



Missouri Department of  
**Social Services**

**Children's Division**

# **Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Report Fiscal Year 2024**

# Our Mission



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



---

MICHAEL L. PARSON, GOVERNOR • ROBERT J. KNODELL, DIRECTOR  
KAYLA UELIGGER, ACTING 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 2024, July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024. 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, 2023 through June 30, 2024. As a result of pending investigations or changes in conclusions, the data is prone to change. The data reported is current as of December 1, 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 11 part-time trained and experienced Children's Service Workers during the fiscal year. A call to the hotline is referred to as a "report" or "reported incident" of child abuse/neglect. A report may involve from one to several children. Over the course of the fiscal year, the hotline had received over 64,000 reported incidents that involved over 91,000 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 2024, thirty-eight percent (38.2%) of reports taken by the CANHU were assigned as investigation and fifty-six percent (56.1%) as family assessments. Six percent (5.8%) were assigned as juvenile assessments, where a child under the age of fourteen is alleged to have committed an act of sexual abuse against a person under the age of eighteen.

Investigations/assessments must be initiated within 24 hours, or immediately when it is determined that the child is in imminent danger. When the only allegation is educational neglect, or the allegation is an old allegation and the child is protected, an investigation/assessment must be initiated within 72 hours.

Unless there is good cause, Children's Service Workers complete investigations and assessments within 45 days of report. At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion. Of the 91,671 children with reports in FY 2024, 4,509 (4.9%), were substantiated as abused/neglected.

# Reports

## Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline

The CANHU received 141,729\* hotline calls between July 2023 and June 2024. Of those reports, 64,497 were classified as Investigations or Assessments and involved 91,671 children.

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

Year	Total Reports**	Annual Change	Total Children***	Annual Change
2020	55,853		78,328	
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%
2024	64,497	4.5%	91,671	6.5%


\*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, July had the least number and April had the highest number of reported incidents during the year. An average of 5,375 reports involving 7,639 children were made each month.


### FY 2024 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 71,202 children had been involved in at least one report during FY 2024, with the majority (80.1%) having only been reported once. More than one call was received for 14,186 children with fourteen percent (14.2%) involved in two reports and almost six percent (5.7%) involved in more than two.

**Number of Reported Incidents Per Child during FY 2024**




## 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. Three-fourths of reporters were mandated.

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

**Type of Child/Abuse Neglect Reporters during FY 2024**



## 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 2024 by Occupation

	Number	Percent
Permissive	15,560	20.2%
Principal/Other School Staff	10,982	14.3%
Peace officer or law enforcement official	10,822	14.1%
Social worker	9,799	12.7%
Mental health professional	6,803	8.8%
Teacher	5,366	7.0%
Nurse	4,633	6.0%
Other	3,006	3.9%
Other person with responsibility for care of children	3,272	4.2%
Children`s Division Worker	1,463	1.9%
Juvenile Officer	885	1.1%
Other health practitioner	838	1.1%
Day care center or other childcare worker	797	1.0%
Physician	762	1.0%
Other hospital/clinic personnel	624	0.8%
Psychologist	331	0.4%
Intern	250	0.3%
Resident	161	0.2%
Minister	151	0.2%
Volunteer/personnel of community service program	126	0.2%
Probation or Parole Officer	121	0.2%
Medical examiner	99	0.1%
Jail/detention personnel and volunteers	67	0.1%
Dentist/dental hygienist	55	0.1%
Coroner	28	0.0%
Chiropractor	3	0.0%
Optometrist	3	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	24,583	1,192	24,616
Family Assessment	36,211	1,220	36,171
Juvenile Assessment	3,703	6	3,710



---

## ***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 2024

	Number	Percent
Adequate Living Conditions	9,708	24.3%
Extended Family Support System	8,078	20.3%
Community/Cultural Support	7,615	19.1%
Single Parent Household	6,628	16.6%
Amenable to Services	6,029	15.1%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	4,934	12.4%
Problem Solving Skills	4,838	12.1%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	4,342	10.9%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	3,008	7.5%
No History of Violence	1,200	3.0%
Stable Marriage	918	2.3%
Manages Finances Well	878	2.2%
Good Physical/Mental Health	677	1.7%
Lack of Parenting Skills	581	1.5%
Domestic Violence	527	1.3%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	522	1.3%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	510	1.3%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	403	1.0%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	312	0.8%
Crowded Living Conditions	309	0.8%
Positive Childhood Experiences	304	0.8%
Marital Problems	303	0.8%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	270	0.7%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	261	0.7%
Homelessness	231	0.6%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	213	0.5%
Dangerous Living Conditions	155	0.4%
Loss of Employment	150	0.4%
Teen Parent(s)	110	0.3%
Social Isolation	88	0.2%
Lack of Utilities	86	0.2%
Illness	44	0.1%
Role Reversal	38	0.1%
Incapacity due to Physical Handicap	36	0.1%
Intellectual Disability	24	0.1%

Percent is the percentage of 39,881 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 2024

	Number	Percent
Adequate Living Conditions	5,557	22.6%
Extended Family Support System	5,087	20.7%
Community/Cultural Support	4,283	17.4%
Amenable to Services	3,525	14.3%
Single Parent Household	3,522	14.3%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	2,551	10.4%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	2,396	9.7%
Problem Solving Skills	2,366	9.6%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	1,628	6.6%
Manages Finances Well	767	3.1%
No History of Violence	752	3.1%
Lack of Parenting Skills	720	2.9%
Stable Marriage	675	2.7%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	606	2.5%
Domestic Violence	549	2.2%
Good Physical/Mental Health	546	2.2%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	358	1.5%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	279	1.1%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	248	1.0%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	245	1.0%
Crowded Living Conditions	226	0.9%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	222	0.9%
Dangerous Living Conditions	219	0.9%
Marital Problems	216	0.9%
Positive Childhood Experiences	183	0.8%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	178	0.7%
Homelessness	153	0.6%
Loss of Employment	109	0.4%
Social Isolation	92	0.4%
Teen Parent(s)	92	0.4%
Lack of Utilities	56	0.2%
Incapacity due to Physical Handicap	32	0.1%
Role Reversal	27	0.1%
Illness	24	0.1%
Intellectual Disability	14	0.1%

Percent is the percentage of 24,620 reports tracked as Investigations. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each Family Assessment.

# Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

Unless there is good cause, investigations and assessments should be closed within 45 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	
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
2024	3,242	5.0%	1,479	2.3%	18,407	28.5%	38,558	59.8%	2,811	4.4%	64,497

# 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	
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
2024	4,509	4.9%	2,210	2.4%	25,061	27.3%	55,553	60.6%	4,338	4.7%	91,671

## 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 2024, 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	
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
2024	1,923	5.0%	614	1.6%	24,533	63.6%	9,510	24.7%	367	1.0%	1,611	4.2%	38,558

#### 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	
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
2024	3,172	5.7%	957	1.7%	34,436	62.0%	13,987	25.2%	583	1.0%	2,418	4.4%	55,553

# Assessment Conclusions

Agency Responded Concerns Addressed or Agency Responded No Concerns Found were most often concluded for both Family Assessments and Juvenile Assessments.


## Reported Incidents by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2024

Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	1,848	5.3%	75	2.1%	1,923	5.0%
Agency Responded Services Provided	556	1.6%	58	1.6%	614	1.6%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	21,842	62.5%	2,691	74.4%	24,533	63.6%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	8,852	25.3%	658	18.2%	9,510	24.7%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	344	1.0%	23	0.6%	367	1.0%
Family Non-Cooperative, Child Safe	1,499	4.3%	112	3.1%	1,611	4.2%
<b>Total Assessment Conclusions</b>	<b>34,941</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>38,558</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


## Reported Children by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2024

Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	3,074	6.0%	98	2.2%	3,172	5.7%
Agency Responded Services Provided	880	1.7%	77	1.7%	957	1.7%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	31,134	60.9%	3,302	74.3%	34,436	62.0%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	13,187	25.8%	800	18.0%	13,987	25.2%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	549	1.1%	34	0.8%	583	1.0%
Family Non-Cooperative, Child Safe	2,283	4.5%	135	3.0%	2,418	4.4%
<b>Total Assessment Conclusions</b>	<b>51,107</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,446</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>55,553</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**FY 2024 Concluded Family Assessments**



**FY 2024 Concluded Juvenile Assessments**



# Assessment Conclusions

## Demographics of Assessment Children

Children involved in reports concluded as assessments were almost evenly split between males (50.1%) and females (49.7%). The majority of children were white (66.8%), and almost nine percent (8.6%) were Hispanic.

### Assessment Concluded Children during FY 2024


	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>55,553</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,172</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Age</b>								
< 1	2,229	4.0%	211	6.7%	51	5.3%	24	4.1%
1	2,292	4.1%	182	5.7%	38	4.0%	24	4.1%
2	2,425	4.4%	191	6.0%	36	3.8%	21	3.6%
3	2,656	4.8%	174	5.5%	42	4.4%	21	3.6%
4	3,077	5.5%	201	6.3%	46	4.8%	31	5.3%
5	3,522	6.3%	227	7.2%	41	4.3%	48	8.2%
6	3,723	6.7%	217	6.8%	54	5.6%	40	6.9%
7	3,819	6.9%	187	5.9%	75	7.8%	34	5.8%
8	3,796	6.8%	200	6.3%	68	7.1%	44	7.5%
9	3,604	6.5%	172	5.4%	46	4.8%	28	4.8%
10	3,362	6.1%	188	5.9%	67	7.0%	35	6.0%
11	3,443	6.2%	171	5.4%	64	6.7%	33	5.7%
12	3,205	5.8%	165	5.2%	70	7.3%	39	6.7%
13	3,235	5.8%	150	4.7%	48	5.0%	33	5.7%
14	3,213	5.8%	169	5.3%	63	6.6%	40	6.9%
15	3,100	5.6%	169	5.3%	60	6.3%	30	5.1%
16	2,901	5.2%	126	4.0%	56	5.9%	31	5.3%
17	1,740	3.1%	72	2.3%	25	2.6%	25	4.3%
Not available	211	0.4%	0	0.0%	7	0.7%	2	0.3%
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	27,811	50.1%	1,604	50.6%	451	47.1%	284	48.7%
Female	27,590	49.7%	1,568	49.4%	499	52.1%	297	50.9%
Not available	152	0.3%	0	0.0%	7	0.7%	2	0.3%
<b>Race</b>								
White	37,135	66.8%	2,352	74.1%	624	65.2%	402	69.0%
Black	9,678	17.4%	366	11.5%	176	18.4%	96	16.5%
Other/unknown	8,740	15.7%	454	14.3%	157	16.4%	85	14.6%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>								
Hispanic	4,803	8.6%	251	7.9%	95	9.9%	48	8.2%
Not Hispanic	45,318	81.6%	2,643	83.3%	782	81.7%	485	83.2%
Unknown	5,432	9.8%	278	8.8%	80	8.4%	50	8.6%

# Substantiated Conclusions

## Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

During FY 2024, 4,509 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 2024.

**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2024**




**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2024**

	Number	Percent
Neglect	2,332	51.7%
Physical Abuse	1,252	27.8%
Sexual Abuse	1,236	27.4%
Emotional Abuse	380	8.4%
Medical Neglect	78	1.7%
Educational Neglect	50	1.1%

Percent is the percentage of 4,509 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

January had the highest number of substantiated abused/neglected children (442) during the fiscal year while February had the least (339). July saw the highest incidence of neglect (232), January had the highest incidence of sexual abuse (124), and November and January each had the highest for physical abuse (120).



