

Bulletin

August 2, 2007

Minnesota Department of Human Services □ P.O. Box 64962, St. Paul, MN 55164-0962

OF INTEREST TO

- County directors
- Social services supervisors
- Financial assistance supervisors
- Financial management supervisors
- Tribal directors

ACTION/DUE DATE

Service Agreements are due **October 15, 2007**.

EXPIRATION DATE

December 31, 2009

CYs 2008-09 County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement Guidelines

TOPIC

Update county directors on the calendar years 2008-09 Biennial Service Agreement requirements for the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and the Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) consolidated funds.

PURPOSE

Notify counties of accomplishments, updates, legislative changes, requirements, time frames and responsibilities regarding the preparation and submission of the 2008-09 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreements.

CONTACTS

Paul H. Ramcharit
Administrative Planning Coordinator
(651) 431-3877 or paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us

Minnesota Department of Human Services
Child Safety and Permanency Division
PO Box 64962
St. Paul, Minnesota 55164-0962

SIGNED

CHARLES E. JOHNSON
Assistant Commissioner
Children and Family Services Administration

SECTION I: BACKGROUND and ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Background

The Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) statutory language requires counties to submit a Biennial Service Agreement to the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) to receive these funds. The department combined the requirements for the two funds into one Service Agreement. The next Service Agreement is for the Calendar Years 2008-09 biennium.

The primary purpose of the service agreement and the consolidated funding model is to achieve stated outcomes and work toward goals of *economic stability for poor families* under MFIP and *keeping children safe and improving their well-being* under CCSA. The agreement provides the state with an assessment of ongoing needs of families and children within the respective program parameters, resources available to address these needs, budgeting of allocated resources, and community participation and review in the service agreement planning and development.

One of the goals in designing the 2008-09 Biennial Service Agreements was to build upon the 2006-07 Biennial Service Agreements in order to establish continuity in the efforts undertaken by counties. This allows time to evaluate the performance of current strategies to see how well they are addressing and advancing MFIP and CCSA outcomes. This design of the service agreement will make the document more of a useful tool to counties, in addition to fulfilling statutory requirements. County staff will need to refer to their 2006-07 agreements as they respond to questions in the new service agreement.

The department encourages and supports the sharing of useful information across counties and between counties and tribes. Applicable county responses from these service agreements will be summarized and shared with other staff and counties in various reports and publications. Counties are encouraged to provide concise, edited responses when preparing their service agreements.

Type of Service Agreement Submitted

Counties may again choose to submit individual or multi-county service agreements. Counties can enter into a joint MFIP service agreement with other counties while maintaining an individual Service Agreement for CCSA or vice versa. Individual and multi-county agreements must indicate that the agreement is approved by the respective county boards by completing the *Certification for Submission* box in Section VII of the 2008-09 County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement Form.

In previous service agreement submission, a number of counties used the same information provided by employment providers serving multiple counties. In this round of service agreements, the department is requesting that responses be individualized for each county. Service agreements will be reviewed as “incomplete” if responses regarding MFIP are not individualized.

Public Input and Comment

Counties must specify that the public was informed and input was sought for the use of federal Social Services Block Grant (Title XX) funds and state funds as required by federal and state laws provided through this agreement. In completing the biennial service agreement, the county board must specify how county citizens, including potential service recipients, participated in the county's planning process, and what opportunities for such participation were provided. Counties may choose to integrate this with their ongoing quality of service evaluations or public participation and feedback processes. In addition, the county must allow a period of no less than 30 days prior to submitting the agreement to the department for solicitation of comments from the public on the content of the agreement.

Deadline

As required by statute, the 2008-09 County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreements must be submitted to the Minnesota Department of Human Services by **Oct. 15, 2007**. Counties are encouraged to plan ahead to ensure that the 30-day public input process and final board approval are completed in time to comply with the statutory deadline of Oct. 15, 2007.

Completion and Submission

The 2008-09 County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement Form can be accessed by clicking the link below. The form is in a Microsoft® Word format and can be saved preferably using the county's name (e.g. Hennepin County 2008-09 MFIP-CCSA Biennial Service Agreement). Use this form to complete and save responses.

- [2008-09 County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement Form](#)

Upon completion and approval by the county board or authorized designee, submit the Microsoft® Word document as an email attachment to: paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us. For questions, inquiries, or technical assistance, contact Paul at (651) 431-3877. The department is not requiring use of the web submission process.

DHS Approval

The department must approve all Biennial Service Agreements. The department will inform the county agency by December 14, 2007 if the service agreement has been approved. If the service agreement is not approved, the department will inform the county of any revisions or additional information needed for approval. **Counties must have an approved service agreement to receive the consolidated funds.**

Technical Assistance

The department is not planning an interactive teleconference as conducted in the past. If county staff have questions regarding the service agreements, they should contact Paul Ramcharit at: paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us or (651) 431-3877.

Accomplishments

Under MFIP and CCSA, Minnesota counties and tribes continued to make strides in helping families transition to economic stability; keeping children safe; supporting child development; and improving the quality, efficiency and accountability of services. Minnesota continues to set

high standards for improving the lives of the poor, and providing environments for the safety, stability and development of children and vulnerable adults. The achievement of these standards is facilitated by continued commitment and partnerships between the state and counties.

Some recent accomplishments of the Minnesota Family Investment Program include:

- In March 2007 more than 72 percent of MFIP families, followed over a three-year period, had either left assistance or were on MFIP and working 30 or more hours per week.
- The number of families receiving welfare has decreased more than 30 percent since 1994.
- Minnesota received a \$13.4 million federal bonus in 2005, the highest bonus possible, for its welfare-to-work efforts for participants in MFIP. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services recognized Minnesota for its success in helping MFIP participants enter the work force. The state ranked fifth in the nation on this measure. While this bonus is no longer available, Minnesota has received the federal bonus six of the last seven years.
- Eight Integrated Services Pilot projects are underway to identify and meet the needs of MFIP families with serious and multiple issues that jeopardize their efforts to become economically stable.
- The Employability Measure was piloted in five sites as well as the eight Integrated Services Projects with recommendations for future use of this instrument.
- The department also worked with Full Circle Community Institute to secure funding to support county and tribal efforts to reduce disparities in outcomes for MFIP families. The initial phase of the MFIP Taking Actions in Disparities project, which includes 16 counties and tribal governments, was completed.
- The department continues to publish a quarterly management indicators report, providing counties with data, including progress on MFIP indicators and measures. Additional performance information on racial/ethnic and immigrant groups is published in alternate quarters.

