



**Child Abuse and Neglect
Annual Report
Fiscal Year 2022**

OUR MISSION

*Empower Missourians
to live safe, healthy, &
productive lives*





MICHAEL L. PARSON, GOVERNOR • ROBERT J. KNOPELL, DIRECTOR
DARRELL MISSEY, 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 Reader:

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 2022, July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022. It includes the substantiation status of the reports and the number of children and families served by a program within the Missouri Children's Division.

Any questions about the report should be directed to the Children's Division within the Department of Social Services.



AUXILIARY AIDS AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST TO INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

TDD / TTY: 800-735-2966

RELAY MISSOURI: 711

Missouri Department of Social Services is an Equal Opportunity Employer/Program.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Reports	2
Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline	2
Reporters	3
Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations	5
Observed Family Characteristics	7
Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion	9
Assessment Conclusions	11
Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion.....	11
Demographics of Assessment Children.....	13
Substantiated Conclusions	15
Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect	15
Observed Family Characteristics	18
Demographics of Substantiated Children	19
Child Abuse/Neglect Fatalities	20
Perpetrators	23
Perpetrator Demographics	23
Observed Perpetrator Characteristics	24
Prevention/Treatment Services	25
Family-Centered Services (FCS)	25
Intensive In-Home Services (IIS)	26
Out-of-Home Placement	26
Child Care	26
Crisis Nurseries	26
Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board	27
Calls from Reporters	27
Newborn Crisis Assessments and Services	27
Appendices	29
A. Reported Incidents by Conclusion	30
B. Reported Children by Conclusion	32
C. Assessment Conclusion Incidents by Assessment Type	34
D. Assessment Conclusion Children by Assessment Type	36
E. Family Assessment Incidents by Conclusion	38
F. Family Assessment Children by Conclusion	40
G. Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect	42
H. Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect	44
I. Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year	46
J. 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, 2021 through June 30, 2022. As a result of pending investigations or changes in conclusions, the data is prone to change. The data reported is current as of August 2023.

The Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline Unit (CANHU) accepts confidential reports of suspected child abuse, neglect, or exploitation. 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>.

The CANHU is operated year-round on a 24 hours per day, seven days per week basis. It was staffed by 50 full-time and 11 part-time trained and experienced Children's Service Workers during the fiscal year. 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 58,000 reported incidents that involved over 80,000 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 J 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 an 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 2022, thirty-seven percent (36.9%) of reports taken by the CANHU were assigned as investigation and fifty-eight percent (58.3%) as family assessments. Five percent (4.8%) were assigned as juvenile assessments, where a child under the age of fourteen is alleged to have committed an act of sexual abuse against a person under the age of eighteen.

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.

Unless there is good cause, Children's Service Workers complete investigations and family assessments within 45 days of report, and juvenile and differential response assessments within 90 days. At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion. Of the 80,529 children with reports in FY 2022, 4,244 (5.3%), were substantiated as abused/neglected.

Reports

Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline

Over the past fiscal year, the CANHU received 133,617* hotline calls. Of those reports, 58,242 were classified as Investigations or Assessments and were completed by the Children’s Division. A total of 80,529 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
2018	73,924		106,090	
2019	64,920	-12.2%	89,738	-15.4%
2020	55,853	-14.0%	78,328	-12.7%
2021	54,515	-2.4%	77,108	-1.6%
2022	58,242	6.8%	80,529	4.4%

*Data provided by CANHU; excludes calls classified as Prior Checks or Other.

** 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.

Comparing months, April had the highest number, and July the least, of both reported incidents and children. During FY 2022, an average of 4,854 reports involving 6,711 children were made each month.


FY 2022 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 2022, a total of 65,493 children had been involved in one or more reports. The majority of children (82.8%) had been reported only once; thirteen percent (13.1%) were involved in two reports. Four percent (4.1%) were involved in more than two reports.

Number of Reported Incidents Per Child during FY 2022




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. The majority of reporters during FY 2022 were mandated reporters.

Type of Child/Abuse Neglect Reporters during FY 2022



Reports

Mandated reporters were more often in the occupations of peace officer/law enforcement official, school principal/official or social worker.

Reporters of Child Abuse/Neglect during FY 2022 by Occupation

	Number	Percent
Permissive	15,014	20.9%
Principal/Other School Staff	10,961	15.2%
Peace officer or law enforcement official	10,282	14.3%
Social worker	9,737	13.5%
Mental health professional	6,301	8.8%
Teacher	4,764	6.6%
Nurse	3,806	5.3%
Other person with responsibility for care of children	2,523	3.5%
Children's Division Worker	1,432	2.0%
Unknown	1,277	1.8%
Physician	873	1.2%
Other health practitioner	709	1.0%
Juvenile Officer	674	0.9%
Day care center or other childcare worker	627	0.9%
Foster parents	492	0.7%
Other hospital/clinic personnel	435	0.6%
Psychologist	307	0.4%
Intern	210	0.3%
Probation or Parole Officer	134	0.2%
Minister	132	0.2%
Resident	116	0.2%
Medical examiner	110	0.2%
Coroner	50	0.1%
Volunteer personnel of community service program	43	0.1%
Dentist /dental hygienist	42	0.1%
Jail detention personnel and volunteers	37	0.1%
Chiropractor	4	0.0%
Optometrist	4	0.0%
Podiatrist	2	0.0%

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


Child Protection System: 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. Its primary focus is to protect children from abuse/neglect in the least disruptive and intrusive way while recognizing 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.

A child abuse/neglect report is screened to determine the appropriate intervention method at the time the report is received by the CANHU. 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 or a Juvenile Assessment for reports of children with problem sexual behavior. The main purpose of an assessment is to determine the child's safety and the family's need for services. Both investigated families and those who receive the assessment response receive prompt and effective delivery of services in order to address their needs.

Of the reports received in FY 2022, fifty-eight percent (58.4%) were initially assigned as Family Assessments, five percent (4.9%) as Juvenile Assessments, and thirty-seven percent (36.8%) as Investigations by the CANHU.

FY 2022 Reports by Type of Response




After the Children's Division worker has made contact with the reported family, or when law enforcement is involved and calls a worker into the field, a report initially assigned as an assessment may change its track to an investigation, or an investigation may be changed to an assessment track.

In May 2018, CD policy was changed to allow for reports to be tracked as Differential Response (DR) assessments. DR assessments are assessments that have been determined by the family, CD worker and supervisor as needing more intensive work with the family, and traditionally go beyond the 45 days to complete. Its purpose is to provide the family with needed resources, support and services to further promote safety and well-being of the family during the assessment period.

Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

Over half of reports (58.8%) were tracked as Family Assessments and over one-third (36.1%) as Investigations. Less than one percent (0.2%) of reports were changed to Differential Response after assignment.



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.

Child Protection System: 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.

A third of reported families tracked as an assessment had adequate living conditions (30.0%) and extended family support systems (25.7%). Following are the top 25 observed characteristics.

Characteristics of Families Involved in Family Assessments during FY 2021

	Number	Percent
Adequate Living Conditions	11,139	30.0%
Extended Family Support System	9,550	25.7%
Community/Cultural Support	7,341	19.7%
Single Parent Household	6,558	17.6%
Amenable to Services	5,243	14.1%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	5,028	13.5%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	4,952	13.3%
Problem Solving Skills	4,209	11.3%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	3,547	9.5%
No History of Violence	2,799	7.5%
Manages Finances Well	1,986	5.3%
Good Physical/Mental Health	1,669	4.5%
Stable Marriage	1,532	4.1%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	871	2.3%
Domestic Violence	834	2.2%
Lack of Parenting Skills	713	1.9%
Positive Childhood Experiences	645	1.7%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	460	1.2%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	440	1.2%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	405	1.1%
Marital Problems	389	1.0%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	378	1.0%
Crowded Living Conditions	359	1.0%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	346	0.9%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	342	0.9%

Percent is the percentage of 37,191 reports tracked as Family Assessments, Juvenile Assessments or Differential Response. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each Family Assessment.

Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

The characteristics of reported families involved in investigations are similar to families assessed. Around a quarter of families had adequate living conditions (27.8%) and extended family support systems (25.7%). Below are the top 25 observed characteristics.

Characteristics of Families Involved in Investigations during FY 2022

	Number	Percent
Adequate Living Conditions	5,861	27.8%
Extended Family Support System	5,403	25.7%
Community/Cultural Support	3,754	17.8%
Single Parent Household	3,264	15.5%
Amenable to Services	3,016	14.3%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	2,423	11.5%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	2,414	11.5%
Problem Solving Skills	1,967	9.3%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	1,861	8.8%
No History of Violence	1,287	6.1%
Manages Finances Well	1,181	5.6%
Good Physical/Mental Health	914	4.3%
Stable Marriage	862	4.1%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	729	3.5%
Lack of Parenting Skills	682	3.2%
Domestic Violence	579	2.8%
Positive Childhood Experiences	361	1.7%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	312	1.5%
Dangerous Living Conditions	274	1.3%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	263	1.2%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	257	1.2%
Marital Problems	241	1.1%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	237	1.1%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	232	1.1%
Crowded Living Conditions	201	1.0%

Percent is the percentage of 21,051 reports tracked as Investigations. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each Family Assessment.

Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

Unless there is good cause, investigations/assessments should be closed within 45 days. Juvenile assessments and Differential Response assessments are usually completed within 90 days. Upon completion of the investigation, 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.

Conclusions categorized as Other include unable to locate, inappropriate report, located out of state, home schooling, already investigated, and school investigation by school board. See Appendix J for further definition.

Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion

Five percent of incidents (5.3%) and of children (5.3%) were concluded as substantiated, consistent with past years.

Reported Incidents of CA/N by Conclusion


Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Family, Juvenile, DR Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2018	4,097	5.5%	2,136	2.9%	17,535	23.7%	46,848	63.4%	3,308	4.5%	73,924
2019	3,819	5.9%	1,677	2.6%	15,207	23.4%	40,775	62.8%	3,442	5.3%	64,920
2020	3,466	6.2%	1,563	2.8%	13,730	24.6%	34,890	62.5%	2,204	3.9%	55,853
2021	3,473	6.4%	1,512	2.8%	14,138	25.9%	32,993	60.5%	2,399	4.4%	54,515
2022	3,111	5.3%	1,198	2.1%	14,957	25.7%	35,325	60.7%	3,651	6.3%	58,242

Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

Reported Children of CA/N by Conclusion

Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Family, Juvenile, DR Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2018	5,633	5.3%	3,126	2.9%	23,836	22.5%	68,673	64.7%	4,822	4.5%	106,090
2019	5,225	5.8%	2,453	2.7%	19,889	22.2%	57,303	63.9%	4,868	5.4%	89,738
2020	4,736	6.0%	2,253	2.9%	18,155	23.2%	49,964	63.8%	3,220	4.1%	78,328
2021	4,688	6.1%	2,168	2.8%	18,997	24.6%	47,613	61.7%	3,642	4.7%	77,108
2022	4,244	5.3%	1,772	2.2%	19,455	24.2%	49,792	61.8%	5,266	6.5%	80,529

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;
- Assessment: Agency Responded Refer to FCS or AC Case Opened, Agency Responded No Concerns Found, Family Uncooperative Child Safe, Agency Responded Services Provided, Family Declined Services Child Safe, and Agency Responded Concerns Addressed;
- Other - Unable to Locate, Inappropriate Report, Located Out of State, Already Investigated, and Home Schooling

Assessment Conclusions

The majority of CANHU reports were concluded as assessments. 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.

Family Assessments, Juvenile Assessments and Differential Response are concluded as the agency responded and either provided services, addressed concerns, or no concerns were found; or where the child is safe but the family refused services or refused to participate in the assessment process.

Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion

The majority of Family Assessments and Juvenile Assessments were concluded as concerns addressed or no concerns found. Most Differential Response Assessments were concluded as concerns addressed but had a notable percentage of providing services or referred to Family Centered Services (FCS)/Alternative Care (AC) case opened.

Reported Incidents by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2022


Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Differential Response		Total Assessments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	2,029	6.2%	48	1.8%	14	13.5%	2,091	5.9%
Agency Responded Services Provided	697	2.1%	41	1.6%	16	15.4%	754	2.1%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	17,261	52.9%	1,745	66.7%	52	50.0%	19,058	54.0%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	10,710	32.8%	673	25.7%	9	8.7%	11,392	32.2%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	390	1.2%	16	0.6%	8	7.7%	414	1.2%
Family Uncooperative, Child Safe	1,518	4.7%	93	3.6%	5	4.8%	1,616	4.6%
Total Assessment Conclusions	32,605	100.0%	2,616	100.0%	104	100.0%	35,325	100.0%

Reported Children by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2022

Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Differential Response		Total Children	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	3,201	6.9%	60	2.0%	22	13.0%	3,283	6.6%
Agency Responded Services Provided	1,039	2.2%	46	1.5%	24	14.2%	1,109	2.2%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	24,323	52.2%	2,030	66.7%	87	51.5%	26,440	53.1%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	15,199	32.6%	780	25.6%	12	7.1%	15,991	32.1%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	590	1.3%	21	0.7%	14	8.3%	625	1.3%
Family Uncooperative, Child Safe	2,226	4.8%	108	3.5%	10	5.9%	2,344	4.7%
Total Assessment Conclusions	46,578	100.0%	3,045	100.0%	169	100.0%	49,792	100.0%

Assessment Conclusions

Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2022



For reports concluded as assessments during FY 2022, half were found to have concerns addressed (54.0%) and a third found no concerns (32.2%). Six percent (5.9%) resulted in opening a Family Centered Services (FCS) case or an Alternative Care (AC) case for 3,283 children, and two percent (2.1%) resulted in providing services for 1,109 children.

Reported Incidents by Assessment Conclusion

Year	Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened		Agency Responded Services Provided		Agency Responded Concerns Addressed		Agency Responded No Concerns Found		Family Declined Services Child Safe		Family Uncooperative Child Safe		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2018	3,916	8.5%	3,587	7.8%	NA		34,836	75.7%	1,204	2.6%	2,478	5.4%	46,021
2019	2,508	6.2%	2,054	5.0%	16,686	40.9%	16,379	40.2%	784	1.9%	2,364	5.8%	40,775
2020	2,621	7.5%	1,294	3.7%	16,318	46.8%	12,311	35.3%	523	1.5%	1,823	5.2%	34,890
2021	2,435	7.4%	1,043	3.2%	16,455	49.9%	11,137	33.8%	557	1.7%	1,366	4.1%	32,993
2022	2,091	5.9%	754	2.1%	19,058	54.0%	11,392	32.2%	414	1.2%	1,616	4.6%	35,325

Assessment Conclusions


Reported Children by Assessment Conclusion

Year	Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened		Agency Responded Services Provided		Agency Responded Concerns Addressed		Agency Responded No Concerns Found		Family Declined Services Child Safe		Family Uncooperative Child Safe		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2018	6,379	9.5%	5,312	7.9%	NA		50,271	74.5%	1,876	2.8%	3,629	5.4%	67,467
2019	3,939	11.5%	2,957	8.6%	23,086		22,804	66.6%	1,177	3.4%	3,340	9.8%	34,217
2020	4,164	8.3%	1,989	4.0%	22,806	45.6%	17,605	35.2%	800	1.6%	2,600	5.2%	49,964
2021	3,844	8.1%	1,542	3.2%	23,321	49.0%	15,923	33.4%	847	1.8%	2,136	4.5%	47,613
2022	3,283	6.6%	1,109	2.2%	26,440	53.1%	15,991	32.1%	625	1.3%	2,344	4.7%	49,792

Demographics of Assessment Children

During the year, 49,792 children were involved in reports concluded as assessments. More Families with children age five and younger were referred to Family Centered Services (FCS) or had an Alternative Case (AC) opened with Children’s Division.

Children of Assessment Conclusions during FY 2022 by Age



Assessment Conclusions

Children involved in reports concluded as assessments were split between males (49.1%) and females (50.8%). Nearly three-fourths were white (69.9%) and sixteen percent (16.5%) were black. Nine percent (9.4%) were Hispanic.

