

| SUMMARY OF MINNESOTA AND COUNTY PERFORMANCE ON FEDERAL MEASURES   | National Standard | Goal | MN Performance CY 2009 | Carver Co Performance 2009 |
|---|-------------------|------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Safety Indicator 1: Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence  | 94.6%             | ↑    | 95.3%                  | 100%<br>(20 / 20)          |
| Safety Indicator 2: Absence of CA/N in Foster Care  | 99.68%            | ↑    | 99.56%                 | 100%<br>(113 / 113)        |
| <b>Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification</b>   |                   |      |                        |                            |
| <i>Component A: Timeliness of Reunification</i>   |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C1.1 Reunification in less than 12 months for children exiting foster care  | 75.2%             | ↑    | 83.7%                  | 88.6%<br>(39 / 44)         |
| C1.2 Median stay in foster care to reunification (months)   | 5.4               | ↓    | 4.1                    | 3.4                        |
| C1.3 Entry cohort of children who reunify in less than 12 months  | 48.4%             | ↑    | 61.8%                  | 73.7%<br>(14 / 19)         |
| <i>Component B: Permanency of Reunification</i>   |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C1.4 Children who exit and re-enter foster care in less than 12 months  | 9.9%              | ↓    | 24%                    | 29.2%<br>(19 / 65)         |
| <b>Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions</b>  |                   |      |                        |                            |
| <i>Component A: Timeliness of Adoptions of Children Discharged From Foster Care</i>   |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C2.1 Adoption in less than 24 months for children exiting to adoption   | 36.6%             | ↑    | 47%                    | 0.0%<br>(0 / 1)            |
| C2.2 Median length of stay to adoption (months)   | 27.3              | ↓    | 24.8                   | 25.6                       |
| <i>Component B: Adoption for Children Meeting ASFA Time-In-Care Requirements</i>  |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C2.3 Children in foster care for 17 or more months (on day 1 of the year) who were adopted by the end of the year                               | 22.7%             | ↑    | 20.5%                  | 0.0%<br>(0 / 11)           |
| C2.4 Children in foster care for 17 or more months (on day 1 of the year) who achieved legal freedom within 6 months of start of the year       | 10.9%             | ↑    | 1.7%                   | 0.0%<br>(0 / 12)           |
| <i>Component C: Adoption of Children Who Are Legally Free for Adoption</i>  |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C2.5 Legally free children adopted in less than 12 months   | 53.7%             | ↑    | 36.5%                  | 0.0%<br>(0 / 1)            |
| <b>Permanency Composite 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care</b>   |                   |      |                        |                            |
| <i>Component A: Achieving permanency for Children in Care for Extended Periods of Time</i>  |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C3.1 Children (age 17 or younger on day 1 of the year) in foster care 24+ months discharged to permanent home before the end of year and age 18 | 29.1%             | ↑    | 19.8%                  | 0.0%<br>(0 / 10)           |
| C3.2 Children (age 17 or younger on day 1 of the year) with TPR discharged from foster care to a permanent home prior to age 18                 | 98.0%             | ↑    | 91.7%                  | 100%<br>(1 / 1)            |
| <i>Component B: Children Emancipated Who Were in Foster Care for Extended Periods Of Time</i>   |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C3.3 Children emancipated/age 18 who were in foster care for 3 years or longer  | 37.5%             | ↓    | 43.0%                  | 42.9%<br>(6 / 14)          |
| <b>Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability (no components)</b>  |                   |      |                        |                            |
| C4.1 Two or fewer placement settings for children in foster care less than 12 months  | 86.0%             | ↑    | 86.0%                  | 84.5%<br>(49 / 58)         |
| C4.2 Two or fewer placement settings for children in foster care for 12 to 24 months  | 65.4%             | ↑    | 57.9%                  | 36.4%<br>(8 / 22)          |
| C4.3 Two or fewer placement settings for children in foster care for 24+ months   | 41.8%             | ↑    | 29.4%                  | 43.8%<br>(7 / 16)          |

Notes:

- The National Standard is computed at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of all states' performance, using federal AFCARS data for the period April 1, 2003 through September 20, 2004.
- Goal column arrow indicates if the performance goal for each measure is either higher or lower than the national standard.
- MN and county performance on each *Safety Indicator and permanency measure* is calculated for CY 2009 from January 1 through December 31, 2009 from SSIS data. (Source: Minnesota Department of Human Services)

|                         |                         |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Meets National Standard | Below National Standard |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|

## **Tips for Reviewing County Performance on Federal Data Indicators**

### **Important points to keep in mind:**

- The data is about individual children in the child welfare system.
- Each measure expresses a result that we seek to achieve.
- The focus should remain on improving practice – good case work/court practices will produce good outcomes.
- Data is used to measure the effects of practice and progress toward achieving outcomes; data is a tool to inform or guide decisions about practice and policy.

### **Using the data effectively:**

- Social service agencies can generate reports on each of the federal data indicators/performance measures using Charting and Analysis.
- Using Charting and Analysis, social service agencies can drill down to data at the child level, and create charts and graphs that can be helpful for conducting further analysis.
- Reviewing the measures over time is most effective for understanding performance. The data included here represents performance in 2009. Teams are strongly encouraged to review their own data on a regular basis, e.g. quarterly, semi-annually or annually.
- Reports generated in Charting and Analysis may not be an exact match to the data included here - there may be slight differences.

### **Reviewing the data:**

Please note the following when reviewing performance on the Permanency Composites and Measures.

- The data on the permanency measures represents all children who are entered in the Social Services Information System (SSIS) as being in out-of-home placement, including children in placement through delinquency petitions when the social services and corrections agencies have a Title IV-E agreement. Statewide, approximately 10-13 percent of the children/youth represented in the data are in placement through corrections.
- The same youth are represented across many of the performance measures. Youth who have been in care for extended periods of time, and are not making progress toward permanency, will have a negative impact on numerous performance measures for adoption, permanency and stability.
- Permanency Composite 1: There is a correlation between time to reunification and the median length of time in care (C1.1, C1.2 and C1.3), which are also interrelated with foster care re-entry (C1.4).
- Permanency Composite 2: Statewide, Minnesota does well in finalizing adoptions for children within 24 months of their most recent entry into out-of-home placement (Measures C2.1 and C2.2). The remaining measures in that composite are measuring progress toward adoption.
- Permanency Composite 3: These measures evaluate performance on achieving permanency for children/youth who have been in care for extended periods of time. Minnesota is more effective at achieving timely permanency for younger children. Additional efforts are needed to address barriers to achieving permanency for older youth, and youth in care for extended period of time.