



---

# Minnesota Family Investment Program Management Indicators Report

April — June 2018

---

September 2018

This report is published on the [MFIP Reports page](#) on the Minnesota Department of Human Services website at <http://mn.gov/dhs/>.

For information on this report, contact:

Ben Jaques-Leslie

Research Unit

Economic Assistance and Employment Supports Division

651-431-3940

[benjamin.jaques-leslie@state.mn.us](mailto:benjamin.jaques-leslie@state.mn.us)



For accessible formats of this publication and additional equal access to human services, write to [DHS.Info@state.mn.us](mailto:DHS.Info@state.mn.us), call 651-431-4000, or use your preferred relay service. (ADA1 [9-15])

# Contents

Minnesota Family Investment Program Management Indicators Report..... 1

Abbreviations ..... 7

Introduction ..... 8

Indicators ..... 9

    Indicator 1: MFIP Closings..... 9

        MFIP Closings—State ..... 9

        MFIP Closings—Southeast ..... 10

        MFIP Closings—Northeast ..... 10

        MFIP Closings—Southwest ..... 11

        MFIP Closings—South Central ..... 11

        MFIP Closings—Suburban Metro..... 12

        MFIP Closings—Core Metro ..... 12

        MFIP Closings—Northwest ..... 12

        MFIP Closings—West Central ..... 13

        MFIP Closings—Central..... 14

    Indicator 2: MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage ..... 14

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—State..... 15

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Southeast..... 15

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Northeast..... 15

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Southwest..... 16

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—South Central ..... 16

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Suburban Metro ..... 17

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Core Metro ..... 17

        MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Northwest..... 17

3

MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—West Central ..... 18

MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Central ..... 19

Indicator 3: TANF Work Participation Rate..... 19

    TANF Work Participation Rate—State ..... 22

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Southeast ..... 22

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Northeast ..... 23

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Southwest ..... 23

    TANF Work Participation Rate—South Central ..... 24

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Suburban Metro..... 24

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Core Metro ..... 25

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Northwest ..... 25

    TANF Work Participation Rate—West Central..... 26

    TANF Work Participation Rate—Central..... 27

    Tribal TANF Work Participation Rate ..... 28

Indicator 4: MFIP Counted Months ..... 29

    MFIP Counted Months—State ..... 30

    MFIP Counted Months—Southeast ..... 30

    MFIP Counted Months—Northeast ..... 31

    MFIP Counted Months—Southwest ..... 31

    MFIP Counted Months—South Central ..... 31

    MFIP Counted Months—Suburban Metro..... 32

    MFIP Counted Months—Core Metro..... 32

    MFIP Counted Months—Northwest ..... 32

    MFIP Counted Months—West Central ..... 33

    MFIP Counted Months—Central..... 34

Indicator 5: MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons ..... 34

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—State ..... 35

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Southeast..... 35

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Northeast..... 36

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Southwest..... 36

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—South Central..... 37

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Suburban Metro ..... 37

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Core Metro ..... 38

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Northwest..... 38

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—West Central..... 39

MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Central ..... 40

Indicator 6: MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (S-SI) and Range of Expected Performance ..... 40

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—State ..... 42

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Southeast ..... 42

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Northeast ..... 43

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Southwest ..... 44

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—South Central ..... 45

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Suburban Metro..... 46

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Core Metro..... 46

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Northwest ..... 47

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—West Central ..... 48

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Central..... 49

MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Tribal ..... 50

Indicator 7: MFIP Exits and Returns..... 51

MFIP Exits and Returns—State ..... 51

MFIP Exits and Returns—Southeast ..... 52

MFIP Exits and Returns—Northeast ..... 52

MFIP Exits and Returns—Southwest ..... 53

MFIP Exits and Returns—South Central..... 53

MFIP Exits and Returns—Suburban Metro ..... 54

MFIP Exits and Returns—Core Metro ..... 54

MFIP Exits and Returns—Northwest ..... 54

MFIP Exits and Returns—West Central..... 55

MFIP Exits and Returns—Central ..... 56

Indicator 8: MFIP Unaccounted For Cases ..... 56

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—State ..... 57

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Southeast..... 57

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Northeast ..... 57

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Southwest..... 58

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—South Central..... 58

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Suburban Metro ..... 58

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Core Metro ..... 59

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Northwest..... 59

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—West Central..... 60

MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Central ..... 61

Notes ..... 62

# Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Title
AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
CM	Combined Manual
DEED	Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development
DHS	Minnesota Department of Human Services (department)
DRA	Deficit Reduction Act of 2005
DVHHS	Des Moines Valley Health and Human Services
DWP	Diversionary Work Program
FSS	Family Stabilization Services
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
MAXIS	Minnesota Department of Human Services' eligibility system
MFIP	Minnesota Family Investment Program
MN Prairie	Minnesota Prairie County Alliance
MOE	TANF Maintenance of Effort
PRWORA	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996
RSDI	Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance
S-SI	MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index
SNAP	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
SWHHS	Southwest Health and Human Services
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
WEI	TANF Work-eligible Individual
WF1	Workforce One – DEED workforce data entry system
WPR	TANF Work Participation Rate

## Introduction

The Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) “Management Indicators Report” was developed to report on eight measures: MFIP closings, MFIP/DWP placement wages, TANF work participation rate, MFIP counted months, MFIP employment services enrollments, closures and exit reasons, the MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index, MFIP exits and returns, and MFIP unaccounted for cases. The report, for human service directors, employment services providers and other interested parties, is published quarterly in compliance with statutory requirements for a quarterly comparison report. [Minn. Stat. 256J.751, subd. 2] This report and other MFIP reports are posted to the Minnesota Department of Human Services (department) web page (<http://mn.gov/dhs>): Select Partners and Providers/Economic Supports/MFIP/Reports. **As part of an effort to improve the performance measurement system, department staff are reviewing the measures included in this report and invite input. Direct questions and suggestions regarding this report, the usefulness of existing measures and ideas for additional measures, to the contact on the inside cover.**

A large drop in the TANF work participation rate was observed in December 2014 upon suspension of the Work Benefit program. In 2015, the statewide WPR and the average caseload size were smaller than before this policy change.

In July 2015, the MFIP housing grant went into effect. Starting with the third quarter of 2015, the Self-Support Index was updated to include receipt of a housing grant in the definition of cash assistance. Participants who receive cash, including only the housing grant, will not be included in the numerator of the measure unless they are working the required number of hours for success on the Self-Support Index for MFIP participants with a cash grant. This change resulted in a slight decrease in the index.

The requirement that a case remain active in the second month after the reporting quarter has been dropped for Indicator 8, MFIP unaccounted for cases. This change aligns the measure with others in the report and results in a slight increase in MFIP unaccounted for cases. Note that the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development’s (DEED) person-level report on unaccounted for cases will continue to drop cases no longer active.

For more information on this report, see the Notes section at the end of the report.



# Indicators

## Indicator 1: MFIP Closings

**What are MFIP closings?** An MFIP case is considered closed for this quarterly measure when it was eligible (active) in any month during the quarter previous to the measurement quarter, and ineligible during the entire measurement quarter.

**Background.** This measure helps a service area to examine its point-in-time closings – cases moving off active MFIP assistance in a quarter. Information on the number of closed cases staying off or returning to active MFIP is in Indicator 7.

**Formula.** Number of MFIP case closings as defined above, **divided by** the count of active MFIP cases in the quarter previous to the measurement quarter.

**Details.** The number of active MFIP cases is unduplicated (counted only once per quarter). Case counts and closing counts include all types of active MFIP cases, both child-only cases (no eligible adults) and cases with eligible adults. Counts and rates are reported for each service area, each region and statewide, with a closing being credited to a case’s service area in the exit month. Each service area rate is compared to its region and the state to gauge performance of a service area relative to its neighbors and the state.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [department’s website](#).

### MFIP Closings—State

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate
State	4,492	32,354	13.9%

**MFIP Closings—Southeast**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Fillmore	6	58	10.3%	-6.0%	-3.6%
Freeborn	26	187	13.9%	-2.4%	0.0%
Goodhue	29	150	19.3%	3.0%	5.4%
Houston	11	54	20.4%	4.1%	6.5%
MN Prairie	62	416	14.9%	-1.4%	1.0%
Mower	38	280	13.6%	-2.7%	-0.3%
Olmsted	152	848	17.9%	1.6%	4.0%
Rice	47	262	17.9%	1.6%	4.0%
Wabasha	12	59	20.3%	4.0%	6.4%
Winona	29	215	13.5%	-2.8%	-0.4%
Southeast	412	2,529	16.3%	0.0%	2.4%

**MFIP Closings—Northeast**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Aitkin	14	71	19.7%	6.4%	5.8%
Carlton	21	162	13.0%	-0.3%	-0.9%
Cook	6	27	22.2%	8.9%	8.3%
Itasca	47	312	15.1%	1.8%	1.2%
Koochiching	15	79	19.0%	5.7%	5.1%
Lake	6	28	21.4%	8.1%	7.5%
St Louis	191	1,578	12.1%	-1.2%	-1.8%
Northeast	300	2,257	13.3%	0.0%	-0.6%

