



## **House Bill 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care**

---



**January 2026**

**Reporting Period: July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025**



**Published by:**  
Children's Division  
January 2026

**Contact Information:**  
CD.RESPONSEEVALTEAM @dss.mo.gov

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>HB1414 Metric Reporting Timeline</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluation Tool and Metrics (13 CSR 35-35.100)</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Foster Care Case Management Dashboard (HB1414, Section 210.122 Performance Data Indicators)</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Child and Family Service Review (CFSR)</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Foster Care Case Management Agency Codes</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Standardized Stakeholder Feedback Tool</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses .....	7
<b>Phase I (Reporting Period: July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025)</b> .....	<b>13</b>
A. Safety Domain: Caseworker Monthly Visits with Children in Foster Care .....	13
B. Safety Domain: Victimization in Foster Care.....	21
C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child .....	29
D. Well-Being Domain: Medical Exam Completion (HCY/EPSTDT) .....	32
E. Permanency Domain: Worker Visits with Parent.....	38
F. Permanency Domain: Reentry into Foster Care .....	46
G. Service Domain: Average Number of Workers Per Child in Care (Less than 12 Months and 12+ Months).....	52
<b>Phase II (Reporting Period: July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025)</b> .....	<b>63</b>
H. Well-Being Domain: Placement Category/Residential Type .....	63
I. Well-Being Domain: Case Managers and Supervisors Trauma Trained/Informed.....	88
J. Permanency Domain: Timely Achievement of Child’s Court Approved Plan.....	89
K. Service Domain: Effective Ratio of Supervisors to Supervision of Case Managers .....	109
L. Service Domain: Cases Returned to CD for Catastrophic Costs/Court Order.....	110
<b>Phase III (Reporting Period: July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025)</b> .....	<b>111</b>
M. Permanency Domain: Placement Stability.....	111
<b>Technical Assistance</b> .....	<b>116</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>117</b>

## Introduction

In 2020, the Missouri General Assembly and the Governor enacted [House Bill 1414](#) into law. This law requires the establishment of a Response and Evaluation (R&E) Team to review and evaluate foster care case management in Missouri with the goal of implementing objective metrics to measure the quality of services for children in foster care. The Children's Division, in conjunction with the Response and Evaluation Team, is required to develop and implement a standard report as outlined in Section 210.112 RSMo. and 13 CSR 35-35.100. The report is intended to share and analyze the data from processes outlined in the statute and the regulation and to report lessons learned from that data. The regulation requires all metrics and performance measures be designed to take into consideration the following factors:

- That caseloads of Foster Care Case Management Case Managers are capped; and
- That Foster Care Case Management Contracted Agencies may return cases to the Children's Division for case management due to a court order.

Implementation of HB1414 was broken into three phases. The metrics outlined in the chart below are directly from regulation 13 CSR 35-35.100. The Response and Evaluation Team determined which metrics from this regulation would be included in each phase and to utilize existing federal benchmarks and definitions, when available and appropriate. When those did not exist, the Response and Evaluation Team determined how to define those measures. The regulation directs the Response and Evaluation Team to continuously evaluate the most appropriate way to assess outcomes in child welfare.

### HB1414 Metric Reporting Timeline

*Safety Domain (Sa), Well-Being Domain (W), Permanency Domain (P), Service Domain (Sv)*

<b>Phase 1 (October 2022)</b>	<b>Phase 2 (October 2023)</b>	<b>Phase 3 (October 2024)</b>
1. Worker/Child visits (Sa)	1. Residential (W)	1. Sentinel Events (Sa) and Timely Reporting of Sentinel Events (Sv)
2. Reports of Child Abuse/Neglect in Foster Care (Sa)	2. Case Managers/Sups trauma trained/informed (W)	2. Education (W)
3. Parent/Child Visits (W)	3. Timely Achievement of child's court approved permanency plan (P)	3. Stability of Placements (P)
4. Healthy Child/Youth Exams (W)	4. Effective ratio of supervisors to supervision of Case Managers (Sv)	4. Provision of services to meet the needs of older youth (P)
5. Worker/Parent Visits (P)	5. Cases returned to CD for catastrophic costs/court order (Sv)	5. Timely development and implementation of a Social Service Plan to address the reasons why the child is in care (P) and timely development and implementation of primary and concurrent permanency plan (P)
6. Re-Entries into Foster Care (P)		
7. Number of Caseworker Changes (Sv)		

Any other metrics and outcome goals that may be required by law or that Children's Division may decide are appropriate can be added.

Additional information regarding the origins, purpose, and implementation of HB1414, including historical information contained in previous reports, can be found on the [HB1414 Page](#).

## **Evaluation Tool and Metrics**

### **Foster Care Case Management Dashboard**

The Foster Care Case Management Dashboard (FCCMD), available to all case management agencies, will display Missouri's data each month by circuit, case management provider, and county. The data and metrics will apply to both the Children's Division and its contracted case management agencies. Each agency's leadership and quality teams, along with the Children's Division's contracted case management oversight team, will review the data and create improvement plans as indicated.

### **Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)**

In order to comply with the requirements of case evaluation, the Response and Evaluation Team made the determination to utilize the existing Child and Family Services Review process and tools in the collection of information for purposes of HB 1414 evaluation of case management. The CFSR is a federally required process for evaluating child welfare systems nationwide. The Children's Bureau conducts the CFSRs, which are periodic reviews of state child welfare systems, to achieve three goals:

- Ensure conformity with federal child welfare requirements
- Determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services
- Assist states in helping children and families achieve positive outcomes

The CFSR case review includes children in foster care under the age of eighteen, throughout the state, and includes cases managed by Children's Division and Foster Care Case Management (FCCM) agencies. Cases are randomly chosen quarterly following federally approved procedures. The number of foster care cases reviewed each quarter was negotiated and approved by the federal Child and Family Service Review Measurement and Sampling Committee (MASC). The CFSR case review tool assesses 18 items related to safety, permanency, and child and family wellbeing.

Missouri implemented a review process in April 2018 that embraced the standards of the federal Child and Family Services Review. The initial review system was built into the Children's Division's electronic case management system and mirrored all aspects of the federal onsite review instrument (OSRI). In September 2022, Missouri made the transition from their internal system to the federal online monitoring system (OMS).

The CFSR Online Monitoring System (OMS) is a web-based application consisting of the Onsite Review Instrument (OSRI), the Stakeholder Interview Guide (SIG), review and user management functions for OMS State Administrators, data indicator visualizations, and data

analysis reports and tools. The OMS is used for both Children’s Bureau-led CFSRs and State-led CFSRs. States can use the OMS for their own continuous quality improvement (CQI) and training/practice purposes.

The Onsite Review Instrument is the federal review tool used to review both foster care and in-home services cases during the onsite review component of the Child and Family Services Reviews. In completing the instrument, reviewers conduct case file reviews and case-related interviews with children, parents, foster parents, caseworkers, and other professionals involved with the child. The instrument is organized into a Face Sheet and three sections. On the Face Sheet, reviewers document general information about a case, such as the type of case. The three sections focus on the outcome domains that form the basis of the Child and Family Services Reviews: safety, permanency, and child and family well-being. For each outcome, reviewers collect information on items related to that outcome.

In addition to data from the OMS, the Children’s Bureau provides each state with CFSR Data Profiles. These profiles are produced by the Children’s Bureau twice annually, typically in February and August. The profiles contain data relevant to this report. Data for the profiles is pulled from the [Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System](#) (AFCARS) and the [National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System](#) (NCANDS).

AFCARS was established to provide data to assist in policy development and program management. Data can be used by policymakers at the federal, Tribal, and state levels to assess and identify trends related to how many children are in foster care, reasons why they enter, how they exit, and to develop strategies to prevent unnecessary placement into foster care.

The data enables the Children’s Bureau to administer the federal title IV-E foster care and adoption assistance programs more effectively. The Children’s Bureau and Administration for Children and Families (ACF) use these data sets for several purposes, including:

- Responding to Congressional requests for current data on children in foster care or those who have been adopted;
- Responding to questions and requests from other Federal departments and agencies, including the General Accounting Office (GAO), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Department of Health and Human Services’ Office of Inspector General (OIG), national advocacy organizations, States, Tribes, and other interested organizations;
- Developing short and long-term budget projections;
- Developing trend analyses and short and long-term planning;
- Targeting areas for greater or potential technical assistance efforts, for discretionary service grants, research and evaluation, and regulatory change; and
- Determining and assessing outcomes for children and families.

The National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) is a voluntary data collection system that gathers information from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico about reports of child abuse and neglect. NCANDS was established in response to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) of 1988. The data are used to examine trends in

child abuse and neglect across the country, and key findings are published in [Child Welfare Outcomes Reports](#) to Congress and annual [Child Maltreatment reports](#).

## **Foster Care Case Management Agency Codes (FCCM)**

Due to character limits across many data entry and reporting points, each contract held by an FCCM agency is assigned an abbreviated code. For any data that is sorted by agency, these codes will represent the agency which holds the contract. It should be noted that Missouri Alliance for Children and Families (MACF) holds multiple contracts throughout the state.

- 6AW: Missouri Alliance for Children and Families (MACF); Specialized Care Contract
- 6ZA: MO Alliance Permanency Program (MACF)
- 6ZB: Children's Permanency Partnership
- 6ZC: St. Louis Partners
- 6ZO: Crittenton
- 6ZM: Springfield Children's Coalition (MACF)
- 6ZL: Southwest Children's Coalition (MACF)
- 6ZJ: Central Children's Coalition (MACF)
- 6ZK: South Central Children's Coalition (MACF)
- 6ZR: Kansas City Children's Coalition (MACF)
- 6ZS: Southeast Children's Coalition (MACF)
- 6ZV: KVC Missouri (Previously named Great Circle and changed to KVC in 4/2023)

## **Standardized Stakeholder Feedback Tool**

Regulation 13 CSR 13 35-35.100 requires the use of a standardized stakeholder feedback tool annually. Missouri designed the feedback tool in the form of a survey. The purpose of the survey is to collect data from stakeholders pertaining to the quantity, quality, and effectiveness of case management services provided by the Division and its Foster Care Case Management (FCCM) Agencies. Surveys are sent to the following groups:

- Youth in Alternative Care (12+)
- Foster Parents & Resource Parents
- Adoptive Parents
- Parent(s) or Legal Guardian(s) of Children in Care
- Juvenile Officers
- Judges of the Juvenile and/or Family Court

As of March 2024, the Children's Division and FCCM agencies have adopted an electronic survey platform to send and receive survey information. The surveys include rating scale questions and open-ended questions.

Surveys were emailed to stakeholders in September 2025 using email addresses from the electronic case management system (FACES) used by CD and FCCM. Additionally, CD and

FCCM staff were provided a survey link to share with any stakeholder which may not have had an email address in FACES. Three hundred and forty-eight (348) surveys were completed by stakeholders.

All survey responses were sent to FCCM Oversight, FCCM Quality Assurance, Children's Division Circuit Managers, and Children's Division Regional Field Operations Specialists for local continuous quality improvement conversations.

## Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses (Reporting Period: September 2025)

Respondents were given the following instructions:

Using the rating scale below, answer which question best shows how you feel. If you had experience with more than one agency, please complete a separate survey for each agency for which you are addressing.

1 = Strongly Disagree      2 = Disagree      3 = Agree      4 = Strongly Agree

Survey results listed as "unable to be displayed" indicates the participant left the survey before the page was displayed.

## Adoptive Parent Survey Responses

Thirty-four (34) survey responses were received from Adoptive Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Nine surveys were unable to be displayed.

	Adoptive Parent Survey Responses						
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	% Positive Responses
1	Prior to adoption, my family understood the established permanency plan.	7	2	2	14	25	64%
2	The case manager clearly communicated the adoption process and timeline of court procedures.	6	6	4	9	25	52%
3	My family understands the adoption plan and staffing process.	6	5	5	9	25	56%
4	The adoption subsidy contract was created with our feedback and our child(ren) future needs in mind.	11	3	6	5	25	44%
5	Overall, I am satisfied with the services provided during the adoption process.	8	6	4	7	25	44%

## Biological Parent Survey Responses

Ninety-three (93) survey responses were received from Biological Parents. With the exclusion of question three, all surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Five surveys were unable to be displayed.

<b>Biological Parent Survey Responses</b>							
<b>Question #</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Positive Responses</b>
<b>1</b>	I know how to contact my agency worker.	25	12	20	31	88	58%
<b>2</b>	I am satisfied with the amount of contact I have with the case manager(s).	48	18	8	14	88	25%
<b>3</b>	I am satisfied with the quality of contact I have with the case manager(s).	52	12	11	12	87	26%
<b>4</b>	My case manager responds to my needs timely.	49	12	15	12	88	31%
<b>5</b>	I have at least monthly visitation with my child(ren).	40	8	11	29	88	45%
<b>6</b>	I have a voice in developing case planning goals and decisions for my family.	53	9	9	17	88	29%
<b>7</b>	I have been able to invite my friends and family supports to have a voice in developing case planning goals and decisions for my family.	53	11	9	15	88	27%
<b>8</b>	I am aware of services and activities in my community for myself and my family.	39	10	21	18	88	44%
<b>9</b>	The case manager(s) working with my family treats me with respect and values my opinions.	47	12	12	17	88	33%
<b>10</b>	I feel respected by the Family Support Team.	54	10	12	12	88	27%
<b>11</b>	I have someone, other than my case manager, who I can talk with if I need support or help.	37	9	15	27	88	47%
<b>12</b>	Agency involvement has made a positive impact in my family.	56	8	13	11	88	27%



## Resource Parent Survey Responses

One hundred and ninety-six (196) survey responses were received from Resource Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Thirty-three (33) surveys were unable to be displayed.

	Resource Parent Survey Responses						
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	% Positive Responses
1	I am aware of how to contact the case manager for daytime and/or after-hour emergencies.	9	13	48	93	163	86%
2	I have clear, open communication with my case manager.	19	19	34	91	163	77%
3	The case manager(s) provided adequate information on the child(ren) placed in my home (i.e. physical/mental health, behaviors, etc.)	24	23	37	79	163	71%
4	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home treats me with respect and values my opinions.	20	20	22	101	163	75%
5	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home is shows awareness of their identified needs.	22	22	33	86	163	73%
6	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home assists in accessing resources and referrals needed to meet the child's needs.	26	20	38	79	163	71%
7	I have a voice in the case planning for the child(ren) in my home.	24	24	39	76	163	70%
8	The case manager(s) visits the child(ren) in my home at least once per month.	7	11	26	119	163	89%
9	Home visits and meetings that I am to attend are scheduled with consideration for my family's schedules.	17	23	27	96	163	75%
10	I am informed of court hearings timely.	18	17	38	90	163	78%
11	I have the opportunity to provide information in court hearings.	19	22	49	73	163	75%
12	Overall, I feel supported by agency staff in doing my job.	27	27	30	79	163	67%
13	I would recommend fostering to other people in the community.	27	22	45	69	163	70%

## Older Youth (12+) Survey Responses

Twenty-three (23) survey responses were received from Older Youth. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Four surveys were unable to be displayed.

	Older Youth (12+) Survey Responses						
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	% Positive Responses
1	I have a voice in case planning.	4	0	7	8	19	79%
2	In Family Support Team meetings, I am able to share what is important to me.	2	3	8	6	19	74%
3	I understand my case plan.	2	1	9	7	19	84%
4	I know my goals for the future.	2	1	7	9	19	84%
5	My case manager supports me in the achievement of my goals.	4	0	3	12	19	79%
6	I am informed of the date and time of court hearings.	3	2	6	8	19	74%
7	I am heard in court hearings.	2	1	7	9	19	84%
8	My case manager prepares me to speak for myself in court hearings.	4	3	5	7	19	63%
9	I am satisfied with the amount of contact I have with my case manager.	4	2	2	11	19	84%
10	I know how to contact my case manager.	0	1	6	12	19	95%
11	I understand why I have a case manager.	2	0	3	14	19	89%
12	My case manager talks with me about my concerns.	4	1	2	12	19	74%
13	My case manager responds to my needs. For example: accessing resources and providing referrals.	4	1	3	11	19	74%
14	I feel respected by my caseworker.	4	0	2	13	19	84%
15	I feel safe in my placement.	0	0	4	15	19	84%

## Juvenile Officer Survey Responses

Forty-one (41) survey responses were received from Juvenile Officers. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Two surveys were unable to be displayed.

	Juvenile Officer Survey Responses						
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	% Positive Responses
1	Are you notified of Family Support Team meetings two weeks in advance?	5	12	12	10	39	56%
2	Are court reports received prior to court? (A description of the facts pertaining to the case, any updates on progress or lack of progress made towards the safety goals, any relevant changes to the family situation, the recommended permanency and concurrent plan for each child, and any recommendations made by the Family Support Team)	5	16	14	4	39	46%
3	In general, are court reports easy to understand?	4	15	19	1	39	51%
4	Are court reports and other information given to you helpful in preparing for court?	7	13	15	4	39	49%
5	Are case managers familiar with the case at court?	3	14	15	7	39	56%
6	Are case managers prepared and knowledgeable while testifying?	6	19	11	3	39	36%
7	In general, are case managers available within a reasonable amount of time?	6	17	11	5	39	41%
8	Are case managers supportive of their clients?	2	12	21	4	39	64%
9	Do you feel you are able to provide input during Family Support Team meetings?	3	0	21	15	39	92%
10	Do you feel attorneys representing case managers help to move the case to permanency quicker?	10	10	15	4	39	49%
11	Do you feel you are able to provide input during other interactions with the team?	2	4	16	17	39	85%

## Judge Survey Responses

Ten (10) survey responses were received from Judges. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Two surveys were unable to be displayed.

	Judge Survey Responses							
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	I have no information	Total	% Positive Responses
1	Has your circuit achieved at least 95% timeliness for required hearings in accordance with Court Operating Rule 23.01?	1	1	0	6	0	8	75%
2	Is transportation offered/available to families to assist them in attending court hearings?	3	1	2	0	2	8	25%
3	Are foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, relative caregivers, and families given an opportunity to be heard during court proceedings?	0	0	1	6	1	8	75%
4	Are families given an opportunity to provide input during treatment planning?	0	0	1	5	2	8	75%
5	Are affidavits, reports, and other paperwork submitted by the case manager to the Court purposeful, specific, factual, and pertinent to the work being done with the family being served?	0	0	2	6	0	8	100%
6	With regard to parents requesting legal representation in accordance with SCR 115.03, is the process to obtain legal representation explained by Court staff in a timely,	0	0	1	7	0	8	100%

	developmentally appropriate manner, utilizing clear and understandable language?							
7	In general, are all parties present and prepared for court hearings?	0	0	4	4	0	8	100%
8	In general, are case managers knowledgeable about the case and helpful during court proceedings?	0	0	3	5	0	8	100%
		<b>Set Hearing Times</b>			<b>Blocks of Time</b>			
9	Are dockets scheduled with set hearing times or in blocks of time?	3			5		8	N/A

## Phase I Reporting (Reporting Period: July 1, 2025 – September 30, 2025)

### A. Safety Domain: Caseworker Monthly Visits with Children in Foster Care

Children’s Division policy states that the caseworker should meet face-to-face with the child a minimum of one time per month with the majority of the visits being in the placement to monitor and assess the safety of the child.

Table 1 below depicts the percentage of children in foster care seen by a worker during the calendar month. This data set is displayed by each county and each agency in the state. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed.

<b>Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	98.1%	99.1%	99.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Andrew	CD	100%	100%	100%
Atchison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Audrain	CD	100%	94.9%	94.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Barry	CD	96.7%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Barton	CD	100%	94.4%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%

<b>Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%</b>				
Bates	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%		
Benton	CD	98.0%	94.4%	97.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Bollinger	CD	100%	100%	100%
Boone	CD	96.9%	99.1%	86.5%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	98.9%	97.8%	97.2%
Buchanan	CD	97.8%	98.9%	86.5%
Butler	CD	98.8%	100%	98.8%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	93.6%	99.2%	86.3%
Caldwell	CD	100%	87.5%	100%
Callaway	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	98.1%	98.1%	100%
Camden	CD	96.3%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	98.8%	99.3%	99.4%
Carroll	CD		100%	50.0%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	96.6%	100%	96.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	98.4%	100%
Cedar	CD	95.5%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Chariton	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	0.0%		
Christian	CD	93.3%	96.8%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	94.9%	95.6%	100%
Clark	CD	100%	91.3%	97.8%
Clay	CD	82.9%	98.0%	94.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Clinton	CD	97.0%	91.4%	100%
Cole	CD	95.7%	100%	92.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	97.8%	91.1%	94.5%
Cooper	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Crawford	CD	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%
Dade	CD	100%	100%	100%
Dallas	CD	100%	87.1%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Daviess	CD	100%	96.2%	100%
DeKalb	CD	100%	100%	100%

<b>Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%</b>				
Dent	CD	86.2%	96.0%	82.7%
Douglas	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Dunklin	CD	95.6%	100%	100%
	6ZS	87.5%	98.3%	79.2%
Franklin	CD	95.8%	90.4%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	93.5%	88.9%	100%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
	6ZC	100%	100%	95.0%
Gasconade	CD	100%	100%	96.6%
Gentry	CD	100%	100%	100%
Greene	CD	99.0%	97.5%	96.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	99.2%	98.4%	98.8%
	6ZV	97.7%	97.8%	96.6%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	100%
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	94.4%
Henry	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Hickory	CD	100%	100%	100%
Holt	CD	100%	100%	100%
Howard	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Howell	CD	98.6%	98.6%	95.9%
Iron	CD	86.3%	89.1%	94.9%
Jackson	CD	96.5%	95.7%	96.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	98.1%	98.8%	98.8%
	6ZR	95.6%	99.0%	96.2%
Jasper	CD	96.5%	96.9%	97.5%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	97.0%	96.4%	92.5%
Jefferson	CD	97.2%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	98.8%	97.3%	90.0%
	6ZB	98.8%	99.6%	100%
	6ZC	94.6%	98.3%	98.4%
Johnson	CD	100%	100%	98.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	100%	76.9%	100%
Laclede	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	93.6%	100%	97.6%
Lafayette	CD	100%	100%	91.2%
	CD	100%	100%	91.7%
Lewis	CD	100%	100%	95.0%
Lincoln	CD	98.0%	97.0%	97.1%

<b>Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%</b>				
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Linn	CD	100%	97.1%	100%
Livingston	CD	100%	98.5%	100%
Macon	CD	98.3%	98.4%	91.5%
Madison	CD	98.1%	100%	100%
Maries	CD	80.0%	52.9%	88.2%
Marion	CD	99.3%	98.7%	92.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
McDonald	CD	100%	97.8%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	100%	97.1%	100%
Miller	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Mississippi	CD	94.3%	97.2%	90.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Moniteau	CD	100%	100%	100%
Monroe	CD	100%	100%	90.5%
Montgomery	CD	94.4%	94.7%	97.5%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Morgan	CD	100%	96.8%	100%
	6AW	100%	75.0%	100%
New Madrid	CD	95.1%	95.6%	98.0%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Newton	CD	100%	98.5%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	92.5%	97.4%	95.3%
Nodaway	CD	100%	100%	100%
Oregon	CD	100%	94.7%	100%
Osage	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ozark	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Pemiscot	CD	95.8%	96.0%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Perry	CD	100%	100%	100%
Pettis	CD	100%	94.8%	89.1%
	6AW	100%		
Phelps	CD	86.4%	82.8%	83.8%
	6ZK	100%	100%	97.8%
Pike	CD	100%	100%	100%
Platte	CD	89.1%	100%	88.9%
Polk	CD	100%	96.8%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Pulaski	CD	93.3%	81.9%	78.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	50%
	6ZK	100%	100%	92.6%
Putnam	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ralls	CD	100%	100%	88.9%
Randolph	CD	98.1%	100%	98.3%



<b>Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%</b>				
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	98.9%	95.3%	100%
Ray	CD	100%	100%	95.5%
Reynolds	CD	100%	94.4%	100%
Ripley	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Saline	CD	100%	90.5%	88.9%
Schuyler	CD	92.9%	85.7%	100%
Scotland	CD	93.3%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Scott	CD	100%	89.2%	81.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Shannon	CD	100%	93.8%	94.4%
Shelby	CD	94.4%	100%	100%
St. Charles	CD	94.7%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	80.0%	100%	100%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
	6ZC	97.3%	97.2%	85.1%
St. Clair	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
St. Francois	CD	98.0%	95.5%	98.7%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
	6ZC	98.4%	100%	98.1%
St. Louis City	CD	86.7%	94.0%	87.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	92.2%	90.9%	89.8%
	6ZB	98.3%	99.2%	100%
	6ZC	96.6%	97.3%	94.6%
St. Louis County	CD	87.4%	87.2%	87.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	92.6%	90.3%	92.4%
	6ZB	98.8%	99.3%	100%
	6ZC	96.2%	95.6%	97.2%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	100%	100%	100%
Stoddard	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	98.0%
Stone	CD	100%	100%	95.0%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	97.0%	100%
Sullivan	CD	100%	100%	100%
Taney	CD	91.7%	94.0%	95.4%
	6AW	100%	100%	95.8%
	6ZV	100%	100%	96.1%
Texas	CD	95.7%	97.8%	89.1%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%

<b>Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%</b>				
Vernon	CD	96.3%	88.5%	98.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Warren	CD	100%	94.0%	100%
	6AW	75.0%	100%	75.0%
Washington	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZB	93.2%	93.0%	91.3%
Wayne	CD	89.1%	76.7%	94.9%
Webster	CD	98.1%	90.6%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	96.2%	96.3%	97.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 1: Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in July: 112.  
Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 84 (75.0%).

Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in August: 113.  
Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 81 (71.6%).

Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in September: 113.  
Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 80 (70.8%).

Number of counties that met the benchmark each month during the reporting period: 56.

Chart 1 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their percentage of children seen monthly. The data set includes children managed by both CD and FCCM agencies. The federal goal is 95%.

<b>Chart 1: Percentage of Worker Child Visits Grouped by Circuit</b>					
<b>Federal Goal is 95%</b>					
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
	<b>0.0%- 70.9%</b>	<b>71.0%- 80.9%</b>	<b>81.0%- 90.9%</b>	<b>91.0%- 94.9%</b>	<b>95% or greater</b>
<b>July</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>August</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>September</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>30</b>

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025


Analysis of Chart 1: Number of circuits requiring worker-child visits in July: 46.  
Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 38 (82.6%)

Number of circuits requiring worker-child visits in August: 46.  
Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 35 (76.0%).


Number of circuits requiring worker-child visits in September: 46.

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 30 (65.2%).

Charts 2 & 3 depict circuits that met or exceeded the benchmark all three months during the reporting period. The federal goal is 95%.




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Charts 2 & 3: Twenty-four (24) circuits met or exceeded the benchmark for worker-child visits in July, August, and September of 2025. This is a decrease from 30 circuits the previous reporting period.

Chart 4 depicts the percentage of children in foster care seen by a worker during the calendar month. This data set is displayed by each agency. The federal goal is 95%.




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 4: Number of agencies that met the benchmark during each month: July (11), August (12), September (9).

Nine (9) agencies met the benchmark all three months: 6AW, 6ZB, 6ZJ, 6ZK, 6ZM, 6ZO, 6ZR, 6ZV, and CD. This is a decrease from 10 agencies the previous quarter.

Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) Data: Item 14 of the CFSR evaluates frequency and quality of caseworker visits with children in foster care. The purpose of these visits is to ensure the child's safety, permanency, and well-being and to promote achievement of case goals. Chart 5 depicts the 31 cases reviewed this reporting period. This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both CD and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 14 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 5: Twenty-four (24) of the 31 cases available for review were rated Strength in this area. The visits were rated a Strength in frequency because they were typically about an hour in duration and occurred at least monthly. The visits were of sufficient quality because they included face-to-face contact with the child in the placement setting. Some visits occurred with the child alone and some occurred with the placement provider when the child's age or developmental level was not conducive to meeting with the child alone. The caseworker observed the interactions between the child and others living in the home as well as the physical environment to assess appropriateness and safety of the placement setting. Conversations with both the child and the placement providers focused on the child's needs, services, and case planning.

Of the 31 cases reviewed, seven were rated Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in the frequency and/or quality of the caseworker visits with a child. Factors contributing to a rating of ANI included the worker not visiting with the child alone, not observing the child's interactions with other household members, and not addressing the conditions of the home.

#### Data Analysis Summary for Worker Child Visits:

Fifty-six (56) counties met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from 48 counties the previous reporting period.

Twenty-four (24) circuits met the benchmark all three months. This is a decrease from 30 circuits the previous reporting period.

Nine (9) agencies met the benchmark all three months. This is a decrease from 10 agencies the previous reporting period.

Twenty-four (24) cases (77.4%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for caseworker visits with children. This is an increase from 65.6% of cases during the previous reporting period.

## B. Safety Domain: Victimization in Foster Care

Victimization in foster care is defined as a child in foster care whom the state has determined to be the victim of abuse or neglect by at least one preponderance of evidence finding. It should be noted that this metric measures a rolling calendar year, thus a report counted in one month will be reflected in subsequent months until the 12-month period has been reached for that report.

Table 2 depicts the Rate of Victimization for each county and each agency in the state during the reporting period. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed. The National Performance for this measure is 9.07% or less. A lower value is desirable.

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Andrew	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Atchison	CD	34.72	35.17	34.85

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Audrain	CD	6.90	6.92	7.13
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Barry	CD	7.78	8.31	8.87
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Barton	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bates	CD	11.54	11.51	11.83
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Benton	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	139.28	280.90	280.90
Bollinger	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Boone	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	3.15	3.16	3.16
Buchanan	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Butler	CD	17.66	21.39	17.60
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	0.00	2.23	2.23
Caldwell	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Callaway	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	45.96	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	0.00	0.00	0.00
Camden	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	CD	3.76	3.76	3.76
Carroll	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Carter	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cass	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	133.51	131.58	126.42
	6ZO	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZR	4.33	4.33	8.71
Cedar	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chariton	CD	18.10	18.96	19.90
	6ZJ		0.00	0.00
Christian	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZM	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clark	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clay	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clinton	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cole	CD	0.00	0.00	5.89
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	9.13	6.13	9.33

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Cooper	CD	0.00	0.00	19.49
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	CD	3.70	3.71	3.72
Dade	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dallas	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	54.76	110.07
Daviess	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
DeKalb	CD	14.74	15.33	0.00
Dent	CD	0.00	4.35	8.76
Douglas	CD	7.57	7.54	7.53
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	CD	5.76	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	0.00
Franklin	CD	3.92	3.97	2.01
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	6.22	0.00	0.00
Gasconade	CD	0.00	9.24	9.55
Gentry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	CD	2.06	2.05	2.04
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZM	1.18	1.17	0.00
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grundy	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Harrison	CD	19.85	40.01	39.44
Henry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hickory	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Holt	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howard	CD	25.56	13.60	14.41
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howell	CD	4.12	8.43	8.57
Iron	CD	16.27	16.89	17.44
Jackson	CD	0.00	0.00	4.13
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZO	0.67	0.00	0.68
	6ZR	0.73	0.75	2.26
Jasper	CD	0.00	0.00	1.34
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZL	2.43	2.40	2.37
Jefferson	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZB	24.49	24.46	22.21
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
Johnson	CD	8.93	9.01	9.08
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Laclede	CD	4.22	4.25	17.37
	6AW	64.04	62.38	94.61
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lafayette	CD	0.00	0.00	20.80
Lawrence	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZV	10.48	10.66	11.03
Lewis	CD	14.03	27.74	27.27
Lincoln	CD	2.62	2.63	2.64
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Linn	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Livingston	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Macon	CD	12.08	5.83	5.59
Madison	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maries	CD	52.12	48.23	44.56
Marion	CD	4.98	6.76	6.90
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
McDonald	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZL	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mercer	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Miller	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	CD	11.26	11.19	11.10
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Moniteau	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW			
Monroe	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montgomery	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Morgan	CD	9.44	9.28	4.55
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZR	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Newton	CD	0.00	3.89	4.06
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZL	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nodaway	CD	12.53	12.88	13.24
Oregon	CD	64.45	71.12	69.31



<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Osage	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ozark	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00		
Pemiscot	CD	4.06	8.05	8.04
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Perry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pettis	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Phelps	CD	4.21	4.39	4.51
	6ZK	15.38	0.00	0.00
Pike	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Platte	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Polk	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	CD	8.05	8.01	9.88
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Putnam	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ralls	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Randolph	CD	10.59	10.47	10.41
	6AW	145.35	133.33	123.92
	6ZJ	3.33	3.32	3.28
Ray	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ripley	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	9.30	9.56	9.73
Saline	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Schuyler	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Scotland	CD	0.00	20.50	21.18
Scott	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shannon	CD	19.59	18.66	17.87
Shelby	CD	57.80	44.76	46.64
St. Charles	CD	6.21	6.14	6.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Clair	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	68.73	71.79	0.00
St. Francois	CD	2.11	4.14	4.08
	6ZB		0.00	0.00
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Louis City	CD	1.44	2.93	4.47
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.95
	6ZB	2.10	6.35	6.38

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Louis County	CD	3.79	2.92	3.02
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	1.29	1.29	0.65
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	2.09	4.19	4.20
Ste. Genevieve	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stoddard	CD	0.00	0.00	7.06
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA			
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stone	CD	8.12	8.65	9.15
	6AW	102.35	96.25	90.83
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Taney	CD	5.80	3.93	3.85
	6AW	21.20	20.70	20.21
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Texas	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vernon	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warren	CD	25.10	28.41	27.88
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	3.98	3.98
Wayne	CD	6.13	6.06	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Webster	CD	0.00	11.51	11.66
	6AW	67.70	66.31	0.00
Wright	CD	6.73	10.10	10.08
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 2: Number of counties with victimization rates for July: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 81 (71.05%).

Number of counties with victimization rates for August: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 82 (71.92%).

Number of counties with victimization rates for September: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 81 (71.05%).

Number of counties that met the benchmark all three months in the reporting period: 74.

Chart 6 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their rate of victimization for children in foster care. This data includes children managed by both CD and FCCM agencies. The National Performance is 9.07 or less. A lower number is desirable.

<b>Chart 6: Victimization Rates Grouped by Circuit</b>				
<b>National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
	<b>20.01+</b>	<b>15.01-20.00</b>	<b>9.08-15.00</b>	<b>0.00-9.07</b>
<b>July</b>	2	0	4	40
<b>August</b>	1	3	2	40
<b>September</b>	1	4	2	39

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 6: Number of circuits with victimization rates for July: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 40 (86.95%).

Number of circuits with victimization rates for August: 46.


Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 40 (86.95%).

Number of circuits with victimization rates for September: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 39 (84.78%).

Chart 7 depicts victimization in foster care by each agency. The National Performance is 9.07 or less. A lower number is desirable.

**Chart 7: Victimization in Foster Care July-September 2025**  
**National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)**




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 7: Ten (10) agencies performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months.

Child and Family Services Review Data: Risk Standardized Performance (RSP) is used to assess state performance on the CFSR statewide data indicators. RSP is derived from a multi-level statistical model and considers the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children, and, for one data indicator, the state's entry rate. It uses risk adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors the state has little control over and provides a fairer comparison of state performance against the national performance. For more information about how RSP is calculated, please visit [What is National Performance and How is it Calculated](#). The reporting period for this report corresponds to the federal fiscal year, October through September. The goal of 9.07 or less is based on the National Performance of 9.07. A lower value is desirable.

Child and Family Services Review Data Profiles are based on the semiannual submission of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data from states. Data Profiles are produced by the Children's Bureau and shared with Missouri approximately every six months, in February and August of each year.

Chart 8 compares the rate of victimization for children in foster care in Missouri to the rate of victimization for children in foster care nationwide.



\*Source: MO CFSR 4 Data Profile, Released August 2025

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Seventy-eight (74) counties performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 78 counties the previous reporting period.

Ten (10) agencies performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 11 agencies the previous reporting period.

More than 84% of all circuits performed at or below the National Performance for victimization every month.

CFSR Data Profile indicates Missouri's most recent federal fiscal year rate of victimization is 6.37, which is below the national performance of 9.07.

### C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child

Children's Division policy is to facilitate at least one visit a month for each child for parents that are eligible to receive visits. In some cases, visits are prohibited due to a court order. Neither CD nor FCCM agencies are required to facilitate visits where a court has ordered no visitation to occur.

In July of 2025, Children's Division implemented a change to the requirements and process for documenting parent visits with children in the automated case management system. This change improved and simplified how parent visits with children are recorded but also altered how the data must be pulled for reporting purposes.


During the July-September reporting period, the parent with child visit data generated using the new process did not yet meet data quality and validation standards for public reporting. As a result, parent with child visit data is not included in this quarterly report.

Children's Division is actively validating and refining the reporting logic to ensure the data accurately reflects practice. Once validation is complete, parent with child visit data will resume in future reports.

Child and Family Services Review Data: Item 8 of the CFSR evaluates frequency and quality of each applicable parent's visits with their child to ensure the child's safety, permanency, and well-being and to promote achievement of case goals. To be applicable for review of this item, each parent must be either a parent from whom the child was removed or who had a preexisting relationship with the child, and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. Frequency of the visits, or how often they occur, is assessed based on the circumstances of the case, including the child's age and imminence of reunification.

Factors considered in assessing the quality of the child's visits with their parents include, but are not limited to, the duration of visits, whether they took place in a comfortable atmosphere that would encourage interaction, and whether unsupervised visits were allowed to take place in the parent's home.

Chart 9 depicts the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement (ANI) regarding the child's visits with the mother and father. To receive an overall rating of Strength, all parents identified as applicable for review of this item must have received a Strength rating for both the frequency and quality of their visits with their children. This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both CD and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.




\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 8 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 9: Of 26 cases applicable for rating of this item, 10 received an overall rating of Strength, indicating that both the frequency and quality were sufficient.

Sixteen (16) cases were rated ANI. All cases received that rating, at least in part, due to inadequate frequency of visits with one or both parents. In one case, the child chose to stop having visits with their mother and no efforts were made by the agency to address the issues that caused the child to not want to visit their parent. Several cases were rated ANI due to the agency not making concerted efforts to locate parents and engage them in visitation with their child.

Chart 10 depicts the percentage of cases in which the children's visits with their mother and father were of sufficient frequency or quality to promote continuity in the child's relationships with them. The number of cases applicable for rating frequency and quality can differ. For example, if the child never visited the parent, then the rating would reflect that the visits were not of sufficient frequency and the quality of the visits would not be rated, as there were no visits during which the quality could have been demonstrated. Each bar indicates how many cases were applicable for rating (n) and the percentage of sufficient frequency and quality.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 8 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 10: Twenty-one (21) cases were applicable for review regarding the frequency of the child's visits with the mother. Of those, 11 were rated Strength and 10 were rated ANI. Sixteen (16) cases were applicable for review of the frequency of the child's visits with the father. Of those, seven were rated Strength and nine were rated ANI. Factors contributing to a rating of Strength included visits occurring more than once per week. In most cases with a Strength rating, there was a gradual increase in visitation as the case progressed and safety concerns were rectified. In most cases, additional phone contact occurred between the child and parent(s) several times each week.

Seventeen (17) cases were applicable for review regarding the quality of the caseworker's visits with the mother. Of those, 12 were rated Strength and five were rated ANI. Ten (10) cases were applicable for review of the quality of the caseworker's visits with the father. Seven (7) were rated Strength and three were rated ANI. Common themes of cases receiving a Strength rating for quality include visits where the parent(s) and child can strengthen the parent-child relationship as well as practice responsibilities that comprise the role of a parent.

## Data Analysis Summary:

Ten (10) of 26 cases (38.5%) reviewed for CFSR received a rating of Strength meaning they met the requirements for both frequency and quality. This is a decrease from 64.3% the previous reporting period.

## D. Well-Being Domain: Medical Exam Completion (HCY)

Every child is required to have a Healthy Child and Youth Exam (HCY) within 30 days of entering foster care. The HCY exam includes basic vision, hearing and dental screenings. This data could include children who were in care for less than 30 days.

Table 4 depicts the percentage of children who entered care during the reporting period and received an HCY exam within 30 days of entry. This data set is displayed by each county and each agency in the state. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed. Additionally, 6AW does not receive new foster care entries and is therefore not included in this measure. The goal established by the R&E Team is 98%.

<b>Table 3: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	100%	100%	33.33%
Andrew	CD			20.00%
Atchison	CD	50.00%		
Audrain	CD	100%	0.00%	25.00%
Barry	CD	50.00%		23.08%
	6ZV			100%
Barton	CD	100%		100%
Bates	CD	100%		0.00%
Benton	CD	100%		25.00%
Boone	CD	100%	90.91%	80.00%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Buchanan	CD	25.00%	20.00%	56.25%
Butler	CD	100%	70.00%	60.00%
	6ZS	100%	100%	
Caldwell	CD			0.00%
Callaway	CD		100%	85.71%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Camden	CD	0.00%	58.33%	40.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	100%	33.33%	50.00%
Carroll	CD	33.33%		
Carter	CD			100%
Cass	CD	100%		0.00%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Cedar	CD	100%		
Chariton	CD	100%		
Christian	CD	50.00%	66.67%	100%
	6ZM	100%		100%
Clark	CD	100%	100%	100%



<b>Table 3: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Clay	CD	33.33%	25.00%	26.67%
Clinton	CD	50.00%		0.00%
Cole	CD			15.38%
	6ZJ	60.00%	100%	100%
Cooper	CD			0.00%
Crawford	CD	0.00%	80.00%	11.11%
Dallas	CD	100%	100%	
Daviess	CD	0.00%		
DeKalb	CD			100%
Dent	CD	33.33%	100%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	100%		0.00%
Dunklin	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	100%		100%
Franklin	CD	0.00%	100%	80.00%
	6ZA		100%	
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
Gasconade	CD	100%	100%	33.33%
Greene	CD	71.88%	53.85%	47.62%
	6ZM	100%	100%	92.31%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	88.24%
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Henry	CD	50.00%	63.64%	80.00%
Holt	CD	100%		
Howard	CD		100%	100%
Howell	CD	50.00%	71.43%	66.67%
Iron	CD	100%		
Jackson	CD	66.67%	56.10%	43.75%
	6ZO	95.00%	100%	100%
	6ZR	94.12%	70.00%	80.95%
Jasper	CD	100%	85.00%	43.75%
	6ZL	66.67%	0.00%	100%
Jefferson	CD			58.33%
	6ZA	100%	100%	100%
	6ZB	83.33%	100%	92.86%
	6ZC	100%	100%	
Johnson	CD	40.00%	12.50%	58.33%
Laclede	CD	0.00%		71.43%
	6ZK			50.00%
Lafayette	CD	100%	50.00%	28.57%
Lawrence	CD	83.33%	50.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	100%		100%
Lewis	CD			0.00%
Lincoln	CD	80.00%	88.89%	66.67%
Linn	CD	0.00%		0.00%
Livingston	CD	80.00%	100%	57.14%
Macon	CD	100%	100%	100%
Maries	CD	33.33%		100%
Marion	CD	60.00%	14.29%	33.33%
McDonald	CD	0.00%		80.00%
	6ZL	0.00%	100%	100%

<b>Table 3: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Miller	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	50.00%	50.00%	100%
Moniteau	CD	100%		50.00%
Monroe	CD	100%		0.00%
Montgomery	CD	100%	50.00%	100%
Morgan	CD	100%	100%	
New Madrid	CD	66.67%	20.00%	33.33%
Newton	CD	85.71%	33.33%	100%
	6ZL	100%		
Nodaway	CD	100%	100%	
Oregon	CD		0.00%	
Ozark	CD	0.00%	100%	100%
Pemiscot	CD	62.50%	100%	88.89%
Perry	CD	80.00%		
Pettis	CD	10.00%	0.00%	60.00%
Phelps	CD	44.44%	12.50%	0.00%
	6ZK	100%	100%	
Pike	CD	100%	100%	100%
Platte	CD	0.00%	100%	9.09%
Polk	CD	0.00%	50.00%	
Pulaski	CD		0.00%	20.00%
	6ZK		100%	
Putnam	CD		100%	
Ralls	CD	100%		0.00%
Randolph	CD	50.00%	100%	50.00%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	
Ray	CD	33.33%	0.00%	
Reynolds	CD	0.00%		
Ripley	CD	0.00%		66.67%
	6ZS	100%	100%	
Saline	CD	100%	53.85%	40.00%
Scott	CD	50.00%	15.38%	38.46%
Shannon	CD	100%	100%	100%
Shelby	CD			100%
St. Charles	CD	100%	87.50%	100%
	6ZB	100%		100%
	6ZC		100%	100%
St. Francois	CD	85.71%	50.00%	
	6ZB		100%	100%
	6ZC	100%		100%
St. Louis City	CD	40.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	82.35%	81.82%	75.00%
	6ZB	40.00%	85.71%	100%
	6ZC	100%	66.67%	
St. Louis County	CD	75.00%	33.33%	7.69%
	6ZA	88.89%	94.44%	83.33%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
Ste. Genevieve	CD		0.00%	
Stoddard	CD		0.00%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%

<b>Table 3: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Stone	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	0.00%	
Taney	CD	24.00%	45.45%	55.56%
	6ZV	100%	100%	14.29%
Texas	CD			80.00%
	6ZK		0.00%	
Vernon	CD	100%		
Warren	CD	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%
Washington	CD	100%	100%	
	6ZB			100%
Wayne	CD	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Webster	CD	40.00%	50.00%	87.50%
Wright	CD	28.57%	66.67%	50.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025; 10NOV2025

Analysis of Table 3: Number of counties requiring HCY exams for July: 88.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 37 (42.04%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for August: 77.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 29 (37.66%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for September: 84.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 21 (25.00%).

Eighteen (18) counties met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required.

Chart 11 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their percentage of timely HCY completions. This data includes children managed by both Children's Division and FCCM agencies. It should be noted that not all circuits had new foster care entries requiring HCY exam completions during this reporting period.

<b>Chart 11: HCY Exams Completed Within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody Grouped by Circuit</b>						
<b>R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>						
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
	<b>0.00% - 24.99%</b>	<b>25.00% - 39.99%</b>	<b>40.00% - 64.99%</b>	<b>65.00% - 79.99%</b>	<b>80.00% - 97.99%</b>	<b>98% or greater</b>
<b>July</b>	4	3	10	7	13	9
<b>August</b>	4	3	14	5	7	11
<b>September</b>	5	6	11	10	6	6

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025; 10NOV2025

Analysis of Chart 13: Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for July: 46.


Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 9 (19.56%).

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for August: 44.  
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 11 (25.00%).

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for September: 44.  
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 6 (13.63%)

One (1) circuit met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required: Circuit 01.

Chart 12 depicts the percentage of children, by agency, who entered care during the reporting period and received an HCY exam within 30 days of the entry. It should be noted that 6AW does not receive new foster care entries and is therefore excluded from this measure.




