



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



October 2025

Reporting Period: April 1, 2025, through June 30, 2025



Published by:
Children's Division
October 2025

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

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
HB1414 Metric Reporting Timeline	3
Evaluation Tool and Metrics (13 CSR 35-35.100)	4
Foster Care Case Management Dashboard (HB1414, Section 210.122 Performance Data Indicators)	4
Child and Family Service Review (CFSR)	4
Foster Care Case Management Agency Codes	6
Standardized Stakeholder Feedback Tool	6
Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses	7
Phase I (Reporting Period: April 1, 2025, through June 30, 2025)	10
A. Safety Domain: Caseworker Monthly Visits with Children in Foster Care	10
B. Safety Domain: Victimization in Foster Care	19
C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child	26
D. Well-Being Domain: Medical Exam Completion (HCY/EPSTDT)	35
E. Permanency Domain: Worker Visits with Parent	42
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)	56
Phase II (Reporting Period: April 1, 2025, through June 30, 2025)	67
H. Well-Being Domain: Placement Category/Residential Type	67
I. Well-Being Domain: Case Managers and Supervisors Trauma Trained/Informed	92
J. Permanency Domain: Timely Achievement of Child's Court Approved Plan	92
K. Service Domain: Effective Ratio of Supervisors to Supervision of Case Managers	112
L. Service Domain: Cases Returned to CD for Catastrophic Costs/Court Order	113
Phase III (Reporting Period: April 1, 2025, through June 30, 2025)	114
M. Permanency Domain: Placement Stability	114
Technical Assistance	119
Conclusion	120

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)

Phase 1 (October 2022)	Phase 2 (October 2023)	Phase 3 (October 2024)
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 June 2025 using email addresses from the electronic case management system (FACES) used by CD and FCCM. Additionally, CD and FCCM staff

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

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

Standardized Stakeholder Survey Responses (Reporting Period: 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

Thirty-nine (39) 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.	7	1	6	22	36	78%
2	The case manager clearly communicated the adoption process and timeline of court procedures.	8	5	9	14	36	64%
3	My family understands the adoption plan and staffing process.	7	4	6	19	36	69%
4	The adoption subsidy contract was created with our feedback and our child(ren) future needs in mind.	7	5	6	18	36	66%
5	Overall, I am satisfied with the services provided during the adoption process.	6	4	12	14	36	72%

Biological Parent Survey Responses

Ninety-two (92) survey responses were received from Biological Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. One survey was 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.	16	4	22	49	91	78%
2	I am satisfied with the amount of contact I have with the case manager(s).	39	20	10	22	91	35%
3	I am satisfied with the quality of contact I have with the case manager(s).	45	11	13	22	91	38%
4	My case manager responds to my needs timely.	39	14	13	25	91	42%
5	I have at least monthly visitation with my child(ren).	32	4	15	40	91	60%
6	I have a voice in developing case planning goals and decisions for my family.	54	12	10	15	91	27%
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.	50	14	14	13	91	30%
8	I am aware of services and activities in my community for myself and my family.	40	9	20	22	91	46%
9	The case manager(s) working with my family treats me with respect and values my opinions.	46	12	12	21	91	36%
10	I feel respected by the Family Support Team.	55	11	10	15	91	27%
11	I have someone, other than my case manager, who I can talk with if I need support or help.	37	8	19	27	91	50%
12	Agency involvement has made a positive impact in my family.	53	8	15	15	91	33%

Resource Parent Survey Responses

One hundred and eighteen (118) survey responses were received from Resource Parents. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. Two 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.	4	8	28	76	116	90%
2	I have clear, open communication with my case manager.	9	12	20	75	116	82%
3	The case manager(s) provided adequate information on the child(ren) placed in my home (i.e. physical/mental health, behaviors, etc.)	15	12	23	66	116	77%
4	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home treats me with respect and values my opinions.	7	8	21	80	116	87%
5	The case manager(s) working with the child(ren) in my home is shows awareness of their identified needs.	10	15	22	69	116	78%
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.	12	15	22	67	116	77%
7	I have a voice in the case planning for the child(ren) in my home.	11	15	20	70	116	78%
8	The case manager(s) visits the child(ren) in my home at least once per month.	5	1	25	85	116	95%
9	Home visits and meetings that I am to attend are scheduled with consideration for my family's schedules.	9	8	26	73	116	85%
10	I am informed of court hearings timely.	5	8	34	69	116	89%
11	I have the opportunity to provide information in court hearings.	7	10	29	70	116	85%
12	Overall, I feel supported by agency staff in doing my job.	18	7	27	64	116	78%
13	I would recommend fostering to other people in the community.	11	14	28	63	116	78%

Older Youth (12+) Survey Responses

Thirty-five (35) survey responses were received from Older Youth. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. All surveys were able to be displayed.

Older Youth (12+) Survey Responses							
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	% Positive Responses
1	I have a voice in case planning.	4	4	12	15	35	77%
2	In Family Support Team meetings, I am able to share what is important to me.	2	5	11	17	35	80%
3	I understand my case plan.	2	6	12	15	35	77%
4	I know my goals for the future.	3	4	12	16	35	80%
5	My case manager supports me in the achievement of my goals.	4	3	10	18	35	80%
6	I am informed of the date and time of court hearings.	3	3	14	15	35	83%
7	I am heard in court hearings.	4	6	8	17	35	71%
8	My case manager prepares me to speak for myself in court hearings.	9	5	9	12	35	60%
9	I am satisfied with the amount of contact I have with my case manager.	4	4	10	17	35	77%
10	I know how to contact my case manager.	1	2	10	22	35	91%
11	I understand why I have a case manager.	1	2	6	26	35	91%
12	My case manager talks with me about my concerns.	6	2	8	19	35	77%
13	My case manager responds to my needs. For example: accessing resources and providing referrals.	6	3	10	16	35	74%
14	I feel respected by my caseworker.	6	1	9	19	35	94%
15	I feel safe in my placement.	1	1	8	25	35	94%

Juvenile Officer Survey Responses

Fifty-eight (58) survey responses were received from Juvenile Officers. All surveys displayed below were answered in their entirety. One survey was 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?	4	17	31	5	57	63%
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)	6	22	25	4	57	51%
3	In general, are court reports easy to understand?	5	15	29	8	57	65%
4	Are court reports and other information given to you helpful in preparing for court?	7	20	23	7	57	53%
5	Are case managers familiar with the case at court?	1	20	31	5	57	63%
6	Are case managers prepared and knowledgeable while testifying?	2	28	24	3	57	47%
7	In general, are case managers available within a reasonable amount of time?	3	11	37	6	57	75%
8	Are case managers supportive of their clients?	1	12	40	4	57	77%
9	Do you feel you are able to provide input during Family Support Team meetings?	1	4	29	23	57	91%
10	Do you feel attorneys representing case managers help to move the case to permanency quicker?	9	22	20	6	57	46%
11	Do you feel you are able to provide input during other interactions with the team?	2	4	31	20	57	89%

Judge Survey Responses

Six (6) survey responses were received from Judges. All surveys were able to be displayed.

Judge Survey Responses								
Question #		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	I have no information	Total	% Positive Responses
1	Has your circuit achieved at least 95% timeliness for required hearings in accordance with Court Operating Rule 23.01?	1	2	2	1	0	6	50%
2	Is transportation offered/available to families to assist them in attending court hearings?	1	1	1	1	2	6	50%
3	Are foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, relative caregivers, and families given an opportunity to be heard during court proceedings?	0	0	2	3	1	6	100%
4	Are families given an opportunity to provide input during treatment planning?	0	0	1	1	4	6	100%
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	4	0	1	6	80%
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	1	1	3	1	6	80%
7	In general, are all parties present and prepared for court hearings?	0	1	2	2	1	6	80%
8	In general, are case managers knowledgeable about the case and helpful during court proceedings?	0	2	3	0	1	6	60%
		Set Hearing Times			Blocks of Time			
9	Are dockets scheduled with set hearing times or in blocks of time?	3			3			N/A

Phase I Reporting (Reporting Period: April 1, 2025 – June 30, 2025)

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

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

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

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	97.5%	100%	96.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Andrew	CD	100%	100%	100%
Atchison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Audrain	CD	100%	94.6%	95.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Barry	CD	87.5%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	96.9%	93.5%	100%
Barton	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Bates	CD	100%	100%	100%

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Benton	CD	100%	100%	94.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Bollinger	CD	100%	100%	100%
Boone	CD	95.6%	97.7%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	95.1%	95.7%	100%
Buchanan	CD	94.3%	97.7%	78.7%
Butler	CD	100%	94.7%	98.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	100%	99.2%	98.3%
Caldwell	CD	94.1%	100%	93.8%
Callaway	CD	100%	98.1%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	98.0%	96.1%	96.2%
Camden	CD	96.2%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	98.8%	98.8%	98.8%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	100%	100%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	94.3%	100%	97.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	100%	98.2%	98.1%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Cedar	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Chariton	CD	100%	100%	93.8%
Christian	CD	100%	98.3%	98.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	100%	100%	95.8%
Clark	CD	100%	100%	97.9%
Clay	CD	97.2%	87.9%	94.0%
Clinton	CD	92.6%	100%	97.0%
Cole	CD	93.8%	97.8%	93.8%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	96.8%	89.6%	98.9%
Cooper	CD	100%	93.8%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Crawford	CD	97.3%	95.7%	90.3%
Dade	CD	100%	100%	100%
Dallas	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Daviess	CD	100%	96.6%	100%
DeKalb	CD	100%	100%	100%
Dent	CD	98.6%	90.9%	96.8%
Douglas	CD	97.3%	100%	100%

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Dunklin	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	96.8%	96.7%	98.2%
Franklin	CD	95.7%	100%	98.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	96.7%	93.3%	96.8%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
Gasconade	CD	100%	96.3%	100%
Gentry	CD	100%	100%	100%
Greene	CD	99.2%	96.8%	99.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	98.4%	98.0%	98.0%
	6ZV	96.4%	94.4%	97.9%
Grundy	CD	100%	75.0%	100%
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Henry	CD	84.2%	97.3%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Hickory	CD	100%	100%	100%
Holt	CD	100%	88.9%	100%
Howard	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	87.0%	90.5%	100%
Howell	CD	98.6%	93.2%	100%
Iron	CD	90.0%	92.0%	97.9%
Jackson	CD	95.7%	94.9%	97.0%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	98.6%	98.1%	98.1%
	6ZR	97.4%	97.6%	94.8%
Jasper	CD	98.5%	93.9%	98.5%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	98.5%	98.4%	97.0%
Jefferson	CD	91.7%	95.5%	95.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	97.7%	96.6%	94.5%
	6ZB	98.8%	97.9%	98.8%
	6ZC	96.45	98.3%	98.2%
Johnson	CD	98.7%	100%	98.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	100%	100%	100%
Laclede	CD	100%	100%	94.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZK	100%	97.8%	95.6%
Lafayette	CD	97.1%	100%	91.2%
Lawrence	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	90.0%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Lewis	CD	100%	100%	95.0%
Lincoln	CD	94.9%	94.1%	99.1%

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Linn	CD	100%	100%	97.1%
Livingston	CD	98.2%	91.7%	95.5%
Macon	CD	100%	93.1%	100%
Madison	CD	97.9%	98.0%	100%
Maries	CD	100%	64.3%	86.7%
Marion	CD	96.4%	95.5%	97.4%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
McDonald	CD	97.2%	100%	94.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	100%	100%	100%
Mercer	CD	100%		
Miller	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW			100%
Mississippi	CD	100%	100%	94.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Moniteau	CD	87.5%	100%	100%
Monroe	CD	100%	100%	100%
Montgomery	CD	100%	97.4%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Morgan	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	75.0%	100%	100%
New Madrid	CD	100%	92.6%	91.7%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Newton	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZL	97.6%	97.6%	97.7%
Nodaway	CD	100%	97.7%	100%
Oregon	CD	97.2%	89.2%	100%
Osage	CD	100%	94.7%	100%
Ozark	CD	83.3%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Pemiscot	CD	95.2%	87.2%	93.4%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Perry	CD	100%	100%	100%
Pettis	CD	90.3%	85.6%	91.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Phelps	CD	91.2%	94.0%	93.4%
	6ZK	100%	97.2%	100%
Pike	CD	100%	100%	100%
Platte	CD	86.5%	91.8%	80.8%
Polk	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Pulaski	CD	88.7%	85.0%	89.0%
	6AW			100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Putnam	CD	100%	100%	100%

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Ralls	CD	100%	88.9%	81.8%
Randolph	CD	98.3%	94.3%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	100%	97.6%	98.9%
Ray	CD	25.0%	91.7%	100%
Reynolds	CD	100%	100%	96.2%
Ripley	CD	92.3%	93.3%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Saline	CD	100%	87.2%	78.4%
Schuyler	CD	100%	100%	100%
Scotland	CD	92.9%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Scott	CD	100%	100%	98.1%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Shannon	CD	100%	94.7%	100%
Shelby	CD	94.7%	100%	100%
St. Charles	CD	100%	100%	96.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA		100%	100%
	6ZB	100%	100%	98.1%
	6ZC	88.2%	84.2%	100%
St. Clair	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
St. Francois	CD	97.8%	98.0%	97.4%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
St. Louis City	CD	95.8%	87.8%	91.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	91.9%	93.3%	92.6%
	6ZB	100%	96.9%	100%
	6ZC	95.5%	85.8%	100%
St. Louis County	CD	96.5%	90.5%	88.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZA	97.2%	93.6%	95.6%
	6ZB	98.0%	96.4%	97.9%
	6ZC	92.6%	82.6%	94.2%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	97.5%	100%	100%
Stoddard	CD	97.7%	97.9%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	97.7%	97.7%	100%
Stone	CD	100%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Sullivan	CD	100%	100%	83.3%
Taney	CD	97.8%	99.3%	85.9%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	97.1%	97.2%	92.1%

Table 1: Worker-Child Visits – Federal Goal is 95%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Texas	CD	73.5%	88.5%	71.2%
	6ZK	100%	100%	92.3%
Vernon	CD	95.5%	100%	100%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Warren	CD	98.8%	98.8%	97.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	75.0%
Washington	CD	96.0%	96.0%	94.4%
	6ZB	100%	95.7%	97.2%
Wayne	CD	91.3%	97.7%	93.3%
Webster	CD	100%	100%	96.2%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	98.8%	98.7%	98.8%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Table 1: Number of counties requiring worker-child visits in April: 114.

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 84 (73.6%).

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

Number of counties meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 74 (65.4%).

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

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

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%.

Chart 1: Percentage of Worker Child Visits Grouped by Circuit					
Federal Goal is 95%					
	A	B	C	D	E
	21.4% - 70.9%	71.0% - 80.9%	81.0% - 90.9%	91.0% - 94.9%	95% or greater
April	1	0	2	2	41
May	0	0	4	9	33
June	0	2	3	7	34

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 1: Number of circuits requiring worker-child visits in April: 46.

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 41 (89.1%)


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

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 33 (71.7%).


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

Number of circuits meeting the benchmark for worker-child visits: 34 (73.9%).

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, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025



*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Charts 2 & 3: Thirty (30) circuits met or exceeded the benchmark for worker-child visits in April, May, and June of 2025. This is an increase from 28 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, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 4: Number of agencies that met the benchmark during each month: April (12), May (10), June (12).

Ten (10) agencies met the benchmark all three months: 6AW, 6ZB, 6ZK, 6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZO, 6ZR, 6ZS, 6ZV, and CD. This is an increase from eight 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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 5: Twenty (21) of the 32 cases available for review were rated Strength in this area. The visits were rated a Strength in frequency because they were typically about an hour in duration and occurred at least monthly. The visits were of sufficient quality because they included face-to-face contact with the child in the placement setting. Some visits occurred with the child alone and some occurred with the placement provider when the child's age or developmental level was not conducive to meeting with the child alone. The caseworker observed the 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, 11 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. One case received an ANI rating due to the worker not completing a visit with the child until two weeks after the case was initially opened.

Data Analysis Summary for Worker Child Visits:

Forty-eight (48) counties met the benchmark all three months. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Ten (10) agencies met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from eight agencies the previous reporting period.

Thirty (30) circuits met the benchmark all three months. This is an increase from 28 circuits the previous reporting period.

Twenty-one (21) cases (65.6%) were rated a Strength on CFSR reviews for caseworker visits with children. This is an increase from 62.5% 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.

Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW		0.00	0.00
Andrew	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Atchison	CD	34.35	34.05	51.22
Audrain	CD	0.00	0.00	7.02
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Barry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	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	11.28	11.56
	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	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	1.58	3.15	3.15
Buchanan	CD	7.06	7.02	6.93
Butler	CD	17.18	17.43	17.61
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	
	6ZS	2.27	2.26	2.24
Caldwell	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Callaway	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	45.33
	6ZJ	0.00	0.00	0.00
Camden	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	20.13	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	CD	1.90	1.90	1.89

Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Carroll	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Carter	CD	22.62	0.00	0.00
Cass	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	95.6	134.95	129.70
	6ZO	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZR	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cedar	CD	7.36	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chariton	CD	16.58	16.98	17.63
Christian	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	344.83	344.83	344.83
	6ZM	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clark	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clay	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clinton	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cole	CD	5.36	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	9.21	9.16	9.07
Cooper	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	CD	7.17	7.25	3.68
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	12.76	13.32	13.89
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	5.83	5.84	5.82
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	0.00
Franklin	CD	1.88	1.90	1.93
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	6.27	6.28	6.24
Gasconade	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gentry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	CD	4.05	3.06	2.05
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZM	3.57	3.56	2.36
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grundy	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Harrison	CD	19.83	19.55	19.74
Henry	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Hickory	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Holt	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howard	CD	23.24	23.40	24.20
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZJ	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howell	CD	11.85	8.05	4.05
Iron	CD	14.52	15.01	15.61
Jackson	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZO	1.30	1.32	1.33
	6ZR	1.42	2.16	2.18
Jasper	CD	1.19	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZL	0.00	2.46	2.45
Jefferson	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	13.80	13.78	20.71
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
Johnson	CD	8.58	8.66	8.86
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Laclede	CD	8.34	8.40	4.20
	6AW	106.99	101.56	66.31
	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	10.44	10.42
Lewis	CD	14.29	14.22	14.17
Lincoln	CD	5.04	2.60	2.61
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Linn	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Livingston	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Macon	CD	13.44	12.96	6.26
Madison	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maries	CD	63.69	62.56	56.55
Marion	CD	1.57	4.77	4.84
	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

Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Moniteau	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00		
Monroe	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montgomery	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Morgan	CD	4.82	4.88	9.52
	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	5.85	11.91	12.16
Oregon	CD	58.61	57.53	65.72
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	4.14	4.14	4.10
	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	3.94	4.03	2.06
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	15.34
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	6.12	8.20	10.12
	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	16.10	10.64	10.65
	6AW	395.26	176.68	159.24
	6ZJ	3.35	3.37	3.35
Ray	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ripley	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	5.24	0.00	0.00
	6ZS	8.72	8.93	9.14
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

Table 2: Victimization in Foster Care – Goal is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Shannon	CD	22.51	21.46	20.55
Shelby	CD	38.42	39.76	55.26
St. Charles	CD	6.43	6.37	6.29
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Clair	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	62.42	63.61	66.01
St. Francois	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZC	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Louis City	CD	4.09	2.82	2.83
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.96	0.97	0.97
	6ZB	6.49	6.46	6.30
	6ZC	2.44	2.44	0.00
St. Louis County	CD	3.47	3.56	2.76
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZA	0.65	1.30	0.65
	6ZB	1.86	1.88	0.00
	6ZC	4.14	2.08	2.08
Ste. Genevieve	CD	6.94	6.89	0.00
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	6.81	7.17	7.64
	6AW	125.79	116.96	109.05
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Taney	CD	7.66	3.87	3.88
	6AW	0.00	22.63	21.87
	6ZV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Texas	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZK	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vernon	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warren	CD	14.49	14.45	18.04
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6ZB	8.19	0.00	0.00
Wayne	CD	12.30	12.30	12.37
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Webster	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6AW	73.75	71.07	69.11
Wright	CD	6.93	6.83	6.79
	6AW	0.00	0.00	0.00

Analysis of Table 2: Number of counties with victimization rates for April: 114.
Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 87 (76.3%).