**MFIP Closings—Southwest**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Big Stone	5	23	21.7%	5.5%	7.8%
Chippewa	8	67	11.9%	-4.3%	-2.0%
DVHHS	18	96	18.8%	2.6%	4.9%
Lac qui Parle	5	25	20.0%	3.8%	6.1%
Nobles	21	138	15.2%	-1.0%	1.3%
SWHHS	51	291	17.5%	1.3%	3.6%
Swift	3	56	5.4%	-10.8%	-8.5%
Yellow Medicine	8	39	20.5%	4.3%	6.6%
Southwest	119	735	16.2%	0.0%	2.3%

**MFIP Closings—South Central**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Blue Earth	53	308	17.2%	-1.6%	3.3%
Brown	14	82	17.1%	-1.7%	3.2%
Faribault- Martin	33	149	22.1%	3.3%	8.2%
Le Sueur	19	105	18.1%	-0.7%	4.2%
Nicollet	27	177	15.3%	-3.5%	1.4%
Sibley	11	64	17.2%	-1.6%	3.3%
Watonwan	22	65	33.8%	15.0%	19.9%
South Central	179	950	18.8%	0.0%	4.9%

**MFIP Closings—Suburban Metro**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Anoka	226	1,600	14.1%	-1.5%	0.2%
Carver	26	146	17.8%	2.2%	3.9%
Dakota	240	1,453	16.5%	0.9%	2.6%
Scott	46	262	17.6%	2.0%	3.7%
Washington	80	504	15.9%	0.3%	2.0%
Suburban Metro	618	3,965	15.6%	0.0%	1.7%

**MFIP Closings—Core Metro**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Hennepin	1,181	9,741	12.1%	0.1%	-1.8%
Ramsey	666	5,692	11.7%	-0.3%	-2.2%
Core Metro	1,847	15,433	12.0%	0.0%	-1.9%

**MFIP Closings—Northwest**

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Kittson	2	12	16.7%	2.8%	2.8%
Marshall	2	18	11.1%	-2.8%	-2.8%
Norman	5	30	16.7%	2.8%	2.8%
Pennington	14	72	19.4%	5.5%	5.5%
Polk	30	304	9.9%	-4.0%	-4.0%
Red Lake	2	15	13.3%	-0.6%	-0.6%
Roseau	15	51	29.4%	15.5%	15.5%
Northwest	70	502	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%

## MFIP Closings—West Central

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Becker	26	130	20.0%	4.7%	6.1%
Beltrami	76	449	16.9%	1.6%	3.0%
Cass	54	441	12.2%	-3.1%	-1.7%
Clay	71	401	17.7%	2.4%	3.8%
Clearwater	5	51	9.8%	-5.5%	-4.1%
Crow Wing	39	278	14.0%	-1.3%	0.1%
Douglas	17	105	16.2%	0.9%	2.3%
Grant	6	25	24.0%	8.7%	10.1%
Hubbard	16	151	10.6%	-4.7%	-3.3%
Lake of the Woods	1	10	10.0%	-5.3%	-3.9%
Mahnomen	4	42	9.5%	-5.8%	-4.4%
Morrison	22	137	16.1%	0.8%	2.2%
Otter Tail	40	206	19.4%	4.1%	5.5%
Pope	6	36	16.7%	1.4%	2.8%
Stevens	5	22	22.7%	7.4%	8.8%
Todd	13	67	19.4%	4.1%	5.5%
Traverse	2	30	6.7%	-8.6%	-7.2%
Wadena	13	85	15.3%	0.0%	1.4%
White Earth Nation	46	380	12.1%	-3.2%	-1.8%
Wilkin	10	48	20.8%	5.5%	6.9%
West Central	472	3,094	15.3%	0.0%	1.4%

## MFIP Closings—Central

Service area	MFIP case closings	Active MFIP caseload	MFIP closing rate	Difference from region	Difference from state
Benton	44	239	18.4%	2.0%	4.5%
Chisago	17	108	15.7%	-0.7%	1.8%
Isanti	24	134	17.9%	1.5%	4.0%
Kanabec	12	82	14.6%	-1.8%	0.7%
Kandiyohi	49	317	15.5%	-0.9%	1.6%
McLeod	13	77	16.9%	0.5%	3.0%
Meeker	9	80	11.2%	-5.2%	-2.7%
Mille Lacs	29	166	17.5%	1.1%	3.6%
Pine	28	188	14.9%	-1.5%	1.0%
Renville	8	74	10.8%	-5.6%	-3.1%
Sherburne	42	259	16.2%	-0.2%	2.3%
Stearns	174	935	18.6%	2.2%	4.7%
Wright	26	230	11.3%	-5.1%	-2.6%
Central	475	2,889	16.4%	0.0%	2.5%

## Indicator 2: MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage

**What is the median placement wage?** A median is the midpoint of a sorted list of values. A median is used as an average wage to avoid the bias of extreme wages skewing the mean (the arithmetic average). This measure gives the service area’s median wage for the first job MFIP participants started after enrolling in employment services, as recorded in Workforce One (WF1).

**Background.** Job placement and wage data are collected by the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED). The servicing county or county consortium categories are from MAXIS, the department’s eligibility system.

**Formula.** The median is the placement wage in the middle of the sorted list of wages (when there is an odd number of new workers with a recorded hourly placement wage), or the midpoint between the two middle values (if there is an even number of new workers).

**Details.** This indicator gives the number of MFIP and DWP Employment Services (ES) participants newly enrolled in the quarter who obtained employment in that quarter, and the median placement (starting) wage by service area at the start of the job. It includes all first jobs as coded in WF1 for either part- or full-time employment. Blanks indicate that no newly enrolled persons in that service area got a job.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [department’s website](#).

**MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—State**

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
State	1,565	\$12.00	1,175	\$12.50

**MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Southeast**

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Fillmore	5	\$12.00	2	\$13.24
Freeborn	15	\$10.15	9	\$11.00
Goodhue	9	\$12.00	9	\$12.00
Houston	3	\$12.00	7	\$10.63
MN Prairie	31	\$11.00	35	\$10.50
Mower	26	\$11.70	13	\$11.50
Olmsted	69	\$12.00	70	\$13.00
Rice	21	\$13.25	15	\$12.00
Wabasha	8	\$10.64	2	\$9.38
Winona	6	\$12.75	3	\$12.00
Southeast	193	\$12.00	165	\$12.00

**MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Northeast**

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Aitkin	3	\$10.00	5	\$10.00
Carlton	5	\$11.20	5	\$10.50
Cook	1	\$12.00	0	-
Itasca	9	\$10.50	4	\$13.50
Koochiching	2	\$11.02	4	\$9.82
Lake	2	\$9.45	2	\$9.65
St Louis	45	\$11.13	50	\$11.00
Northeast	67	\$11.00	70	\$11.00

### MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Southwest

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Big Stone	4	\$12.53	1	\$10.00
Chippewa	6	\$12.62	3	\$12.50
DVHHS	7	\$13.25	1	\$15.50
Lac qui Parle	4	\$10.00	1	\$10.00
Nobles	5	\$10.00	8	\$12.50
SWHHS	27	\$11.12	13	\$11.50
Swift	8	\$12.00	7	\$12.50
Yellow Medicine	2	\$10.82	0	-
Southwest	63	\$11.50	34	\$12.00

### MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—South Central

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Blue Earth	28	\$12.00	14	\$11.50
Brown	11	\$11.45	6	\$12.50
Le Sueur	8	\$11.38	6	\$13.85
Faribault- Martin	26	\$12.66	12	\$12.50
Nicollet	13	\$11.25	3	\$11.00
Sibley	5	\$12.25	1	\$9.65
Watonwan	9	\$13.50	1	\$13.63
South Central	100	\$12.00	43	\$12.00



### MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Suburban Metro

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Anoka	123	\$12.50	87	\$13.00
Carver	8	\$12.95	9	\$13.00
Dakota	105	\$12.50	82	\$14.00
Scott	14	\$13.25	18	\$12.00
Washington	22	\$13.00	23	\$12.54
Suburban Metro	272	\$12.79	219	\$13.25

### MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Core Metro

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Hennepin	303	\$12.50	256	\$13.00
Ramsey	181	\$12.50	177	\$13.00
Core Metro	484	\$12.50	433	\$13.00

### MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Northwest

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Kittson	0	-	1	\$10.00
Marshall	1	\$10.00	1	\$11.00
Norman	2	\$11.75	1	\$21.00
Pennington	7	\$12.25	2	\$11.00
Polk	25	\$13.00	2	\$14.88
Red Lake	1	\$13.50	1	\$10.50
Roseau	1	\$11.00	0	-
Northwest	37	\$12.25	8	\$11.00

## MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—West Central

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Becker	10	\$11.68	4	\$11.80
Beltrami	30	\$10.50	10	\$10.52
Cass	12	\$10.70	14	\$11.68
Clay	22	\$11.47	21	\$11.00
Clearwater	2	\$11.62	2	\$15.70
Crow Wing	14	\$10.00	15	\$10.50
Douglas	13	\$12.00	3	\$11.63
Grant	0	-	2	\$9.32
Hubbard	13	\$11.00	7	\$10.30
Lake of the Woods	0	-	0	-
Mahnomen	2	\$9.07	1	\$11.36
Morrison	8	\$10.80	7	\$12.00
Otter Tail	15	\$11.00	4	\$15.66
Pope	5	\$12.00	0	-
Stevens	1	\$12.00	3	\$10.00
Todd	4	\$13.29	2	\$17.25
Traverse	4	\$10.74	3	\$14.00
Wadena	13	\$11.00	6	\$11.25
White Earth Nation	0	-	1	\$25.00
Wilkin	5	\$10.50	0	-
West Central	173	\$11.00	105	\$11.25

