



Bulletin

NUMBER

#15-68-09

DATE

July 8, 2015

OF INTEREST TO

County Directors

Tribal Directors

Social Services Supervisors

Fiscal Supervisors

Financial Assistance
Supervisors and Staff

ACTION/DUE DATE

Please read and submit
amended plan.

EXPIRATION DATE

July 8, 2017

Child Protection Allocation

TOPIC

Funds allocated by the Minnesota Legislature for child protection staffing and services.

PURPOSE

Notify county agencies of requirements and responsibilities regarding submission of amended plan to Vulnerable Children and Adults Act and use of child protection funds.

CONTACT

Ralph McQuarter, director, Management Operations,
Children and Family Services Administration, 651-431-3858,
or ralph.mcquarter@state.mn.us

SIGNED

JAMES G. KOPPEL
Assistant Commissioner
Children and Family Services Administration

TERMINOLOGY NOTICE

The terminology used to describe people we serve has changed over time. The Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) supports the use of "People First" language.

I. Child Protection Funding Background

During the 2015 legislative session, \$23,350,000 was appropriated annually to the Minnesota Department of Human Services (department) for allocation to county agencies for child protection staffing and services under Minnesota Statutes, section 256M.41. The intent of the legislation is to improve the current child protection worker caseloads so that more timely case work will occur to support children in need of protection.

A. Formula

Allocations to county agencies are shown in Attachment A and are determined as follows:

1. Child population

Fifty percent must be distributed to county agencies based on the child population residing in the county.

2. Screened in reports

Twenty-five percent must be distributed based on the number of screened in reports of child maltreatment in the county.

3. Open child protection case management

Twenty-five percent must be distributed based on the number of open child protection case management cases in the county.

B. Guaranteed Floor

No county will be awarded an allocation less than \$75,000 each year.

II. Payments based on Performance

County agencies will receive 80 percent of their full allocation between July 1 and July 10 each year. However, 20 percent of the full allocation will be retained until it is determined in January of the next calendar year that the agency met two requirements in the previous calendar year. If the requirements are met, then the remaining portion will be distributed in February. If requirements are not met, those remaining funds will be re-distributed to county agencies meeting the requirements.

A. Timely Face-to-face Contact with Alleged Child Victims

Ten percent of a county agency's full allocation will be withheld until the department determines if an agency has met the performance outcome threshold of 90 percent based

on face-to-face contact with alleged child victims. To receive the performance allocation, county child protection workers must have timely face-to-face contact with at least 90 percent of all alleged child victims of screened in maltreatment reports. The face-to-face contact with the child and primary caregiver shall occur immediately if sexual abuse or substantial child endangerment is alleged and within five calendar days for all other reports.

B. Monthly Caseworker Visits

Ten percent of a county agency's full allocation will be withheld until the department determines if an agency has met the performance outcome threshold of 90 percent based on face-to-face visits by the case manager. To receive the performance allocation, the total number of visits made by caseworkers on a monthly basis to children in foster care and children receiving child protection services while residing in their home must be at least 90 percent of the total number of such visits that would occur if every child were visited once per month. Note: For 2015 only, the Minnesota Legislature requires that the department apply the standard only to monthly foster care visits, and not to visits to children residing in their home.

III. Non-supplantation

County agencies are prohibited from supplanting existing county funds with the funds appropriated under Minnesota Statutes, section 256M.41. Funds received under this section must be used to address additional staffing for child protection or expand child protection services.

A. Eligible BRASS Codes

The BRASS (Budgeting, Reporting and Accounting for Social Services) codes in the Children's 1000 series have been approved as eligible services for use under 256M.41. The Social Service Information System (SSIS) uses BRASS codes as the basis for tracking county social service activity.

The department will be reviewing each county agency's Social Services Expenditure and Grant Reconciliation (SEAGR) report for eligible Children's 1000 series codes by "Staff Costs" and "Purchased Services Costs" provided in SSIS for the calendar year to determine if the non-supplantation requirements have been met.

Complete descriptions of BRASS services can be found in bulletin #14-32-13, titled ["Changes to DHS BRASS Manual for Calendar Year 2015"](#).

