



2021

CALENDAR YEAR



**JUVENILE
&
FAMILY DIVISION**
ANNUAL REPORT



Submitted by:
Supreme Court of Missouri
Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)

Prepared by:
Court Business Services Division
Research Section and
Juvenile & Adult Programs Resources & Support Unit

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	6
Section 1: Missouri’s Youth Population	7
Figure 1-1 Youth Population.....	7
Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population	7
Figure 1-3 Youth Population by Age and Sex	7
Figure 1-4 Youth Population by Sex	8
Figure 1-5 Youth Population by Race	8
Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals.....	9
Table 2-1 Source of Referrals	10
Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type.....	10
Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex	11
Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race.....	11
Table 2-2 Referrals by Age.....	11
Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend.....	12
Figure 2-5 Youth Referrals by Sex	12
Figure 2-6 Youth Referrals by Race	12
Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken	15
Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome	15
Section 3: Law Violation Referrals.....	16
Table 3-1 Source of Law Violation Referrals	16
Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level	16
Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex	17
Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race	17
Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age.....	17
Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals.....	18
Table 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group.....	19
Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken	20
Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Outcome.....	20
Section 4: Status Offense Referrals.....	21
Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals.....	21
Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation	21
Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex.....	22
Figure 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	22
Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age.....	23

Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken.....	24
Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome.....	24
Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals	25
Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals.....	25
Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type.....	25
Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex	26
Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race	26
Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age.....	26
Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken.....	27
Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome	27
Section 6: Assessment & Classification	28
Figure 6-1 Risk by Level	30
Figure 6-2 Risk by Sex	30
Figure 6-3 Risk by Race.....	30
Table 6-1 Risk Factors.....	31
Table 6-2 Needs Factors	32
Section 7: Detention Services.....	34
Table 7-1 Youth Population August 31, 2021.....	35
Figure 7-1 Total Admissions by Sex	35
Figure 7-2 Total Admissions by Race.....	36
Figure 7-3 Total Admissions by Sex and Race	36
Figure 7-4 Total Admissions by Age Group	36
Figure 7-5 Total Admissions by Sex and Age Group.....	37
Figure 7-6 Total Admissions by Race and Age Group.....	37
Figure 7-7 Average Daily Population by Sex.....	37
Figure 7-8 Average Daily Population by Race.....	38
Figure 7-9 Average Daily Population by Sex and Race	38
Figure 7-10 Average Daily Population by Age Group	38
Figure 7-11 Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex.....	39
Figure 7-12 Average and Median Length of Stay by Race.....	39
Figure 7-13 Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race	39
Figure 7-14 Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race	40
Figure 7-15 Average and Median Length of Stay by Age Group.....	40
Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments	41
Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race	41
Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group	41

Figure 8-3 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group	42
Section 9: Certification to Adult Court	43
Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex	43
Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race	43
Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age	43
Figure 9-4 Certification Trends by Race	44
Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism	45
Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population	46
Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law)	46
Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misd A or Felony)	46
Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony)	47
Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year	47
Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex	47
Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race	48
Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type	48
Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age	48
Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity	49
Table 11-1: Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations	51
Table 11-2: Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values	51
Table 11-3: 2021 Statewide Relative Rate Indices	52
Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth	52
Table 11-4: 2021 Statewide Law and Status Offenses by Race Percent Change	54
Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload	55
Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020)	56
Table 12-2: Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload CY 21	57
Section 13: CA/N Time Standards	58
Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely	59
Section 14: Juvenile & Family Division Programs and Diversion	60
Table 14–1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of participants	62
Table 14–2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants	62
Appendices	67
Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County	68
Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County	71
Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County	74
Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County	77
Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County	80

Appendix F: Type of Referral by Circuit and County	81
Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County	84
Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County	87
Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County	90
Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County	93
Appendix K: Out of Home Placements by Circuit.....	94
Appendix L: In Home Services by Circuit	95
Appendix M: Commitments to DYS by Circuit, Race, and Sex	96
Appendix N: Certification to Adult Court by Circuit, Race, and Sex.....	97
Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals	98
Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals	101
Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals	104
Appendix R1: Relative Rate Indices/Parity Number by County All Offenses	107
Appendix R2: Relative Rate Indices/Parity Number by County All Offenses	108
Appendix S1: 2020-2021 Case Count Change by County - All Offenses.....	109
Appendix S2: 2020-2021 Case Count Change by County - All Offenses.....	111
Appendix T: Map of Missouri’s 46 Judicial Circuits	113

Introduction

The *Missouri Juvenile and Family Division Annual Report* provides a comprehensive account of both case activity and youth served for calendar year 2021. This report presents general population data for Missouri youth; summary statistics on the youth referred for status, law, and abuse and neglect to Missouri's juvenile division; the risk and needs characteristics of the juvenile offender population; detention and DYS populations; recidivism rates; certifications of juveniles to adult court; disproportionate minority contact rates; Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload; time standards for child abuse and neglect cases; Juvenile Officer Performance Standards information; and juvenile and family division programs with participation rates.

The *Missouri Juvenile and Family Division Annual Report* is not possible without the help of Missouri's juvenile and family court staff. It is their commitment to improving outcomes for court involved youth and their families that ensures the integrity of the information reported here.

Section 1: Missouri's Youth Population

Section 1 describes the 2020 population of Missouri's youth (ages 10-17). This description provides a useful context for considering subsequent sections of the report related to a subset of youth involved with juvenile and family court divisions in Missouri [Source: Missouri Census Data Center].

<p style="text-align: center;">2010-2020 Youth Population: 10 - 17 Year Olds</p> <table border="1"> <caption>2010-2020 Youth Population (Estimated)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2010</td><td>645,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>640,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2012</td><td>635,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2013</td><td>630,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2014</td><td>628,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2015</td><td>628,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2016</td><td>628,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2017</td><td>628,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2018</td><td>628,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2019</td><td>625,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2020</td><td>624,715</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Population	2010	645,000	2011	640,000	2012	635,000	2013	630,000	2014	628,000	2015	628,000	2016	628,000	2017	628,000	2018	628,000	2019	625,000	2020	624,715	<p>Figure 1-1 Youth Population In CY20, Missouri's youth population, ages 10-17, was 624,715. This represents roughly a 0.1% increase from the previous year; and a 3% decrease from 2010.</p>			
Year	Population																											
2010	645,000																											
2011	640,000																											
2012	635,000																											
2013	630,000																											
2014	628,000																											
2015	628,000																											
2016	628,000																											
2017	628,000																											
2018	628,000																											
2019	625,000																											
2020	624,715																											
<p style="text-align: center;">Projected Youth Population: 10-19 Year Olds</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Projected Youth Population (Estimated)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2000</td><td>825,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>830,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>800,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2015</td><td>795,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2020</td><td>815,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2025</td><td>835,000</td></tr> <tr><td>2030</td><td>855,000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Population	2000	825,000	2005	830,000	2010	800,000	2015	795,000	2020	815,000	2025	835,000	2030	855,000	<p>Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population Population projections, compiled in 2008 for the Missouri youth population, suggested it will decrease until approximately 2015 at which time the population will increase at an average rate of nearly 2.5% every 5 years until 2030.</p>											
Year	Population																											
2000	825,000																											
2005	830,000																											
2010	800,000																											
2015	795,000																											
2020	815,000																											
2025	835,000																											
2030	855,000																											
<p style="text-align: center;">2020 Youth Population: 10-17 Year Olds by Age and Sex</p> <table border="1"> <caption>2020 Youth Population by Age and Sex (Estimated)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>Male</th> <th>Female</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>10</td><td>39,000</td><td>37,000</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>39,000</td><td>37,000</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>40,500</td><td>38,500</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>40,500</td><td>38,500</td></tr> <tr><td>14</td><td>40,500</td><td>38,500</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>40,000</td><td>38,000</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>40,000</td><td>38,000</td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td>39,500</td><td>37,500</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Male	Female	10	39,000	37,000	11	39,000	37,000	12	40,500	38,500	13	40,500	38,500	14	40,500	38,500	15	40,000	38,000	16	40,000	38,000	17	39,500	37,500	<p>Figure 1-3 Youth Population by Age and Sex In CY20, males outnumbered females across all age groups in Missouri's population of 10-17-year-old youths.</p>
Age	Male	Female																										
10	39,000	37,000																										
11	39,000	37,000																										
12	40,500	38,500																										
13	40,500	38,500																										
14	40,500	38,500																										
15	40,000	38,000																										
16	40,000	38,000																										
17	39,500	37,500																										

Section 1: Missouri's Youth Population

<p>Figure 1-4 Youth Population by Sex In CY20, 51% [319,472] of Missouri's youth population was male and 49% [305,243] was female. These percentages have remained the same since 1990.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2020 Youth Population: 10-17 Year Olds by Sex</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>319,472</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>305,243</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Population	Male	319,472	Female	305,243						
Sex	Population												
Male	319,472												
Female	305,243												
<p>Figure 1-5 Youth Population by Race Between CY19 and CY20, the Missouri population of Hispanic youth increased the most by 15% to 43,352. Asian/Pacific Islander youth population also had a significant increase of 13% to 17,432. The Black youth population had an increase but only by 1% to 95,534. While the White [506,127] and Native American [4,868] youth populations noticed a decrease of 1%.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2020 Youth Population: 10-17 Year Olds by Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>506,127</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>95,534</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>43,352</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>17,432</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>4,868</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Population	White	506,127	Black	95,534	Hispanic	43,352	Asian/Pacific Islander	17,432	Native American	4,868
Race	Population												
White	506,127												
Black	95,534												
Hispanic	43,352												
Asian/Pacific Islander	17,432												
Native American	4,868												

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) define a juvenile and family division referral as “the initial information provided to the juvenile officer from the referring agency inclusive of the identifying information and basis for the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.” For the purpose of annual reporting, unless otherwise indicated, disposed referrals represent the unit of measurement, not individual youth. A disposition refers to the outcome or finding of a referral [see pages 13-14] for details about how these dispositions and outcomes are reported in Missouri’s Judicial Information System (JIS)].

The juvenile and family division is responsible for processing and supervising four referral types:

- **Status Offenses:** Status offense referrals include Behavior Injurious to Self/Others, Habitually Absent from Home, Truancy, Beyond Parental Control, and Status-Other. **Note:** The following offenses are also counted as Status Offenses: Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations, which are those municipal ordinance violations that are explicitly labeled with “JVMUNI” in the charge code (<https://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=2018>).
- **Law Offenses:** Law offense referrals include all criminal violations listed in the Missouri Charge Code Manual, including infraction and ordinance violations, except Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations.
- **Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N):** CA/N referrals are allegations of child abuse or neglect where the child is the victim or custody related matters are an issue. Abuse referrals include Abuse-Emotional, Abuse-Incest, Abuse-Other Sexual, and Physical Abuse. Neglect referrals include Abandonment, Neglect-Education, Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision, Neglect-Medical Care, Neglect-Surgical Care, and Neglect-Other. Custody referrals include Abduction, Protective Custody, Transfer of Custody, Termination of Parental Rights, and Relief of Custody.
- **Administrative:** Administrative referrals include Violation of Valid Court Order, Juvenile Informal Supervision/Technical Violation, and Juvenile Formal Supervision/Technical Violation.¹

Section 2 presents information on disposed referrals at the state level for the juvenile and family division in calendar 2021.

¹ Counts of Administrative referrals throughout this report include these additional violations: Prob / Parole Violation and Probation Violation (Municipal Ordinance). While not sanctioned for use on juvenile referrals, circuits have used these charge codes in calendar year 2021.

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

Table 2-1 Source of Referrals


Referrals to Missouri’s juvenile and family division originate from a variety of sources. In CY21, 47% of all referrals originated from some type of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [37%]. The Children’s Division of Missouri’s Department of Social Services accounted for 23% of all referrals. An additional 18% of referrals occurred at schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer).
Missing Data [743]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal Police	13,698	37.1%
Children’s Division	8,647	23.4%
School Personnel	4,625	12.5%
County Sheriff	3,152	8.5%
School Resource Officer	1,989	5.4%
Parent	1,398	3.8%
Juv Court Personnel	1,357	3.7%
Other	692	1.9%
Other Juv Court	426	1.2%
Other Law Enforcement	323	0.9%
Private Social Agency	302	0.8%
Highway Patrol	183	0.5%
Other Relative	95	0.3%
Victim or Self	31	0.1%
Public Social Agency	15	0.0%
DMH	14	0.0%
Grand Total	36,947	100.00 %



Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type

In CY21, a total of 37,690 referrals were disposed. The largest percentage [36%, 13,734] was for abuse/neglect allegations. The rest of the referrals were divided between delinquency [33%, 12,528], status offenses [29%, 10,790], and administrative offenses [2%, 638].
Missing Data [0]

Total Referrals by Referral Type



Note: Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations are included with status referrals.

<p style="text-align: center;">Total Referrals by Sex</p>  <p style="text-align: center;"> ■ Male ■ Female </p>	<p>Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex For all the disposed referrals in CY21, males were responsible for 59% [22,193] and females for the remaining 41% [15,416]. Missing Data [81]</p>																																				
<p style="text-align: center;">Total Referrals by Race</p> 	<p>Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race Approximately, 71% [26,212] of all disposed referrals were for white youth. The second largest percentage of referrals was 25% [9,354] for black youth. The remaining groups are Hispanic youth which accounted for 2.9% [1,097], Asian/Pacific Islander youth which accounted for 0.5% [182], and Native American youth which accounted for 0.2% [74]. Missing Data [771]</p> <p>Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option</p>																																				
<p style="text-align: center;">Total Referrals by Age</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #f4a460;"> <th>Age</th> <th>Frequency</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>< 10</td><td>8,941</td><td>23.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>1,078</td><td>2.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>1,415</td><td>3.8%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>2,320</td><td>6.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>3,892</td><td>10.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>14</td><td>5,102</td><td>13.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>5,641</td><td>15.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>6,092</td><td>16.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td>2,813</td><td>7.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>> = 18</td><td>368</td><td>1.0%</td></tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4a460;"> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>37,662</td> <td>100.0 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Frequency	Percentage	< 10	8,941	23.7%	10	1,078	2.9%	11	1,415	3.8%	12	2,320	6.2%	13	3,892	10.3%	14	5,102	13.5%	15	5,641	15.0%	16	6,092	16.2%	17	2,813	7.5%	> = 18	368	1.0%	Grand Total	37,662	100.0 %	<p>Table 2-2 Referrals by Age The youngest age group, under 10 years, was responsible for 23.7% [8,941] of all referrals. Youth aged 16, were responsible for the next largest proportion of referrals, [16.2%, 6,092], followed by youth aged 15, [15.0%, 5,641] and youth aged 14 [13.5%, 5,102]. Missing Data [28]</p>
Age	Frequency	Percentage																																			
< 10	8,941	23.7%																																			
10	1,078	2.9%																																			
11	1,415	3.8%																																			
12	2,320	6.2%																																			
13	3,892	10.3%																																			
14	5,102	13.5%																																			
15	5,641	15.0%																																			
16	6,092	16.2%																																			
17	2,813	7.5%																																			
> = 18	368	1.0%																																			
Grand Total	37,662	100.0 %																																			

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend

The total number of disposed referrals declined by 35% from 2011 to 2021. The trend shows the greatest decrease in delinquency referrals (-59%). All other referral types decreased: status referrals (-35%), CA/N referrals (-18%), and administrative referrals (-37%) over that period. Since last year, there was a decrease in administrative referral types (-25%). There was an increase in all other case types: delinquency (16%), CA/N (9%), and status (7%).

Youth Referrals by Referral Type: 2011-2021




Figure 2-5 Youth Referrals by Sex

Disposed referrals declined more for males (-39%) than for females (-31%) from 2011 to 2021. Between 2020 and 2021, the number of referrals for males and females increased by 9.8%.

Youth Referrals by Sex: 2011 - 2021





Figure 2-6 Youth Referrals by Race

From 2011-2021, disposed referrals declined for black youth (-40.4%), white youth (-36.0%), Asian/Pacific Islander youth (-25.7%), Native American youth (-28.8%) and Hispanic youth (-5.0%)

Note: Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American youth are not displayed to maintain readability.

Youth Referrals by Race: 2011-2021



The juvenile and family division will respond to referrals either through a formal or informal process. Through the formal process, a juvenile officer files a petition in the juvenile and family division to have a judge hear and determine the outcome of the allegations contained in the petition. Through the informal process, a juvenile officer determines the outcome of the allegations contained in the referral without filing a petition seeking formal judicial jurisdiction. The following referral outcomes are recorded on the ***Site Defined (COASITE)*** form when a VDYSJ docket code is entered on the ***Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)*** form in Judicial Information System (JIS).

Formal Outcomes:

Allegation True, Youth Receives Out-of-Home Placement – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth is placed out-of-home with the Division of Youth Services (DYS), in foster care, with a relative, or with a private or public agency.

Allegation True, Youth Receives In-Home Services – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth receives services while remaining in his or her home. This outcome requires the youth to receive supervision through the juvenile division.

Allegation True, No Services – A judicial action finding the allegation true; however, the youth receives no services or supervision.

Allegation Not True – A judicial action which results in the termination of a juvenile case during the initial juvenile division hearing because the allegation is found not true.

Sustain Motion to Dismiss – A judicial action which results in a motion to dismiss the petition before the initial division hearing.

Juvenile Certified – Felony Allegation - A judicial action sustaining a motion to dismiss a petition to the juvenile division and allow prosecution of youth under the general law.

Informal Outcomes:

Informal Adjustment without Supervision: Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and involves supervision of youth by written agreement and complies with Missouri Supreme Court Rules for an informal adjustment conference. Although services may be monitored, this disposition does not include direct supervision of a youth in accordance with the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. However, because the disposition is applied on the basis of an informal adjustment conference, completion of the mandated risk and needs assessments is required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.

Informal Adjustment with Supervision: Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and involves supervision of youth by written agreement and complies with Missouri Supreme Court Rules for an informal adjustment conference and the relevant contact standards contained in the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. This disposition requires completion of the risk and needs assessment when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.

Informal Adjustment – No Action: Any informal non-judicial activity that entails no more than brief face-to-face, telephone, or warning letter with the intent to inform, counsel, and warn the youth and/or family regarding a referral received. No official informal adjustment conference, per Supreme Court Rule is held; therefore completion of the mandated risk or needs assessments is not required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.

Transfer to Other Juvenile Division: A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another juvenile division for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.

Transfer to Other Agency: A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another agency (CD, DMH, DYS, or other public or private agency) for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.

Referral Rejected: The referral is rejected because there is insufficient information for administrative action to proceed or the referral is found not true. No informal adjustment conference is conducted and no assessments are required.

Youth Referrals by Action Taken




Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken

In CY21, 71% [26,712] of all referrals were disposed through the informal process. Only 27% [10,156] of referrals required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing disposition information. Missing Data [822]

Total Referrals by Outcome




Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment – No Action [17.5%, 6,598] was the most frequently used informal finding, and the most frequently used formal finding was Allegation Found True with Out-of-Home Placement [18.4%, 6,934]. Missing Data [822]

Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Section 3 describes law violation referrals disposed by Missouri’s juvenile and family division. Law violation referrals made up 33% of all referrals disposed in calendar 2021. A law violation referral is counted as a single delinquent act represented by the most serious allegation charged (misdemeanor or higher). However, multiple delinquent acts may be associated with a single referral. **Note:** Infractions and municipal ordinances are included under law violations. Juvenile municipal ordinances are listed under status offenses.

<p>Table 3-1 Source of Law Violation Referrals The source of 84% of law violation referrals was some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [68.3%] and county sheriff departments [13.8%]. Schools were the second highest referring agency [12%] (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined). Missing Data [146]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Source of Referral</th> <th>Frequency</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Municipal Police</td><td>8,463</td><td>68.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>County Sheriff</td><td>1,706</td><td>13.8%</td></tr> <tr><td>School Resource Officer</td><td>1,190</td><td>9.6%</td></tr> <tr><td>School Personnel</td><td>297</td><td>2.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other Law Enforcement</td><td>163</td><td>1.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other Juv Court</td><td>144</td><td>1.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>CD</td><td>130</td><td>1.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Highway Patrol</td><td>130</td><td>1.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Juv Court Personnel</td><td>82</td><td>0.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Parent</td><td>30</td><td>0.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other</td><td>25</td><td>0.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Victim or Self</td><td>10</td><td>0.1%</td></tr> <tr><td>DMH</td><td>6</td><td>0.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other Relative</td><td>5</td><td>0.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Private Social Agency</td><td>1</td><td>0.0%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>12,382</td> <td>100.00 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage	Municipal Police	8,463	68.3%	County Sheriff	1,706	13.8%	School Resource Officer	1,190	9.6%	School Personnel	297	2.4%	Other Law Enforcement	163	1.3%	Other Juv Court	144	1.2%	CD	130	1.0%	Highway Patrol	130	1.0%	Juv Court Personnel	82	0.7%	Parent	30	0.2%	Other	25	0.2%	Victim or Self	10	0.1%	DMH	6	0.0%	Other Relative	5	0.0%	Private Social Agency	1	0.0%	Grand Total	12,382	100.00 %
Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage																																																		
Municipal Police	8,463	68.3%																																																		
County Sheriff	1,706	13.8%																																																		
School Resource Officer	1,190	9.6%																																																		
School Personnel	297	2.4%																																																		
Other Law Enforcement	163	1.3%																																																		
Other Juv Court	144	1.2%																																																		
CD	130	1.0%																																																		
Highway Patrol	130	1.0%																																																		
Juv Court Personnel	82	0.7%																																																		
Parent	30	0.2%																																																		
Other	25	0.2%																																																		
Victim or Self	10	0.1%																																																		
DMH	6	0.0%																																																		
Other Relative	5	0.0%																																																		
Private Social Agency	1	0.0%																																																		
Grand Total	12,382	100.00 %																																																		
<p>Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level The most common charge level for law referrals was misdemeanor [62.4%] with Class A misdemeanors accounting the largest amount [33.8%, 4,229]. Felonies represented 33.3% of law referrals, with Class D being the most common type of felony referral [14.8%, 1,857]. Roughly six percent of all law violations were for Class A and B felonies [306 & 396]. Missing Data [0]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Charge Level</th> <th>Frequency</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Felony A</td><td>306</td></tr> <tr><td>Felony B</td><td>396</td></tr> <tr><td>Felony C</td><td>115</td></tr> <tr><td>Felony D</td><td>1,857</td></tr> <tr><td>Felony E</td><td>1,251</td></tr> <tr><td>Felony U</td><td>247</td></tr> <tr><td>Infraction</td><td>279</td></tr> <tr><td>Misdemeanor A</td><td>4,229</td></tr> <tr><td>Misdemeanor B</td><td>1,693</td></tr> <tr><td>Misdemeanor C</td><td>584</td></tr> <tr><td>Misdemeanor D</td><td>1,265</td></tr> <tr><td>Misdemeanor U</td><td>47</td></tr> <tr><td>Ordinance</td><td>259</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Charge Level	Frequency	Felony A	306	Felony B	396	Felony C	115	Felony D	1,857	Felony E	1,251	Felony U	247	Infraction	279	Misdemeanor A	4,229	Misdemeanor B	1,693	Misdemeanor C	584	Misdemeanor D	1,265	Misdemeanor U	47	Ordinance	259																							
Charge Level	Frequency																																																			
Felony A	306																																																			
Felony B	396																																																			
Felony C	115																																																			
Felony D	1,857																																																			
Felony E	1,251																																																			
Felony U	247																																																			
Infraction	279																																																			
Misdemeanor A	4,229																																																			
Misdemeanor B	1,693																																																			
Misdemeanor C	584																																																			
Misdemeanor D	1,265																																																			
Misdemeanor U	47																																																			
Ordinance	259																																																			

<p style="text-align: center;">Law Violations by Charge Level and Sex</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Infractions and Ordinances</th> <th>Misdemeanor</th> <th>Felony</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>180</td> <td>2,564</td> <td>824</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>356</td> <td>5,243</td> <td>3,335</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Infractions and Ordinances	Misdemeanor	Felony	Female	180	2,564	824	Male	356	5,243	3,335	<p>Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex</p> <p>Law violations at the misdemeanor level were the most common allegation for both male and female offenders. However, within sex, the percentage of referrals for misdemeanors was higher for females [72%, 2,564] than for males [59%, 5,243]. Conversely, males were referred at a higher rate [37%, 3,335] for felonies than were females [23%, 824].</p> <p>Missing Data [26]</p>																																
Sex	Infractions and Ordinances	Misdemeanor	Felony																																										
Female	180	2,564	824																																										
Male	356	5,243	3,335																																										
<p style="text-align: center;">Law Violations by Charge Level and Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Infractions and Ordinances</th> <th>Misdemeanor</th> <th>Felony</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>409</td> <td>5,147</td> <td>2,251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>106</td> <td>2,369</td> <td>1,721</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>13</td> <td>181</td> <td>117</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>5</td> <td>29</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>0</td> <td>9</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Infractions and Ordinances	Misdemeanor	Felony	White	409	5,147	2,251	Black	106	2,369	1,721	Hispanic	13	181	117	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	29	16	Native American	0	9	4	<p>Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race</p> <p>Misdemeanor was the most common charge among all race categories. However, within race, the percentage of felony referrals was higher for youth of color than white youth: Black youth [41%, 1,721], Hispanic youth [38%, 117], Asian/Pacific Islander youth [32%, 16], Native American youth [31%, 4], White youth [29%, 2,251].</p> <p>Missing Data [151]</p> <p>Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option</p>																				
Race	Infractions and Ordinances	Misdemeanor	Felony																																										
White	409	5,147	2,251																																										
Black	106	2,369	1,721																																										
Hispanic	13	181	117																																										
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	29	16																																										
Native American	0	9	4																																										
<p style="text-align: center;">Law Violations by Charge Level and Age</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Infractions and Ordinances</th> <th>Misdemeanor</th> <th>Felony</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>< 10</td> <td>5</td> <td>119</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>5</td> <td>101</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>237</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>51</td> <td>560</td> <td>183</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>79</td> <td>993</td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>120</td> <td>1,362</td> <td>641</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>103</td> <td>1,568</td> <td>841</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16</td> <td>111</td> <td>1,859</td> <td>1,090</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>49</td> <td>930</td> <td>664</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=18</td> <td>2</td> <td>179</td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Infractions and Ordinances	Misdemeanor	Felony	< 10	5	119	50	10	5	101	42	11	12	237	75	12	51	560	183	13	79	993	400	14	120	1,362	641	15	103	1,568	841	16	111	1,859	1,090	17	49	930	664	>=18	2	179	85	<p>Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age</p> <p>Youth aged 15 and 16 years old were responsible for the largest number of misdemeanors and the largest number of felonies. Youth under age 10 were proportionally the most likely to commit misdemeanors (68% of their violations), while youth aged 18 and older were proportionally the most likely to commit felonies (67% of their violations).</p> <p>Missing Data [12]</p>
Age Group	Infractions and Ordinances	Misdemeanor	Felony																																										
< 10	5	119	50																																										
10	5	101	42																																										
11	12	237	75																																										
12	51	560	183																																										
13	79	993	400																																										
14	120	1,362	641																																										
15	103	1,568	841																																										
16	111	1,859	1,090																																										
17	49	930	664																																										
>=18	2	179	85																																										

Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals

Violations for Assault, Property Damage, Stealing, Dangerous Drugs, and Peace Disturbance accounted for the majority [69%] of major allegations on law referrals. The Top 5 Law Violations remain unchanged from the previous year.