## MFIP and DWP Median Placement Wage—Central

Service area	Number of job placements (MFIP)	Median placement wage (MFIP)	Number of job placements (DWP)	Median placement wage (DWP)
Benton	10	\$13.22	5	\$10.25
Chisago	0	-	2	\$11.25
Isanti	5	\$16.75	5	\$12.00
Kanabec	7	\$10.30	2	\$10.58
Kandiyohi	32	\$13.00	13	\$13.00
McLeod	11	\$14.00	3	\$14.00
Meeker	4	\$10.38	2	\$10.50
Mille Lacs	2	\$14.75	2	\$10.50
Pine	7	\$13.00	4	\$14.82
Renville	13	\$12.00	3	\$13.94
Sherburne	15	\$11.25	5	\$16.00
Stearns	68	\$12.00	48	\$13.12
Wright	2	\$5.50	4	\$13.25
Central	176	\$12.20	98	\$13.00

## Indicator 3: TANF Work Participation Rate

**What is the work participation rate (WPR)?** The WPR is the percentage of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) cases whose adults are required to participate in work or specified work-directed activities who participate for the required number of hours in a month. The annual WPR is the average of the monthly WPRs in a 12-month period.

**Background.** The TANF work participation rate is the federal performance measure for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. The federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005, which reauthorized TANF, specifies the definition and reporting requirements of this measure. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) computes an annual statewide rate from person-level data that the state reports to HHS. The latest published TANF WPR report listing Minnesota's WPR for federal fiscal year 2012 was 45.3 percent, published in May 2015.<sup>1</sup> Approximately one-quarter of all MFIP cases are included in the WPR denominator (e.g., 22.6 percent in June 2014).

<sup>1</sup> From October 2009 through November 2014, Minnesota had a Work Benefit program that provided a monthly cash benefit for families that had exited MFIP or the Diversionary Work Program and were working a required number of hours with income below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Guideline.

Department estimates of the statewide WPR come very close to the official rate reported much later. To give county and tribal agencies, and county consortia more timely information on their WPR performance, the department also computes monthly estimates at the local level, published in this quarterly report. The department's annual WPR estimates for county and tribal agencies, and county consortia are the average of the monthly values in a 12-month period. (The department uses the statewide federal methods to compute the local monthly and annual values, but uses an April to March period – rather than the federal fiscal year starting in October – so the latest possible data is available for preparing Biennial Service Agreements.)

**Formula.** Number of participating cases – those required to participate with the prescribed number of documented hours in activities that count – **divided by** the number of cases required to participate.

**Details.** TANF cases are a subset of MFIP cases. TANF cases that have caregivers who are Work-eligible Individuals (WEIs) are required to participate. MFIP cash grants for most of these cases are federal TANF funds; most parents or relative caregivers on these cases are personally eligible for MFIP. Cases with teen or non-citizen caregivers that are state-funded with Maintenance of Effort (MOE) funds are also included. Cases with two MFIP-eligible parents, cases in Family Stabilization Services (a service track of MFIP), and most child-only cases (those with no MFIP-eligible caregiver), are not included.

Work is paid employment verified by employer documents. Work activities are divided into core (types of work and vocational training) and non-core (basic skills training and high school completion or its equivalent). While the department can only count up to 30 percent of WEIs in education or training in the numerator, this limit was suspended at the local level as of July 1, 2014, for service areas (county and tribal agencies, and county consortia).

Cases with the following activities meet the monthly hours requirement:

- 87 hours (in work or other specified core activities) for families with a child under age 6 and only one caregiver in the household
- 130 hours, of which 87 must be core, for all other families.

Teen caregivers with at least three monthly hours in the high school completion or GED activity categories also meet their requirement.

TANF cases enrolled with a tribal employment services provider are included in their tribal provider's measure, not in their county's measure. A tribal provider WPR is computed following the same rules as

---

These cases were included in the WPR numerator and denominator during that time. Without the Work Benefit program, the 2012 TANF rate would have been lower.

for county agencies. Three tribal providers do not operate a separate tribal TANF program and are reported here.<sup>2</sup>

The tables below represent average TANF caseloads and monthly work participation rates beginning April 2017. A blank indicates that the service area had no work eligible individuals that month; annual averages exclude these months.

**To learn more:** The following are links to reports on [WPR background in Minnesota](#), [the WPR documentation review](#) and [the U.S. Health and Human Services TANF website](#).

---

<sup>2</sup> The tribal providers are Leech Lake, Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and White Earth Nation (White Earth Nation's totals also include tribal cases for which White Earth Nation administers MFIP in a three-county area). Mille Lacs Band and Red Lake Nation operate tribal TANF programs and are not included here.

### TANF Work Participation Rate—State

Service area	Average TANF caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Statewide	7,123	35.8%	35.1%	37.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### TANF Work Participation Rate—Southeast

Service area	Average TANF caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Statewide	7,123	35.8%	35.1%	37.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fillmore	12	33.3%	27.3%	8.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Freeborn	45	44.2%	31.8%	40.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goodhue	28	25.9%	20.0%	17.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Houston	16	7.7%	6.7%	15.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MN Prairie	100	43.0%	40.8%	48.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mower	59	35.2%	26.7%	35.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Olmsted	192	42.2%	47.9%	46.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rice	51	21.8%	34.0%	26.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wabasha	13	37.5%	36.4%	38.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Winona	27	36.4%	25.0%	28.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Southeast	542	37.5%	37.0%	38.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### TANF Work Participation Rate—Northeast

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Aitkin	8	20.0%	28.6%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carlton	24	38.1%	33.3%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cook	2	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Itasca	36	43.9%	31.6%	43.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koochiching	16	38.9%	43.8%	46.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake	6	50.0%	60.0%	66.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St Louis	289	39.0%	34.4%	41.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northeast	381	39.2%	34.6%	41.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### TANF Work Participation Rate—Southwest

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Big Stone	5	75.0%	80.0%	60.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chippewa	16	33.3%	43.8%	53.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DVHHS	14	37.5%	33.3%	28.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lac qui Parle	8	42.9%	50.0%	37.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nobles	21	22.7%	18.2%	25.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWHHS	54	30.0%	40.0%	44.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Swift	13	26.7%	15.4%	25.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yellow Medicine	6	50.0%	80.0%	66.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Southwest	137	32.4%	37.4%	40.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### TANF Work Participation Rate—South Central

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Blue Earth	62	37.3%	39.3%	39.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brown	27	26.9%	28.0%	31.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Faribault	24	30.8%	44.0%	40.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Le Sueur	19	66.7%	65.0%	70.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nicollet	40	27.3%	25.6%	47.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sibley	14	37.5%	41.7%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Watonwan	9	40.0%	57.1%	40.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Central	196	36.2%	39.1%	43.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### TANF Work Participation Rate—Suburban Metro

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Anoka	319	40.3%	37.8%	41.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carver	22	40.0%	35.0%	34.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dakota	293	48.6%	45.5%	54.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Scott	49	58.0%	54.0%	51.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington	115	48.2%	44.1%	52.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suburban Metro	798	45.5%	42.5%	48.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### TANF Work Participation Rate—Core Metro

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Average TANF caseload											
		April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Hennepin	2,336	37.6%	35.9%	35.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ramsey	1,490	30.0%	30.4%	33.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Core Metro	3,826	34.6%	33.7%	34.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

### TANF Work Participation Rate—Northwest

Service area	Average TANF caseload	Average TANF caseload											
		April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Kittson	5	20.0%	40.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marshall	2	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norman	6	16.7%	42.9%	60.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pennington	18	35.7%	47.4%	27.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polk	42	22.2%	19.5%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Red Lake	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roseau	10	15.4%	40.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northwest	84	22.1%	31.8%	34.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## TANF Work Participation Rate—West Central

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Becker	38	25.8%	39.5%	43.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beltrami	96	22.4%	28.3%	29.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cass	40	26.1%	17.5%	21.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clay	81	20.7%	25.0%	35.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clearwater	9	66.7%	44.4%	40.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Crow Wing	80	23.7%	28.7%	32.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Douglas	26	38.5%	25.0%	40.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grant	4	40.0%	40.0%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hubbard	22	55.0%	42.9%	28.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake of the Woods	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahnomen	5	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morrison	41	34.9%	34.2%	39.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Otter Tail	52	24.1%	29.4%	45.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pope	7	20.0%	12.5%	28.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stevens	6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Todd	13	66.7%	64.3%	64.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traverse	5	40.0%	25.0%	80.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wadena	18	26.7%	31.6%	42.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wilkin	9	55.6%	33.3%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West Central	551	28.7%	29.7%	35.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## TANF Work Participation Rate—Central

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Benton	70	38.8%	38.2%	37.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chisago	13	50.0%	62.5%	43.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isanti	31	44.1%	50.0%	67.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kanabec	13	46.7%	41.7%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kandiyohi	48	51.2%	49.0%	37.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McLeod	24	28.6%	34.6%	44.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Meeker	13	54.5%	38.5%	66.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mille Lacs	21	30.0%	33.3%	43.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pine	31	31.2%	37.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Renville	19	21.4%	40.0%	31.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sherburne	52	36.4%	31.4%	28.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stearns	221	30.3%	34.7%	37.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wright	39	23.5%	26.2%	21.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Central	594	34.9%	37.1%	38.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Tribal TANF Work Participation Rate

Service area	Average TANF												
	caseload	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Leech Lake Band	56	19.3%	24.1%	23.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MN Chippewa Tribe	40	26.3%	17.1%	19.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White Earth Nation	49	17.0%	17.0%	10.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Tribal	145	20.4%	19.6%	17.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Indicator 4: MFIP Counted Months

**What are counted months?** MFIP counted months are those in which an MFIP caregiver is personally eligible for an MFIP cash grant and not exempt from the 60-month time limit. In Minnesota, these months began counting in July 1997. Total counted months include any months counted in other states or U.S. territories. People acquire counted months; cases do not. A two-caregiver case reaches the time limit when either adult reaches 60 months.