B. Amended Vulnerable Children and Adults Services Plan

The 2011 Minnesota Legislature created the Vulnerable Children and Adults Act (VCA). Minnesota Statutes, section 256M.30 requires county agencies to update plans as needed to reflect current county policy and procedures regarding requirements and use of

funds under Minnesota Statutes, chapter 256M. As child protection funding has been incorporated into the Act, agencies are required to submit a revised VCA plan to describe plans for use of the funds, and to certify that these funds will not be used to supplant existing county funds. This information will be provided to the legislature. Plans must be submitted to the Minnesota Department of Human Services by August 31, 2015.

The format for the VCA plan amendment is found in Attachment D. Multi-county consortiums can submit one amendment in lieu of individual county amendments.

Submit plans with signatures electronically to: ralph.mcquarter@state.mn.us.

The department may require revisions to submitted plans if it is determined to be in non-compliance with legislative intent.

IV. Frequently Asked Questions

The following questions have been asked since the Minnesota Legislature enacted Minnesota Statutes, section 256M.41 and appropriated funds.

A. Staffing

1. Can funds be used for staff hired prior to the effective date of the law? **Answer:** No. Only additional positions that increased the county's child protection staff levels hired after June 30, 2015, can be considered new hires.
2. What classifications are eligible? **Answer:** Social worker, social worker-child protection specialist, social work team leader; paraprofessional classifications such as case aide or family based services provider; and supervisory job classifications such as social services supervisor or human services supervisor.
3. What costs can be covered under staffing? Can funds be used for staff equipment and set-up of new hires? **Answer:** Eligible staffing costs include staff salaries, overhead, and support costs, such as supplies and equipment.

B. Services

1. During the legislative session, there was discussion about use of the funds for child care, Head Start, and other services for children in need of protection to address waiting lists. Can the funds be used for those purposes? **Answer:** Final legislative action did not include these provisions.

C. Data

1. How will performance be determined and what data will be used? **Answer:** For the remaining 20 percent withheld, in January of 2016 staff will run a data query on county performance for the two performance measures that represents calendar

year 2015 performance. As indicated earlier, for 2015 only, the Minnesota Legislature requires that the department apply the monthly caseworker visits standard only to monthly foster care visits, and not to visits to children residing in their home. Note: The data tables provided in this bulletin are for reference only. The older data will not be used for determination of a withhold.

D. Allocations

1. How will re-distribution occur in February of each year? **Answer:** Withheld funds not released to original county agencies will be re-distributed on a pro-rated basis to county agencies meeting the requirements.

2. Will the allocation formula change over time? **Answer:** Not until and unless the Minnesota Legislature changes the statute. However, the department is required to evaluate the formula and recommend an updated equitable distribution formula beginning in fiscal year 2018. This includes:

- Funding for child protection staffing and expanded services to county agencies and tribes
- Taking into consideration any relief to county agencies and tribes for child welfare and foster care costs
- Additional tribes delivering social services
- Any other relevant information that should be considered in developing a new distribution formula.

The report is due to the Minnesota Legislature by December 15, 2016.

E. Amended VCA Plans

1. How will county agencies know if their submitted amendment is approved? **Answer:** The county contact person submitting an amendment will be contacted with a verification when the plan is approved.

2. How does a county agency obtain a copy of its current VCA plan? **Answer:** Each county agency should be maintaining its current plan but, if necessary, request current plans by contacting: ralph.mcquarter@state.mn.us.

E. Miscellaneous

1. Can county boards choose to use these funds to cover costs of the sheriff's office, county attorney's office, or other areas? **Answer:** During the task force hearings and during the legislative session, there were discussions about the impact on the sheriff's office and county attorney's office, but final legislative action did not include appropriations for these activities.

2. Do the background study requirements passed this session apply to new positions added by county agencies as a result of these allocations? **Answer:** Yes. County employees hired on or after July 1, 2015, who have responsibility for child protection duties or current county employees who are assigned new child protection duties on or after July 1, 2015, are required to undergo a background study. A county may complete these background studies by either use of the Department of Human Services NetStudy 2.0 system, or an alternative process defined by the county.

County social service agencies and local welfare agencies must initiate background studies before an individual begins a position allowing direct contact with persons served by the agency. Contact Jennifer.Henthorne@state.mn.us of the Office of Inspector General for more information.