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 2024

	Number	Percent
Lack of supervision	1,722	73.8%
Unsafe/Inadequate shelter	438	18.8%
Failure to protect	309	13.3%
Unsanitary living conditions	267	11.4%
Bruises, welts, red marks	152	6.5%
Other physical abuse or injury	132	5.7%
Blaming, verbal abuse, threatening	128	5.5%
Other sexual abuse	106	4.5%
Fondling/touching	74	3.2%
Locking in or out/expelling from home	63	2.7%

Percent is the percentage of 2,332 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 2024**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Bruises, welts, red marks	782	63.3%
Other physical abuse or injury	604	48.9%
Abrasions, lacerations	203	16.4%
Lack of supervision	197	15.9%
Blaming, verbal abuse, threatening	111	9.0%
Failure to Protect	104	8.4%
Inappropriately giving drugs	102	8.3%
Wounds, cuts, punctures	92	7.4%
Fractures	62	5.0%
Unsafe/Inadequate shelter	53	4.3%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,252 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 2024**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Other sexual abuse	697	55.7%
Fondling/Touching	623	49.8%
Intercourse	265	21.2%
Oral sex, sodomy	214	17.1%
Digital penetration	133	10.6%
Pornography	94	7.5%
Lack of supervision	84	6.7%
Failure to protect	54	4.3%
Blaming, verbal abuse, threatening	39	3.1%
Child Sex Trafficking	37	3.0%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,236 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 2024**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Extended Family Support System	1,157	35.7%
Adequate Living Conditions	772	23.8%
Single Parent Household	665	20.5%
Amenable to Services	646	19.9%
Community/Cultural Support	609	18.8%
Lack of Parenting Skills	423	13.0%
Other Drug Related Problem	411	12.7%
Domestic Violence	292	9.0%
Problem Solving Skills	273	8.4%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	241	7.4%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	242	7.5%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	197	6.1%
Manages Finances Well	185	5.7%
Alcohol Related Problem	174	5.4%
No History of Violence	165	5.1%
Dangerous Living Conditions	151	4.7%
Stable Marriage	126	3.9%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	103	3.2%
Good Physical/Mental Health	94	2.9%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	94	2.9%

**Percent is the percentage of 3,242 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 2024, over half (57.6%) were female. More sexually abused children were female than male. Neglect was more prevalent among younger children while sexual abuse occurred more often among older children.

### Child Abuse/Neglect Children during FY 2024 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>	4,509	103.7%	2,332	100.0%	1,252	100.0%	1,236	100.0%	380	100.0%	78	100.0%	50	100.0%
<b>Age</b>														
< 1	304	6.7%	223	9.6%	122	9.7%	3	0.2%	10	2.6%	16	20.5%	0	0.0%
1	260	5.8%	222	9.5%	52	4.2%	6	0.5%	8	2.1%	8	10.3%	0	0.0%
2	258	5.7%	205	8.8%	74	5.9%	3	0.2%	7	1.8%	3	3.8%	0	0.0%
3	273	6.1%	198	8.5%	67	5.4%	22	1.8%	9	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	232	5.1%	150	6.4%	55	4.4%	32	2.6%	15	3.9%	2	2.6%	0	0.0%
5	228	5.1%	140	6.0%	51	4.1%	46	3.7%	8	2.1%	6	7.7%	0	0.0%
6	215	4.8%	126	5.4%	61	4.9%	27	2.2%	26	6.8%	4	5.1%	2	4.0%
7	261	5.8%	139	6.0%	71	5.7%	66	5.3%	20	5.3%	4	5.1%	5	10.0%
8	246	5.5%	139	6.0%	76	6.1%	48	3.9%	25	6.6%	3	3.8%	5	10.0%
9	208	4.6%	91	3.9%	68	5.4%	56	4.5%	23	6.1%	3	3.8%	6	12.0%
10	197	4.4%	83	3.6%	58	4.6%	62	5.0%	25	6.6%	3	3.8%	5	10.0%
11	209	4.6%	97	4.2%	45	3.6%	73	5.9%	34	8.9%	7	9.0%	3	6.0%
12	232	5.1%	88	3.8%	59	4.7%	97	7.8%	32	8.4%	0	0.0%	2	4.0%
13	267	5.9%	81	3.5%	77	6.2%	126	10.2%	29	7.6%	6	7.7%	4	8.0%
14	310	6.9%	108	4.6%	90	7.2%	146	11.8%	26	6.8%	2	2.6%	7	14.0%
15	311	6.9%	106	4.5%	90	7.2%	134	10.8%	34	8.9%	5	6.4%	3	6.0%
16	314	7.0%	84	3.6%	84	6.7%	182	14.7%	31	8.2%	5	6.4%	5	10.0%
17	183	4.1%	54	2.3%	52	4.2%	107	8.7%	18	4.7%	1	1.3%	3	6.0%
<b>Gender</b>														
Male	2,006	44.5%	1,193	51.2%	719	57.4%	203	16.4%	179	47.1%	43	55.1%	21	42.0%
Female	2,503	55.5%	1,139	48.8%	533	42.6%	1,033	83.6%	201	52.9%	35	44.9%	29	58.0%
<b>Race</b>														
White	3,008	66.7%	1,540	66.0%	779	62.2%	938	75.9%	234	61.6%	54	69.2%	31	62.0%
Black	808	17.9%	417	17.9%	269	21.5%	156	12.6%	87	22.9%	13	16.7%	11	22.0%
Other	693	15.4%	375	16.1%	204	16.3%	142	11.5%	59	15.5%	11	14.1%	8	16.0%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>														
Hispanic	384	8.5%	162	6.9%	101	8.1%	141	11.4%	38	10.0%	4	5.1%	7	14.0%
Not Hispanic	3,681	81.6%	1,894	81.2%	1,029	82.2%	1,014	82.0%	313	82.4%	63	80.8%	39	78.0%
Unknown	444	9.8%	276	11.8%	122	9.7%	81	6.6%	29	7.6%	11	14.1%	4	8.0%

---

## ***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 2024, 55 children died as a result of child abuse/neglect.

The following chart represents the number of child fatalities for fiscal years 2020 to 2024, 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 2024

	Number	Percent
Neglect	38	69.1%
Physical Abuse	25	45.5%
Medical Neglect	4	7.3%
Emotional Abuse	1	1.8%
Sexual Abuse	0	0.0%

Percent is the percent of the 55 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 2024, the majority were under the age of one, male and white.

### Substantiated Fatalities during FY 2024

Age	Number	Percent
0	22	40.0%
1	2	3.6%
2	6	10.9%
3	4	7.3%
4	3	5.5%
5	1	1.8%
6	2	3.6%
7	1	1.8%
9	3	5.5%
10	1	1.8%
11	1	1.8%
12	1	1.8%
13	2	3.6%
15	1	1.8%
16	3	5.5%
17	2	3.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	33	60.0%
Female	22	40.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	24	43.6%
Black	16	29.1%
Other	15	27.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

# Perpetrators

## Perpetrator Demographics

For FY 2024 substantiated reports, most perpetrators were white, male and between ages 20 and 49.

### Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2024

Age	Number	Percent
<20	149	3.5%
20-29	1,026	24.0%
30-39	1,556	36.4%
40-49	765	17.9%
50-59	239	5.6%
60-69	118	2.8%
70+	42	1.0%
Unknown	378	8.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,273</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	2,800	65.5%
Black	781	18.3%
Other/unknown	692	16.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,273</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Female	1,496	35.0%
Male	2,469	57.8%
Unknown	308	7.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,273</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 2024

	#
Natural parent	3,268
Parent/Caretaker's Partner	462
Step-parent	337
Aunt/Uncle/Cousin (Also Great)	320
Grandparent	229
Friend	163
Sibling/half, step-sibling	72
Adoptive Parent	64
Institution/staff	63
No Relationship Exists	60
Other Caregiver	54
Natural Child	39
Foster parent	39
Neighbor	34
Alleged Father	30
Legal Guardian	30
School/personnel	27
Day care provider	22
Other relative	21
Putative Father	19
Other	859

---

# 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 2024

	Number	Percent
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	673	15.8%
No Apparent Mental/Emotional Disturbance	655	15.3%
History of Criminal Behavior	478	11.2%
Adequate Support System	460	10.8%
Mental/Emotional Disturbance	457	10.7%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	357	8.4%
Amenable to Services	317	7.4%
Pattern of Violent Behavior	316	7.4%
Unemployed	272	6.4%
Loss of Control During Discipline	258	6.0%
Unrealistic Expectations of Child	243	5.7%
High School Education or Higher	190	4.4%
Parental History of Abuse/Neglect as a Child	181	4.2%
Financial Problems	173	4.0%
Immaturity	168	3.9%
Undetermined	165	3.9%
Low Self Esteem	103	2.4%
No One to Call on in Time of Crisis	86	2.0%
Other	74	1.7%
Institutional Report/Unknown Perpetrator	50	1.2%
Less than High School Education	24	0.6%
Illness	16	0.4%
Incapacity Due to Physical Handicap	12	0.3%
Intellectual Disability	12	0.3%
Other	79	1.8%

Percentage is the percentage of 4,273 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 2024, 83 of 3,514 FCS cases opened due to 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 2024, the review board heard 530 cases and 411 were upheld (77.6%). 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.

The Division received a total of 4,534 Newborn Crisis Assessment calls to CANHU during FY 2024. 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 2024, 321 children reported to CANHU were subsequently identified as drug-exposed.