Assessment Concluded Children during FY 2022


	Assessments		Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened		Agency Responded Services Provided		Family Declined Services Needed Child Safe	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	49,792	100.0%	3,283	100.0%	1,109	100.0%	625	100.0%
Age								
< 1	2,065	4.1%	207	6.3%	61	5.5%	35	5.6%
1	2,141	4.3%	222	6.8%	53	4.8%	30	4.8%
2	2,358	4.7%	213	6.5%	70	6.3%	26	4.2%
3	2,425	4.9%	191	5.8%	48	4.3%	35	5.6%
4	2,564	5.1%	168	5.1%	43	3.9%	29	4.6%
5	3,010	6.0%	194	5.9%	70	6.3%	34	5.4%
6	3,351	6.7%	195	5.9%	73	6.6%	21	3.4%
7	3,278	6.6%	190	5.8%	82	7.4%	39	6.2%
8	3,290	6.6%	177	5.4%	70	6.3%	40	6.4%
9	3,148	6.3%	185	5.6%	61	5.5%	41	6.6%
10	2,950	5.9%	181	5.5%	60	5.4%	40	6.4%
11	2,825	5.7%	152	4.6%	61	5.5%	44	7.0%
12	3,136	6.3%	180	5.5%	62	5.6%	39	6.2%
13	3,302	6.6%	206	6.3%	74	6.7%	39	6.2%
14	3,010	6.0%	211	6.4%	81	7.3%	40	6.4%
15	2,765	5.6%	185	5.6%	60	5.4%	42	6.7%
16	2,521	5.1%	158	4.8%	52	4.7%	33	5.3%
17	1,529	3.1%	68	2.1%	26	2.3%	18	2.9%
Not available	124	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%
Gender								
Male	24,434	49.1%	1,619	49.3%	522	47.1%	318	50.9%
Female	25,285	50.8%	1,664	50.7%	586	52.8%	307	49.1%
Not available	73	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Race								
White	34,792	69.9%	2,510	76.5%	805	72.6%	429	68.6%
Black	8,192	16.5%	363	11.1%	160	14.4%	116	18.6%
Other/unknown	6,808	13.7%	410	12.5%	144	13.0%	80	12.8%
Hispanic Origin								
Hispanic	4,659	9.4%	256	7.8%	100	9.0%	67	10.7%
Not Hispanic	39,843	80.0%	2,720	82.9%	882	79.5%	509	81.4%
Unknown	5,290	10.6%	307	9.4%	127	11.5%	49	7.8%

Substantiated Conclusions

Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

During FY 2022, 4,244 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 2022 investigations.

Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2022




Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2022

	Number	Percent
Neglect	2,307	54.4%
Physical Abuse	1,387	32.7%
Sexual Abuse	1,424	33.6%
Emotional Abuse	580	13.7%
Medical Neglect	132	3.1%
Educational Neglect	60	1.4%

Percent is the percentage of 4,244 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 August with 485 children. August saw the highest incidence of neglect (308), and highest incidence of physical abuse (158) and September had the highest incidence of sexual abuse (147). The lowest number of substantiated children was reported in December (281).



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 2021

	Number	Percent
Lack of Supervision	1,694	73.4%
Unsafe/Inadequate Shelter	499	21.6%
Unsanitary Living Conditions	443	19.2%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	351	15.2%
Failure to Protect	260	11.3%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	255	11.1%
Bruises, Welts, Red Marks	213	9.2%
Other Sexual Abuse	169	7.3%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	142	6.2%
Fondling/Touching	106	4.6%

Percent is the percentage of 2,307 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. 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 2022

	Number	Percent
Bruises, Welts, Red Marks	696	48.9%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	659	46.3%
Lack of Supervision	395	27.7%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	221	15.5%
Abrasions, Lacerations	195	13.7%
Failure to Protect	131	9.2%
Other Sexual Abuse	121	8.5%
Unsanitary Living Conditions	112	7.9%
Unsafe/Inadequate Shelter	106	7.4%
Fractures (Other than Skull)	78	5.5%

Percent is the percentage of 1,397 substantiated physically abused children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.

Other sexual abuse and fondling/touching were the most frequent worker findings for sexually abused children. Following are the ten most often reported worker findings for sexually abused children.

Worker Findings for Sexually Abused Children during FY 2022

	Number	Percent
Other Sexual Abuse	886	63.9%
Fondling/Touching	682	49.2%
Intercourse	381	27.5%
Oral Sex, Sodomy	237	17.1%
Digital Penetration	175	12.6%
Lack of Supervision	143	10.3%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	101	7.3%
Pornography	87	6.3%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	79	5.7%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	78	5.6%

Percent is the percentage of 1,424 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 majority of families involved in substantiated incidents had an extended family support and adequate living conditions. The top twenty family characteristics are listed below.

Characteristics of Families Involved in Substantiated Incidents during FY 2022

	Number	Percent
Extended Family Support System	1,147	36.9%
Adequate Living Conditions	904	29.1%
Single Parent Household	688	22.1%
Amenable to Services	605	19.4%
Community/Cultural Support	548	17.6%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	497	16.0%
Lack of Parenting Skills	431	13.9%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	315	10.1%
Problem Solving Skills	294	9.5%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	284	9.1%
Domestic Violence	281	9.0%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	246	7.9%
Manages Finances Well	214	6.9%
Dangerous Living Conditions	209	6.7%
No History of Violence	178	5.7%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	160	5.1%
Stable Marriage	137	4.4%
Good Physical/Mental Health	131	4.2%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	110	3.5%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	109	3.5%

Percent is the percentage of 3,111 total substantiated incidents. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to four family characteristics may be reported per incident.

Substantiated Conclusions

Demographics of Substantiated Children

Of the substantiated children during FY 2022, over half (60.2%) were female and forty percent (39.8%) were male. More sexually abused children were female. Neglect was more prevalent among younger children while sexual abuse occurred more often among older children.

Child Abuse/Neglect Children during FY 2022 by Category of Abuse

	Substantiated		Neglect		Physical Abuse		Sexual Abuse		Emotional Abuse		Medical Neglect		Educational Neglect	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	4,244	100.0%	2,307	100.0%	1,387	100.0%	1,424	100.0%	580	100.0%	132	100.0%	60	100.0%
Age														
<1	315	7.4%	218	9.4%	167	12.0%	3	0.2%	20	3.4%	24	18.2%	1	1.7%
1	252	5.9%	211	9.1%	78	5.6%	6	0.4%	29	5.0%	9	6.8%	0	0.0%
2	232	5.5%	196	8.5%	82	5.9%	6	0.4%	20	3.4%	10	7.6%	0	0.0%
3	226	5.3%	185	8.0%	67	4.8%	17	1.2%	27	4.7%	9	6.8%	0	0.0%
4	205	4.8%	149	6.5%	56	4.0%	33	2.3%	23	4.0%	5	3.8%	3	5.0%
5	222	5.2%	152	6.6%	78	5.6%	41	2.9%	23	4.0%	8	6.1%	3	5.0%
6	162	3.8%	112	4.9%	48	3.5%	35	2.5%	29	5.0%	2	1.5%	3	5.0%
7	185	4.4%	109	4.7%	62	4.5%	44	3.1%	25	4.3%	11	8.3%	4	6.7%
8	212	5.0%	135	5.9%	65	4.7%	50	3.5%	24	4.1%	5	3.8%	2	3.3%
9	188	4.4%	103	4.5%	68	4.9%	52	3.7%	39	6.7%	3	2.3%	2	3.3%
10	209	4.9%	108	4.7%	63	4.5%	75	5.3%	42	7.2%	7	5.3%	5	8.3%
11	199	4.7%	90	3.9%	56	4.0%	87	6.1%	32	5.5%	6	4.5%	6	10.0%
12	240	5.7%	109	4.7%	52	3.7%	132	9.3%	37	6.4%	5	3.8%	9	15.0%
13	314	7.4%	128	5.5%	90	6.5%	166	11.7%	50	8.6%	6	4.5%	6	10.0%
14	326	7.7%	113	4.9%	107	7.7%	189	13.3%	50	8.6%	6	4.5%	5	8.3%
15	328	7.7%	87	3.8%	112	8.1%	213	15.0%	48	8.3%	8	6.1%	5	8.3%
16	261	6.1%	76	3.3%	89	6.4%	159	11.2%	42	7.2%	5	3.8%	5	8.3%
17	167	3.9%	25	1.1%	47	3.4%	116	8.1%	20	3.4%	3	2.3%	1	1.7%
Not Available	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender														
Male	1,688	39.8%	1,123	48.7%	706	50.9%	174	12.2%	257	44.3%	69	52.3%	27	45.0%
Female	2,555	60.2%	1,183	51.3%	681	49.1%	1,250	87.8%	323	55.7%	63	47.7%	33	55.0%
Unknown	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Race														
White	3,212	75.7%	1,677	72.7%	1,035	74.6%	1,201	84.3%	410	70.7%	99	75.0%	48	80.0%
Black	536	12.6%	306	13.3%	190	13.7%	127	8.9%	81	14.0%	17	12.9%	6	10.0%
Other/Unknown	496	11.7%	324	14.0%	162	11.7%	96	6.7%	89	15.3%	16	12.1%	6	10.0%
Hispanic Origin														
Hispanic	359	8.5%	173	7.5%	100	7.2%	167	11.7%	50	8.6%	7	5.3%	6	10.0%
Not Hispanic	3,479	82.0%	1,873	81.2%	1,155	83.3%	1,167	82.0%	176	30.3%	118	89.4%	51	85.0%
Unknown	406	9.6%	261	11.3%	132	9.5%	90	6.3%	54	9.3%	7	5.3%	3	5.0%

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 2022, 49 children died as a result of child abuse/neglect.


The following chart represents the number of child fatalities for fiscal years 2018 to 2022, when abuse and/or neglect was associated with the child's death.



Substantiated Conclusions

Types of abuse most often found to be substantiated in CA/N fatalities were neglect (63.3%) and physical abuse (34.7%).

Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2022



Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2022

	Number	Percent
Neglect	32	63.3%
Physical Abuse	17	34.7%
Medical Neglect	0	0.0%
Emotional Abuse	0	0.0%
Sexual Abuse	0	0.0%

Percent is the percent of the 49 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 FY 2022, the many (49.0%) were under a year old. The highest incidence of child deaths occurred in August, December and January.


Substantiated Fatalities during FY 2022

Age	Number	Percent
< 1	24	49.0%
1	4	8.2%
2	4	8.2%
3	4	8.2%
4	2	4.1%
5	1	2.0%
6	1	2.0%
7	0	0.0%
8	1	2.0%
9	1	2.0%
10	1	2.0%
11	0	0.0%
12	0	0.0%
13	1	2.0%
14	2	4.1%
15	0	0.0%
16	1	2.0%
17	2	4.1%
Total	49	100.0%

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	29	59.2%
Female	20	40.8%
Total	49	100.0%

Race	Number	Percent
White	33	67.3%
Black	7	14.3%
Other	9	18.4%
Total	49	100.0%

Substantiated Fatalities by Month of Death during FY 2022



Perpetrators

Perpetrator Demographics

For FY 2022 substantiated reports, the majority of perpetrators were white, male and between ages 20 and 40.

Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2022

Age	Number	Percent
<20	195	5.1%
20-29	924	24.1%
30-39	1431	37.3%
40-49	654	17.1%
50-59	294	7.7%
60-69	127	3.3%
70+	51	1.3%
Unknown	156	4.1%
Total	3,832	100.0%

Race	Number	Percent
White	2,916	76.1%
Black	512	13.4%
Am. Indian/AK Native	16	0.4%
Asian	7	0.2%
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	7	0.2%
Other/unknown	374	9.8%
Total	3,832	100.0%

Sex	Number	Percent
Female	1,372	35.8%
Male	2,314	60.4%
Unknown	146	3.8%
Total	3,832	100.0%

A perpetrator may be involved in more than one incident, and in more than one relationship type, during the report year. A natural parent and parent's partner accounted for the majority of both known alleged and substantiated perpetrators involved in an investigation or an assessment.

Perpetrators by Relationship to Child during FY 2022

	Alleged Perpetrators	Substantiated Perpetrators	Percent Found Substantiated
Natural parent	74,685	2,901	3.9%
Parent/Caretaker's Partner	8,732	430	4.9%
Step-parent	6,428	321	5.0%
Grandparent	4,560	240	5.3%
Aunt/Uncle/Cousin (Also Great)	2,948	228	7.7%
Adoptive parent	1,719	51	3.0%
Friend	1,400	158	11.3%
Sibling/half, step-sibling	1,306	69	5.3%
Legal Guardian	1,207	16	1.3%
Institution/staff	638	63	9.9%
Foster parent	901	27	3.0%
Natural Child	892	37	4.1%
No Relationship Exists	708	33	4.7%
Alleged Father	684	31	4.5%
Day care provider	615	43	7.0%
Other Caregiver	388	35	9.0%
School/personnel	557	65	11.7%
Other relative	353	26	7.4%
Neighbor	237	22	9.3%
Putative Father	58	10	17.2%
Other	11,245	611	5.4%

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.

The most prevalent perpetrator characteristic in FY 2022 investigations was drug related problem(s) (20.9%).

Characteristics of Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2022

	Number	Percent
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	802	20.9%
No Apparent Mental/Emotional Disturbance	592	15.4%
Adequate Support System	532	13.9%
History of Criminal Behavior	478	12.5%
Mental/Emotional Disturbance	468	12.2%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	277	7.2%
Unemployed	272	7.1%
Amenable to Services	266	6.9%
Pattern of Violent Behavior	249	6.5%
Undetermined	215	5.6%
Unrealistic Expectations of Child	210	5.5%
Loss of Control During Discipline	168	4.4%
Financial Problems	164	4.3%
High School Education or Higher	145	3.8%
Immaturity	137	3.6%
Parental History of Abuse/Neglect as a Child	132	3.4%
Low Self Esteem	96	2.5%
No One to Call on in Time of Crisis	61	1.6%
Institutional Report/Unknown Perpetrator	44	1.1%
Less than High School Education	27	0.7%
Illness	21	0.5%
Incapacity Due to Physical Handicap	9	0.2%
Mental Retardation	8	0.2%
Other	69	1.8%

Percentage is the percentage of 3,832 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 2022, 90 of the 3,201 FCS cases opened were the result of a substantiated Child Abuse/Neglect report. Due to a policy change in March 2017, staff no longer open FCS functions on families when children are placed in alternative care.

FCS Cases Opened



	FY 2022	FY 2021	FY 2020	FY 2019	FY 2018
■ Substantiated CA/N	90	102	139	166	184
■ Other*	3,111	3,679	4,466	6,353	9,010

***Other includes Family Requests Preventive Services, Court Order, Newborn Crisis Assessment, Family Assessment and Services Needed, 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 six 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 decide to uphold or reverse the original CD decision. During FY 2022, the review board heard 432 cases and upheld almost eighty percent (78.4%) of the cases. Following the Child Abuse and Neglect Review Board's disposition, the alleged perpetrator has 60 days to request a judicial review.

Calls from Reporters

When a reported concern does not meet the criteria of a report of Child Abuse and Neglect (Investigation or 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 reporters are referred to field staff if there is an open case on the family.

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 through various workgroups and initiatives 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. On July 22, 2016, (P.L. 114-198) The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA) established a comprehensive, coordinated, balanced strategy through enhanced grant programs that would expand prevention and education efforts while also promoting treatment and recovery. CARA amended sections of the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) to remove the term "illegal" as applied to substance abuse affecting the identified infant and to specifically require that Plans of Safe Care address the needs of both infants and their families/caretakers.

Prevention/Treatment Services

In most instances, CD receives a Newborn Crisis Assessment, via the CA/N hotline, from the physician or health care provider, who requests CD to conduct an assessment to determine the caretaker's ability to care for an infant, or to provide protective services as directed by a physician. A physician or healthcare provider may also report non-drug related concerns about releasing a newborn from the hospital. Newborn Crisis Assessments are accepted until the child is one year of age if seen by a medical professional within the previous twenty-four hours of reporting.

