



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

---



**July 2025**

**Reporting Period: January 1, 2025, through March 31, 2025**



**Published by:**  
Children's Division  
April 2025

**Contact Information:**  
[CD.RESPONSEEVALTEAM@dss.mo.gov](mailto: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>6</b>
Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses .....	7
<b>Phase I (Reporting Period: January 1, 2025, through March 31, 2025)</b> .....	<b>10</b>
A. Safety Domain: Caseworker Monthly Visits with Children in Foster Care .....	10
B. Safety Domain: Victimization in Foster Care.....	18
C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child .....	25
D. Well-Being Domain: Medical Exam Completion (HCY/EPSTD) .....	33
E. Permanency Domain: Worker Visits with Parent.....	40
F. Permanency Domain: Reentry into Foster Care .....	47
G. Service Domain: Average Number of Workers Per Child in Care (Less than 12 Months and 12+ Months).....	54
<b>Phase II (Reporting Period: January 1, 2025, through March 31, 2025)</b> .....	<b>64</b>
H. Well-Being Domain: Placement Category/Residential Type .....	64
I. Well-Being Domain: Case Managers and Supervisors Trauma Trained/Informed.....	90
J. Permanency Domain: Timely Achievement of Child’s Court Approved Plan.....	90
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: January 1, 2025, through March 31, 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)*

<u>Phase 1 (October 2022)</u>	<u>Phase 2 (October 2023)</u>	<u>Phase 3 (October 2024)</u>
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 March 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. Four hundred and fifty-five (455) 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: December 2024)

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

Forty (40) survey responses were received from Adoptive Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Three 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.	3	0	2	32	37	95%
2	The case manager clearly communicated the adoption process and timeline of court procedures.	3	3	4	27	37	84%
3	My family understands the adoption plan and staffing process.	3	0	4	30	37	92%
4	The adoption subsidy contract was created with our feedback and our child(ren) future needs in mind.	5	2	5	25	37	81%
5	Overall, I am satisfied with the services provided during the adoption process.	4	2	4	27	37	84%



## Biological Parent Survey Responses

One hundred and thirty-nine (139) survey responses were received from Biological Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Five surveys were unable to be displayed.

Biological Parent Survey Responses							
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	% Positive Responses
1	I know how to contact my agency worker.	17	15	35	67	134	76%
2	I am satisfied with the amount of contact I have with the case manager(s).	50	14	37	33	134	52%
3	I am satisfied with the quality of contact I have with the case manager(s).	56	15	31	32	134	47%
4	My case manager responds to my needs timely.	51	16	34	33	134	50%
5	I have at least monthly visitation with my child(ren).	38	7	25	64	134	66%
6	I have a voice in developing case planning goals and decisions for my family.	72	13	15	34	134	37%
7	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.	68	17	19	30	134	37%
8	I am aware of services and activities in my community for myself and my family.	45	26	29	34	134	47%
9	The case manager(s) working with my family treats me with respect and values my opinions.	51	17	24	42	134	49%
10	The Family Support Team respects my values, beliefs, and traditions.	60	21	19	34	134	40%
11	I have someone, other than my case manager, who I can talk with if I need support or help.	47	9	26	52	134	58%
12	Agency involvement has made a positive impact in my family.	72	19	20	23	134	32%

## Resource Parent Survey Responses

One hundred and forty-six (146) survey responses were received from Resource Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Five 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.	14	10	26	91	141	83%
2	I have clear, open communication with my case manager.	20	11	24	86	141	78%
3	The case manager(s) provided adequate information on the child(ren) placed in my home (i.e. physical/mental health, behaviors, etc.)	25	12	32	72	141	74%
4	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home treats me with respect and values my opinions.	22	9	17	93	141	78%
5	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home is respectful of the child's cultural background and specific needs.	13	11	23	94	141	83%
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.	19	19	28	75	141	73%
7	I have a voice in the case planning for the child(ren) in my home.	22	23	25	71	141	68%
8	The case manager(s) visits the child(ren) in my home at least once per month.	14	5	22	100	141	87%
9	Home visits and meetings that I am to attend are scheduled with consideration for my family's schedules.	19	22	26	74	141	71%
10	I am informed of court hearings timely.	24	16	20	81	141	72%
11	I have the opportunity to provide information in court hearings.	24	15	28	74	141	72%
12	Overall, I feel supported by agency staff in doing my job.	23	16	29	73	141	72%
13	I would recommend fostering to other people in the community.	26	16	36	63	141	70%



## Older Youth (12+) Survey Responses

Forty-one (41) 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.	3	3	17	14	37	84%
2	In Family Support Team meetings, I am able to share what is important to me.	5	4	10	18	37	76%
3	I understand my case plan.	4	5	9	19	37	76%
4	I know my goals for the future.	2	3	12	20	37	86%
5	My case manager supports me in the achievement of my goals.	3	2	12	20	37	86%
6	I am informed of the date and time of court hearings.	4	3	11	19	37	81%
7	I am heard in court hearings.	4	6	11	16	37	73%
8	My case manager prepares me to speak for myself in court hearings.	6	5	11	15	37	70%
9	I am satisfied with the amount of contact I have with my case manager.	5	7	10	15	37	68%
10	I know how to contact my case manager.	3	1	12	21	37	89%
11	I understand why I have a case manager.	2	1	9	25	37	92%
12	My case manager talks with me about my concerns.	4	4	11	18	37	78%
13	My case manager responds to my needs. For example: accessing resources and providing referrals.	4	2	11	20	37	84%
14	My case manager respects my identity and culture.	2	1	10	24	37	92%
15	I feel safe in my placement.	2	1	7	27	37	92%

## Juvenile Officer Survey Responses

Sixty-eight (68) survey responses were received from Juvenile Officers. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Three 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?	6	19	29	11	65	62%
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)	7	22	27	9	65	55%
3	In general, are court reports easy to understand?	4	15	33	13	65	71%
4	Are court reports and other information given to you helpful in preparing for court?	6	14	32	13	65	69%
5	Are case managers familiar with the case at court?	3	17	35	10	65	69%
6	Are case managers prepared and knowledgeable while testifying?	2	24	28	11	65	60%
7	In general, are case managers available within a reasonable amount of time?	2	16	38	9	65	72%
8	Are case managers supportive of their clients?	0	14	41	10	65	78%
9	Do you feel you are able to provide input during Family Support Team meetings?	1	2	41	21	65	95%
10	Do you feel attorneys representing case managers help to move the case to permanency quicker?	4	13	24	24	65	74%
11	Do you feel you are able to provide input during other interactions with the team?	1	5	38	21	65	91%

## Judge Survey Responses

Twenty-two (22) survey responses were received from Judges. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety with the exclusion of one response to Question 5.

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?	4	1	3	6	8	22	41%
2	Is transportation offered/available to families to assist them in attending court hearings?	5	1	2	2	12	22	18%
3	Are foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, relative caregivers, and families given an opportunity to be heard during court proceedings?	0	0	4	17	1	22	95%
4	Are families given an opportunity to provide input during treatment planning?	0	0	3	9	10	22	55%
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	1	14	5	1	21	90%
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, developmentally appropriate manner, utilizing clear and understandable language?	0	0	5	15	2	22	91%
7	In general, are all parties present and prepared for court hearings?	0	1	13	8	0	22	95%
8	In general, are case managers knowledgeable about the case and helpful during court proceedings?	0	2	14	6	0	22	91%
		Set Hearing Times			Blocks of Time			
9	Are dockets scheduled with set hearing times or in blocks of time?	16			6		22	N/A

## Phase I Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2025 – March 31, 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.

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	January	February	March
Adair	CD	95.0%	94.8%	99.2%
	6AW		100%	100%
Andrew	CD	83.3%	100%	100%
Atchison	CD	100%	100%	93.3%
Audrain	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Barry	CD	95.0%	94.1%	92.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	96.6%	100%
Barton	CD	100%	91.7%	100%

	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Bates	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Benton	CD	100%	100%	96.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Bollinger	CD	100%	100%	95.8%
Boone	CD	99.0%	96.0%	93.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	97.8%	96.0%	98.9%
Buchanan	CD	72.5%	80.7%	81.9%
Butler	CD	98.7%	98.8%	97.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	99.2%	96.0%	92.6%
Caldwell	CD	68.2%	100%	89.5%
Callaway	CD	96.2%	98.1%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	98.2%	87.0%	98.1%
Camden	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	98.7%	98.1%	99.4%
Carroll	CD	100%	100%	100%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	100%	100%	97.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	98.1%	100%	100%
	6ZR	98.4%	100%	100%
Cedar	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Chariton	CD	94.4%	94.4%	100%
Christian	CD	100%	97.9%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	88.4%	100%	97.8%
Clark	CD	83.3%	93.5%	93.6%
Clay	CD	83.7%	86.7%	89.1%
Clinton	CD	100%	100%	96.3%
Cole	CD	96.1%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	94.6%	97.9%	100%
Cooper	CD	83.3%	84.6%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Crawford	CD	97.2%	100%	98.4%
Dade	CD	100%	100%	100%
Dallas	CD	100%	100%	95.8%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Daviess	CD	100%	97.0%	100%
DeKalb	CD	100%	94.4%	100%
Dent	CD	98.6%	98.5%	97.0%
Douglas	CD	91.4%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Dunklin	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	95.1%	93.5%	90.6%
Franklin	CD	94.2%	94.1%	97.3%

	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	90.0%	96.7%	96.7%
	6ZC	100%	100%	97.5%
Gasconade	CD	100%	100%	100%
Gentry	CD	100%	87.5%	100%
Greene	CD	97.7%	97.8%	98.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	96.3%	98.4%	99.6%
	6ZV	97.2%	92.0%	97.3%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	100%
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Henry	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Hickory	CD	100%	100%	100%
Holt	CD	100%	100%	100%
Howard	CD	91.3%	91.3%	100%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	95.8%
Howell	CD	94.4%	95.8%	98.6%
Iron	CD	98.1%	98.1%	98.1%
Jackson	CD	94.5%	93.5%	96.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	98.8%	98.4%	99.1%
	6ZR	97.5%	94.8%	97.7%
Jasper	CD	98.6%	97.7%	98.5%
	6AW	100%	90.9%	100%
	6ZL	81.0%	94.1%	98.4%
Jefferson	CD	97.9%	95.7%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	89.0%	91.6%	98.9%
	6ZB	99.2%	96.3%	99.2%
	6ZC	98.3%	98.3%	100%
Johnson	CD	96.0%	96.0%	97.8%
	6AW	100%	85.7%	100%
Knox	CD	100%	100%	100%
Laclede	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	100%	87.2%	100%
Lafayette	CD	96.4%	93.9%	94.1%
Lawrence	CD	96.7%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Lewis	CD	100%	100%	100%
Lincoln	CD	90.7%	97.2%	98.0%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Linn	CD	88.2%	97.1%	97.1%
Livingston	CD	98.3%	94.5%	98.1%
Macon	CD	98.1%	100%	100%
Madison	CD	94.3%	94.3%	96.2%
Maries	CD	100%	100%	75.0%
Marion	CD	91.8%	95.3%	94.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
McDonald	CD	97.6%	94.9%	94.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%

	6ZL	90.0%	100%	100%
Mercer	CD	100%	100%	100%
Miller	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	
Mississippi	CD	100%	100%	98.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Moniteau	CD	100%	100%	100%
Monroe	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%		
Montgomery	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Morgan	CD	96.7%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	80.0%
New Madrid	CD	97.0%	96.6%	94.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Newton	CD	95.5%	97.1%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	97.8%	100%	97.7%
Nodaway	CD	100%	100%	97.7%
Oregon	CD	93.9%	100%	91.9%
Osage	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ozark	CD	85.7%	91.7%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Pemiscot	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Perry	CD	100%	90.5%	100%
Pettis	CD	85.1%	86.2%	89.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Phelps	CD	94.4%	94.4%	94.2%
	6ZK	100%	97.1%	80.0%
Pike	CD	83.3%	100%	100%
Platte	CD	79.7%	82.1%	93.0%
Polk	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Pulaski	CD	97.8%	95.7%	82.1%
	6ZK	100%	90.6%	80.0%
Putnam	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ralls	CD	90.0%	100%	100%
Randolph	CD	93.3%	98.5%	98.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	98.8%	98.8%	98.9%
Ray	CD	100%	100%	100%
Reynolds	CD	92.9%	100%	100%
Ripley	CD	100%	93.3%	93.8%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	96.2%
Saline	CD	92.9%	96.0%	96.6%
Schuyler	CD	66.7%	76.9%	92.3%
Scotland	CD	93.8%	68.8%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Scott	CD	98.6%	100%	98.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Shannon	CD	94.4%	100%	94.7%

Shelby	CD	100%	94.7%	100%
St. Charles	CD	97.8%	97.2%	99.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
	6ZC	100%	89.0%	94.3%
St. Clair	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
St. Francois	CD	98.6%	99.3%	98.5%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
St. Louis City	CD	93.2%	85.7%	96.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	87.7%	79.1%	94.0%
	6ZB	100%	99.2%	98.3%
	6ZC	98.1%	93.5%	91.9%
St. Louis County	CD	84.1%	85.4%	95.7%
	6AW	83.3%	100%	100%
	6ZA	90.6%	82.7%	94.4%
	6ZB	99.3%	98.0%	98.1%
	6ZC	99.3%	92.7%	98.6%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	100%	100%	100%
Stoddard	CD	96.7%	96.9%	95.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	93.0%
Stone	CD	100%	100%	96.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Sullivan	CD	100%	90.0%	100%
Taney	CD	94.1%	98.6%	79.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	94.1%	96.0%	94.7%
Texas	CD	83.0%	83.0%	100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	92.3%
Vernon	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Warren	CD	100%	98.7%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Washington	CD	100%	96.3%	96.3%
	6AW	100%		
	6ZB	98.7%	98.6%	100%
Wayne	CD	98.0%	91.3%	95.0%
Webster	CD	100%	100%	96.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	100%	98.9%	89.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 1: Number of counties that met the benchmark during each month: January (76), February (73), March (85).

Number of counties that met the benchmark each month during the reporting period: 48.

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>59.0%- 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>January</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>February</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>March</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>36</b>


\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 1: Number of circuits requiring Worker Child visits in January: 46.  
Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for Worker Child visits: 31 (67.3%).

Number of circuits requiring Worker Child visits in February: 46.  
Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for Worker Child visits: 37 (80.4%).


Number of circuits requiring Worker Child visits in December: 46.  
Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for Worker Child visits: 36 (78.3%).

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, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025






\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Charts 3 & 4: Twenty-eight (28) circuits met or exceeded the benchmark for Worker Child visits in January, February, and March of 2025. This is an increase from 22 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, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 4: Number of agencies that met the benchmark during each month: January (11), February (10), March (10).

Eight (8) agencies met the benchmark all three months: 6AW, 6ZB, 6ZJ, 6ZM, 6ZO, 6ZR, 6ZV, and CD. This is an increase from four 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 32 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 5: Twenty (20) of the 32 cases available for review was 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 home during the visits to assess appropriateness and safety of the living environment. Conversations with both the child and the placement providers focused on the child’s needs, services, and case planning.

Of the 32 cases reviewed, 12 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. In three cases, it was determined that, based on the circumstance surrounding the familial interactions and placement stability, visits should have been occurring more frequently than once per month.

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

Forty-eight (48) counties met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from 47 counties the previous reporting period.

Eight (8) agencies met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from four agencies the previous reporting period.

Twenty-eight (28) circuits met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from 22 circuits the previous reporting period.

Twenty (20) cases (62.5%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for caseworker visits with children. This is a decrease from 81% 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.

County	Agency	January	February	March
Adair	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Andrew	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Atchison	CD	37.38	36.32	35.45
Audrain	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	81.77	0.00	0.00
Barry	CD	4.62	4.99	5.44
	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	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Benton	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bollinger	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Boone	CD	3.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	3.12	1.57	1.58
Buchanan	CD	6.74	6.77	7.03
Butler	CD	10.12	13.50	17.03
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	9.32	9.19	2.29
Caldwell	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Callaway	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	0.00	0.00	0.00
Camden	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	20.51
	6ZK	20.58	20.58	0.00

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Cape Girardeau	CD	0.00	0.00	1.89
Carroll	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Carter	CD	17.55	20.64	21.38
Cass	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	104.38	101.11	98.52
	6ZO	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZR	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cedar	CD	6.09	6.46	6.87
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chariton	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Christian	CD	4.19	0.00	0.00
	6AW	343.64	343.64	344.83
	6ZM	19.93	0.00	0.00
Clark	CD	6.08	6.06	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	
Clay	CD	1.86	0.00	0.00
Clinton	CD	8.75	0.00	0.00
Cole	CD	5.30	5.22	5.41
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	6.42	9.45	9.34
Cooper	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	CD	3.46	3.53	3.53
Dade	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dallas	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daviess	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
DeKalb	CD	23.25	11.91	12.21
Dent	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Douglas	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	CD	5.75	5.81	5.84
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	0.00
Franklin	CD	3.60	1.82	1.85
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	6.27	6.25	6.24
Gasconade	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gentry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	CD	4.77	5.84	5.96
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZM	6.05	6.01	5.98
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grundy	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Harrison	CD	20.66	20.31	19.92
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

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Holt	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howard	CD	11.81	11.66	11.62
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howell	CD	10.72	11.09	11.52
Iron	CD	0.00	13.61	14.08
Jackson	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZO	1.92	1.29	1.29
	6ZR	1.37	1.39	1.41
Jasper	CD	2.25	1.15	1.17
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZL	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZR	0.00	0.00	
Jefferson	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	6.90	13.78	12.66
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
Johnson	CD	2.95	2.94	5.77
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Laclede	CD	4.00	4.06	4.11
	6AW	39.45	38.20	112.57
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lafayette	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lawrence	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lewis	CD	0.00	0.00	14.56
Lincoln	CD	5.00	5.00	5.02
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Linn	CD	31.76	24.20	0.00
Livingston	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Macon	CD	14.69	14.32	14.01
Madison	CD	4.56	0.00	0.00
Maries	CD	33.47	33.28	32.21
Marion	CD	0.00	0.00	1.56
	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	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Moniteau	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Monroe	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	305.81	305.81	0.00

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Montgomery	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Morgan	CD	4.91	4.79	4.77
	6AW	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	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZL	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nodaway	CD	0.00	0.00	5.75
Oregon	CD	10.17	10.07	0.00
Osage	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ozark	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pemiscot	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	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	3.67	3.74	3.85
	6ZK	0.00	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	5.84	5.96	6.07
	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	5.36	5.37	16.18
	6AW	0.00	0.00	209.64
	6ZJ	6.75	3.34	3.35
Ray	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	CD	10.56	10.50	0.00
Ripley	CD	14.75	13.91	13.84
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saline	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Schuyler	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Scotland	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Scott	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shannon	CD	25.65	25.31	23.96
Shelby	CD	32.55	24.10	24.73
St. Charles	CD	2.23	2.18	6.50
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Clair	6ZC	3.78	3.80	3.82
	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	58.93	60.02	61.24

<b>Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
St. Francois	CD	2.31	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Louis City	CD	3.68	2.55	3.97
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	2.95	1.94	1.93
	6ZB	2.22	2.20	4.37
	6ZC	2.53	2.50	2.48
St. Louis County	CD	1.55	3.25	3.36
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	2.71	0.66	0.66
	6ZB	5.51	5.55	1.85
	6ZC	2.03	2.03	4.11
Ste. Genevieve	CD	22.66	21.75	21.20
Stoddard	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stone	CD	0.00	0.00	6.32
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Taney	CD	5.62	5.65	5.70
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZV	3.82	3.87	3.85
Texas	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vernon	CD	8.71	9.08	9.47
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warren	CD	18.09	21.85	14.61
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	12.54	12.53	12.38
Wayne	CD	11.85	11.85	11.92
	6AW			0.00
Webster	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	73.96	73.96	74.18
Worth	CD	0.00	0.00	
Wright	CD	0.00	7.21	7.08
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB14AM0) ELIPS RS5HBAM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 2: Number of counties that met the benchmark each month: January (90), February (87), March (84).

