



Missouri
Juvenile & Family
Division
Annual Report

Calendar 2011

Submitted by:
Supreme Court of Missouri
Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)
Prepared by:
Court Business Services Division
Research and Statistics Section

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	3
Section 1: Missouri's Juvenile Population	4
Figure 1-1: Juvenile Population.....	4
Figure 1-2: Projected Juvenile Population.....	4
Figure 1-3: Juvenile Population by Age and Gender.....	4
Figure 1-4: Juvenile Population by Gender.....	5
Figure 1-5: Juvenile Population by Race.....	5
Section 2: Juvenile and Family Division Referrals	6
Table 2-1: Source of Referrals.....	7
Figure 2-1: Referrals by Case Type.....	7
Figure 2-2: Referrals by Gender.....	8
Figure 2-3: Referrals by Race.....	8
Figure 2-4: Referrals by Age.....	8
Figure 2-5: Juvenile Referral Trend.....	9
Figure 2-6: Juvenile Referrals by Gender.....	9
Figure 2-7: Juvenile Referrals by Race.....	9
Figure 2-8: Juvenile Referrals by Action Taken.....	12
Figure 2-9: Juvenile Referrals by Disposition.....	12
Section 3: Juvenile and Family Division Law Violation Referrals	13
Table 3-1: Source of Law Violation Referrals.....	13
Figure 3-1: Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level.....	13
Figure 3-2: Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Gender.....	14
Figure 3-3: Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race.....	14
Figure 3-4: Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age.....	14
Table 3-2: Top Twenty-Five Law Violation Referrals.....	15
Table 3-3: Law Violation Referrals by Allegation and Age.....	16
Figure 3-5: Juvenile Referrals by Action Taken.....	17
Figure 3-6: Juvenile Referrals by Disposition.....	17
Section 4: Juvenile and Family Division Status Violation Referrals	18
Table 4-1: Source of Status Violation Referrals.....	18
Figure 4-1: Status Violation Referrals by Charge Level.....	18
Figure 4-2: Status Violation Referrals by Allegation and Gender.....	19
Figure 4-3: Status Violation Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	19
Figure 4-4: Status Violation Referrals by Allegation and Age.....	19
Figure 4-5: Status Violation Referrals by Action Taken.....	20
Figure 4-6: Status Violation Referrals by Disposition.....	20
Section 5: Juvenile and Family Division CA/N Referrals	21
Table 5-1: Source of CA/N Referrals.....	21
Figure 5-1: CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type.....	21
Figure 5-2: CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Gender.....	22
Figure 5-3: CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	22
Figure 5-4: CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age.....	22
Figure 5-5: CA/N Referrals by Action Taken.....	23
Figure 5-6: CA/N Referrals by Disposition.....	23
Section 6: Assessment & Classification	24
Figure 6-1: Risk by Level.....	25
Figure 6-2: Risk by Gender.....	25
Figure 6-3: Risk by Race.....	25
Table 6-1: Risk Factors.....	26
Table 6-2: Needs Factors.....	27-28

Section 7: Detention Services	29
Table 7-1: Youth in Detention Last Day of CY11	30
Figure 7-1: Total Admissions by Gender	30
Figure 7-2: Total Admissions by Race	31
Figure 7-3: Total Admissions by Gender & Race	31
Figure 7-4: Total Admissions by Age	31
Figure 7-5: Average Daily Population by Gender	32
Figure 7-6: Average Daily Population by Race	32
Figure 7-7: Average Daily Population by Gender & Race	32
Figure 7-8: Average Daily Population by Age	33
Figure 7-9: Average Length of Stay by Gender	33
Figure 7-10: Average Length of Stay by Race	33
Figure 7-11: Average Length of Stay by Gender & Race	34
Figure 7-12: Average Length of Stay by Age	34
Section 8: Division of Youth Services (DYS) Commitments	35
Figure 8-1: Statewide DYS Commitments by Gender	35
Figure 8-2: Statewide DYS Commitments by Race	35
Figure 8-3: Statewide DYS Commitments by Age	35
Section 9: Certification to Adult Court	36
Figure 9-1: Certifications by Gender	36
Figure 9-2: Certifications by Race	36
Figure 9-3: Certifications by Age	36
Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism	37
Figure 10-1: Missouri Offender Population	38
Figure 10-2: Recidivism Rate for Law Referral	38
Figure 10-3: Recidivism Rate for Class A Misdemeanor or Felony	38
Figure 10-4: Recidivism Rate for Felony	39
Figure 10-5: Recidivism Trend	39
Figure 10-6: Recidivism by Gender	39
Figure 10-7: Recidivism by Race	40
Figure 10-8: Recidivism by Location	40
Figure 10-9: Recidivism by Age	40
Section 11: Juvenile Officer Workload	41
Table 11-1: Workload Values from 2006 Juvenile Officer Workload Study	42
Table 11-2: Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload for Multi-County Circuits	43
Section 12: CA/N Time Standards	44
Table 12-1: CA/N Hearings Held Timely	45
Appendices:	46
A. Total Juvenile Division Referral Outcomes by Circuit & County	47-48
B. Law Violation Referral Outcomes by Circuit & County	49-50
C. Status Violation Referral Outcomes by Circuit & County	51-52
D. CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit & County	53-54
E. Type of Referrals by Circuit & County	55-56
F. Referrals by Type, Level, Circuit & County	57-58
G. Out of Home Placements by Circuit	59
H. In-Home Services by Circuit	60
I. DYS Commitments by Circuit, Race, & Gender	61
J. Certification to Adult Court by Circuit, Race, & Gender	62
K. Map of Missouri's 45 Judicial Circuits	63


Introduction

The *Missouri Juvenile and Family Division Annual Report* provides a comprehensive account of both case activity and youth served for calendar 2011. 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 this juvenile offender population; recidivism rates; Juvenile Officer weighted workload for fiscal 2014; and time standards for child abuse and neglect cases.

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 Juvenile Population

Section 1 describes the 2010 population of Missouri's juveniles (age 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].



Section 1: Missouri's Juvenile Population

2010 Population: 10-17 Year Olds by Gender




Figure 1-4

In CY10, 51.3% of Missouri's juvenile population was male and 48.7% was female. This is a 0.1% increase for the male population; a trend continued from CY09.

2010 Population: 10-17 Year Olds by Race




Figure 1-5

In CY10, Missouri's population of white juveniles decreased to 77.3% (a change of 1.3%), while the population of black juveniles increased to 15.5% (a change of 0.8%). The remaining population included Hispanic (4.7%), Asian/Pacific Islander (1.8%), and American Indian (0.6%) youth. Both Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander had small increases over the previous year.

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

The Revised Missouri Court Performance Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice define a juvenile and family division referral as “*information received by the juvenile officer or other authorized staff that alleges facts, which brought the juvenile under the applicable provisions of Chapter 211 of the Missouri Juvenile Code.*” For the purpose of annual reporting, disposed referrals represent the unit of measurement, not individual youth. A disposition refers to the outcome or finding of a referral [see pages 10 & 11 for details about how these dispositions are reported in Missouri’s Judicial Information System (JIS)].

Missouri statute identifies three referral types over which the juvenile and family division has jurisdiction:

- **Status Offenses:** Acts that are violations only if committed by a juvenile. Status offenses include Behavior Injurious to Self/Others, Habitually Absent from Home, Truancy, Beyond Parental Control, and Status-Other.

- **Law Offenses:** Law offenses include all criminal and municipal ordinance violations listed in the Missouri Charge Code Manual.

- **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 Protective Custody, Transfer of Custody, Termination of Parental Rights, and Relief of Custody.

Section 2 presents information on referrals at the state level for the juvenile and family division in calendar 2011.

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percent
Law Enforcement		
Municipal Police	26,489	45.22
County Sheriff	4,169	7.12
Other Law Enforcement	386	0.66
Highway Patrol	208	0.36
Children's Division	11,237	19.18
School Personnel	8,028	13.71
School Resource Officer	477	0.81
Parent	2,540	4.34
Juvenile Division Personnel	2,500	4.27
Other	838	1.43
Other Juvenile Division	537	0.92
Private Social Agency	216	0.37
Relative other than Parent	163	0.28
Public Social Agency	118	0.20
Victim or Self-Referral	95	0.16
Department of Mental Health	26	0.04
Total	57,550	100.00

Table 2-1

Referrals of youth in Missouri to the juvenile and family division originate from a variety of sources. In CY11, 53% of referrals primarily originated from some type of law enforcement agency, the Children's Division of Missouri's Department of Social Services (19%) and schools (15%). Missing Data [546].







Figure 2-1

In CY11, the juvenile and family divisions disposed a total of 58,573 referrals. Law violations were responsible for 50% [29,324] of the referrals. Abuse and neglect allegations made up 26% [15,374] and status offenses accounted for 24% [13,875].

<p>Figure 2-2 Males were involved in 62% [36,175] of referrals, and females were involved in the remaining 38% [22,311]. Missing Data [87]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total Referrals by Gender</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender	Percentage	Male	62%	Female	38%				
Gender	Percentage										
Male	62%										
Female	38%										
<p>Figure 2-3 Approximately, 70% [40,953] of all referrals received by the juvenile and family division were for white youth and 27% [15,711] for black youth. Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian youth accounted for 3% [1,506]. Referrals that listed race as unknown represented less than 1% [403].</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total Referrals by Race</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Percentage	White	70%	Black	27%	Other	3%		
Race	Percentage										
White	70%										
Black	27%										
Other	3%										
<p>Figure 2-4 Older youth, ages 15-16, were responsible for 41% [23,492] of all referrals. Youth in the 12 and under age group were responsible for 34% of referrals [19,682], primarily status and abuse/neglect allegations. Youth of age 13-14 years were responsible for 23% [13,676] of referrals, while 17 year olds were only responsible for 2% [1,360]. Missing Data [363]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total Referrals by Age at Referral</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Percentage	15-16	41%	<=12	34%	13-14	23%	17	2%
Age Group	Percentage										
15-16	41%										
<=12	34%										
13-14	23%										
17	2%										