**Background.** The federal government passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 creating Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. The legislation allowed states to create their own TANF programs within certain guidelines, within which Minnesota implemented the Minnesota Family Investment Program in early 1998. Among other requirements, PRWORA mandated a lifetime limit of 60 months for receipt of cash assistance, with limited extensions for hardship. States could start counting months anytime between September 1996 and July 1997; those months also count if a person moves to another state. Family assistance months counted before the start of TANF were under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

States are also allowed to provide TANF-funded extensions for up to 20 percent of caseloads for documented hardships. Most extended cases in Minnesota are state-funded, meaning these cases are not counted toward the 20 percent limit. Minnesota provides extensions for:

- People experiencing barriers to work, such as:
  - Illness lasting more than 30 days
  - Caring for an ill or incapacitated relative for more than 30 days
  - IQ lower than 80
  - Certain mental illnesses
- Working families not earning enough to exit MFIP, although working the required number of hours.

**Formula.** Active MFIP cases with one or two eligible caregivers in the last month of the measurement quarter are divided into categories based on the number of months the caregiver with the higher count of months has accumulated toward the 60-month limit; percentages of all cases are reported in service area, region or state.

**Details.** Those with zero months have been exempt from the time limit for all their active months. Extended cases have been allowed to remain active due to documented hardships, as listed below.

Time limit exception reasons – for an MFIP month not to count – include:

- Living on a reservation with a “not employed” rate of at least 50 percent
- Having a family violence waiver while complying with an employment plan
- Age 60 or older
- Minor caregiver complying with an education plan
- Age 18 or 19

- Emancipated caregiver complying with education requirements in an employment plan.

There are two other situations in which months are not counted toward the time limit: \* Child-only cases where no caregiver is eligible and a cash grant is issued for MFIP-eligible children \* Food-only cases where the cash part of the grant is down to zero (due to other income sources or opting out of cash) and only food assistance is issued.

MFIP combines family cash assistance with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), as permitted by federal waiver.

The most common reasons for caregiver ineligibility are receipt of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for a disability and relative care. Cases cannot become child-only solely because a caregiver reached 60 counted months; caregivers must meet other criteria to be eligible for a child-only case.

**To learn more:** The [Combined Manual](#) (CM) gives the rules for determining eligibility for the cash and food assistance programs.

### MFIP Counted Months—State

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
State	20,311	2.6%	25.3%	19.7%	14.6%	10.4%	9.7%	17.8%

### MFIP Counted Months—Southeast

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Fillmore	40	7.5%	47.5%	7.5%	15.0%	15.0%	7.5%	0.0%
Freeborn	123	2.4%	35.8%	19.5%	11.4%	13.0%	10.6%	7.3%
Goodhue	90	0.0%	25.6%	26.7%	14.4%	3.3%	15.6%	14.4%
Houston	44	2.3%	29.6%	25.0%	20.4%	9.1%	11.4%	2.3%
MN Prairie	260	2.3%	29.2%	18.5%	18.8%	12.3%	10.0%	8.8%
Mower	173	4.0%	30.1%	23.1%	18.5%	7.5%	8.1%	8.7%
Olmsted	518	5.4%	27.4%	21.6%	14.1%	10.4%	9.5%	11.8%
Rice	151	0.7%	31.8%	21.8%	16.6%	12.6%	6.0%	10.6%
Wabasha	30	0.0%	6.7%	56.7%	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%	23.3%
Winona	139	4.3%	28.8%	16.6%	18.7%	8.6%	10.8%	12.2%
Southeast	1,568	3.5%	29.3%	21.4%	15.9%	10.3%	9.4%	10.3%

### MFIP Counted Months—Northeast

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Aitkin	24	0.0%	20.8%	16.7%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	20.8%
Carlton	69	4.3%	23.2%	23.2%	15.9%	10.1%	8.7%	14.5%
Cook	15	0.0%	26.7%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	20.0%
Itasca	163	4.3%	24.5%	16.6%	13.5%	10.4%	12.3%	18.4%
Koochiching	43	0.0%	32.6%	16.3%	16.3%	9.3%	16.3%	9.3%
Lake	14	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St Louis	1,010	2.6%	22.2%	16.3%	16.2%	11.6%	9.6%	21.7%
Northeast	1,338	2.7%	23.4%	16.8%	15.6%	11.3%	10.2%	20.2%

### MFIP Counted Months—Southwest

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Big Stone	19	5.3%	47.4%	21.0%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	15.8%
Chippewa	45	4.4%	20.0%	24.4%	17.8%	6.7%	15.6%	11.1%
DVHHS	43	2.3%	39.5%	11.6%	14.0%	9.3%	11.6%	11.6%
Lac qui Parle	25	0.0%	20.0%	24.0%	20.0%	16.0%	8.0%	12.0%
Nobles	55	5.4%	38.2%	16.4%	12.7%	12.7%	5.4%	9.1%
SWHHS	170	6.5%	31.8%	24.7%	10.6%	12.9%	7.1%	6.5%
Swift	40	2.5%	20.0%	30.0%	22.5%	12.5%	7.5%	5.0%
Yellow Medicine	16	6.2%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%	6.2%	25.0%
Southwest	413	4.8%	30.8%	22.0%	13.8%	11.4%	8.0%	9.2%

### MFIP Counted Months—South Central

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Blue Earth	214	0.9%	28.0%	21.5%	13.6%	11.2%	7.5%	17.8%
Brown	65	1.5%	44.6%	18.5%	9.2%	9.2%	9.2%	7.7%
Faribault- Martin	95	3.2%	35.8%	21.0%	14.7%	9.5%	5.3%	10.5%
Le Sueur	55	5.4%	38.2%	23.6%	9.1%	10.9%	7.3%	5.4%
Nicollet	117	1.7%	29.9%	18.8%	20.5%	11.1%	9.4%	9.4%
Sibley	33	3.0%	24.2%	33.3%	9.1%	21.2%	3.0%	6.1%
Watonwan	31	0.0%	61.3%	3.2%	19.4%	3.2%	6.4%	6.4%
South Central	610	2.0%	33.8%	20.5%	14.3%	10.8%	7.4%	11.6%

### MFIP Counted Months—Suburban Metro

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Anoka	978	1.2%	25.9%	18.5%	14.5%	9.6%	8.5%	21.9%
Carver	84	0.0%	33.3%	21.4%	15.5%	5.9%	8.3%	15.5%
Dakota	850	1.3%	28.2%	19.3%	14.5%	11.3%	8.8%	16.7%
Scott	132	2.3%	32.6%	23.5%	15.9%	11.4%	3.0%	11.4%
Washington	322	1.6%	22.7%	19.6%	14.9%	8.7%	13.7%	19.2%
Suburban Metro	2,366	1.3%	26.9%	19.3%	14.7%	10.1%	9.0%	18.8%

### MFIP Counted Months—Core Metro

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Hennepin	6,364	2.6%	23.6%	18.6%	14.4%	10.4%	9.8%	20.6%
Ramsey	3,762	2.3%	20.6%	18.8%	14.0%	9.7%	11.0%	23.9%
Core Metro	10,126	2.5%	22.5%	18.7%	14.3%	10.2%	10.3%	21.8%

### MFIP Counted Months—Northwest

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Kittson	7	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Marshall	13	0.0%	30.8%	30.8%	15.4%	0.0%	7.7%	15.4%
Norman	18	5.6%	50.0%	11.1%	11.1%	16.7%	5.6%	0.0%
Pennington	39	0.0%	38.5%	30.8%	18.0%	7.7%	0.0%	5.1%
Polk	236	1.7%	31.8%	22.5%	15.2%	9.3%	5.1%	14.4%
Red Lake	13	7.7%	23.1%	23.1%	15.4%	23.1%	0.0%	7.7%
Roseau	28	0.0%	35.7%	28.6%	10.7%	7.1%	10.7%	7.1%
Northwest	354	2.0%	33.3%	23.7%	15.2%	9.3%	4.8%	11.6%