In FY 2022, the Division received a total of 6,414 Newborn Crisis Assessments. 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 2022, 284 children reported to CANHU were subsequently identified as drug-exposed.

Appendices

Appendix A: FY 2022 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	4	3.1%	0	0.0%	41	32.3%	80	63.0%	2	1.6%	127
	ATCHISON	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	10	29.4%	20	58.8%	1	2.9%	34
	BUCHANAN	72	5.1%	6	0.4%	352	24.8%	926	65.3%	61	4.3%	1,417
	CALDWELL	8	10.8%	2	2.7%	21	28.4%	43	58.1%	0	0.0%	74
	CARROLL	4	3.8%	0	0.0%	32	30.5%	67	63.8%	2	1.9%	105
	CASS	63	7.0%	11	1.2%	232	26.0%	573	64.1%	15	1.7%	894
	CHARITON	3	4.7%	6	9.4%	8	12.5%	46	71.9%	1	1.6%	64
	CLAY	60	3.2%	53	2.8%	451	23.7%	1,285	67.5%	55	2.9%	1,904
	CLINTON	8	4.3%	4	2.2%	53	28.5%	119	64.0%	2	1.1%	186
	COOPER	10	6.9%	2	1.4%	37	25.5%	95	65.5%	1	0.7%	145
	DAVISS	4	6.1%	3	4.5%	18	27.3%	39	59.1%	2	3.0%	66
	DE KALB	6	9.5%	2	3.2%	14	22.2%	41	65.1%	0	0.0%	63
	GENTRY	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	11	18.0%	46	75.4%	3	4.9%	61
	GRUNDY	7	5.7%	5	4.1%	15	12.2%	95	77.2%	1	0.8%	123
	HARRISON	0	0.0%	3	3.3%	16	17.8%	69	76.7%	2	2.2%	90
	HOLT	2	4.4%	0	0.0%	14	31.1%	26	57.8%	3	6.7%	45
	JOHNSON	33	7.8%	2	0.5%	113	26.8%	268	63.7%	5	1.2%	421
	LA FAYETTE	28	9.0%	7	2.3%	94	30.3%	175	56.5%	6	1.9%	310
	LINN	12	10.2%	7	5.9%	27	22.9%	72	61.0%	0	0.0%	118
	LIVINGSTON	22	13.9%	9	5.7%	27	17.1%	98	62.0%	2	1.3%	158
	MERCER	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	5	23.8%	15	71.4%	0	0.0%	21
	NODAWAY	16	10.7%	3	2.0%	36	24.0%	92	61.3%	3	2.0%	150
	PETTIS	31	6.2%	2	0.4%	133	26.7%	325	65.1%	8	1.6%	499
	PLATTE	26	4.3%	8	1.3%	151	25.1%	405	67.4%	11	1.8%	601
	PUTNAM	4	8.2%	0	0.0%	5	10.2%	39	79.6%	1	2.0%	49
	RAY	11	4.9%	0	0.0%	57	25.4%	155	69.2%	1	0.4%	224
	SALINE	27	7.7%	5	1.4%	82	23.4%	231	66.0%	5	1.4%	350
	SULLIVAN	1	2.6%	2	5.3%	9	23.7%	26	68.4%	0	0.0%	38
WORTH	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	9	
	REGION TOTAL	468	5.6%	142	1.7%	2,066	24.8%	5,476	65.6%	194	2.3%	8,346
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	30	11.2%	15	5.6%	46	17.2%	174	64.9%	3	1.1%	268
	AUDRAIN	21	7.7%	2	0.7%	61	22.3%	187	68.2%	3	1.1%	274
	BOONE	66	4.3%	18	1.2%	423	27.5%	1,004	65.3%	26	1.7%	1,537
	CALLAWAY	34	6.2%	16	2.9%	126	23.0%	363	66.4%	8	1.5%	547
	CLARK	12	18.2%	4	6.1%	6	9.1%	44	66.7%	0	0.0%	66
	COLE	26	4.6%	19	3.4%	162	28.7%	355	62.9%	2	0.4%	564
	FRANKLIN	77	7.5%	18	1.8%	234	22.8%	676	65.9%	21	2.0%	1,026
	GASCONADE	6	3.8%	5	3.1%	30	18.8%	109	68.1%	10	6.3%	160
	HOWARD	10	14.9%	3	4.5%	20	29.9%	34	50.7%	0	0.0%	67
	KNOX	6	14.0%	2	4.7%	5	11.6%	28	65.1%	2	4.7%	43
	LEWIS	9	7.1%	6	4.7%	24	18.9%	84	66.1%	4	3.1%	127
	LINCOLN	61	9.6%	10	1.6%	133	20.9%	427	67.0%	6	0.9%	637
	MACON	19	12.0%	1	0.6%	32	20.3%	103	65.2%	3	1.9%	158
	MARION	37	8.2%	31	6.8%	85	18.8%	283	62.5%	17	3.8%	453
	MONROE	7	7.1%	13	13.1%	9	9.1%	67	67.7%	3	3.0%	99
	MONTGOMERY	11	8.7%	5	3.9%	28	22.0%	82	64.6%	1	0.8%	127
	OSAGE	8	8.1%	1	1.0%	28	28.3%	58	58.6%	4	4.0%	99
	PIKE	16	9.3%	4	2.3%	35	20.3%	115	66.9%	2	1.2%	172
	RALLS	8	8.4%	9	9.5%	10	10.5%	66	69.5%	2	2.1%	95
	RANDOLPH	25	9.4%	10	3.7%	71	26.6%	155	58.1%	6	2.2%	267
	SCHUYLER	5	12.8%	4	10.3%	10	25.6%	20	51.3%	0	0.0%	39
	SCOTLAND	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	4	15.4%	18	69.2%	0	0.0%	26
	SHELBY	12	16.7%	2	2.8%	9	12.5%	49	68.1%	0	0.0%	72
ST CHARLES	176	8.4%	14	0.7%	528	25.1%	1,319	62.8%	63	3.0%	2,100	
WARREN	28	6.7%	6	1.4%	112	26.9%	262	63.0%	8	1.9%	416	
	REGION TOTAL	714	7.6%	218	2.3%	2,231	23.6%	6,082	64.4%	194	2.1%	9,439
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	10	7.6%	2	1.5%	21	16.0%	95	72.5%	3	2.3%	131
	BUTLER	68	11.0%	14	2.3%	172	27.7%	360	58.0%	7	1.1%	621
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	35	6.3%	6	1.1%	99	17.9%	397	71.9%	15	2.7%	552
	CARTER	6	11.1%	1	1.9%	17	31.5%	27	50.0%	3	5.6%	54
	CRAWFORD	18	7.1%	8	3.1%	53	20.9%	167	65.7%	8	3.1%	254
	DENT	8	4.8%	6	3.6%	36	21.4%	114	67.9%	4	2.4%	168
	DUNKLIN	16	3.9%	5	1.2%	132	32.3%	244	59.7%	12	2.9%	409

Appendix A: FY 2022 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	45	7.7%	23	4.0%	126	21.7%	373	64.2%	14	2.4%	581
	IRON	10	8.1%	7	5.7%	31	25.2%	73	59.3%	2	1.6%	123
	JEFFERSON	122	6.6%	98	5.3%	273	14.9%	1,302	70.9%	42	2.3%	1,837
	MADISON	15	8.0%	3	1.6%	38	20.2%	127	67.6%	5	2.7%	188
	MARIES	10	14.1%	1	1.4%	13	18.3%	46	64.8%	1	1.4%	71
	MISSISSIPPI	15	9.3%	2	1.2%	36	22.2%	107	66.0%	2	1.2%	162
	NEW MADRID	18	9.6%	9	4.8%	42	22.3%	117	62.2%	2	1.1%	188
	OREGON	10	11.5%	3	3.4%	23	26.4%	51	58.6%	0	0.0%	87
	PEMISCOT	17	7.7%	8	3.6%	43	19.4%	151	68.0%	3	1.4%	222
	PERRY	8	4.8%	1	0.6%	28	16.8%	122	73.1%	8	4.8%	167
	PHELPS	41	9.3%	21	4.8%	99	22.5%	271	61.6%	8	1.8%	440
	PULASKI	44	8.4%	25	4.8%	128	24.5%	310	59.3%	16	3.1%	523
	REYNOLDS	9	13.2%	1	1.5%	13	19.1%	41	60.3%	4	5.9%	68
	RIPLEY	10	6.3%	2	1.3%	38	23.9%	103	64.8%	6	3.8%	159
	SCOTT	30	6.5%	1	0.2%	115	24.9%	307	66.6%	8	1.7%	461
	SHANNON	9	14.3%	2	3.2%	17	27.0%	32	50.8%	3	4.8%	63
	ST FRANCOIS	68	8.0%	24	2.8%	213	24.9%	525	61.5%	24	2.8%	854
	STE GENEVIEVE	6	4.8%	3	2.4%	28	22.4%	86	68.8%	2	1.6%	125
	STODDARD	23	8.1%	2	0.7%	33	11.6%	224	78.6%	3	1.1%	285
	TEXAS	21	8.4%	13	5.2%	63	25.1%	143	57.0%	11	4.4%	251
WASHINGTON	28	8.3%	5	1.5%	76	22.6%	223	66.4%	4	1.2%	336	
WAYNE	18	12.8%	10	7.1%	22	15.6%	90	63.8%	1	0.7%	141	
	REGION TOTAL	738	7.8%	306	3.2%	2,028	21.3%	6,228	65.4%	221	2.3%	9,521
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	7	1.8%	10	2.6%	116	29.9%	249	64.2%	6	1.5%	388
	BARTON	7	5.9%	3	2.5%	29	24.4%	79	66.4%	1	0.8%	119
	BATES	4	2.8%	12	8.5%	25	17.6%	97	68.3%	4	2.8%	142
	BENTON	12	6.5%	7	3.8%	38	20.7%	121	65.8%	6	3.3%	184
	CAMDEN	25	5.9%	10	2.3%	99	23.2%	290	68.1%	2	0.5%	426
	CEDAR	16	10.1%	2	1.3%	36	22.8%	102	64.6%	2	1.3%	158
	CHRISTIAN	27	2.7%	20	2.0%	265	26.5%	684	68.3%	5	0.5%	1,001
	DADE	2	2.8%	2	2.8%	19	26.4%	48	66.7%	1	1.4%	72
	DALLAS	14	7.6%	0	0.0%	51	27.6%	119	64.3%	1	0.5%	185
	DOUGLAS	8	7.0%	5	4.4%	30	26.3%	69	60.5%	2	1.8%	114
	GREENE	178	4.6%	49	1.3%	891	23.1%	2,666	69.0%	79	2.0%	3,863
	HENRY	16	5.7%	14	4.9%	67	23.7%	183	64.7%	3	1.1%	283
	HICKORY	11	11.7%	4	4.3%	28	29.8%	51	54.3%	0	0.0%	94
	JASPER	70	4.3%	24	1.5%	417	25.8%	1,046	64.7%	60	3.7%	1,617
	LACLEDE	29	4.9%	9	1.5%	170	28.9%	376	63.8%	5	0.8%	589
	LAWRENCE	9	1.6%	16	2.9%	176	32.0%	340	61.8%	9	1.6%	550
	MCDONALD	11	4.2%	6	2.3%	87	33.3%	149	57.1%	8	3.1%	261
	MILLER	24	8.1%	6	2.0%	76	25.8%	187	63.4%	2	0.7%	295
	MONITEAU	6	5.4%	3	2.7%	25	22.3%	77	68.8%	1	0.9%	112
	MORGAN	21	8.8%	6	2.5%	62	25.8%	148	61.7%	3	1.3%	240
	NEWTON	21	3.5%	7	1.2%	185	31.0%	364	61.1%	19	3.2%	596
	OZARK	12	13.2%	5	5.5%	18	19.8%	55	60.4%	1	1.1%	91
	POLK	22	4.9%	4	0.9%	121	26.8%	301	66.6%	4	0.9%	452
	ST CLAIR	8	8.9%	5	5.6%	17	18.9%	59	65.6%	1	1.1%	90
	STONE	8	2.3%	7	2.1%	101	29.6%	213	62.5%	12	3.5%	341
	TANEY	59	9.0%	23	3.5%	132	20.2%	420	64.2%	20	3.1%	654
VERNON	14	5.5%	10	4.0%	57	22.5%	167	66.0%	5	2.0%	253	
WEBSTER	37	8.2%	12	2.7%	119	26.3%	274	60.6%	10	2.2%	452	
WRIGHT	12	4.9%	12	4.9%	64	26.0%	156	63.4%	2	0.8%	246	
	REGION TOTAL	690	5.0%	293	2.1%	3,521	25.4%	9,090	65.5%	274	2.0%	13,868
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	155	2.2%	99	1.4%	2,045	28.6%	4,257	59.6%	586	8.2%	7,142
	REGION TOTAL	155	2.2%	99	1.4%	2,045	28.6%	4,257	59.6%	586	8.2%	7,142
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	98	3.9%	53	2.1%	538	21.5%	1,140	45.7%	668	26.8%	2,497
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	140	2.6%	84	1.5%	1,143	21.1%	2,700	49.7%	1,361	25.1%	5,428
	REGION TOTAL	238	3.0%	137	1.7%	1,681	21.2%	3,840	48.5%	2,029	25.6%	7,925
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	108	5.8%	3	0.2%	1,385	73.9%	352	18.8%	27	1.4%	1,875
	OUT OF STATE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	126	100.0%	126
	REGION TOTAL	108	5.4%	3	0.1%	1,385	69.2%	352	17.6%	153	7.6%	2,001
STATE TOTAL		3,111	5.3%	1,198	2.1%	14,957	25.7%	35,325	60.7%	3,651	6.3%	58,242

Appendix B: FY 2022 Reported Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTAN- TIATED	UNSUB. PSI	UNSUB.	ASSESS- MENT	OTHER	TOTAL CHILDREN	SUBSTAN- TIATED CHILDREN PER 1,000	TOTAL CHILDREN PER 1,000
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	5	0	63	118	5	191	1.13	43.10
	ATCHISON	3	0	10	23	1	37	2.64	32.54
	BUCHANAN	86	10	456	1,264	81	1,897	4.61	101.62
	CALDWELL	9	5	33	71	0	118	4.41	57.79
	CARROLL	5	0	43	95	3	146	2.72	79.52
	CASS	81	13	319	774	20	1,207	3.10	46.12
	CHARITON	7	8	9	67	1	92	4.22	55.49
	CLAY	77	81	554	1,712	90	2,514	1.24	40.57
	CLINTON	8	5	72	152	2	239	1.61	48.24
	COOPER	17	2	47	137	2	205	4.47	53.85
	DAVISS	4	4	25	64	2	99	1.84	45.45
	DE KALB	8	2	19	56	0	85	3.81	40.44
	GENTRY	1	0	27	72	7	107	0.64	68.28
	GRUNDY	9	6	25	135	1	176	3.67	71.84
	HARRISON	0	3	24	112	2	141	0.00	73.51
	HOLT	2	0	20	40	6	68	2.20	74.64
	JOHNSON	46	3	163	386	8	606	3.78	49.82
	LAFAYETTE	32	9	114	245	7	407	4.22	53.67
	LINN	13	11	32	102	0	158	4.70	57.16
	LIVINGSTON	25	12	36	138	3	214	8.11	69.39
	MERCER	1	0	5	21	0	27	1.23	33.29
	NODAWAY	24	3	45	129	3	204	5.66	48.15
	PETTIS	46	2	188	497	14	747	4.27	69.32
PLATTE	38	14	183	517	15	767	1.49	30.05	
PUTNAM	4	0	5	49	1	59	3.90	57.56	
RAY	11	0	81	239	2	333	2.06	62.48	
SALINE	44	10	112	318	10	494	8.44	94.76	
SULLIVAN	2	2	12	33	0	49	1.43	35.00	
WORTH	2	0	2	7	1	12	4.90	29.41	
	REGION TOTAL	610	205	2,724	7,573	287	11,399	2.80	52.26
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	50	17	66	232	5	370	10.30	76.23
	AUDRAIN	28	2	73	277	3	383	4.75	65.00
	BOONE	88	30	550	1,365	39	2,072	2.29	54.02
	CALLAWAY	41	25	147	506	14	733	4.30	76.79
	CLARK	22	4	8	63	0	97	14.02	61.82
	COLE	33	35	195	483	7	753	1.93	43.99
	FRANKLIN	91	28	296	920	30	1,365	3.86	57.83
	GASCONADE	9	7	39	162	20	237	2.90	76.40
	HOWARD	21	5	23	55	1	105	9.34	46.71
	KNOX	13	2	6	32	2	55	14.35	60.71
	LEWIS	19	8	27	118	7	179	8.92	84.00
	LINCOLN	87	17	174	595	6	879	5.73	57.87
	MACON	35	3	38	142	4	222	9.88	62.66
	MARION	50	44	109	404	25	632	7.57	95.74
	MONROE	8	21	10	91	8	138	4.10	70.70
	MONTGOMERY	11	7	40	115	1	174	4.45	70.33
	OSAGE	13	1	38	79	4	135	4.30	44.70
	PIKE	26	4	39	165	3	237	6.38	58.16
	RALLS	8	9	11	88	2	118	3.53	52.10
	RANDOLPH	37	16	86	209	9	357	6.99	67.42
	SCHUYLER	6	5	16	28	0	55	5.76	52.78
	SCOTLAND	10	0	6	34	0	50	7.12	35.59
	SHELBY	18	4	16	69	0	107	12.06	71.72
ST CHARLES	242	25	677	1,728	89	2,761	2.56	29.17	
WARREN	35	12	153	366	13	579	4.23	69.98	
	REGION TOTAL	1,001	331	2,843	8,326	292	12,793	3.84	49.09
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	14	5	25	132	5	181	6.03	77.98
	BUTLER	95	25	253	503	19	895	9.66	91.03
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	60	7	110	571	15	763	3.45	43.82
	CARTER	6	3	24	37	6	76	5.31	67.20
	CRAWFORD	27	10	72	260	15	384	5.18	73.70
	DENT	13	8	43	166	7	237	4.09	74.62
	DUNKLIN	25	10	192	370	18	615	3.59	88.29