Missing Data [0]

According to *Juvenile Court Statistics 2019* report published by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, assault was also the most common offense for juveniles in the United States. Following assault, the next highest number of cases handled by juvenile courts nationwide were larceny-theft and then followed by obstruction of justice.



Note: Juvenile municipal ordinances are listed under status offenses.

Top Law Violations CY21	Frequency	Percentage
Assault	3,555	28.4%
Property Damage	1,765	14.1%
Stealing	1,342	10.7%
Dangerous Drugs	1,166	9.3%
Peace Disturbance	864	6.9%
Sexual Assault	625	5.0%
Invasion of Privacy	434	3.5%
Burglary	353	2.8%
Liquor Laws	281	2.2%
Weapons	275	2.2%
Municipal Charges	259	2.1%
Obstructing Police	246	2.0%
Robbery	198	1.6%
Health and Safety	189	1.5%
Sex Offenses	170	1.4%
Obscenity	155	1.2%
Threats	155	1.2%
Motor Vehicle Violations	126	1.0%
Obstruct Jud Proc	69	0.6%
Fraud	54	0.4%
Arson	53	0.4%
Homicide	36	0.3%
Public Order Crimes	32	0.3%
Stolen Property	32	0.3%
Conservation	25	0.2%
Flight/Escape	20	0.2%
Family Offenses	17	0.1%
Kidnapping	15	0.1%
Other	10	0.1%
Forgery	7	0.1%
Grand Total	12,528	100.00 %

Table 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group

Forty four percent of all juvenile law violation referrals were committed by youth aged 15 and 16. These youth were responsible for 53% of homicides, 54% of drug charges, 53% of liquor law violations, 52% of robberies, and 48% of stealing referrals. Only threats, forgery and municipal charges were committed at a higher rate by youth 13-14. Missing Data [12] **Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances are listed under status offenses.

Major Allegation	Age Range										Total
	<10	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	>=18	
Assault	65	57	114	298	472	691	698	762	359	39	3,555
Property Damage	31	19	42	100	205	329	353	446	223	17	1,765
Stealing	9	13	30	68	117	202	292	350	219	41	1,341
Dangerous Drugs	0	2	9	33	84	157	229	403	229	20	1,166
Peace Disturbance	15	14	30	88	137	145	178	178	72	4	861
Sexual Assault	11	16	16	32	73	91	110	129	77	63	618
Invasion of Privacy	5	8	25	40	62	69	71	95	58	1	434
Burglary	4	3	10	19	46	50	71	92	47	11	353
Liquor Laws	1	0	1	8	23	29	47	101	65	6	281
Weapons	2	3	4	10	26	15	60	94	50	11	275
Municipal Charges	4	3	4	20	44	68	43	52	19	2	259
Obstructing Police	0	1	9	6	12	43	54	70	49	2	246
Robbery	0	0	1	4	15	27	40	63	38	10	198
Health and Safety	0	1	6	17	33	41	44	32	11	3	188
Sex Offenses	18	5	5	9	17	29	36	15	15	21	170
Obscenity	3	0	1	12	38	25	38	25	11	2	155
Threats	0	1	5	17	27	43	35	21	6	0	155
Motor Vehicle Violations	0	0	0	3	7	24	27	33	29	3	126
Obstruct Jud Proc	0	0	0	0	12	7	22	17	11	0	69
Fraud	0	1	2	6	6	9	8	13	8	1	54
Arson	3	1	6	2	9	6	14	7	4	1	53
Homicide	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	11	7	6	36
Public Order Crimes	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	8	5	1	32
Stolen Property	0	0	3	2	4	3	6	7	7	0	32
Conservation	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	11	6	0	25
Flight/Escape	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	0	20
Family Offenses	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	2	1	17
Kidnapping	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	3	0	15
Other	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4	0	10
Forgery	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	7
Grand Total	174	148	324	794	1,472	2,123	2,512	3,060	1,643	266	12,516

<p>Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken Eighty-two percent [10,217] of law violation referrals were disposed through the informal court process. Seventeen percent [2,123] required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing outcome information. Missing Data [188]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Law Violations by Action Taken</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Action Taken</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Informal</td> <td>10,217</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formal</td> <td>2,123</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action Taken	Count	Informal	10,217	Formal	2,123																				
Action Taken	Count																										
Informal	10,217																										
Formal	2,123																										
<p>Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Outcome The most frequently used methods of disposing law violation referrals were Referral Rejected [24.1%, 3,017] and Informal Adj No Action [16.7%, 2,091]. Allegation Found True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [9.2%, 1,150], followed by Allegation Found True-Out-of-Home Placement [4.3%, 543]. Less than 1% [35] of referrals resulted in petitions for Certification to Adult Court. Missing Data [188]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Law Violations By Outcome</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Referral Rejected</td> <td>3,017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Informal Adj - No Action</td> <td>2,091</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Informal Adj w/ Supervision</td> <td>1,820</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Informal Adj w/o Supervision</td> <td>1,662</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Allegation Found True (with Petition) In-Home Services*</td> <td>1,150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfer to Other Juvenile Court</td> <td>1,089</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Allegation Found True (with Petition) Out-of-Home Placement*</td> <td>543</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfer to Other Agency</td> <td>538</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sustain Motion to Dismiss (with Petition)*</td> <td>229</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Allegation Found Not True (with Petition)*</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Allegation Found True (with Petition) No Services*</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Juvenile Certified - Felony Allegation*</td> <td>35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">* Formal Outcomes</p>	Outcome	Count	Referral Rejected	3,017	Informal Adj - No Action	2,091	Informal Adj w/ Supervision	1,820	Informal Adj w/o Supervision	1,662	Allegation Found True (with Petition) In-Home Services*	1,150	Transfer to Other Juvenile Court	1,089	Allegation Found True (with Petition) Out-of-Home Placement*	543	Transfer to Other Agency	538	Sustain Motion to Dismiss (with Petition)*	229	Allegation Found Not True (with Petition)*	89	Allegation Found True (with Petition) No Services*	77	Juvenile Certified - Felony Allegation*	35
Outcome	Count																										
Referral Rejected	3,017																										
Informal Adj - No Action	2,091																										
Informal Adj w/ Supervision	1,820																										
Informal Adj w/o Supervision	1,662																										
Allegation Found True (with Petition) In-Home Services*	1,150																										
Transfer to Other Juvenile Court	1,089																										
Allegation Found True (with Petition) Out-of-Home Placement*	543																										
Transfer to Other Agency	538																										
Sustain Motion to Dismiss (with Petition)*	229																										
Allegation Found Not True (with Petition)*	89																										
Allegation Found True (with Petition) No Services*	77																										
Juvenile Certified - Felony Allegation*	35																										

Section 4: Status Offense Referrals

Section 4 describes status offense referrals disposed by the juvenile and family division. Status offense referrals made up 29% of all referrals in calendar 2021. A status violation referral is counted as a single behavioral act represented by the most serious allegation charged. However, multiple status offense acts may be associated with a single referral. **Note:** Juvenile Municipal Ordinances are included in Status Offenses.

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal Police	4,081	38.0%
School Personnel	3,151	29.3%
County Sheriff	1,085	10.1%
Parent	808	7.5%
School Resource Officer	571	5.3%
CD	438	4.1%
Juv Court Personnel	322	3.0%
Other Juv Court	63	0.6%
Other Law Enforcement	58	0.5%
Other Relative	52	0.5%
Other	38	0.4%
Highway Patrol	34	0.3%
Private Social Agency	28	0.3%
Victim or Self	11	0.1%
Public Social Agency	5	0.0%
DMH	2	0.0%
Grand Total	10,747	100.0 %

Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals

Forty nine percent of status violation referrals originated from some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [38%] and county sheriff departments [10%]. Schools [35%] were the second highest referring agency (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined), followed by parents [8%] and Children’s Division [4%]. Missing Data [43]

Status Offense Referrals by Allegation




Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation

Behavior Injurious to Self or Others [34%, 3,709] was the most frequent status offense for which youth were referred, followed closely by Truancy [23%, 2,525]. Muni-Curfew constitutes 3% of status offense referrals, while the remaining Juvenile Municipal Ordinance charges combined account for less than 1% of all status offense referrals. Missing data [0].

Section 4: Status Offense Referrals

Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common allegation for both males [37%, 2,279] and females [31%, 1,425]. Proportionally, Females were more likely than males to be referred for Truancy and Habitually Absent from Home. Also, the number of Females [24%, 1,119] referred for Habitually Absent from Home was greater than males [17%, 1,046]. Males were more likely to be referred for all other offenses. Missing Data [18]

Note: Due to space constraints, the only Municipal Ordinance charge included is Muni-Curfew.

Status Offenses by Allegation and Sex




Figure 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common reason to be referred for White youth [36%, 2,921] and Native American youth [39%, 11]. Black youth were most frequently referred for Habitually Absent from Home [36%, 769]. Hispanic [32%, 102] and Asian/Pacific Islander [38%, 26] youth were most referred for Truancy. Missing Data [118]

Note: Due to space constraints, the only Municipal Ordinance charge included is Muni-Curfew.

Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race




Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common type of referral for youth of all ages. Youth aged 15-16 was the group most often referred for Truancy [26%, 1,135]. The youth older than 17 were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Habitually Absent from Home [30%, 236]. Also, youth younger than the age of 12 were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Beyond Parental Control [17%, 334].

Missing Data [2]

	Age Range									
	< 10	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	>=18
Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	236	131	170	319	560	710	677	619	260	26
Truancy	85	47	93	183	404	466	530	605	104	8
Habitually Absent From Home	25	27	68	123	222	428	509	528	225	11
Beyond Parental Control	52	52	76	154	268	301	298	277	66	4
Status Offense - Other	26	6	21	31	56	72	76	92	52	5
Muni - Curfew	1	1	2	11	30	81	103	99	30	1
Muni- Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product	0	1	2	2	2	9	8	5	4	1
Muni - Other Violation	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	0
Muni - Possession/Discharge Arms	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Muni - Pedestrian Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Grand Total	425	267	432	825	1,542	2,068	2,204	2,226	743	56

Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken

The vast majority of status offense referrals [91%, 9,823] were disposed through the informal process, leaving only 8% [896] to be disposed through the formal court process. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.
Missing Data [71]

Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken





Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment, No Action [29%, 3,079] was the most frequently used method for disposing status referrals, followed by Informal Adjustment without Supervision [21%, 2,310]. Allegation True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [4%, 459].
Missing Data [71]

Status Offense Referrals by Outcome



* Formal Outcomes

Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals

Section 5 describes child abuse and neglect (CA/N) referrals disposed by Missouri’s juvenile and family division. CA/N referrals made up 36% of all referrals in calendar 2021. A CA/N referral is counted as a single event, represented by the most serious allegation where a youth is the victim. However, a youth may be the victim of multiple incidences of abuse and/or neglect at the time at which they are referred.

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percent
CD	8,051	60.9%
School Personnel	1,149	8.7%
Municipal Police	1,007	7.6%
Other	629	4.8%
Juv Court Personnel	617	4.7%
Parent	553	4.2%
County Sheriff	355	2.7%
Private Social Agency	244	1.8%
School Resource Officer	225	1.7%
Other Juv Court	212	1.6%
Other Law Enforcement	102	0.8%
Other Relative	36	0.3%
Highway Patrol	17	0.1%
Public Social Agency	10	0.1%
Victim or Self	7	0.1%
DMH	6	0.0%
Total	13,220	100 %

Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals

Roughly 60% of all CA/N referrals are from Children’s Division (CD) of Missouri’s Department of Social Services (DSS). Law enforcement agencies (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement) were responsible for 11% of the referrals. Approximately 10% of the referrals originated from schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).
Missing Data [514]

Child Abuse & Neglect Referrals by Allegation Type





Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type

Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision represented [43%, 5,966] most of all CA/N referrals, followed by Neglect-Other [18%, 2,414]. Abuse-Physical [8%, 1,060] was the fourth highest allegation type.
Missing Data [0]

Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals

<p>Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex</p> <p>Within sex, the percentage of neglect related referrals were higher for males [74%, 4,997] than for females [71%, 4,941]. Conversely, referrals for abuse were greater for females [18%, 1,282] compared with their male counterparts [12%, 831]. Missing Data [37]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals by Charge Level and Sex</p>  <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Juvenile Custody</th> <th>Juvenile Neglect</th> <th>Juvenile Abuse</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>768</td> <td>4,997</td> <td>1,282</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>878</td> <td>4,941</td> <td>831</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Juvenile Abuse	Female	768	4,997	1,282	Male	878	4,941	831																																																
Sex	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Juvenile Abuse																																																										
Female	768	4,997	1,282																																																										
Male	878	4,941	831																																																										
<p>Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race</p> <p>Neglect was the most common type of referral for all youth [73%, 9,581]. Proportionately, Asian/Pacific Islander youth were the most likely group to be referred for abuse [20%, 10]. Missing Data [498]</p> <p>Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #f4a460;"> <th>Race/Ethnicity</th> <th>Juvenile Abuse</th> <th>Juvenile Custody</th> <th>Juvenile Neglect</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>1,460</td> <td>1,254</td> <td>7,261</td> <td>9,975</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>511</td> <td>326</td> <td>1,899</td> <td>2,736</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>59</td> <td>31</td> <td>352</td> <td>442</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>29</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>10</td> <td>1</td> <td>40</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4a460;"> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>2,040</td> <td>1,615</td> <td>9,581</td> <td>13,236</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race/Ethnicity	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total	White	1,460	1,254	7,261	9,975	Black	511	326	1,899	2,736	Hispanic	59	31	352	442	Native American	0	3	29	32	Asian/Pacific Islander	10	1	40	51	Grand Total	2,040	1,615	9,581	13,236																									
Race/Ethnicity	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total																																																									
White	1,460	1,254	7,261	9,975																																																									
Black	511	326	1,899	2,736																																																									
Hispanic	59	31	352	442																																																									
Native American	0	3	29	32																																																									
Asian/Pacific Islander	10	1	40	51																																																									
Grand Total	2,040	1,615	9,581	13,236																																																									
<p>Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age</p> <p>The vast majority of abuse, neglect, and custody referrals were for youth 10 years of age and younger [61%, 8,337]. Proportionately, youth age 14 [27%, 218] were the most likely to be referred for abuse amongst the age groups. Missing Data [14]</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #f4a460;"> <th>Age</th> <th>Juvenile Abuse</th> <th>Juvenile Custody</th> <th>Juvenile Neglect</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>< 10</td> <td>966</td> <td>1,147</td> <td>6,224</td> <td>8,337</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>95</td> <td>62</td> <td>505</td> <td>662</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>95</td> <td>50</td> <td>513</td> <td>658</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>143</td> <td>63</td> <td>490</td> <td>696</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>195</td> <td>67</td> <td>562</td> <td>824</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>218</td> <td>74</td> <td>509</td> <td>801</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>168</td> <td>78</td> <td>505</td> <td>751</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16</td> <td>149</td> <td>75</td> <td>426</td> <td>650</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>75</td> <td>28</td> <td>219</td> <td>322</td> </tr> <tr> <td>> = 18</td> <td>8</td> <td>3</td> <td>8</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4a460;"> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>2,112</td> <td>1,647</td> <td>9,961</td> <td>13,720</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total	< 10	966	1,147	6,224	8,337	10	95	62	505	662	11	95	50	513	658	12	143	63	490	696	13	195	67	562	824	14	218	74	509	801	15	168	78	505	751	16	149	75	426	650	17	75	28	219	322	> = 18	8	3	8	19	Grand Total	2,112	1,647	9,961	13,720
Age	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total																																																									
< 10	966	1,147	6,224	8,337																																																									
10	95	62	505	662																																																									
11	95	50	513	658																																																									
12	143	63	490	696																																																									
13	195	67	562	824																																																									
14	218	74	509	801																																																									
15	168	78	505	751																																																									
16	149	75	426	650																																																									
17	75	28	219	322																																																									
> = 18	8	3	8	19																																																									
Grand Total	2,112	1,647	9,961	13,720																																																									




Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken

Fifty percent of CA/N referrals were disposed through the formal court process [6,923]. Forty six percent [6,288] of referrals were handled through the informal court process. The remainder were missing data.

Missing Data [523]




Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome

Allegation True, Out-of-Home Placement was the most frequently applied outcome [44%, 5,977] to CA/N referrals, followed by Referral Rejected [15%, 2,023] and Informal Adjustment, No Action [10%, 1,418].

Missing Data [523]

Section 6: Assessment & Classification

In 1995, the Missouri General Assembly passed the Juvenile Crime and Crime Prevention Bill [HB 174]. The bill was aimed at reshaping Missouri's juvenile justice system through the development of a comprehensive juvenile justice strategy. As part of the strategy, the Office of State Courts Administrator was charged with coordinating an effort to design and implement a standardized assessment process for classifying juvenile offenders. The result of this effort was the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System.




The Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System includes an empirically validated risk assessment for estimating a youthful offender's relative likelihood of future delinquency and a classification matrix that links the level of risk and offense severity to a recommended set of graduated sanctions. The system also includes a needs assessment for identifying the underlying psychosocial needs of youth.

Since its inception, the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification system has helped Missouri's juvenile justice professionals to ensure public safety and promote statewide consistency in the services and supervision of youthful offenders.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) sections 2.6 Risk Assessment and 2.7 Needs Assessment mandates the juvenile officer complete a Missouri Juvenile Officer Risk Assessment and Missouri Juvenile Officer Needs Assessment on "all juveniles with a legally sufficient referral for a delinquent or status offense if an informal adjustment conference was conducted, or the matter was subject to adjudication." Subsequent risk assessments are to be completed "if the juvenile receiving services is subject to a new delinquent or status offense referral, and additional sanctions or services will be required." Subsequent needs assessments are to be completed "upon significant changes in the juvenile's circumstances or every 90 days as an indicator of progress toward the supervision or treatment goals."

Section 6 presents information on juveniles with referrals who were disposed during calendar 2021, and who had risk and needs assessments entered on the **Custom Assessment Maintenance (CZAASMT)** form of JIS. When a referral has more than one associated risk/needs assessment(s), the highest score is reported. When a referral is not associated with any risk/needs assessment(s) in the reporting year, the score associated with the risk/needs assessment that was completed on the nearest date before or after the initial filing date of the referral is the one that is reported, regardless of the year the assessment was completed. Figures 6-1 to 6-3 provide risk level information with Tables 6-1 and 6-2 providing information about the prevalence of individual risk and need factors. **

***Readers should refer to [Missouri's Juvenile Offender Risk & Needs Assessment and Classification System Manual \(2005\)](#) for the operational definitions of risk and needs factors.*

<p style="text-align: center;">Risk by Level</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Risk Level</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td>1,918</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moderate</td> <td>5,526</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>1,566</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Risk Level	Count	Low	1,918	Moderate	5,526	High	1,566	<p>Figure 6-1 Risk by Level The majority of youth [61%, 5,526] scored at moderate risk for future delinquent acts on risk assessments in CY21. The remaining youth scored at low [21%, 1,918] or high risk levels [17%, 1,566]. Missing Data [0]</p>																
Risk Level	Count																								
Low	1,918																								
Moderate	5,526																								
High	1,566																								
<p style="text-align: center;">Risk Level by Sex</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Low</th> <th>Moderate</th> <th>High</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>1,221</td> <td>3,639</td> <td>1,127</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>690</td> <td>1,881</td> <td>437</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Low	Moderate	High	Male	1,221	3,639	1,127	Female	690	1,881	437	<p>Figure 6-2 Risk by Sex Proportionately, more male youth [19%, 1,127] were assessed high risk than females [15%, 437]. Females [23%, 690] were more likely than their male counterparts [20%, 1,221] to be assessed low risk. Female youth were also more likely [63%, 1,881] than male youth [61%, 3,639] to be assessed as moderate risk. Missing Data [15]</p>												
Sex	Low	Moderate	High																						
Male	1,221	3,639	1,127																						
Female	690	1,881	437																						
<p style="text-align: center;">Risk Level by Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>High</th> <th>Moderate</th> <th>Low</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>1,047</td> <td>4,100</td> <td>1,505</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>464</td> <td>1,168</td> <td>307</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>45</td> <td>167</td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>4</td> <td>21</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>4</td> <td>18</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	High	Moderate	Low	White	1,047	4,100	1,505	Black	464	1,168	307	Hispanic	45	167	52	Asian/Pacific Islander	4	21	19	Native American	4	18	1	<p>Figure 6-3 Risk by Race Proportionately, more black youth [24%, 464] were assessed high risk than white youth [16%, 1,047]. White youth [23%, 1,505] were more likely than their black counterparts [16%, 307] to be assessed low risk. Missing Data [88]</p>
Race	High	Moderate	Low																						
White	1,047	4,100	1,505																						
Black	464	1,168	307																						
Hispanic	45	167	52																						
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	21	19																						
Native American	4	18	1																						

Section 6: Assessment & Classification

Age at First Referral	Frequency	Percentage
12 and under	3,322	36.9
13	1,517	16.8
14	1,554	17.2
15	1,343	14.9
16	1,230	13.7
Prior Referrals	Frequency	Percentage
None	4,013	44.5
One or more	4,953	55.0
Assault Referrals	Frequency	Percentage
No prior or present referrals for assault	6,346	70.4
One or more prior or present referrals for misdemeanor assault	2,003	22.2
One or more prior or present referrals for felony assault	617	6.8
History of Placement	Frequency	Percentage
No prior out-of-home placement	6,024	66.9
Prior out-of-home placement	2,942	32.7
Peer Relationships	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral influence	4,611	51.2
Negative influence	3,477	38.6
Strong negative influence	878	9.7
History of Child Abuse/Neglect	Frequency	Percentage
No history of child abuse/neglect	6,467	71.8
History of child abuse/neglect	2,499	27.7
Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percentage
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	6,454	71.6
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	2,195	24.4
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	317	3.5
School Attendance/Disciplinary	Frequency	Percentage
No or only minor problems	3,895	43.2
Moderate problems	3,555	39.5
Severe problems	1,516	16.8
Parental Management Style	Frequency	Percentage
Effective management style	3,962	44.0
Moderately effective management style	3,836	42.6
Severely ineffective management style	1,168	13.0
Parental History of Incarceration	Frequency	Percentage
No prior incarceration	6,027	66.9
Prior incarceration	2,939	32.6

Behavior Problems	Frequency	Percentage
No significant behavior problem	3,133	35.2
Moderate behavior problem	4,220	47.4
Severe behavior problem	1,450	16.3
Attitude	Frequency	Percentage
Motivated to change/accepts responsibility	5,419	60.9
Generally uncooperative, defensive, not motivated to change	2,690	30.2
Very negative attitude, defiant, and resistant to change	694	7.8
Interpersonal Skills	Frequency	Percentage
Good interpersonal skills	5,353	60.2
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	3,048	34.3
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	402	4.5
Peer Relationships	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral influence	4,541	51.1
Negative Influence	3,419	38.4
Strong negative Influence	843	9.5
History of Child Abuse/Neglect	Frequency	Percentage
No history child abuse/neglect	6,311	70.9
History of child abuse/neglect	2,492	28.0
Mental Health	Frequency	Percentage
No mental health disorder	5,484	61.7
Mental health disorder with treatment	2,589	29.1
Mental health disorder with no treatment	730	8.2
Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percentage
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	6,348	71.4
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	2,146	24.1
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	309	3.5
School Attendance	Frequency	Percentage
No or only minor problems	3,880	43.6
Moderate problems	3,441	38.7
Severe problems	1,482	16.7
Academic Performance	Frequency	Percentage
Passing without difficulty	4,262	47.9
Functioning below average	2,989	33.6
Failing	1,552	17.4
Learning Disorder	Frequency	Percentage
No diagnosed learning disorder	7,468	84.0
Diagnosed learning disorder	1,335	15.0

Section 6: Assessment & Classification

Needs Factors (Cont.)		
Employment	Frequency	Percentage
Full-time employment	520	5.8
Part-time employment	554	6.2
Unemployed	875	9.8
Not Applicable	6,854	77.1
Juvenile's Parental Responsibility	Frequency	Percentage
No children	8,572	96.4
One child	144	1.6
Two children	46	0.5
Three or more children	41	0.5
Health/Handicaps	Frequency	Percentage
No health problems or physical handicaps	8,458	95.1
No health problems/handicaps but limited access to health care	106	1.2
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	207	2.3
Pregnancy	6	0.1
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	26	0.3
Parental Management Style	Frequency	Percentage
Effective management style	3,897	43.8
Moderately ineffective management style	3,757	42.2
Severely ineffective management style	1,149	12.9
Parental Mental Health	Frequency	Percentage
No parental history of mental health disorder	6,798	76.4
Parental history of mental health disorder	2,005	22.5
Parental Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percentage
No parental substance abuse	6,487	72.9
Parental substance abuse	2,316	26.0
Social Support System	Frequency	Percentage
Strong social support system	4,246	47.7
Limited support system, with one positive role model	3,680	41.4
Weak support system; no positive role models	727	8.2
Strong negative or criminal influence	150	1.7

Section 7: Detention Services


Missouri's juvenile and family division of the circuit court includes 18 detention facilities to house youth in need of secure detention. Juvenile justice personnel identify offenders most in need of secure detention using the objective criteria contained in Missouri's Juvenile Detention Assessment (JDTA). In addition, 17 detention centers participate in the Annie Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) [highlighted in table 7-1] for calendar 2021. [The 32nd circuit also participates in JDAI, but does not have detention centers.] JDAI is an effort to assist the juvenile and family division with the development and use of community-based alternatives to secure detention when detention is determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate. The initiative emphasizes the collection and application of objective data to identify practices that may contribute to over-utilization of secure detention, detention overcrowding, and disproportionate minority confinement. On February 18, 2014 the Supreme Court of Missouri adopted the "Standards for Operation of a Secure Juvenile Detention Facility" which then became effective on January 1, 2015 that guides detention policy and practices.




