

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



Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026

Published by:
Children's Division
July 2026

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

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses (Reporting Period: March 2026).....	3
Phase I Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026).....	3
A. Safety Domain: Caseworker Monthly Visits with Children in Foster Care.....	3
B. Safety Domain: Victimization in Foster Care	5
C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child.....	7
D. Well-Being Domain: Medical Exam Completion (HCY).....	8
E. Permanency Domain: Worker Visits with Parent.....	10
F. Permanency Domain: Reentry into Foster Care	12
G. Service Domain: Average Number of Workers Per Child in Care (Less Than 12 Months and 12+ Months)	14
Phase II Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026)	15
H. Well-Being Domain: Placement Category/Residential Type.....	15
I. Well-Being Domain: Case Managers and Supervisors Trauma Trained/Informed.....	18
J. Permanency Domain: Timely Achievement of Child's Court Approved Plan.....	18
K. Service Domain: Effective Ratio of Supervisors to Supervision of Case Managers	23
L. Service Domain: Cases Returned to CD for Catastrophic Costs/Court Order	23
Phase III Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026)	24
M. Permanency Domain: Placement Stability	24
Technical Assistance.....	26
Conclusion	26

Introduction

This report provides a high-level summary of performance outcomes related to House Bill 1414. It focuses on key trends and patterns observed during the reporting period and is intended to support interpretation of the detailed data available on the [Foster Care Case Management Dashboard](#).

Readers seeking additional background information, including historical context, Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) information, applicable regulatory requirements, and information regarding contracted case management agencies (FCCMs), are encouraged to visit the [House Bill 1414 Information Page](#).

Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses (Reporting Period: March 2026)

Stakeholder survey responses, including response summaries and trend data, are available on the Foster Care Case Management Dashboard.

Phase I Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026)

Detailed data, including provider-level performance by county and trend analyses for all metrics, is available on the Foster Care Case Management Dashboard, accessible on the [House Bill 1414 Information Page](#).

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.

The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that met or exceeded the benchmark for Caseworker Monthly Visits with Children in Foster Care. The benchmark set by the Response and Evaluation Team (R&E) for this metric is 95%.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in January: 113.

Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 91 (80.5%).

Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in February: 113.

Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 83 (73.5%).

Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in March: 113.

Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 84 (74.3%).

Fifty-seven (57) counties met the benchmark all three months.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

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

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 35 (76.1%) This is no change from the previous reporting period.

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

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 35 (76.1%). This is an increase from 69.6% the previous reporting period.

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

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 34 (73.9%). This is a decrease from 82.6% the previous reporting period.

Twenty-five (25) circuits met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from 18 circuits the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies that met the benchmark during each month: January (11), February (12), March (10).

Eight (8) agencies met the benchmark all three months: 6AW, 6ZB, 6ZC, 6ZJ, 6ZK, 6ZM, 6ZO, and 6ZV. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data:

Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) measures are based on a case review sample and are intended to provide insight into system-level performance. While more detailed results, including county-level results, are available on the Foster Care Case Management Dashboard, this report presents findings in aggregate, as further disaggregation would result in small sample sizes and limit meaningful interpretation.

Data presented in CFSR sections of this report reflects validated data for the reporting period and may differ from data currently displayed on the Foster Care Case Management Dashboard due to identified data discrepancies. Efforts are underway to resolve these discrepancies in the dashboard.

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. To receive a Strength rating, both the frequency and quality of the visits must be sufficient.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 14: Caseworker Visits with Children):

Of the 34 cases available for review, 25 (73.5%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for caseworker visits with children. This is an increase from 70.5% of cases during the previous reporting period. Nine (9) cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

Common themes in cases rated Strength included face-to-face monthly visitation, private conversations with children to assess safety and wellbeing, observation of home conditions, and increased visitation during periods of transition such as Trial Home Visits. Cases rated ANI most commonly involved failure to meet with children alone, inadequate responsiveness during periods of heightened need, lack of communication with resource providers, or limited assessment of placement conditions.

Data Analysis Summary:

While many counties and circuits met the benchmark in at least one month, sustained performance across all three months was less common. CFSR findings indicate opportunities to strengthen visit quality, particularly regarding private conversations with children and assessment of safety and wellbeing.