Appendix B: FY 2022 Reported Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED	UNSUB. PSI	UNSUB.	ASSESSMENT	OTHER	TOTAL CHILDREN	SUBSTANTIATED CHILDREN PER 1,000	TOTAL CHILDREN PER 1,000
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	59	37	160	529	17	802	6.23	84.70
	IRON	18	15	46	113	2	194	8.98	96.81
	JEFFERSON	162	123	348	1,868	58	2,559	3.09	48.85
	MADISON	22	9	43	176	6	256	7.64	88.95
	MARIES	16	2	16	55	1	90	8.76	49.26
	MISSISSIPPI	26	2	48	165	4	245	9.87	92.98
	NEW MADRID	27	13	59	166	4	269	6.93	69.08
	OREGON	17	5	30	81	0	133	8.99	70.33
	PEMISCOT	24	16	67	260	7	374	5.95	92.73
	PERRY	11	2	31	187	10	241	2.51	55.02
	PHELPS	55	31	133	374	17	610	6.01	66.70
	PULASKI	62	35	162	416	26	701	5.08	57.45
	REYNOLDS	13	1	20	57	5	96	9.95	73.51
	RIPLEY	15	2	53	172	8	250	6.28	104.69
	SCOTT	39	1	144	481	14	679	4.28	74.47
	SHANNON	13	4	28	39	4	88	8.47	57.33
	ST FRANCOIS	95	35	271	768	40	1,209	6.78	86.25
	STE GENEVIEVE	7	3	36	147	5	198	1.77	49.92
	STODDARD	37	4	49	353	5	448	5.75	69.59
	TEXAS	30	17	94	214	19	374	5.61	69.95
WASHINGTON	35	7	102	337	6	487	6.70	93.30	
WAYNE	26	12	28	140	1	207	12.29	97.87	
	REGION TOTAL	1,049	444	2,687	9,137	344	13,661	5.14	66.88
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	8	15	152	374	8	557	1.01	70.08
	BARTON	11	6	36	130	1	184	3.84	64.25
	BATES	6	18	28	127	6	185	1.64	50.46
	BENTON	13	17	44	178	12	264	3.74	75.91
	CAMDEN	31	14	121	398	3	567	3.97	72.70
	CEDAR	17	3	42	160	2	224	4.79	63.15
	CHRISTIAN	32	33	326	924	13	1,328	1.38	57.34
	DADE	2	2	24	66	1	95	1.24	58.90
	DALLAS	21	0	64	193	2	280	5.15	68.73
	DOUGLAS	10	8	46	87	3	154	3.99	61.50
	GREENE	235	69	1,109	3,782	107	5,302	3.82	86.25
	HENRY	21	17	78	274	7	397	4.32	81.70
	HICKORY	18	4	38	68	1	129	13.30	95.34
	JASPER	79	27	543	1,465	82	2,196	2.59	72.13
	LACLEDE	36	13	228	517	10	804	4.17	93.03
	LAWRENCE	9	37	225	517	21	809	0.94	84.37
	MCDONALD	15	8	113	226	14	376	2.45	61.35
	MILLER	38	8	88	251	3	388	6.51	66.46
	MONITEAU	11	3	34	116	1	165	2.79	41.81
	MORGAN	26	9	81	247	6	369	5.43	77.10
	NEWTON	28	16	238	507	25	814	2.01	58.54
	OZARK	18	8	27	89	1	143	11.21	89.04
	POLK	24	11	160	435	7	637	3.15	83.69
	ST CLAIR	10	7	21	72	2	112	5.07	56.74
	STONE	11	11	132	293	15	462	2.08	87.33
	TANEY	84	29	157	568	36	874	7.39	76.90
	VERNON	29	11	81	241	6	368	6.07	77.04
WEBSTER	55	21	161	387	19	643	5.20	60.75	
WRIGHT	16	17	87	224	6	350	3.41	74.50	
	REGION TOTAL	914	442	4,484	12,916	420	19,176	3.52	73.89
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	182	145	2,780	5,957	822	9,886	1.12	60.64
	REGION TOTAL	182	145	2,780	5,957	822	9,886	1.12	60.64
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	126	80	728	1,719	986	3,639	2.33	67.35
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	175	117	1,491	3,607	1,922	7,312	0.80	33.27
	REGION TOTAL	301	197	2,219	5,326	2,908	10,951	1.10	40.00
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	187	8	1,718	557	37	2,507	0.00	0.00
	OUT OF STATE	0	0	0	0	156	156	0.00	0.00
	REGION TOTAL	187	8	1,718	557	193	2,663	0.00	0.00
STATE TOTAL		4,244	1,772	19,455	49,792	5,266	80,529	3.08	58.38

Appendix C: FY 2022 Assessment Conclusion Incidents by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	75	93.8%	5	6.3%	0	0.0%	80
	ATCHISON	14	70.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	20
	BUCHANAN	859	92.8%	67	7.2%	0	0.0%	926
	CALDWELL	42	97.7%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	43
	CARROLL	59	88.1%	6	9.0%	2	3.0%	67
	CASS	515	89.9%	47	8.2%	11	1.9%	573
	CHARITON	42	91.3%	4	8.7%	0	0.0%	46
	CLAY	1,175	91.4%	108	8.4%	2	0.2%	1,285
	CLINTON	112	94.1%	6	5.0%	1	0.8%	119
	COOPER	90	94.7%	5	5.3%	0	0.0%	95
	DAVISS	37	94.9%	2	5.1%	0	0.0%	39
	DE KALB	37	90.2%	4	9.8%	0	0.0%	41
	GENTRY	40	87.0%	6	13.0%	0	0.0%	46
	GRUNDY	89	93.7%	5	5.3%	1	1.1%	95
	HARRISON	63	91.3%	4	5.8%	2	2.9%	69
	HOLT	26	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26
	JOHNSON	251	93.7%	16	6.0%	1	0.4%	268
	LAFAYETTE	159	90.9%	14	8.0%	2	1.1%	175
	LINN	69	95.8%	3	4.2%	0	0.0%	72
	LIVINGSTON	90	91.8%	8	8.2%	0	0.0%	98
	MERCER	13	86.7%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	15
	NODAWAY	81	88.0%	10	10.9%	1	1.1%	92
	PETTIS	301	92.6%	24	7.4%	0	0.0%	325
	PLATTE	364	89.9%	37	9.1%	4	1.0%	405
	PUTNAM	35	89.7%	3	7.7%	1	2.6%	39
	RAY	145	93.5%	10	6.5%	0	0.0%	155
	SALINE	214	92.6%	14	6.1%	3	1.3%	231
SULLIVAN	26	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26	
WORTH	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	
	REGION TOTAL	5,028	91.8%	417	7.6%	31	0.6%	5,476
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	161	92.5%	13	7.5%	0	0.0%	174
	AUDRAIN	163	87.2%	22	11.8%	2	1.1%	187
	BOONE	890	88.6%	113	11.3%	1	0.1%	1,004
	CALLAWAY	342	94.2%	19	5.2%	2	0.6%	363
	CLARK	42	95.5%	2	4.5%	0	0.0%	44
	COLE	328	92.4%	27	7.6%	0	0.0%	355
	FRANKLIN	614	90.8%	56	8.3%	6	0.9%	676
	GASCONADE	103	94.5%	5	4.6%	1	0.9%	109
	HOWARD	27	79.4%	7	20.6%	0	0.0%	34
	KNOX	25	89.3%	3	10.7%	0	0.0%	28
	LEWIS	80	95.2%	4	4.8%	0	0.0%	84
	LINCOLN	399	93.4%	28	6.6%	0	0.0%	427
	MACON	97	94.2%	6	5.8%	0	0.0%	103
	MARION	262	92.6%	20	7.1%	1	0.4%	283
	MONROE	60	89.6%	7	10.4%	0	0.0%	67
	MONTGOMERY	73	89.0%	8	9.8%	1	1.2%	82
	OSAGE	57	98.3%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	58
	PIKE	100	87.0%	15	13.0%	0	0.0%	115
	RALLS	64	97.0%	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	66
	RANDOLPH	146	94.2%	9	5.8%	0	0.0%	155
	SCHUYLER	18	90.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	20
	SCOTLAND	17	94.4%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	18
	SHELBY	41	83.7%	8	16.3%	0	0.0%	49
ST CHARLES	1,200	91.0%	119	9.0%	0	0.0%	1,319	
WARREN	251	95.8%	8	3.1%	3	1.1%	262	
	REGION TOTAL	5,560	91.4%	505	8.3%	17	0.3%	6,082
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	90	94.7%	5	5.3%	0	0.0%	95
	BUTLER	331	91.9%	29	8.1%	0	0.0%	360
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	379	95.5%	18	4.5%	0	0.0%	397
	CARTER	24	88.9%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	27
	CRAWFORD	161	96.4%	6	3.6%	0	0.0%	167
	DENT	109	95.6%	5	4.4%	0	0.0%	114
	DUNKLIN	228	93.4%	16	6.6%	0	0.0%	244

Appendix C: FY 2022 Assessment Conclusion Incidents by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	335	89.8%	37	9.9%	1	0.3%	373
	IRON	68	93.2%	5	6.8%	0	0.0%	73
	JEFFERSON	1,218	93.5%	84	6.5%	0	0.0%	1,302
	MADISON	107	84.3%	20	15.7%	0	0.0%	127
	MARIES	44	95.7%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	46
	MISSISSIPPI	100	93.5%	7	6.5%	0	0.0%	107
	NEW MADRID	111	94.9%	6	5.1%	0	0.0%	117
	OREGON	49	96.1%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	51
	PEMISCOT	146	96.7%	5	3.3%	0	0.0%	151
	PERRY	119	97.5%	3	2.5%	0	0.0%	122
	PHELPS	252	93.0%	19	7.0%	0	0.0%	271
	PULASKI	273	88.1%	37	11.9%	0	0.0%	310
	REYNOLDS	35	85.4%	6	14.6%	0	0.0%	41
	RIPLEY	100	97.1%	3	2.9%	0	0.0%	103
	SCOTT	290	94.5%	17	5.5%	0	0.0%	307
	SHANNON	30	93.8%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%	32
	ST FRANCOIS	490	93.3%	35	6.7%	0	0.0%	525
	STE GENEVIEVE	79	91.9%	7	8.1%	0	0.0%	86
	STODDARD	217	96.9%	7	3.1%	0	0.0%	224
	TEXAS	134	93.7%	9	6.3%	0	0.0%	143
WASHINGTON	209	93.7%	14	6.3%	0	0.0%	223	
WAYNE	83	92.2%	7	7.8%	0	0.0%	90	
	REGION TOTAL	5,811	93.3%	416	6.7%	1	0.0%	6,228
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	232	93.2%	17	6.8%	0	0.0%	249
	BARTON	77	97.5%	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	79
	BATES	92	94.8%	5	5.2%	0	0.0%	97
	BENTON	113	93.4%	8	6.6%	0	0.0%	121
	CAMDEN	266	91.7%	21	7.2%	3	1.0%	290
	CEDAR	96	94.1%	6	5.9%	0	0.0%	102
	CHRISTIAN	622	90.9%	59	8.6%	3	0.4%	684
	DADE	47	97.9%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	48
	DALLAS	111	93.3%	8	6.7%	0	0.0%	119
	DOUGLAS	64	92.8%	5	7.2%	0	0.0%	69
	GREENE	2,407	90.3%	236	8.9%	23	0.9%	2,666
	HENRY	174	95.1%	9	4.9%	0	0.0%	183
	HICKORY	49	96.1%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	51
	JASPER	975	93.2%	71	6.8%	0	0.0%	1,046
	LACLEDE	356	94.7%	18	4.8%	2	0.5%	376
	LAWRENCE	325	95.6%	15	4.4%	0	0.0%	340
	MCDONALD	142	95.3%	7	4.7%	0	0.0%	149
	MILLER	166	88.8%	16	8.6%	5	2.7%	187
	MONITEAU	70	90.9%	5	6.5%	2	2.6%	77
	MORGAN	133	89.9%	13	8.8%	2	1.4%	148
	NEWTON	328	90.1%	36	9.9%	0	0.0%	364
	OZARK	52	94.5%	3	5.5%	0	0.0%	55
	POLK	275	91.4%	26	8.6%	0	0.0%	301
	ST CLAIR	57	96.6%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	59
	STONE	197	92.5%	16	7.5%	0	0.0%	213
TANEY	394	93.8%	26	6.2%	0	0.0%	420	
VERNON	159	95.2%	8	4.8%	0	0.0%	167	
WEBSTER	241	88.0%	27	9.9%	6	2.2%	274	
WRIGHT	147	94.2%	9	5.8%	0	0.0%	156	
	REGION TOTAL	8,367	92.0%	677	7.4%	46	0.5%	9,090
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	3,910	91.8%	338	7.9%	9	0.2%	4,257
	REGION TOTAL	3,910	91.8%	338	7.9%	9	0.2%	4,257
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	1,046	91.8%	94	8.2%	0	0.0%	1,140
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	2,531	93.7%	169	6.3%	0	0.0%	2,700
	REGION TOTAL	3,577	93.2%	263	6.8%	0	0.0%	3,840
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	352	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	352
	REGION TOTAL	352	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	352
STATE TOTAL		32,605	92.3%	2,616	7.4%	104	0.3%	35,325