Number of counties with victimization rates for May: 114.
Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 85 (74.5%).

Number of counties with victimization rates for June: 114.
Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 83 (72.8%).

Number of counties that met the benchmark all three months in the reporting period: 78.

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.

Chart 6: Victimization Rates Grouped by Circuit				
National Performance is 9.07 or Less (lower is better)				
	A	B	C	D
	20.01+	15.01-20.00	9.08-15.00	0.00-9.07
April	2	0	2	42
May	2	0	2	42
June	2	1	3	40


*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 6: Number of circuits with victimization rates for April: 46.
Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 42 (91.3%).

Number of circuits with victimization rates for May: 46.
Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 42 (91.3%).

Number of circuits with victimization rates for June: 46.
Number of circuits that performed at or below the National Performance for victimization: 40 (86.9%).

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.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 7: Eleven (11) agencies performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months.

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

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

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



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

Data Analysis Summary:

Seventy-eight (78) counties performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 80 counties the previous reporting period.

Eleven (11) agencies performed at or below the National Performance for victimization all three months of the reporting period. This is a decrease from 12 agencies the previous reporting period.

More than 85% of all circuits performed at or below the National Performance for victimization every month.

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

C. Well-Being Domain: Parent Visits with Child

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

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%.

Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&E Agreed-Upon Goal is 60%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	53.08%	66.67%	46.96%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	45.71%	57.89%	50.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	31.25%	23.81%	40.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	25.81%	32.14%	14.81%
Barton	CD	33.33%	52.94%	50.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	42.42%	18.18%	17.24%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	32.76%	24.59%	22.81%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	5.00%	40.91%	35.00%
Boone	CD	29.70%	47.27%	45.05%
	6AW	9.09%	10.00%	20.00%
	6ZJ	33.62%	35.24%	38.14%
Buchanan	CD	21.70%	18.18%	15.04%
Butler	CD	21.88%	20.00%	29.17%
	6AW	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%
	6ZS	11.03%	7.30%	7.59%
Caldwell	CD	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	71.19%	60.00%	57.81%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	42.00%	34.48%	36.07%
Camden	CD	93.33%	82.76%	53.85%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	60.00%	60.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	18.59%	24.53%	28.57%
Carter	CD	33.33%	33.33%	100%
Cass	CD	8.51%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	41.10%	34.62%	35.44%
	6ZR	91.67%	94.12%	96.30%
Cedar	CD	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Christian	CD	62.50%	74.47%	58.33%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	42.86%	19.05%	56.10%
Clark	CD	52.24%	38.71%	46.67%
Clay	CD	18.41%	18.14%	13.12%
Clinton	CD	4.00%	19.35%	16.22%
Cole	CD	23.91%	28.89%	24.00%
	6ZJ	48.74%	50.00%	54.47%
Cooper	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	9.80%	11.88%	8.65%
Dade	CD	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	62.86%	75.00%	39.47%

Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&E Agreed-Upon Goal is 60%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
Daviess	CD	4.55%	4.76%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dent	CD	35.16%	37.78%	36.59%
Douglas	CD	33.33%	60.61%	60.61%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	
Dunklin	CD	50.00%	40.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	1.54%	4.62%	12.70%
Franklin	CD	28.83%	27.81%	24.71%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	36.36%	54.55%	56.52%
	6ZC	54.76%	60.47%	51.22%
Gasconade	CD	51.72%	41.67%	41.67%
Gentry	CD	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	52.51%	55.73%	53.55%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	44.05%	35.59%	34.52%
	6ZV	36.75%	36.51%	30.70%
Grundy	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	83.33%	85.71%	66.67%
Henry	CD	34.21%	32.56%	33.33%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	64.29%	21.05%	60.00%
Holt	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Howard	CD	62.50%	33.33%	83.33%
	6ZJ	57.14%	50.00%	45.45%
Howell	CD	13.51%	13.70%	17.39%
Iron	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	63.75%	62.65%	53.25%
	6AW	6.67%	14.29%	7.14%
	6ZO	42.48%	36.91%	31.22%
	6ZR	58.47%	53.85%	49.58%
Jasper	CD	52.92%	47.35%	47.69%
	6AW	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%
	6ZL	31.36%	38.46%	35.67%
Jefferson	CD	26.83%	21.21%	19.35%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	19.17%	17.80%	8.26%
	6ZB	14.41%	16.86%	21.97%
	6ZC	32.31%	38.89%	30.99%
Johnson	CD	0.00%	0.00%	2.00%
	6AW	66.67%	50.00%	50.00%
Knox	CD	12.50%	29.41%	29.41%
Laclede	CD	45.33%	45.45%	28.57%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	55.77%	54.72%	66.04%
Lafayette	CD	6.82%	0.00%	17.50%
Lawrence	CD	29.73%	52.78%	67.74%
	6AW	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%
	6ZV	22.86%	55.17%	39.13%
Lewis	CD	19.05%	37.50%	54.55%

Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&E Agreed-Upon Goal is 60%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Lincoln	CD	40.98%	41.38%	54.17%
Linn	CD	2.27%	2.27%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	28.30%	3.51%	8.06%
Macon	CD	68.97%	65.56%	50.57%
Madison	CD	0.00%	0.00%	4.88%
Maries	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	22.95%	25.77%	22.44%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	39.47%	25.00%	34.88%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	70.59%	47.83%	66.67%
Mercer	CD	100%		
Miller	CD	53.33%	43.75%	42.86%
	6AW			0.00%
Mississippi	CD	52.38%	81.25%	40.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	55.56%	81.25%	81.25%
Monroe	CD	50.00%	35.29%	18.18%
Montgomery	CD	43.48%	40.00%	13.95%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	100%
Morgan	CD	57.35%	66.13%	48.44%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	17.24%	3.45%	3.70%
Newton	CD	24.62%	28.81%	61.67%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	53.33%	65.91%	61.67%
Nodaway	CD	23.33%	15.63%	21.21%
Oregon	CD	7.14%	6.90%	20.00%
Osage	CD	80.00%	80.00%	80.95%
Ozark	CD	42.86%	28.75%	28.57%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	11.22%	8.33%	10.31%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	31.58%	29.17%	41.67%
Pettis	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.85%
Phelps	CD	1.96%	5.49%	10.14%
	6ZK	70.91%	33.33%	21.82%
Pike	CD	45.45%	60.00%	80.00%
Platte	CD	51.95%	36.62%	36.36%
Polk	CD	43.48%	47.83%	61.54%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	1.40%	2.64%	1.32%
	6ZK	64.52%	62.07%	9.68%
Putnam	CD	25.00%	11.11%	30.77%
Ralls	CD	25.00%	33.33%	35.71%
Randolph	CD	75.00%	76.67%	71.43%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	42.11%	39.13%	45.74%
Ray	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	33.33%	23.08%	33.33%

Table 3: Parent-Child Visits – R&E Agreed-Upon Goal is 60%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZS	12.00%	8.00%	4.00%
Saline	CD	6.67%	25.93%	18.18%
Schuyler	CD	40.00%	37.50%	38.89%
Scotland	CD	31.82%	14.29%	14.29%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	52.50%	52.17%	37.27%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	11.76%	13.33%	15.38%
Shelby	CD	61.11%	66.67%	42.86%
St. Charles	CD	36.84%	24.42%	35.16%
	6AW		100%	50.00%
	6ZB	9.52%	1.61%	0.00%
	6ZC	64.00%	51.65%	57.14%
St. Clair	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	21.02%	15.17%	11.83%
	6ZC	27.27%	15.17%	11.83%
St. Louis City	CD	4.55%	1.76%	3.93%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	8.83%	10.42%	5.86%
	6ZB	1.55%	1.53%	14.84%
	6ZC	35.85%	32.73%	27.88%
St. Louis County	CD	7.03%	6.15%	8.18%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	13.81%	15.12%	9.11%
	6ZB	8.74%	4.79%	7.60%
	6ZC	34.53%	27.54%	29.63%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	19.57%	13.64%	5.00%
Stoddard	CD	9.80%	1.75%	11.86%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	16.92%	21.57%	35.00%
Stone	CD	46.15%	45.83%	60.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	34.15%	28.57%	46.00%
Sullivan	CD	15.38%	36.36%	9.09%
Taney	CD	28.74%	30.18%	30.67%
	6AW	16.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	53.75%	66.29%	73.47%
Texas	CD	20.37%	24.53%	17.39%
	6ZK	61.54%	58.33%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	20.00%	16.67%	22.22%
Warren	CD	18.92%	34.34%	26.53%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%
Washington	CD	26.32%	26.32%	0.00%
	6ZB	12.64%	5.06%	24.42%
Wayne	CD	5.36%	3.64%	5.36%
Webster	CD	53.70%	64.15%	55.56%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Wright	CD	59.76%	66.25%	54.55%
	6AW	9.09%	7.69%	8.33%

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Table 3: Number of counties requiring parent-child visits for April: 114.
 Number of counties that met the benchmark for parent-child visit completion: 7 (6.14%).

Number of counties requiring parent-child visits for May: 113.
 Number of counties that met the benchmark for parent-child visit completion: 6 (5.31%).

Number of counties requiring parent-child visits for June: 113.
 Number of counties that met the benchmark for parent-child visit completion: 7 (6.19%).

Three (3) counties met the benchmark all three months during the reporting period: Mercer, Harrison, and Osage.

Five (5) counties met the benchmark two of three months during the reporting period: Hickory, Macon, Moniteau, Pike, and Shelby.


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.

Chart 9: Parent-Child Visits Grouped by Circuit						
R&E Goal is 60%						
	A	B	C	D	E	F
	0.00%- 19.99%	20.0%- 29.99%	30.0%- 39.99%	40.0%- 49.99%	50.0%- 59.99%	60% or greater
April	19	5	6	9	6	1
May	18	6	6	11	4	1
June	18	5	7	13	3	0

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Chart 9 Analysis: One (1) circuit met the benchmark in April, one (1) circuit met the benchmark in May, and zero (0) circuits met the benchmark in June. The highest concentration of other circuits falls into the 0.00%-19.9% and 40.0%-49.99% 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.



*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025


Chart 10 Analysis: Parent-Child Visit data reflects that no agency met the benchmark of 60% all three months of the reporting period. Two (2) agencies, 6ZK and 6ZR, met the benchmark one 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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 11: Of 28 cases applicable for rating of this item, 18 received an overall rating of Strength, indicating that both the frequency and quality were sufficient.

Ten (10) 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 two cases, visitation is contingent upon negative drug screens by the parents per a court order. Due to the parents not participating in drug screening, thus not being allowed to visit with their child, the cases received ANI ratings. In another case, a criminal court order barring contact between the mother and child prohibited visits from occurring. Because the worker made no attempts to request the court order be lifted, the case received an ANI rating.

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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 12: Twenty-five (25) cases were applicable for review regarding the frequency of the child's visits with the mother. Of those, 17 were rated Strength and eight were rated ANI. Thirteen (13) cases were applicable for review of the frequency of the child's visits with the father. Of those, nine were rated Strength and four 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.

Nineteen (19) cases were applicable for review regarding the quality of the caseworker's visits with the mother. Of those, 16 were rated Strength and three were rated ANI. Ten (10) cases were applicable for review of the quality of the caseworker's visits with the father. Seven (7) were rated Strength and three were rated ANI. Common themes of cases receiving a Strength rating for quality include visits where the parent(s) and child can strengthen the parent-child relationship as well as practice responsibilities that comprise the role of a parent.

Data Analysis Summary:

Three (3) counties met the benchmark all three months. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

No circuit met the benchmark all three months. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

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

Eighteen (18) of 32 cases (64.3%) reviewed for CFSR received a rating of Strength meaning they met the requirements for both frequency and quality. This is an increase from 41.9% 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	April	May	June
Adair	CD	100%	100%	90.00%
Atchison	CD			100%
Audrain	CD	100%	12.50%	
Barry				0.00%
	6ZV		100%	100%
Barton	CD	100%	100%	100%
Bates	CD	33.33%		100%
Benton	CD	0.00%	66.67%	100%
Boone	CD	88.89%	50.00%	22.22%
	6ZJ		100%	100%
Buchanan	CD	0.00%	46.15%	40.00%
Butler	CD		100%	25.00%
	6ZS	100%	87.50%	100%
Caldwell	CD		0.00%	
Callaway	CD	100%	100%	

Table 4: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&E Goal is 98%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZJ	100%	100%	
Camden	CD			100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	75.00%	36.36%	100%
Carter	CD			100%
Cass	CD	100%	0.00%	
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	100%	
Cedar			0.00%	
Chariton	CD			0.00%
Christian	CD	100%	66.67%	66.67%
	6ZM	100%		
Clark	CD	100%		100%
Clay	CD	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%
Cole	CD	100%	75.00%	
	6ZJ	100%		100%
Cooper	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD		0.00%	28.57%
Dallas	CD	100%	100%	0.00%
Daviess	CD			100%
DeKalb	CD	0.00%		
Dent	CD		0.00%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	100%	0.00%	50.00%
Dunklin	CD		100%	100%
	6ZS	100%		100%
Franklin	CD	33.33%	16.67%	25.00%
	6ZB	100%		
	6ZC	100%	100%	80.00%
Greene	CD	65.52%	84.62%	47.37%
	6ZM	90.91%	77.78%	100%
	6ZV	80.00%	100%	
Harrison	CD	100%	100%	100%
Henry	CD	100%	100%	83.33%
Hickory	CD	100%		
Howard	6ZJ		100%	100%
Howell	CD	0.00%	50.00%	100%
Iron	CD	0.00%		0.00%
Jackson	CD	100%	77.78%	60.00%
	6ZO	100%	100%	88.89%
	6ZR	100%	83.33%	78.57%
Jasper	CD	50.00%	87.50%	100%
	6ZL	100%	80.00%	100%
Jefferson	CD	100%	100%	33.33%
	6ZA	100%	100%	
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
	6ZC	100%		50.00%
Johnson	CD	71.43%	100%	50.00%
Laclede	CD	90.00%	100%	
	6ZK	100%		0.00%
Lafayette	CD	100%	100%	
Lawrence	CD	100%	100%	100%

Table 4: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&E Goal is 98%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Lewis	CD	100%	66.67%	100%
Lincoln	CD	25.00%	100%	
Linn	CD		0.00%	100%
Livingston	CD	50.00%	0.00%	
Macon	CD		0.00%	50.00%
Madison	CD	100%	100%	
Maries	CD	14.29%	0.00%	
Marion	CD	100%	80.00%	66.67%
McDonald	CD	100%		90.00%
	6ZL	60.00%		
Miller	CD	100%	0.00%	
Mississippi	CD	60.00%	0.00%	66.67%
Moniteau	CD	100%		
Monroe	CD	100%	100%	
Morgan	CD	100%	100%	83.33%
New Madrid	CD	25.00%	100%	
Newton	CD	66.67%	66.67%	66.67%
	6ZL		100%	
Nodaway	CD	100%	100%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	100%		100%
Ozark	CD			100%
Pemiscot	CD	83.33%		100%
Perry	CD			100%
Pettis	CD	0.00%	20.00%	25.00%
Phelps	CD	10.00%	100%	40.00%
	6ZK		100%	
Pike	CD	0.00%		
Platte	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Polk	CD	50.00%	100%	100%
Pulaski	CD	33.33%	14.29%	
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Putnam	CD		100%	
Ralls	CD	0.00%	50.00%	
Randolph	CD			100%
	6ZJ		100%	
Ray	CD			0.00%
Reynolds	CD	0.00%		0.00%
Ripley	CD	100%		100%
	6ZS		100%	100%
Saline	CD	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%
Schuyler	CD	100%	100%	
Scotland	CD			100%
Scott	CD	28.57%	100%	0.00%
Shelby	CD		100%	
St. Charles	CD	100%	94.12%	91.67%
	6ZA	100%		
	6ZC	87.50%		
St. Francois	CD	76.47%	80.00%	80.00%
	6ZC	100%		100%
St. Louis City	CD	0.00%	18.75%	6.67%
	6ZA	100%	0.00%	100%

Table 4: HCY Exam Completion within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody – R&E Goal is 98%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZB	57.14%	100%	
	6ZC	57.14%	100%	100%
St. Louis County	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	100%	53.33%	100%
	6ZB	100%	88.89%	100%
	6ZC	100%	66.67%	100%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	0.00%		
Stoddard	CD	100%	87.50%	
	6ZS	75.00%	75.00%	100%
Stone	CD	100%		100%
	6ZV	100%		
Taney	CD		18.18%	33.33%
	6ZV	100%	50.00%	100%
Texas	CD	50.00%	100%	
Vernon	CD	100%	100%	100%
Warren	CD		0.00%	0.00%
Washington	6ZB	100%		50.00%
Wayne	CD		0.00%	0.00%
Webster	CD	100%		100%
Wright	CD	100%	100%	

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025; 08AUG2025

Analysis of Table 4: Number of counties requiring HCY exams for April: 77.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 35 (45.45%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for May: 75.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 31 (41.3%).

Number of counties requiring HCY exams for June: 76.

Number of counties that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 31 (40.7%).

Twenty-nine (29) 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.

Chart 13: HCY Exams Completed Within 30 Days of Entering AC Custody Grouped by Circuit						
R&E Goal is 98%						
	A	B	C	D	E	F
	0.0% - 24.9%	25.0% - 39.9%	40.0% - 64.9%	65.0% - 79.9%	80.0% - 97.9%	98% or greater
April	7	3	3	6	9	14
May	7	3	6	10	10	9
June	6	2	10	14	3	10

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025; 08AUG2025


Analysis of Chart 13: Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for April: 42.
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 14 (33.3%).

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for May: 45.
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 9 (20.0%).

Number of circuits requiring HCY exams for June: 45.
Number of circuits that met the benchmark for timely HCY exam completion: 10 (22.2%)

Three (3) circuits met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required: Circuit 01, Circuit 03, & Circuit 14.

