



Minnesota's Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2017

Children and Family Services

November 2018

Minnesota Department of Human Services
Child Safety and Permanency Division
P.O. Box 64943
St. Paul, MN 55155
651-431-4660

dhs.csp.research@state.mn.us

<https://mn.gov/dhs/people-we-serve/children-and-families/services/child-protection/>



For accessible formats of this information or assistance with additional equal access to human services, write to DHS.info@state.mn.us, call 651-431-4670, or use your preferred relay service. ADA1 (2-18)

Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 3.197, requires the disclosure of the cost to prepare this report. The estimated cost of preparing this report is \$10,667.30.

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

Contents

- Minnesota’s Out-of-home Care and Permanency Report, 2017 1
 - Out-of-home Care and Permanency report summary, 2017..... 6
 - Purpose 6
 - Findings 6
 - Legislation 8
 - Introduction 9
 - Minnesota children 9
 - What is out-of-home care? 9
 - Minnesota’s out-of-home care system 10
 - Pathway from out-of-home care to permanency 10
 - Placement in out-of-home care 10
 - Children and placements: Enterers and continuers 11
 - Sidebar: Why are more children experiencing out-of-home care in a single year? 14
 - Characteristics of children in out-of-home care 15
 - Sidebar: A closer look at the two or more races category 16
 - Reasons for entering care 19
 - Supervision and case management 22
 - Supervising agency 22
 - Case management services 23
 - Caseworker visits with children in out-of-home care 24
 - Placement experiences 24
 - Placement moves 26
 - Leaving out-of-home care 27
 - Length of time in care 27

Reasons for leaving out-of-home care.....	29
Adoptions.....	30
Children and state guardianship: Enterers and continuers	31
Characteristics of children under state guardianship	32
Characteristics of children who were adopted.....	35
Children who aged out of guardianship.....	38
Time to adoption.....	38
Adoption of siblings	39
Tribal customary adoptions	40
Post placement services and outcomes.....	40
Post reunification services	41
Adoption and kinship assistance.....	41
Re-entry.....	42
Sidebar: A closer look at out-of-home care re-entry and program of services	43
The out-of-home care and permanency appendix	44
Table 6. Number of children in out-of-home care by sex and agency with U.S. Census child population estimate and rate per 1,000, 2017	45
Table 7. Number of children in out-of-home care by age and agency, 2017	48
Table 8. Number of children in out-of-home care by race, ethnicity and by agency, 2017	51
Table 9. Number of new placement episodes by primary reason for removal from the home and by agency, 2017	54
Table 10. Number of children who experienced out-of-home care by location setting type and by agency, 2017	57
Table 11. Number of foster care families who cared for children by race/ethnicity and by agency, 2017	61
Table 12. American Indian children in out-of-home care by tribe, 2017	64
Table 13. Number of placement episodes ending by length of stay in care and by agency, 2017	66

Table 14. Number of children under state guardianship by agency, 2017.....	69
References	72

Out-of-home Care and Permanency report summary, 2017

Purpose

The purpose of this annual report is to provide information on children placed in out-of-home care in Minnesota, and to highlight work across the state to ensure and promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children who experience out-of-home care. For the purpose of this report, the terms out-of-home care, out-of-home placement, foster care, and in care will be used interchangeably to refer to any instance in which a child is removed from their home of origin and placed in the care of the responsible social service agency. For information about performance on all state and federal performance measures, see the [Minnesota Child Welfare Data Dashboard](#).

Findings

Placement data for out-of-home care in 2017 is as follows:

- There were 16,593 children in 17,241 out-of-home care episodes who experienced one or more days in out-of-home care. (Children could be in multiple episodes of out-of-home care if they achieved permanency and then re-entered care.)
- There was a 10.6 percent increase in children experiencing out-of-home care from 2016.
- There were 7,482 children who entered out-of-home care in 2017, consistent with the previous year.
- The number of children who continued in out-of-home care is on the rise in 2017, with 9,413 children continued in care from 2016, a 21 percent increase from the year prior (that is, their episode began in a prior year and extended into 2017).
- Parental drug abuse continued to be the most common primary reason for new out-of-home care episodes, accounting for 2,260 new episodes or 29 percent of all new episodes, continuing a trend started in 2016.
- White children remain the largest group in care, however, disproportionality remains a significant concern.
- American Indian children were 18.5 times more likely, African-American children were more than 3.0 times, and those identified as two or more races were 4.8 times more likely than white children to experience care, based on Minnesota population estimates from 2016.
- Children under age 2 and those between 15 and 17 years of age were the most likely age groups to experience out-of-home care.

Supervision and case management data is as follows:

- Of all out-of-home care placements, most are supervised by county social services (86.8 percent of enterers and 81.0 percent of continuers). The rest were overseen by corrections (5.9 percent of enterers, 3.4 percent of continuers), and tribal social services (7.3 percent of enterers, 15.6 percent of continuers).

- The most common settings experienced by children who entered care were family foster homes, with just over 80 percent of children spending some time in that type of setting.

Leaving out-of-home care data is as follows:

- There were 6,978 unique children in 7,194 placement episodes that ended in 2017.
- Of placement episodes that ended, 35.4 percent lasted six months or less.
- Most (64.1 percent) placements that ended in 2017 were because children were able to safely return home to their parents or other primary caregivers.
- More than one-in-five (21.7 percent) continuous placement episodes ended with children being adopted, or transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative.
- There were 2,314 children who spent at least one day under guardianship of the commissioner, an increase of 14 percent from 2016.
- Adoptions were finalized for 955 children under guardianship of the commissioner.
- For American Indian children under jurisdiction of tribal court, 70 had a customary tribal adoption, a 63 percent increase from 2016.
- Using the federal performance measure, re-entry into foster care in 2017 was 17.2 percent. Minnesota's re-entry rate is much higher than the federal performance standard of 8.3 percent.

Legislation

This report was prepared by the Minnesota Department of Human Services, Children and Family Services Administration, Child Safety and Permanency Division, for the Minnesota Legislature in response to a legislative directive in Minn. Stat., section 257.0725. This report also fulfills reporting requirements under the Vulnerable Children and Adults Act, [Minn. Stat., section 256M.80, subd. 2] and the Minnesota Indian Family Preservation Act. [Minn. Stat., section 260.775]

Minn. Stat., section 257.0725: The commissioner of human services shall publish an annual report on child maltreatment and on children in out-of-home placement. The commissioner shall confer with county agencies, child welfare organizations, child advocacy organizations, courts, and other groups on how to improve the content and utility of the department's annual report. Regarding child maltreatment, the report shall include the number and kinds of maltreatment reports received, and other data that the commissioner determines appropriate in a child maltreatment report.

Minn. Stat., section 256M.80, subd. 2: Statewide evaluation. Six months after the end of the first full calendar year and annually thereafter, the commissioner shall make public county agency progress in improving outcomes of vulnerable children and adults related to safety, permanency and well-being.

Minn. Stat., section 260.775: The commissioner of human services shall publish annually an inventory of all Indian children in residential facilities. The inventory shall include, by county and statewide, information on legal status, living arrangement, age, sex, tribe in which the child is a member or eligible for membership, accumulated length of time in foster care, and other demographic information deemed appropriate concerning all Indian children in residential facilities. The report must also state the extent to which authorized child-placing agencies comply with the order of preference described in United States Code, title 25, section 1901, et seq.

Introduction

Placement in out-of-home care is sometimes necessary. Foster care, especially family foster care settings, can mitigate the negative effects of maltreatment and/or neglect, providing children with supports that are essential for healthy development. [Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2012] It is imperative that the Minnesota Department of Human Services (department) monitor and assess information on children placed in out-of-home care, ranging from conditions that resulted in a child's removal from their home to how effective the system is at helping children find safe, permanent homes.

Entering out-of-home care can cause significant trauma for many children. Those in out-of-home care have been found more likely to have difficulties in school and exhibit emotional and behavioral problems. [Kortenkamp & Ehrle, 2002] Placement in out-of-home care, especially during particularly important developmental periods, can be problematic for a child's attachment with their primary caregiver(s). Additional negative impacts on emotional development are associated with multiple moves, and with re-entry into foster care. [American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Early Childhood, Adoption and Dependent Care, 2000]

Minnesota children

According to the National Kids Count Data Book, Minnesota has fewer children entering out-of-home care than many other states relative to the population of children. [Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2016] However, recent increases in children involved in child protection and a growing drug epidemic are contributing to more children entering care and staying in care longer. Minnesota has seen a 10.6 percent increase in children experiencing out-of-home care from 2016 to 2017.



Minnesota has significant racial disparities in out-of-home care; African-American and American Indian children are disproportionately likely to experience out-of-home care. [Minnesota Department of Human Services, 2013 and 2014]

What is out-of-home care?


Minnesota Statutes provide a detailed description of what constitutes out-of-home care or foster care. [Minn. Stat., 260C.007, subd. 18] Out-of-home care or foster care is any 24-hour substitute care for children placed away from their parents or guardians and for whom a responsible social services agency has placement and care responsibility. Foster care includes, but is not limited to, placement in foster family homes (relative and non-relative), group homes, emergency shelters, residential facilities, child

care institutions and pre-adoptive homes. In Minnesota, children can enter out-of-home care for a variety of reasons: Child protection, specialized treatment for mental health concerns or developmental disabilities, and juvenile corrections.

Minnesota’s out-of-home care system

Minnesota is a state supervised, locally administered child welfare system. This means that local social service agencies (87 counties and two American Indian tribes participating in the American Indian Child Welfare Initiative) are responsible for the care and protection of children in out-of-home placement. The Minnesota Department of Human Services, Child Safety and Permanency Division, provides oversight, guidance, training, technical assistance, and quality assurance monitoring of local agencies in support of that work. The purpose of this annual report is to provide information on children affected, and the work being done across the state to ensure and promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children who have experienced out-of-home care. There is an additional annual report that provides information on children who may have been maltreated, “Minnesota’s Child Maltreatment Report, 2017.” For information about performance on all state and federal child welfare performance measures, see the [Minnesota Child Welfare Data Dashboard](#).

Pathway from out-of-home care to permanency



Placement in out-of-home care

Children are placed in out-of-home care for a variety of reasons: Juvenile delinquency, developmental disabilities, access to needed mental health or other specialized treatment, or as a result of child protection involvement. There are three ways children can be placed into care (see [Minn. Stat., Chapter 260C](#) and [Minn. Stat., Chapter 260D](#)):

1. Voluntary placement agreement
2. Court order of a placement (involuntary), or
3. A 72-hour hold by law enforcement (involuntary)

A voluntary placement occurs when parents or custodians of a child agree to allow the local social service agency to temporarily take responsibility for care of a child. A court-ordered placement occurs

because a family is unable or unwilling to meet the safety or specialized needs of a child in their home. A 72-hour hold occurs when a child is found in surroundings or conditions which endanger their health or welfare; law enforcement has authority to remove a child from the home and place them in foster care. For a child to remain in care longer than 72 hours, the child welfare agency must have court-approved placement, or a parent must sign a voluntary agreement.