Appendix D: FY 2022 Assessment Conclusion Children by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL	
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	111	94.1%	7	5.9%	0	0.0%	118	
	ATCHISON	17	73.9%	6	26.1%	0	0.0%	23	
	BUCHANAN	1,186	93.8%	78	6.2%	0	0.0%	1,264	
	CALDWELL	69	97.2%	2	2.8%	0	0.0%	71	
	CARROLL	84	88.4%	6	6.3%	5	5.3%	95	
	CASS	705	91.1%	55	7.1%	14	1.8%	774	
	CHARITON	59	88.1%	8	11.9%	0	0.0%	67	
	CLAY	1,583	92.5%	125	7.3%	4	0.2%	1,712	
	CLINTON	144	94.7%	6	3.9%	2	1.3%	152	
	COOPER	131	95.6%	6	4.4%	0	0.0%	137	
	DAVISS	62	96.9%	2	3.1%	0	0.0%	64	
	DE KALB	52	92.9%	4	7.1%	0	0.0%	56	
	GENTRY	66	91.7%	6	8.3%	0	0.0%	72	
	GRUNDY	128	94.8%	6	4.4%	1	0.7%	135	
	HARRISON	105	93.8%	4	3.6%	3	2.7%	112	
	HOLT	40	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	40	
	JOHNSON	366	94.8%	19	4.9%	1	0.3%	386	
	LAFAYETTE	226	92.2%	17	6.9%	2	0.8%	245	
	LINN	97	95.1%	5	4.9%	0	0.0%	102	
	LIVINGSTON	130	94.2%	8	5.8%	0	0.0%	138	
	MERCER	19	90.5%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	21	
	NODAWAY	116	89.9%	11	8.5%	2	1.6%	129	
	PETTIS	473	95.2%	24	4.8%	0	0.0%	497	
	PLATTE	468	90.5%	43	8.3%	6	1.2%	517	
	PUTNAM	45	91.8%	3	6.1%	1	2.0%	49	
	RAY	228	95.4%	11	4.6%	0	0.0%	239	
	SALINE	298	93.7%	15	4.7%	5	1.6%	318	
SULLIVAN	33	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33		
WORTH	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7		
	REGION TOTAL	7,048	93.1%	479	6.3%	46	0.6%	7,573	
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	219	94.4%	13	5.6%	0	0.0%	232	
	AUDRAIN	240	86.6%	33	11.9%	4	1.4%	277	
	BOONE	1,232	90.3%	132	9.7%	1	0.1%	1,365	
	CALLAWAY	482	95.3%	21	4.2%	3	0.6%	506	
	CLARK	61	96.8%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	63	
	COLE	452	93.6%	31	6.4%	0	0.0%	483	
	FRANKLIN	847	92.1%	61	6.6%	12	1.3%	920	
	GASCONADE	156	96.3%	5	3.1%	1	0.6%	162	
	HOWARD	45	81.8%	10	18.2%	0	0.0%	55	
	KNOX	29	90.6%	3	9.4%	0	0.0%	32	
	LEWIS	114	96.6%	4	3.4%	0	0.0%	118	
	LINCOLN	564	94.8%	31	5.2%	0	0.0%	595	
	MACON	136	95.8%	6	4.2%	0	0.0%	142	
	MARION	377	93.3%	26	6.4%	1	0.2%	404	
	MONROE	81	89.0%	10	11.0%	0	0.0%	91	
	MONTGOMERY	105	91.3%	9	7.8%	1	0.9%	115	
	OSAGE	78	98.7%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	79	
	PIKE	149	90.3%	16	9.7%	0	0.0%	165	
	RALLS	86	97.7%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	88	
	RANDOLPH	196	93.8%	13	6.2%	0	0.0%	209	
	SCHUYLER	26	92.9%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	28	
	SCOTLAND	33	97.1%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	34	
	SHELBY	59	85.5%	10	14.5%	0	0.0%	69	
	ST CHARLES	1,587	91.8%	141	8.2%	0	0.0%	1,728	
	WARREN	352	96.2%	9	2.5%	5	1.4%	366	
		REGION TOTAL	7,706	92.6%	592	7.1%	28	0.3%	8,326
	SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	127	96.2%	5	3.8%	0	0.0%	132
BUTLER		469	93.2%	34	6.8%	0	0.0%	503	
CAPE GIRARDEAU		548	96.0%	23	4.0%	0	0.0%	571	
CARTER		34	91.9%	3	8.1%	0	0.0%	37	
CRAWFORD		253	97.3%	7	2.7%	0	0.0%	260	
DENT		161	97.0%	5	3.0%	0	0.0%	166	
DUNKLIN		352	95.1%	18	4.9%	0	0.0%	370	

Appendix D: FY 2022 Assessment Conclusion Children by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	481	90.9%	47	8.9%	1	0.2%	529
	IRON	108	95.6%	5	4.4%	0	0.0%	113
	JEFFERSON	1,780	95.3%	88	4.7%	0	0.0%	1,868
	MADISON	155	88.1%	21	11.9%	0	0.0%	176
	MARIES	53	96.4%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	55
	MISSISSIPPI	157	95.2%	8	4.8%	0	0.0%	165
	NEW MADRID	159	95.8%	7	4.2%	0	0.0%	166
	OREGON	79	97.5%	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	81
	PEMISCOT	255	98.1%	5	1.9%	0	0.0%	260
	PERRY	184	98.4%	3	1.6%	0	0.0%	187
	PHELPS	352	94.1%	22	5.9%	0	0.0%	374
	PULASKI	378	90.9%	38	9.1%	0	0.0%	416
	REYNOLDS	49	86.0%	8	14.0%	0	0.0%	57
	RIPLEY	167	97.1%	5	2.9%	0	0.0%	172
	SCOTT	460	95.6%	21	4.4%	0	0.0%	481
	SHANNON	37	94.9%	2	5.1%	0	0.0%	39
	ST FRANCOIS	727	94.7%	41	5.3%	0	0.0%	768
	STE GENEVIEVE	139	94.6%	8	5.4%	0	0.0%	147
	STODDARD	346	98.0%	7	2.0%	0	0.0%	353
	TEXAS	203	94.9%	11	5.1%	0	0.0%	214
WASHINGTON	323	95.8%	14	4.2%	0	0.0%	337	
WAYNE	132	94.3%	8	5.7%	0	0.0%	140	
	REGION TOTAL	8,668	94.9%	468	5.1%	1	0.0%	9,137
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	357	95.5%	17	4.5%	0	0.0%	374
	BARTON	127	97.7%	3	2.3%	0	0.0%	130
	BATES	122	96.1%	5	3.9%	0	0.0%	127
	BENTON	167	93.8%	11	6.2%	0	0.0%	178
	CAMDEN	371	93.2%	23	5.8%	4	1.0%	398
	CEDAR	152	95.0%	8	5.0%	0	0.0%	160
	CHRISTIAN	840	90.9%	81	8.8%	3	0.3%	924
	DADE	65	98.5%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	66
	DALLAS	185	95.9%	8	4.1%	0	0.0%	193
	DOUGLAS	82	94.3%	5	5.7%	0	0.0%	87
	GREENE	3,459	91.5%	279	7.4%	44	1.2%	3,782
	HENRY	264	96.4%	10	3.6%	0	0.0%	274
	HICKORY	66	97.1%	2	2.9%	0	0.0%	68
	JASPER	1,382	94.3%	83	5.7%	0	0.0%	1,465
	LACLEDE	493	95.4%	21	4.1%	3	0.6%	517
	LAWRENCE	500	96.7%	17	3.3%	0	0.0%	517
	MCDONALD	218	96.5%	8	3.5%	0	0.0%	226
	MILLER	227	90.4%	18	7.2%	6	2.4%	251
	MONITEAU	105	90.5%	8	6.9%	3	2.6%	116
	MORGAN	231	93.5%	14	5.7%	2	0.8%	247
	NEWTON	465	91.7%	42	8.3%	0	0.0%	507
	OZARK	86	96.6%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	89
	POLK	403	92.6%	32	7.4%	0	0.0%	435
	ST CLAIR	70	97.2%	2	2.8%	0	0.0%	72
	STONE	274	93.5%	19	6.5%	0	0.0%	293
	TANEY	540	95.1%	28	4.9%	0	0.0%	568
	VERNON	229	95.0%	12	5.0%	0	0.0%	241
WEBSTER	339	87.6%	32	8.3%	16	4.1%	387	
WRIGHT	214	95.5%	10	4.5%	0	0.0%	224	
	REGION TOTAL	12,033	93.2%	802	6.2%	81	0.6%	12,916
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	5,546	93.1%	398	6.7%	13	0.2%	5,957
	REGION TOTAL	5,546	93.1%	398	6.7%	13	0.2%	5,957
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	1,608	93.5%	111	6.5%	0	0.0%	1,719
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	3,412	94.6%	195	5.4%	0	0.0%	3,607
	REGION TOTAL	5,020	94.3%	306	5.7%	0	0.0%	5,326
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	557	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	557
	REGION TOTAL	557	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	557
STATE TOTAL		46,578	93.5%	3,045	6.1%	169	0.3%	49,792

Appendix E: FY 2022 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/		AGENCY RESPONDED				SERVICES		FAMILY		TOTAL			
		AC	OPENED	SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	NO CONCERNS FOUND	DECLINED CHILD SAFE	UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE							
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	1	1.3%	2	2.5%	39	48.8%	36	45.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.5%	80	
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	85.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	
	BUCHANAN	30	3.2%	7	0.8%	560	60.5%	269	29.0%	4	0.4%	56	6.0%	926	
	CALDWELL	1	2.3%	2	4.7%	27	62.8%	11	25.6%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	43	
	CARROLL	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	39	58.2%	24	35.8%	1	1.5%	1	1.5%	67	
	CASS	12	2.1%	5	0.9%	276	48.2%	267	46.6%	3	0.5%	10	1.7%	573	
	CHARITON	7	15.2%	1	2.2%	28	60.9%	9	19.6%	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	46	
	CLAY	18	1.4%	18	1.4%	900	70.0%	291	22.6%	5	0.4%	53	4.1%	1,285	
	CLINTON	5	4.2%	1	0.8%	70	58.8%	38	31.9%	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	119	
	COOPER	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	59	62.1%	35	36.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	95	
	DAVISS	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	20	51.3%	16	41.0%	0	0.0%	2	5.1%	39	
	DE KALB	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	23	56.1%	15	36.6%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	41	
	GENTRY	5	10.9%	3	6.5%	33	71.7%	5	10.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	46	
	GRUNDY	15	15.8%	11	11.6%	40	42.1%	22	23.2%	3	3.2%	4	4.2%	95	
	HARRISON	9	13.0%	9	13.0%	28	40.6%	22	31.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	69	
	HOLT	2	7.7%	1	3.8%	14	53.8%	9	34.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26	
	JOHNSON	5	1.9%	1	0.4%	126	47.0%	126	47.0%	0	0.0%	10	3.7%	268	
	LAFAYETTE	5	2.9%	1	0.6%	108	61.7%	59	33.7%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	175	
	LINN	10	13.9%	5	6.9%	40	55.6%	14	19.4%	2	2.8%	1	1.4%	72	
	LIVINGSTON	6	6.1%	11	11.2%	51	52.0%	27	27.6%	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	98	
	MERCER	4	26.7%	3	20.0%	4	26.7%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	
	NODAWAY	7	7.6%	0	0.0%	65	70.7%	20	21.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	92	
	PETTIS	11	3.4%	2	0.6%	179	55.1%	130	40.0%	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	325	
	PLATTE	9	2.2%	5	1.2%	287	70.9%	91	22.5%	2	0.5%	11	2.7%	405	
	PUTNAM	7	17.9%	3	7.7%	21	53.8%	4	10.3%	3	7.7%	1	2.6%	39	
	RAY	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	98	63.2%	51	32.9%	2	1.3%	3	1.9%	155	
	SALINE	17	7.4%	0	0.0%	157	68.0%	50	21.6%	4	1.7%	3	1.3%	231	
SULLIVAN	1	3.8%	4	15.4%	11	42.3%	9	34.6%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	26		
WORTH	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5		
	REGION TOTAL	192	3.5%	97	1.8%	3,323	60.7%	1,658	30.3%	40	0.7%	166	3.0%	5,476	
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	8	4.6%	10	5.7%	123	70.7%	30	17.2%	0	0.0%	3	1.7%	174	
	AUDRAIN	10	5.3%	4	2.1%	113	60.4%	49	26.2%	2	1.1%	9	4.8%	187	
	BOONE	50	5.0%	8	0.8%	494	49.2%	419	41.7%	6	0.6%	27	2.7%	1,004	
	CALLAWAY	23	6.3%	2	0.6%	209	57.6%	117	32.2%	4	1.1%	8	2.2%	363	
	CLARK	3	6.8%	2	4.5%	23	52.3%	14	31.8%	0	0.0%	2	4.5%	44	
	COLE	30	8.5%	5	1.4%	243	68.5%	72	20.3%	1	0.3%	4	1.1%	355	
	FRANKLIN	53	7.8%	9	1.3%	301	44.5%	277	41.0%	2	0.3%	34	5.0%	676	
	GASCONADE	11	10.1%	0	0.0%	82	75.2%	14	12.8%	0	0.0%	2	1.8%	109	
	HOWARD	6	17.6%	2	5.9%	6	17.6%	20	58.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	34	
	KNOX	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	17	60.7%	7	25.0%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%	28	
	LEWIS	4	4.8%	7	8.3%	55	65.5%	16	19.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.4%	84	
	LINCOLN	22	5.2%	5	1.2%	248	58.1%	137	32.1%	3	0.7%	12	2.8%	427	
	MACON	10	9.7%	1	1.0%	46	44.7%	44	42.7%	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	103	
	MARION	23	8.1%	10	3.5%	122	43.1%	112	39.6%	3	1.1%	13	4.6%	283	
	MONROE	9	13.4%	2	3.0%	24	35.8%	23	34.3%	4	6.0%	5	7.5%	67	
	MONTGOMERY	3	3.7%	2	2.4%	52	63.4%	24	29.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	82	
	OSAGE	12	20.7%	0	0.0%	40	69.0%	4	6.9%	0	0.0%	2	3.4%	58	
	PIKE	9	7.8%	0	0.0%	54	47.0%	47	40.9%	1	0.9%	4	3.5%	115	
	RALLS	5	7.6%	3	4.5%	32	48.5%	24	36.4%	0	0.0%	2	3.0%	66	
	RANDOLPH	15	9.7%	7	4.5%	57	36.8%	67	43.2%	4	2.6%	5	3.2%	155	
	SCHUYLER	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	12	60.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	20	
	SCOTLAND	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	11	61.1%	5	27.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	
	SHELBY	3	6.1%	3	6.1%	27	55.1%	16	32.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	
	ST CHARLES	15	1.1%	22	1.7%	693	52.5%	488	37.0%	11	0.8%	90	6.8%	1,319	
	WARREN	14	5.3%	3	1.1%	179	68.3%	49	18.7%	4	1.5%	13	5.0%	262	
		REGION TOTAL	341	5.6%	108	1.8%	3,263	53.7%	2,081	34.2%	47	0.8%	242	4.0%	6,082
	SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	18	18.9%	2	2.1%	57	60.0%	15	15.8%	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	95
BUTLER		25	6.9%	6	1.7%	238	66.1%	65	18.1%	4	1.1%	22	6.1%	360	
CAPE GIRARDEAU		55	13.9%	15	3.8%	258	65.0%	49	12.3%	11	2.8%	9	2.3%	397	
CARTER		3	11.1%	3	11.1%	9	33.3%	9	33.3%	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	27	
CRAWFORD		12	7.2%	10	6.0%	67	40.1%	69	41.3%	0	0.0%	9	5.4%	167	
DENT		8	7.0%	4	3.5%	37	32.5%	55	48.2%	1	0.9%	9	7.9%	114	
DUNKLIN		31	12.7%	1	0.4%	103	42.2%	104	42.6%	1	0.4%	4	1.6%	244	