# Appendices

## Appendix A: FY 2024 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	9	7.7%	2	1.7%	25	21.4%	78	66.7%	3	2.6%	117
	ATCHISON	2	5.0%	0	0.0%	7	17.5%	31	77.5%	0	0.0%	40
	BUCHANAN	93	6.6%	20	1.4%	393	28.1%	867	62.0%	26	1.9%	1,399
	CALDWELL	11	12.5%	7	8.0%	18	20.5%	50	56.8%	2	2.3%	88
	CARROLL	2	2.6%	0	0.0%	29	37.7%	46	59.7%	0	0.0%	77
	CASS	52	5.4%	8	0.8%	247	25.5%	637	65.8%	24	2.5%	968
	CHARITON	4	5.5%	3	4.1%	12	16.4%	53	72.6%	1	1.4%	73
	CLAY	95	4.6%	47	2.3%	556	26.7%	1,350	64.8%	35	1.7%	2,083
	CLINTON	11	5.4%	4	2.0%	56	27.6%	130	64.0%	2	1.0%	203
	COOPER	7	4.2%	4	2.4%	41	24.8%	106	64.2%	7	4.2%	165
	DAVISS	4	4.6%	4	4.6%	20	23.0%	59	67.8%	0	0.0%	87
	DE KALB	2	2.5%	3	3.8%	21	26.3%	54	67.5%	0	0.0%	80
	GENTRY	5	6.5%	0	0.0%	13	16.9%	59	76.6%	0	0.0%	77
	GRUNDY	8	6.6%	8	6.6%	22	18.2%	82	67.8%	1	0.8%	121
	HARRISON	10	12.0%	4	4.8%	6	7.2%	60	72.3%	3	3.6%	83
	HOLT	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	10	20.0%	37	74.0%	0	0.0%	50
	JOHNSON	24	4.8%	3	0.6%	92	18.3%	375	74.7%	8	1.6%	502
	LAFAYETTE	16	4.3%	8	2.2%	115	31.0%	230	62.0%	2	0.5%	371
	LINN	5	4.2%	7	5.9%	28	23.5%	78	65.5%	1	0.8%	119
	LIVINGSTON	20	11.8%	6	3.6%	38	22.5%	101	59.8%	4	2.4%	169
	MERCER	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	3	14.3%	17	81.0%	0	0.0%	21
	NODAWAY	17	11.3%	3	2.0%	42	27.8%	89	58.9%	0	0.0%	151
	PETTIS	35	5.7%	17	2.8%	171	27.7%	368	59.6%	26	4.2%	617
	PLATTE	34	4.6%	17	2.3%	198	26.5%	484	64.8%	14	1.9%	747
PUTNAM	3	8.1%	3	8.1%	4	10.8%	25	67.6%	2	5.4%	37	
RAY	9	3.3%	5	1.8%	66	23.9%	195	70.7%	1	0.4%	276	
SALINE	18	5.1%	9	2.6%	87	24.9%	233	66.6%	3	0.9%	350	
SULLIVAN	3	4.5%	5	7.6%	16	24.2%	42	63.6%	0	0.0%	66	
WORTH	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	14	77.8%	0	0.0%	18	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2,339</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>5,950</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>9,155</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	21	8.0%	6	2.3%	43	16.3%	163	62.0%	30	11.4%	263
	AUDRAIN	22	6.3%	12	3.4%	90	25.7%	216	61.7%	10	2.9%	350
	BOONE	61	3.8%	26	1.6%	430	26.8%	1,047	65.4%	38	2.4%	1,602
	CALLAWAY	29	5.4%	12	2.2%	140	26.1%	346	64.6%	9	1.7%	536
	CLARK	13	15.3%	2	2.4%	17	20.0%	53	62.4%	0	0.0%	85
	COLE	30	4.6%	22	3.4%	185	28.2%	410	62.6%	8	1.2%	655
	FRANKLIN	75	6.5%	30	2.6%	292	25.5%	726	63.3%	24	2.1%	1,147
	GASCONADE	6	3.7%	3	1.8%	37	22.6%	112	68.3%	6	3.7%	164
	HOWARD	20	18.5%	10	9.3%	18	16.7%	57	52.8%	3	2.8%	108
	KNOX	3	6.7%	0	0.0%	12	26.7%	26	57.8%	4	8.9%	45
	LEWIS	9	8.9%	5	5.0%	24	23.8%	52	51.5%	11	10.9%	101
	LINCOLN	69	8.5%	26	3.2%	157	19.4%	549	67.7%	10	1.2%	811
	MACON	12	9.7%	1	0.8%	34	27.4%	77	62.1%	0	0.0%	124
	MARION	24	5.7%	24	5.7%	92	21.7%	268	63.4%	15	3.5%	423
	MONROE	5	7.2%	4	5.8%	20	29.0%	37	53.6%	3	4.3%	69
	MONTGOMERY	15	9.9%	3	2.0%	32	21.2%	100	66.2%	1	0.7%	151
	OSAGE	4	4.2%	3	3.2%	24	25.3%	51	53.7%	13	13.7%	95
	PIKE	20	12.0%	4	2.4%	38	22.9%	97	58.4%	7	4.2%	166
	RALLS	3	3.3%	8	8.8%	21	23.1%	58	63.7%	1	1.1%	91
	RANDOLPH	24	5.9%	35	8.6%	76	18.8%	262	64.7%	8	2.0%	405
	SCHUYLER	7	20.0%	0	0.0%	8	22.9%	19	54.3%	1	2.9%	35
	SCOTLAND	4	13.3%	2	6.7%	8	26.7%	14	46.7%	2	6.7%	30
	SHELBY	11	14.1%	2	2.6%	18	23.1%	47	60.3%	0	0.0%	78
	ST CHARLES	201	6.5%	41	1.3%	772	25.0%	1,951	63.3%	117	3.8%	3,082
WARREN	20	4.6%	12	2.8%	106	24.5%	285	65.8%	10	2.3%	433	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>2,694</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>7,023</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>11,049</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	6	4.7%	1	0.8%	21	16.5%	96	75.6%	3	2.4%	127
	BUTLER	52	7.8%	21	3.1%	201	30.1%	381	57.0%	13	1.9%	668
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	26	3.6%	14	1.9%	201	28.0%	461	64.2%	16	2.2%	718
	CARTER	8	10.0%	2	2.5%	14	17.5%	56	70.0%	0	0.0%	80
	CRAWFORD	14	5.5%	4	1.6%	66	26.0%	160	63.0%	10	3.9%	254
	DENT	16	8.1%	7	3.6%	45	22.8%	125	63.5%	4	2.0%	197
	DUNKLIN	14	3.3%	18	4.3%	115	27.2%	260	61.5%	16	3.8%	423

## Appendix A: FY 2024 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	38	6.1%	35	5.6%	174	27.8%	371	59.2%	9	1.4%	627
	IRON	13	9.9%	8	6.1%	25	19.1%	80	61.1%	5	3.8%	131
	JEFFERSON	132	4.0%	146	4.5%	718	22.0%	2,185	66.9%	84	2.6%	3,265
	MADISON	15	8.2%	3	1.6%	47	25.8%	109	59.9%	8	4.4%	182
	MARIES	11	14.1%	2	2.6%	17	21.8%	47	60.3%	1	1.3%	78
	MISSISSIPPI	4	3.0%	3	2.3%	39	29.5%	82	62.1%	4	3.0%	132
	NEW MADRID	17	8.3%	1	0.5%	53	25.7%	132	64.1%	3	1.5%	206
	OREGON	10	7.6%	9	6.9%	28	21.4%	76	58.0%	8	6.1%	131
	PEMISCOT	12	5.4%	5	2.3%	77	34.8%	121	54.8%	6	2.7%	221
	PERRY	15	7.8%	4	2.1%	49	25.4%	124	64.2%	1	0.5%	193
	PHELPS	55	10.1%	20	3.7%	152	27.8%	308	56.3%	12	2.2%	547
	PULASKI	62	11.0%	11	2.0%	127	22.5%	353	62.6%	11	2.0%	564
	REYNOLDS	8	10.5%	3	3.9%	15	19.7%	49	64.5%	1	1.3%	76
	RIPLEY	25	12.3%	4	2.0%	63	31.0%	108	53.2%	3	1.5%	203
	SCOTT	19	3.9%	6	1.2%	127	25.9%	323	65.8%	16	3.3%	491
	SHANNON	7	6.8%	5	4.9%	14	13.6%	71	68.9%	6	5.8%	103
	ST FRANCOIS	60	6.3%	31	3.3%	255	26.8%	576	60.6%	28	2.9%	950
	STE GENEVIEVE	5	2.9%	7	4.1%	32	18.6%	126	73.3%	2	1.2%	172
	STODDARD	17	5.8%	15	5.1%	49	16.8%	207	70.9%	4	1.4%	292
	TEXAS	22	8.5%	14	5.4%	83	32.0%	138	53.3%	2	0.8%	259
WASHINGTON	22	6.5%	7	2.1%	75	22.0%	226	66.3%	11	3.2%	341	
WAYNE	17	14.5%	6	5.1%	19	16.2%	71	60.7%	4	3.4%	117	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2,901</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>7,422</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>11,748</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	8	1.9%	10	2.3%	139	32.4%	260	60.6%	12	2.8%	429
	BARTON	1	0.7%	5	3.7%	37	27.2%	92	67.6%	1	0.7%	136
	BATES	16	8.2%	8	4.1%	53	27.0%	117	59.7%	2	1.0%	196
	BENTON	11	4.6%	2	0.8%	42	17.7%	177	74.7%	5	2.1%	237
	CAMDEN	18	4.0%	9	2.0%	141	31.7%	273	61.3%	4	0.9%	445
	CEDAR	3	1.9%	1	0.6%	45	28.3%	106	66.7%	4	2.5%	159
	CHRISTIAN	24	2.5%	13	1.4%	269	28.3%	634	66.7%	10	1.1%	950
	DADE	0	0.0%	2	2.8%	28	38.9%	41	56.9%	1	1.4%	72
	DALLAS	18	6.9%	13	5.0%	60	22.9%	167	63.7%	4	1.5%	262
	DOUGLAS	12	6.5%	5	2.7%	63	34.2%	103	56.0%	1	0.5%	184
	GREENE	180	4.2%	66	1.5%	1,121	26.2%	2,817	65.8%	97	2.3%	4,281
	HENRY	15	4.4%	5	1.5%	80	23.4%	239	69.9%	3	0.9%	342
	HICKORY	3	3.5%	5	5.8%	25	29.1%	52	60.5%	1	1.2%	86
	JASPER	50	2.9%	21	1.2%	495	28.8%	1,075	62.6%	75	4.4%	1,716
	LACLEDE	17	2.8%	13	2.2%	200	33.1%	368	60.9%	6	1.0%	604
	LAWRENCE	9	1.8%	15	3.0%	167	33.4%	298	59.6%	11	2.2%	500
	MCDONALD	6	1.9%	14	4.4%	95	30.2%	190	60.3%	10	3.2%	315
	MILLER	16	4.8%	6	1.8%	108	32.4%	198	59.5%	5	1.5%	333
	MONITEAU	5	3.5%	1	0.7%	42	29.8%	93	66.0%	0	0.0%	141
	MORGAN	27	11.2%	7	2.9%	65	26.9%	142	58.7%	1	0.4%	242
	NEWTON	17	2.6%	18	2.7%	216	33.0%	388	59.2%	16	2.4%	655
	OZARK	5	4.2%	6	5.1%	28	23.7%	77	65.3%	2	1.7%	118
	POLK	11	2.4%	9	2.0%	138	30.4%	289	63.7%	7	1.5%	454
ST CLAIR	6	6.7%	1	1.1%	24	27.0%	55	61.8%	3	3.4%	89	
STONE	6	1.5%	17	4.4%	110	28.3%	243	62.5%	13	3.3%	389	
TANEY	62	8.0%	20	2.6%	193	25.0%	479	62.0%	18	2.3%	772	
VERNON	11	4.5%	6	2.4%	69	27.9%	156	63.2%	5	2.0%	247	
WEBSTER	24	4.8%	9	1.8%	133	26.8%	326	65.7%	4	0.8%	496	
WRIGHT	15	6.1%	5	2.0%	66	26.7%	159	64.4%	2	0.8%	247	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>4,252</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>9,614</b>	<b>63.7%</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>15,097</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	212	2.8%	137	1.8%	2,423	31.7%	4,534	59.4%	565	7.4%	7,638
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>2,423</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>4,534</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>7,871</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	148	5.4%	52	1.9%	762	27.7%	1,425	51.8%	365	13.3%	2,752
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	236	5.6%	76	1.8%	1,224	28.8%	2,244	52.8%	468	11.0%	4,248
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1,986</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>3,669</b>	<b>52.4%</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>7,000</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	116	5.0%	0	0.0%	1,812	78.8%	346	15.1%	25	1.1%	2,299
	OUT OF STATE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	278	100.0%	278
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1,812</b>	<b>70.3%</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>2,577</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>3,242</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>1,479</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>18,407</b>	<b>28.5%</b>	<b>38,558</b>	<b>59.8%</b>	<b>2,811</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>64,497</b>