When a child enters out-of-home care, one of three different types of agencies assumes, or is delegated by the court, responsibility for supervision of that out-of-home care placement episode: County social services, corrections, or tribal social services.

There were 16,593 children who experienced 17,241 placements during 2017. Of these placement episodes, 11.6 percent began as a voluntary or court-reviewed voluntary hold (N = 1,992), and 88.3 percent began as a court-ordered or protective involuntary hold (N = 15,220). There were 40 episodes that did not have placement authority data entered.

Children and placements: Enterers and continuers

This report distinguishes between two groups of children who experience out-of-home care in a year: Enterers and continuers. Enterers are those children who had a placement episode which began in 2017, and continuers are those who were in a placement episode that began prior to 2017 and continued into 2017. As mentioned earlier, the number of placement episodes is higher than the number of children as a child could have been in multiple episodes.

- Of the 16,593 children who experienced 17,241 episodes of out-of-home care in 2017, there were 7,482 children in 7,828 placement episodes who were enterers, and 9,413 in placement episodes who were continuers.
- There were 302 children who were continuers and, after returning home in 2017, had a new entry into out-of-home care in 2017 and were subsequently categorized as enterers, as well. See Figure 1 for a diagram that shows the overlap in children.



Figure1. Continuers and Enterers

Total number who experienced care in 2017:

16,593 children





Figure 2. Number of children experiencing care by continuers, enterers and all children, 2008-2017



- The figure above shows 10-year trends for the number of children experiencing care, broken down by total number of children, number of enterers, and number of continuers
- In 2017, there was a 10 percent increase in the number of children experiencing care for at least one day of the year from the previous year.
- For the second year, more children were continuers than enterers in care, accounting for approximately 57 percent of children in out-of-home care in 2017.
- Additionally, there has been a 21 percent increase in children who are continuing in care from the previous year.
- The number of children who entered care in 2017 remained nearly the same as the previous year, increasing by 41 children.




Sidebar: Why are more children experiencing out-of-home care in a single year?

Over the last five years Minnesota has seen an increase in the number of children in care across the state. There has been a sharper increase in the number of continuers than enterers, which highlights the fact that children are staying in care for longer periods and not exiting to permanency. The chart below displays the decreases in the percent of children reaching permanency over time, starting with those who entered care in 2013. As shown, the one-year permanency rates dropped from 48 percent to 34 percent from 2013 to 2017, with two-year permanency rates dropping from 80 percent to 67 percent.

The median length of time in care for exiters has increased from 175 days in 2013 to 297 days in 2017. This increase can be partially tied to the reason for removal. There continues to be an increase in the number of children removed for parental substance abuse, and these cases have historically taken longer to reach permanency due to a variety of factors. As county or tribal courts have oversight in the majority of placements, it is important to recognize the vital role the courts play in ensuring that children achieve permanency within legally mandated time frames.

Decreases in number of episodes reaching permanency from 2013 to 2017



Characteristics of children in out-of-home care

This section provides data on the race, age, and disability status of children who entered care and continued in care in 2017. Disproportionality remains a significant concern for children in out-of-home placement.

- White children remain the largest group, both entering and continuing in care in 2017, accounting for 46.3 percent of enterers and 42.4 percent of continuers.
- African-American/Black children comprised the second largest number and percent of enterers, at 18.4 percent and American Indian children comprised the second largest group of continuers, at 24.1 percent.

Figure 3. Number and percentage by race/ethnicity of *children* in care in 2017





Figure 4. Rate per 1,000 for *children* in care in 2017




Sidebar: A closer look at the two or more races category

Minnesota is becoming more diverse, with many children and families identifying with more than one race. The rate of children identified as more than one race has been steadily increasing since 2010. Of those children who experienced care in 2017 and identified as more than one race:

- **87.6** percent identified at least one race as White
- **59.9** percent identified at least one race as African-American/Black
- **54.4** percent identified at least one race as American Indian
- **4.6** percent identified at least one race as Asian
- **1.2** percent identified as Pacific Islander.

- As shown in Figure 5 below, the rates of children experiencing out-of-home care have continued to increase for both American Indian children and those who identify as two or more races.
- American Indian children were 18.5 times more likely, African-American children were more than 3.0 times, and those identified as two or more races were 4.8 times more likely than white children to experience care, based on Minnesota population estimates from 2016 (rates of entry per 1,000 children in the population by race are shown in Figure 4).

Figure 5. Rate per 1,000 children in out-of-home care by race/ethnicity, 2008 – 2017








Figure 6. Number of *children* by age experiencing care in 2017



- Figure 6 shows the distribution of children experiencing out-of-home care by enterers and continuers by age. Age is calculated at either Jan. 1, 2017, for continuers, or the date of entry into care for those who entered out-of-home care in 2017.
- Children under age 2 and those between 15 and 17 years of age were more likely to experience out-of-home care.



Figure 7. Number and percentage of *children* by disability status in 2017



Note: The “Other” category includes hearing or visual impairment, physical disability, brain injury, HIV/AIDS.


- Some children who experienced out-of-home care have disabilities and may need additional support while in out-of-home placement. These range from learning and physical disabilities, emotional disturbances to Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders. Data show that 23.5 percent of children who entered care in 2017 had an identified disability, while 33.8 percent who continued in care into 2017 did (see Figure 7).

- For those children who entered or continued in care in 2017 with an identified disability, the most common was severe emotional disturbance (13.8 percent for enterers and 18.5 percent for continuers, a reduction of 2.8 percent from 2016 for continuers).
- Despite the difficulty in defining disability across disciplines, a review of relevant research suggests children with disabilities experience out-of-home care at higher rates than those without identified disabilities. There are several reasons why this may be true. Research has shown that there are higher rates of child maltreatment for this population. [Lightfoot & LaLiberte, 2013] Alternatively, children in out-of-home care may have higher rates of disability because they are more likely to come into contact with more child-serving professionals who often have training and experience in identifying red flags for developmental delays.

Reasons for entering care

Children enter out-of-home care for many different reasons. Most are related to the behavior of a parent or caregiver; a few are related to the behavior and needs of a child. Generally, removal due to a parental reason is a result of some factor that compromises the ability of that parent or caregiver to provide safety for a child. This may include parental drug use, alleged abuse or neglect of a child, incarceration, or parental mental health needs. Alternatively, a removal due to a child reason is typically a result of factors that affect the ability of a child to remain safe while in their home, or jeopardizes the safety of community members. Usually, a child has special needs, such as mental health and/or substance abuse that require specialized treatment. Although children may enter care for multiple reasons, more than three of every four placements (78.9 percent) had an indicated *primary* removal reason attributed to parents.


Figure 8: Number and percent of *placement episodes* with parental and child reasons beginning in 2017



Note: At the time of data analysis, there were 72 continuous placement episodes in which a local agency had not selected a primary reason for removal from the home.

- Although most placement episodes that began in 2017 were supported by at least one parental reason, child reasons were substantially more common in placements with older children. Figure 9 shows the number of placement episodes beginning in 2017 by parent and child reasons for each age group. Generally, children age 11 and younger were removed from their home due to parental reasons. For older children, increasingly higher proportions of new placement episodes began due to child reasons.


Figure 9: Number of placement episodes by age and primary removal reason beginning in 2017



Note: Age here is calculated at either Jan. 1, 2017, (for continuers) or the date of entry into care for those whose out-of-home care episode began in 2017.

- There are several reasons that may explain why older children are removed for child reasons more often. For example:
 - Older children may be more likely to become involved in delinquent activity and be placed in a juvenile detention facility. Some child welfare agencies in Minnesota have an agreement with juvenile corrections to provide funding for placement of these children.
 - Older children are more likely to have diagnosed mental health needs. Previous research has shown a relationship between children with complex mental health/behavioral needs and an increased likelihood of out-of-home placement. [Bhatti-Sinclair & Sutcliffe, 2012]

Figure 10: Number and percent of *placement episodes* by primary removal reason beginning in 2017



- More than one-quarter (29.2 percent) of placement episodes had a primary removal reason of parental drug abuse, whereas just less than one-quarter (23.5 percent) had a primary removal reason of alleged neglect. See Figure 10.
- There were 99 fewer children removed in 2017 due to a child reason (1,633 compared to 1,732 in 2016).
- Compared to parental reasons, removal from the home due to child reasons tended to occur at lower rates. Of the placement episodes where a child reason was identified as the primary reason for removal, almost all (1,504 of 1,732 or 92.2 percent) had either child delinquency, child mental health, or child family conflict listed as the primary removal reason.



Supervision and case management

The next section of the report provides information about what happens to children once they are placed in out-of-home care. It includes information on supervising agencies, placement locations where children are during their episode, and other information regarding what happens when children are in out-of-home care.

Supervising agency

There are three different agencies that assume, or are delegated by a county or tribal court, responsibility for placement of a child into out-of-home care: County social services, tribal social services, or corrections. These agencies ensure that state and federal laws are appropriately followed.

- A high proportion of American Indian children who entered care in 2017 were placed under supervision of tribal social services (42.8 percent), and an even higher proportion of American Indian children who continued in care in 2017 (61.3 percent) were under supervision of tribal social services.
- The proportion of children under supervision of corrections also varies by race, with African-American/Black children entering and continuing in care at a higher rate than other racial groups (14.0 percent for enterers and 9.2 percent for continuers). These numbers were reduced by more than 20 percent from 2016 data.

Table 1. Number and percent of placement episodes by race/ethnicity for three types of supervising agencies in 2017

	Enterers			Continuers			
	County social services	Corrections	Tribal social services	County social services	Corrections	Tribal social services	
African-American / Black	1,264 (86.0%)	206 (14.0%)		1,262 (90.8%)	128 (9.2%)		2,860 (100.0%)
American Indian	690 (53.7%)	46 (3.6%)	550 (42.8%)	844 (37.2%)	34 (1.5%)	1,391 (61.3%)	3,555 (100.0%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	145 (94.2%)	9 (5.8%)		190 (95.5%)	9 (4.5%)		353 (100.0%)
Two or more races	1,051 (93.8%)	49 (4.4%)	21 (1.9%)	1,343 (91.5%)	46 (3.1%)	79 (5.4%)	2,589 (100.0%)
Unknown / declined	176 (96.7%)	5 (2.7%)	1 (0.5%)	95 (97.9%)	2 (2.1%)		279 (100.0%)
White	3,468 (95.9%)	147 (4.1%)		3,890 (97.5%)	100 (2.5%)		7,605 (100.0%)
All races	6,794 (86.8%)	462 (5.9%)	572 (7.3%)	7,624 (81.0%)	319 (3.4%)	1,470 (15.6%)	17,241 (100.0%)
Hispanic (any race)	762 (93.2%)	45 (5.5%)	11 (1.3%)	794 (89.6%)	32 (3.6%)	60 (6.8%)	1,704 (100.0%)

Case management services

Case management services are provided for families with children in out-of-home care for more than 30 days. Services are customized based on the reasons for placement, including: Child protection, specialized treatment for mental health concerns or developmental disabilities, and juvenile corrections.