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025; 10NOV2025

Analysis of Chart 12: One agency met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period: 6ZJ. This is no change from the previous reporting period. Four (4) agencies (6ZA, 6ZC, 6ZM, & 6ZO) met the benchmark two out of the three months during the reporting period. This is an increase from three agencies the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data: Item 17 of the CFSR assesses whether the agency conducted accurate initial and on-going assessments of, and addressed, the physical health needs of the child, including dental needs.

Chart 13 depicts the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement (ANI). This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both CD and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.




\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 17 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 13: Of the 31 cases reviewed, 18 were rated Strength, indicating all physical health needs, including dental, were assessed, and addressed. Thirteen (13) were rated ANI. In four of the 13 cases rated ANI, the sole reason for the ANI ratings was the child's dental health needs not being appropriately assessed and/or addressed. Two cases received an ANI rating due to the child's vision needs not being appropriately assessed.

Item 18 of the CFSR assesses whether the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child. Foster care cases are only applicable for an assessment of this item if the child had mental/behavioral health needs, including substance abuse issues.

Chart 14 depicts the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement (ANI). This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both Children's Division and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 18 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 14: Of 18 cases applicable for review, 15 were rated Strength. Factors contributing to a Strength rating include accurately assessing and addressing the child's mental/behavioral health needs, providing appropriate services to address identified needs, and providing appropriate oversight of prescription medications. Three (3) cases were rated ANI. Two (2) cases were rated ANI, at least partly, due to the agency's failure to appropriately assess the child's mental/behavioral health needs.

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Eighteen (18) counties met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required. This is a decrease from 29 counties the previous reporting period.

One (1) circuit met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required. This is a decrease from three circuits the previous reporting period.

One (1) agency met the benchmark for HCY exams in all months where HCY exams were required. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

When comparing this quarter's CFSR results to the previous reporting period, there was a 16.9% decrease in cases receiving an overall Strength rating for Item 17 and a 27.7% increase in cases receiving an overall Strength rating for Item 18.

## E. Permanency Domain: Worker Visits with Parent

Children's Division policy requires at least one worker visit with each parent each month.

Table 4 depicts the percentage of parents of children in foster care that were visited by an agency worker for each month. This data set is displayed by each county and each agency in the state. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed. The goal of 50% was established by the R&E Team.

Table 4: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	July	August	September
Adair	CD	67.3%	57.3%	43.7%
	6AW	14.3%	22.2%	0.0%
Andrew	CD	100%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	70.0%	64.5%	64.5%
Audrain	CD	85.5%	80.4%	61.4%
	6AW	50.0%	100%	100%
Barry	CD	72.7%	45.7%	65.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	28.6%	24.4%	32.7%
	CD	73.3%	77.4%	84.8%
Barton	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
	CD	60.0%	67.3%	37.8%
Bates	6AW	50.0%		

Table 4: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	July	August	September
Benton	CD	56.1%	38.6%	47.9%
	6AW	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	51.2%	40.0%	36.7%
Boone	CD	68.2%	50.3%	61.1%
	6AW	18.2%	25.0%	35.7%
	6ZJ	28.1%	50.3%	49.1%
Buchanan	CD	54.1%	42.9%	43.9%
Butler	CD	52.3%	53.1%	59.9%
	6AW	21.4%	23.1%	23.1%
	6ZS	45.8%	49.2%	34.6%
Caldwell	CD	32.3%	54.8%	44.8%
Callaway	CD	76.7%	73.9%	65.7%
	6AW	50.0%	33.3%	40.0%
	6ZJ	23.0%	29.3%	53.8%
Camden	CD	80.9%	80.9%	73.7%
	6AW	66.7%	33.3%	20.0%
	6ZK	4.2%	0.0%	28.6%
Cape Girardeau	CD	59.9%	52.2%	50.4%
Carroll	CD		0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	57.1%	62.5%	60.0%
	6AW	45.5%	44.4%	44.4%
	6ZO	51.6%	37.5%	52.5%
	6ZR	64.7%	57.0%	58.1%
Cedar	CD	63.9%	46.3%	43.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	33.3%	18.2%	41.7%
	6ZJ	0.0%		
Christian	CD	70.3%	71.3%	60.6%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZM	60.9%	67.1%	56.9%
Clark	CD	52.4%	55.7%	53.2%
Clay	CD	41.8%	45.9%	54.9%
	6AW	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%
Clinton	CD	53.2%	65.4%	52.8%
Cole	CD	38.5%	44.3%	45.2%
	6AW	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	28.2%	29.7%	33.8%
Cooper	CD	50.0%	27.3%	55.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	14.1%	20.9%	14.0%
Dade	CD	75.0%	62.5%	12.5%
Dallas	CD	69.0%	64.8%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	8.3%	33.3%
Daviess	CD	37.8%	64.4%	41.9%
DeKalb	CD	26.9%	42.3%	32.0%
Dent	CD	28.0%	22.4%	30.4%
Douglas	CD	62.7%	55.8%	32.0%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	46.6%	53.7%	48.4%
	6ZS	16.7%	34.0%	27.1%

<b>Table 4: Worker-Parent Visits – R&amp;E Goal is 50%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Franklin	CD	63.1%	51.9%	60.1%
	6AW	16.7%	10.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	35.7%	35.7%	29.8%
	6ZB	100%	75.0%	75.0%
	6ZC	60.9%	72.3%	80.3%
Gasconade	CD	36.4%	55.0%	47.4%
Gentry	CD	80.0%	60.0%	80.0%
Greene	CD	59.6%	54.5%	55.4%
	6AW	16.7%	25.0%	11.1%
	6ZM	49.7%	56.0%	49.5%
	6ZV	60.5%	50.0%	64.5%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	100%
Harrison	CD	94.7%	88.0%	81.5%
Henry	CD	59.1%	54.0%	57.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Hickory	CD	92.3%	88.9%	88.9%
	6AW		100%	100%
Holt	CD	66.7%	61.5%	64.3%
Howard	CD	94.4%	26.3%	61.9%
	6ZJ	42.1%	51.4%	38.5%
Howell	CD	50.0%	37.1%	44.2%
Iron	CD	47.4%	35.8%	9.1%
Jackson	CD	54.0%	47.5%	34.7%
	6AW	33.3%	21.7%	20.0%
	6ZO	41.4%	45.1%	38.9%
	6ZR	43.5%	51.9%	47.3%
Jasper	CD	52.1%	57.8%	56.6%
	6AW	20.0%	5.9%	11.1%
	6ZL	28.8%	37.7%	34.6%
Jefferson	CD	47.1%	66.7%	65.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
	6ZA	36.9%	27.7%	50.8%
	6ZB	37.5%	34.9%	38.4%
	6ZC	41.0%	35.3%	50.6%
Johnson	CD	91.6%	79.7%	72.4%
	6AW	33.3%	60.0%	33.3%
Knox	CD	30.0%	20.0%	42.9%
Laclede	CD	67.3%	80.6%	67.9%
	6AW	6.3%	12.5%	10.5%
	6ZK	60.3%	79.4%	60.3%
Lafayette	CD	63.5%	56.9%	49.1%
Lawrence	CD	78.0%	77.5%	77.6%
	6AW	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	43.2%	36.1%	53.8%
Lewis	CD	61.5%	35.9%	41.2%
Lincoln	CD	62.0%	56.6%	53.4%
	6AW		50.0%	
Linn	CD	50.0%	39.6%	53.8%
Livingston	CD	82.2%	90.0%	75.0%
Macon	CD	69.6%	63.1%	65.9%
Madison	CD	54.3%	58.6%	58.3%



Table 4: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	July	August	September
Maries	CD	72.0%	26.7%	50.0%
Marion	CD	45.7%	43.5%	41.3%
	6AW	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
McDonald	CD	70.6%	55.2%	60.9%
	6AW	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	40.0%	47.1%	37.2%
Mercer	CD			
Miller	CD	79.2%	66.7%	55.4%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Mississippi	CD	35.2%	32.7%	17.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	75.0%	82.6%	56.5%
Monroe	CD	22.2%	55.6%	55.6%
	6AW			
Montgomery	CD	37.0%	31.9%	42.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Morgan	CD	75.5%	75.5%	68.5%
	6AW	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
New Madrid	CD	47.2%	33.3%	38.5%
Newton	CD	74.7%	73.6%	64.5%
	6AW	15.0%	15.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	54.5%	35.0%	29.9%
Nodaway	CD	73.9%	75.0%	65.7%
Oregon	CD	65.7%	42.6%	43.3%
Osage	CD	10.0%	76.7%	43.3%
Ozark	CD	42.9%	50.0%	66.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	49.1%	56.3%	39.6%
	6AW	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Perry	CD	50.0%	56.5%	54.8%
Pettis	CD	41.1%	38.4%	38.9%
	6AW	0.0%		
Phelps	CD	42.2%	36.0%	32.1%
	6ZK	49.3%	50.0%	64.1%
Pike	CD	69.2%	86.7%	64.7%
Platte	CD	57.9%	40.9%	47.3%
Polk	CD	73.0%	76.2%	55.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Pulaski	CD	18.6%	19.2%	17.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	48.7%	51.3%	64.1%
Putnam	CD	60.0%	47.1%	15.0%
Ralls	CD	71.4%	35.7%	16.7%
Randolph	CD	87.1%	83.8%	83.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	57.4%	36.1%	53.0%
Ray	CD	8.0%	25.0%	19.0%
Reynolds	CD	31.4%	27.6%	39.3%
Ripley	CD	61.9%	37.9%	64.3%
	6ZS	63.2%	69.2%	49.0%
Saline	CD	54.7%	66.1%	43.0%

<b>Table 4: Worker-Parent Visits – R&amp;E Goal is 50%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Schuyler	CD	52.6%	44.4%	44.4%
Scotland	CD	75.0%	72.7%	66.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	44.6%	35.3%	17.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%
Shannon	CD	66.7%	46.7%	50.0%
Shelby	CD	53.8%	50.0%	54.5%
St. Charles	CD	53.6%	48.2%	55.7%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	83.3%
	6ZA	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	16.4%	30.8%	25.8%
	6ZC	49.5%	50.5%	35.9%
St. Clair	CD	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	59.2%	66.2%	61.0%
	6ZB	100%	0.0%	20.0%
	6ZC	70.1%	69.3%	71.2%
St. Louis City	CD	23.4%	16.7%	18.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	13.3%	21.4%	19.6%
	6ZB	26.0%	23.1%	26.9%
	6ZC	39.4%	39.3%	40.1%
St. Louis County	CD	22.8%	22.3%	25.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	15.3%	16.8%	20.5%
	6ZB	23.0%	23.9%	27.0%
	6ZC	34.3%	44.6%	39.5%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	66.7%	70.9%	67.3%
Stoddard	CD	63.9%	67.6%	66.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	37.7%	52.5%	48.2%
Stone	CD	71.0%	67.6%	71.9%
	6AW	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%
	6ZV	46.2%	42.3%	47.4%
Sullivan	CD	58.3%	25.0%	75.0%
Taney	CD	39.7%	56.6%	60.7%
	6AW	8.3%	3.4%	3.2%
	6ZV	55.0%	59.8%	61.0%
Texas	CD	37.0%	34.2%	21.7%
	6ZK	63.2%	78.9%	74.1%
Vernon	CD	69.0%	75.0%	89.7%
	6AW	0.0%	100%	100%
Warren	CD	62.3%	61.2%	63.6%
	6AW	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Washington	CD	14.3%	16.7%	26.7%
	6ZB	10.5%	25.0%	17.9%
Wayne	CD	27.4%	17.5%	26.0%
Webster	CD	62.8%	62.8%	59.3%
	6AW	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%
Wright	CD	64.2%	59.7%	67.3%
	6AW	27.3%	25.0%	33.3%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025  
HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care  
January 2026


Analysis of Table 4: Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for July: 112.  
 Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 43 (38.4%).

Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for August: 113.  
 Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 34 (30.1%).

Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for September: 113.  
 Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 31 (27.4%).


Twenty-one (21) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period: Atchison, Audrain, Cape Girardeau, Carter, Clark, Clinton, Gentry, Grundy, Harrison, Hickory, Lincoln, Livingston, Macon, Madison, Miller, Moniteau, Nodaway, Perry, Pike, Shelby, and Ste. Genevieve. This is a decrease from 23 counties the previous reporting period.

Charts 15 & 16 depict circuits that met or exceeded the benchmark for worker-parent visits all three months during the reporting period. This chart includes both CD and FCCM data. The Response & Evaluation Team established a benchmark of 50%.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

**Chart 16: Circuits that Met or Exceeded the Benchmark for Worker-Parent Visits All Three Months Cont.  
R&E Goal is 50%**




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Charts 15 & 16: Sixteen (16) circuits met the benchmark for worker-parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 19 circuits the previous reporting period.

Chart 17 depicts the percentage of parents of children in foster care that were visited by each agency. The Response & Evaluation Team established a benchmark of 50%.

**Chart 17: Worker-Parent Visits July-September 2025  
R&E Goal is 50%**




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 17: One (1) agency, 6ZM, met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from two agencies the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data: Item 15 of the CFSR assesses whether the frequency and quality of the worker's visits with each of the parents was sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals.

HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care  
January 2026

Chart 18 depicts the percentage of cases where the caseworker's visits with the mother and father were of sufficient frequency or quality. The number of cases applicable for rating of each of these measures can differ. For example, if the agency did not conduct a visit with the parent, the rating would reflect the visits were not of sufficient frequency and the quality would not be rated, as no visits occurred to measure the quality. Each bar indicates how many cases were applicable for rating (n). This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both CD and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 15 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 18: Twenty-three (23) cases were applicable for review regarding frequency of visits with the mother. Sixteen (16) received a Strength rating and seven were rated ANI. Fifteen (15) cases were applicable for review of the frequency of caseworker visits with the father. Of those, seven received a Strength rating and eight were rated ANI. In one case with a father residing out-of-state, a Strength rating was able to be achieved due to the worker maintaining monthly phone contact with the father where case planning and service updates were routinely discussed. Additionally, the worker would ensure face-to-face visits with the father on the one occasion he traveled to the state to visit his child.

All cases received an ANI for the frequency of visits due to the visits occurring less than once per month with inconsistent or no concerted efforts made locate, engage, and visit with parents.

Twenty (20) cases were applicable for review regarding the quality of the caseworker's visits with the mother. Of those, 11 were rated Strength and nine were rated ANI. Eleven (11) cases were applicable for review of the quality of the caseworker's visits with the father. Seven (7) cases were rated Strength and four were rated ANI.

Cases that received a Strength rating for quality included visits between the agency worker and the mother and/or father where issues pertaining to safety, permanency, and wellbeing of the child were assessed and addressed. Visits occurred in comfortable settings that promoted engagement and quality conversations.

A common factor contributing to ANI for quality of visits indicated a lack of conversations centered around case planning, service delivery, and goal achievement.

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Twenty-one (21) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 23 counties the previous reporting period.

Sixteen (16) circuits met the benchmark for worker-parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 19 circuits the previous reporting period.

One (1) agency, 6ZM, met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from two agencies the previous reporting period.

Quarterly CFSR case review results indicate the frequency of worker visits with mothers (69.9%) and fathers (46.7%) is below the federal goal of 95%. The quality of worker visits with mothers (55.0%) and fathers (63.6%) was also below the federal goal. When comparing this quarter's CFSR results to the previous reporting period, there was an increase in the frequency of worker visits with mothers and a decrease in the quality of worker visits with mothers. There was an increase in both the quality and frequency of worker visits with fathers.

Twenty-four (24) cases were applicable for a Strength or ANI rating. Of those, 10 (41.7%) received an overall Strength rating, meaning both frequency and quality were sufficient. This is an increase from 31.0% Strength ratings from the previous reporting period.

## F. Permanency Domain: Reentry into Foster Care

Reentry into foster care is identified as foster children who exited care to reunification, guardianship, or placement with a fit and willing relative during a 12-month period and then reentered care within 12 months of their exit date. The reentry is counted for the agency that was assigned the case when it closed in the system. A 0.00% represents that there were no reentries. MO Alliance (6AW) is a specialized case management contract serving children and youth with very complex needs which could contribute to a higher frequency of reentries.

Table 5 depicts children who reentered care in July, August, and September of 2025. This table displays reentry information for each county and each agency in the state. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed. The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or less. A lower percentage is desirable.

Table 5: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	July	August	September
Adair	CD	7.5%	10.2%	7.9%
Atchison	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Audrain	CD	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Barry	CD	8.7%	7.4%	7.1%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 5: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Bates	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	9.1%	7.7%	0.0%
Boone	CD	7.3%	6.5%	6.3%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Buchanan	CD	3.8%	3.6%	3.6%
Butler	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Caldwell	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Callaway	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Camden	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cape Girardeau	CD	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Carter	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cass	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cedar	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Christian	CD	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Clay	CD	3.4%	1.7%	1.9%
Clinton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cole	CD	3.1%	4.0%	4.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZJ	37.9%	35.7%	21.7%
Cooper	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	5.7%	5.7%	7.9%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dallas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DeKalb	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dent	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Dunklin	CD	10.6%	10.9%	14.0%
	6ZS	11.1%	0.0%	15.8%
Franklin	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%		
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gasconade	CD	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	2.9%	2.9%	3.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 5: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZM	5.8%	5.7%	3.0%
	6ZV	17.6%	13.6%	14.3%
Grundy	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harrison	CD	25.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Henry	CD	6.3%	10.7%	11.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%		0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	4.7%	4.4%	4.4%
Iron	CD	4.0%	3.8%	0.0%
Jackson	CD	6.1%	6.0%	6.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	8.0%	10.2%	10.7%
	6ZR	6.3%	6.8%	6.2%
Jasper	CD	3.2%	2.8%	2.7%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jefferson	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	4.5%	5.0%	5.3%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson	CD	2.9%	2.7%	2.9%
Knox	CD	14.3%	14.3%	16.7%
Laclede	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lafayette	CD	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Lawrence	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lewis	CD	50.0%	100%	100%
Lincoln	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Linn	CD	15.4%	14.3%	15.4%
Livingston	CD	13.3%	15.4%	21.4%
Macon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Maries	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Marion	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
McDonald	CD	2.9%	3.7%	4.5%
	6AW	0.0%		
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Miller	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR			0.0%
Mississippi	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Monroe	CD	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Montgomery	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	18.2%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZR		0.0%	0.0%



<b>Table 5: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
New Madrid	CD	6.9%	5.7%	12.5%
Newton	CD	5.7%	9.1%	5.5%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nodaway	CD	40.9%	45.0%	43.8%
Oregon	CD	8.3%	9.1%	0.0%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	4.8%	4.5%	2.3%
Perry	CD	0.0%	13.3%	12.5%
Pettis	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pike	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Platte	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pulaski	CD	2.2%	13.2%	14.0%
	6ZK	40.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Putnam	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ralls	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Randolph	CD	4.0%	4.2%	4.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	4.3%	3.7%	3.7%
Ray	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reynolds	CD	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ripley	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Saline	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Schuyler	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scotland	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Shannon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shelby	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Charles	CD	3.7%	5.3%	5.3%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Clair	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	3.7%	4.3%	4.0%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Louis City	CD	2.0%	0.9%	1.0%
	6ZA	3.3%	3.0%	3.0%
	6ZB	3.0%	2.7%	2.8%
	6ZC	6.3%	5.9%	11.8%
St. Louis County	CD	2.3%	2.5%	2.7%
	6ZA	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%
	6ZB	3.0%	3.0%	3.6%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	57.1%	57.1%	57.1%
Stoddard	CD	9.8%	9.9%	10.7%

<b>Table 5: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZS	6.3%	4.3%	4.7%
Stone	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sullivan	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taney	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Texas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Vernon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Warren	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Wayne	CD	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%
Webster	CD	8.0%	8.0%	8.7%
Worth	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wright	CD	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 5: Number of counties with reentries in July: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 81 (72.3%).

Number of counties with reentries in August: 111.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 82 (73.8%).

Number of counties with reentries in September: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 84 (75.0%).

Seventy-seven (77) counties met the benchmark in all months with reentry data during the reporting period.

Chart 19 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their percentage of children who reentered foster care. The data includes children managed by both CD and FCCM agencies. The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or less. A lower percentage is desirable.

<b>Chart 19: Percentage of Reentry into Foster Care Grouped by Circuit</b>				
<b>National Performance is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
	<b>12.5% +</b>	<b>10.1% -12.4%</b>	<b>5.7% -10.0%</b>	<b>0.0% -5.6%</b>
<b>July</b>	2	0	5	39
<b>August</b>	2	1	4	39
<b>September</b>	2	1	7	36


\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 21: Number of circuits with reentries in July: 46.  
 Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 39 (84.7%)

Number of circuits with reentries in August: 46.  
 Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 39 (84.7%)

Number of circuits with reentries in September: 46.  
 Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 36 (78.2%)

Chart 20 reflects children who reentered care in July, August, and September of 2025. The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or less. A lower percentage is desirable.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025


Analysis of Chart 20: Eight (8) agencies performed at or below the National Performance in all three months of the reporting period. One (1) agency performed at or below the National Performance in two of the three months of the reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data: Risk Standardized Performance (RSP) is used to assess state performance on the CFSR statewide data indicators. Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP) is derived from a multi-level statistical model and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children, and, for one data indicator, the state's entry rate. It uses risk adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a fairer comparison of state performance against the national performance. For more information about how the RSP is calculated, please visit [What is National Performance and How is it Calculated](#). A lower rate is desirable. This data does not differentiate between Children's Division and FCCM agencies.

Child and Family Service Review Data Profiles are based on the semiannual submission of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data from states. Data Profiles are produced by the Children's Bureau and shared with Missouri approximately every six months, in February and August of each year.

HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care  
 January 2026

Chart 21 compares the rate of reentry into foster care for children in Missouri to the rate of reentry into foster care for children in the nation.



\*Source: MO CFSR 4 Data Profile, Released August 2025

Analysis of Chart 21: On the most recent Missouri Data Profile, released in August of 2025, Missouri's most recent rate of reentry into foster care remains below the National Performance.

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Seventy-seven (77) counties met the benchmark all three months during the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

More than 78% of all circuits met the benchmark for reentry all three months of the reporting period.

Eight (8) agencies met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 9 agencies the previous reporting period.

### **G. Service Domain: Average Number of Workers Per Child in Care (Less Than 12 Months and 12+ Months)**

This measure observes the average number of workers assigned to children who have been in foster care less than 12 months and those in care 12 or more months. There is no federal benchmark for the number of case workers per child and a benchmark has not yet been established by the R&E Team. It should be noted that the average number of workers includes all workers assigned to a case and is not separated between Children's Division and FCCM. The measure is pulled by who is currently case managing the case. For example, if the case had two CD workers and two 6AW workers and the case is currently case managed by 6AW, then the average would be reflected under 6AW.

Table 6 depicts the average number of workers for each child who was in care less than 12 months. This data set is displayed by each county and each agency in the state where data is available. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed.

