti	74	57.8	54	42.2	0	0	128
Itasca	132	48	127	46.2	16	5.8	275
Kanabec	52	54.7	41	43.2	2	2.1	95
Kandiyohi	140	39.9	202	57.5	9	2.6	351
Kittson	4	40	6	60	0	0	10
Koochiching	73	76.8	21	22.1	1	1.1	95
Lac qui Parle	33	62.3	19	35.8	1	1.9	53
Lake	31	81.6	7	18.4	0	0	38
Lake of the Woods	19	82.6	4	17.4	0	0	23
Le Sueur	41	53.2	36	46.8	0	0	77
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	204	87.6	26	11.2	3	1.3	233
MN Prairie	329	72.9	105	23.3	17	3.8	451
Mahnomen	8	53.3	7	46.7	0	0	15
Marshall	31	73.8	8	19	3	7.1	42
McLeod	68	40.7	95	56.9	4	2.4	167
Meeker	93	75.6	27	22	3	2.4	123
Mille Lacs	126	54.1	102	43.8	5	2.1	233
Morrison	60	68.2	26	29.5	2	2.3	88
Mower	153	75.7	47	23.3	2	1	202
Nicollet	152	75.2	44	21.8	6	3	202
Nobles	112	73.2	39	25.5	2	1.3	153
Norman	36	83.7	7	16.3	0	0	43
Olmsted	296	74	96	24	8	2	400
Otter Tail	206	66.2	96	30.9	9	2.9	311

Agency	FA cases (N)	FA cases (%)	FI cases (N)	FI cases (%)	Fac. Inv. cases (N)	Fac. Inv. cases (%)	Total cases
Pennington	50	73.5	15	22.1	3	4.4	68
Pine	126	63.6	69	34.8	3	1.5	198
Polk	103	69.6	41	27.7	4	2.7	148
Ramsey	1,609	64.2	849	33.9	49	2	2,507
Red Lake County	18	66.7	8	29.6	1	3.7	27
Renville	54	62.8	31	36	1	1.2	86
Rice	200	61.9	112	34.7	11	3.4	323
Roseau	57	76	18	24	0	0	75
Scott	424	75.7	120	21.4	16	2.9	560
Sherburne	283	72	95	24.2	15	3.8	393
Sibley	78	78	22	22	0	0	100
Southwest HHS	282	66.4	136	32	7	1.6	425
St. Louis	1,086	55.4	794	40.5	79	4	1,959
Stearns	526	67.5	238	30.6	15	1.9	779
Stevens	71	68.3	29	27.9	4	3.8	104
Swift	27	61.4	17	38.6	0	0	44
Todd	76	67.9	35	31.3	1	0.9	112
Traverse	22	61.1	14	38.9	0	0	36
Wabasha	51	63	27	33.3	3	3.7	81
Wadena	76	63.9	36	30.3	7	5.9	119
Washington	368	65.7	182	32.5	10	1.8	560
Watonwan	80	70.2	32	28.1	2	1.8	114
Western Prairie Human Services	81	55.9	58	40	6	4.1	145
White Earth Nation	94	88.7	11	10.4	1	0.9	106
Wilkin	39	75	13	25	0	0	52
Winona	176	70.4	72	28.8	2	0.8	250
Wright	425	60.2	260	36.8	21	3	706
Yellow Medicine	49	64.5	26	34.2	1	1.3	76
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>15,923</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>7,953</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>24,489</b>

**Table 13b. Number and percent of alleged victims by path assignment and agency, 2022**

FA – Family Assessment; FI – Family Investigation; Fac. Inv. – Facility Investigation

Agency	FA alleged victims (N)	FA alleged victims (%)	FI alleged victims (N)	FI alleged victims (%)	Fac. Inv. alleged victims (N)	Fac. Inv. alleged victims (%)	Total alleged victims
Aitkin	102	69.4	41	27.9	16	10.9	147
Anoka	674	58.6	472	41	31	2.7	1,151
Becker	136	57.6	96	40.7	11	4.7	236
Beltrami	98	60.1	64	39.3	2	1.2	163

Agency	FA alleged victims (N)	FA alleged victims (%)	FI alleged victims (N)	FI alleged victims (%)	Fac. Inv. alleged victims (N)	Fac. Inv. alleged victims (%)	Total alleged victims
Benton	150	56.4	117	44	3	1.1	266
Big Stone	29	76.3	8	21.1	2	5.3	38
Blue Earth	315	80.6	77	19.7	7	1.8	391
Brown	144	74.6	53	27.5	8	4.1	193
Carlton	262	72	103	28.3	15	4.1	364
Carver	250	62.8	156	39.2	5	1.3	398
Cass	114	82	28	20.1	2	1.4	139
Chippewa	121	64	72	38.1	12	6.3	189
Chisago	127	60.5	95	45.2	3	1.4	210
Clay	274	72.1	110	28.9	12	3.2	380
Clearwater	55	70.5	29	37.2	0	0	78
Cook	18	75	7	29.2	0	0	24
Crow Wing	207	67.2	99	32.1	7	2.3	308
Dakota	1,032	62.7	611	37.1	54	3.3	1,647
Des Moines Valley HHS	127	83	25	16.3	4	2.6	153
Douglas	235	59	205	51.5	10	2.5	398
Faribault-Martin	221	72.7	84	27.6	4	1.3	304
Fillmore	49	90.7	5	9.3	0	0	54
Freeborn	158	66.9	95	40.3	0	0	236
Goodhue	222	77.1	66	22.9	12	4.2	288
Hennepin	3,645	64.4	2,171	38.3	159	2.8	5,664
Houston	87	82.9	17	16.2	4	3.8	105
Hubbard	124	51.9	98	41	40	16.7	239
Isanti	99	55.3	87	48.6	0	0	179
Itasca	223	54	184	44.6	25	6.1	413
Kanabec	71	65.1	50	45.9	1	0.9	109
Kandiyohi	206	38.8	297	55.9	57	10.7	531
Kittson	6	54.5	6	54.5	0	0	11
Koochiching	88	77.9	26	23	1	0.9	113
Lac qui Parle	40	74.1	25	46.3	1	1.9	54
Lake	46	86.8	7	13.2	0	0	53
Lake of the Woods	22	84.6	4	15.4	0	0	26
Le Sueur	65	53.7	58	47.9	0	0	121
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	258	87.8	41	13.9	11	3.7	294
MN Prairie	482	74.5	165	25.5	34	5.3	647
Mahnomen	9	45	11	55	0	0	20
Marshall	41	64.1	19	29.7	5	7.8	64
McLeod	113	46.3	132	54.1	8	3.3	244
Meeker	115	74.7	43	27.9	4	2.6	154
Mille Lacs	182	53.7	172	50.7	10	2.9	339
Morrison	74	73.3	27	26.7	2	2	101

Agency	FA alleged victims (N)	FA alleged victims (%)	FI alleged victims (N)	FI alleged victims (%)	Fac. Inv. alleged victims (N)	Fac. Inv. alleged victims (%)	Total alleged victims
Mower	192	74.7	70	27.2	2	0.8	257
Nicollet	178	76.7	59	25.4	6	2.6	232
Nobles	157	75.8	60	29	2	1	207
Norman	50	86.2	11	19	0	0	58
Olmsted	461	74.5	150	24.2	16	2.6	619
Otter Tail	278	68.1	128	31.4	16	3.9	408
Pennington	67	78.8	18	21.2	3	3.5	85
Pine	170	62	111	40.5	6	2.2	274
Polk	141	69.1	71	34.8	3	1.5	204
Ramsey	2,049	61.2	1,347	40.2	64	1.9	3,350
Red Lake County	24	68.6	11	31.4	1	2.9	35
Renville	72	64.3	48	42.9	1	0.9	112
Rice	247	59.7	188	45.4	14	3.4	414
Roseau	82	78.1	23	21.9	0	0	105
Scott	485	75.8	158	24.7	24	3.8	640
Sherburne	366	70.1	146	28	29	5.6	522
Sibley	107	82.9	31	24	0	0	129
Southwest HHS	375	64.4	233	40	10	1.7	582
St. Louis	1,322	57.6	1,111	48.4	120	5.2	2,294
Stearns	684	67.7	349	34.6	42	4.2	1,010
Stevens	75	67.6	50	45	9	8.1	111
Swift	36	58.1	29	46.8	0	0	62
Todd	111	68.5	51	31.5	2	1.2	162
Traverse	23	62.2	17	45.9	0	0	37
Wabasha	67	56.8	37	31.4	20	16.9	118
Wadena	113	63.1	62	34.6	12	6.7	179
Washington	511	68.4	247	33.1	15	2	747
Watonwan	116	72.5	50	31.3	2	1.3	160
Western Prairie Human Services	94	56.3	77	46.1	8	4.8	167
White Earth Nation	133	86.9	19	12.4	4	2.6	153
Wilkin	42	76.4	14	25.5	0	0	55
Winona	225	69.2	116	35.7	3	0.9	325
Wright	551	61.2	356	39.5	37	4.1	901
Yellow Medicine	73	75.3	35	36.1	1	1	97
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>20,793</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>11,841</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>1,054</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>32,047</b>

## Mandatory and discretionary reasons for child protection response paths

As stated previously, there are both mandatory and discretionary reasons that local child protection agency staff will assign a case to the Family Investigation response path. Table 14 shows the percent of alleged victims assigned to Family Investigation by discretionary and mandatory reasons by race.