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.

The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that performed at or below the National Performance for Victimization in Foster Care. The National Performance for this measure is 9.07% or less. A lower value is desirable.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties with victimization rates for January: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 96 (84.2%).

Number of counties with victimization rates for February: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 96 (84.2%).

Number of counties with victimization rates for March: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 94 (82.5%).

Ninety-two (92) counties that met the benchmark all three months in the reporting period. This is an increase from 89 counties the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits with victimization rates for January: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 41 (89.13%). This is an increase from 84.78% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with victimization rates for February: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 43 (93.47%). This is an increase from 86.95% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with victimization rates for March: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 43 (93.47%). This is an increase from 89.13% the previous reporting period.

Forty-one (41) circuits met the benchmark for victimization all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from 39 circuits the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies with victimization rates for January: 13.

Number of agencies that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 13 (100%). This is an increase from 84.61% the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with victimization rates for February: 13.

Number of agencies that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 13 (100%). This is an increase from 84.61% the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with victimization rates for March: 13.

Number of agencies that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 13 (100%). This is an increase from 92.30% the previous reporting period.

Thirteen (13) agencies performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months. This is an increase from 11 agencies the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data:

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

Child and Family Services Review Data Profiles are based on the semiannual submission of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data from states. Data Profiles are produced by the Children's Bureau and shared with Missouri approximately every HB 1414 (2020) Response and Evaluation Report for Case Management of Children in Foster Care July 2026

six months, in February and August of each year, and are available for viewing on the [CFSR Data Profile Dashboard](#). The National Performance for this measure is 9.07 or less.

Analysis of CFSR Data Profile:

According to the most recent Missouri Data Profile, released in February of 2026, Missouri's RSP rate of victimization is 6.37%. This is no change from the previous reporting period and remains below the National Performance.

Data Analysis Summary:

The majority of counties, circuits, and agencies performed at or below the National Performance. This suggests overall alignment with expected outcomes. Improvement was observed across circuits and agencies compared to the previous reporting period while statewide CFSR data continues to reflect rates below National Performance, suggesting consistent system-level performance in this area.

C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child

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

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

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

Children's Division is actively validating and refining the reporting logic to ensure the data accurately reflects practice. Data for this measure is expected to be incorporated in future reporting periods following validation.

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.

The following information summarizes the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or 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.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 8: Visits with Parents and Children):

Of the 28 cases available for review, 18 (64.3%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for parent visits with children. This is an increase from 38.5% the previous reporting period. Ten (10) cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

Strength-rated cases demonstrated frequent, meaningful, and progressively less restrictive visitation that supported reunification and maintained family relationships. Cases rated ANI most often involved insufficient visitation frequency, failure to explore alternative forms of contact when barriers existed, limited efforts to engage reluctant parents or children, and inadequate sibling visitation when children were placed separately.

Data Analysis Summary:

Parent-child visit dashboard data is not included in this reporting period due to ongoing data validation efforts following system changes. While this limits the ability to assess performance trends, CFSR findings suggest ongoing challenges related to visit frequency and parent engagement. This measure remains a priority for future reporting once data reliability is established.

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.

The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that met or exceeded the benchmark for Medical Exam Completion (HCY) within 30 days of entry into foster care. Missouri Alliance (6AW) does not receive new foster care entries and is therefore not included in this measure. The benchmark established by the R&E Team is 98%.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for January: 76.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 17 (22.36%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for February: 80.
Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 22 (27.50%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for March: 80.
Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 16 (20.00%).

Fourteen (14) counties met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for January: 45.
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 5 (11.11%). This is a decrease from 20.45% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for February: 44.
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 8 (18.18%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for March: 44.
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 4 (9.09%). This is a decrease from 18.18% the previous reporting period.