Section 7 presents admission, discharge, population, and length of stay information entered on the ***Custom Room Facility Assignment (CZAROOM)*** form of JIS for Missouri's secure detention facilities. Depending on the reporting objective, counts are based on admissions or discharges; a single youth may be counted multiple times if they were detained on more than one occasion.

Please note that as of August 2021, youth that are certified shall be held in detention facilities. Since that data was not collected for the full year, the data for those youth has been excluded from the following counts.




Section 7: Detention Services

<p>Table 7-1 Youth Population August 31, 2021</p> <p>Metropolitan circuits [16, 21, & 22] account for roughly 39% of all youth detained in Missouri on the last day of August 2021.</p> <p>Note: Non-JDAI sites with detention facilities are shaded.</p>	Youth Population on August 31, 2021		
	Circuit	Population	Percent MO Youth Detained
	2	9	6.4%
	5	1	0.7%
	7	5	3.5%
	11	10	7.1%
	13	13	9.2%
	16	14	9.9%
	17	8	5.7%
	19	3	2.1%
	21	25	17.7%
	22	16	11.3%
	23	6	4.3%
	24	6	4.3%
	26	2	1.4%
	29	5	3.5%
	31	2	1.4%
33	11	7.8%	
35	3	2.1%	
44	2	1.4%	
Grand Total		141	100.0 %



<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Admissions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>1,032</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>875</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Admissions	White	1,032	Black	875	Hispanic	70	Asian/Pacific Islander	9	Native American	3	<p>Figure 7-2 Total Admissions by Race</p> <p>White youth accounted for 51% [1,032] of admissions to secure detention facilities while black youth accounted for 43% [875]. Hispanic youth accounted for 3% [70] of admissions, while Asian/Pacific Islander youth [9] and Native American youth [3] accounted for less than 1% combined. Missing Data [27]</p>													
Race	Admissions																									
White	1,032																									
Black	875																									
Hispanic	70																									
Asian/Pacific Islander	9																									
Native American	3																									
<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Sex and Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Race</th> <th>Admissions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Male</td> <td>White</td> <td>806</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>720</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Female</td> <td>White</td> <td>226</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Race	Admissions	Male	White	806	Black	720	Hispanic	57	Asian/Pacific Islander	6	Native American	3	Female	White	226	Black	154	Hispanic	13	Asian/Pacific Islander	3	Native American	0	<p>Figure 7-3 Total Admissions by Sex and Race</p> <p>Among male detainees, white males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities [50%, 806], followed by black males [45%, 720]. Among female detainees, white females accounted for the largest percentage of admissions to a detention center [57%, 226], followed by black females [39%, 154]. Missing data [28]</p>
Sex	Race	Admissions																								
Male	White	806																								
	Black	720																								
	Hispanic	57																								
	Asian/Pacific Islander	6																								
	Native American	3																								
Female	White	226																								
	Black	154																								
	Hispanic	13																								
	Asian/Pacific Islander	3																								
	Native American	0																								
<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Age Group</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Admissions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>505</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>1,061</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>376</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Admissions	<=12	72	13-14	505	15-16	1,061	>=17	376	<p>Figure 7-4 Total Admissions by Age Group</p> <p>Youth between the ages of 15 and 16 years accounted for the majority of admissions [53%, 1,061], followed by ages 13-14 [25%, 505]. The age groups of 17 years or older [19%, 376] and 12 years or younger [4%, 72] accounted for the lowest percentage of admissions across age groups. Missing Data [2]</p>															
Age Group	Admissions																									
<=12	72																									
13-14	505																									
15-16	1,061																									
>=17	376																									

<p>Figure 7-5 Total Admissions by Sex and Age Group Male youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [42%, 846]. Missing Data [3]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Sex & Age Group</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Male</th> <th>Female</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>57</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>382</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>846</td> <td>215</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>331</td> <td>45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Male	Female	<=12	57	15	13-14	382	122	15-16	846	215	>=17	331	45															
Age Group	Male	Female																													
<=12	57	15																													
13-14	382	122																													
15-16	846	215																													
>=17	331	45																													
<p>Figure 7-6 Total Admissions by Race and Age Group White youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [27%, 544], followed by black youth of the same age group [23%, 455]. Missing Data [27]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Race & Age Group</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>White</th> <th>Black</th> <th>Hispanic</th> <th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th> <th>Native American</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>43</td> <td>27</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>292</td> <td>191</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>544</td> <td>455</td> <td>40</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>153</td> <td>202</td> <td>18</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	<=12	43	27	2	0	0	13-14	292	191	10	4	0	15-16	544	455	40	4	2	>=17	153	202	18	1	1
Age Group	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American																										
<=12	43	27	2	0	0																										
13-14	292	191	10	4	0																										
15-16	544	455	40	4	2																										
>=17	153	202	18	1	1																										
<p>Figure 7-7 Average Daily Population by Sex The statewide average daily detention population was 129. The vast majority [111, 86%] of these detainees were male. Missing Data [4]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Average Daily Population by Sex</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Average Daily Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>111.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>17.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Average Daily Population	Male	111.2	Female	17.3																								
Sex	Average Daily Population																														
Male	111.2																														
Female	17.3																														

<p style="text-align: center;">Average Daily Population by Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Average Daily Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>49.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>72.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>5.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>0.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Average Daily Population	White	49.3	Black	72.9	Hispanic	5.1	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.2	Native American	0.1	<p>Figure 7-8 Average Daily Population by Race</p> <p>The statewide average daily population for black youth [73] in secure detention was greater than all other youth combined [55]. Missing Data [28]</p>													
Race	Average Daily Population																									
White	49.3																									
Black	72.9																									
Hispanic	5.1																									
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.2																									
Native American	0.1																									
<p style="text-align: center;">Average Daily Population by Sex and Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Race</th> <th>Average Daily Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Male</td> <td>White</td> <td>40.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>64.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>5.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Female</td> <td>White</td> <td>8.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>8.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>0.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Race	Average Daily Population	Male	White	40.6	Black	64.5	Hispanic	5.1	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.6	Native American	1.9	Female	White	8.8	Black	8.3	Hispanic	0.2	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0	Native American	0.0	<p>Figure 7-9 Average Daily Population by Sex and Race</p> <p>Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for black males [65]. For the female population, white detainees had the highest average daily detention population [9]. Missing Data [28]</p>
Sex	Race	Average Daily Population																								
Male	White	40.6																								
	Black	64.5																								
	Hispanic	5.1																								
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.6																								
	Native American	1.9																								
Female	White	8.8																								
	Black	8.3																								
	Hispanic	0.2																								
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0																								
	Native American	0.0																								
<p style="text-align: center;">Average Daily Population by Age Group</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Average Daily Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>26.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>72.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>26.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Average Daily Population	<=12	4.2	13-14	26.0	15-16	72.5	>=17	26.1	<p>Figure 7-10 Average Daily Population by Age Group</p> <p>Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16-year old youth [73], followed by 13-14 year old youth [26]. The average daily population was the lowest for ages 12 and younger [4]. Missing Data [2]</p>															
Age Group	Average Daily Population																									
<=12	4.2																									
13-14	26.0																									
15-16	72.5																									
>=17	26.1																									

<p>Figure 7-11 Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex</p> <p>The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities was 23 days for males and 15 days for females.</p> <p>Missing Data [4]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Average LOS</th> <th>Median LOS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>22.9</td> <td>10.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>14.8</td> <td>7.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Average LOS	Median LOS	Male	22.9	10.0	Female	14.8	7.0									
Sex	Average LOS	Median LOS																	
Male	22.9	10.0																	
Female	14.8	7.0																	
<p>Figure 7-12 Average and Median Length of Stay by Race</p> <p>Statewide, black youth had the longest average length of stay of 28 days and had the longest median length of stay of 10 days.</p> <p>Missing Data [27]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Average and Median Length of Stay by Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Average LOS</th> <th>Median LOS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>16.3</td> <td>8.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>27.8</td> <td>10.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>21.2</td> <td>9.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td> <td>11.5</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>15.6</td> <td>9.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Average LOS	Median LOS	White	16.3	8.0	Black	27.8	10.0	Hispanic	21.2	9.0	Asian / Pacific Islander	11.5	5.0	Native American	15.6	9.5
Race	Average LOS	Median LOS																	
White	16.3	8.0																	
Black	27.8	10.0																	
Hispanic	21.2	9.0																	
Asian / Pacific Islander	11.5	5.0																	
Native American	15.6	9.5																	
<p>Figure 7-13 Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race</p> <p>The statewide average length of stay was longest for Black males at 30 days. Also, Black females at 19 days was the longest average length of stay amongst females in detention.</p> <p>Missing Data [27]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>White</th> <th>Black</th> <th>Hispanic</th> <th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th> <th>Native American</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>17.2</td> <td>29.7</td> <td>24.9</td> <td>8.7</td> <td>17.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>18.5</td> <td>6.8</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Male	17.2	29.7	24.9	8.7	17.7	Female	12.9	18.5	6.8	4.0	0
Sex	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American														
Male	17.2	29.7	24.9	8.7	17.7														
Female	12.9	18.5	6.8	4.0	0														

<p style="text-align: center;">Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>White</th> <th>Black</th> <th>Hispanic</th> <th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th> <th>Native American</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>11.0</td> <td>12.0</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>9.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Male	8.0	11.0	12.0	6.0	9.5	Female	7.0	8.0	3.0	2.0	0	<p>Figure 7-14 Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race The statewide median length of stay was longest for Black males [12 days]. The second longest median length was for white males [11 days]. Missing Data [27]</p>
Sex	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American														
Male	8.0	11.0	12.0	6.0	9.5														
Female	7.0	8.0	3.0	2.0	0														
<p style="text-align: center;">Average and Median Length of Stay by Age Group</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Average LOS</th> <th>Median LOS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>21.9</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>17.3</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>22.8</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>22.3</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Average LOS	Median LOS	<=12	21.9	4.5	13-14	17.3	8	15-16	22.8	10	>=17	22.3	10	<p>Figure 7-15 Average and Median Length of Stay by Age Group Youth between the age of 15 and 16 years represented the longest average length of stay [23 days]. The average length of stay for the 13 and 14 year old youths was the shortest [17 days]. Missing Data [2]</p>			
Age Group	Average LOS	Median LOS																	
<=12	21.9	4.5																	
13-14	17.3	8																	
15-16	22.8	10																	
>=17	22.3	10																	

Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments

Section 8 presents demographic information on youth committed to the Division of Youth Services (DYS) identified by a docket entry of DDYS – Committed to DYS on the **Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)** form of JIS in calendar 2021. For circuit level information on these commitments, refer to Appendix M. Assuming commitments to DYS are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count is unduplicated. (**Note:** Docket entries in JIS produce data different from that historically reported by DYS.)

<p>Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race</p> <p>There were 359 youths committed to the custody of DYS in CY21. The majority [87%, 311] were male. White youth accounted for 65% [234] of juveniles committed to DYS, while black youth accounted for 31% [110]. The remaining 4% [14] were from other race groups. Missing Data [1]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>White</th> <th>Black</th> <th>Hispanic</th> <th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th> <th>Native American</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>204</td> <td>95</td> <td>12</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Male	204	95	12	0	0	Female	30	15	1	0	1
Sex	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American														
Male	204	95	12	0	0														
Female	30	15	1	0	1														
<p>Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group</p> <p>Fifty-seven percent [206] of youth committed to DYS were between the ages of 15 and 16. An additional 26% [95] were between 13-14 years of age. Youth younger than 13 years accounted for less than 1% [32], while 15% [55] of youth were aged 17 or older. Missing Data [1]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16</td> <td>104</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=18</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Count	<=12	2	13	30	14	65	15	102	16	104	17	52	>=18	3		
Age Group	Count																		
<=12	2																		
13	30																		
14	65																		
15	102																		
16	104																		
17	52																		
>=18	3																		

Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments




			Race					
			White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/ Pacific Islander	
Sex	Male	Age	<=12	2	0	0	0	0
			13	21	6	0	0	0
			14	37	14	2	0	0
			15	54	31	3	0	0
			16	56	30	4	0	0
			17	32	13	3	0	0
			>=18	2	1	0	0	0
			Total	204	95	12	0	0
	Sex	Female	Age	<=12	0	0	0	0
13				3	0	0	0	0
14				7	3	1	1	0
15				9	5	0	0	0
16				9	5	0	0	0
17				2	2	0	0	0
>=18				0	0	0	0	0
Total				30	15	1	1	0


**Figure 8-3
Statewide DYS
Commitments
by Sex, Race,
and Age Group**
White males age 16 [56] were the most common group committed to DYS. This was more than all females combined [47]. Females age 17 had the same amount of commitments for black youth [2] and white youth [2]. All other age groups had more white youth commitments than minority youth in CY21. Missing Data [1]

Section 9: Certification to Adult Court

Section 9 presents demographic information about youth certified to adult court, identified by the docket entry of DJVCA - JUV Certified to Adult Court on the **Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)** form of JIS in calendar 2021. For additional circuit level information about these certifications, refer to Appendix N. Assuming certifications are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count presented is unduplicated.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.4 Certification mandates “the juvenile officer shall consider the implications of certification and consider certification only in circumstances in which issues of public safety cannot be mitigated by supervision and services in the juvenile justice system.”

<p>Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex The statewide total for offenders certified to adult court was 35. Majority were males [94%, 33]. Missing Data [0]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide Certified Youth by Sex</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	Count	Male	33	Female	2				
Sex	Count										
Male	33										
Female	2										
<p>Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race The percentage of offenders certified to adult court was greater for black youth [57%, 20] than for white youth [43%, 15]. Missing Data [0]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide Certified Youth by Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Count	White	15	Black	20	Hispanic	0	Asian/Pacific Islander	0
Race	Count										
White	15										
Black	20										
Hispanic	0										
Asian/Pacific Islander	0										
<p>Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age The largest portions of offenders certified to adult courts were 17 years old [43%, 15] and 18 years or older [29%, 10]. Twenty percent [7] were 16 years old and the remaining 9% [3] were 15 years old. Missing Data [0]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide Certified Youth by Age</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=18</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Count	15	3	16	7	17	15	>=18	10
Age	Count										
15	3										
16	7										
17	15										
>=18	10										



Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism

Juvenile divisions across the country are being asked to provide evidence that public funds are used in cost-effective ways to reduce and prevent juvenile crime. For Missouri juvenile divisions to measure progress in this area, the following statewide definition of juvenile offender recidivism was developed through consensus:

“A juvenile offender recidivist is any youth, referred to the juvenile office for a legally sufficient law violation during a calendar year, who receives one or more legally sufficient law violation(s) to the juvenile or adult court within one year of the initial referral’s disposition date.”

Section 10 presents the demographic and offense characteristics that influenced recidivism rates for the calendar 2020 cohort of Missouri juvenile law offenders who were tracked through calendar 2021 for recidivism. Note that recidivism is tracked by the offender’s party id entered in JIS and is only tracked if the new offense occurs in the same circuit as the original offense.

Offender Population as a Proportion of Missouri Youth




Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population

Approximately 0.7% [4,477] of the 624,715 juveniles aged 10-17 were referred to Missouri’s juvenile and family division for legally sufficient law violation referrals in CY20.

Percentage of Youth Recidivating




Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law)

Approximately 20% [877] of the 4,477 juvenile law offenders in CY20 recidivated through a new law violation within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felonies or Misdemeanor A)







Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misd A or Felony)

Roughly 14% [617] of the 4,477 juvenile law offenders in CY20 recidivated either with a new Class A misdemeanor or felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism

<p>Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony) Eight percent [337] of the 4,477 juvenile law offenders in CY20 recidivated with a felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony Charges)</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Non-Recidivating Offenders</td> <td>92.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recidivating Offenders</td> <td>7.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	Non-Recidivating Offenders	92.5%	Recidivating Offenders	7.5%																																										
Category	Percentage																																																
Non-Recidivating Offenders	92.5%																																																
Recidivating Offenders	7.5%																																																
<p>Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year The percentage of the recidivists with any law violation decreased by 1.0% between the 2019 cohort and the 2020 cohort. The percent of youth who recidivated with either a Class A misdemeanor or felony stayed the same between the cohorts. The percentage of youth recidivating with a felony increased by 0.4% from CY19 cohort.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Cohort</th> <th>All sufficient law violations</th> <th>Misdemeanor A or Felony</th> <th>Felony Only</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2010 Cohort</td><td>23.0%</td><td>18.0%</td><td>7.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2011 Cohort</td><td>24.0%</td><td>20.0%</td><td>8.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2012 Cohort</td><td>22.0%</td><td>18.0%</td><td>7.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2013 Cohort</td><td>21.0%</td><td>15.0%</td><td>5.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2014 Cohort</td><td>21.0%</td><td>16.0%</td><td>5.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2015 Cohort</td><td>21.0%</td><td>15.0%</td><td>5.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2016 Cohort</td><td>22.0%</td><td>16.0%</td><td>6.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2017 Cohort</td><td>21.0%</td><td>15.0%</td><td>6.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2018 Cohort</td><td>22.0%</td><td>15.0%</td><td>7.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2019 Cohort</td><td>21.0%</td><td>14.0%</td><td>7.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>2020 Cohort</td><td>20.0%</td><td>14.0%</td><td>7.4%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Cohort	All sufficient law violations	Misdemeanor A or Felony	Felony Only	2010 Cohort	23.0%	18.0%	7.0%	2011 Cohort	24.0%	20.0%	8.0%	2012 Cohort	22.0%	18.0%	7.0%	2013 Cohort	21.0%	15.0%	5.0%	2014 Cohort	21.0%	16.0%	5.0%	2015 Cohort	21.0%	15.0%	5.0%	2016 Cohort	22.0%	16.0%	6.0%	2017 Cohort	21.0%	15.0%	6.0%	2018 Cohort	22.0%	15.0%	7.0%	2019 Cohort	21.0%	14.0%	7.0%	2020 Cohort	20.0%	14.0%	7.4%
Cohort	All sufficient law violations	Misdemeanor A or Felony	Felony Only																																														
2010 Cohort	23.0%	18.0%	7.0%																																														
2011 Cohort	24.0%	20.0%	8.0%																																														
2012 Cohort	22.0%	18.0%	7.0%																																														
2013 Cohort	21.0%	15.0%	5.0%																																														
2014 Cohort	21.0%	16.0%	5.0%																																														
2015 Cohort	21.0%	15.0%	5.0%																																														
2016 Cohort	22.0%	16.0%	6.0%																																														
2017 Cohort	21.0%	15.0%	6.0%																																														
2018 Cohort	22.0%	15.0%	7.0%																																														
2019 Cohort	21.0%	14.0%	7.0%																																														
2020 Cohort	20.0%	14.0%	7.4%																																														
<p>Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex Males [21.1%] from the CY20 cohort recidivated at a higher rate than their female [15.8%] counterparts. This holds true for those who recidivated with either Class A misdemeanor or felony offense, as well as for those who recidivated with only a felony offense.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>All Law</th> <th>Felonies or Misdemeanor A</th> <th>Felonies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>21.1%</td> <td>14.9%</td> <td>8.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>15.8%</td> <td>11.0%</td> <td>5.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sex	All Law	Felonies or Misdemeanor A	Felonies	Male	21.1%	14.9%	8.6%	Female	15.8%	11.0%	5.0%																																				
Sex	All Law	Felonies or Misdemeanor A	Felonies																																														
Male	21.1%	14.9%	8.6%																																														
Female	15.8%	11.0%	5.0%																																														

<p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>All Law Referrals</th> <th>Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors</th> <th>Felonies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>18.7%</td> <td>12.1%</td> <td>6.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>22.3%</td> <td>17.8%</td> <td>10.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>14.4%</td> <td>13.1%</td> <td>7.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	All Law Referrals	Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors	Felonies	White	18.7%	12.1%	6.3%	Black	22.3%	17.8%	10.4%	Other	14.4%	13.1%	7.2%	<p>Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race Proportionately, black youth [22%, 292] from the CY20 cohort had a higher rate of recidivism than their other minority counterparts [14%, 22] and white counterparts [19%, 559] for all law referrals. The same holds true for referrals for felonies with class A misdemeanors, as well as all felony charges.</p>				
Race	All Law Referrals	Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors	Felonies																		
White	18.7%	12.1%	6.3%																		
Black	22.3%	17.8%	10.4%																		
Other	14.4%	13.1%	7.2%																		
<p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Circuit Type</th> <th>All Law Referrals</th> <th>Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors</th> <th>Felonies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Multi-County Circuit</td> <td>21.0%</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>7.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Single County Circuit</td> <td>17.8%</td> <td>14.1%</td> <td>8.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Circuit Type	All Law Referrals	Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors	Felonies	Multi-County Circuit	21.0%	13.5%	7.0%	Single County Circuit	17.8%	14.1%	8.1%	<p>Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type Recidivism from CY20 for all law violations was higher for youth in multi-county circuits [21%, 525] than for youth in single county circuits, [18%, 352]. However, the percentages were higher for Class A misdemeanors and felonies [14%, 279] in single county circuits than in multi-county circuits [14%, 338], and also higher for just felony referrals in single county circuits [8%, 161] than in multi-county circuits [7%, 176].</p>								
Circuit Type	All Law Referrals	Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors	Felonies																		
Multi-County Circuit	21.0%	13.5%	7.0%																		
Single County Circuit	17.8%	14.1%	8.1%																		
<p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age Group</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>All Law Referrals</th> <th>Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors</th> <th>Felonies</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>17.6%</td> <td>12.7%</td> <td>4.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>21.5%</td> <td>15.5%</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>19.0%</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>8.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>17.1%</td> <td>13.3%</td> <td>10.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	All Law Referrals	Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors	Felonies	<=12	17.6%	12.7%	4.7%	13-14	21.5%	15.5%	7.7%	15-16	19.0%	13.0%	8.0%	>=17	17.1%	13.3%	10.5%	<p>Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age The percentage of recidivism is highest for youth between the ages of 13 and 14 years for all types of offenses, except felony only charges. Proportionately, youth 17 years or older had a higher recidivism rate for felonies [11%, 11].</p>
Age Group	All Law Referrals	Felonies & Class A Misdemeanors	Felonies																		
<=12	17.6%	12.7%	4.7%																		
13-14	21.5%	15.5%	7.7%																		
15-16	19.0%	13.0%	8.0%																		
>=17	17.1%	13.3%	10.5%																		

Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity

Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED) Initiative

RED is one of four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 2002. All states are required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to make efforts to document and reduce RED. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 2018, also known as the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018. One of its key components is to further determine if there are racial and ethnic disparities (RED) identified within in the juvenile justice system and actively work to address those issues by identifying and analyzing data on race and ethnicity at decision points in State, local or tribal juvenile justice systems to determine which such points create racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Disproportionate minority contact occurs whenever the overall volume of activity for minority youth at various juvenile justice contact points is disproportionately larger than the volume of activity for white youth at those points. It is important to examine *all* juvenile justice contact points due to the likelihood that minority youth will penetrate deeper into the juvenile justice system as a result of disproportionate minority contact with the system. Racial and ethnic disparities further involve the unfair or inequitable treatment of youth of color at those decision points in the juvenile justice system due to various reasons.

The existence of disproportionality does not necessarily mean that minority youth are experiencing disparity (or unequal treatment), because further analysis is needed to determine whether or not disproportionality is a consequence of disparities and/or other contributing mechanisms.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 1.15 Antidiscrimination and Disproportionate Minority Contact mandates “the juvenile officer shall prohibit discrimination and proactively address racial and ethnic disparities to ensure fundamental fairness and equal justice for those served by the juvenile office.”

What is a Relative Rate Index (RRI)?

The data analysis of the OJJDP Relative Rate Index (RRI) compares the relative volume of activity (rate) for eight court contact points for each minority youth group with the volume of activity (rate) for the majority group (white youth). It provides a single index number that indicates the extent to which the volume of contact differs.

Because the Relative Rate Index is intended to capture the overall extent of youth involvement with the juvenile justice system, the RRI calculation is based on *cases*, not individual *youth*. If a youth is referred to the juvenile court multiple times during the course of a single year, all of those referrals are included. Therefore, the data provided include ***duplicated*** counts for all court contact points.

Example: The RRI comparing rates of referral to juvenile court:

Rate of Referral for black youth:				
<u># of black youth referred</u>	<u>150</u>	= 0.30 X 1000	= 300	
# of black youth in population	500			
Rate of Referral for white youth:				
<u># of white youth referred</u>	<u>200</u>	= 0.04 X 1000	= 40	
# of white youth in population	5000			
Relative Rate Calculation for Referrals:				
<u>Rate of Referral for black youth</u>	<u>300</u>	= 7.5 RRI		
Rate of Referral for white youth	40			

If the RRI is larger than 1.0, that means that the minority group experiences contact more often than white youth. If it is less than 1.0, that means that contact is less frequent. In this example, the RRI for black referrals is 7.5. This means that black youth are seven and a half times more likely to be referred to the juvenile office than white youth.

With the exception of the first rate (referral), which is calculated using the base of the number of youth in each major racial/ethnic grouping in the general population, each of the subsequent RRIs is calculated based on the volume of activity for that racial/ethnic group in a proceeding stage in the case process. See Table 11-1.

Table 11-1: Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations

Decision Stage / Contact Point	Base for Rates
Referrals to Juvenile Court	Rate per 1,000 Population
Referrals Diverted	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Involving Secure Detention	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Petitioned	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings	Rate per 100 Petitions
Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Transferred to Adult Court	Rate per 100 Petitions Filed

Table 11-2: Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values

Area of Concern	Decision States or Contact Points
More than 1.00	Referrals to Juvenile Court Referrals Involving Secure Detention Referrals Petitioned Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities Referrals Transferred to Adult Court
Less Than 1.00	Referrals Diverted Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement

Note: RRI values that cause RED concern can be greater than 1.00 or less than 1.00.

What Data are Used?

- U.S. Census data for youth ages 10-17 in all counties in Missouri.
- Census data from the previous calendar year was used, because the Census population updates for the current year are not available at the time of publication.
- Office of State Courts Administrator delinquency data in the Judicial Information System (JIS). Law violation referrals and status referrals (but not child abuse and neglect referrals) were included.
- Transfers to other juvenile court referrals were not included.

Table 11-3: 2021 Statewide Relative Rate Indices

Black youth experienced the largest disproportionality overall. Black youth were over-represented at referral, while Hispanic and Asian /Pacific Islander youth were under-represented at that contact point. Black youth also experienced negative disproportionality at: diversion, secure detention, petition, and secure confinement.

