



Missouri Department of  
**Social Services**

**Children's Division**

**Child Abuse and Neglect  
Annual Report  
Fiscal Year 2023**

# Our Mission



Empower Missourians to live safe, healthy, and productive lives.



---

MICHAEL L. PARSON, GOVERNOR • ROBERT J. KNODELL, DIRECTOR

DARRELL MISSEY, DIRECTOR

CHILDREN'S DIVISION

P.O. BOX 88 • JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65103-0088

WWW.DSS.MO.GOV • 573-522-8448 • 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 2023, July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. 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***

---

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Reports</b> .....	2
Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline .....	2
Reporters .....	3
<b>Child Protection System: Assessments &amp; Investigations</b> .....	5
Observed Family Characteristics .....	7
Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion .....	9
<b>Assessment Conclusions</b> .....	11
Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion .....	11
Demographics of Assessment Children.....	13
<b>Substantiated Conclusions</b> .....	14
Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	14
Observed Family Characteristics .....	17
Demographics of Substantiated Children .....	18
Child Abuse/Neglect Fatalities .....	19
<b>Perpetrators</b> .....	21
Perpetrator Demographics .....	21
Observed Perpetrator Characteristics .....	22
<b>Prevention/Treatment Services</b> .....	23
Family-Centered Services (FCS) .....	23
Intensive In-Home Services (IIS) .....	23
Out-of-Home Placement .....	23
Child Care .....	24
Crisis Nurseries .....	24
Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board .....	24
Calls from Reporters .....	24
Newborn Crisis Assessments and Services .....	25
<b>Appendices</b> .....	27
A. Reported Incidents by Conclusion .....	28
B. Reported Children by Conclusion .....	30
C. Assessment Incidents by Conclusion .....	32
D. Assessment Children by Conclusion .....	34
E. Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	36
F. Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	38
G. Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year .....	40
H. Legal and Methodological Definitions .....	42



---

## ***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, 2022 through June 30, 2023. As a result of pending investigations or changes in conclusions, the data is prone to change. The data reported is current as of January 7, 2024.

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 12 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 61,000 reported incidents that involved over 86,000 children in Missouri.

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

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

After a report of suspected abuse, neglect, or exploitation has been made to the hotline, the information is forwarded electronically to one of the 114 county offices or the St. Louis City office for either investigation or assessment. A report indicating behavior that may constitute a criminal violation is screened as an investigation and law enforcement is contacted to co-investigate. Reports of child abuse/neglect that do not appear to be of a criminal nature may be responded to as 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 2023, thirty-eight percent (38.0%) of reports taken by the CANHU were assigned as investigation and fifty-six percent (56.1%) as family assessments. Six percent (5.9%) 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 assessments within 90 days. At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion. Of the 86,088 children with reports in FY 2023, 4,347 (5.0%), were substantiated as abused/neglected.

# Reports

## Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline

The CANHU received 139,739\* hotline calls between July 2022 and June 2023. Of those reports, 61,712 were classified as Investigations or Assessments and involved 86,088 children.

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

Year	Total Reports**	Annual Change	Total Children***	Annual Change
2019	64,920		89,738	
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%
2023	61,712	6.0%	86,088	6.9%


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

\*\* Total reports include only reports with a Type of Response of Investigation or Assessment and investigated 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.

\*\*\* All counts of children are duplicated because a child may be reported more than once during the year.

Comparing months, March had the highest number, and July the least, of both reported incidents and children. During FY 2023, an average of 5,143 reports involving 7,174 children were made each month.


### FY 2023 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. A total of 68,708 children had been involved in at least one report during FY 2023, with the majority (81.6%) having only been reported once. More than one call was received for 12,633 children with fourteen percent (13.6%) involved in two reports and five percent (4.8%) involved more than twice.

**Number of Reported Incidents Per Child during FY 2023**




## Reporters

Reports of child abuse/neglect can be made by persons who are either "mandated" or "permissive" reporters. More than one reporter may be involved in a report to the hotline.

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 law enforcement. The majority of reporters during FY 2023 were mandated reporters.

Permissive reporters, such as relatives or neighbors, are not required to report suspected abuse/neglect.

**Type of Child/Abuse Neglect Reporters during FY 2023**



## Reports

Mandated reporters were more often in the occupations of an education or health profession, law enforcement or social work.

### Reporters of Child Abuse/Neglect during FY 2023 by Occupation

	Number	Percent
Permissive	12,966	17.8%
Principal or other school official	10,855	14.9%
Peace Officer or Law Enforcement Official	10,333	14.2%
Social worker	9,547	13.1%
Mental Health Professional	6,501	8.9%
Teacher	5,197	7.2%
Nurse	4,144	5.7%
Unknown	3,556	4.9%
Other Person with Responsibility for Care of Children	3,177	4.4%
Children's Division Worker	1,497	2.1%
Other Health Practitioner	826	1.1%
Juvenile Officer	819	1.1%
Physician	762	1.0%
Day Care center or other childcare worker	715	1.0%
Other Hospital/Clinic Personnel	514	0.7%
Psychologist	290	0.4%
Intern	227	0.3%
Minister	162	0.2%
Probation Officer or Parole Officer	132	0.2%
Medical examiner	126	0.2%
Resident	114	0.2%
Jail/detention personnel and volunteers	62	0.1%
Volunteer/personnel of community service program	61	0.1%
Coroner	49	0.1%
Dentist/dental hygienist	41	0.1%
Chiropractor	1	0.0%
Optometrist	1	0.0%
Podiatrist	0	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.

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.

Around five percent of investigation tracks were later changed to assessments, and three percent of assessments were later tracked as investigations.

	Track at time of call	Changed Track	Final Track
Investigation	23,468	1,204	23,461
Family Assessment	34,623	1,194	34,625
Juvenile Assessment	3,621	6	3,626



---

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

---

Children's Service Workers investigate or 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.

### **Observed Family Characteristics**

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

The most often cited family characteristics during assessments and also during investigations included adequate living conditions, extended family support systems and community/cultural support.

# Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

## Characteristics of Families Involved in Family Assessments during FY 2023

	Number	Percent
Adequate Living Conditions	9,554	25.0%
Extended Family Support System	7,645	20.0%
Community/Cultural Support	7,511	19.6%
Single Parent Household	6,110	16.0%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	5,072	13.3%
Amenable to Services	4,895	12.8%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	4,425	11.6%
Problem Solving Skills	3,610	9.4%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	2,993	7.8%
No History of Violence	1,534	4.0%
Good Physical/Mental Health	1,345	3.5%
Stable Marriage	1,023	2.7%
Manages Finances Well	893	2.3%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	596	1.6%
Domestic Violence	585	1.5%
Lack of Parenting Skills	547	1.4%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	484	1.3%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	351	0.9%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	300	0.8%
Crowded Living Conditions	284	0.7%
Marital Problems	258	0.7%
Positive Childhood Experiences	253	0.7%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	251	0.7%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	238	0.6%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	229	0.6%
Homelessness	202	0.5%
Dangerous Living Conditions	180	0.5%
Loss of Employment	125	0.3%
Social Isolation	95	0.2%
Teen Parent(s)	84	0.2%
Lack of Utilities	75	0.2%
Illness	60	0.2%
Role Reversal	33	0.1%
Incapacity due to Physical Handicap	27	0.1%
Intellectual Disability	16	0.0%

*Percent is the percentage of 38,251 reports tracked as Family Assessments or Juvenile Assessments.*

*Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each assessment.*

# Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

## Characteristics of Families Involved in Investigations during FY 2023

	Number	Percent
Adequate Living Conditions	5,041	21.5%
Extended Family Support System	4,560	19.4%
Community/Cultural Support	3,824	16.3%
Single Parent Household	2,990	12.7%
Amenable to Services	2,858	12.2%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	2,360	10.1%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	2,148	9.2%
Problem Solving Skills	1,773	7.6%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	1,588	6.8%
No History of Violence	817	3.5%
Manages Finances Well	777	3.3%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	691	2.9%
Stable Marriage	666	2.8%
Good Physical/Mental Health	659	2.8%
Lack of Parenting Skills	659	2.8%
Domestic Violence	526	2.2%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	294	1.3%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	254	1.1%
Dangerous Living Conditions	252	1.1%
Marital Problems	247	1.1%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	225	1.0%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	216	0.9%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	203	0.9%
Positive Childhood Experiences	190	0.8%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	182	0.8%
Crowded Living Conditions	152	0.6%
Homelessness	127	0.5%
Loss of Employment	83	0.4%
Social Isolation	81	0.3%
Teen Parent(s)	74	0.3%
Lack of Utilities	50	0.2%
Role Reversal	32	0.1%
Illness	20	0.1%
Incapacity due to Physical Handicap	13	0.1%
Intellectual Disability	9	0.0%

*Percent is the percentage of 23,461 reports tracked as Investigations.*

*Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each assessment.*

## Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

Unless there is good cause, investigations and assessments should be closed within 45 days. Juvenile 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 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, school investigation by school board, or the report has not yet been concluded. See Appendix J for further definition.

### Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion

Five percent of incidents (4.9%) and of children (5.0%) were concluded as substantiated, consistent with past years.

#### Reported Incidents of CA/N by Conclusion


Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
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
2023	3,041	4.9%	1,182	1.9%	15,331	24.8%	34,801	56.4%	7,357	11.9%	61,712

# Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

## Reported Children of CA/N by Conclusion

Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
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
2023	4,347	5.0%	1,718	2.0%	20,119	23.4%	49,565	57.6%	10,339	12.0%	86,088

## 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, Home Schooling, Not Concluded

## 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 and Juvenile Assessments 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

For reports concluded as assessments during FY 2023, the majority had concerns addressed or there were no concerns found.

#### 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	
2019	2,508	10.4%	2,054	8.5%	16,686	69.3%	16,379	68.0%	784	3.3%	2,364	9.8%	24,089
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
2023	1,767	5.1%	520	1.5%	21,588	62.0%	9,199	26.4%	326	0.9%	1,401	4.0%	34,801

#### 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	
2019	3,939	11.5%	2,957	8.6%	23,086	67.5%	22,804	66.6%	1,177	3.4%	3,340	9.8%	34,217
2020	4,164	15.3%	1,989	7.3%	22,806	84.0%	17,605	64.8%	800	2.9%	2,600	9.6%	27,158
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
2023	2,823	5.7%	777	1.6%	30,113	60.8%	13,209	26.6%	529	1.1%	2,118	4.3%	49,565

## Assessment Conclusions

Agency Responded Concerns Addressed or Agency Responded Services Provided were most often concluded for both Family Assessments and Juvenile Assessments.


### Reported Incidents by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2023

Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	1,712	5.4%	55	1.8%	1,767	5.1%
Agency Responded Services Provided	479	1.5%	41	1.3%	520	1.5%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	19,309	61.0%	2,279	72.8%	21,588	62.0%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	8,561	27.0%	638	20.4%	9,199	26.4%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	314	1.0%	12	0.4%	326	0.9%
Family Uncooperative, Child Safe	1,297	4.1%	104	3.3%	1,401	4.0%
<b>Total Assessment Conclusions</b>	<b>31,672</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,129</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>34,811</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


### Reported Children by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2023

Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Total Assessments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	2,746	6.0%	77	2.0%	2,823	5.7%
Agency Responded Services Provided	718	1.6%	55	1.4%	773	1.6%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	27,369	59.8%	2,744	72.0%	30,113	60.8%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	12,424	27.2%	785	20.6%	13,209	26.6%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	513	1.1%	16	0.4%	529	1.1%
Family Uncooperative, Child Safe	1,984	4.3%	134	3.5%	2,118	4.3%
<b>Total Assessment Conclusions</b>	<b>45,754</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,811</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>49,565</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### FY 2023 Concluded Family Assessments



#### FY 2023 Concluded Juvenile Assessments



# Assessment Conclusions

## Demographics of Assessment Children

Children involved in reports concluded as assessments were almost evenly split between males (50.0%) and females (49.7%). The majority of children were white (71.0%), and almost nine percent (8.6%) were Hispanic.