<b>Table 6: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	1.24	1.20	1.41
Andrew	CD			1.00
Atchison	CD	1.13	1.14	1.14
Audrain	CD	1.04	1.05	1.55
Barry	CD	1.30	1.30	1.28
	6ZV	1.40	1.80	1.71
Barton	CD	1.26	1.44	1.41
Bates	CD	1.28	1.21	1.53
Benton	CD	1.41	1.58	1.47
Bollinger	CD	1.67	1.40	1.78
Boone	CD	1.42	1.35	1.31
	6AW		2.00	2.50
	6ZJ	1.91	1.92	2.14
Buchanan	CD	1.41	1.30	1.26
Butler	CD	1.31	1.43	1.18
	6AW	3.25	3.33	3.33
	6ZS	1.33	1.23	1.28
Caldwell	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Callaway	CD	1.54	1.52	1.38
	6ZJ	1.50	1.38	1.45
Camden	CD	1.27	1.17	1.04
	6ZK	1.00	1.00	2.00
Cape Girardeau	CD	1.59	1.52	1.31
Carroll	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Carter	CD	1.50	1.60	1.50
Cass	CD	1.07	1.09	1.08
	6ZO	1.80	1.57	1.33
	6ZR	2.83	2.63	2.04
Cedar	CD	1.33	1.50	1.67
Chariton	CD	1.67	2.33	2.00
Christian	CD	1.41	1.68	1.67
	6ZM	1.56	1.54	1.53
	6ZV	1.00		
Clark	CD	1.53	1.33	1.46
Clay	CD	1.46	1.47	1.49
Clinton	CD	1.11	1.11	1.11
Cole	CD	1.18	1.18	1.08
	6ZJ	1.65	1.79	1.65
Cooper	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Crawford	CD	1.67	1.98	1.88
Dallas	CD	1.33	1.29	1.56
Daviess	CD	1.27	1.30	1.43
DeKalb	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dent	CD	2.05	2.00	2.76
Douglas	CD	1.24	1.20	1.11
Dunklin	CD	1.00	1.07	1.08

<b>Table 6: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Franklin	6ZS	1.77	1.82	2.10
	CD	1.55	1.38	1.44
	6ZA	1.67	1.50	1.50
	6ZB	1.00	1.00	1.00
	6ZC	1.87	1.67	1.57
Gasconade	CD	1.10	1.10	1.06
Gentry	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Greene	CD	1.29	1.24	1.25
	6AW			
	6ZM	1.61	1.59	1.61
	6ZV	1.62	1.69	1.60
	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Grundy	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Harrison	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Henry	CD	1.13	1.30	1.32
Hickory	CD	1.13	1.20	1.00
	6AW		2.00	2.00
	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	CD		1.00	1.00
	6ZJ	1.86	1.86	1.86
	CD	1.43	1.42	1.36
Howell	CD	1.43	1.42	1.36
Iron	CD	2.40	2.94	3.00
Jackson	CD	1.12	1.05	1.06
	6AW			
	6ZO	1.54	1.46	1.41
	6ZR	1.63	1.68	1.53
	CD	1.39	1.43	1.38
	6AW		3.00	3.00
	6ZL	1.83	1.69	1.76
	CD	1.10	1.17	1.06
	6AW			2.00
	6ZA	1.32	1.32	1.84
	6ZB	1.62	1.68	1.64
	6ZC	1.38	1.33	1.33
	CD	1.15	1.15	1.11
	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	CD	1.21	1.14	1.29
	6AW			2.00
	6ZK	2.00	2.00	2.63
	CD	1.21	1.23	1.16
	CD	1.39	1.32	1.84
	6ZV	2.00	2.83	2.63
	CD	1.60	1.60	1.93
Lewis	CD	1.60	1.60	1.93
Lincoln	CD	1.21	1.16	1.18
Linn	CD	1.67	1.83	1.83
Livingston	CD	1.18	1.18	1.30
Macon	CD	1.39	1.34	1.53
Madison	CD	1.17	1.25	1.25
Maries	CD	1.33	1.17	1.08
Marion	CD	1.42	1.56	1.62
McDonald	CD	1.12	1.00	1.00
	6ZL	1.06	1.20	1.68

<b>Table 6: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Miller	CD	1.84	1.80	1.73
Mississippi	CD	1.09	1.08	1.19
Moniteau	CD	1.00	1.00	1.56
Monroe	CD	1.08	1.50	1.46
Montgomery	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Morgan	CD	1.06	1.06	1.21
New Madrid	CD	1.12	1.11	1.25
Newton	CD	1.13	1.09	1.10
	6ZL	1.06	1.09	2.20
Nodaway	CD	1.13	1.12	1.05
Oregon	CD	1.50	1.47	1.05
Osage	CD	1.17	1.17	1.17
Ozark	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Pemiscot	CD	1.12	1.11	1.33
Perry	CD	1.13	1.21	1.29
Pettis	CD	1.27	1.13	1.14
Phelps	CD	1.34	1.49	1.43
	6ZK	2.42	2.00	2.00
Pike	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Platte	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Polk	CD	1.15	1.23	1.19
Pulaski	CD	1.99	1.95	1.72
	6ZK	1.78	2.00	2.00
Putnam	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ralls	CD	1.38	1.67	1.43
Randolph	CD	1.31	1.59	1.48
	6ZJ	1.92	2.03	2.03
Ray	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Reynolds	CD	1.00	1.67	1.67
Ripley	CD	1.70	1.70	1.40
	6ZS	2.00	1.91	1.90
Saline	CD	1.03	1.02	1.04
Schuyler	CD	1.00	1.20	1.20
Scotland	CD	1.00	1.33	1.20
Scott	CD	1.63	1.49	1.54
Shannon	CD	1.69	1.67	1.55
Shelby	CD	1.75	1.75	1.13
St. Charles	CD	1.11	1.17	1.24
	6AW			3.00
	6ZA	3.00	3.00	3.00
	6ZB	2.78	2.50	2.56
	6ZC	2.65	1.94	2.10
St. Clair	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
St. Francois	CD	1.31	1.45	1.41
	6ZB	2.00	2.00	1.67
	6ZC	1.64	2.09	2.00
St. Louis City	CD	1.13	1.21	1.32
	6ZA	1.50	1.40	1.41
	6ZB	1.57	1.92	1.41
	6ZC	1.63	1.72	1.85
St. Louis County	CD	1.49	1.50	1.49

<b>Table 6: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZA	1.70	1.73	1.67
	6ZB	1.81	1.48	2.01
	6ZC	1.97	1.89	1.90
Ste. Genevieve	CD	1.25	1.25	1.29
Stoddard	CD	1.21	1.26	1.24
	6ZS	1.59	1.58	1.54
Stone	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	6ZV	1.40	1.33	1.53
Sullivan	CD	2.33	2.33	2.33
Taney	CD	1.20	1.17	1.24
	6AW		2.00	2.00
	6ZV	1.50	1.53	1.49
Texas	CD	1.14	1.67	1.55
	6ZK	2.43	1.89	1.33
Vernon	CD	1.07	1.35	1.44
Warren	CD	1.42	1.34	1.36
Washington	CD	2.00	2.00	1.50
	6ZB	2.05	1.95	1.95
Wayne	CD	1.70	1.61	1.37
Webster	CD	1.58	1.47	1.58
Wright	CD	1.10	1.08	1.08
	6AW		2.00	2.00

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 6: Average number of workers for children who were in foster care less than 12 months: July (1 to 3.25), August (1 to 3.33), September (1 to 3.33).

Chart 22 depicts the average number of workers for children in care less than 12 months. This data set includes both CD and FCCM information grouped together.


<b>Chart 22: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months Grouped by Circuit</b>				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
	<b>3.1-4.0</b>	<b>2.1-3.0</b>	<b>1.1-2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>July</b>	0	0	43	3
<b>August</b>	0	2	41	3
<b>September</b>	0	1	42	3

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 22: The majority of circuits have an average of 1.1-2.0 workers for children in care less than 12 months.

Chart 23 depicts the average number of workers for children who were in care less than 12 months. This data set is displayed by agency. A lower number is desirable for this measure.





\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 25: Agencies averaged anywhere from 1.33 to 3.25 workers for children in foster care less than 12 months. This is an increase from 1.36 to 2.67 the previous reporting period.

Table 7 depicts the average number of workers for children who were in care 12 months or more. This data set is displayed by each county and each agency in the state. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed.

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	July	August	September
Adair	CD	3.21	3.07	3.41
	6AW	8.60	7.83	7.83
Andrew	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	6AW	8.60	7.83	7.83
Atchison	CD	2.36	2.36	2.50
Audrain	CD	2.15	2.05	2.52
	6AW	3.67	3.67	3.67
Barry	CD	4.13	4.57	4.47
	6AW	5.25	5.25	5.29
	6ZV	3.46	3.64	3.19
Barton	CD	4.83	4.50	4.00
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
Bates	CD	1.20	1.20	1.73
	6AW	4.00	4.00	
Benton	CD	1.12	1.22	1.27
	6AW	4.67	4.67	4.67
Bollinger	CD	3.24	3.06	2.94
Boone	CD	4.47	4.25	4.10
	6AW	7.38	7.38	7.80
	6ZJ	4.63	4.86	4.99
Buchanan	CD	3.46	3.52	3.52
Butler	CD	3.96	3.73	3.52
	6AW	9.00	7.75	7.75

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZS	3.79	3.69	3.82
Caldwell	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00
Callaway	CD	3.71	3.74	3.88
	6AW	9.40	9.60	9.60
	6ZJ	4.37	4.46	4.68
Camden	CD	2.35	2.31	2.25
	6AW	5.20	5.20	5.00
	6ZK	2.21	2.21	3.31
Cape Girardeau	CD	3.19	3.08	2.98
Carroll	CD		1.00	
Carter	CD	1.50	2.25	2.25
Cass	CD	3.05	3.30	3.33
	6AW	5.00	5.00	5.83
	6ZO	2.90	2.82	2.95
	6ZR	3.71	3.73	3.83
Cedar	CD	3.75	4.17	4.28
	6AW	9.00	9.00	9.00
Chariton	CD	4.36	4.20	4.40
	6ZJ	3.00		
Christian	CD	4.87	5.07	5.07
	6AW	7.50	7.50	7.50
	6ZM	4.68	1.69	5.21
Clark	CD	3.78	3.77	4.11
Clay	CD	2.49	2.38	2.40
	6AW	5.00	3.50	3.50
Clinton	CD	3.76	3.88	3.72
Cole	CD	3.89	3.97	3.97
	6AW	6.00	6.00	7.00
	6ZJ	3.47	3.32	3.53
Cooper	CD	3.00	3.00	3.00
	6AW	16.00	17.00	17.00
Crawford	CD	4.32	4.32	4.31
Dade	CD	4.00	4.00	4.00
Dallas	CD	1.60	1.60	1.50
	6AW	4.57	4.57	4.57
Daviess	CD	3.11	3.12	2.89
DeKalb	CD	3.83	3.73	3.73
Dent	CD	4.05	4.31	4.86
Douglas	CD	1.96	1.96	2.05
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
Dunklin	CD	1.96	2.00	2.11
	6ZS	4.94	4.58	3.62
Franklin	CD	2.79	2.84	2.90
	6AW	8.91	8.91	9.20
	6ZA	4.76	4.86	4.86
	6ZC	4.71	4.50	4.00
Gasconade	CD	1.73	1.73	1.77
Gentry	CD	2.40	2.40	2.40
Greene	CD	2.56	2.52	2.50
	6AW	4.88	5.07	5.14
	6ZM	3.61	3.50	3.45

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZV	4.09	4.31	3.74
Grundy	CD	3.00	3.00	3.00
Harrison	CD	2.00	2.00	1.67
Henry	CD	2.18	2.40	2.50
	6AW	5.00	5.00	5.00
Hickory	CD	1.00	1.00	1.50
Holt	CD	1.38	1.38	1.00
Howard	CD	2.40	2.82	2.82
	6ZJ	2.88	3.43	3.41
Howell	CD	4.45	4.67	4.58
Iron	CD	5.66	5.70	5.55
Jackson	CD	6.53	6.33	6.47
	6AW	9.50	9.48	9.44
	6ZO	4.11	4.02	3.91
	6ZR	5.33	5.29	5.25
Jasper	CD	2.63	2.56	2.56
	6AW	3.89	4.50	4.50
	6ZL	3.77	3.47	3.35
Jefferson	CD	3.34	3.19	3.50
	6AW	5.00	5.00	6.00
	6ZA	3.65	3.68	4.00
	6ZB	3.57	3.50	3.44
	6ZC	3.85	3.97	3.97
Johnson	CD	1.90	1.77	1.83
	6AW	4.75	4.75	4.33
Knox	CD	6.33	6.33	2.33
Laclede	CD	2.13	2.16	2.44
	6AW	4.73	4.73	4.50
	6ZK	3.75	3.62	3.97
Lafayette	CD	1.67	1.67	1.67
Lawrence	CD	3.79	3.89	4.05
	6AW	4.67	4.60	4.60
	6ZV	3.17	3.06	3.20
Lewis	CD	4.71	4.71	4.86
Lincoln	CD	2.62	2.53	2.45
	6AW	12.00	8.00	10.50
Linn	CD	5.04	5.20	5.41
Livingston	CD	3.06	2.91	2.86
Macon	CD	4.56	4.44	4.50
Madison	CD	2.10	2.10	2.19
Maries	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00
Marion	CD	3.31	3.46	3.47
	6AW	15.00	9.00	9.50
McDonald	CD	2.27	1.80	1.80
	6AW	4.00	4.20	4.20
	6ZL	3.16	3.29	3.56
Miller	CD	3.62	3.47	3.58
	6AW	6.00	6.00	6.00
Mississippi	CD	2.57	2.57	2.72
	6AW	11.00	9.50	9.50
Moniteau	CD	1.67	1.67	1.83

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Monroe	CD	3.78	3.78	3.50
Montgomery	CD	1.73	1.73	1.62
	6AW	11.00	11.00	11.00
Morgan	CD	3.63	3.26	3.17
	6AW	6.00	6.00	6.00
New Madrid	CD	4.37	4.14	4.10
	6AW	10.00	10.00	10.00
Newton	CD	1.91	1.77	1.89
	6AW	4.33	5.00	5.09
	6ZL	3.31	2.76	3.00
Nodaway	CD	2.23	2.23	2.21
Oregon	CD	5.04	5.00	5.09
Osage	CD	1.25	1.09	1.09
Ozark	CD	3.20	3.20	3.20
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.00
Pemiscot	CD	2.58	2.42	2.24
	6AW	5.67	5.67	5.67
Perry	CD	1.30	1.30	1.38
Pettis	CD	2.40	2.37	2.41
	6AW	12.00	12.00	
Phelps	CD	3.79	3.92	3.87
	6ZK	6.50	7.17	7.17
Pike	CD	2.08	2.08	1.67
Platte	CD	1.76	1.78	1.77
Polk	CD	3.68	3.35	3.35
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.00
Pulaski	CD	4.25	4.22	4.06
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.00
	6ZK	4.46	4.21	4.31
Putnam	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ralls	CD	4.83	4.83	4.83
Randolph	CD	4.34	4.40	3.94
	6AW	12.00	12.00	9.75
	6ZJ	3.47	3.75	3.75
Ray	CD	1.88	1.88	1.64
Reynolds	CD	2.64	2.62	3.44
Ripley	CD	2.43	2.86	2.88
	6AW	14.00	14.00	14.00
	6ZS	2.67	2.71	3.00
Saline	CD	3.83	4.00	3.83
Schuyler	CD	2.56	2.78	2.78
Scotland	CD	5.00	4.75	4.92
	6AW	11.00	11.00	11.00
Scott	CD	4.38	4.75	3.99
	6AW	7.38	7.38	7.38
Shannon	CD	4.40	4.40	4.25
Shelby	CD	3.21	3.21	3.80
St. Charles	CD	3.06	3.08	3.07
	6AW	5.00	5.00	4.33
	6ZA	3.00	3.00	
	6ZB	4.22	4.05	4.24

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZC	5.38	5.35	5.53
St. Clair	CD	3.50	3.50	4.00
	6AW	3.33	3.33	3.33
St. Francois	CD	2.61	2.64	2.55
	6ZC	3.55	3.70	3.73
	6ZC			
St. Louis City	CD	4.83	4.73	4.85
	6AW	9.50	9.50	10.00
	6ZA	5.23	5.06	5.05
	6ZB	5.71	5.55	5.43
	6ZC	3.84	3.98	4.06
St. Louis County	CD	4.45	4.46	4.50
	6AW	11.17	11.17	11.86
	6ZA	4.73	4.78	4.77
	6ZB	5.38	5.39	5.41
	6ZC	4.64	4.59	4.63
Ste. Genevieve	CD	2.53	2.48	2.55
Stoddard	CD	3.83	3.58	3.70
	6AW	7.67	7.67	7.67
	6ZS	4.67	4.50	4.50
Stone	CD	4.32	4.31	4.50
	6AW	4.50	4.50	4.50
	6ZV	3.22	3.50	3.50
Sullivan	CD	4.89	4.88	4.88
Taney	CD	2.62	2.55	2.22
	6AW	5.43	5.05	4.95
	6ZV	5.08	5.05	4.90
Texas	CD	2.90	3.33	3.33
	6ZK	3.67	3.25	3.18
Vernon	CD	3.71	3.89	5.00
	6AW	5.00	5.00	5.00
Warren	CD	1.80	1.82	1.79
	6AW	7.50	7.50	7.50
Washington	CD	3.92	4.09	4.09
	6ZB	4.19	4.35	4.71
Wayne	CD	3.50	3.45	3.72
Webster	CD	2.69	2.68	2.73
	6AW	4.50	4.50	4.50
Wright	CD	1.63	1.60	1.60
	6AW	4.20	4.20	4.20

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 7: For July, August, and September of 2025, children in foster care 12 months or more experienced between one and 17 workers.


Chart 24 depicts the average number of workers for children in care 12 months or more. This data set is grouped by circuits and includes both CD and FCCM information together.

<b>Chart 24: Average # of Workers per Child in Care 12+ Months</b>				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
	<b>4.1-5.23</b>	<b>3.01-4.00</b>	<b>2.01-3.00</b>	<b>1.00-2.00</b>
<b>July</b>	11	22	10	3
<b>August</b>	13	18	12	3
<b>September</b>	13	18	12	3

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 24: The majority of circuits have an average of 3.01-4.00 workers for children in care 12 months or more.

Chart 25 depicts the average number of workers per agency for children in care 12 months or more. A lower number is desirable for this measure.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Chart 25: Agencies averaged anywhere from 3.26 to 6.55 workers for children in foster care 12 months or more. This is a decrease from the average of 3.29 to 6.65 workers during the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data: There is no CFSR case review information applicable to this measure. Research does indicate that with each worker change children can experience delays in reaching permanency. The Response and Evaluation Team included this measure to help understand the functioning of the child welfare system in Missouri because continued changes can impact how children and families are served.

## Data Analysis Summary:

Children in care 12 months or less experienced an average of:

- 1-3.33 workers at the county level
- 1-2.10 workers at the circuit level
- 1.33-2.67 workers at the agency level

Children in care 12 months or more experienced an average of:

- 1-17 workers at the county level
- 1.50-5.23 workers at the circuit level
- 3.26-6.55 workers at the agency level

## Phase II Reporting (Reporting Period: July 1, 2025 – September 30, 2025)

### H. Well-Being Domain: Placement Category/Residential Type

This measure depicts the child's primary placement type in foster care. The Response and Evaluation Team will determine the expected performance benchmarks once enough data is collected to establish a reasonable goal.

#### Non-Residential Placement Types

<b>Foster Home</b>	<b>Trial Home Visit</b>
FHO - Foster Home	THV - Trial Home Visit
FHE - Emergency Foster Home	<b>Other</b>
FGH - Foster Family Group Home	JHO - Juvenile Court Home
CFP - Career Foster Parent Home	CTO - Non-licensed court ordered facility
FHB - Behavioral Foster Home	ILA - Independent Living Arrangement
FGB – No longer utilized as a placement type.	MMD - Medical Facility
FGM –No longer utilized as a placement type.	MMH - Mental Health Home
FHM - Medical Foster Home	MMF - Mental Health Facility
<b>Relative Home</b>	MMW - Mental Health Medical Waiver
RHO - Relative Home	DET - Detention
RHB - Behavioral Relative Home	RFT - Residential Facility Transition Placement
RHM - Medical Relative Home	RUN - Runaway
RHU - Unlicensed Relative Home	SCH - School
KHU - Unlicensed Non-Relative Home	UNK - Unknown
KHO - Non-Relative/Kinship Home	TLG - Transitional Living Group Home
KHM - Medical Non-Relative Home	TLP - Transitional Living Placement
KHB - Behavioral Non-Relative Home	TLS - Transitional Living Scattered Site
LGS - Legal Guardianship Subsidy	TLA - Transitional Living Advocate
<b>Adoptive Home</b>	ESP - Emergency shelter placement
ADF - Adoption by foster parent	
ADR - Adoption by relative	
ADO - Adoption by other	
FAH - Foster Adoptive Home	

Tables 8-10 depict a percentage of primary placement types for foster children by each county and each agency. Adoptive Home placement types/codes are used when children are placed in pre-adoptive homes awaiting finalization of their adoption. Additional youth/children are placed in committed homes who have been recognized by the Family Support Team or court as the permanent resource upon the legal termination of parental rights. Those situations are represented in several placement categories for foster and relative homes. Youth on a Trial Home Visit are counted as its own placement category. Beginning in March 2024, Treatment Foster Care is captured in the Relative and Foster Home categories when a sub-placement category of Relative Home or Foster Home is identified. If no sub-placement category is identified, then Treatment Foster Care is captured in residential placement categories.