Contact Point	Black	Hispanic	Asian / Pacific Islander	Native American
Referral	1.94	0.44	0.23	**
Diversion	0.94	0.95	0.92	**
Secure Detention	1.72	1.28	1.31	**
Petition	1.30	1.30	1.57	**
Delinquent Findings	0.91	0.98	**	**
Supervision	0.87	1.06	**	**
Secure Confinement	1.42	1.39	**	**
Certification	3.97	**	**	**

Statistically significant results **Bold Font**


Group is less than 1% of youth population *

Insufficient number of cases for analysis **

Note: Caution should be used when interpreting the Hispanic data, because race and ethnicity are not separated in JIS. Thus, Hispanic youth are under-counted.

Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth

While the number of referrals has declined over the last decade, the RRI for referrals of black youth has remained relatively steady with the highest in 2013 at 2.3 and the lowest in 2018 and 2021 at 1.9. The reason for this is that, although referrals declined for all youth from 2012 to 2021, they did not do so evenly across groups in each year.



What is percent change?

The percent change calculation compares the year over year amounts of referrals, diversion, detention, petitions, delinquent findings, supervision, secure confinement and certifications for each minority youth group. This provides a measurement of how data has changed year over year. OJJDP changed their reporting requirements from RRI to percent change in 2021 for Racial and Ethnic Disparity research.

The percent change calculations for each contact point uses the number of cases, not the number of youth. If a youth is referred to the court multiple times in a year, each of those cases are included in the calculation. Therefore, the data provided include duplicated counts for all court contact points.

Example: The percent change of referrals to juvenile courts.

Calendar Year 2020:

Number of referrals: 100

Calendar Year 2021:

Number of referrals: 150

Percent Change Calculation:

$$(150-100)/ 100 \times 100 = \mathbf{50\% \text{ increase}}$$

In this example, referrals increased from 100 to 150 leading to a 50% increase. If the percent is negative then there was a decrease year over year. If a location began with any number larger than 0, but then the next year had 0 cases, the percent increase will be -100% (100% decrease). If a location started with 0, then increased its case count to any other number, the percent change calculation will return an undefined result, because the case count can not be divided by zero.

Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity

Table 11-4: 2021 Statewide Law and Status Offenses by Race Percent Change

The largest increases occurred in the Delinquency Findings, Petitions, Supervision, and Detention, each with double digit growth. Adult transfers saw a decrease of just over 9% statewide, but this is largely due to a reduction of adult transfers for white youth by over 52%. Black and Hispanic youth actually experienced an increase of adult transfer cases.

These increases could be explained by a few different factors, unique to the 2020-2021 timeframe. First, in 2021, the statewide “Raise the Age” legislation went into effect, which allowed for youth up to 18 years of age to continue to be charged as juveniles. Therefore, the 2020 data included youth 10-16 years of age, however the 2021 data included youth 10-17 years old. Also due to the pandemic, in 2020 and 2021, many courts and juvenile justice facilities modified their activities to follow local health safety guidelines. Therefore, increases in case counts were expected as juvenile offices returned to pre-pandemic activities.

Contact Point	White CY2020	White CY2021	Percent Change	Black CY2020	Black CY2021	Percent Change	American Indian CY2020	American Indian CY2021	Percent Change
Population	443,513	468,307	5.59%	84,013	93,166	10.89%	4,300	3,323	-22.72%
Referral Cases	13,666	14,401	5.38%	5,111	5,565	8.88%	44	37	-15.91%
Diversion Cases	11,984	12,386	3.35%	4,300	4,514	4.98%	40	34	-15.00%
Detention Cases	699	847	21.17%	422	562	33.18%	4	1	-75.00%
Petitions Cases	1,642	1,884	14.74%	763	950	24.51%	4	3	-25.00%
Delinquency Findings Cases	1,511	1,693	12.05%	615	775	26.02%	4	3	-25.00%
Supervision Cases	929	1,087	17.01%	347	435	25.36%	3	1	-66.67%
Secure Confinement Cases	210	207	-1.43%	111	135	21.62%	1	0	-100.00%
Adult Transfer Cases	19	9	-52.63%	14	18	28.57%	0	0	U*

Contact Point	Asian CY2020	Asian CY2021	Percent Change	Hispanic CY2020	Hispanic CY2021	Percent Change	CY2020 Total	CY2021 Total	Total Change
Population	15,050	16,567	10.08%	37,667	43,352	15.09%	584,543	624,715	6.87%
Referral Cases	92	117	27.17%	517	586	13.35%	19,430	20,706	6.57%
Diversion Cases	76	93	22.37%	440	480	9.09%	16,840	17,507	3.96%
Detention Cases	5	9	80.00%	36	44	22.22%	1,166	1,463	25.47%
Petitions Cases	16	24	50.00%	77	100	29.87%	2,502	2,961	18.35%
Delinquency Findings Cases	16	22	37.50%	69	88	27.54%	2,215	2,581	16.52%
Supervision Cases	13	10	-23.08%	44	60	36.36%	1,336	1,593	19.24%
Secure Confinement Cases	2	0	-100.00%	15	15	0.00%	339	357	5.31%
Adult Transfer Cases	0	0	U*	0	3	U*	33	30	-9.09%

Note: U* denotes an undefined result because the case count can not be divided by zero.

Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload

The Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload (JOWWL) system is an automated means of estimating the direct service need for additional deputy juvenile officers in Missouri's 35 multi-county circuits. The JOWWL compares the number of staff hours required to screen and process the status, law, and CA/N referrals received by juvenile divisions and to supervise youth in accordance with the **Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards**, against the actual number of staff hours available to complete these direct service activities. When workload demand exceeds the number of staff hours available to meet it, a need for additional direct service personnel is projected. The Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) adopted and first used the results of the JOWWL for estimating FTE needs for juvenile officers in fiscal 2004. The CCBC has since used the JOWWL annually for this budgetary purpose. In January of 2020 a new workload study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts, and a new model was delivered the summer of 2020. The new model adjusted workload weights for various case processing activities and eliminated the Alternatives to Detention case processing category.

Example of Workload Estimate for Mock Multi-County Circuit

Annual Case-Specific Workload: Annual total work minutes required to service juvenile cases at established standards includes screening, processing and supervising delinquency and CA/N cases, based on workload values identified by the 2020 juvenile officer workload study [Table 12-1].

Example: Mock Circuit, 255,314 minutes of direct service work are required to accommodate case management demand.

Staffing Demand: Total number of direct service staff needed to meet Annual Case-Specific Workload. (Annual available work minutes per Juvenile Office is 75,761)

Example: Mock Circuit, Total Annual Case-Specific Workload / 75,761 mnts. = Staffing Demand (255,314 / 75,761 mnts. = 3.4 direct service staff needed).

Circuit FTE: Total number of direct service staff currently employed by circuit.

Example: Mock Circuit employs 2 direct service staff. Currently this includes all state-paid DJO I, II & III positions and all full-time staff paid through DYS diversion grant funds.

FTE Need: Additional direct service staff needed to service Total Workload Hours per standards.

Example: Mock Circuit, Staffing Demand – Circuit FTE = FTE Need (3.4 - 2.0 = 1.4 additional direct service staff).

Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload

Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020)		
Section Name	Column Description	Workload Value (Mnts.)
Diversion	Diversion	639.24
Status Cases	Screening (Informal/formal)	1243.58
	Informal Processing	4521.62
	Informal Supervision	1021.78
	Formal Processing	5040.46
	Formal Supervision: All risk levels	2084.64
	Truancy Court	1849.89
Law Cases	Screening (Informal/formal)	1522.67
	Informal Processing	4838.43
	Informal Supervision	783.48
	Formal Processing	16761.28
	Formal Supervision: All risk levels	3296.88
	Juvenile Treatment Court	2116.20
CA/N Cases	Screening (Informal/formal)	1383
	Informal Processing	8942.14
	Informal Supervision	1125.96
	Formal Processing	13055.17
	Formal Supervision and out-of-home placement	367.30
	Protections Orders	261.60
	Family Treatment Court	873.07
Termination of Parental Rights	Screening	1333.13
	Court Related Activity	1333.13

Section 13: CA/N Time Standards

In March 2005, the Supreme Court of Missouri issued an order adopting Court Operating Rule (COR) 23.01, Reporting Requirements for Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, effective July 1, 2005. This COR requires the presiding judge in each circuit to submit a quarterly report (CA/N Quarterly) to OSCA. The CA/N Quarterly Report lists all child abuse and neglect hearings where standards were not met during the quarter. These standards are based on the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 124.01, Rules of Practice and Procedure in Juvenile Divisions and Family Court Divisions of the Circuit, which states that the following hearings shall be held:

- 1) Within three days, excluding Saturday, Sunday and legal holidays, a protective custody hearing
- 2) Within 60 days, an adjudication hearing
- 3) Within 90 days, a dispositional hearing
- 4) Every 90 to 120 days after the dispositional hearing during the first 12 months in which the juvenile is in the custody of the children's division, a dispositional review hearing
- 5) Within 12 months and at least annually thereafter, a permanency hearing
- 6) As often as necessary after each permanency hearing, but at least every six months, during the period in which the juvenile remains in the custody of the children's division, a permanency review hearing.

The data from each circuit is compiled into a final report and submitted to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri and the Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.7 Timeliness of Proceedings and Applicable Time Standards mandates "the juvenile officer shall ensure the timely scheduling of all hearings and not be a party to undue and unnecessary delays. Further, the juvenile officer shall comply with established time standards in the scheduling of hearings to the extent such is in control of the juvenile officer and serves the interest of justice."

Section 13: CA/N Time Standards

	Circuit	Hearings Held	Hearings Held Timely	Percent Held Timely
	1	261	261	100%
	2	677	678	100%
	3	306	320	96%
	4	390	416	94%
	5	371	372	100%
	6	166	166	100%
	7	488	527	93%
	8	80	109	73%
	9	406	413	98%
	10	411	581	71%
	11	825	849	97%
	12	685	685	100%
	13	1,792	1,902	94%
	14	505	557	91%
	15	318	318	100%
	16	4,044	5,656	71%
	17	697	718	97%
	18	377	377	100%
	19	628	648	97%
	20	1,368	1,444	95%
	21	3,778	4,053	93%
	22	1,878	1,942	97%
	23	2,184	2,355	93%
	24	2,007	2,113	95%
	25	2,172	2,181	100%
	26	1,435	1,435	100%
	27	480	482	100%
	28	313	330	95%
	29	1,627	1,640	99%
	30	1,123	1,171	96%
	31	2,945	2,951	100%
	32	1,239	1,357	91%
	33	710	713	100%
	34	755	801	94%
	35	1,095	1,137	96%
	36	772	919	84%
	37	630	640	98%
	38	611	611	100%
	39	1,321	1,321	100%
	40	956	1,078	89%
	41	339	339	100%
	42	1,367	1,474	93%
	43	537	542	99%
	44	711	725	98%
	45	709	730	97%
	46	1,127	1,127	100%
<p>Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely In FY21, the juvenile and family divisions conducted the required CA/N hearings in a timely fashion. Thirty-two divisions held 95% or more of their hearings on time; while at the statewide level, 93% of hearings were held timely.</p>	Statewide	47,616	51,164	93%

Section 14: Juvenile & Family Division Programs and Diversion

Juvenile Officers across the state of Missouri provide a variety of programming to youth and their families on a daily basis to address their particular risk and needs. These programs are intended to decrease recidivism, promote accountability, enhance community safety, enhance child and family safety, and teach prosocial behaviors. The programs detailed below are programs that have been documented in the Justice Information System.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 2.4 Diversion mandates “the juvenile officer shall utilize evidence-based diversion programming whenever appropriate.” Section 3.13 Specialized Services and Treatment mandates “the juvenile officer shall provide specialized services and treatment specific to the offense, gender, and culture of the juvenile to the extent practicable based on available resources.”

These programs are categorized into several main areas listed below:

- **Accountability Programs:** These programs primarily try to teach youth how to take responsibility for their actions and empower them to develop more prosocial behaviors at home, school, and in the community.
- **Alternative Court Programs:** These are specialty court dockets or programs that are meant to address a specific problem area for youth and provide accountability, education, and resources for a specific issue.
- **Anger Management/Conflict Resolution Programs:** These programs are meant to teach youth how to effectively identify their anger and manage it appropriately in a variety of social settings.
- **Diversionary Programs:** Diversionary Programs are programs that are meant to divert youth from various entry points into the juvenile justice system. Diversion programs are divided into four levels based on the time that the offense is committed by the juvenile and when the juvenile participates in the program.
 - Level one diversion programs are used to completely prevent unnecessary referrals from coming to the juvenile office.
 - Level two diversion programs are used when the actions of a juvenile could result in a referral to the juvenile officer.
 - Level three diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile court from formal court action into appropriate community based programs.
 - Level four diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile office from secure confinement or commitment to the Missouri Division of Youth Services so that they can remain in the community.

- **Gender Specific Programs:** These programs provide prosocial interventions and education specific to the needs of boys or girls that are involved with the juvenile justice system.
- **Health and Fitness Programs:** These programs are meant to promote the overall health and well-being of youth referred to the juvenile justice system.
- **Mental Health Programs:** These programs provide a variety of mental health services to a youth or their family that address both the internal and external issues that may be contributing to problematic behaviors by youth.
- **Monitoring Programs:** These programs primarily monitor the whereabouts and activities of youth to promote community safety according to a youth's risk level.
- **Parenting Education and Support Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education, resources, and support to parents or guardians whose children are involved in either the juvenile justice system or child welfare system.
- **Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education and support to youth referred to the court for problem sexual behaviors or sex offenses to try to prevent re-offense and promote more prosocial thought patterns.
- **Prosocial Juvenile Programs:** These programs created by juvenile officers are innovative and may fit into several categories.
- **School and Academic Related Programs:** These are programs that are meant to promote success for youth in school and the educational setting.
- **Sexual Education Programs:** These programs are meant to provide overall education and support to youth involved with the court to improve their health and who are at risk for pregnancy, sexual violence or receiving a sexually transmitted infection.
- **Substance Abuse Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education, treatment, and support to youth who have been referred for substance related offenses or identify as having a substance abuse problem.
- **Victim Education and Restorative Justice Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education to youth regarding the impact of their offense on the victim and promote empathy for the victim. These programs further provide services that are meant to restore for the victim what has been done wrong by the juvenile.
- **Vocational and Life Skills Development Programs:** These are programs that meant to teach youth skills that can help them demonstrate socially appropriate behaviors and gain and retain employment in the community.

Section 14: Juvenile & Family Division Programs and Diversion

<p>Table 14–1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of participants</p> <p>In CY21 there were 8,765 juveniles that participated in court sponsored programs.</p> <p>Monitoring was the most frequently used program category with participants [1,836, 21%].</p> <p>Victim Education and Restorative Justice [1,561, 18%], Vocational or Life Skills [1,317, 15%], and Mental Health [1,150, 13%], were the other most common program categories.</p> <p>Missing Data [0]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Juvenile Program Categories CY21</th> <th>Number of Participants</th> <th>Percent of Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Accountability</td> <td>644</td> <td>7.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative Court</td> <td>152</td> <td>1.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Anger Management/Conflict Resolution</td> <td>194</td> <td>2.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gender Specific Programming</td> <td>247</td> <td>2.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health and Fitness</td> <td>103</td> <td>1.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mental Health</td> <td>1,150</td> <td>13.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring</td> <td>1,836</td> <td>20.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parenting Education and Support</td> <td>251</td> <td>2.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending</td> <td>28</td> <td>0.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prosocial Activities</td> <td>104</td> <td>1.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School or Academic Support</td> <td>286</td> <td>3.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sexual Education</td> <td>10</td> <td>0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Substance Abuse</td> <td>882</td> <td>10.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Victim Education and Restorative Justice</td> <td>1,561</td> <td>17.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vocational and Life Skills Development</td> <td>1,317</td> <td>15.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>8,765</td> <td>100.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Juvenile Program Categories CY21	Number of Participants	Percent of Total	Accountability	644	7.3%	Alternative Court	152	1.7%	Anger Management/Conflict Resolution	194	2.2%	Gender Specific Programming	247	2.8%	Health and Fitness	103	1.2%	Mental Health	1,150	13.1%	Monitoring	1,836	20.9%	Parenting Education and Support	251	2.9%	Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending	28	0.3%	Prosocial Activities	104	1.2%	School or Academic Support	286	3.3%	Sexual Education	10	0.1%	Substance Abuse	882	10.1%	Victim Education and Restorative Justice	1,561	17.8%	Vocational and Life Skills Development	1,317	15.0%	Total	8,765	100.0%
Juvenile Program Categories CY21	Number of Participants	Percent of Total																																																		
Accountability	644	7.3%																																																		
Alternative Court	152	1.7%																																																		
Anger Management/Conflict Resolution	194	2.2%																																																		
Gender Specific Programming	247	2.8%																																																		
Health and Fitness	103	1.2%																																																		
Mental Health	1,150	13.1%																																																		
Monitoring	1,836	20.9%																																																		
Parenting Education and Support	251	2.9%																																																		
Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending	28	0.3%																																																		
Prosocial Activities	104	1.2%																																																		
School or Academic Support	286	3.3%																																																		
Sexual Education	10	0.1%																																																		
Substance Abuse	882	10.1%																																																		
Victim Education and Restorative Justice	1,561	17.8%																																																		
Vocational and Life Skills Development	1,317	15.0%																																																		
Total	8,765	100.0%																																																		
<p>Table 14–2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants</p> <p>In CY21, Juvenile Diversion Programs served 7,149 youth. A youth could have participated in more than one diversion program.</p> <p>Level 1 Diversion programs were the most commonly used with 5,278 participants [74%] followed by Level 2 diversion programs with 1,816 participants [25%].</p> <p>Missing Data [0]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Juvenile Diversion Programs CY21</th> <th>Number of Participants</th> <th>Percent of Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level 1 Diversion</td> <td>5,278</td> <td>73.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2 Diversion</td> <td>1,816</td> <td>25.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3 and 4 Diversion</td> <td>55</td> <td>0.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>7,149</td> <td>100.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Juvenile Diversion Programs CY21	Number of Participants	Percent of Total	Level 1 Diversion	5,278	73.8%	Level 2 Diversion	1,816	25.4%	Level 3 and 4 Diversion	55	0.8%	Total	7,149	100.0%																																				
Juvenile Diversion Programs CY21	Number of Participants	Percent of Total																																																		
Level 1 Diversion	5,278	73.8%																																																		
Level 2 Diversion	1,816	25.4%																																																		
Level 3 and 4 Diversion	55	0.8%																																																		
Total	7,149	100.0%																																																		

During CY2021, over 15,900 youth have been referred to and participated in a variety of programs and services offered by juvenile offices across the state. This section highlights several programs submitted by various juvenile offices around the state and serve as examples of the wide range of beneficial programs and services available to Missouri youth involved with the juvenile justice system.

Sixth Circuit - Youth Accountability Diversion- Adolescents and Parents Together Program

The Platte County Juvenile Office initiated the Youth Accountability Diversion Program in August 1993, which allows youth to participate on a formal or informal basis as a level three diversion program. Since the start of the program, 644 youth have participated in the program. Of the youth who have successfully completed the program and aged out of the juvenile system (turned 18) and were under 21 years old, Missouri Case.net reveals 99% of those youth had no adult criminal convictions in Missouri as of December 31, 2021.

Participation in the Youth Accountability Diversion Program is a privilege. The judge makes the decision whether youth are accepted into the program; therefore, the burden to prove appropriateness is placed upon the youth to show they deserve the opportunity to participate. Youth voluntarily appear before the judge for a contract hearing. Participation requires the cooperation of the youth and custodial parents. The parents, as well as the youth, must agree to attend and complete a variety of programs and activities together. Parental participation is a key to the program's success. The contract sets the time frame and behavioral performance expectations for the youth and parents. If the judge approves the contract, the youth is placed into the diversion program. When the youth successfully completes the terms of the contract, a request is made to the court to dismiss the petition. If the youth fails to complete the contract, an adjudication hearing is scheduled.

The ultimate goal of the Youth Accountability Diversion Program is to impact delinquency offenders through short-term, high impact services to help ensure their continued presence in the home, by the reduction of subsequent referrals for law violations. The diversion program allows intervention as an alternative to court adjudication. Services include monetary restitution, community service, mandatory participation in the adolescent/parent education program, drug prevention program, anger control program, and other services as needed. Youth and their parents who are on informal supervision are also invited to participate in this program to receive additional services as needed. In calendar year 2021, 25 youth and 31 parents participated in the eight-week program.

23rd Circuit – Violence Prevention Project

The Violence Prevention Project is an effort to provide educational and awareness services to a specific population of youth with the intent of diverting these youth from further involvement in the juvenile justice system. The target population for this project are those youth who have been referred to the juvenile office for exhibiting acts of aggressive or assaultive behavior. School districts and law enforcement agencies in Jefferson County are viewed as the primary sources of such referrals. By partnering with the school districts, the opportunity to identify these youth at an early age is afforded. Through early identification, the juvenile office can intervene to prevent further aggressive acts by the youth in the home, school or community and divert the youth from potential formal involvement with the juvenile court.

The Jefferson County Juvenile Office has partnered with Chestnut Health Systems to provide an extensive six-week anger management course to the youth and families in our community. The preferred target age range for these services are juveniles between the ages of twelve years old and sixteen years old. Chestnut provides breakout sessions for both the youth and their parents to provide specific instruction for both groups.

The anticipated goals for this project are to identify and intervene with youth for aggressive and assaultive behaviors at an earlier stage in order to divert them away from the juvenile justice system and potential commitment to the Missouri Division of Youth Services. During calendar year 2021, 16 youth actively participated in this program.

36th Circuit – Juvenile Diversion Program

The Juvenile Diversion Program targets youth nine to 17 years of age. The program provides life skills education which includes drug and alcohol prevention, money management, job application assistance and health/well-being improvement sessions. The program staff implement and deliver classes along with other community partners such as SEMO Behavioral Health, Butler County Health Department and the University of Missouri Extension Office.

The program also provides scheduling and supervision of community service hours. The 36th Circuit Juvenile Diversion Program partners with the University of Missouri Extension Office to plant a community garden maintained on juvenile office grounds. Youth are given community service credit hours for time spent in the garden. The garden allows for the youth to plant, care for and produce vegetables to share with their families and other community members. As part of the programming, youth are given a cooking class where they are shown how to prepare and cook the vegetables grown in the garden. Many of the youth show a lot of pride in their accomplishments and ask to help maintain the garden after their release from the program.

This program encourages youth accountability, to include drug testing, in-patient or out-patient drug/alcohol treatment and mental health referrals. Emphasis is placed on diversion from the Missouri Division of Youth Services and formal court supervision as a level three and level four diversion program.

For calendar year 2021, there were 283 youth served by the program. 209 of those youth were diverted from commitment to the Missouri Division of Youth Services and formal court supervision.

38th Circuit – Christian County Diversionary Services

Christian County Diversionary Services started in 2019. The mission is to maximize the potential for selected students in Christian County and instill hope through a supportive partnership between the student's family, the school, the court system and the community for the purpose of strengthening each student's readiness for the future.

Students and families are selected for diversionary services when the student begins to make a pattern of undesirable choices in school. Those choices could be truancy from school, failure to thrive academically, numerous office referrals in a short amount of time, or a single very serious office referral from someone who isn't normally referred to the office for discipline.

After a student is referred to the program, the Diversion Specialist contacts the family to discuss whether or not the diversion program will work for the family. Since it is a voluntary program, it is essential all stakeholders are fully committed to the success of the child involved in the process.

Once the paperwork is signed and submitted, the student and Diversion Specialist meet many times throughout the week, individually or in a classroom setting, with other students involved in the diversion program. During the individual meetings, goals, struggles and solutions are discussed and agreed upon. During class, the students walk through a curriculum which emphasizes self-awareness, self-assessment and self-regulation. This is done through direct instruction supplemented with activities to help the students build positive relationships with the Diversion Specialist and other students. These positive activities, habits, and relationships help guide the students and give them the support they need to make positive changes necessary for success in the program and in life.

The diversion meetings consist of stakeholders which include the student, parents/guardians, a representative from the juvenile office, a representative from school administration, the Diversion Specialist and the juvenile court judge. If the student is in phase one or two of the program, meetings are held every other week. If the student is in phase three or four of the program, meetings are held every month. The students are monitored closely and through a communication network with counselors, social workers and teachers. The program aims to provide transparency to help in identifying underlying issues which may cause problematic behaviors.

Students enter the program in phase one and staff get to know the student and the family. After some improvements are made with grades, attendance or behavior, the student is usually moved to phase two of the program. In phase two of the program, students continue to meet every other week and focus on goals. During this phase, a “Resilience Plan” is created to help students plan for difficult situations, thoughts and emotions in order to achieve behavior consistency. During phase three, meetings are reduced to once a month and the student is given more opportunities to make positive, independent decisions. The student also writes a letter of self-reflection about positive changes they have made. If the student is successful during this phase, they may be moved to phase four. If there are further negative behaviors, the student may be held on phase three or moved back down to phase two. Finally, in phase four, students create a plan for success for when they leave the program and if positive behaviors continue, the student graduates from the program. After students graduate from the program, the Diversion Specialist continues to meet with the student either monthly or bi-weekly to maintain a positive connection with the student and school.

Everyone involved in diversionary services, including the Ozark School District, the juvenile office and the juvenile court judge are the student’s biggest supporters. Staff work with the families to strengthen bonds, improve the student’s mental and physical well-being and motivate the students to be successful in school and in life.

In calendar year 2021, there were 37 total participants in the program. 18 students graduated from the program successfully, five students were unsuccessful in the program and five students were eventually referred to the juvenile office. The remaining students continue to participate in the program voluntarily.