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

<p style="text-align: center;">Juvenile Referrals: 2001-2011</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Juvenile Referrals: 2001-2011</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Law Violations</th> <th>Status Offenses</th> <th>Child Abuse & Neglect</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2001</td><td>50000</td><td>20000</td><td>18000</td></tr> <tr><td>2002</td><td>46000</td><td>19000</td><td>16000</td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>44000</td><td>18000</td><td>15000</td></tr> <tr><td>2004</td><td>44000</td><td>17000</td><td>14000</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>42000</td><td>16000</td><td>13000</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>43000</td><td>16000</td><td>12000</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>40000</td><td>16000</td><td>13000</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>40000</td><td>15000</td><td>13000</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>38000</td><td>15000</td><td>14000</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>34000</td><td>15000</td><td>15000</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>29000</td><td>14000</td><td>15000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Law Violations	Status Offenses	Child Abuse & Neglect	2001	50000	20000	18000	2002	46000	19000	16000	2003	44000	18000	15000	2004	44000	17000	14000	2005	42000	16000	13000	2006	43000	16000	12000	2007	40000	16000	13000	2008	40000	15000	13000	2009	38000	15000	14000	2010	34000	15000	15000	2011	29000	14000	15000	<p>Figure 2-5 The total number of referrals in the juvenile and family division declined 33% from 2001 to 2011. Law violation referrals declined 41%, status offense referrals declined 31%, and CA/N referrals declined 12%. In CY11 referrals declined overall by 8% from CY10; however, CA/N referrals increased by 2%.</p>
Year	Law Violations	Status Offenses	Child Abuse & Neglect																																														
2001	50000	20000	18000																																														
2002	46000	19000	16000																																														
2003	44000	18000	15000																																														
2004	44000	17000	14000																																														
2005	42000	16000	13000																																														
2006	43000	16000	12000																																														
2007	40000	16000	13000																																														
2008	40000	15000	13000																																														
2009	38000	15000	14000																																														
2010	34000	15000	15000																																														
2011	29000	14000	15000																																														
<p style="text-align: center;">Juvenile Referrals by Gender: 2001-2011</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Juvenile Referrals by Gender: 2001-2011</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Males</th> <th>Females</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2001</td><td>56000</td><td>32000</td></tr> <tr><td>2002</td><td>52000</td><td>29000</td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>50000</td><td>28000</td></tr> <tr><td>2004</td><td>49000</td><td>27000</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>46000</td><td>27000</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>46000</td><td>26000</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>45000</td><td>25000</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>44000</td><td>25000</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>42000</td><td>24000</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>40000</td><td>24000</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>36000</td><td>23000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Males	Females	2001	56000	32000	2002	52000	29000	2003	50000	28000	2004	49000	27000	2005	46000	27000	2006	46000	26000	2007	45000	25000	2008	44000	25000	2009	42000	24000	2010	40000	24000	2011	36000	23000	<p>Figure 2-6 Referrals declined more for males (36%) than for females (28%) from 2001 to 2011. The rate of decline during 2011 for females (7%) continued to be less than males (9%); however the rate of decline for females was over 3 times greater than the previous year's rate (2%).</p>												
Year	Males	Females																																															
2001	56000	32000																																															
2002	52000	29000																																															
2003	50000	28000																																															
2004	49000	27000																																															
2005	46000	27000																																															
2006	46000	26000																																															
2007	45000	25000																																															
2008	44000	25000																																															
2009	42000	24000																																															
2010	40000	24000																																															
2011	36000	23000																																															
<p style="text-align: center;">Juvenile Referrals by Race: 2001-2011</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Juvenile Referrals by Race: 2001-2011</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>White</th> <th>Black</th> <th>Other</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2001</td><td>62000</td><td>24000</td><td>4000</td></tr> <tr><td>2002</td><td>56000</td><td>21000</td><td>4000</td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>52000</td><td>21000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2004</td><td>51000</td><td>21000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>48000</td><td>21000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>48000</td><td>21000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>47000</td><td>23000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>46000</td><td>21000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>45000</td><td>20000</td><td>3000</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>44000</td><td>19000</td><td>2000</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>41000</td><td>16000</td><td>2000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	White	Black	Other	2001	62000	24000	4000	2002	56000	21000	4000	2003	52000	21000	2000	2004	51000	21000	2000	2005	48000	21000	2000	2006	48000	21000	2000	2007	47000	23000	2000	2008	46000	21000	2000	2009	45000	20000	3000	2010	44000	19000	2000	2011	41000	16000	2000	<p>Figure 2-7 The number of referrals declined for all youth from 2001 to 2011. Comparing data for 2001 and 2011, referrals for white youth declined by 33%, compared with 32% for black youth and 55% for other races. However, the average rate of change for the last 4 years has shown a greater decline for black youth (23%) than (11%) white youth.</p>
Year	White	Black	Other																																														
2001	62000	24000	4000																																														
2002	56000	21000	4000																																														
2003	52000	21000	2000																																														
2004	51000	21000	2000																																														
2005	48000	21000	2000																																														
2006	48000	21000	2000																																														
2007	47000	23000	2000																																														
2008	46000	21000	2000																																														
2009	45000	20000	3000																																														
2010	44000	19000	2000																																														
2011	41000	16000	2000																																														

The juvenile and family division responds 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 disposition of the allegations contained in the referral without filing a petition seeking formal judicial jurisdiction. The following referral dispositions are recorded on the *Site Defined (COASITE)* form of the *Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)* of JIS.

Formal Dispositions:

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 another private or public agency. [JIS Docket = DVPTN]

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 disposition requires the youth to receive supervision through the juvenile division. [JIS Docket = DVPTN]

Allegation True, No Services – A judicial action finding the allegation true, however, the youth receives no services or supervision. [JIS Docket = DVPTN]

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. [JIS Docket = DVPTN]

Sustain Motion to Dismiss – A judicial action which results in a motion to dismiss the petition before the initial division hearing. [JIS Docket = DVPTN]

Sustain Motion to Dismiss for Certification - A judicial action sustaining a motion to dismiss a petition to the juvenile division and allow prosecution of youth under the general law. [JIS Docket = DVPTN]

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

Informal Dispositions:

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 Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice. This disposition requires completion of the risk and needs assessment when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation. [JIS Docket = VIAWS]

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 Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice. 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. [JIS Docket = VIANS]

Informal Adjustment, Counseled and Warned: 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. [JIS Docket = DVCAW]

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. [JIS Docket = DVTJC]

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. [JIS Docket = DVTA]

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. [JIS Docket = DVRIE – Insufficient information; DVRNT – Not True]

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

Figure 2-8

Seventy-six percent [44,319] of all referrals were disposed through the informal process. Only 24% [13,683] of referrals required formal court intervention.
Missing Data [571]





Figure 2-9

Informal Adjustment Without Supervision (19%) was the most frequently used method of disposing referrals, followed by Informal Adjustment Counsel and Warn and Informal Adjustment With Supervision at 15% for both. Allegation True, Out-of-home Placement (12%) was the most frequently applied formal disposition, followed by referrals where supervision was applied as an in-home service (7%).
Missing Data [571]



Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Section 3 describes law violation referrals disposed by Missouri’s juvenile and family division. Law violation referrals make up 50 percent of all referrals in calendar 2011. A law violation referral is counted as a single delinquent act, represented by the most serious allegations charged. However, multiple delinquent acts may make up a referral.

Law Violation Referral Source	Frequency	Percent
Law Enforcement		
Municipal Police	20,988	71.57
County Sheriff	2,776	9.47
Other Law Enforcement	309	1.05
Highway Patrol	154	0.53
School Personnel	1,984	6.77
School Resource Officer	265	0.90
Children’s Division	632	2.16
Juvenile Division Personnel	987	3.37
Other Juvenile Division	357	1.22
Parent	382	1.30
Other	69	0.24
Victim or Self-Referral	58	0.20
Private Social Agency	57	0.19
Public Social Agency	53	0.18
Relative other than Parent	35	0.12
Department of Mental Health	4	0.01
Total	29,110	100.00

Table 3-1

The source of 83% of law violation referrals was some form of law enforcement agency, primarily municipal police (72%) and county sheriff departments (9%). Schools were the second highest referring agency (8%).
Missing Data [214]

Note: The option of School Resource Officer as a source of referral was added during CY11.




Figure 3-1

Class A misdemeanor violations (43%) accounted for the majority of law violation referrals, followed by Class B misdemeanors (14%). Felonies represented about one-fifth (19%) of law violation referrals, the majority of which were Class C. Only about 3% of all law violations were for Class A and B felonies.
Missing Data [170]

Figure 3-2

Law violations at the misdemeanor level were the most common allegation for both male and female offenders. However, within gender the percentage of referrals for misdemeanors was higher for females (79%) than for males (65%). Conversely, males were referred at a higher rate (22%) for felonies than their female counterparts (10%). Missing Data [197]




Figure 3-3

Misdemeanor was the most common charge for all law violations. However, within race categories, the percentage of felony referrals was higher for black youth (23%) than white youth (17%) and other minorities (20%). Missing Data [383]





Figure 3-4

Although youth between 15-16 years were responsible for the largest number of misdemeanors, younger youth were proportionately more likely to commit these offenses. Figures indicate that 67% of 15-16 year old youth committed misdemeanors while 71% of 13-14 year olds and 79% of 8-12 year old youth committed these violations. Youth between 15-16 years were responsible for the largest number of felony violations; however, 17 year olds were proportionately more likely to commit these offenses. Missing Data [416]



Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Top Law Violations for 2011	Frequency	Percent	
Assault	6,367	21.84	
Theft/Stealing	5,686	19.51	
Property Damage	2,478	8.50	
Dangerous Drugs	2,376	8.15	
Peace Disturbance	2,005	6.88	
Juvenile Municipal Violation	1,546	5.30	
Liquor Law Violation	1,207	4.14	
Burglary	1,143	3.92	
Invasion of Privacy	1,024	3.51	
Violation of Valid Court Order	950	3.26	
Sexual Offense	911	3.13	
Probation/Parole Violation	519	1.78	
Weapon Violation	448	1.54	
Sexual Assault	442	1.52	
Obstructing Law Enforcement	373	1.28	
Health and Safety Violation	369	1.27	
Robbery	246	0.84	
Receiving Stolen Property	214	0.73	
Arson	160	0.55	
Municipal Violation	155	0.53	
Driving without a License	100	0.34	
Fraud	85	0.29	
Promoting Obscenity	70	0.24	
Violation of Wildlife Law	43	0.15	
Public Order Offense	43	0.15	
Making Threats/False Reports	43	0.15	
Left Scene of Accident	42	0.14	
Miscellaneous Motor/Vehicle	30	0.10	
Forgery	28	0.10	
Endangering Welfare of Child	18	0.06	
Homicide	15	0.05	
Kidnapping	9	0.03	
DWI - Alcohol	6	0.02	
Total	29,151	100.00	

Table 3-2
 Violations for Assault, Theft/Stealing, Property Damage, and Dangerous Drugs accounted for 58% of law referrals.
 Missing Data [173]

Table 3-3

Fifty-five percent of all law violation referrals were committed by juveniles between the ages of 15 and 16. These youth were responsible for 87% of homicides, 70% of robberies, 69% of drug charges, and 60% of stealing. Only sex offenses were committed at a higher rate by youth ages 12 or under. Missing Data [417]