## Appendix B: FY 2024 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	15	2	39	112	7	175	3.38	39.49	
	ATCHISON	2	0	11	50	0	63	1.76	55.41	
	BUCHANAN	118	35	586	1,282	34	2,055	6.32	110.09	
	CALDWELL	11	9	24	72	3	119	5.39	58.28	
	CARROLL	2	0	34	72	0	108	0.54	58.82	
	CASS	73	14	322	909	37	1,355	2.79	51.77	
	CHARITON	12	3	17	86	1	119	7.24	71.77	
	CLAY	123	59	710	1,877	57	2,826	1.99	45.58	
	CLINTON	12	6	79	179	6	282	2.42	56.92	
	COOPER	7	7	58	168	8	248	1.84	65.14	
	DAVISS	5	7	24	84	0	120	2.30	55.10	
	DE KALB	2	3	28	67	0	100	0.95	47.57	
	GENTRY	5	0	17	109	0	131	3.83	84.24	
	GRUNDY	12	11	26	110	1	160	4.90	65.31	
	HARRISON	12	5	17	92	6	132	6.26	68.82	
	HOLT	3	0	15	55	0	73	3.29	80.13	
	JOHNSON	32	7	125	578	13	755	2.71	62.06	
	LAFAYETTE	20	9	152	323	2	506	2.64	66.59	
	LINN	9	11	40	122	1	183	3.26	66.21	
	LIVINGSTON	27	10	55	139	7	238	8.75	77.17	
	MERCER	1	0	3	26	0	30	1.23	36.99	
	NODAWAY	20	5	66	136	0	227	4.72	53.58	
	PETTIS	44	32	239	551	36	902	4.08	83.61	
	PLATTE	39	19	247	676	21	1,002	1.53	39.25	
	PUTNAM	3	6	4	36	2	51	2.93	49.76	
	RAY	14	7	89	279	1	390	2.63	73.17	
	SALINE	22	16	104	347	3	492	4.22	94.19	
	SULLIVAN	4	12	22	80	0	118	2.86	84.29	
WORTH	2	0	3	27	0	32	4.90	78.43		
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>3,156</b>	<b>8,644</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>12,992</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>59.55</b>	
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	41	13	66	263	46	429	7.83	88.38	
	AUDRAIN	29	16	118	346	11	520	4.92	88.42	
	BOONE	84	30	574	1,431	45	2,164	2.19	56.44	
	CALLAWAY	41	17	201	515	10	784	4.30	82.14	
	CLARK	23	3	25	74	0	125	14.66	79.67	
	COLE	36	32	251	582	14	915	2.10	53.46	
	FRANKLIN	90	48	387	1,030	38	1,593	3.81	67.49	
	GASCONADE	7	4	54	155	11	231	2.26	74.47	
	HOWARD	32	15	18	84	3	152	14.23	67.62	
	KNOX	7	0	16	40	5	68	7.73	75.06	
	LEWIS	15	7	31	72	19	144	7.04	67.57	
	LINCOLN	95	46	196	759	14	1,110	6.25	73.08	
	MACON	17	2	36	125	0	180	4.80	50.80	
	MARION	44	32	116	372	15	579	6.51	87.71	
	MONROE	9	6	23	61	7	106	4.61	54.30	
	MONTGOMERY	15	4	54	155	1	229	6.06	92.56	
	OSAGE	4	13	36	79	15	147	1.32	48.68	
	PIKE	29	6	49	137	12	233	7.12	57.18	
	RALLS	6	11	25	85	1	128	2.65	56.51	
	RANDOLPH	32	48	109	382	9	580	6.04	109.54	
	SCHUYLER	9	0	9	21	1	40	8.64	38.39	
	SCOTLAND	9	3	10	17	3	42	6.41	29.89	
	SHELBY	12	3	24	69	0	108	8.04	72.39	
	ST CHARLES	300	61	991	2,542	149	4,043	3.13	42.70	
	WARREN	26	21	128	410	17	602	3.14	72.76	
		<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,012</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>3,547</b>	<b>9,806</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>15,252</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>58.53</b>
	SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	6	1	27	141	3	178	2.59	76.69
		BUTLER	93	38	264	611	20	1,026	9.46	104.35
CAPE GIRARDEAU		31	18	264	652	21	986	1.78	56.62	
CARTER		11	8	16	75	0	110	9.73	97.26	
CRAWFORD		17	5	89	230	12	353	3.26	67.75	
DENT		26	10	58	180	5	279	8.19	87.85	
DUNKLIN		22	29	166	388	27	632	3.16	90.73	

## Appendix B: FY 2024 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	53	50	256	531	10	900	5.60	95.05
	IRON	21	16	47	146	7	237	10.48	118.26
	JEFFERSON	163	201	973	3,008	113	4,458	3.07	85.09
	MADISON	17	4	62	168	8	259	5.91	89.99
	MARIES	18	2	23	68	1	112	9.85	61.30
	MISSISSIPPI	8	6	66	139	5	224	3.04	85.01
	NEW MADRID	24	4	74	185	3	290	6.16	74.47
	OREGON	12	13	41	119	9	194	6.87	103.12
	PEMISCOT	19	7	124	186	6	342	4.71	84.80
	PERRY	23	4	69	179	1	276	5.25	63.01
	PHELPS	91	35	214	424	15	779	9.95	85.18
	PULASKI	93	20	176	514	12	815	7.62	66.79
	REYNOLDS	18	6	24	83	1	132	13.78	101.07
	RIPLEY	40	11	96	182	4	333	16.75	139.45
	SCOTT	30	16	166	498	21	731	3.40	80.28
	SHANNON	11	8	23	101	8	151	7.17	98.37
	ST FRANCOIS	88	43	360	856	38	1,385	6.28	98.81
	STE GENEVIEVE	7	12	42	184	5	250	1.77	63.04
	STODDARD	23	20	61	344	4	452	3.57	70.21
	TEXAS	28	18	112	226	3	387	5.42	72.56
WASHINGTON	36	17	112	354	16	535	6.90	102.49	
WAYNE	28	10	28	118	5	189	13.24	89.36	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,057</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>4,033</b>	<b>10,890</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>16,995</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>83.22</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	9	15	186	403	14	627	1.13	78.89
	BARTON	1	8	59	127	1	196	0.35	68.44
	BATES	21	15	74	182	2	294	5.73	80.20
	BENTON	20	2	61	246	6	335	5.75	96.32
	CAMDEN	37	13	191	386	10	637	4.74	81.68
	CEDAR	3	1	58	158	5	225	0.85	63.43
	CHRISTIAN	34	20	349	916	15	1,334	1.47	57.60
	DADE	0	3	34	81	2	120	0.00	74.40
	DALLAS	23	17	81	235	6	362	5.65	88.86
	DOUGLAS	18	6	93	150	1	268	7.19	107.43
	GREENE	247	95	1,482	3,885	121	5,830	4.07	94.92
	HENRY	18	8	104	354	6	490	3.70	100.84
	HICKORY	4	5	32	62	1	104	2.96	76.87
	JASPER	72	27	645	1,530	100	2,374	2.36	77.97
	LACLEDE	25	21	284	535	8	873	2.89	101.02
	LAWRENCE	11	19	223	438	15	706	1.15	73.63
	MCDONALD	8	23	129	289	13	462	1.31	75.38
	MILLER	22	8	142	291	5	468	3.77	80.16
	MONITEAU	5	1	54	148	1	209	1.27	52.97
	MORGAN	38	21	99	260	2	420	7.94	87.76
	NEWTON	25	25	299	578	24	951	1.80	68.39
	OZARK	7	13	33	113	3	169	4.36	105.23
	POLK	12	11	166	407	8	604	1.58	79.36
	ST CLAIR	12	1	35	88	3	139	6.08	70.42
	STONE	9	29	143	363	20	564	1.70	106.62
	TANEY	79	31	261	687	29	1,087	6.95	95.64
	VERNON	16	10	94	206	7	333	3.35	69.71
WEBSTER	38	10	183	460	5	696	3.59	65.75	
WRIGHT	17	6	88	243	4	358	3.62	76.20	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>5,682</b>	<b>13,821</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>21,235</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>81.85</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	275	204	3,468	6,516	843	11,306	1.59	69.36
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>3,468</b>	<b>6,516</b>	<b>843</b>	<b>11,306</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>69.36</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	199	75	1,082	2,162	612	4,130	3.68	76.44
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	342	99	1,726	3,185	969	6,321	1.56	28.77
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>2,808</b>	<b>5,347</b>	<b>1,581</b>	<b>10,451</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>38.18</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	142	0	2,367	529	36	3,074	0.00	0.00
	OUT OF STATE	0	0	0	0	366	366	0.00	0.00
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,367</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>3,440</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>4,509</b>	<b>2,210</b>	<b>25,061</b>	<b>55,553</b>	<b>4,338</b>	<b>91,671</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>66.47</b>

## Appendix C: FY 2024 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	AGENCY RESPONDED						SERVICES		FAMILY		TOTAL		
		FCS REFER/ AC OPENED		SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED		NO CONCERNS FOUND		DECLINED CHILD SAFE	UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE				
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	58	74.4%	17	21.8%	2	2.6%	1	1.3%	78
	ATCHISON	3	9.7%	1	3.2%	18	58.1%	8	25.8%	0	0.0%	1	3.2%	31
	BUCHANAN	10	1.2%	5	0.6%	638	73.6%	185	21.3%	3	0.3%	26	3.0%	867
	CALDWELL	2	4.0%	2	4.0%	35	70.0%	9	18.0%	1	2.0%	1	2.0%	50
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32	69.6%	12	26.1%	0	0.0%	2	4.3%	46
	CASS	23	3.6%	5	0.8%	443	69.5%	155	24.3%	0	0.0%	11	1.7%	637
	CHARITON	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	35	66.0%	16	30.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	53
	CLAY	35	2.6%	13	1.0%	1,009	74.7%	236	17.5%	7	0.5%	50	3.7%	1,350
	CLINTON	4	3.1%	1	0.8%	91	70.0%	32	24.6%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%	130
	COOPER	11	10.4%	0	0.0%	75	70.8%	18	17.0%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%	106
	DAVISS	5	8.5%	0	0.0%	36	61.0%	15	25.4%	1	1.7%	2	3.4%	59
	DE KALB	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	42	77.8%	11	20.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	54
	GENTRY	3	5.1%	0	0.0%	37	62.7%	14	23.7%	0	0.0%	5	8.5%	59
	GRUNDY	14	17.1%	6	7.3%	41	50.0%	20	24.4%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	82
	HARRISON	12	20.0%	4	6.7%	32	53.3%	10	16.7%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%	60
	HOLT	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	22	59.5%	12	32.4%	0	0.0%	2	5.4%	37
	JOHNSON	18	4.8%	2	0.5%	208	55.5%	135	36.0%	0	0.0%	12	3.2%	375
	LAFAYETTE	5	2.2%	4	1.7%	153	66.5%	67	29.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	230
	LINN	3	3.8%	0	0.0%	45	57.7%	29	37.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	78
	LIVINGSTON	6	5.9%	2	2.0%	77	76.2%	11	10.9%	3	3.0%	2	2.0%	101
	MERCER	7	41.2%	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17
NODAWAY	4	4.5%	1	1.1%	62	69.7%	20	22.5%	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	89	
PETTIS	30	8.2%	3	0.8%	238	64.7%	94	25.5%	2	0.5%	1	0.3%	368	
PLATTE	12	2.5%	7	1.4%	366	75.6%	81	16.7%	5	1.0%	13	2.7%	484	
PUTNAM	4	16.0%	2	8.0%	18	72.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	25	
RAY	3	1.5%	0	0.0%	151	77.4%	40	20.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	195	
SALINE	7	3.0%	2	0.9%	188	80.7%	33	14.2%	1	0.4%	2	0.9%	233	
SULLIVAN	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	28	66.7%	13	31.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	42	
WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>4,198</b>	<b>70.6%</b>	<b>1,296</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>5,950</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	11	6.7%	7	4.3%	95	58.3%	36	22.1%	3	1.8%	11	6.7%	163
	AUDRAIN	19	8.8%	5	2.3%	136	63.0%	45	20.8%	3	1.4%	8	3.7%	216
	BOONE	37	3.5%	6	0.6%	705	67.3%	270	25.8%	3	0.3%	26	2.5%	1,047
	CALLAWAY	25	7.2%	3	0.9%	238	68.8%	65	18.8%	6	1.7%	9	2.6%	346
	CLARK	3	5.7%	1	1.9%	37	69.8%	10	18.9%	0	0.0%	2	3.8%	53
	COLE	24	5.9%	3	0.7%	263	64.1%	114	27.8%	1	0.2%	5	1.2%	410
	FRANKLIN	34	4.7%	8	1.1%	433	59.6%	220	30.3%	5	0.7%	26	3.6%	726
	GASCONADE	12	10.7%	2	1.8%	84	75.0%	13	11.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	112
	HOWARD	4	7.0%	1	1.8%	38	66.7%	13	22.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	57
	KNOX	3	11.5%	0	0.0%	17	65.4%	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	26
	LEWIS	1	1.9%	2	3.8%	37	71.2%	9	17.3%	0	0.0%	3	5.8%	52
	LINCOLN	27	4.9%	5	0.9%	384	69.9%	103	18.8%	8	1.5%	22	4.0%	549
	MACON	2	2.6%	0	0.0%	54	70.1%	19	24.7%	0	0.0%	2	2.6%	77
	MARION	18	6.7%	2	0.7%	148	55.2%	87	32.5%	3	1.1%	10	3.7%	268
	MONROE	3	8.1%	0	0.0%	21	56.8%	11	29.7%	0	0.0%	2	5.4%	37
	MONTGOMERY	17	17.0%	0	0.0%	66	66.0%	14	14.0%	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	100
	OSAGE	4	7.8%	0	0.0%	37	72.5%	8	15.7%	0	0.0%	2	3.9%	51
	PIKE	6	6.2%	2	2.1%	69	71.1%	16	16.5%	1	1.0%	3	3.1%	97
	RALLS	5	8.6%	4	6.9%	28	48.3%	18	31.0%	0	0.0%	3	5.2%	58
	RANDOLPH	6	2.3%	2	0.8%	196	74.8%	50	19.1%	0	0.0%	8	3.1%	262
	SCHUYLER	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	14	73.7%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	19
SCOTLAND	1	7.1%	2	14.3%	8	57.1%	3	21.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	
SHELBY	5	10.6%	1	2.1%	34	72.3%	7	14.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	47	
ST CHARLES	42	2.2%	45	2.3%	1,138	58.3%	557	28.5%	22	1.1%	147	7.5%	1,951	
WARREN	16	5.6%	1	0.4%	203	71.2%	52	18.2%	1	0.4%	12	4.2%	285	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>4,483</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>1,746</b>	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>7,023</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	9	9.4%	2	2.1%	69	71.9%	15	15.6%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	96
	BUTLER	21	5.5%	8	2.1%	227	59.6%	113	29.7%	1	0.3%	11	2.9%	381
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	61	13.2%	6	1.3%	293	63.6%	92	20.0%	4	0.9%	5	1.1%	461
	CARTER	3	5.4%	0	0.0%	42	75.0%	10	17.9%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	56
	CRAWFORD	9	5.6%	2	1.3%	104	65.0%	39	24.4%	1	0.6%	5	3.1%	160
	DENT	7	5.6%	2	1.6%	77	61.6%	30	24.0%	2	1.6%	7	5.6%	125
	DUNKLIN	23	8.8%	4	1.5%	145	55.8%	85	32.7%	0	0.0%	3	1.2%	260

## Appendix C: FY 2024 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED	AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS FOUND		SERVICES DECLINED CHILD SAFE		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE		TOTAL	
			SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED										
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	29	7.8%	2	0.5%	240	64.7%	81	21.8%	8	2.2%	11	3.0%	371
	IRON	9	11.3%	2	2.5%	40	50.0%	24	30.0%	2	2.5%	3	3.8%	80
	JEFFERSON	85	3.9%	42	1.9%	1,373	62.8%	477	21.8%	51	2.3%	157	7.2%	2,185
	MADISON	6	5.5%	2	1.8%	72	66.1%	24	22.0%	2	1.8%	3	2.8%	109
	MARIES	1	2.1%	2	4.3%	35	74.5%	6	12.8%	0	0.0%	3	6.4%	47
	MISSISSIPPI	3	3.7%	0	0.0%	44	53.7%	32	39.0%	0	0.0%	3	3.7%	82
	NEW MADRID	12	9.1%	0	0.0%	74	56.1%	38	28.8%	0	0.0%	8	6.1%	132
	OREGON	7	9.2%	1	1.3%	47	61.8%	15	19.7%	0	0.0%	6	7.9%	76
	PEMISCOT	9	7.4%	1	0.8%	62	51.2%	45	37.2%	0	0.0%	4	3.3%	121
	PERRY	20	16.1%	4	3.2%	78	62.9%	19	15.3%	1	0.8%	2	1.6%	124
	PHELPS	16	5.2%	5	1.6%	217	70.5%	50	16.2%	1	0.3%	19	6.2%	308
	PULASKI	17	4.8%	3	0.8%	234	66.3%	59	16.7%	8	2.3%	32	9.1%	353
	REYNOLDS	7	14.3%	2	4.1%	24	49.0%	14	28.6%	1	2.0%	1	2.0%	49
	RIPLEY	3	2.8%	2	1.9%	79	73.1%	19	17.6%	1	0.9%	4	3.7%	108
	SCOTT	14	4.3%	0	0.0%	198	61.3%	103	31.9%	2	0.6%	6	1.9%	323
	SHANNON	7	9.9%	2	2.8%	32	45.1%	25	35.2%	0	0.0%	5	7.0%	71
	ST FRANCOIS	35	6.1%	11	1.9%	334	58.0%	178	30.9%	8	1.4%	10	1.7%	576
	STE GENEVIEVE	11	8.7%	4	3.2%	72	57.1%	34	27.0%	1	0.8%	4	3.2%	126
	STODDARD	43	20.8%	0	0.0%	114	55.1%	47	22.7%	1	0.5%	2	1.0%	207
	TEXAS	7	5.1%	2	1.4%	81	58.7%	34	24.6%	6	4.3%	8	5.8%	138
WASHINGTON	18	8.0%	7	3.1%	125	55.3%	68	30.1%	2	0.9%	6	2.7%	226	
WAYNE	7	9.9%	7	9.9%	44	62.0%	8	11.3%	2	2.8%	3	4.2%	71	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>4,576</b>	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>1,784</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>7,422</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	16	6.2%	1	0.4%	170	65.4%	69	26.5%	0	0.0%	4	1.5%	260
	BARTON	5	5.4%	0	0.0%	57	62.0%	27	29.3%	0	0.0%	3	3.3%	92
	BATES	9	7.7%	8	6.8%	76	65.0%	24	20.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	117
	BENTON	16	9.0%	12	6.8%	97	54.8%	50	28.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	177
	CAMDEN	10	3.7%	3	1.1%	198	72.5%	56	20.5%	2	0.7%	4	1.5%	273
	CEDAR	3	2.8%	3	2.8%	68	64.2%	27	25.5%	0	0.0%	5	4.7%	106
	CHRISTIAN	33	5.2%	2	0.3%	460	72.6%	132	20.8%	5	0.8%	2	0.3%	634
	DADE	3	7.3%	2	4.9%	23	56.1%	11	26.8%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	41
	DALLAS	10	6.0%	6	3.6%	97	58.1%	51	30.5%	0	0.0%	3	1.8%	167
	DOUGLAS	16	15.5%	1	1.0%	55	53.4%	21	20.4%	2	1.9%	8	7.8%	103
	GREENE	172	6.1%	33	1.2%	1,779	63.2%	673	23.9%	30	1.1%	130	4.6%	2,817
	HENRY	18	7.5%	11	4.6%	138	57.7%	65	27.2%	0	0.0%	7	2.9%	239
	HICKORY	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	27	51.9%	18	34.6%	2	3.8%	4	7.7%	52
	JASPER	67	6.2%	12	1.1%	693	64.5%	276	25.7%	6	0.6%	21	2.0%	1,075
	LACLEDE	16	4.3%	1	0.3%	257	69.8%	88	23.9%	2	0.5%	4	1.1%	368
	LAWRENCE	10	3.4%	10	3.4%	199	66.8%	73	24.5%	1	0.3%	5	1.7%	298
	MCDONALD	33	17.4%	5	2.6%	103	54.2%	44	23.2%	2	1.1%	3	1.6%	190
	MILLER	10	5.1%	3	1.5%	132	66.7%	45	22.7%	5	2.5%	3	1.5%	198
	MONITEAU	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	74	79.6%	16	17.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	93
	MORGAN	11	7.7%	3	2.1%	99	69.7%	26	18.3%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	142
	NEWTON	41	10.6%	3	0.8%	248	63.9%	87	22.4%	3	0.8%	6	1.5%	388
	OZARK	3	3.9%	1	1.3%	45	58.4%	23	29.9%	3	3.9%	2	2.6%	77
	POLK	16	5.5%	5	1.7%	141	48.8%	114	39.4%	3	1.0%	10	3.5%	289
	ST CLAIR	6	10.9%	2	3.6%	37	67.3%	10	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	55
	STONE	15	6.2%	3	1.2%	158	65.0%	62	25.5%	2	0.8%	3	1.2%	243
	TANEY	51	10.6%	20	4.2%	279	58.2%	123	25.7%	4	0.8%	2	0.4%	479
VERNON	10	6.4%	4	2.6%	91	58.3%	48	30.8%	0	0.0%	3	1.9%	156	
WEBSTER	16	4.9%	16	4.9%	160	49.1%	121	37.1%	5	1.5%	8	2.5%	326	
WRIGHT	21	13.2%	2	1.3%	87	54.7%	46	28.9%	1	0.6%	2	1.3%	159	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>6,048</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>2,426</b>	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>9,614</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	149	3.3%	53	1.2%	2,894	63.8%	1,096	24.2%	42	0.9%	300	6.6%	4,534
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>2,894</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>1,096</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>4,534</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	39	2.7%	43	3.0%	789	55.4%	400	28.1%	19	1.3%	135	9.5%	1,425
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	45	2.0%	52	2.3%	1,313	58.5%	655	29.2%	29	1.3%	150	6.7%	2,244
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>2,102</b>	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>1,055</b>	<b>28.8%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>3,669</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	1	0.3%	3	0.9%	232	67.1%	107	30.9%	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	346
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>67.1%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>346</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>1,923</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>24,533</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>9,510</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1,611</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>38,558</b>