Appendix E: FY 2022 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/		AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS		SERVICES DECLINED		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE		TOTAL
		AC	OPENED	SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	CONCERNS	ADDRESSED	FOUND	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE			
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	31	8.3%	8	2.1%	197	52.8%	91	24.4%	14	3.8%	32	8.6%	373
	IRON	9	12.3%	2	2.7%	35	47.9%	19	26.0%	4	5.5%	4	5.5%	73
	JEFFERSON	102	7.8%	18	1.4%	707	54.3%	330	25.3%	37	2.8%	108	8.3%	1,302
	MADISON	10	7.9%	8	6.3%	49	38.6%	56	44.1%	1	0.8%	3	2.4%	127
	MARIES	6	13.0%	1	2.2%	18	39.1%	7	15.2%	0	0.0%	14	30.4%	46
	MISSISSIPPI	12	11.2%	1	0.9%	52	48.6%	40	37.4%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	107
	NEW MADRID	13	11.1%	3	2.6%	63	53.8%	36	30.8%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%	117
	OREGON	2	3.9%	2	3.9%	30	58.8%	14	27.5%	0	0.0%	3	5.9%	51
	PEMISCOT	26	17.2%	7	4.6%	61	40.4%	54	35.8%	2	1.3%	1	0.7%	151
	PERRY	25	20.5%	7	5.7%	74	60.7%	15	12.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	122
	PHELPS	37	13.7%	0	0.0%	134	49.4%	57	21.0%	3	1.1%	40	14.8%	271
	PULASKI	14	4.5%	2	0.6%	173	55.8%	53	17.1%	5	1.6%	63	20.3%	310
	REYNOLDS	5	12.2%	1	2.4%	26	63.4%	9	22.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	41
	RIPLEY	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	70	68.0%	14	13.6%	4	3.9%	9	8.7%	103
	SCOTT	23	7.5%	6	2.0%	165	53.7%	110	35.8%	2	0.7%	1	0.3%	307
	SHANNON	3	9.4%	2	6.3%	12	37.5%	10	31.3%	1	3.1%	4	12.5%	32
	ST FRANCOIS	33	6.3%	13	2.5%	215	41.0%	243	46.3%	7	1.3%	14	2.7%	525
	STE GENEVIEVE	7	8.1%	4	4.7%	37	43.0%	37	43.0%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	86
	STODDARD	75	33.5%	2	0.9%	94	42.0%	50	22.3%	1	0.4%	2	0.9%	224
	TEXAS	10	7.0%	2	1.4%	76	53.1%	43	30.1%	1	0.7%	11	7.7%	143
	WASHINGTON	13	5.8%	5	2.2%	85	38.1%	100	44.8%	9	4.0%	11	4.9%	223
WAYNE	11	12.2%	1	1.1%	50	55.6%	21	23.3%	3	3.3%	4	4.4%	90	
	REGION TOTAL	622	10.0%	139	2.2%	3,192	51.3%	1,775	28.5%	116	1.9%	384	6.2%	6,228
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	14	5.6%	13	5.2%	140	56.2%	76	30.5%	0	0.0%	6	2.4%	249
	BARTON	14	17.7%	8	10.1%	27	34.2%	28	35.4%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	79
	BATES	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	73	75.3%	20	20.6%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	97
	BENTON	12	9.9%	5	4.1%	55	45.5%	46	38.0%	2	1.7%	1	0.8%	121
	CAMDEN	9	3.1%	3	1.0%	162	55.9%	105	36.2%	4	1.4%	7	2.4%	290
	CEDAR	12	11.8%	3	2.9%	46	45.1%	40	39.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	102
	CHRISTIAN	43	6.3%	16	2.3%	397	58.0%	215	31.4%	6	0.9%	7	1.0%	684
	DADE	5	10.4%	3	6.3%	18	37.5%	19	39.6%	1	2.1%	2	4.2%	48
	DALLAS	7	5.9%	8	6.7%	56	47.1%	43	36.1%	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	119
	DOUGLAS	14	20.3%	1	1.4%	30	43.5%	22	31.9%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	69
	GREENE	200	7.5%	47	1.8%	1,694	63.5%	579	21.7%	31	1.2%	115	4.3%	2,666
	HENRY	22	12.0%	5	2.7%	92	50.3%	53	29.0%	8	4.4%	3	1.6%	183
	HICKORY	1	2.0%	2	3.9%	18	35.3%	25	49.0%	2	3.9%	3	5.9%	51
	JASPER	69	6.6%	51	4.9%	572	54.7%	331	31.6%	5	0.5%	18	1.7%	1,046
	LACLEDE	21	5.6%	4	1.1%	220	58.5%	122	32.4%	2	0.5%	7	1.9%	376
	LAWRENCE	16	4.7%	12	3.5%	167	49.1%	139	40.9%	3	0.9%	3	0.9%	340
	MCDONALD	13	8.7%	3	2.0%	87	58.4%	41	27.5%	4	2.7%	1	0.7%	149
	MILLER	15	8.0%	3	1.6%	91	48.7%	72	38.5%	5	2.7%	1	0.5%	187
	MONITEAU	4	5.2%	2	2.6%	39	50.6%	28	36.4%	3	3.9%	1	1.3%	77
	MORGAN	9	6.1%	3	2.0%	90	60.8%	42	28.4%	0	0.0%	4	2.7%	148
	NEWTON	35	9.6%	5	1.4%	231	63.5%	91	25.0%	1	0.3%	1	0.3%	364
	OZARK	10	18.2%	1	1.8%	27	49.1%	16	29.1%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	55
	POLK	15	5.0%	6	2.0%	152	50.5%	108	35.9%	3	1.0%	17	5.6%	301
	ST CLAIR	5	8.5%	0	0.0%	36	61.0%	18	30.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	59
	STONE	21	9.9%	5	2.3%	112	52.6%	69	32.4%	2	0.9%	4	1.9%	213
	TANEY	35	8.3%	5	1.2%	233	55.5%	135	32.1%	2	0.5%	10	2.4%	420
	VERNON	15	9.0%	19	11.4%	77	46.1%	50	29.9%	1	0.6%	5	3.0%	167
WEBSTER	10	3.6%	10	3.6%	96	35.0%	149	54.4%	6	2.2%	3	1.1%	274	
WRIGHT	34	21.8%	2	1.3%	74	47.4%	40	25.6%	1	0.6%	5	3.2%	156	
	REGION TOTAL	683	7.5%	245	2.7%	5,112	56.2%	2,722	29.9%	96	1.1%	232	2.6%	9,090
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	147	3.5%	51	1.2%	2,051	48.2%	1,577	37.0%	32	0.8%	399	9.4%	4,257
	REGION TOTAL	147	3.5%	51	1.2%	2,051	48.2%	1,577	37.0%	32	0.8%	399	9.4%	4,257
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	36	3.2%	26	2.3%	611	53.6%	350	30.7%	33	2.9%	84	7.4%	1,140
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	65	2.4%	83	3.1%	1,345	49.8%	1,052	39.0%	47	1.7%	108	4.0%	2,700
	REGION TOTAL	101	2.6%	109	2.8%	1,956	50.9%	1,402	36.5%	80	2.1%	192	5.0%	3,840
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	5	1.4%	5	1.4%	161	45.7%	177	50.3%	3	0.9%	1	0.3%	352
	REGION TOTAL	5	1.4%	5	1.4%	161	45.7%	177	50.3%	3	0.9%	1	0.3%	352
STATE TOTAL		2,091	5.9%	754	2.1%	19,058	54.0%	11,392	32.2%	414	1.2%	1,616	4.6%	35,325

Appendix F: FY 2022 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/		AGENCY RESPONDED				SERVICES		FAMILY		TOTAL		
		AC	OPENED	SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	NO CONCERNS FOUND	DECLINED CHILD SAFE	UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE						
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	58	49.2%	53	44.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	118
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	87.0%	3	13.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23
	BUCHANAN	45	3.6%	10	0.8%	746	59.0%	383	30.3%	5	0.4%	75	5.9%	1,264
	CALDWELL	1	1.4%	3	4.2%	48	67.6%	17	23.9%	2	2.8%	0	0.0%	71
	CARROLL	2	2.1%	0	0.0%	53	55.8%	35	36.8%	4	4.2%	1	1.1%	95
	CASS	20	2.6%	7	0.9%	383	49.5%	344	44.4%	5	0.6%	15	1.9%	774
	CHARITON	10	14.9%	1	1.5%	41	61.2%	14	20.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	67
	CLAY	25	1.5%	28	1.6%	1,200	70.1%	382	22.3%	8	0.5%	69	4.0%	1,712
	CLINTON	9	5.9%	1	0.7%	87	57.2%	46	30.3%	6	3.9%	3	2.0%	152
	COOPER	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	91	66.4%	45	32.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	137
	DAVIESS	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	38	59.4%	23	35.9%	0	0.0%	2	3.1%	64
	DE KALB	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	30	53.6%	20	35.7%	5	8.9%	0	0.0%	56
	GENTRY	8	11.1%	3	4.2%	53	73.6%	8	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	72
	GRUNDY	21	15.6%	17	12.6%	61	45.2%	26	19.3%	4	3.0%	6	4.4%	135
	HARRISON	18	16.1%	15	13.4%	48	42.9%	29	25.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.8%	112
	HOLT	4	10.0%	3	7.5%	22	55.0%	11	27.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	40
	JOHNSON	7	1.8%	2	0.5%	170	44.0%	193	50.0%	0	0.0%	14	3.6%	386
	LAFAYETTE	13	5.3%	1	0.4%	146	59.6%	82	33.5%	1	0.4%	2	0.8%	245
	LINN	16	15.7%	6	5.9%	59	57.8%	18	17.6%	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	102
	LIVINGSTON	16	11.6%	12	8.7%	72	52.2%	33	23.9%	4	2.9%	1	0.7%	138
	MERCER	6	28.6%	3	14.3%	8	38.1%	4	19.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21
NODAWAY	9	7.0%	0	0.0%	91	70.5%	29	22.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	129	
PETTIS	20	4.0%	2	0.4%	276	55.5%	195	39.2%	1	0.2%	3	0.6%	497	
PLATTE	11	2.1%	10	1.9%	366	70.8%	113	21.9%	2	0.4%	15	2.9%	517	
PUTNAM	9	18.4%	4	8.2%	25	51.0%	6	12.2%	4	8.2%	1	2.0%	49	
RAY	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	161	67.4%	72	30.1%	2	0.8%	3	1.3%	239	
SALINE	23	7.2%	0	0.0%	213	67.0%	71	22.3%	8	2.5%	3	0.9%	318	
SULLIVAN	1	3.0%	4	12.1%	14	42.4%	13	39.4%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	33	
WORTH	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	
	REGION TOTAL	300	4.0%	137	1.8%	4,584	60.5%	2,269	30.0%	64	0.8%	219	2.9%	7,573
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	11	4.7%	13	5.6%	161	69.4%	44	19.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.3%	232
	AUDRAIN	13	4.7%	4	1.4%	175	63.2%	70	25.3%	3	1.1%	12	4.3%	277
	BOONE	68	5.0%	13	1.0%	657	48.1%	582	42.6%	6	0.4%	39	2.9%	1,365
	CALLAWAY	38	7.5%	2	0.4%	286	56.5%	161	31.8%	6	1.2%	13	2.6%	506
	CLARK	4	6.3%	2	3.2%	38	60.3%	15	23.8%	0	0.0%	4	6.3%	63
	COLE	45	9.3%	6	1.2%	323	66.9%	100	20.7%	1	0.2%	8	1.7%	483
	FRANKLIN	80	8.7%	15	1.6%	406	44.1%	367	39.9%	3	0.3%	49	5.3%	920
	GASCONADE	19	11.7%	0	0.0%	121	74.7%	15	9.3%	0	0.0%	7	4.3%	162
	HOWARD	10	18.2%	3	5.5%	9	16.4%	33	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	55
	KNOX	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	19	59.4%	9	28.1%	1	3.1%	2	6.3%	32
	LEWIS	6	5.1%	9	7.6%	82	69.5%	19	16.1%	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	118
	LINCOLN	36	6.1%	7	1.2%	340	57.1%	190	31.9%	6	1.0%	16	2.7%	595
	MACON	12	8.5%	3	2.1%	64	45.1%	60	42.3%	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	142
	MARION	36	8.9%	18	4.5%	174	43.1%	154	38.1%	3	0.7%	19	4.7%	404
	MONROE	13	14.3%	3	3.3%	31	34.1%	33	36.3%	6	6.6%	5	5.5%	91
	MONTGOMERY	5	4.3%	3	2.6%	72	62.6%	34	29.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	115
	OSAGE	14	17.7%	0	0.0%	58	73.4%	5	6.3%	0	0.0%	2	2.5%	79
	PIKE	13	7.9%	0	0.0%	79	47.9%	66	40.0%	1	0.6%	6	3.6%	165
	RALLS	6	6.8%	3	3.4%	48	54.5%	29	33.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.3%	88
	RANDOLPH	22	10.5%	9	4.3%	72	34.4%	95	45.5%	5	2.4%	6	2.9%	209
	SCHUYLER	3	10.7%	0	0.0%	16	57.1%	7	25.0%	0	0.0%	2	7.1%	28
SCOTLAND	1	2.9%	2	5.9%	23	67.6%	8	23.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	34	
SHELBY	3	4.3%	4	5.8%	42	60.9%	20	29.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	69	
ST CHARLES	26	1.5%	28	1.6%	900	52.1%	631	36.5%	23	1.3%	120	6.9%	1,728	
WARREN	21	5.7%	4	1.1%	250	68.3%	61	16.7%	10	2.7%	20	5.5%	366	
	REGION TOTAL	506	6.1%	151	1.8%	4,446	53.4%	2,808	33.7%	76	0.9%	339	4.1%	8,326
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	23	17.4%	2	1.5%	85	64.4%	18	13.6%	4	3.0%	0	0.0%	132
	BUTLER	40	8.0%	7	1.4%	338	67.2%	85	16.9%	4	0.8%	29	5.8%	503
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	87	15.2%	20	3.5%	356	62.3%	82	14.4%	15	2.6%	11	1.9%	571
	CARTER	4	10.8%	3	8.1%	14	37.8%	13	35.1%	0	0.0%	3	8.1%	37
	CRAWFORD	21	8.1%	18	6.9%	92	35.4%	113	43.5%	0	0.0%	16	6.2%	260
	DENT	18	10.8%	4	2.4%	54	32.5%	74	44.6%	1	0.6%	15	9.0%	166
	DUNKLIN	49	13.2%	1	0.3%	139	37.6%	174	47.0%	1	0.3%	6	1.6%	370