Under the Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) and child welfare, counties continue to advance the overall goal of keeping children safe and improving their well-being:

- In July 2007, the [Annie E. Casey Foundation](#) released its 18th annual KIDS COUNT 2007 report, ranking Minnesota first in the nation on the well-being of children. While Minnesota continues to do well comparatively and showed improvement on three measures from 2000 to 2005, setbacks were experienced on five of the ten measures. The most notable setback over the period was the 33 percent increase in the number of children in poverty. In 2005, 12 percent of Minnesota's children lived in poverty compared to the national rate of 19 percent.
- The department expanded the Family Assessment Response program in 2006 to serve more than half (55 percent) of the families encountered by county child protection programs. This service program has now assisted more than 40,000 families since beginning in 2000.
- Minnesota continues to demonstrate improved performance on national standard indicators since they were first applied as statewide standards for child welfare performance in the 2001 Child and Family Service Review.
- There were significant reductions in subsequent reporting of child abuse and neglect of children from families served by Family Assessment Response with lower likelihood of out-of-home placement, reduced cost of services per family over time, and greater service

satisfaction, according to the 2006 Extended Follow-up Study of Minnesota's Family Assessment Response.

- Minnesota received honors for Family Assessment Response for excellence in programming by the National Center for Adoption Law and Policy with its 2006 MVP Award.
- The Homecoming Project, a state-county-private adoption agency partnership that works to place youth with families who will make a lifelong commitment to them through adoption has helped place 15 youth in pre-adoptive homes, six in adoptive homes, and two in other permanent families since its inception.
- The department continues to publish annual performance reports under the Children and Community Services Act, providing counties with data on their progress on child safety and permanency measures, including information on addressing race and ethnicity disproportionality.

Minnesota also consistently ranks at the top in key health care, child well-being and public assistance measures. Follow the link below for the department's most current publication on these accomplishments:

- [Minnesota ranks at the top in key human services measures](#)

SECTION II: WHAT'S NEW FOR 2008-09

Changes to the National Standards for Child Welfare

Six of the 10 CCSA performance measures are based on national standards established under the federal regulations that set forth requirements of the Child and Family Service Reviews (CFSRs). These standards were applied as performance standards during the first round of CFSRs conducted in all 50 states from 2001 to 2004.

Prior to the second round of CFSRs, the Administration of Children and Families announced new national standards to assess each state's performance. The new standards include two safety measures, similar to the two existing CCSA measures (reduced recurrence of child abuse/neglect, and reduced incidence of child abuse/neglect in out-of-home placement) and four permanency data composites, comprised of 15 separate performance measures, that incorporate four existing CCSA measures (reduced return to out-of-home placement, reunification within 12 months, adoption within 24 months, and maintaining placement stability). Eleven other permanency measures have been added to provide a broader, more comprehensive evaluation of the state's performance on achieving permanency across age groups and varying time frames.

Minnesota is scheduled for a second round of CFSR in 2007, with the onsite review occurring at the end of September. These new national standards have been applied to assess the state's performance on safety and permanency outcomes. In upcoming months, the department will be working to compute the new national standards to the county level and adapt child welfare data systems and reporting to reflect the new national standards. The department plans to conduct orientation and training on the new national standards starting later this year, and will work with county agencies to plan a timeline for aligning CCSA performance goals with the new national requirements.

Minnesota 2007 Legislative Changes

Child welfare services:

With reductions in federal funding for Targeted Case Management (TCM) for child welfare and mental health services expected, new legislation reserves \$32.7 million in one-time funding to help counties preserve core services in child welfare, mental health, and vulnerable adult protection services to cover potential losses in federal TCM funding.

Minnesota Family Investment Program:

The 2007 legislative changes on MFIP, DWP and Food Support are detailed in [bulletin #07-11-03](#).

SECTION III: GUIDELINES FOR THE MFIP CONSOLIDATED FUND

The MFIP Consolidated Fund provides funding for services counties and tribes must provide by law and for other services counties may provide to eligible families. The decision to fund a program or service, and the level of funding within statutory guidelines, should be made based on the county's best determination of which investments will lead to the greatest improvement in outcomes for families. Current statutory obligations for counties' use of MFIP Consolidated Funds are as follows:

- Administer MFIP financial assistance
- Deliver basic MFIP employment services
- Process MFIP cases approaching the 60-month time limit
- Administer the Diversionary Work Program
- Provide Family Stabilization Services (new for the 2008-09 biennium; more information will be forthcoming).

Counties and tribes may continue successful approaches or develop new strategies to move MFIP and DWP families to work and transition to economic stability.

Counties and tribes have the flexibility to determine levels of funding for the primary services in MFIP, including whether or not to administer emergency services programs and at what funding levels. Counties also determine effective strategies they want to implement in addressing local needs.

There is **no** carry forward of funds between state fiscal years for counties and tribes. The department, however, may reallocate unencumbered or unexpended MFIP funds to those counties or tribes that can demonstrate a need for additional money or use the funds for innovative projects to address the needs of MFIP participants.

Eligibility for benefits and services under the MFIP Consolidated Fund is limited to pregnant women, families with a minor child, or non-custodial parents of minor children receiving MFIP, who are under 200 percent of the federal poverty guidelines (FPG).

Counties that administer an emergency services program should send a copy of their current policy to the department. The policy should be submitted as an email attachment when submitting the 2008-09 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement. The department retains a file on county's current emergency services plans in order to answer requests for information from internal and external sources, including the Minnesota Legislature. Whenever changes are made to county emergency services plans, counties should submit a copy of the revised plan as an email attachment to: mayjoua.ly@state.mn.us.

Counties needing more information on administering an emergency services program can refer to [bulletin #03-11-04](#), "2003 MFIP Consolidated Fund Policy Clarifications". Counties can also access recent publications on emergency services plans and data in [bulletin #07-11-02](#), "County

MFIP Emergency Services Policies Summary” and [bulletin #06-11-04](#), “Emergency Assistance to Families under MFIP”.

