



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Missouri

## Final Report

## 2017



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

# Final Report: Missouri Child and Family Services Review

## INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Missouri. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Missouri are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Missouri Department of Social Services, Children's Division, and submitted to the Children's Bureau on May 24, 2017. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the Title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home) conducted via a Traditional Review process in Jackson, Jasper, and St. Charles counties, Missouri, during the week of July 23, 2017
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency, children and youth, and parents
  - Children's Division managers
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Child welfare agency director, senior managers, and program managers
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Contract child welfare caseworkers and supervisors
  - Foster and adoptive parent licensing staff
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Information system staff
  - Judges
  - Juvenile officers and attorneys for juveniles

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Parents
- Public and private agency training staff
- Representatives from the courts and Court Improvement Program (CIP)
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children's Bureau suspended the use of the state's performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state's performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children's Bureau will refer to the national standards as "national performance." This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

### Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Missouri's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Missouri's performance in Round 2.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### Missouri 2017 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 2 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

#### Children's Bureau Comments on Missouri Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Missouri's overall performance:

Missouri collaborates with stakeholders and partners through its longstanding CFSR Advisory Committee. Many partners—including foster/adoptive parents, foster youth, and representatives from Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Mental Health, and Office of State Courts Administrator, among others—come together on a quarterly basis to collaborate on initiatives to improve services, provide feedback on the Child and Family Services Plan, and participate in the CFSR process. This collaboration is an important strength to build upon as the state develops its Program Improvement Plan. Missouri has experienced growth in the number of children in foster care, which has presented challenges for the state in workforce and placement resources. In Missouri, management of child welfare cases is provided by agency staff and through contracted agencies.

The CFSR identified cross-cutting practice concerns that affect the state's ability to meet safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. The Children's Bureau encourages Missouri, in developing its Program Improvement Plan, to focus on the following key cross-cutting priorities: improving quality of safety and needs assessments; improving parent engagement and quality of worker visits with children; and improving timely permanency by eliminating court delays, Juvenile Officers' delays, and agency delays. A comprehensive process for reviewing cases will be foundational for improving outcomes. Finally, strengthening the agency and contract case management workforce through consistent staff/contractor training and reducing staff turnover will support improved practice and outcomes.

The review showed strong findings in initiating investigations timely. Services such as parent aids and intensive in-home services were effective in keeping children safely at home and preventing the need for foster care. The CFSR identified challenges in assessing and managing risk and safety concerns in both in-home and foster care cases. Safety concerns identified during the review include insufficient initial risk and safety assessments and a lack of ongoing risk and safety assessments. Case review results showed safety services that were needed but not provided and safety plans that were put in place but not monitored.

To achieve timely permanency for children in foster care, Missouri can build on strong outcomes when children are placed with relatives. In the cases reviewed, most of these children had stable placements and were able to maintain important family and community connections. The review showed good efforts in placing siblings together, providing for parent-child visits, and

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

maintaining sibling and family connections. In most cases, the agency established timely and appropriate permanency goals. However, concerted efforts by the agency, Juvenile Officers, and the courts toward achieving those goals were not made. Even though two permanency goals were assigned in most cases, Missouri did not actively work the goals concurrently.

Concerns regarding achieving permanency may be due, in part, to the case review court processes that support permanency. The role of the Juvenile Officer is unique in Missouri. The Juvenile Officer is responsible for areas that are usually within the purview of the courts or a legal representative of the child welfare agency, such as initiating legal actions, issuing child protection orders, deciding when a goal should be changed to adoption, filing for termination of parental rights (TPR), and notifying foster parents of court hearings and their right to be heard. In most court circuits, the agency does not have legal representation except in complex cases. Juvenile Officers are appointed by the courts but do not participate in cases before judges who have responsibility for them. The review found that in some cases, decisions to remove children from their homes or to deny children visitation with their parents were made by Juvenile Officers that were not consistent with safety, permanency, and well-being goals. Finally, stakeholders reported that the following factors impeded timely permanency: the increase in the number of children in care and in worker turnover, a lack of legal representation for the agency, delays in filing TPR paperwork by Juvenile Officers, and the courts'/Juvenile Officers' reluctance to change permanency goals.