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.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025; 08AUG2025

Analysis of Chart 14: One agency met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period: 6ZJ. This is an increase from zero agencies the previous reporting period. Three (3) agencies (6ZA, 6ZK, & 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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 15: Of the 32 cases reviewed, 24 were rated Strength, indicating all physical health needs, including dental, were assessed, and addressed. Eight (8) were rated ANI. In six of the eight cases rated ANI, the sole reason for the ANI ratings was the targeted child's dental health needs not being appropriately assessed and/or addressed.

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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 16: Of 18 cases applicable for review, 10 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. Eight (8) cases were rated ANI. Four (4) 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. In one case receiving an ANI rating, the worker failed to secure continuing counseling services after the child's school-based counseling ended.

Data Analysis Summary:

Twenty-nine (29) counties met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required. This is an increase from 22 counties from the previous reporting period.

Three (3) circuits met the benchmark in all months where HCY exams were required. This is an increase from two circuits the previous reporting period.

One (1) agency met the benchmark for HCY exams in all months where HCY exams were required. This is an increase from zero (0) agencies the previous reporting period.

When comparing this quarter's CFSR results to the previous reporting period, there was a 31.2% increase in cases receiving an overall Strength rating for Item 17 and a 4.4% decrease 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	April	May	June
Adair	CD	46.1%	54.8%	43.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	57.7%	58.3%	54.5%
Audrain	CD	78.8%	70.6%	79.4%
	6AW	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Barry	CD	56.7%	69.2%	72.2%
	6AW	37.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	35.0%	29.3%	42.4%
Barton	CD	81.3%	88.0%	80.8%
	6AW	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bates	CD	79.5%	81.0%	77.5%
	6AW	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Benton	CD	69.7%	52.0%	56.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	55.0%	48.9%	45.0%
Boone	CD	52.8%	58.3%	59.3%
	6AW	16.7%	27.3%	36.4%
	6ZJ	45.1%	33.2%	38.4%
Buchanan	CD	37.0%	35.7%	46.8%
Butler	CD	35.2%	45.5%	55.2%
	6AW	33.3%	18.2%	18.2%
	6ZS	42.1%	41.3%	39.1%
Caldwell	CD	48.5%	39.4%	29.0%
Callaway	CD	69.1%	81.2%	72.0%
	6AW	60.0%	50.0%	28.6%
	6ZJ	52.1%	36.1%	54.4%
Camden	CD	89.1%	90.7%	85.4%
	6AW	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%
	6ZK	75.0%	41.7%	58.3%
Cape Girardeau	CD	62.2%	54.3%	59.1%
Carroll	CD	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%
Carter	CD	78.6%	77.8%	100%
Cass	CD	63.8%	67.2%	66.1%
	6AW	42.9%	28.6%	33.3%
	6ZO	51.6%	57.3%	43.8%
	6ZR	60.6%	54.9%	52.8%
Cedar	CD	70.3%	65.7%	64.9%
	6AW	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	63.6%	68.2%	40.0%
Christian	CD	79.5%	70.6%	71.3%

Table 5: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZM	50.7%	56.8%	57.0%
Clark	CD	34.2%	53.8%	51.3%
Clay	CD	59.9%	56.8%	48.0%
Clinton	CD	57.9%	54.5%	52.1%
Cole	CD	52.8%	46.2%	44.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	39.5%	29.8%	31.3%
Cooper	CD	50.0%	43.8%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	33.1%	35.4%	25.0%
Dade	CD	71.8%	44.4%	62.5%
Dallas	CD	71.8%	75.0%	73.8%
	6AW	21.4%	7.7%	7.1%
Daviess	CD	51.9%	54.0%	36.7%
DeKalb	CD	39.3%	35.7%	35.7%
Dent	CD	47.7%	51.5%	45.5%
Douglas	CD	40.9%	43.5%	56.3%
	6AW	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Dunklin	CD	48.6%	56.1%	61.3%
	6ZS	26.0%	33.3%	24.1%
Franklin	CD	48.0%	51.2%	58.3%
	6AW	8.3%	16.7%	8.3%
	6ZA	26.8%	38.1%	14.3%
	6ZC	80.6%	89.1%	89.8%
Gasconade	CD	61.8%	50.0%	38.2%
Gentry	CD	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Greene	CD	53.6%	63.0%	61.8%
	6AW	9.5%	13.6%	9.1%
	6ZM	56.0%	45.2%	46.6%
	6ZV	42.0%	45.7%	58.6%
Grundy	CD	88.9%	83.3%	83.3%
Harrison	CD	100%	93.8%	85.7%
Henry	CD	59.3%	57.6%	58.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	50.0%	52.6%	47.4%
Holt	CD	77.8%	72.2%	61.1%
Howard	CD	97.0%	68.4%	88.9%
	6ZJ	51.3%	37.1%	56.8%
Howell	CD	49.6%	50.0%	47.4%
Iron	CD	23.0%	23.9%	29.9%
Jackson	CD	61.3%	62.5%	51.4%
	6AW	20.8%	64.8%	30.4%
	6ZO	43.4%	41.1%	45.3%
	6ZR	45.8%	48.1%	45.8%
Jasper	CD	59.4%	64.1%	55.2%
	6AW	17.6%	29.4%	0.0%
	6ZL	38.2%	39.1%	36.6%
Jefferson	CD	52.2%	45.9%	50.0%
	6AW	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%
	6ZA	33.3%	34.0%	27.9%

Table 5: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZB	32.2%	33.4%	38.7%
	6ZC	48.9%	51.0%	48.4%
Johnson	CD	64.9%	61.4%	65.1%
	6AW	57.1%	50.0%	33.3%
Knox	CD	55.0%	65.0%	75.0%
Laclede	CD	69.1%	60.6%	65.4%
	6AW	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	62.1%	73.3%	47.5%
Lafayette	CD	51.9%	59.2%	45.1%
Lawrence	CD	78.2%	64.0%	78.4%
	6AW	33.3%	10.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	35.6%	25.6%	32.4%
Lewis	CD	58.8%	37.5%	83.3%
Lincoln	CD	49.6%	64.0%	57.3%
Linn	CD	74.5%	65.5%	41.8%
Livingston	CD	78.0%	69.9%	80.2%
Macon	CD	97.7%	65.3%	66.7%
Madison	CD	55.0%	43.3%	62.0%
Maries	CD	18.2%	13.6%	60.0%
Marion	CD	59.7%	56.0%	51.8%
	6AW	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
McDonald	CD	67.3%	59.3%	57.9%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZL	21.9%	70.7%	66.7%
Mercer	CD	50.0%		
Miller	CD	77.4%	65.5%	65.5%
Mississippi	CD	49.5%	40.8%	55.6%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Moniteau	CD	60.0%	75.0%	70.0%
Monroe	CD	36.4%	20.8%	31.0%
Montgomery	CD	27.1%	59.6%	25.5%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Morgan	CD	78.2%	65.2%	71.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
New Madrid	CD	41.7%	40.3%	73.4%
Newton	CD	63.3%	64.4%	76.4%
	6AW	12.5%	16.7%	25.0%
	6ZL	35.0%	52.5%	54.1%
Nodaway	CD	72.2%	73.7%	74.6%
Oregon	CD	51.7%	66.1%	52.4%
Osage	CD	73.3%	83.3%	63.3%
Ozark	CD	30.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	54.2%	39.0%	48.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Perry	CD	59.4%	47.1%	54.5%
Pettis	CD	47.3%	45.8%	34.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	51.5%	51.0%	56.1%
	6ZK	47.0%	48.2%	55.6%
Pike	CD	66.7%	80.0%	84.6%

Table 5: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Platte	CD	64.0%	43.4%	34.8%
Polk	CD	42.9%	50.0%	62.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Pulaski	CD	22.2%	7.5%	29.6%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZK	62.5%	58.7%	39.5%
Putnam	CD	78.6%	57.1%	54.5%
Ralls	CD	30.8%	50.0%	47.4%
Randolph	CD	74.7%	74.6%	80.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	46.9%	46.2%	53.2%
Ray	CD	4.2%	39.1%	8.7%
Reynolds	CD	21.2%	47.1%	58.8%
Ripley	CD	41.2%	38.1%	47.6%
	6ZS	76.6%	68.2%	52.3%
Saline	CD	54.4%	65.2%	29.5%
Schuyler	CD	38.9%	57.9%	52.6%
Scotland	CD	56.5%	59.1%	22.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	52.9%	48.7%	54.2%
	6AW	9.1%	0.0%	7.7%
Shannon	CD	63.6%	69.7%	75.8%
Shelby	CD	59.3%	60.9%	57.7%
St. Charles	CD	55.1%	55.2%	52.6%
	6AW		100%	50.0%
	6ZA		57.1%	0.0%
	6ZB	17.9%	33.3%	26.9%
	6ZC	42.0%	37.9%	54.4%
St. Clair	CD	42.9%	42.9%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	69.1%	64.8%	62.1%
	6ZC	61.3%	69.0%	68.9%
St. Louis City	CD	22.7%	15.8%	19.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	17.2%	14.3%	19.9%
	6ZB	15.8%	26.7%	32.5%
	6ZC	37.2%	38.1%	34.2%
St. Louis County	CD	36.8%	20.3%	23.3%
	6AW	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	20.3%	17.9%	17.1%
	6ZB	20.8%	18.0%	17.5%
	6ZC	36.6%	40.4%	35.4%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	74.6%	52.4%	47.6%
Stoddard	CD	59.1%	40.0%	61.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	56.8%	38.2%	52.7%
Stone	CD	71.4%	70.6%	82.4%
	6AW	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%
	6ZV	50.0%	62.5%	44.8%
Sullivan	CD	64.3%	75.0%	16.7%
Taney	CD	47.7%	55.1%	36.5%

Table 5: Worker-Parent Visits – R&E Goal is 50%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	15.4%	18.5%	4.2%
	6ZV	58.3%	52.3%	53.1%
Texas	CD	24.4%	21.7%	33.3%
	6ZK	66.7%	66.7%	55.6%
Vernon	CD	68.6%	83.9%	70.6%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
Warren	CD	56.7%	43.1%	52.6%
	6AW	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Washington	CD	34.6%	15.4%	25.0%
	6ZB	41.0%	37.6%	38.5%
Wayne	CD	36.9%	42.2%	43.8%
Webster	CD	70.8%	69.2%	74.3%
	6AW	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%
Wright	CD	73.6%	72.7%	69.4%
	6AW	23.1%	20.0%	25.0%

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025


Analysis of Table 5: Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for April: 114.
Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 43 (37.7%).

Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for May: 113.
Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 42 (37.1%).


Number of counties requiring worker-parent visits for June: 113.
Number of counties that met the benchmark for worker-parent visit completion: 38 (33.6%).

Twenty-three (23) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period: Atchison, Cape Girardeau, Carter, Clinton, Gentry, Grundy, Harrison, Holt, Knox, Livingston, Macon, Madison, Moniteau, Nodaway, Oregon, Osage, Mercer, Pike, Putnam, Shannon, Shelby, St. Francois, and Vernon. This is an increase from 22 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 established a benchmark of 50%.




*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025



*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Charts 17 & 18: Nineteen (19) circuits met the benchmark for worker-parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from 13 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 established a benchmark of 50%.




*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 19: Two (2) agencies, 6ZK & CD, met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from one (1) agency 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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 20: Twenty-eight (28) cases were applicable for review regarding the frequency of the caseworker’s visits with the mother. Of those, 16 were rated Strength and 12 were rated ANI. Twenty-three (23) cases were applicable for review of the frequency of the caseworker’s visits with the father. Of those, nine were rated Strength and 14 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.

Twenty-four (24) cases were applicable for review regarding the quality of the caseworker’s visits with the mother. Of those, 17 were rated Strength and seven were rated ANI. Fifteen (15) cases were applicable for review of the quality of the caseworker’s visits with the father. Nine (9) cases were rated Strength and six were rated ANI.

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

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

Data Analysis Summary:

Twenty-three (23) counties met the benchmark all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from 22 the previous reporting period.

Nineteen (19) circuits met the benchmark for worker-parent visits in all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from 13 circuits the previous reporting period.

Two (2) agencies, 6ZK & CD, met the benchmark in all three months of the reporting period. This is an increase from one agency the previous reporting period.

Quarterly CFSR case review results indicate the frequency of worker visits with mothers (57.1%) and fathers (40.6%) is below the federal goal of 95%. The quality of worker visits with mothers (70.8%) and fathers (60.0%) was also below the federal goal. When comparing this quarter's CFSR results to the previous reporting period, there was a decrease in both the frequency and quality of worker visits with mothers. There was a decrease in the quality of worker visits with fathers and no change in the frequency of worker visits with fathers.

Twenty-nine (29) cases were applicable for a Strength or ANI rating. Of those, nine (31.0%) 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 April, May, and June of 2025. This table displays reentry information for each county and each agency in the state. It should be noted that not all agencies (including CD) have children in custody in all counties during all reporting months. Those agencies will have no data displayed. The National Performance for this measure is 5.6% or less. A lower percentage is desirable.

Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	7.0%	6.8%	7.1%
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.0%	
Atchison	CD	60.0%	75.0%	0.0%
Audrain	CD	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%
Barry	CD	4.8%	4.2%	4.2%
	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	5.6%	6.7%	11.1%
Boone	CD	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Buchanan	CD	3.4%	3.7%	3.8%
Butler	CD	11.7%	8.1%	0.0%

Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Caldwell	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Callaway	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Camden	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cape Girardeau	CD	1.1%	1.1%	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	3.0%	3.1%	3.2%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clay	CD	2.9%	3.0%	3.0%
Clinton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cole	CD	5.3%	5.6%	5.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	32.3%	32.3%	36.7%
Cooper	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crawford	CD	2.4%	2.4%	5.9%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dallas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DeKalb	CD	20.0%	22.2%	0.0%
Dent	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	CD	17.6%	15.8%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	11.5%	11.8%	9.8%
	6ZS	12.5%	11.1%	10.5%
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%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gasconade	CD	0.0%	10.0%	8.3%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	3.3%	4.2%	4.0%
	6ZM	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%
	6ZV	16.7%	15.8%	16.7%
Grundy	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harrison	CD	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%
Henry	CD	3.8%	6.9%	7.4%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ		0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	8.8%	7.7%	9.1%

Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Iron	CD	5.6%	5.6%	6.3%
Jackson	CD	4.7%	4.9%	4.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	1.7%	1.6%	5.7%
	6ZR	4.4%	3.8%	3.8%
Jasper	CD	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jefferson	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	5.2%	5.2%	5.1%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson	CD	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Knox	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Laclede	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lafayette	CD	10.0%	10.0%	11.1%
Lawrence	CD	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	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%	16.7%
Livingston	CD	23.8%	22.7%	13.3%
Macon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Maries	CD	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%
Marion	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
McDonald	CD	2.8%	3.3%	3.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mercer	CD	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%
Monroe	CD	20.0%	20.0%	16.7%
Montgomery	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	11.1%	9.1%	12.5%
New Madrid	CD	9.1%	8.3%	7.1%
Newton	CD	4.0%	4.9%	4.3%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nodaway	CD	34.6%	36.0%	36.0%
Oregon	CD	12.5%	14.3%	9.1%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	7.9%	6.5%	6.4%
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%

Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Pike	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Platte	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pulaski	CD	8.3%	5.5%	5.9%
	6ZK	25.0%	22.2%	28.6%
Putnam	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ralls	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Randolph	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	7.1%	4.8%	4.3%
Ray	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reynolds	CD	12.5%	10.0%	10.0%
Ripley	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Saline	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Schuyler	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scotland	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%
Shannon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shelby	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Charles	CD	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%
St. Francois	CD	3.1%	3.3%	3.8%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Louis City	CD	2.2%	2.0%	2.0%
	6ZA	0.0%	3.2%	3.6%
	6ZB	2.9%	2.9%	3.1%
	6ZC	31.8%	31.8%	26.1%
St. Louis County	CD	2.3%	2.3%	2.2%
	6ZA	2.4%	2.2%	2.2%
	6ZB	2.7%	6.1%	3.3%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	90.9%	70.0%	70.0%
Stoddard	CD	8.2%	8.9%	9.8%
	6ZS	6.7%	6.9%	6.3%
Stone	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sullivan	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taney	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Texas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Vernon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Warren	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 6: Reentry into Foster Care – Goal is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZB	5.9%	5.3%	5.9%
Wayne	CD	15.4%	13.3%	11.1%
Webster	CD	3.2%	6.3%	6.7%
Worth	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wright	CD	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%		

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Table 6: Number of counties with reentries in April: 113.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 85 (75.2%).

Number of counties with reentries in May: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 83 (72.3%).

Number of counties with reentries in June: 112.

Number of counties that performed at or below the National Performance: 82 (73.2%).

Seventy-seven (77) 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.

Chart 21: Percentage of Reentry into Foster Care Grouped by Circuit				
National Performance is 5.6% or Less (lower is better)				
	A	B	C	D
	12.5% +	10.1%-12.4%	5.7%-10%	0%-5.6%
April	3	1	6	36
May	2	2	7	35
June	2	2	6	36

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

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

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


Number of circuits with reentries in May: 46.

Number of circuits that met the benchmark for reentry: 35 (76.1%)

Number of circuits with reentries in June: 46.

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

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




*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 22: Nine (9) agencies performed at or below the National Performance in all three months of the reporting period. One (1) agency performed at or below the National Performance in two of the three months of the reporting period.

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

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

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 August 2025

Analysis of Chart 23: On the most recent Missouri Data Profile, released in August of 2025, Missouri's most recent rate of reentry into foster care remains below the National Performance.

Data Analysis Summary:

Seventy-seven (77) counties met the benchmark all three months during the reporting period. This is a decrease from 79 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 no change from 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.

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care <12 Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	1.49	1.46	1.31
Andrew	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Atchison	CD	1.78	1.86	1.00
Audrain	CD	1.38	1.26	1.17
Barry	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00
	6ZV	2.00	1.50	1.36
Barton	CD	1.00	1.18	1.14
Bates	CD	1.26	1.38	1.33
Benton	CD	1.11	1.11	1.09
Bollinger	CD	1.50	1.50	1.50
Boone	CD	1.35	1.40	1.49
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
	6ZJ	1.44	1.41	1.55
Buchanan	CD	1.76	1.65	1.62
Butler	CD	1.41	1.42	1.41
	6AW	3.00	2.67	2.67
	6ZS	1.45	1.33	1.33
Caldwell	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Callaway	CD	1.38	1.28	1.25
	6ZJ	2.24	1.46	1.53
Camden	CD	1.30	1.38	1.30
	6ZK	1.75	1.75	1.00
Cape Girardeau	CD	1.38	1.58	1.63
Carroll	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Carter	CD	2.00	2.00	1.50
Cass	CD	1.04	1.06	1.06
	6ZO	1.77	1.65	1.61
	6ZR	2.05	2.55	3.00
Cedar	CD	2.00	1.50	1.50
Chariton	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Christian	CD	1.27	1.22	1.62
	6ZM	2.33	2.00	1.62
Clark	CD	1.85	1.85	1.62
Clay	CD	1.47	1.51	1.56
Clinton	CD	1.20	1.15	1.13
Cole	CD	1.73	1.44	1.40
	6ZJ	1.58	1.66	1.60
Cooper	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Crawford	CD	1.44	1.47	1.39
Dallas	CD	1.25	1.23	1.43
	6AW	3.00		
Daviess	CD	1.30	1.33	1.30
DeKalb	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dent	CD	1.50	1.65	1.90
Douglas	CD	1.30	1.26	1.24
Dunklin	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
	6ZS	1.56	1.55	1.55
Franklin	CD	1.73	1.58	1.52
	6ZA	1.70	1.70	1.44

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care <12 Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZC	2.25	2.40	1.92
Gasconade	CD	1.08	1.20	1.20
Gentry	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Greene	CD	1.21	1.27	1.27
	6AW	3.00	3.00	3.00
	6ZM	1.51	1.50	1.59
	6ZV	1.21	1.27	1.73
Grundy	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Harrison	CD	1.10	1.08	1.08
Henry	CD	1.03	1.10	1.10
Hickory	CD	1.11	1.13	1.13
Holt	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Howard	CD	1.00		1.00
	6ZJ	1.18	1.55	1.91
Howell	CD	1.50	1.43	1.35
Iron	CD	2.82	2.88	2.60
Jackson	CD	1.18	1.14	1.13
	6AW		3.00	
	6ZO	1.67	1.63	1.57
	6ZR	1.88	1.75	1.71
Jasper	CD	1.31	1.43	1.43
	6ZL	1.69	1.72	1.78
Jefferson	CD	1.00	1.14	1.00
	6ZA	1.36	1.32	1.32
	6ZB	1.39	1.49	1.58
	6ZC	1.43	1.43	1.43
Johnson	CD	1.16	1.16	1.14
Knox	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Laclede	CD	1.29	1.21	1.23
	6ZK	2.50	2.86	2.81
Lafayette	CD	1.26	1.25	1.22
Lawrence	CD	1.92	1.60	1.50
	6ZV	2.18	2.50	2.17
Lewis	CD	2.00	1.69	1.61
Lincoln	CD	1.37	1.19	1.28
Linn	CD	1.75	1.67	1.70
Livingston	CD	1.23	1.16	1.17
Macon	CD	1.33	1.52	1.46
Madison	CD	1.18	1.20	1.17
Maries	CD	1.36	1.33	1.33
Marion	CD	1.53	1.45	1.44
McDonald	CD	1.07	1.08	1.11
	6ZL	1.57	1.48	1.07
Mercer	CD	1.00	1.00	
Miller	CD	1.35	1.67	1.89
Mississippi	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Moniteau	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Monroe	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Montgomery	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Morgan	CD	1.07	1.07	1.06
	6ZK			2.00

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care <12 Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
New Madrid	CD	1.22	1.18	1.33
Newton	CD	1.14	1.17	1.15
	6ZL	1.07	1.07	1.07
Nodaway	CD	1.13	1.14	1.15
Oregon	CD	1.69	1.69	1.53
Osage	CD	1.29	1.29	1.29
Ozark	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Pemiscot	CD	1.25	1.09	1.14
Perry	CD	1.25	1.25	1.20
Pettis	CD	1.30	1.24	1.35
Phelps	CD	1.36	1.27	1.36
	6ZK	1.96	2.00	2.30
Pike	CD	1.20	1.00	1.00
Platte	CD	1.36	1.07	1.06
Polk	CD	1.67	1.40	1.20
Pulaski	CD	1.77	1.55	1.92
	6ZK	1.53	1.21	1.95
Putnam	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ralls	CD	3.50	1.20	1.33
Randolph	CD	1.37	1.54	1.38
	6ZJ	1.54	1.63	1.76
Ray	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Reynolds	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ripley	CD	1.63	1.50	1.43
	6ZS	2.38	2.22	2.00
Saline	CD	1.04	1.04	1.03
Schuyler	CD	1.33	1.29	1.29
Scotland	CD	2.57	2.57	1.33
Scott	CD	1.34	1.24	1.56
Shannon	CD	1.77	1.73	1.73
Shelby	CD	2.25	1.75	1.75
St. Charles	CD	1.64	1.41	1.19
	6ZA		2.00	3.00
	6ZB	2.71	2.79	2.80
	6ZC	2.20	2.26	2.59
St. Clair	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
St. Francois	CD	1.35	1.29	1.24
	6ZC	1.67	1.40	1.53
St. Louis City	CD	1.27	1.28	1.22
	6ZA	1.39	1.38	1.50
	6ZB	1.60	1.84	1.45
	6ZC	1.55	1.63	1.81
St. Louis County	CD	1.68	1.64	1.54
	6ZA	1.58	1.53	1.63
	6ZB	1.77	1.58	1.64
	6ZC	1.57	1.68	1.97
Ste. Genevieve	CD	1.00	1.17	1.25
Stoddard	CD	1.26	1.13	1.14
	6ZS	1.48	1.50	1.62
Stone	CD	1.40	1.00	1.00
	6ZV	1.70	1.74	1.60

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care <12 Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Sullivan	CD	2.33	2.33	2.33
Taney	CD	1.27	1.26	1.23
	6AW	2.00		
	6ZV	1.70	1.58	1.50
Texas	CD	1.44	1.20	1.15
	6ZK	1.50	1.50	2.50
Vernon	CD	1.29	1.25	1.11
Warren	CD	1.03	1.03	1.45
Washington	CD	1.67	1.67	1.67
	6ZB	2.22	2.22	2.04
Wayne	CD	1.90	1.77	1.77
Webster	CD	1.22	1.36	1.55
Wright	CD	1.08	1.11	1.09
	6AW	3.00	3.00	3.00

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Table 7: Average number of workers for children who were in foster care less than 12 months: April (1 to 3.50), May (1 to 3.00), June (1 to 3.00).

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.


Chart 24: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care <12 Months Grouped by Circuit				
	A	B	C	D
	3.0-4.0	2.1-3.0	1.1-2.0	1.0
April	0	0	45	1
May	0	0	45	1
June	0	0	45	1

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

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.

**Chart 25: Average Number of Workers Per Child in Care <12 Months
(lower is better)**



*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 25: Agencies averaged anywhere from 1.34 to 2.67 workers for children in foster care less than 12 months. This is an increase from 1.36 to 2.43 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.

County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	3.67	3.44	3.21
	6AW	9.67	9.67	9.75
Andrew	CD	1.00		
Atchison	CD	2.13	2.13	2.36
Audrain	CD	2.42	2.42	2.10
	6AW	3.50	3.67	3.67
Barry	CD	3.73	4.00	4.22
	6AW	5.20	5.22	5.22
	6ZV	3.48	3.52	3.57
Barton	CD	4.75	5.25	5.25
	6AW	2.00	2.00	2.00
Bates	CD	1.50	1.30	1.30
	6AW	3.00	3.00	4.00
Benton	CD	1.35	1.31	1.19
	6AW	5.00	5.00	5.50
Bollinger	CD	2.58	3.15	3.11
Boone	CD	4.19	4.33	4.27
	6AW	4.78	7.83	7.83
	6ZJ	4.63	4.57	4.64
Buchanan	CD	3.66	3.63	3.69
Butler	CD	4.08	4.02	3.80
	6AW	8.67	8.67	8.67

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZS	3.86	3.72	3.73
Caldwell	CD	1.94	1.80	1.80
Callaway	CD	3.78	3.71	3.69
	6AW	9.00	9.40	8.50
	6ZJ	4.08	4.07	4.31
Camden	CD	2.50	2.28	2.35
	6AW	3.00	6.50	5.00
	6ZK	2.38	2.38	2.21
Cape Girardeau	CD	3.43	3.32	3.29
Carroll	CD	2.00		
Carter	CD	2.14	2.14	1.50
Cass	CD	2.96	3.10	3.21
	6AW	5.00	5.20	5.00
	6ZO	3.30	3.10	3.08
	6ZR	2.91	3.42	3.50
Cedar	CD	3.96	3.81	3.81
	6AW	9.00	9.00	9.00
Chariton	CD	4.57	4.33	4.29
Christian	CD	5.34	5.16	5.16
	6AW	7.50	7.50	7.50
	6ZM	4.61	4.91	4.94
Clark	CD	4.03	3.85	3.78
Clay	CD	2.49	2.38	2.41
Clinton	CD	3.67	3.67	3.76
Cole	CD	4.11	4.06	4.09
	6AW	6.00	6.00	6.00
	6ZJ	4.06	4.14	3.96
Cooper	CD	3.44	3.44	3.50
	6AW	16.00	16.00	16.00
Crawford	CD	4.46	4.37	4.39
Dade	CD	3.83	3.83	3.83
Dallas	CD	1.92	1.92	1.85
	6AW	4.71	4.50	4.50
Daviess	CD	2.62	2.60	3.11
DeKalb	CD	3.83	3.92	4.09
Dent	CD	3.94	3.96	3.91
Douglas	CD	2.05	2.00	2.00
	6AW	2.00	2.50	2.00
Dunklin	CD	2.04	2.00	1.88
	6ZS	5.78	5.77	5.45
Franklin	CD	2.71	2.76	2.76
	6AW	8.98	8.92	8.73
	6ZA	5.15	5.15	5.27
	6ZC	4.86	4.95	4.61
Gasconade	CD	1.84	1.73	1.73
Gentry	CD	2.40	2.40	2.17
Greene	CD	2.61	2.63	2.58
	6AW	5.13	4.94	4.94
	6ZM	3.60	3.59	3.65
	6ZV	4.19	4.09	4.06
Grundy	CD	3.00	3.00	3.00

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Harrison	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00
Henry	CD	2.33	2.10	2.20
	6AW	4.67	4.67	4.67
Hickory	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Holt	CD	1.30	1.38	1.38
Howard	CD	1.88	1.88	2.36
	6ZJ	3.50	3.18	3.27
Howell	CD	4.98	4.72	4.42
Iron	CD	5.30	5.50	5.72
Jackson	CD	6.96	6.55	6.53
	6AW	8.97	9.03	9.56
	6ZO	4.04	4.07	4.08
	6ZR	5.54	5.43	5.44
Jasper	CD	2.83	2.68	2.63
	6AW	4.00	3.60	3.78
	6ZL	3.85	3.71	3.64
Jefferson	CD	3.28	3.03	3.22
	6AW	7.33	5.00	5.00
	6ZA	3.72	3.70	3.70
	6ZB	3.32	3.46	3.59
	6ZC	3.83	3.64	3.89
Johnson	CD	2.05	1.93	1.88
	6AW	6.17	5.80	4.75
Knox	CD	5.20	5.20	5.20
Laclede	CD	2.20	2.27	2.23
	6AW	4.36	4.36	4.45
	6ZK	4.24	3.69	3.61
Lafayette	CD	1.67	1.69	1.69
Lawrence	CD	3.72	3.45	3.68
	6AW	4.50	4.56	4.60
	6ZV	2.85	2.94	3.17
Lewis	CD	3.89	4.14	4.14
Lincoln	CD	2.71	2.76	2.68
	6AW	12.00	12.00	12.00
Linn	CD	4.30	4.33	4.70
Livingston	CD	3.19	2.94	2.89
Macon	CD	4.73	4.56	4.56
Madison	CD	1.96	2.10	2.10
Maries	CD	2.00	2.00	2.00
Marion	CD	3.14	3.19	3.34
	6AW	15.00	15.00	15.00
McDonald	CD	2.73	2.58	2.64
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.00
	6ZL	3.00	3.14	3.05
Miller	CD	4.32	4.20	3.73
	6AW			6.00
Mississippi	CD	2.84	2.90	2.47
	6AW	9.00	9.00	9.00
Moniteau	CD	3.00	3.00	3.00
Monroe	CD	3.57	3.63	3.80
Montgomery	CD	1.82	1.82	1.73

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	11.00	11.00	11.00
Morgan	CD	3.47	3.47	3.47
	6AW	5.50	5.50	5.50
New Madrid	CD	4.16	3.91	3.97
	6AW	10.00	10.00	10.00
Newton	CD	1.91	2.30	2.07
	6AW	4.89	4.55	4.33
	6ZL	3.48	3.31	3.31
Nodaway	CD	2.95	2.38	2.27
Oregon	CD	4.77	5.04	5.04
Osage	CD	1.19	1.25	1.25
Ozark	CD	3.20	2.30	3.20
	6AW	3.50	4.00	4.00
Pemiscot	CD	2.71	2.66	2.63
	6AW	7.00	7.00	5.67
Perry	CD	1.30	1.27	1.27
Pettis	CD	2.33	2.33	2.29
	6AW	7.00	12.00	12.00
Phelps	CD	3.53	3.69	3.85
	6ZK	8.92	7.93	6.25
Pike	CD	2.62	2.62	2.40
Platte	CD	1.87	1.95	1.67
Polk	CD	3.52	3.52	4.00
	6AW	3.52	3.50	4.00
Pulaski	CD	4.21	4.14	4.30
	6AW			4.00
	6ZK	4.40	4.35	4.45
Putnam	CD	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ralls	CD	4.13	4.29	4.57
Randolph	CD	4.55	4.61	4.23
	6AW	11.67	11.67	11.67
	6ZJ	3.59	3.47	3.37
Ray	CD	3.33	3.33	3.33
Reynolds	CD	3.22	2.64	2.64
Ripley	CD	3.00	2.78	3.10
	6AW	14.00	14.00	14.00
	6ZS	2.81	2.85	2.89
Saline	CD	3.31	3.47	3.47
Schuyler	CD	3.38	3.38	3.38
Scotland	CD	5.22	6.67	5.78
	6AW	11.00	11.00	11.00
Scott	CD	4.29	4.35	4.14
	6AW	7.86	7.25	7.25
Shannon	CD	5.50	4.63	4.63
Shelby	CD	2.80	3.07	3.21
St. Charles	CD	3.16	3.17	3.14
	6AW	5.00	5.00	5.00
	6ZA			5.00
	6ZB	3.41	3.58	3.84
	6ZC	4.65	5.00	5.38
St. Clair	CD	3.00	3.00	3.14

Table 7: Average # of Workers Per Child in Care 12+ Months (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6AW	3.25	3.25	3.33
St. Francois	CD	2.40	2.39	3.00
	6AW	3.25		
	6ZC		3.47	3.54
St. Louis City	CD	4.93	4.79	4.84
	6AW	9.00	9.00	9.00
	6ZA	4.92	5.11	5.12
	6ZB	5.93	5.82	5.71
	6ZC	3.67	3.70	3.83
St. Louis County	CD	4.49	1.60	4.39
	6AW	11.00	11.17	9.00
	6ZA	4.61	4.55	4.66
	6ZB	5.34	5.74	5.45
	6ZC	4.56	4.47	4.60
Ste. Genevieve	CD	2.40	2.45	2.28
Stoddard	CD	3.80	3.64	3.96
	6AW	7.00	7.25	7.67
	6ZS	4.81	5.07	4.83
Stone	CD	4.41	4.72	4.53
	6AW	4.50	4.50	4.50
	6ZV	3.50	3.33	3.18
Sullivan	CD	4.50	4.50	4.89
Taney	CD	2.71	2.65	2.65
	6AW	5.24	5.14	5.20
	6ZV	4.76	4.98	4.63
Texas	CD	2.64	2.62	2.95
	6ZK	2.50	2.57	3.43
Vernon	CD	3.65	3.75	3.67
	6AW	4.00	4.00	5.00
Warren	CD	1.55	1.51	3.67
	6AW	7.50	7.50	7.50
Washington	CD	3.50	3.41	3.53
	6ZB	4.19	4.32	4.40
Wayne	CD	3.52	3.50	3.44
Webster	CD	2.69	2.74	2.56
	6AW	4.00	4.00	4.33
Wright	CD	1.73	1.69	1.67
	6AW	7.00	6.29	6.50

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Table 8: For April, May, and June of 2025, children in foster care 12 months or more experienced between one and 16 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.


Chart 26: Average # of Workers per Child in Care 12+ Months Grouped by Circuit				
	A	B	C	D
	4.01-5.12	3.01-4.00	2.01-3.00	1.00-2.00
April	13	18	13	2
May	13	20	10	3
June	14	19	11	2

*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

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



*Source: DSS\Research Report SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL.PROD(HB14DM0) RS5HBDM0, 09MAY2025; 09JUNE2025; 09JUL2025

Analysis of Chart 27: Agencies averaged anywhere from 3.29 to 6.65 workers for children in foster care 12 months or more. This is an increase from the average of 3.34 to 6.64 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:

- 1-3.50 workers at the county level
- 1-1.97 workers at the circuit level
- 1.34-2.71 workers at the agency level

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

- 1-16 workers at the county level
- 1.44-5.12 workers at the circuit level
- 3.29-6.65 workers at the agency level

Phase II Reporting (Reporting Period: April 1, 2025 – June 30, 2025)

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

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

Non-Residential Placement Types

Foster Home	Trial Home Visit
FHO - Foster Home	THV - Trial Home Visit
FHE - Emergency Foster Home	Other
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
Relative Home	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
Adoptive Home	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 – April 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	52.94%	29.41%	7.56%	7.56%	2.52%	0.00%
	6AW	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	73.33%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	28.57%	54.76%	7.14%	7.14%	2.38%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	45.83%	29.17%	16.67%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	44.44%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	46.88%	12.50%	3.13%	3.13%	34.38%	0.00%
Barton	CD	61.54%	23.08%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	65.38%	19.23%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	60.66%	8.20%	4.92%	3.28%	22.95%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	50.00%	12.50%	8.33%	0.00%	29.17%	0.00%
Boone	CD	46.94%	30.61%	18.37%	1.02%	3.06%	0.00%
	6AW	13.33%	60.00%	13.33%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	49.73%	34.05%	5.41%	8.65%	2.16%	0.00%
Buchanan	CD	57.30%	20.22%	13.48%	5.62%	2.25%	1.12%
Butler	CD	37.50%	16.25%	23.75%	8.75%	13.75%	0.00%
	6AW	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	45.08%	27.87%	9.84%	9.84%	7.38%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	47.06%	5.88%	5.88%	5.88%	35.29%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	61.54%	23.08%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	39.29%	35.71%	5.36%	0.00%	17.86%	1.79%
Camden	CD	30.77%	50.00%	3.85%	11.54%	3.85%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	47.37%	15.20%	14.04%	3.51%	19.88%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	0.00%	44.44%	0.00%	11.11%	44.44%	0.00%
Cass	CD	56.76%	10.81%	18.92%	8.11%	5.41%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	50.91%	30.91%	3.64%	7.27%	7.27%	0.00%
	6ZR	34.92%	36.51%	4.76%	11.11%	12.70%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	45.83%	20.83%	20.83%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	29.41%	11.76%	23.53%	5.88%	29.41%	0.00%
Christian	CD	38.71%	17.74%	16.13%	3.23%	24.19%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	40.91%	15.91%	9.09%	6.82%	27.27%	0.00%
Clark	CD	44.38%	29.79%	2.13%	14.89%	8.51%	0.00%
Clay	CD	41.89%	33.11%	13.51%	4.73%	6.76%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	16.13%	51.61%	6.45%	9.68%	16.13%	0.00%
Cole	CD	38.78%	16.33%	12.24%	16.33%	16.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	40.63%	26.04%	11.46%	9.38%	12.50%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	50.00%	31.25%	6.25%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	47.95%	21.92%	13.70%	6.85%	9.59%	0.00%
Dade	CD	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	56.00%	36.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	37.50%	12.50%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	54.84%	35.48%	6.45%	0.00%	3.23%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	33.33%	40.00%	6.67%	13.33%	6.67%	0.00%
Dent	CD	53.62%	20.29%	8.70%	10.14%	7.25%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	40.00%	45.00%	10.00%	2.50%	2.50%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	44.00%	30.00%	8.00%	4.00%	14.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	60.94%	21.88%	6.25%	4.69%	6.25%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	49.29%	28.57%	8.57%	2.14%	11.43%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.33%	20.00%	26.67%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	45.65%	30.43%	4.35%	2.17%	17.39%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	66.67%	29.63%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	42.56%	33.56%	12.46%	1.04%	8.65%	1.73%
	6AW	5.88%	41.18%	41.18%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	44.75%	32.68%	9.34%	4.67%	8.56%	0.00%
	6ZV	49.44%	33.71%	10.11%	3.37%	3.37%	0.00%
Grundy	CD	28.57%	14.29%	28.57%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	83.33%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%
Henry	CD	46.51%	25.58%	9.30%	6.98%	11.63%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	33.33%	0.00%
Howard	CD	27.78%	27.78%	0.00%	0.00%	44.44%	0.00%
	6ZJ	47.83%	26.09%	13.04%	4.35%	8.70%	0.00%
Howell	CD	18.42%	38.16%	28.95%	10.53%	3.95%	0.00%
Iron	CD	52.83%	22.64%	11.32%	5.66%	7.55%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	37.37%	21.21%	35.35%	1.01%	5.05%	0.00%
	6AW	23.53%	29.41%	29.41%	11.76%	5.88%	0.00%
	6ZO	44.02%	36.34%	8.13%	4.97%	6.55%	0.00%
	6ZR	48.11%	34.51%	8.82%	4.03%	4.53%	0.00%
Jasper	CD	59.50%	21.00%	11.00%	3.00%	5.00%	0.50%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6AW	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	44.36%	32.33%	8.27%	8.27%	6.77%	0.00%
Jefferson	CD	41.67%	18.75%	16.67%	0.00%	22.92%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	42.70%	35.96%	10.11%	2.25%	8.99%	0.00%
	6ZB	54.00%	28.40%	2.80%	6.00%	8.40%	0.40%
	6ZC	52.46%	26.23%	4.92%	3.28%	13.11%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	54.12%	30.59%	3.53%	0.00%	11.76%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	58.33%	8.33%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	41.10%	39.73%	8.22%	1.37%	9.59%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	78.26%	8.70%	4.35%	6.52%	2.17%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	40.00%	37.14%	8.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	68.57%	14.17%	11.43%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	37.50%	62.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	64.29%	21.43%	3.57%	10.71%	0.00%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	47.62%	4.76%	4.76%	9.52%	33.33%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	42.16%	40.20%	4.90%	8.82%	3.92%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	51.43%	20.00%	14.29%	2.86%	11.43%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	45.90%	44.26%	8.20%	1.64%	0.00%	0.00%
Macon	CD	47.37%	33.33%	12.28%	5.26%	1.75%	0.00%
Madison	CD	39.22%	13.73%	13.73%	15.69%	17.65%	0.00%
Maries	CD	64.29%	28.57%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	43.03%	32.73%	7.27%	8.48%	8.48%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	46.34%	34.15%	7.32%	0.00%	12.20%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	36.36%	36.36%	12.12%	3.03%	12.12%	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	62.30%	18.03%	11.48%	0.00%	8.20%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	50.00%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	81.25%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	60.53%	23.68%	13.16%	2.63%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	50.91%	40.00%	3.64%	3.64%	1.82%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	48.21%	26.79%	16.07%	1.79%	7.14%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	58.46%	16.92%	10.77%	1.54%	12.31%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	44.44%	0.00%	44.44%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	26.19%	33.33%	11.90%	14.29%	11.90%	2.38%
Nodaway	CD	53.49%	13.95%	11.63%	6.98%	13.95%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	32.43%	40.54%	18.92%	8.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	42.11%	26.32%	5.26%	10.53%	15.79%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Pemiscot	CD	58.82%	17.65%	5.88%	7.06%	10.59%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	61.11%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	47.92%	27.08%	14.58%	3.13%	7.29	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	42.62%	31.15%	6.56%	6.56%	13.11%	0.00%
	6ZK	40.00%	30.00%	12.50%	7.50%	10.00%	0.00%
Pike	CD	41.18%	35.29%	5.88%	0.00%	17.65%	0.00%
Platte	CD	57.69%	21.15%	3.85%	5.77%	11.54%	0.00%
Polk	CD	39.29%	42.86%	3.57%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	45.34%	24.94%	10.56%	9.32%	9.94%	0.00%
	6ZK	41.18%	32.35%	0.00%	2.94%	23.53%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	63.64%	9.09%	18.18%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	34.48%	43.10%	13.79%	5.17%	3.45%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	45.98%	40.23%	6.90%	3.45%	3.45%	0.00%
Ray	CD	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	59.26%	7.41%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	33.33%	26.67%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	65.52%	6.90%	6.90%	3.45%	17.24%	0.00%
Saline	CD	56.41%	25.64%	7.69%	2.56%	7.69%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	64.29%	14.29%	7.14%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	50.00%	7.14%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	51.22%	24.39%	4.88%	1.22%	18.29%	0.00%
	6AW	28.57%	14.29%	14.29%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	63.16%	10.53%	21.05%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%
Shelby	CD	42.11%	21.05%	15.79%	15.79%	5.26%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	48.59%	39.44%	7.04%	0.00%	4.93%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	39.57%	47.92%	8.33%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	48.68%	48.68%	2.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Clair	CD	60.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	53.25%	22.73%	12.34%	1.30%	10.39%	0.00%
	6ZC	45.00%	40.00%	6.67%	6.67%	1.67%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	31.09%	36.79%	22.28%	5.70%	4.15%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	50.00%	34.53%	8.27%	2.88%	4.32%	0.00%
	6ZB	49.60%	36.00%	7.20%	5.60%	0.80%	0.80%
	6ZC	42.74%	44.44%	7.69%	3.42%	1.71%	0.00%
St. Louis County	CD	44.48%	27.59%	18.62%	4.48%	4.83%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	57.14%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	54.71%	32.64%	5.75%	3.91%	2.99%	0.00%
	6ZB	51.92%	30.77%	10.26%	3.21%	3.85%	0.00%
	6ZC	34.53%	44.60%	10.07%	5.04%	5.76%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Ste. Genevieve	CD	35.00%	40.00%	10.00%	12.50%	2.50%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	45.10%	11.76%	19.61%	21.57%	1.96%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	65.96%	21.289%	2.13%	8.51%	2.13%	0.00%
Stone	CD	45.83%	25.00%	12.50%	8.33%	8.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	32.35%	47.06%	5.88%	11.76%	2.94%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	38.46%	30.77%	23.08%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	52.52%	29.50%	8.63%	5.76%	3.60%	0.00%
	6AW	4.76%	47.62%	33.33%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	41.89%	37.84%	8.11%	2.70%	9.46%	0.00%
Texas	CD	18.00%	42.00%	20.00%	8.00%	12.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	64.29%	21.43%	0.00%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	43.48%	39.13%	8.70%	4.35%	4.35%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	59.30%	30.23%	2.33%	4.65%	3.49%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	12.00%	32.00%	52.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	72.37%	19.74%	2.63%	3.95%	1.32%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	54.35%	13.04%	17.39%	10.87%	4.35%	0.00%
Webster	CD	50.00%	21.67%	10.00%	1.67%	16.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Wright	CD	54.02%	18.39%	5.75%	2.30%	19.54%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	28.57%	28.57%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09MAY25

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	46.02%	29.20%	8.85%	6.19%	9.73%	0.00%
	6AW	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	64.29%	28.57%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	40.00%	46.67%	6.67%	4.44%	2.22%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Barry	CD	58.62%	17.24%	13.79%	10.34%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	44.44%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	39.39%	15.15%	6.06%	0.00%	39.39%	0.00%
Barton	CD	53.33%	33.33%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	68.00%	4.00%	12.00%	0.00%	16.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	54.10%	8.20%	4.92%	3.28%	29.51%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	46.15%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%	30.77%	0.00%
Boone	CD	50.98%	26.47%	18.63%	1.96%	1.96%	0.00%
	6AW	15.38%	61.54%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	51.06%	31.91%	6.91%	7.45%	2.66%	0.00%
Buchanan	CD	57.58%	21.21%	15.15%	4.04%	1.01%	1.01%
Butler	CD	40.26%	16.88%	22.08%	7.79%	12.99%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	16.67%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZS	47.66%	25.00%	10.91%	8.59%	7.81%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	47.37%	15.79%	0.00%	5.26%	31.58%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	54.39%	22.81%	15.79%	3.51%	3.51%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.30%	37.04%	5.56%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
Camden	CD	30.77%	50.00%	7.69%	7.69%	3.85%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	48.57%	14.86%	14.29%	3.43%	18.86%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	0.00%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
Cass	CD	47.37%	10.53%	21.05%	7.89%	13.16%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	58.62%	25.86%	1.72%	6.90%	6.90%	0.00%
	6ZR	35.38%	33.85%	4.62%	12.31%	13.85%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	43.48%	21.74%	21.74%	0.00%	13.04%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	29.41%	11.76%	23.53%	5.88%	29.41%	0.00%
Christian	CD	33.90%	28.81%	20.34%	3.39%	13.56%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	42.22%	15.56%	8.89%	6.67%	26.67%	0.00%
Clark	CD	38.30%	29.79%	4.26%	12.77%	14.89%	0.00%
Clay	CD	46.05%	28.29%	13.82%	4.61%	7.24%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	20.59%	47.06%	5.88%	11.76%	14.71%	0.00%
Cole	CD	35.42%	16.67%	12.50%	18.75%	16.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	41.67%	27.08%	12.50%	11.46%	7.29%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	52.63%	26.32%	5.26%	10.53%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	54.93%	18.31%	12.68%	7.04%	7.04%	0.00%
Dade	CD	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	56.00%	32.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	14.29%	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	55.17%	34.48%	6.90%	0.00%	3.45%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	33.33%	46.67%	0.00%	13.33%	6.67%	0.00%
Dent	CD	54.72%	19.40%	7.46%	10.45%	5.97%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	36.59%	43.90%	12.20%	2.44%	4.88%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	49.02%	23.53%	7.84%	5.99%	13.73%	0.00%
	6ZS	61.67%	23.33%	5.00%	5.00%	3.33%	0.00%
Franklin	CD	50.00%	27.40%	8.90%	2.05%	11.64%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	58.33%	16.67%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.33%	20.00%	26.67%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	53.33%	26.67%	2.22%	2.22%	15.56%	0.00%
Gasconade	CD	59.26%	25.93%	7.41%	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%
Gentry	CD	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Greene	CD	43.52%	32.23%	12.29%	2.66%	7.31%	1.99%
	6AW	5.88%	47.06%	35.29%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	42.58%	32.03%	9.77%	1.95%	12.89%	0.78%
	6ZV	47.31%	34.41%	11.83%	2.15%	4.30%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Grundy	CD	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	57.14%	21.43%	14.29%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
Henry	CD	50.00%	18.42%	10.53%	7.89%	13.16%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Hickory	CD	41.67%	25.00%	8.33%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Holt	CD	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	33.33%	0.00%
Howard	CD	36.36%	45.45%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%
	6ZJ	50.00%	27.27%	9.09%	4.55%	9.09%	0.00%
Howell	CD	18.67%	40.00%	28.00%	10.67%	2.67%	0.00%
Iron	CD	50.00%	24.00%	12.00%	6.00%	8.00%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	38.32%	22.43%	32.71%	1.87%	4.67%	0.00%
	6AW	21.21%	30.30%	36.36%	6.06%	6.06%	0.00%
	6ZO	44.62%	37.07%	8.01%	4.81%	5.26%	0.23%
	6ZR	45.41%	35.46%	9.18%	4.59%	5.36%	0.00%
Jasper	CD	52.94%	19.61%	11.76%	5.88%	9.80%	0.00%
	6AW	10.00%	50.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	48.51%	29.85%	11.19%	5.97%	4.48%	0.00%
Jefferson	CD	42.22%	17.78%	15.56%	0.00%	24.44%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.48%	35.87%	7.61%	3.26%	9.78%	0.00%
	6ZB	55.20%	29.60%	2.00%	7.20%	6.00%	0.00%
	6ZC	48.33%	28.33%	6.67%	3.33%	13.33%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	53.09%	29.63%	3.70%	0.00%	13.58%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Knox	CD	58.33%	8.33%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Laclede	CD	42.86%	38.57%	7.14%	1.43%	10.00%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	76.09%	6.52%	6.52%	4.35%	6.52%	0.00%
Lafayette	CD	26.47%	38.24%	8.82%	14.71%	11.76%	0.00%
Lawrence	CD	58.33%	25.00%	13.89%	0.00%	2.78%	0.00%
	6AW	11.11%	22.22%	55.56%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	60.00%	12.00%	8.00%	8.00%	12.00%	0.00%
Lewis	CD	52.17%	17.39%	4.35%	8.470%	17.39%	0.00%
Lincoln	CD	42.99%	38.32%	4.67%	9.35%	4.67%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Linn	CD	52.78%	19.44%	13.89%	2.78%	11.11%	0.00%
Livingston	CD	48.48%	39.39%	7.58%	3.03%	1.52%	0.00%
Macon	CD	40.68%	37.29%	13.566%	5.08%	3.39%	0.00%
Madison	CD	36.54%	13.46%	17.31%	15.38%	17.31%	0.00%
Maries	CD	73.33%	13.33%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marion	CD	43.75%	30.63%	8.13%	8.13%	9.38%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
McDonald	CD	42.11%	36.84%	7.89%	0.00%	13.16%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	40.00%	31.43%	14.29%	5.71%	8.57%	0.00%
Miller	CD	41.46%	39.02%	12.20%	0.00%	7.32%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	53.45%	18.97%	10.34%	0.00%	17.24%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	72.73%	9.09%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	76.47%	5.88%	11.76%	0.00%	5.88%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Montgomery	CD	57.89%	23.63%	10.53%	7.89%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	54.10%	34.43%	4.92%	3.28%	3.28%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	47.27%	27.27%	14.55%	3.64%	7.27%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	61.19%	11.94%	13.43%	1.49%	11.94%	0.00%
	6AW	9.09%	45.45%	9.09%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	25.58%	30.23%	18.60%	11.63%	11.63%	2.33%
Nodaway	CD	36.36%	20.45%	15.91%	0.00%	27.27%	0.00%
Oregon	CD	24.32%	43.24%	24.32%	8.11%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	42.11%	26.32%	5.26%	10.53%	15.79%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	56.98%	22.09%	8.14%	6.98%	5.81%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Perry	CD	63.16%	21.05%	10.53%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	44.21%	28.42%	14.74%	3.16%	9.47%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	45.30%	27.35%	6.84%	6.84%	13.68%	0.00%
	6ZK	26.83%	39.02%	17.07%	9.76%	7.32%	0.00%
Pike	CD	41.18%	35.29%	5.88%	0.00%	17.65%	0.00%
Platte	CD	60.38%	18.87%	3.77%	5.66%	11.32%	0.00%
Polk	CD	42.86%	35.71%	14.29%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	45.40%	27.59%	11.49%	7.47%	8.05%	0.00%
	6ZK	38.71%	38.71%	0.00%	3.23%	19.35%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	76.92%	7.69%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Randolph	CD	35.85%	39.62%	9.43%	9.43%	5.66%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.51%	39.53%	5.81%	3.49%	4.65%	0.00%
Ray	CD	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	42.31%	7.69%	19.23%	11.54%	19.23%	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%
	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%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	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, 09JUN25