MFIP Goal and Outcomes

MFIP overall goal is economic stability for poor families. There are specific performance measures defined in statute for monitoring the success of MFIP. Counties that meet or exceed the county-specific performance requirements are eligible for performance based funding.

1 Three-year MFIP Self-Support Index

The three-year MFIP Self-support Index (SSI) is the percentage of MFIP/DWP cases off cash assistance or working 30 or more hours per week three years after a baseline quarter. Each quarter, counties are notified of their performance on the three-year Self-support Index as well as their ranges of expected performance on this measure. These ranges of expected performance level the playing field among counties by accounting for differences in caseloads and economic characteristics.

2 MFIP Work Participation Rate

The MFIP Work Participation Rate (WPR) is the percentage of non-exempt MFIP adults who meet the work requirements.

Counties are notified of their performance on the three-year Self-support Index and their MFIP Work Participation Rate in the quarterly Management Indicator’s Report. Recent publications can be accessed by clicking on the link below and paging down to the section titled, ‘MFIP Management Indicators Report’:

- [MFIP Management Indicator’s Report](#)

3 Promoting Equity in MFIP Outcomes

In addition to SSI and WPR, a third indicator was developed—promoting equity in MFIP outcomes—to assist counties to monitor and address performance gaps among racial/ethnic and immigrant groups. Data covering alternate quarters is published by the department to assist counties to monitor and address performance gaps among racial/ethnic and immigrant groups with caseloads of 30 or more in the three-year Self-support Index and the Work Participation Rate.

In the 2006-07 service agreements, the department used data from the first quarter of CY 2005, to identify counties with a racial/ethnic or immigrant group whose performance on the three-year SSI and the WPR were five percentage points or more below the overall county rates. These counties were required to create an action plan and engage community-based partners to reduce performance gaps by the end of the 2006-07 biennium. The goals of the department were to raise awareness of subgroup performance and to begin the process of addressing issues of performance gaps.

With the availability of longitudinal data sets over the last few years, trend data is beginning to differentiate between subgroups that fluctuate above or below the five percentage point threshold and those with more persistent performance gaps over time. While state and county

efforts will continue to promote equity in performance across subgroups, more focused efforts will be required for subgroups with consistent underperformance.

Recent and past publications can be accessed by clicking on the link below and paging down to the section on 'MFIP Performance Measures':

- [MFIP Performance Measures by Racial/Ethnic or Immigrant Group and County](#)

SECTION IV: GUIDELINES FOR THE CCSA CONSOLIDATED FUND

Making CCSA Funding Decisions

The CCSA Consolidated Fund is designated to serve children, adolescents and other individuals in transition from childhood to adulthood, and adults who experience dependency, abuse, neglect, poverty, disability and chronic health conditions. Funds may be used to provide services to racial/ethnic groups experiencing poor outcomes, or where inequities in outcomes are identified. Funds may be used for services performed by professionals or nonprofessionals, including the person's natural supports in the community.

Under statutory requirements, counties must budget at least 40 percent of CCSA funds for services to ensure the mental health, safety, permanency, and well-being of children from low-income families. Provisions in statute allow for the commissioner to reduce the 40 percent requirement if:

- The incidence of children in low-income families within the county's population is significantly below the statewide median; or
- The county has successfully achieved past performance targets for children's mental health, child safety, permanency and well-being; and, its proposed service plan is judged by the commissioner to provide an adequate level of service to the population with less funding.

Counties must endeavor, within the limits of funds available, to consider the continuing need for services and programs for children and persons with disabilities funded by the former Children's Services and Community Service Grants. The county shall be responsible for providing day training and habilitation services or alternative habilitation services during the day for persons with developmental disabilities to the extent required by the person's Individualized Service Plan.

If a county has made reasonable efforts to provide services according to the service agreement, but CCSA funds are insufficient, the county may limit services that do not meet the following criteria while giving the highest funding priority to items 1, 2, and 3:

1. Services needed to protect individuals from maltreatment, abuse and neglect
2. Emergency and crisis services needed to protect clients from physical, emotional or psychological harm
3. Services that maintain a person in their home or least restrictive setting
4. Assessment of persons applying for services and referral to appropriate services when necessary
5. Public guardianship services
6. Case management for persons with developmental disabilities, children with serious emotional disturbances, and adults with serious and persistent mental illness
7. Fulfilling licensing responsibilities delegated to the county by DHS under MS 245A.16.

CCSA Goal and Outcomes

The overall goal for CCSA is *keeping children safe and improving their well-being*. The department publishes an annual performance report on CCSA outcomes and measures. Outcome data for racial/ethnic groups are also provided for three CCSA measures in the performance reports.

The first report was published in 2005 in [bulletin #05-68-08](#) and the second in 2006, [bulletin #06-68-11](#). A third bulletin is being prepared for publication. While continued improvement across all counties and across measures is the statewide goal, the overall expectation is that counties attain and surpass the national or state standard for each measure. Counties with performance below national and/or state standards are required to set targets and develop and implement strategies to improve these outcomes. CCSA program areas, outcomes, measures and standards are as follows:

Children's Mental Health

Improved mental health

1 Of all children receiving mental health case management services during the reporting period, what percentage showed improvement as measured by the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) or the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS)? *In January 2007 most counties began collecting data in the Social Service Information System (SSIS) on the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS) or the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) scores for children receiving mental health case management services. Counties participating in the Child and Adolescent Service Intensity Instrument (CASII) and the Strengths and Difficulty Questionnaire (SDQ) pilots are reporting data directly to the department's Children's Mental Health Division. The 2007 data will be available in 2008.*

Child Safety

Reduced recurrence of child abuse/neglect

2 Of all children who were victims of determined maltreatment during the first six months of the reporting period, what percentage had another determined report within six months and within 12 months? *For the six-month recurrence rate, a county meets or exceeds the national standard if 6.1 percent or fewer children had another determined report within six months of the first. For the 12-month recurrence rate, the annual state performance is used as the standard (7.5 percent in 2006).*

Reduced incidence of child abuse/neglect in out-of-home placement

3 Of all children in out-of-home placement during the reporting period, what percentage experienced determined maltreatment by a foster parent? *A county meets or exceeds the national standard if 0.57 percent or fewer children experienced determined maltreatment by a foster parent.*

Child Permanency

Reduced return to out-of-home placement

4 Of all children who entered out-of-home placement during the reporting period, what percentage re-entered within 12 months of a prior placement? *A county meets or exceeds the national standard if 8.6 percent or fewer children re-entered placement within 12 months.*

Timeliness of permanency

5 Of all children who exited out-of-home placement to reunify with their parents or caretakers during the reporting period, what percentage were reunified within 12 months from the time of last removal from the home? *A county meets or exceeds the national standard if 76.2 percent or more children were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

6 Of all children who exited out-of-home placement to adoption during the reporting period, what percentage were adopted within 24 months from the time of last removal from the home? *A county meets or exceeds the national standard if 32.0 percent or more children exited out of home placement to adoption in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.*

7 Of all children who exited out-of-home placement to a permanent transfer of legal and physical custody to a relative during the reporting period, what percentage transferred within 12 months from the time of last removal from the home? *The annual state performance is used as the standard for this measure (64.0 percent in 2006).*

Placement stability

8 Of all children who have been in out-of-home placement for less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home during the reporting period, what percentage had two or fewer placement settings? *A county meets or exceeds the national standard if 86.7 percent or more children had no more than two placement settings.*

Child Well-being

Received adequate services to meet physical and mental health needs

9 What percentage of children in out-of-home placement longer than 30 days during the reporting period received a health exam within one year? *Preliminary numbers were published in [bulletin #06-68-11](#) (page 30) for county review.*

10 What percentage of eligible children in child protective services or out-of-home placement during the reporting period received a mental health screening? *In 2005 county social services agencies started entering child welfare mental health screening data in the Social Services Information System (SSIS). The 2007 calendar year screening data will be published in the 2008 CCSA performance report.*

Integrating Minnesota Child and Family Service Reviews (MnCFSR) and CCSA

Performance targets for CCSA present counties with the opportunity to plan for improved child and family outcomes through two formal processes: the Biennial Service Agreement and the

Minnesota Child and Family Service Review (MnCFSR). Both processes use common elements that focus on plans and strategies to achieve improved outcomes.

The Minnesota Child and Family Service Review process includes three distinct phases that result in a comprehensive and thorough assessment of the county's child welfare system: a county self-assessment, an on-site case review and development of a Program Improvement Plan (PIP). Approximately 20 counties per year complete their initial review and implement a program improvement plan to address the child welfare practices and systemic issues that need improvement. All Minnesota counties will complete an initial MnCFSR and develop a Program Improvement Plan by early 2008.

Counties are encouraged to integrate results from these MnCFSR/PIP evaluations into the Biennial Service Agreement requirements as a unified approach to improve outcomes for children. Although counties may need to approach integration efforts differently because of the unique timing of these two processes, minimally, elements of the county self-assessment, findings from the case reviews, and goals of the Program Improvement Plan should be incorporated into the county statement of needs, strengths, resources, and strategies to improve outcomes. These activities will lead to consistency of efforts to improve common outcomes across program areas.

SECTION V: INTEGRATING SERVICES FOR MFIP/CCSA FAMILIES

The department continues to encourage and support practical approaches for the seamless delivery of services to families needing both financial assistance and child welfare services. The department is examining data to identify who these families are, services accessed and the development of potential integrated services measures. In addition, data and results from the ongoing Integrated Services Projects are being analyzed.

In the 2006-07 Service Agreement, the department asked counties if they were looking at integrating services for families who are receiving MFIP and CCSA services. Nearly half (40) of counties responded favorably and described various approaches and issues. A brief summary of county responses is provided below:

Diverse Needs of Families

A strong, supportive collaboration by community professionals is necessary to address issues such as mental health, child care, housing, alternative education, chemical dependency, parenting skills and services that help children transition to adulthood.

Increased diversity of needs of participants has created a need for improved coordination of individualized case plans across units.

Approaches: Examples of Integration Efforts Underway at the County Level taken from the 2006-07 Service Agreements

- There is joint case planning, conferences, coordination and regular communication between financial assistance and child welfare staff when families are shared between employment services (ES) contractors and agency social workers.
- Social workers assist MFIP families whose children are at risk of maltreatment and/or placement. Economic and employment planning are often included in protective services and out-of-home placement case plans, and social service plans are often included in MFIP eligibility requirements with such populations as pregnant and parenting teens.
- Team intervention by social, income maintenance and employment services workers is used in cases of MFIP sanctions where families are in danger of losing their benefits, creating instability for their children.
- A service coordination committee brings together supervisors and staff from various services within the county for coordinated case planning for the most challenging families. In addition, the contracted staff from the MFIP Integrated Services Project (ISP) has the goal of bringing together various service providers in case planning and service delivery. This includes collaboration between child protection and ISP, within the limits of law, and with permission from the family. The county ISP project has a stronger connection to community mental health services, and in tracking families that move to another county. All MFIP, DWP and ISP staff attend child protection mandated reporter training.

- County personnel routinely screen all newly opened child protection, mental health, chemical dependency and developmental disability services to determine if families are participating in MFIP. If families are on MFIP, the case manager obtains client authorization and coordinates activities with the financial and employment workers. When cases are assigned by MFIP for family advocate case management services, the client's case is screened for other human services needs. If other services are identified, the family advocate obtains an authorized release of information and then coordinates the client's individual service plan.
- Three areas have launched efforts to integrate their services—employment services, aging and disability services, behavioral health and child protection. Families are targeted in which a child is to be reunified after an out-of-home placement. A few weeks prior to an anticipated reunification date, and referral by a family's social worker, an integrated team of dedicated staff from Eligibility Supports, Work Supports, Child Care Assistance, the Shelter Team and the Office of Multicultural Services, come together with the client to discuss the family's needs and facilitate the process by which the family will apply for benefits. The primary goal is to provide needed services to the family more quickly and more effectively, addressing potential barriers and disconnects between the requirements of the child protection and eligibility supports systems. It is anticipated that in the long term, this type of integration activity might also result in reduced out-of-home placement costs.
- A good referral system is in place between the Income Maintenance and Social Services Units since all departments are housed in the same building and clients are referred from one unit to the other, depending on their needs. Co-located MFIP and social work services, Family Support and Assistance, Child and Family Services and Adult and Family Services work cooperatively to achieve better results for families.
- By design, the county's human services agency integrates MFIP and CCSA services. By having Social Services, Family and Children Services, Child Support, Public Health, and publicly funded financial programs within a single department, the clients' needs are addressed as appropriately and as efficiently as possible. When clients first contact the county, they are assessed in the Gateway Services Division and are then directed to the services for which they qualify—they have the full range of services available from the first contact.