Number of counties that met the benchmark all three months in the reporting period: 80.

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>January</b>	0	2	4	40
<b>February</b>	0	1	4	41
<b>March</b>	0	1	3	42

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB14AM0) ELIPS RS5HBAM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 6: Number of circuits with victimization rates in January: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for victimization: 40 (86.9%).


Number of circuits with victimization rates in February: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for victimization: 41 (89.1%).

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for victimization in March: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for victimization: 42 (91.3%).

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



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB14AM0) ELIPS RS5HBAM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 7: Twelve (12) agencies met the goal 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

HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care  
July 2025

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.

It should be noted that CFSR Data Profiles are based on the semiannual submission of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data from states. They are produced by the Children’s Bureau and shared with Missouri approximately every six months, in February and August of each year. The chart below is from the data profile produced in August 2024 and was reported in previous quarterly reports. New data will be available when it is provided by the Children’s Bureau to Children’s Division in August 2025.

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 February 2025

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Eighty (80) counties met the goal all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from 76 counties the previous reporting period.

Twelve (12) agencies met the goal all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from 11 agencies the previous reporting period.

More than 85% of all circuits met the goal for victimization every month.

CFSR Data Profile indicates Missouri’s most recent federal fiscal year rate of victimization is 5.19, 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.

Table 3 depicts the percentage of parent child visits completed by 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 goal established by the R&E Team for this measure is 60%.

<b>Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&amp;E Goal is 60%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	51.61%	50.00%	55.04%
	6AW			0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	56.10%	50.00%	66.67%
	6AW			0.00%
Barry	CD	34.48%	24.00%	31.58%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
	6ZV	41.38%	32.26%	23.33%
Barton	CD	10.00%	14.29%	46.15%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	40.00%	29.63%	24.24%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	12.86%	11.39%	31.43%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	24.14%	17.86%	10.00%
Boone	CD	47.79%	33.96%	56.00%
	6AW	28.57%	33.33%	0.00%
	6ZJ	39.75%	36.50%	30.45%
Buchanan	CD	17.00%	20.79%	17.65%
Butler	CD	36.23%	34.72%	22.95%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	10.42%	4.17%	4.55%
Caldwell	CD	4.76%	5.26%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	68.75%	62.90%	72.41%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	29.23%	40.30%	37.74%
Camden	CD	77.27%	59.09%	86.36%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	52.94%	47.06%	52.63%
Cape Girardeau	CD	7.79%	8.44%	9.09%
Carter	CD	25.00%	50.00%	33.33%
Cass	CD	28.26%	21.43%	1.96%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	20.25%	27.85%	58.90%
	6ZR	82.35%	86.11%	91.67%
Cedar	CD	0.00%	11.54%	8.33%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

<b>Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&amp;E Goal is 60%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Christian	CD	67.50%	65.79%	63.16%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	24.32%	36.11%	32.50%
Clark	CD	32.81%	32.31%	44.44%
Clay	CD	7.04%	9.00%	11.88%
Clinton	CD	20.00%	24.14%	14.81%
Cole	CD	28.00%	17.95%	31.82%
	6AW			0.00%
	6ZJ	45.45%	52.29%	41.27%
Cooper	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	9.00%	4.44%	12.09%
Dade	CD	0.00%	44.44%	55.56%
Dallas	CD	50.00%	59.38%	62.16%
	6AW	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
	CD	6.00%	24.00%	20.83%
DeKalb	CD	6.90%	7.69%	7.69%
Dent	CD	28.05%	31.03%	37.65%
Douglas	CD	42.31%	26.67%	50.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%
Dunklin	6ZS	11.29%	12.50%	1.45%
	CD	28.40%	25.00%	26.29%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Franklin	6ZA	9.09%	29.63%	25.93%
	6ZC	56.60%	53.57%	65.91%
	CD	64.52%	59.38%	58.62%
Gasconade	CD	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	44.71%	35.88%	52.33%
Greene	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	37.13%	43.65%	43.23%
	6ZV	38.20%	44.09%	37.86%
Grundy	CD	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%
Harrison	CD	100%	0.00%	62.50%
Henry	CD	24.24%	12.90%	23.53%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	54.55%	18.18%	54.55%
Holt	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Howard	CD	0.00%	37.50%	33.33%
	6ZJ	60.00%	60.00%	55.17%
	CD	5.26%	4.05%	1.43%
Howell	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Iron	CD	10.81%	4.08%	30.56%
	6AW	14.29%	17.65%	13.33%
	6ZO	29.20%	27.75%	35.06%
Jasper	6ZR	50.00%	60.89%	57.26%
	CD	55.27%	49.45%	46.69%
	6AW	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%
Jefferson	6ZL	34.26%	50.00%	42.17%
	CD	11.11%	14.81%	8.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	7.89%	16.39%	21.85%

Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&E Goal is 60%				
County	Agency	January	February	March
	6ZB	16.25%	14.78%	14.99%
	6ZC	39.02%	31.25%	34.29%
Johnson	CD	0.00%	0.84%	1.94%
	6AW	42.86%	80.00%	75.00%
Knox	CD	50.00%	18.18%	20.00%
Laclede	CD	31.91%	37.78%	44.83%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	49.02%	34.00%	61.54%
Lafayette	CD	13.79%	10.81%	12.20%
Lawrence	CD	63.64%	63.16%	52.63%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	37.14%	32.43%	28.57%
Lewis	CD	9.68%	13.79%	24.14%
Lincoln	CD	35.66%	35.48%	34.40%
Linn	CD	2.22%	0.00%	10.42%
Livingston	CD	51.79%	27.45%	38.00%
Macon	CD	28.72%	38.04%	51.76%
Madison	CD	0.00%	13.64%	14.29%
Maries	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	17.28%	21.51%	20.34%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	28.95%	25.00%	36.84%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
	6ZL	20.00%	40.00%	53.85%
Mercer	CD	50.00%	100%	0.00%
Miller	CD	41.30%	55.81%	41.67%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	
Mississippi	CD	45.31%	52.63%	65.08%
Moniteau	CD	72.73%	72.73%	58.33%
Monroe	CD	33.33%	40.00%	66.67%
Montgomery	CD	31.71%	20.00%	46.67%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%
Morgan	CD	54.67%	55.13%	45.45%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	5.06%	6.25%	16.95%
Newton	CD	25.64%	26.32%	41.79%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	67.86%	75.00%	51.06%
Nodaway	CD	0.00%	23.08%	32.26%
Oregon	CD	7.14%	5.56%	5.71%
Osage	CD	80.00%	70.00%	76.19%
Ozark	CD	7.69%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	14.67%	11.49%	9.68%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	47.83%	21.74%	42.11%
Pettis	CD	0.00%	1.74%	0.85%
Phelps	CD	3.27%	3.87%	2.55%
	6ZK	76.19%	93.88%	96.23%
Pike	CD	66.67%	55.56%	66.67%
Platte	CD	56.47%	65.85%	30.12%

<b>Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&amp;E Goal is 60%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Polk	CD	58.82%	48.15%	43.48%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	1.76%	1.07%	0.50%
	6ZK	63.33%	87.88%	96.77%
Putnam	CD	42.86%	71.43%	57.14%
Ralls	CD	38.46%	38.46%	30.77%
Randolph	CD	40.63%	21.74%	54.29%
	6AW		0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	42.65%	36.26%	34.44%
Ray	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	28.57%	33.33%	25.00%
	6ZS	11.11%	5.26%	15.79%
Saline	CD	17.86%	17.86%	20.00%
Schuyler	CD	18.18%	11.76%	18.75%
Scotland	CD	31.82%	22.73%	22.73%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	38.96%	59.74%	50.65%
Scott	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	19.05%	0.00%	44.44%
Shelby	CD	33.94%	23.35%	25.29%
St. Charles	CD		50.00%	50.00%
	6ZB	6.90%	4.76%	1.82%
	6ZC	61.73%	52.63%	56.94%
St. Clair	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	7.78%	16.25%	10.69%
	6ZC	39.29%	16.67%	34.38%
St. Louis City	CD	2.02%	4.10%	7.22%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	7.33%	5.69%	8.74%
	6ZB	4.51%	4.55%	3.85%
	6ZC	34.09%	40.22%	28.13%
St. Louis County	CD	10.45%	6.25%	12.50%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	5.10%	8.23%	12.85%
	6ZB	3.93%	2.15%	5.67%
	6ZC	34.11%	35.61%	34.33%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	4.76%	41.46%	18.60%
Stoddard	CD	17.24%	6.06%	2.27%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	30.16%	42.86%	26.15%
Stone	CD	68.00%	57.69%	44.44%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	39.47%	10.53%	13.16%
Sullivan	CD	0.00%	22.22%	30.77%
Taney	CD	28.85%	31.79%	27.27%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%
	6ZV	41.67%	42.25%	42.11%
Texas	CD	20.83%	3.64%	7.41%

<b>Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&amp;E Goal is 60%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZK	71.43%	42.86%	42.86%
Vernon	CD	20.69%	24.14%	17.39%
	6AW	0.00%		
Warren	CD	21.88%	13.68%	21.24%
	6AW	0.00%		0.00%
Washington	CD	0.00%	0.00%	4.00%
	6ZB	10.75%	2.13%	2.25%
Wayne	CD	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%
Webster	CD	71.93%	70.21%	60.71%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Wright	CD	56.96%	38.71%	47.31%
	6AW	14.29%	0.00%	9.09%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14EMX) RS5HBEM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 3: Five (5) counties met the benchmark for January: Gasconade, Harrison, Moniteau, Osage, and Pike.

Five (5) counties met the benchmark for February: Mercer, Moniteau, Osage, Platte, and Putnam.

Five (5) counties met the benchmark for March: Harrison, Mississippi, Monroe, Osage, and Pike.

One (1) county met the benchmark all three months during the reporting period: Osage.

Three (3) counties met the benchmark two of three months during the reporting period: Harrison, Pike, and Moniteau.

Chart 9 depicts the number of circuits in relation to their percentage of monthly visits between parents and children. This data includes children managed by both Children's Division and FCCM agencies. The Response & Evaluation Team set a benchmark of 60% for this metric.

<b>Chart 9: Parent-Child Visits Grouped by Circuit</b>						
<b>R&amp;E Goal is 60%</b>						
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
	<b>0.00%- 19.99%</b>	<b>20.00%- 29.99%</b>	<b>30.00%- 39.99%</b>	<b>40.00%- 49.99%</b>	<b>50.00%- 59.99%</b>	<b>60% or greater</b>
<b>January</b>	20	5	10	9	2	0
<b>February</b>	18	9	10	6	2	1
<b>March</b>	19	6	7	10	4	0


\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14EMX) RS5HBEM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Chart 9 Analysis: Zero (0) circuits met the benchmark in January, one (1) circuit met the benchmark in February, and zero (0) circuits met the benchmark in March. The highest concentration of other circuits falls into the 0.00%-19.9% and 30.0%-39.9% ranges.

Chart 10 depicts the percentage of parent child visits completed by each agency. The Response & Evaluation Team set a benchmark of 60% for this metric.

HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care  
July 2025






\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14EMX) RS5HBEM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Chart 10 Analysis: Parent-Child Visit data reflects one agency, 6ZK, met the benchmark of 60% all three months of the reporting period. One agency, 6ZR, met the benchmark two of three months of the reporting period.

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 11 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 11: Of 31 cases applicable for rating of this item, 13 received an overall rating of Strength, indicating that both the frequency and quality were sufficient.

Eighteen (18) 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, visitation was suspended by court order due to both parents' incarceration. However, because there were no efforts to facilitate other forms of communication between the parents and children, this case received an ANI rating. In another case, an ANI rating was given due to the agency's lack of effort to seek out transportation assistance for the mother to visit her child placed in a residential setting 1.5 hours away from the mother.

Chart 12 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 12: Twenty-eight (28) cases were applicable for review regarding the frequency of the child's visits with the mother. Of those, 14 were rated Strength and 14 were rated ANI. Twenty-one (21) cases were applicable for review of the frequency of the child's visits with the father. Of those, 13 were rated Strength and eight 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.

Twenty (20) cases were applicable for review regarding the quality of the caseworker's visits with the mother. Of those, 17 were rated Strength and three were rated ANI. Fifteen (15) cases were applicable for review of the quality of the caseworker's visits with the father. Thirteen (13) were rated Strength and two 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:

Three (3) counties met the benchmark all three months. This is a decrease from four counties the previous reporting period.

No circuit met the benchmark all three months. This is a decrease from one circuit the previous reporting period.

One (1) agency met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from zero agencies the previous reporting period.

Thirteen (13) of 32 cases (41.9%) reviewed for CFSR received a rating of Strength meaning they met the requirements for both frequency and quality. This is a decrease from 51.6% the previous reporting period.

Parent-Child visits may be underrepresented in the data. Information related to parent-child visitation has been difficult to identify and extract from FACES due to irregularities in the location of documentation in the system.

Barriers to accurate data collections include:

1. There are many options to select a person's relationship with a child and if not entered correctly the visit is not counted in the data.
2. Several steps need to be taken in specific screens in FACES for a parent-child visit to be captured in the data. It is believed that some staff are entering these visits elsewhere in FACES (e.g., as contacts) causing those parent/child visits to be uncounted.

Technical Assistance has been provided from the Quality Assurance teams to Children's Division and Foster Care Case Management staff about how and where to enter the parent-child visits within FACES. This assistance will be ongoing.

## 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%.

County	Agency	January	February	March
Adair	CD	80.00%	100%	100%
Atchison	CD		100%	100%
Audrain	CD	100%	0.00%	100%
Barry	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Barton	CD	100%	100%	
Bates	CD		100%	
Benton	CD	85.71%	100%	100%
Bollinger	CD		0.00%	
Boone	CD	100%		0.00%
	6ZJ	100%	91.67%	100%
Buchanan	CD	33.33%	66.67%	25.00%
Butler	CD	100%	0.00%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	83.33%
Callaway	CD	90.91%	100%	100%
Camden	CD			80.00%

<b>Table 4: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZK		0.00%	
Cape Girardeau	CD	100%		80.00%
Carroll				0.00%
Cass	CD	33.33%	66.67%	
	6ZR	100%		100%
Chariton	CD	0.00%		
Christian	CD	66.67%	100%	41.67%
	6ZM		100%	
Clark	CD	100%	100%	100%
Clay	CD	25.00%	33.33%	22.22%
Clinton	CD	0.00%		
Cole	CD		100%	55.56%
	6ZJ	100%		
Cooper	CD	0.00%	0.00%	
Crawford	CD		33.33%	10.00%
Dallas	CD	66.67%	100%	
Dent	CD	0.00%		0.00%
Douglas	CD	66.67%	100%	100%
Dunklin	CD	66.67%	100%	100%
	6ZS	0.00%	33.33%	100%
Franklin	CD	100%	85.71%	
	6ZC	100%		100%
Gasconade	CD	100%		
Greene	CD	33.33%	68.75%	54.55%
	6ZM	91.67%	75.00%	100%
	6ZV	100%	83.33%	80.00%
Grundy	CD		100%	100%
Harrison	CD	100%		
Henry	CD	50.00%	100%	100%
Hickory	CD		100%	100%
Howell	CD			14.29%
Iron	CD	0.00%		0.00%
Jackson	CD	77.78%	63.16%	100%
	6ZO	100%	100%	87.50%
	6ZR	66.67%	81.82%	92.31%
Jasper	CD	80.00%	100%	60.00%
	6ZL	100%	100%	100%
Jefferson	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	85.71%	42.86%	100%
	6ZB	100%		100%
	6ZC			83.33%
Johnson	CD	50.00%	66.67%	100%
Knox	CD	100%		100%
Laclede	CD	100%		100%
	6ZK		0.00%	
Lafayette	CD	16.67%	100%	100%
Lawrence	CD	0.00%		
	6ZV			100%
Lincoln	CD			100%
Linn	CD	0.00%		
Livingston	CD		100%	0.00%

<b>Table 4: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Macon	CD	0.00%	100%	
Madison	CD			100%
Marion	CD	100%	71.43%	100%
McDonald	CD	0.00%	100%	
	6ZL	100%	100%	100%
Miller	CD	100%	100%	
Mississippi	CD	33.33%	100%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD		0.00%	
Monroe	CD		100%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	100%		100%
New Madrid	CD	0.00%		50.00%
Newton	CD	20.00%	100%	100%
	6ZL	33.33%		
Nodaway	CD		40.00%	
Oregon	CD	0.00%		
Ozark	CD	100%		
Pemiscot	CD	81.82%	62.50%	0.00%
Perry	CD	100%		
Pettis	CD		33.33%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	80.00%	100%	100%
Platte	CD		50.00%	
Polk	CD		100%	
Pulaski	CD	0.00%	15.38%	10.00%
	6ZK	100%	100%	
Putnam	CD	100%		0.00%
Randolph	CD	0.00%		100%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Ray	CD			0.00%
Reynolds	CD		0.00%	
Ripley	CD		50.00%	
Saline	CD		100%	100%
Schuyler	CD	66.67%		
Scott	CD		100%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	100%	100%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	100%		
St. Charles	CD	100%	100%	80.00%
	6ZB	100%		
	6ZC		100%	100%
St. Clair	CD	100%		100%
St. Francois	CD	100%	71.43%	100%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
St. Louis City	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	100%	87.50%	87.50%
	6ZB	100%	100%	50.00%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
St. Louis County	CD	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
	6ZA	100%	100%	83.33%
	6ZB	100%	100%	85.71%
	6ZC	100%	83.33%	100%

<b>Table 4: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&amp;E Goal is 98%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Ste. Genevieve	CD			0.00%
Stoddard	CD	50.00%	71.43%	92.31%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Stone	CD			100%
	6ZV	100%		100%
Sullivan	CD		0.00%	
Taney	CD	66.67%	14.29%	57.14%
	6ZV	16.67%	100%	100%
Texas	CD	75.00%		100%
	6ZK			100%
Vernon	CD		100%	100%
Warren	CD		80.00%	100%
Washington	CD			0.00%
	6ZB	100%	100%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	0.00%		0.00%
Webster	CD		100%	100%
Wright	CD	40.00%		

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414F) RS5HBFM0, 10MAR2025; 08APR2025; 09MAY2025

Analysis of Table 4: Number of counties requiring HCY exams for January: 69.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 26 (37.6%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for February: 68.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 34 (50.0%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for March: 72.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 33 (45.8%).

Twenty-two (22) counties met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required.

Chart 13 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 13: 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>0.0%- 24.9%</b>	<b>25.0%- 39.9%</b>	<b>40.0%- 64.9%</b>	<b>65.0%- 79.9%</b>	<b>80.0%- 97.9%</b>	<b>98% or greater</b>
<b>January</b>	7	6	7	4	8	10
<b>February</b>	3	4	5	7	6	19
<b>March</b>	9	1	8	3	8	14

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414F) RS5HBFM0, 10MAR2025; 08APR2025; 09MAY2025




Analysis of Chart 13: Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for January: 42.  
 Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 10 (23.8%).

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for February: 44.  
 Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 19 (43.2%).

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for March: 40.  
 Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 14 (32.5%)

Two (2) circuits met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required: Circuit 28 & Circuit 45.

Chart 14 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.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414F) RS5HBFM0, 10MAR2025; 08APR2025; 09MAY2025

Analysis of Chart 14: No agency met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. Four (4) agencies (6ZB, 6ZJ, 6ZL & 6ZO) met the benchmark two out of the three months during the 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 15 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 15: Of the 32 cases reviewed, 14 were rated Strength, indicating all physical health needs, including dental, were assessed, and addressed. Eighteen (18) were rated ANI. In 17 of the 18 cases rated ANI, the targeted child's dental health needs were not appropriately assessed and/or addressed. In one case rated ANI, the child was diagnosed with asthma and was prescribed an inhaler. The child's current foster placement was unaware of the child's asthma diagnosis and the need for an inhaler.

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 16 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 16: Of 25 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. Ten (10) cases were rated ANI. Five cases were rated ANI, at least partly, due to the agency's failure to appropriately address the child's mental/behavioral health once those needs had been identified. Four cases were rated ANI because the agency did not provide appropriate oversight of prescription medications by discussing medication management during monthly worker/child visits with the placement provider.

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Twenty-two (22) counties met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required. This is a decrease from 33 counties from the previous reporting period.

Two (2) circuits met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required. This is a decrease from five circuits the previous reporting period.

No agency met the benchmark for HCY exams in all months where HCY exams were required. This is a decrease from two agencies the previous reporting period.

When comparing this quarter's CFSR results to the previous reporting period, there was a 6.2% decrease in cases receiving an overall Strength rating for Item 17 and a 21.1% 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 5 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 5: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	January	February	March
Adair	CD	54.9%	59.6%	51.7%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
Andrew	CD	83.3%	100%	100%
Atchison	CD	84.0%	44.0%	69.2%
Audrain	CD	83.6%	81.8%	83.9%
	6AW	0.0%	100%	0.0%
Barry	CD	51.0%	61.2%	68.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	49.1%	62.3%	35.1%
Barton	CD	76.9%	37.5%	61.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bates	CD	66.7%	67.6%	52.5%
	6AW	0.0%	50.0%	100%
Benton	CD	54.4%	61.2%	56.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Bollinger	CD	51.3%	42.5%	50.0%
Boone	CD	54.0%	60.6%	63.3%
	6AW	25.0%	14.3%	20.0%
	6ZJ	34.2%	35.2%	31.0%
Buchanan	CD	39.0%	28.9%	27.0%
Butler	CD	65.6%	61.7%	52.7%
	6AW	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	43.3%	40.0%	38.5%
Caldwell	CD	31.0%	40.5%	35.1%
Callaway	CD	75.7%	65.8%	81.6%
	6AW	57.1%	40.0%	60.0%
	6ZJ	30.3%	27.9%	33.3%
Camden	CD	92.7%	81.0%	83.3%
	6AW	28.6%	14.3%	20.0%
	6ZK	47.8%	0.0%	64.0%
Cape Girardeau	CD	53.1%	55.5%	63.0%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	100%	0.0%
Carter	CD	62.5%	92.3%	76.9%
Cass	CD	57.5%	61.4%	76.3%
	6AW	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%
	6ZO	43.0%	44.6%	47.2%
	6ZR	66.0%	56.4%	54.8%
Cedar	CD	59.1%	32.5%	54.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	58.3%	26.1%	63.6%
Christian	CD	73.6%	72.9%	73.5%

	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZM	40.6%	47.9%	48.6%
Clark	CD	27.4%	29.6%	49.4%
Clay	CD	37.3%	47.7%	51.6%
Clinton	CD	48.8%	55.3%	63.2%
Cole	CD	46.1%	47.6%	40.6%
	6AW	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	39.9%	38.8%	48.8%
Cooper	CD	26.3%	31.6%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	44.3%	43.6%	38.6%
Dade	CD	33.3%	55.6%	55.6%
Dallas	CD	57.1%	75.0%	69.2%
	6AW	0.0%	28.6%	42.9%
Daviess	CD	31.0%	63.8%	65.5%
DeKalb	CD	33.3%	55.2%	42.9%
Dent	CD	43.9%	64.2%	58.8%
Douglas	CD	59.6%	55.3%	57.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Dunklin	CD	44.4%	50.0%	47.8%
	6ZS	34.0%	34.0%	27.9%
Franklin	CD	46.1%	36.2%	50.9%
	6AW	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%
	6ZA	11.4%	18.2%	29.5%
	6ZC	81.2%	77.8%	76.7%
Gasconade	CD	67.4%	55.3%	61.9%
Gentry	CD	64.3%	64.3%	50.0%
Greene	CD	52.1%	49.1%	56.0%
	6AW	17.6%	11.8%	10.5%
	6ZM	40.5%	50.0%	57.0%
	6ZV	38.3%	37.5%	44.6%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	85.7%
Harrison	CD	100%	78.9%	84.2%
Henry	CD	40.5%	45.2%	61.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	90.9%	90.9%	58.3%
Holt	CD	72.7%	50.0%	72.7%
Howard	CD	81.4%	86.0%	66.7%
	6ZJ	43.5%	56.5%	59.5%
Howell	CD	28.1%	39.5%	44.7%
Iron	CD	40.8%	41.0%	37.3%
Jackson	CD	48.6%	48.1%	53.9%
	6AW	11.1%	12.5%	18.2%
	6ZO	33.3%	46.4%	48.5%
	6ZR	49.3%	41.6%	45.3%
Jasper	CD	57.8%	60.6%	59.8%
	6AW	22.2%	11.1%	22.2%
	6ZL	33.1%	40.4%	45.4%
Jefferson	CD	46.3%	44.8%	46.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	22.3%	35.6%	46.2%
	6ZB	30.8%	36.1%	34.3%
	6ZC	45.8%	46.3%	46.0%

Johnson	CD	70.9%	60.2%	60.0%
	6AW	40.0%	40.0%	50.0%
Knox	CD	25.0%	40.0%	64.3%
Laclede	CD	73.1%	67.3%	72.3%
	6AW	20.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	6ZK	74.2%	51.5%	64.2%
Lafayette	CD	32.5%	63.8%	68.0%
Lawrence	CD	80.0%	81.7%	81.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	28.3%	29.2%	46.9%
Lewis	CD	48.6%	57.9%	55.3%
Lincoln	CD	50.6%	59.1%	54.4%
Linn	CD	60.8%	55.8%	58.2%
Livingston	CD	64.8%	74.0%	81.5%
Macon	CD	44.0%	41.8%	54.5%
Madison	CD	70.1%	54.4%	54.5%
Maries	CD	41.2%	47.1%	76.9%
Marion	CD	27.9%	38.5%	44.4%
	6AW	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
McDonald	CD	55.2%	58.5%	70.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	6ZL	37.8%	67.6%	48.4%
Mercer	CD	100%	100%	100%
Miller	CD	69.8%	66.7%	69.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
Mississippi	CD	47.1%	55.3%	66.7%
	6AW	100%	0.0%	100%
Moniteau	CD	71.7%	36.4%	25.0%
Monroe	CD	62.5%	0.0%	23.5%
	6AW	0.0%		
Montgomery	CD	70.2%	76.5%	70.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	67.6%	74.3%	69.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
New Madrid	CD	75.3%	63.8%	50.0%
Newton	CD	66.7%	54.3%	51.5%
	6AW	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%
	6ZL	61.4%	71.2%	57.4%
Nodaway	CD	68.6%	66.2%	71.1%
Oregon	CD	30.4%	35.9%	30.8%
Osage	CD	72.5%	80.0%	78.4%
Ozark	CD	53.3%	38.9%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	72.1%	66.7%	55.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Perry	CD	15.8%	21.1%	15.6%
Pettis	CD	30.6%	35.4%	45.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	42.0%	51.2%	60.4%
	6ZK	69.4%	53.7%	43.1%
Pike	CD	73.7%	52.6%	80.0%
Platte	CD	33.3%	41.7%	57.6%
Polk	CD	56.4%	40.9%	57.1%

	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pulaski	CD	31.3%	19.8%	22.1%
	6ZK	53.1%	49.0%	54.2%
Putnam	CD	90.9%	83.3%	50.0%
Ralls	CD	58.8%	58.8%	47.1%
Randolph	CD	44.9%	49.4%	62.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	35.3%	45.5%	38.0%
Ray	CD	43.5%	43.5%	18.2%
Reynolds	CD	62.2%	54.5%	63.6%
Ripley	CD	47.8%	47.6%	35.0%
	6ZS	73.8%	66.7%	82.9%
Saline	CD	53.2%	53.7%	70.8%
Schuyler	CD	38.5%	26.3%	61.1%
Scotland	CD	64.0%	48.0%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	44.4%	49.2%	51.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%
Shannon	CD	10.3%	28.6%	63.6%
Shelby	CD	48.0%	25.0%	59.3%
St. Charles	CD	57.8%	46.8%	47.3%
	6AW		50.0%	50.0%
	6ZB	25.0%	33.3%	28.1%
	6ZC	55.3%	35.9%	49.0%
St. Clair	CD	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	69.1%	62.9%	72.1%
	6ZC	60.8%	74.3%	67.6%
St. Louis City	CD	27.8%	24.0%	22.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	20.0%	19.0%	19.6%
	6ZB	17.6%	15.9%	24.3%
	6ZC	34.3%	40.4%	30.8%
St. Louis County	CD	36.5%	21.1%	34.2%
	6AW	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	6ZA	16.5%	16.7%	19.7%
	6ZB	21.1%	20.2%	18.7%
	6ZC	40.8%	35.5%	36.8%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	55.6%	63.1%	62.7%
Stoddard	CD	33.3%	34.7%	44.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	51.3%	59.2%	37.8%
Stone	CD	91.4%	68.6%	77.8%
	6AW	33.3%	0.0%	20.0%
	6ZV	13.3%	62.2%	31.8%
Sullivan	CD	25.0%	44.4%	76.9%
Taney	CD	39.3%	42.9%	34.3%
	6AW	14.8%	0.0%	4.0%
	6ZV	51.0%	47.8%	56.4%
Texas	CD	17.8%	27.6%	28.8%
	6ZK	39.1%	43.5%	52.6%
Vernon	CD	66.7%	71.1%	76.5%
	6AW	0.0%	100%	100%


Warren	CD	45.8%	34.9%	35.0%
	6AW	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	CD	45.7%	44.1%	28.6%
	6ZB	43.9%	22.1%	29.2%
Wayne	CD	35.5%	25.4%	38.1%
Webster	CD	75.6%	79.5%	74.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Wright	CD	62.7%	65.9%	78.1%
	6AW	33.3%	15.4%	23.1%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 5: Number of counties that met the benchmark each month: January (26), February (37), March (49).


Twenty-two (22) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period: Andrew, Cape Girardeau, Carter, Gasconade, Gentry, Grundy, Harrison, Hickory, Holt, Lincoln, Linn, Livingston, Madison, Mercer, New Madrid, Nodaway, Osage, Pike, Putnam, Reynolds, St. Francois, and Ste. Genevieve. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Charts 17 & 18 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 set a benchmark of 50%.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025






\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Charts 17 & 18: Thirteen (13) circuits met the benchmark for worker parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 15 circuits the previous reporting period.

Chart 19 depicts the percentage of parents of children in foster care that were visited by each agency. The Response & Evaluation Team set a benchmark of 50%.




\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 19: One (1) agency, CD, met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. One (1) agency, 6ZK, met the benchmark two of three months during the reporting period. This is no change from 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.

Chart 20 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 20: Twenty-nine (29) cases were applicable for review regarding the frequency of the caseworker's visits with the mother. Of those, 17 were rated Strength and 12 were rated ANI. Thirty-two (32) were applicable for review of the frequency of the caseworker's visits with the father. Of those, 13 were rated Strength and 19 were rated ANI.

All cases received a rating of ANI for the frequency of visits due to those visits occurring less than monthly with few or inconsistent attempts to engage parents in monthly visits. Most cases receiving a Strength rating included those where in-person visits occurred at least monthly. If visits did not occur monthly, the agency made concerted efforts to engage the parent(s) through in-person visit attempts, phone calls, and emails.

Thirty-two (32) cases were applicable for review regarding the quality of the caseworker's visits with the mother. Of those, 24 were rated Strength and eight were rated ANI. Twenty-four (24) cases were applicable for review of the quality of the caseworker's visits with the father. Fifteen (15) cases were rated Strength and nine 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. In one case rated ANI, some of the in-person visits were completed during Family Support Team meetings where the tone of the meetings would become argumentative and affected the ability to have quality conversations between the agency worker and parent. In another case, although the father had been visited with monthly, and the conversations centered around worries, successes, case planning, and needed services, because the agency worker made no attempts to visit with the father in his home to accurately assess for the safety and wellbeing in the father's living environment, the case received an ANI rating.

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Twenty-two (22) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Thirteen (13) circuits met the benchmark for worker parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 15 circuits the previous reporting period.

One (1) agency, CD, met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period. 6ZK met the benchmark two of three months during the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Quarterly CFSR case review results indicate the frequency of worker visits with mothers (58.6%) and fathers (40.6%) is below the federal goal of 95%. The quality of worker visits with mothers (75.0%) and fathers (62.5%) was also below the federal goal. When comparing this quarter's CFSR results to the previous reporting period, there was improvement in both the frequency and quality of worker visits with fathers and a slight decrease in the frequency and quality of visits with mothers.

Twenty-nine (29) cases were applicable for review of both frequency and quality of worker visits with mothers and fathers. Of those, 11 (37.9%) received an overall Strength rating, meaning both frequency and quality were sufficient. This is a decrease from 41.4% 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 6 depicts children who reentered care in January, February, and March 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.

<b>Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – National Performance is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	7.0%	7.1%	7.8%
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	42.9%	42.9%	60.0%
Audrain	CD	5.0%	4.8%	4.2%
Barry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bates	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	5.0%	4.8%	4.8%
Boone	CD	4.4%	4.0%	2.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Buchanan	CD	3.7%	3.6%	3.7%
Butler	CD	9.6%	9.5%	10.3%
	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%
Cape Girardeau	CD	2.4%	2.4%	1.1%
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	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clay	CD	1.6%	3.0%	2.8%
Clinton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cole	CD	9.8%	9.8%	9.5%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6ZB	0.0%		
	6ZJ	32.1%	33.3%	33.3%
Cooper	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
	6ZB	0.0%		
	6ZR		0.0%	0.0%
Dade	CD			0.0%
Dallas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – National Performance is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Daviess	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DeKalb	CD	28.6%	28.6%	33.3%
Dent	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	CD	21.1%	22.2%	23.5%
Dunklin	CD	5.2%	10.0%	11.1%
	6ZS	18.8%	13.3%	12.5%
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	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	5.4%	3.5%	3.4%
	6ZM	5.1%	5.7%	6.3%
	6ZT	25.0%	25.0%	
	6ZV	0.0%	25.0%	20.0%
Grundy	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harrison	CD	25.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Henry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%		
Howell	CD	8.3%	7.1%	6.7%
Iron	CD	5.6%	5.0%	5.3%
Jackson	CD	3.7%	3.1%	3.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	2.8%	3.4%	3.3%
	6ZR	3.0%	2.7%	4.7%
Jasper	CD	1.1%	1.2%	1.4%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jefferson	CD	6.6%	5.0%	5.3%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	5.0%	4.5%	4.7%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Knox	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Laclede	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lafayette	CD	12.5%	11.1%	11.1%
Lawrence	CD	11.1%	6.9%	3.6%
	6ZT	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lewis	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lincoln	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Linn	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Livingston	CD	20.0%	17.6%	26.3%
Macon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	CD	0.0%		0.0%
Maries	CD	7.7%	6.3%	5.9%

<b>Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – National Performance is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Marion	CD	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
McDonald	CD	2.2%	2.3%	2.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	22.2%	20.0%	8.3%
Mercer	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Miller	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mississippi	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
Monroe	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Montgomery	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	10.0%	11.1%	11.1%
New Madrid	CD	6.5%	6.9%	7.4%
Newton	CD	4.3%	3.3%	3.7%
	6ZL	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Nodaway	CD	26.5%	28.1%	31.0%
Oregon	CD	9.1%	11.1%	12.5%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	9.1%	7.5%	7.1%
Perry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pettis	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	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%
Pulaski	CD	5.8%	7.1%	7.1%
	6ZK	25.0%	22.2%	22.2%
Putnam	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ralls	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Randolph	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
Ray	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reynolds	CD	10.0%	12.5%	12.5%
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%
Shannon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shelby	CD	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Charles	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Clair	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – National Performance is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
St. Francois	CD	5.3%	6.1%	5.9%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Louis City	CD	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	3.2%	3.3%	3.2%
	6ZC	33.3%	35.0%	31.8%
St. Louis County	CD	3.2%	3.1%	2.9%
	6ZA	2.3%	4.2%	4.0%
	6ZB	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	90.9%	90.9%	90.9%
Stoddard	CD	8.7%	6.5%	6.8%
	6ZS	8.7%	8.7%	8.3%
Stone	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	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%
	6ZT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Texas	CD	20.0%	17.6%	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	0.0%	7.1%	7.7%
Wayne	CD	11.1%	12.5%	10.5%
Webster	CD	3.1%	6.1%	3.2%
Worth	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wright	CD	3.7%	4.2%	3.8%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414C) ELIPS RS5HBCM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 6: Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance of 5.6%: January (82), February (82), March (85).

Seventy-nine (79) counties met the benchmark in all months with reentry data during the reporting period.

Chart 21 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 21: 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%</b>	<b>0%-5.6%</b>
<b>January</b>	2	1	7	36
<b>February</b>	2	1	8	35
<b>March</b>	3	1	7	35

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414C) ELIPS RS5HBCM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 21: Number of circuits with reentries in January: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 36 (78.2%)


Number of circuits with reentries in February: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 35 (76.0%)

Number of circuits with reentries in March: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 35 (76.0%)

Chart 22 reflects children who reentered care in January, February, and March of 2025. The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or less. A lower percentage is desirable.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414C) ELIPS RS5HBCM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 22: Nine (9) agencies performed at or below the National Performance in all three months of the reporting period. Two (2) agencies 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.

It should be noted that CFSR Data Profiles are based on the semiannual submission of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data from states. They are produced by the Children's Bureau and shared with Missouri approximately every six months, in February and August of each year. The chart below is from the data profile produced in February 2025 and was reported in previous quarterly reports. New data will be available when it is provided by the Children's Bureau to Children's Division in August of 2025.

Chart 23 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 February 2025

Analysis of Chart 23: On the most recent Missouri Data Profile, released in February of 2025, performance for Reentry into Foster Care was unable to be calculated. This happens when a state exceeds the data quality limit on one or more data quality checks completed for the data indicator, or there is missing AFCARS and/or NCADS submissions.

#### Data Analysis Summary:

Seventy-nine (79) counties met the benchmark all three months during the reporting period. This is an increase from 74 counties the previous reporting period.

More than 75% of all circuits met the benchmark for reentry all three months of the reporting period.