To improve parent engagement and the quality of contact with parents and children, Missouri can build upon positive family engagement with Family Support Team meetings. The insufficient quality and frequency of caseworker visits with parents and children significantly affected performance in Well-Being outcome items related to case planning, caseworker visits, service provision, and ongoing risk and safety assessments of children. Visits were not of sufficient quality to address needs of the parents and children or to promote achievement of case goals. The agency had challenges in working with incarcerated parents and making concerted efforts to locate parents. Case review results for fathers were lower than for mothers, with fewer efforts to locate fathers and paternal relatives for placement.

Missouri has a long history of focusing on Continuous Quality Improvement. However, the state does not have a fully functioning system to review cases. Missouri has dedicated Quality Assurance/Quality Improvement staff who are active, but their effectiveness is diminished when they are asked to take on other roles, such as covering vacancies in other units. Missouri is in the implementation stage of establishing a consistent statewide case review process and tool that can assess safety, permanency, and well-being. A strong training program and quality assurance process will be important for consistency of ratings and sustainability.

To strengthen the agency and contract case management workforce, Missouri can build on the positive collaboration with its contract case management agencies. The CFSR noted opportunities to improve the program by assuring that the training curricula for agency and contract case management caseworkers statewide are consistent and that all staff are prepared for their positions and understand the goals of the child welfare program. While the Children's Division's regionalization of the staff training program allows each region to tailor the curriculum offered to employees, it is a challenge to ensure consistency of training statewide. The agency has a program to track employee training but has not been able to track all staff training or training for contracted case management agencies or licensed residential staff.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

The systemic factors of Statewide Information System and Agency Responsiveness to the Community were found to be functioning within federal standards. While the state did not meet the requirements for Service Array, the review showed strong services in some areas of the state, such as housing and educational services for women addicted to substances and their children, crisis care for families, intensive in-home services, home visitation, parent aid services, family reunification services, hard goods that support basic needs of families, and independent living services. The review showed barriers to providing services in rural areas. The foundation of services in Missouri and the agency's collaboration with stakeholders and community partners provide a solid foundation for Missouri to build upon in its efforts to improve outcomes for children and families.

## II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Missouri provides an alternative/differential response to, in addition to a traditional investigation of, incoming reports of child maltreatment or children in need of services. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care, in-home, and in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to the Children's Division. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 93% of the 30 applicable cases reviewed.

#### ***Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance***

##### **Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that reports accepted for Investigations or Family Assessments be assigned one of three priority levels. Reports assigned as Priority Level 1 require face-to-face contact with all alleged child victims within 3 hours of receipt of the report. Reports

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

assigned as Priority Level 2 require face-to-face contact with all alleged child victims within 24 hours of receipt of the report. Reports assigned as Priority Level 3 require face-to-face contact with all alleged child victims within 72 hours of receipt of the report. Face-to-face contact should be made by the Children's Service Worker whenever possible. However, for Priority Level 1 and 2 reports, face-to-face contact may be made by a multidisciplinary team member, when the child's safety can be assured with such contact. When an alleged victim child's initial safety is assured by a multidisciplinary team member, staff must complete face-to-face contact with the child within 72 hours.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 93% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

### **Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 40 foster care cases, 52% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

#### **Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance**

##### **Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 52% of the 23 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 40% of the 10 applicable foster care cases and 62% of the 13 applicable in-home services cases. None of the in-home services alternative/differential response cases was applicable for assessment on this item.

##### **Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.



## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 60% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 40 applicable foster care cases, 52% of the 23 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.

#### State Outcome Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 23% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

#### *Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance*

##### Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 88% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 55% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 25% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

#### State Outcome Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 65% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

#### Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance

##### Item 7. Placement With Siblings

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 7 because 97% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>1</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 71% of the 35 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 100% of the 9 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 72% of the 32 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- In 70% of the 23 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

### Item 9. Preserving Connections

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 70% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. Relative Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 79% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>2</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 58% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 63% of the 32 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 61% of the 23 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

## Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

---

<sup>2</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### State Outcome Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 37% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 33% of the 40 foster care cases, 48% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

#### Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>3</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 37% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 33% of the 40 foster care cases, 48% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

#### Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 62% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 40 foster care cases, 61% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 43% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 42% of the 38 applicable foster care cases, 48% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 58% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 37% of the 49 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 68% of the 40 foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>4</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 48% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 51% of the 39 applicable foster care cases, 48% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 64% of the 45 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 68% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 45% of the 47 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 60% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 73% of the 40 foster care cases, 43% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>5</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 43% of the 61 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 39% of the 36 applicable foster care cases, 52% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 58% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 38% of the 45 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

## Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

### State Outcome Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

The outcome was substantially achieved in 83% of the 42 applicable cases reviewed.