<b>Table 8: Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025</b>							
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Relative Home</b>	<b>Foster Home</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Residential</b>	<b>Trial Home Visit</b>	<b>Adoptive Home</b>
Adair	CD	40.45	36.04%	8.11%	2.70%	12.61%	0.00%
	6AW	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	61.11%	16.67%	5.56%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	41.03%	41.03%	10.26%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%
Barry	CD	56.25%	18.75%	15.63%	9.38%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	46.88%	12.50%	6.25%	0.00%	34.38%	0.00%
Barton	CD	47.83%	30.43%	13.04%	4.35%	4.35%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	70.97%	9.68%	6.45%	0.00%	12.90%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	60.00%	9.09%	1.82%	1.82%	27.27%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	52.17%	13.04%	8.70%	4.35%	21.74%	0.00%
Boone	CD	58.18%	22.73%	17.27%	1.82%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	7.69%	46.15%	30.77%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%
	6ZJ	48.63%	31.69%	9.29%	7.10%	3.28%	0.00%
Buchanan	CD	52.08%	17.71%	13.54%	11.76%	4.17%	1.04%
Butler	CD	36.14%	20.48%	20.48%	13.25%	9.64%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%
	6ZS	49.61%	22.83%	13.39%	6.30%	7.87%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	50.00%	18.75%	0.00%	6.25%	25.00%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	50.00%	25.00%	19.64%	1.79%	3.57%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	45.10%	39.22%	5.88%	1.96%	7.84%	0.00%
Camden	CD	32.14%	57.14%	3.57%	3.57%	3.57%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	49.70%	19.76%	15.57%	1.20%	13.77%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	12.50%	37.50%	12.50%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%
Cass	CD	30.00%	13.33%	20.00%	6.67%	30.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	56.90%	24.14%	3.45%	8.62%	6.90%	0.00%
	6ZR	34.85%	24.24%	6.06%	12.12%	22.73%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	39.13%	26.09%	21.74%	0.00%	13.04%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	38.46%	15.38%	30.77%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%



Table 8: Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Christian	CD	31.75%	25.40%	19.05%	4.76%	19.05%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	44.44%	20.00%	11.11%	6.67%	17.78%	0.00%
	6ZV	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Clark	CD	38.78%	30.61%	8.16%	6.12%	16.33%	0.00%
Clay	CD	49.69%	26.42%	11.95%	3.77%	8.18%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	22.86%	54.29%	5.71%	17.14%	0.00%	0.00%
Cole	CD	41.30%	19.57%	10.87%	21.74%	4.35%	2.17%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	45.26%	24.21%	11.58%	8.42%	10.53%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	52.63%	31.58%	5.26%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	46.99%	26.51%	13.25%	7.23%	6.02%	0.00%
Dade	CD	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	59.38%	28.13%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	42.86%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	59.26%	33.33%	7.41%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	50.00%	42.86%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
Dent	CD	50.00%	22.41%	8.62%	10.34%	8.62%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	40.91%	43.18%	6.82%	4.55%	4.55%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	44.44%	22.22%	8.89%	6.67%	17.78%	0.00%
	6ZS	57.63%	25.42%	5.08%	8.47%	3.39%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	50.00%	27.40%	8.90%	2.05%	11.64%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	38.71%	22.58%	25.81%	6.45%	0.00%	6.45%
	6ZB	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	42.55%	36.17%	2.13%	4.26%	14.89%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	56.25%	25.00%	9.38%	0.00%	9.38%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	43.49%	34.32%	11.24%	1.78%	8.88%	0.30%
	6AW	6.67%	40.00%	46.67%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	42.58%	30.86%	10.55%	4.30%	11.72%	0.00%
	6ZV	44.32%	34.09%	10.23%	2.27%	9.09%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	70.59%	17.65%	5.88%	0.00%	5.88%	0.00%
Henry	CD	53.66%	21.95%	12.20%	2.44%	9.76%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	22.22%	0.00%	11.11%	44.44%	22.22%	0.00%
Holt	CD	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	30.00%	0.00%
Howard	CD	40.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	56.52%	21.74%	8.70%	4.35%	8.70%	0.00%
Howell	CD	21.33%	42.67%	22.67%	12.00%	1.33%	0.00%
Iron	CD	51.92%	23.08%	13.46%	5.77%	5.77%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	30.53%	21.05%	38.95%	3.16%	6.32%	0.00%
	6AW	13.33%	26.67%	46.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
	6ZO	47.85%	35.37%	6.80%	4.54%	5.44%	0.00%
	6ZR	43.25%	36.50%	8.25%	5.25%	6.75%	0.00%
Jasper	CD	50.25%	18.41%	12.94%	1.99%	16.42%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	55.56%	11.11%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%
	6ZL	41.61%	57.74%	12.41%	9.49%	8.76%	0.00%
Jefferson	CD	33.33%	11.11%	16.67%	5.56%	33.33%	0.00%

Table 8: Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	45.12%	42.68%	8.54%	1.22%	2.44%	0.00%
	6ZB	52.02%	31.85%	4.44%	6.45%	5.24%	0.00%
	6ZC	51.67%	30.00%	8.33%	3.33%	6.67%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	46.34%	26.83%	4.88%	0.00%	21.95%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	53.85%	15.38%	15.38%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	38.81%	41.79%	7.46%	1.49%	10.45%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	45.45%	9.09%	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	76.60%	4.26%	6.38%	4.26%	8.51%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	33.33%	38.89%	8.33%	11.11%	8.33%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	61.90%	21.43%	14.29%	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	33.33%	44.44%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	48.00%	4.00%	16.00%	8.00%	24.00%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	45.45%	22.73%	13.64%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	48.57%	33.33%	5.71%	9.52%	2.86%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	51.35%	18.92%	13.51%	5.41%	10.81%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	33.33%	39.39%	7.58%	7.58%	12.12%	0.00%
Macon	CD	42.86%	33.33%	9.52%	3.17%	11.11%	0.00%
Madison	CD	40.74%	12.96%	16.67%	14.81%	14.81%	0.00%
Maries	CD	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	26.67%	0.00%
Marion	CD	40.79%	31.58%	11.84%	6.58%	9.21%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	54.35%	26.09%	2.17%	0.00%	17.39%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	47.22%	33.33%	8.33%	2.78%	8.33%	0.00%
Miller	CD	50.00%	39.47%	7.89%	0.00%	2.63%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	55.56%	27.78%	5.56%	2.78%	8.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	53.85%	30.77%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	50.00%	25.00%	15.00%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	56.41%	20.51%	15.38%	5.13%	2.56%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	56.25%	32.81%	4.69%	3.13%	3.13%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	48.00%	26.00%	16.00%	8.00%	2.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	54.93%	12.68%	11.27%	0.00%	21.13%	0.00%
	6AW	8.33%	50.00%	8.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	18.60%	34.88%	11.63%	11.63%	20.93%	2.33%
Nodaway	CD	35.56%	17.78%	17.78%	0.00%	28.89%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	35.56%	40.00%	20.00%	7.50%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	47.06%	23.53%	5.88%	5.88%	17.65%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	62.50%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	51.90%	29.11%	11.39%	3.80%	3.80%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	51.90%	29.11%	11.39%	3.80%	3.80%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%
Perry	CD	62.50%	33.33%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	40.21%	32.99%	12.37%	7.22%	7.22%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	50.43%	25.64%	5.98%	7.69%	10.26%	0.00%

Table 8: Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZK	30.23%	41.86%	13.95%	11.63%	2.33%	0.00%
Pike	CD	46.67%	40.00%	6.67%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%
Platte	CD	67.86%	12.50%	3.57%	7.14%	8.93%	0.00%
Polk	CD	30.00%	56.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	47.85%	21.47%	8.59%	5.52%	16.56%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	55.56%	37.04%	0.00%	3.70%	3.70%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	75.00%	8.33%	8.33%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	57.14%	28.57%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	39.62%	28.30%	11.32%	9.43%	11.32%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	44.94%	32.58%	7.87%	4.49%	10.11%	0.00%
Ray	CD	70.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	48.28%	6.90%	20.69%	10.34%	13.79%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	52.94%	17.65%	17.65%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	79.17%	8.33%	0.00%	8.33%	4.17%	0.00%
Saline	CD	54.76%	30.95%	9.52%	2.38%	2.38%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	64.29%	21.43%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	46.67%	6.67%	33.33%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	53.21%	19.27%	8.26%	0.92%	18.35%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	37.50%	37.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	55.00%	15.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	5.56%	11.11%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	46.63%	38.04%	7.36%	3.07%	4.91%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	40.91%	47.73%	2.27%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	48.00%	44.00%	8.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Clair	CD	33.33%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	57.14%	22.73%	12.99%	0.65%	6.49%	0.00%
	6ZC	38.71%	37.10%	6.45%	8.06%	9.68%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	35.18%	39.20%	20.60%	3.52%	1.51%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	53.22%	33.90%	7.12%	3.39%	2.37%	0.00%
	6ZB	43.90%	36.59%	8.13%	6.50%	4.07%	0.81%
	6ZC	43.22%	38.98%	11.02%	2.54%	4.24%	0.00%
St. Louis County	CD	43.94%	32.53%	17.99%	3.46%	1.73%	0.35%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	53.63%	32.32%	4.22%	3.98%	5.85%	0.00%
	6ZB	47.24%	34.87%	7.98%	1.84%	7.98%	0.00%
	6ZC	35.04%	43.07%	12.41%	5.84%	3.65%	0.00%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	32.50%	32.50%	12.50%	12.50%	10.00%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	58.70%	15.22%	13.04%	8.70%	4.35%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	57.69%	7.69%	13.46%	11.54%	9.62%	0.00%
Stone	CD	38.10%	23.81%	14.29%	9.52%	14.29%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	33.33%	51.52%	9.09%	3.03%	3.03%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	45.45%	36.36%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	45.06%	31.48%	8.02%	4.94%	10.49%	0.00%

Table 8: Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	15.00%	45.00%	30.00%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	50.65%	32.47%	7.79%	1.30%	7.79%	0.00%
Texas	CD	17.02%	40.43%	21.28%	6.38%	14.89%	0.00%
	6ZK	61.54%	30.77%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	64.29%	21.43%	10.71%	3.57%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	64.37%	21.84%	3.45%	3.45%	6.90%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	7.14%	21.43%	64.29%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
	6ZB	59.46%	28.38%	2.70%	4.05%	5.41%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	52.08%	18.75%	20.83%	4.17%	4.17%	0.00%
Webster	CD	59.65%	19.30%	14.04%	1.75%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
Wright	CD	58.75%	18.75%	7.50%	0.00%	15.00%	0.00%
	6AW	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08AUG25

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	42.34%	37.84%	8.11%	0.90%	10.81%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	52.94%	17.65%	5.88%	0.00%	23.53%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	40.00%	45.00%	7.50%	7.50%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	54.84%	16.13%	16.13%	9.68%	3.23%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	71.43%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	41.38%	13.79%	6.90%	0.00%	27.59%	10.34%
Barton	CD	72.22%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	65.52%	10.34%	10.34%	0.00%	13.79%	0.00%
Benton	CD	61.11%	9.26%	1.85%	1.85%	25.93%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	51.85%	11.11%	14.81%	3.70%	18.52%	0.00%
Boone	CD	52.03%	26.83%	16.26%	1.63%	3.25%	0.00%
	6AW	7.69%	30.77%	30.77%	23.08%	7.69%	0.00%
	6ZJ	48.40%	30.85%	7.98%	6.38%	5.85%	0.53%
Buchanan	CD	56.99%	19.35%	16.13%	4.30%	3.23%	0.00%
Butler	CD	34.52%	20.24%	21.43%	11.90%	11.90%	0.00%
	6AW	28.57%	14.29%	28.57%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	52.34%	25.78%	10.16%	5.47%	6.25%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	50.00%	18.75%	0.00%	6.25%	25.00%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	52.73%	23.64%	18.18%	3.64%	1.82%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	50.00%	35.71%	3.57%	3.57%	5.36%	1.79%
Camden	CD	40.00%	52.50%	0.00%	2.50%	5.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	43.51%	20.78%	16.88%	1.95%	16.88%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	14.29%	42.86%	14.29%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%
Cass	CD	27.59%	13.79%	24.14%	3.45%	31.03%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	58.49%	26.42%	1.89%	7.55%	5.66%	0.00%
	6ZR	34.38%	21.88%	12.50%	10.94%	20.31%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	31.03%	34.48%	24.14%	0.00%	10.34%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	41.67%	16.67%	33.33%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Christian	CD	34.38%	21.88%	20.31%	3.13%	20.31%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	44.44%	20.00%	8.89%	4.44%	22.22%	0.00%
Clark	CD	48.94%	27.66%	6.38%	6.38%	10.64%	0.00%
Clay	CD	52.90%	25.16%	9.68%	2.58%	9.68%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	25.71%	54.29%	8.57%	8.57%	2.86%	0.00%
Cole	CD	38.10%	21.43%	11.90%	23.81%	4.76%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	45.74%	22.34%	11.70%	9.57%	10.64%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	47.37%	31.58%	5.26%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	53.01%	19.28%	14.46%	7.23%	6.02%	0.00%
Dade	CD	80.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	70.59%	17.65%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	0.00%
	6AW	28.57%	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	57.69%	34.62%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	50.00%	42.86%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
Dent	CD	43.42%	25.00%	15.79%	6.57%	9.21%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	38.64%	43.18%	9.09%	2.27%	6.82%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	60.47%	9.30%	11.63%	6.98%	11.63%	0.00%
	6ZS	55.17%	25.86%	5.17%	12.07%	1.72%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	50.00%	28.08%	8.90%	1.37%	11.64%	0.00%
	6AW	20.00%	60.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	44.83%	17.24%	31.03%	3.45%	3.45%	0.00%
	6ZB	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	47.83%	32.61%	2.17%	6.52%	10.87%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	53.13%	31.25%	6.25%	0.00%	9.38%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	45.74%	30.97%	11.36%	1.99%	9.94%	0.00%
	6AW	15.38%	53.85%	23.08%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	43.97%	28.79%	10.51%	5.06%	10.89%	0.78%
	6ZV	41.76%	34.07%	12.09%	1.10%	10.99%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	33.33%	33.33%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	52.63%	31.58%	5.26%	0.00%	10.53%	0.00%
Henry	CD	68.09%	21.28%	8.51%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	85.71%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Howard	CD	41.67%	41.67%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%
	6ZJ	57.14%	19.05%	4.76%	4.76%	14.29%	0.00%
Howell	CD	21.62%	40.54%	22.97%	13.51%	1.35%	0.00%
Iron	CD	43.48%	28.26%	10.87%	4.35%	13.04%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	56.21%	15.38%	21.30%	1.78%	5.33%	0.00%
	6AW	12.12%	30.30%	51.52%	6.06%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZO	48.30%	34.24%	6.35%	4.99%	5.90%	0.23%
	6ZR	45.43%	33.09%	9.63%	3.46%	8.15%	0.25%
Jasper	CD	48.58%	20.28%	13.21%	2.36%	15.57%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	45.45%	9.09%	36.36%	9.09%	0.00%
	6ZL	39.57%	29.50%	13.67%	7.19%	10.07%	0.00%
Jefferson	CD	31.25%	9.38%	18.75%	9.38%	31.25%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	42.86%	44.16%	10.39%	2.60%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	54.00%	31.20%	4.40%	5.60%	4.40%	0.40%
	6ZC	52.46%	27.87%	8.20%	4.92%	6.56%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	40.00%	27.06%	5.88%	2.35%	24.71%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	53.85%	15.38%	15.38%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	39.68%	42.86%	9.52%	0.00%	7.94%	0.00%
	6AW	27.27%	36.36%	9.09%	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	75.56%	4.44%	6.67%	4.44%	8.89%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	27.78%	44.44%	11.11%	13.89%	2.78%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	41.30%	19.57%	15.22%	2.17%	21.74%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	40.00%	10.00%	15.00%	5.00%	30.00%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	45.45%	22.73%	9.09%	13.64%	9.09%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	46.30%	35.19%	5.56%	9.26%	3.70%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	50.00%	17.65%	17.65%	5.88%	8.82%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	36.36%	37.88%	7.58%	7.58%	10.61%	0.00%
Macon	CD	32.39%	33.80%	12.68%	1.41%	19.72%	0.00%
Madison	CD	42.22%	15.56%	20.00%	8.89%	13.33%	0.00%
Maries	CD	35.29%	29.41%	0.00%	5.88%	29.41%	0.00%
Marion	CD	46.58%	30.43%	9.32%	6.21%	7.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	55.56%	24.44%	0.00%	2.22%	17.78%	0.00%
	6AW	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	48.65%	32.43%	8.11%	2.70%	8.11%	0.00%
Miller	CD	51.28%	30.77%	7.69%	0.00%	10.26%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	55.00%	30.00%	7.50%	2.50%	5.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	53.85%	30.77%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	47.62%	28.57%	14.29%	4.76%	4.76%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	61.90%	21.43%	11.90%	2.38%	2.38%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	49.23%	33.85%	6.15%	1.54%	9.23%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	55.10%	18.37%	18.37%	6.12%	2.04%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	57.89%	13.16%	9.21%	0.00%	19.74%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	58.33%	8.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	12.82%	41.03%	12.82%	12.82%	20.51%	0.00%
Nodaway	CD	36.96%	17.39%	19.57%	2.17%	23.91%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	36.84%	36.84%	18.42%	7.89%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	47.06%	23.53%	5.88%	5.88%	17.65%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	70.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Pemiscot	CD	51.95%	23.38%	11.69%	7.79%	5.19%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%
Perry	CD	58.33%	20.83%	4.17%	4.17%	12.50%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	42.42%	32.32%	10.10%	8.08%	7.07%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	45.16%	29.84%	4.84%	7.26%	12.90%	0.00%
	6ZK	34.78%	36.96%	17.39%	8.70%	2.17%	0.00%
Pike	CD	53.33%	20.00%	6.67%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Platte	CD	72.22%	11.11%	5.56%	5.56%	5.56%	0.00%
Polk	CD	30.30%	54.55%	9.09%	6.06%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	46.45%	20.65%	9.03%	5.16%	18.71%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	60.71%	32.14%	0.00%	3.57%	3.57%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	55.56%	22.22%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	30.65%	25.81%	16.13%	8.06%	19.35%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	44.57%	33.70%	8.70%	5.43%	7.61%	0.00%
Ray	CD	72.73%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	44.44%	16.67%	22.22%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	52.94%	17.65%	17.65%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	68.00%	12.00%	8.00%	8.00%	4.00%	0.00%
Saline	CD	58.18%	29.09%	7.27%	1.82%	3.64%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	64.29%	14.29%	0.00%	21.43%	0.00%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	57.14%	0.00%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	52.10%	19.33%	6.72%	3.36%	18.49%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	37.50%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	61.11%	16.67%	16.67%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	47.06%	17.65%	23.53%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	45.66%	41.04%	5.78%	2.31%	5.20%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	42.22%	44.44%	4.44%	8.89%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	48.00%	36.00%	6.67%	2.67%	6.67%	0.00%
	CD	33.33%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	55.77%	21.15%	13.46%	1.28%	8.33%	0.00%
	6ZB	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	36.67%	40.00%	6.67%	8.33%	8.33%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	35.15%	38.61%	20.30%	4.46%	1.49%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	51.89%	35.85%	7.86%	2.52%	1.57%	0.31%
	6ZB	49.62%	33.59%	9.92%	4.58%	2.29%	0.00%
	6ZC	44.25%	39.82%	8.85%	1.77%	4.42%	0.88%
	CD	42.75%	34.57%	18.22%	2.97%	1.49%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	55.29%	30.77%	5.53%	3.85%	4.57%	0.00%
	6ZB	45.16%	37.42%	8.39%	1.94%	7.10%	0.00%
	6ZC	38.19%	40.28%	13.19%	4.86%	3.47%	0.00%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	35.14%	40.54%	16.22%	8.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	54.35%	15.22%	13.04%	8.70%	8.70%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZS	67.31%	7.69%	5.77%	15.38%	3.85%	0.00%
Stone	CD	41.67%	20.83%	8.33%	16.67%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	33.33%	54.55%	9.09%	0.00%	3.03%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	45.45%	36.36%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	43.26%	31.46%	7.87%	4.49%	12.92%	0.00%
	6AW	13.64%	45.45%	31.82%	4.55%	4.55%	0.00%
	6ZV	53.95%	32.89%	6.58%	1.32%	5.26%	0.00%
Texas	CD	17.39%	34.78%	19.57%	8.70%	19.57%	0.00%
	6ZK	52.94%	29.41%	0.00%	17.65%	0.00%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	69.23%	11.54%	11.54%	3.85%	3.85%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	68.13%	21.98%	2.20%	3.30%	4.40%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	7.69%	23.08%	69.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	56.34%	30.99%	2.82%	4.23%	5.63%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	50.00%	15.91%	20.45%	6.82%	6.82%	0.00%
Webster	CD	61.02%	16.95%	15.25%	1.69%	5.08%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
Wright	CD	55.42%	21.69%	7.23%	0.00%	15.66%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09SEP25

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	45.38%	34.45%	7.56%	2.52%	10.08%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	64.71%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%	23.53%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	46.81%	42.55%	8.51%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	57.14%	20.00%	11.43%	8.57%	2.86%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	57.14%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	45.45%	15.15%	9.09%	0.00%	30.30%	0.00%
Barton	CD	60.00%	25.00%	10.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	66.67%	13.33%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
Benton	CD	70.21%	10.64%	4.26%	2.13%	12.77%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	53.85%	11.54%	7.69%	7.69%	19.23%	0.00%
Boone	CD	57.36%	20.16%	17.05%	0.00%	5.43%	0.00%
	6AW	8.33%	16.67%	16.67%	50.00%	8.33%	0.00%
	6ZJ	47.85%	31.18%	8.06%	6.99%	5.38%	0.54%
Buchanan	CD	55.36%	21.43%	11.61%	8.93%	2.68%	0.00%
Butler	CD	34.34%	28.28%	18.18%	8.08%	11.11%	0.00%
	6AW	28.57%	14.29%	28.57%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	55.65%	25.81%	11.29%	5.65%	1.61%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	47.06%	23.53%	0.00%	5.88%	23.53%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	55.00%	23.33%	16.67%	3.33%	1.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	52.73%	34.55%	3.64%	3.64%	5.45%	0.00%
Camden	CD	43.59%	51.28%	0.00%	0.00%	5.13%	0.00%



Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	61.11%	33.33%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	48.28%	18.97%	13.79%	2.30%	16.67%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	0.00%	50.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%
Cass	CD	28.57%	10.71%	32.14%	3.57%	25.00%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	49.02%	29.41%	3.92%	7.84%	9.80%	0.00%
	6ZR	37.50%	31.25%	9.38%	15.63%	6.25%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	33.33%	29.63%	25.93%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	41.67%	16.67%	33.33%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Christian	CD	42.65%	22.06%	17.65%	1.47%	16.18%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	51.06%	17.02%	10.64%	6.38%	14.89%	0.00%
Clark	CD	44.68%	27.66%	8.51%	8.51%	10.64%	0.00%
Clay	CD	53.01%	23.49%	8.43%	2.41%	12.05%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	27.78%	55.56%	8.33%	5.56%	2.78%	0.00%
Cole	CD	52.73%	16.36%	12.73%	14.55%	3.64%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	50.53%	21.05%	10.53%	10.53%	7.37%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	47.37%	31.58%	10.53%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	60.00%	16.47%	12.94%	4.71%	5.88%	0.00%
Dade	CD	60.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	71.05%	10.53%	0.00%	2.63%	15.79%	0.00%
	6AW	28.57%	14.29%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	56.00%	32.00%	8.00%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Dent	CD	44.16%	22.08%	14.29%	6.49%	12.99%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	41.03%	38.46%	10.26%	2.56%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	48.84%	6.98%	11.63%	9.30%	23.26%	0.00%
	6ZS	50.00%	29.63%	5.56%	12.96%	1.85%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	48.57%	28.57%	11.43%	1.43%	10.00%	0.00%
	6AW	30.00%	50.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.33%	13.33%	33.33%	6.67%	3.33%	0.00%
	6ZB	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	47.73%	34.09%	2.27%	6.82%	9.09%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	45.71%	40.00%	5.71%	0.00%	8.57%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	47.30%	28.65%	11.89%	2.16%	9.46%	0.54%
	6AW	14.29%	42.86%	35.71%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	47.08%	28.79%	8.95%	3.50%	10.51%	1.17%
	6ZV	43.96%	29.67%	12.09%	1.10%	13.19%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	76.47%	11.76%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	52.63%	31.58%	5.26%	0.00%	10.53%	0.00%
Henry	CD	64.15%	22.64%	7.55%	1.89%	3.77%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	85.71%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Howard	CD	46.15%	38.46%	0.00%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%
	6ZJ	50.00%	25.00%	8.33%	4.17%	12.50%	0.00%
Howell	CD	31.65%	29.11%	24.05%	13.92%	1.27%	0.00%
Iron	CD	50.00%	26.32%	15.79%	2.63%	5.26%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	56.02%	20.42%	17.80%	1.05%	4.71%	0.00%
	6AW	9.09%	33.33%	48.48%	6.06%	3.03%	0.00%
	6ZO	48.42%	35.14%	6.53%	4.05%	5.86%	0.00%
	6ZR	46.97%	32.93%	9.69%	2.66%	7.26%	0.48%
	CD	54.55%	23.18%	11.36%	1.82%	9.09%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	54.55%	27.27%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	33.33%	34.07%	12.59%	6.67%	13.33%	0.00%
	CD	41.03%	2.56%	12.82%	7.69%	35.90%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.90%	41.46%	7.32%	3.66%	3.66%	0.00%
	6ZB	54.94%	31.62%	3.95%	5.14%	4.35%	0.00%
	6ZC	49.18%	29.51%	9.84%	4.92%	6.56%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	47.67%	23.26%	8.14%	1.16%	19.77%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	57.14%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	42.19%	43.75%	9.38%	0.00%	4.69%	0.00%
	6AW	23.08%	46.15%	15.38%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	76.19%	4.76%	4.76%	4.76%	9.52%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	34.88%	41.86%	6.98%	13.95%	2.33%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	44.44%	15.56%	13.33%	2.22%	24.44%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	43.48%	13.04%	13.04%	4.35%	26.09%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	42.11%	21.05%	10.53%	15.79%	10.53%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	46.85%	31.53%	6.31%	9.91%	5.41%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	48.48%	21.21%	15.15%	6.06%	9.09%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	36.76%	35.29%	7.35%	5.88%	14.71%	0.00%
Macon	CD	41.33%	32.00%	12.00%	2.67%	12.00%	0.00%
Madison	CD	37.50%	20.00%	17.50%	10.00%	15.00%	0.00%
Maries	CD	55.56%	5.56%	5.56%	5.56%	27.78%	0.00%
Marion	CD	45.86%	30.57%	10.19%	5.10%	8.28%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	56.52%	26.09%	0.00%	2.17%	15.22%	0.00%
	6AW	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	62.86%	28.57%	5.71%	2.86%	0.00%	0.00%
Miller	CD	53.66%	29.27%	7.32%	0.00%	9.76%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	59.09%	25.00%	9.09%	2.27%	4.55%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	60.00%	26.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	43.48%	34.78%	13.04%	4.35%	4.35%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	65.85%	21.95%	9.76%	2.44%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	51.56%	34.38%	4.69%	1.56%	7.81%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	50.94%	16.98%	18.87%	7.55%	5.66%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	49.33%	17.33%	9.33%	0.00%	24.00%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZL	18.60%	41.86%	13.95%	6.98%	18.60%	0.00%
Nodaway	CD	44.74%	21.05%	21.05%	0.00%	13.16%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	36.84%	28.95%	18.42%	7.89%	7.89%	0.00%
Osage	CD	47.06%	23.53%	11.76%	0.00%	17.65%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	78.57%	7.14%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	51.81%	25.30%	9.64%	6.02%	7.23%	0.00%
	6AW	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	54.55%	13.64%	13.64%	4.55%	13.64%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	42.45%	32.08%	11.32%	6.60%	6.60%	0.94%
Phelps	CD	50.41%	23.58%	6.50%	8.94%	10.57%	0.00%
	6ZK	28.89%	46.67%	13.33%	8.89%	2.22%	0.00%
Pike	CD	50.00%	25.00%	6.25%	0.00%	18.75%	0.00%
Platte	CD	70.31%	14.06%	6.25%	4.69%	4.69%	0.00%
Polk	CD	36.11%	44.44%	5.56%	8.33%	0.00%	5.56%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	45.28%	22.64%	10.69%	5.03%	16.35%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	55.56%	33.33%	0.00%	3.70%	7.41%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	69.23%	7.69%	7.69%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	30.00%	23.33%	13.33%	10.00%	23.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.51%	31.40%	8.14%	9.30%	4.65%	0.00%
Ray	CD	68.18%	27.27%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	47.06%	17.65%	23.53%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	60.87%	17.39%	8.70%	8.70%	4.35%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	56.67%	10.00%	10.00%	6.67%	16.67%	0.00%
Saline	CD	57.63%	28.81%	8.47%	1.69%	3.39%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	64.29%	14.29%	0.00%	21.43%	0.00%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	46.67%	6.67%	26.67%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	54.20%	19.08%	6.87%	3.05%	16.79%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	28.57%	42.86%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	63.16%	10.53%	15.78%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	52.17%	13.04%	21.74%	4.35%	8.70%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	47.67%	41.28%	5.81%	2.91%	2.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	39.53%	44.19%	2.33%	11.63%	2.33%	0.00%
	6ZC	46.67%	34.67%	13.33%	2.67%	2.67%	0.00%
St. Clair	CD	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	56.41%	19.23%	13.46%	1.28%	9.62%	0.00%
	6ZB	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	31.67%	43.33%	8.33%	6.67%	10.00%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	37.02%	39.42%	19.23%	3.37%	0.96%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	50.33%	34.97%	7.52%	2.61%	3.92%	0.65%
	6ZB	50.00%	35.25%	8.20%	4.92%	1.64%	0.00%
	6ZC	44.64%	41.07%	8.93%	0.89%	4.46%	0.00%
St. Louis County	CD	45.82%	30.18%	17.45%	5.09%	1.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZA	54.46%	31.69%	3.99%	3.76%	5.87%	0.23%
	6ZB	46.30%	33.33%	8.02%	3.09%	9.26%	0.00%
	6ZC	39.16%	41.96%	10.49%	4.20%	4.20%	0.00%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	36.11%	36.11%	16.67%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	51.11%	13.33%	13.33%	13.33%	8.89%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	68.52%	9.26%	5.56%	14.81%	1.85%	0.00%
Stone	CD	33.33%	28.57%	9.52%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	37.14%	54.29%	5.71%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	45.45%	36.36%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	46.30%	27.78%	8.64%	6.17%	11.11%	0.00%
	6AW	8.33%	45.83%	37.50%	4.17%	4.17%	0.00%
	6ZV	50.65%	31.17%	6.49%	1.30%	10.39%	0.00%
Texas	CD	27.45%	29.41%	19.61%	3.92%	19.61%	0.00%
	6ZK	41.18%	47.06%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	73.91%	8.70%	4.35%	8.70%	4.35%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	65.52%	22.99%	2.30%	4.60%	4.60%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	21.43%	14.29%	64.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	57.14%	28.57%	7.14%	1.43%	5.71%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	51.22%	12.20%	17.07%	12.20%	7.32%	0.00%
Webster	CD	68.25%	11.11%	12.70%	4.76%	3.17%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
Wright	CD	62.82%	16.67%	8.97%	0.00%	8.97%	2.56%
	6AW	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08OCT25

Analysis of Tables 8-10: The majority of placements for foster children occur in either a Relative Home or Foster Home with Relative Home placements occurring more frequently than Foster Home placements. For all three months of the reporting period, Relative Home placements accounted for more than 46% of the total placements for foster children. All agencies are making efforts to place children with relatives. 6AW is a specialized contract that serves children with higher behavioral needs. This population sometimes lacks stability and can frequently change placements.

### Residential Placement Types

FBR – Family Based Residential	RFI – Residential Facility Infant Placement
RF2 – Residential Level 2 – (Moderate Need)	RFP - Residential Facility Placement
RF3 – Residential Level 3 (Severe Need)	RFH – Residential Foster Home
RF4 – Residential Level 4 (Intensive Need)	RST - Residential Sex Trafficking Facility
PRTF – Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility	RFT - Residential Facility Transition Placement
RFE – Residential Facility Emergency Placement	RFM - Residential Facility Maternity Placement
RFA – Residential Treatment Facility	

Tables 11-13 depict the percentages of residential placement types for children placed in residential settings. This information is displayed by each county and each agency. Additional information about each placement type can be found in the [Child Welfare Manual](#).

Table 11: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD			1	2								
	6AW						1						
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				2		1						
Barry	CD			1				2					
Barton	CD					1							
	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				1								
	6AW			1		1							
Bollinger	CD						1						
Boone	CD				1		1						
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ			3	8	0	1	1					
Buchanan	CD				1	1	9						
Butler	CD			2	5	0	3	1					
	6AW				2								
	6ZS			2	4		2						
Caldwell	CD			1									
Callaway	CD				1								
	6AW				1		1						
	6ZJ				1								
Camden	CD				1								
	6AW				1		1						
Cape Girardeau	CD				2								
Cass	CD				2								
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZO			1	2	2							
	6ZR				4	3		1					
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD				2		1						
	6ZM				1		2						
Clark	CD			1	2								
Clay	CD			2	4								
	6AW			1									
Clinton	CD			2	1		3						
Cole	CD	2		2	2	1	2	1					
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				5	1	1	1					
Cooper	CD				1								
Crawford	CD			1	2		2	1					
Dallas	6AW			1									
DeKalb	CD				1								
Dent	CD			3	2		1						
Douglas	CD						2						
Dunklin	CD			1	2								
	6ZS				3		1	1					
Franklin	CD			1			1	1					
	6AW				2								
	6ZA				2								
	6ZC			1		1							
Gentry	CD			1									
Greene	CD			1	1		3	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZM				5	2	4						

Table 11: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6ZV				1		1						
Grundy	CD				1								
Henry	CD				1								
Hickory	CD				1	3							
Holt	CD					1							
Howard	6ZJ							1					
Howell	CD				3	1	5						
Iron	CD			1			1	1					
Jackson	CD				2		1						
	6AW				1			1					
	6ZO			2	12	2	3						1
	6ZR				10	3	6	1					1
Jasper	CD				3			1					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZL				8		5						
Jefferson	CD				1			1					
	6ZA				1								
	6ZB			1	10		4	1					
	6ZC				1			1					
Knox	CD				1								
Laclede	CD				1								
	6AW				2			1					
	6ZK				2								
Lafayette	CD				4								
Lawrence	6AW					1							
	6ZV				2								
Lewis	CD			2									
Lincoln	CD			3	7								
Linn	CD			1	1								
Livingston	CD				1	1	3						
Macon	CD				1			1					
Madison	CD			5	3								
Maries	CD						1						
Marion	CD			1	6			3					
	6AW				1								
McDonald	6ZL				1								
Mississippi	CD				1								
Moniteau	CD						1						
Monroe	CD			1									
Montgomery	CD				1		1						
	6AW			1									
Morgan	CD				2								
	6AW												1
New Madrid	CD			1	1	1	1						
Newton	6AW			1	2	1							
	6ZL				4		1						
Oregon	CD				2		1						
Osage	CD			1									
Ozark	CD				1								
Pemiscot	CD				2		1						
	6AW			1									
Pettis	CD			2	4		1						
Phelps	CD			4	3		2						
	6ZK			1	1	3							
Platte	CD				3			1					

Table 11: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – July 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Polk	CD				1	1							
Pulaski	CD			1	4	2	2						
	6AW				1								
	6ZK				1								
Ralls	CD							1					
Randolph	CD			1	1		1	2					
	6AW				2								
	6ZJ			1	3								
Reynolds	CD			1	2								
Ripley	CD						1						
	6ZS				1			1					
Saline	CD				1								
Schuyler	CD				2								
Scotland	CD			1	1								
Scott	CD				1								
	6AW				1								
Shannon	CD				1		1						
Shelby	CD			1									
St. Charles	CD				3	1		1					
	6AW							1					
	6ZB				1		1	2					
St. Clair	6AW				1								
St. Francois	CD				1								
	6ZC			2			3						
St. Louis City	CD			1	2	1	3						
	6AW				1								
	6ZA			1	4		2	2					1
	6ZB			1	5			2					
	6ZC					1	1	1					
St. Louis Co.	CD				2		3	5					
	6AW			1									
	6ZA			3	6	2	3	3					
	6ZB				1	1	1						
	6ZC				2	1	4	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			2	2		1						
Stoddard	CD			1	2			1					
	6ZS			2	1		1	2					
Stone	CD						1	1					
	6ZV						1						
Sullivan	CD			1									
Taney	CD			1	5		2						
	6AW					1							
	6ZV				1								
Texas	CD			1	1		1						
	6ZK					1							
Vernon	CD			1									
Warren	CD			1	1		1						
Washington	6ZB			1	1	1							
Wayne	CD						1	1					
Webster	CD				1								
	6AW					1							
Wright	6AW			1	1								
<b>TOTAL</b>		2	0	87	269	47	118	52	0	0	0	0	4

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08AUG25

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD			1									
	6AW				1								
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				2		1						
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1				2					
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				1								
	6AW					1							
Bollinger	CD						1						
Boone	CD			1	1								
	6AW				2		1						
	6ZJ			2	7		1	2					
Buchanan	CD				1	2	1						
Butler	CD			3	5		2						
	6AW			1	1								
	6ZS			3	3		1						
Caldwell	CD			1									
Callaway	CD				2								
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ				1	1							
Camden	CD				1								
	6AW				3								
Cape Girardeau	CD				2		1						
Cass	CD				1								
	6AW					1							
	6ZO			1	2	1							
	6ZR				5	2							
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD				2								
	6ZM				2								
Clark	CD			1	2								
Clay	CD			1	3								
	6AW			1				1					
Clinton	CD			2	1								
Cole	CD	2		3	2	2	1						
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				5	1	2	1					
Cooper	CD				1								
Crawford	CD			1	2		3						
Dallas	6AW						1						
DeKalb	CD				1								
Dent	CD			1	2		2						
Douglas	CD				1								
Dunklin	CD			1	2								
	6ZS				3		3	1					
Franklin	CD			1			1						
	6AW				1								
	6ZA				1								
	6ZC			1	1		1						
Gentry	CD			1									
Greene	CD			1	2		3	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZM				4	1	4	4					



Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6ZV				1								
Grundy	CD				1								
Henry	CD				1								
Hickory	CD					1							
	6AW					2							
Holt	CD					1							
Howard	6ZJ							1					
Howell	CD				3	1	6						
Iron	CD							2					
Jackson	CD				2		1						
	6AW				1			1					
	6ZO			2	11	4	4						1
	6ZR				8	3	2						1
Jasper	CD				1		3	1					
	6AW				3	1							
	6ZL				7		3						
Jefferson	CD				2			1					
	6ZA				1		1						
	6ZB			1	8		4	1					
	6ZC				1		1	1					
Johnson	CD				1		1						
Knox	CD				1								
Laclede	6AW			1	2								
	6ZK				2								
Lafayette	CD				5								
Lawrence	CD						1						
	6ZV				1								
Lewis	CD			2			1						
Lincoln	CD			2	7		1						
	6AW			1	1								
Linn	CD			1	1								
Livingston	CD				1	1	3						
Macon	CD							1					
Madison	CD			2	2								
Maries	CD						1						
Marion	CD			1	5		1	3					
	6AW				1			1					
McDonald	CD						1						
					1								
Mississippi	CD				1								
Moniteau	CD						1						
Monroe	CD			1									
Montgomery	CD				1								
	6AW			1									
Morgan	CD				1								
New Madrid	CD				1	1	1						
Newton	6AW				2								
	6ZL				4		1						
Nodaway	CD						1						
Oregon	CD				3								
Osage	CD			1									
Ozark	CD				1								
Pemiscot	CD				3		2	1					
	6AW			1									
Perry	CD						1						

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Pettis	CD			2	5		1						
Phelps	CD			5	3		1						
	6ZK			1	1	1		1					
Platte	CD				3								
Polk	CD				1	1							
Pulaski	CD			1	4		3						
	6AW				1								
	6ZK				1								
Ralls	CD							1					
Randolph	CD			1	1		1	2					
	6AW				2		1						
	6ZJ				2		3						
Reynolds	CD			1	2								
Ripley	CD						1						
	6ZS				1			1					
Saline	CD				1								
Schuyler	CD				2		1						
Scotland	CD			1	1								
Scott	CD				3	1							
	6AW				1								
Shannon	CD				1								
Shelby	CD			1									
St. Charles	CD				2		1	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZB				2			2					
	6ZC						1	1					
St. Clair	6AW				1								
St. Francois	CD				1		1						
	6ZC			2			3						
St. Louis City	CD			1	3	1	3	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZA			1	4		2	1					
	6ZB				4		1	1					
	6ZC						1	1					
St. Louis Co.	CD				2		4	2					
	6AW			1									
	6ZA			2	8	2	2	2					
	6ZB				1		1	1					
	6ZC				2		2	3					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			1	2								
Stoddard	CD			1	2			1					
	6ZS			1	1		6						
Stone	CD						3	1					
Sullivan	CD			1									
Taney	CD			2	3		3						
	6AW					1							
	6ZV				1								
Texas	CD			1	1		2						
	6ZK					1	2						
Vernon	CD			1									
Warren	CD				2		1						
Washington	6ZB			1	1	1							
Wayne	CD					1	1	1					
Webster	CD				1								
	6AW					1							

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – August 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Wright	6AW			1	1								
<b>TOTAL</b>		2	0	77	266	39	124	50	0	0	0	0	2

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09SEP25

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD			1	1		1						
	6AW				1								
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				1								
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1				2					
Barton	6AW				1								
Bates	CD				1		1						
Benton	CD				1								
	6AW					1							
Bollinger	CD				1		1						
Boone	CD												
	6AW			1	3		2						
	6ZJ			1	7		3	2					
Buchanan	CD				2	2	6						
Butler	CD			3	3		2						
	6AW			1	1								
	6ZS			2	3		2						
Caldwell	CD			1									
Callaway	CD				2								
	6ZJ				1	1							
	6AW			1	2								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	2			1					
Carter	CD						1						
Cass	CD				1								
	6AW							1					
	6ZO			1	2	1							
	6ZR				7	3							
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD				1								
	6ZM				3								
Clark	CD			1	2		1						
Clay	CD				3		1						
	6AW			1				1					
Clinton	CD			2									
Cole	CD	1		3	2	2							
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				5	2	1	2					
Cooper	CD				1								
Crawford	CD			1	2		1						
Dallas	CD				1								
Daviess	CD						1						
DeKalb	CD				1								
Dent	CD			1	2		2						
Douglas	CD				1								
Dunklin	CD			2	2								
	6ZS				4		2	1					
Franklin	CD			1			1						

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6AW				1		1						
	6ZA				1		1						
	6ZC			1	1		1						
Gentry	CD			1									
Greene	CD			1	3		3	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZM				5	1	3						
	6ZV				1								
Grundy	CD				1								
Henry	CD				1								
	6AW						1						
Hickory	CD					1							
	6AW			1		1							
Howard	6ZJ							1					
Howell	CD			1	2	1	7						
Iron	CD							1					
Jackson	CD				2								
	6AW				1			1					
	6ZO			1	10	5	2						
	6ZR				7	2	1						1
Jasper	CD	1						3					
	6AW				2								
	6ZL				6		3						
Jefferson	CD				2			1					
	6AW					1							
	6ZA				3								
	6ZB			3	7			3					
	6ZC				1		1	1					
Johnson	CD				1								
Laclede	6AW			1	1								
	6ZK				2								
Lafayette	CD				6								
Lawrence	CD						1						
	6ZV				1								
Lewis	CD			2	1								
Lincoln	CD			2	7		2						
	6AW			1									
Linn	CD			1	1								
Livingston	CD				2	1	1						
Macon	CD				1		1						
Madison	CD			2	2								
Maries	CD			1									
Marion	CD				6		1	1					
	6AW				1			1					
McDonald	CD						1						
	6ZL				1								
Mississippi	CD				1								
Moniteau	CD						1						
Monroe	CD			1									
Montgomery	CD				1								
	6AW			1									
Morgan	CD				1								
New Madrid	CD				2	1	1						
Newton	6AW				1								
	6ZL			1	2								

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Oregon	CD				3								
Ozark	CD				1								
Pemiscot	CD				3		1	1					
	6AW			1									
Perry	CD						1						
Pettis	CD			1	5			1					
Phelps	CD			5	2		4						
	6ZK			1	1	1		1					
Platte	CD			1	2								
Polk	CD			1	1	1							
Pulaski	CD			2	3		3						
	6AW				1								
	6ZK				1								
Ralls	CD						1	1					
Randolph	CD			1	1		2	2					
	6AW				2								
	6ZJ			1	2		5						
Reynolds	CD			1	1								
Ripley	CD				1	1							
	6ZS				1			1					
Saline	CD				1								
Schuyler	CD				2		1						
Scotland	CD			1	2								
Scott	CD				3	1							
	6AW				1								
Shannon	CD				1		1						
Shelby	CD			1									
St. Charles	CD				2		2	1					
	6AW				2	1							
	6ZB				2		1	2					
	6ZC						1	1					
St. Clair	6AW				1								
St. Francois	CD				1		1						
	6ZC			1			3						
St. Louis City	CD			2	3	1	1						
	6AW				1								
	6ZA			1	4		3						
	6ZB				4		1	1					
	6ZC						1						
St. Louis Co.	CD				2	1	8	3					
	6AW			1	1								
	6ZA			2	7	1	4	2					
	6ZB				2		1	2					
	6ZC			1	2		1	2					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			2	1		1						
Stoddard	CD			1	2		2	1					
	6ZS			2	2		3	1					
Stone	CD						2	1					
Sullivan	CD			1									
Taney	CD			1	3		5	1					
	6AW					1							
	6ZV				1								
Texas	CD			1			1						
	6ZK						1						
Vernon	CD			1			1						

<b>Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – September 2025</b>													
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>FBR</b>	<b>RF2</b>	<b>RF3</b>	<b>RF4</b>	<b>PRTF</b>	<b>RFE</b>	<b>RFA</b>	<b>RFI</b>	<b>RFP</b>	<b>RFH</b>	<b>RST</b>	<b>RFM</b>
Warren	CD				3		1						
Washington	6ZB			1									
Wayne	CD						3	2					
Webster	CD				2		1						
	6AW					1							
Wright	6AW			1	1								
<b>TOTAL</b>		2	0	77	266	39	124	50	0	0	0	0	2

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08OCT25

Analysis of Tables 11-13: Most children who are receiving residential services are in a Level 4 placement. For all three months of the reporting period, Level 4 residential placements accounted for more than 46% of the total residential placements.

As defined in the Child Welfare Manual, a Level 4 placement is “an extended placement resource for children requiring active, coordinated, and professional intervention in a highly structured and secure environment. Such children will have demonstrated an inability to function in any less restrictive setting. This level is indicated for children who have a significant emotional and/or psychiatric need. These children present a chronic runaway risk and typically present a history of impulsivity, intensity of behavioral problems, significant family issues, self-destructive behaviors, etc. Residential Treatment agencies should provide reunification services, work with the family, community-based services, schools, etc. as a part of the therapeutic services provided. They also typically present a history of showing rage, including physical aggression”.

Chart 26 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their percentage of children who are placed in a residential setting. The data includes children managed by both CD and FCCM agencies.

<b>Chart 26: Residential Placement Utilization Grouped by Circuit</b>				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
	<b>15.01%+</b>	<b>10.01-15.00%</b>	<b>5.01-10.00%</b>	<b>0.00-5.00%</b>
<b>July</b>	0	3	20	23
<b>August</b>	0	4	17	25
<b>September</b>	0	4	17	25


\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08AUG25; 09SEP25; 08OCT25

Analysis of Chart 26: Twenty-three (23) circuits (50.00%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in July. This is an increase from 45.65% of circuits the previous reporting period.

Twenty-five (25) circuits (54.34%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in August. This is an increase from 43.47% of circuits the previous reporting period.

Twenty-five (25) circuits (54.34%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in March. This is an increase from 52.17% of circuits the previous reporting period.

Chart 27 depicts the percentage of foster children who are placed in a residential setting. This data is displayed by agency.




\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08AUG25; 09SEP25; 08OCT25

Analysis of Chart 27: Five (5) agencies maintained below 5.00% residential utilization during all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from four agencies the previous reporting period. Two agencies maintained below 5.00% residential utilization two of three months during the reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data: Item 10 of the CFSR assesses if concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives. All foster care cases are applicable for rating of this item except for cases in which the child needed specialized care throughout their entire time in foster care, making placement with relatives unsuitable, or situations where the identities of both parents and all relatives are unknown despite documented efforts to identify them.

Chart 28 depicts the percentage of cases where sufficient efforts were made to place a child with relatives.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 10 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 28: Of 30 cases applicable for rating of this item, 13 cases were rated a Strength. Ten (10) cases rated Strength were instances where the child was placed in a relative home placement during the period under review. The remaining three cases received a Strength rating due to the agency's concerted efforts to locate a relative placement.

Seventeen (17) cases were rated ANI. Sixteen (16) cases were rated ANI due to the agency's failure to locate, identify, inform, and evaluate relatives for potential placement. One case was rated ANI due to the agency's delay in completing an Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) request.

Data Analysis Summary: When comparing placement types of children in foster care over the past three months, most children are placed in relative placements.

Foster children in residential placements are mostly in a Level 4 placement type. The number of children in residential placements has slightly increased from 557 in June of 2025 to 570 in September of 2025. In September of 2025, the State of Missouri maintained 4.90% residential utilization. This is a decrease from 5.05% residential utilization in June of 2025.