3. Will tribes receive allocations? **Answer:** As participants in the American Indian Child Welfare Initiative, White Earth and Leech Lake Bands of Ojibwe will each receive \$75,000 per a separate statute [Minnesota Statutes, section 256E.28].

In addition, a state allocation of \$1,500,000 to address child welfare disparities will be awarded through a request for proposal process; tribes are eligible applicants.

V. Authority for Child Protection Funding

Laws of Minnesota 2015, chapter 71, article 1, section 46.

VI. Attachments

Multiple attachments

- Attachment A: County Staffing/Services Allocation
- Attachment B: Performance Withholds: Timely Face-to-face Contact with Alleged Child Victim
- Attachment C: Performance Withholds: Monthly Face-to-face Visits by Caseworker
- Attachment D: Vulnerable Children and Adults Plan Amendment for Child Protection Funding

Bulletin #15-68-09

July 8, 2015

Page 7

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Advisory

This information is available in accessible formats for people with disabilities by calling (651) 431-4670 (voice) or by using your preferred relay service. For other information on disability rights and protections, contact the agency's ADA coordinator.

Attachment A: County Staffing/Services Allocation

County/County Consortium	Base Allocation (issued in July)	Performance Withhold (issued in February)	Total Allocation	Est. FTEs at Salary Avg (\$75,000)	County/County Consortium	Base Allocation (issued in July)	Performance Withhold (issued in February)	Total Allocation	Est. FTEs at Salary Avg (\$75,000)
Aitkin	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Meeker	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Anoka	\$955,200	\$238,800	\$1,194,000	15.9	Mille Lacs	\$120,800	\$30,200	\$151,000	2.0
Becker	\$172,800	\$43,200	\$216,000	2.9	Morrison	\$112,800	\$28,200	\$141,000	1.9
Beltrami	\$180,800	\$45,200	\$226,000	3.0	Mower	\$148,000	\$37,000	\$185,000	2.5
Benton	\$138,400	\$34,600	\$173,000	2.3	Nicollet	\$103,200	\$25,800	\$129,000	1.7
Big Stone	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Nobles	\$81,600	\$20,400	\$102,000	1.4
Blue Earth	\$162,400	\$40,600	\$203,000	2.7	Norman	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Brown	\$99,200	\$24,800	\$124,000	1.7	Olmsted	\$492,800	\$123,200	\$616,000	8.2
Carlton	\$125,600	\$31,400	\$157,000	2.1	Otter Tail	\$188,800	\$47,200	\$236,000	3.1
Carver	\$278,400	\$69,600	\$348,000	4.6	Pennington	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Cass	\$108,000	\$27,000	\$135,000	1.8	Pine	\$111,200	\$27,800	\$139,000	1.9
Chippewa	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Polk	\$122,400	\$30,600	\$153,000	2.0
Chisago	\$148,000	\$37,000	\$185,000	2.5	Pope	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Clay	\$205,600	\$51,400	\$257,000	3.4	Ramsey	\$1,608,000	\$402,000	\$2,010,000	26.8
Clearwater	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Red Lake	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Cook	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Renville	\$68,800	\$17,200	\$86,000	1.1
Crow Wing	\$196,800	\$49,200	\$246,000	3.3	Rice	\$184,000	\$46,000	\$230,000	3.1
Dakota	\$1,139,200	\$284,800	\$1,424,000	19.0	Roseau	\$60,800	\$15,200	\$76,000	1.0
Douglas	\$117,600	\$29,400	\$147,000	2.0	St. Louis	\$786,400	\$196,600	\$983,000	13.1
Fillmore	\$64,000	\$16,000	\$80,000	1.1	Scott	\$453,600	\$113,400	\$567,000	7.6
Freeborn	\$97,600	\$24,400	\$122,000	1.6	Sherburne	\$262,400	\$65,600	\$328,000	4.4
Goodhue	\$126,400	\$31,600	\$158,000	2.1	Sibley	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Grant	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Stearns	\$448,000	\$112,000	\$560,000	7.5
Hennepin	\$4,361,600	\$1,090,400	\$5,452,000	72.7	Stevens	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Houston	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Swift	\$65,600	\$16,400	\$82,000	1.1
Hubbard	\$116,000	\$29,000	\$145,000	1.9	Todd	\$86,400	\$21,600	\$108,000	1.4
Isanti	\$131,200	\$32,800	\$164,000	2.2	Traverse	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Itasca	\$156,000	\$39,000	\$195,000	2.6	Wabasha	\$63,200	\$15,800	\$79,000	1.1
Kanabec	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Wadena	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Kandiyohi	\$149,600	\$37,400	\$187,000	2.5	Washington	\$582,400	\$145,600	\$728,000	9.7
Kittson	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Watsonwan	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Koochiching	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Wilkin	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Lac qui Parle	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Winona	\$149,600	\$37,400	\$187,000	2.5
Lake	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Wright	\$383,200	\$95,800	\$479,000	6.4
Lake of the Woods	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Yellow Medicine	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0
Le Sueur	\$84,800	\$21,200	\$106,000	1.4	SWHHS: Lincoln, Lyon, Murray, Pipestone, Rock, Redwood	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	6.0
McLeod	\$161,600	\$40,400	\$202,000	2.7	DVHHS: Cottonwood & Jackson	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000	2.0
Mahnomen	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	Faribault-Martin	\$161,600	\$40,400	\$202,000	2.7
Marshall	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$75,000	1.0	MN Prairie: Dodge, Steele, Waseca	\$257,600	\$64,400	\$322,000	4.3
					Total	\$18,680,000	\$4,670,000	\$23,350,000	311.3