Law Violation Referrals by Allegation and Age	<=12	13-14	15-16	17	Total
Arson	45	57	56	2	160
Assault	1,365	2,074	2,820	82	6,342
Burglary	153	283	662	39	1,137
Dangerous Drugs	90	572	1,644	66	2,372
Driving without a License	7	42	49	1	99
DWI - Alcohol	0	0	6	0	6
Endangering Welfare of Child	5	1	12	0	18
Forgery	2	3	21	2	28
Fraud	2	9	69	5	85
Health and Safety Violation	18	126	217	8	369
Homicide	0	1	13	1	15
Invasion of Privacy	111	313	575	21	1,020
Juvenile Municipal Violation	63	425	1,021	36	1,545
Kidnapping	2	1	4	1	8
Left Scene of Accident	0	2	38	1	41
Liquor Law Violation	13	170	972	49	1,204
Making Threat/False Reports	11	17	14	1	43
Miscellaneous Motor/Vehicle Violation	3	9	17	0	29
Municipal Violation	19	49	85	3	156
Obstructing Law Enforcement	25	101	230	16	372
Peace Disturbance	351	720	905	24	2,000
Probation/Parole Violation	41	99	320	51	511
Promoting Obscenity	5	29	31	4	69
Property Damage	534	713	1,163	49	2,459
Public Order Offense	3	10	30	0	43
Receiving Stolen Property	11	70	125	8	214
Robbery	3	57	171	14	245
Sexual Assault	65	115	174	40	394
Sexual Offense	309	277	252	27	865
Theft/Stealing	624	1,496	3,427	131	5,678
Violation of Valid Court Order	21	171	518	179	889
Violation of Wildlife Law	0	4	38	1	43
Weapon Violation	84	136	221	7	448
Total	3,985	8,152	15,900	870	28,90

Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Action Taken for Law Violation Referrals




Figure 3-5

Eighty-one percent [23,516] of law violation referrals were disposed through the informal court process. The remaining 19% required formal court intervention [5,581].
Missing Data [227]

Law Violations by Disposition




Figure 3-6

The most frequently used method of disposing law violation referrals was Informal Adjustment without Supervision (21%), followed by Informal Adjustment with Supervision (17%). Both Informal Adjustment, Counsel and Warn and Referral Rejected were the outcomes 16% of the time. Allegation True With In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal disposition (10%), followed by Allegation True-Out-of-home Placement (5%). Less than 1% of referrals resulted in Certification to Adult Court. Missing Data [227]

Section 4: Status Violation Referrals

Section 4 describes status violation referrals disposed by the juvenile and family division. Status violation referrals made up 24 percent of all referrals in calendar 2011. A status violation referral is counted as a single behavioral act, represented by the most serious allegation charged.

However, multiple delinquent acts may make up a referral.

	Source of Referral	Frequency	Percent
<p>Table 4-1 Similar to law violation referrals, 40% of all status violation referrals originated from some form of law enforcement agency, primarily municipal police (31%) and county sheriff departments (8%). Schools (38%) were the second highest referring agency, followed by parents (11%). Missing Data [40]</p>	Law Enforcement		
	Municipal Police	4,296	31.05
	County Sheriff	1,103	7.97
	Other Law Enforcement	47	0.34
	Highway Patrol	35	0.25
	School Personnel	5,086	36.76
	School Resource Officer	187	1.35
	Parent	1,463	10.57
	Children's Division	645	4.66
	Juvenile Division Personnel	639	4.62
	Other Juvenile Division	90	0.65
	Relative other than Parent	86	0.62
	Other	56	0.40
	Victim or Self-Referral	33	0.24
	Public Social Agency	29	0.21
	Private Social Agency	27	0.20
Department of Mental Health	13	0.09	
Total	13,835	100.00	

	Charge Level	FREQ.	%
<p>Figure 4-1 Behavior Injurious to Self or Others (30%) was the most frequent status offense for which youth were referred to the juvenile and family division, followed closely by Truancy (29%). Youth were referred at about the same rate for both, Habitually Absent from Home and Beyond Parental Control (19%). Missing data [0].</p>	Behavior Injurious To Self/Oth	4,112	29.64
	Truancy	3,968	28.60
	Habitually Absent from Home	2,662	19.19
	Beyond Parental Control	2,581	18.60
	Status Offense - Other	552	3.98

Section 4: Status Violation Referrals




Figure 4-2
Males were most likely to be referred for Behavior Injurious to Self/Others (34%), whereas females were more likely to be referred for Truancy (32%). Males were least likely to be referred for Habitually Absent from Home (16%), whereas females were least likely to be referred for Beyond Parental Control (18%). Missing Data [25]

Figure 4-3
Status violation referrals for white youth were most frequently for Behavior Injurious to Self/Others (32%) and Truancy (30%). Black youth were most frequently referred for Habitually Absent from Home (37%), followed by Truancy (21%). Missing Data [111]

Figure 4-4
Proportionally, the age group of 12 years or less was referred for Behavior Injurious to Self or Others (44%) more than any other age group. Youth in the age groups 13-14 and 15-16 received the most referrals for Truancy. The age group of 17 years had the largest referrals for Habitually Absent from Home (37%) and Status Offense-Other (9%). Missing Data [60]

Figure 4-5

The vast majority of status violation referrals [88%, 12,181] were disposed through the informal process, and only 12% [1,647] of referrals were disposed through the formal court process.
Missing Data [47]

Action Taken for Status Referrals





Figure 4-6

Informal Adjustment without Supervision (28%) was the mostly frequently used method for disposing status referrals, followed by Informal Adjustment with Supervision and Informal Adjustment, Counsel and Warn (21% and 20%, respectively). Allegation True with In-home Services was the most frequently applied formal disposition (6%).
Missing Data [47]

Status Referral by Disposition



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 26 percent of all referrals in calendar 2011. A CA/N referral is counted as a single event, represented by the most serious allegation where a youth is the victim. However, youth may be the victim of multiple incidences of abuse and/or neglect at the time they are referred.

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percent
Children’s Division	9,960	66.04
Law Enforcement		
Municipal Police	1,205	7.99
County Sheriff	290	1.92
Highway Patrol	19	0.13
Other Law Enforcement	30	0.20
Parent	695	4.61
Juvenile Division Personnel	874	5.79
School Personnel	958	6.35
School Resource Officer	25	0.17
Other	713	4.73
Private Social Agency	132	0.88
Other Juvenile Division	90	0.60
Relative other than Parent	42	0.28
Public Social Agency	36	0.24
Victim or Self-Referral	4	0.03
Department of Mental Health	9	0.06
Total	15,082	100.00

Table 5-1

The source of 66% of all CA/N referrals was Children’s Division (CD) of Missouri’s Department of Social Services (DSS). Approximately, 10% of the referrals originated from law enforcement agencies. Parents were responsible for another 5% of CA/N referrals. Juvenile division personnel and school personnel were both the source of 6% of referrals disposed by the juvenile and family division. Missing Data [292]

Child Abuse & Neglect Referrals by Offense Type




Figure 5-1

Neglect–Improper Care/Supervision represented nearly half (45%) of all CA/N referrals, followed by Abuse-Physical (12%) and Neglect-Other (10%).

Figure 5-2

The percentage of referrals for neglect, abuse, and custody was fairly proportionate among all genders.
Missing Data [31]




Figure 5-3

Within race, the percentage of referrals for the areas of neglect and abuse was similar for black and white youth. Other youth (29%) had proportionately the most referrals for abuse. Custody related referrals were more frequent for black youth (14%) than white (12%) and other (10%) youth.
Missing Data [73]





Figure 5-4

The vast majority of abuse, neglect and custody referrals were for youth 12 years of age and under [12,503] with neglect (66%) as the most frequently reported allegation, followed by abuse (21%).
Missing Data [52]



Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals

Action Taken for Child Abuse & Neglect Referrals




Figure 5-5

Over half (57%) of CA/N referrals were disposed through the informal court process [8,622]. The remaining 43% [6,455] of referrals were handled formally. Missing Data [297]

Child Abuse & Neglect Referral by Disposition




Figure 5-6

Allegation True, Out-of-home Placement was the most frequently applied disposition (34%) to CA/N referrals, followed by Transfer to Other Agency (CD) (18%) and Referral Rejected (15%). Missing Data [297]

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 which 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, promote statewide consistency in the services and supervision of youthful offenders, and estimate juvenile officer workload.

Section 6 presents information on juveniles with referrals, disposed during calendar 2011, who had risk and needs assessments entered on the *Custom Assessment Maintenance (CZAASMT)* form of JIS. When a referral had more than one associated risk/needs assessment(s), the highest score was reported. When a referral was not associated with any risk/needs assessment(s) in the reporting year, the score associated with the risk/needs assessment that was completed most closely to the initial filing date of the referral was 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 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.*

Section 6: Assessment & Classification

Figure 6-1

The majority of youth [65%, 12,232] scored at moderate risk for future delinquent acts on risk assessments in CY11. The remaining youth scored at low [22%, 4,227] or high risk levels [13%, 2,437].




Figure 6-2

Proportionately, more male youth (14%) were assessed high risk than females (11%). Females (25%) were more likely than their male counterparts (21%) to be assessed low risk. Missing Data [28]




Figure 6-3

Proportionately, more black youth (18%) were assessed high risk than white youth (11%). White youth (24%) were more likely than their black counterparts (16%) to be assessed low risk. Missing Data [134]




Table 6-1 Risk Factors	Frequency	Percent
Age at First Referral		
16	2,531	14%
15	3,217	17%
14	3,475	18%
13	3,116	17%
12 and under	6,467	34%
Prior Referrals		
None	8,774	47%
One or more	10,032	53%
Assault Referrals		
No prior or present referral(s) for assault	13,549	72%
One or more prior or present referral(s) for misdemeanor assault	4,788	25%
One or more prior or present referral(s) for felony assault	469	3%
History of Placement		
No prior of out-of-home placement	14,479	77%
Prior of out-of-home placement	4,327	23%
Peer Relationships		
Neutral influence	8,640	46%
Negative influence	8,235	44%
Strong negative influence	1,931	10%
History of Child Abuse or Neglect		
No history of child abuse or neglect	15,366	82%
History of child abuse or neglect	3,440	18%
Substance Abuse		
No apparent substance abuse problem	14,247	76%
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	3,845	20%
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	714	4%
School Attendance/Disciplinary Problems		
No or only minor problems	8,279	44%
Moderate school behavior problems	7,741	41%
Severe school behavior problems	2,786	15%
Parent Management Style		
Effective management style	8,499	45%
Moderately ineffective management style	7,908	42%
Severely ineffective management style	2,399	13%
Parental History of Incarceration		
No prior incarceration	14,188	75%
Prior incarceration	4,618	25%