**Table 14. Number and percent of alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations assigned to Family Investigation by discretionary versus mandatory reasons, by race/ethnicity (alone, no other race value), 2022**

Race/ethnicity	Discretionary (N)	Discretionary (%)	Mandatory (N)	Mandatory (%)	Total alleged victims
African American/Black	540	29.8	1,305	72.1	1,810
American Indian/Alaska Native	259	30.1	636	73.9	861
Asian/Pacific Islander	101	26.6	281	73.9	380
Two or more races	774	31.1	1,813	72.9	2,487
Unknown/declined	134	22.7	458	77.6	590
White	1,285	22.5	4,536	79.4	5,713
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,093</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>9,029</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>11,841</b>
Hispanic/Latinx (any race)	385	24.6	1,227	78.3	1,567

Note on race and ethnicity categories: This breakdown relies on exclusive racial categories, except Hispanic/Latinx (any race). A client is only counted in a single row or column, based on their identification with a single race value. If a client identified with more than one race value, they will be counted in the multi-racial “two or more races” category. ‘Hispanic/Latinx (any race)’ shows clients who identified with that ethnicity regardless of exclusive race category.

## Assessment of safety, risk and service need

After a maltreatment report is screened in and a case assigned to the appropriate child protection response path, caseworkers must contact alleged victims and all other relevant parties to assess their immediate safety. The specifics of how those meetings occur, when and with whom, are specific to each case and family. After initial interviews and meetings in both the Family Assessment and Family Investigation response paths, caseworkers assess safety, based on professional judgement and information provided from a safety assessment tool. If a safety threat is indicated, caseworkers, along with other partners, determine whether a safety plan can keep the child/ren safe, or if additional intervention such as placement in out-of-home care, is warranted.

During the assessment or investigation phase, caseworkers also determine the risk of future maltreatment and decide whether child protective services are needed to provide ongoing safety, well-being and permanency. The assessment or investigation phase of all types of child protection responses is 45 days. If child protective services are needed, ongoing case management services are provided to families by opening child protection case management. At closing of a Family or Facility Investigation, a determination as to whether maltreatment occurred is made. At any point during the assessment or investigation phase, if local agency staff feel a child is not safe, they may seek removal and place the child in out-of-home care, and/or seek a Child in Need of Protection or Services (CHIPS) petition to provide court oversight and monitoring.

## Timeliness of face-to-face contact with alleged victims of child maltreatment

After screening a report, the first step in all child protection responses is to have face-to-face contact with alleged victims of maltreatment to determine if children are safe or in need of protection. Occasionally, at the time of receiving a report, children may already be placed on a 72-hour hold by local law enforcement. Caseworkers must see all alleged victims in a report. Two response time frames align with the assignment of child protection response. Allegations that indicate a risk of substantial child endangerment or sexual abuse require an investigation and require local agencies to see all alleged victims within 24 hours. The five-day timeline applies to children named as alleged victims in child protection cases assigned either a Family Assessment response or a Family Investigation response, which is due to the discretion of agency staff (rather than for mandatory reasons because of severity of current allegation/s).

**Table 15. Timeliness of face-to-face contact with alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by agency, 2022**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Total alleged victims</b>	<b>Alleged victims seen in timely manner</b>	<b>Percent of alleged victims seen in timely manner</b>
Aitkin	153	136	88.9%
Anoka	1,142	1,053	92.2%
Becker	216	196	90.7%
Beltrami	159	146	91.8%
Benton	252	245	97.2%
Big Stone	39	39	100.0%
Blue Earth	410	401	97.8%
Brown	201	192	95.5%
Carlton	355	249	70.1%
Carver	397	380	95.7%
Cass	148	129	87.2%
Chippewa	207	173	83.6%
Chisago	221	199	90.0%
Clay	374	306	81.8%
Clearwater	76	56	73.7%
Cook	9	3	33.3%
Crow Wing	291	274	94.2%
Dakota	1,659	1,475	88.9%
Des Moines Valley HHS	151	149	98.7%
Douglas	482	455	94.4%
Faribault-Martin	308	265	86.0%
Fillmore	56	56	100.0%
Freeborn	279	253	90.7%
Goodhue	279	243	87.1%
Hennepin	5,461	4,389	80.4%
Houston	119	110	92.4%
Hubbard	215	185	86.0%
Isanti	183	169	92.3%
Itasca	379	288	76.0%
Kanabec	127	86	67.7%
Kandiyohi	519	441	85.0%
Kittson	12	12	100.0%
Koochiching	105	89	84.8%
Lac qui Parle	64	58	90.6%
Lake	53	48	90.6%
Lake of the Woods	32	27	84.4%
Le Sueur	125	125	100.0%
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	291	116	39.9%
Mahnomen	20	20	100.0%

Agency	Total alleged victims	Alleged victims seen in timely manner	Percent of alleged victims seen in timely manner
Marshall	64	58	90.6%
McLeod	229	218	95.2%
Meeker	168	155	92.3%
Mille Lacs	341	319	93.5%
MN Prairie	643	449	69.8%
Morrison	100	100	100.0%
Mower	245	221	90.2%
Nicollet	257	242	94.2%
Nobles	213	187	87.8%
Norman	58	52	89.7%
Olmsted	615	576	93.7%
Otter Tail	353	314	89.0%
Pennington	92	84	91.3%
Pine	252	154	61.1%
Polk	220	206	93.6%
Ramsey	3,303	2,895	87.6%
Red Lake	34	34	100.0%
Renville	122	116	95.1%
Rice	464	393	84.7%
Roseau	109	106	97.2%
Scott	656	590	89.9%
Sherburne	504	477	94.6%
Sibley	135	129	95.6%
Southwest HHS	582	470	80.8%
St. Louis	2,585	1,682	65.1%
Stearns	1,034	970	93.8%
Stevens	143	143	100.0%
Swift	64	57	89.1%
Todd	141	114	80.9%
Traverse	50	46	92.0%
Wabasha	108	107	99.1%
Wadena	185	182	98.4%
Washington	740	651	88.0%
Watonwan	168	156	92.9%
Western Prairie Human Services	186	181	97.3%
White Earth Nation	22	12	54.5%
Wilkin	63	52	82.5%
Winona	331	296	89.4%
Wright	933	859	92.1%
Yellow Medicine	112	110	98.2%
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>32,193</b>	<b>27,399</b>	<b>85.1%</b>

## Assessment of safety and risk

After making initial contact with alleged victims and their family, child protection caseworkers utilize a formal assessment tool regarding safety. Ratings of conditionally safe require caseworkers to create a safety plan to immediately address safety needs identified in the assessment tool for an alleged victim to remain in their home. Ratings of unsafe indicate the removal of child is likely necessary to achieve safety if the caregiver(s) is/are unable or unwilling to make necessary changes to ensure safety; a court order is ultimately required to place a child in out-of-home care unless a parent voluntarily agrees to removal. Sometimes children’s removals last only a few days, but they can be in care for many months while their families work to ensure they can provide for their children’s safety. Children may enter out-of-home care at times outside of a child protection assessment or investigation because of maltreatment or for other reasons (e.g., children’s mental health needs or developmental disabilities).

Tables 16 and 17 contain information regarding assessments of safety and removals that occur during an assessment or investigation of maltreatment. For information on children in out-of-home care, see **Minnesota’s 2022 Out-of-Home Care and Permanency Report**.