CFSR data indicates the state is not meeting the federal goal of 95% for concerted efforts made to place children with relatives. When comparing this quarter's CFSR case review results to the previous reporting period, there was a 22.3% decrease in cases receiving an overall rating of Strength.

## **I. Well-Being Domain: Case Managers and Supervisors Trauma Trained/Informed**

Children's Division and the private Foster Care Case Management agencies do not share a common platform to record and track staff training completion. Great effort has been made to integrate training data however such processes are labor intensive and unreliable. The Office of HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care January 2026



Administration has recently implemented a new training tracking system for Children's Division, but work is ongoing to integrate Foster Care Case Management trainings into the new system.. It should be noted that all staff are required to complete trauma-informed training within 12 months of their hire date. Staff are being trauma trained despite the difficulty in uniformly tracking and reporting on their completion.

## **J. Permanency Domain: Timely Achievement of Child's Court Approved Plan**

Timely achievement of a child's court-approved plan is considered permanency. This measure looks at timely permanency (through reunification, adoption, guardianship, or living with a relative) for children in foster care.

Table 14 depicts the percentage of children in foster care where permanency is achieved within 12 months of children entering foster care. This data is displayed by each county and each agency. It should be noted that counties with no information available have been excluded from the data set. This number is calculated by dividing the number of children who enter foster care in a 12-month period (denominator) and the number of children in the denominator who are discharged to permanency within 12 months of entering foster care (numerator). The National Performance for this measure is 35.2%.

<b>Table 14: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	26.7%	31.1%	26.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Andrew	CD	83.3%	83.3%	71.4%
Atchison	CD	30.8%	28.6%	30.8%
Audrain	CD	48.1%	40.6%	41.2%
Barry	CD	9.1%	8.3%	7.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	22.7%	34.8%	31.8%
Barton	CD	20.0%	20.0%	25.0%
Bates	CD	47.6%	55.6%	52.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benton	CD	25.8%	25.8%	35.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV			
Bollinger	CD	9.1%	9.1%	10.0%
Boone	CD	34.8%	37.2%	38.5%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZJ	13.5%	13.1%	8.5%
Buchanan	CD	25.0%	24.4%	21.6%
Butler	CD	44.4%	50.0%	48.8%
	6ZB			0.0%
	6ZS	4.5%	8.8%	13.4%
Caldwell	CD	44.4%	44.4%	50.0%
Callaway	CD	33.3%	41.9%	41.9%
	6AW			
	6ZJ	14.7%	12.5%	14.3%
Camden	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 14: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZK	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%
	6ZR		0.0%	0.0%
Cape Girardeau	CD	8.7%	11.9%	8.5%
	6ZS	0.0%		
Carter	CD	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
Cass	CD	57.1%	58.8%	58.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZJ		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	20.6%	20.6%	18.2%
	6ZR	28.6%	25.0%	35.0%
Cedar	CD	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%
Chariton	CD	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%
Christian	CD	61.9%	61.9%	61.9%
	6ZM	38.7%	39.1%	37.1%
Clark	CD	18.8%	16.7%	17.6%
Clay	CD	23.5%	25.0%	17.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clinton	CD	22.2%	22.2%	22.2%
Cole	CD	35.7%	50.0%	52.0%
	6ZJ	31.4%	28.8%	27.6%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cooper	CD	80.0%	83.3%	62.5%
	6ZJ	0.0%		
Crawford	CD	17.9%	28.0%	27.6%
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dallas	CD	27.8%	26.3%	21.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%
DeKalb	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dent	CD	23.5%	24.5%	26.2%
	6ZK			
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Douglas	CD	46.2%	46.2%	47.6%
	6AW			
Dunklin	CD	63.9%	66.7%	65.6%
	6ZS	44.0%	35.7%	35.5%
Franklin	CD	8.3%	8.5%	9.5%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%		
	6ZC	42.9%	43.5%	45.5%
Gasconade	CD	28.6%	28.6%	31.6%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	31.5%	28.8%	27.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	27.9%	27.0%	25.2%
	6ZO			0.0%
	6ZV	40.5%	45.5%	38.5%
Grundy	CD	83.3%	90.9%	91.7%
Harrison	CD	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%
Henry	CD	72.0%	72.0%	75.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 14: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	42.9%	42.9%
Howard	CD	68.8%	73.3%	84.6%
	6ZJ	42.9%	46.2%	35.3%
Howell	CD	29.4%	20.6%	22.9%
	6ZK	0.0%	66.7%	50.0%
	6ZV			100%
Iron	CD	34.4%	39.1%	37.5%
Jackson	CD	71.4%	71.4%	72.7%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	27.1%	26.7%	26.6%
	6ZR	21.2%	23.0%	23.7%
	CD	15.2%	16.7%	23.3%
Jasper	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZL	30.6%	39.7%	37.3%
	CD	20.0%	20.0%	22.2%
Jefferson	6ZA	25.0%	10.0%	11.1%
	6ZB	22.8%	24.6%	21.7%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	100%	100%
	6ZS			
Johnson	CD	31.3%	30.9%	30.4%
	6AW			
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	
Knox	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Laclede	CD	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lafayette	CD	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Lawrence	CD	55.0%	57.9%	45.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%		
	6ZV	6.7%	11.1%	15.4%
Lewis	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Lincoln	CD	17.1%	16.7%	17.9%
	6AW	0.0%		
Linn	CD	26.7%	26.7%	26.7%
Livingston	CD	9.1%	10.0%	10.0%
Macon	CD	26.7%	20.0%	20.0%
Madison	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Maries	CD	44.4%	71.4%	71.4%
Marion	CD	21.4%	19.1%	18.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
McDonald	CD	74.2%	69.7%	69.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	59.1%	48.1%	40.9%
Mercer	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Miller	CD	20.0%	15.4%	27.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 14: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Mississippi	CD	50.0%	37.5%	37.5%
Moniteau	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Monroe	CD	60.0%	60.0%	75.0%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Montgomery	CD	25.0%	22.2%	22.2%
Morgan	CD	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
New Madrid	CD	35.3%	31.3%	36.4%
	6ZK	100%		
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Newton	CD	65.3%	62.5%	64.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	28.2%	25.7%	30.3%
Nodaway	CD	43.8%	33.3%	40.0%
Oregon	CD	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	57.1%	57.1%	80.0%
Pemiscot	CD	45.8%	41.1%	26.2%
Perry	CD	9.1%	12.5%	0.0%
Pettis	CD	29.4%	25.0%	25.7%
Phelps	CD	39.7%	46.3%	46.2%
	6ZK	37.5%	25.0%	21.4%
Pike	CD	50.0%	37.5%	0.0%
	6ZJ		100%	100%
Platte	CD	14.7%	17.1%	15.6%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO			0.0%
Polk	CD	42.1%	41.2%	42.9%
Pulaski	CD	43.5%	45.3%	43.9%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZK	47.4%	47.4%	47.6%
Putnam	CD	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Ralls	CD	20.0%	25.0%	33.3%
Randolph	CD	6.3%	7.1%	8.3%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZJ	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Ray	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reynolds	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ripley	CD	47.6%	62.5%	64.7%
	6ZS	33.3%	36.4%	33.3%
Saline	CD	46.7%	53.8%	50.0%
Schuyler	CD	25.0%	25.0%	20.0%
Scotland	CD	25.0%	14.3%	11.1%
Scott	CD	3.6%	3.1%	0.0%
Shannon	CD	60.0%	60.0%	50.0%
Shelby	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Charles	CD	5.0%	4.3%	6.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	31.0%	26.9%	32.0%

<b>Table 14: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
St. Clair	CD	42.9%	42.9%	75.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	14.3%	13.3%	14.6%
	6ZA			
	6ZC	11.1%	14.3%	15.2%
St. Louis City	CD	41.2%	39.0%	37.8%
	6AW			
	6ZA	11.0%	11.1%	11.8%
	6ZB	21.1%	20.7%	18.6%
	6ZC	26.8%	24.4%	21.7%
St. Louis County	CD	26.7%	28.8%	23.4%
	6AW			
	6ZA	14.4%	15.8%	15.5%
	6ZB	10.2%	11.5%	15.2%
	6ZC	6.9%	5.6%	10.3%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	45.8%	29.2%	29.2%
Stoddard	CD	68.1%	66.7%	60.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZA	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	63.3%	65.9%	69.8%
Stone	CD	27.3%	20.0%	28.6%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sullivan	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taney	CD	27.3%	30.9%	30.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	18.4%	18.8%	27.3%
Texas	CD	16.7%	25.0%	23.5%
	6ZK	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Vernon	CD	21.1%	30.8%	36.4%
Warren	CD	15.4%	11.5%	12.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	27.3%	20.0%	20.0%
Wayne	CD	48.0%	50.0%	60.0%
Webster	CD	20.7%	19.2%	24.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Worth	CD	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	17.1%	19.5%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 14: Number of counties with entries in July: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 27 (23.7%).

Number of counties with entries in August: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 28 (24.6%).

Number of counties with entries in September: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 27 (23.7%).

Twenty (20) counties met or exceeded the National Performance timely permanency for those entering care within 12 months all three months of the reporting period.

Table 15 depicts timely permanency for children who have been in foster care for at least 12 months and not more than 23 months. This data is displayed by each county and each agency. This number is calculated by dividing the number of children in foster care on the first day of a 12-month period who had been in foster care continuously between 12 and 23 months (denominator) by the number of children in the denominator who discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day of the 12-month period (numerator). The National Performance for this measure is 43.8%.

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	36.0%	44.4%	37.0%
Andrew	CD			100%
Atchison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Audrain	CD	57.1%	83.3%	85.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barry	CD	57.1%	83.3%	85.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Barton	CD	50.0%	40.0%	25.0%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bates	CD	80.0%	80.0%	57.1%
	6ZL	100%		
Benton	CD	66.7%	66.7%	75.0%
	6ZO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	45.5%	45.5%	50.0%
Boone	CD	40.4%	52.6%	52.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	40.4%	38.9%	39.3%
Buchanan	CD	53.8%	46.2%	37.5%
Butler	CD	70.2%	70.5%	73.3%
	6ZC		100%	100%
				0.0%
	6ZS	46.2%	33.3%	45.5%
Caldwell	CD	75.0%	60.0%	50.0%
Callaway	CD	85.7%	85.0%	85.0%
	6AW	100%		
	6ZJ	11.1%	12.5%	11.1%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Camden	CD	45.5%	40.0%	53.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	25.0%	100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	55.1%	59.4%	59.7%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	77.8%	76.5%	70.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	46.2%	30.8%	36.4%

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZR	66.7%	69.2%	40.0%
Cedar	CD	41.2%	56.3%	50.0%
Chariton	CD	37.5%	42.9%	37.5%
Christian	CD	60.0%	57.5%	56.8%
	6ZM	50.0%	60.0%	55.6%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Clark	CD	9.5%	9.5%	29.2%
Clay	CD	55.4%	53.3%	58.7%
Clinton	CD	57.1%	63.6%	70.0%
Cole	CD	58.8%	70.0%	61.5%
	6ZJ	65.2%	61.5%	54.2%
Cooper	CD	14.3%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	66.7%	66.7%	67.9%
Dade	CD			100%
Dallas	CD	38.5%	33.3%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	42.9%	50.0%	60.0%
DeKalb	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR		0.0%	0.0%
Dent	CD	71.4%	69.2%	64.3%
Douglas	CD	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%
Dunklin	CD	85.0%	69.6%	68.2%
	6ZS	23.1%	16.7%	23.1%
Franklin	CD	53.8%	57.5%	59.3%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Gasconade	CD	52.9%	47.1%	47.1%
Gentry	CD	100%	100%	100%
Greene	CD	56.0%	55.1%	58.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	55.2%	52.7%	50.6%
	6ZV	73.9%	81.8%	89.5%
Grundy	CD	100%	66.7%	66.7%
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Henry	CD	75.0%	84.2%	77.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
Howard	CD	12.5%	16.7%	33.3%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Howell	CD	36.7%	43.3%	51.6%
	6ZK		25.0%	75.0%
Iron	CD	35.3%	55.6%	50.0%
Jackson	CD	83.0%	87.2%	86.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	100%	100%	

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZO	43.7%	49.3%	51.7%
	6ZR	28.0%	37.3%	38.0%
Jasper	CD	45.2%	42.0%	42.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	58.3%	55.6%	56.0%
Jefferson	CD	59.4%	51.9%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	33.3%	33.3%	21.9%
	6ZB	43.5%	46.7%	50.0%
	6ZC	33.3%	33.3%	30.8%
	6ZK		20.0%	20.0%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Johnson	CD	92.3%	93.3%	93.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%
Laclede	CD	15.4%	22.7%	22.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	19.0%	16.7%	11.1%
Lafayette	CD	57.1%	57.1%	50.0%
Lawrence	CD	36.0%	35.0%	47.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	57.1%	71.4%	57.1%
Lewis	CD	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Lincoln	CD	34.3%	28.1%	42.9%
	6ZC		0.0%	0.0%
Linn	CD	33.3%	37.5%	33.3%
Livingston	CD	63.6%	58.3%	58.3%
Macon	CD	66.7%	66.7%	63.2%
Madison	CD	35.3%	41.2%	41.2%
Maries	CD	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Marion	CD	37.3%	36.5%	30.6%
McDonald	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
Miller	CD	55.6%	62.5%	53.8%
Mississippi	CD	41.7%	30.0%	36.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	22.2%	50.0%	50.0%
Monroe	CD	22.2%	22.2%	25.0%
Montgomery	CD	31.6%	35.0%	23.5%
Morgan	CD	43.8%	42.9%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
New Madrid	CD	45.8%	48.0%	66.7%
	6ZC	0.0%		
	6ZK	0.0%		
Newton	CD	46.7%	50.0%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZL	68.2%	56.3%	57.1%
Nodaway	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Oregon	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Osage	CD	83.3%	80.0%	80.0%
Ozark	CD	77.8%	83.3%	83.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	40.0%	35.3%	44.4%
	6AW	0.0%		
Perry	CD	69.2%	58.3%	72.7%
Pettis	CD	56.3%	54.1%	55.6%
Phelps	CD	51.1%	54.2%	51.1%
	6ZK	40.0%	25.0%	20.0%
Pike	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Platte	CD	46.7%	47.1%	52.9%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	CD	50.0%	58.3%	64.3%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
Pulaski	CD	38.9%	38.9%	50.0%
	6ZK	87.5%	85.7%	83.3%
Putnam	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ralls	CD	75.0%	60.0%	50.0%
Randolph	CD	40.0%	44.4%	48.0%
	6ZJ	35.0%	23.5%	33.3%
Ray	CD	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%
Reynolds	CD	100%	100%	50.0%
Ripley	CD	85.7%	100%	100%
	6ZS	75.0%	62.5%	66.7%
Saline	CD	87.5%	88.9%	87.5%
	6ZO	0.0%	100%	100%
Schuyler	CD	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Scotland	CD	33.3%	37.5%	42.9%
Scott	CD	50.0%	54.8%	60.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shannon	CD	66.7%	66.7%	100%
Shelby	CD	75.0%	71.4%	62.5%
St. Charles	CD	67.6%	63.3%	52.2%
	6ZA			0.0%
	6ZB	21.4%	13.3%	22.2%
	6ZC	45.7%	41.2%	44.8%
St. Clair	CD	60.0%	50.0%	100%
St. Francois	CD	47.1%	49.0%	45.5%
	6ZC	41.2%	57.9%	66.7%
St. Louis City	CD	36.6%	38.3%	38.5%
	6ZA	25.7%	14.6%	23.9%
	6ZB	37.9%	35.7%	37.9%
	6ZC	38.1%	47.6%	47.6%
St. Louis County	CD	44.3%	44.6%	45.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	30.4%	22.5%	29.4%
	6ZB	38.2%	34.9%	42.2%
	6ZC	41.2%	36.8%	48.6%

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	14.3%	12.5%	0.0%
Stoddard	CD	70.0%	70.7%	73.5%
	6ZS	75.0%	75.0%	66.7%
Stone	CD	61.5%	61.5%	56.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	60.0%	66.7%	63.6%
Sullivan	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taney	CD	52.3%	55.1%	54.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	73.3%	58.8%	58.8%
Texas	CD	60.0%	60.0%	58.8%
	6ZK	66.7%	75.0%	66.7%
Vernon	CD	73.3%	86.7%	86.7%
Warren	CD	46.4%	53.6%	34.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
Washington	CD	47.8%	75.0%	70.0%
	6ZB	47.8%	52.4%	57.9%
Wayne	CD	75.0%	76.9%	81.3%
Webster	CD	40.0%	38.5%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	100%	
Worth	CD	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	18.2%	35.7%	33.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 15: Number of counties with entries in July: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 49 (43.7%).

Number of counties with entries in August: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 54 (48.2%).

Number of counties with entries in September: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 57 (50.0%).

Forty-six (46) counties met or exceeded the National Performance timely permanency for those in care 12-23 months all three months of the reporting period.

Table 16 depicts timely permanency for children who have been in foster care for 24 months or more. This data is displayed by each county and each agency. This number is calculated by dividing the number of children in foster care on the first day of a 12-month period who had been in foster care continuously for 24 months or more (denominator) by the number of children in the denominator who discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day of the 12-month period (numerator). The National Performance for this measure is 37.3%.

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	53.8%	56.1%	47.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Audrain	CD	60.0%	50.0%	47.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barry	CD	36.7%	52.9%	51.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	18.2%	18.2%	27.3%
Barton	CD	11.1%	12.5%	0.0%
Bates	CD	80.0%	80.0%	66.7%
Benton	CD	44.4%	50.0%	42.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%
Boone	CD	39.7%	40.5%	41.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	26.5%	36.4%	39.6%
Buchanan	CD	0.0%	8.3%	15.4%
Butler	CD	25.0%	32.5%	30.8%
	6AW	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	6ZC		100%	100%
	6ZM		100%	100%
	6ZS	28.6%	31.3%	16.7%
Caldwell	CD	25.0%	25.0%	33.3%
Callaway	CD	30.6%	27.3%	27.3%
	6AW	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Camden	CD	63.2%	78.3%	64.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	50.0%	20.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	54.9%	51.5%	53.4%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	
Cass	CD	37.5%	37.5%	42.9%
	6AW	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	6ZO	45.5%	45.5%	50.0%
	6ZR	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%
Cedar	CD	12.5%	27.3%	30.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Christian	CD	40.0%	48.1%	53.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	47.4%	47.4%	50.0%
Clark	CD	11.1%	6.3%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clay	CD	42.4%	45.7%	47.9%
Clinton	CD	36.4%	45.8%	45.8%
Cole	CD	12.5%	13.3%	7.1%
	6AW	100%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	55.6%	45.0%	47.4%
Cooper	CD	33.3%	20.0%	20.0%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Crawford	CD	66.7%	62.5%	58.8%
Dade	CD	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Dallas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
DeKalb	CD	23.1%	23.1%	23.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
Dent	CD	17.6%	17.6%	20.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
Douglas	CD	20.0%	25.0%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	27.3%	27.3%	30.0%
	6AW	100%	100%	40.0%
	6ZS	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Franklin	CD	27.7%	36.8%	36.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	25.0%	37.5%	75.0%
	6ZC	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Gasconade	CD	64.3%	64.3%	61.5%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	37.9%	33.6%	31.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	30.0%	30.0%	35.7%
	6ZV	33.3%	30.8%	26.7%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	100%
Harrison	CD	60.0%	33.3%	33.3%
Henry	CD	58.8%	47.6%	35.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	29.6%	34.3%	30.0%
Iron	CD	16.7%	28.6%	37.5%
Jackson	CD	58.8%	56.9%	56.5%
	6AW	5.0%	2.5%	4.9%
	6ZO	25.5%	26.6%	41.7%
	6ZR	38.1%	37.2%	41.7%
Jasper	CD	36.9%	42.0%	43.7%
	6AW	14.3%	13.3%	13.3%
	6ZL	33.3%	35.3%	36.1%
Jefferson	CD	44.9%	50.7%	42.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
	6ZA	23.3%	16.7%	16.7%
	6ZB	27.3%	34.0%	30.0%
	6ZC	27.8%	26.3%	25.0%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson	CD	45.5%	40.0%	40.0%
	6AW	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Laclede	CD	60.7%	59.4%	57.6%
	6AW	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
	6ZK	40.0%	47.1%	50.0%
Lafayette	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
Lawrence	CD	16.7%	33.3%	40.0%
	6AW	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%
	6ZV	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Lewis	CD	100%	100%	100%
Lincoln	CD	36.0%	28.0%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Linn	CD	13.0%	13.0%	17.4%
Livingston	CD	36.4%	45.5%	45.5%
Macon	CD	18.2%	15.8%	11.8%
Madison	CD	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Maries	CD	88.9%	88.9%	100%
Marion	CD	35.5%	32.1%	31.3%
	6AW	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%
McDonald	CD	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
	6ZL	100%	100%	100%
Miller	CD	40.0%	50.0%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mississippi	CD	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Monroe	CD	58.3%	53.8%	50.0%
Montgomery	CD	70.6%	70.6%	73.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	50.0%	50.0%	46.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
New Madrid	CD	16.0%	13.6%	32.1%
	6AW	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	0.0%		
	6ZM	100%		
Newton	CD	68.8%	70.6%	64.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	27.3%	70.6%	33.3%
Nodaway	CD	42.9%	42.9%	42.9%
Oregon	CD	21.1%	26.3%	26.3%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	16.7%	23.1%	23.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Pemiscot	CD	40.7%	36.0%	36.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Perry	CD	38.5%	41.7%	64.3%
Pettis	CD	45.8%	45.8%	34.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	47.5%	45.9%	46.7%
	6ZK	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%
Pike	CD	37.5%	37.5%	40.0%
Platte	CD	23.5%	14.3%	7.7%
	6ZM	100%	100%	
	6ZO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
	CD	16.7%	22.2%	23.5%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Pulaski	CD	41.2%	38.2%	29.0%
	6ZK	55.6%	55.6%	55.6%
Putnam	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ralls	CD	81.3%	81.3%	70.0%
Randolph	CD	41.7%	36.4%	22.2%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZJ	22.2%	30.0%	27.3%
Ray	CD	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
Reynolds	CD	40.0%	40.0%	16.7%
Ripley	CD	22.2%	22.2%	37.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	33.3%	71.4%	71.4%
Saline	CD	45.5%	40.0%	33.3%
Scotland	CD	25.0%	25.0%	20.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	34.2%	34.2%	26.3%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	30.0%
Shannon	CD	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
Shelby	CD	30.8%	50.0%	44.4%
St. Charles	CD	37.0%	34.9%	35.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	54.5%	60.0%	42.9%
	6ZC	33.3%	33.3%	38.9%
	CD	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%
St. Clair	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	CD	34.4%	33.3%	37.5%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	38.9%	17.6%	31.6%
	CD	37.2%	39.6%	41.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	29.2%	30.7%	38.5%
	6ZB	28.2%	33.3%	34.9%
	6ZC	36.0%	29.2%	30.8%
St. Louis City	CD	33.1%	33.8%	33.1%
	6AW	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
	6ZA	22.9%	23.2%	21.8%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
	6ZB	37.5%	41.3%	43.1%
	6ZC	38.6%	32.7%	32.7%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	30.8%	38.5%	35.7%
Stoddard	CD	20.0%	11.1%	11.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stone	CD	20.0%	27.3%	27.3%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Sullivan	CD	26.7%	38.5%	35.7%
Taney	CD	47.4%	47.5%	44.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	50.0%	50.0%	55.6%
Texas	CD	12.5%	12.5%	9.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Vernon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Warren	CD	22.2%	19.2%	42.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
Washington	CD	35.0%	36.8%	25.0%
	6ZB	12.5%	6.3%	5.6%
Wayne	CD	38.5%	33.3%	37.5%
Webster	CD	30.8%	30.8%	27.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wright	CD	17.2%	15.4%	15.4%
	6AW	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
	6ZM			100%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Analysis of Table 17: Number of counties with entries in July: 111.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 23 (21.0%).