APPENDICES A-T

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. With Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	0	36	21	26	0	1	0	26	43	36	1	7	51	248
Clark	0	18	10	21	0	0	0	23	14	23	0	0	44	153
Schuyler	0	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	4	0	27
Scotland	0	12	7	2	0	1	0	3	25	7	1	3	7	68
2	0	99	5	0	1	10	0	35	48	10	17	39	28	292
Adair	0	55	4	0	1	6	0	23	12	5	12	31	14	163
Knox	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	1	1	3	37
Lewis	0	22	1	0	0	4	0	10	28	5	4	7	11	92
3	0	51	45	0	0	0	1	19	54	39	8	86	113	416
Grundy	0	14	37	0	0	0	0	12	27	35	7	50	85	267
Harrison	0	17	6	0	0	0	0	1	21	4	1	14	9	73
Mercer	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	14	6	32
Putnam	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	8	13	44
4	0	78	13	0	0	0	0	179	98	3	6	19	121	517
Atchison	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	0	0	2	11	37
Gentry	0	26	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	2	0	23	67
Holt	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	11	20	1	2	4	17	65
Nodaway	0	33	5	0	0	0	0	151	59	2	2	13	67	332
Worth	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	16
5	3	131	53	0	1	6	0	188	499	185	8	183	117	1,374
Andrew	1	11	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	5	1	6	7	50
Buchanan	2	120	50	0	1	6	0	182	489	180	7	177	110	1,324
6	0	36	8	0	0	2	2	33	51	46	24	0	34	236
Platte	0	36	8	0	0	2	2	33	51	46	24	0	34	236
7	5	123	13	0	0	13	4	97	133	20	43	7	266	724
Clay	5	123	13	0	0	13	4	97	133	20	43	7	266	724
8	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	70	17	65	14	0	4	182
Carroll	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5	19	0	0	0	36
Ray	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	60	12	46	14	0	4	146
9	0	46	17	1	0	0	0	29	31	35	4	10	56	229
Chariton	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	16	2	2	17	59
Linn	0	32	12	1	0	0	0	13	9	10	1	6	28	112
Sullivan	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	8	14	9	1	2	11	58
10	94	5	3	3	0	0	0	81	64	11	0	2	8	271
Marion	82	5	2	3	0	0	0	71	61	11	0	2	6	243
Monroe	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	1	22
Ralls	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	6
11	60	109	28	0	0	13	1	32	194	140	106	1	397	1,081
St. Charles	60	109	28	0	0	13	1	32	194	140	106	1	397	1,081
12	0	110	20	3	3	5	0	81	81	132	24	61	40	560
Audrain	0	47	8	3	3	5	0	26	19	51	11	24	22	219
Montgomery	0	34	10	0	0	0	0	23	33	27	10	26	9	172
Warren	0	29	2	0	0	0	0	32	29	54	3	11	9	169
13	1	331	281	0	1	20	0	107	75	537	91	48	40	1,532
Boone	0	225	205	0	0	15	0	105	45	281	76	23	29	1,004
Callaway	1	106	76	0	1	5	0	2	30	256	15	25	11	528
14	0	90	10	0	4	0	44	63	214	35	79	27	566	
Howard	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	8	31	12	23	2	84
Randolph	0	86	8	0	0	3	0	43	55	183	23	56	25	482
15	0	45	17	2	0	4	0	58	38	117	9	11	80	381
Lafayette	0	21	12	0	0	3	0	6	16	83	5	3	49	198
Saline	0	24	5	2	0	1	0	52	22	34	4	8	31	183
16	343	642	80	6	46	175	5	56	41	57	35	156	776	2,418
Jackson	343	642	80	6	46	175	5	56	41	57	35	156	776	2,418

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. With Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
17	0	151	276	1	4	1	2	316	255	352	44	3	50	1,455
Cass	0	108	195	1	1	0	1	250	181	276	17	3	8	1,041
Johnson	0	43	81	0	3	1	1	66	74	76	27	0	42	414
18	0	51	48	1	3	0	0	54	77	148	60	20	50	512
Cooper	0	6	9	0	2	0	0	22	33	61	16	4	18	171
Pettis	0	45	39	1	1	0	0	32	44	87	44	16	32	341
19	4	95	43	5	2	14	2	32	49	195	67	16	157	681
Cole	4	95	43	5	2	14	2	32	49	195	67	16	157	681
20	18	185	24	2	2	7	1	72	85	184	43	6	85	714
Franklin	14	154	20	1	2	4	1	63	74	163	39	5	70	610
Gasconade	0	23	0	0	0	3	0	8	8	15	1	0	9	67
Osage	4	8	4	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	1	6	37
21	164	410	63	82	162	22	4	142	134	795	410	26	1,807	4,221
St. Louis Co.	164	410	63	82	162	22	4	142	134	795	410	26	1,807	4,221
22	30	330	42	2	5	54	8	6	42	80	128	7	412	1,146
St. Louis City	30	330	42	2	5	54	8	6	42	80	128	7	412	1,146
23	23	268	92	0	0	68	1	100	133	449	25	67	59	1,285
Jefferson	23	268	92	0	0	68	1	100	133	449	25	67	59	1,285
24	1	181	46	0	5	23	0	218	22	92	19	33	54	694
Madison	0	25	6	0	0	2	0	21	2	1	0	15	3	75
St. Francois	1	81	34	0	5	18	0	110	13	72	8	15	37	394
St. Genevieve	0	21	4	0	0	1	0	38	5	16	11	2	3	101
Washington	0	54	2	0	0	2	0	49	2	3	0	1	11	124
25	8	307	24	0	0	15	0	738	85	19	24	606	188	2,014
Maries	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	1	0	4	7	39
Phelps	6	138	6	0	0	9	0	233	37	18	4	194	145	790
Pulaski	0	95	9	0	0	5	0	298	20	0	0	190	34	651
Texas	1	64	9	0	0	1	0	191	28	0	20	218	2	534
26	0	151	28	15	3	0	0	107	174	450	31	99	175	1,233
Camden	0	37	2	3	3	0	0	29	30	107	5	32	24	272
Laclede	0	77	9	0	0	0	0	67	107	130	2	38	83	513
Miller	0	25	12	10	0	0	0	10	27	106	17	29	33	269
Moniteau	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	5	0	8	34
Morgan	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	94	2	0	27	145
27	5	97	22	0	0	4	0	182	106	52	17	27	12	524
Bates	0	20	3	0	0	1	0	92	51	24	5	14	11	221
Henry	5	60	16	0	0	3	0	55	39	6	9	6	0	199
St. Clair	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	35	16	22	3	7	1	104
28	0	63	67	0	0	3	2	375	63	240	30	24	60	927
Barton	0	17	24	0	0	2	0	118	21	29	3	5	6	225
Cedar	0	22	5	0	0	0	0	122	16	6	5	6	28	210
Dade	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	27	1	0	1	0	0	34
Vernon	0	21	38	0	0	1	0	108	25	205	21	13	26	458
29	1	226	72	1	3	5	0	27	36	33	1	3	15	423
Jasper	1	226	72	1	3	5	0	27	36	33	1	3	15	423
30	0	149	49	2	0	3	2	64	59	137	57	101	128	751
Benton	0	9	6	0	0	1	1	5	7	28	7	16	6	86
Dallas	0	40	12	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	1	10	27	102
Hickory	0	10	4	2	0	0	0	4	8	17	5	6	6	62
Polk	0	30	21	0	0	1	0	13	21	60	27	17	55	245
Webster	0	60	6	0	0	1	1	38	19	28	17	52	34	256
31	7	375	61	0	5	32	0	9	70	25	50	17	61	712
Greene	7	375	61	0	5	32	0	9	70	25	50	17	61	712
32	1	169	94	1	0	8	0	77	267	179	25	64	56	941
Bollinger	0	26	11	0	0	0	0	2	46	22	3	3	5	118
Cape Girardeau	1	140	57	1	0	8	0	74	98	157	16	61	49	662
Perry	0	3	26	0	0	0	0	1	123	0	6	0	2	161

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. With Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
33	0	83	29	9	0	1	0	65	194	35	9	33	108	566
Mississippi	0	30	15	4	0	0	0	19	46	12	0	9	34	169
Scott	0	53	14	5	0	1	0	46	148	23	9	24	74	397
34	0	98	28	0	0	0	0	116	126	5	4	72	71	520
New Madrid	0	33	5	0	0	0	0	50	71	4	2	14	30	209
Pemiscot	0	65	23	0	0	0	0	66	55	1	2	58	41	311
35	3	194	32	5	0	77	0	150	221	263	14	126	9	1,094
Dunklin	0	42	24	5	0	36	0	21	3	260	0	5	1	397
Stoddard	3	152	8	0	0	41	0	129	218	3	14	121	8	697
36	1	158	74	3	0	5	0	45	65	226	6	20	49	652
Butler	0	128	61	3	0	5	0	38	64	202	5	19	46	571
Ripley	1	30	13	0	0	0	0	7	1	24	1	1	3	81
37	2	112	29	0	1	12	0	110	73	12	16	75	60	502
Carter	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	17	4	0	5	6	12	52
Howell	2	68	25	0	0	11	0	69	55	12	7	53	27	329
Oregon	0	21	2	0	1	1	0	8	4	0	2	7	7	53
Shannon	0	16	1	0	0	0	0	16	10	0	2	9	14	68
38	0	123	19	28	9	1	0	201	104	27	5	218	161	896
Christian	0	123	19	28	9	1	0	201	104	27	5	218	161	896
39	0	214	28	1	0	0	0	307	51	279	47	29	135	1,091
Barry	0	79	12	0	0	0	0	95	21	151	8	7	29	402
Lawrence	0	80	8	1	0	0	0	176	22	38	9	10	95	439
Stone	0	55	8	0	0	0	0	36	8	90	30	12	11	250
40	8	177	32	1	5	46	0	59	68	120	32	108	84	740
McDonald	1	73	24	0	3	17	0	53	49	12	2	28	19	281
Newton	7	104	8	1	2	29	0	6	19	108	30	80	65	459
41	1	43	7	2	0	4	0	53	78	19	4	2	36	249
Macon	1	21	2	1	0	4	0	33	22	16	3	2	30	135
Shelby	0	22	5	1	0	0	0	20	56	3	1	0	6	114
42	13	126	10	3	1	0	0	26	46	34	9	17	25	310
Crawford	3	51	3	0	0	0	0	15	20	21	6	9	16	144
Dent	0	19	4	3	0	0	0	10	18	13	3	7	9	86
Iron	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Reynolds	0	24	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	35
Wayne	10	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	21
43	0	73	19	2	0	3	0	50	96	74	7	89	87	500
Caldwell	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	22	1	10	11	83
Clinton	0	25	5	2	0	2	0	22	9	4	0	9	2	80
Daviess	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	0	13	3	55
DeKalb	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	7	0	7	8	41
Livingston	0	20	9	0	0	1	0	19	47	26	6	50	63	241
44	0	125	11	1	0	11	0	3	35	1	5	9	0	201
Douglas	0	35	2	0	0	5	0	1	1	0	3	2	0	49
Ozark	0	31	1	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	41
Wright	0	59	8	1	0	2	0	2	31	1	2	5	0	111
45	11	78	30	2	2	7	0	20	15	371	14	15	109	674
Lincoln	7	58	29	2	1	2	0	19	3	348	10	8	56	543
Pike	4	20	1	0	1	5	0	1	12	23	4	7	53	131
46	15	186	6	0	1	6	0	33	36	55	34	34	29	435
Taney	15	186	6	0	1	6	0	33	36	55	34	34	29	435
Statewide Total	822	6,934	2,027	210	265	685	35	4,892	4,395	6,598	1,662	2,675	6,490	37,690

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	0	5	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	7	32
Clark	0	3	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	22
Schuyler	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Scotland	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
2	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	20	19	3	13	10	10	85
Adair	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	18	6	2	9	10	9	63
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	5
Lewis	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	3	0	1	17
3	0	9	23	0	0	0	1	2	24	2	7	12	24	104
Grundy	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	6	6	14	55
Harrison	0	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	0	1	5	9	38
Mercer	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Putnam	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	7
4	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	22	39	1	6	4	33	117
Atchison	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	8
Gentry	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	5
Holt	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	2	0	12	25
Nodaway	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	21	27	1	2	3	16	76
Worth	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
5	2	21	22	0	0	2	0	82	45	30	5	42	54	305
Andrew	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	5	15
Buchanan	1	20	20	0	0	2	0	80	43	30	4	41	49	290
6	0	8	7	0	0	0	2	27	42	30	18	0	19	153
Platte	0	8	7	0	0	0	2	27	42	30	18	0	19	153
7	0	29	10	0	0	5	4	88	115	14	39	7	1	312
Clay	0	29	10	0	0	5	4	88	115	14	39	7	1	312
8	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	29	7	10	8	0	2	65
Carroll	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	9
Ray	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	27	5	6	8	0	2	56
9	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	10
Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Linn	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	6
Sullivan	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
10	41	4	2	1	0	0	0	39	18	4	0	2	2	113
Marion	37	4	2	1	0	0	0	38	18	4	0	2	2	108
Monroe	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Ralls	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
11	24	3	24	0	0	7	1	24	119	50	96	1	283	632
St. Charles	24	3	24	0	0	7	1	24	119	50	96	1	283	632
12	0	21	8	2	1	1	0	21	23	17	12	11	11	128
Audrain	0	14	2	2	1	1	0	14	9	10	6	7	4	70
Montgomery	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4	2	1	26
Warren	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	6	2	2	6	32
13	1	30	131	0	0	8	0	47	38	174	49	31	20	529
Boone	0	28	94	0	0	6	0	46	17	66	38	15	17	327
Callaway	1	2	37	0	0	2	0	1	21	108	11	16	3	202
14	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	4	17	21	7	1	6	68
Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	7
Randolph	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	4	15	19	5	0	6	61
15	0	6	10	1	0	2	0	40	27	54	6	3	55	204
Lafayette	0	3	8	0	0	2	0	4	10	31	4	1	35	98
Saline	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	36	17	23	2	2	20	106
16	50	63	57	1	14	76	5	52	30	50	12	93	391	894
Jackson	50	63	57	1	14	76	5	52	30	50	12	93	391	894

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
17	0	8	170	1	2	1	2	114	71	53	22	3	23	470
Cass	0	7	124	1	1	0	1	102	45	45	10	3	1	340
Johnson	0	1	46	0	1	1	1	12	26	8	12	0	22	130
18	0	6	39	1	3	0	0	27	49	48	39	9	30	251
Cooper	0	2	6	0	2	0	0	11	18	15	13	1	7	75
Pettis	0	4	33	1	1	0	0	16	31	33	26	8	23	176
19	1	14	12	4	2	9	2	15	19	89	43	10	14	234
Cole	1	14	12	4	2	9	2	15	19	89	43	10	14	234
20	11	5	18	1	2	1	1	24	48	45	33	0	53	242
Franklin	11	4	14	1	2	1	1	23	44	35	31	0	47	214
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	4	14
Osage	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	2	14
21	19	36	35	22	44	2	4	122	107	319	242	9	927	1,888
St. Louis Co.	19	36	35	22	44	2	4	122	107	319	242	9	927	1,888
22	12	30	26	0	0	8	8	5	25	32	113	5	332	596
St. Louis City	12	30	26	0	0	8	8	5	25	32	113	5	332	596
23	6	17	47	0	0	38	1	64	67	242	22	0	17	521
Jefferson	6	17	47	0	0	38	1	64	67	242	22	0	17	521
24	1	21	44	0	4	3	0	125	14	51	13	10	38	324
Madison	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	11	1	1	0	3	2	24
St. Francois	1	14	32	0	4	3	0	72	7	46	7	5	31	222
Ste. Genevieve	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	19	4	2	6	1	3	40
Washington	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	23	2	2	0	1	2	38
25	0	1	14	0	0	2	0	44	26	1	12	35	21	156
Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Phelps	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	9	7	1	0	14	18	52
Pulaski	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	20	6	0	0	7	3	43
Texas	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	14	13	0	12	13	0	59
26	0	8	26	13	2	0	0	30	58	65	23	4	40	269
Camden	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	12	15	13	2	1	8	58
Laclede	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	15	29	1	1	0	18	76
Miller	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	3	12	33	15	3	8	94
Moniteau	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	1	16
Morgan	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	1	0	5	25
27	0	2	8	0	0	1	0	17	33	2	8	3	5	79
Bates	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	22	1	3	2	5	37
Henry	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	4	1	0	20
St. Clair	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	8	9	1	1	0	0	22
28	0	4	28	0	0	0	2	82	33	90	17	12	15	283
Barton	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	27	11	4	3	3	2	60
Cedar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	9	1	5	3	1	51
Dade	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	1	0	0	10
Vernon	0	2	19	0	0	0	0	18	12	85	8	6	12	162
29	0	21	43	1	3	5	0	24	34	23	1	1	7	163
Jasper	0	21	43	1	3	5	0	24	34	23	1	1	7	163
30	0	8	31	2	0	3	2	54	59	82	36	33	73	383
Benton	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	5	7	20	5	6	4	53
Dallas	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	1	3	9	23
Hickory	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	4	8	10	2	2	5	38
Polk	0	2	18	0	0	1	0	9	21	22	15	10	25	123
Webster	0	4	5	0	0	1	1	33	19	28	13	12	30	146
31	1	21	51	0	3	15	0	6	64	20	48	4	11	244
Greene	1	21	51	0	3	15	0	6	64	20	48	4	11	244
32	1	5	29	0	0	5	0	17	100	37	15	14	32	255
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	4	10
Cape Girardeau	1	5	27	0	0	5	0	17	63	37	11	13	27	206
Perry	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	4	0	1	39

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
33	0	18	15	4	0	1	0	39	69	8	8	23	70	255
Mississippi	0	5	6	1	0	0	0	12	17	4	0	8	24	77
Scott	0	13	9	3	0	1	0	27	52	4	8	15	46	178
34	0	21	28	0	0	0	0	38	42	2	1	7	32	171
New Madrid	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	12	19	1	0	1	13	54
Pemiscot	0	18	23	0	0	0	0	26	23	1	1	6	19	117
35	2	18	15	0	0	26	0	32	46	28	2	11	1	181
Dunklin	0	5	7	0	0	11	0	1	0	26	0	3	1	54
Stoddard	2	13	8	0	0	15	0	31	46	2	2	8	0	127
36	1	7	25	2	0	0	0	38	8	119	6	10	43	259
Butler	0	5	17	2	0	0	0	31	7	109	5	9	40	225
Ripley	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	7	1	10	1	1	3	34
37	2	1	18	0	0	4	0	25	21	3	10	11	26	121
Carter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	0	5	2	7	31
Howell	2	1	15	0	0	3	0	8	11	3	2	7	11	63
Oregon	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	10
Shannon	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	2	2	6	17
38	0	12	9	0	9	1	0	59	59	4	3	39	66	261
Christian	0	12	9	0	9	1	0	59	59	4	3	39	66	261
39	0	9	20	1	0	0	0	91	32	79	29	3	77	341
Barry	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	7	7	36	5	1	24	94
Lawrence	0	2	6	1	0	0	0	58	18	11	8	1	49	154
Stone	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	26	7	32	16	1	4	93
40	2	13	28	0	0	1	0	20	48	54	21	31	60	278
McDonald	1	11	21	0	0	1	0	18	35	9	2	11	11	120
Newton	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	13	45	19	20	49	158
41	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	11	3	3	0	10	37
Macon	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	3	0	9	24
Shelby	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	1	13
42	2	5	8	3	0	0	0	8	15	16	7	5	11	80
Crawford	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	12	6	3	8	45
Dent	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	1	9	4	1	2	3	27
Iron	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Reynolds	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Wayne	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
43	0	6	11	0	0	2	0	11	46	27	3	11	8	125
Caldwell	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	12	1	0	0	31
Clinton	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	1	0	3	0	12
Daviess	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	1	0	16
DeKalb	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	0	1	1	13
Livingston	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	5	21	5	2	6	7	53
44	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	23	1	0	8	0	43
Douglas	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
Ozark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	5
Wright	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	20	1	0	4	0	34
45	7	0	16	0	0	0	0	15	13	64	6	5	40	166
Lincoln	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	14	1	54	2	3	30	124
Pike	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	10	4	2	10	42
46	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	11	16	22	24	4	15	101
Taney	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	11	16	22	24	4	15	101
Statewide Total	188	543	1,150	77	89	229	35	1,662	1,820	2,091	1,089	538	3,017	12,528

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	0	9	8	8	0	1	26	43	34	0	0	20	149
Clark	0	5	6	7	0	0	23	14	23	0	0	17	95
Schuyler	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	12
Scotland	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	25	7	0	0	3	42
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	29	7	4	22	6	83
Adair	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	3	18	1	36
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	1	7
Lewis	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	4	1	4	4	40
3	0	3	13	0	0	0	15	15	35	1	9	50	141
Grundy	0	2	12	0	0	0	10	7	31	1	4	47	114
Harrison	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	0	1	0	14
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Putnam	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	3	10
4	0	3	4	0	0	0	111	42	0	0	11	21	192
Atchison	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	3	20
Gentry	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	9
Holt	0	2	1	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	4	2	21
Nodaway	0	1	1	0	0	0	95	25	0	0	7	9	138
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
5	1	32	13	0	1	1	105	208	154	3	77	26	621
Andrew	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	0	1	2	23
Buchanan	1	29	13	0	1	1	101	200	149	3	76	24	598
6	0	4	1	0	0	0	6	9	16	4	0	5	45
Platte	0	4	1	0	0	0	6	9	16	4	0	5	45
7	0	11	2	0	0	0	9	18	6	4	0	0	50
Clay	0	11	2	0	0	0	9	18	6	4	0	0	50
8	0	0	1	0	0	0	39	9	32	6	0	0	87
Carroll	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	11	0	0	0	19
Ray	0	0	1	0	0	0	33	7	21	6	0	0	68
9	0	6	11	0	0	0	27	25	31	3	7	49	159
Chariton	0	1	1	0	0	0	8	8	16	2	2	17	55
Linn	0	4	9	0	0	0	12	7	9	1	5	25	72
Sullivan	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	10	6	0	0	7	32
10	43	0	0	0	0	0	41	46	7	0	0	6	143
Marion	39	0	0	0	0	0	33	43	7	0	0	4	126
Monroe	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	1	13
Ralls	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	4
11	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	64	76	10	0	95	254
St. Charles	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	64	76	10	0	95	254
12	0	12	5	0	0	0	58	58	109	8	31	21	302
Audrain	0	5	0	0	0	0	12	10	38	5	17	14	101
Montgomery	0	7	5	0	0	0	22	24	26	3	9	4	100
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	24	45	0	5	3	101
13	0	30	122	0	0	9	55	37	346	39	17	16	671
Boone	0	29	98	0	0	8	54	28	208	35	8	11	479
Callaway	0	1	24	0	0	1	1	9	138	4	9	5	192
14	0	32	4	0	0	0	24	41	90	14	39	15	259
Howard	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	19	6	9	1	45
Randolph	0	31	2	0	0	0	23	35	71	8	30	14	214
15	0	1	6	1	0	1	18	10	57	3	7	21	125
Lafayette	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	5	46	1	2	14	75
Saline	0	0	2	1	0	1	16	5	11	2	5	7	50
16	4	10	2	0	3	4	3	10	7	4	0	46	93
Jackson	4	10	2	0	3	4	3	10	7	4	0	46	93

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
17	0	0	74	0	1	0	185	167	81	21	0	21	550
Cass	0	0	55	0	0	0	144	124	64	7	0	3	397
Johnson	0	0	19	0	1	0	41	43	17	14	0	18	153
18	0	9	8	0	0	0	25	24	89	19	10	8	192
Cooper	0	3	2	0	0	0	9	12	35	2	3	5	71
Pettis	0	6	6	0	0	0	16	12	54	17	7	3	121
19	3	12	10	1	0	4	17	28	60	20	5	15	175
Cole	3	12	10	1	0	4	17	28	60	20	5	15	175
20	1	4	5	0	0	0	48	37	139	7	6	31	278
Franklin	1	3	5	0	0	0	40	30	128	5	5	22	239
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	9	1	0	5	27
Osage	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	4	12
21	2	2	0	7	11	1	20	24	397	101	17	450	1,032
St. Louis Co.	2	2	0	7	11	1	20	24	397	101	17	450	1,032
22	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	12	16	6	0	32	72
St. Louis City	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	12	16	6	0	32	72
23	8	11	43	0	0	17	36	66	206	3	1	6	397
Jefferson	8	11	43	0	0	17	36	66	206	3	1	6	397
24	0	1	1	0	0	0	93	8	40	1	10	6	160
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	3	0	14
St. Francois	0	0	1	0	0	0	38	6	26	0	6	4	81
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	14	1	1	0	36
Washington	0	1	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	2	29
25	1	34	8	0	0	8	444	58	11	9	158	64	795
Maries	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	14
Phelps	1	17	3	0	0	4	115	30	11	3	57	45	286
Pulaski	0	7	3	0	0	3	179	14	0	0	51	16	273
Texas	0	9	2	0	0	1	140	14	0	6	49	1	222
26	0	26	2	1	0	0	71	90	73	8	46	66	383
Camden	0	6	0	1	0	0	15	7	23	3	15	9	79
Laclede	0	17	1	0	0	0	48	65	11	1	30	30	203
Miller	0	2	1	0	0	0	7	12	13	2	1	9	47
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	7	15
Morgan	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	1	0	11	39
27	2	3	2	0	0	1	72	53	14	7	12	4	170
Bates	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	20	7	2	5	3	73
Henry	2	3	2	0	0	1	25	27	2	5	3	0	70
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	5	0	4	1	27
28	0	7	24	0	0	2	130	30	105	11	7	3	319
Barton	0	1	9	0	0	2	50	10	2	0	0	0	74
Cedar	0	1	0	0	0	0	46	7	2	0	3	0	59
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Vernon	0	5	15	0	0	0	26	13	101	11	4	3	178
29	1	15	10	0	0	0	3	2	9	0	1	1	42
Jasper	1	15	10	0	0	0	3	2	9	0	1	1	42
30	0	2	1	0	0	0	5	0	25	16	20	17	86
Benton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	3	1	14
Dallas	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4	13
Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	6
Polk	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	11	5	8	41
Webster	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	3	4	12
31	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	0	0	0	16
Greene	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	0	0	0	16
32	0	0	2	1	0	0	22	112	142	7	16	14	316
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	22	0	2	1	63
Cape Girardeau	0	0	2	1	0	0	21	26	120	5	14	12	201
Perry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	2	0	1	52