Section 6: Assessment & Classification

Needs Factors	Frequency	Percent
Behavior Problems		
No significant behavioral problems	6,104	37%
Moderate behavioral problems	8,282	50%
Severe behavioral problems	2,193	13%
Attitude		
Motivated to change; accepts responsibility	10,632	64%
Generally uncooperative; not motivated to change	4,906	29%
Very negative attitude; resistant to change	1,042	6%
Interpersonal Skills		
Good interpersonal skills	9,895	60%
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	5,965	36%
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	719	4%
Peer Relationships		
Neutral peer group influence	7,070	43%
Negative peer group influence	7,779	47%
Strong negative peer group influence	1,732	10%
History of Child Abuse		
No history of child abuse or neglect	13,417	81%
History of child abuse and/or neglect	3,164	19%
Mental Health		
No mental health disorder	12,814	77%
Mental health disorder with treatment	3,170	19%
Mental health disorder with no treatment	595	4%
Substance Abuse		
No substance abuse problem	12,473	75%
Moderate alcohol and/or substance abuse problem	3,541	21%
Severe alcohol and/or substance abuse or dependence	567	4%
School Attendance		
No or only minor school behavior problems	6,986	42%
Moderate school behavior problems	7,125	43%
Severe school behavior problems	2,470	15%
Academic Performance		
Passing (or 16 years old and not enrolled)	8,216	49%
Functioning below average	6,079	37%
Failing	2,284	14%
Learning Disorder		
No diagnosed learning disorder	14,552	88%
Diagnosed learning disorder	2,027	12%

Table 6-2 Cont. Needs Factors	Frequency	Percent
Employment		
Full-time employment	1,192	27%
Part-time employment	474	11%
Unemployed	2,671	62%
Juvenile's Parental Responsibility		
No children	15,885	96%
One child	317	2%
Two children	213	1%
Three or more children	164	1%
Health/Handicaps		
No health problems or physical handicaps	15,929	96%
No health problems/handicaps, limited access to health care	191	1%
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	382	2%
Pregnancy	24	0.1%
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	53	0.3%
Parental Management Style		
Effective management style	7,074	43%
Moderately ineffective management style	7,205	43%
Severely ineffective management style	2,302	14%
Parental Mental Health		
No parental history of mental health disorder	14,064	85%
Parental history of mental health disorder	2,515	15%
Parental Substance Abuse		
No parental substance abuse	13,409	81%
Parental substance abuse	3,170	19%
Social Support System		
Strong support system	7,420	44%
Limited support system with one positive role model	7,126	43%
Weak support system with no positive role models	1,768	11%
Strong negative or criminal influence in support system	265	2%


Section 7: Detention Services

Missouri had 24 detention centers at the beginning of the calendar 2011. Five centers were closed during the year. By the end of the calendar year there were 19 detention facilities to house youth in need of secure confinement. Juvenile justice personnel identify offenders most in need of secure confinement using the objective criteria contained in Missouri's Juvenile Detention Assessment (JDTA). In addition, 11 detention centers participate in the Annie Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) [highlighted in table 7-1]. JDAI is an effort to assist the juvenile and family division with 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.

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.

Section 7: Detention Services

	Population on Last Day of CY11		
	Circuit	Population	Percent MO Youth Detained
<p>Table 7-1* Metropolitan circuits [16, 21, 22, & 31] account for 65% of all youth detained in Missouri on the last day of CY11.</p> <p><i>* JDAI sites are highlighted</i></p> <p>(The 17th Circuit has 2 detention facilities.)</p>	02	4	2.86
	05	2	1.43
	07	1	0.71
	11	5	3.57
	13	3	2.14
	16	11	7.86
	17	10	7.14
	19	1	0.71
	21	33	23.57
	22	32	22.86
	23	3	2.14
	24	5	3.57
	26	4	2.86
	29	2	1.43
	31	10	7.14
	33	1	0.71
	35	8	5.71
	44	5	3.57
Total	140	100.00	



Section 7: Detention Services

<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Race</p> <p>A pie chart titled 'Total Detention Admissions by Race' showing the distribution of admissions by race. The largest slice is White at 57%, followed by Black at 39%, and Other at 4%.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Percentage	White	57%	Black	39%	Other	4%	<p>Figure 7-2 White youth accounted for 57% [3,688] of admissions to secure detention facilities while black youth accounted for 39% [2,551]. About 4% [255] of admissions were for youth of other races. Missing Data [459]</p>																
Race	Percentage																								
White	57%																								
Black	39%																								
Other	4%																								
<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Gender and Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>GENDER</th> <th>Race</th> <th>FREQ.</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Male</td> <td>White</td> <td>2,578</td> <td>53.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>2,023</td> <td>42.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>199</td> <td>4.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Female</td> <td>White</td> <td>1,101</td> <td>65.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>528</td> <td>31.37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>54</td> <td>3.21</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>A horizontal bar chart titled 'Total Detention Admissions by Gender and Race'. The x-axis represents frequency from 0 to 3000. The y-axis lists gender and race combinations. The bars are color-coded: yellow for White, maroon for Black, and blue for Other.</p>	GENDER	Race	FREQ.	%	Male	White	2,578	53.71	Black	2,023	42.15	Other	199	4.15	Female	White	1,101	65.42	Black	528	31.37	Other	54	3.21	<p>Figure 7-3 White males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities, followed by black males. Within gender, white females accounted for the largest number of admissions to a detention center. Missing data [470]</p>
GENDER	Race	FREQ.	%																						
Male	White	2,578	53.71																						
	Black	2,023	42.15																						
	Other	199	4.15																						
Female	White	1,101	65.42																						
	Black	528	31.37																						
	Other	54	3.21																						
<p style="text-align: center;">Total Detention Admissions by Age</p> <p>A pie chart titled 'Total Detention Admissions by Age' showing the distribution of admissions by age group. The largest slice is 15-16 at 62%, followed by 13-14 at 26%, and both <=12 and >=17 at 6% each.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Percentage	15-16	62%	13-14	26%	<=12	6%	>=17	6%	<p>Figure 7-4 Youth between the ages 15-16 years accounted for a majority of admissions [62%, 4,254], followed by 13-14 year olds [26%, 1,778]. Fewer youth of age 12 or under [6%, 423] and over the age of 16 [6%, 377] were admitted. Missing Data [121]</p>														
Age Group	Percentage																								
15-16	62%																								
13-14	26%																								
<=12	6%																								
>=17	6%																								

Figure 7-5

The statewide average daily detention population was 209. The vast majority [74%] of these detainees were male. Missing Data [128]




Figure 7-6

The statewide average daily population for black youth [106] in secure detention was greater than that of white youth [87]. Missing Data [459]





Figure 7-7

Within gender, the statewide average daily detention population was greater for black males [93] and white females [20]. Missing Data [470]



Section 7: Detention Services

<p style="text-align: center;">Average Daily Population by Age</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>AGE</th> <th>FREQ.</th> <th>Daily_Pop SUM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><=12</td> <td>423</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-14</td> <td>1,778</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-16</td> <td>4,254</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>=17</td> <td>377</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AGE	FREQ.	Daily_Pop SUM	<=12	423	8	13-14	1,778	54	15-16	4,254	135	>=17	377	10	<p>Figure 7-8 Within age groupings, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16 year old youth [135], followed by 13-14 year old youth [54]. The average daily population was least for ages 12 and younger [8]. Missing Data [121].</p>
AGE	FREQ.	Daily_Pop SUM														
<=12	423	8														
13-14	1,778	54														
15-16	4,254	135														
>=17	377	10														
<p style="text-align: center;">Average Length of Stay by Gender</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>FREQ.</th> <th>DAYS MEAN</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>5,040</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>1,785</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender	FREQ.	DAYS MEAN	Male	5,040	12	Female	1,785	8	<p>Figure 7-9 The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities was 12 days for males and 8 days for females. Missing Data [128].]</p>						
Gender	FREQ.	DAYS MEAN														
Male	5,040	12														
Female	1,785	8														
<p style="text-align: center;">Average Length of Stay by Race</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>FREQ.</th> <th>DAYS MEAN</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>3,688</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>2,551</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>255</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	FREQ.	DAYS MEAN	White	3,688	9	Black	2,551	15	Other	255	9	<p>Figure 7-10 Black youth had a longer statewide average length of stay in detention facilities [15 days] than other youth. The average length of stay for white youth and other minorities was 9 days. Missing Data [459]]</p>			
Race	FREQ.	DAYS MEAN														
White	3,688	9														
Black	2,551	15														
Other	255	9														

Figure 7-11

The statewide average length of stay for black males [17 days] was longer than white males [10] and other male minorities [9]. The same was true for females where the average length of stay for black females [9 days] was longer than white females and other female minorities [7].

Missing Data [470]





Figure 7-12




Youth between the age of 15-16 years represented the largest number of detained youth and the longest average length of stay [12 days], followed by youth age 13-14 [11 days]. The length of stay for the youngest detainees (12 years and under) was the shortest [7 days] with the 17 or older group having the next shortest stay [10 days].

Missing Data [121]






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 2011. For circuit level information on these commitments, refer to Appendix I. The count presented is unduplicated. (**Note:** Docket entries in JIS produce data different from that historically reported by DYS.)

<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide DYS Commitments by Gender</p>  <p>A pie chart titled 'Statewide DYS Commitments by Gender'. The chart is divided into two segments: a large blue segment representing 'Male' at 83%, and a smaller maroon segment representing 'Female' at 17%.</p>	<p>Figure 8-1 There were 822 youths committed to the custody of DYS in CY11. Eighty-three percent [686] were male and 17% [136] were female.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide DYS Commitments by Race</p>  <p>A pie chart titled 'Statewide DYS Commitments by Race'. The chart is divided into three segments: a large blue segment representing 'White' at 60%, a maroon segment representing 'Black' at 35%, and a small yellow segment representing 'Other' at 5%.</p>	<p>Figure 8-2 White youth accounted for 60% [496] of juveniles committed to DYS, while black youth accounted for 35% [285]. The remaining 5% percent [41] were from other race groups.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide DYS Commitments by Age</p>  <p>A pie chart titled 'Statewide DYS Commitments by Age'. The chart is divided into three segments: a large blue segment representing '>=15' at 77%, a maroon segment representing '13-14' at 21%, and a small yellow segment representing '<=12' at 2%.</p>	<p>Figure 8-3 Seventy-seven percent [635] of youth committed to DYS were over the age of 15. An additional 21% [172] were between 13-14 years of age. The remaining 2% [15] of youth were age 12 or under.</p>

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 2011. For additional circuit level information about these certifications, refer to Appendix J. Assuming certifications are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count presented is unduplicated.