Attachment B: Performance Withholds: Timely Face-to-face Contact with Alleged Child Victim

Final CY 2014				CY 2013			CY 2012			Three Year Average (2012-2014)		
	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results
County/County Consortium	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame
Aitkin	57	102	55.9%	59	111	53.2%	47	87	54.0%	163	300	54.3%
Anoka	805	965	83.4%	737	925	79.7%	862	1,055	81.7%	2,404	2,945	81.6%
Becker	279	328	85.1%	266	361	73.7%	159	223	71.3%	704	912	77.2%
Beltrami	195	278	70.1%	194	287	67.6%	129	209	61.7%	518	774	66.9%
Benton	142	163	87.1%	111	137	81.0%	135	153	88.2%	388	453	85.7%
Big Stone	30	42	71.4%	14	15	93.3%	16	31	51.6%	60	88	68.2%
Blue Earth	171	190	90.0%	154	204	75.5%	195	292	66.8%	520	686	75.8%
Brown	179	206	86.9%	183	200	91.5%	150	167	89.8%	512	573	89.4%
Carlton	209	248	84.3%	177	196	90.3%	201	227	88.5%	587	671	87.5%
Carver	275	302	91.1%	265	317	83.6%	300	339	88.5%	840	958	87.7%
Cass	104	143	72.7%	122	155	78.7%	105	143	73.4%	331	441	75.1%
Chippewa	45	45	100.0%	46	46	100.0%	34	34	100.0%	125	125	100.0%
Chisago	127	154	82.5%	125	154	81.2%	102	133	76.7%	354	441	80.3%
Clay	274	323	84.8%	268	371	72.2%	190	307	61.9%	732	1,001	73.1%
Clearwater	123	133	92.5%	139	182	76.4%	167	207	80.7%	429	522	82.2%
Cook	16	22	72.7%	29	37	78.4%	13	22	59.1%	58	81	71.6%
Crow Wing	279	333	83.8%	216	237	91.1%	198	250	79.2%	693	820	84.5%
Dakota	1,393	1,677	83.1%	1,295	1,518	85.3%	1,385	1,652	83.8%	4,073	4,847	84.0%
Douglas	197	237	83.1%	195	264	73.9%	197	247	79.8%	589	748	78.7%
Fillmore	70	80	87.5%	62	69	89.9%	55	61	90.2%	187	210	89.0%
Freeborn	127	142	89.4%	140	164	85.4%	95	108	88.0%	362	414	87.4%
Goodhue	138	156	88.5%	117	145	80.7%	38	75	50.7%	293	376	77.9%
Grant	49	59	83.1%	63	67	94.0%	52	58	89.7%	164	184	89.1%
Hennepin	3,974	6,701	59.3%	3,751	6,757	55.5%	3,899	6,029	64.7%	11,624	19,487	59.7%
Houston	31	49	63.3%	26	46	56.5%	22	42	52.4%	79	137	57.7%
Hubbard	191	220	86.8%	124	145	85.5%	92	129	71.3%	407	494	82.4%
Isanti	122	160	76.3%	183	233	78.5%	156	185	84.3%	461	578	79.8%
Itasca	194	255	76.1%	211	295	71.5%	151	209	72.2%	556	759	73.3%
Kanabec	54	65	83.1%	45	58	77.6%	97	113	85.8%	196	236	83.1%
Kandiyohi	251	294	85.4%	284	342	83.0%	249	306	81.4%	784	942	83.2%
Kittson	15	16	93.8%	3	5	60.0%	11	16	68.8%	29	37	78.4%
Koochiching	55	70	78.6%	52	61	85.2%	51	68	75.0%	158	199	79.4%
Lac qui Parle	35	40	87.5%	46	56	82.1%	26	26	100.0%	107	122	87.7%
Lake	45	53	84.9%	52	64	81.3%	44	71	62.0%	141	188	75.0%
Lake of the Woods	15	16	93.8%	21	21	100.0%	13	14	92.9%	49	51	96.1%
Le Sueur	98	110	89.1%	67	67	100.0%	90	92	97.8%	255	269	94.8%
McLeod	279	304	91.8%	233	255	91.4%	184	211	87.2%	696	770	90.4%
Mahnomen	18	21	85.7%	7	12	58.3%	4	8	50.0%	29	41	70.7%