Nine (9) agencies met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from seven 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 7 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>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	1.87	1.70	1.49
Andrew	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Atchison	CD	1.80	2.00	1.83
Audrain	CD	1.62	1.62	1.45
Barry	CD	1.25	1.25	1.50
	6ZV	2.20	1.83	1.91
Barton	CD	1.33	1.43	1.43
Bates	CD	1.20	1.19	1.25
Benton	CD	1.10	1.10	1.08
Bollinger	CD	1.00	1.00	1.25
Boone	CD	1.31	1.50	1.54
	6AW			2.00
	6ZJ	1.43	1.32	1.40
Buchanan	CD	1.73	1.75	1.55
Butler	CD	1.19	1.37	1.45
	6ZS	1.39	1.45	1.52
Caldwell	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Callaway	CD	1.11	1.10	1.31
	6ZJ	2.45	3.00	3.00
Camden	CD	1.88	1.50	1.27
	6ZK	2.14	1.75	1.75
Cape Girardeau	CD	1.43	1.45	1.46
Carroll	CD			1.00
Carter	CD	1.00	1.00	2.00
Cass	CD	1.04	1.04	1.04
	6ZO	1.32	1.57	1.65
	6ZR	1.71	1.85	1.79
Cedar	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Chariton	CD	1.25	1.00	1.00
Christian	CD	1.21	1.36	1.36
	6ZM	2.62	2.50	2.29
Clark	CD	2.06	2.07	1.92
Clay	CD	1.43	1.36	1.48
Clinton	CD	1.00	1.00	1.33
Cole	CD	1.62	1.81	1.76
	6ZJ	1.56	1.54	1.67
Cooper	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Crawford	CD	1.46	1.74	1.58
Dallas	CD	1.25	1.20	1.33
	6AW		3.00	3.00
Daviess	CD	1.23	1.30	1.30
DeKalb	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dent	CD	1.49	1.41	1.57
Douglas	CD	1.25	1.25	1.40
Dunklin	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	6ZS	1.79	1.57	1.52
Franklin	CD	1.69	1.58	1.64
	6ZA	2.00	2.00	2.00
	6ZC	2.26	2.09	2.30
Gasconade	CD	1.06	1.06	1.07
Gentry	CD	1.33	1.33	1.00
Greene	CD	1.21	1.20	1.19
	6AW	2.00	3.00	3.00
	6ZM	1.55	1.50	1.54
	6ZV	2.07	2.02	1.73
Grundy	CD	1.67	1.00	1.00
Harrison	CD	1.00	1.13	1.17
Henry	CD	1.16	1.10	1.10
	6AW	2.00	2.00	
Hickory	CD	1.17	1.14	1.14
Holt	CD	1.75	1.75	1.75
Howard	CD	2.71	1.50	1.50
	6ZJ	1.23	1.23	1.09
Howell	CD	1.50	1.64	1.55
Iron	CD	2.21	3.47	3.21
Jackson	CD	1.35	1.13	1.16
	6ZO	1.69	1.69	1.70
	6ZR	2.00	1.87	1.95
Jasper	CD	1.28	1.33	1.32
	6ZL	1.54	1.41	1.50
Jefferson	CD	1.00	1.07	1.08
	6ZA	1.60	1.09	1.08
	6ZB	1.52	1.50	1.38
	6ZC	2.20	2.00	1.68
Johnson	CD	1.03	1.03	1.04
Knox	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Laclede	CD	1.11	1.09	1.00
	6AW		2.00	2.00
	6ZK	2.15	2.43	2.71

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Lafayette	CD	1.32	1.35	1.25
Lawrence	CD	1.25	1.29	1.00
	6ZV	2.38	2.20	2.09
Lewis	CD	2.21	2.11	2.13
Lincoln	CD	1.40	1.45	1.39
Linn	CD	1.20	1.00	1.00
Livingston	CD	1.45	1.65	1.39
Macon	CD	1.39	1.37	1.30
Madison	CD	1.33	1.50	1.55
Maries	CD	1.50	1.50	1.75
Marion	CD	1.69	1.61	1.58
McDonald	CD	1.07	1.08	1.08
	6AW	2.00	2.00	
	6ZL	1.38	1.53	1.42
Mercer	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Miller	CD	1.00	1.00	1.35
Mississippi	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Moniteau	CD	1.40	1.00	1.00
Monroe	CD	1.13	1.22	1.00
Montgomery	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Morgan	CD	1.08	1.00	1.08
New Madrid	CD	1.35	1.35	1.26
Newton	CD	1.11	1.10	1.16
	6ZL	1.41	1.39	1.18
Nodaway	CD	1.35	1.13	1.13
Oregon	CD	1.29	1.64	1.69
Osage	CD	1.16	1.25	1.29
Ozark	CD	1.20	1.00	1.00
Pemiscot	CD	1.34	1.30	1.27
Perry	CD	1.00	1.17	1.18
Pettis	CD	1.37	1.37	1.32
Phelps	CD	1.51	1.25	1.28
	6ZK	2.06	1.95	1.96
Pike	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Platte	CD	1.31	1.27	1.40
Polk	CD	1.75	1.75	1.86
Pulaski	CD	1.79	1.70	1.88
	6ZK	2.24	1.82	1.67
Putnam	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ralls	CD	2.00	2.00	2.33
Randolph	CD	1.31	1.26	1.31
	6ZJ	1.63	1.51	1.49
Ray	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Reynolds	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ripley	CD	1.30	1.33	1.53
	6ZS	1.89	1.89	1.80
Saline	CD	1.35	1.07	1.05
Schuyler	CD	1.50	1.40	1.40
Scotland	CD	2.57	2.57	2.57
Scott	CD	1.91	1.56	1.48
Shannon	CD	1.55	1.54	1.50

<b>Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care &lt;12 Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Shelby	CD	1.43	1.20	1.25
St. Charles	CD	1.74	1.69	1.59
	6ZB	1.89	2.11	2.31
	6ZC	2.19	2.55	2.48
St. Clair	CD	1.50	1.50	1.00
St. Francois	CD	1.40	1.52	1.46
	6ZC	1.45	1.45	1.80
St. Louis City	CD	1.47	1.46	1.32
	6ZA	1.53	1.41	1.44
	6ZB	1.76	1.53	1.63
	6ZC	1.82	1.84	1.68
St. Louis County	CD	1.58	1.56	1.53
	6ZA	1.75	1.74	1.72
	6ZB	1.67	1.73	1.87
	6ZC	1.58	1.64	1.57
Ste. Genevieve	CD	1.09	1.09	1.00
Stoddard	CD	1.12	1.04	1.48
	6ZS	1.97	1.89	1.67
Stone	CD	1.67	1.67	1.50
	6ZV	2.63	2.88	2.31
Sullivan	CD	2.33	1.80	2.00
Taney	CD	1.26	1.25	1.17
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
	6ZV	1.84	1.68	1.79
Texas	CD	1.27	1.43	1.50
	6ZK	1.80	1.80	1.67
Vernon	CD	2.00	2.50	1.33
Warren	CD	1.00	1.03	1.03
Washington	CD	1.33	1.33	1.25
	6ZB	1.70	1.61	2.36
Wayne	CD	1.22	1.70	1.68
Webster	CD	1.17	1.17	1.20
Wright	CD	1.00	1.00	1.07
	6AW	2.50	2.50	3.00

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414B) ELIPS RS5HBBM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 7: Average number of workers for children who were in foster care less than 12 months: January (1 to 2.71), February (1 to 3.47), March (1 to 3.21).


Chart 24 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 24: 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>3.0-4.0</b>	<b>2.1-3.0</b>	<b>1.1-2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>January</b>	0	3	42	1
<b>February</b>	0	4	41	1
<b>March</b>	0	1	44	1

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414B) ELIPS RS5HBBM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 24: The majority of circuits have an average of 1.1-2.0 workers for children in care less than 12 months.

Chart 25 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.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414B) ELIPS RS5HBBM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 25: Agencies averaged anywhere from 1.36 to 2.43 workers for children in foster care less than 12 months. This is an increase from 1.36 to 2.25 the previous reporting period.

Table 8 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.

<b>Table 8: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	3.74	3.56	3.60
	6AW		18.00	18.00
Andrew	CD	4.00	1.00	1.00
Atchison	CD	2.20	2.00	2.00

<b>Table 8: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Audrain	CD	2.59	2.59	2.44
	6AW	3.00	3.50	3.50
Barry	CD	3.70	3.60	3.67
	6AW	5.33	5.20	5.20
	6ZV	3.53	3.45	3.48
Barton	CD	3.00	3.64	3.80
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
Bates	CD	1.33	1.50	1.90
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
Benton	CD	1.39	1.35	1.35
	6AW	5.00	5.00	5.00
Bollinger	CD	2.86	2.81	2.50
Boone	CD	4.05	4.11	4.23
	6AW	9.08	8.14	8.14
	6ZJ	4.55	4.55	4.71
Buchanan	CD	3.59	3.58	3.58
Butler	CD	4.05	4.00	4.17
	6AW	9.67	8.67	8.67
	6ZS	3.88	3.75	3.94
Caldwell	CD	2.00	1.79	1.88
Callaway	CD	4.32	4.22	3.96
	6AW	8.14	9.00	9.00
	6ZJ	3.94	3.91	3.93
Camden	CD	2.50	2.59	2.78
	6AW	6.50	6.50	6.50
	6ZK	2.38	2.38	2.38
Cape Girardeau	CD	3.59	3.54	3.54
Carroll	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00
Carter	CD	3.27	1.71	2.14
Cass	CD	2.83	2.83	2.91
	6AW	4.50	4.50	4.50
	6ZO	3.42	3.31	3.40
	6ZR	3.02	2.88	2.92
Cedar	CD	3.97	3.92	3.96
	6AW	9.00	9.00	9.00
Chariton	CD	4.33	4.19	4.20
Christian	CD	4.84	5.21	5.27
	6AW	7.50	7.50	7.50
	6ZM	4.86	4.33	4.32
Clark	CD	4.59	4.50	4.03
Clay	CD	2.86	2.69	2.61
Clinton	CD	3.44	3.48	3.70
Cole	CD	4.15	4.37	4.35
	6AW	8.00	6.00	6.00
	6ZJ	4.00	4.11	4.00
Cooper	CD	3.44	3.44	3.44
	6AW	16.00	16.00	16.00
Crawford	CD	3.96	4.23	4.42
Dallas	CD	1.93	1.92	1.92
	6AW	4.57	4.71	4.71
Daviess	CD	2.57	2.61	2.74

<b>Table 8: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
DeKalb	CD	3.28	3.44	3.60
Dent	CD	4.58	4.64	4.50
Douglas	CD	2.21	1.90	2.05
	6AW	2.50	2.50	2.00
Dunklin	CD	2.09	2.20	2.04
	6ZS	5.24	5.24	5.35
Franklin	CD	2.78	2.68	2.77
	6AW	8.27	8.58	8.83
	6ZA	5.16	5.16	5.16
	6ZC	5.89	5.89	5.65
Gasconade	CD	1.78	1.83	1.79
Gentry	CD	2.60	2.60	2.50
Greene	CD	2.45	2.48	2.52
	6AW	5.29	5.36	5.20
	6ZM	3.71	3.74	3.69
	6ZV	4.41	4.44	4.58
Grundy	CD	3.00	3.00	3.00
Harrison	CD	1.33	2.00	2.00
Henry	CD	3.00	3.00	2.31
	6AW	6.00	6.00	4.67
Hickory	CD			1.00
Holt	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Howard	CD	2.17	2.43	2.17
	6ZJ	3.23	3.23	3.23
Howell	CD	5.27	5.22	5.00
Iron	CD	4.33	5.21	5.08
Jackson	CD	6.64	6.91	6.50
	6AW	8.68	8.54	8.69
	6ZO	4.10	4.15	4.10
	6ZR	5.61	5.63	5.63
Jasper	CD	2.97	2.93	2.93
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.00
	6ZL	3.78	3.64	3.53
Jefferson	CD	3.61	3.56	3.34
	6AW	5.60	5.75	6.67
	6ZA	3.53	3.53	3.54
	6ZB	3.44	3.34	3.32
	6ZC	4.04	3.98	3.91
Johnson	CD	1.87	1.85	1.94
	6AW	6.14	6.14	6.17
Knox	CD	4.33	5.43	5.43
Laclede	CD	2.36	2.23	2.19
	6AW	5.20	5.20	4.67
	6ZK	4.12	4.24	4.24
Lafayette	CD	1.69	1.71	1.71
Lawrence	CD	3.30	3.43	3.24
	6AW	4.00	4.50	4.57
	6ZV	2.56	2.60	2.60
Lewis	CD	2.00	4.60	4.60
Lincoln	CD	2.63	2.65	2.67
	6AW	11.00	11.00	12.00



<b>Table 8: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Linn	CD	4.32	4.15	4.30
Livingston	CD	3.36	3.73	3.19
Macon	CD	4.57	4.68	4.42
Madison	CD	1.85	1.88	1.82
Maries	CD	2.00	2.00	1.67
Marion	CD	3.03	3.02	3.08
	6AW	14.50	14.00	15.00
McDonald	CD	2.53	2.61	2.73
	6AW	4.33	4.67	4.00
	6ZL	3.60	3.08	2.93
Miller	CD	3.50	3.50	4.32
	6AW	5.00	5.00	
Mississippi	CD	2.90	2.77	2.84
	6AW	7.00	7.00	7.00
Moniteau	CD	2.67	2.00	3.00
Monroe	CD	3.00	3.33	3.44
	6AW	11.00		
Montgomery	CD	1.82	1.82	2.00
	6AW	10.00	11.00	11.00
Morgan	CD	3.43	3.38	3.67
	6AW	6.00	6.00	5.60
	6ZK			10.00
New Madrid	CD	3.57	3.78	3.92
	6AW	10.00	10.00	10.00
Newton	CD	2.46	2.14	2.00
	6AW	4.50	4.50	5.13
	6ZL	4.05	3.61	3.36
Nodaway	CD	2.61	2.83	2.90
Oregon	CD	4.79	4.88	4.92
Osage	CD	1.33	1.18	1.17
Ozark	CD	2.50	2.45	3.00
	6AW	3.50	3.50	3.50
Pemiscot	CD	2.51	2.92	2.84
	6AW	6.50	7.00	7.00
Perry	CD	2.45	2.30	1.43
Pettis	CD	2.37	2.37	2.37
	6AW	12.00	12.00	12.00
Phelps	CD	3.54	3.53	3.60
	6ZK	6.43	7.67	7.80
Pike	CD	2.53	2.50	2.62
Platte	CD	1.80	1.79	1.81
Polk	CD	2.96	2.97	3.07
	6AW	2.67	3.00	3.00
Pulaski	CD	3.98	3.90	4.16
	6ZK	4.92	4.50	4.18
Putnam	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ralls	CD	4.14	4.67	4.14
Randolph	CD	4.58	4.50	4.80
	6AW	11.00	11.67	11.67
	6ZJ	3.92	3.88	3.62
Ray	CD	4.00	4.00	3.25

<b>Table 8: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Reynolds	CD	4.07	3.71	3.22
Ripley	CD	4.20	4.60	4.80
	6AW	14.00	14.00	14.00
	6ZS	3.00	2.89	2.62
Saline	CD	4.09	3.47	3.31
Schuyler	CD	3.00	3.38	3.38
Scotland	CD	5.00	5.22	5.22
	6AW	11.00	11.00	11.00
Scott	CD	4.48	4.34	4.33
	6AW	7.40	8.00	8.00
Shannon	CD	6.13	6.13	5.17
Shelby	CD	3.20	3.07	2.60
St. Charles	CD	3.28	3.03	3.12
	6AW	4.00	5.00	5.00
	6ZB	3.17	3.32	3.52
	6ZC	5.05	5.14	4.77
St. Clair	CD	3.50	3.50	3.00
	6AW	3.25	3.25	3.25
St. Francois	CD	2.49	2.57	2.53
	6ZC	3.58	3.35	3.43
St. Louis City	CD	4.92	4.92	4.81
	6AW	8.50	8.50	9.00
	6ZA	4.88	4.95	4.73
	6ZB	5.70	5.60	5.76
	6ZC	3.89	3.78	3.91
St. Louis County	CD	4.52	4.58	4.55
	6AW	9.83	10.00	10.29
	6ZA	4.82	4.67	4.78
	6ZB	5.50	5.37	5.19
	6ZC	4.62	4.51	4.54
Ste. Genevieve	CD	2.90	2.86	2.52
Stoddard	CD	4.59	4.41	4.59
	6AW	7.67	7.67	7.00
	6ZS	4.77	5.08	4.71
Stone	CD	4.04	4.08	4.28
	6AW	5.00	4.33	4.50
	6ZV	2.64	2.70	3.33
Sullivan	CD	5.29	5.29	5.00
Taney	CD	2.49	2.50	2.51
	6AW	5.23	5.45	5.35
	6ZV	4.81	4.91	4.90
Texas	CD	2.08	2.35	2.65
	6ZK	2.80	2.80	2.57
Vernon	CD	3.06	3.26	3.53
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.00
Warren	CD	1.59	1.57	1.53
	6AW	5.50	7.50	7.50
Washington	CD	3.67	3.48	3.42
	6AW	12.00		
	6ZB	3.95	4.06	4.30
Wayne	CD	3.07	3.15	3.41

<b>Table 8: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)</b>				
County	Agency	January	February	March
Webster	CD	2.22	2.23	2.27
	6AW	3.00	3.00	3.50
Wright	CD	3.02	2.00	1.81
	6AW	7.60	8.00	7.00

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414B) ELIPS RS5HBBM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 8: For January, February, and March of 2025, children in foster care 12 months or more experienced between one and 18 workers.


Chart 26 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 26: Average # of Workers per Child in Care 12+ Months Grouped by Circuit</b>				
	A	B	C	D
	<b>4.01-5.21</b>	<b>3.01-4.00</b>	<b>2.01-3.00</b>	<b>1.00-2.00</b>
<b>January</b>	13	20	11	2
<b>February</b>	13	19	12	2
<b>March</b>	12	19	13	2

\*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414B) ELIPS RS5HBBM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 26: The majority of circuits have an average of 3.01-4.00 workers for children in care 12 months or more.

Chart 27 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.BROWVCR.JCL.SCHDLR(HB1414B) ELIPS RS5HBBM0, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Chart 27: Agencies averaged anywhere from 3.34 to 6.64 workers for children in foster care 12 months or more. This is an increase from the average of 3.33 to 6.58 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:

- 1-3.47 workers at the county level
- 1-2.08 workers at the circuit level
- 1.36-2.43 workers at the agency level

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

- 1-18 workers at the county level
- 1.43-5.21 workers at the circuit level
- 3.34-6.64 at the agency level

## Phase II Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2025 – March 31, 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 9-11 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.