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
33	0	0	7	3	0	0	21	72	25	1	8	35	172
Mississippi	0	0	6	3	0	0	5	23	7	0	1	9	54
Scott	0	0	1	0	0	0	16	49	18	1	7	26	118
34	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	81	3	2	15	19	197
New Madrid	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	49	3	2	6	7	104
Pemiscot	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	32	0	0	9	12	93
35	1	1	17	0	0	3	65	81	142	4	14	6	334
Dunklin	0	0	17	0	0	3	0	0	141	0	1	0	162
Stoddard	1	1	0	0	0	0	65	81	1	4	13	6	172
36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	75	0	8	2	91
Butler	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	65	0	8	2	81
Ripley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
37	0	5	11	0	0	1	77	40	7	6	14	24	185
Carter	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	5	13
Howell	0	5	10	0	0	1	60	32	7	5	7	11	138
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	4	3	16
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	5	18
38	0	21	9	0	0	0	141	40	12	2	80	46	351
Christian	0	21	9	0	0	0	141	40	12	2	80	46	351
39	0	0	6	0	0	0	37	19	70	16	8	39	195
Barry	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	14	20	3	0	4	44
Lawrence	0	0	1	0	0	0	28	4	9	1	7	29	79
Stone	0	0	3	0	0	0	8	1	41	12	1	6	72
40	2	4	3	0	0	0	25	20	59	10	58	21	202
McDonald	0	2	3	0	0	0	21	14	3	0	11	8	62
Newton	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	56	10	47	13	140
41	0	5	1	1	0	0	45	46	13	1	1	16	129
Macon	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	16	11	0	1	13	69
Shelby	0	4	1	1	0	0	18	30	2	1	0	3	60
42	1	8	1	0	0	0	18	31	15	2	9	5	90
Crawford	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	14	9	0	4	5	43
Dent	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	9	6	2	5	0	32
Iron	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Reynolds	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	11
Wayne	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
43	0	0	8	0	0	0	38	46	34	3	2	11	142
Caldwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	10	0	0	0	21
Clinton	0	0	5	0	0	0	19	2	3	0	0	0	29
Daviess	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	0	0	2	18
DeKalb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	1	0	10
Livingston	0	0	3	0	0	0	14	26	8	3	1	9	64
44	0	4	3	0	0	3	1	12	0	2	0	0	25
Douglas	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Ozark	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Wright	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	11	0	2	0	0	18
45	1	0	7	0	0	1	5	2	173	4	8	17	218
Lincoln	1	0	7	0	0	1	5	2	164	4	5	14	203
Pike	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	3	3	15
46	0	4	3	0	0	1	22	9	33	5	16	9	102
Taney	0	4	3	0	0	1	22	9	33	5	16	9	102
Statewide Total	71	334	459	24	16	63	2,310	1,882	3,079	397	770	1,385	10,790

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	0	22	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	24	67
Clark	0	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	36
Schuyler	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	9
Scotland	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	22
2	0	94	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	7	12	124
Adair	0	50	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	64
Knox	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	25
Lewis	0	22	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	35
3	0	39	9	0	0	0	2	15	2	0	65	39	171
Grundy	0	12	7	0	0	0	2	11	2	0	40	24	98
Harrison	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	0	22
Mercer	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	24
Putnam	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	9	27
4	0	68	1	0	0	0	46	15	2	0	4	66	202
Atchison	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	9
Gentry	0	26	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	19	53
Holt	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	1	0	0	3	19
Nodaway	0	27	0	0	0	0	35	5	1	0	3	41	112
Worth	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
5	0	70	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	36	186
Andrew	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	12
Buchanan	0	63	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	36	174
6	0	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	35
Platte	0	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	35
7	5	83	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	265	362
Clay	5	83	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	265	362
8	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	23	0	0	2	30
Carroll	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	8
Ray	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	2	22
9	0	37	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	1	2	5	60
Chariton	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Linn	0	27	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	34
Sullivan	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	1	4	22
10	10	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
Marion	6	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Monroe	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Ralls	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	33	103	4	0	0	5	0	11	14	0	0	19	189
St. Charles	33	103	4	0	0	5	0	11	14	0	0	19	189
12	0	77	7	1	2	4	2	0	6	4	19	8	130
Audrain	0	28	6	1	2	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	48
Montgomery	0	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4	46
Warren	0	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	4	0	36
13	0	271	28	0	1	3	5	0	17	3	0	4	332
Boone	0	168	13	0	0	1	5	0	7	3	0	1	198
Callaway	0	103	15	0	1	2	0	0	10	0	0	3	134
14	0	46	0	0	0	4	16	5	103	14	39	6	233
Howard	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	4	13	1	32
Randolph	0	43	0	0	0	3	16	5	93	10	26	5	201
15	0	38	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	1	4	49
Lafayette	0	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	22
Saline	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	27
16	272	544	12	5	23	74	1	0	0	1	57	286	1,275
Jackson	272	544	12	5	23	74	1	0	0	1	57	286	1,275

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
17	0	141	26	0	1	0	17	16	217	1	0	6	425
Cass	0	101	15	0	0	0	4	11	167	0	0	4	302
Johnson	0	40	11	0	1	0	13	5	50	1	0	2	123
18	0	36	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	2	0	12	67
Cooper	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	1	0	6	25
Pettis	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	42
19	0	68	21	0	0	1	0	2	45	2	0	128	267
Cole	0	68	21	0	0	1	0	2	45	2	0	128	267
20	6	176	1	1	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	1	194
Franklin	2	147	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	157
Gasconade	0	23	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Osage	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
21	124	362	24	38	67	12	0	2	79	67	0	422	1,197
St. Louis Co.	124	362	24	38	67	12	0	2	79	67	0	422	1,197
22	17	287	6	2	5	40	0	5	32	7	0	48	449
St. Louis City	17	287	6	2	5	40	0	5	32	7	0	48	449
23	9	240	2	0	0	12	0	0	1	0	66	36	366
Jefferson	9	240	2	0	0	12	0	0	1	0	66	36	366
24	0	157	1	0	1	20	0	0	1	4	13	10	207
Madison	0	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	37
St. Francois	0	65	1	0	1	15	0	0	0	1	4	2	89
Ste. Genevieve	0	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	24
Washington	0	47	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	57
25	7	272	2	0	0	5	250	1	7	3	413	103	1,063
Maries	1	9	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	2	5	23
Phelps	5	120	2	0	0	4	109	0	6	1	123	82	452
Pulaski	0	88	0	0	0	1	99	0	0	0	132	15	335
Texas	1	55	0	0	0	0	37	1	0	2	156	1	253
26	0	117	0	0	1	0	6	26	312	0	49	69	580
Camden	0	30	0	0	1	0	2	8	71	0	16	7	135
Laclede	0	56	0	0	0	0	4	13	118	0	8	35	234
Miller	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	0	25	16	127
Moniteau	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Morgan	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	62	0	0	11	81
27	3	92	12	0	0	2	91	19	36	2	12	3	272
Bates	0	20	3	0	0	0	51	8	16	0	7	3	108
Henry	3	55	9	0	0	2	24	10	4	0	2	0	109
St. Clair	0	17	0	0	0	0	16	1	16	2	3	0	55
28	0	52	15	0	0	1	159	0	43	1	5	40	316
Barton	0	15	6	0	0	0	39	0	23	0	2	4	89
Cedar	0	21	5	0	0	0	44	0	3	0	0	27	100
Dade	0	2	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	16
Vernon	0	14	4	0	0	1	62	0	17	1	3	9	111
29	0	190	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	218
Jasper	0	190	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	218
30	0	139	17	0	0	0	5	0	29	5	48	38	281
Benton	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	19
Dallas	0	39	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	65
Hickory	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	1	18
Polk	0	28	2	0	0	0	3	0	23	1	2	22	81
Webster	0	55	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	37	0	98
31	6	353	9	0	2	16	0	0	1	2	13	50	452
Greene	6	353	9	0	2	16	0	0	1	2	13	50	452
32	0	164	63	0	0	3	38	55	0	3	34	10	370
Bollinger	0	26	11	0	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	45
Cape Girardeau	0	135	28	0	0	3	36	9	0	0	34	10	255
Perry	0	3	24	0	0	0	1	42	0	0	0	0	70

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
33	0	59	7	1	0	0	2	43	1	0	2	3	118
Mississippi	0	21	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	28
Scott	0	38	4	1	0	0	2	40	1	0	2	2	90
34	0	77	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	50	20	152
New Madrid	0	30	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	7	10	51
Pemiscot	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	43	10	101
35	0	175	0	5	0	48	53	94	93	8	101	2	579
Dunklin	0	37	0	5	0	22	20	3	93	0	1	0	181
Stoddard	0	138	0	0	0	26	33	91	0	8	100	2	398
36	0	151	49	0	0	5	4	55	32	0	2	4	302
Butler	0	123	44	0	0	5	4	55	28	0	2	4	265
Ripley	0	28	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	37
37	0	105	0	0	1	7	8	12	2	0	50	10	195
Carter	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8
Howell	0	61	0	0	0	7	1	12	2	0	39	5	127
Oregon	0	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	27
Shannon	0	16	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7	3	33
38	0	90	1	28	0	0	1	5	11	0	99	49	284
Christian	0	90	1	28	0	0	1	5	11	0	99	49	284
39	0	204	0	0	0	0	179	0	130	2	18	19	552
Barry	0	74	0	0	0	0	87	0	95	0	6	1	263
Lawrence	0	77	0	0	0	0	90	0	18	0	2	17	204
Stone	0	53	0	0	0	0	2	0	17	2	10	1	85
40	4	160	1	1	5	45	14	0	7	1	19	3	260
McDonald	0	60	0	0	3	16	14	0	0	0	6	0	99
Newton	4	100	1	1	2	29	0	0	7	1	13	3	161
41	0	38	3	0	0	4	3	21	3	0	1	10	83
Macon	0	20	0	0	0	4	3	4	2	0	1	8	42
Shelby	0	18	3	0	0	0	0	17	1	0	0	2	41
42	10	113	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	9	140
Crawford	3	47	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	56
Dent	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	27
Iron	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Reynolds	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Wayne	7	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	16
43	0	67	0	2	0	1	1	4	13	1	76	68	233
Caldwell	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	31
Clinton	0	24	0	2	0	0	1	4	0	0	6	2	39
Daviess	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	21
DeKalb	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	18
Livingston	0	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	1	43	47	124
44	0	120	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	3	1	0	133
Douglas	0	34	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	41
Ozark	0	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Wright	0	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	59
45	3	78	4	2	2	6	0	0	134	4	2	52	287
Lincoln	1	58	4	2	1	1	0	0	130	4	0	12	213
Pike	2	20	0	0	1	5	0	0	4	0	2	40	74
46	14	176	1	0	1	5	0	11	0	5	14	5	232
Taney	14	176	1	0	1	5	0	11	0	5	14	5	232
Statewide Total	523	5,977	382	92	114	358	910	430	1,418	150	1,357	2,023	13,734

Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	6
Nodaway	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	6
5	0	8	2	0	0	3	1	246	1	0	0	1	262
Buchanan	0	8	2	0	0	3	1	246	1	0	0	1	262
6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
Platte	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
11	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
St. Charles	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
14	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Randolph	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Lafayette	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
16	17	25	9	0	6	21	0	1	0	18	6	53	156
Jackson	17	25	9	0	6	21	0	1	0	18	6	53	156
17	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10
Cass	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Johnson	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Pettis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	5
Cole	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	5
21	19	10	4	15	40	7	0	1	0	0	0	8	104
St. Louis Co.	19	10	4	15	40	7	0	1	0	0	0	8	104
22	1	11	10	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	29
St. Louis City	1	11	10	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	29
23	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
24	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
St. Francois	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
26	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Miller	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
27	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Bates	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
28	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	2	9
Barton	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Vernon	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	7
30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Dallas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
33	0	6	0	1	0	0	3	10	1	0	0	0	21
Mississippi	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	10
Scott	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	11
37	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Howell	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
39	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Barry	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lawrence	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
45	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Lincoln	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Statewide Total	40	80	36	17	46	35	10	263	10	26	10	65	638

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Misc.	People	Property	Peace Disturb	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
1	0	23	6	1	2	149	67	248
Clark	0	19	1	1	1	95	36	153
Schuyler	0	3	3	0	0	12	9	27
Scotland	0	1	2	0	1	42	22	68
2	5	37	30	3	10	83	124	292
Adair	3	33	19	2	6	36	64	163
Knox	0	0	4	0	1	7	25	37
Lewis	2	4	7	1	3	40	35	92
3	5	42	42	3	12	141	171	416
Grundy	0	22	25	0	8	114	98	267
Harrison	2	15	15	3	3	14	22	74
Mercer	2	2	0	0	0	3	24	31
Putnam	1	3	2	0	1	10	27	44
4	18	25	42	11	27	192	202	517
Atchison	1	5	0	0	2	20	9	37
Gentry	0	2	3	0	0	9	53	67
Holt	2	2	19	0	2	21	19	65
Nodaway	15	14	19	11	23	138	112	332
Worth	0	2	1	0	0	4	9	16
5	386	91	46	25	19	621	186	1,374
Andrew	5	2	3	3	2	23	12	50
Buchanan	381	89	43	22	17	598	174	1,324
6	47	46	16	11	36	45	35	236
Platte	47	46	16	11	36	45	35	236
7	13	136	109	10	44	50	362	724
Clay	13	136	109	10	44	50	362	724
8	4	33	19	0	9	87	30	182
Carroll	0	5	1	0	3	19	8	36
Ray	4	28	18	0	6	68	22	146
9	0	5	4	0	1	159	60	229
Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	55	4	59
Linn	0	4	2	0	0	72	34	112
Sullivan	0	1	2	0	1	32	22	58
10	14	36	15	34	14	143	15	271
Marion	14	34	14	33	13	126	9	243
Monroe	0	1	1	0	1	13	6	22
Ralls	0	1	0	1	0	4	0	6
11	75	272	195	26	70	254	189	1,081
St. Charles	75	272	195	26	70	254	189	1,081
12	31	53	32	2	10	302	130	560
Audrain	19	22	23	1	5	101	48	219
Montgomery	9	9	4	1	3	100	46	172
Warren	3	22	5	0	2	101	36	169
13	38	224	147	59	61	671	332	1,532
Boone	21	135	110	23	38	479	198	1,004
Callaway	17	89	37	36	23	192	134	528
14	8	25	21	11	9	259	233	566
Howard	0	2	3	1	1	45	32	84
Randolph	8	23	18	10	8	214	201	482
15	51	82	38	13	23	125	49	381
Lafayette	22	30	20	9	20	75	22	198
Saline	29	52	18	4	3	50	27	183
16	245	426	264	50	65	93	1,275	2,418
Jackson	245	426	264	50	65	93	1,275	2,418

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Misc.	People	Property	Peace Disturb	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
17	69	240	91	17	63	550	425	1,455
Cass	33	186	70	6	47	397	302	1,041
Johnson	36	54	21	11	16	153	123	414
18	18	95	71	26	43	192	67	512
Cooper	7	35	11	18	4	71	25	171
Pettis	11	60	60	8	39	121	42	341
19	28	75	67	45	24	175	267	681
Cole	28	75	67	45	24	175	267	681
20	13	92	61	30	46	278	194	714
Franklin	11	78	54	29	42	239	157	610
Gasconade	1	8	4	0	1	27	26	67
Osage	1	6	3	1	3	12	11	37
21	314	653	797	67	161	1,032	1,197	4,221
St. Louis Co.	314	653	797	67	161	1,032	1,197	4,221
22	77	176	330	11	31	72	449	1,146
St. Louis City	77	176	330	11	31	72	449	1,146
23	57	284	85	22	74	397	366	1,285
Jefferson	57	284	85	22	74	397	366	1,285
24	21	148	102	18	38	160	207	694
Madison	2	13	6	0	3	14	37	75
St. Francois	12	105	71	14	22	81	89	394
Ste. Genevieve	4	15	11	3	8	36	24	101
Washington	3	15	14	1	5	29	57	124
25	21	43	58	6	28	795	1,063	2,014
Maries	0	1	1	0	0	14	23	39
Phelps	1	22	21	2	6	286	452	790
Pulaski	7	10	11	3	12	273	335	651
Texas	13	10	25	1	10	222	253	534
26	69	105	42	14	40	383	580	1,233
Camden	6	28	8	2	14	79	135	272
Laclede	7	35	12	10	12	203	234	513
Miller	52	16	13	2	12	47	127	269
Moniteau	3	9	3	0	1	15	3	34
Morgan	1	17	6	0	1	39	81	145
27	15	30	26	2	9	170	272	524
Bates	9	13	11	1	6	73	108	221
Henry	5	9	4	0	2	70	109	199
St. Clair	1	8	11	1	1	27	55	104
28	71	123	54	18	26	319	316	927
Barton	20	22	6	7	7	74	89	225
Cedar	9	24	11	4	3	59	100	210
Dade	2	3	4	0	1	8	16	34
Vernon	40	74	33	7	15	178	111	458
29	15	81	42	6	19	42	218	423
Jasper	15	81	42	6	19	42	218	423
30	24	178	87	27	68	86	281	751
Benton	2	23	16	1	11	14	19	86
Dallas	3	11	3	3	4	13	65	102
Hickory	1	12	12	3	10	6	18	62
Polk	3	70	25	9	16	41	81	245
Webster	15	62	31	11	27	12	98	256
31	13	145	62	8	16	16	452	712
Greene	13	145	62	8	16	16	452	712
32	58	87	64	23	23	316	370	941
Bollinger	1	8	0	0	1	63	45	118
Cape Girardeau	47	70	57	20	12	201	255	662
Perry	10	9	7	3	10	52	70	161

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Misc.	People	Property	Peace Disturb	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
33	57	110	43	46	20	172	118	566
Mississippi	20	34	16	15	2	54	28	169
Scott	37	76	27	31	18	118	90	397
34	13	51	53	23	31	197	152	520
New Madrid	6	11	16	10	11	104	51	209
Pemiscot	7	40	37	13	20	93	101	311
35	43	45	21	53	19	334	579	1,094
Dunklin	15	16	7	8	8	162	181	397
Stoddard	28	29	14	45	11	172	398	697
36	21	126	62	20	30	91	302	652
Butler	17	116	49	20	23	81	265	571
Ripley	4	10	13	0	7	10	37	81
37	21	40	38	8	15	185	195	502
Carter	10	7	7	2	5	13	8	52
Howell	7	28	24	1	4	138	127	329
Oregon	1	3	5	0	1	16	27	53
Shannon	3	2	2	5	5	18	33	68
38	31	113	65	14	38	351	284	896
Christian	31	113	65	14	38	351	284	896
39	57	161	82	4	40	195	552	1,091
Barry	15	42	24	2	12	44	263	402
Lawrence	26	72	39	1	18	79	204	439
Stone	16	47	19	1	10	72	85	250
40	51	92	58	34	43	202	260	740
McDonald	31	26	30	11	22	62	99	281
Newton	20	66	28	23	21	140	161	459
41	23	7	4	1	2	129	83	249
Macon	14	5	3	0	2	69	42	135
Shelby	9	2	1	1	0	60	41	114
42	19	19	23	1	18	90	140	310
Crawford	8	16	11	0	10	43	56	144
Dent	9	2	10	0	6	32	27	86
Iron	0	0	1	0	0	2	21	24
Reynolds	2	0	1	0	1	11	20	35
Wayne	0	1	0	1	1	2	16	21
43	7	54	32	13	19	142	233	500
Caldwell	3	13	9	2	4	21	31	83
Clinton	2	6	2	0	2	29	39	80
Daviess	0	10	2	2	2	18	21	55
DeKalb	1	5	1	5	1	10	18	41
Livingston	1	20	18	4	10	64	124	241
44	6	21	9	4	3	25	133	201
Douglas	1	1	1	1	0	4	41	49
Ozark	0	5	0	0	0	3	33	41
Wright	5	15	8	3	3	18	59	111
45	19	69	30	32	19	218	287	674
Lincoln	12	55	20	32	8	203	213	543
Pike	7	14	10	0	11	15	74	131
46	8	31	21	12	29	102	232	435
Taney	8	31	21	12	29	102	232	435
Statewide Total	2,199	5,050	3,606	864	1,447	10,790	13,734	37,690

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Misd. A	Misd. B	Misd. C	Misd. D	Misd. U	Ordinance	Total
1	2	1	1	11	2	1	0	3	9	0	2	0	0	32
Clark	1	1	0	5	2	0	0	3	9	0	1	0	0	22
Schuyler	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Scotland	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
2	0	0	0	14	10	2	11	22	10	1	15	0	0	85
Adair	0	0	0	12	9	2	9	16	7	1	7	0	0	63
Knox	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	5
Lewis	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	1	0	7	0	0	17
3	0	3	0	19	14	4	2	19	16	6	21	0	0	104
Grundy	0	1	0	7	7	0	0	12	9	5	14	0	0	55
Harrison	0	1	0	10	5	3	1	6	7	0	5	0	0	38
Mercer	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Putnam	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	7
4	0	2	1	3	7	0	1	37	19	12	33	2	0	117
Atchison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	2	0	0	8
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	5
Holt	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	0	4	2	0	25
Nodaway	0	2	1	3	4	0	1	26	4	9	26	0	0	76
Worth	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
5	6	3	0	26	26	1	22	85	17	39	18	0	62	305
Andrew	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	6	2	0	3	0	1	15
Buchanan	6	3	0	24	25	1	22	79	15	39	15	0	61	290
6	2	5	1	12	7	3	30	31	17	13	32	0	0	153
Platte	2	5	1	12	7	3	30	31	17	13	32	0	0	153
7	9	4	0	33	20	14	0	64	57	49	58	4	0	312
Clay	9	4	0	33	20	14	0	64	57	49	58	4	0	312
8	0	1	0	4	3	1	5	34	9	1	7	0	0	65
Carroll	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	9
Ray	0	1	0	3	2	0	5	30	9	1	5	0	0	56
9	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	10
Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Linn	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Sullivan	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
10	7	4	0	7	5	0	3	23	37	5	11	0	11	113
Marion	7	4	0	7	5	0	3	21	35	4	11	0	11	108
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Ralls	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
11	9	12	6	81	57	10	11	236	93	15	100	1	1	632
St. Charles	9	12	6	81	57	10	11	236	93	15	100	1	1	632
12	1	8	1	15	17	4	1	30	13	6	15	0	17	128
Audrain	1	7	0	6	8	3	0	11	12	2	8	0	12	70
Montgomery	0	0	0	4	5	0	1	5	0	2	4	0	5	26
Warren	0	1	1	5	4	1	0	14	1	2	3	0	0	32
13	10	13	4	69	37	7	3	213	98	25	50	0	0	529
Boone	10	13	3	48	19	4	0	132	58	12	28	0	0	327
Callaway	0	0	1	21	18	3	3	81	40	13	22	0	0	202
14	0	0	0	10	3	0	7	14	25	7	2	0	0	68
Howard	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	7
Randolph	0	0	0	9	3	0	7	13	22	6	1	0	0	61
15	1	2	2	11	17	2	6	93	7	9	22	7	25	204
Lafayette	0	2	2	9	7	0	2	39	6	4	17	3	7	98
Saline	1	0	0	2	10	2	4	54	1	5	5	4	18	106
16	85	91	23	197	112	48	3	245	44	14	28	0	4	894
Jackson	85	91	23	197	112	48	3	245	44	14	28	0	4	894

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Misd. A	Misd. B	Misd. C	Misd. D	Misd. U	Ordinance	Total
17	10	13	1	53	45	18	26	193	36	18	57	0	0	470
Cass	4	12	1	42	28	10	18	150	23	10	42	0	0	340
Johnson	6	1	0	11	17	8	8	43	13	8	15	0	0	130
18	8	6	1	21	32	1	4	91	37	4	45	1	0	251
Cooper	4	4	0	2	13	1	0	40	4	0	6	1	0	75
Pettis	4	2	1	19	19	0	4	51	33	4	39	0	0	176
19	2	4	0	22	19	1	0	91	64	3	28	0	0	234
Cole	2	4	0	22	19	1	0	91	64	3	28	0	0	234
20	2	2	3	23	26	3	0	60	52	18	51	1	1	242
Franklin	2	2	2	19	23	2	0	52	45	17	49	1	0	214
Gasconade	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	4	4	1	0	0	1	14
Osage	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	4	3	0	2	0	0	14
21	56	74	9	412	110	48	18	773	239	58	79	3	9	1,888
St. Louis Co.	56	74	9	412	110	48	18	773	239	58	79	3	9	1,888
22	34	27	1	182	46	7	1	203	58	3	25	0	9	596
St. Louis City	34	27	1	182	46	7	1	203	58	3	25	0	9	596
23	6	17	10	44	69	9	6	255	54	10	36	0	5	521
Jefferson	6	17	10	44	69	9	6	255	54	10	36	0	5	521
24	4	6	1	50	37	5	5	96	40	44	33	0	3	324
Madison	0	0	0	3	4	0	2	8	3	0	3	0	1	24
St. Francois	4	5	1	37	19	4	3	68	24	38	18	0	1	222
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	12	7	4	8	0	1	40
Washington	0	1	0	5	12	0	0	8	6	2	4	0	0	38
25	2	5	3	20	15	2	0	46	19	6	35	0	3	156
Maries	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Phelps	2	4	0	1	5	0	0	23	7	1	9	0	0	52
Pulaski	0	0	2	6	3	1	0	11	5	4	11	0	0	43
Texas	0	1	0	13	6	1	0	12	7	1	15	0	3	59
26	7	8	1	30	22	3	2	69	28	39	30	2	28	269
Camden	1	2	0	2	6	0	1	13	7	13	12	0	1	58
Laclede	0	0	1	6	4	1	1	22	12	17	10	0	2	76
Miller	6	3	0	13	5	2	0	18	9	3	8	2	25	94
Moniteau	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	16
Morgan	0	2	0	8	1	0	0	8	0	6	0	0	0	25
27	0	2	0	10	9	1	2	18	10	13	10	0	4	79
Bates	0	1	0	4	2	0	2	10	7	5	6	0	0	37
Henry	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	3	2	2	2	0	4	20
St. Clair	0	1	0	3	4	0	0	5	1	6	2	0	0	22
28	3	3	0	18	28	3	46	101	38	8	25	0	10	283
Barton	0	0	0	1	3	1	19	19	9	2	6	0	0	60
Cedar	2	1	0	4	7	2	1	14	6	2	3	0	9	51
Dade	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	10
Vernon	1	1	0	11	16	0	26	65	21	4	16	0	1	162
29	6	8	3	30	23	1	2	53	20	5	12	0	0	163
Jasper	6	8	3	30	23	1	2	53	20	5	12	0	0	163
30	0	3	2	30	54	4	6	133	56	15	79	0	1	383
Benton	0	1	1	6	3	0	0	25	8	1	8	0	0	53
Dallas	0	1	0	2	3	0	1	8	4	0	4	0	0	23
Hickory	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	11	8	0	9	0	0	38
Polk	0	0	0	6	31	3	0	45	18	0	19	0	1	123
Webster	0	1	1	13	10	1	5	44	18	14	39	0	0	146
31	2	5	0	48	51	7	0	90	9	6	26	0	0	244
Greene	2	5	0	48	51	7	0	90	9	6	26	0	0	244
32	3	12	2	42	30	8	3	50	40	12	16	1	36	255
Bollinger	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	10
Cape Girardeau	1	10	2	38	26	7	1	45	29	12	8	1	26	206
Perry	1	1	0	3	2	1	2	5	7	0	8	0	9	39