### ***Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance***

#### **Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 83% of the 42 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 34 applicable foster care cases, 86% of the 7 applicable in-home services cases, and 0% of the 1 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response case.

### **Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 60 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 50% of the 40 foster care cases, 74% of the 19 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 1 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response case.

### ***Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance***

#### **Item 17. Physical Health of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 66% of the 50 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 40 foster care cases, 78% of the 9 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 1 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 72% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 69% of the 29 applicable foster care cases and 76% of the 17 applicable in-home services cases. None of the in-home services alternative/differential response cases was applicable for assessment for this item.

## III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

### Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Missouri is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### Statewide Information System Item Performance

### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.



## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Data and information from the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Missouri's statewide information system can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for placement of every child who is, or within the immediate preceding 12 months, has been in foster care.

### Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### *Case Review System Item Performance*

##### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Missouri agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that efforts are needed to ensure that all children have written case plans containing all required elements. Missouri is focused on improving parental engagement in case planning, but these practice changes have not been implemented statewide.

##### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment from the Office of State Courts Administrator showed that subsequent periodic reviews were held timely in FFY 2016. Stakeholders reported that courts are consistently reviewing cases every 6 months, and often every 3 months.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that permanency hearings are routinely occurring no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment. Missouri agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Missouri provided data showing that termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions are not routinely filed across the state in a timely manner as required.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are not consistently provided notice of hearings. Stakeholders reported that how notice is provided varies across the state. Stakeholders said that in most circumstances, when caregivers do attend hearings, they are provided an opportunity to be heard.

## Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

### ***Quality Assurance System Item Performance***

#### **Item 25. Quality Assurance System**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed through stakeholder interviews showed that Missouri is in the implementation stage of establishing a consistent statewide case review process and coordinating quality assurance activities to systematically assess services included in the Child and Family Services Plan. Because Missouri's new case review process does not include dedicated case reviewers, consistently achieving accurate ratings is a challenge that needs to be addressed.

### **Staff and Provider Training**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### ***Staff and Provider Training Item Performance***

#### **Item 26. Initial Staff Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that across the state, new child welfare agency staff met initial training requirements within established time frames. However, stakeholders' opinions varied with regard to whether initial training routinely providing new caseworkers with the knowledge and skills needed to perform their duties. Initial training for contractor case management is not consistent with Children's Division training, and a considerable number of the state's child welfare cases are managed by contracted agencies. The state agency does not monitor or track initial training for contractors.

### Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>6</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the Children's Division's regionalization of the training program does not provide the state with a mechanism to ensure that the ongoing training curriculum is consistent and delivered with fidelity in each region. Results from the Survey for Employee Engagement (SEE) completed by state staff every 2 years showed that the ongoing training is not consistently providing staff with knowledge and skills needed. Stakeholders reported a need for specific ongoing training on topics such as domestic violence, mental health, and substance-affected infants. The Children's Division does not currently monitor the completion of and quality of ongoing training for contracted case management staff.

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

---

<sup>6</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the training for current and prospective foster and adoptive parents does not provide them with the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adoptive children. The Children's Division does not have a process to collect training data on licensed residential staff.

### Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### *Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance*

##### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment described the broad array of services available across the state. However, stakeholders reported that in the outlying areas, there are gaps in services and waiting lists for services such as Intensive Family Reunification Services, Intensive In-Home Services, substance abuse treatment, mental health services, domestic violence services, and housing assistance.

##### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the individualization of services to meet the unique needs of children and families poses challenges for the state, especially in the rural areas of Missouri. Transportation, accessibility to services, and lack of culturally sensitive services/interpreters were identified as barriers to providing individualized services. Contracted case management agencies have flexible funding to meet individual needs but the state agency does not have the same access to funding.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Missouri is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### *Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance*

##### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state engages in ongoing consultation in the development and updating of the CFSP. The CFSR Advisory Committee—which includes managers from the Children's Division, representatives from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Mental Health, Department of Health and Senior Services, Children's Trust Fund, CASA, Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, health care community, private child welfare agencies, public university partners, a Tribal representative, foster/adoptive parents, foster youth, frontline staff, and Office of State Courts Administrator—meets quarterly to provide input into the state's CFSP/APSR and CFSR processes. The State Youth Advisory Board (SYAB) and the Foster Parent Advisory Board were also asked for input. Missouri's APSR is posted on the Children's Division website and available to all child welfare partners.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Missouri provided many examples to demonstrate how the state coordinates services and/or benefits with other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Missouri is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### *Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance*

### Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment. Missouri agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Missouri reported that the state is implementing a process to review the application of licensing standards for child-placing agencies to ensure that standards are applied equally. However, the process is not currently in place.

### Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

## Missouri 2017 CFSR Final Report

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Missouri provided data from a recent statewide audit that showed criminal background checks occur before the licensure of any foster or adoptive placement. Missouri has an established ongoing process to review case files and monitor compliance with state and federal background check requirements. The state also has provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

### Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that the state foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state who need foster and adoptive homes.

### Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Missouri received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment. Missouri agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that most home study assessments received from other states were not completed within the required time frame.



## Appendix A

### Summary of Missouri 2017 Child and Family Services Review Performance

#### I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	93% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	93% Strength

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	58% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	52% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	23% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	25% Strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	65% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Strength	97% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	71% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	58% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	37% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	37% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	43% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	43% Strength

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	83% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	58% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength

## II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Case Review System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 20</b> Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 21</b> Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 22</b> Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 23</b> Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 24</b> Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Quality Assurance System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Staff and Provider Training</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 26</b> Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Item 27</b> Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 28</b> Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Service Array and Resource Development</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 29</b> Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 30</b> Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Statewide Assessment	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention</b>	Statewide Assessment	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>7</sup>

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

---

<sup>7</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

## Appendix A: Summary of Missouri 2017 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	6.0%	5.3%–6.7%	FY14–FY15
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	6.13	5.34–7.04	15A–15B, FY15
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	32.4%	31.4%–33.6%	13B–16A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12–23 months	43.6%	Higher	47.5%	45.8%–49.1%	15B–16A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	33.4%	31.9%–34.9%	15B–16A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	6.1%	5.1%–7.2%	13B–16A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	5.75	5.61–5.89	15B–16A

\* Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP) is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children and, for some indicators, 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 more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

\*\* 95% Confidence Interval is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

\*\*\* Data Period(s) Used for State Performance: Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1–September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1–March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1–September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.



## Appendix B

### Summary of CF SR Round 2 Missouri 2010 Key Findings

The Children’s Bureau conducted a CF SR in Missouri in 2010. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CF SR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state’s performance in the third round of the CF SR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

#### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children’s Bureau Region:</b> 7
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> June 7–11, 2010
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2009, through June 11, 2010
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> September 2, 2010
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> December 3, 2010
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> October 1, 2011

#### Highlights of Findings

<b>Performance Measurements</b>
A. The state met the national standards for <b>three</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>none</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes.
C. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>five</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Appendix B: Missouri 2010 CFSR Key Findings

### State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	97.1	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.71	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	115.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	101.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	103.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	136.8	Meets Standard

### State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Missouri 2010 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

### State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Missouri 2010 CFSR Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
2. Repeat Maltreatment	Strength
3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
12. Placement With Siblings	Strength
13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix B: Missouri 2010 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
22. Physical Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### **Systemic Factors**

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
24. Statewide Information System	Strength
25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
26. Periodic Reviews	Area Needing Improvement
27. Permanency Hearings	Strength
28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
35. Array of Services	Strength
36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
37. Individualizing Services	Area Needing Improvement
38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength

## Appendix B: Missouri 2010 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Area Needing Improvement
45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength