



**Children's Division**

**Child Abuse and Neglect**

**Fiscal Year 2016**

**Annual Report**

Missouri Department of Social Services  
Division of Finance & Administrative Services  
Research and Data Analysis  
221 West High Street  
Broadway Building  
Jefferson City, MO 65102



**Children's Division**

**Child Abuse and Neglect  
in Missouri**

**Fiscal Year 2016  
Annual Report**

Missouri Department of Social Services  
P.O. Box 1527  
221 West High Street  
Broadway Building  
Jefferson City, MO 65102-1527

# **Missouri Department of Social Services Mission Statement**

**To maintain or improve the quality of life for  
Missouri citizens.**



*Working with you in protecting Missouri's children.*

## Our Vision:

Safety, permanency, well being and equity for every Missouri child!

## Our Mission:

To protect Missouri children from abuse and neglect; assuring their safety and well being by partnering with families, communities and government in an ethically, culturally and socially responsible manner.

## Our Guiding Principles:

**PREVENTION** - Families are supported through proactive, intentional activities that promote positive child development and prevent abuse and neglect.

**PROTECTION** - Children have a right to be safe and live free from abuse and neglect.

**PRESERVATION** - The cultural and ethnic diversity of the children and families of Missouri are recognized, honored and respected.

**PARTNERSHIP** - Families, communities and government share the responsibility to create safe, nurturing environments for families to raise their children.

**PRACTICE** - The family is the basic building block of society and is irreplaceable. Families are empowered to identify and access services that support, preserve and strengthen their functioning.

**PERMANENCY** - Children are entitled to enduring, nurturing relationships that provide stability and belonging through family and community connections.

**PROFESSIONALISM** - Staff are valued, respected and supported throughout their career, and in turn provide quality service with value, respect and support for families.





ERIC R. GREITENS, GOVERNOR • JENNIFER TIDBALL, ACTING DIRECTOR

TIM DECKER, DIRECTOR  
CHILDREN'S DIVISION  
P.O. BOX 88 • JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65103-0088  
WWW.DSS.MO.GOV • 573-522-8024 • 573-526-3971 FAX

Dear Friends and Colleagues:

Thank you for your interest and concern regarding child abuse and neglect in Missouri. This report contains information regarding reports and referrals to the Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline during Fiscal Year 2016, including the substantiation status of the reports and the number of children and families served by a program within the Missouri Children's Division.

Additionally, the report includes a description of Missouri's unique multiple-response system to responding to child abuse and neglect reports. Over the past several years, the Children's Division has worked to enhance our child and family-centered and community-based practice model.

As evident in this report, there is a continued need for strong community support for Missouri's children and families. Through ongoing support of community partners, such as you, we are able to strengthen Missouri's child protection system, reinforce safety networks, and enhance the well-being of children and families.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Tim Decker", written in a cursive style.

Tim Decker  
Director

RELAY MISSOURI  
FOR HEARING AND SPEECH IMPAIRED  
1-800-735-2466 VOICE • 1-800-735-2966 TEXT PHONE

*An Equal Opportunity Employer, services provided on a nondiscriminatory basis.*





---

# ***Table of Contents***

---

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Reports</b> .....	3
Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline .....	3
Reporters .....	4
<b>Child Protection System: Family Assessments &amp; Investigations</b> .....	6
Observed Family Characteristics .....	8
Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion .....	11
<b>Family Assessment Conclusions</b> .....	13
Reported Incidents and Children by Family Assessment Conclusion .....	13
Demographics of Family Assessment Children .....	14
<b>Substantiated Conclusions</b> .....	16
Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	16
Observed Family Characteristics .....	19
Demographics of Substantiated Children .....	20
Child Abuse/Neglect Fatalities .....	21
<b>Perpetrators</b> .....	24
Perpetrator Demographics .....	24
Observed Perpetrator Characteristics .....	25
<b>Prevention/Treatment Services</b> .....	26
Family-Centered Services (FCS) .....	26
Intensive In-Home Services (IIS) .....	27
Out-of-Home Placement .....	27
Child Care .....	27
Crisis Nurseries .....	27
Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board .....	28
Background Screening and Investigation Unit .....	28
Calls from Mandated Reporters .....	28
Newborn Crisis Assessments and Services .....	29
<b>Appendices</b> .....	31
A. Reported Incidents by Conclusion .....	32
B. Reported Children by Conclusion .....	34
C. Family Assessment Incidents by Conclusion .....	36
D. Family Assessment Children by Conclusion .....	38
E. Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	40
F. Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	42
G. Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year .....	44
H. CA/N Juvenile Reports .....	46
I. Legal and Methodological Definitions .....	48



---

## ***Introduction***

---

This report compiles data collected by the Missouri Department of Social Services (DSS), Children's Division (CD), in the course of Child Abuse and/or Neglect (CA/N) investigations/assessments during the fiscal year, July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. As a result of pending investigations or changes in conclusions, the data is prone to change.

The data reported is current as of October 2016. Please note that data reported prior to fiscal year 2013 reflects a calendar year, January 1 through December 31. Charts, graphs and appendixes in past years' reports may have moved or changed in this report.

The Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline Unit (CANHU) accepts confidential reports of suspected child abuse, neglect, or exploitation. The CANHU is operated year-round on a 24 hours per day, seven days per week basis by 44 full-time and 2 part-time trained and experienced Children's Service Workers. Missouri's toll-free number for reporting child abuse/neglect is **1-800-392-3738**. Mandated reporters can also report online at <http://dss.mo.gov/cd/can.htm>.

A call to the hotline is referred to as a "report" or "reported incident" of child abuse/neglect. A report may involve from one to several children. Over the course of the fiscal year, the hotline had received over 72,000 reported incidents that involved over 100,000 children in Missouri.

When a call is received at the CANHU, information is analyzed to determine whether:

- the child is under age 18;
- the alleged perpetrator has care, custody and control of the child;
- the report meets the legal definition of abuse and/or neglect as stipulated in 210.110, RSMo (see Appendix I definitions).

After a report of suspected abuse, neglect, or exploitation has been made to the hotline, the information is forwarded electronically to one of the 114 county offices or the St. Louis City office for either investigation or assessment. A report indicating behavior that may constitute a criminal violation is screened as an investigation and law enforcement is contacted to co-investigate. Reports of child abuse/neglect that do not appear to be of a criminal nature may be responded to as a family assessment, where resources or services may be offered to the families to help prevent abuse or to meet a family's specific need. During FY 2016, forty-six percent (45.7%) of reports were assigned as investigation and fifty-four percent (54.3%) as family assessments.

Investigations/assessments must be initiated within 24 hours, or immediately when it is determined that the child is in imminent danger. When the only allegation is educational neglect, or the allegation is an old allegation and the child is protected, an investigation/assessment must be initiated within 72 hours. Per legislation, the number of days Children's Service Workers have to complete their investigations changed from 30 to 45 days August 28, 2014.

At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion. Of the 106,067 children with reports in FY 2016, 6,302 or six percent (5.9%), were substantiated as abused/neglected.

---

## ***Introduction***

---

As of August 28, 2015, CD utilizes a family assessment and services approach when reports are received that contain concerns of children with problem sexual behaviors. These reports are screened by CANHU when any child under the age of fourteen is alleged to have committed an act of sexual abuse against any person under the age of eighteen. During FY 2016, there were 3,585 juvenile reports made. The information contained within this report focuses primarily on investigations and traditional family assessments. For information regarding juvenile reports, see Appendix H.

# Reports

## Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline

Over the past fiscal year, the CANHU received 129,051\* reports. Of those reports, 72,388 were classified as Investigations or Assessments and were completed by the Children’s Division. A total of 106,067 children\*\* were involved in the investigations/assessments.

### Incidents and Children Reported to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline


Year	Total Reports	Annual Change	Total Children**	Annual Change
2012	62,460		92,593	
2013	61,765	-1.1%	91,812	-0.8%
2014	68,234	10.5%	102,100	11.2%
2015	68,623	0.6%	100,625	-1.4%
2016	72,388	5.5%	106,067	5.4%

\*Data provided by CANHU.

\*\* All counts of children are duplicated because a child may be reported more than once during the year. Total reports include only reports with a Type of Response of Investigation or Assessment and completed by field staff. Other CANHU reports requiring staff attention or action but do not meet the requirement for Investigation or Assessment are not included in the overall count.

Reports fluctuated by month during the year. April had the highest number of reported incidents completed by the Children’s Division, as well as the highest number of children, while July had the least number of incidents and June had the least number of children. Each month, an average of 6,032 reports involving 8,839 children were made during FY 2016.


**FY 2016 Child Abuse/Neglect Reports and Children by Month of Report**



# Reports

A child may be reported as an alleged victim more than once during the year. In FY 2016, a total of 79,098 children had been involved in one or more reports. Over three-fourths of children (77.2%) had been reported only once; sixteen percent (15.9%) were involved in two reports. Seven percent (7.2%) were involved in more than two reports.

**Number of Reported Incidents Per Child during FY 2016**




## Reporters

Reports of child abuse/neglect can be made by persons who are either "mandated" or "permissive" reporters. Mandated reporters are required by state statute to report abuse/neglect when they have reasonable cause to suspect a child has been or is being abused or neglected. Mandated reporters include, but are not limited to, health and education professionals, social workers and foster parents. Permissive reporters, such as relatives or neighbors, are not required to report suspected abuse/neglect.

More than one reporter may be involved in a report to the hotline. Two-thirds of reporters, sixty-seven percent (66.9%), during FY 2016 were mandated reporters. Twenty-nine percent (29.3%) were permissive reporters.

**Type of Child/Abuse Neglect Reporters during FY 2016**



---

## Reports

---

Mandated reporters were more often in the occupations of school principal/official, social worker or peace officer/law enforcement. Fourteen percent (14.0%) of mandated reporters worked in the health or mental health fields.

### Reporters of Child Abuse/Neglect during FY 2016 by Occupation

	Number	Percent
Permissive	24,180	29.3%
Principal or other school official	13,983	17.0%
Social Worker	10,250	12.4%
Peace Officer or Law Enforcement Official	10,004	12.1%
Nurse	4,804	5.8%
Mental Health	4,440	5.4%
Teacher	4,219	5.1%
Unknown	3,107	3.8%
Other Person with Responsibility for Care of Children	2,933	3.6%
Physician	995	1.2%
Juvenile Officer	850	1.0%
Day Care	688	0.8%
Psychologist	520	0.6%
Other Health Practitioner	410	0.5%
Other Hospital/Clinic Personnel	381	0.5%
Intern	188	0.2%
Probation Officer or Parole Officer	182	0.2%
Minister	130	0.2%
Medical Examiner	81	0.1%
Coroner	40	0.0%
Dentist/Dental Hygienist	31	0.0%
Jail/Detention Personnel	30	0.0%
Resident	22	0.0%
Optometrist	2	0.0%
Chiropractor	2	0.0%

*Note: Reporters exceed reports because more than one person may report an incident.*

---

## ***Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations***


---

Missouri's Child Protection Services system culminated from a collaborative effort between the Children's Division, elected officials, community organizations and private citizens. Senate Bill 595 (SB 595) was signed into law in 1994 and expanded statewide in 1998. The primary focus of SB 595 is to protect children from abuse/neglect in the least disruptive and intrusive way, that recognizes the value of the family. In addition, the child's protection is provided in the most efficient and effective manner possible within the framework of state, community, and family resources.

When a child abuse/neglect report is received, it is screened to determine the appropriate intervention method. If behaviors that constitute a criminal violation are indicated, the response to the report is a fact-finding investigation and the appropriate local law enforcement agency is notified to assist. The response for remaining reports is a Family Assessment of which the main purpose is to determine the child's safety and the family's need for services. Both investigated families and those who receive the Family Assessment response receive prompt and effective delivery of services in order to address their needs.

Of the reports received in FY 2016, over half (54.3%) were initially assigned as Family Assessments and forty-six percent (45.7%) as Investigations.

**FY 2016 Reports by Type of Response**




In FY 2016, 4,639 reports initially assigned as either Family Assessments or Investigations involved being unable to locate the family, the family was located out of state, or the report was inappropriate. Therefore, the conclusion was categorized as Other.



# Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations


Of all reports assigned as Family Assessments, twenty-three percent (22.5%) resulted in services needed, services needed-linked initial 45 days or services needed but declined. The majority (71.2%) did not need services.

**Family Assessments by Conclusion during FY 2016**



Of the 33,077 reports assigned as investigations, thirteen percent (13.1%) were substantiated while the majority (64.9%) were unsubstantiated.

**Investigations by Conclusion during FY 2016**



# Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations

## Observed Family Characteristics

Children's Service Workers may designate up to fifteen **Observed Family Characteristics** during each family assessment/investigation. Services and supports for families are designed to build on the strengths and resources of the families and communities.

The majority of families assigned as Family Assessment had adequate living conditions (56.2%). Over one-fourth (26.9%) had extended family support systems and almost one-fourth (23.4%) were amenable to services. Other frequently cited family characteristics include appropriate parenting skills, single parent households and community/cultural support. Following are the top 25 characteristics.

### Characteristics of Families Involved in Family Assessments during FY 2016

	Number	Percent
Adequate living conditions	22,107	56.2%
Extended family support system	10,573	26.9%
Amenable to services	9,194	23.4%
Appropriate parenting skills	8,516	21.7%
Community/Cultural support	7,120	18.1%
Single parent household	6,552	16.7%
Appropriate child development knowledge	5,709	14.5%
Lack of parenting skills	2,201	5.6%
Good physical/mental health	2,165	5.5%
Other drug related problem(s)	1,851	4.7%
Stable family relationships/household	1,714	4.4%
Recent/frequent relocation	1,647	4.2%
Crowded living conditions	1,525	3.9%
Heavy continuous childcare responsibility	1,414	3.6%
Domestic violence	1,261	3.2%
Problem solving skills	1,215	3.1%
Insufficient/misuse of income	1,106	2.8%
Recent loss/addition to household members	1,003	2.6%
New baby in home/pregnancy	915	2.3%
No history of violence	808	2.1%
Loss of employment	686	1.7%
Marital problems	679	1.7%
Alcohol related problem(s)	619	1.6%
Stable marriage	602	1.5%
Homelessness	517	1.3%

Percent is the percentage of 39,311 reports assigned to the Family Assessment approach. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each Family Assessment.

## ***Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations***

The characteristics of families involved in investigations are similar in rank to families assessed. Over half (52.6%) had adequate living conditions and one-fourth (25.2%) had extended family support systems. Other common characteristics were amenable to services, appropriate parenting skills, community/cultural support, and single parent households.

### **Characteristics of Families Involved in Investigations during FY 2016**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Adequate living conditions	17,395	52.6%
Extended family support system	8,339	25.2%
Amenable to services	7,552	22.8%
Appropriate parenting skills	6,369	19.3%
Community/Cultural support	5,553	16.8%
Single parent household	4,627	14.0%
Appropriate child development knowledge	4,239	12.8%
Lack of parenting skills	2,141	6.5%
Other drug related problem(s)	1,700	5.1%
Good physical/mental health	1,633	4.9%
Domestic violence	1,303	3.9%
Stable family relationships/household	1,253	3.8%
Heavy continuous child care responsibility	1,111	3.4%
Recent/Frequent relocation	1,010	3.1%
Crowded living conditions	1,004	3.0%
Problem solving skills	794	2.4%
Recent loss/addition to household members	769	2.3%
New baby in home/pregnancy	752	2.3%
Insufficient/Misuse of income	647	2.0%
No history of violence	610	1.8%
Marital problems	564	1.7%
Alcohol related problem(s)	540	1.6%
Dangerous living conditions	486	1.5%
Loss of employment	439	1.3%
Stable marriage	427	1.3%

Percent is the percentage of 33,077 reports assigned as an investigation. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each investigation.

---

## ***Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations***

---

Children's Service Workers investigate/assess each report to determine if abuse/neglect is occurring or has occurred and evaluate the family's need for services. Thorough investigations/assessments require hours of interviews and information collection, and usually include the following major steps.

- Contacting the reporter, if known, for additional information before proceeding with the investigation;
- Contacting appropriate law enforcement personnel or multidisciplinary team members to request a co-investigation if the alleged report, if true, would constitute a violation of the law;
- Making a determination regarding the safety of the children within 24 hours, or immediately if deemed as an emergency;
- Contacting the School District Liaison when the victim in the child abuse/neglect report is school-aged;
- Determining the safety of all other children in the household within 72 hours;
- Consulting with the Chief Investigator within 72 hours;
- Contacting collateral persons;
- Interviewing witnesses;
- Interviewing the non-offending parent;
- Interviewing the alleged perpetrator(s);
- Evaluating and documenting all information collected and observed;
- Determining whether abuse/neglect has occurred or is occurring;
- Evaluating the family's need for services and making appropriate referrals for needed services;
- Notifying the child's parent(s), alleged perpetrator and, if applicable, school district liaison and the mandated reporter of the report conclusion and related findings.

CD policy requires completion of investigations/assessments within 45 days. Upon completion of the investigation/assessment, a report may be concluded as Substantiated, Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated (PSI), Unsubstantiated, or Family Assessment.

**Substantiated:** A finding that a preponderance of evidence exists to conclude abuse/neglect has occurred or is occurring as a result of the observation of visible signs, physical and/or credible verbal evidence provided to the Children's Service Worker by the child, perpetrator or witnesses in accordance with the definitions of abuse/neglect. This includes cases which are adjudicated by the courts.

**Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated:** A finding that insufficient visible signs, physical and/or credible evidence exist, but where the Children's Service Worker determines that indicators are present which, if unresolved, could potentially contribute to child abuse/neglect.

**Unsubstantiated:** A finding that insufficient physical or credible verbal evidence exists and where few or no indicators are identified and the Children's Service Worker has not identified a specific threat exists for the child.

# Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations

**Family Assessments** are concluded as a need or services is identified, either from CD or the community; as services are not needed; or where the child is safe but the family refuses to participate in the assessment process.

Other conclusions include unable to locate, inappropriate report, located out of state, home schooling, and school investigation by school board. See Appendix I for further definition.

## Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion

Over one-third of incidents (34.5%) and of children (34.4%) were found to be unsubstantiated or unsubstantiated PSI. Six percent of incidents (6.0%) and of children (5.9%) were concluded as substantiated.

### Reported Incidents of CA/N by Conclusion


Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Family Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2012	4,370	7.0%	4,512	7.2%	21,065	33.7%	29,710	47.6%	2,803	4.5%	62,460
2013	4,251	6.9%	4,058	6.6%	19,513	31.6%	31,281	50.6%	2,662	4.3%	61,765
2014	4,439	6.5%	4,199	6.2%	21,282	31.2%	36,071	52.9%	2,243	3.3%	68,234
2015	4,360	6.4%	3,807	5.5%	20,569	30.0%	37,168	54.2%	2,719	4.0%	68,623
2016	4,346	6.0%	3,535	4.9%	21,458	29.6%	38,410	53.1%	4,639	6.4%	72,388

### Reported Children of CA/N by Conclusion

Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Family Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2012	6,322	6.8%	7,092	7.7%	31,256	33.8%	44,070	47.6%	3,853	4.2%	92,593
2013	6,066	6.6%	6,378	6.9%	28,987	31.6%	46,656	50.8%	3,725	4.1%	91,812
2014	6,439	6.3%	6,657	6.5%	31,129	30.5%	54,500	53.4%	3,375	3.3%	102,100
2015	6,244	6.2%	5,899	5.9%	29,779	29.6%	55,019	54.7%	3,684	3.7%	100,625
2016	6,302	5.9%	5,603	5.3%	30,880	29.1%	56,950	53.7%	6,332	6.0%	106,067

# Child Protection System: Family Assessments & Investigations

Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion



Conclusions are as follows:

- Substantiated - Court Adjudicated and Preponderance of Evidence;
- Unsub.-PSI - Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated;
- Unsub. - Unsubstantiated;
- FA - Family Assessment: Services Needed, Services Not Needed, Non-cooperative/Child Safe, Services Needed-Linked Initial 45 Days, and Services Needed-Family Declined;
- Other - Unable to Locate, Inappropriate Report, Located Out of State, and Home Schooling

## Family Assessment Conclusions

Of FY 2016 CANHU reports, half were concluded as Family Assessment. The goal of this approach is to assure child safety, address the strengths of the family, and to identify and treat the family's needs.

### Reported Incidents and Children by Family Assessment Conclusion

For reports concluded as Family Assessment, services were found to be needed for eleven percent (11.2%) of incidents and twelve percent (12.3%) of children. The majority were found not to need services, seventy-three percent for incidents (72.9%) and seventy-two percent (71.9%) of children. Only four percent were non-cooperative. Percentages have remained consistent over the past five years among all categories.

#### Reported Incidents by Family Assessment Conclusion


Year	Services Needed		Services Not Needed		Non-Cooperative		Services Needed-Linked Initial 45 Days		Services Needed-Declined		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2012	3,957	13.3%	21,514	72.4%	789	2.7%	2,581	8.7%	880	3.0%	29,721
2013	4,210	13.5%	22,448	71.8%	873	2.8%	2,696	8.6%	1,054	3.4%	31,281
2014	4,795	13.3%	25,961	72.0%	1,152	3.2%	3,029	8.4%	1,134	3.1%	36,071
2015	4,750	12.8%	27,083	72.9%	1,255	3.4%	2,859	7.7%	1,221	3.3%	37,168
2016	4,321	11.2%	28,002	72.9%	1,563	4.1%	3,200	8.3%	1,324	3.4%	38,410

#### Reported Children by Family Assessment Conclusion

Year	Services Needed		Services Not Needed		Non-Cooperative		Services Needed-Linked Initial 45 Days		Services Needed-Declined		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2012	6,336	14.4%	31,571	71.6%	1,125	2.6%	3,682	8.4%	1,356	3.1%	44,070
2013	6,770	14.5%	33,121	71.0%	1,260	2.7%	3,873	8.3%	1,632	3.5%	46,656
2014	7,948	14.6%	38,738	71.1%	1,657	3.0%	4,402	8.1%	1,755	3.2%	54,500
2015	7,687	14.0%	39,625	72.0%	1,775	3.2%	4,055	7.4%	1,877	3.4%	55,019
2016	6,984	12.3%	40,963	71.9%	2,267	4.0%	4,608	8.1%	2,128	3.7%	56,950

# Family Assessment Conclusions

Reported Incidents and Children by Family Assessment Conclusion



## Demographics of Family Assessment Children

During the year, 56,950 children were involved in reports concluded as Family Assessment. Of those, 13,720 children or twenty-four percent (24.1%) were found in need of services.

Based on the children in need of services, those age five and younger were somewhat more likely to fall in the Services Needed category while children over age five were more likely to be classified as Services Needed-Linked Initial 45 days. There were no significant differences for gender or race among the three classifications.

Slightly over half of the children involved in reports concluded as Family Assessment were male (51.2%) while slightly under half were female (48.7%). Nearly three-fourths were white (72.5%) and eighteen percent (18.2%) were black. Four percent (4.3%) were of Hispanic origin.



## Family Assessment Conclusions

### Family Assessment Concluded Children during FY 2016

	Family Assessment		Services Needed		Services Needed Linked Initial 45 Days		Services Needed Family Declined	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Total</b>	<b>56,950</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>6,984</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,608</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Age</b>								
< 1	2,402	4.2%	428	6.1%	188	4.1%	90	4.2%
1	2,806	4.9%	398	5.7%	187	4.1%	136	6.4%
2	2,989	5.2%	460	6.6%	193	4.2%	117	5.5%
3	2,808	4.9%	379	5.4%	208	4.5%	101	4.7%
4	3,066	5.4%	374	5.4%	214	4.6%	108	5.1%
5	3,436	6.0%	420	6.0%	265	5.8%	110	5.2%
6	4,111	7.2%	468	6.7%	289	6.3%	153	7.2%
7	4,153	7.3%	487	7.0%	317	6.9%	150	7.0%
8	4,146	7.3%	487	7.0%	296	6.4%	141	6.6%
9	3,736	6.6%	441	6.3%	264	5.7%	140	6.6%
10	3,499	6.1%	413	5.9%	279	6.1%	144	6.8%
11	3,299	5.8%	391	5.6%	286	6.2%	113	5.3%
12	3,091	5.4%	362	5.2%	290	6.3%	111	5.2%
13	3,070	5.4%	362	5.2%	274	5.9%	119	5.6%
14	3,103	5.4%	354	5.1%	304	6.6%	104	4.9%
15	3,042	5.3%	366	5.2%	337	7.3%	141	6.6%
16	2,666	4.7%	286	4.1%	290	6.3%	105	4.9%
17	1,467	2.6%	103	1.5%	125	2.7%	45	2.1%
Not available	60	0.1%	5	0.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	29,146	51.2%	3,566	51.1%	2,319	50.3%	1,072	50.4%
Female	27,714	48.7%	3,415	48.9%	2,289	49.7%	1,056	49.6%
Not available	90	0.2%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Race</b>								
White	41,273	72.5%	5,461	78.2%	3,640	79.0%	1,609	75.6%
Black	10,343	18.2%	926	13.3%	573	12.4%	320	15.0%
Other/unknown	5,334	9.4%	597	8.5%	395	8.6%	199	9.4%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>								
Hispanic	2,443	4.3%	291	4.2%	149	3.2%	56	2.6%
Not Hispanic	51,977	91.3%	6,355	91.0%	4,289	93.1%	1,977	92.9%
Unknown	2,530	4.4%	338	4.8%	170	3.7%	95	4.5%

---


## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

### **Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect**

During FY 2016, 6,302 children were involved in incidents that were concluded as substantiated for abuse/neglect. When a Children's Service Worker determines there is preponderance of evidence that abuse/neglect has occurred, up to six categories of abuse/neglect can be assigned to each child. Neglect was the most prevalent category assigned during FY 2016 investigations

**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2016**




**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2016**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Neglect	3,723	59.1%
Physical Abuse	1,393	22.1%
Sexual Abuse	1,250	19.8%
Emotional Abuse	318	5.0%
Medical Neglect	169	2.7%
Educational Neglect	62	1.0%

Percent is the percentage of 6,302 total substantiated children. Percent total is greater than 100 because a child may be substantiated for up to six categories of abuse/neglect.

## Substantiated Conclusions

Most substantiated incidents were reported in March with 628 children. March also saw the highest incidence of neglect (400), January saw the highest incidence of physical abuse (149) and sexual abuse (126). The lowest number of substantiated children was reported in May (471). The lowest occurrences of neglect, physical abuse and sexual abuse were in May (253), June (74) and April (91), for children respectively.



In addition to assigning categories of abuse or neglect, a Children's Service Worker may also describe up to fifty specific findings of abuse. For neglected children, the most frequent worker descriptions are those typically associated with neglect, such as a lack of supervision and unsafe or inadequate shelter. The ten most frequently reported worker findings for neglected children are shown below.

### Worker Findings for Neglected Children during FY 2016

	Number	Percent
Lack of Supervision	2,700	72.5%
Unsafe/Inadequate Shelter	946	25.4%
Unsanitary Living Conditions	615	16.5%
Failure to Protect	246	6.6%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	88	2.4%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	88	2.4%
Lack of Food	83	2.2%
Bruises, Welts, Red Marks	83	2.2%
Untreated Illness/Injury	82	2.2%
Abandonment	75	2.0%

Percent is the percentage of 3,723 substantiated neglected children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

For physically abused children, the most frequently reported worker findings were bruises, welts or red marks along with other abuse or injury and abrasions or lacerations. Lack of supervision was also cited quite often, suggesting that neglect may occur in some abusive situations. The ten most often reported worker findings for physically abused children are shown below.

### **Worker Findings for Physically Abused Children during FY 2016**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Bruises, Welts, Red Marks	833	59.8%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	580	41.6%
Abrasions, Lacerations	235	16.9%
Lack of Supervision	128	9.2%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	100	7.2%
Wounds, Cuts, Punctures	97	7.0%
Fractures (Other than Skull)	73	5.2%
Unsafe/Inadequate Shelter	65	4.7%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	64	4.6%
Methamphetamine Lab Exposure	44	3.2%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,393 substantiated physically abused children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.**

Fondling or touching was the most frequent worker finding for sexually abused children. The ten most often reported worker findings for sexually abused children are shown below.

### **Worker Findings for Sexually Abused Children during FY 2016**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Fondling/Touching	759	60.7%
Other Sexual Abuse	539	43.1%
Oral Sex, Sodomy	256	20.5%
Intercourse	237	19.0%
Digital Penetration	147	11.8%
Pornography	54	4.3%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	25	2.0%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	21	1.7%
Lack of Supervision	19	1.5%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	15	1.2%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,250 substantiated sexually abused children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.**

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

### **Observed Family Characteristics**

Information gathered during an investigation of child abuse/neglect can help identify factors which place a child at risk for abuse/neglect. In addition to establishing an investigative conclusion for each child, Children's Service Workers may designate up to four **Observed Family Characteristics** for each reported incident. These characteristics may indicate which services could help prevent the recurrence of abuse/neglect. It is important to note that these are not absolute counts. For instance, a problem with alcohol or other drugs may be difficult to detect during the course of an investigation.

The family characteristics reported in fiscal year 2016 are similar to those reported in prior years. Forty-six percent (45.9%) of the families involved in substantiated incidents had adequate living conditions. Almost one-third of the substantiated incidents (31.6%) involved families that had an extended family support. The top twenty family characteristics are listed below.

#### **Characteristics of Families Involved in Substantiated Incidents during FY 2016**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Adequate living conditions	1,996	45.9%
Extended family support system	1,372	31.6%
Amenable to services	1,266	29.1%
Lack of parenting skills	1,153	26.5%
Other drug related problem(s)	902	20.8%
Single parent household	899	20.7%
Community/Cultural support	717	16.5%
Appropriate parenting skills	596	13.7%
Domestic violence	511	11.8%
Dangerous living conditions	396	9.1%
Appropriate child development knowledge	390	9.0%
Heavy continuous child care responsibility	298	6.9%
Recent/Frequent relocation	265	6.1%
Insufficient/misuse of income	262	6.0%
Alcohol related problem(s)	249	5.7%
Crowded living conditions	205	4.7%
Recent loss/addition to household members	184	4.2%
Good physical/mental health	183	4.2%
New baby in home/pregnancy	170	3.9%
Marital problems	169	3.9%

**Percent is the percentage of 4,346 total substantiated incidents. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to four family characteristics may be reported for each incident.**

## Substantiated Conclusions

### Demographics of Substantiated Children

Of the substantiated children during FY 2016, over half (54.6%) were female and forty-five percent (45.4%) were male. Sexually abused children were more likely to be female. Neglect was more prevalent among younger children while sexual abuse occurred more often among children older than age ten.

#### Child Abuse/Neglect Children during FY 2016 by Category of Abuse

	Substantiated		Neglect		Physical Abuse		Sexual Abuse		Emotional Abuse		Medical Neglect		Educational Neglect	
Total	6,302	100.0%	3,723	100.0%	1,393	100.0%	1,250	100.0%	318	100.0%	169	100.0%	62	100.0%
<b>Age</b>														
< 1	437	6.9%	321	8.6%	127	9.1%	3	0.2%	10	3.1%	12	7.1%	0	0.0%
1	444	7.0%	373	10.0%	82	5.9%	0	0.0%	13	4.1%	12	7.1%	0	0.0%
2	434	6.9%	373	10.0%	63	4.5%	6	0.5%	12	3.8%	14	8.3%	0	0.0%
3	430	6.8%	339	9.1%	76	5.5%	24	1.9%	8	2.5%	14	8.3%	0	0.0%
4	399	6.3%	292	7.8%	67	4.8%	40	3.2%	15	4.7%	11	6.5%	0	0.0%
5	367	5.8%	246	6.6%	75	5.4%	48	3.8%	19	6.0%	10	5.9%	0	0.0%
6	372	5.9%	246	6.6%	65	4.7%	62	5.0%	17	5.3%	4	2.4%	4	6.5%
7	361	5.7%	223	6.0%	86	6.2%	58	4.6%	17	5.3%	10	5.9%	3	4.8%
8	384	6.1%	214	5.7%	96	6.9%	79	6.3%	18	5.7%	13	7.7%	5	8.1%
9	346	5.5%	186	5.0%	77	5.5%	84	6.7%	28	8.8%	7	4.1%	7	11.3%
10	340	5.4%	176	4.7%	61	4.4%	99	7.9%	23	7.2%	8	4.7%	5	8.1%
11	309	4.9%	147	3.9%	71	5.1%	86	6.9%	24	7.5%	7	4.1%	4	6.5%
12	279	4.4%	127	3.4%	68	4.9%	89	7.1%	12	3.8%	6	3.6%	7	11.3%
13	287	4.6%	96	2.6%	74	5.3%	112	9.0%	20	6.3%	8	4.7%	5	8.1%
14	326	5.2%	108	2.9%	91	6.5%	128	10.2%	26	8.2%	3	1.8%	3	4.8%
15	343	5.4%	119	3.2%	92	6.6%	138	11.0%	25	7.9%	13	7.7%	9	14.5%
16	295	4.7%	83	2.2%	84	6.0%	125	10.0%	22	6.9%	12	7.1%	10	16.1%
17	149	2.4%	54	1.5%	38	2.7%	69	5.5%	9	2.8%	5	3.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Gender</b>														
Male	2,860	45.4%	1,909	51.3%	775	55.6%	167	13.4%	164	51.6%	83	49.1%	32	51.6%
Female	3,442	54.6%	1,814	48.7%	618	44.4%	1,083	86.6%	154	48.4%	86	50.9%	30	48.4%
<b>Race</b>														
White	4,556	72.3%	2,721	73.1%	930	66.8%	958	76.6%	240	75.5%	120	71.0%	52	83.9%
Black	1,079	17.1%	545	14.6%	330	23.7%	209	16.7%	46	14.5%	32	18.9%	8	12.9%
Am. Indian/Alaska Native	19	0.3%	15	0.4%	2	0.1%	4	0.3%	1	0.3%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%
Asian	17	0.3%	9	0.2%	4	0.3%	4	0.3%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	10	0.2%	6	0.2%	5	0.4%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other/Unknown	621	9.9%	427	11.5%	122	8.8%	72	5.8%	30	9.4%	16	9.5%	2	3.2%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>														
Hispanic	273	4.3%	138	3.7%	50	3.6%	85	6.8%	25	7.9%	4	2.4%	3	4.8%
Not Hispanic	5,682	90.2%	3,325	89.3%	1,263	90.7%	1,149	91.9%	279	87.7%	158	93.5%	59	95.2%
Unknown	347	5.5%	260	7.0%	80	5.7%	16	1.3%	14	4.4%	7	4.1%	0	0.0%

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

### **Child Abuse/Neglect Fatalities**


Missouri has a strong capacity to become aware of fatalities resulting from child abuse/neglect. If the medical examiner or coroner determines that the child died of natural causes while under medical care for an established natural disease, the coroner, medical examiner, or physician are required to notify the division of the child's death. In all other cases, the medical examiner or coroner accepts the report for investigation, immediately notifies the division of the child's death as required under section 58.452, RSMo, and reports the findings to the child fatality review panel established pursuant to section 210.192, RSMo.

Child Abuse and Neglect fatalities reported by the Children's Division include fatalities of children under the age of 18 for which a report of child abuse and neglect has been received by CANHU and which are classified as substantiated based on a Preponderance of the Evidence evidentiary standard of proof as stipulated in 210.110, RSMo.

In Missouri, there are three entities within state government responsible for child fatality information: Department of Health and Senior Services' Bureau of Vital Statistics, Department of Social Services, Children's Division and the Child Fatality Review Program. All three exchange and match child fatality data in order to ensure accuracy throughout the system. However, the Bureau of Vital Statistics, Children's Division and the Child Fatality Review Program serve very different functions and, therefore, different classifications and timing periods apply, when child fatality data is reported. Therefore, totals included in this report may differ from totals reported by the other entities.

The number of fatalities reported during any given year may change as a result of pending investigations, changes in conclusions and deaths not reported in a timely manner. During fiscal year 2016, thirty-six children died as a result of child abuse/neglect.


The following chart represents the number of child fatalities for fiscal years 2012 to 2016, when abuse, neglect, or maltreatment was associated with the child's death. This information was reported by calendar year in prior annual reports. To ensure accuracy of the data, and to allow for meaningful comparison, the Children's Division revised the process for compilation, verification, and reporting of this data, beginning in fiscal year 2014.



## Substantiated Conclusions

The CA/N fatalities were caused more often by neglect (72.2%). Physical abuse was present in over a third the fatalities (36.1%) and a smaller percentage involved medical neglect (8.3%).

**Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2016**



**Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2016**

	Number	Percent
Physical Abuse	13	36.1%
Neglect	26	72.2%
Medical Neglect	3	8.3%
Emotional Abuse	1	2.8%
Sexual Abuse	0	0.0%
Educational Neglect	0	0.0%

Percent is the percent of the 36 substantiated fatalities. Percent total is greater than 100 because a child may be substantiated for up to six categories of abuse/neglect.



## Substantiated Conclusions

Of the children involved in substantiated fatalities in 2016, the majority (77.8%) were two years old or younger. The highest incidence of child deaths occurred in August.


### Substantiated Fatalities during FY 2016

Age	Number	Percent
< 1	15	41.7%
1	6	16.7%
2	7	19.4%
3	3	8.3%
4	1	2.8%
5	1	2.8%
7	1	2.8%
14	1	2.8%
17	1	2.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	24	66.7%
Female	12	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	16	44.4%
Black	7	19.4%
Other	13	36.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Substantiated Fatalities by Month of Death during FY 2016



# Perpetrators

## Perpetrator Demographics

For substantiated reports during FY 2016, over two-thirds of the perpetrators (68.0%) were between the ages of 20 and 39. Slightly over half (54.9%) were male and forty-three percent (43.2%) were female. The race of substantiated perpetrators was similar to that of substantiated children. Three-fourths (75.0%) were white and seventeen percent (17.2%) were black.

### Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2016

Age	Number	Percent
<20	262	4.7%
20-29	1,788	32.1%
30-39	2,002	35.9%
40-49	835	15.0%
50-59	368	6.6%
60-69	121	2.2%
70+	43	0.8%
Unknown	150	2.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,569</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	4,174	75.0%
Black	960	17.2%
Am. Indian/AK Native	10	0.2%
Asian	11	0.2%
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	3	0.1%
Other	411	7.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,569</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Female	2,406	43.2%
Male	3,059	54.9%
Unknown	104	1.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,569</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A natural parent and a paramour accounted for the majority of both alleged and substantiated perpetrators. A perpetrator may be involved in more than one incident, and in more than one relationship type, during the report year.

### Perpetrators by Relationship to Child during FY 2016

	Alleged Perpetrators	Substantiated Perpetrators	Percent Found Substantiated
Natural Parent	96,002	5,059	5.3%
Parent/Caretaker's Paramour	12,324	838	6.8%
Step-parent	6,400	406	6.3%
Grandparent	5,754	127	2.2%
Unknown	5,655	368	6.5%
Other	4,771	531	11.1%
Aunt/Uncle/Cousin	3,739	360	9.6%
Adoptive Parent	1,497	43	2.9%
Friend	1,420	256	18.0%
No relationship exists	1,549	180	11.6%
School/Personnel	1,202	14	1.2%
Day Care Provider	1,045	42	4.0%
Foster parent	1,034	28	2.7%
Institution/Staff	1,004	28	2.8%
Sibling	977	55	5.6%
	<b>144,373</b>	<b>8,335</b>	<b>5.8%</b>

---

## Perpetrators

---

### Observed Perpetrator Characteristics

Children's Service Workers may indicate up to four **Observed Perpetrator Characteristics** for each substantiated perpetrator of child abuse/neglect. These characteristics are used to assist in determining which services may be beneficial to a family. For instance, if perpetrators have unrealistic expectations of children, providing information on child development can help teach more appropriate disciplinary techniques.

In FY 2016, the most prevalent perpetrator characteristics were drug related problem(s) (20.9%), having an adequate support system (15.1%), history of criminal behavior (13.1%), and having no apparent mental/emotional disturbance (12.6%).

#### Characteristics of Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2016

	Number	Percent
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	1,746	20.9%
Adequate Support System	1,256	15.1%
History of Criminal Behavior	1,092	13.1%
No Apparent Mental/Emotional Disturbance	1,052	12.6%
Mental/Emotional Disturbance	865	10.4%
Amenable to Services	812	9.7%
Unemployed	721	8.7%
Unrealistic Expectations of Child	534	6.4%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	468	5.6%
Immaturity	438	5.3%
Pattern of Violent Behavior	374	4.5%
Financial Problems	353	4.2%
Parental History of Abuse/Neglect as a Child	321	3.9%
Undetermined	268	3.2%
High School Education or Higher	253	3.0%
Low Self Esteem	212	2.5%
No One to Call on in Time of Crisis	191	2.3%
Other	144	1.7%
Institutional Report/Unknown Perpetrator	93	1.1%
Less than High School Education	83	1.0%
Illness	40	0.5%
Developmentally Disabled	25	0.3%
Incapacity Due to Physical Handicap	14	0.2%

Percentage is the percentage of 8,335 substantiated perpetrators. Percent total is greater than 100 because a worker may list up to four characteristics for each perpetrator.


## Prevention/Treatment Services

The Children’s Division has several programs designed to provide treatment and to help prevent future occurrences of child abuse and neglect.

### Family-Centered Services (FCS)

FCS are provided to families and children in their own homes when a child abuse/neglect investigation has been concluded Substantiated, Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated or Family Assessment-Services Needed. These services are also provided to families who voluntarily seek help and to families whose children are placed out of the home. Services are provided following a family-centered assessment to identify risk issues, family strengths and service needs. A family treatment plan is developed with the family to help them change the conditions which brought them to the attention of CD. Services are designed to help the family direct their own affairs and provide suitable care for the children. The primary purpose of FCS is to improve and maintain the family unit or to reunify the family when alternative care services are provided. Services include a range of treatment and support services. The family treatment plan determines whether services are provided by CD staff and/or purchased or provided by community agencies. Purchased services include day care, family and/or individual counseling, home-based family-centered services, evaluation and diagnosis, homemaker services and respite care, among others.

During FY 2016, a total of 9,194 FCS cases opened and 664 of those were the result of a substantiated Child Abuse/Neglect report. The percentage of FCS cases opened due to a substantiated CA/N has declined slightly every year for the past five years, dropping from nine percent (9.3%) in FY 2012 to seven percent (7.2%) in FY 2016.



**\*Other includes Family Requests Preventive Services, Court Order, Newborn Crisis Assessment, Family Assessment and Services, and Pending Investigation/Assessment.**

---

## ***Prevention/Treatment Services***

---

### **Intensive In-Home Services (IIS)**

IIS is designed to prevent unnecessary out-of-home placement of children. An in-home specialist provides a variety of services to the entire family to address the crisis that would normally necessitate out-of-home care for a child. Services are delivered immediately at the time of crisis and are time-limited, usually four to six weeks. In-home specialists carry small caseloads of two families. This enables them to spend as much time with the family as needed. The emphasis of IIS is on strengthening the entire family by improving its problem-solving capabilities and teaching them necessary life skills. Among other services, families may receive family therapy, individual and marital counseling, parenting education, child development training, household maintenance and nutritional training, job readiness training and referrals to other community resources. Families authorized for IIS may have children who have been abused or neglected, have committed a status offense, have displayed delinquent behavior, or who are seriously emotionally disturbed and are at imminent risk of being removed from the home. This service is voluntary and at least one caretaker must be willing to participate.

### **Out-of-Home Placement**

Out-of-home care is provided in situations where a caregiver(s) is incapable of providing a child or children with adequate social, emotional and physical care. Out-of-home is defined as care provided in licensed foster or approved relative family homes or kinship care, in licensed residential facilities, or in licensed foster group homes. The service provides substitute settings for children. Children are placed only after it is determined that they cannot remain at home.

### **Child Care**

Assistance with child care services through payment of full or partial cost for eligible families is based on a sliding scale fee system. The primary purpose of the subsidized child care program is to enable families to obtain and retain employment, or the skills necessary to obtain employment, with the ultimate goal of breaking the cycle of poverty. Child care is to be considered an on-going benefit to the family's efforts of self-sufficiency. Additionally, protective services child care is available for children who are receiving preventive services or treatment for child abuse or neglect as part of the family's treatment plan.

### **Crisis Nurseries**

The first state-funded crisis nurseries began providing services to children and their families in May 1993. There are nine of these facilities. Crisis nurseries are child care facilities which protect children by providing a safe environment at a time when the chances of abuse/neglect in the home are increased. Parents voluntarily request and arrange this service directly with the crisis nursery.

---

## ***Prevention/Treatment Services***

---

### **Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board**

Children's Service Workers reach a conclusion on each child abuse/neglect investigation and notify the parents and alleged perpetrator (if different than the parents) by letter of the conclusion. In some investigations where the conclusion is substantiated, the alleged perpetrator may disagree with the finding. The alleged perpetrator may appeal to the Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board for review of the investigation by contacting the local CD office within 60 days of the notification of the finding. If there are pending criminal charges, the request may be made 60 days from the court's final disposition or dismissal of charges. If convicted, there is no appeal.

The Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board consists of five boards of nine private citizens appointed by the Governor. These boards each meet monthly to review child abuse/neglect appeals. They listen to testimony from CD staff, the alleged perpetrator, and representatives of the child and then make a decision to uphold or reverse the original CD decision. During FY 2016, the review board heard 507 cases and upheld almost sixty-six percent (65.6%) of the cases. Following the Child Abuse and Neglect Review Board's disposition, the alleged perpetrator has 30 days to request a judicial review.

### **Background Screening and Investigation Unit**

The Background Screening and Investigation Unit conducts background checks through the child abuse/neglect systems in CD. These checks are run on prospective foster and adoptive parents for CD and for current or prospective employees in the child care industry (day care, residential care providers, schools, etc.). The purpose of the unit is to provide information on potential employees so that a prospective employer can assess if the person is appropriate to care for children. The unit processed 102,154 background checks during FY 2016.

### **Calls from Mandated Reporters**

The state child abuse/neglect law mandates certain professions (mandated reporters) to make a report to the Missouri Children's Division when they have reasonable cause to suspect that a child has been or may be subjected to abuse or neglect. However, many times the mandated reporter may not suspect abuse or neglect but has some other concern about a family. When the reported concern does not meet the criteria of a report of Child Abuse and Neglect (Investigation or Family Assessment), hotline staff document the concerns and, based on the topic of the call, provide referral contact information, as available, directly to the caller. In short, callers receive the referral contact information directly from the hotline worker, rather than being contacted with it later by someone in the field. This immediate communication regarding available resources to the caller allows for a quicker referral to the family through collaboration with professional partners. This process provides assurance that local offices can respond in the most efficient manner possible to reports that meet the statutory definition of Child Abuse and Neglect. Reports received from mandated reporters are referred to field staff if there is an open case on the family.

---

## ***Prevention/Treatment Services***

---

### **Newborn Crisis Assessments and Services**

CD collaborates with the Department of Health in conjunction with the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to address the increasing problem of substance abusing pregnant women and drug exposed infants. Missouri law requires the Departments of Health, Mental Health, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Social Services (CD) to provide a non-punitive system of educational and treatment services related to the prenatal consumption of alcohol and other drugs. This inter-departmental effort is known as the Perinatal Substance Abuse Advisory Council. This council meets quarterly to discuss issues related to the needs of the drug-exposed infant, substance abusing pregnant woman, assessment process, training, accessing available resources, legislative and policy changes.

In most instances, CD receives a Newborn Crisis Assessment Referral, via the CA/N hotline, from the physician or health care provider, who requests CD to conduct an assessment to determine the caretaker's suitability to care for an infant, or to provide protective services as directed by a physician. Following the completion of the Newborn Crisis Assessment, CD coordinates services with the Department of Health and the Department of Mental Health. Service Coordinators in the Department of Health's Bureau of Special Health Care Needs provide health and developmental screenings throughout their involvement with the family. The Department of Mental Health provides drug treatment services for the substance abusing parent, as well as for the family. In FY 2016, the Division received a total of 4,398 Newborn Crisis Assessment Referrals.

Children reported to the Division for abuse and neglect are sometimes identified during the investigation process as having been exposed prenatally to drugs. In FY 2016, 353 children reported to CANHU were subsequently identified as drug-exposed.





# Appendices

## Appendix A: FY 2016 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		FAMILY ASSESS.		OTHER		TOTAL
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	ANDREW	10	9.6%	3	2.9%	31	29.8%	57	54.8%	3	2.9%	104
	ATCHISON	3	8.3%	2	5.6%	8	22.2%	21	58.3%	2	5.6%	36
	BUCHANAN	80	4.5%	42	2.4%	620	34.8%	985	55.3%	53	3.0%	1,780
	CALDWELL	7	7.9%	5	5.6%	19	21.3%	51	57.3%	7	7.9%	89
	CARROLL	14	12.8%	3	2.8%	33	30.3%	51	46.8%	8	7.3%	109
	CASS	48	4.9%	21	2.1%	353	36.1%	535	54.6%	22	2.2%	979
	CHARITON	6	6.6%	4	4.4%	31	34.1%	50	54.9%	0	0.0%	91
	CLAY	136	6.4%	84	4.0%	627	29.5%	1,231	58.0%	45	2.1%	2,123
	CLINTON	17	6.9%	18	7.3%	76	30.6%	132	53.2%	5	2.0%	248
	COOPER	11	6.2%	3	1.7%	51	28.8%	92	52.0%	20	11.3%	177
	DAVISS	6	5.5%	9	8.3%	29	26.6%	62	56.9%	3	2.8%	109
	DE KALB	3	3.3%	4	4.4%	25	27.8%	56	62.2%	2	2.2%	90
	GENTRY	6	7.9%	5	6.6%	26	34.2%	36	47.4%	3	3.9%	76
	GRUNDY	11	6.4%	27	15.8%	27	15.8%	105	61.4%	1	0.6%	171
	HARRISON	13	11.0%	9	7.6%	25	21.2%	66	55.9%	5	4.2%	118
	HOLT	5	14.3%	1	2.9%	9	25.7%	18	51.4%	2	5.7%	35
	JOHNSON	23	4.7%	13	2.7%	152	31.3%	289	59.6%	8	1.6%	485
	LA FAYETTE	40	12.2%	11	3.3%	114	34.7%	159	48.3%	5	1.5%	329
	LINN	20	12.5%	11	6.9%	50	31.3%	78	48.8%	1	0.6%	160
	LIVINGSTON	9	5.5%	8	4.9%	44	27.0%	96	58.9%	6	3.7%	163
	MERCER	3	7.5%	5	12.5%	9	22.5%	23	57.5%	0	0.0%	40
	NODAWAY	18	9.5%	12	6.3%	53	28.0%	101	53.4%	5	2.6%	189
	PETTIS	24	4.3%	8	1.4%	186	33.6%	276	49.9%	59	10.7%	553
	PLATTE	23	3.3%	18	2.6%	237	33.8%	391	55.8%	32	4.6%	701
	PUTNAM	3	4.6%	9	13.8%	16	24.6%	34	52.3%	3	4.6%	65
	RAY	9	2.7%	5	1.5%	112	33.2%	181	53.7%	30	8.9%	337
	SALINE	21	6.0%	11	3.1%	137	39.0%	174	49.6%	8	2.3%	351
SULLIVAN	5	7.9%	7	11.1%	18	28.6%	33	52.4%	0	0.0%	63	
WORTH	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	5	35.7%	7	50.0%	1	7.1%	14	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>3,123</b>	<b>31.9%</b>	<b>5,390</b>	<b>55.1%</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>9,785</b>
<b>NORTHEAST</b>	ADAIR	21	6.3%	31	9.3%	59	17.7%	212	63.5%	11	3.3%	334
	AUDRAIN	27	6.9%	33	8.4%	92	23.4%	224	56.9%	18	4.6%	394
	BOONE	114	6.5%	69	4.0%	387	22.2%	838	48.0%	338	19.4%	1,746
	CALLAWAY	52	7.6%	32	4.7%	168	24.6%	412	60.3%	19	2.8%	683
	CLARK	7	7.4%	15	15.8%	11	11.6%	59	62.1%	3	3.2%	95
	COLE	30	3.5%	53	6.2%	244	28.7%	489	57.6%	33	3.9%	849
	FRANKLIN	58	4.8%	104	8.6%	350	29.0%	670	55.5%	26	2.2%	1,208
	GASCONADE	6	3.6%	13	7.7%	51	30.2%	97	57.4%	2	1.2%	169
	HOWARD	11	9.0%	9	7.4%	21	17.2%	80	65.6%	1	0.8%	122
	JEFFERSON	144	7.1%	212	10.5%	286	14.1%	1,249	61.7%	134	6.6%	2,025
	KNOX	3	7.5%	1	2.5%	8	20.0%	27	67.5%	1	2.5%	40
	LEWIS	6	5.5%	9	8.2%	28	25.5%	65	59.1%	2	1.8%	110
	LINCOLN	59	7.1%	53	6.4%	211	25.5%	492	59.6%	11	1.3%	826
	MACON	23	14.8%	11	7.1%	33	21.3%	79	51.0%	9	5.8%	155
	MARION	66	15.2%	26	6.0%	60	13.8%	268	61.6%	15	3.4%	435
	MONROE	6	7.1%	1	1.2%	24	28.2%	52	61.2%	2	2.4%	85
	MONTGOMERY	10	6.0%	7	4.2%	59	35.3%	88	52.7%	3	1.8%	167
	OSAGE	8	9.0%	8	9.0%	26	29.2%	44	49.4%	3	3.4%	89
	PIKE	32	13.7%	15	6.4%	47	20.1%	135	57.7%	5	2.1%	234
	RALLS	12	14.3%	6	7.1%	14	16.7%	49	58.3%	3	3.6%	84
	RANDOLPH	48	11.8%	21	5.1%	75	18.4%	251	61.5%	13	3.2%	408
	SCHUYLER	2	6.9%	7	24.1%	3	10.3%	17	58.6%	0	0.0%	29
	SCOTLAND	6	16.2%	5	13.5%	7	18.9%	17	45.9%	2	5.4%	37
	SHELBY	14	14.7%	4	4.2%	17	17.9%	54	56.8%	6	6.3%	95
	ST CHARLES	228	9.1%	51	2.0%	730	29.0%	1,420	56.4%	89	3.5%	2,518
	WARREN	25	5.1%	27	5.5%	133	26.9%	295	59.7%	14	2.8%	494
		<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,018</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>3,144</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>7,683</b>	<b>57.2%</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	BOLLINGER	18	11.5%	3	1.9%	24	15.3%	80	51.0%	32	20.4%	157
	BUTLER	72	9.7%	59	8.0%	217	29.4%	372	50.3%	19	2.6%	739
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	48	7.1%	13	1.9%	146	21.7%	338	50.1%	129	19.1%	674
	CARTER	11	12.1%	4	4.4%	29	31.9%	45	49.5%	2	2.2%	91
	CRAWFORD	26	6.7%	23	5.9%	138	35.4%	195	50.0%	8	2.1%	390
	DENT	42	14.3%	40	13.6%	71	24.1%	135	45.9%	6	2.0%	294
	DUNKLIN	22	4.1%	25	4.7%	174	32.4%	274	51.0%	42	7.8%	537

## Appendix A: FY 2016 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		FAMILY ASSESS.		OTHER		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	64	8.4%	66	8.7%	205	27.0%	407	53.6%	17	2.2%	759
	IRON	13	8.6%	17	11.2%	49	32.2%	72	47.4%	1	0.7%	152
	MADISON	19	9.2%	7	3.4%	70	33.8%	93	44.9%	18	8.7%	207
	MARIES	12	13.5%	10	11.2%	17	19.1%	39	43.8%	11	12.4%	89
	MISSISSIPPI	6	3.3%	8	4.4%	49	27.1%	101	55.8%	17	9.4%	181
	NEW MADRID	23	7.9%	25	8.6%	78	26.7%	151	51.7%	15	5.1%	292
	OREGON	24	15.9%	14	9.3%	51	33.8%	59	39.1%	3	2.0%	151
	PEMISCOT	34	9.7%	22	6.3%	84	23.9%	191	54.3%	21	6.0%	352
	PERRY	15	7.4%	3	1.5%	41	20.3%	114	56.4%	29	14.4%	202
	PHELPS	42	7.3%	56	9.7%	146	25.3%	292	50.6%	41	7.1%	577
	PULASKI	40	7.6%	44	8.3%	125	23.6%	236	44.6%	84	15.9%	529
	REYNOLDS	6	7.8%	4	5.2%	22	28.6%	38	49.4%	7	9.1%	77
	RIPLEY	15	6.8%	21	9.5%	65	29.5%	113	51.4%	6	2.7%	220
	SCOTT	43	7.1%	30	5.0%	194	32.2%	285	47.3%	50	8.3%	602
	SHANNON	6	6.2%	6	6.2%	32	33.0%	51	52.6%	2	2.1%	97
	ST FRANCOIS	67	6.3%	34	3.2%	369	34.9%	527	49.8%	61	5.8%	1,058
	STE GENEVIEVE	19	11.5%	7	4.2%	41	24.8%	91	55.2%	7	4.2%	165
	STODDARD	39	11.0%	14	4.0%	81	22.9%	207	58.5%	13	3.7%	354
	TEXAS	25	6.4%	32	8.2%	114	29.3%	209	53.7%	9	2.3%	389
	WASHINGTON	27	7.4%	17	4.7%	125	34.3%	184	50.5%	11	3.0%	364
WAYNE	24	11.1%	20	9.3%	57	26.4%	104	48.1%	11	5.1%	216	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>2,814</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>5,003</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>9,915</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	30	7.0%	21	4.9%	144	33.7%	229	53.6%	3	0.7%	427
	BARTON	9	5.6%	9	5.6%	54	33.8%	83	51.9%	5	3.1%	160
	BATES	10	5.6%	5	2.8%	34	18.9%	120	66.7%	11	6.1%	180
	BENTON	19	9.9%	7	3.6%	53	27.6%	109	56.8%	4	2.1%	192
	CAMDEN	56	10.3%	25	4.6%	147	27.1%	310	57.2%	4	0.7%	542
	CEDAR	14	5.8%	6	2.5%	79	32.5%	133	54.7%	11	4.5%	243
	CHRISTIAN	47	5.4%	50	5.7%	245	27.9%	515	58.7%	20	2.3%	877
	DADE	5	6.3%	4	5.0%	25	31.3%	42	52.5%	4	5.0%	80
	DALLAS	25	8.0%	28	8.9%	60	19.1%	196	62.4%	5	1.6%	314
	DOUGLAS	12	6.9%	14	8.0%	57	32.8%	86	49.4%	5	2.9%	174
	GREENE	174	3.5%	335	6.7%	1,443	28.8%	2,786	55.6%	274	5.5%	5,012
	HENRY	15	4.7%	11	3.5%	64	20.2%	199	62.8%	28	8.8%	317
	HICKORY	10	10.9%	4	4.3%	20	21.7%	53	57.6%	5	5.4%	92
	JASPER	63	3.6%	100	5.6%	598	33.7%	950	53.6%	61	3.4%	1,772
	LACLEDE	64	10.0%	53	8.3%	129	20.2%	375	58.8%	17	2.7%	638
	LAWRENCE	30	5.5%	33	6.1%	181	33.2%	295	54.1%	6	1.1%	545
	MCDONALD	6	1.8%	29	8.9%	108	33.2%	166	51.1%	16	4.9%	325
	MILLER	34	9.4%	14	3.9%	92	25.5%	218	60.4%	3	0.8%	361
	MONITEAU	10	5.4%	15	8.2%	38	20.7%	120	65.2%	1	0.5%	184
	MORGAN	35	12.8%	31	11.3%	47	17.2%	159	58.0%	2	0.7%	274
	NEWTON	22	3.2%	79	11.5%	220	32.1%	349	50.9%	15	2.2%	685
	OZARK	11	9.2%	5	4.2%	34	28.6%	61	51.3%	8	6.7%	119
	POLK	27	4.5%	37	6.1%	157	25.9%	374	61.7%	11	1.8%	606
ST CLAIR	5	4.0%	11	8.8%	34	27.2%	61	48.8%	14	11.2%	125	
STONE	29	7.2%	28	7.0%	112	27.9%	224	55.9%	8	2.0%	401	
TANEY	57	6.4%	88	9.9%	203	22.7%	497	55.7%	48	5.4%	893	
VERNON	20	5.8%	5	1.5%	125	36.4%	173	50.4%	20	5.8%	343	
WEBSTER	48	8.6%	28	5.0%	130	23.2%	330	58.8%	25	4.5%	561	
WRIGHT	34	9.5%	23	6.4%	105	29.2%	188	52.4%	9	2.5%	359	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>921</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>4,738</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>9,401</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>16,801</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	371	4.4%	161	1.9%	1,892	22.6%	5,431	64.8%	528	6.3%	8,383
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1,892</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>5,431</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>8,383</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	270	6.6%	213	5.2%	1,170	28.5%	1,904	46.3%	554	13.5%	4,111
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	331	4.6%	254	3.6%	2,110	29.5%	3,597	50.3%	857	12.0%	7,149
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>3,280</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>5,501</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>1,411</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>11,260</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	58	2.1%	4	0.1%	2,467	90.1%	1	0.0%	209	7.6%	2,739
	OUT OF STATE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	74	100.0%	74
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>2,467</b>	<b>87.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>2,813</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>4,346</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>3,535</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>21,458</b>	<b>29.6%</b>	<b>38,410</b>	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>4,639</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>72,388</b>

## Appendix B: FY 2016 Reported Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTAN- TIATED	UNSUB. PSI	UNSUB.	FAMILY ASSESS.	OTHER	TOTAL CHILDREN	SUBSTAN- TIATED CHILDREN PER 1,000	TOTAL CHILDREN PER 1,000
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	14	7	51	91	5	168	3.36	40.35
	ATCHISON	4	2	11	30	1	48	3.38	40.61
	BUCHANAN	100	78	880	1,546	77	2,681	4.77	127.89
	CALDWELL	12	6	30	73	8	129	4.99	53.66
	CARROLL	15	3	60	79	6	163	6.84	74.36
	CASS	71	31	468	732	27	1,329	2.69	50.37
	CHARITON	6	4	47	83	0	140	3.39	79.14
	CLAY	184	123	861	1,730	60	2,958	3.21	51.65
	CLINTON	27	30	97	189	5	348	5.30	68.32
	COOPER	14	6	74	139	24	257	3.52	64.59
	DAVISS	8	15	46	119	5	193	3.55	85.70
	DE KALB	7	7	36	82	2	134	3.03	58.01
	GENTRY	10	6	35	60	1	112	6.05	67.71
	GRUNDY	12	34	51	169	2	268	4.86	108.63
	HARRISON	27	10	35	106	7	185	12.16	83.30
	HOLT	7	1	10	25	2	45	7.21	46.34
	JOHNSON	30	15	226	412	15	698	2.49	57.96
	LAFAYETTE	54	17	164	247	3	485	6.60	59.24
	LINN	28	17	72	128	0	245	8.87	77.63
	LIVINGSTON	15	9	60	152	12	248	4.51	74.50
	MERCER	5	6	10	31	0	52	5.19	54.00
	NODAWAY	31	13	75	158	5	282	7.27	66.15
	PETTIS	35	9	259	398	88	789	3.25	73.16
	PLATTE	28	29	320	529	46	952	1.27	43.28
PUTNAM	6	17	26	66	5	120	5.17	103.45	
RAY	10	9	180	267	43	509	1.70	86.76	
SALINE	29	20	184	266	6	505	5.37	93.59	
SULLIVAN	5	8	22	59	0	94	3.08	57.85	
WORTH	3	0	8	11	0	22	6.76	49.55	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>4,398</b>	<b>7,977</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>14,159</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>65.40</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	36	47	91	335	17	526	7.24	105.79
	AUDRAIN	36	57	136	325	28	582	5.65	91.38
	BOONE	166	116	543	1,197	450	2,472	4.85	72.17
	CALLAWAY	75	52	255	612	22	1,016	7.50	101.57
	CLARK	7	19	13	99	4	142	4.08	82.70
	COLE	47	77	322	682	47	1,175	2.62	65.51
	FRANKLIN	90	172	513	1,037	28	1,840	3.59	73.30
	GASCONADE	8	25	84	146	2	265	2.38	78.78
	HOWARD	18	15	34	114	2	183	8.26	84.02
	JEFFERSON	201	338	403	1,778	204	2,924	3.66	53.18
	KNOX	8	1	8	37	1	55	7.75	53.29
	LEWIS	14	13	40	108	2	177	5.85	73.90
	LINCOLN	87	80	283	754	16	1,220	5.91	82.85
	MACON	37	19	50	131	9	246	9.79	65.10
	MARION	109	35	80	433	20	677	15.82	98.29
	MONROE	8	5	28	80	2	123	3.88	59.68
	MONTGOMERY	14	9	95	130	7	255	4.91	89.38
	OSAGE	14	11	39	73	5	142	4.08	41.36
	PIKE	51	24	67	196	6	344	12.42	83.76
	RALLS	20	8	16	76	4	124	8.41	52.14
	RANDOLPH	76	29	110	383	17	615	12.93	104.61
	SCHUYLER	2	12	5	23	0	42	1.75	36.84
	SCOTLAND	16	5	13	27	3	64	11.75	46.99
	SHELBY	22	7	27	83	6	145	13.78	90.80
ST CHARLES	363	76	980	1,901	103	3,423	3.91	36.86	
WARREN	33	51	205	460	18	767	4.06	94.39	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,558</b>	<b>1,303</b>	<b>4,440</b>	<b>11,220</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>19,544</b>	<b>4.94</b>	<b>61.95</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	36	5	42	131	44	258	12.34	88.45
	BUTLER	122	106	335	580	15	1,158	12.24	116.14
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	75	19	200	529	197	1,020	4.52	61.45
	CARTER	18	7	45	73	2	145	11.88	95.71
	CRAWFORD	44	39	190	302	15	590	7.33	98.32
	DENT	56	59	107	226	8	456	15.33	124.86
	DUNKLIN	31	44	272	442	64	853	3.83	105.52

## Appendix B: FY 2016 Reported Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTAN- TIATED	UNSUB. PSI	UNSUB.	FAMILY ASSESS.	OTHER	TOTAL CHILDREN	SUBSTAN- TIATED CHILDREN PER 1,000	TOTAL CHILDREN PER 1,000
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	87	115	297	602	26	1,127	8.64	111.98
	IRON	15	25	81	104	1	226	6.24	94.05
	MADISON	24	11	107	138	25	305	8.19	104.06
	MARIES	19	25	29	65	12	150	8.82	69.64
	MISSISSIPPI	9	10	77	178	25	299	2.82	93.79
	NEW MADRID	34	44	129	237	18	462	7.53	102.35
	OREGON	48	27	92	96	4	267	19.79	110.06
	PEMISCOT	50	52	129	324	32	587	9.93	116.61
	PERRY	21	6	49	191	48	315	4.41	66.15
	PHELPS	71	92	216	449	51	879	7.25	89.77
	PULASKI	56	63	174	347	111	751	4.47	59.90
	REYNOLDS	9	11	34	68	9	131	5.87	85.51
	RIPLEY	19	39	94	182	6	340	5.75	102.81
	SCOTT	58	43	292	438	70	901	5.89	91.47
	SHANNON	6	12	56	88	2	164	3.04	83.21
	ST FRANCOIS	87	53	564	804	90	1,598	6.04	110.91
	STE GENEVIEVE	27	14	63	151	13	268	6.40	63.49
	STODDARD	62	18	113	329	20	542	9.08	79.34
	TEXAS	44	50	180	328	13	615	7.69	107.50
	WASHINGTON	34	27	179	284	19	543	5.61	89.56
WAYNE	50	45	94	156	16	361	17.82	128.65	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>1,061</b>	<b>4,240</b>	<b>7,842</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>15,311</b>	<b>7.33</b>	<b>92.65</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	43	35	214	369	4	665	4.98	76.97
	BARTON	12	17	82	134	5	250	3.73	77.78
	BATES	12	9	42	177	23	263	2.82	61.82
	BENTON	24	11	86	160	8	289	6.98	84.08
	CAMDEN	77	45	228	448	6	804	9.18	95.83
	CEDAR	24	8	124	222	18	396	7.26	119.71
	CHRISTIAN	60	88	340	734	28	1,250	2.83	59.00
	DADE	5	4	44	61	4	118	2.80	66.11
	DALLAS	35	53	90	285	6	469	8.40	112.50
	DOUGLAS	20	24	82	133	5	264	6.53	86.25
	GREENE	259	519	2,035	3,939	350	7,102	4.44	121.67
	HENRY	15	24	100	300	42	481	3.03	97.05
	HICKORY	16	4	32	76	6	134	9.61	80.48
	JASPER	74	161	892	1,366	74	2,567	2.44	84.78
	LACLEDE	105	80	170	588	24	967	11.79	108.57
	LAWRENCE	52	52	266	448	10	828	5.11	81.38
	MCDONALD	8	48	172	259	25	512	1.24	79.07
	MILLER	49	20	127	342	8	546	7.98	88.87
	MONITEAU	12	16	52	194	1	275	3.06	70.05
	MORGAN	55	42	70	223	2	392	12.13	86.46
	NEWTON	27	124	326	528	26	1,031	1.83	69.84
	OZARK	17	6	48	86	10	167	8.72	85.68
	POLK	53	56	241	572	12	934	6.91	121.84
	ST CLAIR	8	15	56	95	18	192	4.08	97.96
	STONE	48	53	150	346	11	608	7.96	100.80
	TANEY	89	144	291	729	64	1,317	7.79	115.25
VERNON	27	10	173	285	25	520	5.13	98.80	
WEBSTER	77	45	193	552	39	906	7.67	90.25	
WRIGHT	46	39	144	298	11	538	9.44	110.43	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>1,349</b>	<b>1,752</b>	<b>6,870</b>	<b>13,949</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>24,785</b>	<b>5.17</b>	<b>95.02</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	460	255	2,683	8,082	822	12,302	2.78	74.27
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>2,683</b>	<b>8,082</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>12,302</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>74.27</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	343	315	1,824	2,860	824	6,166	5.08	91.30
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	491	380	2,977	5,019	1,027	9,894	2.10	42.25
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>4,801</b>	<b>7,879</b>	<b>1,851</b>	<b>16,060</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>53.23</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	92	5	3,448	1	267	3,813	0.00	0.00
	OUT OF STATE	0	0	0	0	93	93	0.00	0.00
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3,448</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>3,906</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>6,302</b>	<b>5,603</b>	<b>30,880</b>	<b>56,950</b>	<b>6,332</b>	<b>106,067</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>74.41</b>

## Appendix C: FY 2016 Family Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SERVICES NEEDED		SERVICES NOT NEEDED		NON-COOPERATIVE		SERVICES NEEDED-LINKED INITIAL 45 DAYS		SERVICES NEEDED-DECLINED		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	0	0.0%	50	87.7%	4	7.0%	3	5.3%	0	0.0%	57
	ATCHISON	4	19.0%	12	57.1%	0	0.0%	3	14.3%	2	9.5%	21
	BUCHANAN	48	4.9%	834	84.7%	44	4.5%	47	4.8%	12	1.2%	985
	CALDWELL	8	15.7%	33	64.7%	0	0.0%	7	13.7%	3	5.9%	51
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	46	90.2%	0	0.0%	5	9.8%	0	0.0%	51
	CASS	35	6.5%	396	74.0%	13	2.4%	80	15.0%	11	2.1%	535
	CHARITON	5	10.0%	39	78.0%	0	0.0%	5	10.0%	1	2.0%	50
	CLAY	22	1.8%	957	77.7%	67	5.4%	165	13.4%	20	1.6%	1,231
	CLINTON	17	12.9%	92	69.7%	1	0.8%	15	11.4%	7	5.3%	132
	COOPER	4	4.3%	82	89.1%	3	3.3%	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	92
	DAVISS	7	11.3%	46	74.2%	0	0.0%	3	4.8%	6	9.7%	62
	DE KALB	6	10.7%	42	75.0%	0	0.0%	6	10.7%	2	3.6%	56
	GENTRY	4	11.1%	14	38.9%	2	5.6%	14	38.9%	2	5.6%	36
	GRUNDY	17	16.2%	47	44.8%	1	1.0%	37	35.2%	3	2.9%	105
	HARRISON	14	21.2%	24	36.4%	1	1.5%	24	36.4%	3	4.5%	66
	HOLT	0	0.0%	16	88.9%	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	18
	JOHNSON	25	8.7%	230	79.6%	5	1.7%	28	9.7%	1	0.3%	289
	LAFAYETTE	16	10.1%	132	83.0%	1	0.6%	4	2.5%	6	3.8%	159
	LINN	16	20.5%	55	70.5%	0	0.0%	5	6.4%	2	2.6%	78
	LIVINGSTON	10	10.4%	71	74.0%	1	1.0%	5	5.2%	9	9.4%	96
	MERCER	1	4.3%	9	39.1%	1	4.3%	10	43.5%	2	8.7%	23
NODAWAY	23	22.8%	54	53.5%	2	2.0%	22	21.8%	0	0.0%	101	
PETTIS	7	2.5%	254	92.0%	2	0.7%	8	2.9%	5	1.8%	276	
PLATTE	22	5.6%	298	76.2%	11	2.8%	39	10.0%	21	5.4%	391	
PUTNAM	5	14.7%	18	52.9%	0	0.0%	9	26.5%	2	5.9%	34	
RAY	3	1.7%	159	87.8%	4	2.2%	12	6.6%	3	1.7%	181	
SALINE	11	6.3%	154	88.5%	0	0.0%	6	3.4%	3	1.7%	174	
SULLIVAN	8	24.2%	22	66.7%	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	0	0.0%	33	
WORTH	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>4,193</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>5,390</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	36	17.0%	89	42.0%	7	3.3%	70	33.0%	10	4.7%	212
	AUDRAIN	25	11.2%	155	69.2%	10	4.5%	29	12.9%	5	2.2%	224
	BOONE	98	11.7%	635	75.8%	45	5.4%	33	3.9%	27	3.2%	838
	CALLAWAY	60	14.6%	298	72.3%	4	1.0%	39	9.5%	11	2.7%	412
	CLARK	7	11.9%	30	50.8%	2	3.4%	18	30.5%	2	3.4%	59
	COLE	62	12.7%	365	74.6%	9	1.8%	34	7.0%	19	3.9%	489
	FRANKLIN	106	15.8%	430	64.2%	22	3.3%	40	6.0%	72	10.7%	670
	GASCONADE	28	28.9%	64	66.0%	1	1.0%	3	3.1%	1	1.0%	97
	HOWARD	15	18.8%	50	62.5%	1	1.3%	13	16.3%	1	1.3%	80
	JEFFERSON	192	15.4%	706	56.5%	57	4.6%	208	16.7%	86	6.9%	1,249
	KNOX	2	7.4%	14	51.9%	1	3.7%	5	18.5%	5	18.5%	27
	LEWIS	15	23.1%	34	52.3%	0	0.0%	9	13.8%	7	10.8%	65
	LINCOLN	48	9.8%	356	72.4%	10	2.0%	63	12.8%	15	3.0%	492
	MACON	11	13.9%	49	62.0%	0	0.0%	18	22.8%	1	1.3%	79
	MARION	37	13.8%	204	76.1%	0	0.0%	22	8.2%	5	1.9%	268
	MONROE	5	9.6%	30	57.7%	0	0.0%	15	28.8%	2	3.8%	52
	MONTGOMERY	8	9.1%	65	73.9%	4	4.5%	9	10.2%	2	2.3%	88
	OSAGE	5	11.4%	36	81.8%	1	2.3%	1	2.3%	1	2.3%	44
	PIKE	12	8.9%	98	72.6%	5	3.7%	13	9.6%	7	5.2%	135
	RALLS	11	22.4%	31	63.3%	0	0.0%	7	14.3%	0	0.0%	49
	RANDOLPH	53	21.1%	167	66.5%	2	0.8%	19	7.6%	10	4.0%	251
SCHUYLER	2	11.8%	9	52.9%	0	0.0%	6	35.3%	0	0.0%	17	
SCOTLAND	2	11.8%	7	41.2%	0	0.0%	6	35.3%	2	11.8%	17	
SHELBY	12	22.2%	32	59.3%	0	0.0%	6	11.1%	4	7.4%	54	
ST CHARLES	110	7.7%	1,206	84.9%	56	3.9%	23	1.6%	25	1.8%	1,420	
WARREN	58	19.7%	189	64.1%	11	3.7%	24	8.1%	13	4.4%	295	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,020</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>5,349</b>	<b>69.6%</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>7,683</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	17	21.3%	53	66.3%	3	3.8%	4	5.0%	3	3.8%	80
	BUTLER	71	19.1%	194	52.2%	8	2.2%	83	22.3%	16	4.3%	372
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	98	29.0%	202	59.8%	17	5.0%	14	4.1%	7	2.1%	338
	CARTER	9	20.0%	28	62.2%	3	6.7%	5	11.1%	0	0.0%	45
	CRAWFORD	22	11.3%	146	74.9%	0	0.0%	16	8.2%	11	5.6%	195
	DENT	30	22.2%	78	57.8%	4	3.0%	5	3.7%	18	13.3%	135
	DUNKLIN	39	14.2%	212	77.4%	3	1.1%	10	3.6%	10	3.6%	274

## Appendix C: FY 2016 Family Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SERVICES NEEDED		SERVICES NOT NEEDED		NON-COOPERATIVE		SERVICES NEEDED-LINKED INITIAL 45 DAYS		SERVICES NEEDED-DECLINED		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	95	23.3%	246	60.4%	29	7.1%	29	7.1%	8	2.0%	407
	IRON	12	16.7%	53	73.6%	0	0.0%	3	4.2%	4	5.6%	72
	MADISON	6	6.5%	68	73.1%	1	1.1%	16	17.2%	2	2.2%	93
	MARIES	7	17.9%	23	59.0%	5	12.8%	1	2.6%	3	7.7%	39
	MISSISSIPPI	17	16.8%	73	72.3%	1	1.0%	7	6.9%	3	3.0%	101
	NEW MADRID	46	30.5%	101	66.9%	2	1.3%	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	151
	OREGON	14	23.7%	39	66.1%	2	3.4%	4	6.8%	0	0.0%	59
	PEMISCOT	46	24.1%	136	71.2%	1	0.5%	4	2.1%	4	2.1%	191
	PERRY	46	40.4%	57	50.0%	2	1.8%	9	7.9%	0	0.0%	114
	PHELPS	55	18.8%	169	57.9%	23	7.9%	31	10.6%	14	4.8%	292
	PULASKI	42	17.8%	130	55.1%	17	7.2%	33	14.0%	14	5.9%	236
	REYNOLDS	5	13.2%	30	78.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	7.9%	38
	RIPLEY	23	20.4%	65	57.5%	2	1.8%	19	16.8%	4	3.5%	113
	SCOTT	49	17.2%	207	72.6%	2	0.7%	24	8.4%	3	1.1%	285
	SHANNON	3	5.9%	38	74.5%	1	2.0%	8	15.7%	1	2.0%	51
	ST FRANCOIS	15	2.8%	416	78.9%	16	3.0%	68	12.9%	12	2.3%	527
	STE GENEVIEVE	3	3.3%	71	78.0%	5	5.5%	10	11.0%	2	2.2%	91
	STODDARD	73	35.3%	114	55.1%	2	1.0%	15	7.2%	3	1.4%	207
	TEXAS	27	12.9%	148	70.8%	5	2.4%	19	9.1%	10	4.8%	209
	WASHINGTON	6	3.3%	138	75.0%	13	7.1%	25	13.6%	2	1.1%	184
WAYNE	19	18.3%	68	65.4%	4	3.8%	8	7.7%	5	4.8%	104	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>3,303</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>5,003</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	29	12.7%	170	74.2%	2	0.9%	21	9.2%	7	3.1%	229
	BARTON	12	14.5%	59	71.1%	0	0.0%	10	12.0%	2	2.4%	83
	BATES	15	12.5%	88	73.3%	1	0.8%	10	8.3%	6	5.0%	120
	BENTON	5	4.6%	76	69.7%	1	0.9%	24	22.0%	3	2.8%	109
	CAMDEN	30	9.7%	239	77.1%	3	1.0%	20	6.5%	18	5.8%	310
	CEDAR	13	9.8%	112	84.2%	4	3.0%	1	0.8%	3	2.3%	133
	CHRISTIAN	71	13.8%	349	67.8%	20	3.9%	56	10.9%	19	3.7%	515
	DADE	9	21.4%	31	73.8%	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	42
	DALLAS	23	11.7%	120	61.2%	13	6.6%	19	9.7%	21	10.7%	196
	DOUGLAS	8	9.3%	64	74.4%	4	4.7%	4	4.7%	6	7.0%	86
	GREENE	261	9.4%	2,032	72.9%	85	3.1%	212	7.6%	196	7.0%	2,786
	HENRY	35	17.6%	144	72.4%	1	0.5%	12	6.0%	7	3.5%	199
	HICKORY	1	1.9%	36	67.9%	1	1.9%	6	11.3%	9	17.0%	53
	JASPER	177	18.6%	705	74.2%	10	1.1%	54	5.7%	4	0.4%	950
	LACLEDE	88	23.5%	214	57.1%	8	2.1%	23	6.1%	42	11.2%	375
	LAWRENCE	33	11.2%	243	82.4%	5	1.7%	12	4.1%	2	0.7%	295
	MCDONALD	18	10.8%	117	70.5%	3	1.8%	26	15.7%	2	1.2%	166
	MILLER	39	17.9%	167	76.6%	0	0.0%	7	3.2%	5	2.3%	218
	MONITEAU	14	11.7%	99	82.5%	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	2	1.7%	120
	MORGAN	47	29.6%	100	62.9%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	10	6.3%	159
	NEWTON	69	19.8%	202	57.9%	5	1.4%	63	18.1%	10	2.9%	349
	OZARK	3	4.9%	46	75.4%	2	3.3%	3	4.9%	7	11.5%	61
	POLK	45	12.0%	281	75.1%	16	4.3%	19	5.1%	13	3.5%	374
ST CLAIR	9	14.8%	40	65.6%	0	0.0%	8	13.1%	4	6.6%	61	
STONE	38	17.0%	166	74.1%	3	1.3%	12	5.4%	5	2.2%	224	
TANEY	81	16.3%	360	72.4%	12	2.4%	21	4.2%	23	4.6%	497	
VERNON	7	4.0%	155	89.6%	4	2.3%	3	1.7%	4	2.3%	173	
WEBSTER	21	6.4%	229	69.4%	14	4.2%	43	13.0%	23	7.0%	330	
WRIGHT	31	16.5%	115	61.2%	8	4.3%	13	6.9%	21	11.2%	188	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,232</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>6,759</b>	<b>71.9%</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>9,401</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	416	7.7%	4,151	76.4%	310	5.7%	495	9.1%	59	1.1%	5,431
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>4,151</b>	<b>76.4%</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>5,431</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	141	7.4%	1,409	74.0%	208	10.9%	84	4.4%	62	3.3%	1,904
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	279	7.8%	2,837	78.9%	232	6.4%	143	4.0%	106	2.9%	3,597
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>4,246</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>5,501</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>4,321</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>28,002</b>	<b>72.9%</b>	<b>1,563</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>1,324</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>38,410</b>

## Appendix D: FY 2016 Family Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SERVICES NEEDED		SERVICES NOT NEEDED		NON-COOPERATIVE		SERVICES NEEDED-LINKED INITIAL 45 DAYS		SERVICES NEEDED-DECLINED		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	0	0.0%	80	87.9%	5	5.5%	6	6.6%	0	0.0%	91
	ATCHISON	4	13.3%	19	63.3%	0	0.0%	5	16.7%	2	6.7%	30
	BUCHANAN	79	5.1%	1,292	83.6%	74	4.8%	83	5.4%	18	1.2%	1,546
	CALDWELL	12	16.4%	50	68.5%	0	0.0%	7	9.6%	4	5.5%	73
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	74	93.7%	0	0.0%	5	6.3%	0	0.0%	79
	CASS	48	6.6%	550	75.1%	15	2.0%	106	14.5%	13	1.8%	732
	CHARITON	9	10.8%	63	75.9%	0	0.0%	10	12.0%	1	1.2%	83
	CLAY	33	1.9%	1,331	76.9%	94	5.4%	233	13.5%	39	2.3%	1,730
	CLINTON	26	13.8%	129	68.3%	1	0.5%	22	11.6%	11	5.8%	189
	COOPER	6	4.3%	126	90.6%	4	2.9%	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	139
	DAVISS	22	18.5%	79	66.4%	0	0.0%	5	4.2%	13	10.9%	119
	DE KALB	10	12.2%	58	70.7%	0	0.0%	7	8.5%	7	8.5%	82
	GENTRY	9	15.0%	26	43.3%	2	3.3%	21	35.0%	2	3.3%	60
	GRUNDY	35	20.7%	75	44.4%	1	0.6%	53	31.4%	5	3.0%	169
	HARRISON	25	23.6%	40	37.7%	1	0.9%	35	33.0%	5	4.7%	106
	HOLT	0	0.0%	21	84.0%	1	4.0%	3	12.0%	0	0.0%	25
	JOHNSON	43	10.4%	319	77.4%	7	1.7%	42	10.2%	1	0.2%	412
	LAFAYETTE	26	10.5%	207	83.8%	2	0.8%	5	2.0%	7	2.8%	247
	LINN	32	25.0%	87	68.0%	0	0.0%	7	5.5%	2	1.6%	128
	LIVINGSTON	15	9.9%	114	75.0%	2	1.3%	8	5.3%	13	8.6%	152
	MERCER	1	3.2%	14	45.2%	1	3.2%	13	41.9%	2	6.5%	31
	NODAWAY	34	21.5%	87	55.1%	3	1.9%	34	21.5%	0	0.0%	158
	PETTIS	8	2.0%	363	91.2%	4	1.0%	14	3.5%	9	2.3%	398
	PLATTE	31	5.9%	397	75.0%	14	2.6%	54	10.2%	33	6.2%	529
	PUTNAM	8	12.1%	33	50.0%	0	0.0%	15	22.7%	10	15.2%	66
	RAY	5	1.9%	234	87.6%	4	1.5%	20	7.5%	4	1.5%	267
	SALINE	19	7.1%	233	87.6%	0	0.0%	8	3.0%	6	2.3%	266
SULLIVAN	24	40.7%	30	50.8%	0	0.0%	5	8.5%	0	0.0%	59	
WORTH	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>6,142</b>	<b>77.0%</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>7,977</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	58	17.3%	146	43.6%	14	4.2%	102	30.4%	15	4.5%	335
	AUDRAIN	39	12.0%	224	68.9%	14	4.3%	41	12.6%	7	2.2%	325
	BOONE	163	13.6%	869	72.6%	63	5.3%	48	4.0%	54	4.5%	1,197
	CALLAWAY	92	15.0%	439	71.7%	6	1.0%	55	9.0%	20	3.3%	612
	CLARK	9	9.1%	55	55.6%	2	2.0%	28	28.3%	5	5.1%	99
	COLE	87	12.8%	519	76.1%	10	1.5%	38	5.6%	28	4.1%	682
	FRANKLIN	191	18.4%	643	62.0%	34	3.3%	55	5.3%	114	11.0%	1,037
	GASCONADE	39	26.7%	99	67.8%	1	0.7%	5	3.4%	2	1.4%	146
	HOWARD	24	21.1%	72	63.2%	1	0.9%	16	14.0%	1	0.9%	114
	JEFFERSON	285	16.0%	991	55.7%	82	4.6%	290	16.3%	130	7.3%	1,778
	KNOX	3	8.1%	21	56.8%	1	2.7%	6	16.2%	6	16.2%	37
	LEWIS	25	23.1%	49	45.4%	0	0.0%	19	17.6%	15	13.9%	108
	LINCOLN	83	11.0%	541	71.8%	15	2.0%	92	12.2%	23	3.1%	754
	MACON	29	22.1%	78	59.5%	0	0.0%	20	15.3%	4	3.1%	131
	MARION	56	12.9%	328	75.8%	0	0.0%	39	9.0%	10	2.3%	433
	MONROE	5	6.3%	50	62.5%	0	0.0%	22	27.5%	3	3.8%	80
	MONTGOMERY	13	10.0%	100	76.9%	5	3.8%	10	7.7%	2	1.5%	130
	OSAGE	10	13.7%	59	80.8%	2	2.7%	1	1.4%	1	1.4%	73
	PIKE	26	13.3%	136	69.4%	6	3.1%	17	8.7%	11	5.6%	196
	RALLS	15	19.7%	48	63.2%	0	0.0%	13	17.1%	0	0.0%	76
	RANDOLPH	89	23.2%	258	67.4%	2	0.5%	24	6.3%	10	2.6%	383
	SCHUYLER	2	8.7%	11	47.8%	0	0.0%	10	43.5%	0	0.0%	23
	SCOTLAND	4	14.8%	10	37.0%	0	0.0%	8	29.6%	5	18.5%	27
	SHELBY	24	28.9%	46	55.4%	0	0.0%	7	8.4%	6	7.2%	83
	ST CHARLES	157	8.3%	1,604	84.4%	69	3.6%	27	1.4%	44	2.3%	1,901
	WARREN	99	21.5%	279	60.7%	22	4.8%	46	10.0%	14	3.0%	460
		<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,627</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>7,675</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>4.7%</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	32	24.4%	81	61.8%	6	4.6%	5	3.8%	7	5.3%	131
	BUTLER	101	17.4%	311	53.6%	13	2.2%	132	22.8%	23	4.0%	580
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	184	34.8%	286	54.1%	25	4.7%	21	4.0%	13	2.5%	529
	CARTER	15	20.5%	42	57.5%	8	11.0%	8	11.0%	0	0.0%	73
	CRAWFORD	40	13.2%	229	75.8%	0	0.0%	19	6.3%	14	4.6%	302
	DENT	58	25.7%	124	54.9%	6	2.7%	9	4.0%	29	12.8%	226
	DUNKLIN	77	17.4%	331	74.9%	4	0.9%	13	2.9%	17	3.8%	442



## Appendix D: FY 2016 Family Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SERVICES NEEDED		SERVICES NOT NEEDED		NON-COOPERATIVE		SERVICES NEEDED-LINKED INITIAL 45 DAYS		SERVICES NEEDED-DECLINED		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	151	25.1%	345	57.3%	44	7.3%	50	8.3%	12	2.0%	602
	IRON	21	20.2%	74	71.2%	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	6	5.8%	104
	MADISON	11	8.0%	103	74.6%	1	0.7%	22	15.9%	1	0.7%	138
	MARIES	16	24.6%	35	53.8%	10	15.4%	1	1.5%	3	4.6%	65
	MISSISSIPPI	34	19.1%	132	74.2%	1	0.6%	8	4.5%	3	1.7%	178
	NEW MADRID	84	35.4%	149	62.9%	2	0.8%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	237
	OREGON	28	29.2%	61	63.5%	3	3.1%	4	4.2%	0	0.0%	96
	PEMISCOT	90	27.8%	220	67.9%	2	0.6%	5	1.5%	7	2.2%	324
	PERRY	81	42.4%	94	49.2%	2	1.0%	14	7.3%	0	0.0%	191
	PHELPS	89	19.8%	249	55.5%	44	9.8%	42	9.4%	25	5.6%	449
	PULASKI	71	20.5%	183	52.7%	27	7.8%	46	13.3%	20	5.8%	347
	REYNOLDS	17	25.0%	45	66.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	8.8%	68
	RIPLEY	43	23.6%	107	58.8%	3	1.6%	23	12.6%	6	3.3%	182
	SCOTT	77	17.6%	317	72.4%	2	0.5%	35	8.0%	7	1.6%	438
	SHANNON	10	11.4%	63	71.6%	2	2.3%	12	13.6%	1	1.1%	88
	ST FRANCOIS	21	2.6%	626	77.9%	26	3.2%	108	13.4%	23	2.9%	804
	STE GENEVIEVE	6	4.0%	119	78.8%	8	5.3%	15	9.9%	3	2.0%	151
	STODDARD	121	36.8%	169	51.4%	5	1.5%	25	7.6%	9	2.7%	329
	TEXAS	43	13.1%	233	71.0%	7	2.1%	27	8.2%	18	5.5%	328
	WASHINGTON	13	4.6%	203	71.5%	22	7.7%	42	14.8%	4	1.4%	284
WAYNE	39	25.0%	95	60.9%	6	3.8%	10	6.4%	6	3.8%	156	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,573</b>	<b>20.1%</b>	<b>5,026</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>7,842</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	37	10.0%	286	77.5%	2	0.5%	32	8.7%	12	3.3%	369
	BARTON	23	17.2%	95	70.9%	0	0.0%	14	10.4%	2	1.5%	134
	BATES	23	13.0%	128	72.3%	1	0.6%	14	7.9%	11	6.2%	177
	BENTON	9	5.6%	114	71.3%	1	0.6%	32	20.0%	4	2.5%	160
	CAMDEN	43	9.6%	342	76.3%	3	0.7%	27	6.0%	33	7.4%	448
	CEDAR	31	14.0%	178	80.2%	6	2.7%	3	1.4%	4	1.8%	222
	CHRISTIAN	103	14.0%	495	67.4%	33	4.5%	75	10.2%	28	3.8%	734
	DADE	14	23.0%	45	73.8%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	61
	DALLAS	34	11.9%	182	63.9%	16	5.6%	24	8.4%	29	10.2%	285
	DOUGLAS	12	9.0%	100	75.2%	4	3.0%	7	5.3%	10	7.5%	133
	GREENE	371	9.4%	2,799	71.1%	126	3.2%	335	8.5%	308	7.8%	3,939
	HENRY	52	17.3%	220	73.3%	4	1.3%	16	5.3%	8	2.7%	300
	HICKORY	1	1.3%	50	65.8%	1	1.3%	6	7.9%	18	23.7%	76
	JASPER	264	19.3%	1,014	74.2%	12	0.9%	70	5.1%	6	0.4%	1,366
	LACLEDE	140	23.8%	329	56.0%	15	2.6%	31	5.3%	73	12.4%	588
	LAWRENCE	54	12.1%	369	82.4%	10	2.2%	13	2.9%	2	0.4%	448
	MCDONALD	28	10.8%	186	71.8%	5	1.9%	38	14.7%	2	0.8%	259
	MILLER	59	17.3%	256	74.9%	0	0.0%	12	3.5%	15	4.4%	342
	MONITEAU	22	11.3%	160	82.5%	4	2.1%	4	2.1%	4	2.1%	194
	MORGAN	69	30.9%	138	61.9%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	14	6.3%	223
	NEWTON	109	20.6%	313	59.3%	7	1.3%	83	15.7%	16	3.0%	528
	OZARK	3	3.5%	66	76.7%	5	5.8%	3	3.5%	9	10.5%	86
	POLK	88	15.4%	410	71.7%	25	4.4%	28	4.9%	21	3.7%	572
	ST CLAIR	12	12.6%	69	72.6%	0	0.0%	10	10.5%	4	4.2%	95
	STONE	62	17.9%	253	73.1%	3	0.9%	20	5.8%	8	2.3%	346
	TANEY	129	17.7%	513	70.4%	19	2.6%	33	4.5%	35	4.8%	729
VERNON	12	4.2%	252	88.4%	7	2.5%	7	2.5%	7	2.5%	285	
WEBSTER	44	8.0%	371	67.2%	24	4.3%	74	13.4%	39	7.1%	552	
WRIGHT	43	14.4%	187	62.8%	11	3.7%	18	6.0%	39	13.1%	298	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,891</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>9,920</b>	<b>71.1%</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>1,030</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>13,949</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	695	8.6%	6,144	76.0%	442	5.5%	700	8.7%	101	1.2%	8,082
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>6,144</b>	<b>76.0%</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>8,082</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	227	7.9%	2,101	73.5%	303	10.6%	130	4.5%	99	3.5%	2,860
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	407	8.1%	3,954	78.8%	312	6.2%	181	3.6%	165	3.3%	5,019
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>634</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>6,055</b>	<b>76.8%</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>7,879</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>6,984</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>40,963</b>	<b>71.9%</b>	<b>2,267</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>4,608</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>56,950</b>

## Appendix E: FY 2016 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL INCIDENTS
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	ANDREW	2	20.0%	5	50.0%	2	20.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	10
	ATCHISON	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	BUCHANAN	30	37.5%	34	42.5%	3	3.8%	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	17	21.3%	80
	CALDWELL	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
	CARROLL	4	28.6%	5	35.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	35.7%	14
	CASS	10	20.8%	22	45.8%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	33.3%	48
	CHARITON	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	CLAY	45	33.1%	55	40.4%	3	2.2%	3	2.2%	0	0.0%	39	28.7%	136
	CLINTON	5	29.4%	9	52.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	23.5%	17
	COOPER	2	18.2%	7	63.6%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11
	DAVISS	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	DE KALB	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	GENTRY	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	GRUNDY	5	45.5%	4	36.4%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	HARRISON	5	38.5%	10	76.9%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13
	HOLT	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	JOHNSON	5	21.7%	5	21.7%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	69.6%	23
	LAFAYETTE	14	35.0%	17	42.5%	1	2.5%	1	2.5%	0	0.0%	12	30.0%	40
	LINN	1	5.0%	15	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	20
	LIVINGSTON	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9
	MERCER	1	33.3%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	3
	NODAWAY	4	22.2%	11	61.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	22.2%	18
	PETTIS	8	33.3%	8	33.3%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	1	4.2%	10	41.7%	24
	PLATTE	6	26.1%	10	43.5%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	39.1%	23
PUTNAM	3	100.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	
RAY	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	9	
SALINE	9	42.9%	11	52.4%	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	21	
SULLIVAN	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5	
WORTH	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>29.7%</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>575</b>
<b>NORTHEAST</b>	ADAIR	6	28.6%	12	57.1%	1	4.8%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	21
	AUDRAIN	8	29.6%	9	33.3%	4	14.8%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	10	37.0%	27
	BOONE	36	31.6%	65	57.0%	6	5.3%	4	3.5%	0	0.0%	15	13.2%	114
	CALLAWAY	11	21.2%	29	55.8%	1	1.9%	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	12	23.1%	52
	CLARK	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
	COLE	9	30.0%	11	36.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	12	40.0%	30
	FRANKLIN	14	24.1%	31	53.4%	1	1.7%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	15	25.9%	58
	GASCONADE	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6
	HOWARD	3	27.3%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	JEFFERSON	39	27.1%	76	52.8%	8	5.6%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	37	25.7%	144
	KNOX	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	3
	LEWIS	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	6
	LINCOLN	19	32.2%	27	45.8%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	23.7%	59
	MACON	6	26.1%	12	52.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	30.4%	23
	MARION	12	18.2%	44	66.7%	6	9.1%	2	3.0%	4	6.1%	6	9.1%	66
	MONROE	1	16.7%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	MONTGOMERY	3	30.0%	6	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	10
	OSAGE	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	PIKE	8	25.0%	25	78.1%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	5	15.6%	32
	RALLS	2	16.7%	8	66.7%	4	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	12
	RANDOLPH	11	22.9%	29	60.4%	2	4.2%	3	6.3%	0	0.0%	11	22.9%	48
	SCHUYLER	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	SCOTLAND	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	SHELBY	3	21.4%	8	57.1%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	4	28.6%	14
ST CHARLES	44	19.3%	144	63.2%	18	7.9%	13	5.7%	5	2.2%	46	20.2%	228	
WARREN	6	24.0%	15	60.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	24.0%	25	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>1,018</b>
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	BOLLINGER	2	11.1%	10	55.6%	1	5.6%	2	11.1%	0	0.0%	6	33.3%	18
	BUTLER	15	20.8%	46	63.9%	17	23.6%	5	6.9%	1	1.4%	10	13.9%	72
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	14	29.2%	32	66.7%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	14.6%	48
	CARTER	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	CRAWFORD	3	11.5%	22	84.6%	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.8%	26
	DENT	5	11.9%	25	59.5%	2	4.8%	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	14	33.3%	42
	DUNKLIN	7	31.8%	9	40.9%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	22