<p>Figure 9-1 The statewide total for youth certified to adult courts was 74. Males represented the vast majority [71, 96%] while females only represented 4% [3]. (When checked for duplicates, three were found and deleted. This had not been done in previous reports.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide Certified Youth by Gender</p>  <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender	Percentage	Male	96%	Female	4%				
Gender	Percentage										
Male	96%										
Female	4%										
<p>Figure 9-2 The percentage of youth certified to adult courts was greater for black youth [69%] than white youth [30%] or youth of other minority status [1%].</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide Certified Youth by Race</p>  <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race	Percentage	Black	69%	White	30%	Other	1%		
Race	Percentage										
Black	69%										
White	30%										
Other	1%										
<p>Figure 9-3 Forty percent [30] of youth certified to adult court were 17 years old. Thirty-five percent [26] were age 16. Twenty-two percent [16] were over 17 years of age. Only 3% [2] were age 15 or younger.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Statewide Certified Youth by Age</p>  <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>16 years</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 years</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>17 yrs</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><=15 years</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Percentage	16 years	35%	17 years	40%	>17 yrs	22%	<=15 years	3%
Age Group	Percentage										
16 years	35%										
17 years	40%										
>17 yrs	22%										
<=15 years	3%										




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 CY10 cohort of Missouri juvenile law offenders who were tracked through CY11 for recidivism.

Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism

<p>Figure 10-1 Approximately 2% [14,614] of the 644,736 juveniles age 10-17 were referred to Missouri's juvenile and family division for legally sufficient law violation referrals in CY10.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Offender Population as a Proportion of Missouri Youth</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Non-Offenders</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Offenders</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	Non-Offenders	98%	Offenders	2%
Category	Percentage						
Non-Offenders	98%						
Offenders	2%						
<p>Figure 10-2 Twenty-three percent [3,376] of the 14,614 juvenile law offenders in CY10 recidivated through a new law violation within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Recidivism Rate for Youth Offender Group (All Law)</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Non-recidivists</td> <td>77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recidivists</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	Non-recidivists	77%	Recidivists	23%
Category	Percentage						
Non-recidivists	77%						
Recidivists	23%						
<p>Figure 10-3 Eighteen percent [2,685] of the CY10 offenders recidivated either with a new class A misdemeanor or felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Recidivism Rate for Youth Offender Group (Misd A & Felony)</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Non-recidivists</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recidivists</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	Non-recidivists	82%	Recidivists	18%
Category	Percentage						
Non-recidivists	82%						
Recidivists	18%						

Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism




Figure 10-4
Seven percent [1,063] of the CY10 offenders recidivated with a felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.




Figure 10-5
The recidivism percent for the CY10 cohort [23%] indicates a decrease of 6% from the CY09 cohort [29%]. However, the percent of youth who recidivated with either a Class A misdemeanor or felony increased slightly from 17% to 18%, and the cohort with only a new felony charge stayed constant over the last two years [7%].




Figure 10-6
Males (26%) from the CY10 cohort recidivated at a much higher rate than their female (18%) counterparts. Missing data [2]

Figure 10-7

Proportionately, youth of minority status from CY10 had a higher rate of recidivism (28%) than their white counterparts (21%) for all law referrals. Recidivism rates were also proportionately higher for minorities with Class A misdemeanor or felony referrals by 8%. Recidivism rates for minorities who had only felony referrals were proportionately higher than white youths by 6%.




Figure 10-8

Re-referrals rates from CY10 for all law violations were approximately the same for youth in urban and rural locations [23%]. The rates were higher by 4% for Class A misdemeanor and felony referrals in urban locations than rural, and also higher by 5% for just felony referrals.





Figure 10-9

The rate of recidivism is highest for youth between the ages of 13 and 14 years. Twenty-six percent of this group re-offended within 12 months, compared with 21% for 12 year olds and under and 23% for youth ages 15-16.



Section 11: Juvenile Officer Workload

The Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload (JWWL) system is an automated means of estimating the direct service need for additional deputy juvenile officers in Missouri's 35 multi-county circuits. The JWWL 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 *Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice*, 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 JWWL for estimating FTE needs for juvenile officers in fiscal 2004. The CCBC has since used the JWWL annually for this budgetary purpose. When fiscally advisable, the CCBC uses the 100 percent staffing level of the JWWL. At other times, the CCBC considers JWWL staffing levels based on assumptions that only 60 to 80 percent of workload demand can be provided.

The 60/80 percent staffing estimates are calculated by multiplying by 60/80 percent the total number of staff needed to service every youth and referral to the juvenile division at established direct service standards (*Rounded Est. Staff Needed for 100%*), then subtracting from that total the actual number of direct service staff currently available (*Current Staff*). This is an equitable method for distributing a limited number of new officers across the multi-county circuits because it provides a 60/80 percent staffing baseline for all circuits and allocates proportionately more staff to those farthest from that 60/80 percent baseline. For example, while some circuits may require several new officers to reach 100 percent of their estimated staffing need, they may require no new officers to reach 60/80 percent of their staffing need. For other circuits, numerous officers may be required just to reach 60/80 percent of their estimated staffing need.

Example of Workload Estimate for Mock Multi-County Circuit

Total Workload Hours: Monthly total work hours 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 2006 juvenile officer workload study [Table 11-1].

Example: Mock Circuit, 550 hrs of direct service work are required to accommodate case management demand.

Rounded Est Staff Needed for 100%: Total number of direct service staff needed to meet Total Workload Hours.

Example: Mock Circuit, Total Workload Hours / 130.8 hrs. = Rounded Est Staff Needed for 100% (550 / 130.8 hrs = 4.0 direct service staff needed).

Current Staff: Total number of direct service staff currently employed by circuit.

Example: Mock Circuit employs 3 direct service staff. Currently this includes all state-paid DJO I & II positions and all full-time staff paid through DYS diversion grant funds.

Total FTE Hours: Total number of staff hours available for direct service work.

Example: Mock Circuit, there are 3 direct service staff @ 130.8 hrs available per officer for direct service activity = 392.4 hrs.

FTE Qualified for FY14 100%: Additional direct service staff needed to service Total Workload Hours per standards.

Example: Mock Circuit, Rounded Est Staff Needed for 100% – Current Staff = FTE Qualified for FY14 100% (4.0 - 3.0 = 1.0 additional direct service staff)

Total Staff Inc Needed for 100%: Percent increase in actual staff that is necessary to accommodate Total Workload Hours represents one method to compare circuits in terms of staff need.

Example: Mock Circuit, FTE Qualified for FY14 100% / Current Staff = Total Staff Inc Needed for 100% (1.0 / 3 = 33%)

Staff Needed to Reach 60 or 80% of Total Workload Hours (60/80PercentLevel): Methods for equitable distribution of new staff among multi-county circuits at less than 100% level.

80% Example: Mock Circuit Total Workload Hours (550) multiplied by 80% (440) divided by 130.8 hrs = 3.0. Rounded Est Staff Needed for 80% – Current Staff = FTE Qualified for FY 14 80% (3.0 - 3.0 = 0 additional direct service staff needed).

60% Example: Mock Circuit Total Workload Hours (550) multiplied by 60% (330) divided by 130.8 hrs = 2.5 Rounded Est Staff Needed for 60% – Current Staff = FTE Qualified for FY14 60% (2.0 - 3.0 = -1 additional direct service staff needed).

Column Name	Column Description	Workload Value (hrs)
CBI Avg	Youth Receiving Intensive Supervision	7.0
Informal Avg	Youth Receiving Informal Supervision	2.6
Formal Low Avg	Youth Receiving Formal Low Risk Sup	2.2
Formal Moderate Avg	Youth Receiving Formal Moderate Risk Sup	2.8
Formal High Avg	Youth Receiving Formal High Risk Sup	7.0
Formal Not Class Avg	Youth Receiving Formal Sup Not Classified	2.2
Screened	Referrals Screened for Sufficiency	1.6
Inf Proc Avg	Referrals Informally Processed	1.9
From Proc Avg	Referrals Formally Processed	5.6
New Child Welfare	Child Welfare Cases < 31 Days Old	2.2
Ongoing Child Welfare	Child Welfare Cases > 31 Days Old	

Section 11: Juvenile Officer Workload

Table 11-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload FY14																	
CT	CBI Avg	Informal Avg	Formal Low Avg	Formal Mod Avg	Formal High Avg	Formal Not Class Avg	Screened	Inf Proc Avg	Form Proc Avg	New Child Welfare	Ongoing Child Welfare	Total Workload Hours	Total FTE Hours	Current Staff	Rounded Est Staff Needed for 100%	FTE Qualified for FY 14 100%	Total Staff Inc Needed for 100%
01	14	40	0	6	9	0	33	24	5	4	202	870	262	2	7	5	2
02	6	24	1	11	5	0	49	16	9	2	85	529	654	5	4	-1	0
03	3	65	3	15	7	1	21	4	10	4	149	735	392	3	6	3	1
04	13	50	1	21	4	0	34	14	14	2	110	592	523	4	5	1	0
05	2	57	2	103	22	3	84	28	25	1	104	1274	1570	12	10	-2	0
08	0	16	0	15	3	0	23	8	5	0	9	213	262	2	2	0	0
09	7	93	3	22	1	0	35	9	10	3	55	647	392	3	5	2	1
10	1	66	6	56	31	1	41	19	11	3	107	1028	883	7	8	1	0
12	21	85	2	40	32	4	34	13	3	1	103	1085	916	7	8	1	0
13	14	71	0	53	58	0	180	66	73	14	260	2316	2093	16	18	2	0
14	1	69	2	25	21	1	62	26	8	7	94	851	654	5	7	2	0
15	6	48	1	20	7	0	51	25	10	6	124	719	523	4	6	2	0
17	1	302	4	62	21	0	115	47	36	8	311	2361	1177	9	18	9	1
18	2	132	1	19	17	0	48	15	2	2	131	956	687	5	7	2	0
20	2	44	9	45	6	6	60	20	17	1	231	1117	1112	9	9	0	0
24	40	86	3	76	8	2	62	24	13	3	269	1679	916	7	13	6	1
25	16	26	2	22	2	0	367	106	18	6	168	1560	1046	8	12	4	0
26	0	49	12	77	20	2	106	42	17	19	356	1760	1046	8	13	5	1
27	12	48	1	3	0	0	49	32	9	6	175	812	654	5	6	1	0
28	0	30	0	23	14	2	47	19	7	2	92	627	523	4	5	1	0
30	9	38	0	5	3	0	122	57	8	12	151	909	916	7	7	0	0
32	43	211	2	23	13	3	69	44	8	6	103	1518	1046	8	12	4	0
33	20	54	16	89	9	1	66	13	38	2	80	1248	916	7	10	3	0
34	30	56	4	5	0	0	30	6	9	5	146	824	785	6	6	0	0
35	1	15	5	28	10	0	120	8	35	13	263	1246	1308	10	10	0	0
36	2	21	1	39	3	0	59	9	25	9	149	842	654	5	6	1	0
37	13	38	2	14	16	1	64	47	6	1	69	670	785	6	5	-1	0
38	12	73	0	25	13	0	90	29	17	10	246	1323	785	6	10	4	1
39	13	67	4	12	6	0	69	10	24	1	227	1129	785	6	9	3	0
40	45	0	1	1	1	1	45	1	21	11	275	1153	687	5	9	4	1
41	1	34	0	27	7	0	50	17	4	3	121	657	523	4	5	1	0
42	16	108	0	0	0	0	51	23	8	2	110	727	785	6	6	0	0
43	4	116	4	56	40	11	73	31	23	6	117	1411	392	3	11	8	2
44	1	50	1	13	1	0	27	7	6	2	63	417	392	3	3	0	0
45	7	33	5	20	7	1	84	14	21	3	126	837	654	5	6	1	0
10	66	3	31	12	1	72	25	16	5	154	36643	27697	211	284	72		
Statewide Averages for Each Workload Category											Totals						

Section 12: 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 are compiled into a final report and submitted to the Supreme Court Chief Justice and the Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline.

Section 12: CA/N Time Standards

Table 12-1 CA/N Quarterly Hearings Report (Hearings Held Timely CY11)			
CT	Hearings Held	Hearing Held Timely	Percent Held Timely
CT01	157	157	100%
CT02	439	439	100%
CT03	236	236	100%
CT04	237	237	100%
CT05	145	145	100%
CT06	100	100	100%
CT07	312	309	99%
CT08	27	27	100%
CT09	137	132	96%
CT10	247	246	100%
CT11	787	727	92%
CT12	441	430	98%
CT13	918	916	100%
CT14	316	306	97%
CT15	288	287	100%
CT16	5,086	4,973	98%
CT17	1,010	971	96%
CT18	416	416	100%
CT19	370	351	95%
CT20	860	803	93%
CT21	3,651	3,576	98%
CT22	2,815	2,813	100%
CT23	2,107	2,053	97%
CT24	1,262	1,241	98%
CT25	979	979	100%
CT26	1,417	1,414	100%
CT27	588	571	97%
CT28	279	248	89%
CT29	1,826	1,723	94%
CT30	587	587	100%
CT31	3,596	3,571	99%
CT32	651	627	96%
CT33	430	426	99%
CT34	373	368	99%
CT35	1,502	1,474	98%
CT36	547	544	99%
CT37	243	239	98%
CT38	955	953	100%
CT39	1,054	1,040	99%
CT40	1,230	1,182	96%
CT41	316	306	97%
CT42	601	588	98%
CT43	338	327	97%
CT44	357	357	100%
CT45	532	522	98%
Statewide	40,765	39,937	98%

Table 12-1
 Most juvenile and family divisions conducted the required CA/N hearings in a timely fashion. Forty-one divisions held 95% or more of their hearings on time; while at the statewide level, 98% of hearings were held timely.

APPENDICES A-K

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	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. With Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total	
1	Clark	0	23	4	0	0	84	31	0	0	0	0	142	
	Schuyler	0	8	0	0	0	54	27	0	0	0	0	89	
	Scotland	0	10	0	0	0	36	30	0	0	0	0	76	
2	Adair	0	43	19	0	0	96	96	71	19	74	5	423	
	Knox	0	2	0	0	0	4	44	0	0	5	0	55	
	Lewis	0	9	5	0	1	57	118	1	0	20	2	214	
3	Grundy	0	16	17	0	0	36	19	53	1	21	30	193	
	Harrison	0	15	4	0	0	7	43	33	3	8	2	115	
	Mercer	0	0	3	3	0	0	3	5	0	4	5	23	
	Putnam	0	11	17	3	0	3	13	6	0	9	20	84	
4	Atchison	0	24	5	0	0	7	23	7	2	10	18	96	
	Gentry	2	4	0	0	0	8	17	1	2	0	22	56	
	Holt	0	10	0	0	0	3	20	1	1	2	4	41	
	Nodaway	0	48	20	0	1	58	27	3	3	8	49	217	
	Worth	0	9	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	9	26	
5	Andrew	0	3	16	0	0	30	17	24	2	5	11	108	
	Buchanan	11	112	174	0	3	282	191	120	11	49	49	1,004	
6	Platte	0	27	34	0	0	7	120	8	48	1	39	287	
7	Clay	2	93	16	0	1	30	282	144	135	45	83	922	
8	Carroll	0	14	12	0	0	0	43	24	0	3	1	7	104
	Ray	0	25	28	0	0	2	133	24	10	19	17	27	285
9	Chariton	0	11	2	0	0	0	36	11	1	1	2	0	64
	Linn	0	22	28	0	2	8	113	15	4	4	1	9	206
	Sullivan	0	13	21	0	0	0	46	34	0	1	6	81	202
10	Marion	7	14	23	1	0	3	19	104	46	5	13	10	245
	Monroe	1	18	19	0	0	0	16	19	0	2	1	10	86
	Ralls	2	7	7	0	0	1	11	14	8	0	7	7	64
11	St. Charles	22	251	178	0	2	34	737	342	13	153	206	452	2,390
12	Audrain	0	5	25	0	1	5	64	113	8	20	13	20	274
	Montgomery	0	27	4	0	1	1	43	21	1	0	4	0	102
	Warren	0	59	11	0	1	0	118	103	31	14	41	4	382
13	Boone	3	157	546	0	2	88	650	144	224	169	60	70	2,113
	Callaway	1	25	125	0	0	24	178	39	63	33	17	52	557
14	Howard	0	12	1	0	0	2	10	18	12	3	2	7	67
	Randolph	0	45	22	0	0	19	146	211	112	42	26	58	681
15	Lafayette	0	39	27	0	0	4	98	28	72	13	9	30	320
	Saline	0	34	8	6	0	0	95	47	18	29	4	6	247
16	Jackson	74	1,176	369	16	175	32	9	77	416	104	26	554	3,028
17	Cass	2	153	87	1	7	2	236	195	81	39	11	19	833
	Johnson	3	33	42	1	1	2	54	190	79	5	1	10	421
18	Cooper	0	6	13	0	0	0	52	71	40	3	8	11	204
	Pettis	0	27	7	2	2	1	188	72	72	15	40	52	478
19	Cole	12	92	68	1	0	2	271	127	228	92	32	123	1,048
20	Franklin	1	118	22	4	0	1	66	126	158	8	8	127	639
	Gasconade	0	7	5	0	0	1	35	24	15	13	0	23	123
	Osage	0	6	1	0	0	0	8	12	8	2	0	6	43
21	St. Louis Co.	168	430	307	422	300	105	1,123	1,206	1,836	1,283	79	2,415	9,674
22	St. Louis City	114	300	188	1	11	209	21	614	521	52	12	945	2,988
23	Jefferson	32	357	277	0	0	172	569	105	376	38	14	74	2,014
24	Madison	1	30	8	0	0	1	76	22	4	8	2	7	159
	St. Francois	0	58	40	0	1	1	269	196	26	26	18	18	653
	St. Genevieve	0	16	11	2	1	0	90	28	9	8	1	0	166
	Washington	0	55	11	3	1	1	79	47	41	6	11	13	268
25	Maries	1	8	2	0	0	0	31	0	19	3	36	49	149
	Phelps	1	57	21	0	2	4	230	6	156	94	356	253	1,180
	Pulaski	3	85	25	0	0	18	321	20	73	11	835	109	1,500
	Texas	0	46	17	0	0	3	216	27	57	27	506	108	1,007

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	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. With Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
26	Camden	0	32	22	3	2	1	83	37	83	3	58	38	362
	Laclede	0	68	19	1	0	6	98	43	52	8	21	110	426
	Miller	0	43	9	0	0	0	60	51	74	24	2	87	350
	Moniteau	0	6	2	0	0	0	18	14	12	0	0	9	61
	Morgan	0	18	10	0	2	2	30	17	16	2	6	22	125
27	Bates	0	16	9	0	0	1	152	88	24	4	14	12	320
	Henry	2	61	17	0	2	8	103	94	36	21	27	18	389
	St. Clair	0	12	7	0	0	3	41	32	6	1	3	0	105
28	Barton	0	26	36	0	1	1	136	36	65	3	21	5	330
	Cedar	1	19	14	0	0	2	63	18	52	13	23	14	219
	Dade	1	8	1	0	0	0	18	4	18	2	18	17	87
	Vernon	1	27	30	0	0	2	75	29	231	47	37	16	495
29	Jasper	6	315	244	1	2	68	386	123	407	24	21	35	1,632
30	Benton	0	9	1	0	0	1	50	8	93	8	51	32	253
	Dallas	1	11	1	0	0	0	44	86	15	6	51	51	266
	Hickory	0	2	0	0	0	0	13	1	18	0	18	11	63
	Polk	0	33	11	0	0	0	60	58	91	15	78	14	360
	Webster	3	37	4	0	1	1	180	73	56	12	13	35	415
31	Greene	18	468	87	5	6	42	185	316	684	124	103	339	2,377
32	Bollinger	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	74	0	1	0	9	111
	Cape	1	77	60	0	1	10	14	327	24	29	48	118	709
	Perry	0	19	13	0	0	1	1	147	0	3	1	22	207
33	Mississippi	0	35	50	0	0	1	16	78	23	2	8	8	221
	Scott	2	58	144	0	1	26	27	60	99	19	26	72	534
34	New Madrid	15	25	4	0	0	0	85	56	1	1	17	6	210
	Pemiscot	26	2	1	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	1	0	38
35	Dunklin	3	61	57	1	1	32	6	11	405	5	76	119	777
	Stoddard	10	195	32	1	0	89	2	71	100	13	136	124	773
36	Butler	1	52	63	0	1	12	79	33	152	14	28	66	501
	Ripley	0	19	33	0	0	3	38	17	28	0	13	25	176
37	Carter	0	0	1	0	0	0	16	15	1	4	5	1	43
	Howell	3	17	56	4	21	6	436	100	14	14	59	44	774
	Oregon	1	5	7	0	0	1	71	11	0	0	7	1	104
	Shannon	1	0	2	0	0	0	42	11	0	1	3	5	65
38	Christian	1	68	44	1	1	15	120	144	101	36	39	143	713
	Taney	6	98	23	0	0	5	137	86	3	42	34	57	491
39	Barry	0	45	17	0	0	1	35	18	113	7	26	6	268
	Lawrence	0	51	4	0	0	2	35	16	47	5	43	17	220
	Stone	0	41	8	0	0	1	68	11	90	17	50	1	287
40	McDonald	0	52	12	0	0	2	16	5	9	1	25	26	148
	Newton	0	140	45	1	16	20	83	23	50	15	72	123	588
41	Macon	0	36	20	0	0	4	76	71	6	3	50	84	350
	Shelby	0	30	7	1	0	0	25	30	7	1	6	46	153
42	Crawford	0	45	1	0	0	0	12	70	14	0	5	6	153
	Dent	0	11	0	0	0	1	20	45	2	8	2	9	98
	Iron	0	13	4	1	0	0	0	79	1	12	69	62	241
	Reynolds	1	9	2	0	1	0	0	20	0	2	47	0	82
	Wayne	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	24	0	52
43	Caldwell	0	10	4	0	0	0	9	12	4	1	1	0	41
	Clinton	0	29	45	0	0	0	71	83	12	8	7	6	261
	Daviess	0	11	2	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	26
	DeKalb	0	13	10	0	0	0	19	19	5	0	1	0	67
	Livingston	0	31	18	0	0	1	19	13	12	0	1	1	96
44	Douglas	0	20	14	1	0	9	10	10	5	0	4	0	73
	Ozark	0	8	2	0	1	3	7	2	5	0	1	0	29
	Wright	0	35	25	0	0	21	26	32	15	6	8	1	169
45	Lincoln	3	64	81	3	0	17	27	85	360	9	18	90	757
	Pike	1	37	8	0	0	5	43	22	0	0	5	76	197
Total		571	7,014	4,388	492	576	1,213	11,049	8,525	9,047	3,081	4,256	8,361	58,573