### Assessment Concluded Children during FY 2023


	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
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,565</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,823</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Age</b>								
< 1	1,945	3.9%	173	6.1%	29	3.8%	27	5.1%
1	2,062	4.2%	179	6.3%	37	4.8%	24	4.5%
2	2,269	4.6%	162	5.7%	25	3.2%	27	5.1%
3	2,387	4.8%	163	5.8%	33	4.3%	15	2.8%
4	2,695	5.4%	143	5.1%	38	4.9%	24	4.5%
5	3,042	6.1%	168	6.0%	47	6.1%	31	5.9%
6	3,381	6.8%	173	6.1%	48	6.2%	46	8.7%
7	3,354	6.8%	165	5.8%	50	6.5%	35	6.6%
8	3,319	6.7%	179	6.3%	44	5.7%	35	6.6%
9	3,072	6.2%	139	4.9%	44	5.7%	31	5.9%
10	2,950	6.0%	138	4.9%	46	6.0%	35	6.6%
11	2,924	5.9%	141	5.0%	42	5.4%	33	6.2%
12	3,021	6.1%	165	5.8%	53	6.9%	24	4.5%
13	3,150	6.4%	177	6.3%	63	8.2%	20	3.8%
14	3,107	6.3%	168	6.0%	61	7.9%	35	6.6%
15	2,683	5.4%	154	5.5%	46	6.0%	31	5.9%
16	2,507	5.1%	158	5.6%	43	5.6%	36	6.8%
17	1,497	3.0%	77	2.7%	23	3.0%	17	3.2%
Not available	299	0.4%	1	0.0%	1	0.1%	3	0.6%
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	24,651	49.7%	1,434	50.8%	388	50.2%	271	51.2%
Female	24,806	50.0%	1,389	49.2%	385	49.8%	257	48.6%
Not available	108	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
<b>Race</b>								
White	35,183	71.0%	2,113	74.8%	574	74.3%	382	72.2%
Black	7,108	14.3%	291	10.3%	117	15.1%	79	14.9%
Other/unknown	7,274	14.7%	419	14.8%	82	10.6%	68	12.9%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>								
Hispanic	4,251	8.6%	222	7.9%	70	9.0%	36	6.8%
Not Hispanic	40,742	82.2%	2,333	82.6%	639	82.7%	440	83.2%
Unknown	4,585	9.2%	268	9.5%	64	8.3%	53	10.0%

# Substantiated Conclusions

## Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

During FY 2023, 4,347 children were involved in incidents that were concluded as substantiated for abuse and/or 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 substantiated category during FY 2023 investigations.

**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2023**




**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2023**

	Number	Percent
Neglect	2,305	53.0%
Sexual Abuse	1,257	28.9%
Physical Abuse	1,077	24.8%
Emotional Abuse	409	9.4%
Medical Neglect	101	2.3%
Educational Neglect	58	1.3%

Percent is the percentage of 4,347 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

March had the highest number of substantiated abused/neglected children (402) during the fiscal year while October had the least (300). June saw the highest incidence of neglect (246), February had the highest incidence of sexual abuse (124), and July had the highest for physical abuse (99).



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 2023

	Number	Percent
Lack of supervision	1,668	72.4%
Unsafe/Inadequate shelter	453	19.7%
Unsanitary living conditions	392	17.0%
Failure to protect	286	12.4%
Blaming, verbal abuse, threatening	172	7.5%
Other physical abuse or injury	127	5.5%
Bruises, welts, red marks	121	5.2%
Other sexual abuse	86	3.7%
Inappropriately giving drugs	77	3.3%
Untreated illness/injury	66	2.9%

Percent is the percentage of 2,305 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 2023**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Bruises, welts, red marks	581	53.9%
Other physical abuse or injury	519	48.2%
Lack of supervision	191	17.7%
Abrasions, lacerations	170	15.8%
Inappropriately giving drugs	147	13.6%
Blaming, verbal abuse, threatening	100	9.3%
Failure to Protect	94	8.7%
Fractures	64	5.9%
Other sexual abuse	47	4.4%
Unsanitary living conditions	45	4.2%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,077 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 2023**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Other sexual abuse	729	58.0%
Fondling/Touching	601	47.8%
Intercourse	313	24.9%
Oral sex, sodomy	228	18.1%
Digital penetration	145	11.5%
Pornography	88	7.0%
Lack of supervision	70	5.6%
Failure to protect	60	4.8%
Blaming, verbal abuse, threatening	48	3.8%
Inappropriately giving drugs	47	3.7%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,257 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 2023**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Extended Family Support System	1,055	34.7%
Adequate Living Conditions	778	25.6%
Single Parent Household	636	20.9%
Amenable to Services	609	20.0%
Community/Cultural Support	606	19.9%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	472	15.5%
Lack of Parenting Skills	426	14.0%
Domestic Violence	284	9.3%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	259	8.5%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	236	7.8%
Problem Solving Skills	236	7.8%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	226	7.4%
Manages Finances Well	203	6.7%
Dangerous Living Conditions	197	6.5%
No History of Violence	175	5.8%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	173	5.7%
Stable Marriage	134	4.4%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	120	3.9%
Marital Problems	108	3.6%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	102	3.4%

**Percent is the percentage of 3,041 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 2023, over half (58.6%) were female and forty percent (41.4%) 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 2023 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
<b>Total</b>	4,347	100.0%	2,305	100.0%	1,077	100.0%	1,257	100.0%	409	100.0%	101	100.0%	58	100.0%
<b>Age</b>														
<1	270	6.2%	193	8.4%	102	9.5%	5	0.4%	9	2.2%	18	17.8%	0	0.0%
1	255	5.9%	211	9.2%	55	5.1%	3	0.2%	11	2.7%	9	8.9%	0	0.0%
2	257	5.9%	219	9.5%	61	5.7%	5	0.4%	13	3.2%	10	9.9%	0	0.0%
3	239	5.5%	173	7.5%	56	5.2%	24	1.9%	13	3.2%	10	9.9%	0	0.0%
4	262	6.0%	194	8.4%	43	4.0%	34	2.7%	18	4.4%	8	7.9%	0	0.0%
5	228	5.2%	152	6.6%	46	4.3%	44	3.5%	12	2.9%	5	5.0%	2	3.4%
6	202	4.6%	123	5.3%	47	4.4%	37	2.9%	24	5.9%	4	4.0%	1	1.7%
7	191	4.4%	102	4.4%	45	4.2%	59	4.7%	21	5.1%	4	4.0%	7	12.1%
8	239	5.5%	137	5.9%	54	5.0%	55	4.4%	25	6.1%	2	2.0%	2	3.4%
9	208	4.8%	101	4.4%	49	4.5%	56	4.5%	15	3.7%	3	3.0%	5	8.6%
10	204	4.7%	115	5.0%	50	4.6%	60	4.8%	35	8.6%	2	2.0%	8	13.8%
11	211	4.9%	95	4.1%	44	4.1%	80	6.4%	26	6.4%	1	1.0%	5	8.6%
12	217	5.0%	78	3.4%	56	5.2%	93	7.4%	29	7.1%	1	1.0%	4	6.9%
13	291	6.7%	90	3.9%	74	6.9%	145	11.5%	43	10.5%	9	8.9%	5	8.6%
14	322	7.4%	104	4.5%	88	8.2%	162	12.9%	34	8.3%	5	5.0%	9	15.5%
15	325	7.5%	107	4.6%	93	8.6%	159	12.6%	28	6.8%	6	5.9%	2	3.4%
16	242	5.6%	62	2.7%	61	5.7%	140	11.1%	33	8.1%	2	2.0%	8	13.8%
17	184	4.2%	49	2.1%	53	4.9%	96	7.6%	20	4.9%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Gender</b>														
Male	1,801	41.4%	1,149	49.8%	583	54.1%	170	13.5%	160	39.1%	46	45.5%	36	62.1%
Female	2,546	58.6%	1,156	50.2%	494	45.9%	1,087	86.5%	249	60.9%	55	54.5%	22	37.9%
<b>Race</b>														
White	3,321	76.4%	1,712	74.3%	818	76.0%	1,052	83.7%	325	79.5%	72	71.3%	49	84.5%
Black	494	11.4%	281	12.2%	125	11.6%	93	7.4%	41	10.0%	11	10.9%	6	10.3%
Other	532	12.2%	312	13.5%	134	12.4%	112	8.9%	43	10.5%	18	17.8%	3	5.2%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>														
Hispanic	369	8.5%	171	7.4%	98	9.1%	120	9.5%	42	10.3%	11	10.9%	5	8.6%
Not Hispanic	3,642	83.8%	1,922	83.4%	900	83.6%	1,067	84.9%	337	82.4%	80	79.2%	53	91.4%
Unknown	336	7.7%	212	9.2%	79	7.3%	70	5.6%	30	7.3%	10	9.9%	0	0.0%

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

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


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

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

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

The number of fatalities reported during any given year may change as a result of pending investigations, changes in conclusions and deaths not reported in a timely manner. During fiscal year 2023, 44 children died as a result of child abuse/neglect.

The following chart represents the number of child fatalities for fiscal years 2019 to 2023, 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 and physical abuse.

### Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2023

	Number	Percent
Neglect	40	90.9%
Physical Abuse	13	29.5%
Medical Neglect	6	13.6%
Emotional Abuse	1	2.3%
Sexual Abuse	0	0.0%

Percent is the percent of the 44 substantiated fatalities. Percent total is greater than 100 because a child may be substantiated for up to six categories of abuse/neglect.

Of the children who died as a result of abuse or neglect in FY 2023, the majority were under the age of one, male and white.

### Substantiated Fatalities during FY 2023

Age	Number	Percent
0	21	47.7%
1	5	11.4%
2	8	18.2%
3	5	11.4%
5	1	2.3%
6	2	4.5%
9	1	2.3%
14	1	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	27	61.4%
Female	17	38.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	28	63.6%
Black	5	11.4%
Other	11	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

# Perpetrators

## Perpetrator Demographics

For FY 2023 substantiated reports, the majority of perpetrators were white, male and between ages 20 and 49.

### Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2023

Age	Number	Percent
<20	159	3.9%
20-29	1,008	25.0%
30-39	1,419	35.1%
40-49	719	17.8%
50-59	269	6.7%
60-69	113	2.8%
70+	41	1.0%
Unknown	310	7.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,038</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	2,986	73.9%
Black	465	11.5%
Other/unknown	587	14.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,038</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Female	1,423	35.2%
Male	2,353	58.3%
Unknown	262	6.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,038</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

During the report year, a substantiated perpetrator may be involved in more than one incident and in more than one relationship type. A natural parent and parent’s partner accounted for the majority of substantiated perpetrators involved in an investigation.

### Substantiated Perpetrators by Relationship to Child during FY 2023

	#
Natural parent	3,226
Parent/Caretaker’s Partner	488
Step-parent	349
Grandparent	258
Aunt/Uncle/Cousin	235
Friend	150
Sibling/half, step-sibling	85
Adoptive Parent	81
No Relationship Exists	68
Institution/staff	46
Day care provider	44
Alleged Father	38
School/personnel	39
Other caregiver	34
Natural child	32
Neighbor	29
Legal Guardian	26
Other relative	29
Foster parent	22
Putative Father	10
Other	863

# 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.

### Characteristics of Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2023

	Number	Percent
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	776	19.2%
No Apparent Mental/Emotional Disturbance	614	15.2%
Mental/Emotional Disturbance	518	12.8%
Adequate Support System	519	12.9%
History of Criminal Behavior	514	12.7%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	314	7.8%
Amenable to Services	314	7.8%
Pattern of Violent Behavior	286	7.1%
Unemployed	263	6.5%
Unrealistic Expectations of Child	209	5.2%
Loss of Control During Discipline	181	4.5%
Parental History of Abuse/Neglect as a Child	175	4.3%
High School Education or Higher	175	4.3%
Financial Problems	165	4.1%
Immaturity	150	3.7%
Undetermined	137	3.4%
Low Self Esteem	102	2.5%
No One to Call on in Time of Crisis	77	1.9%
Institutional Report/Unknown Perpetrator	47	1.2%
Less than High School Education	27	0.7%
Illness	18	0.4%
Intellectual Disability	11	0.3%
Incapacity Due to Physical Handicap	7	0.2%
Other	65	1.6%

Percentage is the percentage of 4,038 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 has determined services are needed. These services are also provided to families who voluntarily seek help and to families whose children are placed out of the home. The primary purpose of FCS is to improve and maintain the family unit or to reunify the family when alternative care services are provided. Upon 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 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 2023, 81 of the 3,040 FCS cases opened were the result of substantiated child abuse/neglect.