## Appendix D: FY 2024 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	AGENCY RESPONDED						SERVICES DECLINED		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE		TOTAL		
		FCS REFER/ AC OPENED	SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED	NO CONCERNS FOUND	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE	CHILD SAFE					
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	80	71.4%	29	25.9%	2	1.8%	1	0.9%	112
	ATCHISON	4	8.0%	1	2.0%	31	62.0%	13	26.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	50
	BUCHANAN	19	1.5%	8	0.6%	948	73.9%	270	21.1%	4	0.3%	33	2.6%	1,282
	CALDWELL	3	4.2%	3	4.2%	50	69.4%	11	15.3%	4	5.6%	1	1.4%	72
	CARROLL	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	53	73.6%	16	22.2%	0	0.0%	3	4.2%	72
	CASS	37	4.1%	5	0.6%	607	66.8%	238	26.2%	0	0.0%	22	2.4%	909
	CHARITON	4	4.7%	0	0.0%	51	59.3%	30	34.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	86
	CLAY	63	3.4%	15	0.8%	1,387	73.9%	334	17.8%	13	0.7%	65	3.5%	1,877
	CLINTON	5	2.8%	1	0.6%	124	69.3%	47	26.3%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	179
	COOPER	16	9.5%	0	0.0%	118	70.2%	30	17.9%	2	1.2%	2	1.2%	168
	DAVISS	9	10.7%	0	0.0%	48	57.1%	23	27.4%	1	1.2%	3	3.6%	84
	DE KALB	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	52	77.6%	14	20.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	67
	GENTRY	4	3.7%	0	0.0%	61	56.0%	36	33.0%	0	0.0%	8	7.3%	109
	GRUNDY	27	24.5%	6	5.5%	53	48.2%	23	20.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	110
	HARRISON	26	28.3%	4	4.3%	44	47.8%	15	16.3%	1	1.1%	2	2.2%	92
	HOLT	5	9.1%	0	0.0%	28	50.9%	17	30.9%	0	0.0%	5	9.1%	55
	JOHNSON	43	7.4%	5	0.9%	314	54.3%	197	34.1%	0	0.0%	19	3.3%	578
	LAFAYETTE	6	1.9%	5	1.5%	200	61.9%	111	34.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	323
	LINN	8	6.6%	0	0.0%	68	55.7%	45	36.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	122
	LIVINGSTON	13	9.4%	2	1.4%	101	72.7%	16	11.5%	3	2.2%	4	2.9%	139
	MERCER	11	42.3%	2	7.7%	11	42.3%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26
NODAWAY	8	5.9%	1	0.7%	98	72.1%	27	19.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.5%	136	
PETTIS	56	10.2%	3	0.5%	339	61.5%	146	26.5%	3	0.5%	4	0.7%	551	
PLATTE	22	3.3%	8	1.2%	507	75.0%	114	16.9%	9	1.3%	16	2.4%	676	
PUTNAM	8	22.2%	2	5.6%	25	69.4%	0	0.0%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	36	
RAY	3	1.1%	0	0.0%	217	77.8%	58	20.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	279	
SALINE	11	3.2%	3	0.9%	275	79.3%	53	15.3%	1	0.3%	4	1.2%	347	
SULLIVAN	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	57	71.3%	22	27.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	80	
WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	85.2%	4	14.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>5,970</b>	<b>69.1%</b>	<b>1,941</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>8,644</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	20	7.6%	14	5.3%	141	53.6%	52	19.8%	9	3.4%	27	10.3%	263
	AUDRAIN	39	11.3%	8	2.3%	207	59.8%	73	21.1%	3	0.9%	16	4.6%	346
	BOONE	61	4.3%	6	0.4%	947	66.2%	375	26.2%	7	0.5%	35	2.4%	1,431
	CALLAWAY	46	8.9%	8	1.6%	329	63.9%	112	21.7%	8	1.6%	12	2.3%	515
	CLARK	3	4.1%	1	1.4%	52	70.3%	14	18.9%	0	0.0%	4	5.4%	74
	COLE	47	8.1%	3	0.5%	364	62.5%	161	27.7%	1	0.2%	6	1.0%	582
	FRANKLIN	54	5.2%	12	1.2%	596	57.9%	315	30.6%	14	1.4%	39	3.8%	1,030
	GASCONADE	16	10.3%	5	3.2%	117	75.5%	16	10.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	155
	HOWARD	4	4.8%	1	1.2%	54	64.3%	24	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	84
	KNOX	4	10.0%	0	0.0%	28	70.0%	6	15.0%	0	0.0%	2	5.0%	40
	LEWIS	2	2.8%	3	4.2%	49	68.1%	15	20.8%	0	0.0%	3	4.2%	72
	LINCOLN	40	5.3%	18	2.4%	518	68.2%	134	17.7%	13	1.7%	36	4.7%	759
	MACON	4	3.2%	0	0.0%	90	72.0%	28	22.4%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	125
	MARION	24	6.5%	3	0.8%	203	54.6%	123	33.1%	3	0.8%	16	4.3%	372
	MONROE	7	11.5%	0	0.0%	33	54.1%	17	27.9%	0	0.0%	4	6.6%	61
	MONTGOMERY	28	18.1%	0	0.0%	92	59.4%	31	20.0%	3	1.9%	1	0.6%	155
	OSAGE	5	6.3%	0	0.0%	58	73.4%	12	15.2%	0	0.0%	4	5.1%	79
	PIKE	9	6.6%	2	1.5%	99	72.3%	22	16.1%	1	0.7%	4	2.9%	137
	RALLS	7	8.2%	5	5.9%	37	43.5%	29	34.1%	0	0.0%	7	8.2%	85
	RANDOLPH	13	3.4%	2	0.5%	280	73.3%	75	19.6%	0	0.0%	12	3.1%	382
	SCHUYLER	1	4.8%	1	4.8%	16	76.2%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	21
SCOTLAND	2	11.8%	2	11.8%	10	58.8%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	
SHELBY	11	15.9%	1	1.4%	49	71.0%	8	11.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	69	
ST CHARLES	68	2.7%	68	2.7%	1,440	56.6%	727	28.6%	35	1.4%	204	8.0%	2,542	
WARREN	28	6.8%	5	1.2%	275	67.1%	83	20.2%	2	0.5%	17	4.1%	410	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>6,084</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>2,457</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>9,806</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	10	7.1%	2	1.4%	104	73.8%	22	15.6%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	141
	BUTLER	33	5.4%	20	3.3%	351	57.4%	187	30.6%	2	0.3%	18	2.9%	611
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	90	13.8%	13	2.0%	388	59.5%	147	22.5%	7	1.1%	7	1.1%	652
	CARTER	4	5.3%	0	0.0%	54	72.0%	16	21.3%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	75
	CRAWFORD	16	7.0%	3	1.3%	150	65.2%	53	23.0%	1	0.4%	7	3.0%	230
	DENT	17	9.4%	5	2.8%	102	56.7%	42	23.3%	3	1.7%	11	6.1%	180
	DUNKLIN	34	8.8%	4	1.0%	201	51.8%	143	36.9%	0	0.0%	6	1.5%	388

## Appendix D: FY 2024 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED	AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS FOUND		SERVICES DECLINED CHILD SAFE		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE		TOTAL	
			SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED										
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	48	9.0%	3	0.6%	332	62.5%	121	22.8%	11	2.1%	16	3.0%	531
	IRON	14	9.6%	3	2.1%	65	44.5%	56	38.4%	2	1.4%	6	4.1%	146
	JEFFERSON	131	4.4%	70	2.3%	1,895	63.0%	613	20.4%	77	2.6%	222	7.4%	3,008
	MADISON	14	8.3%	3	1.8%	105	62.5%	41	24.4%	2	1.2%	3	1.8%	168
	MARIES	1	1.5%	3	4.4%	52	76.5%	8	11.8%	0	0.0%	4	5.9%	68
	MISSISSIPPI	5	3.6%	0	0.0%	66	47.5%	60	43.2%	0	0.0%	8	5.8%	139
	NEW MADRID	17	9.2%	0	0.0%	100	54.1%	52	28.1%	0	0.0%	16	8.6%	185
	OREGON	8	6.7%	3	2.5%	70	58.8%	24	20.2%	0	0.0%	14	11.8%	119
	PEMISCOT	12	6.5%	1	0.5%	85	45.7%	81	43.5%	0	0.0%	7	3.8%	186
	PERRY	32	17.9%	5	2.8%	111	62.0%	28	15.6%	1	0.6%	2	1.1%	179
	PHELPS	26	6.1%	7	1.7%	295	69.6%	63	14.9%	2	0.5%	31	7.3%	424
	PULASKI	25	4.9%	3	0.6%	337	65.6%	92	17.9%	14	2.7%	43	8.4%	514
	REYNOLDS	16	19.3%	3	3.6%	30	36.1%	29	34.9%	3	3.6%	2	2.4%	83
	RIPLEY	4	2.2%	4	2.2%	135	74.2%	33	18.1%	1	0.5%	5	2.7%	182
	SCOTT	33	6.6%	0	0.0%	290	58.2%	162	32.5%	4	0.8%	9	1.8%	498
	SHANNON	10	9.9%	2	2.0%	46	45.5%	37	36.6%	0	0.0%	6	5.9%	101
	ST FRANCOIS	53	6.2%	13	1.5%	490	57.2%	273	31.9%	11	1.3%	16	1.9%	856
	STE GENEVIEVE	22	12.0%	5	2.7%	109	59.2%	40	21.7%	1	0.5%	7	3.8%	184
	STODDARD	72	20.9%	0	0.0%	188	54.7%	78	22.7%	1	0.3%	5	1.5%	344
	TEXAS	10	4.4%	2	0.9%	134	59.3%	56	24.8%	12	5.3%	12	5.3%	226
WASHINGTON	32	9.0%	17	4.8%	174	49.2%	115	32.5%	2	0.6%	14	4.0%	354	
WAYNE	10	8.5%	9	7.6%	74	62.7%	17	14.4%	3	2.5%	5	4.2%	118	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>6,533</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>2,689</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>10,890</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	26	6.5%	1	0.2%	265	65.8%	106	26.3%	0	0.0%	5	1.2%	403
	BARTON	5	3.9%	0	0.0%	75	59.1%	43	33.9%	0	0.0%	4	3.1%	127
	BATES	15	8.2%	10	5.5%	117	64.3%	40	22.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	182
	BENTON	27	11.0%	18	7.3%	120	48.8%	77	31.3%	0	0.0%	4	1.6%	246
	CAMDEN	19	4.9%	8	2.1%	273	70.7%	74	19.2%	4	1.0%	8	2.1%	386
	CEDAR	4	2.5%	5	3.2%	100	63.3%	38	24.1%	0	0.0%	11	7.0%	158
	CHRISTIAN	54	5.9%	4	0.4%	654	71.4%	195	21.3%	5	0.5%	4	0.4%	916
	DADE	10	12.3%	3	3.7%	43	53.1%	16	19.8%	6	7.4%	3	3.7%	81
	DALLAS	11	4.7%	6	2.6%	139	59.1%	76	32.3%	0	0.0%	3	1.3%	235
	DOUGLAS	24	16.0%	1	0.7%	79	52.7%	31	20.7%	2	1.3%	13	8.7%	150
	GREENE	270	6.9%	52	1.3%	2,391	61.5%	936	24.1%	52	1.3%	184	4.7%	3,885
	HENRY	28	7.9%	15	4.2%	198	55.9%	104	29.4%	0	0.0%	9	2.5%	354
	HICKORY	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	30	48.4%	24	38.7%	2	3.2%	5	8.1%	62
	JASPER	104	6.8%	19	1.2%	978	63.9%	394	25.8%	9	0.6%	26	1.7%	1,530
	LACLEDE	36	6.7%	1	0.2%	365	68.2%	127	23.7%	2	0.4%	4	0.7%	535
	LAWRENCE	21	4.8%	14	3.2%	291	66.4%	104	23.7%	1	0.2%	7	1.6%	438
	MCDONALD	47	16.3%	6	2.1%	150	51.9%	79	27.3%	3	1.0%	4	1.4%	289
	MILLER	15	5.2%	4	1.4%	178	61.2%	80	27.5%	11	3.8%	3	1.0%	291
	MONITEAU	2	1.4%	2	1.4%	111	75.0%	33	22.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	148
	MORGAN	24	9.2%	9	3.5%	169	65.0%	50	19.2%	8	3.1%	0	0.0%	260
	NEWTON	63	10.9%	6	1.0%	345	59.7%	152	26.3%	6	1.0%	6	1.0%	578
	OZARK	4	3.5%	1	0.9%	63	55.8%	35	31.0%	5	4.4%	5	4.4%	113
	POLK	26	6.4%	5	1.2%	205	50.4%	150	36.9%	3	0.7%	18	4.4%	407
	ST CLAIR	12	13.6%	4	4.5%	56	63.6%	16	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	88
	STONE	19	5.2%	4	1.1%	239	65.8%	89	24.5%	5	1.4%	7	1.9%	363
	TANEY	92	13.4%	44	6.4%	373	54.3%	166	24.2%	7	1.0%	5	0.7%	687
	VERNON	13	6.3%	5	2.4%	119	57.8%	64	31.1%	0	0.0%	5	2.4%	206
WEBSTER	21	4.6%	25	5.4%	214	46.5%	175	38.0%	9	2.0%	16	3.5%	460	
WRIGHT	39	16.0%	2	0.8%	119	49.0%	75	30.9%	1	0.4%	7	2.9%	243	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>8,459</b>	<b>61.2%</b>	<b>3,549</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>13,821</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	243	3.7%	81	1.2%	4,043	62.0%	1,619	24.8%	65	1.0%	465	7.1%	6,516
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>4,043</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>1,619</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>6,516</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	70	3.2%	61	2.8%	1,178	54.5%	615	28.4%	24	1.1%	214	9.9%	2,162
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	71	2.2%	88	2.8%	1,814	57.0%	958	30.1%	42	1.3%	212	6.7%	3,185
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2,992</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>1,573</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>5,347</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	2	0.4%	7	1.3%	355	67.1%	159	30.1%	3	0.6%	3	0.6%	529
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>67.1%</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>30.1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>529</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>3,172</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>34,436</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>13,987</b>	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>2,418</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>55,553</b>