**Table 16. Number and (percent) of cases by safety assessment level and agency, 2022**

Agency	FA Safe (N)	FA Safe (%)	FA Cond Safe (N)	FA Cond Safe (%)	FA Unsafe (N)	FA Unsafe (%)	FI Safe (N)	FI Safe (%)	FI Cond Safe (N)	FI Cond Safe (%)	FI Unsafe (N)	FI Unsafe (%)	Total cases
Aitkin	47	62.7	27	36	1	1.3	16	42.1	16	42.1	6	15.8	113
Anoka	464	83.9	87	15.7	1	0.2	157	48.8	116	36	49	15.2	875
Becker	50	52.6	45	47.4	0	0	14	21.9	30	46.9	20	31.3	159
Beltrami	46	78	10	16.9	3	5.1	20	44.4	13	28.9	12	26.7	104
Benton	42	38.9	66	61.1	0	0	9	11.8	51	67.1	16	21.1	184
Big Stone	14	66.7	5	23.8	2	9.5	4	100	0	0	0	0	25
Blue Earth	146	56.2	94	36.2	20	7.7	26	42.6	20	32.8	15	24.6	321
Brown	41	40.6	50	49.5	9	8.9	3	9.7	24	77.4	4	12.9	132
Carlton	103	50	97	47.1	6	2.9	9	14.5	51	82.3	2	3.2	268
Carver	104	53.3	78	40	13	6.7	32	32	56	56	12	12	295
Cass	41	51.3	19	23.8	20	25	7	29.2	8	33.3	9	37.5	104
Chippewa	42	47.7	45	51.1	1	1.1	11	23.4	29	61.7	7	14.9	135
Chisago	63	67	29	30.9	2	2.1	36	50	24	33.3	12	16.7	166
Clay	84	48	83	47.4	8	4.6	27	36.5	39	52.7	8	10.8	249
Clearwater	28	93.3	2	6.7	0	0	8	57.1	5	35.7	1	7.1	44
Cook	15	100	0	0	0	0	5	83.3	0	0	1	16.7	21
Crow Wing	73	50	54	37	19	13	30	45.5	27	40.9	9	13.6	212
Dakota	801	90.4	76	8.6	9	1	304	70.2	92	21.2	37	8.5	1,319
Des Moines Valley HHS	62	67.4	27	29.3	3	3.3	8	42.1	11	57.9	0	0	111
Douglas	103	62	61	36.7	2	1.2	22	17.1	102	79.1	5	3.9	295
Faribault-Martin	68	45.3	75	50	7	4.7	11	22	22	44	17	34	200
Fillmore	35	79.5	9	20.5	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	49
Freeborn	76	77.6	17	17.3	5	5.1	21	38.9	21	38.9	12	22.2	152
Goodhue	84	50.9	75	45.5	6	3.6	16	33.3	22	45.8	10	20.8	213
Hennepin	2,461	85.4	336	11.7	83	2.9	907	63.3	352	24.6	169	11.8	4,316

Agency	FA Safe (N)	FA Safe (%)	FA Cond Safe (N)	FA Cond Safe (%)	FA Unsafe (N)	FA Unsafe (%)	FI Safe (N)	FI Safe (%)	FI Cond Safe (N)	FI Cond Safe (%)	FI Unsafe (N)	FI Unsafe (%)	Total cases
Houston	24	35.3	42	61.8	2	2.9	7	43.8	7	43.8	2	12.5	84
Hubbard	47	71.2	15	22.7	4	6.1	23	39.7	21	36.2	14	24.1	124
Isanti	46	62.2	27	36.5	1	1.4	13	24.1	34	63	7	13	128
Itasca	99	75	27	20.5	6	4.5	31	24.4	74	58.3	22	17.3	259
Kanabec	19	36.5	33	63.5	0	0	11	26.8	24	58.5	6	14.6	93
Kandiyohi	58	41.4	82	58.6	0	0	111	55	56	27.7	35	17.3	342
Kittson	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0	5	83.3	1	16.7	10
Koochiching	40	54.8	28	38.4	5	6.8	8	38.1	7	33.3	6	28.6	94
Lac qui Parle	8	24.2	25	75.8	0	0	1	5.3	16	84.2	2	10.5	52
Lake	7	22.6	22	71	2	6.5	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	38
Lake of the Woods	10	52.6	8	42.1	1	5.3	1	25	2	50	1	25	23
Le Sueur	16	39	21	51.2	4	9.8	13	36.1	11	30.6	12	33.3	77
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	156	76.5	33	16.2	15	7.4	11	42.3	14	53.8	1	3.8	230
MN Prairie	290	88.1	29	8.8	10	3	67	63.8	27	25.7	11	10.5	434
Mahnomen	4	50	4	50	0	0	3	42.9	2	28.6	2	28.6	15
Marshall	19	61.3	11	35.5	1	3.2	2	25	4	50	2	25	39
McLeod	59	86.8	9	13.2	0	0	42	44.2	43	45.3	10	10.5	163
Meeker	51	54.8	40	43	2	2.2	15	55.6	9	33.3	3	11.1	120
Mille Lacs	63	50	57	45.2	6	4.8	34	33.3	36	35.3	32	31.4	228
Morrison	31	51.7	17	28.3	12	20	6	23.1	14	53.8	6	23.1	86
Mower	125	81.7	20	13.1	8	5.2	29	61.7	10	21.3	8	17	200
Nicollet	119	78.3	27	17.8	6	3.9	25	56.8	12	27.3	7	15.9	196
Nobles	34	30.4	75	67	3	2.7	9	23.1	25	64.1	5	12.8	151
Norman	22	61.1	14	38.9	0	0	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	43
Olmsted	55	18.6	239	80.7	2	0.7	16	16.7	79	82.3	1	1	392
Otter Tail	136	66	59	28.6	10	4.9	46	47.9	31	32.3	19	19.8	302
Pennington	38	76	10	20	2	4	6	40	5	33.3	4	26.7	65
Pine	84	66.7	40	31.7	2	1.6	36	52.2	29	42	4	5.8	195
Polk	69	67	27	26.2	7	6.8	8	19.5	19	46.3	14	34.1	144
Ramsey	1,457	90.6	126	7.8	26	1.6	638	75.1	163	19.2	48	5.7	2,458
Red Lake County	15	83.3	2	11.1	1	5.6	6	75	2	25	0	0	26
Renville	28	51.9	25	46.3	1	1.9	9	29	15	48.4	7	22.6	85
Rice	128	64	62	31	10	5	42	37.5	40	35.7	30	26.8	312
Roseau	24	42.1	25	43.9	8	14	4	22.2	11	61.1	3	16.7	75
Scott	327	77.1	91	21.5	6	1.4	75	62.5	36	30	9	7.5	544
Sherburne	139	49.1	141	49.8	3	1.1	23	24.2	54	56.8	18	18.9	378
Sibley	20	25.6	57	73.1	1	1.3	1	4.5	19	86.4	2	9.1	100
Southwest HHS	169	59.9	100	35.5	13	4.6	55	40.4	56	41.2	25	18.4	418

Agency	FA Safe (N)	FA Safe (%)	FA Cond Safe (N)	FA Cond Safe (%)	FA Unsafe (N)	FA Unsafe (%)	FI Safe (N)	FI Safe (%)	FI Cond Safe (N)	FI Cond Safe (%)	FI Unsafe (N)	FI Unsafe (%)	Total cases
St. Louis	735	67.7	330	30.4	21	1.9	384	48.4	283	35.6	127	16	1,880
Stearns	352	66.9	157	29.8	17	3.2	98	41.2	96	40.3	44	18.5	764
Stevens	17	23.9	50	70.4	4	5.6	4	13.8	19	65.5	6	20.7	100
Swift	5	18.5	21	77.8	1	3.7	1	5.9	10	58.8	6	35.3	44
Todd	60	78.9	10	13.2	6	7.9	22	62.9	4	11.4	9	25.7	111
Traverse	16	72.7	6	27.3	0	0	5	35.7	9	64.3	0	0	36
Wabasha	15	29.4	33	64.7	3	5.9	9	33.3	17	63	1	3.7	78
Wadena	26	34.2	35	46.1	15	19.7	5	13.9	25	69.4	6	16.7	112
Washington	249	67.7	105	28.5	13	3.5	125	68.7	50	27.5	7	3.8	550
Watonwan	15	18.8	64	80	1	1.3	1	3.1	25	78.1	6	18.8	112
Western Prairie Human Services	44	54.3	37	45.7	0	0	21	36.2	34	58.6	3	5.2	139
White Earth Nation	10	10.6	65	69.1	18	19.1	3	27.3	7	63.6	1	9.1	105
Wilkin	24	61.5	15	38.5	0	0	3	23.1	8	61.5	2	15.4	52
Winona	147	83.5	19	10.8	10	5.7	34	47.2	14	19.4	24	33.3	248
Wright	151	35.5	260	61.2	14	3.3	54	20.8	178	68.5	28	10.8	685
Yellow Medicine	14	28.6	32	65.3	3	6.1	6	23.1	16	61.5	4	15.4	75
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>11,011</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>4,378</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3,911</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>2,947</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>23,876</b>

**Table 17. Number and percent of alleged victims with out-of-home placement during assessment/investigation phase by agency, 2022**

Agency	Total alleged victims	Number removed	Percent removed
Aitkin	147	11	7.5
Anoka	1,151	107	9.3
Becker	236	30	12.7
Beltrami	163	17	10.4
Benton	266	30	11.3
Big Stone	38	1	2.6
Blue Earth	391	57	14.6
Brown	193	17	8.8
Carlton	364	19	5.2
Carver	398	32	8
Cass	139	27	19.4
Chippewa	189	24	12.7
Chisago	210	24	11.4
Clay	380	41	10.8
Clearwater	78	2	2.6