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Misd. A	Misd. B	Misd. C	Misd. D	Misd. U	Ordinance	Total
33	5	9	1	20	19	7	6	78	74	10	21	0	5	255
Mississippi	2	2	0	10	3	2	3	24	22	5	4	0	0	77
Scott	3	7	1	10	16	5	3	54	52	5	17	0	5	178
34	0	5	0	27	31	1	2	47	32	1	25	0	0	171
New Madrid	0	0	0	3	14	1	1	13	12	1	9	0	0	54
Pemiscot	0	5	0	24	17	0	1	34	20	0	16	0	0	117
35	1	6	1	20	18	2	1	44	46	17	21	0	4	181
Dunklin	0	5	0	11	6	2	0	7	9	5	6	0	3	54
Stoddard	1	1	1	9	12	0	1	37	37	12	15	0	1	127
36	1	2	3	26	46	3	6	84	59	1	27	0	1	259
Butler	1	2	3	19	36	3	6	74	54	1	25	0	1	225
Ripley	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	10	5	0	2	0	0	34
37	5	4	1	19	11	3	6	30	15	11	13	0	3	121
Carter	0	1	0	3	4	0	5	5	4	1	8	0	0	31
Howell	5	2	0	12	5	3	1	16	8	9	0	0	2	63
Oregon	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	10
Shannon	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	7	1	0	5	0	1	17
38	5	5	3	34	22	0	0	108	32	24	27	0	1	261
Christian	5	5	3	34	22	0	0	108	32	24	27	0	1	261
39	1	3	21	72	44	1	8	108	44	4	6	25	4	341
Barry	0	2	5	22	11	1	0	36	6	0	1	8	2	94
Lawrence	1	1	9	26	22	0	5	46	22	1	3	16	2	154
Stone	0	0	7	24	11	0	3	26	16	3	2	1	0	93
40	2	8	4	27	38	2	17	96	42	7	35	0	0	278
McDonald	0	4	1	18	21	1	5	38	14	1	17	0	0	120
Newton	2	4	3	9	17	1	12	58	28	6	18	0	0	158
41	3	2	0	3	2	1	0	5	1	6	2	0	12	37
Macon	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	4	0	4	1	0	8	24
Shelby	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	4	13
42	1	4	0	16	9	4	2	17	9	4	14	0	0	80
Crawford	1	1	0	5	6	3	0	10	7	2	10	0	0	45
Dent	0	3	0	7	0	1	2	6	2	2	4	0	0	27
Iron	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Reynolds	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Wayne	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
43	2	3	2	5	10	0	0	33	20	23	27	0	0	125
Caldwell	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	10	7	6	0	0	31
Clinton	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	12
Daviess	1	2	0	0	4	0	0	6	1	1	1	0	0	16
DeKalb	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	9	0	1	1	0	0	13
Livingston	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	10	9	14	17	0	0	53
44	1	0	1	11	7	0	2	13	6	1	1	0	0	43
Douglas	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Ozark	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
Wright	1	0	0	9	5	0	2	12	4	0	1	0	0	34
45	2	0	2	18	27	0	2	60	36	4	15	0	0	166
Lincoln	1	0	2	10	20	0	1	48	31	2	9	0	0	124
Pike	1	0	0	8	7	0	1	12	5	2	6	0	0	42
46	0	1	0	11	14	1	1	31	5	7	30	0	0	101
Taney	0	1	0	11	14	1	1	31	5	7	30	0	0	101
Statewide Total	306	396	115	1,857	1,251	247	279	4,229	1,693	584	1,265	47	259	12,528

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
1	19	0	48	67
Clark	9	0	27	36
Schuyler	7	0	2	9
Scotland	3	0	19	22
2	8	0	116	124
Adair	3	0	61	64
Knox	1	0	24	25
Lewis	4	0	31	35
3	16	1	154	171
Grundy	15	0	83	98
Harrison	1	1	20	22
Mercer	0	0	24	24
Putnam	0	0	27	27
4	18	5	179	202
Atchison	1	0	8	9
Gentry	0	0	53	53
Holt	6	2	11	19
Nodaway	11	3	98	112
Worth	0	0	9	9
5	88	0	98	186
Andrew	5	0	7	12
Buchanan	83	0	91	174
6	10	0	25	35
Platte	10	0	25	35
7	5	17	340	362
Clay	5	17	340	362
8	24	0	6	30
Carroll	4	0	4	8
Ray	20	0	2	22
9	0	4	56	60
Chariton	0	0	4	4
Linn	0	1	33	34
Sullivan	0	3	19	22
10	2	2	11	15
Marion	2	2	5	9
Monroe	0	0	6	6
Ralls	0	0	0	0
11	27	27	135	189
St. Charles	27	27	135	189
12	29	3	98	130
Audrain	15	1	32	48
Montgomery	13	2	31	46
Warren	1	0	35	36
13	3	12	317	332
Boone	3	6	189	198
Callaway	0	6	128	134
14	109	0	124	233
Howard	17	0	15	32
Randolph	92	0	109	201
15	5	24	20	49
Lafayette	3	1	18	22
Saline	2	23	2	27
16	257	191	827	1,275
Jackson	257	191	827	1,275

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
17	4	65	356	425
Cass	0	28	274	302
Johnson	4	37	82	123
18	11	12	44	67
Cooper	9	5	11	25
Pettis	2	7	33	42
19	59	0	208	267
Cole	59	0	208	267
20	0	0	194	194
Franklin	0	0	157	157
Gasconade	0	0	26	26
Osage	0	0	11	11
21	376	192	629	1,197
St. Louis Co.	376	192	629	1,197
22	41	70	338	449
St. Louis City	41	70	338	449
23	100	68	198	366
Jefferson	100	68	198	366
24	26	1	180	207
Madison	5	0	32	37
St. Francois	9	1	79	89
Ste. Genevieve	4	0	20	24
Washington	8	0	49	57
25	247	23	793	1,063
Maries	2	1	20	23
Phelps	72	19	361	452
Pulaski	88	2	245	335
Texas	85	1	167	253
26	83	315	182	580
Camden	21	60	54	135
Laclede	33	120	81	234
Miller	28	71	28	127
Moniteau	0	0	3	3
Morgan	1	64	16	81
27	71	15	186	272
Bates	28	3	77	108
Henry	17	10	82	109
St. Clair	26	2	27	55
28	28	2	286	316
Barton	4	0	85	89
Cedar	10	1	89	100
Dade	5	0	11	16
Vernon	9	1	101	111
29	15	1	202	218
Jasper	15	1	202	218
30	37	36	208	281
Benton	3	1	15	19
Dallas	10	4	51	65
Hickory	0	8	10	18
Polk	12	21	48	81
Webster	12	2	84	98
31	60	50	342	452
Greene	60	50	342	452
32	36	2	332	370
Bollinger	0	0	45	45
Cape Girardeau	36	2	217	255
Perry	0	0	70	70

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
33	1	0	117	118
Mississippi	0	0	28	28
Scott	1	0	89	90
34	38	1	113	152
New Madrid	16	0	35	51
Pemiscot	22	1	78	101
35	29	108	442	579
Dunklin	0	0	181	181
Stoddard	29	108	261	398
36	7	0	295	302
Butler	7	0	258	265
Ripley	0	0	37	37
37	19	94	82	195
Carter	1	4	3	8
Howell	14	59	54	127
Oregon	2	16	9	27
Shannon	2	15	16	33
38	70	31	183	284
Christian	70	31	183	284
39	17	204	331	552
Barry	4	74	185	263
Lawrence	2	77	125	204
Stone	11	53	21	85
40	10	1	249	260
McDonald	2	1	96	99
Newton	8	0	153	161
41	11	4	68	83
Macon	4	3	35	42
Shelby	7	1	33	41
42	4	1	135	140
Crawford	2	0	54	56
Dent	2	1	24	27
Iron	0	0	21	21
Reynolds	0	0	20	20
Wayne	0	0	16	16
43	80	4	149	233
Caldwell	11	0	20	31
Clinton	16	0	23	39
Daviess	15	0	6	21
DeKalb	7	0	11	18
Livingston	31	4	89	124
44	1	8	124	133
Douglas	0	3	38	41
Ozark	0	0	33	33
Wright	1	5	53	59
45	10	15	262	287
Lincoln	9	11	193	213
Pike	1	4	69	74
46	5	39	188	232
Taney	5	39	188	232
Statewide Total	2,116	1,648	9,970	13,734

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Muni - Carry Gun / Unlocked	Muni - Curfew	Muni - Other Violation	Muni- Pedestrian Violation	Muni - Possession/ Discharge Arms	Muni- Solicit without Permission	Muni-Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
1	88	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	149
Clark	52	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	95
Schuyler	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12
Scotland	31	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	42
2	24	21	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	83
Adair	10	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	36
Knox	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7
Lewis	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	40
3	44	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	83	141
Grundy	26	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	81	114
Harrison	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	14
Mercer	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Putnam	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
4	38	102	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	45	192
Atchison	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	20
Gentry	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9
Holt	3	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	21
Nodaway	29	73	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	138
Worth	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
5	160	75	153	0	5	1	0	0	0	4	2	221	621
Andrew	13	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	23
Buchanan	147	74	151	0	4	1	0	0	0	4	2	215	598
6	21	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	45
Platte	21	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	45
7	2	5	20	0	7	3	1	1	0	2	2	7	50
Clay	2	5	20	0	7	3	1	1	0	2	2	7	50
8	30	7	11	0	12	0	0	0	0	6	0	21	87
Carroll	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19
Ray	26	4	8	0	12	0	0	0	0	6	0	12	68
9	119	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	159
Chariton	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	55
Linn	54	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	72
Sullivan	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	32
10	17	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	38	143
Marion	16	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	29	126
Monroe	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	13
Ralls	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4
11	23	2	152	0	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	58	254
St. Charles	23	2	152	0	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	58	254
12	130	25	55	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	59	25	302
Audrain	37	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	15	101
Montgomery	40	16	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	33	3	100
Warren	53	5	28	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	101
13	400	191	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	671
Boone	362	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	479
Callaway	38	91	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	192
14	137	15	30	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	70	259
Howard	34	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	45
Randolph	103	15	26	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	63	214
15	45	43	13	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	13	125
Lafayette	22	20	10	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	12	75
Saline	23	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
16	26	2	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	93
Jackson	26	2	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	93

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Muni - Carry Gun / Unlocked	Muni - Curfew	Muni - Other Violation	Muni- Pedestrian Violation	Muni - Possession/ Discharge Arms	Muni- Solicit without Permission	Muni-Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
17	178	112	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	85	550
Cass	107	80	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	56	397
Johnson	71	32	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	153
18	93	37	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	192
Cooper	33	25	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	71
Pettis	60	12	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
19	74	58	36	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	175
Cole	74	58	36	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	175
20	114	15	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	278
Franklin	89	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	239
Gasconade	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	27
Osage	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12
21	31	23	583	0	246	2	0	1	0	2	31	113	1,032
St. Louis Co.	31	23	583	0	246	2	0	1	0	2	31	113	1,032
22	16	1	22	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	72
St. Louis City	16	1	22	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	72
23	84	60	105	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	140	397
Jefferson	84	60	105	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	140	397
24	37	47	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	13	160
Madison	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	14
St. Francois	10	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	3	81
Ste. Genevieve	18	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	36
Washington	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	29
25	465	47	31	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	246	795
Maries	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14
Phelps	151	39	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	87	286
Pulaski	161	5	14	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	273
Texas	146	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	222
26	141	23	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	70	111	383
Camden	32	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	79
Laclede	81	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	57	203
Miller	12	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	47
Moniteau	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	15
Morgan	15	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	39
27	94	25	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	170
Bates	38	10	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	73
Henry	42	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	70
St. Clair	14	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	27
28	50	107	42	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	0	109	319
Barton	3	12	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	49	74
Cedar	22	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	59
Dade	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8
Vernon	22	78	32	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	178
29	23	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	42
Jasper	23	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	42
30	18	20	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	86
Benton	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14
Dallas	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Hickory	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6
Polk	6	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	41
Webster	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	12
31	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	16
Greene	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	16
32	112	25	81	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	90	316
Bollinger	32	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	25	63
Cape Girardeau	68	18	60	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	201
Perry	12	7	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	52

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Muni - Carry Gun / Unlocked	Muni - Curfew	Muni - Other Violation	Muni- Pedestrian Violation	Muni - Possession/ Discharge Arms	Muni- Solicit without Permission	Muni-Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
33	53	34	27	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	172
Mississippi	12	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	54
Scott	41	25	11	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	118
34	97	62	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	197
New Madrid	48	26	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	104
Pemiscot	49	36	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	93
35	35	32	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	188	334
Dunklin	5	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	131	162
Stoddard	30	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	57	172
36	0	10	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	91
Butler	0	9	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	81
Ripley	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
37	22	29	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	64	185
Carter	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13
Howell	18	20	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	36	138
Oregon	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16
Shannon	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	18
38	315	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	351
Christian	315	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	351
39	71	50	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	195
Barry	12	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Lawrence	26	21	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Stone	33	9	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	72
40	69	40	58	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	202
McDonald	24	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	62
Newton	45	29	46	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	140
41	45	27	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	49	129
Macon	17	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	69
Shelby	28	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	60
42	29	22	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	17	90
Crawford	17	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	43
Dent	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	32
Iron	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Reynolds	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	11
Wayne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
43	52	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	142
Caldwell	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21
Clinton	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29
Daviess	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18
DeKalb	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10
Livingston	34	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	64
44	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	25
Douglas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Ozark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Wright	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18
45	25	0	46	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	218
Lincoln	22	0	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	203
Pike	3	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15
46	58	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	102
Taney	58	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	102
Statewide Total	3,709	1,549	2,166	0	359	8	1	2	0	34	437	2,525	10,790

Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
4	4	2	0	0	0	6
Nodaway	4	2	0	0	0	6
5	221	25	0	0	16	262
Buchanan	221	25	0	0	16	262
6	0	0	0	0	3	3
Platte	0	0	0	0	3	3
11	6	0	0	0	0	6
St. Charles	6	0	0	0	0	6
14	5	0	0	0	1	6
Randolph	5	0	0	0	1	6
15	3	0	0	0	0	3
Lafayette	3	0	0	0	0	3
16	0	121	0	0	35	156
Jackson	0	121	0	0	35	156
17	10	0	0	0	0	10
Cass	2	0	0	0	0	2
Johnson	8	0	0	0	0	8
18	0	1	0	0	1	2
Pettis	0	1	0	0	1	2
19	1	0	0	0	4	5
Cole	1	0	0	0	4	5
21	0	0	0	0	104	104
St. Louis Co.	0	0	0	0	104	104
22	17	11	0	0	1	29
St. Louis City	17	11	0	0	1	29
23	0	0	0	0	1	1
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	1	1
24	0	0	0	0	2	3
St. Francois	0	0	0	0	2	2
St. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	1	1
26	0	0	0	1	0	1
Miller	0	0	0	1	0	1
27	2	1	0	0	0	3
Bates	2	1	0	0	0	3
28	1	1	0	0	7	9
Barton	1	1	0	0	0	2
Vernon	0	0	0	0	7	7
30	0	0	0	0	1	1
Dallas	0	0	0	0	1	1
33	16	1	0	0	4	21
Mississippi	6	1	0	0	3	10
Scott	10	0	0	0	1	11
37	0	0	0	0	1	1
Howell	0	0	0	0	1	1
39	0	0	0	1	1	3
Barry	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lawrence	0	0	0	1	1	2
45	3	0	0	0	0	3
Lincoln	3	0	0	0	0	3
Statewide Total	289	163	0	2	183	638

Appendix K: Out of Home Placements by Circuit

Circuit	Court Res. Care		DMH		CD		DYS*		Relative		Private Agency		Public Agency		Other		Total
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases
1	1	3%	0	0%	28	78%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	5	14%	36
2	0	0%	0	0%	94	95%	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	99
3	1	2%	0	0%	39	76%	3	6%	0	0%	2	4%	4	8%	2	4%	51
4	3	4%	3	4%	44	56%	5	6%	23	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	78
5	43	33%	0	0%	59	45%	6	5%	11	8%	0	0%	11	8%	1	1%	131
6	0	0%	0	0%	24	67%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	5	14%	0	0%	36
7	0	0%	0	0%	82	67%	35	28%	1	1%	0	0%	5	4%	0	0%	123
8	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4
9	0	0%	0	0%	42	91%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	46
10	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
11	0	0%	0	0%	96	89%	5	5%	7	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	108
12	13	12%	0	0%	68	62%	14	13%	10	9%	1	1%	1	1%	3	3%	110
13	14	4%	0	0%	281	85%	6	2%	1	0%	1	0%	28	8%	0	0%	331
14	0	0%	0	0%	52	58%	17	19%	19	21%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	90
15	0	0%	0	0%	38	84%	7	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	45
16	21	3%	0	0%	555	87%	33	5%	22	3%	4	1%	4	1%	2	0%	641
17	3	2%	0	0%	86	57%	7	5%	51	34%	0	0%	0	0%	4	3%	151
18	0	0%	0	0%	42	82%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	51
19	11	12%	0	0%	71	75%	10	11%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	95
20	0	0%	0	0%	177	96%	5	3%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	185
21	0	0%	0	0%	208	51%	22	5%	164	40%	0	0%	7	2%	9	2%	410
22	7	2%	0	0%	281	85%	31	9%	9	3%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	330
23	0	0%	0	0%	65	24%	26	10%	167	62%	4	1%	3	1%	3	1%	268
24	1	1%	0	0%	145	81%	9	5%	11	6%	8	4%	3	2%	2	1%	179
25	6	2%	0	0%	236	77%	2	1%	63	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	307
26	0	0%	2	1%	147	97%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	151
27	0	0%	1	1%	74	76%	5	5%	17	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	97
28	0	0%	0	0%	59	94%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	63
29	11	5%	0	0%	168	74%	19	8%	22	10%	5	2%	0	0%	1	0%	226
30	0	0%	0	0%	141	95%	8	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	149
31	1	0%	0	0%	288	77%	16	4%	69	18%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	375
32	0	0%	0	0%	164	97%	4	2%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	169
33	1	1%	0	0%	51	61%	13	16%	7	8%	0	0%	4	5%	7	8%	83
34	0	0%	0	0%	77	79%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	19	19%	0	0%	98
35	2	1%	1	1%	63	32%	10	5%	117	60%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	194
36	0	0%	0	0%	130	82%	10	6%	17	11%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	158
37	1	1%	0	0%	91	81%	7	6%	13	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	112
38	0	0%	0	0%	95	79%	19	16%	2	2%	0	0%	3	3%	1	1%	120
39	0	0%	0	0%	204	95%	0	0%	3	1%	2	1%	1	0%	4	2%	214
40	2	1%	0	0%	102	58%	12	7%	61	34%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	177
41	0	0%	1	3%	35	88%	0	0%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	40
42	1	1%	0	0%	115	91%	0	0%	5	4%	0	0%	4	3%	1	1%	126
43	3	4%	1	1%	64	88%	3	4%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	73
44	0	0%	0	0%	124	99%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	125
45	0	0%	0	0%	73	94%	0	0%	5	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	78
46	0	0%	0	0%	180	97%	6	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	186
Total	146	2%	9	0%	5,260	76%	406	6%	908	13%	33	0%	105	2%	52	1%	6,919

Appendix L: In Home Services by Circuit

Circuit	Supervision By Court		DMH		CD		DYS		Private Agency		Public Agency		Other		Total
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases
1	55	69%	0	0%	9	11%	0	0%	0	0%	9	11%	7	9%	80
2	52	79%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	14	21%	0	0%	0	0%	66
3	62	62%	5	5%	30	30%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	100
4	103	70%	12	8%	7	5%	0	0%	12	8%	10	7%	3	2%	147
5	480	96%	0	0%	14	3%	1	0%	2	0%	4	1%	0	0%	501
6	59	69%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	5	6%	21	24%	86
7	144	99%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	145
8	24	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	24
9	6	29%	0	0%	14	67%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	21
10	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
11	214	55%	1	0%	3	1%	0	0%	162	42%	7	2%	1	0%	388
12	59	73%	9	11%	3	4%	0	0%	4	5%	2	2%	4	5%	81
13	86	93%	0	0%	6	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	92
14	5	71%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	7
15	23	66%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	6	17%	2	6%	0	0%	35
16	43	93%	0	0%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	46
17	528	98%	1	0%	11	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	540
18	40	71%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	11	20%	0	0%	0	0%	56
19	52	57%	0	0%	23	25%	0	0%	16	17%	0	0%	1	1%	92
20	58	98%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	59
21	48	72%	1	1%	17	25%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	67
22	62	90%	2	3%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	69
23	223	100%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	224
24	38	48%	32	40%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	7	9%	1	1%	80
25	28	72%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	4	10%	6	15%	39
26	30	54%	4	7%	22	39%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	56
27	127	73%	14	8%	26	15%	0	0%	2	1%	3	2%	1	1%	173
28	105	72%	0	0%	30	21%	0	0%	11	8%	0	0%	0	0%	146
29	53	69%	0	0%	23	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	77
30	87	90%	1	1%	8	8%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	97
31	104	95%	0	0%	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	110
32	55	57%	0	0%	37	39%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3	3%	96
33	195	82%	0	0%	11	5%	0	0%	0	0%	30	13%	2	1%	238
34	48	69%	0	0%	5	7%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%	14	20%	70
35	242	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	243
36	17	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	31	65%	48
37	64	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	64
38	21	91%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	23
39	15	60%	5	20%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	25
40	91	98%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	93
41	8	19%	1	2%	17	40%	0	0%	6	14%	0	0%	10	24%	42
42	21	84%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	25
43	52	91%	0	0%	3	5%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	57
44	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9
45	25	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	25
46	41	98%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	42
Total	3,902	81%	96	2%	349	7%	2	0%	260	5%	90	2%	107	2%	4,806

Appendix M: Commitments to DYS by Circuit, Race, and Gender

Circuit	White		Black		Hispanic		Native American		Asian / Pacific Islander		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
3	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
5	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
7	9	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	18
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
10	11	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	14
11	1	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
12	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
13	17	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
15	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
16	3	0	13	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	19
17	6	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
18	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
19	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
20	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
21	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
22	0	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
23	9	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
24	11	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	14
25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
26	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
27	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
28	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
29	15	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	23
30	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
31	10	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
32	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
33	2	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
34	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
35	4	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
36	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
37	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
38	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
39	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
40	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
43	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10
44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
45	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
46	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Total	204	30	95	15	12	1	0	1	0	0	358

Appendix N: Certification to Adult Court by Circuit, Race, and Gender

Circuit	White		Black		Hispanic		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
11	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
17	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
21	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
22	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
28	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
31	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
33	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
34	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
39	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
43	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	14	1	19	1	0	0	0	0	35

**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day
Time Period**

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
1	37	31	84%
Clark	27	21	78%
Schuyler	6	6	100%
Scotland	4	4	100%
2	86	72	84%
Adair	67	58	87%
Knox	7	6	86%
Lewis	12	8	67%
3	120	104	87%
Grundy	67	57	85%
Harrison	39	33	85%
Mercer	4	4	100%
Putnam	10	10	100%
4	103	96	93%
Atchison	2	2	100%
Gentry	5	4	80%
Holt	16	16	100%
Nodaway	78	73	94%
Worth	2	1	50%
5	398	264	66%
Andrew	18	6	33%
Buchanan	380	258	68%
6	194	149	77%
Platte	194	149	77%
7	447	271	61%
Clay	447	271	61%
8	70	56	80%
Carroll	10	9	90%
Ray	60	47	78%
9	15	5	33%
Chariton	1	1	100%
Linn	7	3	43%
Sullivan	7	1	14%
10	189	95	50%
Marion	169	88	52%
Monroe	16	4	25%
Ralls	4	3	75%
11	742	571	77%
St. Charles	742	571	77%
12	129	59	46%
Audrain	75	32	43%
Montgomery	24	14	58%
Warren	30	13	43%
13	626	383	61%
Boone	436	265	61%
Callaway	190	118	62%
14	81	26	32%
Howard	7	1	14%
Randolph	74	25	34%
15	247	138	56%
Lafayette	123	74	60%
Saline	124	64	52%
16	990	494	50%
Jackson	990	494	50%

**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day
Time Period**

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
17	531	460	87%
Cass	390	333	85%
Johnson	141	127	90%
18	263	209	79%
Cooper	74	71	96%
Pettis	189	138	73%
19	264	162	61%
Cole	264	162	61%
20	254	133	52%
Franklin	217	120	55%
Gasconade	19	8	42%
Osage	18	5	28%
21	2,456	1,412	57%
St. Louis Co.	2,456	1,412	57%
22	635	468	74%
St. Louis City	635	468	74%
23	560	306	55%
Jefferson	560	306	55%
24	408	229	56%
Madison	25	13	52%
St. Francois	263	168	64%
St. Genevieve	40	32	80%
Washington	80	16	20%
25	178	144	81%
Maries	10	7	70%
Phelps	50	49	98%
Pulaski	46	43	93%
Texas	72	45	63%
26	291	178	61%
Camden	59	49	83%
Laclede	87	29	33%
Miller	88	69	78%
Moniteau	17	11	65%
Morgan	40	20	50%
27	112	71	63%
Bates	37	25	68%
Henry	49	31	63%
St. Clair	26	15	58%
28	284	185	65%
Barton	62	45	73%
Cedar	48	16	33%
Dade	7	3	43%
Vernon	167	121	72%
29	142	111	78%
Jasper	142	111	78%
30	381	374	98%
Benton	54	54	100%
Dallas	25	18	72%
Hickory	37	37	100%
Polk	123	123	100%
Webster	142	142	100%
31	281	189	67%
Greene	281	189	67%
32	313	238	76%
Bollinger	18	11	61%
Cape Girardeau	229	162	71%
Perry	66	65	98%