Two (2) circuits met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required: Circuit 01 and Circuit 02. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies requiring HCY exams for January: 12
Number of agencies that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 5 (41.66%). This is an increase from two agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies requiring HCY exams for February: 12
Number of agencies that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 2 (16.66%). This is a decrease from six agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies requiring HCY exams for March: 12
Number of agencies that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 4 (33.3%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

No agency met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from one agency the previous reporting period. Three (3) agencies (6ZC, 6ZJ, & 6ZS) met the benchmark two out of the three months during the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data:

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

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

The following information summarizes the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or ANI for the physical health needs of the child.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 17: Physical Health Needs):

Of the 34 cases available for review, 23 (67.6%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for the physical health needs of the child. This is an increase from 60.0% the previous reporting period. Eleven (11) cases were rated as ANI.

Strength-rated cases reflected timely health screenings, routine medical and dental care, specialty care when needed, and appropriate oversight of medications. Cases rated ANI most frequently involved delayed or missing dental services, inadequate assessment of vision needs, insufficient documentation, or failure to ensure children received follow-up treatment.

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.

The following information summarizes the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or ANI for the mental/behavioral health needs of the child.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 18: Mental/Behavioral Health Needs):

Of 21 cases applicable for review, eight (38.1%) were rated Strength for the mental/behavioral health needs of the child. This is a decrease from 87.0% the previous reporting period. Thirteen (13) cases were rated ANI.

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. ANI ratings were received due to delays in service initiation, failure to fully assess trauma-related needs, lack of follow-through on recommendations, insufficient coordination among providers, and gaps in medication oversight.

Data Analysis Summary:

Timely completion of medical exams remains consistently below the established benchmark across counties, circuits, and agencies. Performance showed little variation over the reporting period across most areas of the state. CFSR findings suggest that once physical health needs are identified, they are generally addressed appropriately. In contrast, mental and behavioral health outcomes were substantially weaker, with delays in service initiation, implementation of recommendations, and provider coordination emerging as recurring concerns.

E. Permanency Domain: Worker Visits with Parent

Children's Division policy requires at least one worker visit with each parent each month. The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that met or exceeded the

benchmark for Worker Visits with Parent. The benchmark of 50% was established by the R&E Team.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for January: 113.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 62 (54.9%).

Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for February: 113.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 66 (58.4%).

Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for March: 113.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 57 (50.4%).

Forty-five (45) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits requiring worker-parent visits for January: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 25 (54.3%). This is a decrease from 60.9% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits requiring worker-parent visits for February: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 24 (52.1%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits requiring worker-parent visits for March: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 22 (47.8%). This is an increase from 45.6% the previous reporting period.

Eighteen (18) circuits met the benchmark for worker-parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 19 circuits the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies requiring worker-parent visits for January: 13.

Number of agencies that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 3 (23.1%). This is a decrease from six agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies requiring worker-parent visits for February: 13.

Number of agencies that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 3 (23.1%). This is a decrease from four agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies requiring worker-parent visits for March: 13.

Number of agencies that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 4 (30.8%). This is an increase from three agencies the previous reporting period.

Three (3) agencies (6ZC, 6ZM, and 6ZV) met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data:

Item 15 of the CFSR assesses if caseworker visits with parents occurred with sufficient frequency and demonstrated quality engagement that support case planning and progress toward permanency. The following information summarizes the percentage of cases that had an overall rating of Strength or ANI for caseworker visits with parents.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 15: Caseworker Visits with Parents):

Of 29 cases available for review, 15 (51.7%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for caseworker visits with parents. This is an increase from 45.9% the previous reporting period. Fourteen (14) cases were rated as ANI.

Strength-rated cases generally demonstrated consistent, purposeful, and well documented engagement with parents through regular home visits, case planning, discussions, and monitoring of progress toward reunification.

Cases rated ANI most often involved insufficient frequency of contact, lack of meaningful engagement with fathers, poor visit quality, or missed opportunities to assess parent needs and support permanency efforts.

Data Analysis Summary:

While worker-parent visitation rates on the dashboard remained relatively stable, CFSR findings suggest challenges engaging parents meaningfully. Among reviewed cases, challenges included engagement with fathers, insufficient contact frequency, and visits that did not adequately address case planning or permanency progress.

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. Missouri Alliance (6AW) is a specialized case management contract serving children and youth with complex needs which could contribute to a higher frequency of reentries.

The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that performed at or below the National Performance for Reentry into Foster Care. The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or less. A lower percentage is desirable.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties with reentries in January: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 90 (78.9%).