## Appendix E: FY 2016 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL INCIDENTS
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	HOWELL	26	40.6%	34	53.1%	3	4.7%	3	4.7%	1	1.6%	10	15.6%	64
	IRON	3	23.1%	7	53.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	30.8%	13
	MADISON	8	42.1%	8	42.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	26.3%	19
	MARIES	2	16.7%	7	58.3%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	12
	MISSISSIPPI	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	NEW MADRID	6	26.1%	13	56.5%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%	23
	OREGON	8	33.3%	12	50.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	5	20.8%	24
	PEMISCOT	15	44.1%	14	41.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	17.6%	34
	PERRY	2	13.3%	8	53.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	15
	PHELPS	11	26.2%	24	57.1%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	14	33.3%	42
	PULASKI	10	25.0%	26	65.0%	2	5.0%	2	5.0%	1	2.5%	7	17.5%	40
	REYNOLDS	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	RIPLEY	4	26.7%	8	53.3%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	15
	SCOTT	8	18.6%	26	60.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	23.3%	43
	SHANNON	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	ST FRANCOIS	18	26.9%	33	49.3%	1	1.5%	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	24	35.8%	67
	STE GENEVIEVE	7	36.8%	9	47.4%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	3	15.8%	19
	STODDARD	8	20.5%	19	48.7%	2	5.1%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	10	25.6%	39
	TEXAS	7	28.0%	13	52.0%	3	12.0%	1	4.0%	1	4.0%	5	20.0%	25
	WASHINGTON	10	37.0%	13	48.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	25.9%	27
WAYNE	7	29.2%	15	62.5%	0	0.0%	2	8.3%	1	4.2%	6	25.0%	24	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>55.5%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>802</b>
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	BARRY	5	16.7%	15	50.0%	1	3.3%	1	3.3%	1	3.3%	10	33.3%	30
	BARTON	2	22.2%	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9
	BATES	5	50.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	10
	BENTON	3	15.8%	7	36.8%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	42.1%	19
	CAMDEN	10	17.9%	27	48.2%	4	7.1%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	18	32.1%	56
	CEDAR	3	21.4%	6	42.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	42.9%	14
	CHRISTIAN	10	21.3%	20	42.6%	2	4.3%	2	4.3%	1	2.1%	20	42.6%	47
	DADE	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	DALLAS	4	16.0%	10	40.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	11	44.0%	25
	DOUGLAS	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	12
	GREENE	59	33.9%	83	47.7%	17	9.8%	3	1.7%	2	1.1%	45	25.9%	174
	HENRY	4	26.7%	7	46.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	15
	HICKORY	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10
	JASPER	17	27.0%	20	31.7%	3	4.8%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	28	44.4%	63
	LACLEDE	10	15.6%	45	70.3%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%	5	7.8%	13	20.3%	64
	LAWRENCE	4	13.3%	20	66.7%	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	23.3%	30
	MCDONALD	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	MILLER	11	32.4%	22	64.7%	2	5.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	34
	MONITEAU	1	10.0%	8	80.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	10
	MORGAN	7	20.0%	20	57.1%	2	5.7%	3	8.6%	1	2.9%	5	14.3%	35
	NEWTON	8	36.4%	4	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%	9	40.9%	22
	OZARK	3	27.3%	6	54.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11
	POLK	10	37.0%	18	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	27
ST CLAIR	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	
STONE	7	24.1%	15	51.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	8	27.6%	29	
TANEY	17	29.8%	38	66.7%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	8	14.0%	57	
VERNON	4	20.0%	9	45.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	40.0%	20	
WEBSTER	16	33.3%	21	43.8%	3	6.3%	4	8.3%	1	2.1%	11	22.9%	48	
WRIGHT	6	17.6%	20	58.8%	5	14.7%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	34	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	<b>921</b>
<b>KANSAS CITY</b>	JACKSON	129	34.8%	112	47.6%	10	7.5%	6	5.9%	0	1.6%	140	31.7%	371
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>34.8%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>371</b>
<b>ST. LOUIS</b>	ST LOUIS CITY	89	33.0%	102	37.8%	9	3.3%	16	5.9%	4	1.5%	81	30.0%	270
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	130	39.3%	148	44.7%	17	5.1%	12	3.6%	2	0.6%	89	26.9%	331
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>41.6%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>601</b>
<b>OTHER</b>	OUT HOME INV	19	32.8%	19	31.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	38.6%	58
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>32.8%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>32.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>36.2%</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,236</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>2,143</b>	<b>49.3%</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1,135</b>	<b>26.1%</b>	<b>4,346</b>

A substantiated incident may have up to 6 categories of abuse/neglect. An incident will be counted for each type of abuse/neglect while the total column is a distinct count of substantiated incidents.

## Appendix F: FY 2016 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL CHILDREN
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	2	14.3%	9	64.3%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	4	28.6%	14
	ATCHISON	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	BUCHANAN	31	31.0%	50	50.0%	4	4.0%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	18	18.0%	100
	CALDWELL	1	8.3%	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	12
	CARROLL	4	26.7%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	15
	CASS	15	21.1%	38	53.5%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	25.4%	71
	CHARITON	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	CLAY	47	25.5%	96	52.2%	5	2.7%	3	1.6%	0	0.0%	45	24.5%	184
	CLINTON	6	22.2%	18	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	14.8%	27
	COOPER	2	14.3%	9	64.3%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	14
	DAVISS	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	DE KALB	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	7
	GENTRY	1	10.0%	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10
	GRUNDY	5	41.7%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	12
	HARRISON	9	33.3%	18	66.7%	4	14.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27
	HOLT	0	0.0%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
	JOHNSON	6	20.0%	9	30.0%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	60.0%	30
	LAFAYETTE	15	27.8%	29	53.7%	1	1.9%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	13	24.1%	54
	LINN	1	3.6%	24	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	10.7%	28
	LIVINGSTON	4	26.7%	9	60.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15
	MERCER	1	20.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	5
	NODAWAY	6	19.4%	24	77.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	12.9%	31
	PETTIS	8	22.9%	18	51.4%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	10	28.6%	35
	PLATTE	6	21.4%	15	53.6%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	32.1%	28
	PUTNAM	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	RAY	3	30.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
SALINE	10	34.5%	18	62.1%	0	0.0%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	2	6.9%	29	
SULLIVAN	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5	
WORTH	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	3	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>24.1%</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>797</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	6	16.7%	23	63.9%	2	5.6%	2	5.6%	0	0.0%	5	13.9%	36
	AUDRAIN	12	33.3%	12	33.3%	4	11.1%	2	5.6%	0	0.0%	11	30.6%	36
	BOONE	37	22.3%	108	65.1%	13	7.8%	4	2.4%	0	0.0%	16	9.6%	166
	CALLAWAY	11	14.7%	53	70.7%	3	4.0%	2	2.7%	2	2.7%	12	16.0%	75
	CLARK	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
	COLE	11	23.4%	19	40.4%	0	0.0%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	19	40.4%	47
	FRANKLIN	16	17.8%	59	65.6%	1	1.1%	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	16	17.8%	90
	GASCONADE	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	HOWARD	3	16.7%	12	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18
	JEFFERSON	46	22.9%	123	61.2%	11	5.5%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	39	19.4%	201
	KNOX	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	8
	LEWIS	0	0.0%	10	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	14
	LINCOLN	29	33.3%	44	50.6%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	16.1%	87
	MACON	8	21.6%	23	62.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	18.9%	37
	MARION	12	11.0%	83	76.1%	6	5.5%	2	1.8%	6	5.5%	8	7.3%	109
	MONROE	1	12.5%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	MONTGOMERY	3	21.4%	10	71.4%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	14
	OSAGE	2	14.3%	11	78.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	14
	PIKE	9	17.6%	41	80.4%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.9%	5	9.8%	51
	RALLS	2	10.0%	13	65.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	20
	RANDOLPH	17	22.4%	50	65.8%	3	3.9%	5	6.6%	0	0.0%	11	14.5%	76
	SCHUYLER	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	SCOTLAND	0	0.0%	16	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16
	SHELBY	4	18.2%	16	72.7%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	4	18.2%	22
	ST CHARLES	47	12.9%	263	72.5%	31	8.5%	13	3.6%	8	2.2%	49	13.5%	363
	WARREN	6	18.2%	22	66.7%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	18.2%	33
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>1,030</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>1,558</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	2	5.6%	26	72.2%	2	5.6%	3	8.3%	0	0.0%	6	16.7%	36
	BUTLER	16	13.1%	88	72.1%	29	23.8%	5	4.1%	1	0.8%	11	9.0%	122
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	14	18.7%	56	74.7%	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	9.3%	75
	CARTER	10	55.6%	10	55.6%	3	16.7%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	4	22.2%	18
	CRAWFORD	5	11.4%	38	86.4%	0	0.0%	2	4.5%	0	0.0%	1	2.3%	44
	DENT	6	10.7%	38	67.9%	2	3.6%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	17	30.4%	56
	DUNKLIN	7	22.6%	18	58.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	5	16.1%	31

## **Appendix F: FY 2016 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect**

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL CHILDREN
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	29	33.3%	49	56.3%	5	5.7%	3	3.4%	1	1.1%	11	12.6%	87
	IRON	3	20.0%	9	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	26.7%	15
	MADISON	8	33.3%	12	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	20.8%	24
	MARIES	2	10.5%	13	68.4%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	19
	MISSISSIPPI	2	22.2%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	9
	NEW MADRID	8	23.5%	22	64.7%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	8.8%	34
	OREGON	12	25.0%	35	72.9%	0	0.0%	6	12.5%	0	0.0%	5	10.4%	48
	PEMISCOT	16	32.0%	27	54.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	16.0%	50
	PERRY	2	9.5%	14	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	4	19.0%	21
	PHELPS	16	22.5%	48	67.6%	1	1.4%	4	5.6%	2	2.8%	14	19.7%	71
	PULASKI	10	17.9%	42	75.0%	4	7.1%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	7	12.5%	56
	REYNOLDS	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	66.7%	9
	RIPLEY	4	21.1%	12	63.2%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	19
	SCOTT	8	13.8%	41	70.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	17.2%	58
	SHANNON	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	ST FRANCOIS	19	21.8%	53	60.9%	1	1.1%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	24	27.6%	87
	STE GENEVIEVE	7	25.9%	17	63.0%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	3	11.1%	27
	STODDARD	8	12.9%	42	67.7%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	10	16.1%	62
	TEXAS	11	25.0%	25	56.8%	7	15.9%	1	2.3%	3	6.8%	5	11.4%	44
	WASHINGTON	11	32.4%	20	58.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	20.6%	34
WAYNE	9	18.0%	38	76.0%	0	0.0%	6	12.0%	1	2.0%	7	14.0%	50	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>801</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>1,212</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	5	11.6%	25	58.1%	4	9.3%	1	2.3%	1	2.3%	11	25.6%	43
	BARTON	2	16.7%	7	58.3%	4	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12
	BATES	6	50.0%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	12
	BENTON	5	20.8%	10	41.7%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	41.7%	24
	CAMDEN	12	15.6%	43	55.8%	6	7.8%	2	2.6%	0	0.0%	22	28.6%	77
	CEDAR	3	12.5%	16	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	25.0%	24
	CHRISTIAN	12	20.0%	28	46.7%	2	3.3%	3	5.0%	1	1.7%	25	41.7%	60
	DADE	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	DALLAS	5	14.3%	17	48.6%	4	11.4%	0	0.0%	2	5.7%	13	37.1%	35
	DOUGLAS	1	5.0%	14	70.0%	4	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	20.0%	20
	GREENE	65	25.1%	137	52.9%	20	7.7%	5	1.9%	2	0.8%	55	21.2%	259
	HENRY	4	26.7%	7	46.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	15
	HICKORY	2	12.5%	14	87.5%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16
	JASPER	17	23.0%	30	40.5%	3	4.1%	3	4.1%	0	0.0%	29	39.2%	74
	LACLEDE	15	14.3%	82	78.1%	5	4.8%	5	4.8%	5	4.8%	15	14.3%	105
	LAWRENCE	5	9.6%	36	69.2%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	15.4%	52
	MCDONALD	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	MILLER	12	24.5%	36	73.5%	2	4.1%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	5	10.2%	49
	MONITEAU	2	16.7%	10	83.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	12
	MORGAN	8	14.5%	37	67.3%	2	3.6%	3	5.5%	1	1.8%	5	9.1%	55
	NEWTON	8	29.6%	7	25.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	11	40.7%	27
	OZARK	3	17.6%	12	70.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	17
	POLK	10	18.9%	44	83.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	7.5%	53
	ST CLAIR	2	25.0%	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8
	STONE	8	16.7%	32	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	9	18.8%	48
TANEY	26	29.2%	63	70.8%	3	3.4%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	10	11.2%	89	
VERNON	4	14.8%	16	59.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	29.6%	27	
WEBSTER	26	33.8%	38	49.4%	10	13.0%	4	5.2%	2	2.6%	14	18.2%	77	
WRIGHT	6	13.0%	27	58.7%	10	21.7%	3	6.5%	0	0.0%	4	8.7%	46	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>59.5%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>1,349</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	132	28.7%	182	39.6%	14	3.0%	6	1.3%	0	0.0%	155	33.7%	460
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>39.6%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>460</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	97	28.3%	167	48.7%	11	3.2%	20	5.8%	5	1.5%	85	24.8%	343
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	136	27.7%	248	50.5%	31	6.3%	15	3.1%	3	0.6%	97	19.8%	491
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>27.9%</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>834</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	24	26.1%	47	51.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	23.9%	92
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26.1%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,393</b>	<b>22.1%</b>	<b>3,723</b>	<b>59.1%</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>6,302</b>

A substantiated child may have up to 6 categories of abuse/neglect. A child will be counted for each type of abuse/neglect while the total column is a distinct count of substantiated children.

## Appendix G: Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year

	COUNTY	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	ANDREW	0	0	0	0	0
	ATCHISON	0	0	0	0	0
	BUCHANAN	1	1	1	3	1
	CALDWELL	0	0	0	0	0
	CARROLL	0	0	0	0	0
	CASS	1	0	2	0	0
	CHARITON	0	0	0	0	1
	CLAY	0	2	1	0	2
	CLINTON	1	0	0	0	0
	COOPER	1	0	0	0	0
	DAVIESS	0	0	0	0	0
	DE KALB	0	0	0	0	0
	GENTRY	0	0	0	0	0
	GRUNDY	0	0	0	0	0
	HARRISON	1	1	0	0	0
	HOLT	0	0	0	0	0
	JOHNSON	0	1	1	0	1
	LAFAYETTE	0	1	0	0	0
	LINN	0	0	0	0	0
	LIVINGSTON	0	0	0	0	0
	MERCER	0	0	0	0	0
	NODAWAY	0	0	0	1	0
	PETTIS	0	1	0	0	0
	PLATTE	1	0	0	0	0
	PUTNAM	0	0	0	0	0
	RAY	0	1	0	0	0
	SALINE	0	1	0	0	0
SULLIVAN	0	0	0	0	0	
WORTH	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>NORTHEAST</b>	ADAIR	0	0	0	0	0
	AUDRAIN	0	0	0	0	0
	BOONE	0	0	1	0	0
	CALLAWAY	1	1	0	1	0
	CLARK	0	0	0	0	0
	COLE	0	0	0	0	0
	FRANKLIN	3	2	0	0	1
	GASCONADE	0	0	0	0	0
	HOWARD	0	0	0	0	0
	JEFFERSON	1	1	1	4	2
	KNOX	0	0	0	0	0
	LEWIS	0	0	0	0	0
	LINCOLN	2	1	0	0	1
	MACON	0	0	0	0	0
	MARION	0	0	0	0	0
	MONROE	0	0	0	0	0
	MONTGOMERY	0	0	0	0	0
	OSAGE	0	0	0	0	0
	PIKE	0	0	0	0	0
	RALLS	0	0	0	0	0
	RANDOLPH	0	1	0	0	0
	SCHUYLER	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTLAND	0	0	0	0	0
SHELBY	0	0	0	0	0	
ST. CHARLES	1	2	2	1	1	
WARREN	1	1	1	1	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	BOLLINGER	0	0	0	0	0
	BUTLER	0	0	0	0	0
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	0	0	0	0	0
	CARTER	0	0	0	0	0
	CRAWFORD	0	0	0	0	1
	DENT	0	0	0	0	1
	DUNKLIN	0	0	1	0	0

## Appendix G: Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year

	COUNTY	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	HOWELL	0	0	1	1	0
	IRON	1	0	0	0	0
	MADISON	0	0	0	0	0
	MARIES	0	0	0	1	0
	MISSISSIPPI	0	0	0	0	0
	NEW MADRID	0	1	0	0	0
	OREGON	0	0	0	0	0
	PEMISCOT	0	0	0	1	0
	PERRY	0	0	0	0	0
	PHELPS	0	1	0	0	0
	PULASKI	0	1	0	1	0
	REYNOLDS	0	2	0	0	0
	RIPLEY	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTT	0	0	0	0	0
	SHANNON	0	0	0	0	0
	ST. FRANCOIS	0	0	3	2	0
	STE. GENEVIEVE	0	0	1	1	0
	STODDARD	0	0	0	0	2
	TEXAS	0	0	0	0	0
	WASHINGTON	0	0	1	0	0
WAYNE	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	BARRY	0	0	0	0	0
	BARTON	1	0	1	0	0
	BATES	0	0	0	0	0
	BENTON	0	1	0	0	0
	CAMDEN	0	0	0	1	0
	CEDAR	0	0	0	0	0
	CHRISTIAN	0	1	0	0	0
	DADE	0	0	0	0	0
	DALLAS	1	0	0	0	0
	DOUGLAS	0	0	0	1	0
	GREENE	1	1	4	1	1
	HENRY	0	0	0	2	0
	HICKORY	0	0	0	0	1
	JASPER	2	1	0	0	1
	LACLEDE	0	0	0	1	0
	LAWRENCE	0	0	0	0	0
	MCDONALD	1	0	1	0	0
	MILLER	1	1	0	0	0
	MONITEAU	0	0	0	0	0
	MORGAN	1	1	0	0	0
	NEWTON	2	1	1	0	0
	OZARK	0	0	0	1	1
	POLK	0	0	0	0	0
	ST CLAIR	1	0	0	0	1
	STONE	0	0	0	0	1
	TANEY	0	0	0	1	0
	VERNON	0	0	0	1	0
WEBSTER	0	0	1	0	1	
WRIGHT	1	1	0	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>KANSAS CITY</b>	JACKSON	3	5	4	6	5
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ST. LOUIS</b>	ST. LOUIS CITY	3	2	4	0	1
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	4	3	1	4	8
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>OTHER</b>	OUT HOME INV	0	0	1	1	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>38</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>36</b>