## MFIP Counted Months—West Central

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Becker	77	2.6%	29.9%	18.2%	11.7%	13.0%	16.9%	7.8%
Beltrami	272	5.9%	22.4%	20.6%	16.5%	11.0%	10.3%	13.2%
Cass	220	4.1%	21.8%	19.6%	14.6%	10.0%	12.3%	17.7%
Clay	247	2.0%	34.4%	25.1%	10.5%	9.3%	5.7%	13.0%
Clearwater	31	3.2%	32.3%	29.0%	12.9%	9.7%	9.7%	3.2%
Crow Wing	186	2.1%	26.3%	24.7%	12.4%	13.4%	11.3%	10.2%
Douglas	75	2.7%	21.3%	28.0%	20.0%	12.0%	8.0%	8.0%
Grant	12	8.3%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hubbard	83	7.2%	24.1%	18.1%	9.6%	13.2%	16.9%	10.8%
Lake of the Woods	3	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%
Mahnomen	20	5.0%	20.0%	20.0%	15.0%	10.0%	20.0%	10.0%
Morrison	82	0.0%	34.2%	23.2%	13.4%	12.2%	4.9%	12.2%
Otter Tail	120	4.2%	35.8%	19.2%	10.8%	15.8%	7.5%	7.5%
Pope	23	0.0%	43.5%	26.1%	4.3%	8.7%	8.7%	8.7%
Stevens	22	0.0%	36.4%	13.6%	4.6%	22.7%	13.6%	9.1%
Todd	44	6.8%	40.9%	18.2%	2.3%	13.6%	13.6%	4.6%
Traverse	21	0.0%	33.3%	28.6%	14.3%	19.0%	4.8%	0.0%
Wadena	55	0.0%	30.9%	18.2%	14.6%	5.4%	18.2%	12.7%
White Earth Nation	199	6.5%	14.1%	17.6%	18.1%	14.1%	11.1%	18.6%
Wilkin	23	0.0%	43.5%	34.8%	8.7%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%
West Central	1,815	3.8%	27.0%	21.6%	13.4%	11.8%	10.4%	12.2%

## MFIP Counted Months—Central

Service area	Eligible-adult caseload	0 months	1 - 12	13 - 24	25 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	Extended
Benton	153	3.3%	25.5%	24.2%	11.8%	13.7%	15.0%	6.5%
Chisago	44	2.3%	54.6%	13.6%	9.1%	13.6%	2.3%	4.6%
Isanti	73	1.4%	41.1%	28.8%	11.0%	4.1%	6.8%	6.8%
Kanabec	55	3.6%	29.1%	29.1%	16.4%	7.3%	9.1%	5.4%
Kandiyohi	183	3.8%	33.3%	24.6%	12.6%	9.8%	2.2%	13.7%
McLeod	53	3.8%	32.1%	28.3%	22.6%	7.6%	1.9%	3.8%
Meeker	53	1.9%	35.8%	26.4%	3.8%	9.4%	15.1%	7.6%
Mille Lacs	60	0.0%	23.3%	25.0%	15.0%	6.7%	15.0%	15.0%
Pine	118	1.7%	35.6%	11.9%	22.0%	12.7%	7.6%	8.5%
Renville	51	3.9%	41.2%	21.6%	13.7%	5.9%	7.8%	5.9%
Sherburne	170	4.1%	27.6%	25.9%	11.8%	11.2%	4.1%	15.3%
Stearns	581	3.4%	25.8%	22.7%	18.6%	10.7%	9.6%	9.1%
Wright	127	3.9%	29.1%	19.7%	15.8%	13.4%	10.2%	7.9%
Central	1,721	3.2%	30.0%	23.0%	15.5%	10.5%	8.4%	9.4%

## Indicator 5: MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons

**What are MFIP employment services?** Services are introduced to participants in an overview and include assessment of ability to obtain and maintain employment, assistance in developing an employment plan, intensive job search and coordination, and provision of services needed to fulfill an employment plan. Service areas are responsible for either providing these services directly or contracting with another agency. All caregivers receiving MFIP, including those in the Family Stabilization Services (FSS) track, and those with a fraud disqualification, must be engaged in MFIP employment services, except limited exemptions allowed for those caring for a child less than 12 months old.

**Background.** Closures are divided into three categories. Those with the exit reason “Entered Unsubsidized Employment” are in the first group. Attaining unsubsidized employment, a goal of the program, is an important step toward self-sufficiency. This exit reason is defined in the Employment Services Manual as “Participant is working and the case is closed due to earnings, or a combination of unearned income (such as child support) and earnings.” Agencies instruct staff on how to interpret this definition.

**Formula.** Unduplicated counts of all persons enrolled in employment services any time during the quarter, as well as the number closed during the quarter, are listed. Percentage closed for each reason is the number closed for that reason divided by the number closed.

**Details.** The reasons for closure are split into three groups: Unsubsidized employment, moved from the area (to MFIP in another county or out of Minnesota) and other. The “other” category is comprised of administrative separation, voluntary separation, closed due to sanction or 60-month limit, and an “other” category that includes reasons such as no eligible child on a case, person no longer in a case’s household, failure to file paperwork and receipt of SSI/RSDI. There is wide variability in how exit reasons are used across service areas. Employment services records are entered into the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development Workforce One system, from which the employment and wage data for this indicator are drawn. The service area is the one as of the most recent MFIP exit.

**To learn more:** See the [MFIP and DWP Employment Services Manual](#).

### MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—State

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
State	26,251	5,453	20.8%	32.2%	14.9%	52.9%

### MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Southeast

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Fillmore	44	8	18.2%	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Freeborn	143	33	23.1%	36.4%	30.3%	33.3%
Goodhue	102	21	20.6%	57.1%	4.8%	38.1%
Houston	51	6	11.8%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%
MN Prairie	331	86	26.0%	44.2%	27.9%	27.9%
Mower	198	41	20.7%	36.6%	17.1%	46.3%
Olmsted	648	176	27.2%	55.7%	6.2%	38.1%
Rice	183	58	31.7%	50.0%	10.3%	39.7%
Wabasha	40	14	35.0%	42.9%	35.7%	21.4%
Winona	180	36	20.0%	13.9%	5.6%	80.6%
Southeast	1,920	479	24.9%	46.8%	14.0%	39.2%

### MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons— Northeast

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Aitkin	37	17	45.9%	41.2%	17.6%	41.2%
Carlton	91	14	15.4%	21.4%	28.6%	50.0%
Cook	27	6	22.2%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%
Itasca	223	62	27.8%	32.3%	19.4%	48.4%
Koochiching	55	18	32.7%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Lake	20	7	35.0%	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%
St Louis	1,211	256	21.1%	27.7%	10.9%	61.3%
Northeast	1,664	380	22.8%	30.5%	12.6%	56.8%

### MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons— Southwest

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Big Stone	24	10	41.7%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
Chippewa	51	11	21.6%	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%
DVHHS	53	10	18.9%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%
Lac qui Parle	40	9	22.5%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%
Nobles	73	14	19.2%	28.6%	7.1%	64.3%
SWHHS	214	68	31.8%	8.8%	19.1%	72.1%
Swift	40	15	37.5%	40.0%	26.7%	33.3%
Yellow Medicine	21	6	28.6%	0.0%	83.3%	16.7%
Southwest	516	143	27.7%	16.8%	25.9%	57.3%

## MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—South Central

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Blue Earth	286	79	27.6%	31.6%	17.7%	50.6%
Brown	75	9	12.0%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%
Faribault-Martin	127	48	37.8%	33.3%	14.6%	52.1%
Le Sueur	81	26	32.1%	50.0%	15.4%	34.6%
Nicollet	162	27	16.7%	40.7%	29.6%	29.6%
Sibley	54	20	37.0%	50.0%	15.0%	35.0%
Watonwan	46	16	34.8%	31.2%	25.0%	43.8%
South Central	831	225	27.1%	38.2%	17.8%	44.0%

## MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Suburban Metro

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Anoka	1,342	323	24.1%	37.5%	14.9%	47.7%
Carver	94	22	23.4%	31.8%	4.5%	63.6%
Dakota	1,136	292	25.7%	37.3%	13.7%	49.0%
Scott	168	56	33.3%	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%
Washington	421	99	23.5%	25.3%	18.2%	56.6%
Suburban Metro	3,161	792	25.1%	35.7%	14.4%	49.9%

## MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Core Metro

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Hennepin	8,504	1,362	16.0%	28.7%	15.1%	56.2%
Ramsey	4,838	846	17.5%	30.4%	15.1%	54.5%
Core Metro	13,342	2,208	16.5%	29.3%	15.1%	55.6%

## MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Northwest

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Kittson	5	1	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Marshall	12	3	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Norman	32	10	31.2%	0.0%	30.0%	70.0%
Pennington	51	21	41.2%	23.8%	23.8%	52.4%
Polk	318	73	23.0%	13.7%	27.4%	58.9%
Red Lake	19	8	42.1%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Roseau	38	10	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Northwest	475	126	26.5%	12.7%	25.4%	61.9%

## MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—West Central

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Becker	83	23	27.7%	43.5%	21.7%	34.8%
Beltrami	375	62	16.5%	9.7%	4.8%	85.5%
Cass	282	97	34.4%	17.5%	19.6%	62.9%
Clay	274	55	20.1%	41.8%	3.6%	54.5%
Clearwater	44	9	20.5%	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%
Crow Wing	201	34	16.9%	52.9%	14.7%	32.4%
Douglas	70	17	24.3%	64.7%	17.6%	17.6%
Grant	14	5	35.7%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%
Hubbard	107	29	27.1%	62.1%	10.3%	27.6%
Lake of the Woods	4	2	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Mahnomen	29	7	24.1%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%
Morrison	94	21	22.3%	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%
Otter Tail	145	42	29.0%	50.0%	9.5%	40.5%
Pope	25	5	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%
Stevens	19	3	15.8%	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%
Todd	47	9	19.1%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%
Traverse	31	5	16.1%	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%
Wadena	68	19	27.9%	42.1%	15.8%	42.1%
White Earth Nation	236	69	29.2%	0.0%	13.0%	87.0%
Wilkin	36	12	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%	58.3%
West Central	2,184	525	24.0%	30.9%	12.6%	56.6%