### **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.

---

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

---

### **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/neglect as part of the family's treatment plan.

### **Crisis Nurseries**

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.

### **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 2023, the review board heard 501 cases and 390 were upheld (77.8%). 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.

---

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

---

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

CD collaborates with the Department of Health in conjunction with the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education 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.

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 2023, the Division received a total of 5,726 Newborn Crisis Assessment calls to CANHU. 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 2023, 279 children reported to CANHU were subsequently identified as drug-exposed.



# Appendices

## Appendix A: FY 2023 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL	
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	8	7.1%	1	0.9%	34	30.4%	66	58.9%	3	2.7%	112	
	ATCHISON	1	2.2%	1	2.2%	12	26.1%	29	63.0%	3	6.5%	46	
	BUCHANAN	93	6.2%	11	0.7%	402	26.9%	943	63.0%	48	3.2%	1,497	
	CALDWELL	8	13.1%	3	4.9%	10	16.4%	39	63.9%	1	1.6%	61	
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	28.6%	55	71.4%	0	0.0%	77	
	CASS	70	7.3%	6	0.6%	261	27.3%	594	62.2%	24	2.5%	955	
	CHARITON	3	4.3%	3	4.3%	18	25.7%	43	61.4%	3	4.3%	70	
	CLAY	84	4.2%	58	2.9%	491	24.5%	1,334	66.5%	39	1.9%	2,006	
	CLINTON	6	3.3%	6	3.3%	54	29.5%	114	62.3%	3	1.6%	183	
	COOPER	9	6.5%	1	0.7%	31	22.3%	97	69.8%	1	0.7%	139	
	DAVIESS	10	11.8%	4	4.7%	15	17.6%	54	63.5%	2	2.4%	85	
	DE KALB	3	3.4%	4	4.5%	22	24.7%	58	65.2%	2	2.2%	89	
	GENTRY	10	17.5%	0	0.0%	13	22.8%	33	57.9%	1	1.8%	57	
	GRUNDY	3	2.8%	9	8.3%	27	24.8%	69	63.3%	1	0.9%	109	
	HARRISON	5	5.6%	2	2.2%	15	16.9%	67	75.3%	0	0.0%	89	
	HOLT	4	8.0%	1	2.0%	9	18.0%	35	70.0%	1	2.0%	50	
	JOHNSON	29	6.2%	4	0.9%	117	25.1%	304	65.2%	12	2.6%	466	
	LAFAYETTE	10	2.7%	9	2.4%	101	27.2%	250	67.2%	2	0.5%	372	
	LINN	6	5.5%	6	5.5%	29	26.6%	67	61.5%	1	0.9%	109	
	LIVINGSTON	15	11.6%	10	7.8%	24	18.6%	80	62.0%	0	0.0%	129	
	MERCER	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	8	
	NODAWAY	13	7.5%	3	1.7%	35	20.1%	122	70.1%	1	0.6%	174	
	PETTIS	40	7.2%	6	1.1%	161	29.1%	336	60.8%	10	1.8%	553	
	PLATTE	20	2.9%	17	2.4%	211	30.1%	442	63.1%	10	1.4%	700	
	PUTNAM	2	5.0%	2	5.0%	8	20.0%	27	67.5%	1	2.5%	40	
	RAY	11	4.4%	0	0.0%	78	31.1%	159	63.3%	3	1.2%	251	
	SALINE	24	7.6%	4	1.3%	93	29.6%	188	59.9%	5	1.6%	314	
	SULLIVAN	5	10.4%	2	4.2%	11	22.9%	29	60.4%	1	2.1%	48	
	WORTH	2	14.3%	0	0.0%	5	35.7%	6	42.9%	1	7.1%	14	
		<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>2,310</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>5,646</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>8,803</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	35	11.3%	6	1.9%	68	21.9%	179	57.7%	22	7.1%	310	
	AUDRAIN	23	6.9%	8	2.4%	70	21.0%	226	67.9%	6	1.8%	333	
	BOONE	91	5.9%	27	1.8%	405	26.5%	973	63.6%	34	2.2%	1,530	
	CALLAWAY	36	7.6%	10	2.1%	123	25.8%	303	63.7%	4	0.8%	476	
	CLARK	8	11.1%	6	8.3%	17	23.6%	39	54.2%	2	2.8%	72	
	COLE	38	5.7%	12	1.8%	189	28.6%	413	62.5%	9	1.4%	661	
	FRANKLIN	68	6.6%	24	2.3%	230	22.3%	687	66.7%	21	2.0%	1,030	
	GASCONADE	10	5.0%	2	1.0%	57	28.5%	120	60.0%	11	5.5%	200	
	HOWARD	14	17.9%	0	0.0%	15	19.2%	45	57.7%	4	5.1%	78	
	KNOX	3	7.7%	0	0.0%	9	23.1%	26	66.7%	1	2.6%	39	
	LEWIS	5	5.3%	1	1.1%	22	23.4%	61	64.9%	5	5.3%	94	
	LINCOLN	83	11.3%	27	3.7%	157	21.4%	458	62.5%	8	1.1%	733	
	MACON	22	15.2%	2	1.4%	28	19.3%	93	64.1%	0	0.0%	145	
	MARION	29	6.8%	22	5.2%	81	19.0%	272	63.8%	22	5.2%	426	
	MONROE	4	4.2%	10	10.4%	15	15.6%	64	66.7%	3	3.1%	96	
	MONTGOMERY	12	8.8%	5	3.7%	27	19.9%	90	66.2%	2	1.5%	136	
	OSAGE	8	8.7%	0	0.0%	28	30.4%	51	55.4%	5	5.4%	92	
	PIKE	20	11.6%	6	3.5%	26	15.1%	117	68.0%	3	1.7%	172	
	RALLS	5	5.1%	7	7.1%	21	21.4%	63	64.3%	2	2.0%	98	
	RANDOLPH	39	10.4%	2	0.5%	96	25.6%	218	58.1%	20	5.3%	375	
	SCHUYLER	4	16.0%	0	0.0%	5	20.0%	15	60.0%	1	4.0%	25	
	SCOTLAND	4	9.1%	1	2.3%	4	9.1%	35	79.5%	0	0.0%	44	
	SHELBY	16	28.6%	0	0.0%	6	10.7%	34	60.7%	0	0.0%	56	
	ST CHARLES	145	6.5%	21	0.9%	556	24.8%	1,440	64.3%	79	3.5%	2,241	
	WARREN	26	6.3%	7	1.7%	97	23.4%	278	67.1%	6	1.4%	414	
		<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2,352</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>6,300</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>9,876</b>
	SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	4	3.4%	1	0.8%	28	23.7%	83	70.3%	2	1.7%	118
BUTLER		57	9.3%	13	2.1%	193	31.6%	337	55.2%	11	1.8%	611	
CAPE GIRARDEAU		31	4.8%	10	1.6%	162	25.3%	423	66.0%	15	2.3%	641	
CARTER		5	6.5%	2	2.6%	17	22.1%	51	66.2%	2	2.6%	77	
CRAWFORD		43	13.7%	23	7.3%	63	20.1%	181	57.8%	3	1.0%	313	
DENT		21	11.3%	10	5.4%	49	26.3%	101	54.3%	5	2.7%	186	
DUNKLIN		19	4.5%	12	2.9%	125	29.8%	247	58.8%	17	4.0%	420	

## Appendix A: FY 2023 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	49	7.5%	13	2.0%	171	26.3%	400	61.4%	18	2.8%	651
	IRON	18	12.5%	8	5.6%	39	27.1%	78	54.2%	1	0.7%	144
	JEFFERSON	143	7.5%	113	5.9%	348	18.1%	1,264	65.9%	50	2.6%	1,918
	MADISON	19	10.8%	12	6.8%	47	26.7%	93	52.8%	5	2.8%	176
	MARIES	1	1.1%	2	2.2%	27	30.0%	59	65.6%	1	1.1%	90
	MISSISSIPPI	10	6.8%	2	1.4%	37	25.3%	93	63.7%	4	2.7%	146
	NEW MADRID	23	11.5%	6	3.0%	43	21.5%	125	62.5%	3	1.5%	200
	OREGON	14	10.1%	5	3.6%	41	29.7%	74	53.6%	4	2.9%	138
	PEMISCOT	22	10.0%	15	6.8%	56	25.5%	123	55.9%	4	1.8%	220
	PERRY	9	4.3%	5	2.4%	46	22.1%	144	69.2%	4	1.9%	208
	PHELPS	56	10.0%	17	3.0%	136	24.3%	338	60.4%	13	2.3%	560
	PULASKI	66	11.4%	14	2.4%	143	24.8%	342	59.3%	12	2.1%	577
	REYNOLDS	10	16.1%	5	8.1%	9	14.5%	37	59.7%	1	1.6%	62
	RIPLEY	24	12.5%	2	1.0%	55	28.6%	104	54.2%	7	3.6%	192
	SCOTT	26	5.7%	6	1.3%	119	26.2%	298	65.6%	5	1.1%	454
	SHANNON	7	11.5%	1	1.6%	14	23.0%	38	62.3%	1	1.6%	61
	ST FRANCOIS	58	6.7%	44	5.1%	210	24.1%	536	61.6%	22	2.5%	870
	STE GENEVIEVE	13	8.2%	5	3.1%	36	22.6%	101	63.5%	4	2.5%	159
	STODDARD	23	7.8%	12	4.1%	46	15.6%	210	71.2%	4	1.4%	295
	TEXAS	31	11.6%	7	2.6%	81	30.2%	143	53.4%	6	2.2%	268
WASHINGTON	20	5.9%	17	5.0%	65	19.3%	227	67.4%	8	2.4%	337	
WAYNE	10	8.7%	0	0.0%	20	17.4%	83	72.2%	2	1.7%	115	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>832</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>2,426</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>6,333</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>10,207</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	6	1.4%	19	4.4%	119	27.5%	278	64.2%	11	2.5%	433
	BARTON	6	4.8%	4	3.2%	38	30.4%	75	60.0%	2	1.6%	125
	BATES	3	1.9%	3	1.9%	39	24.7%	112	70.9%	1	0.6%	158
	BENTON	12	5.9%	9	4.4%	44	21.6%	131	64.2%	8	3.9%	204
	CAMDEN	18	4.3%	4	1.0%	109	26.2%	280	67.3%	5	1.2%	416
	CEDAR	12	8.1%	2	1.3%	54	36.2%	81	54.4%	0	0.0%	149
	CHRISTIAN	28	2.7%	14	1.3%	301	28.8%	692	66.3%	9	0.9%	1,044
	DADE	3	4.9%	1	1.6%	12	19.7%	43	70.5%	2	3.3%	61
	DALLAS	15	6.5%	4	1.7%	55	23.8%	153	66.2%	4	1.7%	231
	DOUGLAS	17	11.9%	3	2.1%	38	26.6%	79	55.2%	6	4.2%	143
	GREENE	196	4.6%	64	1.5%	1,043	24.4%	2,884	67.5%	85	2.0%	4,272
	HENRY	15	4.6%	2	0.6%	75	23.1%	227	69.8%	6	1.8%	325
	HICKORY	6	7.1%	11	13.1%	12	14.3%	52	61.9%	3	3.6%	84
	JASPER	48	2.9%	22	1.3%	500	30.4%	1,029	62.6%	45	2.7%	1,644
	LACLEDE	37	5.8%	12	1.9%	190	30.0%	385	60.8%	9	1.4%	633
	LAWRENCE	12	2.3%	19	3.6%	150	28.6%	326	62.1%	18	3.4%	525
	MCDONALD	9	3.1%	8	2.7%	110	37.7%	156	53.4%	9	3.1%	292
	MILLER	17	5.2%	10	3.0%	84	25.6%	214	65.2%	3	0.9%	328
	MONITEAU	6	4.5%	3	2.2%	28	20.9%	96	71.6%	1	0.7%	134
	MORGAN	15	6.0%	11	4.4%	60	24.0%	163	65.2%	1	0.4%	250
	NEWTON	16	2.6%	21	3.4%	192	30.7%	377	60.2%	20	3.2%	626
	OZARK	8	8.2%	2	2.0%	23	23.5%	57	58.2%	8	8.2%	98
	POLK	21	4.4%	5	1.1%	145	30.5%	295	62.0%	10	2.1%	476
	ST CLAIR	5	5.6%	2	2.2%	23	25.6%	56	62.2%	4	4.4%	90
	STONE	17	4.5%	11	2.9%	91	24.1%	241	63.8%	18	4.8%	378
	TANEY	49	6.6%	16	2.1%	160	21.4%	501	67.2%	20	2.7%	746
	VERNON	18	6.5%	6	2.2%	68	24.6%	182	65.9%	2	0.7%	276
WEBSTER	33	6.1%	18	3.4%	131	24.4%	351	65.4%	4	0.7%	537	
WRIGHT	10	4.2%	6	2.5%	62	26.3%	154	65.3%	4	1.7%	236	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3,956</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>9,670</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>14,914</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	109	1.4%	32	0.4%	1,503	19.7%	3,649	47.8%	2,325	30.4%	7,638
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>1,503</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>2,325</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>7,618</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	41	1.6%	13	0.5%	281	11.3%	773	31.0%	1,388	55.6%	2,496
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	52	1.0%	62	1.1%	829	15.4%	2,101	39.0%	2,349	43.6%	5,393
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1,110</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>2,874</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>3,737</b>	<b>47.4%</b>	<b>7,889</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	107	4.9%	1	0.0%	1,674	76.1%	329	15.0%	89	4.0%	2,200
	OUT OF STATE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	205	100.0%	205
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1,674</b>	<b>69.6%</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>2,405</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>3,041</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>1,182</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>15,331</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>34,801</b>	<b>56.4%</b>	<b>7,357</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>61,712</b>