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Adair	CD	42.02%	32.77%	7.56%	6.72%	10.92%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Andrew	CD	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Atchison	CD	76.47%	17.65%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Audrain	CD	40.48%	45.24%	9.52%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%
Barry	CD	55.56%	18.52%	14.91%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	62.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
	6ZV	47.06%	11.76%	2.94%	0.00%	38.24%	0.00%
Barton	CD	50.00%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bates	CD	70.37%	3.70%	7.41%	0.00%	18.52%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Benton	CD	51.67%	11.67%	1.67%	1.67%	33.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
Bollinger	CD	47.83%	17.39%	8.70%	0.00%	26.09%	0.00%
Boone	CD	52.88%	25.96%	18.27%	1.92%	0.96%	0.00%
	6AW	15.38%	61.54%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	49.45%	32.97%	7.69%	6.04%	3.30%	0.55%
Buchanan	CD	53.68%	23.16%	11.58%	9.47%	1.05%	1.05%
Butler	CD	39.24%	20.25%	21.52%	8.86%	10.13%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	33.33%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	53.17%	23.81%	11.11%	7.94%	3.97%	0.00%
Caldwell	CD	50.00%	18.75%	6.25%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
Callaway	CD	53.57%	25.00%	17.86%	0.00%	3.51%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%
	6ZJ	42.59%	37.04%	7.41%	0.00%	12.96%	0.00%
Camden	CD	29.63%	59.26%	0.00%	3.70%	7.41%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	56.25%	37.50%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Cape Girardeau	CD	51.81%	15.66%	14.46%	3.01%	15.06%	0.00%
Carroll	CD	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carter	CD	12.50%	50.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
Cass	CD	37.14%	8.57%	17.14%	5.71%	31.43%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZO	60.71%	23.21%	3.57%	8.93%	3.57%	0.00%
	6ZR	35.38%	21.54%	6.15%	12.31%	24.62%	0.00%
Cedar	CD	43.48%	21.74%	21.74%	0.00%	13.04%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Chariton	CD	29.41%	11.76%	23.53%	5.88%	29.41%	0.00%
Christian	CD	34.38%	29.69%	20.31%	3.13%	12.50%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	38.30%	14.89%	12.77%	2.13%	31.91%	0.00%
Clark	CD	40.82%	28.57%	6.12%	8.16%	16.33%	0.00%
Clay	CD	47.02%	29.80%	11.26%	4.64%	7.28%	0.00%
Clinton	CD	31.43%	42.86%	5.71%	8.57%	11.43%	0.00%
Cole	CD	41.67%	20.83%	10.42%	18.75%	8.33%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	45.92%	27.55%	10.20%	9.18%	7.14%	0.00%
Cooper	CD	47.37%	31.58%	10.53%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford	CD	49.37%	24.05%	15.19%	5.06%	6.33%	0.00%
Dade	CD	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dallas	CD	59.26%	29.63%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
	6AW	12.50%	37.50%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
Daviess	CD	55.17%	27.59%	6.90%	3.45%	6.90%	0.00%
DeKalb	CD	46.67%	40.00%	0.00%	6.67%	6.67%	0.00%
Dent	CD	50.00%	20.31%	9.38%	10.94%	9.38%	0.00%
Douglas	CD	34.88%	46.51%	11.63%	2.33%	4.65%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Dunklin	CD	46.00%	24.00%	8.00%	6.00%	16.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Franklin	6ZS	57.38%	27.87%	6.56%	4.92%	3.28%	0.00%
	CD	46.05%	27.63%	9.87%	1.32%	15.13%	0.00%
	6AW	18.18%	63.64%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	45.16%	19.35%	25.81%	9.68%	0.00%	0.00%
Gasconade	6ZC	46.51%	27.91%	0.00%	4.65%	20.93%	0.00%
	CD	55.56%	29.63%	7.41%	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%
	Gentry	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	Greene	43.75%	35.20%	12.17%	1.64%	7.24%	1.99%
	6AW	6.25%	56.25%	31.25%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZM	38.82%	30.98%	10.20%	4.71%	14.90%	0.39%
	6ZV	44.68%	35.11%	10.64%	3.19%	6.38%	0.00%
	CD	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Harrison	CD	64.29%	21.43%	7.14%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
Henry	CD	56.41%	15.38%	12.82%	2.56%	12.82%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	Hickory	CD	41.67%	0.00%	8.33%	33.33%	0.00%
	Holt	CD	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	33.33%
Howard	CD	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%
	6ZJ	50.00%	22.73%	13.64%	4.55%	9.09%	0.00%
	CD	19.48%	38.96%	24.68%	14.29%	2.60%	0.00%
	Iron	CD	52.00%	24.00%	12.00%	6.00%	0.00%
Jackson	CD	33.33%	21.90%	32.38%	2.86%	9.52%	0.00%
	6AW	12.90%	29.03%	48.39%	3.23%	6.45%	0.00%
	6ZO	45.48%	37.35%	7.42%	4.87%	4.64%	0.23%
	6ZR	43.40%	36.55%	9.14%	5.33%	5.58%	0.00%
Jasper	CD	52.68%	19.02%	11.71%	2.93%	13.66%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	55.56%	11.11%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%
	6ZL	49.62%	27.82%	12.78%	4.51%	5.26%	0.00%
	CD	38.78%	14.29%	14.29%	2.04%	30.61%	0.00%
Jefferson	6AW	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	43.96%	36.26%	8.79%	2.20%	8.79%	0.00%
	6ZB	53.69%	31.15%	2.87%	6.56%	5.74%	0.00%
	6ZC	50.88%	31.58%	5.26%	5.26%	7.02%	0.00%
Johnson	CD	51.90%	27.85%	5.06%	0.00%	15.19%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Knox	CD	58.33%	16.67%	16.67%	8.33%	0.00%
	Laclede	CD	38.57%	37.14%	7.14%	1.43%	15.71%
	6AW	18.18%	45.45%	9.09%	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZK	72.34%	8.51%	8.51%	4.26%	6.38%	0.00%
	Lafayette	CD	23.53%	44.12%	8.82%	14.71%	8.82%
	Lawrence	CD	52.78%	30.56%	13.89%	0.00%	2.78%
	6AW	10.00%	20.00%	60.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	50.00%	4.17%	12.50%	8.33%	25.00%	0.00%
	Lewis	CD	61.90%	19.05%	4.76%	9.52%	4.76%
	Lincoln	CD	45.79%	38.32%	4.67%	8.41%	2.80%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Linn	CD	48.57%	20.00%	14.29%	5.71%	11.43%
	Livingston	CD	45.45%	37.88%	7.58%	3.03%	6.06%
	Macon	CD	41.94%	38.71%	12.90%	1.61%	4.84%
Madison	CD	40.74%	14.81%	14.81%	14.81%	14.81%	0.00%
	Maries	CD	33.33%	40.00%	6.67%	0.00%	20.00%
	Marion	CD	41.83%	30.72%	9.15%	8.50%	9.80%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
McDonald	CD	55.32%	27.66%	4.26%	0.00%	12.77%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	42.42%	33.33%	9.09%	6.06%	9.09%	0.00%
Miller	CD	43.59%	38.46%	10.26%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mississippi	CD	54.76%	21.43%	4.76%	2.38%	16.67%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Moniteau	CD	45.45%	36.36%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe	CD	68.42%	10.53%	10.53%	5.26%	5.26%	0.00%
Montgomery	CD	56.76%	21.62%	13.51%	5.41%	2.70%	0.00%
	6AW	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	CD	53.97%	34.92%	4.76%	3.17%	3.17%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
New Madrid	CD	45.83%	27.08%	14.58%	6.25%	6.25%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Newton	CD	61.11%	13.89%	8.33%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%
	6AW	8.33%	58.33%	8.33%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZL	25.58%	34.88%	13.95%	11.63%	11.63%	2.33%
Nodaway	CD	32.56%	20.93%	18.60%	0.00%	23.26%	4.65%
Oregon	CD	34.15%	41.46%	19.51%	4.88%	0.00%	0.00%
Osage	CD	44.44%	22.22%	5.56%	11.11%	16.67%	0.00%
Ozark	CD	42.86%	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pemiscot	CD	57.14%	25.97%	7.79%	5.19%	3.90%	0.00%
	6AW	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%
Perry	CD	60.00%	30.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pettis	CD	43.62%	26.60%	15.96%	6.38%	7.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Phelps	CD	49.55%	25.23%	6.31%	7.21%	11.71%	0.00%
	6ZK	32.56%	39.53%	11.63%	9.30%	6.98%	0.00%
Pike	CD	50.00%	35.71%	7.14%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
Platte	CD	61.82%	18.18%	3.64%	5.45%	10.91%	0.00%
Polk	CD	37.93%	44.83%	10.34%	3.45%	3.45%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Pulaski	CD	48.77%	23.46%	11.11%	4.94%	11.73%	0.00%
	6ZK	54.84%	35.48%	0.00%	0.00%	9.68%	0.00%
Putnam	CD	78.57%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
Ralls	CD	58.33%	25.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%
Randolph	CD	41.18%	31.37%	13.73%	7.84%	5.88%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZJ	46.15%	35.16%	6.59%	3.30%	8.79%	0.00%
Ray	CD	76.92%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%
Reynolds	CD	46.43%	7.14%	21.43%	10.71%	14.29%	0.00%
Ripley	CD	37.50%	25.00%	12.50%	6.25%	18.75%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	72.41%	10.34%	0.00%	6.90%	10.34%	0.00%
Saline	CD	58.54%	26.73%	12.20%	2.44%	0.00%	0.00%
Schuyler	CD	64.29%	21.43%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Scotland	CD	46.67%	6.67%	33.33%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Scott	CD	52.83%	20.75%	7.55%	0.00%	18.87%	0.00%
	6AW	37.50%	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shannon	CD	57.89%	10.53%	21.05%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 9: Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025							
County	Agency	Relative Home	Foster Home	Other	Residential	Trial Home Visit	Adoptive Home
Shelby	CD	50.00%	16.67%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%
St. Charles	CD	48.10%	37.97%	6.33%	1.90%	5.70%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZB	39.62%	51.54%	1.89%	5.66%	11.32%	0.00%
	6ZC	51.32%	40.79%	7.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Clair	CD	33.33%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Francois	CD	50.96%	22.93%	14.01%	2.55%	9.55%	0.00%
	6ZC	39.34%	34.43%	8.20%	8.20%	9.84%	0.00%
St. Louis City	CD	32.64%	40.41%	20.73%	4.66%	1.55%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	53.00%	35.34%	7.42%	2.12%	2.12%	0.00%
	6ZB	43.90%	39.02%	7.32%	6.50%	3.25%	0.00%
	6ZC	41.74%	42.61%	11.30%	2.61%	1.74%	0.00%
St. Louis County	CD	44.30%	30.87%	19.13%	3.02%	2.68%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZA	54.78%	32.17%	3.73%	4.20%	5.13%	0.00%
	6ZB	50.32%	32.26%	8.39%	2.58%	6.45%	0.00%
	6ZC	37.41%	40.29%	12.95%	5.76%	3.60%	0.00%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	35.00%	35.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Stoddard	CD	54.72%	11.32%	15.09%	16.98%	1.89%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZS	68.89%	11.11%	2.22%	8.89%	8.89%	0.00%
Stone	CD	43.48%	21.74%	17.39%	4.35%	13.04%	0.00%
	6AW	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	34.38%	46.25%	6.25%	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%
Sullivan	CD	41.67%	33.33%	16.67%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Taney	CD	45.58%	29.93%	7.48%	6.80%	10.20%	0.00%
	6AW	15.00%	45.00%	25.00%	10.00%	5.00%	0.00%
	6ZV	50.00%	28.75%	8.75%	2.50%	6.25%	3.75%
Texas	CD	13.46%	38.46%	23.08%	3.85%	21.15%	0.00%
	6ZK	66.67%	25.00%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Vernon	CD	66.67%	16.67%	12.50%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%
Warren	CD	59.30%	25.58%	3.49%	5.81%	5.81%	0.00%
	6AW	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Washington	CD	22.22%	22.22%	50.00%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%
	6ZB	60.27%	26.03%	2.74%	5.48%	5.48%	0.00%
Wayne	CD	53.19%	14.89%	17.02%	8.51%	6.38%	0.00%
Webster	CD	52.94%	21.57%	13.73%	1.96%	9.80%	0.00%
	6AW	52.94%	21.57%	13.73%	1.96%	9.80%	0.00%
Wright	CD	51.25%	20.00%	6.25%	1.25%	21.25%	0.00%
	6AW	16.67%	33.33%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09JUL25

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 – April 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD				3	1	5						
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				2	1							
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1				1					
	6AW			1									
	6ZV						1						
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				2								
	6AW			1									
Boone	CD				1								
	6AW				1								1
	6ZJ			1	10	1	4						
Buchanan	CD				1	2	2						
Butler	CD			1	5	1							
	6AW			1									
	6ZS			2	6		4						
Caldwell	CD				1								
Callaway	6AW				2								
Camden	CD			1	2								
	6ZK				1								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	4		1						
Carter	CD				1								
Cass	CD				3								
	6AW					1							
	6ZO			1	2		1						
	6ZR				5	1	1						
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD				2								
	6ZM			1	2								
Clark	CD			1	4		2						
Clay	CD			2	3		2						
Clinton	CD			2	1								
Cole	CD			2	3	1		2					
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				6	1	2						
Cooper	CD				2								
Crawford	CD			1	2		1	1					
Dallas	6AW			1	1								

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
DeKalb	CD			1		1							
Dent	CD			3	4								
Douglas	CD						1						
Dunklin	CD			1	1								
	6ZS				2		1						
Franklin	CD			1			1	1					
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZA				3								
	6ZC			1									
Gentry	CD				1								
Greene	CD				1		2						
	6AW				2								
	6ZM				4	2	5	1					
	6ZV				2		1						
Henry	CD				3								
	6AW				1								
Hickory	CD				1	1							
Holt	CD					1							
Howard	6ZJ			1									
Howell	CD				2	1	5						
Iron	CD			1			1	1					
Jackson	CD				1								
	6AW				2			2					
	6ZO			1	10	4	6	1					
	6ZR				10	2	2	1					1
Jasper	CD				4		1	1					
	6AW				1		1						
	6ZL				8	1	2						
Jefferson	6ZA				1	1							
	6ZB			1	11		3						
	6ZC				2								
Knox	CD						1	1					
Laclede	CD				1								
	6AW				2								
	6ZK				1		2						
Lafayette	CD				5								
Lawrence	6ZV				2	1							
Lewis	CD			1	1								
Lincoln	CD			2	6		1						
Linn	CD			1									
Livingston	CD						1						
Macon	CD			1	1								1
Madison	CD			5	3								
Marion	CD			3	9	1		1					
	6AW				1								
McDonald	6ZL				1								
Mississippi	6AW					1							
Moniteau	CD						1						
Montgomery	CD				1								
Morgan	CD				2								
New Madrid	CD						1						
Newton	CD				1								
	6AW			1	1	1	1						
	6ZL				4		1	1					
Nodaway	CD						3						

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Oregon	CD			2			1						
Osage	CD			1	1								
Ozark	CD							1					
Pemiscot	CD				5		1						
	6AW			1									
Pettis	CD				3								
Phelps	CD			3	3		2						
	6ZK				1	2							
Platte	CD				2			1					
Pulaski	CD			3	9	1	2						
	6ZK				1								
Randolph	CD			1				2					
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ				2			1					
Reynolds	CD			1	1		1						
Ripley	6ZS				1								
Saline	CD				1								
Schuyler	CD				1								
Scotland	CD			1	1								
Scott	CD				1								
	6AW			1	2								
Shannon	CD				1								
Shelby	CD			1	1		1						
St. Charles	6AW				1								
	6ZB				1			1					
St. Clair	6AW							1					
St. Francois	CD			2									
	6ZC			1	1		2						
St. Louis City	CD			1	4	2	2	1					1
	6AW				1								
	6ZA				2		4	2					
	6ZB				4		3						
	6ZC				2		2						
St. Louis Co.	CD			2	2	2	3	4					
	6AW			1									
	6ZA			3	6	3	2	2					1
	6ZB				1		4						
	6ZC				4		2	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			2	1	1	1						
Stoddard	CD			1	1		9						
	6ZS			2	1		1						
Stone	CD				1			1					
	6AW				2		1						
	6ZV					1	3						
Sullivan	CD						1						
Taney	CD			1	4		2	1					
	6AW				2	1							
	6ZV				1		1						
Texas	CD			2	2								
	6ZK					1							
Vernon	CD						1						
Warren	CD				1		3						
Washington	6ZB				1	2							
Wayne	CD				2		2	1					
Webster	CD				1								

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – April 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
	6AW					1	1						
Wright	CD						2						
	6AW				1								
TOTAL		0	0	80	289	47	130	35	0	0	0	0	5

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09MAY25

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD			1	3		3						
Andrew	CD				1								
Audrain	CD				2								
	6AW				1								
Barry	CD			1				2					
	6AW			1									
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				2								
	6AW			1		1							
Boone	CD				1		1						
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ			1	8	1	4						
Buchanan	CD				1	2	1						
Butler	CD			1	5								
	6AW			1	1								
	6ZS			2	5		3	1					
Caldwell	CD				1								
Callaway	CD						2						
	6AW				2								
Camden	CD				2								
	6ZK				1								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	5								
Carter	CD				1								
Cass	CD				3								
	6AW					1							
	6ZO			1	2	1							
	6ZR				5	2		1					
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD				2								
	6ZM			1	2								
Clark	CD			1	3		2						
Clay	CD			2	4		1						
Clinton	CD			3	1								
Cole	CD			2	4	1	1	1					
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				7	1	3						
Cooper	CD				2								
Crawford	CD			1	2		1	1					
Dallas	6AW			1									
DeKalb	CD			1		1							
Dent	CD			3	3		1						
Douglas	CD						1						
Dunklin	CD			1	2								
	6ZS				1		1	1					
Franklin	CD			2				1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZA				3								

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

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – May 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Randolph	CD			1			1	3					
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ				2			1					
Reynolds	CD			1	1		1						
Ripley	CD						1						
	6ZS				1								
Saline	CD				1								
Schuyler	CD				2								
Scotland	CD			1	1								
Scott	CD				1								
	6AW			1	1								
Shannon	CD				1			1					
Shelby	CD			1	1								
St. Charles	CD				1		1	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZB				1			2					
St. Clair	6AW				1								
St. Francois	CD			2									
	6ZC			1	1		3						
St. Louis City	CD			2	4		1						1
	6AW				1								
	6ZA				2		3	2					
	6ZB				5	1	2						
	6ZC				2	1	1						
	6ZC				2	2	1	4					
St. Louis Co.	CD				2	2	1	4					
	6AW			1									
	6ZA			3	6	5	2	2					1
	6ZB				1		3						
	6ZC				4		3	1					
	6ZC				4		3	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			1	3								
	CD			1	2		5	1					
Stoddard	CD			1	2		5	1					
	6ZS			2	1		1						
Stone	CD				1			1					
	6AW				2								
Sullivan	CD						1						
Taney	CD			1	5		2	1					
	6AW				2	1							
	6ZV				1		1						
Texas	CD			2	3								
	6ZK					1							
Vernon	CD						1						
Warren	CD			1	1		3						
Washington	6ZB				1	2							
Wayne	CD				2		2	1					
Webster	CD				1								
	6AW					1							
Wright	CD						1						
	6AW				1								
TOTAL				79	299	44	115	42					3

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09JUN25

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Adair	CD			2	3		3						
Andrew	CD				1								

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Audrain	CD				2								
Barry	CD			1				2					
	6AW			1									
Barton	6AW					1							
Benton	CD				1								
	6AW			1		1							
Boone	CD				1		1						
	6AW				1								
	6ZJ			2	8		1						
Buchanan	CD				2	2	5						
Butler	CD			2	5								
	6AW				1								
	6ZS			2	5		3						
Callaway	6AW			1	1								
Camden	CD				1								
	6AW				1								
Cape Girardeau	CD			1	4								
Carter	CD			1									
Cass	CD				2								
	6AW				1	1							
	6ZO			1	2	1		1					
	6ZR				4	2	1	1					
Chariton	CD				1								
Christian	CD				2								
	6ZM				1								
Clark	CD			1	3								
Clay	CD			1	5		1						
Clinton	CD			2	1								
Cole	CD			2	3	1	1	2					
	6AW			1									
	6ZJ				5	1	2	1					
Cooper	CD				1								
Crawford	CD			1	2			1					
Dallas	6AW			1									
Daviess	CD						1						
DeKalb	CD			1									
Dent	CD			3	3		1						
Douglas	CD						1						
Dunklin	CD			1	2								
	6ZS				2			1					
Franklin	CD			1				1					
	6AW				1		1						
	6ZA				3								
	6ZC			1		1							
Gentry	CD				1								
Greene	CD			1	1		1	2					
	6AW				1								
	6ZM				5		7						
	6ZV				1		2						
Grundy	CD				1								
Henry	CD				1								
	6AW				1								
Hickory	CD				1	3							
Holt	CD					1							
Howard	6ZJ			1									
Howell	CD				3	1	7						

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

Table 12: Residential Placement Types for Foster Children – June 2025													
County	Agency	FBR	RF2	RF3	RF4	PRTF	RFE	RFA	RFI	RFP	RFH	RST	RFM
Scott	6AW			1	1								
Shannon	CD				1		1						
Shelby	CD			1	1								
St. Charles	CD				1		1	1					
	6AW				1								
	6ZB				1			2					
St. Clair	6AW				1								
St. Francois	CD			1	2		1						
	6ZC			2			3						
St. Louis City	CD			2	4	1	1						1
	6AW				1								
	6ZA				2		2	2					
	6ZB			1	5		1	1					
	6ZC					1		2					
St. Louis Co.	CD				1	1	2	5					
	6AW			1									
	6ZA			3	8	4	1	1					1
	6ZB				1	1	2						
	6ZC				3	1	3	1					
Ste. Genevieve	CD			1	3								
Stoddard	CD			1	2		5	1					
	6ZS			2	1		1						
Stone	CD							1					
	6AW				1								
Sullivan	CD			1									
Taney	CD			1	5		3	1					
	6AW					1		1					
	6ZV				1		1						
Texas	CD			1	1								
	6ZK					1							
Vernon	CD						1						
Warren	CD			1	1		3						
Washington	6ZB			1	1	2							
Wayne	CD				1		2	1					
Webster	CD				1								
	6AW					1							
Wright	CD						1						
	6AW				1		1						
TOTAL				85	278	43	103	48					5

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09JUL25

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 49% 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%
April	0	2	23	21
May	0	2	24	20
June	0	4	18	24


*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5054, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Chart 28: Twenty-one (21) circuits (45.65%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in April. This is a decrease from 47.83% the previous reporting period.