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	53.60%	28.00%	7.20%	8.80%	1.60%	0.80%
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	83.33%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	15.79%	63.16%	7.89%	7.89%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	42.50%	30.00%	12.50%	10.00%	5.00%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	55.56%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	50.00%	9.38%	3.13%	3.13%	34.38%	0.00%
Barton	CD	53.85%	38.46%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	66.67%	9.52%	14.29%	0.00%	9.52%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	61.67%	21.67%	5.00%	3.33%	8.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	50.00%	29.17%	12.50%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%
Boone	CD	52.83%	25.47%	15.09%	1.89%	4.72%	0.00%
	6AW	7.69%	76.92%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	36.61%	41.53%	6.56%	6.56%	6.56%	2.19%
Buchanan	CD	54.22%	22.89%	15.66%	7.23%	0.00%	0.00%
Butler	CD	39.29%	20.24%	21.43%	9.52%	9.52%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	45.67%	28.35%	11.02%	7.87%	7.09%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	40.91%	22.73%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	47.54%	22.95%	16.39%	0.00%	13.11%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	35.09%	43.86%	3.51%	1.75%	14.04%	1.75%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Camden	CD	27.27%	50.00%	0.00%	9.09%	13.64%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	60.00%	26.67%	0.00%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	46.95%	17.68%	14.02%	4.27%	17.07%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	10.00%	50.00%	0.00%	10.00%	30.00%	0.00%
Cass	CD	51.02%	6.12%	16.33%	6.12%	20.41%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	64.81%	27.78%	3.70%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZR	30.88%	42.65%	4.41%	5.88%	16.18%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	54.84%	12.90%	22.58%	0.00%	9.68%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	63.16%	5.26%	21.05%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%
Christian	CD	33.96%	18.87%	22.64%	7.55%	16.98%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	32.56%	23.26%	13.95%	4.65%	25.58%	0.00%
Clark	CD	41.67%	25.00%	4.17%	12.50%	16.67%	0.00%
Clay	CD	50.36%	27.34%	11.51%	5.76%	5.04%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	25.00%	43.75%	6.25%	9.38%	15.63%	0.00%
Cole	CD	41.18%	15.69%	13.73%	11.76%	15.69%	1.96%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	41.24%	25.77%	11.34%	10.31%	11.34%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	30.77%	38.46%	7.69%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	57.75%	14.08%	12.68%	7.04%	8.45%	0.00%
Dade	CD	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	56.00%	24.00%	4.00%	0.00%	16.00%	0.00%
	6AW	28.57%	28.57%	0.00%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	69.70%	24.24%	6.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	26.32%	31.58%	10.53%	26.32%	5.26%	0.00%
Dent	CD	44.00%	18.67%	9.33%	13.33%	14.67%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	26.32%	44.74%	5.26%	7.89%	15.79%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	61.90%	23.81%	9.52%	2.38%	2.38%	0.00%
	6ZS	65.57%	14.75%	6.56%	4.92%	8.20%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	52.14%	25.71%	9.29%	2.86%	10.00%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	50.00%	20.00%	23.33%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	39.13%	47.83%	0.00%	2.17%	10.87%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	52.94%	26.47%	2.94%	2.94%	14.71%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	62.50%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
Greene	CD	40.36%	33.82%	13.45%	2.91%	9.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	53.33%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	46.43%	32.54%	10.71%	5.95%	3.57%	0.79%
	6ZV	38.67%	36.00%	10.67%	2.67%	12.00%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	64.71%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%	23.53%	0.00%
Henry	CD	56.25%	18.75%	12.50%	9.38%	3.13%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Hickory	CD	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	45.45%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	45.45%	0.00%
Howard	CD	26.09%	21.74%	4.35%	0.00%	47.83%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.15%	23.08%	3.85%	3.85%	23.08%	0.00%
Howell	CD	16.67%	43.06%	23.61%	13.89%	2.78%	0.00%
Iron	CD	57.69%	21.15%	11.54%	3.85%	5.77%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	19.12%	17.65%	50.00%	2.94%	10.29%	0.00%
	6AW	18.75%	25.00%	43.75%	9.38%	3.13%	0.00%
	6ZO	41.31%	39.50%	7.45%	5.19%	6.55%	0.00%
	6ZR	47.24%	32.41%	9.05%	4.52%	6.28%	0.50%
	CD	56.19%	24.34%	11.06%	3.10%	5.31%	0.00%
	6AW	27.27%	45.45%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	38.21%	32.52%	9.76%	7.32%	12.20%	0.00%
	CD	28.57%	20.41%	18.37%	0.00%	32.65%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Jefferson	6ZA	49.44%	37.08%	7.87%	4.49%	1.12%	0.00%
	6ZB	54.09%	29.18%	1.95%	5.84%	8.95%	0.00%
	6ZC	55.00%	23.33%	8.33%	5.00%	8.33%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	40.00%	37.14%	3.81%	0.00%	19.05%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	28.57%	28.57%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	44.62%	40.00%	4.62%	6.15%	4.62%	0.00%
	6AW	10.00%	50.00%	20.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	72.34%	8.51%	4.26%	2.13%	12.77%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	46.67%	26.67%	10.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	56.41%	7.69%	15.38%	5.13%	15.38%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	28.57%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	60.00%	20.00%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	68.42%	10.53%	0.00%	10.53%	10.53%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	38.89%	38.89%	4.63%	8.33%	9.26%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	57.14%	17.14%	17.14%	2.86%	5.71%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	45.76%	42.37%	6.78%	1.69%	3.39%	0.00%
Macon	CD	50.00%	30.36%	10.71%	8.93%	0.00%	0.00%
Madison	CD	52.83%	15.09%	11.32%	11.32%	9.43%	0.00%
Maries	CD	50.00%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	40.94%	35.09%	7.60%	8.19%	8.19%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	47.62%	33.33%	4.76%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	25.81%	54.84%	9.68%	3.23%	6.45%	0.00%
Mercer	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Miller	CD	47.06%	35.29%	11.76%	2.94%	2.94%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	69.09%	16.36%	9.09%	0.00%	5.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	57.14%	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	30.00%	30.00%	10.00%	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Montgomery	CD	59.46%	24.32%	8.11%	8.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	38.33%	41.67%	5.00%	5.00%	10.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	61.19%	17.91%	14.93%	1.49%	4.48%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	58.21%	17.91%	8.96%	1.49%	11.94%	1.49%
	6AW	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	62.50%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	29.79%	36.17%	8.51%	17.02%	8.51%	0.00%
Nodaway	CD	65.85%	9.76%	12.20%	0.00%	12.20%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	31.58%	36.84%	18.42%	10.53%	2.63%	0.00%
Osage	CD	32.00%	24.00%	4.00%	8.00%	32.00%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	80.00%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	61.11%	19.44%	6.94%	8.33%	4.17%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	61.90%	14.29%	14.29%	4.76%	4.76%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	44.68%	30.85%	13.83%	3.19%	7.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	40.60%	27.82%	9.02%	4.51%	18.05%	0.00%
	6ZK	40.00%	34.29%	14.29%	2.86%	8.57%	0.00%
Pike	CD	38.89%	33.33%	5.56%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%
Platte	CD	57.63%	16.95%	6.78%	5.08%	13.56%	0.00%
Polk	CD	44.74%	36.84%	2.63%	2.63%	13.16%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	38.57%	26.43%	12.86%	8.57%	13.57%	0.00%
	6ZK	52.94%	20.59%	0.00%	2.94%	23.53%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	70.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	36.92%	36.92%	18.46%	4.62%	3.08%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	43.21%	38.27%	9.88%	3.70%	4.94%	0.00%
Ray	CD	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	57.14%	10.71%	17.86%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	46.67%	20.00%	6.67%	6.67%	20.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	66.67%	7.41%	3.70%	7.41%	14.81%	0.00%
Saline	CD	32.14%	35.71%	14.29%	3.57%	14.29%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	66.67%	8.33%	16.67%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	43.75%	6.25%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	55.56%	20.83%	6.94%	2.78%	13.89%	0.00%
	6AW	10.00%	40.00%	30.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	57.89%	15.79%	15.79%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	40.00%	20.00%	25.00%	10.00%	5.00%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	45.45%	39.86%	10.49%	0.00%	4.20%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	41.30%	41.30%	8.70%	6.52%	2.17%	0.00%
	6ZC	51.35%	40.54%	4.05%	0.00%	4.05%	0.00%



Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
St. Clair	CD	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	51.37%	21.23%	13.01%	3.42%	10.96%	0.00%
	6ZC	35.00%	43.33%	8.33%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	33.50%	32.04%	22.33%	6.31%	5.83%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	51.34%	35.57%	6.38%	1.68%	4.70%	0.34%
	6ZB	47.66%	34.38%	9.38%	3.13%	5.47%	0.00%
St. Louis County	6ZC	38.39%	40.18%	8.04%	3.57%	8.93%	0.89%
	CD	41.91%	33.33%	18.48%	3.63%	2.64%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	55.50%	32.08%	7.26%	2.58%	2.11%	0.47%
Ste. Genevieve	6ZB	54.19%	31.61%	6.45%	1.94%	5.81%	0.00%
	6ZC	34.48%	38.62%	8.97%	4.14%	13.79%	0.00%
	CD	25.58%	37.21%	11.63%	9.30%	16.28%	0.00%
	CD	37.50%	21.88%	28.13%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
Stoddard	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	53.06%	22.45%	14.29%	8.16%	2.04%	0.00%
	CD	48.28%	24.14%	13.79%	6.90%	6.90%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Stone	6ZV	37.04%	40.74%	11.11%	7.41%	3.70%	0.00%
	CD	60.00%	30.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	51.33%	28.67%	9.33%	2.00%	7.33%	1.33%
	6AW	0.00%	47.83%	39.13%	13.04%	0.00%	0.00%
Sullivan	6ZV	31.51%	38.36%	6.85%	2.74%	20.55%	0.00%
	CD	17.65%	39.22%	19.61%	11.76%	11.76%	0.00%
	6ZK	46.67%	20.00%	0.00%	13.33%	20.00%	0.00%
	CD	40.00%	32.00%	20.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%
Taney	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	55.26%	32.89%	2.63%	5.26%	3.95%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	CD	17.86%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
Texas	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	64.47%	21.05%	5.33%	2.63%	6.58%	0.00%
	CD	49.02%	13.73%	15.69%	9.80%	11.76%	0.00%
	CD	50.94%	28.30%	12.31%	1.89%	7.55%	0.00%
Vernon	6AW	0.00%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	CD	53.68%	18.95%	6.32%	2.11%	18.95%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	14.29%	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%
	CD	16.22%	62.16%	8.11%	8.11%	5.41%	0.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 10FEB25

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	50.83%	30.00%	10.83%	7.50%	0.00%	0.83%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	75.00%	18.75%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	16.22%	62.16%	8.11%	8.11%	5.41%	0.00%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	44.12%	20.59%	14.71%	11.76%	8.82%	0.00%
	6AW	10.00%	50.00%	30.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	48.39%	9.68%	3.23%	9.68%	29.03%	0.00%
Barton	CD	53.85%	38.46%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	63.64%	13.64%	13.64%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	54.10%	24.59%	4.92%	3.28%	13.11%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	50.00%	29.17%	8.33%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%
Boone	CD	50.00%	27.00%	17.00%	1.00%	4.00%	1.00%
	6AW	7.14%	71.43%	7.14%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	41.21%	40.66%	8.24%	6.59%	3.30%	0.00%
Buchanan	CD	54.12%	23.53%	12.94%	7.06%	1.18%	1.18%
Butler	CD	37.65%	20.00%	23.53%	8.24%	10.59%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	44.96%	28.68%	11.63%	7.75%	6.98%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	57.89%	26.32%	0.00%	0.00%	15.79%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	54.55%	25.45%	14.55%	0.00%	5.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	37.04%	48.15%	3.70%	1.85%	9.26%	0.00%
Camden	CD	21.74%	47.83%	4.35%	13.04%	13.04%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	44.10%	18.01%	15.53%	3.11%	19.25%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%
Cass	CD	54.90%	3.92%	13.73%	7.84%	19.61%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	57.41%	33.33%	3.70%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZR	31.34%	38.81%	4.48%	8.96%	16.42%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	46.15%	15.38%	26.92%	0.00%	11.54%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	66.67%	5.56%	22.22%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%
Christian	CD	33.33%	20.83%	20.83%	6.25%	18.75%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	40.00%	20.00%	11.11%	4.44%	24.44%	0.00%
Clark	CD	51.06%	21.28%	6.38%	8.51%	12.77%	0.00%
Clay	CD	48.94%	29.79%	10.64%	4.96%	5.67%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	20.69%	48.28%	6.90%	13.79%	10.34%	0.00%
Cole	CD	35.56%	22.22%	13.33%	13.33%	15.56%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	43.62%	24.47%	12.77%	7.45%	11.70%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	30.77%	38.46%	7.69%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	55.38%	12.31%	12.31%	12.31%	7.69%	0.00%
Dade	CD	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	56.00%	36.00%	4.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	63.64%	30.30%	6.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	27.78%	44.44%	5.56%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%
Dent	CD	50.00%	20.59%	7.35%	14.71%	5.88%	1.47%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Douglas	CD	31.43%	45.71%	8.57%	2.86%	11.43%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	54.35%	23.91%	13.04%	4.35%	4.35%	0.00%
	6ZS	65.08%	19.05%	4.76%	3.17%	7.94%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	49.66%	28.19%	8.05%	3.36%	10.74%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	58.33%	8.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	46.67%	23.33%	23.33%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	36.73%	51.02%	0.00%	2.04%	10.20%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	52.94%	26.47%	2.94%	2.94%	14.71%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	50.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	44.77%	29.24%	14.44%	3.61%	7.94%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	40.00%	46.67%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	44.75%	33.07%	8.95%	5.84%	7.39%	0.00%
	6ZV	40.79%	34.21%	9.21%	3.95%	11.84%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	69.23%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%
Henry	CD	54.76%	16.67%	11.90%	7.14%	9.52%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	57.14%	0.00%	14.29%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	45.45%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	45.45%	0.00%
Howard	CD	26.09%	21.74%	4.35%	0.00%	47.83%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.15%	23.08%	7.69%	3.85%	19.23%	0.00%
Howell	CD	16.67%	41.67%	25.00%	12.50%	4.17%	0.00%
Iron	CD	50.00%	23.08%	15.38%	3.85%	7.69%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	30.77%	15.38%	43.59%	2.56%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	20.00%	25.71%	40.00%	11.43%	2.86%	0.00%
	6ZO	41.10%	40.00%	7.69%	4.62%	6.37%	0.22%
	6ZR	46.85%	33.50%	9.32%	5.04%	5.29%	0.00%
Jasper	CD	54.71%	24.22%	12.11%	3.14%	4.93%	0.90%
	6AW	18.18%	36.36%	9.09%	18.18%	18.18%	0.00%
	6ZL	37.40%	30.89%	10.57%	10.57%	10.57%	0.00%
Jefferson	CD	27.66%	23.40%	14.89%	0.00%	34.04%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	47.78%	37.78%	10.00%	3.33%	1.11%	0.00%
	6ZB	54.98%	29.08%	2.39%	5.98%	7.57%	0.00%
	6ZC	59.32%	23.73%	3.39%	5.08%	8.47%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	42.31%	32.69%	2.88%	0.00%	20.19%	1.92%
	6AW	0.00%	28.57%	57.14%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	45.45%	18.18%	27.27%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	46.15%	40.00%	6.15%	4.62%	3.08%	0.00%
	6AW	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	68.75%	10.42%	4.17%	2.08%	14.58%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	37.14%	34.29%	11.43%	14.29%	2.86%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	55.56%	13.89%	16.67%	0.00%	13.89%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	25.00%	50.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	60.00%	20.00%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	57.14%	4.76%	4.76%	9.52%	23.81%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	41.51%	36.79%	4.72%	7.55%	9.43%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	57.14%	20.00%	14.29%	2.86%	5.71%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	46.43%	44.64%	7.14%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%
Macon	CD	50.88%	35.09%	7.02%	7.02%	0.00%	0.00%
Madison	CD	50.94%	13.21%	13.21%	11.32%	11.32%	0.00%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Maries	CD	30.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	39.43%	36.00%	9.14%	6.86%	8.57%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	42.50%	35.00%	7.50%	0.00%	15.00%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	17.24%	58.62%	13.79%	3.45%	6.90%	0.00%
Mercer	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Miller	CD	47.06%	35.29%	11.76%	2.94%	2.94%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	70.69%	15.52%	8.62%	0.00%	5.17%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	71.43%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	63.64%	18.18%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	60.53%	23.68%	10.53%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	40.98%	44.26%	1.64%	3.28%	9.84%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	55.17%	20.69%	17.24%	0.00%	6.90%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	60.87%	15.94%	8.70%	1.45%	13.04%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	62.50%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	32.61%	32.61%	10.87%	10.87%	10.87%	2.17%
Nodaway	CD	56.82%	11.36%	11.36%	6.82%	13.64%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	37.84%	37.84%	18.92%	5.41%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	32.00%	24.00%	4.00%	8.00%	32.00%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	59.26%	18.52%	7.41%	6.17%	8.64%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	66.67%	14.29%	9.52%	4.76%	4.76%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	46.39%	25.77%	14.43%	4.12%	9.28%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	42.06%	27.78%	7.14%	4.76%	18.25%	0.00%
	6ZK	43.24%	40.54%	10.81%	2.70%	2.70%	0.00%
Pike	CD	38.89%	33.33%	5.56%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%
Platte	CD	56.90%	17.24%	6.90%	6.90%	12.07%	0.00%
Polk	CD	45.45%	39.39%	3.03%	3.03%	9.09%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	40.69%	26.21%	11.03%	9.66%	12.41%	0.00%
	6ZK	48.48%	24.24%	0.00%	3.03%	24.24%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	70.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	31.82%	43.94%	16.67%	4.55%	3.03%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	41.67%	39.29%	9.52%	2.38%	7.14%	0.00%
Ray	CD	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	57.69%	19.23%	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	41.18%	23.53%	11.76%	5.88%	17.65%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	62.96%	7.41%	3.70%	3.70%	22.22%	0.00%
Saline	CD	37.93%	34.48%	13.79%	3.45%	10.34%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	61.54%	23.08%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	43.75%	6.25%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%

Table 10: Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	55.84%	23.38%	6.49%	2.60%	11.69%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	44.44%	22.22%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	47.37%	10.53%	21.05%	21.05%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	36.84%	21.05%	26.32%	10.53%	5.26%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	46.94%	33.33%	12.24%	0.00%	5.44%	2.04%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	38.78%	44.90%	8.16%	6.12%	2.04%	0.00%
	6ZC	47.30%	37.84%	5.41%	0.00%	9.46%	0.00%
St. Clair	CD	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	50.69%	22.22%	13.19%	2.78%	11.11%	0.00%
	6ZC	43.33%	40.00%	8.33%	6.67%	1.67%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	33.99%	33.50%	21.67%	5.91%	4.93%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	49.16%	36.79%	6.02%	2.01%	6.02%	0.00%
	6ZB	47.62%	35.71%	7.94%	3.97%	4.76%	0.00%
	6ZC	40.54%	41.44%	7.21%	4.50%	6.31%	0.00%
St. Louis County	CD	43.05%	32.88%	18.98%	3.39%	1.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	28.57%	42.86%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	55.82%	31.12%	6.65%	3.56%	2.85%	0.00%
	6ZB	57.42%	30.97%	5.81%	2.58%	3.23%	0.00%
	6ZC	37.06%	41.26%	9.79%	4.20%	7.69%	0.00%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	27.50%	40.00%	12.50%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	37.84%	21.62%	27.03%	13.51%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	54.35%	23.91%	8.70%	13.04%	0.00%	0.00%
Stone	CD	48.28%	24.14%	13.79%	6.90%	6.90%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	42.31%	42.31%	7.69%	3.85%	3.85%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	50.00%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	53.15%	25.87%	9.79%	3.50%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	54.55%	31.82%	13.64%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	37.50%	35.00%	5.00%	1.25%	21.25%	0.00%
Texas	CD	21.28%	42.55%	17.02%	14.89%	4.26%	0.00%
	6ZK	53.33%	20.00%	0.00%	6.67%	20.00%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	40.00%	40.00%	16.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	56.32%	32.18%	3.45%	4.60%	3.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	18.52%	29.63%	44.44%	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%
	6ZB	70.13%	20.78%	2.60%	2.60%	3.90%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	45.65%	10.87%	15.22%	13.04%	15.22%	0.00%
Webster	CD	40.74%	27.78%	12.96%	1.85%	16.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Wright	CD	52.22%	20.00%	5.56%	2.22%	20.00%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	14.29%	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 10MAR25