## Appendix B: FY 2023 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	10	2	51	91	4	158	2.26	35.65
	ATCHISON	1	1	15	61	6	84	0.88	73.88
	BUCHANAN	132	18	557	1,301	61	2,069	7.07	110.84
	CALDWELL	14	6	10	60	1	91	6.86	44.56
	CARROLL	0	0	27	77	0	104	0.00	56.64
	CASS	93	10	336	853	34	1,326	3.55	50.67
	CHARITON	7	4	23	62	3	99	4.22	59.71
	CLAY	121	90	615	1,739	56	2,621	1.95	42.30
	CLINTON	10	12	74	174	3	273	2.02	55.11
	COOPER	14	1	37	127	1	180	3.68	47.28
	DAVISS	10	5	23	74	2	114	4.59	52.34
	DE KALB	3	4	29	87	2	125	1.43	59.47
	GENTRY	10	0	16	51	1	78	6.38	49.78
	GRUNDY	4	14	42	107	2	169	1.63	68.98
	HARRISON	8	3	24	115	0	150	4.17	78.21
	HOLT	5	2	9	69	1	86	5.49	94.40
	JOHNSON	42	9	163	449	16	679	3.45	55.82
	LAFAYETTE	12	14	138	345	2	511	1.58	67.38
	LINN	8	10	44	101	1	164	2.89	59.33
	LIVINGSTON	22	11	31	134	0	198	7.13	64.20
	MERCER	0	1	1	11	0	13	0.00	16.03
NODAWAY	17	4	42	196	1	260	4.01	61.36	
PETTIS	59	11	200	501	11	782	5.48	72.57	
PLATTE	20	20	259	581	11	891	0.78	34.91	
PUTNAM	5	3	8	36	1	53	4.88	51.71	
RAY	17	0	108	241	4	370	3.19	69.42	
SALINE	27	5	131	288	6	457	5.18	87.67	
SULLIVAN	5	2	16	43	1	67	3.57	47.86	
WORTH	2	0	5	9	1	17	4.90	41.67	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>3,034</b>	<b>7,983</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>12,189</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>55.88</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	71	7	82	267	36	463	14.63	95.39
	AUDRAIN	33	13	89	326	7	468	5.60	79.43
	BOONE	127	45	522	1,335	47	2,076	3.31	54.12
	CALLAWAY	41	13	158	425	6	643	4.30	67.37
	CLARK	14	12	19	68	3	116	8.92	73.93
	COLE	56	18	242	579	13	908	3.27	53.05
	FRANKLIN	88	33	295	946	28	1,390	3.73	58.89
	GASCONADE	14	2	73	158	19	266	4.51	85.75
	HOWARD	19	0	26	53	7	105	8.45	46.71
	KNOX	7	0	15	40	1	63	7.73	69.54
	LEWIS	11	1	25	80	8	125	5.16	58.66
	LINCOLN	128	42	199	685	14	1,068	8.43	70.31
	MACON	33	3	40	138	0	214	9.31	60.40
	MARION	54	31	106	363	25	579	8.18	87.71
	MONROE	6	10	17	95	3	131	3.07	67.11
	MONTGOMERY	13	10	35	139	2	199	5.25	80.44
	OSAGE	9	0	36	70	5	120	2.98	39.74
	PIKE	26	18	39	168	3	254	6.38	62.33
	RALLS	5	12	28	84	4	133	2.21	58.72
	RANDOLPH	65	2	132	325	33	557	12.28	105.19
	SCHUYLER	7	0	5	28	2	42	6.72	40.31
SCOTLAND	5	1	6	46	0	58	3.56	41.28	
SHELBY	27	0	9	59	0	95	18.10	63.67	
ST CHARLES	195	29	713	1,936	90	2,963	2.06	31.31	
WARREN	34	12	116	370	9	541	4.11	65.39	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,088</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>3,027</b>	<b>8,783</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>13,577</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>52.10</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	5	1	44	133	2	185	2.15	79.71
	BUTLER	87	15	255	534	18	909	8.85	92.45
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	38	11	199	592	17	857	2.18	49.21
	CARTER	8	4	23	82	7	124	7.07	109.64
	CRAWFORD	59	34	85	267	8	453	11.32	86.95
	DENT	30	16	70	160	11	287	9.45	90.37
	DUNKLIN	26	15	172	376	27	616	3.73	88.43

## Appendix B: FY 2023 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
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	73	16	236	591	35	951	7.71	100.43
	IRON	31	9	58	118	3	219	15.47	109.28
	JEFFERSON	207	154	462	1,832	75	2,730	3.95	52.11
	MADISON	29	13	57	163	6	268	10.08	93.12
	MARIES	1	4	38	92	2	137	0.55	74.99
	MISSISSIPPI	12	4	51	122	4	193	4.55	73.24
	NEW MADRID	27	8	70	184	4	293	6.93	75.24
	OREGON	27	8	70	114	6	225	14.28	118.98
	PEMISCOT	43	19	69	225	9	365	10.66	90.50
	PERRY	13	6	64	200	5	288	2.97	65.75
	PHELPS	89	35	179	466	17	786	9.73	85.95
	PULASKI	130	18	194	448	14	804	10.65	65.89
	REYNOLDS	18	6	14	56	1	95	13.78	72.74
	RIPLEY	40	2	78	158	11	289	16.75	121.02
	SCOTT	35	7	155	431	5	633	3.84	69.42
	SHANNON	9	1	19	54	1	84	5.86	54.72
	ST FRANCOIS	79	64	310	793	30	1,276	5.64	91.03
	STE GENEVIEVE	22	6	45	135	5	213	5.55	53.71
	STODDARD	41	18	61	320	4	444	6.37	68.97
	TEXAS	61	15	98	213	11	398	11.41	74.43
WASHINGTON	34	24	84	342	16	500	6.51	95.79	
WAYNE	12	0	26	129	4	171	5.67	80.85	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,286</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>3,286</b>	<b>9,330</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>14,793</b>	<b>6.30</b>	<b>72.43</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	9	26	147	425	11	618	1.13	77.76
	BARTON	7	8	46	103	2	166	2.44	57.96
	BATES	3	3	45	163	1	215	0.82	58.65
	BENTON	22	13	63	189	8	295	6.33	84.82
	CAMDEN	21	4	142	390	7	564	2.69	72.32
	CEDAR	20	2	70	117	0	209	5.64	58.92
	CHRISTIAN	32	20	389	891	11	1,343	1.38	57.99
	DADE	5	1	17	54	2	79	3.10	48.98
	DALLAS	19	8	69	231	6	333	4.66	81.74
	DOUGLAS	29	3	51	111	6	200	11.58	79.87
	GREENE	247	92	1,281	3,976	115	5,711	4.02	92.91
	HENRY	22	2	90	332	11	457	4.53	94.05
	HICKORY	6	13	15	86	3	123	4.43	90.91
	JASPER	58	31	640	1,470	63	2,262	1.91	74.30
	LACLEDE	64	18	256	547	11	896	7.41	103.68
	LAWRENCE	13	25	189	480	28	735	1.36	76.65
	MCDONALD	16	9	155	248	15	443	2.61	72.28
	MILLER	20	15	102	309	3	449	3.43	76.91
	MONITEAU	10	4	35	135	2	186	2.53	47.14
	MORGAN	19	25	85	261	1	391	3.97	81.70
	NEWTON	21	24	242	545	26	858	1.51	61.70
	OZARK	10	2	33	87	11	143	6.23	89.04
	POLK	27	7	177	397	15	623	3.55	81.86
	ST CLAIR	6	3	27	95	8	139	3.04	70.42
	STONE	25	18	122	354	24	543	4.73	102.65
	TANEY	62	22	199	695	28	1,006	5.46	88.52
VERNON	32	6	95	272	2	407	6.70	85.20	
WEBSTER	50	30	173	493	6	752	4.72	71.04	
WRIGHT	15	10	87	231	4	347	3.19	73.86	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>5,042</b>	<b>13,687</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>20,493</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>78.96</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	145	48	2,021	5,285	3,277	10,776	0.89	66.10
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>2,021</b>	<b>5,285</b>	<b>3,277</b>	<b>10,776</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>66.10</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	57	31	409	1,087	2,076	3,660	1.05	67.74
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	64	85	1,135	2,882	3,223	7,389	0.29	33.62
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1,544</b>	<b>3,969</b>	<b>5,299</b>	<b>11,049</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>40.36</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	139	1	2,165	528	118	2,951	0.00	0.00
	OUT OF STATE	0	0	0	0	260	260	0.00	0.00
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2,165</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>3,211</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>4,347</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>20,119</b>	<b>49,565</b>	<b>10,339</b>	<b>86,088</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>62.41</b>