Twenty (20) circuits (43.47%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in May. This is a decrease from 47.83% the previous reporting period.

Twenty-four (24) circuits (52.17%) maintained at or below 5.00% residential utilization in June. This is an increase from 47.83% 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, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Chart 29: Four (4) agencies maintained below 5.00% residential utilization during all three months of the reporting period. This is no change from the previous reporting period. One agency 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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 30: Of 32 cases applicable for rating of this item, 21 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.

Eleven (11) cases were rated ANI. All 11 cases received an ANI rating due to the agency's failure to locate, identify, inform, and evaluate relatives for potential 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 decreased from 572 in March of 2025 to 557 in June of 2025. In June of 2025, the State of Missouri maintained 5.05% 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 6.2% increase 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%.

Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	32.9%	25.0%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Andrew	CD	71.4%	83.3%	83.3%
Atchison	CD	46.2%	30.0%	27.3%
Audrain	CD	38.9%	38.1%	36.4%
Barry	CD	21.1%	5.9%	7.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	26.3%	26.3%	26.3%
Barton	CD	25.0%	25.0%	20.0%
Bates	CD	54.2%	47.8%	55.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benton	CD	25.0%	24.1%	31.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	
Bollinger	CD	26.7%	9.1%	9.1%
Boone	CD	40.5%	37.8%	29.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZJ	9.3%	10.6%	12.8%
Buchanan	CD	26.8%	30.2%	26.9%

Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Butler	CD	48.8%	50.0%	47.6%
	6ZS	5.8%	5.4%	5.5%
Caldwell	CD	31.3%	35.3%	41.2%
Callaway	CD	26.3%	21.1%	22.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	15.4%	16.7%	18.8%
Camden	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZK	22.2%	22.2%	33.3%
Cape Girardeau	CD	6.7%	6.3%	6.0%
	6ZS	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
Carter	CD	21.4%	42.9%	42.9%
Cass	CD	60.0%	55.6%	56.0%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZO	25.0%	23.3%	22.6%
	6ZR	18.4%	16.2%	17.6%
Cedar	CD	55.6%	55.6%	55.6%
Chariton	CD	46.2%	46.2%	50.0%
Christian	CD	37.0%	43.5%	52.9%
	6ZM	22.2%	23.3%	25.9%
Clark	CD	20.0%	18.8%	18.8%
Clay	CD	28.0%	26.9%	24.1%
Clinton	CD	0.0%	7.7%	7.7%
Cole	CD	50.0%	62.5%	58.8%
	6ZJ	19.2%	22.2%	30.2%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cooper	CD	83.3%	83.3%	83.3%
Crawford	CD	15.6%	19.0%	20.0%
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dallas	CD	47.6%	45.5%	27.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	44.0%	55.0%	27.3%
DeKalb	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dent	CD	25.7%	31.6%	26.1%
	6ZK	0.0%		
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	CD	48.1%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	51.4%	51.3%	56.8%
	6ZS	30.4%	33.3%	37.5%
Franklin	CD	15.9%	13.8%	14.8%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	40.0%	40.9%	40.9%
Gasconade	CD	13.3%	13.3%	14.3%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	25.3%	30.8%	28.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	28.0%	28.3%	27.6%
	6ZV	38.7%	34.3%	37.1%
Grundy	CD	77.8%	77.8%	83.3%

Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Harrison	CD	14.3%	16.7%	45.5%
Henry	CD	62.5%	72.7%	70.8%
	6AW	58.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	50.0%	50.0%	55.6%
	6ZJ	33.3%	45.5%	45.5%
Howell	CD	45.9%	44.4%	37.9%
Iron	CD	15.8%	16.1%	20.7%
Jackson	CD	70.3%	72.2%	75.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	29.8%	26.7%	27.4%
	6ZR	22.8%	23.5%	22.4%
Jasper	CD	26.5%	26.2%	24.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	29.0%	29.2%	31.4%
Jefferson	CD	87.5%	71.4%	33.3%
	6ZA	21.9%	22.6%	22.2%
	6ZB	26.8%	26.3%	23.6%
	6ZC	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	
Johnson	CD	27.0%	32.9%	32.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Knox	CD	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Laclede	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZK	4.2%	4.3%	5.0%
	6ZL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lafayette	CD	25.0%	27.3%	10.0%
Lawrence	CD	43.5%	52.2%	55.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%
Lewis	CD	0.0%	22.2%	50.0%
Lincoln	CD	33.3%	28.0%	25.6%
	6ZB	0.0%		
Linn	CD	29.4%	25.0%	21.4%
Livingston	CD	14.8%	11.1%	10.7%
Macon	CD	45.5%	30.8%	30.8%
Madison	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Maries	CD	37.5%	50.0%	50.0%
Marion	CD	15.1%	14.9%	20.0%
McDonald	CD	67.7%	71.4%	75.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	50.0%	60.9%	63.2%
Mercer	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Miller	CD	10.0%	20.0%	22.2%
	6AW			0.0%
Mississippi	CD	30.0%	33.3%	50.0%
Moniteau	CD	75.0%	75.0%	0.0%

Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Monroe	CD	60.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6ZJ			100%
Montgomery	CD	28.6%	25.0%	22.2%
Morgan	CD	13.0%	11.5%	10.3%
	6ZK	50.0%		0.0%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
New Madrid	CD	43.9%	42.9%	34.3%
	6ZS	43.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Newton	CD	69.8%	65.9%	66.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	29.4%	27.5%	29.7%
Nodaway	CD	59.0%	59.5%	58.3%
Oregon	CD	20.0%	25.0%	20.0%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ozark	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Pemiscot	CD	46.2%	54.1%	53.3%
Perry	CD	12.5%	14.3%	10.0%
Pettis	CD	21.9%	18.2%	16.7%
Phelps	CD	36.8%	40.0%	45.2%
	6ZK	28.6%	23.1%	33.3%
Pike	CD	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%
Platte	CD	18.8%	18.8%	20.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
Polk	CD	28.0%	23.8%	26.3%
Pulaski	CD	42.3%	47.3%	46.2%
	6ZK	35.3%	43.8%	60.0%
Putnam	CD	20.0%	20.0%	33.3%
Ralls	CD	33.3%	16.7%	20.0%
Randolph	CD	12.5%	12.5%	7.7%
	6ZJ	6.5%	6.5%	7.4%
Ray	CD	100%	0.0%	0.0%
Reynolds	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ripley	CD	27.3%	46.7%	42.1%
	6ZS	7.7%	23.1%	33.3%
Saline	CD	40.0%	37.5%	56.3%
Schuyler	CD	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Scotland	CD	20.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Scott	CD	7.1%	7.1%	6.7%
Shannon	CD	62.5%	71.4%	75.0%
Shelby	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Charles	CD	6.1%	6.2%	4.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	39.1%	35.7%	28.1%
St. Clair	CD	40.0%	33.3%	42.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	8.9%	5.0%	11.4%
	6ZA	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZC	21.7%	25.9%	21.4%
St. Louis City	CD	44.0%	44.1%	50.0%
	6AW			

Table 15: Permanency in 12 Months for Those Entering Care – National Performance is 35.2%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZA	11.3%	11.1%	12.4%
	6ZB	23.5%	25.0%	22.2%
	6ZC	29.8%	31.3%	22.7%
St. Louis County	CD	46.7%	43.5%	31.1%
	6AW	0.0%		
	6ZA	11.5%	13.0%	12.9%
	6ZB	18.9%	18.2%	12.0%
	6ZC	8.2%	8.2%	7.8%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	64.3%	45.0%	45.8%
Stoddard	CD	85.7%	82.6%	69.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	59.6%	60.0%	58.1%
Stone	CD	18.8%	20.0%	27.3%
	6ZV	12.5%	9.1%	7.1%
Sullivan	CD	100%	50.0%	33.3%
Taney	CD	28.6%	28.3%	29.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	15.6%	20.5%	18.2%
Texas	CD	18.2%	21.1%	25.0%
	6ZK	83.3%	62.5%	70.0%
Vernon	CD	35.7%	22.2%	22.2%
Warren	CD	13.0%	16.7%	16.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	CD	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	19.4%	26.9%	24.0%
Wayne	CD	39.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Webster	CD	40.0%	33.3%	22.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Worth	CD	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	25.6%	25.0%	24.4%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Table 15: Number of counties with entries in April: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 23 (20.1%).

Number of counties with entries in May: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 24 (21.0%).

Number of counties with entries in June: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 25 (21.9%).

Sixteen (16) 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%.

Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	30.4%	36.0%	44.4%
Atchison	CD		100%	100%
Audrain	CD	75.0%	83.3%	100%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barry	CD	53.6%	51.7%	43.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	28.6%	69.2%	75.0%
Barton	CD	50.0%	33.3%	33.3%
	6ZM	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bates	CD	85.7%	80.0%	80.0%
	6ZL	100%	100%	100%
Benton	CD	50.0%	40.0%	66.7%
Bollinger	CD	52.4%	45.0%	55.6%
Boone	CD	44.8%	35.7%	38.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	35.3%	28.8%	28.3%
Buchanan	CD	63.6%	54.5%	45.5%
Butler	CD	70.6%	61.2%	63.5%
	6ZS	45.0%	52.3%	56.5%
Caldwell	CD	33.3%	60.0%	80.0%
Callaway	CD	64.3%	68.8%	58.8%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZJ	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Camden	CD	20.0%	25.0%	50.0%
	6AW			0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	6ZR	100%		
Cape Girardeau	CD	56.3%	58.7%	57.7%
	6ZS	100%	100%	
Carroll	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	66.7%	60.0%	100%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	78.3%	77.3%	73.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	47.4%	46.7%	38.5%
	6ZR	75.0%	75.0%	71.4%
Cedar	CD	52.6%	47.4%	47.4%
Chariton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Christian	CD	51.6%	48.5%	53.8%
	6ZM	53.8%	57.1%	50.0%
Clark	CD	0.0%	8.3%	9.1%
Clay	CD	64.1%	62.5%	56.4%
Clinton	CD	52.9%	57.9%	46.7%
Cole	CD	52.6%	66.7%	66.7%
	6AW	0.0%		

Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZJ	81.5%	80.8%	76.7%
Cooper	CD	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Crawford	CD	60.0%	60.6%	73.5%
Dallas	CD	9.1%	30.8%	35.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%
DeKalb	CD	50.0%	90.9%	100%
	6ZO	100%	100%	
Dent	CD	85.7%	81.3%	86.7%
	6ZC	0.0%	0.0%	
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
Douglas	CD	36.4%	50.0%	50.0%
Dunklin	CD	71.4%	75.0%	78.9%
	6ZS	33.3%	22.2%	22.2%
Franklin	CD	49.2%	47.4%	52.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Gasconade	CD	50.0%	35.3%	38.9%
Gentry	CD			100%
Greene	CD	51.4%	47.1%	50.6%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
	6ZM	54.4%	54.5%	53.3%
	6ZV	63.6%	64.0%	68.2%
Grundy	CD	90.9%	100%	100%
Harrison	CD	80.0%	100%	100%
Henry	CD	80.6%	79.3%	78.6%
	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%	66.7%
Howard	CD	23.1%	23.1%	23.1%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	31.4%	31.4%	36.4%
Iron	CD	38.1%	35.0%	35.0%
Jackson	CD	82.3%	82.5%	84.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL			100%
	6ZO	47.8%	47.7%	41.6%
	6ZR	30.4%	26.0%	25.8%
Jasper	CD	57.0%	53.9%	52.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	74.3%	64.3%	58.1%
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Jefferson	CD	56.4%	56.8%	53.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	42.9%	33.3%	36.4%
	6ZB	31.1%	31.7%	37.5%
	6ZC	12.5%	20.0%	20.0%
	6ZM			100%
	6ZS	100%	100%	100%

Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Johnson	CD	81.8%	81.8%	84.6%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	20.0%	20.0%	25.0%
Laclede	CD	29.0%	26.7%	26.7%
	6AW	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	15.8%	15.8%	20.0%
Lafayette	CD	100%	66.7%	75.0%
Lawrence	CD	53.3%	35.7%	36.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZV	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%
Lewis	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Lincoln	CD	36.4%	29.7%	43.6%
Linn	CD	33.3%	36.8%	40.0%
Livingston	CD	72.2%	73.7%	78.9%
Macon	CD	68.2%	73.7%	70.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	CD	23.5%	35.3%	27.8%
Maries	CD	80.0%	83.3%	83.3%
Marion	CD	34.0%	33.3%	34.5%
McDonald	CD	100%	92.3%	90.9%
	6ZL	62.5%	66.7%	66.7%
Miller	CD	50.0%	76.9%	58.8%
	6AW	0.0%		
Mississippi	CD	12.5%	28.6%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD	100%	50.0%	50.0%
Monroe	CD	0.0%	25.0%	22.2%
Montgomery	CD	45.5%	52.4%	41.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
Morgan	CD	23.5%	35.0%	47.4%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
	6ZK	100%	100%	100%
New Madrid	CD	35.3%	27.8%	33.3%
Newton	CD	70.0%	67.7%	60.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	76.0%	76.0%	69.2%
Nodaway	CD	50.0%	46.2%	41.7%
Oregon	CD	37.5%	20.0%	25.0%
Osage	CD	85.7%	85.7%	83.3%
Ozark	CD	60.0%	75.0%	83.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pemiscot	CD	69.2%	38.1%	36.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Perry	CD	56.3%	54.5%	61.5%
Pettis	CD	42.3%	48.0%	58.1%
Phelps	CD	52.3%	56.8%	57.4%
	6ZK	60.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Pike	CD	60.0%	60.0%	58.3%
Platte	CD	8.3%	14.3%	46.7%

Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
	6ZO	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	CD	50.0%	55.6%	28.6%
Pulaski	CD	61.1%	38.1%	45.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	72.7%	75.0%	66.7%
Putnam	CD	100%	100%	100%
Ralls	CD	85.7%	85.7%	66.7%
Randolph	CD	50.0%	36.8%	39.3%
	6ZJ	21.1%	36.4%	28.6%
Ray	CD	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Reynolds	CD	66.7%	66.7%	100%
Ripley	CD	12.5%	40.0%	85.7%
	6ZS	55.6%	40.0%	75.0%
Saline	CD	93.3%	85.7%	75.0%
	6ZO			0.0%
Schuyler	CD	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Scotland	CD	42.9%	50.0%	37.5%
Scott	CD	52.6%	53.5%	56.3%
	6AW	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Shannon	CD	100%	100%	66.7%
Shelby	CD	71.4%	75.0%	75.0%
St. Charles	CD	72.2%	72.0%	76.6%
	6AW	0.0%		
	6ZA	100%		100%
	6ZB	23.1%	25.0%	25.0%
	6ZC	46.2%	46.7%	48.5%
St. Clair	CD	66.7%	60.0%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	
St. Francois	CD	50.0%	55.1%	53.6%
	6ZC	55.0%	47.6%	50.0%
St. Louis City	CD	29.2%	35.6%	36.4%
	6ZA	16.2%	16.2%	25.6%
	6ZB	34.8%	34.8%	40.0%
	6ZC	51.4%	36.6%	39.0%
St. Louis County	CD	32.1%	37.0%	45.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	26.3%	28.1%	30.4%
	6ZB	37.8%	43.8%	41.9%
	6ZC	34.8%	35.3%	40.5%
	6ZJ	100%	100%	100%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	66.7%	40.0%	16.7%
Stoddard	CD	75.0%	71.4%	70.7%
	6ZS	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
Stone	CD	61.1%	70.6%	57.7%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
Sullivan	CD	100%	100%	0.0%
Taney	CD	54.5%	51.9%	57.9%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	60.0%	64.7%	75.0%

Table 16: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 12-23 Months – National Performance is 43.8%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Texas	CD	45.5%	54.5%	56.3%
	6ZK	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
Vernon	CD	43.8%	46.7%	56.3%
Warren	CD	57.7%	56.5%	62.5%
	6AW		0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	100%	100%	100%
Washington	CD	73.7%	73.7%	78.6%
	6ZB	30.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Wayne	CD	83.3%	80.0%	87.5%
Webster	CD	40.7%	42.3%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM		100%	
	6ZV	100%	100%	100%
Worth	CD	100%	100%	100%
Wright	CD	37.5%	31.3%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Table 16: Number of counties with entries in April: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 47 (41.2%).

Number of counties with entries in May: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 49 (42.9%).

Number of counties with entries in June: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 51 (44.7%).

Thirty-three (33) 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%.

Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	42.9%	48.7%	52.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atchison	CD	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
Audrain	CD	55.6%	50.0%	54.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barry	CD	27.3%	30.4%	41.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZT	100%		
	6ZV	18.2%	16.7%	16.7%
Barton	CD	12.5%	11.1%	11.1%

Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Bates	CD	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%
	6ZR	100%	100%	
Benton	CD	50.0%	57.1%	44.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bollinger	CD	61.5%	45.5%	18.2%
Boone	CD	34.3%	38.8%	47.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	21.3%	23.4%	27.8%
Buchanan	CD	22.2%	17.6%	12.5%
Butler	CD	26.3%	26.3%	25.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	50.0%	40.0%	30.8%
Caldwell	CD	40.0%	40.0%	25.0%
Callaway	CD	23.1%	31.4%	31.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%
Camden	CD	50.0%	69.6%	63.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	77.8%	71.4%	50.0%
	6ZR		100%	100%
Cape Girardeau	CD	52.1%	52.1%	54.4%
Carroll	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carter	CD	100%	100%	100%
Cass	CD	18.8%	26.7%	47.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	6ZO	26.7%	23.5%	40.9%
	6ZR	14.3%	14.3%	23.1%
Cedar	CD	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chariton	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Christian	CD	51.2%	44.4%	36.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	16.7%	23.5%	23.5%
Clark	CD	21.4%	20.0%	12.5%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clay	CD	45.5%	42.1%	35.5%
Clinton	CD	33.3%	23.8%	33.3%
Cole	CD	21.4%	13.3%	13.3%
	6AW	100%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	45.5%	42.9%	40.0%
Cooper	CD	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Crawford	CD	0.0%	0.0%	64.7%
	6AW	0.0%		
Dade	CD	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Dallas	CD	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Daviess	CD	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
DeKalb	CD	38.5%	35.7%	33.3%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO			100%

Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Dent	CD	23.5%	20.0%	36.8%
	6AW		0.0%	
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	CD	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dunklin	CD	36.4%	36.4%	30.0%
	6AW	100%	100%	100%
	6ZS	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Franklin	CD	37.5%	30.5%	31.7%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%
	6ZC	11.1%	10.0%	25.0%
Gasconade	CD	50.0%	64.3%	61.5%
Gentry	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	CD	38.8%	43.8%	40.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZM	37.5%	38.5%	35.1%
	6ZV	41.7%	41.7%	42.9%
Grundy	CD	100%	100%	100%
Harrison	CD	50.0%	50.0%	66.7%
Henry	CD	46.2%	58.8%	61.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hickory	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holt	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howard	CD	80.0%	80.0%	75.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZJ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Howell	CD	30.8%	30.8%	20.8%
Iron	CD	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Jackson	CD	52.8%	52.3%	53.0%
	6AW	5.0%	4.9%	4.9%
	6ZO	23.0%	23.4%	25.9%
	6ZR	33.3%	35.9%	37.1%
Jasper	CD	37.8%	37.2%	42.4%
	6AW	7.7%	15.4%	15.4%
	6ZL	36.4%	33.3%	33.3%
Jefferson	CD	50.6%	45.6%	46.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	38.2%	36.4%	28.1%
	6ZB	32.6%	27.3%	28.6%
	6ZC	33.3%	25.0%	27.8%
Johnson	CD	53.3%	53.3%	41.7%
	6AW	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%
Knox	CD	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Laclede	CD	34.5%	60.0%	63.3%
	6AW	0.0%	20.0%	25.0%
	6ZK	45.0%	35.3%	40.0%
Lafayette	CD	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%

Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Lawrence	CD	14.3%	7.7%	8.3%
	6AW	11.1%	11.1%	9.1%
	6ZV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lewis	CD	100%	100%	100%
Lincoln	CD	41.7%	20.0%	23.8%
	6AW	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Linn	CD	25.0%	19.0%	13.0%
Livingston	CD	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%
Macon	CD	20.0%	18.2%	18.2%
Madison	CD	34.8%	16.7%	21.1%
Maries	CD	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%
Marion	CD	38.6%	41.7%	42.3%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
McDonald	CD	85.7%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
	6ZL	80.0%	80.0%	66.7%
Miller	CD	44.4%	40.0%	40.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mississippi	CD	18.2%	25.0%	25.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moniteau	CD		100%	100%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Monroe	CD	20.0%	50.0%	58.3%
Montgomery	CD	61.5%	61.5%	64.3%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	CD	52.0%	48.0%	47.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
New Madrid	CD	21.4%	25.0%	25.0%
	6AW	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Newton	CD	42.9%	36.4%	60.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZL	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
Nodaway	CD	60.0%	60.0%	50.0%
Oregon	CD	12.5%	26.3%	21.1%
Osage	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC			0.0%
Ozark	CD	18.2%	8.3%	8.3%
Pemiscot	CD	40.7%	40.0%	44.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	100%	100%	
Perry	CD	12.5%	35.7%	30.8%
Pettis	CD	52.0%	45.8%	45.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phelps	CD	44.6%	38.3%	40.0%
	6ZK	28.6%	20.0%	20.0%
Pike	CD	53.8%	53.8%	53.8%
Platte	CD	31.3%	29.4%	25.0%
	6ZM	100%	100%	100%
	6ZO	100%	100%	100%
	6ZR	100%	100%	100%

Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Polk	CD	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%
	6AW	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Pulaski	CD	37.8%	35.9%	39.5%
	6ZK	40.0%	44.4%	44.4%
Putnam	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ralls	CD	66.7%	75.0%	81.3%
Randolph	CD	39.1%	46.4%	44.4%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	6ZJ	25.0%	22.2%	22.2%
Ray	CD	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%
Reynolds	CD	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%
Ripley	CD	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Saline	CD	46.2%	54.5%	66.7%
Schuyler	CD	100%		
Scotland	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Scott	CD	23.1%	21.9%	24.2%
	6AW	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%
Shannon	CD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shelby	CD	23.1%	23.1%	23.1%
St. Charles	CD	14.7%	25.6%	26.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZB	54.5%	58.3%	58.3%
	6ZC	26.7%	33.3%	33.3%
St. Clair	CD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francois	CD	38.2%	31.4%	28.1%
	6ZB	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	6ZC	47.6%	47.6%	35.3%
St. Louis City	CD	32.0%	31.2%	35.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZA	24.2%	21.5%	23.9%
	6ZB	30.6%	31.6%	26.3%
	6ZC	40.6%	40.6%	41.4%
St. Louis County	CD	32.5%	30.9%	30.6%
	6AW	11.1%	12.5%	12.5%
	6ZA	31.1%	32.0%	30.7%
	6ZB	38.8%	37.9%	39.5%
	6ZC	32.8%	35.7%	35.7%
Ste. Genevieve	CD	25.0%	25.0%	30.8%
Stoddard	CD	30.8%	30.8%	30.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stone	CD	36.4%	33.3%	20.0%
	6AW	20.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Sullivan	CD	6.3%	6.3%	26.7%
Taney	CD	48.4%	39.6%	45.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV	45.5%	54.5%	54.5%

Table 17: Permanency in 12 Months for Those in Care 24+ Months – National Performance is 37.3%				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Texas	CD	19.0%	16.7%	19.2%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Vernon	CD	44.4%	44.4%	16.7%
Warren	CD	16.7%	25.0%	28.6%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZC	100%	100%	100%
Washington	CD	33.3%	34.8%	37.5%
	6ZB	33.3%	27.8%	12.5%
Wayne	CD	46.2%	42.9%	41.7%
Webster	CD	33.3%	33.3%	30.8%
	6AW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6ZV			100%
Wright	CD	45.2%	30.0%	25.8%
	6AW	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%

*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Table 17: Number of counties with entries in April: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 24 (21.0%).


Number of counties with entries in May: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 20 (17.5%).


Number of counties with entries in June: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 19 (16.6%)


Fourteen (14) counties performed at or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency for those in care 24 months or more all three months of the reporting period. Charts 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, 09MAY2025



*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 09JUN2025




*Source: DSS\Research Report RS5HBHM0 JIRA 5150, 09JUL2025

Analysis of Charts 31-33: April: Five (5) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for permanency in all three timeframes.

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


June: 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 RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

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 RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

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 RS5HBGM0 JIRA=5150, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25


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 months with entries 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: 0.

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, April-June 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.

Data Analysis Summary:

Timely permanency within 12 months of entering care:

Sixteen (16) counties met or exceeded the National Performance for April, May, and June 2025. This is a decrease from 20 counties the previous reporting period.

No agencies met or exceeded the National Performance in April, May, and June 2025. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Timely permanency within 12-23 months of entering care:

Thirty-three (33) counties met or exceeded the National Performance in April, May, and June 2025. This is a decrease from 34 counties the previous reporting period.

Six (6) agencies (6ZL, 6ZM, 6ZS, 6ZT, 6ZV, CD) met or exceeded the National Performance for April, May, and June 2025. This is no change from the previous reporting period.

Timely permanency for those in care 24 month or more:

Fourteen (14) counties met or exceeded the National Performance for April, May, and June 2025. This is a decrease from 24 counties the previous reporting period.

Zero (0) agencies met or exceeded the National Performance for April, May, and June 2025. This is a decrease from four agencies the previous reporting period.

Circuit analysis for timely permanency:

Five (5) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in all three timeframes (12 months or less, 12-23 months, 24+ months) in April: Circuit 03, Circuit 04, Circuit 25, Circuit 27, and Circuit 40. This is an increase from four circuits the previous reporting period.

Three (3) circuits met or exceeded the National Performance for timely permanency in all three timeframes (12 months or less, 12-23 months, 24+ months) in May: Circuit 03, Circuit 04, and Circuit 27. This is a decrease from five 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 June: Circuit 03, Circuit 15, Circuit 25, Circuit 27 and Circuit 40. This is no change from 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 no change 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 April through June of 2025. The Response and Evaluation Team will determine the benchmark for this measure once enough data is collected to establish a reasonable goal.

Table 18: FCCM Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio Grouped by Agency			
Agency	April	May	June
6AW	9:33	9:33	9:34
6ZA	11:52	11:50	11:55
6ZB	8:32	9:29	9:29
6ZC	10:38	10:32	10:29
6ZJ	6:28	6:26	6:23
6ZK	2:9	2:9	2:8
6ZL	3:12	3:13	3:12
6ZM	5:21	5:20	5:20
6ZO	5:33	5:33	5:32
6ZR	8:33	8:32	8:37
6ZS	4:16	4:16	4:19
6ZV	4:17	4:17	4:15

*Source: DSS\Research Data SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL(PH2SUPMF) RS5HBIM0 JIRA 5055, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Table 18: FCCM Supervisor to Case Manager ratios range from 2:8 to 11:55, April through June 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.

Table 19: CD Supervisor to Case Manager Ratio			
Circuit	April	May	June
01	2:2	2:2	2:2
02	3:5	3:5	3:5
03	1:3	1:3	1:3
04	2:5	2:5	2:5
05	2:7	2:6	2:6
06	1:4	1:5	1:5
07	3:9	2:9	3:9
08	1:1	1:1	1:1
09	2:5	1:4	1:3
10	4:15	4:13	4:13
11	4:8	4:8	3:7
12	2:7	2:9	2:8
13	5:12	5:12	5:11
14	1:3	1:3	1:4
15	1:4	1:4	1:4
16	4:9	3:8	3:8
17	3:11	3:11	3:10
18	1:6	1:6	1:6
19	2:5	2:5	2:5
20	3:13	3:13	3:13
21	4:16	4:14	5:16
22	2:10	2:10	2:10

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

*Source: DSS\Research Data SS.EHRH5Y7.JCL(PH2SUPMF) RS5HBIM0 JIRA 5055, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

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

Data Analysis Summary: As a state, Supervisor to Case Manager ratios ranged from 1:1 to 11:55, April through June of 2025.

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

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

Between September of 2022 through May of 2025, no cases were returned to Children’s Division due to catastrophic costs. In June of 2025, one case was returned to Children’s Division by 6ZB in St. Louis County due to catastrophic costs.

Phase III Reporting (Reporting Period: April 1, 2025 – June 30, 2025)

M. Permanency Domain: Placement Stability

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

Table 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.

Table 20: Placement Stability – National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)				
County	Agency	April	May	June
Adair	CD	6.13	5.68	4.95
Andrew	CD	7.68	10.55	15.41
Atchison	CD	3.31	2.74	6.55
Audrain	CD	8.80	9.10	9.02
Barry	CD	6.86	6.37	8.61
	6AW	4.13	4.13	
	6ZV	8.64	6.73	4.89
Barton	CD	0.00	0.00	1.28
Bates	CD	1.64	1.94	1.04
Benton	CD	5.18	4.92	3.95
Bollinger	CD	5.09	3.71	4.34
Boone	CD	6.18	6.40	6.95
	6ZJ	4.66	4.59	4.02
Buchanan	CD	5.24	5.69	5.54
Butler	CD	2.79	2.32	2.25
	6ZS	6.30	5.74	5.22
Caldwell	CD	6.25	4.88	4.92
Callaway	CD	6.25	5.66	4.71
	6AW		16.03	14.62
	6ZJ	3.13	2.72	3.65
Camden	CD	8.43	7.27	8.22
	6ZK	1.19	1.06	2.03
Cape Girardeau	CD	5.48	5.47	5.13
	6ZS	0.00	0.00	
Carter	CD	3.83	4.97	4.99
Cass	CD	6.45	5.43	6.54
	6ZO	7.06	5.79	5.83
	6ZR	7.06	5.79	5.10
Cedar	CD	3.77	3.51	3.08
Chariton	CD	6.99	5.82	4.55
Christian	CD	6.86	5.73	6.99

	6ZM	0.56	0.44	1.48
Clark	CD	7.98	11.02	9.62
Clay	CD	4.06	4.99	4.21
Clinton	CD	4.74	2.90	2.88
Cole	CD	2.15	5.04	10.38
	6ZJ	4.98	4.71	5.49
Cooper	CD	5.45	4.91	4.68
Crawford	CD	4.11	3.49	2.47
Dade	CD	2.33	1.91	1.64
Dallas	CD	5.38	4.42	4.92
	6AW	3.44	3.11	5.70
Daviess	CD	4.35	3.58	4.09
DeKalb	CD	2.20	1.56	2.50
Dent	CD	6.96	7.33	6.39
Douglas	CD	3.14	2.86	2.59
	6AW		9.87	9.09
Dunklin	CD	3.36	3.67	3.41
	6ZS	10.59	9.33	9.18
Franklin	CD	3.70	3.80	3.95
	6ZA	2.42	3.57	3.77
	6ZC	1.68	2.06	2.58
Gasconade	CD	4.65	4.78	6.50
Gentry	CD	1.81	1.60	1.43
Greene	CD	3.98	3.65	4.22
	6AW		10.64	10.64
	6ZM	4.54	4.47	4.04
	6ZV	5.57	6.14	6.23
Grundy	CD	5.20	4.00	3.31
Harrison	CD	2.70	3.06	3.34
Henry	CD	3.93	2.85	2.64
	6AW	5.57		
Hickory	CD	0.00	5.68	4.24
Holt	CD	3.04	2.48	6.90
Howard	CD	3.86	3.28	4.08
	6ZJ	6.25	5.78	5.77
Howell	CD	7.33	8.36	7.84
Iron	CD	2.33	1.92	2.56
Jackson	CD	3.87	3.78	3.44
	6ZO	4.19	3.65	3.92
	6ZR	4.08	4.41	4.11
Jasper	CD	3.77	3.53	3.30
	6ZL	7.11	6.51	5.88
Jefferson	CD	2.25	7.45	3.46
	6ZA	4.47	5.36	5.33
	6ZB	5.35	5.40	5.59
	6ZC	2.44	2.34	3.34
Johnson	CD	3.19	3.10	3.18
	6AW			5.90
Knox	CD	9.60	9.78	8.68
Laclede	CD	4.08	4.27	4.03
	6ZK	3.02	2.86	2.75
Lafayette	CD	6.70	7.57	11.21
Lawrence	CD	4.20	5.17	4.29

	6AW	5.26	4.52	3.98
	6ZV	6.74	7.37	7.32
Lewis	CD	2.45	3.76	8.30
Lincoln	CD	4.54	4.62	4.75
Linn	CD	4.43	4.73	6.35
Livingston	CD	5.20	5.05	4.80
Macon	CD	5.54	5.61	5.86
Madison	CD	4.97	5.35	4.50
Maries	CD	4.49	4.45	5.61
Marion	CD	4.71	4.58	5.18
McDonald	CD	5.19	5.25	4.91
	6ZL	6.24	5.00	6.83
Mercer	CD	11.56	9.80	12.88
Miller	CD	4.33	4.07	3.45
Mississippi	CD	2.83	4.91	5.09
Moniteau	CD	0.00	0.00	15.87
Monroe	CD	4.43	2.11	1.78
Montgomery	CD	0.79	1.41	2.45
Morgan	CD	4.95	3.12	2.72
	6ZR	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	CD	4.95	5.55	5.67
Newton	CD	5.35	5.12	4.39
	6ZL	6.04	5.99	6.08
Nodaway	CD	3.63	3.96	3.67
Oregon	CD	6.48	2.24	2.89
Osage	CD	9.79	9.32	9.88
Ozark	CD	3.64	3.70	3.42
Pemiscot	CD	2.13	1.85	2.05
Perry	CD	4.39	2.22	2.38
Pettis	CD	4.30	4.19	4.75
Phelps	CD	4.11	4.27	3.68
	6ZK	3.86	3.38	3.92
Pike	CD	9.37	6.61	5.95
Platte	CD	5.45	4.62	4.30
Polk	CD	5.11	4.35	4.34
Pulaski	CD	5.85	5.80	5.52
	6ZK	4.35	3.61	3.71
Putnam	CD	6.01	4.10	3.13
Ralls	CD	6.19	7.09	5.63
Randolph	CD	4.33	3.93	3.73
	6ZJ	5.75	5.80	7.30
Ray	CD			0.00
Reynolds	CD	2.81	5.62	3.39
Ripley	CD	4.10	3.57	4.67
	6ZS	3.17	3.46	2.82
Saline	CD	3.03	4.77	4.35
Schuyler	CD	1.85	0.00	4.35
Scotland	CD	7.10	1.61	1.14
Scott	CD	4.64	4.15	3.97
Shannon	CD	5.93	4.25	4.73
Shelby	CD	1.71	3.22	3.75
St. Charles	CD	4.59	5.80	5.39
	6ZB	5.51	7.08	6.98

	6ZC	3.25	2.78	2.55
St. Clair	CD	0.00	0.84	3.51
	6AW	6.43	7.32	7.09
St. Francois	CD	6.87	5.52	5.14
	6ZC	5.44	5.28	4.88
St. Louis City	CD	2.82	4.83	5.12
	6ZA	5.08	4.90	4.83
	6ZB	5.69	5.98	4.33
	6ZC	5.50	5.65	6.61
St. Louis County	CD	5.52	5.90	6.39
	6ZA	6.13	6.52	6.48
	6ZB	7.22	6.54	8.03
	6ZC	7.03	7.71	6.46
Ste. Genevieve	CD	3.02	2.02	2.90
Stoddard	CD	6.89	6.45	5.69
	6ZS	5.45	6.76	6.72
Stone	CD	5.09	4.49	5.17
	6ZV	6.68	6.04	5.39
Sullivan	CD	2.27	4.07	3.75
Taney	CD	9.69	9.11	5.14
	6AW			20.88
	6ZV	5.31	5.11	5.21
Texas	CD	5.82	5.39	6.03
	6ZK	2.63	3.66	3.18
Vernon	CD	4.19	4.89	4.81
Warren	CD	4.30	4.04	5.00
Washington	CD	2.74	5.05	6.59
	6ZB	2.97	3.17	2.97
Wayne	CD	1.44	1.49	1.27
Webster	CD	4.05	4.79	5.44
Worth	CD	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wright	CD	4.35	4.74	3.98

*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Table 20: Number of counties with placements in April: 113.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 48 (42.5%).

Number of counties with placements in May: 113.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 48 (42.5%).

Number of counties with placements in June: 114.

Number of counties that performed at or exceeded the National Performance: 45 (39.5%).

Thirty-one (31) counties met or exceeded National Performance for placement stability all months with placements 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.

Chart 38: Placement Stability Grouped by Circuit					
National Performance is 4.48 or Less (lower is better)					
	A	B	C	D	E
	7.50+	6.50-7.49	5.50-6.49	4.49-5.49	0.00-4.48
April	0	3	6	18	18
May	0	4	5	19	17
June	0	4	8	15	19

*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

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.

Chart 39 depicts the statewide rate of placement stability for each agency during the reporting period.




*Source: DSS\RDA E EHRHARDT JCL(HBPHASE3) JIRA 5322, 09MAY25; 09JUN25; 09JUL25

Analysis of Chart 39: Four (4) agencies (6ZK, 6ZM, 6ZO, and 6ZR) met or exceeded the National Performance for placement stability in all 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, April-June 2025

Analysis of Chart 40: Of 32 cases applicable for rating of this item, 25 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.

Seven (7) 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 46.56% (June 2025) for the state as a whole. In June of 2024, only one agency (6ZK) was meeting the benchmark for Worker-Parent visits. In June 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 quarterly.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

The next reporting period is July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025, with the report to be published by January 1, 2026.

For previous reports, please visit our website: https://dss.mo.gov/hb_1414.html.