Table 11: Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	51.67%	27.50%	9.17%	10.00%	1.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	76.47%	23.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	21.05%	57.89%	7.89%	7.89%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	46.43%	25.00%	14.29%	10.71%	3.57%	0.00%
	6AW	10.00%	30.00%	50.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	43.75%	12.50%	6.25%	3.13%	34.38%	0.00%
Barton	CD	40.00%	30.00%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	62.50%	16.67%	12.50%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	47.46%	22.03%	5.08%	3.39%	22.03%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	50.00%	12.50%	8.33%	0.00%	29.17%	0.00%
Boone	CD	50.00%	27.08%	17.71%	1.04%	4.17%	0.00%
	6AW	7.14%	71.43%	7.14%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.84%	37.37%	6.84%	7.89%	1.05%	0.00%
Buchanan	CD	56.04%	24.18%	12.09%	6.59%	1.10%	0.00%
Butler	CD	31.33%	14.46%	22.89%	9.64%	21.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	44.09%	29.92%	7.09%	8.66%	10.24%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	63.16%	15.79%	10.53%	0.00%	10.53%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	56.67%	20.00%	13.33%	1.67%	8.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	35.85%	37.74%	3.77%	1.89%	18.87%	1.89%
Camden	CD	21.43%	50.00%	7.14%	10.71%	10.71%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	44.97%	17.75%	14.20%	4.14%	18.93%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%
Cass	CD	46.81%	8.51%	14.89%	6.38%	23.40%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	51.92%	34.62%	3.85%	5.77%	3.85%	0.00%
Cedar	6ZR	30.30%	39.39%	4.55%	10.61%	15.15%	0.00%
	CD	45.83%	20.83%	20.83%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	29.41%	5.88%	23.53%	11.76%	29.41%	0.00%
Christian	CD	37.04%	16.67%	18.52%	3.70%	24.07%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	33.33%	17.78%	11.11%	11.11%	26.67%	0.00%
Clark	CD	42.86%	26.53%	2.04%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%
Clay	CD	43.54%	31.29%	12.93%	5.44%	6.80%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	11.11%	51.85%	7.41%	11.11%	18.52%	0.00%
Cole	CD	43.14%	17.65%	11.76%	13.73%	13.73%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	44.21%	26.32%	11.58%	6.32%	11.58%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	38.46%	30.77%	7.69%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	55.41%	20.27%	12.16%	8.11%	4.05%	0.00%
Dade	CD	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 11: Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Dallas	CD	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	37.50%	12.50%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	57.58%	30.30%	9.09%	0.00%	3.03%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	33.33%	40.00%	6.67%	13.33%	6.67%	0.00%
Dent	CD	51.39%	23.61%	9.72%	9.72%	5.56%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	34.15%	43.90%	7.32%	2.44%	12.20%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	51.92%	30.77%	7.69%	5.77%	3.85%	0.00%
	6ZS	66.15%	18.46%	4.62%	4.62%	6.15%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	47.26%	30.82%	8.22%	2.74%	10.96%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	58.33%	8.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.33%	20.00%	26.67%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	43.90%	36.59%	2.44%	2.44%	14.63%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	58.06%	22.58%	3.23%	3.23%	12.90%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	41.24%	34.67%	14.23%	1.09%	8.76%	0.00%
	6AW	6.25%	43.75%	43.75%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	44.96%	33.72%	9.30%	4.65%	6.98%	0.39%
	6ZV	42.86%	30.95%	11.90%	9.52%	4.76%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	57.14%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	76.92%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%
Henry	CD	54.76%	16.67%	9.52%	7.14%	11.90%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	40.00%	20.00%	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	45.45%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	45.45%	0.00%
Howard	CD	33.33%	27.78%	0.00%	0.00%	38.89%	0.00%
	6ZJ	45.83%	25.00%	8.33%	4.17%	16.67%	0.00%
Howell	CD	15.38%	42.31%	26.92%	8.97%	6.41%	0.00%
Iron	CD	47.17%	28.30%	13.21%	3.77%	7.55%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	37.23%	18.09%	37.23%	2.13%	5.32%	0.00%
	6AW	23.53%	29.41%	32.35%	11.76%	2.94%	0.00%
	6ZO	43.78%	37.56%	7.56%	4.22%	6.89%	0.00%
	6ZR	46.50%	33.75%	10.00%	4.25%	5.50%	0.00%
Jasper	CD	57.87%	23.61%	11.57%	2.31%	4.63%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	36.36%	9.09%	18.18%	18.18%	0.00%
	6ZL	40.77%	31.54%	10.77%	9.23%	7.69%	0.00%
Jefferson	CD	28.57%	26.19%	16.67%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	46.15%	34.07%	8.79%	3.30%	7.69%	0.00%
	6ZB	55.47%	28.91%	1.95%	5.86%	7.81%	0.00%
	6ZC	57.38%	22.95%	8.20%	3.28%	8.20%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	45.26%	28.42%	4.21%	0.00%	22.11%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	53.85%	15.38%	15.38%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	49.21%	39.68%	7.94%	1.59%	1.59%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	68.75%	10.42%	6.25%	2.08%	12.50%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	37.84%	32.43%	8.11%	16.22%	0.00%	5.41%
Lawrence	CD	60.61%	18.18%	15.15%	0.00%	6.06%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	42.86%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	61.29%	19.35%	3.23%	9.68%	6.45%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	57.14%	4.76%	4.76%	9.52%	23.81%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	45.10%	37.25%	4.90%	7.84%	4.90%	0.00%

Table 11: Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	57.14%	20.00%	14.29%	2.86%	5.71%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	40.35%	49.12%	8.77%	1.75%	0.00%	0.00%
Macon	CD	46.55%	36.21%	10.34%	6.90%	0.00%	0.00%
Madison	CD	43.64%	16.36%	10.91%	14.55%	14.55%	0.00%
Maries	CD	37.50%	62.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	40.46%	35.26%	8.09%	7.51%	8.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	39.47%	36.84%	7.89%	0.00%	15.79%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	37.50%	43.75%	12.50%	3.13%	3.13%	0.00%
Mercer	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Miller	CD	41.03%	41.03%	10.26%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	67.24%	15.52%	8.62%	0.00%	8.62%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	62.50%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	75.00%	6.25%	18.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	56.10%	21.95%	12.20%	2.44%	7.32%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	44.83%	37.93%	3.45%	3.45%	10.34%	0.00%
	6AW	40.00%	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	53.70%	24.07%	14.81%	3.70%	3.70%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	53.73%	16.42%	11.94%	1.49%	16.42%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	37.50%	12.50%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	25.58%	32.56%	16.28%	11.63%	11.63%	2.33%
Nodaway	CD	56.82%	11.36%	11.36%	6.82%	13.64%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	32.43%	43.24%	18.92%	5.41%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	34.78%	26.09%	4.35%	8.70%	26.09%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	50.00%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	63.53%	16.47%	7.06%	5.88%	7.06%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	50.00%	16.67%	11.11%	5.56%	16.67%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	45.36%	26.80%	15.46%	4.12%	8.25%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	43.33%	28.33%	7.50%	4.17%	16.67%	0.00%
	6ZK	50.00%	35.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pike	CD	41.18%	35.29%	5.88%	0.00%	17.65%	0.00%
Platte	CD	57.89%	15.79%	8.77%	3.51%	14.04%	0.00%
Polk	CD	42.86%	39.29%	3.57%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	41.67%	25.64%	9.62%	8.97%	14.10%	0.00%
	6ZK	46.67%	26.67%	0.00%	3.33%	23.33%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	63.64%	9.09%	18.18%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	31.67%	41.67%	16.67%	6.67%	3.33%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	42.05%	40.91%	11.36%	2.27%	3.41%	0.00%
Ray	CD	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	59.26%	11.11%	22.22%	7.41%	0.00%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	37.50%	25.00%	18.75%	0.00%	18.75%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%



Table 11: Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZS	65.38%	7.69%	3.85%	3.85%	19.23%	0.00%
Saline	CD	50.00%	27.78%	11.11%	2.78%	8.33%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	61.54%	15.38%	15.38%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	43.75%	6.25%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	52.63%	23.68%	3.95%	1.32%	18.42%	0.00%
	6AW	22.22%	22.22%	33.33%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	45.00%	15.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	42.11%	21.05%	21.05%	10.53%	5.26%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	50.00%	35.42%	9.03%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	43.18%	40.91%	9.09%	6.82%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	44.00%	42.67%	5.33%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%
St. Clair	CD	60.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	51.54%	23.19%	12.32%	2.90%	10.14%	0.00%
	6ZC	46.67%	40.00%	8.33%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	34.52%	32.49%	21.83%	7.11%	4.06%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	48.26%	37.15%	7.29%	1.74%	5.56%	0.00%
	6ZB	51.20%	36.80%	7.20%	4.80%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	41.74%	40.87%	7.83%	3.48%	5.22%	0.87%
St. Louis County	CD	39.52%	31.62%	20.27%	3.44%	5.15%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	42.86%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	54.99%	31.32%	5.57%	4.64%	3.48%	0.00%
	6ZB	55.21%	31.90%	7.98%	1.84%	3.07%	0.00%
	6ZC	34.97%	43.36%	8.39%	4.90%	8.39%	0.00%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	27.91%	39.53%	11.63%	11.63%	9.30%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	42.55%	17.02%	23.40%	14.89%	2.13%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	60.00%	20.00%	8.89%	8.89%	2.22%	0.00%
Stone	CD	53.57%	21.43%	14.29%	3.57%	7.14%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	40.74%	44.44%	7.41%	3.70%	3.70%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	50.00%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	52.38%	29.25%	9.52%	4.08%	4.76%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	47.62%	38.10%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	36.36%	40.26%	3.90%	1.30%	18.18%	0.00%
Texas	CD	18.37%	40.82%	18.37%	10.20%	12.24%	0.00%
	6ZK	64.29%	21.43%	0.00%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	41.67%	37.50%	16.67%	0.00%	4.17%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	56.82%	34.09%	3.41%	2.27%	3.41%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	18.52%	29.63%	48.15%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%
	6ZB	68.92%	21.62%	2.70%	5.41%	1.35%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	50.00%	7.50%	17.50%	20.00%	5.00%	0.00%
Webster	CD	47.46%	25.42%	10.17%	1.69%	15.25%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Wright	CD	56.18%	19.10%	4.49%	2.25%	17.98%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	14.29%	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08APR25

Analysis of Tables 9-11: 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 45% 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 12-14 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 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD			1	5	2	3						
Audrain	CD				2			1					
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1	1		2						
	6ZV						1						
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				2								
Boone	CD				1			1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ			1	5	2	4						
Buchanan	CD				2	1	3						
Butler	CD				4	2	2						
	6ZS			1	6		2	1					
Callaway	6AW			1	3								1
	6ZJ				1								
Camden	CD				1		1						
	6AW												1
	6ZK				1								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	3	1	2						
Carter	CD				1								
Cass	CD				2	1							
	6AW					1							
	6ZO				2								
	6ZR				3	1							
Cedar	6AW				1								
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD			1	2		1						
	6ZM				1			1					

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Clark	CD				4		2						
Clay	CD			2	3	2							1
Clinton	CD			2		1							
Cole	CD			2	3	1							
	6AW						1						
	6ZJ				5		3	2					
Cooper	CD				2								
Crawford	CD			1	1		3						
Dallas	6AW				1		1						
DeKalb	CD			1	1		2	1					
Dent	CD			4	4		2						
Douglas	CD						3						
Dunklin	CD			1									
	6ZS				2			1					
Franklin	CD			1	2			1					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZA			1	1								
	6ZC			1									
Gasconade	CD			1									
Gentry	CD						1						
Greene	CD				2	1	4	1					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZM	1			4	3	5	2					
	6ZV				2								
Henry	CD				3								
	6AW				1								
Hickory	CD				1			1					
Holt	CD							1					
Howard	6ZJ			1									
Howell	CD			1	2		7						
Iron	CD				1		1						
Jackson	CD				2								
	6AW				3								
	6ZO			1	11	6	4						1
	6ZR				13	1	1	2					1
Jasper	CD	1			4		2						
	6AW							1					
	6ZL				7		1	1					
Jefferson	6ZA				2	1		1					
	6ZB			3	8		4						
	6ZC				1		1	1					
Johnson	6AW				1								
Laclede	CD				1	1	1	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZK				1								
Lafayette	CD			1	4								
Lawrence	CD						2						
	6ZV				2								
Lewis	CD			1	1								
Lincoln	CD			2	4		2	1					
Linn	CD						1						
Livingston	CD					1							
Macon	CD			1	1		1	1					1
Madison	CD			2	4								

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Marion	CD			1	10	2	1						
	6AW				1								
McDonald	6ZL				1								
Miller	CD				1								
Mississippi	6AW					1							
Moniteau	CD				1								
Monroe	6AW				1								
Montgomery	CD			2	1								
	6AW			1									
Morgan	CD				2		1						
New Madrid	CD				1								
Newton	CD				1								
	6AW			1	3			1					
	6ZL				4		3	1					
Oregon	CD			2	1		1						
Osage	CD			1	1								
Ozark	CD						1						
Pemiscot	CD				5		1						
	6AW				1								
Perry	CD						1						
Pettis	CD				3								
Phelps	CD			1	4		1						
	6ZK				1								
Platte	CD				2		1						
Polk	CD					1							
	6AW					1							
Pulaski	CD			2	7		3						
	6ZK				1								
Ralls	CD			1									
Randolph	CD					1	1	1					
	6ZJ				2	1							
Reynolds	CD			1	1								
Ripley	CD						1						
	6ZS					1	1						
Saline	CD				1								
Scotland	CD				1		1						
Scott	CD				1		1						
	6AW				2								
Shannon	CD			1	1								
Shelby	CD			1	1								
St. Charles	6AW				1								
	6ZB				2	1							
St. Francois	CD			2	3								
	6ZC			1	1		2						
St. Louis City	CD			1	5	3	4						
	6AW					1							
	6ZA				2	2	1						
	6ZB				3		1						
	6ZC				2	1	1						
St. Louis Co.	CD			2	4	2	2	1					
	6AW			1		1	1						
	6ZA			3	3	2	1						1
	6ZB				3								

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – January 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6ZC				3	1	1	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			1	1	1	1						
Stoddard	CD				2		2						
	6ZS			2			2						
Stone	CD				2								
	6AW				1								
	6ZV				1	1							
Taney	CD			1	1		1						
	6AW				2	1							
	6ZV				1		1						
Texas	CD			1	3		1	1					
	6ZK				1		1						
Vernon	6AW				1								
Warren	CD			1	1		2						
Washington	6AW				1								
	6ZB				1		1						
Wayne	CD				2		3						
Webster	CD				1								
Wright	CD						2						
	6AW				1								
<b>TOTAL</b>		2		68	288	56	127	29					7

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 10FEB25

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD				4	2	3						
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				2			1					
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1			3	1					
	6AW												
	6ZV						3						
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				2								
Boone	CD				1								1
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ			1	6	1	3	1					
Buchanan	CD				2	1	3						
Butler	CD			1	4	1		1					
	6AW			1									
	6ZS			1	6		3						
Callaway	6AW				3								
	6ZJ						1						
Camden	CD				1		2						
	6AW												1
	6ZK				1								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	3	1							
Carter	CD				1								
Cass	CD				3	1							
	6AW					1							
	6ZO				2	1							
	6ZR				4	1	1						
Chariton	CD				1								

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Christian	CD			1	2								
	6ZM				2								
Clark	CD				4								
Clay	CD			2	4	1							
Clinton	CD			2		1	1						
Cole	CD			2	3	1							
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				4		3						
Cooper	CD				2								
Crawford	CD			1	2	1	3	1					
Dallas	6AW			1	1								
DeKalb	CD			1		1							
Dent	CD			3	4		3						
Douglas	CD						1						
Dunklin	CD			1			1						
	6ZS				2								
Franklin	CD			1	2		1	1					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZA				2								
	6ZC			1									
Gasconade	CD			1									
Gentry	CD				1								
Greene	CD				2		6	2					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZM				4	3	6	2					
	6ZV				2		1						
Henry	CD				3								
	6AW				1								
Hickory	CD				1	1							
Holt	CD					1							
Howard	6ZJ			1									
Howell	CD			1	2		6						
Iron	CD				1		1						
Jackson	CD				2								
	6AW				2			2					
	6ZO			1	10	6	3						1
	6ZR				11	1	4	3					1
Jasper	CD	1			4		2						
	6AW				1			1					
	6ZL				7	1	5						
Jefferson	6ZA				1	1		1					
	6ZB			2	10		3						
	6ZC				1		1	1					
Johnson	6AW				1								
Knox	CD			1									
Laclede	CD					1		2					
	6AW				2								
	6ZK				1								
Lafayette	CD			1	4								
Lawrence	6AW				1								
	6ZV				1	1							
Lewis	CD			1	1								
Lincoln	CD			2	5			1					
Linn	CD			1									
Livingston	CD					1							
Macon	CD			1	1			1					1
Madison	CD			3	3								

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Marion	CD			2	8	1	1						
	6AW				1								
McDonald	6ZL				1								
Miller	CD				1								
Mississippi	6AW					1							
Moniteau	CD				1								
Montgomery	CD			1	1								
	6AW			1									
Morgan	CD				2								
Newton	CD				1								
	6AW			1	3	1							
	6ZL				4			1					
Nodaway	CD						3						
Oregon	CD			2									
Osage	CD			1	1								
Pemiscot	CD				5								
	6AW			1									
Perry	CD						1						
Pettis	CD				3		1						
Phelps	CD			2	3		1						
	6ZK				1								
Platte	CD				1		2	1					
Polk	CD					1							
	6AW					1							
Pulaski	CD			2	7		4	1					
	6ZK				1								
Ralls	CD			1									
Randolph	CD			1		1		1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ				2								
Reynolds	CD			1	1								
Ripley	CD						1						
	6ZS				1								
Saline	CD				1								
Schuyler	CD						1						
Scotland	CD			1			1						
Scott	CD				1		1						
	6AW			1	1								
Shannon	CD				1		3						
Shelby	CD			1	1								
St. Charles	6AW				1								
	6ZB				2		1						
St. Francois	CD			3	1								
	6ZC			1	1		2						
St. Louis City	CD			1	4	3	3	1					
	6ZA				1	1	3	1					
	6ZB				3		1	1					
	6ZC				2		2	1					
St. Louis Co.	CD			2	4		2	2					
	6AW			1				1					
	6ZA			3	3	3	3	2					1
	6ZB				3		1						
	6ZC				3	1	1	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			2		1	1						
Stoddard	CD				2		3						
	6ZS			2			3	1					

Table 13: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – February 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Stone	CD				2								
	6AW				2								
	6ZV					1							
Taney	CD			1	1		2	1					
	6AW				2	1							
	6ZV				1								
Texas	CD			1	3		2	1					
	6ZK				1								
Warren	CD				1		3						
Washington	6ZB				1	1							
Wayne	CD				2		4						
Webster	CD				1								
	6AW						1						
Wright	CD						2						
	6AW				1								
<b>TOTAL</b>		1		75	274	53	133	39					6

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 10MAR25

Table 14: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD				4	1	7						
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				2	1							
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1			1	1					
	6AW			1									
	6ZV						1						
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				2								
Boone	CD				1								
	6AW				1								1
	6ZJ			1	8	1	5						
Buchanan	CD				1	2	3						
Butler	CD			1	4	1	2						
	6AW			1									
	6ZS			1	6		4						
Callaway	CD						1						
	6AW				2								
	6ZJ						1						
Camden	CD			1	2								
	6ZK				1								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	4	1	1						
Carter	CD				1								
Cass	CD				3								
	6AW					1							
	6ZO				2		1						
	6ZR				4	1	2						
Chariton	CD				1		1						
Christian	CD				2								
	6ZM				2		3						
Clark	CD				4		3						
Clay	CD			2	3	1	2						
Clinton	CD			2		1							
Cole	CD			2	3	1		1					
	6AW			1									



Table 14: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6ZJ				6								
Cooper	CD				2								
Crawford	CD				2		3	1					
Dallas	6AW			1	1								
DeKalb	CD			1		1							
Dent	CD			3	3		1						
Douglas	CD						1						
Dunklin	CD			2			1						
	6ZS				2		1						
Franklin	CD			1	1		1	1					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZA				3								
	6ZC			1									
Gasconade	CD			1									
Gentry	CD				1								
Greene	CD				1	1		1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZM				3	3	4	2					
	6ZV				2		6						
Henry	CD				3								
	6AW				1								
Hickory	CD				1	1							
Holt	CD					1							
Howard	6ZJ			1									
Howell	CD				2		5						
Iron	CD				1		1						
Jackson	CD				1		1						
	6AW				2			2					
	6ZO			1	10	3	4						1
	6ZR			1	10	2	2	1					1
Jasper	CD				4			1					
	6AW				1			1					
	6ZL				7	1	4						
Jefferson	6ZA				1	1		1					
	6ZB			2	12		1						
	6ZC				1			1					
Johnson	6AW							2					
Knox	CD						1	1					
Laclede	CD				1								
	6AW				1			1					
	6ZK				1								
Lafayette	CD				6								
Lawrence	6ZV				1	1		1					
Lewis	CD			1	1								
Lincoln	CD			2	6								
Linn	CD			1									
Livingston	CD					1							
Macon	CD			1	1			1					1
Madison	CD			3	3		2						
Marion	CD			2	8	1	1	1					
	6AW				1								
McDonald	6ZL				1								
Mississippi	6AW					1							
Moniteau	CD						1						
Montgomery	CD				1								
Morgan	CD				2								
New Madrid	CD					1	1						

Table 14: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Newton	CD				1								
	6AW			1	2	1							
	6ZL				4			1					
Nodaway	CD						3						
Oregon	CD			2									
Osage	CD			1	1								
Pemiscot	CD				5								
	6AW			1									
Perry	CD						1						
Pettis	CD				4								
Phelps	CD			2	3								
Platte	CD				1			1					
Pulaski	CD			2	9	1	2						
	6ZK				1								
Ralls	CD			1									
Randolph	CD			1		2		1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ				2								
Reynolds	CD			1	1								
Ripley	6ZS				1								
Saline	CD				1								
Scotland	CD			1	1								
Scott	CD				1								
	6AW			1	1								
Shannon	CD				1		3						
Shelby	CD			1	1								
St. Charles	6AW				1								
	6ZB				2		1						
St. Francois	CD			3			1						
	6ZC			1	1		1						
St. Louis City	CD			1	4	2	4	2					1
	6ZA				1		2	2					
	6ZB				3		1	2					
	6ZC				2		2						
St. Louis Co.	CD			1	4	1	3	1					
	6AW			1									
	6ZA			3	6	2	6	2					1
	6ZB				2		1						
	6ZC				2	1	3	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			2		1	2						
Stoddard	CD			1	1		5						
	6ZS			2			1	1					
Stone	CD				1								
	6AW				2								
	6ZV					1							
Taney	CD			1	1		2	2					
	6AW				2	1							
	6ZV				1								
Texas	CD			2	3								
	6ZK				1								
Warren	CD				1		1						
Washington	6ZB				1	1	1	1					
Wayne	CD				3		4	1					
Webster	CD				1								
	6AW						1						
Wright	CD						2						

Table 14: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – March 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6AW				1								
<b>TOTAL</b>				73	274	47	133	39					6

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 08APR25

Analysis of Tables 12-14: 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 47% 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 present a chronic runaway risk. They also typically present a history of showing rage, including physical aggression”.