## Appendix H: FY 2016 Juvenile Reports

REGION	COUNTY	REPORTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	7	0.2%
	ATCHISON	2	0.1%
	BUCHANAN	100	2.8%
	CALDWELL	5	0.1%
	CARROLL	4	0.1%
	CASS	54	1.5%
	CHARITON	3	0.1%
	CLAY	127	3.5%
	CLINTON	8	0.2%
	COOPER	7	0.2%
	DAVISS	4	0.1%
	DE KALB	3	0.1%
	GENTRY	2	0.1%
	GRUNDY	3	0.1%
	HARRISON	3	0.1%
	HOLT	2	0.1%
	JOHNSON	22	0.6%
	LAFAYETTE	16	0.4%
	LINN	4	0.1%
	LIVINGSTON	7	0.2%
	MERCER	3	0.1%
	NODAWAY	6	0.2%
	PETTIS	15	0.4%
	PLATTE	29	0.8%
	PUTNAM	3	0.1%
	RAY	9	0.3%
SALINE	9	0.3%	
SULLIVAN	0	0.0%	
WORTH	1	0.0%	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>12.8%</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	19	0.5%
	AUDRAIN	24	0.7%
	BOONE	92	2.6%
	CALLAWAY	24	0.7%
	CLARK	10	0.3%
	COLE	35	1.0%
	FRANKLIN	55	1.5%
	GASCONADE	5	0.1%
	HOWARD	14	0.4%
	JEFFERSON	88	2.5%
	KNOX	4	0.1%
	LEWIS	10	0.3%
	LINCOLN	53	1.5%
	MACON	3	0.1%
	MARION	14	0.4%
	MONROE	3	0.1%
	MONTGOMERY	10	0.3%
	OSAGE	5	0.1%
	PIKE	7	0.2%
	RALLS	5	0.1%
	RANDOLPH	16	0.4%
	SCHUYLER	2	0.1%
	SCOTLAND	1	0.0%
	SHELBY	3	0.1%
	ST CHARLES	140	3.9%
	WARREN	17	0.5%
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>18.4%</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	6	0.2%
	BUTLER	24	0.7%
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	25	0.7%
	CARTER	7	0.2%
	CRAWFORD	12	0.3%
	DENT	10	0.3%
	DUNKLIN	7	0.2%



## Appendix H: FY 2016 Juvenile Reports

REGION	COUNTY	REPORTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	50	1.4%
	IRON	2	0.1%
	MADISON	18	0.5%
	MARIES	5	0.1%
	MISSISSIPPI	14	0.4%
	NEW MADRID	9	0.3%
	OREGON	9	0.3%
	PEMISCOT	9	0.3%
	PERRY	7	0.2%
	PHELPS	35	1.0%
	PULASKI	29	0.8%
	REYNOLDS	4	0.1%
	RIPLEY	12	0.3%
	SCOTT	30	0.8%
	SHANNON	4	0.1%
	ST FRANCOIS	35	1.0%
	STE GENEVIEVE	9	0.3%
	STODDARD	15	0.4%
	TEXAS	13	0.4%
	WASHINGTON	22	0.6%
WAYNE	13	0.4%	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>12.1%</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	23	0.6%
	BARTON	3	0.1%
	BATES	3	0.1%
	BENTON	11	0.3%
	CAMDEN	38	1.1%
	CEDAR	12	0.3%
	CHRISTIAN	46	1.3%
	DADE	6	0.2%
	DALLAS	13	0.4%
	DOUGLAS	7	0.2%
	GREENE	304	8.5%
	HENRY	10	0.3%
	HICKORY	0	0.0%
	JASPER	88	2.5%
	LACLEDE	24	0.7%
	LAWRENCE	28	0.8%
	MCDONALD	7	0.2%
	MILLER	12	0.3%
	MONITEAU	7	0.2%
	MORGAN	12	0.3%
	NEWTON	21	0.6%
	OZARK	4	0.1%
	POLK	37	1.0%
	ST CLAIR	11	0.3%
	STONE	16	0.4%
	TANEY	46	1.3%
	VERNON	11	0.3%
	WEBSTER	15	0.4%
WRIGHT	9	0.3%	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>824</b>	<b>23.0%</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	482	13.4%
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>13.4%</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	270	7.5%
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	430	12.0%
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>19.5%</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	27	0.8%
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>3,585</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

---

## **Appendix I. Legal and Methodological Definitions**

---

### **Legal**

The Missouri Child Abuse Law, Section 210.110 RSMo defines:

**Abuse** as any physical injury, sexual abuse, or emotional abuse inflicted on a child other than by accidental means by those responsible for the child's care, custody, and control, except that discipline including spanking, administered in a reasonable manner, shall not be construed to be abuse.

**Neglect** as failure to provide, by those responsible for the care, custody, and control of the child, the proper or necessary support, education as required by law, nutrition or medical, surgical, or any other care necessary for the child's well-being.

**Care, custody and control** of the child includes, but is not limited to, the parents or guardian of a child, other members of the child's household, or those exercising supervision over a child for any part of a twenty-four hour day. Those responsible for the care, custody and control shall also include any adult who, based on their relationship to the parents of the child, members of the child's household or the family, has access to the child.

**Investigation** is the collection of physical and verbal evidence to determine if a child has been abused or neglected.

**Family assessment and services** provides for a prompt assessment of a child and their family when the child has been reported to the CD as a victim of abuse or neglect by a person responsible for that child's care, custody or control. Family assessments include the provision of community-based services to reduce the risk of abuse and neglect and to support the family. This approach takes the place of the traditional investigation.

**RSMo 210.115. Reports of abuse or neglect, who shall make** – When any physician, medical examiner, coroner, dentist, chiropractor, optometrist, podiatrist, resident, intern, nurse, hospital or clinic personnel that are engaged in the examination, care, treatment, or research of persons, and any other health practitioner, psychologist, mental health professional, social worker, day care center worker or other child care worker, juvenile officer, probation or parole officer, jail or detention center personnel, teacher, principal or other school official, minister as provided by section 352.400, RSMo, peace officer or law enforcement official, or other person with responsibility for the care of children, has reasonable cause to suspect that a child has been or may be subjected to abuse or neglect or observes a child being subjected to conditions or circumstances which would reasonably result in abuse or neglect, that person shall immediately report or cause a report to be made to the division in accordance with the provisions of sections 210.109 to 210.183.

**RSMo 352.400** - Christian Science practitioners were added to the definition of ministers with regard to the individuals required to report incidents of suspected child abuse/neglect. Minister is defined as "any person while practicing as a minister of the gospel, clergy person, priest, rabbi, Christian Science practitioner, or other person serving in a similar capacity for any religious organization who is responsible for or who has supervisory authority over one who is responsible for the care, custody, and control of a child or has access to a child", effective August 28, 2003.

---

## Appendix I. Legal and Methodological Definitions

---

### Statute Changes/Modifications

#### HB 1092 (FN4666-02) Children's Issues

- *Section 21.771 – Joint Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N)* – This bill adds an additional task to the Committee's duties. The Committee shall make recommendations on how to improve abuse and neglect proceedings, including examining the role of the judge, the children's division, the juvenile officer, the guardian ad litem, and the foster parents.
- *Section 37.710 – Office of Child Advocate* – This bill gives the OCA the authority to file pleadings to intervene on behalf of a child at the appropriate judicial level using the resources of the Office of the Attorney General.
- *Sections 210.145, 210.152, and 210.183 – Child Abuse and Neglect Investigations* – This bill extends the amount of time the Children's Division (CD) has to complete child abuse and neglect investigations and the amount of time the Children's Division has to provide the alleged perpetrator with written notification of the Children's Division's determination.
- *Section 210.160 – Guardians ad Litem* – In cases where the alleged perpetrator is aggrieved by a decision of the Child Abuse and Neglect Board and has sought de novo judicial review in the circuit court, the judge, either *sua sponte* (on his or her own accord) or upon motion of a party, may appoint a guardian ad litem to appear for and represent an abused or neglected child involved in the proceedings.
- *Subsection 210.183.1 – Written Notice to Perpetrators* – This subsection changes the wording in the required written notice to an alleged perpetrator describing the investigation process to reflect the timeframe extensions made in Subsection 210.14.15.
- *Section 431.056 – Contracting by Minors (Automobile Insurance)* – This subsection expands the conditions of consent by a minor by adding a parent committing an act of domestic violence as defined in section 455.010 against a minor can be considered implied consent to the minor's emancipation. This bill further allows a minor who is 16 yrs or age or older and who is in the legal custody of the Children's Division to contract for the purchase of automobile insurance with the consent of the Children's Division or the juvenile court.
- *Section 1 – Foster parents Granted Legal Standing* – this section grants foster parent's legal standing to fully participate in all court hearings pertaining to a child in their care.

#### SB 530 (FN4301-07) Drug Use and Termination of Parental Rights

- *Section 211.447.5* – existing state statute outlines several grounds for the termination of parental rights, including:
  1. abandonment;
  2. abuse or neglect;
  3. the child has been under juvenile court jurisdiction for more than one year and there is little likelihood that the child can be returned to the home;
  4. the parent has been found guilty of certain felony crimes involving children;
  5. the father's rights can be terminated when the child was conceived as a result of rape; or
  6. the parent is unfit to be a party to the parent/child relationship because of a consistent pattern of child abuse or drug abuse.

---

## **Appendix I. Legal and Methodological Definitions**

---

This bill amends subdivision (6) above by specifying the circumstances which it is presumed a parent is considered unfit to be a party to the parent/child relationship. These circumstances include the mother testing positive for drugs or over the legal limit of alcohol at the time of a child's birth or a newborn testing positive for drugs or alcohol at the time of birth and the mother has a previously adjudicated, abused or neglected child or has previously failed to complete treatment services through a family centered services case. Another provision is that within a three year period prior to adjudication termination, the parent has pled guilty to or been convicted of a felony drug offense involving cocaine, heroin or methamphetamines and the mother has a previously adjudicated, abused or neglected child or has previously failed to complete treatment services through a family centered services case. The language for terminations for the above reasons is permissive in that termination of parental rights may (or may not) be filed, and should ultimately be based on the best interest of the child as well as the federal requirements for filing.

### **SB 869 (FN 5745-04T) Child Care Facilities, CHIPS, & Shared Leave for Foster and Adoptive Parents**

- *Section 21.771 – Joint Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect* – This legislation adds an additional duty to the committee's charge; i.e., the committee is to "make recommendations on how to improve abuse and neglect proceedings including examining the role of the judge, children's division, the juvenile officer, the guardian ad litem, and the foster parents."
- *Section 37.710 – Office of Child Advocate* – This legislation will give OCA a stronger voice in court proceedings to advocate for abused or neglected children.
- *Section 105.271 – Leave Sharing Program for Foster Parents* – Under current law, adoptive parents who are employed by the state or its political subdivision may take leave for the purpose of arranging for an adopted child's placement or care. This bill establishes the same treatment for foster parents.
- *Section 210.145, 210.152, and 210.183 – Child Abuse and Neglect Investigations* – This bill extends the amount time the Children's Division (CD) has to complete child abuse and neglect investigations and the amount of time the Children's Division has to provide the alleged perpetrator with written notification of the Children's Division's determination.
- *Section 210.160 – Guardians ad Litem* – This section allows a judge on his or her own motion, or upon a motion of any party, to appoint a guardian ad litem to appear for and represent an abused or neglected child involved in proceedings arising from judicial review of a decision of a Child Abuse and Neglect Review Board.
- *Section 211.171 – Foster parents Granted Legal Standing* – Grants foster parents' legal standing to fully participate in all court hearings pertaining to a child in their care.

---

## **Appendix I. Legal and Methodological Definitions**

---

### **Operational**

At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion.

The following are operational definitions for **Investigative** conclusions:

**Substantiated:** A finding that abuse/neglect has occurred or is occurring as a result of the observation of visible signs, physical and/or credible verbal evidence provided to the Children's Service Worker by the child, perpetrator or witnesses in accordance with the definitions of abuse/neglect. This includes cases which are adjudicated by the courts and those with preponderance of evidence.

**Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated:** A finding that insufficient visible signs, physical and/or credible evidence exist, but where the Children's Service Worker determines that indicators are present which, if unresolved, could potentially contribute to child abuse/neglect.

**Unsubstantiated:** A finding that insufficient physical or credible verbal evidence exists and where few or no indicators are identified and the Children's Service worker has not identified a specific threat exists for the child.

The following are definitions for **Family Assessment** conclusions:

**Services Needed:** The family has an identified need for services. CD will continue to work with the family after the assessment is completed and will continue providing services for some period of time.

**Services Needed-Linked Initial 45 Days:** The family has an identified need for community services. The identified services were linked with the family during the 45-day family assessment process. CD will not continue working with the family when the family assessment process is completed. The Children's Service Worker should contact referral providers to verify that the family is receiving services.

**Services Needed-Family Declined:** The Children's Service Worker has identified a service that may be beneficial to the family; however, the family declined to receive the services. The child's safety has been assessed, and there is no evidence that warrants court intervention.

**Services Not Needed:** The family does not have an identified need for additional services. Families may be receiving services prior to the date of the hotline. Services Not Needed is used only when the family does not have additional service needs.

---

## **Appendix I. Legal and Methodological Definitions**

---

**Non-cooperative/Child Safe:** Enough information has been obtained to ensure that the child is safe; however, the family refuses to participate in the family assessment process and the allegations do not warrant a co-investigation with law enforcement or court involvement.

For a small number of reports, the definitions on the previous page are not applicable. Other conclusions for either investigations or assessments include **Unable to Locate, Inappropriate Report, Located Out of State, Home Schooling, and School Investigation by School Board (Substantiated, Unsubstantiated, Unresolved)**.

### **Methodological**

The following are technical definitions used in the computations of the statistics throughout this report:

**Reported incident:** An allegation of child abuse/neglect made to the hotline which meets the legal definitions for abuse/neglect and for care, custody, and control. A reported incident may involve more than one child and more than one alleged perpetrator. The terms "report," "incident" and "reported incident" are used interchangeably throughout this report.

**Incident conclusion:** The Children's Service Worker assigns a conclusion for each child and for each alleged perpetrator involved in an incident. If at least one child is substantiated, the incident is considered to be substantiated.

**Incident category of abuse/neglect:** Up to fifty findings of abuse/neglect can be assigned to each substantiated child. Each incident may have up to six categories of abuse/neglect because each child may be substantiated for different types of abuse/neglect. For incidents involving more than one child, each category of abuse/neglect is counted once if at least one child was substantiated for that category.

**Reported child:** A child named in a reported incident of child abuse/neglect. A child may be reported more than one time during the year, and unless otherwise indicated, counts of children are duplicated in this report.

**Child conclusion:** The Children's Service Worker assigns a conclusion for each child involved in an incident. For example, some children in the report may be substantiated while others may be unsubstantiated.

**Child category of abuse/neglect:** Each substantiated child may be assigned up to six categories of abuse/neglect.

**Alleged perpetrator:** A person named as the perpetrator in a reported incident of child abuse/neglect. An alleged perpetrator may be involved in more than one incident during the year. Unless otherwise indicated, counts of alleged perpetrators are duplicated in this report.

---

## ***Appendix I. Legal and Methodological Definitions***

---

**Alleged perpetrator conclusion:** The Children's Service Worker assigns a conclusion to each alleged perpetrator involved in an incident. One perpetrator in a report may be substantiated while another may be unsubstantiated.

**Substantiated perpetrator:** When a conclusion of an investigation in which the Division has made a determination of child abuse or neglect by a Preponderance of Evidence in accordance with the law and the allegations against the perpetrator are determined substantiated.

**Juvenile reports:** As of August 28, 2015 the Children's Division utilizes a family assessment and services approach when reports are received containing concerns of children with problem sexual behaviors. A child with problem sexual behavior is defined as 'any person, under fourteen years of age, who has allegedly committed sexual abuse against another child'. These reports are screened by the Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline Unit when any child under the age of fourteen (14) is alleged to have committed an act of sexual abuse against any person under the age of eighteen (18). Non-caretaker referrals, investigations, or traditional assessments may all meet criteria for a juvenile report.