## MFIP Employment Services Enrollments, Closures and Exit Reasons—Central

Service Area	Total persons enrolled	Total persons closed	Percent closed	Percent closed by unsubsidized employment	Percent closed by moving from the area	Percent closed for some other reason
Benton	176	40	22.7%	47.5%	5.0%	47.5%
Chisago	46	16	34.8%	31.2%	12.5%	56.2%
Isanti	96	24	25.0%	37.5%	16.7%	45.8%
Kanabec	60	12	20.0%	8.3%	25.0%	66.7%
Kandiyohi	239	69	28.9%	29.0%	11.6%	59.4%
McLeod	62	22	35.5%	27.3%	13.6%	59.1%
Meeker	59	15	25.4%	26.7%	0.0%	73.3%
Mille Lacs	76	26	34.2%	3.8%	26.9%	69.2%
Pine	145	31	21.4%	16.1%	9.7%	74.2%
Renville	65	19	29.2%	21.1%	15.8%	63.2%
Sherburne	187	40	21.4%	12.5%	27.5%	60.0%
Stearns	817	223	27.3%	49.3%	9.9%	40.8%
Wright	130	38	29.2%	23.7%	21.1%	55.3%
Central	2,158	575	26.6%	34.4%	13.2%	52.3%

## Indicator 6: MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index (S-SI) and Range of Expected Performance

**What is the S-SI?** The Self-Support Index is an outcome measure that quantifies goals of the Minnesota Family Investment Program to help participants find and maintain employment, increase earnings and decrease use of cash assistance.

**Background.** In 2002, at the direction of the Minnesota Legislature, Minnesota Department of Human Services staff met with local partners, staff from service areas and employment services providers, and representatives from the Minnesota Department of Employment Security (that later became part of the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development), to develop a performance measure of the goals for MFIP. The result of this collaboration was the Self-Support Index and range of expected performance, an outcome measure with customized targets for local partners.

Statewide Self-Support Index values have ranged between a low of 64.8 percent in fourth quarter 2010, to a high of 73.1 percent in second quarter 2006.



**Formula.** The number of participants off cash assistance or working at least 30 hours per week during a measurement quarter who were eligible for MFIP or the Diversionary Work Program (DWP) in the baseline quarter **divided by** the total number of active participants in the baseline quarter. There are three measures for cohorts of active participants in baseline quarters one, two, or three years previous. **Note that the three baseline cohorts are different – although overlapping – groups of people.** The table also gives the range of expected performance for the three-year S-SI and how a service area’s S-SI compares with its range.

**Details.** The Self-Support Index is the percentage of caregivers (usually parents, sometimes other relatives) personally eligible for MFIP or DWP in a baseline quarter who are either no longer receiving MFIP or DWP cash assistance, or are working an average of 30 or more hours per week during each month of the measurement quarter three years later. For example, the three-year Self-Support Index for the second quarter of 2014 reported outcomes during that quarter for the cohort eligible during the second quarter of 2011.

Those who left MFIP after reaching 60 counted MFIP months (the time limit in Minnesota), and those who left due to 100 percent sanction, are only counted as a success if they worked an average of 30 hours per week in their last month of program eligibility, or began receiving Supplemental Security Income after MFIP or DWP cash ended.

Participants are included with the service area or tribal provider that last provided services as of the end of the reporting quarter.

The three-year Self-Support Index has a related standard called the **range of expected performance** that is used to make more fair comparisons across service areas and tribal providers. Performance is assessed as above, within or below the range of expected performance, an interval based on caseload characteristics and economic conditions in each service area. More challenging situations lower the expected range. **Providers cannot influence the size or location of the range of expected performance** because this interval is calculated from regressions predicting success on the S-SI based on demographic and economic characteristics beyond the control of service areas and providers. No measures of the service or provider characteristics are predictors in the regression. **Providers can, however, influence the Self-Support Index through services that help MFIP and DWP participants increase employment and earnings.**

To help county agencies, consortia and tribal providers understand progress toward the three-year measure, the Self-Support Index is also calculated for one- and two-year cohorts. For reporting the second quarter of 2014, for example, the one- and two-year indices reported outcomes for the cohorts personally eligible for MFIP or DWP during the second quarters of 2013 and 2012, respectively. A range of expected performance is not calculated for the one- and two-year measures.

Red Lake Nation remains included in this measure because the Self-Support Index difficulty factor, used to adjust MFIP funding levels, continues to be relevant during transition to a tribal TANF program.

To learn more: See the [Self-Support Index](#) and [Range of Expected Performance](#) links.

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—State

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)
State	33,459	51.1%	32,392	59.9%	31,104	63.9%

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Southeast

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Fillmore	63	52.4%	57	68.4%	43	79.1%	72.0%	80.6%		Within
Freeborn	201	53.7%	193	68.4%	212	74.1%	73.1%	78.7%		Within
Goodhue	152	56.6%	138	62.3%	131	65.6%	61.0%	69.3%		Within
Houston	61	50.8%	60	56.7%	58	60.3%	69.8%	78.2%	-9.4%	Below
MN Prairie	433	56.6%	405	66.7%	351	72.1%	65.1%	73.0%		Within
Mower	265	58.1%	300	70.3%	259	69.1%	72.2%	77.7%	-3.1%	Below
Olmsted	942	57.0%	905	67.0%	791	69.8%	70.7%	74.8%	-0.9%	Below
Rice	300	60.7%	258	72.9%	239	74.9%	70.2%	76.0%		Within
Wabasha	55	50.9%	51	66.7%	64	76.6%	68.5%	76.8%		Within
Winona	190	47.4%	177	57.6%	169	68.0%	60.6%	67.7%	0.3%	Above
Southeast	2,662	56.1%	2,544	66.9%	2,317	70.7%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Northeast

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Aitkin	72	62.5%	67	62.7%	47	61.7%	58.6%	71.2%		Within
Carlton	132	63.6%	109	66.1%	107	75.7%	69.4%	82.9%		Within
Cook	19	47.4%	22	63.6%	20	65.0%	68.1%	81.5%	-3.1%	Below
Itasca	260	50.4%	236	56.4%	218	61.0%	61.8%	69.1%	-0.8%	Below
Koochiching	90	66.7%	83	71.1%	79	69.6%	57.4%	69.3%	0.3%	Above
Lake	24	58.3%	21	85.7%	19	89.5%	69.6%	84.3%	5.1%	Above
St Louis	1,411	42.4%	1,331	52.1%	1,200	58.0%	58.2%	62.2%	-0.2%	Below
Northeast	2,008	46.9%	1,869	55.2%	1,690	60.6%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Southwest

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Big Stone	19	42.1%	13	53.8%	12	58.3%	54.3%	77.9%		Within
Chippewa	75	48.0%	66	56.1%	82	65.9%	67.4%	75.7%	-1.5%	Below
Des Moines Valley HS	91	61.5%	104	66.3%	92	77.2%	67.1%	75.5%	1.7%	Above
Lac Qui Parle	32	46.9%	17	47.1%	17	41.2%	56.8%	76.2%	-15.6%	Below
Nobles	80	57.5%	105	69.5%	92	77.2%	80.6%	86.7%	-3.4%	Below
Southwest Health and Human Services	338	60.1%	291	71.1%	291	77.7%	72.3%	77.0%	0.7%	Above
Swift	55	47.3%	40	55.0%	45	66.7%	53.5%	66.5%	0.2%	Above
Yellow Medicine	40	65.0%	38	71.1%	25	64.0%	53.1%	71.9%		Within
Southwest	730	57.0%	674	66.8%	656	73.5%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—South Central

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Blue Earth	347	52.2%	338	60.4%	294	66.0%	66.9%	72.3%	-1.0%	Below
Brown	94	59.6%	83	72.3%	83	77.1%	69.4%	76.8%	0.3%	Above
Faribault-Martin	136	56.6%	125	61.6%	136	68.4%	70.6%	76.1%	-2.2%	Below
Le Sueur	103	62.1%	101	74.3%	93	82.8%	70.8%	77.3%	5.5%	Above
Nicollet	223	57.8%	237	70.5%	200	73.0%	73.3%	78.8%	-0.3%	Below
Sibley	59	61.0%	65	83.1%	42	83.3%	73.5%	86.3%		Within
Watonwan	58	63.8%	47	70.2%	32	81.2%	74.6%	84.5%		Within
South Central	1,020	56.9%	996	67.3%	880	72.2%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Suburban Metro

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Anoka	1,779	52.7%	1,728	62.7%	1,594	64.2%	62.7%	66.9%		Within
Carver	155	65.2%	143	71.3%	131	78.6%	68.6%	76.1%	2.5%	Above
Dakota	1,438	55.8%	1,430	62.0%	1,422	66.3%	63.9%	68.0%		Within
Scott	283	62.9%	296	69.9%	289	74.4%	70.6%	75.2%		Within
Washington	535	49.0%	584	61.3%	598	64.7%	62.1%	67.4%		Within
Suburban Metro	4,190	54.4%	4,181	63.1%	4,034	66.2%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Core Metro