Final CY 2014				CY 2013			CY 2012			Three Year Average (2012-2014)		
	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results
County/County Consortium	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame	Within time frame	Total child subjects	Percent having contact within time frame
Marshall	56	58	96.6%	50	52	96.2%	52	56	92.9%	158	166	95.2%
Meeker	54	61	88.5%	27	33	81.8%	20	32	62.5%	101	126	80.2%
Mille Lacs	248	280	88.6%	293	329	89.1%	206	229	90.0%	747	838	89.1%
Morrison	164	170	96.5%	125	137	91.2%	126	129	97.7%	415	436	95.2%
Mower	257	317	81.1%	163	238	68.5%	141	179	78.8%	561	734	76.4%
Nicollet	86	89	96.6%	78	78	100.0%	126	140	90.0%	290	307	94.5%
Nobles	144	180	80.0%	93	115	80.9%	67	77	87.0%	304	372	81.7%
Norman	65	67	97.0%	45	58	77.6%	54	59	91.5%	164	184	89.1%
Olmsted	686	775	88.5%	642	709	90.6%	537	613	87.6%	1,865	2,097	88.9%
Otter Tail	255	328	77.7%	223	298	74.8%	241	317	76.0%	719	943	76.2%
Pennington	15	28	53.6%	20	38	52.6%	12	26	46.2%	47	92	51.1%
Pine	167	235	71.1%	114	241	47.3%	125	218	57.3%	406	694	58.5%
Polk	282	299	94.3%	337	352	95.7%	255	286	89.2%	874	937	93.3%
Pope	53	66	80.3%	94	107	87.9%	59	74	79.7%	206	247	83.4%
Ramsey	2,050	2,200	93.2%	1,723	1,865	92.4%	1,659	1,841	90.1%	5,432	5,906	92.0%
Red Lake	7	7	100.0%	2	2	100.0%	4	4	100.0%	13	13	100.0%
Renville	79	114	69.3%	51	92	55.4%	54	71	76.1%	184	277	66.4%
Rice	255	298	85.6%	211	249	84.7%	240	266	90.2%	706	813	86.8%
Roseau	63	67	94.0%	54	63	85.7%	41	50	82.0%	158	180	87.8%
St. Louis	1,270	1,723	73.7%	1,187	1,790	66.3%	1,166	1,663	70.1%	3,623	5,176	70.0%
Scott	493	589	83.7%	539	654	82.4%	452	515	87.8%	1,484	1,758	84.4%
Sherburne	247	278	88.8%	273	302	90.4%	213	239	89.1%	733	819	89.5%
Sibley	79	87	90.8%	76	93	81.7%	65	73	89.0%	220	253	87.0%
Stearns	378	625	60.5%	383	652	58.7%	299	515	58.1%	1,060	1,792	59.2%
Stevens	49	53	92.5%	24	32	75.0%	41	61	67.2%	114	146	78.1%
Swift	137	159	86.2%	59	69	85.5%	85	94	90.4%	281	322	87.3%
Todd	85	119	71.4%	79	129	61.2%	91	118	77.1%	255	366	69.7%
Traverse	64	67	95.5%	39	47	83.0%	35	44	79.5%	138	158	87.3%
Wabasha	91	106	85.8%	56	76	73.7%	54	77	70.1%	201	259	77.6%
Wadena	91	115	79.1%	148	195	75.9%	144	185	77.8%	383	495	77.4%
Washington	514	554	92.8%	533	574	92.9%	511	605	84.5%	1,558	1,733	89.9%
Watonwan	27	32	84.4%	37	49	75.5%	42	60	70.0%	106	141	75.2%
Wilkin	26	32	81.3%	11	15	73.3%	11	19	57.9%	48	66	72.7%
Winona	331	347	95.4%	364	392	92.9%	302	337	89.6%	997	1,076	92.7%
Wright	416	498	83.5%	316	424	74.5%	365	464	78.7%	1,097	1,386	79.1%
Yellow Medicine	66	68	97.1%	87	96	90.6%	58	68	85.3%	211	232	90.9%
SWHHS: Lincoln, Lyon, Murray, Pipestone, Rock, Redwood	305	387	78.8%	288	380	75.8%	277	331	83.7%	870	1,098	79.2%
DVHHS: Cottonwood & Jackson	89	96	92.7%	61	82	74.4%	90	100	90.0%	240	278	86.3%
Faribault-Martin	278	348	79.9%	210	272	77.2%	189	284	66.5%	677	904	74.9%
MN Prairie: Dodge, Steele, Waseca	331	376	88.0%	299	373	80.2%	233	299	77.9%	857	1,048	81.8%
Minnesota (Counties)	21,014	27,000	77.8%	19,496	26,331	74.0%	18,656	24,417	76.4%	59,160	77,748	76.1%