## Appendix C: FY 2023 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	1.5%	0	0.0%	50	75.8%	14	21.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	66	
	ATCHISON	4	13.8%	0	0.0%	16	55.2%	8	27.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.4%	29	
	BUCHANAN	9	1.0%	10	1.1%	680	72.1%	189	20.0%	5	0.5%	50	5.3%	943	
	CALDWELL	1	2.6%	1	2.6%	28	71.8%	8	20.5%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	39	
	CARROLL	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	41	74.5%	12	21.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	55	
	CASS	17	2.9%	3	0.5%	380	64.0%	171	28.8%	3	0.5%	20	3.4%	594	
	CHARITON	4	9.3%	0	0.0%	26	60.5%	13	30.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	43	
	CLAY	19	1.4%	8	0.6%	944	70.8%	307	23.0%	1	0.1%	55	4.1%	1,334	
	CLINTON	7	6.1%	1	0.9%	77	67.5%	28	24.6%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	114	
	COOPER	2	2.1%	0	0.0%	65	67.0%	30	30.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	97	
	DAVISS	6	11.1%	1	1.9%	26	48.1%	20	37.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	54	
	DE KALB	4	6.9%	0	0.0%	42	72.4%	9	15.5%	0	0.0%	3	5.2%	58	
	GENTRY	6	18.2%	0	0.0%	24	72.7%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	33	
	GRUNDY	13	18.8%	13	18.8%	30	43.5%	8	11.6%	2	2.9%	3	4.3%	69	
	HARRISON	11	16.4%	1	1.5%	40	59.7%	11	16.4%	2	3.0%	2	3.0%	67	
	HOLT	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	19	54.3%	13	37.1%	0	0.0%	2	5.7%	35	
	JOHNSON	6	2.0%	3	1.0%	179	58.9%	108	35.5%	0	0.0%	8	2.6%	304	
	LAFAYETTE	8	3.2%	2	0.8%	179	71.6%	59	23.6%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	250	
	LINN	9	13.4%	1	1.5%	36	53.7%	19	28.4%	1	1.5%	1	1.5%	67	
	LIVINGSTON	8	10.0%	4	5.0%	54	67.5%	10	12.5%	1	1.3%	3	3.8%	80	
	MERCER	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	3	50.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	
	NODAWAY	10	8.2%	2	1.6%	75	61.5%	29	23.8%	1	0.8%	5	4.1%	122	
	PETTIS	11	3.3%	4	1.2%	228	67.9%	93	27.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	336	
	PLATTE	7	1.6%	2	0.5%	333	75.3%	89	20.1%	3	0.7%	8	1.8%	442	
	PUTNAM	4	14.8%	4	14.8%	15	55.6%	4	14.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27	
	RAY	4	2.5%	2	1.3%	114	71.7%	38	23.9%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	159	
	SALINE	11	5.9%	0	0.0%	134	71.3%	37	19.7%	5	2.7%	1	0.5%	188	
SULLIVAN	2	6.9%	1	3.4%	20	69.0%	6	20.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29		
WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6		
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>3,864</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>1,337</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>5,646</b>	
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	10	5.6%	4	2.2%	124	69.3%	31	17.3%	2	1.1%	8	4.5%	179	
	AUDRAIN	8	3.5%	7	3.1%	130	57.5%	76	33.6%	2	0.9%	3	1.3%	226	
	BOONE	43	4.4%	4	0.4%	620	63.7%	277	28.5%	4	0.4%	25	2.6%	973	
	CALLAWAY	16	5.3%	1	0.3%	202	66.7%	73	24.1%	2	0.7%	9	3.0%	303	
	CLARK	6	15.4%	1	2.6%	21	53.8%	11	28.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	
	COLE	25	6.1%	4	1.0%	276	66.8%	100	24.2%	5	1.2%	3	0.7%	413	
	FRANKLIN	54	7.9%	8	1.2%	395	57.5%	209	30.4%	3	0.4%	18	2.6%	687	
	GASCONADE	8	6.7%	1	0.8%	94	78.3%	16	13.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	120	
	HOWARD	1	2.2%	2	4.4%	19	42.2%	21	46.7%	0	0.0%	2	4.4%	45	
	KNOX	1	3.8%	2	7.7%	20	76.9%	3	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26	
	LEWIS	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	37	60.7%	22	36.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	61	
	LINCOLN	23	5.0%	5	1.1%	313	68.3%	91	19.9%	8	1.7%	18	3.9%	458	
	MACON	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	65	69.9%	18	19.4%	2	2.2%	4	4.3%	93	
	MARION	23	8.5%	6	2.2%	154	56.6%	70	25.7%	4	1.5%	15	5.5%	272	
	MONROE	6	9.4%	8	12.5%	29	45.3%	16	25.0%	4	6.3%	1	1.6%	64	
	MONTGOMERY	7	7.8%	1	1.1%	62	68.9%	16	17.8%	4	4.4%	0	0.0%	90	
	OSAGE	3	5.9%	0	0.0%	41	80.4%	6	11.8%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	51	
	PIKE	7	6.0%	3	2.6%	75	64.1%	24	20.5%	3	2.6%	5	4.3%	117	
	RALLS	7	11.1%	4	6.3%	24	38.1%	22	34.9%	1	1.6%	5	7.9%	63	
	RANDOLPH	6	2.8%	4	1.8%	118	54.1%	78	35.8%	0	0.0%	12	5.5%	218	
	SCHUYLER	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	11	73.3%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	
	SCOTLAND	1	2.9%	2	5.7%	24	68.6%	8	22.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	35	
	SHELBY	0	0.0%	2	5.9%	21	61.8%	6	17.6%	1	2.9%	4	11.8%	34	
	ST CHARLES	24	1.7%	28	1.9%	872	60.6%	403	28.0%	5	0.3%	108	7.5%	1,440	
	WARREN	19	6.8%	0	0.0%	198	71.2%	54	19.4%	1	0.4%	6	2.2%	278	
		<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>3,945</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>1,653</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>6,300</b>
	SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	12	14.5%	1	1.2%	49	59.0%	20	24.1%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	83
BUTLER		31	9.2%	7	2.1%	199	59.1%	74	22.0%	5	1.5%	21	6.2%	337	
CAPE GIRARDEAU		36	8.5%	6	1.4%	276	65.2%	86	20.3%	12	2.8%	7	1.7%	423	
CARTER		3	5.9%	2	3.9%	27	52.9%	14	27.5%	0	0.0%	5	9.8%	51	
CRAWFORD		21	11.6%	0	0.0%	102	56.4%	43	23.8%	2	1.1%	13	7.2%	181	
DENT		10	9.9%	2	2.0%	58	57.4%	27	26.7%	0	0.0%	4	4.0%	101	
DUNKLIN		27	10.9%	0	0.0%	137	55.5%	79	32.0%	1	0.4%	3	1.2%	247	

## Appendix C: FY 2023 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/		AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS		SERVICES		FAMILY		TOTAL
		AC	OPENED	SERVICES	CONCERNS	CONCERNS	NO CONCERNS	DECLINED	CHILD SAFE	UNCOOPERATIVE	CHILD SAFE			
				PROVIDED	ADDRESSED	FOUND								
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	20	5.0%	4	1.0%	247	61.8%	99	24.8%	3	0.8%	27	6.8%	400
	IRON	7	9.0%	1	1.3%	47	60.3%	18	23.1%	1	1.3%	4	5.1%	78
	JEFFERSON	95	7.5%	19	1.5%	726	57.4%	295	23.3%	41	3.2%	88	7.0%	1,264
	MADISON	7	7.5%	2	2.2%	55	59.1%	25	26.9%	0	0.0%	4	4.3%	93
	MARIES	3	5.1%	0	0.0%	35	59.3%	6	10.2%	0	0.0%	15	25.4%	59
	MISSISSIPPI	9	9.7%	0	0.0%	52	55.9%	31	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	93
	NEW MADRID	20	16.0%	1	0.8%	59	47.2%	42	33.6%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	125
	OREGON	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	48	64.9%	20	27.0%	0	0.0%	4	5.4%	74
	PEMISCOT	22	17.9%	2	1.6%	58	47.2%	40	32.5%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	123
	PERRY	14	9.7%	3	2.1%	93	64.6%	27	18.8%	4	2.8%	3	2.1%	144
	PHELPS	34	10.1%	7	2.1%	211	62.4%	43	12.7%	6	1.8%	37	10.9%	338
	PULASKI	12	3.5%	4	1.2%	212	62.0%	53	15.5%	5	1.5%	56	16.4%	342
	REYNOLDS	4	10.8%	0	0.0%	23	62.2%	8	21.6%	1	2.7%	1	2.7%	37
	RIPLEY	9	8.7%	3	2.9%	64	61.5%	22	21.2%	3	2.9%	3	2.9%	104
	SCOTT	12	4.0%	10	3.4%	191	64.1%	82	27.5%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	298
	SHANNON	3	7.9%	1	2.6%	26	68.4%	5	13.2%	0	0.0%	3	7.9%	38
	ST FRANCOIS	33	6.2%	6	1.1%	318	59.3%	157	29.3%	8	1.5%	14	2.6%	536
	STE GENEVIEVE	3	3.0%	1	1.0%	69	68.3%	25	24.8%	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	101
	STODDARD	45	21.4%	3	1.4%	123	58.6%	37	17.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	210
	TEXAS	13	9.1%	1	0.7%	79	55.2%	40	28.0%	0	0.0%	10	7.0%	143
WASHINGTON	16	7.0%	5	2.2%	131	57.7%	68	30.0%	3	1.3%	4	1.8%	227	
WAYNE	9	10.8%	2	2.4%	51	61.4%	19	22.9%	1	1.2%	1	1.2%	83	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>3,766</b>	<b>59.5%</b>	<b>1,505</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>6,333</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	14	5.0%	2	0.7%	190	68.3%	61	21.9%	4	1.4%	7	2.5%	278
	BARTON	7	9.3%	9	12.0%	33	44.0%	23	30.7%	0	0.0%	3	4.0%	75
	BATES	12	10.7%	3	2.7%	67	59.8%	28	25.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.8%	112
	BENTON	9	6.9%	3	2.3%	72	55.0%	41	31.3%	2	1.5%	4	3.1%	131
	CAMDEN	15	5.4%	2	0.7%	188	67.1%	63	22.5%	3	1.1%	9	3.2%	280
	CEDAR	4	4.9%	4	4.9%	44	54.3%	27	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	2.5%	81
	CHRISTIAN	20	2.9%	2	0.3%	504	72.8%	161	23.3%	2	0.3%	3	0.4%	692
	DADE	3	7.0%	2	4.7%	22	51.2%	15	34.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.3%	43
	DALLAS	10	6.5%	1	0.7%	85	55.6%	53	34.6%	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	153
	DOUGLAS	14	17.7%	1	1.3%	45	57.0%	18	22.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	79
	GREENE	154	5.3%	37	1.3%	1,802	62.5%	735	25.5%	29	1.0%	127	4.4%	2,884
	HENRY	10	4.4%	7	3.1%	139	61.2%	66	29.1%	2	0.9%	3	1.3%	227
	HICKORY	12	23.1%	2	3.8%	19	36.5%	15	28.8%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	52
	JASPER	67	6.5%	15	1.5%	613	59.6%	314	30.5%	6	0.6%	14	1.4%	1,029
	LACLEDE	20	5.2%	5	1.3%	245	63.6%	107	27.8%	4	1.0%	4	1.0%	385
	LAWRENCE	13	4.0%	2	0.6%	229	70.2%	72	22.1%	3	0.9%	7	2.1%	326
	MCDONALD	13	8.3%	3	1.9%	101	64.7%	38	24.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	156
	MILLER	6	2.8%	3	1.4%	133	62.1%	70	32.7%	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	214
	MONITEAU	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	59	61.5%	26	27.1%	1	1.0%	8	8.3%	96
	MORGAN	13	8.0%	2	1.2%	108	66.3%	34	20.9%	2	1.2%	4	2.5%	163
	NEWTON	31	8.2%	8	2.1%	222	58.9%	109	28.9%	2	0.5%	5	1.3%	377
	OZARK	11	19.3%	0	0.0%	28	49.1%	17	29.8%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	57
	POLK	18	6.1%	4	1.4%	154	52.2%	106	35.9%	1	0.3%	12	4.1%	295
ST CLAIR	6	10.7%	2	3.6%	28	50.0%	18	32.1%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	56	
STONE	10	4.1%	2	0.8%	167	69.3%	60	24.9%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	241	
TANEY	32	6.4%	11	2.2%	294	58.7%	155	30.9%	2	0.4%	7	1.4%	501	
VERNON	13	7.1%	7	3.8%	112	61.5%	48	26.4%	1	0.5%	1	0.5%	182	
WEBSTER	10	2.8%	18	5.1%	182	51.9%	130	37.0%	4	1.1%	7	2.0%	351	
WRIGHT	29	18.8%	0	0.0%	81	52.6%	34	22.1%	4	2.6%	6	3.9%	154	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>5,966</b>	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>2,644</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>9,670</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	123	3.4%	40	1.1%	2,128	58.3%	1,103	30.2%	20	0.5%	235	6.4%	3,649
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>1,103</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>3,649</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	16	2.1%	19	2.5%	507	65.6%	181	23.4%	20	2.6%	30	3.9%	773
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	28	1.3%	43	2.0%	1,238	58.9%	629	29.9%	27	1.3%	136	6.5%	2,101
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>1,745</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>2,874</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	2	0.6%	3	0.9%	174	52.9%	147	44.7%	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	329
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>329</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,767</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>21,588</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>9,199</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>34,801</b>