Issues

As counties addressed the needs of participants needing the array of financial and social services, some counties noted a few barriers and constraints they are working to resolve. These include the difficulty of integrating separate information systems and the sharing of data across departments and divisions. Data practices specific to mental health and chemical dependency can create barriers for communication and coordination efforts. Several counties have a mental health center incorporated into human services operations. While this is an asset, it also creates unique issues about accessing client information across program areas such MFIP, public health, corrections, and other social services units.

SECTION VI: ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETS

2008 Allocation

The 2008 allocations bulletin is scheduled to be published in late summer of 2007. In order to facilitate the timely planning and submission of service agreements, counties and tribes should use the MFIP and CCSA CY 2008 preliminary allocations provided in the link below to prepare the service agreement budgets for both CYs 2008 and 2009.

- [Preliminary MFIP and CCSA Allocations for CY 2008](#)

MFIP Consolidated Fund Allocation

For calendar year 2008 and beyond, the initial MFIP allocation will be based 50 percent on the county or tribe's 2002 historical spending, and 50 percent on the county or tribe's adjusted caseload factor.

MFIP Performance-based Funding

For calendar year 2008 and yearly thereafter, a county or tribe that achieves a 50 percent MFIP participation rate or a five percentage point improvement over the previous year's MFIP participation rate, will receive an additional allocation equal to 2.5 percent of its initial allocation. Counties or tribes failing to achieve these thresholds will not receive an additional 2.5 percent until a performance improvement plan is completed and approved by the department. Likewise, a county or tribe that does not perform within its range of expected performance on the annualized three-year Self-support Index will not receive an additional allocation equal to 2.5 percent of its initial allocation until a performance improvement plan is completed and approved by the department.

CCCSA Allocations

There are no changes to the CCSA Consolidated Fund allocations formula from the preceding year.

Budgets

Service Agreement Budgets: Counties must complete and submit a budget for MFIP and CCSA allocations for CYs 2008 and 2009 in the service agreement.

Submitting Budget Changes based on Final Allocation: Counties should use the preliminary MFIP and CCSA allocations for CY 2008 to prepare their service agreement budgets for CYs 2008 and 2009. When final MFIP and CCSA allocations are published, counties should compare the final allocation to their service agreement budgets and submit a budget revision if one or more of the following criteria is met:

- Plus or minus (+/-) 10 percent or more, or
- The difference is plus or minus (+/-) \$100,000 or more.

If a county meets one of the above criteria, a revised budget should be submitted to the department within 30 days after the final allocations bulletin is published, using the Budget

Revision Form provided below. Send the completed Budget Revision Form as an email attachment to paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us. Counties who do not fit the above criteria are encouraged to revise their budgets to reflect actual allocations for operational purposes even though they are not required to submit a revised budget to the department.

- [Budget Revision Form](#)

Submitting MFIP Budgetary Changes: Counties are encouraged to monitor MFIP funds during the year so the use of MFIP dollars is maximized to address the needs of families. Counties have the flexibility, under the consolidated funds and within the respective statutory guidelines, to shift dollars among budget line items based on priorities, local needs, and levels of unspent funds during the calendar year. When budgetary changes are made, counties should send an email informing the department of the budget change, and the department will update its records.

MFIP Administrative Cap Waiver Request: The 2006 Minnesota Legislature enacted provisions allowing counties to request a waiver of the MFIP administrative cap (currently 7.5 percent) for the purpose of providing supported employment, unpaid work or community work experience programs for a major segment of the county's or tribe's MFIP population.

Counties may request a waiver of the administrative cap when submitting their 2008-09 service agreement by completing the information requested in Section V of the service agreement form. To apply for the waiver after the submission of the service agreement, complete the Budget Revision Form found in the link above and answer the questions relating to the administrative cap waiver.

SECTION VII: TITLE XX

Excluded Individuals/Providers

County agencies continue to be responsible for ensuring that Title XX funds are not used to purchase items or services from an individual or entity excluded by the federal government from participation in its programs. County agencies may use the Website provided below to determine which individuals or entities are excluded from participation in Medicare or other health-related programs. This site is from the Office of Inspector General (OIG), U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, at: <http://www.oig.hhs.gov/fraud/exclusions.html>.

Use the OIG Web site to determine if an individual or entity is sanctioned and click Online Search Data Base. Enter the provider's name or business entity. The next screen indicates whether the provider has had a sanction.

SECTION VIII: MISCELLANEOUS

Client Appeals

Under CCSA, before a county denies, reduces, and/or terminates services to an individual due to fiscal limitations, the county must meet the requirements related to fiscal limitations. The county must notify the individual and the individual's guardian in writing of the reason for the denial, reduction, and/or termination of services and must inform the individual and the individual's guardian in writing that the county will, upon request, meet to discuss alternatives before services are terminated or reduced.

Services, programs and funds that are denied, reduced and/or terminated for clients under the CCSA Consolidated Fund and the MFIP Consolidated Fund are subject to client appeal. The department's appeals staff will continue to hear these appeals. The general statutes which govern all human services appeals can be found in Minnesota Statutes, Sections 256.045 and 256.0451. The role of the Appeals and Regulations Division is to ascertain the pertinent facts, and then apply the governing law to those facts in order to determine the person's proper entitlement to benefits, payments or services.

Data Sharing

For concerns regarding the sharing of data within county agencies, staff should refer to the Government Data Practices Act (Minnesota Statutes, section 13.46).

Records Retention

Counties must retain copies of biennial service agreements for at least six years after approval by the department.

Alternative Formats

This information will be made available in other forms to persons with disabilities by contacting us at (651) 431-4671 (voice). TTY/TDD users can call the Minnesota Relay at 711 or (800) 627-3529. For the Speech-to-Speech Relay, call (877) 627-3848.