Attachment C: Performance Withholds: Monthly Face-to-Face Visits by Caseworker

County/County Consortium	Final CY 2014			CY 2013			CY 2012			Three Year Average (2012-2014)		
	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results
	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit
Aitkin	175	204	85.8%	182	204	89.2%	140	145	96.6%	497	553	89.9%
Anoka	1,966	2,223	88.4%	1,731	1,968	88.0%	1,531	1,754	87.3%	5,228	5,945	87.9%
Becker	989	1,050	94.2%	1,008	1,041	96.8%	807	814	99.1%	2,804	2,905	96.5%
Beltrami	1,178	5,755	20.5%	1,203	4,456	27.0%	1,202	1,540	78.1%	3,583	11,751	30.5%
Benton	596	639	93.3%	435	440	98.9%	361	367	98.4%	1,392	1,446	96.3%
Big Stone	96	102	94.1%	68	76	89.5%	128	132	97.0%	292	310	94.2%
Blue Earth	611	670	91.2%	607	653	93.0%	649	698	93.0%	1,867	2,021	92.4%
Brown	242	260	93.1%	209	216	96.8%	130	132	98.5%	581	608	95.6%
Carlton	541	583	92.8%	606	670	90.4%	532	583	91.3%	1,679	1,836	91.4%
Carver	411	522	78.7%	422	493	85.6%	331	385	86.0%	1,164	1,400	83.1%
Cass	415	643	64.5%	345	418	82.5%	228	263	86.7%	988	1,324	74.6%
Chippewa	19	19	100.0%	30	30	100.0%	32	32	100.0%	81	81	100.0%
Chisago	401	453	88.5%	300	331	90.6%	138	149	92.6%	839	933	89.9%
Clay	878	972	90.3%	774	863	89.7%	722	769	93.9%	2,374	2,604	91.2%
Clearwater	172	251	68.5%	228	259	88.0%	85	97	87.6%	485	607	79.9%
Cook	70	82	85.4%	70	81	86.4%	73	79	92.4%	213	242	88.0%
Crow Wing	770	1,057	72.8%	617	909	67.9%	769	1,021	75.3%	2,156	2,987	72.2%
Dakota	972	1,088	89.3%	1,143	1,214	94.2%	1,025	1,054	97.2%	3,140	3,356	93.6%
Douglas	220	246	89.4%	274	299	91.6%	306	332	92.2%	800	877	91.2%
Fillmore	175	203	86.2%	139	153	90.8%	129	135	95.6%	443	491	90.2%
Freeborn	335	350	95.7%	307	324	94.8%	250	278	89.9%	892	952	93.7%
Goodhue	448	499	89.8%	330	370	89.2%	189	243	77.8%	967	1,112	87.0%
Grant	81	95	85.3%	122	130	93.8%	73	73	100.0%	276	298	92.6%
Hennepin	9,452	12,187	77.6%	8,872	10,920	81.2%	7,568	8,953	84.5%	25,892	32,060	80.8%
Houston	116	121	95.9%	112	139	80.6%	96	114	84.2%	324	374	86.6%
Hubbard	451	490	92.0%	292	372	78.5%	198	245	80.8%	941	1,107	85.0%
Isanti	517	534	96.8%	450	461	97.6%	260	265	98.1%	1,227	1,260	97.4%
Itasca	682	895	76.2%	510	621	82.1%	494	570	86.7%	1,686	2,086	80.8%
Kanabec	153	172	89.0%	148	164	90.2%	108	113	95.6%	409	449	91.1%
Kandiyohi	581	622	93.4%	476	549	86.7%	490	547	89.6%	1,547	1,718	90.0%
Kittson	66	92	71.7%	125	148	84.5%	80	92	87.0%	271	332	81.6%
Koochiching	116	203	57.1%	180	264	68.2%	111	158	70.3%	407	625	65.1%
Lac qui Parle	192	201	95.5%	134	138	97.1%	63	64	98.4%	389	403	96.5%
Lake	139	160	86.9%	89	99	89.9%	119	136	87.5%	347	395	87.8%
Lake of the Woods	13	13	100.0%	3	4	75.0%			#DIV/0!	16	17	94.1%
Le Sueur	228	228	100.0%	121	123	98.4%	60	62	96.8%	409	413	99.0%
McLeod	420	460	91.3%	337	362	93.1%	309	331	93.4%	1,066	1,153	92.5%
Mahnomen	91	119	76.5%	31	71	43.7%	38	52	73.1%	160	242	66.1%