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Hennepin	9,521	48.8%	8,905	54.7%	9,063	59.2%	58.3%	60.3%		Within
Ramsey	5,955	46.8%	6,258	57.3%	5,975	60.4%	59.1%	61.4%		Within
Core Metro	15,476	48.0%	15,163	55.8%	15,038	59.7%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Northwest

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Kittson	7	57.1%	9	77.8%	7	100.0%	62.0%	89.0%	11.0%	Above
Marshall	23	52.2%	16	56.2%	19	78.9%	62.1%	78.0%	0.9%	Above
Norman	46	63.0%	40	77.5%	41	87.8%	72.2%	82.1%	5.7%	Above
Pennington	83	69.9%	63	71.4%	38	78.9%	63.0%	75.9%	3.1%	Above
Polk	310	49.7%	277	64.6%	213	66.7%	63.8%	70.6%		Within
Red Lake	17	58.8%	18	83.3%	20	80.0%	59.6%	78.6%	1.4%	Above
Roseau	65	53.8%	55	74.5%	39	76.9%	66.5%	77.0%		Within
Northwest	551	54.8%	478	68.4%	377	73.2%				

## MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—West Central

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Becker	131	56.5%	137	63.5%	127	73.2%	67.6%	74.9%		Within
Beltrami	371	47.2%	374	55.1%	365	58.1%	57.7%	63.4%		Within
Cass	197	47.7%	189	62.4%	175	66.3%	59.3%	68.2%		Within
Clay	483	58.6%	459	73.4%	402	75.1%	70.6%	75.1%	0.1%	Above
Clearwater	43	62.8%	38	71.1%	48	70.8%	56.2%	69.9%	1.0%	Above
Crow Wing	300	58.0%	212	59.9%	210	72.9%	63.7%	70.0%	2.8%	Above
Douglas	105	50.5%	115	60.9%	96	64.6%	68.5%	76.0%	-4.0%	Below
Grant	29	65.5%	28	82.1%	27	88.9%	66.6%	80.7%	8.2%	Above
Hubbard	124	50.8%	91	56.0%	97	69.1%	62.7%	69.9%		Within
Lake of the Woods	7	85.7%	11	90.9%	7	85.7%	54.8%	74.8%	11.0%	Above
Mahnomen	33	48.5%	29	65.5%	31	51.6%	62.4%	75.5%	-10.8%	Below
Morrison	146	52.1%	154	68.2%	121	72.7%	67.1%	73.6%		Within
Otter Tail	235	58.7%	226	73.0%	197	72.1%	68.3%	74.6%		Within
Pope	31	58.1%	30	73.3%	33	75.8%	63.6%	77.5%		Within
Stevens	37	62.2%	31	71.0%	24	75.0%	61.2%	75.2%		Within
Todd	69	62.3%	72	73.6%	75	72.0%	70.8%	77.6%		Within
Traverse	30	46.7%	38	71.1%	22	90.9%	62.7%	77.7%	13.2%	Above
Wadena	87	46.0%	92	55.4%	94	60.6%	61.7%	70.0%	-1.0%	Below
Wilkin	52	69.2%	40	80.0%	17	94.1%	71.0%	83.2%	10.9%	Above
West Central	2,510	54.7%	2,366	65.6%	2,168	69.4%				



## MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Central

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Benton	282	58.9%	286	66.8%	269	74.3%	67.4%	72.7%	1.6%	Above
Chisago	83	69.9%	115	81.7%	114	86.0%	72.8%	78.8%	7.2%	Above
Isanti	140	62.9%	151	73.5%	130	73.1%	71.3%	77.7%		Within
Kanabec	81	56.8%	74	67.6%	71	85.9%	70.8%	78.7%	7.2%	Above
Kandiyohi	327	62.1%	288	69.4%	337	77.7%	75.7%	80.7%		Within
Mcleod	105	66.7%	79	87.3%	81	80.2%	65.9%	74.8%	5.4%	Above
Meeker	62	54.8%	74	68.9%	78	71.8%	70.6%	78.0%		Within
Mille Lacs	138	51.4%	114	64.0%	129	69.0%	67.3%	74.8%		Within
Pine	188	54.8%	199	65.3%	184	73.4%	71.1%	76.5%		Within
Renville	79	57.0%	68	69.1%	61	73.8%	64.7%	76.4%		Within
Sherburne	243	53.1%	245	64.5%	234	67.5%	69.0%	74.1%	-1.5%	Below
Stearns	1,094	58.0%	989	67.4%	935	71.4%	67.4%	71.8%		Within
Wright	212	52.4%	230	67.4%	207	72.0%	64.3%	69.5%	2.5%	Above
Central	3,034	58.0%	2,912	68.5%	2,830	73.5%				

### MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and Range of Expected Performance—Tribal

Service Area	Eligible adults (one-year)	S-SI (one-year)	Eligible adults (two-year)	S-SI (two-year)	Eligible adults (three-year)	S-SI (three-year)	Range of expected performance: Lower limit	Range of expected performance: Upper limit	Difference below (-) or above (+) range	Below, within or above expected performance
Leech Lake	216	36.6%	252	46.0%	226	52.2%	55.6%	63.0%	-3.4%	Below
Minnesota Chippewa Tribe	190	36.8%	170	41.8%	187	47.1%	52.2%	58.7%	-5.1%	Below
Red Lake Nation	596	41.9%	518	46.5%	436	50.9%	42.3%	48.6%	2.3%	Above
White Earth Nation	276	38.0%	269	53.2%	265	54.3%	59.4%	66.5%	-5.1%	Below
Total Tribal	1,278	39.4%	1,209	47.2%	1,114	51.3%				

## Indicator 7: MFIP Exits and Returns

**What is an MFIP exit? What does returning to MFIP mean?** An MFIP case is considered to have exited once it has been ineligible for two consecutive months following an active eligible month. The last eligible month is the exit month. A case returns to MFIP by becoming eligible again by re-applying, being determined eligible for the program, and receiving a grant.

**Background.** MFIP is a temporary assistance program designed to support parents or relative caregivers as they seek economic stability through work. The goal is for families to exit MFIP because they become self-sufficient and no longer need a grant. Three-quarters of MFIP cases that exit the program stay off MFIP for at least one year.

**Formula.** This measure gives the unduplicated count of MFIP cases with an eligible adult that exited from a service area during the quarter one year previous to the measurement quarter. The number of exiting cases staying off at least 12 months after an exit, and the number that returned to MFIP within that 12-month period, are each divided by the number of exiting cases. These two percentages total 100 percent. The last column gives the subset of returning cases that were on at least six of the 12 subsequent months as a percent of exiting cases.

**Details.** Only cases with an eligible adult in the last month of assistance are included in this indicator.

Learn more about the MFIP program on the [department's website](#).

### MFIP Exits and Returns—State

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
State	5,267	69.9%	30.1%	13.0%

### MFIP Exits and Returns—Southeast

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Fillmore	7	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Freeborn	40	65.0%	35.0%	12.5%
Goodhue	19	63.2%	36.8%	15.8%
Houston	12	66.7%	33.3%	25.0%
MN Prairie	86	68.6%	31.4%	10.5%
Mower	64	59.4%	40.6%	17.2%
Olmsted	174	73.6%	26.4%	11.5%
Rice	38	73.7%	26.3%	5.3%
Wabasha	9	44.4%	55.6%	22.2%
Winona	25	80.0%	20.0%	12.0%
Southeast	474	69.6%	30.4%	12.2%

### MFIP Exits and Returns—Northeast

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Aitkin	14	78.6%	21.4%	7.1%
Carlton	32	75.0%	25.0%	6.2%
Cook	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Itasca	44	61.4%	38.6%	13.6%
Koochiching	16	68.8%	31.2%	12.5%
Lake	5	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%
St Louis	195	71.3%	28.7%	11.8%
Northeast	310	71.0%	29.0%	11.0%

**MFIP Exits and Returns—Southwest**

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Big Stone	3	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%
Chippewa	9	44.4%	55.6%	11.1%
DVHHS	16	68.8%	31.2%	6.2%
Lac qui Parle	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nobles	18	77.8%	22.2%	16.7%
SWHHS	69	75.4%	24.6%	5.8%
Swift	9	88.9%	11.1%	0.0%
Yellow Medicine	8	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Southwest	135	75.6%	24.4%	6.7%

**MFIP Exits and Returns—South Central**

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Blue Earth	58	65.5%	34.5%	8.6%
Brown	16	62.5%	37.5%	18.8%
Faribault- Martin	37	64.9%	35.1%	8.1%
Le Sueur	20	65.0%	35.0%	25.0%
Nicollet	22	72.7%	27.3%	9.1%
Sibley	10	70.0%	30.0%	10.0%
Watonwan	11	54.6%	45.4%	27.3%
South Central	174	65.5%	34.5%	12.6%

### MFIP Exits and Returns—Suburban Metro

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Anoka	297	70.4%	29.6%	13.1%
Carver	40	67.5%	32.5%	10.0%
Dakota	272	75.4%	24.6%	8.8%
Scott	60	86.7%	13.3%	10.0%
Washington	89	74.2%	25.8%	12.4%
Suburban Metro	758	73.8%	26.2%	11.1%