Agency	Total alleged victims	Number removed	Percent removed
Cook	24	1	4.2
Crow Wing	308	56	18.2
Dakota	1,647	72	4.4
Des Moines Valley HHS	153	6	3.9
Douglas	398	22	5.5
Faribault-Martin	304	47	15.5
Fillmore	54	0	0
Freeborn	236	27	11.4
Goodhue	288	29	10.1
Hennepin	5,664	482	8.5
Houston	105	13	12.4
Hubbard	239	32	13.4
Isanti	179	15	8.4
Itasca	413	58	14
Kanabec	109	11	10.1
Kandiyohi	531	67	12.6
Kittson	11	1	9.1
Koochiching	113	21	18.6
Lac qui Parle	54	3	5.6
Lake	53	4	7.5
Lake of the Woods	26	2	7.7
Le Sueur	121	15	12.4
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	294	44	15
MN Prairie	647	51	7.9
Mahnomen	20	1	5
Marshall	64	9	14.1
McLeod	244	13	5.3
Meeker	154	5	3.2
Mille Lacs	339	37	10.9
Morrison	101	21	20.8
Mower	257	29	11.3
Nicollet	232	19	8.2
Nobles	207	5	2.4
Norman	58	6	10.3
Olmsted	619	12	1.9
Otter Tail	408	41	10
Pennington	85	8	9.4
Pine	274	13	4.7
Polk	204	35	17.2
Ramsey	3,350	170	5.1
Red Lake County	35	0	0
Renville	112	9	8
Rice	414	63	15.2

Agency	Total alleged victims	Number removed	Percent removed
Roseau	105	8	7.6
Scott	640	45	7
Sherburne	522	36	6.9
Sibley	129	6	4.7
Southwest HHS	582	75	12.9
St. Louis	2,294	273	11.9
Stearns	1,010	91	9
Stevens	111	14	12.6
Swift	62	8	12.9
Todd	162	24	14.8
Traverse	37	4	10.8
Wabasha	118	8	6.8
Wadena	179	41	22.9
Washington	747	41	5.5
Watonwan	160	9	5.6
Western Prairie Human Services	167	11	6.6
White Earth Nation	153	28	18.3
Wilkin	55	3	5.5
Winona	325	75	23.1
Wright	901	54	6
Yellow Medicine	97	6	6.2
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>32,047</b>	<b>2,874</b>	<b>9</b>

By the end of an assessment or investigation, child protection caseworkers must also complete a standardized assessment tool of risk of future maltreatment. Table 18 provides information regarding the number and percent of assessments/investigations in which the current situation of the alleged victims is at low, moderate or high risk of future maltreatment by agency.

**Table 18. The number and (percent) of cases by risk assessment level and agency, 2022**

Agency	FA Low (N)	FA Low (%)	FA Mod (N)	FA Mod (%)	FA High (N)	FA High (%)	FI Low (N)	FI Low (%)	FI Mod (N)	FI Mod (%)	FI High (N)	FI High (%)	Total cases
Aitkin	17	22.7	46	61.3	12	16	9	23.7	19	50	10	26.3	113
Anoka	257	46.5	263	47.6	32	5.8	84	26.1	139	43.2	99	30.7	875
Becker	12	12.6	71	74.7	12	12.6	1	1.6	26	40.6	37	57.8	159
Beltrami	27	45.8	24	40.7	8	13.6	22	48.9	12	26.7	11	24.4	104
Benton	33	30.6	61	56.5	14	13	16	21.1	28	36.8	32	42.1	184
Big Stone	7	33.3	11	52.4	3	14.3	3	75	1	25	0	0	25
Blue Earth	67	25.8	129	49.6	64	24.6	20	32.8	27	44.3	14	23	321
Brown	16	15.8	57	56.4	28	27.7	2	6.5	17	54.8	12	38.7	132
Carlton	66	32	108	52.4	32	15.5	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	268
Carver	91	46.7	95	48.7	9	4.6	39	39	45	45	16	16	295

Agency	FA Low (N)	FA Low (%)	FA Mod (N)	FA Mod (%)	FA High (N)	FA High (%)	FI Low (N)	FI Low (%)	FI Mod (N)	FI Mod (%)	FI High (N)	FI High (%)	Total cases
Cass	28	35	33	41.3	19	23.8	8	33.3	6	25	10	41.7	104
Chippewa	31	35.2	41	46.6	16	18.2	10	21.3	22	46.8	15	31.9	135
Chisago	46	48.9	44	46.8	4	4.3	36	50	28	38.9	8	11.1	166
Clay	29	16.6	104	59.4	42	24	12	16.2	38	51.4	24	32.4	249
Clearwater	11	36.7	19	63.3	0	0	2	14.3	9	64.3	3	21.4	44
Cook	4	26.7	8	53.3	3	20	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	21
Crow Wing	44	30.1	73	50	29	19.9	21	31.8	29	43.9	16	24.2	212
Dakota	366	41.3	450	50.8	70	7.9	178	41.1	204	47.1	51	11.8	1,319
Des Moines Valley HHS	32	34.8	51	55.4	9	9.8	7	36.8	9	47.4	3	15.8	111
Douglas	29	17.5	106	63.9	31	18.7	26	20.2	73	56.6	30	23.3	295
Faribault-Martin	46	30.7	80	53.3	24	16	13	26	19	38	18	36	200
Fillmore	14	31.8	23	52.3	7	15.9	2	40	2	40	1	20	49
Freeborn	15	15.3	57	58.2	26	26.5	5	9.3	29	53.7	20	37	152
Goodhue	32	19.4	71	43	62	37.6	6	12.5	16	33.3	26	54.2	213
Hennepin	1,037	36	1,518	52.7	324	11.2	378	26.4	669	46.7	381	26.6	4,316
Houston	10	14.7	32	47.1	26	38.2	5	31.3	8	50	3	18.8	84
Hubbard	21	31.8	28	42.4	17	25.8	16	27.6	21	36.2	21	36.2	124
Isanti	15	20.3	43	58.1	16	21.6	18	33.3	23	42.6	13	24.1	128
Itasca	38	28.8	71	53.8	23	17.4	45	35.4	52	40.9	30	23.6	259
Kanabec	21	40.4	18	34.6	13	25	7	17.1	13	31.7	21	51.2	93
Kandiyohi	54	38.6	72	51.4	14	10	37	18.3	101	50	64	31.7	342
Kittson	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	6	100	0	0	10
Koochiching	8	11	42	57.5	23	31.5	3	14.3	11	52.4	7	33.3	94
Lac qui Parle	9	27.3	24	72.7	0	0	6	31.6	11	57.9	2	10.5	52
Lake	6	19.4	17	54.8	8	25.8	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	38
Lake of the Woods	4	21.1	11	57.9	4	21.1	0	0	3	75	1	25	23
Le Sueur	3	7.3	27	65.9	11	26.8	11	30.6	11	30.6	14	38.9	77
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	120	58.8	69	33.8	15	7.4	10	38.5	11	42.3	5	19.2	230
MN Prairie	77	23.4	216	65.7	36	10.9	23	21.9	55	52.4	27	25.7	434
Mahnomen	3	37.5	5	62.5	0	0	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1	15
Marshall	3	9.7	21	67.7	7	22.6	2	25	4	50	2	25	39
McLeod	27	39.7	39	57.4	2	2.9	30	31.6	52	54.7	13	13.7	163
Meeker	32	34.4	44	47.3	17	18.3	10	37	9	33.3	8	29.6	120
Mille Lacs	46	36.5	66	52.4	14	11.1	20	19.6	49	48	33	32.4	228
Morrison	15	25	29	48.3	16	26.7	4	15.4	14	53.8	7	26.9	86
Mower	60	39.2	82	53.6	11	7.2	19	40.4	17	36.2	11	23.4	200
Nicollet	42	27.6	91	59.9	19	12.5	10	22.7	24	54.5	10	22.7	196
Nobles	37	33	70	62.5	5	4.5	11	28.2	24	61.5	4	10.3	151