**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day
Time Period**

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
33	251	237	94%
Mississippi	85	81	95%
Scott	166	156	94%
34	171	166	97%
New Madrid	58	57	98%
Pemiscot	113	109	96%
35	231	192	83%
Dunklin	102	64	63%
Stoddard	129	128	99%
36	270	208	77%
Butler	236	186	79%
Ripley	34	22	65%
37	121	105	87%
Carter	22	21	95%
Howell	72	59	82%
Oregon	11	10	91%
Shannon	16	15	94%
38	318	190	60%
Christian	318	190	60%
39	347	253	73%
Barry	101	72	71%
Lawrence	141	116	82%
Stone	105	65	62%
40	342	258	75%
McDonald	139	111	80%
Newton	203	147	72%
41	43	35	81%
Macon	29	23	79%
Shelby	14	12	86%
42	56	49	88%
Crawford	32	29	91%
Dent	15	12	80%
Iron	1	1	100%
Reynolds	4	4	100%
Wayne	4	3	75%
43	131	118	90%
Caldwell	31	31	100%
Clinton	12	12	100%
Daviess	15	15	100%
DeKalb	14	12	86%
Livingston	59	48	81%
44	57	52	91%
Douglas	6	6	100%
Ozark	6	6	100%
Wright	45	40	89%
45	176	85	48%
Lincoln	131	70	53%
Pike	45	15	33%
46	114	86	75%
Taney	114	86	75%
Statewide Total	14,455	9,717	67%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
1	141	140	99%
Clark	90	89	99%
Schuyler	16	16	100%
Scotland	35	35	100%
2	68	66	97%
Adair	35	35	100%
Knox	5	4	80%
Lewis	28	27	96%
3	146	131	90%
Grundy	120	109	91%
Harrison	12	9	75%
Mercer	4	4	100%
Putnam	10	9	90%
4	179	170	95%
Atchison	10	10	100%
Gentry	9	9	100%
Holt	14	14	100%
Nodaway	143	134	94%
Worth	3	3	0%
5	881	778	88%
Andrew	23	20	87%
Buchanan	858	758	88%
6	53	38	72%
Platte	53	38	72%
7	63	50	79%
Clay	63	50	79%
8	95	79	83%
Carroll	21	15	71%
Ray	74	64	86%
9	172	131	76%
Chariton	51	45	88%
Linn	91	59	65%
Sullivan	30	27	90%
10	193	121	63%
Marion	153	112	73%
Monroe	28	6	21%
Ralls	12	3	25%
11	217	191	88%
St. Charles	217	191	88%
12	289	165	57%
Audrain	96	52	54%
Montgomery	93	61	66%
Warren	100	52	52%
13	788	457	58%
Boone	561	334	60%
Callaway	227	123	54%
14	300	163	54%
Howard	46	21	46%
Randolph	254	142	56%
15	136	99	73%
Lafayette	74	52	70%
Saline	62	47	76%
16	67	44	66%
Jackson	67	44	66%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
17	593	508	86%
Cass	437	361	83%
Johnson	156	147	94%
18	196	170	87%
Cooper	71	70	99%
Pettis	125	100	80%
19	178	125	70%
Cole	178	125	70%
20	291	207	71%
Franklin	249	178	71%
Gasconade	30	21	70%
Osage	12	8	67%
21	1,070	812	76%
St. Louis Co.	1,070	812	76%
22	105	72	69%
St. Louis City	105	72	69%
23	419	265	63%
Jefferson	419	265	63%
24	179	123	69%
Madison	14	14	100%
St. Francois	105	64	61%
St. Genevieve	38	34	89%
Washington	22	11	50%
25	838	773	92%
Maries	15	15	100%
Phelps	305	301	99%
Pulaski	285	260	91%
Texas	233	197	85%
26	400	277	69%
Camden	80	66	83%
Laclede	214	129	60%
Miller	52	40	77%
Moniteau	19	14	74%
Morgan	35	28	80%
27	183	127	69%
Bates	65	59	91%
Henry	86	44	51%
St. Clair	32	24	75%
28	298	206	69%
Barton	61	45	74%
Cedar	55	33	60%
Dade	5	0	0%
Vernon	177	128	72%
29	34	34	100%
Jasper	34	34	100%
30	87	87	100%
Benton	14	14	100%
Dallas	14	14	100%
Hickory	6	6	100%
Polk	41	41	100%
Webster	12	12	100%
31	11	5	45%
Greene	11	5	45%
32	360	315	88%
Bollinger	54	44	81%
Cape Girardeau	223	188	84%
Perry	83	83	100%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
33	210	201	96%
Mississippi	80	77	96%
Scott	130	124	95%
34	207	200	97%
New Madrid	106	100	94%
Pemiscot	101	100	99%
35	398	353	89%
Dunklin	230	185	80%
Stoddard	168	168	100%
36	87	85	98%
Butler	79	77	97%
Ripley	8	8	100%
37	188	177	94%
Carter	17	17	100%
Howell	128	121	95%
Oregon	15	12	80%
Shannon	28	27	96%
38	395	265	67%
Christian	395	265	67%
39	227	192	85%
Barry	48	38	79%
Lawrence	103	89	86%
Stone	76	65	86%
40	216	188	87%
McDonald	68	58	85%
Newton	148	130	88%
41	138	130	94%
Macon	75	69	92%
Shelby	63	61	97%
42	95	82	86%
Crawford	27	22	81%
Dent	47	42	89%
Iron	5	5	100%
Reynolds	10	10	100%
Wayne	6	3	50%
43	137	137	100%
Caldwell	22	22	100%
Clinton	30	30	100%
Daviess	18	18	100%
DeKalb	9	9	100%
Livingston	58	58	100%
44	33	23	70%
Douglas	6	4	67%
Ozark	6	3	50%
Wright	21	16	76%
45	206	171	83%
Lincoln	184	160	87%
Pike	22	11	50%
46	109	82	75%
Taney	109	82	75%
Statewide Total	11,676	9,215	79%

**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals within a
Thirty Day Time Period**

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
1	67	67	100%
Clark	36	36	100%
Schuyler	9	9	100%
Scotland	22	22	100%
2	124	124	100%
Adair	64	64	100%
Knox	25	25	100%
Lewis	35	35	100%
3	179	169	94%
Grundy	106	96	91%
Harrison	21	21	100%
Mercer	24	24	100%
Putnam	28	28	100%
4	141	137	97%
Atchison	5	5	100%
Gentry	47	47	100%
Holt	9	9	100%
Nodaway	73	69	95%
Worth	7	7	100%
5	188	186	99%
Andrew	12	12	100%
Buchanan	176	174	99%
6	36	29	81%
Platte	36	29	81%
7	371	270	73%
Clay	371	270	73%
8	36	14	39%
Carroll	10	8	80%
Ray	26	6	23%
9	69	63	91%
Chariton	11	11	100%
Linn	40	34	85%
Sullivan	18	18	100%
10	81	8	10%
Marion	60	3	5%
Monroe	10	5	50%
Ralls	11	0	0%
11	157	147	94%
St. Charles	157	147	94%
12	140	111	79%
Audrain	46	38	83%
Montgomery	49	46	94%
Warren	45	27	60%
13	334	303	91%
Boone	204	176	86%
Callaway	130	127	98%
14	253	91	36%
Howard	79	13	16%
Randolph	174	78	45%
15	48	45	94%
Lafayette	21	20	95%
Saline	27	25	93%
16	1,337	1,116	83%
Jackson	1,337	1,116	83%

**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals within a
Thirty Day Time Period**

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
17	376	346	92%
Cass	269	248	92%
Johnson	107	98	92%
18	64	62	97%
Cooper	20	18	90%
Pettis	44	44	100%
19	228	165	72%
Cole	228	165	72%
20	194	194	100%
Franklin	157	157	100%
Gasconade	26	26	100%
Osage	11	11	100%
21	1,142	946	83%
St. Louis Co.	1,142	946	83%
22	439	374	85%
St. Louis City	439	374	85%
23	341	336	99%
Jefferson	341	336	99%
24	316	185	59%
Madison	37	35	95%
St. Francois	163	87	53%
St. Genevieve	24	24	100%
Washington	92	39	42%
25	1,071	1,030	96%
Maries	23	23	100%
Phelps	455	454	100%
Pulaski	342	323	94%
Texas	251	230	92%
26	589	501	85%
Camden	131	119	91%
Laclede	232	187	81%
Miller	122	114	93%
Moniteau	8	3	38%
Morgan	96	78	81%
27	277	241	87%
Bates	90	88	98%
Henry	130	100	77%
St. Clair	57	53	93%
28	324	276	85%
Barton	89	84	94%
Cedar	103	67	65%
Dade	16	15	94%
Vernon	116	110	95%
29	214	212	99%
Jasper	214	212	99%
30	277	276	100%
Benton	19	19	100%
Dallas	63	62	98%
Hickory	18	18	100%
Polk	80	80	100%
Webster	97	97	100%
31	452	451	100%
Greene	452	451	100%
32	398	393	99%
Bollinger	40	40	100%
Cape Girardeau	287	282	98%
Perry	71	71	100%

**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals within a
Thirty Day Time Period**

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
33	122	119	98%
Mississippi	29	29	100%
Scott	93	90	97%
34	150	150	100%
New Madrid	50	50	100%
Pemiscot	100	100	100%
35	559	489	87%
Dunklin	158	91	58%
Stoddard	401	398	99%
36	301	281	93%
Butler	260	240	92%
Ripley	41	41	100%
37	184	180	98%
Carter	8	8	100%
Howell	122	118	97%
Oregon	28	28	100%
Shannon	26	26	100%
38	310	227	73%
Christian	310	227	73%
39	562	469	83%
Barry	265	219	83%
Lawrence	210	166	79%
Stone	87	84	97%
40	257	254	99%
McDonald	96	96	100%
Newton	161	158	98%
41	84	68	81%
Macon	41	29	71%
Shelby	43	39	91%
42	134	131	98%
Crawford	53	53	100%
Dent	25	24	96%
Iron	17	16	94%
Reynolds	20	20	100%
Wayne	19	18	95%
43	227	227	100%
Caldwell	29	29	100%
Clinton	38	38	100%
Daviess	21	21	100%
DeKalb	16	16	100%
Livingston	123	123	100%
44	139	133	96%
Douglas	42	41	98%
Ozark	34	33	97%
Wright	63	59	94%
45	320	274	86%
Lincoln	234	206	88%
Pike	86	68	79%
46	232	232	100%
Taney	232	232	100%
Statewide Total	13,844	12,102	87%

Appendix R: 2021 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Referrals			Cases Diverted			Secure Detention			Cases Petitioned		
	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Adair	3.06											
Andrew	10.71											
Audrain	6.27			0.70			3.63					
Boone	5.19		0.50	0.86						1.32		
Buchanan	2.96						2.80					
Butler	3.90											
Callaway	2.94											
Camden	2.96											
Cape Girardeau	8.14											
Cass	4.25			0.82			1.95			1.54		
Christian	2.89											
Clay	1.52						2.26			1.86		
Clinton	7.58											
Cole	6.43		2.29									
Cooper	5.54											
Dunklin	1.47	0.42					4.65			1.79		
Franklin	4.14											
Greene	6.36											
Howell	2.76											
Jackson	2.77	0.33	0.37	0.77			2.44			1.81		
Jasper	3.61											
Jefferson	4.55	0.41										
Johnson	9.79									1.60		
Lafayette	3.50											
Lawrence		0.61										
Lewis	3.90											
Lincoln	1.67											
Livingston	2.10											
Macon	4.07											
Marion	2.66											
McDonald	2.31	0.60										
Miller	4.99											
Mississippi	2.19											
Montgomery	2.09	3.23										
Newton		0.38										
Pemiscot	2.72											
Pettis	3.50											
Phelps	1.61											
Platte	2.26											
Pulaski		0.41										
Randolph	1.60											
Ray	2.71											
Saline	3.55	0.40										
Scott	3.58									1.63		
St. Charles	6.11	0.33	0.30									
St. Louis City*	7.15 -430											
St. Louis County	4.24	0.24	0.20	0.95			3.13			2.24		
Stoddard	1.95											
Taney			0.37									
Vernon	3.47											
Warren	2.54											

KEY:

RRI
PARITY

* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

** If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.

Appendix R: 2021 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Delinquent Findings			Supervision			Secure Confinement		
	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Adair									
Audrain									
Boone									
Buchanan									
Butler									
Callaway									
Camden									
Cape Girardeau									
Cass									
Christian									
Clay									
Cole									
Cooper									
Dunklin									
Franklin									
Greene									
Howell									
Jackson				0.72					
Jasper									
Jefferson									
Johnson									
Lincoln									
Livingston									
McDonald									
Macon									
Mississippi									
Montgomery									
New Madrid									
Pemiscot									
Pettis									
Phelps									
Platte									
Polk									
Pulaski									
Randolph									
Ray									
St. Louis City*									
Vernon									
Warren									
Wright									

* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

** If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.

Appendix S: 2020-2021 Case Count Change by County - All Offenses

County	Referrals					Cases Diverted					Secure Detention					Cases Petitioned				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
Adair	3	-5	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	-5	0	0	0	-1	-5	0	0	0
Andrew	-1	-6	-1	0	0	-6	7	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	-1	0	0	0
Atchison	-2	-1	0	3	0	1	1	0	3	0	-2	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0
Audrain	-16	-39	3	0	0	-13	20	2	0	0	-1	16	0	0	0	-3	19	1	0	0
Barry	8	3	8	-1	0	3	-3	9	-1	0	-3	0	1	0	0	5	0	-1	0	0
Barton	-87	-2	0	0	0	-58	2	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	-29	0	0	0	0
Bates	-2	-1	1	0	1	10	1	1	0	1	-2	0	0	0	-1	-10	0	0	0	0
Benton	9	1	3	0	0	7	-1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Bollinger	25	2	1	0	0	27	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0
Boone	-66	11	-6	7	0	-51	-55	-5	-1	0	7	28	1	1	0	-15	44	-1	8	0
Buchanan	12	-38	12	16	-4	41	42	17	11	-4	-12	-6	-7	2	0	-31	-4	-5	5	0
Butler	10	-21	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-2	-3	0	0	0
Caldwell	15	1	-3	0	-1	17	-1	-3	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0
Callaway	71	-7	1	-1	0	51	24	2	-1	0	-10	-7	-1	0	0	19	-17	-1	0	0
Camden	4	5	-1	0	0	3	-2	-1	0	0	-2	-2	-1	0	0	1	-3	0	0	0
Cape Girardeau	19	-77	2	1	0	15	73	-1	1	0	-1	1	2	0	0	4	3	3	0	0
Carroll	-9	-1	1	0	0	-10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Carter	17	2	2	0	0	22	-2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-4	0	0	0	0
Cass	4	-73	-7	-1	4	-25	20	-8	-2	3	19	20	-1	1	0	29	53	1	1	1
Cedar	28	-1	0	0	0	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0
Chariton	-5	-3	0	0	0	-2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-3	1	0	0	0
Christian	-29	4	5	2	1	-61	-2	5	2	1	16	-3	1	0	0	32	-2	0	0	0
Clark	36	0	0	0	0	12	-1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	24	1	0	0	0
Clay	32	17	12	-1	0	7	-17	10	0	0	21	6	5	0	0	25	0	2	-1	0
Clinton	-29	-1	0	-1	-2	-24	-1	0	-1	-1	-7	0	0	0	0	-5	2	0	0	-1
Cole	4	-44	-1	6	0	-3	47	-2	5	0	-1	-11	0	0	0	4	-4	1	1	0
Cooper	-38	-6	-4	0	0	-44	6	-3	0	0	0	4	-1	0	0	6	0	-1	0	0
Crawford	-11	3	0	0	0	-5	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-6	0	-1	0	0
Dade	-17	0	0	0	0	-15	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0
Dallas	-21	4	-2	0	0	-19	-5	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	1	0	0	0
Daviess	10	1	2	-1	0	6	-1	2	-1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
DeKalb	3	1	1	-1	0	4	1	1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	-1	-2	0	0	0
Dent	20	-2	0	-1	0	15	1	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0
Douglas	-3	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dunklin	86	-1	-1	0	0	68	-1	-3	0	0	-2	1	1	0	0	18	2	2	0	0
Franklin	100	-13	3	-2	2	83	11	3	-1	2	2	0	1	-1	0	6	1	0	-1	0
Gasconade	-11	0	1	0	0	-11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gentry	-7	-1	0	0	0	-7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	-10	-10	3	-2	-1	-32	-4	1	-2	-1	16	6	2	-1	-1	22	14	2	0	0
Grundy	29	-2	6	0	0	15	2	2	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	14	0	4	0	0
Harrison	-12	-1	0	0	0	-14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Henry	-1	-2	-5	0	0	1	3	-4	0	0	1	-2	0	0	0	-4	-1	-1	0	0
Hickory	-7	-1	-4	0	0	-7	1	-4	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holt	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Howard	-32	-2	0	0	0	-25	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-7	0	0	0	0
Howell	54	0	5	0	-1	30	0	5	0	-1	10	2	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0
Iron	-47	2	0	0	0	-47	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0
Jackson	42	-64	5	1	-2	55	18	4	3	-1	-23	42	1	0	0	-22	21	0	-2	-1
Jasper	21	-8	10	-2	-2	6	1	5	-1	-1	21	7	2	-1	-2	16	7	5	-1	-1
Jefferson	72	2	7	2	0	57	1	7	2	0	13	-4	0	0	0	8	-3	-1	0	0
Johnson	-15	-34	9	1	-3	-12	10	6	2	-3	0	0	1	-1	0	-3	24	3	-1	0
Knox	-8	0	0	0	0	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
Laclede	27	-5	1	0	0	18	4	1	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	9	1	0	0	0
Lafayette	5	-11	4	-1	0	3	9	4	-1	0	-3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Lawrence	38	0	15	0	1	43	-1	15	0	0	-7	0	0	0	1	-5	1	0	0	1
Lewis	-7	-4	0	0	0	-2	4	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	-5	0	0	0	0
Lincoln	29	4	4	1	0	26	-3	2	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	13	-1	0	0	0

Appendix S: 2020-2021 Case Count Change by County - All Offenses

County	Delinquent Findings					Supervision					Secure Confinement					Certification to Adult				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
Adair	0	-4	0	0	0	-3	-2	0	0	0	3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Andrew	4	-1	0	0	0	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison	-3	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Audrain	-3	19	1	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	-2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	5	0	-1	0	0	4	0	-2	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barton	-30	0	0	0	0	-19	1	0	0	0	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bates	-11	0	0	0	0	-6	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benton	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bollinger	-2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boone	-18	33	-1	8	0	-40	11	-1	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	-29	-5	-6	4	0	-10	-1	-6	-1	0	-11	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Butler	-2	-3	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caldwell	-2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Callaway	18	-17	0	0	0	22	-16	0	0	0	-5	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Camden	0	-3	0	0	0	-3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cape Girardeau	3	-1	3	0	0	5	2	3	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carter	-4	0	0	0	0	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cass	29	52	1	1	1	31	48	2	1	1	0	2	-1	0	0	-1	1	0	0	0
Cedar	-2	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chariton	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Christian	23	-1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	10	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clark	24	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	23	-1	2	-1	0	9	-1	0	-1	0	15	-3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
Clinton	-5	0	0	0	-1	1	1	0	0	-1	-6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cole	1	-5	1	1	0	-2	-4	1	1	0	0	-2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cooper	4	0	-1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crawford	-6	0	-1	0	0	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dade	-2	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Dallas	-2	1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Daviess	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DeKalb	-1	-2	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0
Dent	5	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Douglas	-1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dunklin	14	-1	1	0	0	14	-3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	4	1	0	-1	0	0	1	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	19	12	2	0	0	14	11	3	1	0	7	2	-1	-1	0	-3	-1	0	0	0
Grundy	14	0	4	0	0	17	0	4	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harrison	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Henry	-5	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	-1	0	0	4	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holt	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howell	20	0	0	0	0	16	-1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	-25	4	-2	-2	-1	-21	-2	-5	-2	-1	-2	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Jasper	15	8	4	-1	-1	24	5	2	0	-1	5	5	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	5	-12	0	0	0	15	-4	0	0	0	-9	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	-5	24	3	-1	0	-3	24	3	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knox	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laclede	10	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lafayette	0	2	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lawrence	-5	1	0	0	1	-1	1	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lewis	-5	0	0	0	0	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lincoln	12	-1	0	0	0	12	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix S: 2020-2021 Case Count Change by County - All Offenses

County	Referrals					Cases Diverted					Secure Detention					Cases Petitioned				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
Linn	3	-1	1	-1	0	-3	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	0	
Livingston	37	-1	0	0	2	34	2	0	0	2	-2	-1	0	0	3	-1	0	0	0	
McDonald	45	-10	4	6	1	33	4	2	5	1	5	5	2	1	11	6	2	1	0	
Macon	20	5	-2	0	0	19	-7	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
Madison	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Maries	9	1	0	0	0	10	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Marion	67	-30	2	0	-3	18	14	0	0	-3	-1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	
Mercer	-2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Miller	38	-6	0	0	0	23	5	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	
Mississippi	24	-3	-5	2	0	20	1	-5	0	0	2	1	0	2	4	2	0	2	0	
Moniteau	5	0	-1	0	0	2	0	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	
Monroe	0	-1	0	0	0	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	-11	9	5	0	0	-11	-11	-2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	
Morgan	19	3	-3	-4	0	21	-3	-2	0	0	-3	0	-1	0	-2	0	-1	-4	0	
New Madrid	36	-14	-7	1	0	33	17	-7	1	0	2	-4	0	0	3	-3	0	0	0	
Newton	-4	0	-6	3	0	1	0	-6	3	0	-6	0	0	0	-8	0	0	0	0	
Nodaway	65	-1	-1	1	0	72	1	0	1	0	-4	-1	0	0	-7	0	-1	0	0	
Oregon	4	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Osage	15	-1	-1	0	0	9	1	-1	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	
Ozark	1	-2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Pemiscot	6	-25	-1	0	0	-5	7	-1	0	0	0	12	0	0	11	18	0	0	0	
Perry	18	-1	1	0	0	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Pettis	-36	-4	27	0	0	-38	-1	20	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	
Phelps	56	-1	2	-1	0	56	1	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	
Pike	-5	0	1	0	0	1	-2	1	0	0	-3	0	0	0	-6	0	0	0	0	
Platte	28	-6	-7	-7	1	21	-1	-7	-7	1	4	3	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	
Polk	-22	11	-5	0	-3	-24	-10	-3	0	-3	0	0	-2	0	2	-1	-2	0	0	
Pulaski	67	2	-1	1	1	70	-3	0	2	1	-4	0	-1	-1	-3	1	-1	-1	0	
Putnam	-2	-2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-3	1	0	0	0	
Ralls	-2	-2	0	0	0	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	
Randolph	37	6	-2	0	0	24	0	-2	0	0	2	-1	0	0	13	-6	0	0	0	
Ray	-64	4	3	0	-4	-55	-3	3	0	-4	-1	0	0	0	-9	-1	0	0	0	
Reynolds	-1	-1	0	0	0	-5	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	
Ripley	17	-2	0	0	0	19	2	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	
St. Charles	-87	-86	-7	-4	-1	-94	82	-4	-4	-1	6	3	-2	0	1	1	-3	0	0	
St. Clair	3	-1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	-2	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	
St. Francois	36	-3	6	0	0	26	0	5	0	0	15	2	1	0	10	2	1	0	0	
Ste. Genevieve	30	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	
St. Louis Co	-193	129	-13	3	-1	-205	-113	-14	3	-1	5	4	0	0	14	-18	1	0	0	
Saline	33	-16	-5	1	1	36	13	-6	1	1	1	0	0	0	-3	3	1	0	0	
Schuyler	-4	1	0	0	0	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	-1	0	0	0	
Scotland	8	-2	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	
Scott	20	-25	0	1	2	27	16	0	1	2	1	12	0	0	-7	9	0	0	0	
Shannon	15	0	0	-1	0	15	0	0	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Shelby	33	-3	2	0	0	28	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	
Stoddard	95	-6	3	0	2	80	4	2	0	2	13	0	1	0	12	2	1	0	0	
Stone	-1	1	2	1	0	-4	-1	2	1	0	37	-1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	
Sullivan	7	0	5	0	0	9	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	
Taney	8	-1	-6	0	1	2	-1	-5	0	1	4	1	0	0	6	1	-1	0	0	
Texas	40	1	0	0	1	30	-2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	
Vernon	19	-11	2	0	0	16	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	
Warren	-92	36	-1	0	0	-92	-36	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	-25	1	0	0	0	-21	-2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	-4	1	0	0	0	
Wayne	-4	0	1	0	0	-4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	
Webster	-36	-1	-6	0	0	-37	1	-3	0	0	-1	0	0	0	1	0	-3	0	0	
Worth	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wright	21	1	0	0	0	22	-1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Louis City	-12	18	-12	-2	0	387	-437	-16	-3	0	2	4	1	1	0	-1	1	1	0	

Appendix S: 2020-2021 Case Count Change by County - All Offenses

County	Delinquent Findings					Supervision					Secure Confinement					Certification to Adult				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
Linn	6	0	2	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livingston	3	-1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
McDonald	11	6	1	1	0	9	2	1	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macon	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	4	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marion	0	3	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miller	15	1	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	4	2	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moniteau	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	2	7	0	0	-2	-1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morgan	-2	0	-1	-4	0	4	0	0	-4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Madrid	3	-3	0	0	0	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newton	-6	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nodaway	-7	0	-1	0	0	-6	0	-1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
Osage	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ozark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pemiscot	11	18	0	0	0	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perry	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pettis	2	4	7	0	0	-4	2	7	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Phelps	-4	0	0	0	0	-7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pike	-6	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Platte	8	7	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Polk	1	-1	-2	0	0	6	-1	0	0	0	1	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pulaski	-3	0	0	-1	0	6	2	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Putnam	-3	1	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ralls	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Randolph	15	-5	0	0	0	-13	-3	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ray	-9	-1	0	0	0	-4	0	0	0	0	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reynolds	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ripley	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Charles	-2	0	-3	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	-1	-2	-3	0	0	-5	-1	0	0	0
St. Clair	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Francois	4	2	1	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	-6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ste. Genevieve	5	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Louis Co	5	2	0	0	0	1	-8	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saline	-2	3	0	0	0	-1	4	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schuyler	7	-1	0	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scotland	-2	0	0	0	0	-4	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scott	-7	9	0	0	0	-6	3	0	0	0	-1	3	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stoddard	8	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0
Stone	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	-2	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
Taney	5	1	-1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	12	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vernon	3	1	0	0	0	14	-1	0	0	0	-13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	-4	1	0	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wayne	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Webster	3	0	-3	0	0	0	0	-3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Louis City	1	5	3	0	0	0	-3	-1	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	0