### MFIP Exits and Returns—Core Metro

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Hennepin	1,292	66.6%	33.4%	15.9%
Ramsey	891	70.2%	29.8%	13.1%
Core Metro	2,183	68.0%	32.0%	14.8%

### MFIP Exits and Returns—Northwest

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Kittson	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Marshall	6	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%
Norman	11	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%
Pennington	18	72.2%	27.8%	16.7%
Polk	57	75.4%	24.6%	14.0%
Red Lake	6	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%
Roseau	7	14.3%	85.7%	57.1%
Northwest	106	72.6%	27.4%	14.1%

## MFIP Exits and Returns—West Central

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Becker	21	71.4%	28.6%	9.5%
Beltrami	69	60.9%	39.1%	18.8%
Cass	46	56.5%	43.5%	6.5%
Clay	91	74.7%	25.3%	11.0%
Clearwater	7	71.4%	28.6%	14.3%
Crow Wing	60	65.0%	35.0%	16.7%
Douglas	19	68.4%	31.6%	10.5%
Grant	15	73.3%	26.7%	6.7%
Hubbard	12	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%
Lake of the Woods	3	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%
Mahnomen	7	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morrison	21	81.0%	19.0%	19.0%
Otter Tail	52	76.9%	23.1%	9.6%
Pope	8	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stevens	10	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Todd	19	73.7%	26.3%	10.5%
Traverse	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wadena	19	79.0%	21.0%	5.3%
White Earth Nation	39	53.8%	46.2%	25.6%
Wilkin	10	70.0%	30.0%	0.0%
West Central	533	69.6%	30.4%	13.0%

## MFIP Exits and Returns—Central

Service Area	Exiting cases	Percent off 12 or more months	Percent returned within 12 months	Percent returned for at least six of 12 months
Benton	56	66.1%	33.9%	16.1%
Chisago	23	87.0%	13.0%	4.3%
Isanti	41	80.5%	19.5%	9.8%
Kanabec	14	50.0%	50.0%	28.6%
Kandiyohi	59	69.5%	30.5%	13.6%
McLeod	26	80.8%	19.2%	3.8%
Meeker	13	53.8%	46.2%	23.1%
Mille Lacs	45	73.3%	26.7%	4.4%
Pine	39	71.8%	28.2%	18.0%
Renville	14	78.6%	21.4%	14.3%
Sherburne	44	81.8%	18.2%	2.3%
Stearns	175	68.6%	31.4%	13.1%
Wright	45	71.1%	28.9%	13.3%
Central	594	71.7%	28.3%	11.9%

## Indicator 8: MFIP Unaccounted For Cases

**How is unaccounted for defined?** A case is unaccounted for if it meets all the following conditions in each of the three months of the reporting quarter:

- Includes an eligible caregiver required to participate in employment services (i.e., not exempt)
- Reports no earnings or activity hours
- Not attached to Family Stabilization Services
- Not in sanction.

**Background.** This indicator is intended to be used as a management tool to determine how well the service areas and the employment services providers are doing in engaging families and helping them move toward self-sufficiency. The immediate goal is to minimize unaccounted for cases by reconnecting them to the program.

**Formula.** The number of MFIP cases unaccounted for as defined above divided by the unduplicated MFIP caseload in the reporting quarter.

**Details.** Cases are attributed to service areas in the last month of the reporting quarter. MFIP caseloads in a service area include all cases with an eligible caregiver in any month of the quarter, with every case counted only once.



Learn more about the MFIP program on the [department's website](#).

### MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—State

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
State	23,211	785	3.4%

### MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Southeast

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Fillmore	46	1	2.2%
Freeborn	139	0	0.0%
Goodhue	109	0	0.0%
Houston	46	12	26.1%
MN Prairie	296	2	0.7%
Mower	196	5	2.6%
Olmsted	633	13	2.1%
Rice	179	5	2.8%
Wabasha	38	1	2.6%
Winona	154	2	1.3%
Southeast	1,836	41	2.2%

### MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Northeast

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Aitkin	34	1	2.9%
Carlton	84	1	1.2%
Cook	20	1	5.0%
Itasca	191	4	2.1%
Koochiching	51	2	3.9%
Lake	20	1	5.0%
St Louis	1,151	24	2.1%
Northeast	1,551	34	2.2%

**MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Southwest**

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Big Stone	21	0	0.0%
Chippewa	50	0	0.0%
DVHHS	52	0	0.0%
Lac qui Parle	27	0	0.0%
Nobles	62	0	0.0%
SWHHS	201	2	1.0%
Swift	50	2	4.0%
Yellow Medicine	17	0	0.0%
Southwest	480	4	0.8%

**MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—South Central**

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Blue Earth	253	0	0.0%
Brown	71	5	7.0%
Faribault-Martin	115	0	0.0%
Le Sueur	66	0	0.0%
Nicollet	136	6	4.4%
Sibley	41	0	0.0%
Watonwan	38	0	0.0%
South Central	720	11	1.5%

**MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Suburban Metro**

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Anoka	1,148	31	2.7%
Carver	95	0	0.0%
Dakota	986	19	1.9%
Scott	168	2	1.2%
Washington	364	8	2.2%
Suburban Metro	2,761	60	2.2%

### MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Core Metro

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Hennepin	7,138	303	4.2%
Ramsey	4,192	186	4.4%
Core Metro	11,330	489	4.3%

### MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Northwest

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Kittson	7	0	0.0%
Marshall	15	0	0.0%
Norman	24	1	4.2%
Pennington	49	1	2.0%
Polk	276	4	1.4%
Red Lake	15	0	0.0%
Roseau	32	1	3.1%
Northwest	418	7	1.7%

## MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—West Central

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Becker	91	1	1.1%
Beltrami	304	15	4.9%
Cass	262	21	8.0%
Clay	284	7	2.5%
Clearwater	35	0	0.0%
Crow Wing	210	10	4.8%
Douglas	88	2	2.3%
Grant	14	0	0.0%
Hubbard	99	2	2.0%
Lake of the Woods	3	0	0.0%
Mahnomen	21	0	0.0%
Morrison	95	1	1.1%
Otter Tail	145	1	0.7%
Pope	23	0	0.0%
Stevens	24	0	0.0%
Todd	51	1	2.0%
Traverse	24	0	0.0%
Wadena	69	0	0.0%
White Earth Nation	226	27	11.9%
Wilkin	26	1	3.8%
West Central	2,094	89	4.2%

### MFIP Unaccounted For Cases—Central

Service Area	Eligible-adult cases	Unaccounted for cases	Percent of cases unaccounted for
Benton	176	3	1.7%
Chisago	54	1	1.9%
Isanti	90	1	1.1%
Kanabec	60	1	1.7%
Kandiyohi	214	1	0.5%
McLeod	64	0	0.0%
Meeker	60	0	0.0%
Mille Lacs	73	1	1.4%
Pine	131	2	1.5%
Renville	62	0	0.0%
Sherburne	203	11	5.4%
Stearns	681	26	3.8%
Wright	153	3	2.0%
Central	2,021	50	2.5%

## Notes

**County consortia.** A county consortium is the legal merger of county human services agencies of multiple counties that consolidate administrative activities for human services programs. Such a county consortium is viewed as one entity by the department. Therefore, measures in this report are reported for the county consortium and not for its individual counties. County consortia’s member counties include the following:

1. Faribault/Martin: Faribault and Martin
2. Southwest Health and Human Services: Lincoln, Lyon, Murray, Pipestone, Redwood and Rock
3. Des Moines Valley Health and Human Services: Cottonwood and Jackson
4. Minnesota Prairie County Alliance (MNPrairie): Dodge, Steele and Waseca (Waseca, formerly in the South Central region, is now included with MNPrairie in the Southeast region).

**Minnesota Statute.** The statute on county performance management referenced in the introduction requires a quarterly report to all county agencies on each county agency’s performance on seven measures. Five of the measures named were operationalized as Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 in this quarterly report. The other two measures named (rates of paid employment and receiving the MFIP food portion but not the cash grant) are currently reported in the “MFIP Monthly Report” (statewide data), “MFIP County Specific Report” (county breakdown), and “MFIP Trends Report” (25 months of statewide data). Additional measures are included in each of the reports. Data for county agencies that form consortia are aggregated.

**Tribal nations.** White Earth Nation assumed administrative responsibility for human services programs for tribal members residing in Becker, Clearwater and Mahnommen counties, with cases transferred starting in 2014; for performance reporting purposes, White Earth Nation caseloads are reported with the county agencies and county consortia for six measures. For the two high-stakes performance measures, the MFIP/DWP Self-Support Index and the Work Participation Rate, people served by a tribal employment services provider are taken out of the county numbers and reported by provider, including the Leech Lake Band, Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Red Lake Nation and White Earth Nation employment services providers.

Note that the Mille Lacs Band operates a tribal TANF program that is independent of the state TANF/MFIP program, so is not included in state-level MFIP reporting. Red Lake Nation transitioned to a tribal TANF program from September 2015 to January 2016, but continues to be included in the report during the transition time.

**Service areas.** County agencies, county consortia and tribes are referred to as service areas in this report.

**Data source.** Except as otherwise noted, all data are recorded in the department’s MAXIS eligibility system; all data are extracted from the department’s Data Warehouse.