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

Number of counties with reentries in February: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 87 (76.3%).

Number of counties with reentries in March: 111.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 79 (71.1%).

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

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits with reentries in January: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 36 (78.3%). This is an increase from 76.1% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with reentries in February: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 34 (73.9%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with reentries in March: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 32 (69.6%). This is a decrease from 73.9% the previous reporting period.

Thirty-one (31) circuits performed at or below the National Performance in all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 33 circuits the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies with reentries in January: 13.

Number of agencies that met the benchmark for reentry: 11 (84.6%). This is an increase from 10 agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with reentries in February: 13.

Number of agencies that met the benchmark for reentry: 11 (84.6%). This is an increase from 10 agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with reentries in March: 13.

Number of agencies that met the benchmark for reentry: 12 (92.3%). This is an increase from 11 agencies the previous reporting period.

Ten (10) agencies performed at or below the National Performance in all three months of the reporting period. This is no change from the previous 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

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

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](#).

Child and Family Services Review Data Profiles are based on the semiannual submission of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) data from states. Data Profiles are produced by the Children's Bureau and shared with Missouri approximately every six months, in February and August of each year, and are available for viewing on the [CFSR Data Profile Dashboard](#). The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or lower. A lower percentage is desirable.

Analysis of CFSR Data Profile:

According to the most recent Missouri Data Profile, released in February of 2026, Missouri's RSP rate of Reentry into Foster Care is 5.9%. This is an increase from 5.5% the previous reporting period and exceeds the National Performance for Reentry into Foster Care.

Data Analysis Summary:

Most counties, circuits, and agencies performed at or below the National Performance. While overall performance remained stable, the increase in the state's risk-standardized performance rate indicates a need for continued monitoring of reentry trends.

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.

The following information summarizes the average number of workers for each child who was in care less than 12 months. This information is summarized by county, circuit, and agency.

Analysis of Dashboard Data:

Average number of workers for children who were in foster care less than 12 months by county: January (1 to 3.00), February (1 to 2.44), March (1 to 2.60).

Average number of workers for children who were in foster care less than 12 months by circuit: January (1.06 to 1.83), February (1.08 to 1.99), March (1.08 to 2.13).

Average number of workers for children who were in foster care less than 12 months by agency: January (1.38 to 2.25), February (1.41 to 2.43), March (1.39 to 2.77).

The following information summarizes the average number of workers for each child who was in care 12 months or more. This information is summarized by county, circuit, and agency.

Analysis of Dashboard Data:

Average number of workers for children who were in foster care 12 months or more by county: January (1 to 6.25), February (1 to 6.33), March (1 to 6.58).

Average number of workers for children who were in foster care 12 months or more by circuit: January (1.29 to 5.27), February (1.28 to 5.34), March (1.28 to 5.28).

Average number of workers for children who were in foster care 12 months or more by agency: January (3.30 to 6.40), February (3.31 to 6.29), March (3.33 to 6.36).

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:

The number of workers assigned per child increases notably for children in care longer than 12 months. While no benchmark has been established, this measure highlights potential impacts on continuity of care.

Phase II Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026)

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

The following information summarizes the child's primary Placement Category in foster care. The Response and Evaluation Team will determine the expected performance benchmarks once enough data is collected to establish a reasonable goal.

Analysis of Dashboard Data:

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 48% of the total placements for foster children. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

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.

The following information summarizes Residential Placement Utilization by county, circuit, and agency. Additional information about residential placement types can be found in the [Child Welfare Manual](#).

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

January: Ninety-seven (97) counties had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 1.11% to 30.00%. Fifty-eight (58) counties maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization.

February: One hundred and one (101) counties had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 1.09% to 37.50%. Sixty-four (64) counties maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization.

March: Ninety-three (93) counties had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 1.11% to 30.00%. Seventy (70) counties maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

January: Forty-five (45) circuits had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 1.33% to 11.79%. Twenty-four (24) circuits (53.33%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization. This is an increase from 51.11% the previous reporting period.

February: Forty-five (45) circuits had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 1.33% to 11.61%. Twenty-five (25) circuits (55.55%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization. This is an increase from 51.11% the previous reporting period.

March: Forty-four (44) circuits had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 1.42% to 10.49%. Twenty-five (25) circuits (56.81%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization. This is an increase from 52.27% the previous reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

January: Thirteen (13) agencies had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 2.83% to 19.86%. Six (6) agencies maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization. This is a decrease from eight agencies the previous reporting period.

February: Thirteen (13) agencies had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 3.03% to 17.61%. Six (6) agencies maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization. This is a decrease from seven agencies the previous reporting period.

March: Thirteen (13) agencies had children in residential placements. Residential utilization ranged from 2.84% to 16.61%. Five (5) agencies maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization. This is a decrease from six agencies the previous reporting period.

Five (5) agencies maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from six agencies the previous 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.

The following information summarizes the percentage of cases where sufficient efforts were made to place a child with relatives.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 10: Relative Placement):

Of the 32 cases available for review, 20 (62.5%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for Relative Placement. This is an increase from 43.3% the previous reporting period. Twelve (12) cases were rated as ANI.

Strength ratings were received for cases where children were placed in a relative home placement during the period under review or the agency had made concerted efforts to locate a relative placement.

All cases were rated ANI due to the agency's failure to locate, identify, inform, and evaluate relatives for potential placement. One case was rated ANI due to the child being placed with biological siblings who had previously been adopted by a nonrelated person.

Data Analysis Summary:

Relative placements continue to represent the majority of placement types, reflecting ongoing efforts to place children with family members. Case review findings suggest that despite these efforts, challenges remain in consistently identifying and securing relative placements.

The percentage of foster children placed in a residential setting fluctuated slightly over the reporting period: January (5.05%), February (4.99%), and March (5.05%). In March of 2026, the State of Missouri maintained 5.05% residential utilization. This is an increase from 4.98% residential utilization in December of 2025.

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 45% of the total residential placements. For more information about Level 4 residential placements, please refer to the [Child Welfare Manual](#).

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 19.2% increase in the percentage of cases receiving an overall rating of Strength. Findings from case reviews suggest opportunities to strengthen family finding efforts, particularly involving paternal relative identification, reassessment of previously identified relatives, and timely evaluation of interested family members.

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

All staff are required to complete trauma-informed training within 12 months of their hire date. Children's Division and the private Foster Care Case Management agencies do not share a common platform to record and track staff training completions. These limitations continue to prevent comprehensive reporting on trauma training completion across agencies. While training is occurring, the absence of a unified tracking system limits the ability to assess compliance and trends. Ongoing efforts to improve reporting accuracy continue.

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. 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 following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance for Timely Permanency in 12 Months. The National Performance for this measure is 35.2%.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties with entries in January: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 36 (32.1%).

Number of counties with entries in February: 113.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 36 (31.8%).

Number of counties with entries in March: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 35 (31.2%).

Twenty-nine (29) counties performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency for those entering care within 12 months for all applicable months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits with entries in January: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 13 (28.3%)

Number of circuits with entries in February: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 9 (19.6%)

Number of circuits with entries in March: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 9 (19.6%)

Eight (8) circuits (Circuit 03, Circuit 17, Circuit 19, Circuit 27, Circuit 35, Circuit 36, Circuit 40, and Circuit 42) performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency for those entering care within 12 months for all applicable months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies with entries in January: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 1 (7.7%)

Number of agencies with entries in February: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 1 (7.7%)

Number of agencies with entries in March: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 1 (7.7%)

One agency, 6ZV, performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency within 12 months during all months of the reporting period.

Timely Permanency for children who have been in foster care for at least 12 months and not more than 23 months 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 following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance for Timely Permanency in 12-23 Months. The National Performance for this measure is 43.8%.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties with entries in January: 108.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 65 (60.1%). This is a decrease from 66.3% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with entries in February: 107.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 70 (65.4%). This is a decrease from 68.1% the previous reporting period.

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

Number of counties with entries in March: 107

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 67 (62.6%). This is a decrease from 63.6% the previous reporting period.

Forty-nine (49) counties performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in 12-23 months for all applicable months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits with entries in January: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 30 (65.2%). This is a decrease from 76.1% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with entries in February: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 33 (71.7%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with entries in March: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 32 (69.6%). This is an increase from 67.4% the previous reporting period.

Twenty-nine (29) circuits performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in 12-23 months for all applicable months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies with entries in January: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 7 (53.8%). This is a decrease from 61.5% the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with entries in February: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 7 (53.8%). This is a decrease from 69.2% the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with entries in March: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 7 (53.8%). This is a decrease from 61.5% the previous reporting period.

Seven (7) agencies (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZO, 6ZR, 6ZS, 6ZV, and CD) performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in 12-23 months during all months of the reporting period.

Timely Permanency for children who have been in foster care for 24 months or more 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%.

The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance for Timely Permanency in 24+ Months. The National Performance for this measure is 37.3%.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties with entries in January: 109.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 43 (39.4%). This is a decrease from 44.4% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with entries in February: 110.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 45 (40.1%). This is a decrease from 47.7% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with entries in March: 111.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 49 (44.1%). This is a decrease from 47.7% the previous reporting period.

Forty (40) counties performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in 24+ months for all applicable months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits with entries in January: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 18 (39.1%). This is an increase from 36.9% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with entries in February: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 18 (39.1%). This is an increase from 36.9% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with entries in March: 46

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 19 (41.3%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Thirteen (13) circuits performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in 24+ months for all applicable months of the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies with entries in January: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 6 (46.1%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with entries in February: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 6 (46.1%). This is a decrease from 53.8% the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with entries in March: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 8 (61.5%). This is an increase from 53.8% the previous reporting period.

Six (6) agencies (6ZK, 6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZR, 6ZV, and CD) performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in 24+ months during all months of the reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data:

Item 6 of the CFSR assesses whether concerted efforts were made to achieve the case goal. The following information summarizes the percentage of cases where sufficient efforts were made to achieve the case goal.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 6: Timely Achievement of Case Goal):

Of the 34 cases available for review, 19 (55.9%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for timely achievement of the case goal. This is an increase from 41.9% the previous reporting period. Fifteen (15) cases were rated ANI.

The most common strength identified was active pursuit of reunification through frequent Family Support Team meetings, timely court hearings, consistent parent-child visitation that increased over time, referrals to needed services for parents and children, and timely Trial Home Visit implementation after safety concerns had been addressed. Strength-rated adoption and guardianship cases consistently identified permanency resources timely and demonstrated continuous recruitment efforts for adoptive resources.

Cases rated ANI shared themes of limited agency efforts to assess or engage parents, failure to provide referrals beyond court-ordered services, and a lack of follow-up when parents struggled to engage. Prolonged delays in termination of parental rights referrals, failure to complete subsidy referrals, and a failure to pursue permanent adoptive or guardianship resources despite lengthy times in care also contributed to ANI ratings.

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 14% increase in cases receiving an overall rating of Strength for timely achievement of the case goal.

Data Analysis Summary:

Performance varies significantly by permanency cohort, with stronger outcomes observed for children in care 12-23 months compared to those achieving permanency within the other two cohorts. Fewer counties, circuits, and agencies met the National Performance for permanency in 12 months, suggesting potential delays in initial case progression. CFSR findings suggest that delays in permanency actions, including termination of parental rights referrals, guardianship processes, and identification of permanent placements, may contribute to challenges in achieving timely case goals.

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

This measures the number of foster care Supervisors to the number of staff serving as Case Managers for children in foster care. This measure includes staff who are not typically assigned either role but may be filling the role due to vacancies or other reasons.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in January ranged from 1:0 to 1:8.06.

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in February ranged from 1:0 to 1:8.32.

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in March ranged from 1:0 to 1:8.32.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in January ranged from 1:1.75 to 1:4.93.

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in February ranged from 1:1.8 to 1:4.94.

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in March ranged from 1:1.8 to 1:4.8.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in January ranged from 1:2.46 to 1:4.20.

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in February ranged from 1:2.27 to 1:4.44.

Ratios of Supervisors to Case Managers in March ranged from 1:2.15 to 1:5.71.