## Appendix D: FY 2023 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED		AGENCY RESPONDED				SERVICES DECLINED		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE		TOTAL		
				SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	NO CONCERNS FOUND		CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE					
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	73	80.2%	16	17.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	91
	ATCHISON	12	19.7%	0	0.0%	28	45.9%	19	31.1%	0	0.0%	2	3.3%	61
	BUCHANAN	15	1.2%	13	1.0%	926	71.2%	267	20.5%	7	0.5%	73	5.6%	1,301
	CALDWELL	2	3.3%	1	1.7%	44	73.3%	12	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	60
	CARROLL	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	56	72.7%	19	24.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	77
	CASS	27	3.2%	4	0.5%	524	61.4%	258	30.2%	6	0.7%	34	4.0%	853
	CHARITON	8	12.9%	0	0.0%	33	53.2%	21	33.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	62
	CLAY	29	1.7%	10	0.6%	1,214	69.8%	407	23.4%	2	0.1%	77	4.4%	1,739
	CLINTON	10	5.7%	1	0.6%	124	71.3%	38	21.8%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	174
	COOPER	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	84	66.1%	41	32.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	127
	DAVISS	8	10.8%	3	4.1%	39	52.7%	23	31.1%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	74
	DE KALB	9	10.3%	0	0.0%	57	65.5%	17	19.5%	0	0.0%	4	4.6%	87
	GENTRY	10	19.6%	0	0.0%	36	70.6%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	3	5.9%	51
	GRUNDY	20	18.7%	23	21.5%	46	43.0%	12	11.2%	3	2.8%	3	2.8%	107
	HARRISON	23	20.0%	2	1.7%	59	51.3%	23	20.0%	2	1.7%	6	5.2%	115
	HOLT	5	7.2%	0	0.0%	27	39.1%	32	46.4%	0	0.0%	5	7.2%	69
	JOHNSON	6	1.3%	4	0.9%	272	60.6%	155	34.5%	0	0.0%	12	2.7%	449
	LAFAYETTE	12	3.5%	2	0.6%	245	71.0%	83	24.1%	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	345
	LINN	20	19.8%	1	1.0%	49	48.5%	29	28.7%	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	101
	LIVINGSTON	30	22.4%	5	3.7%	74	55.2%	14	10.4%	3	2.2%	8	6.0%	134
	MERCER	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	6	54.5%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11
	NODAWAY	15	7.7%	2	1.0%	110	56.1%	47	24.0%	7	3.6%	15	7.7%	196
	PETTIS	23	4.6%	8	1.6%	339	67.7%	131	26.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	501
PLATTE	12	2.1%	2	0.3%	434	74.7%	119	20.5%	6	1.0%	8	1.4%	581	
PUTNAM	8	22.2%	4	11.1%	18	50.0%	6	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	36	
RAY	6	2.5%	2	0.8%	175	72.6%	53	22.0%	5	2.1%	0	0.0%	241	
SALINE	21	7.3%	0	0.0%	187	64.9%	69	24.0%	7	2.4%	4	1.4%	288	
SULLIVAN	2	4.7%	1	2.3%	29	67.4%	11	25.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	43	
WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>5,317</b>	<b>66.6%</b>	<b>1,926</b>	<b>24.1%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>7,983</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	18	6.7%	4	1.5%	181	67.8%	50	18.7%	3	1.1%	11	4.1%	267
	AUDRAIN	15	4.6%	11	3.4%	182	55.8%	112	34.4%	2	0.6%	4	1.2%	326
	BOONE	71	5.3%	10	0.7%	823	61.6%	379	28.4%	10	0.7%	42	3.1%	1,335
	CALLAWAY	19	4.5%	5	1.2%	277	65.2%	108	25.4%	2	0.5%	14	3.3%	425
	CLARK	12	17.6%	1	1.5%	30	44.1%	25	36.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	68
	COLE	42	7.3%	6	1.0%	382	66.0%	139	24.0%	7	1.2%	3	0.5%	579
	FRANKLIN	82	8.7%	12	1.3%	526	55.6%	287	30.3%	7	0.7%	32	3.4%	946
	GASCONADE	13	8.2%	1	0.6%	121	76.6%	22	13.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	158
	HOWARD	1	1.9%	2	3.8%	21	39.6%	27	50.9%	0	0.0%	2	3.8%	53
	KNOX	1	2.5%	4	10.0%	30	75.0%	5	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	40
	LEWIS	1	1.3%	3	3.8%	50	62.5%	26	32.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	80
	LINCOLN	35	5.1%	8	1.2%	474	69.2%	138	20.1%	10	1.5%	20	2.9%	685
	MACON	4	2.9%	0	0.0%	100	72.5%	24	17.4%	3	2.2%	7	5.1%	138
	MARION	31	8.5%	7	1.9%	211	58.1%	92	25.3%	4	1.1%	18	5.0%	363
	MONROE	8	8.4%	13	13.7%	43	45.3%	23	24.2%	5	5.3%	3	3.2%	95
	MONTGOMERY	10	7.2%	6	4.3%	89	64.0%	29	20.9%	5	3.6%	0	0.0%	139
	OSAGE	4	5.7%	0	0.0%	50	71.4%	14	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	70
	PIKE	16	9.5%	5	3.0%	105	62.5%	31	18.5%	4	2.4%	7	4.2%	168
	RALLS	8	9.5%	7	8.3%	29	34.5%	30	35.7%	1	1.2%	9	10.7%	84
	RANDOLPH	11	3.4%	8	2.5%	166	51.1%	126	38.8%	0	0.0%	14	4.3%	325
	SCHUYLER	0	0.0%	5	17.9%	18	64.3%	5	17.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28
	SCOTLAND	1	2.2%	3	6.5%	32	69.6%	10	21.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	46
	SHELBY	0	0.0%	2	3.4%	33	55.9%	13	22.0%	1	1.7%	10	16.9%	59
ST CHARLES	34	1.8%	44	2.3%	1,152	59.5%	533	27.5%	13	0.7%	160	8.3%	1,936	
WARREN	30	8.1%	0	0.0%	256	69.2%	76	20.5%	1	0.3%	7	1.9%	370	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>5,381</b>	<b>61.3%</b>	<b>2,324</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>8,783</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	21	15.8%	1	0.8%	81	60.9%	28	21.1%	0	0.0%	2	1.5%	133
	BUTLER	61	11.4%	8	1.5%	314	58.8%	112	21.0%	10	1.9%	29	5.4%	534
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	49	8.3%	6	1.0%	390	65.9%	121	20.4%	17	2.9%	9	1.5%	592
	CARTER	4	4.9%	3	3.7%	44	53.7%	25	30.5%	0	0.0%	6	7.3%	82
	CRAWFORD	34	12.7%	0	0.0%	147	55.1%	60	22.5%	5	1.9%	21	7.9%	267
	DENT	19	11.9%	5	3.1%	87	54.4%	40	25.0%	0	0.0%	9	5.6%	160
	DUNKLIN	46	12.2%	0	0.0%	194	51.6%	129	34.3%	4	1.1%	3	0.8%	376

## Appendix D: FY 2023 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/		AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS		SERVICES		FAMILY		TOTAL
		AC	OPENED	SERVICES	CONCERNS	CONCERNS	NO CONCERNS	DECLINED	UNCOOPERATIVE	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE			
				PROVIDED	ADDRESSED	FOUND		CHILD SAFE						
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	33	5.6%	8	1.4%	334	56.5%	163	27.6%	3	0.5%	50	8.5%	591
	IRON	10	8.5%	1	0.8%	70	59.3%	26	22.0%	2	1.7%	9	7.6%	118
	JEFFERSON	152	8.3%	31	1.7%	1,003	54.7%	438	23.9%	68	3.7%	140	7.6%	1,832
	MADISON	7	4.3%	7	4.3%	102	62.6%	42	25.8%	0	0.0%	5	3.1%	163
	MARIES	12	13.0%	0	0.0%	49	53.3%	8	8.7%	0	0.0%	23	25.0%	92
	MISSISSIPPI	14	11.5%	0	0.0%	59	48.4%	48	39.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	122
	NEW MADRID	29	15.8%	1	0.5%	76	41.3%	72	39.1%	0	0.0%	6	3.3%	184
	OREGON	5	4.4%	0	0.0%	74	64.9%	29	25.4%	0	0.0%	6	5.3%	114
	PEMISCOT	39	17.3%	5	2.2%	99	44.0%	80	35.6%	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	225
	PERRY	16	8.0%	3	1.5%	131	65.5%	40	20.0%	6	3.0%	4	2.0%	200
	PHELPS	51	10.9%	9	1.9%	278	59.7%	62	13.3%	9	1.9%	57	12.2%	466
	PULASKI	16	3.6%	5	1.1%	282	62.9%	71	15.8%	6	1.3%	68	15.2%	448
	REYNOLDS	6	10.7%	0	0.0%	37	66.1%	10	17.9%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	56
	RIPLEY	19	12.0%	8	5.1%	92	58.2%	30	19.0%	6	3.8%	3	1.9%	158
	SCOTT	23	5.3%	12	2.8%	269	62.4%	123	28.5%	0	0.0%	4	0.9%	431
	SHANNON	3	5.6%	1	1.9%	34	63.0%	11	20.4%	0	0.0%	5	9.3%	54
	ST FRANCOIS	50	6.3%	7	0.9%	467	58.9%	232	29.3%	13	1.6%	24	3.0%	793
	STE GENEVIEVE	4	3.0%	1	0.7%	94	69.6%	32	23.7%	0	0.0%	4	3.0%	135
	STODDARD	76	23.8%	3	0.9%	186	58.1%	51	15.9%	0	0.0%	4	1.3%	320
	TEXAS	16	7.5%	1	0.5%	111	52.1%	60	28.2%	0	0.0%	25	11.7%	213
WASHINGTON	23	6.7%	7	2.0%	195	57.0%	106	31.0%	4	1.2%	7	2.0%	342	
WAYNE	19	14.7%	2	1.6%	73	56.6%	33	25.6%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%	129	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>5,372</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>2,282</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>9,330</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	20	4.7%	2	0.5%	276	64.9%	104	24.5%	10	2.4%	13	3.1%	425
	BARTON	14	13.6%	12	11.7%	42	40.8%	31	30.1%	0	0.0%	4	3.9%	103
	BATES	19	11.7%	4	2.5%	101	62.0%	36	22.1%	0	0.0%	3	1.8%	163
	BENTON	19	10.1%	4	2.1%	100	52.9%	55	29.1%	6	3.2%	5	2.6%	189
	CAMDEN	25	6.4%	3	0.8%	255	65.4%	94	24.1%	3	0.8%	10	2.6%	390
	CEDAR	4	3.4%	7	6.0%	65	55.6%	38	32.5%	0	0.0%	3	2.6%	117
	CHRISTIAN	22	2.5%	2	0.2%	633	71.0%	228	25.6%	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	891
	DADE	4	7.4%	2	3.7%	29	53.7%	18	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	54
	DALLAS	14	6.1%	1	0.4%	126	54.5%	83	35.9%	4	1.7%	3	1.3%	231
	DOUGLAS	18	16.2%	1	0.9%	68	61.3%	23	20.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	111
	GREENE	235	5.9%	53	1.3%	2,429	61.1%	1,014	25.5%	52	1.3%	193	4.9%	3,976
	HENRY	14	4.2%	13	3.9%	205	61.7%	94	28.3%	3	0.9%	3	0.9%	332
	HICKORY	22	25.6%	2	2.3%	34	39.5%	18	20.9%	10	11.6%	0	0.0%	86
	JASPER	116	7.9%	18	1.2%	872	59.3%	437	29.7%	8	0.5%	19	1.3%	1,470
	LACLEDE	29	5.3%	7	1.3%	334	61.1%	164	30.0%	5	0.9%	8	1.5%	547
	LAWRENCE	19	4.0%	2	0.4%	336	70.0%	102	21.3%	10	2.1%	11	2.3%	480
	MCDONALD	32	12.9%	4	1.6%	155	62.5%	56	22.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	248
	MILLER	11	3.6%	5	1.6%	189	61.2%	101	32.7%	3	1.0%	0	0.0%	309
	MONITEAU	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	75	55.6%	40	29.6%	2	1.5%	16	11.9%	135
	MORGAN	24	9.2%	3	1.1%	170	65.1%	55	21.1%	2	0.8%	7	2.7%	261
	NEWTON	52	9.5%	13	2.4%	321	58.9%	148	27.2%	2	0.4%	9	1.7%	545
	OZARK	17	19.5%	0	0.0%	43	49.4%	23	26.4%	4	4.6%	0	0.0%	87
	POLK	25	6.3%	4	1.0%	194	48.9%	158	39.8%	1	0.3%	15	3.8%	397
ST CLAIR	14	14.7%	2	2.1%	45	47.4%	29	30.5%	3	3.2%	2	2.1%	95	
STONE	19	5.4%	2	0.6%	248	70.1%	82	23.2%	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	354	
TANEY	45	6.5%	13	1.9%	394	56.7%	226	32.5%	3	0.4%	14	2.0%	695	
VERNON	17	6.3%	14	5.1%	173	63.6%	66	24.3%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	272	
WEBSTER	11	2.2%	27	5.5%	261	52.9%	180	36.5%	5	1.0%	9	1.8%	493	
WRIGHT	40	17.3%	0	0.0%	132	57.1%	44	19.0%	5	2.2%	10	4.3%	231	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>8,305</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>3,747</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>13,687</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	192	3.6%	56	1.1%	3,074	58.2%	1,573	29.8%	27	0.5%	363	6.9%	5,285
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>3,074</b>	<b>58.2%</b>	<b>1,573</b>	<b>29.8%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>5,285</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	26	2.4%	31	2.9%	721	66.3%	249	22.9%	24	2.2%	36	3.3%	1,087
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	38	1.3%	68	2.4%	1,647	57.1%	888	30.8%	44	1.5%	197	6.8%	2,882
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2,368</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>1,137</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>3,969</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	4	0.8%	4	0.8%	296	56.1%	220	41.7%	1	0.2%	3	0.6%	528
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>56.1%</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>528</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>2,823</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>30,113</b>	<b>60.8%</b>	<b>13,209</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>2,118</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>49,565</b>