## Appendix E: FY 2024 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	4	44.4%	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	9
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2
	BUCHANAN	36	38.7%	37	39.8%	3	3.2%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	24	25.8%	93
	CALDWELL	7	63.6%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11
	CARROLL	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	CASS	24	46.2%	22	42.3%	6	11.5%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	12	23.1%	52
	CHARITON	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	CLAY	28	29.5%	24	25.3%	10	10.5%	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	51	53.7%	95
	CLINTON	4	36.4%	4	36.4%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	COOPER	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	DAVISS	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	DE KALB	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	GENTRY	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	GRUNDY	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	HARRISON	2	20.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	HOLT	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	JOHNSON	10	41.7%	10	41.7%	0	0.0%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	8	33.3%	24
	LAFAYETTE	2	12.5%	7	43.8%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	43.8%	16
	LINN	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	LIVINGSTON	14	70.0%	7	35.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	20
	MERCER	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
NODAWAY	10	58.8%	5	29.4%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	17.6%	17	
PETTIS	10	28.6%	12	34.3%	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	45.7%	35	
PLATTE	15	44.1%	12	35.3%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	44.1%	34	
PUTNAM	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3	
RAY	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	9	
SALINE	4	22.2%	6	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	50.0%	18	
SULLIVAN	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3	
WORTH	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>35.9%</b>	<b>504</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	10	47.6%	16	76.2%	5	23.8%	2	9.5%	1	4.8%	4	19.0%	21
	AUDRAIN	4	18.2%	9	40.9%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	45.5%	22
	BOONE	21	34.4%	25	41.0%	4	6.6%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	18	29.5%	61
	CALLAWAY	13	44.8%	12	41.4%	2	6.9%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	6	20.7%	29
	CLARK	4	30.8%	5	38.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	38.5%	13
	COLE	12	40.0%	9	30.0%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.3%	14	46.7%	30
	FRANKLIN	16	21.3%	22	29.3%	6	8.0%	2	2.7%	1	1.3%	41	54.7%	75
	GASCONADE	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	HOWARD	6	30.0%	16	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	20
	KNOX	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	LEWIS	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	9
	LINCOLN	20	29.0%	27	39.1%	8	11.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	30	43.5%	69
	MACON	3	25.0%	6	50.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	12
	MARION	4	16.7%	17	70.8%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	20.8%	24
	MONROE	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	MONTGOMERY	3	20.0%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	53.3%	15
	OSAGE	2	50.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	PIKE	9	45.0%	11	55.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	10.0%	20
	RALLS	2	66.7%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	RANDOLPH	10	41.7%	11	45.8%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	25.0%	24
	SCHUYLER	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
SCOTLAND	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	
SHELBY	0	0.0%	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	36.4%	11	
ST CHARLES	57	28.4%	106	52.7%	16	8.0%	3	1.5%	2	1.0%	53	26.4%	201	
WARREN	4	20.0%	13	65.0%	4	20.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	6	30.0%	20	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>708</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	BUTLER	14	26.9%	32	61.5%	1	1.9%	5	9.6%	0	0.0%	9	17.3%	52
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	9	34.6%	11	42.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	38.5%	26
	CARTER	3	37.5%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	CRAWFORD	6	42.9%	7	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	14
	DENT	4	25.0%	11	68.8%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	18.8%	16
	DUNKLIN	6	42.9%	7	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	14

## Appendix E: FY 2024 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				
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	15	39.5%	14	36.8%	6	15.8%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	17	44.7%	38
	IRON	0	0.0%	9	69.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	38.5%	13
	JEFFERSON	38	28.8%	52	39.4%	4	3.0%	3	2.3%	1	0.8%	54	40.9%	132
	MADISON	6	40.0%	4	26.7%	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	8	53.3%	15
	MARIES	3	27.3%	4	36.4%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	MISSISSIPPI	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	NEW MADRID	3	17.6%	12	70.6%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	4	23.5%	17
	OREGON	3	30.0%	5	50.0%	2	20.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	6	60.0%	10
	PEMISCOT	6	50.0%	6	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	12
	PERRY	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%	15
	PHELPS	16	29.1%	29	52.7%	8	14.5%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	14	25.5%	55
	PULASKI	22	35.5%	41	66.1%	2	3.2%	6	9.7%	3	4.8%	11	17.7%	62
	REYNOLDS	4	50.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	8
	RIPLEY	10	40.0%	15	60.0%	6	24.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	28.0%	25
	SCOTT	3	15.8%	11	57.9%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	42.1%	19
	SHANNON	4	57.1%	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
	ST FRANCOIS	14	23.3%	26	43.3%	4	6.7%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	31	51.7%	60
	STE GENEVIEVE	2	40.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	STODDARD	6	35.3%	7	41.2%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	7	41.2%	17
	TEXAS	10	45.5%	14	63.6%	3	13.6%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%	6	27.3%	22
WASHINGTON	7	31.8%	12	54.5%	4	18.2%	2	9.1%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	22	
WAYNE	3	17.6%	5	29.4%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	10	58.8%	17	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>49.9%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>722</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	2	25.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	8
	BARTON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1
	BATES	7	43.8%	9	56.3%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	31.3%	16
	BENTON	5	45.5%	4	36.4%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	4	36.4%	11
	CAMDEN	4	22.2%	9	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	44.4%	18
	CEDAR	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	CHRISTIAN	4	16.7%	11	45.8%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	45.8%	24
	DADE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	DALLAS	8	44.4%	10	55.6%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	4	22.2%	18
	DOUGLAS	3	25.0%	4	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	50.0%	12
	GREENE	61	33.9%	75	41.7%	16	8.9%	2	1.1%	4	2.2%	63	35.0%	180
	HENRY	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	26.7%	15
	HICKORY	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	JASPER	16	32.0%	11	22.0%	4	8.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	24	48.0%	50
	LACLEDE	6	35.3%	10	58.8%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	6	35.3%	17
	LAWRENCE	6	66.7%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	9
	MCDONALD	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6
	MILLER	4	25.0%	12	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.3%	16
	MONITEAU	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	MORGAN	3	11.1%	15	55.6%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	40.7%	27
	NEWTON	9	52.9%	2	11.8%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	41.2%	17
	OZARK	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	POLK	3	27.3%	4	36.4%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	6	54.5%	11
ST CLAIR	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	6	
STONE	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6	
TANEY	16	25.8%	22	35.5%	10	16.1%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	29	46.8%	62	
VERNON	4	36.4%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	36.4%	11	
WEBSTER	6	25.0%	7	29.2%	3	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	45.8%	24	
WRIGHT	3	20.0%	5	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	60.0%	15	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>31.4%</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>40.6%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>596</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	77	36.3%	63	29.7%	19	9.0%	3	1.4%	2	0.9%	92	43.4%	212
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>36.3%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>29.7%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>212</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	55	12.0%	70	47.3%	21	14.2%	4	2.7%	3	2.0%	41	27.7%	148
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	86	36.4%	100	42.4%	23	9.7%	6	2.5%	1	0.4%	69	29.2%	236
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>44.3%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>384</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	56	48.3%	32	27.6%	1	0.0%	1	0.9%	0	26.0%	37	31.9%	116
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>27.6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>31.9%</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,087</b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>1,387</b>	<b>42.8%</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1,113</b>	<b>34.3%</b>	<b>3,242</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 2024 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL		EMOTIONAL		MEDICAL		EDUCATIONAL		SEXUAL		TOTAL CHILDREN
		ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT	ABUSE	NEGLECT		
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	4	26.7%	9	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	15
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	BUCHANAN	41	34.7%	52	44.1%	3	2.5%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%	118
	CALDWELL	7	63.6%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	11
	CARROLL	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	CASS	26	35.6%	39	53.4%	11	15.1%	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	73
	CHARITON	1	8.3%	9	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12
	CLAY	29	23.6%	40	32.5%	19	15.4%	0	0.0%	5	4.1%	123
	CLINTON	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12
	COOPER	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7
	DAVISS	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	5
	DE KALB	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	GENTRY	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	GRUNDY	2	16.7%	7	58.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	12
	HARRISON	2	16.7%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12
	HOLT	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	JOHNSON	14	43.8%	14	43.8%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	32
	LAFAYETTE	2	10.0%	11	55.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20
	LINN	2	22.2%	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9
	LIVINGSTON	18	66.7%	10	37.0%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27
	MERCER	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1
	NODAWAY	10	50.0%	8	40.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20
	PETTIS	13	29.5%	18	40.9%	3	6.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	44
	PLATTE	16	41.0%	15	38.5%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39
	PUTNAM	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	RAY	6	42.9%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	14
SALINE	5	22.7%	9	40.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	
SULLIVAN	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	
WORTH	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>651</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	15	36.6%	35	85.4%	8	19.5%	3	7.3%	3	7.3%	41
	AUDRAIN	5	17.2%	13	44.8%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29
	BOONE	21	25.0%	37	44.0%	6	7.1%	2	2.4%	0	0.0%	84
	CALLAWAY	14	34.1%	22	53.7%	2	4.9%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	41
	CLARK	4	17.4%	15	65.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23
	COLE	14	38.9%	12	33.3%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	2	5.6%	36
	FRANKLIN	17	18.9%	30	33.3%	6	6.7%	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	90
	GASCONADE	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	7
	HOWARD	6	18.8%	28	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32
	KNOX	0	0.0%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7
	LEWIS	5	33.3%	10	66.7%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	15
	LINCOLN	22	23.2%	49	51.6%	10	10.5%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	95
	MACON	3	17.6%	11	64.7%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17
	MARION	4	9.1%	37	84.1%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	44
	MONROE	1	11.1%	8	88.9%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9
	MONTGOMERY	3	20.0%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15
	OSAGE	2	50.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	PIKE	10	34.5%	20	69.0%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29
	RALLS	5	83.3%	5	83.3%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	RANDOLPH	10	31.3%	17	53.1%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32
	SCHUYLER	2	22.2%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9
	SCOTLAND	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9
	SHELBY	0	0.0%	9	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12
	ST CHARLES	59	19.7%	187	62.3%	27	9.0%	3	1.0%	2	0.7%	300
	WARREN	4	15.4%	19	73.1%	4	15.4%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	26
		<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>59.1%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	BUTLER	15	16.1%	68	73.1%	3	3.2%	5	5.4%	0	0.0%	93
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	10	32.3%	16	51.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31
	CARTER	3	27.3%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11
	CRAWFORD	6	35.3%	8	47.1%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	17
	DENT	4	15.4%	21	80.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26
	DUNKLIN	8	36.4%	15	68.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	9.1%	22

## Appendix F: FY 2024 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	19	35.8%	23	43.4%	9	17.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.8%	19	35.8%	53
	IRON	0	0.0%	15	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	38.1%	21
	JEFFERSON	48	29.4%	72	44.2%	6	3.7%	3	1.8%	1	0.6%	55	33.7%	163
	MADISON	6	35.3%	5	29.4%	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	9	52.9%	17
	MARIES	5	27.8%	7	38.9%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18
	MISSISSIPPI	1	12.5%	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8
	NEW MADRID	3	12.5%	19	79.2%	1	4.2%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	4	16.7%	24
	OREGON	3	25.0%	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	7	58.3%	12
	PEMISCOT	7	36.8%	12	63.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	19
	PERRY	9	39.1%	11	47.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%	23
	PHELPS	21	23.1%	60	65.9%	9	9.9%	2	2.2%	1	1.1%	14	15.4%	91
	PULASKI	26	28.0%	66	71.0%	5	5.4%	8	8.6%	3	3.2%	12	12.9%	93
	REYNOLDS	4	22.2%	14	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	18
	RIPLEY	11	27.5%	25	62.5%	7	17.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	20.0%	40
	SCOTT	4	13.3%	22	73.3%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	26.7%	30
	SHANNON	5	45.5%	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11
	ST FRANCOIS	16	18.2%	46	52.3%	5	5.7%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	39	44.3%	88
	STE GENEVIEVE	4	57.1%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7
	STODDARD	6	26.1%	11	47.8%	1	4.3%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	8	34.8%	23
	TEXAS	13	46.4%	19	67.9%	5	17.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	6	21.4%	28
WASHINGTON	9	25.0%	20	55.6%	10	27.8%	2	5.6%	0	0.0%	5	13.9%	36	
WAYNE	4	14.3%	16	57.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	10	35.7%	28	
<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>		<b>272</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>58.9%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>1,057</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	66.7%	9
	BARTON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1
	BATES	8	38.1%	13	61.9%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	23.8%	21
	BENTON	6	30.0%	11	55.0%	8	40.0%	1	5.0%	1	5.0%	6	30.0%	20
	CAMDEN	6	16.2%	25	67.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	43.2%	37
	CEDAR	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	CHRISTIAN	8	23.5%	17	50.0%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	38.2%	34
	DADE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	DALLAS	8	34.8%	15	65.2%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	4	17.4%	23
	DOUGLAS	3	16.7%	6	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	55.6%	18
	GREENE	72	29.1%	124	50.2%	30	12.1%	2	0.8%	5	2.0%	69	27.9%	247
	HENRY	5	27.8%	7	38.9%	6	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	27.8%	18
	HICKORY	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	JASPER	17	23.6%	29	40.3%	4	5.6%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	27	37.5%	72
	LACLEDE	6	24.0%	18	72.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	6	24.0%	25
	LAWRENCE	6	54.5%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	3	27.3%	11
	MCDONALD	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	MILLER	4	18.2%	18	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%	22
	MONITEAU	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	MORGAN	4	10.5%	24	63.2%	4	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	31.6%	38
NEWTON	9	36.0%	5	20.0%	3	12.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	44.0%	25	
OZARK	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	7	
POLK	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	6	50.0%	12	
ST CLAIR	2	16.7%	9	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	12	
STONE	2	22.2%	7	77.8%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9	
TANEY	16	20.3%	35	44.3%	13	16.5%	1	1.3%	3	3.8%	30	38.0%	79	
VERNON	6	37.5%	6	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	25.0%	16	
WEBSTER	8	21.1%	18	47.4%	3	7.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	34.2%	38	
WRIGHT	3	17.6%	7	41.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	52.9%	17	
<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>		<b>214</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>49.9%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>831</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	84	30.5%	110	40.0%	30	10.9%	4	1.5%	3	1.1%	100	36.4%	275
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>275</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	63	31.7%	102	51.3%	30	15.1%	4	2.0%	4	2.0%	44	22.1%	199
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	112	32.7%	164	48.0%	36	10.5%	6	1.8%	2	0.6%	77	22.5%	342
<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>		<b>175</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>49.2%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>541</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	63	44.4%	48	33.8%	1	0.7%	2	1.4%	0	0.0%	41	28.9%	142
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,252</b>	<b>27.8%</b>	<b>2,332</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1,236</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>4,509</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 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	ANDREW	0	1	0	0	0
	ATCHISON	0	0	0	0	0
	BUCHANAN	1	2	0	1	0
	CALDWELL	0	0	0	0	0
	CARROLL	0	0	0	0	0
	CASS	0	0	1	0	0
	CHARITON	0	0	0	0	0
	CLAY	2	1	3	2	0
	CLINTON	1	1	0	1	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	1	0
	HOLT	0	0	0	0	0
	JOHNSON	0	0	0	0	2
	LAFAYETTE	0	0	0	0	0
	LINN	0	0	0	0	0
	LIVINGSTON	0	0	1	0	0
	MERCER	0	0	0	0	0
	NODAWAY	0	0	0	0	0
	PETTIS	0	1	2	0	0
	PLATTE	1	1	3	0	1
	PUTNAM	0	0	0	0	0
	RAY	0	0	1	0	0
	SALINE	2	0	0	0	0
SULLIVAN	0	0	0	0	0	
WORTH	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>NORTHEAST</b>	ADAIR	1	1	1	0	0
	AUDRAIN	0	0	0	1	0
	BOONE	0	1	0	1	2
	CALLAWAY	0	0	0	0	0
	CLARK	0	2	0	0	1
	COLE	0	2	0	0	0
	FRANKLIN	0	2	1	3	1
	GASCONADE	0	0	0	1	0
	HOWARD	0	0	0	0	0
	KNOX	1	0	0	0	0
	LEWIS	0	0	1	1	0
	LINCOLN	0	2	2	1	0
	MACON	0	0	0	0	0
	MARION	0	2	0	3	0
	MONROE	0	0	0	0	0
	MONTGOMERY	0	0	0	0	0
	OSAGE	1	0	0	0	0
	PIKE	0	1	0	0	0
	RALLS	2	0	0	1	0
	RANDOLPH	1	0	0	0	0
	SCHUYLER	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTLAND	0	0	1	0	0
	SHELBY	0	0	0	0	0
ST. CHARLES	0	3	2	5	2	
WARREN	0	2	2	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	BOLLINGER	1	0	0	0	0
	BUTLER	0	2	1	2	1
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	1	0	1	0	0
	CARTER	0	0	0	1	0
	CRAWFORD	0	0	0	0	0
	DENT	0	1	0	0	0
	DUNKLIN	0	0	0	0	1

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

	COUNTY	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	HOWELL	1	0	1	0	1
	IRON	0	0	0	0	0
	JEFFERSON	3	4	2	2	2
	MADISON	0	0	2	1	1
	MARIES	0	0	0	0	0
	MISSISSIPPI	0	0	1	0	0
	NEW MADRID	1	0	0	0	0
	OREGON	0	0	0	0	0
	PEMISCOT	2	0	1	0	1
	PERRY	0	0	2	0	0
	PHELPS	1	0	0	1	2
	PULASKI	1	0	1	1	0
	REYNOLDS	2	0	0	0	0
	RIPLEY	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTT	1	0	1	0	0
	SHANNON	0	0	0	0	0
	ST. FRANCOIS	1	0	1	0	3
	STE. GENEVIEVE	1	0	0	0	0
	STODDARD	0	1	0	0	0
	TEXAS	0	1	1	0	0
WASHINGTON	1	1	1	0	1	
WAYNE	1	0	0	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	BARRY	0	0	0	0	0
	BARTON	0	1	0	0	0
	BATES	0	0	0	0	0
	BENTON	0	1	1	0	0
	CAMDEN	0	0	1	0	0
	CEDAR	1	0	0	0	0
	CHRISTIAN	0	0	0	0	0
	DADE	0	0	0	1	0
	DALLAS	1	1	0	0	0
	DOUGLAS	0	0	0	0	0
	GREENE	0	3	1	5	3
	HENRY	0	0	0	0	1
	HICKORY	0	0	0	0	0
	JASPER	1	0	1	0	0
	LACLEDE	1	1	1	0	0
	LAWRENCE	1	0	0	0	0
	MCDONALD	0	0	0	0	0
	MILLER	0	1	0	0	1
	MONITEAU	0	0	0	0	0
	MORGAN	0	0	0	1	0
	NEWTON	0	0	0	0	0
	OZARK	0	0	0	0	0
	POLK	0	2	0	1	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	1	1	
WRIGHT	0	1	1	0	0	
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>KANSAS CITY</b>	JACKSON	2	7	8	7	4
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ST. LOUIS</b>	ST. LOUIS CITY	8	13	5	9	5
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	11	15	18	7	15
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>OTHER</b>	OUT HOME INV	2	2	1	4	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>59</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>55</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 Non-Cooperative 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.