County/County Consortium	Final CY 2014			CY 2013			CY 2012			Three Year Average (2012-2014)		
	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results	Numerator	Denominator	Results
	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit	Total months that had a visit	Total months requiring visits in care	Percent of months with a social worker visit
Marshall	87	97	89.7%	64	73	87.7%	66	69	95.7%	217	239	90.8%
Meeker	209	227	92.1%	319	330	96.7%	269	285	94.4%	797	842	94.7%
Mille Lacs	848	1,101	77.0%	279	326	85.6%	186	190	97.9%	1,313	1,617	81.2%
Morrison	439	447	98.2%	422	427	98.8%	306	307	99.7%	1,167	1,181	98.8%
Mower	475	513	92.6%	490	526	93.2%	423	497	85.1%	1,388	1,536	90.4%
Nicollet	281	285	98.6%	232	235	98.7%	237	240	98.8%	750	760	98.7%
Nobles	318	369	86.2%	269	283	95.1%	173	231	74.9%	760	883	86.1%
Norman	70	71	98.6%	84	90	93.3%	67	77	87.0%	221	238	92.9%
Olmsted	1,085	1,125	96.4%	1,004	1,061	94.6%	973	1,007	96.6%	3,062	3,193	95.9%
Otter Tail	376	412	91.3%	271	294	92.2%	264	303	87.1%	911	1,009	90.3%
Pennington	132	401	32.9%	181	359	50.4%	202	317	63.7%	515	1,077	47.8%
Pine	377	625	60.3%	448	666	67.3%	246	296	83.1%	1,071	1,587	67.5%
Polk	483	492	98.2%	579	584	99.1%	449	456	98.5%	1,511	1,532	98.6%
Pope	122	141	86.5%	152	161	94.4%	144	148	97.3%	418	450	92.9%
Ramsey	5,344	6,749	79.2%	5,837	7,190	81.2%	5,003	5,965	83.9%	16,184	19,904	81.3%
Red Lake	10	11	90.9%	5	5	100.0%	10	10	100.0%	25	26	96.2%
Renville	185	227	81.5%	162	184	88.0%	89	97	91.8%	436	508	85.8%
Rice	529	614	86.2%	448	484	92.6%	428	472	90.7%	1,405	1,570	89.5%
Roseau	46	49	93.9%	51	61	83.6%	49	50	98.0%	146	160	91.3%
St. Louis	3,747	5,720	65.5%	3,663	5,283	69.3%	3,251	4,379	74.2%	10,661	15,382	69.3%
Scott	273	280	97.5%	340	361	94.2%	377	386	97.7%	990	1,027	96.4%
Sherburne	480	498	96.4%	378	396	95.5%	297	301	98.7%	1,155	1,195	96.7%
Sibley	161	180	89.4%	75	93	80.6%	57	64	89.1%	293	337	86.9%
Stearns	1,904	2,077	91.7%	1,548	1,689	91.7%	1,314	1,404	93.6%	4,766	5,170	92.2%
Stevens	56	62	90.3%	87	91	95.6%	47	49	95.9%	190	202	94.1%
Swift	267	278	96.0%	152	163	93.3%	173	187	92.5%	592	628	94.3%
Todd	512	524	97.7%	384	407	94.3%	291	302	96.4%	1,187	1,233	96.3%
Traverse	68	69	98.6%	39	43	90.7%	43	46	93.5%	150	158	94.9%
Wabasha	238	298	79.9%	234	280	83.6%	143	188	76.1%	615	766	80.3%
Wadena	108	117	92.3%	113	118	95.8%	217	223	97.3%	438	458	95.6%