Number of counties with entries in August: 111.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 26 (23.4%).


Number of counties with entries in September: 110.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 22 (20.0%)

Ten (10) counties performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency for those in care 24 months or more all three months of the reporting period.


Charts 29-31 depict circuits that met or exceeded the National Performance for permanency in all three timeframes (within 12 months; 12-23 months; 24+ months) for each month of the reporting period. This data is grouped by circuit and includes both CD and FCCM information together.

**Chart 29: Circuits that Met or Exceeded National Performance for Permanency in all Three Timeframes - July 2025**




\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025

**Chart 30: Circuits that Met or Exceeded National Performance for Permanency in all Three Timeframes - August 2025**



\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09SEP2025






\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08OCT2025

Analysis of Charts 29-31: July: Five (5) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for permanency in all three timeframes.

August: Five (5) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for permanency in all three timeframes.


September: Three (3) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for permanency in all three timeframes.

Chart 32 depicts whether permanency is achieved within 12 months of children entering foster care. This data is displayed by each agency statewide.




\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Chart 33 depicts whether permanency is achieved for children who have been in foster care for at least 12 months and not more than 23 months. This data is displayed by each agency statewide.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025

Chart 34 depicts whether permanency is achieved for children and youth in care for 24 months or more. This data is displayed by each agency statewide.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 08AUG2025; 09SEP2025; 08OCT2025


Analysis of Charts 32-34: Number of agencies that met or exceeded National Performance for timely permanency for those entering care within 12 months all three months of the reporting period: 0.

Number of agencies that met or exceeded National Performance for timely permanency within 12-23 months, all months with entries of the reporting period: 4 (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZV, & CD).

Number of agencies that met or exceeded National Performance for timely permanency for those in care 24 months or more all three months of the reporting period: 4 (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZR, & CD).

Child and Family Services Review Data: Item 6 of the CFSR assesses whether concerted efforts were made to achieve the case goal.

Chart 35 depicts the percentage of cases in which sufficient efforts were made to achieve the case goal in a timely manner. This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both CD and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 6 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 35: Of the 31 cases reviewed, 15 cases were rated Strength. Timely identification of a case goal and consistent parent engagement were common themes in cases with a Strength rating. Additional factors contributing to a Strength rating include timely court hearings, frequent FST meetings to monitor case goal progress, and timely negotiation of adoption and guardianship subsidy agreements.

Seventeen (17) cases were rated ANI for this item. One case was rated ANI due to the children remaining on an extended Trial Home Visit while waiting for a custody modification. A lack of changing case goals in a timely manner was a common theme in cases rated ANI for timely achievement of the case goal. Other common themes include not pursuing termination of parental rights filings when the case goal has been changed to adoption and not identifying prospective adoptive parents or guardians when approaching the 12-month mark of the child being in foster care. In one case rated ANI, an adoption subsidy was not obtained by the agency until more than one year after a termination of parental rights had been ordered by the court.

Data Analysis Summary:

Timely permanency within 12 months of entering care:

Twenty (20) counties met or exceeded the National Performance for July, August, and September 2025. This is an increase from 16 counties the previous reporting period.

No agencies met or exceeded the National Performance in July, August, and September 2025. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Timely permanency within 12-23 months of entering care:

Forty-six (46) counties met or exceeded the National Performance in July, August, and September 2025. This is an increase from 33 counties the previous reporting period.

Four (4) agencies (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZV, & CD) met or exceeded the National Performance for July, August, and September 2025. This is a decrease from six agencies the previous reporting period.

Timely permanency for those in care 24 month or more:

Twenty (20) counties met or exceeded the National Performance for July, August, and September 2025. This is an increase from 14 counties the previous reporting period.

Four (4) agencies met or exceeded the National Performance for July, August, and September 2025. This is an increase from zero agencies the previous reporting period.

Circuit analysis for timely permanency:

Five (5) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in all three timeframes (12 months or less, 12-23 months, 24+ months) in July: Circuit 03, Circuit 25, Circuit 27, Circuit 38, and Circuit 40. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Five (5) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in all three timeframes (12 months or less, 12-23 months, 24+ months) in August: Circuit 03, Circuit 25, Circuit 27, Circuit 38, and Circuit 40. This is an increase from three circuits the previous reporting period.

Three (3) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in all three timeframes (12 months or less, 12-23 months, 24+ months) in September: Circuit 03, Circuit 38, and Circuit 40. This is a decrease from five agencies the previous reporting period.

CFSR data indicates that the state is not meeting the federal goal of 95% for timely achievement of the case goal. When comparing this quarter's CFSR case review results to the previous reporting period, there is a 1.5% increase in cases receiving an overall rating of Strength for timely achievement of the case goal.

## K. Service Domain: Effective Ratio of Supervisors to Supervision of Case Managers

This measures the number of Supervisors to Case Managers for children in foster care.

Table 17 depicts the Supervisor to Case Manager ratio for FCCM agencies from July through September 2025. The Response and Evaluation Team will determine the benchmark for this measure once enough data is collected to establish a reasonable goal.

<b>Table 17: FCCM Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio Grouped by Agency</b>			
<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
6AW	1:3.99	1:4.00	1:4.00
6ZA	1:3.98	1:3.54	1:3.38
6ZB	1:3.08	1:3.08	1:3.42
6ZC	1:3.64	1:3.67	1:3.83
6ZJ	1:3.00	1:2.86	1:3.57
6ZK	1:5.00	1:5.50	1:3.00
6ZL	1:2.50	1:2.50	1:2.25
6ZM	1:4.00	1:3.57	1:3.13
6ZO	1:5.57	1:5.57	1:5.71
6ZR	1:5.50	1:5.50	1:5.63
6ZS	1:5.25	1:3.71	1:5.25
6ZV	1:2.54	1:2.09	1:2.40

<https://dssintranet.mo.gov/dss-childrens-division/foster-care/>

Analysis of Table 17: FCCM Supervisor to Case Manager ratios range from 1:2.09 to 1:5.71, July through September of 2025.

Table 18 depicts Supervisor to Case Manager ratios for Children's Division by each circuit. The reason this table is displayed by circuit instead of a total for the agency is due to the concentration of children case managed by Children's Division as compared to individual Foster Care Case Management agencies.

<b>Table 18: CD Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio</b>			
<b>Circuit</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
01	1:1.60	1:1.90	1:1.50
02	1:2.10	1:2.23	1:2.23
03	1:3.00	1:3.00	1:3.00
04	1:2.50	1:2.50	1:2.50
05	1:3.98	1:3.98	1:2.99
06	1:3.00	1:3.00	1:2.98
07	1:2.51	1:3.66	1:3.32
08	1:1.03	1:1.00	1:1.00
09	1:1.74	1:1.74	1:1.68
10	1:2.47	1:2.32	1:2.78
11	1:2.73	1:2.08	1:1.95
12	1:3.33	1:3.00	1:2.67
13	1:2.20	1:2.09	1:1.92
14	1:3.00	1:2.50	1:2.50
15	1:4.00	1:4.00	1:4.00
16	1:2.47	1:2.47	1:2.63

<b>Table 18: CD Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio</b>			
<b>Circuit</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
17	1:3.38	1:3.05	1:2.71
18	1:5.93	1:5.97	1:5.92
19	1:4.00	1:7.00	1:7.00
20	1:3.52	1:3.52	1:3.27
21	1:4.56	1:4.57	1:4.20
22	1:2.63	1:3.31	1:3.10
23	1:4.30	1:6.39	1:3.43
24	1:3.38	1:3.22	1:3.39
25	1:3.54	1:3.02	1:3.12
26	1:4.00	1:3.25	1:3.00
27	1:2.51	1:3.01	1:2.00
28	1:3.50	1:2.67	1:3.00
29	1:4.49	1:4.48	1:3.59
30	1:2.51	1:2.51	1:2.51
31	1:3.33	1:3.60	1:3.55
32	1:4.42	1:4.47	1:4.53
33	1:2.60	1:2.60	1:2.09
34	1:2.91	1:2.70	1:3.32
35	1:2.71	1:2.20	1:2.05
36	1:1.76	1:2.56	1:2.60
37	1:4.41	1:3.86	1:3.39
38	1:3.34	1:2.51	1:2.51
39	1:2.67	1:2.33	1:2.25
40	1:2.20	1:2.20	1:2.40
41	1:3.00	1:3.50	1:2.67
42	1:3.06	1:2.40	1:2.42
43	1:2.94	1:2.85	1:3.17
44	1:3.00	1:3.00	1:3.00
45	1:3.85	1:3.85	1:3.90
46	1:2.50	1:2.75	1:2.50

<https://dssintranet.mo.gov/dss-childrens-division/foster-care/>

Analysis of Table 18: Children’s Division Supervisor to Case Manager ratios by circuit range from 1:1 to 1:6.39 July through September of 2025.

Data Analysis Summary: As a state, Supervisor to Case Manager ratios ranged from 1:1 to 6.39, July through September of 2025.

## **L. Service Domain: Cases Returned to CD for Catastrophic Costs/Court Order**

The intent of the measure was to monitor cases returned to Children’s Division when FCCM agencies experience catastrophic costs. Beginning in September of 2022, Children’s Division began the practice of assuming the foster care maintenance cost from an FCCM agency once a threshold of \$100,000 is reached within a 12-month timeframe. The case will remain with the FCCM agency for all other case management services. There have been no cases returned to Children’s Division due to catastrophic costs during the reporting period.

## Phase III Reporting (Reporting Period: July 1, 2025 – September 30, 2025)

### M. Permanency Domain: Placement Stability

Placement Stability is measured to identify whether children who are removed from their homes experience stability in their placement setting while they are in foster care. Placement Stability is calculated by dividing the total number of placement moves of children who enter foster care during a 12-month period (numerator) by the total number of days the children were in foster care at the end of the 12-month period (denominator). Placement Stability is expressed as a rate per 1,000 days in foster care. This means that the result of the numerator divided by the denominator is multiplied by 1,000 to produce larger numbers that are easier to understand. It should be noted that this metric measures a rolling calendar year, thus a child who entered care one month will be reflected in subsequent months until the end of that 12-month period.

Table 19 depicts the rate of Placement Stability for each county and each agency in the state during the reporting period. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed. The National Performance for this measure is 4.48 moves per 1,000 days in foster care or less. A lower value is desirable.

<b>Table 19: Placement Stability – National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
Adair	CD	5.14	5.57	4.87
Andrew	CD	14.42	12.87	10.87
Atchison	CD	5.61	8.59	8.76
Audrain	CD	9.87	9.30	8.23
	6AW		10.71	9.65
Barry	CD	11.32	9.71	9.42
	6ZV	4.31	4.47	3.80
Barton	CD	1.10	0.97	1.29
Bates	CD	1.05	1.26	1.27
Benton	CD	3.89	3.42	2.45
	6AW	5.52	4.74	4.13
Bollinger	CD	5.08	4.41	3.76
Boone	CD	6.01	6.66	5.84
	6ZJ	3.66	3.73	4.13
Buchanan	CD	4.46	4.06	4.59
Butler	CD	2.18	2.53	3.22
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	
	6ZS	4.76	4.83	4.14
Caldwell	CD	4.35	3.96	4.14
Callaway	CD	4.93	4.93	5.14
	6ZJ	4.63	4.93	4.68
Camden	CD	6.53	5.61	6.23
	6ZK	3.24	3.54	4.12
Cape Girardeau	CD	4.74	4.44	4.56
Carter	CD	6.70	6.69	6.37
Cass	CD	5.43	6.51	4.40
	6ZO	6.58	5.75	5.13
	6ZR	5.57	6.51	7.05
Cedar	CD	4.11	3.66	2.12

Chariton	CD	6.25	5.62	7.77
Christian	CD	5.99	5.32	4.89
	6ZM	3.60	4.23	4.88
Clark	CD	9.31	10.54	10.14
Clay	CD	4.63	4.74	5.22
Clinton	CD	5.13	4.44	4.76
Cole	CD	11.07	10.95	10.59
	6ZJ	5.50	5.36	4.78
Cooper	CD	4.81	4.48	5.48
Crawford	CD	3.17	3.73	3.19
Dade	CD	2.84	2.52	2.26
Dallas	CD	4.14	4.63	4.55
Daviess	CD	4.74	4.47	3.81
DeKalb	CD	7.30	6.45	6.75
Dent	CD	6.08	5.94	5.92
Douglas	CD	2.64	2.74	4.03
Dunklin	CD	4.02	4.02	4.39
	6ZS	9.15	9.12	6.59
Franklin	CD	3.34	3.39	4.27
	6ZA	3.25	5.01	4.91
	6ZC	2.61	3.86	3.22
Gasconade	CD	5.17	3.99	3.85
Gentry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	CD	4.54	4.54	4.45
	6AW	10.64	10.64	10.64
	6ZM	4.30	4.81	4.76
	6ZV	6.93	6.85	5.87
Grundy	CD	2.63	2.75	2.29
Harrison	CD	5.96	4.98	11.11
Henry	CD	2.97	5.12	4.86
Hickory	CD	3.29	7.69	5.84
Holt	CD	5.02	3.97	3.27
Howard	CD	2.86	4.22	7.57
	6ZJ	5.61	6.02	4.85
Howell	CD	8.27	7.48	6.77
Iron	CD	3.86	6.44	5.96
Jackson	CD	3.25	3.53	3.11
	6ZO	4.40	4.22	4.15
	6ZR	4.40	4.27	4.23
Jasper	CD	3.21	3.57	3.24
	6AW	19.80	18.02	
	6ZL	6.14	5.56	5.01
Jefferson	CD	4.47	4.77	5.14
	6ZA	5.28	4.33	4.05
	6ZB	6.36	6.67	6.02
	6ZC	3.56	6.79	5.56
Johnson	CD	3.63	3.87	4.08
Knox	CD	6.80	5.65	4.81
Laclede	CD	3.84	3.49	4.03
	6ZK	2.33	2.30	1.66
Lafayette	CD	11.11	10.80	8.48
Lawrence	CD	4.16	3.75	4.19
	6AW	3.55	3.24	3.24



	6ZV	6.92	5.61	4.24
Lewis	CD	7.51	10.48	10.15
Lincoln	CD	4.71	4.48	4.07
Linn	CD	5.39	5.19	4.70
Livingston	CD	4.03	5.28	4.63
Macon	CD	6.32	6.10	6.44
Madison	CD	3.51	3.00	2.78
Maries	CD	5.20	5.77	5.05
Marion	CD	5.18	5.16	5.13
McDonald	CD	4.49	4.16	3.42
	6ZL	5.73	5.16	6.15
Mercer	CD	11.36	10.20	9.23
Miller	CD	2.93	3.67	2.96
Mississippi	CD	3.67	3.20	3.09
Moniteau	CD	21.51	24.59	12.45
Monroe	CD	1.56	4.21	6.75
Montgomery	CD	2.72	2.41	2.67
Morgan	CD	2.52	2.56	1.12
	6ZR	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	CD	5.82	5.98	5.68
Newton	CD	4.39	4.42	4.89
	6ZL	5.45	4.47	4.09
Nodaway	CD	4.76	5.88	7.52
Oregon	CD	3.55	2.98	3.59
Osage	CD	7.58	6.26	6.98
Ozark	CD	3.31	3.12	3.99
Pemiscot	CD	2.07	2.32	3.24
Perry	CD	3.14	3.27	4.53
Pettis	CD	6.45	7.15	7.21
Phelps	CD	3.65	3.52	3.97
	6ZK	3.71	5.79	4.11
Pike	CD	5.36	4.89	10.96
Platte	CD	3.66	3.63	2.81
Polk	CD	3.91	5.46	5.72
Pulaski	CD	4.95	4.50	4.08
	6ZK	2.87	2.61	2.24
Putnam	CD	3.72	3.14	2.70
Ralls	CD	5.68	7.75	9.32
Randolph	CD	6.13	4.80	6.43
	6ZJ	7.57	9.06	9.90
Ray	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	CD	2.97	0.60	0.92
Ripley	CD	3.74	4.13	2.96
	6ZS	2.94	4.82	4.56
Saline	CD	3.89	3.98	4.15
Schuyler	CD	3.74	4.34	1.43
Scotland	CD	0.97	1.66	2.75
Scott	CD	3.59	5.58	4.72
Shannon	CD	4.19	3.81	0.00
Shelby	CD	5.00	5.79	6.70
St. Charles	CD	5.72	5.60	5.65
	6ZB	5.94	5.80	5.18
	6ZC	3.07	3.58	3.32

St. Clair	CD	3.01	3.72	6.99
St. Francois	CD	5.58	5.90	4.32
	6ZC	5.20	4.53	4.92
St. Louis City	CD	13.38	12.87	10.49
	6ZA	4.92	4.51	5.19
	6ZB	3.72	5.23	5.23
	6ZC	5.95	5.57	5.21
St. Louis County	CD	7.15	8.43	8.62
	6ZA	6.48	6.04	5.78
	6ZB	6.51	6.58	7.07
	6ZC	6.08	7.70	7.91
Ste. Genevieve	CD	2.14	3.07	2.76
Stoddard	CD	6.98	6.70	5.75
	6ZA	14.46	14.18	9.39
	6ZS	7.17	8.06	7.39
Stone	CD	6.56	6.67	4.21
	6ZV	5.94	10.73	9.23
Sullivan	CD	16.53	4.52	3.97
Taney	CD	7.83	7.35	6.82
	6AW	18.26	18.15	16.37
	6ZV	4.51	4.57	4.51
Texas	CD	6.38	8.26	7.39
	6ZK	1.93	1.57	1.32
Vernon	CD	4.37	5.23	6.22
Warren	CD	4.29	3.53	3.28
	6AW	12.50	11.43	
Washington	CD	5.19	5.74	7.82
	6ZB	3.04	2.44	2.01
Wayne	CD	2.25	2.57	2.15
Webster	CD	4.62	3.47	3.48
Worth	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wright	CD	3.94	3.57	3.57

\*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 08AUG25; 09SEP25; 08OCT25

Analysis of Table 19: Number of counties with placements in July: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 47 (41.22%). This is a decrease from 42.5% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with placements in August: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 46 (40.35%). This is a decrease from 42.5% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with placements in September: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 45 (39.47%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Thirty-two (32) counties met or exceeded National Performance for placement stability all months with placements during the reporting period. This is an increase from 31 counties the previous reporting period.

Chart 36 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their rate of placement stability. The data set includes children managed by both CD and FCCM agencies.

<b>Chart 36: Placement Stability Grouped by Circuit</b>					
<b>National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)</b>					
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
	<b>7.50+</b>	<b>6.50-7.49</b>	<b>5.50-6.49</b>	<b>4.49-5.49</b>	<b>0.00-4.48</b>
<b>July</b>	0	2	12	16	16
<b>August</b>	0	6	9	14	17
<b>September</b>	1	4	11	14	16


\*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 08AUG25; 09SEP25; 08OCT25

Analysis of Chart 36: Sixteen (16) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in July. This is a decrease from 18 circuits the previous reporting period.

Seventeen (17) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in August. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Sixteen (16) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in September. This is a decrease from 19 circuits the previous reporting period.


Chart 37 depicts the statewide rate of placement stability for each agency during the reporting period.



\*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 08AUG25; 09SEP25; 08OCT25

Analysis of Chart 37: One (1) agency (6ZK) met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from four agencies the previous reporting period.

Chart 38 depicts the percentage of cases that received a Strength rating on CFSR case reviews for placement stability. To receive a Strength rating for this measure, all moves during the period under review must be planned and for the purpose of moving toward achievement of the child's case goal or to meet the needs of the child. This chart reflects a statewide view that includes both CD and any FCCM agencies who had cases reviewed.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 4 Data, July-September 2025

Analysis of Chart 38: Of 31 cases applicable for rating of this item, 20 cases were rated a Strength. Common themes of cases with Strength ratings include maintaining the same placement for the entire period under review, the placement provider's ability to meet the child's needs, and the placement provider expressing a desire to maintain the child in their home until permanency can be achieved.

Eleven (11) cases were rated ANI. Common themes of cases with ANI ratings include unplanned placement moves, the placement provider expressing a desire for the child to be removed from the home, and placement changes due to a child being initially placed in a temporary placement setting.

## Technical Assistance

Beginning in June of 2024, Technical Assistance meetings have occurred on a quarterly basis throughout all regions of the state. The purpose of these meetings is to collaborate between CD FCCM Oversight, FCCM Quality Assurance, and Children's Division Regional Field Operations Specialists for local continuous quality improvement. The goal of bringing both FCCM and CD partners together is to review data trends, identify areas of needed improvement, set goals for the following quarter, and share best practice efforts to meet goals.

During the meetings, HB1414 data is reviewed, and informal plans are established for ways to improve the data. Emphasis has been placed on improvement of parent engagement and an increase in Worker-Parent visitation. FCCM and CD teams have been able to collaborate with one another to discuss ways to overcome barriers to meeting the metric of Worker-Parent visits. HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care January 2026

Since implementation of the collaborative meetings, Worker-Parent visits have improved from 39.40% (June 2024) to 45.00% (September 2025) for the state as a whole. In June of 2024, only one agency (6ZK) was meeting the benchmark for Worker-Parent visits. In September of 2025, that number increased to three agencies meeting the goal.

CD Oversight staff continue to visit FCCM work sites on a semiregular basis during their data entry days to provide technical assistance with accurate FACES data entry. Field Operation Specialists continue to meet with regional CD staff quarterly to provide support with accurate FACES data entry.

All areas of Technical Assistance are ongoing and regional meetings between FCCM and CD teams will continue quarterly.

## **Conclusion**

House Bill 1414 Implementation continues to be ongoing. Phase I began in October 2022, Phase II began in October 2023, and a portion of Phase III began in January 2025. There is progress being made in all areas of the work. As the data is collected, analyzed, and discussed, it is the intent of this legislation and work to make systematic recommendations to improve outcomes for children and families.

In March of 2024, a Request for Extension was made by the Response and Evaluation Team to the Director of the Department of Social Services for the postponement of one metric in Phase II and five metrics in Phase III. This request for postponement has been approved. The legal basis for this request is pursuant to 13 CSR 35-35.100(3) (E).

Phase II requires that “All case managers and supervisors successfully complete training in providing trauma-informed and trauma-based services”. The training data has proved difficult and unreliable to measure as Children’s Division and the private Foster Care Case Management agencies do not share a common platform in which to record and track staff training completion. A new training tracking system is scheduled to be implemented later in 2025 which is expected to resolve this issue.

Phase III requires measurement of multiple metrics which would require modification of the current computer system. Significant changes to the current computer system have been discontinued in order to concentrate resources on the creation of a new computer system. A Request for Proposal for the acquisition of this new computer system is anticipated to be released in Spring 2026. The new system is being designed to capture all the required data in Phase III.

On October 31, 2025, the House Bill 1414 Dashboard was published on the [HB1414 website](#). With the publication of the Dashboard, and the data contained therein, a proposal to change the reporting format of the quarterly report was submitted to the Response & Evaluation Team on December 9, 2025, for commenting. Once this commenting period ends, the proposal will be submitted to the public for commenting.

The next reporting period is January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026, with the report to be published by April 1, 2026.

For previous reports, please visit our [HB1414 website](#).