Appendix F: FY 2022 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/		AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS		SERVICES		FAMILY		TOTAL
		AC	OPENED	SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	FOUND	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE	UNCOOPERATIVE				
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	55	10.4%	11	2.1%	261	49.3%	132	25.0%	21	4.0%	49	9.3%	529
	IRON	17	15.0%	2	1.8%	54	47.8%	27	23.9%	7	6.2%	6	5.3%	113
	JEFFERSON	167	8.9%	27	1.4%	968	51.8%	484	25.9%	47	2.5%	175	9.4%	1,868
	MADISON	15	8.5%	10	5.7%	67	38.1%	78	44.3%	2	1.1%	4	2.3%	176
	MARIES	7	12.7%	1	1.8%	19	34.5%	12	21.8%	0	0.0%	16	29.1%	55
	MISSISSIPPI	23	13.9%	3	1.8%	72	43.6%	65	39.4%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%	165
	NEW MADRID	17	10.2%	7	4.2%	85	51.2%	55	33.1%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	166
	OREGON	3	3.7%	5	6.2%	51	63.0%	19	23.5%	0	0.0%	3	3.7%	81
	PEMISCOT	35	13.5%	14	5.4%	107	41.2%	96	36.9%	7	2.7%	1	0.4%	260
	PERRY	44	23.5%	14	7.5%	108	57.8%	18	9.6%	0	0.0%	3	1.6%	187
	PHELPS	56	15.0%	0	0.0%	174	46.5%	81	21.7%	3	0.8%	60	16.0%	374
	PULASKI	22	5.3%	2	0.5%	217	52.2%	77	18.5%	8	1.9%	90	21.6%	416
	REYNOLDS	10	17.5%	1	1.8%	35	61.4%	11	19.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	57
	RIPLEY	6	3.5%	3	1.7%	124	72.1%	20	11.6%	6	3.5%	13	7.6%	172
	SCOTT	36	7.5%	8	1.7%	277	57.6%	156	32.4%	3	0.6%	1	0.2%	481
	SHANNON	3	7.7%	2	5.1%	14	35.9%	14	35.9%	1	2.6%	5	12.8%	39
	ST FRANCOIS	58	7.6%	16	2.1%	316	41.1%	347	45.2%	14	1.8%	17	2.2%	768
	STE GENEVIEVE	23	15.6%	13	8.8%	57	38.8%	53	36.1%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	147
	STODDARD	113	32.0%	5	1.4%	150	42.5%	79	22.4%	2	0.6%	4	1.1%	353
	TEXAS	15	7.0%	6	2.8%	114	53.3%	55	25.7%	1	0.5%	23	10.7%	214
WASHINGTON	18	5.3%	8	2.4%	122	36.2%	159	47.2%	14	4.2%	16	4.7%	337	
WAYNE	16	11.4%	1	0.7%	83	59.3%	31	22.1%	3	2.1%	6	4.3%	140	
	REGION TOTAL	1,001	11.0%	214	2.3%	4,553	49.8%	2,628	28.8%	166	1.8%	575	6.3%	9,137
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	24	6.4%	18	4.8%	206	55.1%	117	31.3%	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	374
	BARTON	27	20.8%	11	8.5%	42	32.3%	47	36.2%	1	0.8%	2	1.5%	130
	BATES	5	3.9%	0	0.0%	97	76.4%	24	18.9%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	127
	BENTON	17	9.6%	5	2.8%	83	46.6%	69	38.8%	3	1.7%	1	0.6%	178
	CAMDEN	14	3.5%	6	1.5%	215	54.0%	142	35.7%	11	2.8%	10	2.5%	398
	CEDAR	22	13.8%	5	3.1%	71	44.4%	60	37.5%	0	0.0%	2	1.3%	160
	CHRISTIAN	53	5.7%	23	2.5%	552	59.7%	277	30.0%	10	1.1%	9	1.0%	924
	DADE	7	10.6%	3	4.5%	27	40.9%	25	37.9%	1	1.5%	3	4.5%	66
	DALLAS	15	7.8%	11	5.7%	85	44.0%	76	39.4%	3	1.6%	3	1.6%	193
	DOUGLAS	20	23.0%	1	1.1%	38	43.7%	26	29.9%	0	0.0%	2	2.3%	87
	GREENE	324	8.6%	72	1.9%	2,324	61.4%	841	22.2%	41	1.1%	180	4.8%	3,782
	HENRY	30	10.9%	9	3.3%	142	51.8%	74	27.0%	16	5.8%	3	1.1%	274
	HICKORY	1	1.5%	2	2.9%	23	33.8%	33	48.5%	2	2.9%	7	10.3%	68
	JASPER	112	7.6%	80	5.5%	777	53.0%	465	31.7%	8	0.5%	23	1.6%	1,465
	LACLEDE	27	5.2%	5	1.0%	289	55.9%	177	34.2%	5	1.0%	14	2.7%	517
	LAWRENCE	26	5.0%	20	3.9%	247	47.8%	215	41.6%	5	1.0%	4	0.8%	517
	MCDONALD	23	10.2%	5	2.2%	127	56.2%	66	29.2%	4	1.8%	1	0.4%	226
	MILLER	21	8.4%	3	1.2%	121	48.2%	97	38.6%	7	2.8%	2	0.8%	251
	MONITEAU	5	4.3%	2	1.7%	61	52.6%	41	35.3%	6	5.2%	1	0.9%	116
	MORGAN	16	6.5%	3	1.2%	142	57.5%	77	31.2%	0	0.0%	9	3.6%	247
	NEWTON	64	12.6%	9	1.8%	303	59.8%	128	25.2%	1	0.2%	2	0.4%	507
	OZARK	24	27.0%	2	2.2%	40	44.9%	22	24.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	89
	POLK	23	5.3%	9	2.1%	218	50.1%	160	36.8%	4	0.9%	21	4.8%	435
	ST CLAIR	6	8.3%	0	0.0%	44	61.1%	22	30.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	72
	STONE	35	11.9%	6	2.0%	151	51.5%	94	32.1%	2	0.7%	5	1.7%	293
	TANEY	52	9.2%	5	0.9%	316	55.6%	178	31.3%	3	0.5%	14	2.5%	568
	VERNON	22	9.1%	24	10.0%	111	46.1%	74	30.7%	1	0.4%	9	3.7%	241
	WEBSTER	16	4.1%	15	3.9%	134	34.6%	207	53.5%	12	3.1%	3	0.8%	387
WRIGHT	50	22.3%	4	1.8%	97	43.3%	66	29.5%	1	0.4%	6	2.7%	224	
	REGION TOTAL	1,081	8.4%	358	2.8%	7,083	54.8%	3,900	30.2%	148	1.1%	346	2.7%	12,916
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	238	4.0%	81	1.4%	2,825	47.4%	2,166	36.4%	58	1.0%	589	9.9%	5,957
	REGION TOTAL	238	4.0%	81	1.4%	2,825	47.4%	2,166	36.4%	58	1.0%	589	9.9%	5,957
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	56	3.3%	36	2.1%	924	53.8%	546	31.8%	39	2.3%	118	6.9%	1,719
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	92	2.6%	125	3.5%	1,747	48.4%	1,419	39.3%	67	1.9%	157	4.4%	3,607
	REGION TOTAL	148	2.8%	161	3.0%	2,671	50.2%	1,965	36.9%	106	2.0%	275	5.2%	5,326
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	9	1.6%	7	1.3%	278	49.9%	255	45.8%	7	1.3%	1	0.2%	557
	REGION TOTAL	9	1.6%	7	1.3%	278	49.9%	255	45.8%	7	1.3%	1	0.2%	557
STATE TOTAL		3,283	6.6%	1,109	2.2%	26,440	53.1%	15,991	32.1%	625	1.3%	2,344	4.7%	49,792

Appendix G: FY 2022 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL INCIDENTS
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	4
	ATCHISON	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	3
	BUCHANAN	35	48.6%	28	38.9%	8	11.1%	0	0.0%	2	2.8%	23	31.9%	72
	CALDWELL	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	CARROLL	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4
	CASS	21	33.3%	28	44.4%	7	11.1%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	31	49.2%	63
	CHARITON	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	CLAY	21	35.0%	13	21.7%	13	21.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33	55.0%	60
	CLINTON	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	8
	COOPER	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	10
	DAVISS	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4
	DE KALB	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	GENTRY	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	GRUNDY	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	7
	HARRISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	HOLT	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	JOHNSON	16	48.5%	15	45.5%	4	12.1%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%	15	45.5%	33
	LAFAYETTE	9	32.1%	10	35.7%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	46.4%	28
	LINN	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	12
	LIVINGSTON	9	40.9%	8	36.4%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	7	31.8%	22
	MERCER	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	NODAWAY	7	43.8%	6	37.5%	4	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	31.3%	16
	PETTIS	9	29.0%	9	29.0%	2	6.5%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	14	45.2%	31
	PLATTE	13	50.0%	7	26.9%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	12	46.2%	26
	PUTNAM	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	RAY	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	11
SALINE	11	40.7%	11	40.7%	5	18.5%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	11	40.7%	27	
SULLIVAN	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	
WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	
	REGION TOTAL	187	39.9%	169	36.0%	60	12.8%	10	2.1%	4	0.9%	209	44.6%	468
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	12	40.0%	17	56.7%	4	13.3%	3	10.0%	1	3.3%	10	33.3%	30
	AUDRAIN	14	66.7%	8	38.1%	6	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	7	33.3%	21
	BOONE	31	47.0%	32	48.5%	7	10.6%	6	9.1%	0	0.0%	19	28.8%	66
	CALLAWAY	10	29.4%	14	41.2%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	14	41.2%	34
	CLARK	6	50.0%	7	58.3%	3	25.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	12
	COLE	8	30.8%	9	34.6%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	18	69.2%	26
	FRANKLIN	24	31.2%	30	39.0%	7	9.1%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	41	53.2%	77
	GASCONADE	1	16.7%	6	100.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6
	HOWARD	2	20.0%	6	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	KNOX	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	LEWIS	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	9
	LINCOLN	17	27.9%	34	55.7%	11	18.0%	2	3.3%	1	1.6%	21	34.4%	61
	MACON	6	31.6%	12	63.2%	3	15.8%	3	15.8%	2	10.5%	3	15.8%	19
	MARION	16	43.2%	24	64.9%	5	13.5%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%	5	13.5%	37
	MONROE	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	7
	MONTGOMERY	4	36.4%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	11
	OSAGE	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8
	PIKE	5	31.3%	8	50.0%	2	12.5%	1	6.3%	1	6.3%	7	43.8%	16
	RALLS	5	62.5%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	RANDOLPH	14	56.0%	10	40.0%	5	20.0%	3	12.0%	1	4.0%	5	20.0%	25
	SCHUYLER	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	SCOTLAND	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	SHELBY	5	41.7%	9	75.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	12
	ST CHARLES	53	30.1%	98	55.7%	26	14.8%	4	2.3%	4	2.3%	66	37.5%	176
	WARREN	4	14.3%	9	32.1%	5	17.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	57.1%	28
		REGION TOTAL	248	34.7%	363	50.8%	97	13.6%	27	3.8%	16	2.2%	267	37.4%
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	4	40.0%	5	50.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	BUTLER	23	33.8%	43	63.2%	9	13.2%	6	8.8%	1	1.5%	26	38.2%	68
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	10	28.6%	28	80.0%	5	14.3%	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	5	14.3%	35
	CARTER	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	CRAWFORD	6	33.3%	10	55.6%	4	22.2%	2	11.1%	0	0.0%	9	50.0%	18
	DENT	2	25.0%	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	2	25.0%	8
	DUNKLIN	6	37.5%	4	25.0%	3	18.8%	1	6.3%	1	6.3%	10	62.5%	16

Appendix G: FY 2022 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL INCIDENTS
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	21	46.7%	22	48.9%	6	13.3%	3	6.7%	1	2.2%	16	35.6%	45
	IRON	5	50.0%	7	70.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	60.0%	10
	JEFFERSON	38	31.1%	47	38.5%	13	10.7%	8	6.6%	0	0.0%	64	52.5%	122
	MADISON	6	40.0%	4	26.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	66.7%	15
	MARIES	6	60.0%	3	30.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	MISSISSIPPI	6	40.0%	10	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	40.0%	15
	NEW MADRID	3	16.7%	8	44.4%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	50.0%	18
	OREGON	4	40.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	PEMISCOT	6	35.3%	8	47.1%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	52.9%	17
	PERRY	3	37.5%	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	PHELPS	14	34.1%	20	48.8%	4	9.8%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	17	41.5%	41
	PULASKI	23	52.3%	27	61.4%	8	18.2%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	9	20.5%	44
	REYNOLDS	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	8	88.9%	9
	RIPLEY	6	60.0%	5	50.0%	2	20.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%	10
	SCOTT	7	23.3%	11	36.7%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.3%	18	60.0%	30
	SHANNON	9	100.0%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	9
	ST FRANCOIS	29	42.6%	28	41.2%	12	17.6%	3	4.4%	0	0.0%	36	52.9%	68
	STE GENEVIEVE	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	83.3%	6
	STODDARD	8	34.8%	10	43.5%	4	17.4%	1	4.3%	1	4.3%	9	39.1%	23
	TEXAS	8	38.1%	12	57.1%	3	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	38.1%	21
WASHINGTON	14	50.0%	15	53.6%	6	21.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	32.1%	28	
WAYNE	9	50.0%	8	44.4%	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	12	66.7%	18	
	REGION TOTAL	281	38.1%	363	49.2%	96	13.0%	34	4.6%	8	1.1%	326	44.2%	738
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	7
	BARTON	4	57.1%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	BATES	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	4
	BENTON	6	50.0%	6	50.0%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	12
	CAMDEN	6	24.0%	19	76.0%	2	8.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	28.0%	25
	CEDAR	6	37.5%	8	50.0%	2	12.5%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	5	31.3%	16
	CHRISTIAN	5	18.5%	8	29.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	17	63.0%	27
	DADE	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2
	DALLAS	5	35.7%	9	64.3%	5	35.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	14
	DOUGLAS	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8
	GREENE	79	44.4%	81	45.5%	34	19.1%	6	3.4%	0	0.0%	74	41.6%	178
	HENRY	7	43.8%	5	31.3%	1	6.3%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	7	43.8%	16
	HICKORY	7	63.6%	7	63.6%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	JASPER	23	32.9%	18	25.7%	9	12.9%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	39	55.7%	70
	LACLEDE	11	37.9%	18	62.1%	4	13.8%	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	9	31.0%	29
	LAWRENCE	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	9
	MCDONALD	3	27.3%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	54.5%	11
	MILLER	6	25.0%	16	66.7%	3	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	4.2%	7	29.2%	24
	MONITEAU	3	50.0%	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	MORGAN	9	42.9%	12	57.1%	4	19.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	47.6%	21
	NEWTON	7	33.3%	4	19.0%	3	14.3%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	13	61.9%	21
	OZARK	5	41.7%	5	41.7%	4	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	12
	POLK	7	31.8%	6	27.3%	5	22.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	59.1%	22
ST CLAIR	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	8	
STONE	1	12.5%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8	
TANEY	25	42.4%	25	42.4%	3	5.1%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	23	39.0%	59	
VERNON	3	21.4%	8	57.1%	3	21.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	50.0%	14	
WEBSTER	15	40.5%	21	56.8%	4	10.8%	0	0.0%	2	5.4%	12	32.4%	37	
WRIGHT	5	41.7%	6	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	50.0%	12	
	REGION TOTAL	261	37.8%	308	44.6%	94	13.6%	16	2.3%	5	0.7%	296	42.9%	690
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	59	38.1%	38	24.5%	14	9.0%	4	2.6%	2	1.3%	92	59.4%	155
	REGION TOTAL	59	38.1%	38	24.5%	14	9.0%	4	2.6%	2	1.3%	92	59.4%	155
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	52	53.1%	56	57.1%	12	12.2%	8	8.2%	2	2.0%	20	20.4%	98
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	57	40.7%	74	52.9%	28	20.0%	8	5.7%	1	0.7%	41	29.3%	140
	REGION TOTAL	109	45.8%	130	54.6%	40	16.8%	16	6.7%	3	1.3%	61	25.6%	238
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	57	52.8%	26	24.1%	1	0.9%	3	2.8%	0	0.0%	37	34.3%	108
	REGION TOTAL	57	52.8%	26	24.1%	1	0.9%	3	2.8%	0	0.0%	37	34.3%	108
STATE TOTAL		1,202	38.6%	1,397	44.9%	402	12.9%	110	3.5%	38	1.2%	1,288	41.4%	3,111