Chart 28 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.

Chart 28: Residential Placement Utilization Grouped by Circuit				
	A	B	C	D
	15.01%+	10.01-15.00%	5.01-10.00%	0.00-5.00%
<b>January</b>	0	4	20	22
<b>February</b>	0	2	22	22
<b>March</b>	0	2	22	22


\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 08APR25

Analysis of Chart 28: Twenty-two (22) circuits (47.83%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in January. This is a decrease from 26 circuits the previous reporting period.

Twenty-two (22) circuits (47.83%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in February. This is an increase from 20 circuits the previous reporting period.

Twenty-two (22) circuits (47.83%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in March. This is an increase from 21 circuits the previous reporting period.

Chart 29 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, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 08APR25

Analysis of Chart 29: Four (4) agencies maintained below 5.00% residential utilization during all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from five 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 30 depicts the percentage of cases where sufficient efforts were made to place a child with relatives.



\*Source: Missouri CFSR-Item 10 Data, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 30: Of 32 cases applicable for rating of this item, 19 cases were rated a Strength. All cases rated Strength were cases where the child was placed either in a relative home placement, on a trial home visit, or concerted efforts to locate a relative placement had been exhausted during the period under review.

Thirteen (13) cases were rated ANI. All 13 cases received an ANI rating due to the agency's failure to locate, identify, inform, and evaluate relatives for potential placement. In two cases, relatives were located out-of-state, but no agency efforts were made to complete an Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children referral to evaluate the appropriateness of the relatives for placement.

**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 560 children in December of 2024 to 572 in March of 2025.

In December of 2024, the State of Missouri maintained 5.02% residential utilization.

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 14.6% 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 Administration is implementing a new training tracking system in 2025 which is expected to resolve this issue. 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 15 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 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	38.0%	36.1%	
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	50.0%	50.0%	
Audrain	CD	6.7%	14.3%	7.7%
	6AW			0.0%
Barry	CD	20.8%	26.1%	19.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	20.0%	20.0%	23.1%
Barton	CD	20.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Bates	CD	55.6%	55.6%	55.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benton	CD	24.1%	24.1%	23.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
Bollinger	CD	40.0%	33.3%	33.3%
Boone	CD	32.6%	34.1%	28.3%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZJ	9.5%	11.6%	8.5%
	6ZK	0.0%	11.6%	0.0%
Buchanan	CD	26.2%	26.7%	24.7%
Butler	CD	40.5%	41.7%	38.5%
	6AW		0.0%	
	6ZS	13.4%	7.8%	15.5%
Caldwell	CD	25.0%	50.0%	16.7%
Callaway	CD	45.5%	50.0%	45.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZJ	16.2%	15.0%	12.1%
Camden	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	12.5%	12.5%	28.6%
Cape Girardeau	CD	7.0%	5.1%	12.5%
	6ZS	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%
Carter	CD	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Cass	CD	44.4%	57.1%	50.0%
	6ZO	54.5%	30.0%	54.5%
	6ZR	17.1%	17.1%	16.7%
Cedar	CD	40.9%	45.0%	34.6%
Chariton	CD	70.0%	80.0%	70.0%
Christian	CD	41.9%	37.9%	36.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	35.0%	27.3%	30.0%
Clark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Clay	CD	31.6%	32.0%	29.9%
Clinton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cole	CD	41.7%	44.1%	34.1%
	6ZJ	18.2%	18.4%	17.9%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cooper	CD	100%	100%	40.0%
Crawford	CD	20.4%	17.0%	23.4%
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dallas	CD	45.5%	42.9%	52.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	36.4%	33.3%	40.0%
DeKalb	CD	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Dent	CD	19.4%	24.1%	18.2%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	
Douglas	CD	43.6%	51.6%	45.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	53.3%	55.8%	53.2%
	6ZS	29.2%	25.0%	32.0%
Franklin	CD	21.0%	22.0%	23.2%
	6ZA	27.3%	21.4%	25.0%
	6ZC	42.3%	40.0%	45.8%
Gasconade	CD	16.7%	12.5%	15.0%
Gentry	CD	37.5%	50.0%	37.5%
Greene	CD	27.7%	25.5%	27.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	26.8%	24.0%	26.4%
	6ZV	20.7%	22.6%	13.0%
Grundy	CD	44.4%	44.4%	44.4%
Harrison	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Henry	CD	50.0%	52.9%	42.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	46.2%	36.4%	15.4%
	6ZJ	22.2%	22.2%	22.2%

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Howell	CD	37.2%	40.0%	34.1%
Iron	CD	15.8%	16.7%	26.2%
Jackson	CD	70.0%	70.0%	65.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZO	25.0%	28.3%	20.7%
	6ZR	20.2%	22.0%	18.9%
Jasper	CD	22.7%	22.8%	20.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	21.2%	23.1%	20.0%
Jefferson	CD	72.7%	77.8%	50.0%
	6ZA	25.0%	23.5%	15.6%
	6ZB	28.3%	29.0%	30.1%
	6ZC	11.5%	11.5%	11.1%
Johnson	CD	26.7%	26.2%	32.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Knox	CD	85.7%	85.7%	100%
Laclede	CD	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	3.7%	3.8%	3.7%
Lafayette	CD	33.3%	25.0%	37.5%
	6ZO	0.0%		0.0%
Lawrence	CD	57.1%	57.1%	45.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	8.3%	8.3%	6.3%
Lewis	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lincoln	CD	29.4%	31.3%	30.4%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Linn	CD	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Livingston	CD	12.5%	14.8%	19.2%
Macon	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Madison	CD	3.4%	3.4%	4.0%
Maries	CD	16.7%	37.5%	20.0%
Marion	CD	16.0%	18.1%	16.0%
McDonald	CD	65.5%	65.6%	56.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZL	43.8%	50.0%	43.8%
Mercer	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Miller	CD	25.0%	27.3%	25.0%
Mississippi	CD	33.3%	33.3%	12.5%
Moniteau	CD	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
Monroe	CD	33.3%	60.0%	33.3%
Montgomery	CD	30.0%	25.0%	37.5%
Morgan	CD	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
New Madrid	CD	40.4%	42.0%	30.0%
Newton	CD	72.2%	68.2%	72.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	37.0%	38.7%	32.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Nodaway	CD	55.8%	57.1%	62.8%
Oregon	CD	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	60.0%	64.3%	52.9%
Pemiscot	CD	44.6%	44.3%	51.7%
Perry	CD	44.4%	44.4%	50.0%
Pettis	CD	25.0%	31.4%	25.5%
Phelps	CD	44.0%	43.8%	45.5%
	6ZK	18.8%	18.8%	16.7%
Pike	CD	30.0%	30.0%	20.0%
Platte	CD	18.2%	12.9%	29.2%
	6ZM		100%	
Polk	CD	31.3%	31.3%	30.0%
Pulaski	CD	39.3%	40.5%	40.7%
	6ZK	16.7%	25.0%	23.1%
Putnam	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Ralls	CD	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Randolph	CD	27.3%	22.7%	22.2%
	6ZJ	8.8%	6.1%	8.8%
Ray	CD	100%	100%	50.0%
Reynolds	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ripley	CD	18.8%	25.0%	43.5%
	6ZS	6.3%	6.7%	5.3%
Saline	CD	71.4%	61.5%	78.6%
Schuyler	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scotland	CD	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	10.5%	11.1%	14.7%
Shannon	CD	66.7%	70.0%	66.7%
Shelby	CD	30.8%	30.8%	30.8%
St. Charles	CD	19.4%	18.8%	18.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	33.3%	39.1%	15.4%
	6ZJ			0.0%
St. Clair	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	9.1%	9.3%	11.4%
	6ZB			100%
	6ZC	17.2%	17.2%	13.8%
St. Louis City	CD	46.4%	44.8%	38.9%
	6ZA	8.4%	10.3%	8.2%
	6ZB	25.0%	23.6%	20.5%
	6ZC	19.2%	18.9%	16.4%
St. Louis County	CD	44.2%	41.7%	43.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	9.5%	11.0%	9.7%
	6ZB	15.4%	14.5%	15.5%
	6ZC	11.1%	8.5%	11.9%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	61.5%	88.9%	44.4%
Stoddard	CD	81.5%	81.1%	75.8%
	6ZA	100%	100%	100%

<b>Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZS	48.0%	52.0%	46.2%
Stone	CD	20.0%	16.7%	26.9%
	6AW		0.0%	
	6ZV	9.1%	9.1%	
Sullivan	CD	100%	100%	100%
Taney	CD	25.5%	26.5%	31.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	15.6%	15.2%	13.6%
Texas	CD	10.7%	12.0%	9.1%
	6ZK	83.3%	83.3%	80.0%
Vernon	CD	28.6%	27.8%	26.1%
	6AW	0.0%		0.0%
Warren	CD	15.4%	15.4%	13.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	CD	15.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	6ZB	14.6%	16.7%	9.8%
Wayne	CD	38.7%	38.7%	45.7%
Webster	CD	37.8%	39.5%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	35.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Worth	CD	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	34.3%	35.1%	31.3%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 15: Number of counties that met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency within 12 months: January (26), February (27), March (26).

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 16 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 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	46.4%	42.9%	46.2%
Atchison	CD	100%	100%	
Audrain	CD	66.7%	66.7%	73.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barry	CD	40.0%	39.3%	39.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	20.0%	20.0%	28.6%
Barton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM			0.0%
Bates	CD	83.3%	83.3%	90.9%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZL	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	100%	
Benton	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
Bollinger	CD	66.7%	72.7%	71.4%
Boone	CD	50.0%	54.5%	59.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	35.0%	31.3%	38.0%
Buchanan	CD	50.0%	76.2%	60.0%
Butler	CD	62.5%	75.0%	68.1%
	6ZA	100%		
	6ZS	42.1%	45.8%	45.0%
Caldwell	CD	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Callaway	CD	71.4%	62.5%	68.8%
	6AW			100%
	6ZJ	20.0%	16.7%	16.7%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Camden	CD	100%	55.6%	41.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	47.3%	50.0%	50.0%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	60.0%	60.0%	66.7%
	6ZK		100%	100%
Cass	CD	68.8%	90.9%	78.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	7.7%	8.3%	6.3%
	6ZR	27.8%	31.6%	47.1%
Cedar	CD	46.2%	37.5%	44.4%
Chariton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Christian	CD	74.1%	60.0%	58.3%
	6ZM	36.8%	36.8%	46.7%
Clark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clay	CD	45.6%	44.1%	54.1%
Clinton	CD	33.3%	30.0%	45.5%
Cole	CD	16.7%	25.0%	55.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	100%	100%	
	6ZJ	81.8%	81.8%	86.4%
Cooper	CD	50.0%	40.0%	50.0%
Crawford	CD	50.0%	58.6%	53.8%
Dallas	CD	31.3%	16.7%	16.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	60.0%	33.3%	33.3%
DeKalb	CD	44.4%	50.0%	60.0%
	6ZO	0.0%	0.0%	
Dent	CD	63.2%	78.9%	88.2%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
Douglas	CD	57.1%	45.5%	36.4%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
Dunklin	CD	50.0%	68.8%	48.1%
	6ZS	33.3%	27.3%	27.3%
Franklin	CD	60.6%	50.7%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%
	6ZC	12.5%	20.0%	50.0%
Gasconade	CD	75.0%	70.0%	54.5%
Gentry	CD	100%	100%	
Greene	CD	58.3%	53.6%	47.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZM	57.9%	56.3%	52.9%
	6ZT	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	52.9%	56.3%	50.0%
Grundy	CD	91.7%	90.9%	91.7%
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	80.0%
Henry	CD	72.4%	67.9%	75.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	33.3%	33.3%	28.6%
	6ZJ	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	23.5%	22.9%	26.5%
Iron	CD	38.5%	42.9%	34.8%
Jackson	CD	69.0%	72.2%	76.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	43.3%	42.5%	44.7%
	6ZR	21.9%	21.9%	28.7%
Jasper	CD	53.1%	53.0%	57.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	53.3%	61.3%	74.3%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Jefferson	CD	43.1%	50.0%	53.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	55.6%	48.0%	53.6%
	6ZB	43.9%	40.7%	36.2%
	6ZC	45.5%	50.0%	41.7%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Johnson	CD	70.6%	88.9%	80.0%
	6ZO	100%		
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	14.3%	20.0%	20.0%
Laclede	CD	35.3%	31.4%	29.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	29.4%	23.5%	15.0%
Lafayette	CD	100%	100%	100%
Lawrence	CD	38.1%	30.0%	43.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Lewis	CD	100%	50.0%	50.0%
Lincoln	CD	64.5%	52.8%	48.5%
Linn	CD	35.0%	38.1%	30.0%
Livingston	CD	20.0%	33.3%	71.4%
Macon	CD	29.4%	35.3%	47.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	CD	41.2%	41.2%	27.8%
Maries	CD	100%	80.0%	80.0%
Marion	CD	39.0%	35.7%	37.3%
McDonald	CD	76.5%	83.3%	100%
	6ZL	33.3%	37.5%	62.5%
Miller	CD	18.2%	16.7%	35.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mississippi	CD	50.0%	28.6%	12.5%
	6AW			0.0%
Moniteau	CD	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Monroe	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Montgomery	CD	58.8%	55.6%	45.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	27.8%	26.3%	26.3%
	6AW	33.3%	50.0%	33.3%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
New Madrid	CD	43.8%	35.7%	28.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	
Newton	CD	71.0%	75.9%	72.4%
	6ZL	75.0%	70.0%	66.7%
Nodaway	CD	73.3%	41.7%	53.8%
Oregon	CD	27.3%	33.3%	27.3%
Osage	CD	66.7%	85.7%	85.7%
Ozark	CD	33.3%	55.6%	55.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	71.4%	71.4%	73.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Perry	CD	58.3%	56.3%	53.3%
Pettis	CD	48.5%	46.7%	46.4%
	6ZJ	100%		
Phelps	CD	55.6%	58.6%	63.6%
	6ZK	71.4%	66.7%	75.0%
Pike	CD	30.0%	33.3%	55.6%
Platte	CD	17.6%	13.3%	16.7%
	6ZO	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
	6ZR	100%	50.0%	50.0%
Polk	CD	57.9%	47.4%	40.0%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	
Pulaski	CD	64.4%	57.9%	62.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	80.0%	63.6%	77.8%
Putnam	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ralls	CD	72.7%	88.9%	88.9%
Randolph	CD	64.0%	71.4%	68.2%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZJ	23.5%	23.5%	26.7%
Ray	CD	40.0%	50.0%	33.3%
Reynolds	CD	85.7%	85.7%	66.7%
Ripley	CD	85.7%	20.0%	20.0%
	6ZS	72.7%	72.7%	57.9%
Saline	CD	66.7%	92.3%	92.3%
Schuyler	CD	100%	100%	66.7%
Scotland	CD	42.9%	42.9%	45.9%
Scott	CD	48.6%	47.1%	39.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Shannon	CD	100%	100%	100%
Shelby	CD	66.7%	66.7%	71.4%
St. Charles	CD	76.1%	71.4%	72.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	25.0%	100%	100%
	6ZB	54.5%	44.4%	27.3%
	6ZC	42.9%	52.2%	46.2%
St. Clair	CD	71.4%	60.0%	66.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	59.6%	58.5%	54.5%
	6ZB	0.0%		
	6ZC	50.0%	55.0%	59.1%
St. Louis City	CD	27.0%	29.3%	27.7%
	6ZA	11.9%	18.6%	16.7%
	6ZB	17.4%	27.3%	34.8%
	6ZC	48.4%	48.1%	50.0%
St. Louis County	CD	30.1%	29.9%	32.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	29.5%	27.9%	30.6%
	6ZB	39.6%	41.7%	41.9%
	6ZC	40.0%	38.5%	31.0%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	60.0%	50.0%	66.7%
Stoddard	CD	70.8%	69.6%	79.4%
	6ZS	75.0%	75.0%	50.0%
Stone	CD	68.2%	61.1%	55.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZV	100%	100%	66.7%
Sullivan	CD	100%	100%	100%
Taney	CD	46.4%	51.3%	55.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	53.3%	56.3%	58.8%
Texas	CD	42.3%	52.2%	54.2%
	6ZK	50.0%	50.0%	100%
Vernon	CD	60.0%	54.5%	43.8%
Warren	CD	50.0%	54.2%	54.2%
Washington	CD	58.8%	78.9%	77.8%
	6ZB	39.1%	40.7%	40.7%
Wayne	CD	62.5%	73.3%	80.0%
Webster	CD	50.0%	48.3%	45.2%

<b>Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	42.3%	44.8%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Analysis of Table 16: Number of counties that met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency within 12-23 months: January (42), February (40), March (47).

Thirty-four (34) counties met or exceeded the National Performance timely permanency for those in care 12-23 months all three months of the reporting period.

