

Report on 24-hour Coverage for Child Protective Services

Minnesota Department of Human Services

January 19, 2016

The Department gathered information to clarify statewide status and capacity to respond to reports alleging imminent danger to a child on a 24-hour basis, including weekends and holidays, and to screen all reports within 24 hours of receipt.

- Imminent danger means that a child is threatened with immediate and present maltreatment that is life threatening or likely to result in abandonment, sexual abuse, or serious physical injury (Minn. Admin. Rule 9560.0232, subp. 1)
- Child protective services means services provided by the local agency to protect a child who has reportedly been maltreated by person within the family unit or within a facility who is responsible for the child's care. ...” [Minn. Admin. Rule 9560.0214 subp. 6]
- The local welfare agency shall determine if the report is to be screened in or out as soon as possible but in no event longer than 24 hours after the report is received. Minn. Stat. 626.556; subd. 7(B)

The department defines 24-hour coverage for imminent danger situations as the local agency providing one or more of the following: after-hours crisis response, on-call, or some other contracted service and access to supervisory consultation. It does not include delegation solely to law enforcement.

Constraints have been identified to achieve statewide capacity to meet these requirements. This conclusion was reached based upon survey information provided by local agencies. A survey was conducted in January 2016. Forty-six agencies responded. Concerns were noted as follows:

- Funding for social work/supervisor personnel is needed to build the infrastructure
- The size of the workforce is insufficient, particularly in rural areas
- Local agencies are experiencing a significant increase in accepted reports
- New costs occur for overtime and/or on-call pay
- Union contract negotiation barriers exist
- Current on-call staff are not sufficiently trained on child protection protocols
- Cross-training is needed for social work staff and supervisors
- Imminent danger situations are of very low frequency in rural areas and having a formal system of social work and supervisor staff available has high cost

Potential next steps to accomplish statewide 24-hour coverage:

- Reconvene the County/State Fiscal Work Group to extrapolate statewide information and create a tiered cost system based upon population size using survey responses provided
- Provide technical assistance and planning for creation of formal regional agreements to meet staffing and protocol requirements
- Appropriate funds for additional child protection staff and for comprehensive 24-hour mobile access of SSIS

24-hour coverage survey responses –January 2016

Local Agency	Does your local agency currently provide 24-hour child protective services coverage to respond to reports alleging imminent danger to a child? Screen all reports within 24 hours?	What would the additional cost be to your agency on an annual basis to meet the requirements for 24-hour coverage for reports of imminent danger and screening of all reports within 24 hours?
Aitkin	No survey response	
Anoka	No/No	400,000 or higher
Becker	No survey response	
Beltrami	No survey response	
Benton	No survey response	
Big Stone	No survey response	
Blue Earth	Yes/Yes	200,000-250,000
Brown	Yes/Yes	0-25,000
Carlton	No/No	350,000-400,000
Carver	No survey response	
Cass	Yes/Yes	50,000-100,000
Chippewa	Yes/Yes	0-25,000
Chisago	No/No	100,000-150,000
Clay	Yes/Yes	350,000-400,000
Clearwater	No survey response	
Cook	No survey response	
Crow Wing	No/No	350,000-400,000
Dakota	No survey response	
Douglas	No/No	50,000-100,000
Des Moines Valley Health and Human Services	Yes/Yes	25,000-50,000
Fairbault-Martin	Yes/Yes	0-25,000
Fillmore	No survey response	
Freeborn	Yes/Yes	400,000 or higher
Goodhue	No/No	200,000-250,000
Grant	No/No	25,000-50,000

Hennepin	Yes/No	400,000 or higher
Houston	Yes/No	0-25,000
Hubbard	Yes/Yes	25,000-50,000
Isanti	No survey response	
Itasca	Yes/No	100,000-150,000
Kanabec	No survey response	
Kandiyohi	Yes/Yes	50,000-100,000
Kittson	No survey response	
Koochiching	No survey response	
Lac qui Parle	No survey response	
Lake	No survey response	
Lake of the Woods	Yes/Yes	0-25,000
Le Sueur	Yes/Yes	250,000-300,000
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	Yes/Yes	100,000-150,000
McLeod	No survey response	
Mahnomen	Yes/No	50,000-100,000
Marshall	Yes/Yes	50,000-100,000
Meeker	No survey response	
Mille Lacs	Yes/Yes	0-25,000
Morrison	No/No	100,000-150,000
Mower	No survey response	
Nicollet	Yes/Yes	50,000-100,000
Nobles	No survey response	
Norman	No survey response	
Olmsted	Yes/No	250,000-300,000
Otter Tail	No survey response	
Pennington	No/No	100,000-150,000
Pine	Yes/No	25,000-50,000
Polk	Yes/No	100,000-150,000
Pope	No survey response	
Ramsey	Yes/No	400,000 or higher
Red Lake	No survey response	
Renville	Yes/Yes	25,000-50,000
Rice	Yes/No	25,000-50,000
Roseau	No survey response	
St. Louis	No/No	300,000-350,000

Scott	No/No	400,000 Or higher
Sherburne	No survey response	
Sibley	No/Yes	25,000-50,000
Stearns	Yes/No	50,000-100,000
Stevens	Yes/No	25,000-50,000
Swift	No survey response	
Southwest Health and Human Services	No survey response	
Todd	No survey response	
Traverse	No/No	25,000-50,000
Wabasha	No survey response	
Wadena	Yes/No	25,000-50,000
Washington	No survey response	
Watonwan	Yes/No	100,000-150,000
White Earth Band of Ojibwe	No survey response	
Wilkin	No/No	0-25,000
Winona	No survey response	
Wright	Yes/No	100,000-150,000
Yellow Medicine	Yes/Yes	50,000-100,000
Total Responses	46	46