Agency	FA Low (N)	FA Low (%)	FA Mod (N)	FA Mod (%)	FA High (N)	FA High (%)	FI Low (N)	FI Low (%)	FI Mod (N)	FI Mod (%)	FI High (N)	FI High (%)	Total cases
Norman	11	30.6	20	55.6	5	13.9	2	28.6	2	28.6	3	42.9	43
Olmsted	61	20.6	176	59.5	59	19.9	22	22.9	57	59.4	17	17.7	392
Otter Tail	77	37.4	102	49.5	26	12.6	34	35.4	30	31.3	32	33.3	302
Pennington	19	38	27	54	4	8	3	20	9	60	3	20	65
Pine	47	37.3	53	42.1	26	20.6	20	29	28	40.6	21	30.4	195
Polk	34	33	59	57.3	10	9.7	10	24.4	14	34.1	17	41.5	144
Ramsey	844	52.5	696	43.3	68	4.2	351	41.3	422	49.7	75	8.8	2,458
Red Lake County	13	72.2	5	27.8	0	0	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0	26
Renville	11	20.4	25	46.3	18	33.3	6	19.4	14	45.2	11	35.5	85
Rice	76	38	94	47	30	15	34	30.4	49	43.8	29	25.9	312
Roseau	9	15.8	28	49.1	20	35.1	4	22.2	8	44.4	6	33.3	75
Scott	171	40.3	219	51.7	34	8	54	45	45	37.5	21	17.5	544
Sherburne	112	39.6	139	49.1	31	11	23	24.2	45	47.4	27	28.4	378
Sibley	25	32.1	50	64.1	3	3.8	5	22.7	13	59.1	4	18.2	100
Southwest HHS	91	32.3	142	50.4	49	17.4	37	27.2	62	45.6	37	27.2	418
St. Louis	418	38.5	533	49.1	135	12.4	192	24.2	362	45.6	240	30.2	1,880
Stearns	180	34.2	296	56.3	50	9.5	61	25.6	128	53.8	49	20.6	764
Stevens	11	15.5	41	57.7	19	26.8	4	13.8	15	51.7	10	34.5	100
Swift	4	14.8	16	59.3	7	25.9	0	0	12	70.6	5	29.4	44
Todd	29	38.2	34	44.7	13	17.1	10	28.6	16	45.7	9	25.7	111
Traverse	6	27.3	14	63.6	2	9.1	1	7.1	9	64.3	4	28.6	36
Wabasha	9	17.6	36	70.6	6	11.8	7	25.9	14	51.9	6	22.2	78
Wadena	10	13.2	45	59.2	21	27.6	7	19.4	22	61.1	7	19.4	112
Washington	151	41	194	52.7	23	6.3	76	41.8	92	50.5	14	7.7	550
Watonwan	20	25	43	53.8	17	21.3	8	25	17	53.1	7	21.9	112
Western Prairie Human Services	21	25.9	44	54.3	16	19.8	7	12.1	30	51.7	21	36.2	139
White Earth Nation	30	31.9	36	38.3	27	28.7	4	36.4	4	36.4	3	27.3	105
Wilkin	9	23.1	29	74.4	1	2.6	2	15.4	7	53.8	4	30.8	52
Winona	42	23.9	116	65.9	18	10.2	15	20.8	33	45.8	24	33.3	248
Wright	188	44.2	192	45.2	45	10.6	87	33.5	137	52.7	36	13.8	685
Yellow Medicine	11	22.4	32	65.3	6	12.2	9	34.6	11	42.3	6	23.1	75
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>5,749</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>8,198</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>1,967</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>2,308</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3,733</b>	<b>46.9</b>	<b>1,905</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23,876</b>

### Assessing need for ongoing child protection services post-assessment or investigation phase

At the conclusion of a Family Assessment or Family Investigation, child protection caseworkers indicate whether an alleged victim and/or family need ongoing services to maintain safety and promote permanency and well-being. Table

19 provides information regarding whether the need for child protective services was indicated by risk levels identified through the risk assessment completed during the assessment or investigation phase.

**Table 19. Number and percent of cases where child protective services were indicated by risk level and agency, 2022**

Agency	Total low-risk cases	Low-risk cases - CP services needed (%)	Total moderate-risk cases	Moderate-risk cases - CP services needed (%)	Total high-risk cases	High-risk cases - CP services needed (%)
Aitkin	26	11.5	65	30.8	22	54.5
Anoka	341	2.3	402	11.4	131	44.3
Becker	13	7.7	97	11.3	49	91.8
Beltrami	49	0	36	22.2	19	57.9
Benton	49	0	89	9	46	93.5
Big Stone	10	10	12	16.7	3	66.7
Blue Earth	87	1.1	156	9	78	50
Brown	19	0	74	18.9	40	57.5
Carlton	81	3.7	138	11.6	49	28.6
Carver	131	5.3	140	25	25	84
Cass	36	5.6	39	20.5	29	55.2
Chippewa	41	2.4	63	33.3	31	74.2
Chisago	82	1.2	73	28.8	12	83.3
Clay	41	4.9	142	19	66	57.6
Clearwater	13	0	28	7.1	3	66.7
Cook	5	20	12	16.7	4	0
Crow Wing	65	4.6	102	19.6	45	66.7
Dakota	544	0.9	654	6.9	121	54.5
Des Moines Valley HHS	39	2.6	60	28.3	12	58.3
Douglas	55	3.6	179	19.6	61	68.9
Faribault-Martin	59	5.1	99	16.2	42	50
Fillmore	16	12.5	25	12	8	25
Freeborn	20	0	86	29.1	46	60.9
Goodhue	38	0	87	10.3	88	35.2
Hennepin	1,416	3.8	2,187	19.6	705	62
Houston	15	0	40	12.5	29	20.7
Hubbard	37	8.1	49	22.4	38	47.4
Isanti	33	0	66	12.1	29	93.1
Itasca	83	1.2	123	17.9	53	34
Kanabec	28	28.6	31	45.2	34	52.9
Kandiyohi	91	14.3	173	34.7	78	75.6
Kittson	1	0	8	50	1	0
Koochiching	11	0	53	11.3	30	33.3
Lac qui Parle	15	13.3	35	11.4	2	100
Lake	8	12.5	20	40	10	70
Lake of the Woods	4	25	14	42.9	5	80

Agency	Total low-risk cases	Low-risk cases - CP services needed (%)	Total moderate-risk cases	Moderate-risk cases - CP services needed (%)	Total high-risk cases	High-risk cases - CP services needed (%)
Le Sueur	14	0	38	15.8	25	76
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	130	0.8	80	12.5	20	30
MN Prairie	100	0	271	4.4	63	61.9
Mahnomen	4	0	7	14.3	4	50
Marshall	5	0	25	28	9	44.4
McLeod	57	7	91	17.6	15	40
Meeker	42	2.4	53	9.4	25	56
Mille Lacs	66	1.5	115	17.4	47	59.6
Morrison	19	15.8	43	18.6	23	78.3
Mower	79	0	99	18.2	22	50
Nicollet	52	1.9	115	33	29	65.5
Nobles	48	2.1	94	22.3	9	55.6
Norman	13	7.7	22	18.2	8	50
Olmsted	83	4.8	233	27.5	76	63.2
Otter Tail	111	4.5	132	20.5	58	63.8
Pennington	22	13.6	36	13.9	7	28.6
Pine	68	4.4	81	19.8	47	34
Polk	44	0	73	11	27	96.3
Ramsey	1,195	1.2	1,118	11.4	143	58.7
Red Lake County	20	10	6	33.3	0	N/A
Renville	17	5.9	39	23.1	29	69
Rice	110	5.5	143	17.5	59	55.9
Roseau	13	15.4	36	27.8	26	26.9
Scott	225	1.3	264	18.6	55	63.6
Sherburne	135	1.5	184	8.7	58	46.6
Sibley	30	0	63	39.7	7	85.7
Southwest HHS	128	8.6	204	20.1	86	64
St. Louis	610	1.6	895	13.5	375	58.9
Stearns	241	0.8	424	9.4	99	50.5
Stevens	15	33.3	56	50	29	75.9
Swift	4	0	28	42.9	12	66.7
Todd	39	0	50	26	22	72.7
Traverse	7	28.6	23	34.8	6	100
Wabasha	16	6.3	50	26	12	58.3
Wadena	17	5.9	67	22.4	28	89.3
Washington	227	3.1	286	15.4	37	45.9
Watonwan	28	7.1	60	11.7	24	62.5
Western Prairie Human Services	28	21.4	74	20.3	37	56.8
White Earth Nation	34	0	40	17.5	30	46.7
Wilkin	11	18.2	36	22.2	5	100
Winona	57	8.8	149	10.7	42	76.2

Agency	Total low-risk cases	Low-risk cases - CP services needed (%)	Total moderate-risk cases	Moderate-risk cases - CP services needed (%)	Total high-risk cases	High-risk cases - CP services needed (%)
Wright	275	1.5	329	10.6	81	42
Yellow Medicine	20	15	43	55.8	12	100
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>8,061</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>11,932</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>3,872</b>	<b>58.5</b>

## Determining maltreatment

For both Family and Facility Investigations, there is a final step at the conclusion of a child maltreatment case not made in Family Assessment. The final step is to determine whether maltreatment occurred based on information gathered during an investigation. Table 20 provides information about the number of determined reports and victims by Family or Facility Investigation.

