



Minnesota Child Welfare County Models and Examples of Other State Models: A Brief Comparison

Note: The counties included in this document responded to an invitation to submit information, this is not an exhaustive list.

MN County	Has Written Practice Model	Primary Practice Tools Used	Additional Info
Anoka	No	Signs of Safety (not required)	Strong focus on placement prevention
Carver	No	Signs of Safety (Required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires written safety plan for each family that is measurable Detailed truancy program
Hennepin	Yes (in progress)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signs of Safety Structured Decision Making Family Group Decision Making 	Model includes sections on trauma, using data, CQI and child well-being framework
Olmsted	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differential Response Family Group Conferencing Parallel Protection Process Rapid Response Signs of Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilizes RED team approach: review, evaluate and direct) Integrates domestic violence intervention Strong CQI component Understands the importance of data
Ramsey	Yes	Comprehensive Family Assessment The Golden Thread Part I The Golden Thread Part II	Family assessment model has been evaluated
Scott	Yes	Signs of Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managers and supervisors expected to promote Signs of Safety throughout the system

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works closely with law enforcement to prevent placement
Examples of Other State Models			
State	Has Written Practice Model	Primary Practice Tools Used	Additional Info
Connecticut	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family-Centered Assessments Risk and Safety Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently developed Early Childhood Practice Guide Conducting safe sleep campaign Working with Eckerd's Kids on data analytics
Iowa	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blueprint for Forever Families Parent Partners 	Robust child welfare training academy
New Hampshire	Yes	Solution-Based Practice Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family Development Restorative Justice Parallel Process 	Rollout of new model included input from youth and family consultants
New Jersey	Yes	Family and Youth Engagement Model	Strong data analysis and CQI
Utah	Yes	Five Organizational Keys Key #1 Progress for the initial practice model development was made with the commitment of upper administration. They are expected to remain accountable and that accountability is maintained by all staff. Training is provided to all levels of the organization. Key #2 Utah's practice model is embedded in training and the curriculum is built around the skills and values of the model. Key #3 A Qualitative Case Review with a similar format as the federal CFSR reviews has been implemented "hand in hand" with their training program. They are committed to improving	

		<p>consistency of practice across the state.</p> <p>Key #4 All key outcome indicators and annual reports are available on the DCFS website. This is a public commitment to transparency and monitoring work and outcomes of performance that are elements of the Program Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Key #5 The practice model is there to serve as an anchor of practice and not be continually changed. “Whether it be training, QCR or other efforts to build staff capacity, Utah has continually improved their capacity building efforts based on their lessons learned, without changing the model itself. This process has remained consistent over the years despite multiple changes of leadership at the highest level of DFCS administration.”</p>	
Wisconsin	Yes	Could not determine	Has a strong child well-being statement in its model