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	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total
1 Clark	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	10
Schuyler	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	14
Scotland	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
2 Adair	0	5	18	0	0	0	52	38	16	13	4	1	147
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Lewis	0	2	5	0	1	1	0	23	0	0	0	1	33
3 Grundy	0	2	9	0	0	0	5	14	3	1	3	13	50
Harrison	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	25	0	3	0	1	38
Mercer	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	5
Putnam	0	0	17	0	0	2	0	9	3	0	0	7	38
4 Atchison	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	1	2	1	3	18
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	2	0	13	32
Holt	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	1	11
Nodaway	0	3	7	0	1	0	3	15	0	1	1	17	48
Worth	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
5 Andrew	0	2	10	0	0	0	9	11	3	2	2	10	49
Buchanan	7	56	113	0	3	2	207	146	33	7	34	20	628
6 Platte	0	10	30	0	0	3	6	89	8	48	0	29	223
7 Clay	0	32	8	0	0	17	272	129	119	43	7	21	648
8 Carroll	0	2	9	0	0	0	16	12	0	1	1	4	45
Rav	0	13	14	0	0	2	82	19	7	17	8	22	184
9 Chariton	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
Linn	0	4	3	0	1	1	9	4	1	0	1	4	28
Sullivan	0	1	11	0	0	0	4	13	0	1	0	10	40
10 Marion	3	5	13	0	0	0	6	62	32	3	5	2	131
Monroe	1	6	14	0	0	0	8	10	0	1	0	7	47
Ralls	1	0	3	0	0	0	5	8	6	0	1	4	28
11 St. Charles	15	94	147	0	1	22	680	321	1	124	124	340	1,869
12 Audrain	0	3	13	0	0	2	36	44	5	13	5	10	131
Montgomery	0	7	4	0	1	0	7	11	0	0	1	0	31
Warren	0	12	5	0	1	0	56	48	12	10	4	2	150
13 Boone	2	16	246	0	0	16	401	89	81	88	29	33	1,001
Callaway	1	10	51	0	0	10	109	22	21	19	9	33	285
14 Howard	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	3	2	0	5	23
Randolph	0	7	16	0	0	6	45	81	23	22	5	12	217
15 Lafayette	0	8	21	0	0	2	69	17	47	9	1	26	200
Saline	0	4	5	3	0	0	71	36	11	20	3	5	158
16 Jackson	16	250	232	11	135	25	8	26	396	84	8	430	1,621
17 Cass	2	30	54	1	7	0	133	127	48	28	4	7	441
Johnson	0	12	17	1	0	0	17	68	5	1	1	2	124
18 Cooper	0	1	7	0	0	0	16	38	15	1	2	7	87
Pettis	0	3	7	2	2	0	127	49	46	10	24	45	315
19 Cole	5	43	32	0	0	1	174	76	54	53	17	63	518
20 Franklin	1	11	15	3	0	0	38	93	79	8	7	98	353
Gasconade	0	1	5	0	0	1	27	23	12	13	0	18	100
Osage	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	0	2	12
21 St. Louis Co.	48	125	189	272	147	72	989	794	1,462	1,085	39	1,339	6,561
22 St. Louis City	58	114	184	0	7	144	18	250	311	47	11	812	1,956
23 Jefferson	7	72	195	0	0	100	403	73	267	34	12	23	1,186
24 Madison	1	11	4	0	0	0	46	14	2	6	2	4	90
St. Francois	0	25	37	0	1	0	174	73	16	22	14	16	378
Ste. Genevieve	0	12	11	2	1	0	60	14	8	6	1	0	115
Washington	0	12	7	3	1	1	43	26	21	6	6	4	130
25 Maries	0	1	2	0	0	0	17	0	7	0	1	3	31
Phelps	0	10	15	0	0	0	112	5	40	58	9	27	276
Pulaski	0	5	20	0	0	4	88	12	9	7	13	41	199
Texas	0	6	9	0	0	2	51	24	6	10	31	14	153

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	Inf. w/o Sup	Inf. with Sup	No Action	Trans. Other Court	Trans. Other Agency	Reject	Total	
26	Camden	0	5	20	3	2	1	45	15	50	2	9	27	179
	Laclede	0	0	16	1	0	2	18	4	25	6	5	29	106
	Miller	0	8	5	0	0	0	20	20	26	21	2	45	147
	Moniteau	0	0	2	0	0	0	9	2	7	0	0	7	27
	Morgan	0	3	10	0	1	0	13	12	9	2	5	15	70
27	Bates	0	4	6	0	0	0	22	40	6	1	1	8	88
	Henry	0	4	5	0	0	2	18	31	5	15	1	6	87
	St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	1	0	0	13
28	Barton	0	9	30	0	0	0	57	30	4	2	6	0	138
	Cedar	0	11	12	0	0	1	45	9	15	11	6	7	117
	Dade	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	1	2	0	1	16
	Vernon	0	8	22	0	0	1	27	20	94	27	9	14	222
29	Jasper	6	46	150	1	1	55	156	73	92	21	16	27	644
30	Benton	0	3	1	0	0	1	27	7	17	7	3	8	74
	Dallas	1	7	1	0	0	0	31	24	8	1	13	16	102
	Hickory	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	0	0	4	15
	Polk	0	8	10	0	0	0	37	31	47	9	16	5	163
	Webster	0	6	3	0	0	1	68	29	15	7	3	3	135
31	Greene	16	48	85	3	4	21	117	288	462	106	20	249	1,419
32	Bollinger	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	1	0	6	54
	Cape Girardeau	1	47	48	0	1	0	7	254	11	23	33	32	457
	Perry	0	4	9	0	0	0	1	47	0	2	1	10	74
33	Mississippi	0	12	47	0	0	1	12	51	6	2	4	2	137
	Scott	0	16	59	0	1	14	18	50	56	14	16	47	291
34	New Madrid	11	3	4	0	0	0	37	20	1	0	3	6	85
	Pemiscot	10	2	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	20
35	Dunklin	2	4	46	1	1	12	2	5	97	5	9	21	205
	Stoddard	7	3	23	0	0	37	2	13	48	11	14	16	174
36	Butler	0	16	31	0	1	5	60	17	76	12	13	40	271
	Ripley	0	4	13	0	0	0	13	7	17	0	0	10	64
37	Carter	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	0	3	1	1	16
	Howell	1	1	43	3	21	2	42	36	2	6	5	15	177
	Oregon	1	0	7	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	1	1	26
	Shannon	1	0	2	0	0	0	5	3	0	1	0	4	16
38	Christian	0	16	28	0	0	8	72	85	44	19	9	82	363
	Taney	0	8	13	0	0	1	92	55	0	34	10	50	263
39	Barry	0	3	14	0	0	0	25	11	62	5	10	5	135
	Lawrence	0	4	4	0	0	0	22	10	25	3	6	5	79
	Stone	0	0	7	0	0	1	59	10	45	11	2	0	135
40	McDonald	0	6	11	0	0	0	15	5	8	1	8	25	79
	Newton	0	27	17	1	0	2	64	14	27	10	16	76	254
41	Macon	0	8	14	0	0	0	19	24	0	2	5	11	83
	Shelby	0	4	5	1	0	0	7	10	2	1	0	0	30
42	Crawford	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	37	9	0	4	6	62
	Dent	0	3	0	0	0	0	13	30	1	8	1	2	58
	Iron	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	9	3	4	40
	Reynolds	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	2	0	12
	Wayne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	7
43	Caldwell	0	3	3	0	0	0	4	4	1	1	1	0	17
	Clinton	0	8	29	0	0	0	39	47	3	6	3	3	138
	Daviess	0	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	14
	DeKalb	0	3	8	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	36
	Livingston	0	15	17	0	0	1	8	11	5	0	1	1	59
44	Douglas	0	2	14	1	0	1	5	3	2	0	3	0	31
	Ozark	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	10
	Wright	0	5	24	0	0	7	6	25	10	6	0	0	83
45	Lincoln	0	7	47	2	0	5	20	51	35	5	10	30	212
	Pike	0	1	6	0	0	1	16	14	0	0	5	29	72
Total		227	1,473	2,826	317	343	622	6,170	4,852	4,723	2,376	767	4,628	29,324