## Appendix E: FY 2023 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL		EMOTIONAL		MEDICAL		EDUCATIONAL		SEXUAL		TOTAL INCIDENTS		
		ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT				
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	BUCHANAN	39	41.9%	50	53.8%	4	4.3%	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	25	26.9%	93
	CALDWELL	1	12.5%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	8
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	CASS	33	47.1%	21	30.0%	2	2.9%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	24	34.3%	70
	CHARITON	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	CLAY	24	28.6%	31	36.9%	7	8.3%	2	2.4%	0	0.0%	35	41.7%	84
	CLINTON	3	50.0%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	6
	COOPER	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	77.8%	9
	DAVISS	2	20.0%	4	40.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	DE KALB	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	GENTRY	4	40.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	GRUNDY	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	HARRISON	4	80.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	HOLT	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4
	JOHNSON	10	34.5%	10	34.5%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	44.8%	29
	LAFAYETTE	4	40.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	LINN	4	66.7%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	LIVINGSTON	6	40.0%	8	53.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	15
	MERCER	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	NODAWAY	4	30.8%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	8	61.5%	13
	PETTIS	8	20.0%	19	47.5%	3	7.5%	4	10.0%	0	0.0%	16	40.0%	40
	PLATTE	8	40.0%	3	15.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	20
	PUTNAM	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	RAY	5	45.5%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	11
SALINE	11	45.8%	8	33.3%	2	8.3%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	5	20.8%	24	
SULLIVAN	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	
WORTH	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>35.8%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>494</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	7	20.0%	28	80.0%	2	5.7%	6	17.1%	4	11.4%	5	14.3%	35
	AUDRAIN	10	43.5%	7	30.4%	3	13.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	11	47.8%	23
	BOONE	23	25.3%	44	48.4%	12	13.2%	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	25	27.5%	91
	CALLAWAY	16	44.4%	10	27.8%	3	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.8%	14	38.9%	36
	CLARK	3	37.5%	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	COLE	6	15.8%	13	34.2%	4	10.5%	1	2.6%	4	10.5%	18	47.4%	38
	FRANKLIN	19	27.9%	16	23.5%	2	2.9%	2	2.9%	1	1.5%	38	55.9%	68
	GASCONADE	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	10
	HOWARD	3	21.4%	7	50.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%	5	35.7%	14
	KNOX	1	33.3%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	LEWIS	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	LINCOLN	22	26.5%	43	51.8%	7	8.4%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	28	33.7%	83
	MACON	4	18.2%	9	40.9%	3	13.6%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	22
	MARION	6	20.7%	23	79.3%	2	6.9%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	6	20.7%	29
	MONROE	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	MONTGOMERY	4	33.3%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	66.7%	12
	OSAGE	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	PIKE	6	30.0%	9	45.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	55.0%	20
	RALLS	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	RANDOLPH	14	35.9%	16	41.0%	7	17.9%	4	10.3%	0	0.0%	11	28.2%	39
	SCHUYLER	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4
	SCOTLAND	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4
	SHELBY	4	25.0%	13	81.3%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	18.8%	16
	ST CHARLES	35	24.1%	71	49.0%	7	4.8%	3	2.1%	6	4.1%	48	33.1%	145
	WARREN	5	19.2%	9	34.6%	3	11.5%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	13	50.0%	26
		<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>47.1%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>35.0%</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	BUTLER	10	17.5%	37	64.9%	1	1.8%	2	3.5%	0	0.0%	16	28.1%	57
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	5	16.1%	18	58.1%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	25.8%	31
	CARTER	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	CRAWFORD	15	34.9%	23	53.5%	4	9.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	34.9%	43
	DENT	3	14.3%	12	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	33.3%	21
	DUNKLIN	4	21.1%	5	26.3%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	57.9%	19

## Appendix E: FY 2023 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL		EMOTIONAL		MEDICAL		EDUCATIONAL		SEXUAL		TOTAL INCIDENTS		
		ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE					
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	18	36.7%	25	51.0%	6	12.2%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	24	49.0%	49
	IRON	2	11.1%	12	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	8	44.4%	18
	JEFFERSON	42	29.4%	64	44.8%	16	11.2%	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	58	40.6%	143
	MADISON	6	31.6%	6	31.6%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	10	52.6%	19
	MARIES	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1
	MISSISSIPPI	3	30.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%	10
	NEW MADRID	3	13.0%	9	39.1%	3	13.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	52.2%	23
	OREGON	2	14.3%	5	35.7%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	8	57.1%	14
	PEMISCOT	7	31.8%	13	59.1%	2	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	31.8%	22
	PERRY	1	11.1%	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	9
	PHELPS	9	16.1%	35	62.5%	2	3.6%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	17	30.4%	56
	PULASKI	16	24.2%	46	69.7%	5	7.6%	4	6.1%	0	0.0%	18	27.3%	66
	REYNOLDS	2	20.0%	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	10
	RIPLEY	6	25.0%	12	50.0%	2	8.3%	1	4.2%	1	4.2%	8	33.3%	24
	SCOTT	6	23.1%	9	34.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	11	42.3%	26
	SHANNON	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	7
	ST FRANCOIS	16	27.6%	19	32.8%	6	10.3%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	32	55.2%	58
	STE GENEVIEVE	3	23.1%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	61.5%	13
	STODDARD	7	30.4%	10	43.5%	3	13.0%	3	13.0%	0	0.0%	7	30.4%	23
	TEXAS	13	41.9%	17	54.8%	7	22.6%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	13	41.9%	31
WASHINGTON	5	25.0%	12	60.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	45.0%	20	
WAYNE	3	30.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>39.2%</b>	<b>832</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6
	BARTON	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6
	BATES	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	BENTON	4	33.3%	3	25.0%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	12
	CAMDEN	4	22.2%	8	44.4%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	7	38.9%	18
	CEDAR	4	33.3%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	66.7%	12
	CHRISTIAN	12	42.9%	7	25.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	39.3%	28
	DADE	3	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	DALLAS	5	33.3%	9	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	15
	DOUGLAS	6	35.3%	10	58.8%	5	29.4%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	6	35.3%	17
	GREENE	64	32.7%	88	44.9%	14	7.1%	5	2.6%	0	0.0%	57	29.1%	196
	HENRY	2	13.3%	7	46.7%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	53.3%	15
	HICKORY	3	50.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	JASPER	16	33.3%	15	31.3%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	39.6%	48
	LACLEDE	11	29.7%	20	54.1%	3	8.1%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%	10	27.0%	37
	LAWRENCE	5	41.7%	5	41.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	50.0%	12
	MCDONALD	3	33.3%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	9
	MILLER	3	17.6%	10	58.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	23.5%	17
	MONITEAU	0	0.0%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	6
	MORGAN	2	13.3%	10	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	15
	NEWTON	5	31.3%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	56.3%	16
	OZARK	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	POLK	4	19.0%	7	33.3%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	61.9%	21
ST CLAIR	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	
STONE	5	29.4%	6	35.3%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	41.2%	17	
TANEY	13	26.5%	16	32.7%	3	6.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	59.2%	49	
VERNON	3	16.7%	5	27.8%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	55.6%	18	
WEBSTER	13	39.4%	13	39.4%	6	18.2%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	9	27.3%	33	
WRIGHT	2	20.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>30.1%</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>658</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	47	43.1%	30	27.5%	7	6.4%	5	4.6%	0	0.0%	45	41.3%	109
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>41.3%</b>	<b>109</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	22	12.0%	22	53.7%	4	9.8%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	4	9.8%	41
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	19	36.5%	21	40.4%	4	7.7%	3	5.8%	2	3.8%	17	32.7%	52
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>46.2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>93</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	54	50.5%	31	29.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	26.0%	29	27.1%	107
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>27.1%</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>926</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>1,344</b>	<b>44.2%</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>3,041</b>

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

## Appendix F: FY 2023 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL		MEDICAL		EDUCATIONAL		SEXUAL		TOTAL CHILDREN
		ABUSE		ABUSE		ABUSE		NEGLECT		NEGLECT		ABUSE		
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	10
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	BUCHANAN	43	32.6%	84	63.6%	6	4.5%	2	1.5%	0	0.0%	28	21.2%	132
	CALDWELL	1	7.1%	7	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	42.9%	14
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	CASS	37	39.8%	41	44.1%	3	3.2%	6	6.5%	0	0.0%	24	25.8%	93
	CHARITON	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
	CLAY	29	24.0%	56	46.3%	18	14.9%	2	1.7%	0	0.0%	37	30.6%	121
	CLINTON	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	3	30.0%	2	20.0%	2	20.0%	2	20.0%	10
	COOPER	0	0.0%	4	28.6%	5	35.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	64.3%	14
	DAVISS	2	20.0%	4	40.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	DE KALB	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	GENTRY	4	40.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	GRUNDY	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4
	HARRISON	5	62.5%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	HOLT	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	5
	JOHNSON	11	26.2%	19	45.2%	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	40.5%	42
	LAFAYETTE	5	41.7%	6	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	12
	LINN	5	62.5%	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8
	LIVINGSTON	8	36.4%	15	68.2%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	9.1%	22
	MERCER	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	NODAWAY	5	29.4%	9	52.9%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	8	47.1%	17
	PETTIS	8	13.6%	31	52.5%	5	8.5%	5	8.5%	0	0.0%	23	39.0%	59
	PLATTE	8	40.0%	3	15.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	20
	PUTNAM	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	RAY	5	29.4%	6	35.3%	5	29.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	47.1%	17
SALINE	12	44.4%	9	33.3%	3	11.1%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	5	18.5%	27	
SULLIVAN	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	
WORTH	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>47.5%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>678</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	7	9.9%	60	84.5%	4	5.6%	7	9.9%	10	14.1%	6	8.5%	71
	AUDRAIN	12	36.4%	8	24.2%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	16	48.5%	33
	BOONE	26	20.5%	68	53.5%	16	12.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	28	22.0%	127
	CALLAWAY	17	41.5%	10	24.4%	5	12.2%	0	0.0%	1	2.4%	16	39.0%	41
	CLARK	3	21.4%	12	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	14
	COLE	6	10.7%	26	46.4%	9	16.1%	1	1.8%	7	12.5%	19	33.9%	56
	FRANKLIN	21	23.9%	27	30.7%	2	2.3%	2	2.3%	1	1.1%	42	47.7%	88
	GASCONADE	4	28.6%	10	71.4%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	14
	HOWARD	4	21.1%	12	63.2%	2	10.5%	3	15.8%	0	0.0%	5	26.3%	19
	KNOX	2	28.6%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	7
	LEWIS	1	9.1%	8	72.7%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11
	LINCOLN	25	19.5%	75	58.6%	12	9.4%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	31	24.2%	128
	MACON	4	12.1%	16	48.5%	6	18.2%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	6	18.2%	33
	MARION	8	14.8%	45	83.3%	2	3.7%	2	3.7%	0	0.0%	7	13.0%	54
	MONROE	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	MONTGOMERY	4	30.8%	4	30.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	61.5%	13
	OSAGE	2	22.2%	6	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9
	PIKE	8	30.8%	14	53.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	46.2%	26
	RALLS	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	RANDOLPH	26	40.0%	33	50.8%	15	23.1%	4	6.2%	0	0.0%	13	20.0%	65
	SCHUYLER	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	SCOTLAND	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	5
	SHELBY	4	14.8%	24	88.9%	7	25.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	27
ST CHARLES	36	18.5%	114	58.5%	8	4.1%	4	2.1%	8	4.1%	48	24.6%	195	
WARREN	6	17.6%	10	29.4%	9	26.5%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	13	38.2%	34	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>55.3%</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>1,088</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	BUTLER	10	11.5%	65	74.7%	1	1.1%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	17	19.5%	87
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	6	15.8%	22	57.9%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	23.7%	38
	CARTER	3	37.5%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8
	CRAWFORD	18	30.5%	35	59.3%	7	11.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	27.1%	59
	DENT	3	10.0%	18	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	33.3%	30
	DUNKLIN	4	15.4%	9	34.6%	3	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	46.2%	26