**Table 20. Number and percent of determined victims by Family Investigation and Facility Investigation response paths and agency, 2022**

Agency	Total FI alleged victims	FI determined victims (N)	FI determined victims (%)	Total Fac. Inv. alleged victims	Fac. Inv. determined victims (N)	Fac. Inv. determined victims (%)
Aitkin	41	25	61	16	0	0
Anoka	472	231	48.9	31	5	16.1
Becker	96	46	47.9	11	0	0
Beltrami	64	20	31.3	2	1	50
Benton	117	59	50.4	3	2	66.7
Big Stone	8	0	0	2	1	50
Blue Earth	77	24	31.2	7	3	42.9
Brown	53	32	60.4	8	1	12.5
Carlton	103	31	30.1	15	4	26.7
Carver	156	70	44.9	5	3	60
Cass	28	0	0	2	0	0
Chippewa	72	44	61.1	12	5	41.7
Chisago	95	41	43.2	3	0	0
Clay	110	65	59.1	12	1	8.3
Clearwater	29	16	55.2	0	0	N/A
Cook	7	2	28.6	0	0	N/A
Crow Wing	99	30	30.3	7	6	85.7
Dakota	611	196	32.1	54	14	25.9
Des Moines Valley HHS	25	7	28	4	0	0
Douglas	205	118	57.6	10	0	0
Faribault-Martin	84	12	14.3	4	1	25
Fillmore	5	1	20	0	0	N/A
Freeborn	95	76	80	0	0	N/A
Goodhue	66	41	62.1	12	7	58.3
Hennepin	2,171	906	41.7	159	43	27

Agency	Total FI alleged victims	FI determined victims (N)	FI determined victims (%)	Total Fac. Inv. alleged victims	Fac. Inv. determined victims (N)	Fac. Inv. determined victims (%)
Houston	17	5	29.4	4	1	25
Hubbard	98	38	38.8	40	17	42.5
Isanti	87	49	56.3	0	0	N/A
Itasca	184	27	14.7	25	2	8
Kanabec	50	25	50	1	0	0
Kandiyohi	297	166	55.9	57	49	86
Kittson	6	4	66.7	0	0	N/A
Koochiching	26	9	34.6	1	0	0
Lac qui Parle	25	4	16	1	0	0
Lake	7	6	85.7	0	0	N/A
Lake of the Woods	4	2	50	0	0	N/A
Le Sueur	58	15	25.9	0	0	N/A
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	41	5	12.2	11	9	81.8
MN Prairie	165	51	30.9	34	11	32.4
Mahnomen	11	2	18.2	0	0	N/A
Marshall	19	11	57.9	5	4	80
McLeod	132	43	32.6	8	0	0
Meeker	43	7	16.3	4	0	0
Mille Lacs	172	70	40.7	10	1	10
Morrison	27	13	48.1	2	0	0
Mower	70	21	30	2	1	50
Nicollet	59	27	45.8	6	2	33.3
Nobles	60	12	20	2	0	0
Norman	11	5	45.5	0	0	N/A
Olmsted	150	67	44.7	16	7	43.8
Otter Tail	128	65	50.8	16	0	0
Pennington	18	2	11.1	3	1	33.3
Pine	111	30	27	6	0	0
Polk	71	55	77.5	3	2	66.7
Ramsey	1,347	372	27.6	64	13	20.3
Red Lake County	11	3	27.3	1	0	0
Renville	48	25	52.1	1	0	0
Rice	188	64	34	14	0	0
Roseau	23	7	30.4	0	0	N/A
Scott	158	65	41.1	24	5	20.8
Sherburne	146	63	43.2	29	3	10.3
Sibley	31	14	45.2	0	0	N/A
Southwest HHS	233	149	63.9	10	3	30
St. Louis	1,111	439	39.5	120	36	30
Stearns	349	218	62.5	42	18	42.9
Stevens	50	29	58	9	1	11.1
Swift	29	18	62.1	0	0	N/A

Agency	Total FI alleged victims	FI determined victims (N)	FI determined victims (%)	Total Fac. Inv. alleged victims	Fac. Inv. determined victims (N)	Fac. Inv. determined victims (%)
Todd	51	11	21.6	2	0	0
Traverse	17	15	88.2	0	0	N/A
Wabasha	37	15	40.5	20	1	5
Wadena	62	30	48.4	12	2	16.7
Washington	247	92	37.2	15	4	26.7
Watonwan	50	14	28	2	0	0
Western Prairie Human Services	77	24	31.2	8	1	12.5
White Earth Nation	19	9	47.4	4	3	75
Wilkin	14	5	35.7	0	0	N/A
Winona	116	69	59.5	3	0	0
Wright	356	127	35.7	37	14	37.8
Yellow Medicine	35	11	31.4	1	0	0
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>11,841</b>	<b>4,817</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>1,054</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>29.2</b>

### Social service agency referrals to early intervention for infants and toddlers

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, Part C, children under the age of 3 involved in a report with a determination of maltreatment must be referred to early intervention services. Table 21 provides information on the number of children eligible for referral, and the number and percent that were referred.

**Table 21. Number of social service agency referrals to early intervention for infants and toddlers involved in substantiated cases of maltreatment, 2022**

Agency	Children required to be referred	Children with a referral (N)	Referral rate (%)
Aitkin	4	3	75
Anoka	58	54	93.1
Becker	13	12	92.3
Beltrami	11	10	90.9
Benton	18	17	94.4
Big Stone	1	0	0
Blue Earth	10	10	100
Brown	4	3	75
Carlton	6	4	66.7
Carver	13	10	76.9
Cass	0	0	N/A
Chippewa	8	5	62.5
Chisago	7	5	71.4
Clay	21	13	61.9

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Children required to be referred</b>	<b>Children with a referral (N)</b>	<b>Referral rate (%)</b>
Clearwater	2	1	50
Cook	0	0	N/A
Crow Wing	7	5	71.4
Dakota	53	47	88.7
Des Moines Valley HHS	1	1	100
Douglas	26	25	96.2
Faribault-Martin	6	5	83.3
Fillmore	0	0	N/A
Freeborn	17	16	94.1
Goodhue	6	4	66.7
Hennepin	243	221	90.9
Houston	0	0	N/A
Hubbard	13	2	15.4
Isanti	6	6	100
Itasca	4	3	75
Kanabec	3	3	100
Kandiyohi	27	18	66.7
Kittson	0	0	N/A
Koochiching	1	1	100
Lac qui Parle	2	2	100
Lake	2	2	100
Lake of the Woods	1	0	0
Le Sueur	2	2	100
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	1	1	100
MN Prairie	14	13	92.9
Mahnomen	1	0	0
Marshall	1	1	100
McLeod	6	6	100
Meeker	1	0	0
Mille Lacs	18	13	72.2
Morrison	4	4	100
Mower	7	6	85.7
Nicollet	7	6	85.7
Nobles	1	1	100
Norman	0	0	N/A
Olmsted	8	7	87.5

Agency	Children required to be referred	Children with a referral (N)	Referral rate (%)
Otter Tail	14	8	57.1
Pennington	0	0	N/A
Pine	6	5	83.3
Polk	7	7	100
Ramsey	113	105	92.9
Red Lake County	0	0	N/A
Renville	4	3	75
Rice	12	12	100
Roseau	2	1	50
Scott	15	11	73.3
Sherburne	15	15	100
Sibley	2	2	100
Southwest HHS	39	32	82.1
St. Louis	95	83	87.4
Stearns	58	38	65.5
Stevens	7	0	0
Swift	4	4	100
Todd	2	2	100
Traverse	1	1	100
Wabasha	11	1	9.1
Wadena	7	4	57.1
Washington	14	11	78.6
Watsonwan	4	1	25
Western Prairie Human Services	5	5	100
White Earth Nation	1	1	100
Wilkin	1	1	100
Winona	13	5	38.5
Wright	22	18	81.8
Yellow Medicine	1	1	100
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>1,140</b>	<b>945</b>	<b>82.9</b>

### Relationship of alleged offenders to alleged victims in completed assessments/investigations by determination of maltreatment

Alleged offenders can be anyone responsible for the care of children, including parents or guardians, or anyone given responsibility by the parent or guardian to provide child care. It also includes anyone working within facilities or homes licensed by the Department of Human Services, including child care, foster care or residential facilities. The Minnesota

Department of Education is responsible for the investigation of alleged maltreatment in schools. Strangers who maltreat or harm children would be reported to law enforcement. Table 22 provides information on the number by response path of alleged offenders by their relationship to alleged victims, as well as the number and percent of cases determined by that relationship to the alleged victims.

**Table 22. Alleged offenders by relationship to alleged victims, child protection response path and percent determined, 2022**

<b>Alleged offender relationship</b>	<b>Alleged offenders in FA cases</b>	<b>Alleged offenders in Inv. cases</b>	<b>Determined alleged offenders</b>	<b>Percent determined</b>
Biological parent	14,676	6,668	2,731	41
Unmarried partner of parent	887	884	366	41.4
Stepparent	684	448	164	36.6
Other relative (non-foster parent)	400	552	187	33.9
Legal guardian	305	147	52	35.4
Adoptive parent	259	168	43	25.6
Sibling	147	722	208	28.8
Other	147	361	137	38
Unknown or missing	74	116	48	41.4
Friends or neighbors	15	63	21	33.3
Child daycare provider	11	132	45	34.1
Relative foster parent	5	157	34	21.7
Non-relative foster parent	3	138	19	13.8
Non-caregiver sex trafficker	1	3	0	0
Group home or residential facility staff	1	39	8	20.5
Other professionals	1	17	2	11.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,819</b>	<b>9,590</b>	<b>3,714</b>	<b>38.7</b>

## Child fatalities and near fatalities due to maltreatment

Tables 23 and 24 provide information about victims who died as a result of maltreatment in the reporting year. Table 23 provides information on victims who died as a result of maltreatment and had at least one prior screened-in maltreatment report. Table 24 provides information on victims who died and had no known prior involvement in a screened-in child maltreatment report. There are often several months, and sometimes longer, between when a determination is finalized and when deaths occurred. The delay often results from needing to wait until criminal investigations are completed before making a determination. The related tables provide information about when deaths occurred; in all cases, final determinations about whether deaths were a result of maltreatment were not made until the current reporting year, which is why they are included in this report. Other information included in the tables provides age at time of death, gender and type of maltreatment resulting in death.