Data Analysis Summary:

Supervisor-to-case manager ratios remained relatively stable throughout the reporting period. Continued monitoring of supervisory capacity may help identify workforce factors that influence case practice, staff retention, and service quality.

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

The intent of the measure was to monitor cases returned to Children's Division when FCCM agencies experience catastrophic costs. Beginning in September of 2022, Children's Division began the practice of assuming the foster care maintenance cost from an FCCM agency once a threshold of \$100,000 is reached within a 12-month timeframe. The case will remain with the FCCM agency for all other case management services.

No cases were returned to Children's Division for catastrophic costs during the reporting period.

Phase III Reporting (Reporting Period: January 1, 2026 – March 31, 2026)

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.

Data presented in this section reflects validated data for the reporting period and may differ from data currently displayed on the Foster Care Case Management Dashboard due to identified data discrepancies. Efforts are underway to resolve these discrepancies in the dashboard.

The following information summarizes the counties, circuits, and agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance for Placement Stability. The National Performance for this measure is 4.48 moves per 1,000 days in foster care or less. A lower value is desirable.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by County:

Number of counties with placements in January: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 53 (47.3%). This is an increase from 45.6% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with placements in February: 113.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 64 (56.6%). This is an increase from 46.0% the previous reporting period.

Number of counties with placements in March: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 61 (54.5%). This is an increase from 46.4% the previous reporting period.

Forty-three (43) counties met or exceeded National Performance for placement stability all months with placements during the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Circuit:

Number of circuits with placements in January: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 16 (34.8%). This is a decrease from 41.3% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with placements in February: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 18 (39.1%). This is an increase from 36.9% the previous reporting period.

Number of circuits with placements in March: 46.

Number of circuits that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 19 (41.3%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Fifteen (15) circuits met or exceeded National Performance for placement stability all months with placements during the reporting period.

Analysis of Dashboard Data by Agency:

Number of agencies with placements in January: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 3 (23.1%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with placements in February: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 4 (30.8%). This is an increase from three agencies the previous reporting period.

Number of agencies with placements in March: 13

Number of agencies that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 3 (23.1%). This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Three agencies (6ZK, 6ZO, and 6ZV) performed at or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability all three months of the reporting period.

Child and Family Services Review Data:

Item 4 of the CFSR assesses whether children in foster care were in stable placements and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goals. The following information summarizes the percentage of cases that received a Strength rating for placement stability.

Analysis of CFSR Data (Item 4: Placement Stability):

Of the 34 cases available for review, 25 (73.5%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews. This is an increase from 64.5% the previous reporting period. Nine (9) cases were rated ANI.

Common themes of cases with Strength ratings included continuity of care, maintenance of family connections, and placement decisions that aligned with permanency goals.

The most common reasons for ANI ratings involved unplanned placement disruptions, reliance on temporary placements, delays in placement planning, and placement decisions that hindered progress toward permanency.

Data Analysis Summary:

Placement stability improved compared to the previous reporting period, although fewer than half of circuits met the National Performance. CFSR findings indicate that placement disruptions are frequently associated with temporary placements, delayed transition planning, and placement decisions that create barriers to permanency progress.

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.

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

Ongoing technical assistance efforts continue to support data quality and collaboration between CD and FCCM partners. In addition to supporting data quality and reporting accuracy, technical assistance efforts increasingly focus on practice trends identified through the dashboard. Areas of emphasis include parent and family engagement, visitation practices, and timely permanency planning. These discussions support local continuous quality improvement efforts and help align technical assistance activities with emerging statewide practice needs.

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.

Across reporting domains, performance remains strongest in safety-related measures, while greater variability is observed in well-being and permanency outcomes. These patterns highlight ongoing challenges in achieving consistency across all areas of the system.

Findings from this reporting period reflect both areas of progress and areas requiring continued attention. Improvements were observed in several case review measures, including caseworker visits with children, relative placement efforts, placement stability, and timely achievement of case goals. Despite these improvements, challenges remain in achieving timely permanency, engaging parents and family members, ensuring timely access to mental and behavioral health services, and maintaining consistent quality in case practice activities.

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

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. Ongoing efforts to integrate the systems and provide accurate training data continue.

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, 2026, through June 30, 2026, with the report to be published by October 1, 2026.

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