## Appendix F: FY 2023 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL		EMOTIONAL		MEDICAL		EDUCATIONAL		SEXUAL		TOTAL CHILDREN		
		ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE					
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	21	28.8%	45	61.6%	17	23.3%	0	0.0%	3	4.1%	29	39.7%	73
	IRON	2	6.5%	22	71.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.5%	0	0.0%	11	35.5%	31
	JEFFERSON	48	23.2%	114	55.1%	27	13.0%	2	1.0%	2	1.0%	62	30.0%	207
	MADISON	9	31.0%	11	37.9%	6	20.7%	0	0.0%	2	6.9%	11	37.9%	29
	MARIES	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1
	MISSISSIPPI	3	25.0%	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	4	33.3%	12
	NEW MADRID	3	11.1%	12	44.4%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	44.4%	27
	OREGON	5	18.5%	9	33.3%	11	40.7%	1	3.7%	3	11.1%	11	40.7%	27
	PEMISCOT	7	16.3%	32	74.4%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	18.6%	43
	PERRY	1	7.7%	10	76.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	3	23.1%	13
	PHELPS	9	10.1%	61	68.5%	2	2.2%	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	22	24.7%	89
	PULASKI	24	18.5%	100	76.9%	14	10.8%	5	3.8%	0	0.0%	22	16.9%	130
	REYNOLDS	2	11.1%	15	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	18
	RIPLEY	8	20.0%	28	70.0%	2	5.0%	2	5.0%	2	5.0%	8	20.0%	40
	SCOTT	7	20.0%	17	48.6%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	11	31.4%	35
	SHANNON	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	9
	ST FRANCOIS	18	22.8%	32	40.5%	6	7.6%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	35	44.3%	79
	STE GENEVIEVE	9	40.9%	12	54.5%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	54.5%	22
	STODDARD	8	19.5%	25	61.0%	3	7.3%	5	12.2%	0	0.0%	8	19.5%	41
	TEXAS	21	34.4%	39	63.9%	20	32.8%	4	6.6%	0	0.0%	13	21.3%	61
WASHINGTON	5	14.7%	24	70.6%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	26.5%	34	
WAYNE	3	25.0%	6	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	12	
<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>		<b>261</b>	<b>20.3%</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>1,286</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	7	77.8%	9
	BARTON	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	7
	BATES	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	BENTON	7	31.8%	7	31.8%	6	27.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	22
	CAMDEN	4	19.0%	10	47.6%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	8	38.1%	21
	CEDAR	8	40.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	45.0%	20
	CHRISTIAN	13	40.6%	8	25.0%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	40.6%	32
	DADE	3	60.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	DALLAS	5	26.3%	12	63.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	19
	DOUGLAS	14	48.3%	16	55.2%	14	48.3%	1	3.4%	4	13.8%	8	27.6%	29
	GREENE	68	27.5%	125	50.6%	15	6.1%	6	2.4%	0	0.0%	60	24.3%	247
	HENRY	2	9.1%	12	54.5%	3	13.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	40.9%	22
	HICKORY	3	50.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	JASPER	18	31.0%	24	41.4%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	34.5%	58
	LACLEDE	16	25.0%	45	70.3%	7	10.9%	2	3.1%	0	0.0%	10	15.6%	64
	LAWRENCE	6	46.2%	6	46.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	46.2%	13
	MCDONALD	4	25.0%	9	56.3%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	25.0%	16
	MILLER	3	15.0%	13	65.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	20.0%	20
	MONITEAU	0	0.0%	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	10
	MORGAN	2	10.5%	13	68.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	31.6%	19
	NEWTON	6	28.6%	5	23.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	52.4%	21
	OZARK	3	30.0%	4	40.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	10
	POLK	4	14.8%	12	44.4%	4	14.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	51.9%	27
ST CLAIR	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	
STONE	5	20.0%	12	48.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	36.0%	25	
TANEY	14	22.6%	27	43.5%	5	8.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	50.0%	62	
VERNON	3	9.4%	13	40.6%	6	18.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	34.4%	32	
WEBSTER	17	34.0%	25	50.0%	8	16.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	10	20.0%	50	
WRIGHT	2	13.3%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	15	
<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>		<b>234</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>49.1%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>890</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	50	34.5%	51	35.2%	13	9.0%	5	3.4%	0	0.0%	49	33.8%	145
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>35.2%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>145</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	26	45.6%	36	63.2%	5	8.8%	2	3.5%	0	0.0%	4	7.0%	57
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	21	32.8%	27	42.2%	4	6.3%	4	6.3%	2	3.1%	21	32.8%	64
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>38.8%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>121</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	57	41.0%	50	36.0%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	38	27.3%	139
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>41.0%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>36.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,077</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>2,305</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>1,257</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>4,347</b>

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

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

	COUNTY	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	ANDREW	0	0	1	0	0
	ATCHISON	0	0	0	0	0
	BUCHANAN	1	1	2	0	1
	CALDWELL	0	0	0	0	0
	CARROLL	0	0	0	0	0
	CASS	0	0	0	1	0
	CHARITON	1	0	0	0	0
	CLAY	4	2	1	3	2
	CLINTON	0	1	1	0	1
	COOPER	0	0	0	0	0
	DAVISS	0	0	0	0	0
	DE KALB	0	0	0	0	0
	GENTRY	0	0	0	0	0
	GRUNDY	0	0	0	0	0
	HARRISON	0	0	0	0	1
	HOLT	0	0	0	0	0
	JOHNSON	0	0	0	0	0
	LAFAYETTE	0	0	0	0	0
	LINN	1	0	0	0	0
	LIVINGSTON	0	0	0	1	0
	MERCER	0	0	0	0	0
	NODAWAY	0	0	0	0	0
	PETTIS	0	0	1	2	0
	PLATTE	0	1	1	3	0
	PUTNAM	0	0	0	0	0
	RAY	0	0	0	1	0
	SALINE	0	1	0	0	0
SULLIVAN	0	0	0	0	0	
WORTH	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>NORTHEAST</b>	ADAIR	0	1	1	1	0
	AUDRAIN	0	0	0	0	1
	BOONE	1	0	1	0	1
	CALLAWAY	0	0	0	0	0
	CLARK	0	0	1	0	0
	COLE	1	0	1	0	0
	FRANKLIN	0	0	2	1	3
	GASCONADE	0	0	0	0	1
	HOWARD	0	0	0	0	0
	KNOX	0	1	0	0	0
	LEWIS	1	0	0	1	1
	LINCOLN	0	0	2	2	1
	MACON	0	0	0	0	0
	MARION	0	0	2	0	3
	MONROE	0	0	0	0	0
	MONTGOMERY	0	0	0	0	0
	OSAGE	0	1	0	0	0
	PIKE	0	0	1	0	0
	RALLS	0	2	0	0	0
	RANDOLPH	0	1	0	0	0
	SCHUYLER	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTLAND	0	0	0	1	0
	SHELBY	0	0	0	0	0
ST. CHARLES	2	0	1	2	3	
WARREN	0	0	2	2	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	BOLLINGER	0	1	0	0	0
	BUTLER	1	0	2	1	2
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	1	0	0	0	0
	CARTER	0	0	0	0	1
	CRAWFORD	0	0	0	0	0
	DENT	0	0	1	0	0
	DUNKLIN	0	0	0	0	0

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

	COUNTY	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	1	0	0	1	0
	IRON	0	0	0	0	0
	JEFFERSON	0	3	3	2	2
	MADISON	0	0	0	2	1
	MARIES	1	0	0	0	0
	MISSISSIPPI	1	0	0	1	0
	NEW MADRID	0	1	0	0	0
	OREGON	0	0	0	0	0
	PEMISCOT	1	2	0	1	0
	PERRY	0	0	0	1	0
	PHELPS	0	1	0	0	1
	PULASKI	1	1	0	1	1
	REYNOLDS	1	2	0	0	0
	RIPLEY	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTT	1	1	0	1	0
	SHANNON	0	0	0	0	0
	ST. FRANCOIS	0	1	0	1	0
	STE. GENEVIEVE	0	1	0	0	0
	STODDARD	0	0	1	0	0
	TEXAS	0	0	1	1	0
	WASHINGTON	0	1	1	1	0
	WAYNE	0	1	0	0	0
		<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	0	0	0	0	0
	BARTON	0	0	1	0	0
	BATES	0	0	0	0	0
	BENTON	0	0	1	0	0
	CAMDEN	0	0	0	1	0
	CEDAR	0	1	0	0	0
	CHRISTIAN	0	0	0	0	0
	DADE	0	0	0	0	1
	DALLAS	0	1	1	0	0
	DOUGLAS	1	0	0	0	0
	GREENE	1	0	2	1	4
	HENRY	1	0	0	0	0
	HICKORY	0	0	0	0	0
	JASPER	1	1	0	1	0
	LACLEDE	0	1	1	1	0
	LAWRENCE	0	1	0	0	0
	MCDONALD	0	0	0	0	0
	MILLER	2	0	1	0	0
	MONITEAU	0	0	0	0	0
	MORGAN	0	0	0	0	1
	NEWTON	0	0	0	0	0
	OZARK	0	0	0	0	0
	POLK	0	0	2	0	1
	ST CLAIR	0	0	0	0	0
	STONE	0	0	0	0	0
	TANEY	0	0	0	0	0
	VERNON	0	0	0	0	0
WEBSTER	0	0	0	0	1	
WRIGHT	1	0	1	1	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	4	1	6	5	3
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST. LOUIS CITY	3	7	12	3	1
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	9	9	15	9	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	0	1	2	1	4
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>44</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>44</b>

---

## Appendix H. 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 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; or
- Any person who takes control of the child by deception, force, or coercion.

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

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

---

## **Appendix H. 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.

**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 H. Legal and Methodological Definitions

---

### Statute Changes/Modifications

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

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

- *Sections 210.145, 210.152, and 210.183 – Child Abuse and Neglect Investigations* – This bill extends the amount of time the Children's Division (CD) has to complete child abuse and neglect investigations and the amount of time the Children's Division has to provide the alleged perpetrator with written notification of the Children's Division's determination.

### 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.

---

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

---

**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.

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.

---

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

---

**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.

**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.