Washington	772	862	89.6%	718	776	92.5%	641	670	95.7%	2,131	2,308	92.3%
Watsonwan	92	94	97.9%	127	128	99.2%	145	146	99.3%	364	368	98.9%
Wilkin	44	45	97.8%	41	44	93.2%	54	59	91.5%	139	148	93.9%
Winona	246	278	88.5%	148	195	75.9%	192	225	85.3%	586	698	84.0%
Wright	932	1,026	90.8%	841	977	86.1%	658	768	85.7%	2,431	2,771	87.7%
Yellow Medicine	125	125	100.0%	145	146	99.3%	125	125	100.0%	395	396	99.7%
SWHHS: Lincoln, Lyon, Murray, Pipestone, Rock, Redwood	970	1,056	91.9%	942	998	94.4%	1,076	1,496	71.9%	2,988	3,550	84.2%
DVHHS: Cottonwood & Jackson	292	298	98.0%	443	460	96.3%	333	354	94.1%	1,068	1,112	96.0%
Faribault-Martin	713	758	94.1%	753	801	94.0%	536	557	96.2%	2,002	2,116	94.6%
MN Prairie: Dodge, Steele, Waseca	652	667	97.8%	589	607	97.0%	463	528	87.7%	1,701	1,802	94.4%
Minnesota	49,046	63,731	77.0%	46,087	57,428	80.3%	39,841	46,251	86.1%	134,971	167,410	80.6%

Attachment D: Vulnerable Children and Adult Plan Amendment for Child Protection Funding

County/county consortium submitting amendment: _____

Contact person: _____ Title: _____

Address: _____

Telephone _____ Email address: _____

Assurances

It is understood and agreed by the County Board that any funds granted pursuant to this service agreement amendment will be expended for the purposes outlined in Minnesota Statute 256M.41. It is understood and agreed by the County Board that the commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Human Services has the authority to review and monitor compliance with this amendment and that documentation of compliance will be available to audit.

Budget Plan

Indicate amount and percentage of county's total child protection allocation budget plan for each item listed for calendar year 2015 and 2016. Additional detail may be submitted.

Activity	2015			2016		
	# of New FTE	Budgeted Amount	%	# of New FTE	Budgeted Amount	%
Child protection staff (salaries, overhead, support costs)		\$	%		\$	%
Child protection services		\$	%		\$	%
Total		\$	100%		\$	100%

Certification and Signature

I hereby certify that this amendment to our county's Vulnerable Children and Adults Act plan has been prepared as required and approved by the County Board or its designee under provisions of Minnesota Statute 256M.

County Board representative: _____

Title: _____

Authorized signature: _____ Date: _____

Submit by August 31, 2015 to ralph.mcquarter@state.mn