Appendix

Appendix: 2008-09 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement Form

2008-09 County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement

Minnesota Family Investment Program and Children and Community Services Act

January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2009



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

Type of Service Agreement

<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual county submitting a:
--------------------------	---------------------------------

<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi-county partnership submitting a:
--------------------------	--

<input type="checkbox"/>	Combined MFIP/CCSA Agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	MFIP-only agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	CCSA-only agreement

<input type="checkbox"/>	Combined MFIP/CCSA Agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	MFIP-only agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	CCSA-only agreement

County Name:

--

County Names:

--

County MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement

January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2009

CONTACT

Contact Information:

Contact Person:	
Title:	
Address:	
Telephone:	
Email Address:	
Date:	

* * *

Complete all applicable questions in the following sections. Provide brief but informative responses to the required questions. Information from responses will be shared with staff and other counties. Please ensure that responses are edited before submission to the department.

* * *

Section I: Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP)**A. Statement of Needs**

1. Based on your response on the needs of MFIP participants in the 2006-07 service agreement (Section I, Part A, Question 1), for which stated needs is your county making the most progress?

2. Describe the more persistent needs of participants that your county continues to address with MFIP funds and what kind of support may be needed to help resolve these needs/issues.

3. For each of the categories listed below, tell us what proportion of the MFIP participant caseload will likely need these services in the 2008-09 biennium. A participant could be included in more than one category.

Needs/Services	Percent of Participants
Education	%
Transportation	%
Child Care	%
Employment	%
Housing	%
Mental Health	%
Chemical/Substance	%
Support Services	%
Language	%

4. If you have additional comments regarding the needs of MFIP participants, use the space provided below.

5. Do the needs of the Diversionary Work Program (DWP) participants differ from your MFIP participants? If yes, briefly describe their most important needs below. If no, enter "same" in the response box.

B. Strengths and Resources to Address MFIP Needs

1. In the previous service agreement, counties described plans and efforts to maximize strengths and resources available to the county to address needs of MFIP/DWP families during CYs 2006-7 (Section 1, Part B). Provide a brief evaluation on how well these efforts are working and what your county is planning to do differently in the 2008-09 biennium. Include any new strengths and resources available to the county in 2008-09.

--

2. Family Stabilization Services Addendum

The 2007 legislature requires counties and tribes to describe how they will provide services for those families who qualify for Family Stabilization Services (FSS) under MFIP and DWP effective February 1, 2008. In order to satisfy this requirement, an addendum to the Service Agreement must be submitted to the department by December 31, 2007. The department will issue further instructions by November 1, 2007 on how to complete the addendum.

3. Employment Services Provider Information

List the name, address and phone number of current employment services (ES) providers in your county. *(Insert more rows if there are more than two providers.)*

Name	Address	Phone Number

C. MFIP Outcomes and Measures

Under the MFIP Consolidated Fund and the overall outcome for MFIP—*Economic Stability for Poor Families*—county performance will be based on the following indicators.

Three-year MFIP Self-support Index

Measure: Percent of MFIP/DWP cases off cash assistance or working 30 or more hours per week three years after a baseline quarter.

In the 2006-07 Biennial Service Agreement, your county identified strategies to ensure that the county's three-year Self-support Index (SSI) is either within or above the county's range of expected performance during CYs 2006-07. Review the statistics provided below for your county's performance on the SSI for the four quarters beginning April 2006 and ending March 2007.

- [Quarterly and Annualized Performance on the SSI](#)

1. Counties "within" or "above" their expected range of performance

If your county is "within" or "above" the county's expected range of performance on the annualized Self-support Index, provide a concise analysis on your county's performance during this one-year period including an evaluation of how well the strategies stated in your 2006-07 Service Agreement (section I, part C, Indicator 1) are working to improve your county's current performance on this measure. Include any new strategies your county will implement in the 2008-09 biennium. In addition, enter whether your county is above or within the expected range, your county's annualized performance percentage, and targets your county hopes to achieve by the end of the two 12-month periods noted in

the response box.

Analysis/evaluation/new strategies:		
From the Apr. 06-Mar. 07 annualized data, enter where your county's performance is (above, within or below your expected range) and the percentage performance:		%
Enter annualized targets you hope to achieve for the periods:	Apr. 07 – Mar. 08	%
	Apr. 08 – Mar. 09	%

2. Counties “below” the expected range of performance

If your county is “below” the expected range of performance on the annualized three-year SSI, your county will not receive the 2.5 percent performance bonus unless the county submits a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and it is approved by the department. If your county is planning to submit a PIP, access the link below for instructions on how to complete and submit the Performance Improvement Plan.

- [Performance Improvement Plan for the SSI](#)

MFIP Work Participation Rate

Measure: Percent of non-exempt MFIP adults who meet the TANF work participation requirements.

In the 2006-07 Biennial Service Agreement, counties identified strategies to improve their performance on the MFIP Work Participation Rate (WPR). Review the statistics provided below for your county's performance on the WPR Rate for the four quarters beginning April 2006 and ending March 2007.

- [Quarterly and Annualized Performance on the WPR](#)

1. Counties with a Work Participation Rate of 50 percent or more or a five percent increase from the previous year

If your county meets or exceeds 50 percent on the annualized MFIP Work Participation Rate or had a five percentage point increase from the year before (Apr. 05 – Mar. 06), provide a concise analysis of your county's performance during Apr. 06 – Mar. 07 and include an evaluation of how well the strategies stated in your county's 2006-07 Service Agreement (section I, part C, Indicator 2) are working to improve your county's current performance. Include any new strategies your county will implement in the 2008-09 biennium, and at the bottom of the response box enter anticipated targets your county will work to achieve in the next two years.

Analysis/evaluation/new strategies:		
Enter your county's annualized Work Participation Rate for Apr. 06 – Mar. 07		%
Enter annualized targets you hope to achieve for the periods:	Apr. 07 – Mar. 08	%
	Apr. 08 – Mar. 09	%

2. Counties with a Work Participation Rate below 50 percent that did not achieve a five percentage point improvement from the previous year:

If your county performance is below 50 percent on the annualized MFIP Work Participation Rate for Apr. 06 – Mar. 07 and did not achieve a five percentage point increase from the previous year (Apr. 05 – Mar. 06), your county will not receive the 2.5 percent performance bonus unless your county submits a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and it is approved by the department. If your county is planning to submit a PIP, access the link below for instructions on how to complete and submit the Performance Improvement Plan.