While children are in care, county and tribal agency staff work with the child, their family, and providers to develop a comprehensive Out-of-home Placement Plan (OHPP). The OHPP is the case plan that drives the services that a child and family receive; it outlines all specific provisions that must be met for a child to safely return home. Often, there are certain safety requirements that a family must meet or exceed for a child to return home.

Out-of-home Placement Plans are completed:


- Within 30 days of a child's initial placement
- Jointly with parents
- Jointly with a child, when of appropriate age, and
- In consultation with guardian ad litem, foster parent, and tribe, if a child is American Indian.

For placements that have court involvement, OHPPs receive court approval and are reviewed every 90 days while a child remains in care to ensure that adequate and appropriate services are being provided.

An independent living skills (ILS) plan for children age 14 or older is also required. This plan is developed with youth, caseworker, caretaker(s), and other supportive adults in a youth's life to encourage continued development of independent living skills, and life-long connections with family, community and tribe. Specific independent living skills include, but are not limited to, the following areas: Educational, vocational or employment planning; transportation; money management; health care and medical coverage; housing; and social and/or recreation. It does not conflict with, or replace the goal of, achieving permanency for youth. [See [Minn. Stat., section 260C.212, subd. 1\(c\)\(11\)](#)]

Additional services available to youth in out-of-home care, based on eligibility, include:

- Support for Emancipation and Living Functionally (SELF) program: Helps youth working with a county or tribal caseworker prepare for a successful transition to adulthood, including independent living skills training, housing, transportation, permanent connections, education, and employment services to youth ages 14 - 20
- Minnesota Education and Training Voucher (ETV) program: Current and former foster youth can get up to \$5,000 per school year for post-secondary education at college, university, vocational, technical or trade schools




- Extended foster care (EFC) services and payments: Youth can stay in their foster care setting longer, live on their own with additional support, or request to return to foster care through age 20
- Healthy Transition and Homeless Prevention program: Partnership with nonprofit agencies statewide to provide independent living skills services to youth currently or previously experiencing out-of-home care through age 21.

Caseworker visits with children in out-of-home care

Caseworkers are required to meet monthly with children in out-of-home placement. Monthly visits are critical to a child remaining safe, achieving successful and timely reunification, or reaching alternative means of permanency. Visits provide an opportunity for caseworkers to monitor a child’s safety, stability of placement, progress on services provided to a child and family, and well-being while in care. Often, children are seen more frequently than monthly, depending on the needs of a child, family, or placement provider.

- Of enterers in 2017, for the months where face-to-face visits were required, caseworkers saw children monthly 85.7 percent of the time; for continuers, caseworkers saw children monthly 78.8 percent of the time (see Figure 11).
- Minnesota’s child welfare agencies continue to work on improving the frequency with which children are seen by examining the barriers to monthly case worker visits. There was a small increase in the case worker visits in 2017, following the appropriation of additional funds by the Minnesota Legislature to increase the number of child welfare workers.

Figure 11: Percent of months in which children received a required monthly caseworker visit (enterers vs. continuers) in 2017



Note: Caseworker visit calculations include only children under 18 years old.

Placement experiences


Once a child has been removed from the home or even prior to their removal, whenever possible, child welfare agencies work diligently to locate a safe and stable placement. There are a variety of out-of-home care settings that vary on overall level of restrictiveness, as well as the types of services provided. These settings range from family-type settings, including foster homes to more intensive settings like residential treatment centers. Children may experience multiple placement setting types during a single placement episode, depending on their unique needs.

Minnesota Statutes dictate that when placing a child, an agency must first consider placing them with a suitable individual who is related to them, then consider any individuals who a child may have significant contact with (see [Minn. Stat., 260C.212, subd. 2 \(a\)](#) for details). Numerous factors related to a child’s overall well-being, such as their educational, medical, developmental, religious, and cultural needs, as well as their personal preference if old enough, are considered.

- Table 2 provides information about the racial diversity of individuals who provided family foster care for at least one day to a child in placement in Minnesota.


Table 2: Number and percent of foster care homes where at least one caregiver identifies as a specified race/ethnicity in 2017

	Number	Percent
African-American / Black	1,248	14.5%
American Indian	1,079	12.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	147	1.7%
Two or more races	421	4.9%
Unknown / declined	351	4.1%
White	6,046	70.0%
Hispanic	402	4.7%



- Placement in the least restrictive, most home-like environment is preferred whenever possible. Children were most often placed in home-like settings (see Figure 12). Of the 7,482 children who entered care in 2017, about three-quarters (77.6 percent) spent some time in either a relative or non-relative foster home setting. Just under half of all children in care (45.7 percent) spent at least some time in relative family foster care more specifically. (Children can spend time in multiple location settings during an episode of out-of-home care, and could therefore be counted multiple times across different setting types.)
- Other types of settings such as group homes, residential treatment centers and correctional facilities are more restrictive for a child and are less common than family foster care.
- The remaining settings prepare a child for adoption or other permanent placement, i.e., pre-adoptive or pre-kinship homes and independent living centers.

Figure 12: Number and percent of *children* by location setting in 2017



Note: This graph shows only children who entered out-of-home care in 2017. ICF-DD stands for Intermediate Care Facilities for persons with developmental disabilities.


Placement moves

During a placement episode, children may move from one location to another to better meet their particular needs. Although moves can create further trauma for a child in out-of-home care, some moves are necessary to better ensure safety of a child, provide needed services and/or a less restrictive environment, or achieve permanency.



- When taking into account the entire length of an out-of-home care episode for all episodes occurring in 2017 (both enterers and continuers), the vast majority of placement episodes had between zero and three moves (89.1 percent). Children who were in care for longer periods of time experience more moves. See Figure 13.
- The majority of children who entered care in 2017 only experienced one placement location (62.7 percent).
- The majority of continuers experienced one placement location (29.7 percent).

Figure 13: Number of total moves children experienced while in a placement episode (through 2017)



Leaving out-of-home care

This section focuses on children who left out-of-home care in 2017. The designation of exiters will be used for children who were in out-of-home placement and exited during 2017.

Length of time in care


There were 6,978 unique children in 7,194 placement episodes that ended in 2017 (e.g., some children experienced more than one placement episode that ended during the year). Some children were in care for only a few days while others had been in care for multiple years. Approximately 35.4 percent of placements were for six months or less (see Figure 14).

The length of time that a child spends in care is highly variable and may be influenced by the following, among many other factors:

- Needs of child and family
- Safety concerns
- Availability of resources to help families reach goals in their case plan
- Overall permanency goal(s)
- Administrative requirements/barriers, and
- Legal responsibilities/court decisions.

Although most children discharge prior to their 18th birthday, Minnesota law allows youth in foster care on their 18th birthday to receive extended foster care services through age 20, if they meet certain criteria. There were 902 children/youth who experienced extended foster care during 2016. The most common criteria were: Completing high school/GED (58.6 percent), employed at least 80 hours per month (29.5 percent), and enrolled in post-secondary or vocational education (21.6 percent).

Figure 14: Length of stay for placement episodes ending in 2017



- Length of time in care also varies by race and ethnicity. Table 3 shows the number and percentage of placement episodes broken down by length of stay and race and ethnicity.
- American Indian children have high proportions who stay in care for two years or longer compared to other racial and ethnic groups.



Table 3: Number and percent of *placement episodes* ending in 2017 by length of time in care and race/ethnicity

	African-American / Black	American Indian	Asian / Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown / declined	White	All races	Hispanic (any race)
1 to 7 days	260 (21.2%)	58 (5.1%)	29 (19.5%)	88 (8.6%)	39 (31.0%)	297 (8.4%)	771 (10.7%)	84 (11.5%)
8 to 30 days	114 (9.3%)	39 (3.4%)	10 (6.7%)	53 (5.2%)	10 (7.9%)	205 (5.8%)	431 (6.0%)	64 (8.8%)
1 to 3 months	97 (7.9%)	78 (6.8%)	10 (6.7%)	97 (9.5%)	13 (10.3%)	338 (9.6%)	633 (8.8%)	72 (9.9%)
3 to 6 months	108 (8.8%)	102 (8.9%)	16 (10.7%)	103 (10.1%)	11 (8.7%)	370 (10.5%)	710 (9.9%)	72 (9.9%)
6 to 12 months	254 (20.7%)	213 (18.6%)	31 (20.8%)	192 (18.8%)	31 (24.6%)	851 (24.1%)	1,572 (21.9%)	159 (21.8%)
12 to 24 months	205 (16.7%)	322 (28.1%)	35 (23.5%)	298 (29.1%)	18 (14.3%)	1,027 (29.1%)	1,905 (26.5%)	167 (22.9%)
24 to 36 months	107 (8.7%)	177 (15.5%)	12 (8.1%)	120 (11.7%)	4 (3.2%)	274 (7.8%)	694 (9.6%)	70 (9.6%)
36 months or more	82 (6.7%)	155 (13.5%)	6 (4.0%)	73 (7.1%)		162 (4.6%)	478 (6.6%)	42 (5.8%)
Total	1,227 (100.0%)	1,144 (100.0%)	149 (100.0%)	1,024 (100.0%)	126 (100.0%)	3,524 (100.0%)	7,194 (100.0%)	730 (100.0%)


Reasons for leaving out-of-home care

The following section provides information about the reasons why children were discharged from their out-of-home placement episode.

- For placement episodes that ended in 2017 (see Figure 15), the majority (64.1 percent) ended because children were able to safely return home to their parents or other primary caregivers.
- More than one-quarter (26.8 percent) of placement episodes ended with children being adopted, living with relatives (including a non-custodial father), or a transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative.
- A small proportion of placements ended because children turned 18, ran away, or transferred to a different agency, such as a correctional facility.
- Tragically, there were eight cases where continuous placement episodes ended because the child died while in care. Five instances were due to accidental or natural causes, two were undetermined, and one was due to child maltreatment.
- In 2017, the department began using a trauma-informed, robust and scientific systemic critical incident review process for child fatalities that occur in foster care settings. The review process is designed to systemically analyze the child welfare system to identify opportunities for improvement, as well as address barriers to providing the best possible services to children and families. The model utilizes components from the same science used by other safety-critical industries, including aviation and health

care; it moves away from blame and toward a system of accountability that focuses on identifying underlying systemic issues to improve Minnesota’s child welfare system.

Figure 15: Number and percent of *placement episodes* ending by discharge reason in 2017




Adoptions

Some children exited out-of-home care in 2017 due to adoption. The following section provides details about children who exited to adoption, as well as the process through which a child goes from being in out-of-home care to being adopted. Adoption is the preferred permanency option if reunification with parents or primary caregivers cannot be achieved in a safe and/or timely fashion. Children may ultimately be adopted by their foster parents, relatives, or other individuals who have developed a relationship with a child; all pre-adoptive parents must meet the necessary state requirements for adoption. When reunification is not possible, and adoption is determined to be the appropriate permanency option for a child, the court must order a termination of parental rights (TPR), which severs the legal parent-child relationship, or accept parents’ consent to adoption. The court must also order guardianship of a child to the department’s commissioner.