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 H: FY 2022 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	40.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	5
	ATCHISON	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	3
	BUCHANAN	38	44.2%	38	44.2%	13	15.1%	0	0.0%	2	2.3%	24	27.9%	86
	CALDWELL	2	22.2%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	9
	CARROLL	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	CASS	27	33.3%	38	46.9%	13	16.0%	1	1.2%	1	1.2%	33	40.7%	81
	CHARITON	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	CLAY	23	29.9%	25	32.5%	23	29.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	38	49.4%	77
	CLINTON	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	8
	COOPER	4	23.5%	14	82.4%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	29.4%	17
	DAVISS	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4
	DE KALB	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	GENTRY	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	GRUNDY	6	66.7%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	9
	HARRISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	HOLT	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	JOHNSON	20	43.5%	28	60.9%	4	8.7%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	15	32.6%	46
	LAFAYETTE	9	28.1%	14	43.8%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	40.6%	32
	LINN	8	61.5%	5	38.5%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	23.1%	13
	LIVINGSTON	9	36.0%	10	40.0%	1	4.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	8	32.0%	25
	MERCER	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	NODAWAY	7	29.2%	13	54.2%	6	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	20.8%	24
	PETTIS	10	21.7%	18	39.1%	5	10.9%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	15	32.6%	46
	PLATTE	17	44.7%	15	39.5%	4	10.5%	2	5.3%	0	0.0%	13	34.2%	38
	PUTNAM	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	RAY	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	11
SALINE	13	29.5%	25	56.8%	8	18.2%	4	9.1%	1	2.3%	12	27.3%	44	
SULLIVAN	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	
WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	2	
	REGION TOTAL	219	35.9%	270	44.3%	92	15.1%	13	2.1%	4	0.7%	225	36.9%	610
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	16	32.0%	33	66.0%	6	12.0%	3	6.0%	1	2.0%	13	26.0%	50
	AUDRAIN	14	50.0%	15	53.6%	6	21.4%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	7	25.0%	28
	BOONE	32	36.4%	52	59.1%	14	15.9%	6	6.8%	0	0.0%	20	22.7%	88
	CALLAWAY	11	26.8%	21	51.2%	5	12.2%	0	0.0%	2	4.9%	14	34.1%	41
	CLARK	10	45.5%	16	72.7%	4	18.2%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	6	27.3%	22
	COLE	8	24.2%	14	42.4%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%	20	60.6%	33
	FRANKLIN	25	27.5%	43	47.3%	10	11.0%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	41	45.1%	91
	GASCONADE	1	11.1%	9	100.0%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9
	HOWARD	4	19.0%	15	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	23.8%	21
	KNOX	1	7.7%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13
	LEWIS	8	42.1%	15	78.9%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	19
	LINCOLN	19	21.8%	58	66.7%	18	20.7%	2	2.3%	1	1.1%	23	26.4%	87
	MACON	8	22.9%	26	74.3%	5	14.3%	4	11.4%	3	8.6%	3	8.6%	35
	MARION	18	36.0%	35	70.0%	7	14.0%	0	0.0%	2	4.0%	5	10.0%	50
	MONROE	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	8
	MONTGOMERY	4	36.4%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	11
	OSAGE	1	7.7%	11	84.6%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	30.8%	13
	PIKE	6	23.1%	17	65.4%	4	15.4%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	7	26.9%	26
	RALLS	5	62.5%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	RANDOLPH	14	37.8%	21	56.8%	9	24.3%	3	8.1%	1	2.7%	5	13.5%	37
	SCHUYLER	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	SCOTLAND	1	10.0%	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10
	SHELBY	7	38.9%	14	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18
	ST CHARLES	54	22.3%	154	63.6%	41	16.9%	4	1.7%	6	2.5%	73	30.2%	242
	WARREN	4	11.4%	14	40.0%	8	22.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	51.4%	35
		REGION TOTAL	275	27.5%	616	61.5%	149	14.9%	29	2.9%	21	2.1%	287	28.7%
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	4	28.6%	9	64.3%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	21.4%	14
	BUTLER	27	28.4%	67	70.5%	10	10.5%	6	6.3%	1	1.1%	30	31.6%	95
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	13	21.7%	53	88.3%	11	18.3%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	5	8.3%	60
	CARTER	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	CRAWFORD	6	22.2%	17	63.0%	8	29.6%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	12	44.4%	27
	DENT	4	30.8%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%	13
	DUNKLIN	8	32.0%	10	40.0%	4	16.0%	1	4.0%	1	4.0%	12	48.0%	25

Appendix H: FY 2022 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL CHILDREN
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	22	37.3%	35	59.3%	7	11.9%	3	5.1%	1	1.7%	19	32.2%	59
	IRON	9	50.0%	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	38.9%	18
	JEFFERSON	47	29.0%	78	48.1%	14	8.6%	10	6.2%	0	0.0%	70	43.2%	162
	MADISON	11	50.0%	8	36.4%	3	13.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	45.5%	22
	MARIES	9	56.3%	6	37.5%	6	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	31.3%	16
	MISSISSIPPI	8	30.8%	20	76.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	26.9%	26
	NEW MADRID	6	22.2%	14	51.9%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	37.0%	27
	OREGON	6	35.3%	11	64.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	29.4%	17
	PEMISCOT	8	33.3%	13	54.2%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	41.7%	24
	PERRY	3	27.3%	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11
	PHELPS	17	30.9%	33	60.0%	4	7.3%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	18	32.7%	55
	PULASKI	27	43.5%	44	71.0%	13	21.0%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	10	16.1%	62
	REYNOLDS	4	30.8%	4	30.8%	0	0.0%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	9	69.2%	13
	RIPLEY	9	60.0%	8	53.3%	4	26.7%	4	26.7%	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	15
	SCOTT	8	20.5%	20	51.3%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	18	46.2%	39
	SHANNON	12	92.3%	9	69.2%	1	7.7%	6	46.2%	5	38.5%	3	23.1%	13
	ST FRANCOIS	36	37.9%	46	48.4%	14	14.7%	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	41	43.2%	95
	STE GENEVIEVE	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	7
	STODDARD	8	21.6%	16	43.2%	6	16.2%	3	8.1%	3	8.1%	11	29.7%	37
	TEXAS	11	36.7%	19	63.3%	4	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	33.3%	30
WASHINGTON	15	42.9%	22	62.9%	9	25.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	25.7%	35	
WAYNE	10	38.5%	14	53.8%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	14	53.8%	26	
	REGION TOTAL	352	33.6%	617	58.8%	132	12.6%	46	4.4%	15	1.4%	364	34.7%	1,049
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	8
	BARTON	4	36.4%	8	72.7%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	BATES	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	BENTON	6	46.2%	7	53.8%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	4	30.8%	13
	CAMDEN	6	19.4%	25	80.6%	4	12.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	22.6%	31
	CEDAR	6	35.3%	9	52.9%	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	5	29.4%	17
	CHRISTIAN	5	15.6%	13	40.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	18	56.3%	32
	DADE	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	DALLAS	5	23.8%	16	76.2%	8	38.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	21
	DOUGLAS	4	40.0%	7	70.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	GREENE	91	38.7%	125	53.2%	47	20.0%	7	3.0%	0	0.0%	75	31.9%	235
	HENRY	8	38.1%	8	38.1%	1	4.8%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	9	42.9%	21
	HICKORY	10	55.6%	14	77.8%	3	16.7%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18
	JASPER	24	30.4%	25	31.6%	15	19.0%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	40	50.6%	79
	LACLEDE	13	36.1%	25	69.4%	4	11.1%	1	2.8%	2	5.6%	10	27.8%	36
	LAWRENCE	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	9
	MCDONALD	4	26.7%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	15
	MILLER	6	15.8%	26	68.4%	5	13.2%	0	0.0%	3	7.9%	9	23.7%	38
	MONITEAU	3	27.3%	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11
	MORGAN	11	42.3%	16	61.5%	5	19.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	38.5%	26
	NEWTON	7	25.0%	8	28.6%	5	17.9%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	15	53.6%	28
	OZARK	6	33.3%	10	55.6%	5	27.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18
	POLK	7	29.2%	7	29.2%	7	29.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	54.2%	24
ST CLAIR	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	80.0%	10	
STONE	2	18.2%	7	63.6%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11	
TANEY	26	31.0%	49	58.3%	3	3.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	26	31.0%	84	
VERNON	4	13.8%	21	72.4%	7	24.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	31.0%	29	
WEBSTER	18	32.7%	38	69.1%	7	12.7%	0	0.0%	4	7.3%	13	23.6%	55	
WRIGHT	5	31.3%	10	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	37.5%	16	
	REGION TOTAL	292	31.9%	494	54.0%	138	15.1%	17	1.9%	10	1.1%	317	34.7%	914
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	62	34.1%	54	29.7%	18	9.9%	4	2.2%	2	1.1%	103	56.6%	182
	REGION TOTAL	62	34.1%	54	29.7%	18	9.9%	4	2.2%	2	1.1%	103	56.6%	182
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	60	47.6%	83	65.9%	19	15.1%	11	8.7%	3	2.4%	20	15.9%	126
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	64	36.6%	101	57.7%	31	17.7%	9	5.1%	5	2.9%	42	24.0%	175
	REGION TOTAL	124	41.2%	184	61.1%	50	16.6%	20	6.6%	8	2.7%	62	20.6%	301
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	63	33.7%	72	38.5%	1	0.5%	3	1.6%	0	0.0%	66	35.3%	187
	REGION TOTAL	63	33.7%	72	38.5%	1	0.5%	3	1.6%	0	0.0%	66	35.3%	187
STATE TOTAL		1,387	32.7%	2,307	54.4%	580	13.7%	132	3.1%	60	1.4%	1,424	33.6%	4,244

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 I: Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year

	COUNTY	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	0	0	0	1	0	
	ATCHISON	0	0	0	0	0	
	BUCHANAN	4	1	1	2	0	
	CALDWELL	0	0	0	0	0	
	CARROLL	0	0	0	0	0	
	CASS	0	0	0	0	1	
	CHARITON	1	1	0	0	0	
	CLAY	1	4	2	1	3	
	CLINTON	0	0	1	1	0	
	COOPER	0	0	0	0	0	
	DAVISS	0	0	0	0	0	
	DE KALB	0	0	0	0	0	
	GENTRY	1	0	0	0	0	
	GRUNDY	0	0	0	0	0	
	HARRISON	0	0	0	0	0	
	HOLT	0	0	0	0	0	
	JOHNSON	0	0	0	0	0	
	LAFAYETTE	0	0	0	0	0	
	LINN	0	1	0	0	0	
	LIVINGSTON	0	0	0	0	1	
	MERCER	0	0	0	0	0	
	NODAWAY	0	0	0	0	0	
	PETTIS	0	0	0	1	2	
	PLATTE	0	0	1	1	3	
	PUTNAM	0	0	0	0	0	
	RAY	0	0	0	0	1	
	SALINE	0	0	1	0	0	
SULLIVAN	0	0	0	0	0		
WORTH	0	0	0	0	0		
	REGION TOTAL	7	7	6	7	11	
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	1	0	1	1	1	
	AUDRAIN	0	0	0	0	0	
	BOONE	1	1	0	1	0	
	CALLAWAY	1	0	0	0	0	
	CLARK	0	0	0	1	0	
	COLE	0	1	0	1	0	
	FRANKLIN	2	0	0	2	1	
	GASCONADE	0	0	0	0	0	
	HOWARD	0	0	0	0	0	
	KNOX	0	0	1	0	0	
	LEWIS	0	1	0	0	1	
	LINCOLN	1	0	0	2	2	
	MACON	1	0	0	0	0	
	MARION	0	0	0	2	0	
	MONROE	0	0	0	0	0	
	MONTGOMERY	0	0	0	0	0	
	OSAGE	0	0	1	0	0	
	PIKE	0	0	0	1	0	
	RALLS	0	0	2	0	0	
	RANDOLPH	0	0	1	0	0	
	SCHUYLER	0	0	0	0	0	
	SCOTLAND	0	0	0	0	1	
	SHELBY	0	0	0	0	0	
	ST. CHARLES	3	2	0	1	2	
	WARREN	0	0	0	2	2	
		REGION TOTAL	10	5	6	14	10
	SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	0	0	1	0	0
BUTLER		0	1	0	2	1	
CAPE GIRARDEAU		2	1	0	0	0	
CARTER		0	0	0	0	0	
CRAWFORD		2	0	0	0	0	
DENT		0	0	0	1	0	
DUNKLIN		0	0	0	0	0	

Appendix I: Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year

	COUNTY	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	0	1	0	0	1
	IRON	0	0	0	0	0
	JEFFERSON	1	0	3	3	1
	MADISON	0	0	0	0	0
	MARIES	0	1	0	0	0
	MISSISSIPPI	0	1	0	0	1
	NEW MADRID	2	0	1	0	0
	OREGON	0	0	0	0	0
	PEMISCOT	0	1	2	0	1
	PERRY	0	0	0	0	1
	PHELPS	0	0	1	0	0
	PULASKI	1	1	1	0	1
	REYNOLDS	0	1	2	0	0
	RIPLEY	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTT	0	1	1	0	1
	SHANNON	0	0	0	0	0
	ST. FRANCOIS	1	0	1	0	1
	STE. GENEVIEVE	0	0	1	0	0
	STODDARD	0	0	0	1	0
	TEXAS	0	0	0	1	1
WASHINGTON	1	0	1	1	1	
WAYNE	0	0	1	0	0	
	REGION TOTAL	10	9	16	9	11
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	0	0	0	0	0
	BARTON	0	0	0	1	0
	BATES	0	0	0	0	0
	BENTON	0	0	0	1	0
	CAMDEN	0	0	0	0	1
	CEDAR	0	0	1	0	0
	CHRISTIAN	2	0	0	0	0
	DADE	0	0	0	0	0
	DALLAS	0	0	1	1	0
	DOUGLAS	0	1	0	0	0
	GREENE	2	1	0	2	1
	HENRY	0	1	0	0	0
	HICKORY	0	0	0	0	0
	JASPER	2	1	1	0	1
	LACLEDE	1	0	1	1	1
	LAWRENCE	0	0	1	0	0
	MCDONALD	0	0	0	0	0
	MILLER	0	2	0	1	0
	MONITEAU	0	0	0	0	0
	MORGAN	0	0	0	0	0
	NEWTON	0	0	0	0	0
	OZARK	1	0	0	0	0
	POLK	1	0	0	2	0
	ST CLAIR	0	0	0	0	0
	STONE	1	0	0	0	0
	TANEY	0	0	0	0	0
	VERNON	0	0	0	0	0
WEBSTER	0	0	0	0	0	
WRIGHT	0	1	0	1	1	
	REGION TOTAL	10	7	5	10	5
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	2	4	1	6	5
	REGION TOTAL	2	4	1	6	5
ST. LOUIS	ST. LOUIS CITY	1	3	7	10	1
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	6	9	9	14	5
	REGION TOTAL	7	12	16	24	6
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	3	0	1	2	1
	REGION TOTAL	3	0	1	2	1
STATE TOTAL		49	44	51	72	49

Appendix J. 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. Victims of abuse shall also include any victims of sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking as those terms are defined in 22 U.S.C. 78 Section 7102(9)-(10).

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. Victims of neglect shall also include any victims of sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking as those terms are defined in 22 U.S.C. 78 Section 7102(9)-(10).

Sex trafficking is defined as the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act.

Severe forms of trafficking in persons is defined as:

- (A) Sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or
- (B) The recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.

Care, custody and control of the child includes, but is not limited to:

- The parents or legal guardians of the child;
- Other members of the child's household;
- Those exercising supervision over a child for any part of a twenty-four hour day;
- Any adult person who has access to the child based on relationship to the parents of the child or members of the child's household or the family;
- Any person who takes control of the child by deception, force, or coercion; or
- School personnel, contractors and volunteers, if the relationship with the child was established through the school or through school-related activities, even if the alleged abuse or neglect occurred outside of school hours or off school grounds.

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

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. 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.

Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions

Juvenile assessments: 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). Prior to May 2018, non-caretaker referrals, investigations, or traditional assessments may all have met criteria for a juvenile report. In May 2018, CD policy allowed juvenile reports to be treated like Family Assessments and the system was changed to be able to track the report as juvenile.

Differential response assessments are those assessments determined by the family, CD worker and supervisor as needing more intensive work, Its’ purpose is to provide the family with needed resources, support and services to further promote safety and well-being of the family during the assessment period.

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, clergyperson, 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 J. 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 **Assessment** conclusions:

Agency Responded Refer to FCS or AC Case Opened: The Division responded to the report and at some point during the assessment period referred the family to Family Centered Services (FCS) or the child was taken into custody and Alternative Care (AC) case was opened.

Agency Responded Services Provided: The Division responded to the report and found concerns in the home.

Agency Responded Concerns Addressed: The Division responded to the report and found concerns in the home but those concerns were addressed during the assessment process, community resources or other resources from staff.

Agency Responded No Concerns Found: The Division responded to the report, assured the safety of the children, spoke with parents/caretaker, made a home visit and found the allegations in the report to have no merit.

Family Declined Services Child Safe: The Division offered to provide Differential Response services but the family refused. CD staff was able to document the child was safe.

Family Uncooperative Child Safe: The Division offered to provide Differential Response services but the family refused. CD staff was able to document the child was safe.

Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions

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, Already Investigated,** 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 J. 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.