- [Performance Improvement Plan for the WPR](#)

Promoting Equity in MFIP Outcomes

Performance gaps of subgroups over the four alternate quarters covering the period Jul. 2005 to Mar. 2007 (Jul.-Sep. 2005, Jan.-Mar. 2006, Jul.-Sep. 2006 and Jan. - Mar. 2007) are provided below. Performance gaps were calculated when a subgroup within a county had at least 30 cases. Click on the link below to review a summary of subgroup performance data for SSI and WPR within your county (note: there are two sheets in the excel file):

- [Two-Year Performance Trend of Racial/Ethnic and Immigrant Groups](#)

1. Counties needing to submit an action plan for the 2008-09 biennium

If your county has one or more subgroups with a gap of at least five percentage points from the county rate in both the last quarter (Jan.-Mar. 2007) and the average of the four quarters, the county must submit an action plan addressing the questions below. If your county has already submitted an action plan in the 2006-07 service agreement, skip this question and move to question 2. *(One response box is provided below. Copy and paste if there are more than one subgroup).*

Name of subgroup:	
Percentage gap from county's rate for the Jan.-Mar. 2007 qtr. (e.g. -15.3%):	%
Anticipated percentage gap you hope to achieve by the end of 2009 (e.g. -10%):	%

- i) What efforts has your county taken to date to acknowledge and address these outcome gaps?

- ii) What community-based partners has your county engaged with to address these gaps, and to what extent have these efforts been successful?

- iii) What is your county's plan to reduce these gaps in the next biennium?

2. Counties who already submitted an action plan for the 2006-07 biennium

If your county already submitted an action plan for the 2006-07 biennium, provide a concise response to the following questions:

Since the submission of your action plan, briefly summarize:

- Which activities were conducted by your county;
- Which partners were engaged;
- What progress has been made to reduce these gaps; and
- What activities are being planned for the 2008-09 biennium.

3. Counties not required to submit an action plan

Minnesota is becoming an increasingly diverse state. If your county does not have a racial/ethnic or immigrant group with 30 or more cases, or a gap of five percentage points or more, provide a brief summary of your county's approaches and practices as you work to address the diverse MFIP populations within your county during the 2008-09 biennium.

Section II: Children and Community Services Act (CCSA)

A. Statement of Needs

1. In the CYs 2006-07 Biennial Service Agreements, counties identified the most important social services issues/needs of children who experience dependency, abuse, neglect, poverty, disability, chronic health conditions or other factors in the following four program areas. For each of the four program areas below, answer the following questions: Will these needs change for the 2008-09 biennium? What are the long-term needs of children your county continues to wrestle with?

Children's Mental Health:

Child Safety:

Child Permanency:

Child Well-being:

2. In the 2006-07 service agreement, you identified key issues your county was planning to address in CYs 2006-07 for adults with developmental disabilities and other vulnerable populations in your county. For what issues is your county making the most progress and what priorities of needs will you be addressing in the 2008-09 biennium?

3. Minnesota is becoming an increasingly diverse state. What practices and approaches does your county have in place and/or developing to address the social services issues/needs of children from diverse racial/ethnic and immigrant groups in your county?

B. Strengths and Resources to Address CCSA Needs

In the previous service agreement, you described your county's plan or efforts to maximize strengths and resources available to the county to address needs of CCSA families during CYs 2006-07 (section 1, part B). Provide a brief evaluation on how well these efforts are working and what your county is planning to do differently in the 2008-

09 biennium. Include any new strengths and resources available to your county in 2008-09.

--

C. CCSA Outcomes and Measures

Keeping children safe and improving their well-being is the overall goal for CCSA. In 2005, the department began issuing annual performance reports on CCSA measures starting with calendar year 2004 data ([Bulletin #05-68-08](#) and [Bulletin #06-68-11](#)). The performance report with CY 2006 data is being prepared for publication.

The link below provides a summary of county performance for the last three years, including an average three-year performance. Review your county performance and respond to the questions that follow:

- [CCSA Performance Data for Calendar Years 2004-06](#)

1. All counties

In the table below, enter your county's 2006 performance and three-year average (from the data provided) for each of the measures, and the anticipated target you hope to achieve in CYs 2008 and 2009.

CCSA Measures (abbreviated)		Fed/State Standards	County			
			CY 2006	3-Year Average	Anticipated Targets	
					2008	2009
1: Children who showed improved mental health						
2: Recurrence of child abuse/neglect	within 6 months	6.1 %	%	%	%	%
	within 12 months	7.5 %	%	%	%	%
3: Child maltreatment by foster parent		.57 %	%	%	%	%
4: Re-entered placement within 12 months		8.6 %	%	%	%	%
5: Reunified within 12 months of placement		76.2 %	%	%	%	%
6: Adopted within 24 months		32.0 %	%	%	%	%
7: Transfer of legal custody to a relative within 12 months		64.0 %	%	%	%	%
8: Two or fewer placement settings		86.7 %	%	%	%	%
9: Received a health exam within one year						
10: Received mental health screening						

2. Counties not meeting the national/state standard for CY 2006 and for the three-year average

For any measure for which your county is not meeting the national/state standard for both CY 2006 and the county's three-year average, enter the measure number and briefly discuss strategies your county will continue, change or do differently to ensure your county reaches and exceeds the anticipated targets set for 2008 and 2009. If a Minnesota Child and Family Service Review was recently conducted in your county and your

county is currently working under a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) for that measure, reference the PIP, and briefly describe the strategies. If your county would like to see the approaches and strategies of other counties on a particular measure as reported in the 2006-07 service agreement, refer to [bulletin #06-68-11](#) and [click on Link 4 on Page 8](#). *(One response box is provided below. Copy and paste as needed).*

Measure #:	
Steps to improve performance:	

3. All Counties (optional)

The department continues to encourage the sharing of good practices and approaches that are working well across the state. If your county has identified one or more practices that is leading to positive outcomes for children in a particular measure, identify the measure number below and briefly summarize the practice/approach. *(One response box is provided below. Copy and paste as needed).*

Measure #:	
Approaches and steps that led to positive outcomes:	

4. CCSA performance by racial/ethnic groups

CCSA 2006 data by racial/ethnic subgroups (using Bureau of Census categories) are provided for measures 4 (re-enter placement within 12 months), 5 (reunified within 12 months of placement) and 8 (two or fewer placement settings).

Counties with two or more racial/ethnic subgroups having 10 or more individuals in a numerator were examined to determine subgroup performance from the average county performance. Access the link below and review the data provided for Measures 4, 5 and 8. (Note: three spreadsheets—one for each measure—are included in this excel document).