Children under guardianship of the commissioner are referred to as “state wards” in this section. The commissioner is the temporary guardian of these children until they are adopted. Adoption is the only permanency option for children under guardianship of the commissioner.¹ As designated agents of the

¹ The exception is when a court determines that re-establishing parental rights is the most appropriate permanency option. There are specific eligibility criteria that must be met prior to making this determination, including age of a child, length of time in care post-termination of parental rights, and whether a parent has corrected conditions that led to the termination of parental rights. See [Minn. Stat., 260C.329](#) for more information.

commissioner, county and tribal social service agencies are responsible for safety, placement, and well-being of these children, including identifying appropriate adoptive parents and working with adoptive parents, courts, and others to facilitate the adoption process. This process may be lengthy. Children may remain under guardianship of the commissioner for months, years, or until they turn age 18 and either age out of the foster care system or continue in extended foster care. Once a child turns 18, they are no longer under guardianship of the commissioner.



Children and state guardianship: Enterers and continuers

The remainder of this report uses county data from the department’s Adoption Information System, and includes data from court, county, and tribal social services documents entered at the department. As was done in the section about children who experienced out-of-home placement, this section will distinguish between two groups of children who are under guardianship of the commissioner in a year: Enterers and continuers.

Enterers are those children where the commissioner became their legal guardian in 2017 due to termination of parental rights or court’s acceptance of parents’ consent to



adoption. Continuers are those who became wards of the state prior to 2017 and remained under state guardianship into 2017. During 2017, there were 2,314 children who spent at least one day under guardianship of the commissioner. There were 965 children who entered guardianship and 1,349 who continued in guardianship.

Characteristics of children under state guardianship

This section focuses on the age and race of children who entered guardianship and continued to be under state guardianship in 2017. White children remain the largest group, both entering and continuing in guardianship in 2017 (see Figure 16). Although white children comprised the greatest number of children under guardianship, American Indian children and those with two or more races have the highest rate per 1,000 for children continuing in care under guardianship (see Figure 17).



Figure 16: Number and percent of *children* under guardianship by race/ethnicity in 2017




Figure 17: Rate per 1,000 for *children* under guardianship in 2017






Figure 18: Rate per 1,000 of *children* entering guardianship by race/ethnicity, 2010 – 2017



- Figure 19 shows the distribution of children entering and continuing guardianship by age
- Children entering guardianship tended to be younger, with approximately half being age 4 or younger
- Children continuing under guardianship were more evenly distributed across age groups, although approximately 35.5 percent of these children were also age 4 or younger.

Figure 19. Number of *children* by age experiencing state guardianship in 2017




Characteristics of children who were adopted

The following section provides information on the characteristics of children who had been state wards in 2017 and who had finalized adoptions during the year.

- During 2017, 955 children had finalized adoptions. Of these, 218 became state wards during the same year, and 737 were state wards prior to the beginning of 2017.
- In total, approximately 41.8 percent of all children under state guardianship in 2017 were adopted.
- White children comprised the largest proportion who were adopted. The racial and ethnic breakdown of all children adopted during 2017 is shown in Figure 20.




Figure 20. Number and percent of *children* adopted by race/ethnicity in 2017



- Children birth to age 5 comprise the largest proportion of adopted children. This pattern is more pronounced for children who entered guardianship in 2017 than for those who were already under guardianship on the first of the year, (Figure 21).

Figure 21. Number and percent of *children* adopted by age group in 2017



The number of children adopted in all age categories increased in 2017 from 2016.

- As displayed in the next two graphs (Figures 22 and 23), white children continue to comprise the largest group of adopted children; white children comprised 52.6 percent of children under guardianship in 2017, and 77.7 percent of Minnesota’s child population.
- The number adopted increased for all races, excluding Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic children of any race, (Figures 22 and 23).

Figure 22. Number of *children* adopted by age group, 2010 – 2017





Figure 23. Number of *children* adopted by race/ethnicity, 2010 – 2017



Children who aged out of guardianship

Not all children who become state wards eventually get adopted. Some children turn age 18 and “age out” of the foster care system. Children may still be adopted after turning 18, although this information is not monitored by the department.


- During 2017, 55 children who had been state wards aged out before being adopted
- Eleven of the 55 children (20 percent) continued in care after turning 18 through the extended foster care program.

Time to adoption

The average time from being placed under state guardianship to adoption has overall improved over the last eight years. The following figure (Figure 24) provides information about how long it takes from the date of entering state guardianship to adoption for children who were adopted between 2010 and 2017.

- Younger children are typically adopted faster than older children, with those birth - 3 remaining in care for 303 days, on average.
- Children age 15 - 18 increased by an average of 176 days in 2017 as compared with their length of time in guardianship in 2016.
- Every age group saw an increase in the time to adoption from 2015 to 2017.

Figure 24. Days from entering guardianship to adoption by age, 2010 – 2017



Adoption of siblings²

Keeping siblings together contributes to maintaining family relationships and cultural connections. Separating siblings in foster care and adoption may add to the trauma experienced by separation from birth parents and other family members. Both state and federal laws require siblings to be placed together for foster care and adoption at the earliest possible time, unless it is determined not to be in the best interest of a child, or is not possible after reasonable efforts by an agency.

- Table 4 shows the number and percentages of sibling groups that were adopted fully intact, and either partially or fully intact for the years 2010–2017.
- In 2017, 65.8 percent of sibling groups were adopted together.
- About 81 percent of sibling groups were adopted either partially or fully intact in 2017. These percentages have had only minor fluctuations between 2010 and 2017.

Table 4. Sibling group preservation in adoptions, 2010 – 2017

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Sibling groups available for adoption with at least one child adopted	153	133	135	135	184	169	237	234
Sibling groups adopted fully intact	111	90	97	97	130	118	172	154
Sibling groups adopted partially intact	18	14	13	16	22	23	27	36
Percent of sibling groups adopted fully intact	72.5%	67.7%	71.9%	71.9%	70.7%	69.8%	72.6%	65.8%
Percent of sibling groups adopted partially or fully intact	84.3%	78.2%	81.5%	83.7%	82.6%	83.4%	84.0%	81.1%

² Currently, the Social Service Information System categorizes siblings based on the biological mother, so siblings placed with, or separated from paternal siblings, are not included in the data. In addition, siblings who are 18 years or older, who were previously adopted, or who were never under guardianship of the commissioner, are also not counted as part of a sibling group in this data table. Because percentages of sibling groups preserved are calculated for adoption within a calendar year, some intact adoptions may not be counted if adoptions of individual children took place over the span of more than one year. Note that the percentages for sibling group preservation are smaller than those reported in previous years due to increased accuracy in determining sibling groups. The current method includes all sibling groups available for adoption during a given year in which one or more siblings were adopted.

Tribal customary adoptions

Most tribes in Minnesota offer culturally appropriate permanency options through tribal court. Some tribes utilize customary adoption as a permanency option, which occurs after suspension of parental rights rather than a termination of parental rights.

- Table 5 includes American Indian children who were under tribal court jurisdiction and were adopted through customary adoption from 2010 – 2017 by age group. Although there are minor fluctuations in numbers by age group across years, the relatively small number of tribal court children within each group limits interpretation of these trends.



Table 5. Number and percentage of American Indian children adopted through customary adoption by age group, 2010 - 2017

	Birth through 5 yrs.		6 yrs. or older		Total Number
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2010	14	60.9%	9	39.1%	23
2011	23	60.5%	15	39.5%	38
2012	22	73.3%	8	26.7%	30
2013	10	47.6%	11	52.4%	21
2014	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	22
2015	37	43.5%	48	56.5%	85
2016	24	55.8%	19	44.2%	43
2017	28	40.0%	42	60.0%	70

Post placement services and outcomes

After achieving permanency, either through reunification, adoption, or transfer of permanent legal and physical custody to a relative, the local social services agency or the department may provide services to support families. Some children who have achieved permanency may continue to have challenges and re-enter out-of-home care. The following section provides information about the services received post placement and on re-entry into out-of-home care.


Post reunification services

Children and their families may continue receiving support after their out-of-home placement has ended through provision of case management services by the local social services agency. The following section provides information about how many children received this type of service and for how long.

- For episodes that ended in reunification with parents/caretakers and children/families receiving case management, nearly 60 percent of episodes remained open for three months or more after a child was reunified.
- See Figure 25 for information on episodes that ended with reunification and ongoing case management services.



Figure 25. Number and percent of *episodes* that closed to reunification where ongoing services were provided by length of time in 2017



Adoption and kinship assistance


A child and family may receive ongoing support in the form of adoption assistance, available to many adoptive families or kinship assistance if they meet eligibility criteria. For more information about eligibility criteria and the process, see [Northstar Adoption Assistance Program](#). While adoption assistance has been available for the past few decades, Northstar kinship assistance is a new program that began in 2015 to support relatives who assume permanent legal and physical custody of a related child.

- There were 7,832 children who received payments for adoption assistance in 2017.
- Of the 7,832 children, 731 were adopted or had a customary tribal adoption finalized in 2017.
- There were 1,898 children who received payments for Northstar kinship assistance in 2017.

Re-entry

Despite the best efforts of county and tribal agency staff, some children who experience out-of-home care and achieve permanency will re-enter the foster care system due to either safety concerns or the need for specialized treatment. Using the CFSR Round 3 performance measure for re-entry into foster care, Minnesota’s re-entry rate is much higher than the federal performance standard of 8.3 percent.


Figure 26. Re-entry into foster care in 2017



Sidebar: A closer look at out-of-home care re-entry and program of services

When foster care re-entry is further explored by program area in which a child is being served by social services, the majority of children who re-entered according to this performance measure received services from one of the following programs: Child protection, child welfare (frequently juvenile correctional placements), or children’s mental health. Child protection consistently has the lowest re-entry rate of the three (13.9 percent in 2017), although it is still above the federal performance standard.

Re-entry rates by program area



The out-of-home care and permanency appendix

Table 6. Number of children in out-of-home care by sex and agency with U.S. Census child population estimate and rate per 1,000, 2017

Agency	Under 18 (female)	Under 18 (male)	18 or older (female)	18 or older (male)	Total children / young adults	2016 child population estimate	Child rate per 1,000
Aitkin	31	34	1	0	66	2,630	24.7
Anoka	251	258	11	14	534	83,398	6.1
Becker	101	108	6	0	215	8,207	25.5
Beltrami	563	565	10	5	1,143	11,651	96.8
Benton	53	60	1	1	115	9,882	11.4
Big Stone	10	5	0	0	15	1,042	14.4
Blue Earth	82	84	0	0	166	13,013	12.8
Brown	26	30	0	0	56	5,563	10.1
Carlton	64	82	3	2	151	8,085	18.1
Carver	95	66	6	6	173	27,384	5.9
Cass	69	60	4	0	133	6,190	20.8
Chippewa	3	5	0	0	8	2,781	2.9
Chisago	68	70	1	1	140	12,543	11.0
Clay	95	129	2	5	231	15,053	14.9
Clearwater	9	15	0	0	24	2,194	10.9
Cook	10	14	0	1	25	820	29.3
Crow Wing	125	119	2	3	249	13,965	17.5
Dakota	228	234	3	2	467	102,983	4.5
Douglas	51	44	3	1	99	7,982	11.9
Fillmore	12	13	0	0	25	5,095	4.9
Freeborn	48	50	1	0	99	6,621	14.8
Goodhue	51	55	4	0	110	10,466	10.1
Grant	5	5	0	1	11	1,360	7.4
Hennepin	1,463	1,580	65	79	3,187	273,089	11.1
Houston	17	24	0	0	41	4,065	10.1
Hubbard	39	51	1	1	92	4,407	20.4
Isanti	51	67	1	4	123	9,312	12.7
Itasca	125	149	7	10	291	9,563	28.7
Kanabec	22	28	1	1	52	3,394	14.7
Kandiyohi	52	56	3	1	112	10,193	10.6

Agency	Under 18 (female)	Under 18 (male)	18 or older (female)	18 or older (male)	Total children / young adults	2016 child population estimate	Child rate per 1,000
Kittson	5	3	1	1	10	925	8.6
Koochiching	25	37	1	1	64	2,350	26.4
Lac qui Parle	9	6	0	0	15	1,322	11.3
Lake	11	16	1	0	28	1,947	13.9
Lake of the Woods	3	8	0	0	11	687	16.0
Le Sueur	29	28	1	0	58	6,623	8.6
McLeod	67	68	2	0	137	8,379	16.1
Mahnomen	10	15	2	0	27	1,710	14.6
Marshall	7	4	1	0	12	2,124	5.2
Meeker	20	14	0	3	37	5,612	6.1
Mille Lacs	120	139	3	0	262	6,180	41.9
Morrison	48	48	1	1	98	7,732	12.4
Mower	47	52	0	1	100	9,793	10.1
Nicollet	41	39	3	1	84	7,425	10.8
Nobles	31	39	3	1	74	5,842	12.0
Norman	12	11	0	0	23	1,511	15.2
Olmsted	93	105	10	7	215	37,756	5.2
Otter Tail	75	95	1	2	173	12,591	13.5
Pennington	24	29	1	0	54	3,291	16.1
Pine	78	75	0	1	154	5,799	26.4
Polk	46	47	1	1	95	7,543	12.3
Pope	14	15	0	4	33	2,292	12.7
Ramsey	815	906	34	30	1,785	126,468	13.6
Red Lake	5	5	0	0	10	983	10.2
Renville	18	33	0	0	51	3,248	15.7
Rice	88	97	5	3	193	14,302	12.9
Roseau	15	10	0	0	25	3,792	6.6
St. Louis	602	624	20	19	1,265	38,252	32.1
Scott	92	65	1	2	160	40,371	3.9
Sherburne	67	80	1	2	150	25,074	5.9
Sibley	19	20	0	0	39	3,509	11.1
Stearns	191	230	7	11	439	35,620	11.8
Stevens	13	18	1	1	33	2,037	15.2

Agency	Under 18 (female)	Under 18 (male)	18 or older (female)	18 or older (male)	Total children / young adults	2016 child population estimate	Child rate per 1,000
Swift	22	28	0	1	51	2,150	23.3
Todd	47	55	1	4	107	5,783	17.6
Traverse	8	9	0	1	18	686	24.8
Wabasha	19	29	2	1	51	4,693	10.2
Wadena	33	49	1	1	84	3,355	24.4
Washington	124	129	10	6	269	62,865	4.0
Watonwan	7	11	2	2	22	2,622	6.9
Wilkin	4	9	0	1	14	1,420	9.2
Winona	69	67	2	0	138	9,300	14.6
Wright	114	137	3	1	255	37,621	6.7
Yellow Medicine	20	23	0	0	43	2,289	18.8
Southwest HHS	143	140	4	6	293	18,037	15.7
Des Moines Valley HHS	27	43	3	0	73	4,929	14.2
Faribault-Martin	78	78	1	3	160	7,349	21.2
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	121	130	1	1	253	1,975	127.1
White Earth Nation	248	249	3	0	500	1,981	250.9
MN Prairie	103	91	0	1	195	19,213	10.1
Minnesota	7,746	8,318	270	259	16,593	1,288,333	12.5

†Note: The data for these two groups are 2010 Census numbers which represent children residing on the Leech Lake and White Earth reservations who indicated American Indian alone or as one of two or more races. There are no intercensal child population estimates for these groups. The Leech Lake reservation overlaps Cass, Itasca, Beltrami and Hubbard counties. The White Earth reservation overlaps Mahnommen, Becker and Clearwater counties.

Note: Child rate per 1,000 only includes children under 18. Age was calculated either on the first of the year for those who were in care on Jan. 1, 2017 or on the day an out-of-home care placement episode began in 2017 for all others.

Table 7. Number of children in out-of-home care by age and agency, 2017

Agency	Birth - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 8 years	9 - 11 years	12 - 14 years	15 - 17 years	18 or older	Total children
Aitkin	12	7	9	13	12	12	1	66
Anoka	115	86	75	68	78	87	25	534
Becker	56	34	35	26	27	31	6	215
Beltrami	296	214	186	164	140	128	15	1,143
Benton	26	18	10	17	12	30	2	115
Big Stone	4	3	0	2	1	5	0	15
Blue Earth	35	41	30	31	19	10	0	166
Brown	12	10	6	5	12	11	0	56
Carlton	28	26	14	23	33	22	5	151
Carver	26	14	23	21	30	47	12	173
Cass	20	19	19	23	18	30	4	133
Chippewa	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	8
Chisago	38	29	19	18	14	20	2	140
Clay	39	27	29	20	46	63	7	231
Clearwater	6	4	2	4	2	6	0	24
Cook	4	3	1	6	6	4	1	25
Crow Wing	71	47	39	25	35	27	5	249
Dakota	131	79	79	48	53	72	5	467
Douglas	18	20	14	10	18	15	4	99
Fillmore	4	3	4	1	4	9	0	25
Freeborn	26	21	11	10	8	22	1	99
Goodhue	21	16	17	15	17	20	4	110
Grant	2	2	0	2	2	2	1	11
Hennepin	877	458	417	378	386	527	144	3,187
Houston	12	8	6	2	7	6	0	41
Hubbard	21	19	8	12	17	13	2	92
Isanti	22	19	19	22	16	20	5	123
Itasca	45	45	27	30	57	70	17	291
Kanabec	14	7	5	4	8	12	2	52
Kandiyohi	25	13	14	11	22	23	4	112
Kittson	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	10

Agency	Birth - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 8 years	9 - 11 years	12 - 14 years	15 - 17 years	18 or older	Total children
Koochiching	7	10	3	12	13	17	2	64
Lac qui Parle	2	1	2	3	2	5	0	15
Lake	4	3	5	5	4	6	1	28
Lake of the Woods	3	4	1	0	1	2	0	11
Le Sueur	11	13	8	7	6	12	1	58
McLeod	27	25	24	19	18	22	2	137
Mahnomen	4	4	3	0	3	11	2	27
Marshall	2	3	0	0	1	5	1	12
Meeker	4	2	3	4	11	10	3	37
Mille Lacs	86	41	37	28	37	30	3	262
Morrison	22	22	7	14	17	14	2	98
Mower	24	11	22	21	13	8	1	100
Nicollet	22	4	12	12	18	12	4	84
Nobles	3	8	12	10	16	21	4	74
Norman	6	3	1	2	3	8	0	23
Olmsted	55	19	21	21	30	52	17	215
Otter Tail	50	19	25	19	30	27	3	173
Pennington	21	8	9	2	5	8	1	54
Pine	41	26	23	18	19	26	1	154
Polk	16	14	11	6	21	25	2	95
Pope	5	8	4	5	3	4	4	33
Ramsey	419	249	231	181	245	396	64	1,785
Red Lake	1	5	2	0	2	0	0	10
Renville	8	10	7	6	12	8	0	51
Rice	48	32	22	27	21	35	8	193
Roseau	2	3	3	2	5	10	0	25
St. Louis	327	217	208	147	178	149	39	1,265
Scott	42	23	25	18	21	28	3	160
Sherburne	32	24	21	15	25	30	3	150
Sibley	10	8	8	2	3	8	0	39
Stearns	95	75	50	41	61	99	18	439
Stevens	5	4	5	3	4	10	2	33
Swift	15	11	9	4	6	5	1	51

Agency	Birth - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 8 years	9 - 11 years	12 - 14 years	15 - 17 years	18 or older	Total children
Todd	21	24	20	20	10	7	5	107
Traverse	3	4	2	1	3	4	1	18
Wabasha	9	6	4	6	9	14	3	51
Wadena	15	14	11	14	16	12	2	84
Washington	59	30	23	28	35	78	16	269
Watonwan	5	2	0	3	1	7	4	22
Wilkin	2	1	2	2	1	5	1	14
Winona	32	21	19	13	23	28	2	138
Wright	50	36	36	42	33	54	4	255
Yellow Medicine	8	6	8	12	4	5	0	43
Southwest HHS	57	48	40	44	48	46	10	293
Des Moines Valley HHS	10	11	6	13	14	16	3	73
Faribault-Martin	33	28	20	19	23	33	4	160
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	49	73	47	37	27	18	2	253
White Earth Nation	144	92	78	54	70	59	3	500
MN Prairie	42	31	44	30	17	30	1	195
Minnesota	3,966	2,632	2,304	2,006	2,291	2,865	529	16,593

Table 8. Number of children in out-of-home care by race, ethnicity and by agency, 2017

Agency	African-American / Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/declined	White	Grand total	Hispanic (any race)
Aitkin	*	16	*	9	*	36	66	*
Anoka	77	21	8	94	*	324	534	44
Becker	*	74	*	39	*	99	215	14
Beltrami	*	995	*	44	*	93	1,143	24
Benton	13	*	*	23	*	73	115	*
Big Stone	*	*	*	*	*	14	15	*
Blue Earth	25	*	*	24	*	100	166	11
Brown	*	*	*	*	*	54	56	12
Carlton	*	65	*	29	*	54	151	*
Carver	17	*	*	18	*	129	173	13
Cass	*	34	*	*	*	86	133	*
Chippewa	*	*	*	*	*	7	8	*
Chisago	*	*	*	17	*	109	140	7
Clay	18	35	*	58	*	120	231	50
Clearwater	*	12	*	*	*	7	24	*
Cook	*	*	*	*	*	15	25	*
Crow Wing	20	24	*	18	*	186	249	*
Dakota	86	11	8	84	*	253	467	65
Douglas	13	*	*	19	*	59	99	*
Fillmore	*	*	*	*	*	24	25	*
Freeborn	*	*	*	12	*	84	99	23
Goodhue	*	*	*	9	*	92	110	17
Grant	*	*	*	*	*	8	11	*
Hennepin	1,274	448	91	731	*	598	3,187	413
Houston	*	*	*	*	*	30	41	*
Hubbard	8	22	*	12	*	49	92	10
Isanti	*	*	*	23	*	90	123	*
Itasca	*	44	*	30	*	211	291	*
Kanabec	*	*	*	*	*	48	52	*
Kandiyohi	9	*	*	*	*	93	112	54
Kittson	*	*	*	*	*	8	10	*

Agency	African-American / Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/declined	White	Grand total	Hispanic (any race)
Koochiching	*	9	*	*	*	50	64	*
Lac qui Parle	*	*	*	*	*	13	15	*
Lake	*	*	*	*	*	24	28	*
Lake of the Woods	*	*	*	*	*	*	11	*
Le Sueur	*	*	*	*	*	50	58	13
McLeod	*	*	*	10	*	120	137	18
Mahnomen	*	20	*	*	*	*	27	*
Marshall	*	*	*	*	*	10	12	*
Meeker	*	*	*	*	*	28	37	*
Mille Lacs	*	178	*	17	*	62	262	*
Morrison	*	*	*	23	*	72	98	*
Mower	11	*	11	15	*	63	100	16
Nicollet	*	*	*	16	*	61	84	19
Nobles	*	*	*	*	*	53	74	33
Norman	*	*	*	*	*	21	23	*
Olmsted	28	*	*	41	*	139	215	17
Otter Tail	8	13	*	19	*	127	173	9
Pennington	*	*	*	*	*	46	54	15
Pine	*	58	*	13	*	80	154	*
Polk	*	*	*	15	*	70	95	30
Pope	*	*	*	*	*	26	33	*
Ramsey	669	143	173	312	*	466	1,785	201
Red Lake	*	*	*	*	*	7	10	*
Renville	*	*	*	*	*	40	51	9
Rice	40	*	*	17	*	122	193	26
Roseau	*	*	*	*	*	17	25	*
St. Louis	105	316	*	224	*	602	1,265	36
Scott	11	*	*	30	*	105	160	18
Sherburne	18	*	*	34	*	88	150	*
Sibley	*	*	*	*	*	35	39	16
Stearns	84	12	*	69	*	265	439	56
Stevens	*	*	*	*	*	29	33	8
Swift	*	*	*	*	*	41	51	15

Agency	African-American / Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/declined	White	Grand total	Hispanic (any race)
Todd	*	*	*	19	*	83	107	*
Traverse	*	*	*	*	*	10	18	*
Wabasha	*	*	*	*	*	45	51	11
Wadena	*	*	*	17	*	60	84	*
Washington	33	15	*	46	*	146	269	47
Watonwan	*	*	*	*	*	21	22	13
Wilkin	*	*	*	*	*	12	14	*
Winona	15	*	*	17	*	101	138	12
Wright	20	*	*	29	*	201	255	20
Yellow Medicine	*	12	*	11	*	19	43	*
Southwest HHS	8	50	*	46	*	179	293	37
Des Moines Valley HHS	*	*	*	*	*	70	73	12
Faribault-Martin	*	*	*	15	*	137	160	22
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	*	247	*	*	*	*	253	8
White Earth Nation	*	469	*	31	*	*	500	12
MN Prairie	12	*	*	20	*	162	195	37
Minnesota	2,710	3,434	346	2,499	*	7,337	16,593	1,629

* If the number of children is less than seven it is omitted to prevent identification of individuals. Totals include the omitted data.

Table 9. Number of new placement episodes by primary reason for removal from the home and by agency, 2017

Agency	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical abuse health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total children
Aitkin	15	7	0	0	2	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Anoka	92	45	42	6	18	23	7	12	7	21	5	3	0	6	3	1	1	0	0	292
Becker	27	34	11	18	2	1	0	1	4	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Beltrami	90	258	3	12	11	1	3	8	0	3	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	397
Benton	16	8	11	8	7	2	3	0	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	63
Big Stone	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Blue Earth	27	17	3	1	4	1	4	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Brown	12	4	2	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	29
Carlton	19	22	8	5	18	3	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	84
Carver	9	15	2	4	1	12	4	8	0	5	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	65
Cass	12	6	5	0	7	2	0	4	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	42
Chippewa	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Chisago	21	22	0	2	2	2	4	1	1	2	4	3	1	10	0	1	0	0	0	76
Clay	3	7	1	57	5	16	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	96
Clearwater	2	4	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Cook	6	0	6	0	3	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
Crow Wing	38	35	1	2	0	5	3	1	0	1	4	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	95
Dakota	79	75	41	1	1	19	1	7	7	6	9	2	2	8	14	0	0	1	0	273
Douglas	11	10	5	5	5	6	0	3	1	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Fillmore	2	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
Freeborn	13	1	4	2	4	1	8	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	41
Goodhue	5	18	9	4	3	4	3	0	3	7	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	60
Grant	0	1	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Hennepin	388	317	207	121	70	23	49	78	75	29	34	10	21	5	14	0	17	0	1	1,459
Houston	4	0	2	3	1	1	1	3	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Hubbard	6	17	2	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	32
Isanti	26	11	8	0	5	1	1	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	60
Itasca	27	24	6	23	22	10	8	3	3	11	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	143
Kanabec	10	1	1	5	4	0	2	3	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Kandiyohi	11	21	1	4	7	10	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	62
Kittson	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Koochiching	14	6	2	4	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Lac qui Parle	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Agency	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical abuse health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total children
Lake	9	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Lake of the Woods	0	6	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Le Sueur	9	11	2	0	5	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
McLeod	40	9	6	1	2	0	4	4	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	71
Mahnomen	7	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
Marshall	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
Meeker	5	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	15
Mille Lacs	41	20	1	5	9	0	0	2	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	86
Morrison	14	9	5	1	7	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Mower	14	7	5	0	0	1	5	1	1	8	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	46
Nicollet	9	14	4	0	6	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	46
Nobles	10	0	0	4	10	2	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	32
Norman	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Olmsted	21	25	3	10	12	7	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	88
Otter Tail	17	24	7	1	8	0	2	1	1	7	2	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	79
Pennington	17	11	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Pine	35	10	4	2	5	1	4	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	70
Polk	13	7	1	9	5	6	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	50
Pope	3	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Ramsey	139	263	82	217	27	30	37	6	38	5	8	2	7	2	3	2	5	0	1	874
Red Lake	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Renville	6	0	1	2	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	20
Rice	39	24	24	0	6	3	4	3	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Roseau	4	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
St. Louis	270	42	19	9	72	21	26	18	8	13	16	4	5	6	0	5	1	0	0	535
Scott	23	17	2	8	4	6	5	9	2	6	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	87
Sherburne	22	5	10	13	11	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	70
Sibley	10	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	22
Stearns	43	69	55	15	19	12	1	7	5	3	7	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	240
Stevens	1	0	11	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Swift	27	3	5	0	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Todd	23	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	1	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	44
Traverse	4	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Wabasha	5	11	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Wadena	17	5	9	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	48
Washington	30	23	5	13	25	10	7	3	4	4	2	2	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	136

Agency	Parental drug abuse	Alleged neglect	Child delinquency	Alleged physical abuse	Child mental health	Child family conflict	Caretaker mental health	Parental alcohol abuse	Alleged sexual abuse	Incarceration of parents	Abandonment	Inadequate housing	Child drug abuse	Relinquish or TPR	Child disability	Caretaker physical abuse health	Death of parent(s)	Child alcohol abuse	Safe Place for Newborns	Total children
Watonwan	1	4	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	12
Wilkin	0	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Winona	27	21	2	6	3	18	3	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	88
Wright	36	41	13	3	15	5	0	4	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	5	0	0	1	132
Yellow Medicine	11	3	0	0	3	3	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Southwest HHS	42	25	17	4	4	11	4	0	4	12	5	7	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	142
Des Moines Valley HHS	11	9	5	2	7	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Faribault-Martin	40	6	3	2	5	1	2	0	3	1	4	1	4	0	0	11	0	1	0	84
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	36	27	8	1	0	0	3	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	87
White Earth Nation	98	31	6	2	2	2	3	7	2	1	4	5	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	168
MN Prairie	37	15	12	4	8	2	8	14	8	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	114
Minnesota	2,260	1,812	723	653	523	330	258	239	221	192	158	95	73	65	55	54	28	8	4	7,751

Note: This table counts unique continuous placement episodes; children may have been placed in care on multiple occasions during the year.

Table 10. Number of children who experienced out-of-home care by location setting type and by agency, 2017

Agency	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Pre-kinship home – relative	Group home	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Foster home – corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD	Total children
Aitkin	22	25	9	13	1	1	6	0	0	1	6	0	0	66
Anoka	272	152	41	49	15	36	53	3	14	12	40	4	2	534
Becker	98	68	14	31	2	7	23	10	4	4	0	18	0	215
Beltrami	555	545	63	118	78	30	11	22	11	14	25	7	0	1,143
Benton	47	28	14	2	11	15	15	1	3	1	8	2	0	115
Big Stone	6	2	5	0	1	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	15
Blue Earth	66	54	8	18	0	12	15	0	2	0	1	1	1	166
Brown	20	12	10	4	4	11	5	1	5	0	1	1	1	56
Carlton	56	53	40	23	26	7	4	5	6	3	2	0	0	151
Carver	57	44	21	32	7	4	10	3	5	15	20	1	0	173
Cass	42	22	16	21	16	12	6	2	5	3	5	3	0	133
Chippewa	1	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	8
Chisago	73	50	8	1	4	12	9	2	4	3	5	1	0	140
Clay	73	26	14	13	22	49	13	1	3	3	79	1	0	231
Clearwater	10	8	3	4	2	2	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	24
Cook	9	11	7	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	25
Crow Wing	117	84	16	16	12	33	21	0	5	1	4	0	0	249
Dakota	209	167	34	29	9	39	29	4	15	5	3	0	2	467
Douglas	56	27	8	6	5	3	2	1	1	2	3	4	0	99
Fillmore	4	0	3	0	7	5	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	25
Freeborn	42	30	8	4	7	13	17	2	1	2	0	0	0	99
Goodhue	54	34	22	8	3	4	4	1	3	5	0	0	0	110
Grant	5	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	11
Hennepin	1,275	1,256	496	213	241	204	190	131	62	118	11	1	2	3,187
Houston	19	7	4	4	0	8	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	41
Hubbard	34	22	6	22	1	11	5	0	2	2	2	0	1	92

Agency	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Pre-kinship home – relative	Group home	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Foster home– corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD	Total children
Isanti	50	43	18	15	9	9	8	1	5	2	3	0	0	123
Itasca	127	63	77	19	6	18	22	12	11	7	12	13	0	291
Kanabec	22	15	7	2	6	2	8	2	0	1	0	2	0	52
Kandiyohi	33	45	10	5	8	11	13	3	4	5	6	8	0	112
Kittson	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	10
Koochiching	11	27	13	7	2	8	2	1	0	4	1	2	0	64
Lac qui Parle	3	5	1	0	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	15
Lake	7	7	4	5	3	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	28
Lake of the Woods	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	11
Le Sueur	28	15	10	10	0	5	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	58
McLeod	46	70	7	3	3	4	14	0	2	3	0	0	0	137
Mahnomen	8	9	4	2	1	1	1	4	0	2	1	3	0	27
Marshall	1	7	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	12
Meeker	10	5	5	7	8	0	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	37
Mille Lacs	104	94	13	60	16	21	2	9	4	4	9	3	0	262
Morrison	38	29	8	2	1	16	20	0	7	2	0	0	0	98
Mower	37	25	10	8	6	20	17	2	1	1	0	0	0	100
Nicollet	38	17	11	4	6	9	4	0	6	3	1	0	1	84
Nobles	21	8	15	2	4	8	5	1	7	3	6	0	0	74
Norman	6	3	4	2	2	0	4	2	3	0	0	4	0	23
Olmsted	65	49	18	21	10	22	35	3	6	9	9	10	1	215
Otter Tail	61	53	27	36	6	10	5	3	12	1	1	5	0	173
Pennington	23	23	8	3	1	2	4	3	1	0	0	1	0	54
Pine	81	34	14	18	3	15	8	5	2	2	5	1	0	154
Polk	44	15	24	1	3	9	1	3	3	1	5	15	0	95
Pope	6	5	3	4	1	6	5	0	1	3	0	0	0	33
Ramsey	642	683	189	78	163	64	151	182	45	59	1	1	0	1,785
Red Lake	0	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Agency	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Pre-kinship home – relative	Group home	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Foster home– corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD	Total children
Renville	13	2	9	13	12	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	51
Rice	79	73	14	13	13	12	19	0	4	3	4	2	0	193
Roseau	4	7	4	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	5	6	0	25
St. Louis	457	410	142	204	208	92	75	25	27	26	2	0	0	1,265
Scott	48	51	10	12	5	22	15	2	6	3	8	16	0	160
Sherburne	48	32	18	22	13	17	15	2	13	3	5	6	0	150
Sibley	10	18	4	3	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	39
Stearns	187	130	28	24	48	45	36	25	15	11	7	7	0	439
Stevens	3	10	7	2	5	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	0	33
Swift	30	16	2	3	3	7	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	51
Todd	52	34	8	2	3	11	7	0	1	4	2	0	0	107
Traverse	14	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	18
Wabasha	29	13	7	0	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	51
Wadena	27	38	13	10	4	5	0	9	1	0	2	0	0	84
Washington	67	92	50	12	24	13	18	2	13	12	14	11	0	269
Watonwan	8	2	9	0	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	0	0	22
Wilkin	12	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	14
Winona	55	52	15	10	27	7	6	5	3	2	4	1	1	138
Wright	114	77	24	23	10	10	28	1	6	1	1	2	0	255
Yellow Medicine	2	22	2	5	7	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Southwest HHS	84	106	21	23	25	25	21	4	11	15	7	0	2	293
Des Moines Valley HHS	21	15	11	5	5	3	4	0	7	3	5	0	0	73
Faribault-Martin	49	58	23	12	8	13	17	1	1	3	0	1	2	160
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	131	101	10	26	5	15	5	0	0	0	7	1	0	253
White Earth Nation	239	171	29	45	16	20	46	5	2	1	21	14	0	500
MN Prairie	69	75	17	7	2	19	34	4	4	0	0	1	0	195

Agency	Foster family home – non-relative	Foster family home – relative	Residential treatment center	Pre-kinship home – relative	Group home	Pre-adoptive home – non-relative	Pre-adoptive home – relative	Correctional facility (locked)	Foster home– corporate/shift staff	Supervised independent living	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 13 or more children)	Juvenile correctional facility (non-secure, 12 or fewer children)	ICF-DD	Total children
Minnesota	6,588	5,702	1,859	1,428	1,201	1,153	1,142	525	412	408	384	188	17	16,593

*ICF-DD: Intermediate Care Facilities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities

Note: Children may have spent time in multiple settings during their time in out-of-home care. Subsequently, adding the numbers up within a county will not equal the “Total children” column on the right of this table.

Table 11. Number of foster care families who cared for children by race/ethnicity and by agency, 2017

Agency	African- American / Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/ declined	White	Total families	Hispanic (any race)
Aitkin	*	*	*	*	*	34	40	*
Anoka	29	8	*	*	*	236	274	7
Becker	*	18	*	8	*	104	116	7
Beltrami	*	335	*	19	*	209	534	*
Benton	*	*	*	*	*	53	55	*
Big Stone	*	*	*	*	*	13	13	*
Blue Earth	7	*	*	*	*	75	85	*
Brown	*	*	*	*	*	33	33	*
Carlton	*	19	*	8	*	32	50	*
Carver	10	*	*	*	*	87	101	8
Cass	*	11	*	*	15	57	74	*
Chippewa	*	*	*	*	*	9	9	*
Chisago	*	*	*	*	*	77	79	*
Clay	*	*	*	*	*	97	101	*
Clearwater	*	*	*	*	*	14	16	*
Cook	*	*	*	*	*	10	14	*
Crow Wing	*	*	*	*	*	165	173	*
Dakota	25	*	*	13	19	226	271	10
Douglas	*	*	*	*	*	54	58	*
Fillmore	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Freeborn	*	*	*	*	*	56	56	*
Goodhue	*	*	*	*	*	56	62	*
Grant	*	*	*	*	*	7	7	*
Hennepin	713	194	52	102	33	841	1,791	113
Houston	*	*	*	*	*	21	22	*
Hubbard	*	*	*	*	*	43	48	*
Isanti	*	*	*	*	*	71	72	*
Itasca	*	10	*	9	*	96	109	*
Kanabec	*	*	*	*	*	29	30	*
Kandiyohi	*	*	*	*	*	62	66	18
Kittson	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Agency	African- American / Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/ declined	White	Total families	Hispanic (any race)
Koochiching	*	*	*	*	*	28	32	*
Lac qui Parle	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Lake	*	*	*	*	*	12	12	*
Lake of the Woods	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Le Sueur	*	*	*	*	*	36	37	*
McLeod	*	*	*	*	*	69	75	*
Mahnomen	*	*	*	*	*	9	14	*
Marshall	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Meeker	*	*	*	*	*	21	21	*
Mille Lacs	*	60	*	22	*	87	142	*
Morrison	*	*	*	*	*	72	73	*
Mower	*	*	*	*	*	51	56	*
Nicollet	*	*	*	*	*	36	38	*
Nobles	*	*	*	*	*	21	21	*
Norman	*	*	*	*	*	10	11	*
Olmsted	10	*	*	*	*	130	138	9
Otter Tail	*	*	*	*	*	95	97	*
Pennington	*	*	*	*	*	27	27	*
Pine	*	15	*	*	*	69	86	*
Polk	*	*	*	*	*	36	39	*
Pope	*	*	*	*	*	15	16	*
Ramsey	326	34	64	63	44	458	924	74
Red Lake	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Renville	*	*	*	*	*	22	23	*
Rice	11	*	*	*	*	104	117	14
Roseau	*	*	*	*	*	8	9	*
St. Louis	46	107	*	53	66	528	728	15
Scott	*	*	*	*	12	73	91	*
Sherburne	8	*	*	*	16	55	76	*
Sibley	*	*	*	*	*	27	28	*
Stearns	13	*	*	9	*	197	218	7
Stevens	*	*	*	*	*	10	10	*

Agency	African- American / Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Unknown/ declined	White	Total families	Hispanic (any race)
Swift	*	*	*	*	*	31	37	*
Todd	*	*	*	*	*	61	63	*
Traverse	*	*	*	*	*	15	15	*
Wabasha	*	*	*	*	*	27	28	*
Wadena	*	*	*	*	*	50	51	*
Washington	13	*	*	*	29	106	141	7
Watonwan	*	*	*	*	*	11	12	*
Wilkin	*	*	*	*	*	7	8	*
Winona	*	*	*	*	*	72	81	*
Wright	*	*	*	*	*	133	141	*
Yellow Medicine	*	*	*	*	*	16	20	*
Southwest HHS	*	19	*	*	*	123	141	*
Des Moines Valley HHS	*	*	*	*	*	33	33	*
Faribault-Martin	*	*	*	*	*	89	92	*
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	*	61	*	12	22	50	129	*
White Earth Nation	*	137	*	42	7	77	203	*
MN Prairie	*	*	*	*	*	115	118	8
Minnesota	1,248	1,079	147	421	351	6,046	8,632	402

*The number of families is less than seven and is not shown to prevent identification of individuals. Totals include omitted data.

Note: This table shows the number of foster care families who provided a home for children who experienced care during 2017. Note: Cells will not sum to the column or row totals, as provider homes will be counted across both race/ethnicity groupings and child welfare agencies. Row and column totals show unduplicated counts of individual homes.

Table 12. American Indian children in out-of-home care by tribe, 2017

State where the Tribe is primarily located	Tribe	American Indian children
Minnesota	Bois Forte Band of Chippewa	209
	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	276
	Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	31
	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	778
	Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota	79
	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	416
	Minnesota Chippewa tribe (cannot identify specific band)	9
	Prairie Island Indian Community	11
	Red Lake Nation	1,138
	Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	8
	Upper Sioux Community of Minnesota	22
	White Earth Nation	1,022
Iowa	Meskwaki Nation	1
Michigan	Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians	1
	Hannahville Indian Community of Michigan	10
	Keweenaw Bay Indian Community	5
	Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians	2
	Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Michigan	1
	Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Michigan	2
Nebraska	Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux tribes	1
	Omaha Tribe of Nebraska	12
	Santee Sioux Nation	8
	Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska	14
North Dakota	Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians	4
	Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation	18
	Spirit Lake Tribe	48
	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	96
	Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	86

State where the Tribe is primarily located	Tribe	American Indian children
South Dakota	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe	26
	Crow Creek Sioux Tribe	14
	Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe	1
	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe	7
	Oglala Sioux Tribe	80
	Rosebud Sioux Tribe	48
	Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate	109
	Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota	46
Wisconsin	Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians	26
	Forest County Potawatomi Community	12
	Ho-Chunk Nation	14
	Lac Courte Oreilles Band (LCO)	39
	Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	14
	Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	21
	Oneida Nation of Wisconsin	25
	Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	24
	Sokaogon Chippewa Community	3
	St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin	24
Other unknown	Canadian tribe	15
	Other foreign tribe	7
	Other U.S. tribe	176
	Unknown Dakota, Lakota or Nakota (Sioux)	17
	Unknown Ojibwe, Ojibwa or Chippewa	26
	Unknown tribe	327
	Canadian tribe	15
Total American Indian children		4,769

Note: Numbers include children identified as American Indian alone or as one of two or more races. More than one tribal affiliation may be indicated for a child. Indication of a tribe does not necessarily mean a child is an enrolled member.