**Table 23. Details regarding deaths determined to be a result of maltreatment in 2022, with prior child protection history**

Year of death	Age and gender	Type of maltreatment
2021	3 years old, male	Neglect
2021	2 years old, female	Neglect
2021	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect, physical abuse
2021	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect, threatened injury
2022	1 year old, male	Neglect
2022	13 years old, male	Neglect, physical abuse
2022	6 years old, male	Physical abuse
2022	3 years old, female	Neglect
2022	2 years old, male	Neglect
2022	2 years old, male	Physical abuse
2022	1 year old, female	Physical abuse
2022	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect
2022	Less than 1 year old, female	Neglect, threatened injury

Year of death	Age and gender	Type of maltreatment
2022	Less than 1 year old, female	Neglect

**Table 24. Details regarding deaths determined to be a result of maltreatment in 2022, with no prior child protection history**

Year of death	Age and gender	Type of maltreatment
2021	2 years old, female	Physical abuse, Sexual abuse
2021	1 year old, female	Neglect
2021	Less than 1 year old, female	Physical abuse
2021	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect
2021	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect, Threatened injury
2021	Less than 1 year old, male	Physical abuse
2022	10 years old, male	Neglect
2022	7 years old, male	Neglect
2022	5 years old, male	Mental injury, physical abuse
2022	4 years old, male	Mental injury, physical abuse
2022	3 years old, female	Mental injury, physical abuse
2022	2 years old, male	Neglect
2022	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect
2022	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect

Year of death	Age and gender	Type of maltreatment
2022	6 years old, male	Neglect
2022	Less than 1 year old, male	Neglect
2022	6 years old, male	Neglect

## Outcomes after child maltreatment assessments/investigations concluded

To determine how successful child protection is in assessing the needs of children and families and providing appropriate services to meet those needs, local agency and Child Safety and Permanency Administration staff monitor whether children who were alleged or determined to be victims in maltreatment reports had another occurrence of alleged or determined victimization in a screened-in report within 12 months

### Rereporting of alleged maltreatment and recurrence of maltreatment determinations

Table 25 provides information on how many alleged victims in screened-in maltreatment reports during the prior reporting year had another screened-in maltreatment report within 12 months of the first report by an agency. Table 26 provides information on children who were determined to be victims of maltreatment in the prior reporting year and had another maltreatment determination within 12 months of the first determined report by agency. Maltreatment recurrence is a federal performance measure examined annually by the Children’s Bureau. It sets a federal performance standard that states must meet or face the possibility of a performance improvement plan with fiscal penalties. Table 27 provides data by race and ethnicity for the recurrence.

**Table 25. Number and percent of alleged victims with a rereport of maltreatment within 12 months by agency, 2022**

Agency	Total alleged victims	Alleged victims with rereport (N)	Alleged victims with rereport (%)
Aitkin	119	27	22.7%
Anoka	1,182	169	14.3%
Becker	269	49	18.2%
Beltrami	428	31	7.2%
Benton	273	40	14.7%
Big Stone	49	11	22.4%
Blue Earth	417	69	16.5%
Brown	216	59	27.3%
Carlton	369	104	28.2%
Carver	351	44	12.5%
Cass	118	19	16.1%

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Total alleged victims</b>	<b>Alleged victims with rereport (N)</b>	<b>Alleged victims with rereport (%)</b>
Chippewa	189	56	29.6%
Chisago	213	38	17.8%
Clay	400	56	14.0%
Clearwater	109	24	22.0%
Cook	60	7	11.7%
Crow Wing	304	32	10.5%
Dakota	1,508	210	13.9%
Des Moines Valley HHS	143	25	17.5%
Douglas	281	74	26.3%
Faribault-Martin	332	73	22.0%
Fillmore	66	10	15.2%
Freeborn	208	28	13.5%
Goodhue	261	75	28.7%
Hennepin	5,942	1,026	17.3%
Houston	71	21	29.6%
Hubbard	205	44	21.5%
Isanti	174	18	10.3%
Itasca	379	76	20.1%
Kanabec	100	20	20.0%
Kandiyohi	440	90	20.5%
Kittson	9	0	0.0%
Koochiching	162	50	30.9%
Lac qui Parle	44	14	31.8%
Lake	55	11	20.0%
Lake of the Woods	31	8	25.8%
Le Sueur	133	10	7.5%
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	171	39	22.8%
Mahnomen	21	1	4.8%
Marshall	61	19	31.1%
McLeod	306	56	18.3%
Meeker	143	41	28.7%
Mille Lacs	267	49	18.4%
MN Prairie	616	149	24.2%
Morrison	209	11	5.3%
Mower	339	53	15.6%
Nicollet	242	49	20.2%

Agency	Total alleged victims	Alleged victims with rereport (N)	Alleged victims with rereport (%)
Nobles	179	30	16.8%
Norman	57	13	22.8%
Olmsted	744	78	10.5%
Otter Tail	385	93	24.2%
Pennington	84	8	9.5%
Pine	133	21	15.8%
Polk	149	35	23.5%
Ramsey	3,242	556	17.1%
Red Lake County	27	3	11.1%
Renville	154	26	16.9%
Rice	354	94	26.6%
Roseau	88	15	17.0%
Scott	729	113	15.5%
Sherburne	528	90	17.0%
Sibley	163	25	15.3%
Southwest HHS	578	96	16.6%
St. Louis	2,566	861	33.6%
Stearns	831	165	19.9%
Stevens	122	24	19.7%
Swift	103	8	7.8%
Todd	106	15	14.2%
Traverse	69	17	24.6%
Wabasha	98	16	16.3%
Wadena	186	52	28.0%
Washington	772	98	12.7%
Watsonwan	141	34	24.1%
Western Prairie Human Services	197	56	28.4%
White Earth Nation	233	56	24.0%
Wilkin	66	9	13.6%
Winona	290	63	21.7%
Wright	838	150	17.9%
Yellow Medicine	101	32	31.7%
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>32,298</b>	<b>6,137</b>	<b>19.0%</b>

**Table 26. Number and percent of determined victims with a maltreatment determination recurrence within 12 months by agency, 2022**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Total determined victims</b>	<b>Determined victims with recurrence (N)</b>	<b>Determined victims with recurrence (%)</b>
Aitkin	16	2	12.5%
Anoka	239	16	6.7%
Becker	90	1	1.1%
Beltrami	119	0	0.0%
Benton	63	2	3.2%
Big Stone	5	0	0.0%
Blue Earth	34	1	2.9%
Brown	27	0	0.0%
Carlton	24	0	0.0%
Carver	62	6	9.7%
Cass	9	0	0.0%
Chippewa	55	7	12.7%
Chisago	35	2	5.7%
Clay	45	0	0.0%
Clearwater	25	2	8.0%
Cook	9	0	0.0%
Crow Wing	37	0	0.0%
Dakota	232	6	2.6%
Des Moines Valley HHS	30	0	0.0%
Douglas	82	9	11.0%
Faribault-Martin	33	1	3.0%
Fillmore	6	0	0.0%
Freeborn	62	8	12.9%
Goodhue	41	4	9.8%
Hennepin	1,040	50	4.8%
Houston	8	1	12.5%
Hubbard	37	1	2.7%
Isanti	25	1	4.0%
Itasca	34	0	0.0%
Kanabec	20	2	10.0%
Kandiyohi	185	17	9.2%
Kittson	4	0	0.0%
Koochiching	5	0	0.0%

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Total determined victims</b>	<b>Determined victims with recurrence (N)</b>	<b>Determined victims with recurrence (%)</b>
Lac qui Parle	5	0	0.0%
Lake	4	0	0.0%
Lake of the Woods	0	0	N/A
Le Sueur	15	0	0.0%
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	2	0	0.0%
Mahnomen	1	0	0.0%
Marshall	8	0	0.0%
McLeod	64	6	9.4%
Meeker	6	0	0.0%
Mille Lacs	57	10	17.5%
MN Prairie	44	5	11.4%
Morrison	24	1	4.2%
Mower	63	0	0.0%
Nicollet	26	1	3.8%
Nobles	31	1	3.2%
Norman	8	0	0.0%
Olmsted	91	0	0.0%
Otter Tail	53	1	1.9%
Pennington	2	0	0.0%
Pine	27	2	7.4%
Polk	47	1	2.1%
Ramsey	519	10	1.9%
Red Lake County	1	0	0.0%
Renville	28	4	14.3%
Rice	71	11	15.5%
Roseau	8	0	0.0%
Scott	61	1	1.6%
Sherburne	90	1	1.1%
Sibley	11	0	0.0%
Southwest HHS	184	13	7.1%
St. Louis	495	82	16.6%
Stearns	214	11	5.1%
Stevens	22	1	4.5%
Swift	22	1	4.5%
Todd	15	0	0.0%