- [CCSA Performance Data by Racial/Ethnic Groups for CY 2006](#)

If your county has a racial/ethnic subgroup with a performance rate that is five percentage points or more below the county rate on any measure (shaded cell), briefly described what issues may have led to these differences in outcomes, and steps your county will take to improve the outcome for this group for CYs 2008 and 2009.

--

Section III: Integrating Services for Child Welfare and MFIP Families

In the 2006-07 service agreement, the department asked counties if they were looking at integrating services for families who are receiving MFIP and CCSA services. Nearly half (40) of Minnesota counties responded favorably and described various approaches and issues.

In the response box below, briefly discuss: (1) what efforts your county has taken since the last service agreement to assist families that need MFIP and child welfare services, (2) your county's experiences as you worked with these families, (3) strategies to coordinate these services, and (4) strengths and limitations of your county's efforts.

--

If your county has a racial/ethnic or immigrant group with an inequity in **both** an MFIP and CCSA outcome measures, briefly discuss your county's efforts to coordinate and address these inequities across MFIP and child welfare programs across your county agency.

--

Section IV: Public Input

Counties must specify that the public was informed and input was sought for the use of funds as required by laws provided through this agreement.

1. From the list below, select how the public was informed in the development of the service agreement:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Public hearing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Newspapers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community meetings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Radio announcements
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Website
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others (specify):

2. Prior to submitting your service agreement to the Minnesota Department of Human Services, did your county allow at least 30 days for soliciting of comments from the public on the content of the agreement?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

3. Describe the public input received and how it impacted your planning process or the service agreement by selecting one of the following two options:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Public input was received (<i>continue with the questions below</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not impact our planning process/service agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Did impact our planning process/service agreement, particularly the:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Statement section
<input type="checkbox"/>	Strategies and Outcomes section
<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget section
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify):
	Briefly describe the changes made to the service agreement:
<input type="checkbox"/>	No public input was received

Section V: County Budget

In the budget table below, indicate the amount and percentage for each item listed with the specific MFIP or CCSA consolidated fund for calendar years 2008-09. Also note:

- Total percent must equal 100
- MFIP administration is capped at 7.5 percent unless your county is applying for an administrative cap waiver. To apply for the administrative cap waiver, respond to the questions following this budget page
- If “other” is used, please specify.

2008 MFIP	Budgeted Amount	Percent	2008 CCSA	Budgeted Amount	Percent
Employment Services (DWP)	\$	%	Children’s Mental Health	\$	%
Employment Services (MFIP)	\$	%	Child and Family Services	\$	%
Emergency Services ¹	\$	%	Adult Services	\$	%
Administration	\$	%	Other 1:	\$	%
Income Maintenance Administration	\$	%	Other 2:	\$	%
Other 1:	\$	%	Other 3:	\$	%
Other 2:	\$	%	Other 4:	\$	%
2008 MFIP Budget	\$	%	2008 CCSA Budget	\$	%

A portion of 2009 allocations to counties will depend on legislative actions in 2008. Use your county’s 2008 allocation or its anticipated allocation for CY 2009. When 2009 final allocations are published, use the criteria set forth in the instructions bulletin to determine if your county should submit an amended budget page.

2009 MFIP	Budgeted Amount	Percent	2009 CCSA	Budgeted Amount	Percent
Employment Services (DWP)	\$	%	Children’s Mental Health	\$	%
Employment Services (MFIP)	\$	%	Child and Family Services	\$	%
Emergency Services ¹	\$	%	Adult Services	\$	%
Administration	\$	%	Other 1:	\$	%
Income Maintenance Administration	\$	%	Other 2:	\$	%
Other 1:	\$	%	Other 3:	\$	%
Other 2:	\$	%	Other 4:	\$	%
2009 MFIP Budget	\$	100 %	2009 CCSA Budget	\$	100%

¹ If dollars are budgeted for emergency services, send a copy of the county’s emergency services policy as an email attachment when submitting the 2008-09 MFIP/CCSA Biennial Service Agreement.

Administrative Cap Waiver

Is your county requesting a waiver of the MFIP administrative cap?

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Yes If yes, provide a concise response to the following three questions.

No If no, skip this section.

1. Describe the budget change (include any staff changes)

--

2. What new activities or services will be provided?

--

3. Describe the targeted population and number of people expected to be served?

--

Section VI: Assurances

It is understood and agreed by the county board that any funds granted pursuant to this service agreement will be expended for the purposes outlined in Minnesota Statutes 256J and 256M. 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 the service agreement and that documentation of compliance will be available for audit.

The counties shall make reasonable efforts to comply with all Children and Community Services Act requirements, including efforts to identify and apply for available state and federal funding for services within the limits of available funding.

Acceptance and use of state and federal funds through the MFIP Consolidated Fund means the county agrees to operate the MFIP program in accordance with state law and guidance from the Minnesota Department of Human Services.

Contingency Planning

As required under the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 and under state guidance, counties and subcontractors will have a contingency plan in place by Sept. 28, 2007, to address specific federal criteria on how programs funded through Title IV-B, part 2 and Title IV-E would respond to a natural or man-made disaster. The federal criteria of the county and subcontractor's disaster preparedness plan would include:

- Identify, locate, and continue availability of services for children under State care or supervision who are displaced or adversely affected by a disaster;
- Respond, as appropriate, to new child welfare cases in areas adversely affected by a disaster, and provide services in those cases;
- Remain in communication with caseworkers and other essential child welfare personnel who are displaced because of a disaster;
- Preserve essential program records; and coordinate services and share information with other states.

Details on the preparation of this plan can be found in Bulletin #07-68-10, titled "Child Welfare Disaster Preparedness Plans." If you have questions or need clarification, contact Jean Thompson at (651) 431-3856.

Section VII: Certification for Submission

- ☐ Checking this box certifies that this Biennial Service Agreement has been prepared as required and approved by the county board(s) under the provisions of Minnesota Statutes 256M (Children and Community Services Act) and 256J (Minnesota Family Investment Program).

Chair, County Board of Commissioners or Authorized Designee

(State the name of the chair or designee, their mailing address and the name of their county)

Name (chair or designee)	Mailing Address	County

Date of Submission

Date:	
-------	--