Table 13. Number of placement episodes ending by length of stay in care and by agency, 2017

Agency	1 to 7 days	8 to 30 days	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 to 24 months	24 to 36 months	36 months or more	Total
Aitkin	5	2	3	2	9	17	0	2	40
Anoka	63	13	20	24	56	62	11	19	268
Becker	1	2	8	12	33	31	5	11	103
Beltrami	8	15	8	39	97	108	61	41	377
Benton	2	0	6	9	15	8	2	3	45
Big Stone	1	0	0	1	2	6	0	0	10
Blue Earth	10	2	3	2	22	25	7	0	71
Brown	0	5	3	4	7	12	3	0	34
Carlton	0	2	8	4	14	27	1	2	58
Carver	2	1	5	9	17	32	10	1	77
Cass	3	1	5	11	11	24	12	5	72
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Chisago	5	3	11	6	13	9	4	1	52
Clay	48	8	8	3	16	28	21	5	137
Clearwater	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	4
Cook	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	0	10
Crow Wing	5	0	5	8	21	21	15	2	77
Dakota	42	20	19	36	50	50	21	3	241
Douglas	1	7	9	8	12	12	6	1	56
Fillmore	0	3	4	7	3	2	0	1	20
Freeborn	1	4	0	3	12	9	1	2	32
Goodhue	4	3	10	13	8	14	0	4	56
Grant	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	6
Hennepin	165	55	82	116	274	305	161	113	1,271
Houston	0	0	4	5	8	4	1	1	23
Hubbard	2	4	1	2	14	11	6	3	43
Isanti	11	2	4	4	2	16	8	3	50
Itasca	6	5	26	16	33	54	10	6	156
Kanabec	0	3	5	7	3	3	0	1	22

Agency	1 to 7 days	8 to 30 days	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 to 24 months	24 to 36 months	36 months or more	Total
Kandiyohi	6	3	9	2	8	27	1	4	60
Kittson	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	5
Koochiching	0	0	6	2	9	9	3	5	34
Lac qui Parle	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	4	10
Lake	0	0	1	1	3	2	2	0	9
Lake of the Woods	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	7
Le Sueur	0	5	2	3	4	4	5	2	25
McLeod	8	5	1	5	29	11	2	3	64
Mahnomen	0	2	4	0	1	3	0	4	14
Marshall	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
Meeker	0	0	1	2	1	9	0	0	13
Mille Lacs	10	1	8	2	13	33	12	17	96
Morrison	1	0	3	3	14	20	1	3	45
Mower	15	2	0	3	10	17	8	2	57
Nicollet	4	1	2	5	19	3	4	1	39
Nobles	3	3	10	5	11	7	11	5	55
Norman	1	3	2	2	2	4	1	0	15
Olmsted	2	5	9	8	18	41	12	6	101
Otter Tail	4	1	5	4	5	34	5	2	60
Pennington	3	0	4	1	7	4	2	3	24
Pine	11	2	7	5	19	15	3	7	69
Polk	0	1	9	15	15	3	4	1	48
Pope	2	0	1	4	1	9	5	2	24
Ramsey	130	64	65	63	167	178	59	35	761
Red Lake	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4
Renville	0	1	5	3	3	13	4	0	29
Rice	14	13	8	14	23	23	9	5	109
Roseau	0	1	6	0	3	8	0	0	18
St. Louis	17	38	73	41	91	153	55	36	504
Scott	12	15	10	13	15	25	3	0	93
Sherburne	14	5	9	7	15	29	3	2	84

Agency	1 to 7 days	8 to 30 days	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 to 24 months	24 to 36 months	36 months or more	Total
Sibley	1	1	0	9	4	4	0	0	19
Stearns	32	25	20	31	42	62	17	13	242
Stevens	0	0	1	0	6	5	0	1	13
Swift	2	2	8	7	4	3	2	0	28
Todd	0	1	1	12	17	16	0	6	53
Traverse	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
Wabasha	0	4	4	0	16	4	3	2	33
Wadena	2	4	9	1	4	15	2	1	38
Washington	21	14	10	13	42	36	5	5	146
Watonwan	1	1	1	4	2	1	0	2	12
Wilkin	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	8
Winona	9	17	3	3	4	9	3	1	49
Wright	17	3	12	16	17	25	3	1	94
Yellow Medicine	0	0	5	10	2	4	0	0	21
Southwest HHS	27	6	10	8	39	22	17	7	136
Des Moines Valley HHS	1	1	1	1	3	16	2	2	27
Faribault-Martin	7	10	7	11	13	19	8	5	80
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	2	0	1	4	6	3	5	8	29
White Earth Nation	1	6	7	3	50	57	36	39	199
MN Prairie	0	2	9	5	24	21	10	1	72
Minnesota	771	431	633	710	1,572	1,905	694	478	7,194

Table 14. Number of children under state guardianship by agency, 2017

Agency	Entered guardianship prior to 2017	Entered guardianship in 2017	Total children
Aitkin	2	4	6
Anoka	23	38	61
Becker	12	19	31
Beltrami	23	17	40
Benton	11	14	25
Big Stone	5	2	7
Blue Earth	15	11	26
Brown	9	7	16
Carlton	7	5	12
Carver	9	4	13
Cass	13	3	16
Chippewa	2	0	2
Chisago	7	12	19
Clay	41	27	68
Clearwater	0	0	0
Cook	1	0	1
Crow Wing	21	35	56
Dakota	47	23	70
Douglas	3	2	5
Fillmore	2	4	6
Freeborn	12	15	27
Goodhue	3	5	8
Grant	0	1	1
Hennepin	373	230	603
Houston	3	2	5
Hubbard	7	12	19
Isanti	12	6	18
Itasca	20	19	39
Kanabec	7	4	11
Kandiyohi	5	17	22
Kittson	0	0	0
Koochiching	8	3	11

Agency	Entered guardianship prior to 2017	Entered guardianship in 2017	Total children
Lac qui Parle	5	1	6
Lake	0	2	2
Lake of the Woods	0	0	0
Le Sueur	5	1	6
McLeod	8	7	15
Mahnomen	0	1	1
Marshall	1	1	2
Meeker	0	0	0
Mille Lacs	9	12	21
Morrison	20	13	33
Mower	22	13	35
Nicollet	6	3	9
Nobles	12	1	13
Norman	1	3	4
Olmsted	29	32	61
Otter Tail	3	9	12
Pennington	1	6	7
Pine	10	12	22
Polk	4	7	11
Pope	4	5	9
Ramsey	155	65	220
Red Lake	1	1	2
Renville	4	5	9
Rice	17	11	28
Roseau	2	0	2
St. Louis	91	42	133
Scott	2	27	29
Sherburne	17	8	25
Sibley	0	6	6
Stearns	55	42	97
Stevens	0	2	2
Swift	5	2	7
Todd	6	7	13
Traverse	1	3	4

Agency	Entered guardianship prior to 2017	Entered guardianship in 2017	Total children
Wabasha	12	1	13
Wadena	6	0	6
Washington	17	14	31
Watonwan	1	2	3
Wilkin	2	0	2
Winona	9	1	10
Wright	24	10	34
Yellow Medicine	2	4	6
Southwest HHS	25	13	38
Des Moines Valley HHS	6	3	9
Faribault-Martin	19	10	29
MN Prairie	27	16	43
Minnesota	1,349	965	2,314

References

- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2012). Reconnecting Child Development and Child Welfare: Evolving Perspectives on Residential Placement. Baltimore, MD, USA. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-ReconnectingChildDevelopmentandChildWelfare-2013.pdf>
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2016). The 2016 KIDS COUNT Data Book. Baltimore, MD, USA. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/the-2016-kids-count-data-book>
- Bhatti-Sinclair, K., & Sutcliffe, C. (2012). What determines the out-of-home placement of children in the USA? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34, 1749-1755.
- Burns, B. J., Phillips, S. D., Wagner, H. R., Barth, R. P., Kolko, D. J., Campbell, Y., & Landsverk, J. (2004). Medical health needs and access to mental health services by youth involved with child welfare: A national survey. *American Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 43, 960-970. doi:10.1097/01.chi.0000127590.95585.65
- Collins, J. (2016, April 18). *Here's why Minnesota has a big problem with opioid overdoses*. Retrieved from Minnesota Public Radio News: <https://www.mprnews.org/story/2016/04/18/opioid-overdose-epidemic-explained>
- Katz, J. (2017, June 5). Drug deaths in America are rising faster than ever. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/06/05/upshot/opioid-epidemic-drug-overdose-deaths-are-rising-faster-than-ever.html>
- Kortenkamp, K., & Ehrle, J. (2002, January). The well-being of children involved with the child welfare system: A national overview. *New Federalism*, B-43. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/59916/310413-The-Well-Being-of-Children-Involved-with-the-Child-Welfare-System.PDF>
- Lightfoot, E., & LaLiberte, T. (2013). Defining disability and understanding prevalence among children in child welfare. (T. Crudo, & T. LaLiberte, Eds.) *CW 360°: The Intersection of Child Welfare and Disability: Focus on Children*. Retrieved from https://www.cascw.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Spring2013_360_web-FINAL.pdf
- Minnesota Department of Human Services. (2013). *Minnesota's Child Welfare Report, 2013*. Retrieved from <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/Public/DHS-5408F-ENG>
- Minnesota Department of Human Services. (2015). *Children's Mental Health: Transforming Services and Supports to Better Meet Children's Needs*. St. Paul, Minn. Retrieved from <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfservlet/Public/DHS-5051-ENG>
- Nowacki, K., & Schoelmerich, A. (2010). Growing up in foster families or institutions: Attachment representation and psychological adjustment of young adults. *Attachment and Human Development*, 12, 551-566. doi:10.1080/14616734.2010.504547

- Rubin, D. M., O'Reilly, A., Luan, X., & Loalio, A. R. (2007). The impact of placement stability on behavioral well-being for children in foster care. *Pediatrics*, *119*, 336-344. doi:10.1542/peds.2006-1995
- Rudd, R. A., Seth, P., David, F., & Scholl, L. (2016). Increases in Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths - United States, 2010-2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *65*, 1445-1452. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm655051e1>
- Ryan, J. P., & Testa, M. F. (2015). Child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency: Investigating the role of placement and placement instability. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *27*, 227-249. doi:10.1016/j.chidyouth.2004.05.007
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2016, August 15). Small Area Income and Poverty Estimate. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/data/>
- Weiss, A. J., Bailey, M. K., O'Malley, L., Baret, M. L., Elixhauser, A., & Steiner, C. A. (2014). *Patient Characteristics of Opioid- Related Inpatient Stays and Emergency Department Visits Nationally and by State, 2014*. Statistical Brief #224, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. Retrieved from <https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/reports/statbriefs/sb224-Patient-Characteristics-Opioid-Hospital-Stays-ED-Visits-by-State.pdf>