Agency	Total determined victims	Determined victims with recurrence (N)	Determined victims with recurrence (%)
Traverse	14	0	0.0%
Wabasha	12	0	0.0%
Wadena	30	2	6.7%
Washington	112	5	4.5%
Watonwan	15	0	0.0%
Western Prairie Human Services	40	4	10.0%
White Earth Nation	3	0	0.0%
Wilkin	14	0	0.0%
Winona	41	3	7.3%
Wright	154	5	3.2%
Yellow Medicine	12	0	0.0%
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>5,504</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>5.8%</b>

**Table 27. Number and percent of determined victims with a maltreatment determination recurrence within 12 months by race/ethnicity, (alone, no other race value), 2022**

Race/ethnicity	Determined victims	Determined victims with maltreatment recurrence within 12 months	Percent with maltreatment recurrence
African American/Black	793	34	4.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	480	35	7.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	181	5	2.8
Two or more races	1,258	104	8.3
White	208	8	3.8
Unknown/declined	2,584	135	5.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,504</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>5.8</b>
Hispanic/Latinx (any race)	810	51	6.3

Note on race and ethnicity categories: This breakdown relies on exclusive racial categories, except Hispanic/Latinx (any race). A client is only counted in a single row or column, based on their identification with a single race value. If a client identified with more than one race value, they will be counted in the multi-racial “two or more races” category. ‘Hispanic/Latinx (any race)’ shows clients who identified with that ethnicity regardless of exclusive race category.



For accessible formats of this information or assistance with additional equal access to human services, email us at [dhs.child.safety-permanency@state.mn.us](mailto:dhs.child.safety-permanency@state.mn.us), call 651-431-4660, or use your preferred relay service. ADA1 (3-24)

**NO ENGLISH**



**651-431-4660**

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

ማሳሰቢያ:- ስለ ዶክሜንቱ ነፃ ገለፃ ከፈለጉ፣ ሠራተኛዎን ያነጋግሩ። Amharic

انتباه. إذا احتجت الى مساعدة مجانية في ترجمة هذه الوثيقة، اتصل بالرقم الموجود في المربع أعلاه. Arabic

মেনাযোগ দিন। যিদ আপিন বিনামূলেয এই নিখটির বযাযার জেনয সহায় চান তাহেল উপেরাকত বাকেস থাকা নমবরটিতে কল করুন। Bengali

သတိပြုရန်။ ဤစာတမ်းကို ဘာသာပြန်ဆိုင်ရန်အတွက် အခမဲ့အကူအညီ လိုအပ်ပါက၊ အထက်ဖော်ပြပါ အကွက်ရှိ နံပါတ်ကို ခေါ်ဆိုပါ။ Burmese

ការយកចិត្តទុកដាក់។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកត្រូវការជំនួយឥតគិតថ្លៃ ឬ ការបកស្រាយឯកសារនេះ សូមហៅទូរសព្ទទៅលេខក្នុង ឯប្រអប់ខាងលើ។ Cambodian

注意！如果您需要免費的口譯支持，請撥打上方方框中的電話號碼。 Cantonese (Traditional Chinese)

wán. héčínhanj niyé wačhínjyAnj wayúiyeska ki de wówapi sutá, ečíyA kinj wóiyawa ed ophiýe wanj. Dakota

Paunawa. Kung kailangan mo ng libreng tulong sa pag-unawa sa kahulugan ng dokumentong ito, tawagan ang numero sa kahon sa itaas. Filipino (Tagalog)

Attention. Si vous avez besoin d'aide gratuite pour interpréter ce document, appelez le numéro indiqué dans la case ci-dessus. French

સાવધાન. જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજને સમજવા માટે નિ:શુલ્ક મદદની જરૂર હોય, તો ઉપરના બોક્સ પૈકીના નંબર પર કોલ કરો. Gujarati

ध्यान दें। यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ की व्याख्या में निशुल्क सहायता की आवश्यकता है, तो ऊपर बॉक्स में दिए गए नंबर पर कॉल करें। Hindi

**NO ENGLISH**



**651-431-4660**

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

ማሳሰቢያ:- ስለ ዶክሜንቱ ነፃ ገለፃ ከፈለጉ፣ ሠራተኛዎን ያነጋግሩ። Amharic

انتباه. إذا احتجت الى مساعدة مجانية في ترجمة هذه الوثيقة، اتصل بالرقم الموجود في المربع أعلاه. Arabic

মেনাযোগ দিন। যিদ আপিন বিনামূলেয এই নিখটিৰ বযাযাৰ জেনয সহায় চান তাহেল উপেরাকত বাকেস থাকা নমবরটিতে কল করুন। Bengali

သတိပြုရန်။ ဤစာတမ်းကို ဘာသာပြန်ဆိုင်ရန်အတွက် အခမဲ့အကူအညီ လိုအပ်ပါက၊ အထက်ဖော်ပြပါ အကွက်ရှိ နံပါတ်ကို ခေါ်ဆိုပါ။ Burmese

ការយកចិត្តទុកដាក់។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកត្រូវការជំនួយភតតិកែច្នៃក្នុង ដកការ បកស្រាយឯកសារនេះ សូមហៅទូរសព្ទទៅលេខក្នុង ដប្រអប់ខាងលើ។ Cambodian

注意！如果您需要免費的口譯支持，請撥打上方方框中的電話號碼。 Cantonese (Traditional Chinese)

wán. héčínhan niyé wačínjyAn wayúiyeska ki de wówapi sutá, ečiyA kin wóiyawa ed ophiye wan. Dakota

Paunawa. Kung kailangan mo ng libreng tulong sa pag-unawa sa kahulugan ng dokumentong ito, tawagan ang numero sa kahon sa itaas. Filipino (Tagalog)

Attention. Si vous avez besoin d'aide gratuite pour interpréter ce document, appelez le numéro indiqué dans la case ci-dessus. French

સાવધાન. જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજને સમજવા માટે નિ:શુલ્ક મદદની જરૂર હોય, તો ઉપરના બોક્સ પૈકીના નંબર પર કોલ કરો. Gujarati

ध्यान दें। यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ की व्याख्या में निशुल्क सहायता की आवश्यकता है, तो ऊपर बॉक्स में दिए गए नंबर पर कॉल करें। Hindi

**NO ENGLISH**



**651-431-4660**

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

ማሳሰቢያ፡- ስለ ደክሜንቱ ነፃ ገለፃ ከፈለጉ፣ ሠራተኛዎን ያነጋግሩ። Amharic

انتباه. إذا احتجت الى مساعدة مجانية في ترجمة هذه الوثيقة، اتصل بالرقم الموجود في المربع أعلاه. Arabic

মেনাযোগ দিন। যিদ আপিন বিনামূলেয এই নিখটিৰ বযাযাৰ জেনয সহায় চান তাহেল উপেরাকত বাকেস থাকা নমবরটিতে কল করুন। Bengali

သတိပြုရန်။ ဤစာတမ်းကို ဘာသာပြန်ဆိုရန်အတွက် အခမဲ့အကူအညီ လိုအပ်ပါက၊ အထက်ဖော်ပြပါ အကွက်ရှိ နံပါတ်ကို ခေါ်ဆိုပါ။ Burmese

ការយកចិត្តទុកដាក់។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកត្រូវការជំនួយឥតគិតថ្លៃ ដើម្បី បកស្រាយឯកសារនេះ សូមហៅទូរសព្ទទៅលេខក្នុង ប្រអប់ខាងលើ។ Cambodian

注意！如果您需要免費的口譯支持，請撥打上方方框中的電話號碼。 Cantonese (Traditional Chinese)

wąj. héčínhanj niyé wačhínjyAŋ wayúiyeska ki de wówapi sutá, ečiyA kin wóiyawa ed ophiye wanj. Dakota

Paunawa. Kung kailangan mo ng libreng tulong sa pag-unawa sa kahulugan ng dokumentong ito, tawagan ang numero sa kahon sa itaas. Filipino (Tagalog)

Attention. Si vous avez besoin d'aide gratuite pour interpréter ce document, appelez le numéro indiqué dans la case ci-dessus. French

સાવધાન. જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજને સમજવા માટે નિ:શુલ્ક મદદની જરૂર હોય, તો ઉપરના બોક્સ પૈકીના નંબર પર કોલ કરો. Gujarati

ध्यान दें। यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ की व्याख्या में निशुल्क सहायता की आवश्यकता है, तो ऊपर बॉक्स में दिए गए नंबर पर कॉल करें। Hindi