Table 17 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 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	43.2%	54.1%	44.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	50.0%	75.0%	80.0%
Audrain	CD	20.0%	20.0%	38.9%
	6AW	20.0%	25.0%	33.3%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	
Barry	CD	34.8%	32.0%	30.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6ZV	22.2%	22.2%	18.2%
Barton	CD	25.0%	22.2%	22.2%
Bates	CD	80.0%	75.0%	75.0%
	6ZR			100%
Benton	CD	42.9%	42.9%	50.0%
	6AW			0.0%
Bollinger	CD	50.0%	40.0%	50.0%
Boone	CD	27.96%	28.6%	33.3%
	6AW	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	26.9%	20.4%	26.0%
Buchanan	CD	29.4%	29.4%	25.0%
Butler	CD	29.3%	21.6%	23.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	62.5%	50.0%	50.0%
Caldwell	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Callaway	CD	26.4%	24.1%	22.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Camden	CD	56.0%	45.8%	45.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<b>Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZK	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%
Cape Girardeau	CD	51.5%	50.7%	56.8%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	66.7%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	15.4%	12.5%	18.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	40.0%	28.6%	28.6%
	6ZR	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%
Cedar	CD	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Christian	CD	35.3%	47.6%	47.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Clark	CD	28.6%	23.1%	21.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clay	CD	52.8%	54.3%	51.4%
Clinton	CD	33.3%	40.0%	40.0%
Cole	CD	33.3%	21.4%	21.4%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	45.5%	45.5%	45.5%
Cooper	CD	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Crawford	CD	30.8%	41.7%	46.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dallas	CD	75.0%	33.3%	33.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	66.7%	66.7%	33.3%
DeKalb	CD	41.7%	46.7%	46.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Dent	CD	36.8%	29.4%	17.6%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	CD	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	28.6%	33.3%	36.4%
	6AW	0.0%	100%	100%
	6ZS	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Franklin	CD	40.6%	37.5%	39.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%
	6ZC	50.0%	12.5%	11.1%
Gasconade	CD	37.5%	37.5%	50.0%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	48.6%	45.0%	41.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	42.9%	38.6%	30.8%
	6ZT	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	45.5%	41.7%	41.7%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	50.0%
Harrison	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%



<b>Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Henry	CD	43.8%	40.0%	38.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	24.0%	28.0%	28.0%
Iron	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jackson	CD	46.1%	46.6%	48.6%
	6AW	7.1%	7.1%	5.0%
	6ZO	22.4%	23.5%	23.4%
	6ZR	34.4%	37.0%	33.0%
Jasper	CD	51.5%	47.3%	42.4%
	6AW	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%
	6ZL	41.2%	38.7%	36.4%
Jefferson	CD	41.7%	48.8%	52.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	41.7%	47.4%	37.1%
	6ZB	40.0%	33.3%	36.2%
	6ZC	42.1%	31.6%	31.3%
Johnson	CD	50.0%	57.1%	53.3%
	6AW	0.0%	12.5%	14.3%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Laclede	CD	51.4%	46.7%	34.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	28.6%	28.6%	33.3%
Lafayette	CD	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
Lawrence	CD	38.5%	27.3%	23.1%
	6AW	9.1%	9.1%	10.0%
	6ZT	100%	100%	
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lewis	CD	100%	100%	100%
Lincoln	CD	52.6%	50.0%	44.4%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Linn	CD	30.4%	29.2%	26.1%
Livingston	CD	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Macon	CD	22.2%	21.1%	20.0%
Madison	CD	34.8%	36.4%	34.8%
Maries	CD	91.7%	91.7%	90.0%
Marion	CD	32.4%	39.7%	34.8%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
McDonald	CD	100%	77.8%	85.7%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
	6ZL	50.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Miller	CD	38.5%	53.8%	54.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mississippi	CD	18.2%	18.2%	18.2%

<b>Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	100%		
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Monroe	CD	20.0%	20.0%	16.7%
	6AW	0.0%		
Montgomery	CD	53.3%	64.3%	64.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	69.4%	70.0%	52.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	50.0%	100%	50.0%
New Madrid	CD	26.7%	24.1%	21.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Newton	CD	59.1%	50.0%	42.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Nodaway	CD	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%
Oregon	CD	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%
Osage	CD	100%	50.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	18.2%	18.2%	18.2%
Pemiscot	CD	11.1%	16.7%	20.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Perry	CD	40.0%	14.3%	25.0%
Pettis	CD	53.8%	55.6%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	38.7%	44.4%	40.3%
	6ZK	40.0%	44.4%	44.4%
Pike	CD	53.8%	57.1%	53.8%
Platte	CD	43.8%	43.8%	31.3%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Polk	CD	23.1%	0.0%	12.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pulaski	CD	35.5%	33.3%	37.8%
	6ZK	50.0%	37.5%	33.3%
Putnam	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ralls	CD	22.2%	30.0%	50.0%
Randolph	CD	33.3%	38.1%	48.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	28.6%	14.3%	25.0%
Ray	CD	83.3%	66.7%	66.7%
Reynolds	CD	28.6%	33.3%	28.6%
Ripley	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Saline	CD	50.0%	41.7%	46.2%
Schuyler	CD	100%	100%	100%
Scotland	CD	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	37.5%	37.5%	26.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%


<b>Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Shannon	CD	22.2%	12.5%	12.5%
Shelby	CD	8.3%	25.0%	23.1%
St. Charles	CD	18.4%	21.1%	19.4%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
	6ZB	54.5%	58.3%	58.3%
	6ZC	16.7%	25.0%	25.0%
St. Clair	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	69.6%	36.1%	40.0%
	6ZB	100%	50.0%	50.0%
	6ZC	100%	60.9%	50.0%
St. Louis City	CD	27.1%	30.8%	31.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	20.0%	20.3%	27.4%
	6ZB	31.1%	33.3%	25.7%
	6ZC	39.3%	43.8%	44.4%
St. Louis County	CD	30.9%	31.6%	32.3%
	6AW	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%
	6ZA	23.1%	24.4%	26.0%
	6ZB	38.7%	38.2%	35.0%
	6ZC	34.5%	35.1%	34.5%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Stoddard	CD	44.4%	33.3%	33.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stone	CD	30.8%	27.3%	30.0%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	20.0%
Sullivan	CD	11.8%	6.7%	6.7%
Taney	CD	47.8%	43.8%	47.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Texas	CD	29.4%	16.7%	21.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Vernon	CD	33.3%	40.0%	33.3%
Warren	CD	19.2%	19.2%	17.4%
	6AW	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
Washington	CD	32.1%	46.7%	36.0%
	6ZB	42.9%	46.7%	33.3%
Wayne	CD	53.8%	50.0%	50.0%
Webster	CD	42.9%	45.5%	37.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wright	CD	46.4%	46.4%	46.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025


Analysis of Table 17: Number of counties that performed at or higher than the National Performance for timely permanency in 24 months or more: January (30), February (30), March (26).

Twenty-four (24) counties performed at or higher than the National Performance for timely permanency for those in care 24 months or more all three months of the reporting period.


Charts 31-33 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.



\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025



\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10MAR2025




\*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 08APR2025

Analysis of Charts 31-33: January: Four (4) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for permanency in all three timeframes.

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


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

Chart 34 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 RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Chart 35 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 RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025

Chart 36 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 RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 10FEB2025; 10MAR2025; 08APR2025


Analysis of Charts 34-36: 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 three months of the reporting period: 6 (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZS, 6ZT, 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 (6ZK, 6ZL, 6ZT, CD).

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

Chart 37 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 37: Of the 32 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 identification of permanent placement resources and timely negotiation of adoption and guardianship subsidy agreements.

Seventeen (17) cases were rated ANI for this item. 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 engaging with incarcerated parents, 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, a child had been in care for 31 months and there is no evidence that the agency has made any concerted efforts toward establishing a concurrent case goal for the child.

Data Analysis Summary:

Timely permanency within 12 months of entering care:

Twenty (20) counties met or exceeded the National Performance for January, February, and March 2025. This is an increase from 19 counties the previous reporting period.

No agency met or exceeded the National Performance for January, February, or March 2025. This is a decrease from one agency the previous reporting period.

Timely permanency within 12-23 months of entering care:

Thirty-four (34) counties met or exceeded the National Performance in January, February, and March 2025. This is a decrease from 37 counties the previous reporting period.

Six (6) agencies (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZS, 6ZT, 6ZV, CD) met or exceeded the National Performance for January, February, and March 2025. This is an increase from four agencies the previous reporting period.

Timely permanency for those in care 24 month or more:

Twenty-four (24) counties met or exceeded the National Performance for January, February, and March 2025. This is an increase from 21 counties the previous reporting period.

Four (4) agencies (6ZK, 6ZL, 6ZT, CD) met or exceeded the National Performance for January, February, and March 2025. This is a decrease from five agencies the previous reporting period.

Four (4) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in all three timeframes (12 months or less, 12-23 months, 24+ months) in January: Circuit 15, Circuit 25, Circuit 27, 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 February: Circuit 04, Circuit 15, and Circuit 25, Circuit 27, Circuit 40. This is an increase from three circuits 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 March: Circuit 03, Circuit 15, Circuit 25, Circuit 27 and Circuit 40. This is an increase from four circuits 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 3.1% decrease 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 18 depicts the Supervisor to Case Manager ratio for FCCM agencies from January through March of 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 18: FCCM Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio Grouped by Agency</b>			
<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
6AW	9:30	9:34	9:32
6ZA	11:47	11:49	11:50
6ZB	9:30	9:26	9:30
6ZC	11:32	11:33	11:35
6ZJ	7:29	8:30	7:29
6ZK	2:10	2:10	2:9
6ZL	3:12	3:12	3:14
6ZM	4:19	5:19	5:18
6ZO	5:33	5:33	5:32
6ZR	7:34	6:37	6:34
6ZS	4:19	4:18	4:16
6ZV	3:13	3:14	4:18

\*Source: DSS\Research Data SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL(PH2SUPMF) RS5HBIM0 JIRA 5055, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 08APR25

Analysis of Table 18: FCCM Supervisor to Case Manager ratios range from 2:9 to 11:50, January through March of 2025.

Table 19 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 19: CD Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio</b>			
<b>Circuit</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
01	2:3	2:2	2:2
02	3:6	3:6	3:6
03	1:3	2:5	1:3
04	2:5	2:5	2:5
05	2:8	2:8	2:8
06	1:3	1:3	1:4
07	3:10	3:11	3:10
08	1:1	1:1	1:1
09	2:5	2:4	2:5
10	4:13	4:13	3:16
11	4:7	4:7	3:8
12	2:7	2:7	2:7
13	5:11	5:11	4:13
14	1:3	1:3	2:3
15	1:4	1:4	1:4
16	4:8	4:8	4:9

<b>Table 19: CD Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio</b>			
<b>Circuit</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
17	3:11	3:11	3:12
18	1:6	1:6	1:6
19	2:4	2:5	2:5
20	3:12	3:12	4:14
21	5:11	4:14	5:16
22	4:16	4:14	2:10
23	3:8	2:6	3:8
24	4:15	4:15	4:15
25	4:15	4:14	4:14
26	3:12	3:13	3:11
27	2:7	2:7	2:7
28	3:10	2:7	2:7
29	4:18	5:18	4:17
30	3:8	3:8	3:9
31	6:22	6:22	5:21
32	4:22	4:21	4:21
33	2:5	2:6	2:6
34	2:9	2:9	2:9
35	3:12	3:12	3:12
36	2:8	4:9	2:7
37	2:7	2:7	2:8
38	2:8	2:6	2:6
39	3:12	3:12	4:11
40	3:10	3:10	3:10
41	2:4	2:5	2:7
42	3:10	3:11	3:11
43	2:7	2:8	2:8
44	3:8	3:8	2:7
45	3:11	3:11	3:11
46	3:8	3:8	3:7

\*Source: DSS\Research Data SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL(PH2SUPMF) RS5HBIM0 JIRA 5055, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 08APR25

Analysis of Table 19: Children’s Division Supervisor to Case Manager ratios by circuit range from 1:1 to 6:22 January through March of 2025.

Data Analysis Summary: As a state, Supervisor to Case Manager ratios ranged from 1:1 to 11:50, January through March 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. However, there is no available data as it is no longer the practice for FCCM agencies to return cases due to high cost. The new practice is for Children’s Division to take over the placement cost once a threshold of \$100,000.00 is reached within a 12-month timeframe. The case will remain with the FCCM for all other case management services. The last FCCM case returned to Children’s Division for this reason was in August 2022. The practice was ended in October 2022.

## Phase III Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2025 – March 31, 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 20 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 20: Placement Stability – National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Adair	CD	6.71	6.58	6.08
Andrew	CD	1.05	0.00	0.00
Atchison	CD	6.94	5.91	3.74
Audrain	CD	6.42	9.51	7.77
Barry	CD	7.07	6.85	7.89
	6AW	4.63	8.13	7.22
	6ZV	3.67	4.21	4.23
Barton	CD	1.61	0.00	0.00
Bates	CD	3.02	2.62	2.28
Benton	CD	6.95	5.91	5.90
Bollinger	CD	6.50	5.16	4.79
Boone	CD	4.95	4.05	4.62
	6ZJ	5.52	4.76	5.27
Buchanan	CD	6.27	6.39	6.47
Butler	CD	3.01	2.46	2.79
	6ZS	7.10	6.70	6.84
Caldwell	CD	9.63	7.26	5.80
Callaway	CD	5.55	6.51	6.13
	6ZJ	2.63	2.30	2.68
Camden	CD	4.20	3.48	1.37
	6ZK	1.52	1.66	3.24
Cape Girardeau	CD	4.26	4.32	4.40
Carter	CD	5.45	4.46	3.77
Cass	CD	5.63	6.65	6.95
	6ZO	6.97	10.89	8.49
	6ZR	5.59	5.05	4.43
Cedar	CD	7.44	6.86	4.56
Chariton	CD	7.51	6.36	6.41
Christian	CD	5.89	6.45	6.34

<b>Table 20: Placement Stability – National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
	6ZM	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clark	CD	6.01	8.13	6.97
Clay	CD	3.78	3.95	3.67
Clinton	CD	4.72	4.91	4.17
Cole	CD	2.44	2.57	2.45
	6ZJ	4.75	4.53	5.38
Cooper	CD	1.95	3.80	4.89
Crawford	CD	3.87	3.74	4.10
Dade	CD	0.94	1.60	1.39
Dallas	CD	5.24	5.03	5.18
Daviess	CD	5.00	5.63	4.94
DeKalb	CD	2.15	2.09	1.58
Dent	CD	4.71	7.44	7.03
Douglas	CD	3.67	4.50	3.60
Dunklin	CD	3.98	3.69	3.37
	6ZS	5.64	9.41	8.88
Franklin	CD	3.72	3.39	3.15
	6ZA	3.14	2.83	2.35
	6ZC	1.64	1.88	1.94
Gasconade	CD	4.17	4.53	4.71
Gentry	CD	0.00	1.17	1.52
Greene	CD	5.17	4.49	4.41
	6ZM	5.15	4.63	4.56
	6ZV	5.91	6.10	6.57
Grundy	CD	4.28	2.68	4.36
Harrison	CD	5.62	2.73	2.33
Henry	CD	5.13	4.70	3.95
	6AW	7.43	6.67	6.04
Hickory	CD	8.97	7.87	7.02
Holt	CD	3.80	4.78	3.69
Howard	CD	6.25	5.58	4.54
	6ZJ	11.69	8.38	7.72
Howell	CD	8.10	8.52	7.58
Iron	CD	3.38	2.83	2.65
Jackson	CD	3.77	4.08	4.28
	6ZO	4.88	4.54	4.37
	6ZR	4.57	4.37	4.15
Jasper	CD	4.13	3.73	3.62
	6ZL	8.12	7.97	7.23
Jefferson	CD	4.42	0.73	2.57
	6ZA	6.28	6.20	5.87
	6ZB	4.15	4.17	4.49
	6ZC	2.93	2.96	2.39
Johnson	CD	3.68	3.56	3.02
Knox	CD	2.84	2.68	5.57
Laclede	CD	3.41	2.94	3.76
	6ZK	3.93	3.68	3.01
Lafayette	CD	5.22	5.39	5.07
Lawrence	CD	2.80	3.93	3.83
	6ZV	7.48	6.70	6.85
Lewis	CD	2.40	2.67	2.81

<b>Table 20: Placement Stability – National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
Lincoln	CD	4.75	4.37	4.46
Linn	CD	11.03	9.78	5.29
Livingston	CD	6.87	6.07	5.62
Macon	CD	5.94	6.01	5.44
Madison	CD	6.54	5.88	4.86
Maries	CD	3.02	4.49	4.29
Marion	CD	5.42	5.80	4.25
McDonald	CD	5.63	5.96	5.23
	6ZL	6.87	7.92	6.35
Mercer	CD	11.90	8.70	6.94
Miller	CD	3.30	3.41	2.96
Mississippi	CD	1.48	1.28	2.26
Moniteau	CD	1.92	1.81	1.72
Monroe	CD	8.16	6.61	5.24
Montgomery	CD	6.53	3.32	0.93
Morgan	CD	4.65	3.84	3.06
	6ZR		0.00	0.00
New Madrid	CD	4.31	4.25	5.15
Newton	CD	5.75	4.91	5.36
	6ZL	9.45	7.89	6.00
Nodaway	CD	1.47	2.08	3.53
Oregon	CD	5.70	4.54	10.82
Osage	CD	3.89	2.48	2.15
Ozark	CD	2.26	2.28	3.95
Pemiscot	CD	2.61	2.30	2.28
Perry	CD	4.89	5.29	5.19
Pettis	CD	4.43	4.88	4.93
Phelps	CD	3.38	3.23	3.35
	6ZK	3.49	3.16	4.39
Pike	CD	12.97	10.95	10.16
Platte	CD	7.31	7.17	6.10
Polk	CD	4.70	4.58	4.44
Pulaski	CD	6.02	5.72	5.76
	6ZK	2.28	2.79	3.50
Putnam	CD	1.13	1.56	0.00
Ralls	CD	1.79	3.38	4.67
Randolph	CD	8.82	8.22	6.26
	6ZJ	6.21	6.11	7.01
Ray	CD	4.15		
Reynolds	CD	3.61	3.83	3.48
Ripley	CD	2.17	5.44	4.66
	6ZS	3.66	2.17	2.24
Saline	CD	4.00	4.16	3.15
Schuyler	CD	4.55	4.40	2.60
Scotland	CD	9.58	11.01	8.57
Scott	CD	3.51	4.49	3.54
Shannon	CD	7.67	5.56	5.62
Shelby	CD	2.24	2.60	4.21
St. Charles	CD	5.86	5.47	5.20
	6ZB	5.01	6.46	6.55
	6ZC	2.36	4.52	4.42

<b>Table 20: Placement Stability – National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
St. Clair	CD	1.71	1.35	0.00
	6AW	9.09	7.97	7.09
St. Francois	CD	6.93	6.23	6.96
	6ZC	4.73	4.32	4.95
St. Louis City	CD	3.74	4.25	3.44
	6ZA	6.09	5.03	4.88
	6ZB	9.08	9.55	7.97
	6ZC	5.60	5.92	5.90
St. Louis County	CD	3.61	4.25	5.86
	6ZA	7.01	6.19	5.72
	6ZB	6.61	7.21	7.57
	6ZC	7.52	6.91	6.99
Ste. Genevieve	CD	6.45	12.66	4.39
Stoddard	CD	5.12	5.43	5.45
	6ZS	5.59	4.71	5.89
Stone	CD	6.07	5.51	5.74
	6ZV	5.00	7.33	7.74
Sullivan	CD	2.05	1.82	2.62
Taney	CD	6.37	7.72	7.84
	6ZV	5.88	5.10	4.82
Texas	CD	5.13	4.78	4.34
	6ZK	2.71	2.17	1.81
Vernon	CD	2.67	2.96	2.90
	6AW	11.40		
Warren	CD	5.69	5.26	5.40
Washington	CD	3.16	4.09	3.79
	6ZB	4.85	3.79	3.58
Wayne	CD	3.38	2.75	2.54
Webster	CD	4.99	4.57	4.21
	6AW	8.43	9.17	8.98
Worth	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wright	CD	5.48	4.73	4.94

\*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 09APR25

Analysis of Table 20: Number of counties that met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability: January (43), February (44), March (48).


Twenty-nine (29) counties met or exceeded National Performance for placement stability all months where entries occurred during the reporting period.

Chart 38 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 38: 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>January</b>	3	2	8	16	17
<b>February</b>	2	3	10	13	17
<b>March</b>	0	2	9	17	17

\*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 09APR25


Analysis of Chart 38: Seventeen (17) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in each month of the reporting period. The next highest concentration of circuits experienced an average of 4.49-5.49 placement moves for foster children.



\*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 10FEB25; 10MAR25; 09APR25

Analysis of Chart 39: One agency (6ZK) met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in all three months of the reporting period. Two agencies (6ZL & 6ZR) met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability two of three months of the reporting period.

Chart 40 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, January-March 2025

Analysis of Chart 40: Of 32 cases applicable for rating of this item, 22 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.

Ten (10) 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.

Since implementation of the collaborative meetings, Worker-Parent visits have improved from 39.40% (June 2024) to 47.26% (January 2025) for the state as a whole. In June of 2024, only



one agency (6ZK) was meeting the benchmark for Worker-Parent visits. In March 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.

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

## **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.

The next reporting period is April 1, 2025, through June 30, 2025, with the report to be published by October 1, 2025.

For previous reports, please visit our website: [https://dss.mo.gov/hb\\_1414.html](https://dss.mo.gov/hb_1414.html).