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	Clark	0	6	3	0	0	0	69	22	0	0	0	0	100
	Schuyler	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	19
	Scotland	0	8	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	28
2	Adair	0	1	1	0	0	0	44	58	55	5	9	2	175
	Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	36	0	0	1	0	40
	Lewis	0	2	0	0	0	0	53	69	1	0	6	1	132
3	Grundv	0	1	1	0	0	0	29	5	22	0	11	3	72
	Harrison	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	1	0	1	1	18
	Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	4
	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	1	0	8
4	Atchison	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	5	0	0	3	27
	Gentry	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	4	14
	Holt	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	1	1	2	2	20
	Nodaway	0	0	4	0	0	0	42	10	1	1	4	5	67
	Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	8
5	Andrew	0	1	6	0	0	0	21	6	21	0	3	1	59
	Buchanan	4	34	60	0	0	0	75	45	83	4	15	8	328
6	Platte	0	4	4	0	0	0	1	31	0	0	1	6	47
7	Clay	0	21	0	0	0	1	9	11	9	1	3	0	55
8	Carroll	0	11	3	0	0	0	26	12	0	2	0	1	55
	Ray	0	2	14	0	0	0	35	5	3	2	5	5	71
9	Chariton	0	5	2	0	0	0	36	10	1	0	0	0	54
	Linn	0	1	12	0	1	1	101	10	3	4	0	4	137
	Sullivan	0	4	9	0	0	0	42	17	0	0	5	64	141
10	Marion	1	0	7	0	0	0	12	35	12	2	1	6	76
	Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	2	18
	Ralls	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	5	2	0	0	3	19
11	St. Charles	4	31	16	0	1	5	57	21	12	26	82	85	340
12	Audrain	0	1	9	0	0	1	23	67	3	2	5	7	118
	Montgomery	0	1	0	0	0	0	32	10	0	0	1	0	44
	Warren	0	8	4	0	0	0	48	51	14	3	6	2	136
13	Boone	0	12	268	0	0	55	197	54	115	70	31	21	823
	Callaway	0	1	30	0	0	10	69	8	38	11	7	4	178
14	Howard	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	8	0	1	1	30
	Randolph	0	7	3	0	0	6	72	112	62	13	11	16	302
15	Lafayette	0	3	4	0	0	1	29	11	25	4	7	3	87
	Saline	0	4	2	3	0	0	24	11	7	9	1	1	62
16	Jackson	1	11	2	0	1	0	1	51	18	0	0	10	95
17	Cass	0	10	4	0	0	0	98	59	28	10	7	2	218
	Johnson	0	5	7	0	0	2	32	115	7	4	0	2	174
18	Cooper	0	5	6	0	0	0	35	33	24	2	6	3	114
	Pettis	0	1	0	0	0	1	57	23	24	4	14	5	129
19	Cole	4	17	24	1	0	0	77	50	39	29	12	36	289
20	Franklin	0	8	5	1	0	0	28	33	78	0	1	27	181
	Gasconade	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	3	0	0	5	18
	Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	6	1	0	4	26
21	St. Louis Co.	12	7	8	85	17	13	74	297	337	100	40	522	1,512
22	St. Louis City	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	225	57	1	1	62	358
23	Jefferson	0	9	43	0	0	28	128	32	109	2	1	3	355
24	Madison	0	2	0	0	0	0	30	8	2	2	0	3	47
	St. Francois	0	5	0	0	0	0	94	122	9	0	4	0	234
	Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	14	1	2	0	0	47
	Washington	0	1	3	0	0	0	31	20	17	0	2	4	78
25	Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	12	0	2	2	28
	Phelps	0	8	6	0	0	0	89	1	103	28	23	7	265
	Pulaski	0	8	5	0	0	6	232	8	64	2	37	45	407
	Texas	0	6	7	0	0	0	159	3	48	11	80	61	375

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
26	Camden	0	7	1	0	0	0	19	6	27	1	17	6	84
	Laclede	0	6	3	0	0	1	44	13	20	1	9	21	118
	Miller	0	10	1	0	0	0	26	16	37	3	0	28	121
	Moniteau	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	4	2	0	0	1	18
	Morgan	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	1	7	0	1	2	25
27	Bates	0	1	2	0	0	0	61	44	12	3	4	4	131
	Henry	0	7	3	0	0	0	52	25	10	6	6	10	119
	St. Clair	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	1	0	1	0	23
28	Barton	0	6	5	0	0	0	19	5	4	1	2	3	45
	Cedar	1	6	2	0	0	1	18	9	8	2	3	1	51
	Dade	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	1	6	0	4	2	25
	Vernon	1	4	5	0	0	1	17	8	88	17	9	1	151
29	Jasper	0	20	49	0	0	4	81	50	75	3	5	1	288
30	Benton	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	58	1	8	9	92
	Dallas	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	4	7	2	9	10	44
	Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	0	0	4	17
	Polk	0	1	1	0	0	0	19	9	36	2	7	3	78
	Webster	0	12	1	0	0	0	77	18	24	4	1	3	140
31	Greene	2	2	2	2	0	1	68	28	210	18	13	86	432
32	Bollinger	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	3	22
	Cape Girardeau	0	3	3	0	0	1	7	72	13	6	15	26	146
	Perry	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	33	0	1	0	0	38
33	Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	7	0	2	1	41
	Scott	0	1	79	0	0	12	4	9	40	4	10	18	177
34	New Madrid	1	0	0	0	0	0	48	36	0	0	8	0	93
	Pemiscot	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
35	Dunklin	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	36	0	8	9	64
	Stoddard	3	0	5	0	0	6	0	24	44	1	19	16	118
36	Butler	0	8	18	0	0	0	18	15	57	1	3	9	129
	Ripley	0	2	15	0	0	0	20	10	5	0	1	8	61
37	Carter	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	1	0	2	0	24
	Howell	0	2	10	1	0	4	333	64	10	7	13	15	459
	Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	3	0	0	2	0	39
	Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	8	0	0	2	1	39
38	Christian	1	15	16	0	0	2	44	55	44	11	18	43	249
	Taney	0	4	8	0	0	2	45	30	3	5	13	5	115
39	Barrv	0	0	2	0	0	0	8	7	32	0	5	1	55
	Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	13	2	6	4	37
	Stone	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	1	31	3	3	0	48
40	McDonald	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	7	1	15
	Newton	0	7	9	0	0	0	19	9	16	2	9	34	105
41	Macon	0	8	3	0	0	1	49	27	2	1	10	2	103
	Shelby	0	4	2	0	0	0	11	11	4	0	0	0	32
42	Crawford	0	6	0	0	0	0	9	33	5	0	1	0	54
	Dent	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	1	0	0	3	26
	Iron	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	51	1	0	2	4	63
	Reynolds	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	5	0	19
	Wayne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	12	0	24
	Caldwell	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	8	3	0	0	0	20
43	Clinton	0	11	16	0	0	0	32	36	5	2	2	2	106
	Daviess	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
	DeKalb	0	4	2	0	0	0	9	4	5	0	1	0	25
	Livingston	0	4	1	0	0	0	9	2	4	0	0	0	20
	Douglas	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	2	0	0	0	15
44	Ozark	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	7
	Wright	0	4	0	0	0	2	20	7	5	0	2	0	40
	Lincoln	0	5	18	0	0	2	7	34	215	2	3	42	328
45	Pike	0	2	0	0	0	2	18	8	0	0	0	18	48
	Total	47	469	885	93	21	179	3,824	2,881	2,744	470	733	1,529	13,875

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	Clark	0	17	0	0	0	13	2	0	0	0	0	32
	Schuyler	0	8	0	0	0	43	5	0	0	0	0	56
	Scotland	0	2	0	0	0	25	17	0	0	0	0	44
2	Adair	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	61	2	101
	Knox	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	9
	Lewis	0	5	0	0	0	4	26	0	0	14	0	49
3	Grundy	0	13	7	0	0	2	0	28	0	7	14	71
	Harrison	0	14	0	0	0	1	5	32	0	7	0	59
	Mercer	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	2	0	4	0	14
	Putnam	0	11	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	8	13	38
4	Atchison	0	24	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	9	12	51
	Gentry	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	10
	Holt	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	10
	Nodaway	0	45	9	0	0	13	2	2	1	3	27	102
	Worth	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14
5	Andrew	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Buchanan	0	22	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	21	48
6	Platte	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	17
7	Clay	2	40	8	0	1	12	1	4	7	1	73	219
8	Carroll	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	4
	Rav	0	10	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	4	0	30
9	Chariton	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	7
	Linn	0	17	13	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	1	41
	Sullivan	0	8	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	7	21
10	Marion	3	9	3	1	0	3	1	7	2	0	7	38
	Monroe	0	12	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	21
	Ralls	1	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	17
11	St. Charles	3	126	15	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	27	181
12	Audrain	0	1	3	0	1	2	5	2	0	5	3	25
	Montgomery	0	19	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	2	0	27
	Warren	0	39	2	0	0	14	4	5	1	31	0	96
13	Boone	1	129	32	0	2	17	52	1	28	11	16	289
	Callaway	0	14	44	0	0	4	0	9	4	3	15	94
14	Howard	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	14
	Randolph	0	31	3	0	0	7	29	18	27	7	10	162
15	Lafayette	0	28	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	33
	Saline	0	26	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
16	Jackson	57	915	135	5	39	7	0	0	2	20	114	1,312
17	Cass	0	113	29	0	0	2	5	9	5	1	10	174
	Johnson	3	16	18	0	1	0	5	7	67	0	6	123
18	Cooper	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3
	Pettis	0	23	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	2	2	34
19	Cole	3	32	12	0	0	1	20	1	135	10	3	241
20	Franklin	0	99	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	105
	Gasconade	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Osage	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
21	St. Louis Co.	108	298	110	65	136	20	60	115	37	98	0	554
22	St. Louis City	48	185	4	1	4	63	2	139	153	4	0	71
23	Jefferson	25	276	39	0	0	44	38	0	0	2	1	48
24	Madison	0	17	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
	St. Francois	0	28	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	0	41
	Ste. Genevieve	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Washington	0	42	1	0	0	0	5	1	3	0	3	60
25	Maries	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	33	44
	Phelps	1	39	0	0	2	4	29	0	13	8	324	219
	Pulaski	3	72	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	2	785	23
	Texas	0	34	1	0	0	1	6	0	3	6	395	33

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	
26	Camden	0	20	1	0	0	19	16	6	0	32	5	99	
	Laclede	0	62	0	0	3	36	26	7	1	7	60	202	
	Miller	0	25	3	0	0	14	15	11	0	0	14	82	
	Moniteau	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	1	16	
	Morgan	0	13	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	5	30	
27	Bates	0	11	1	0	0	69	4	6	0	9	0	101	
	Henry	2	50	9	0	2	33	38	21	0	20	2	183	
	St. Clair	0	11	7	0	0	28	13	5	0	2	0	69	
28	Barton	0	11	1	0	1	60	1	57	0	13	2	147	
	Cedar	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	14	6	51	
	Dade	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	14	14	46	
	Vernon	0	15	3	0	0	31	1	49	3	19	1	122	
29	Jasper	0	249	45	0	1	9	149	0	240	0	7	700	
30	Benton	0	6	0	0	0	7	1	18	0	40	15	87	
	Dallas	0	3	0	0	0	2	58	0	3	29	25	120	
	Hickory	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	18	3	31	
	Polk	0	24	0	0	0	4	18	8	4	55	6	119	
	Webster	3	19	0	0	1	0	35	26	17	9	29	140	
31	Greene	0	418	0	0	2	20	0	0	12	0	70	526	
32	Bollinger	0	18	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	35	
	Cape Girardeau	0	27	9	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	60	106	
	Perry	0	15	0	0	0	1	0	67	0	0	12	95	
33	Mississippi	0	23	3	0	0	0	0	10	0	2	5	43	
	Scott	2	41	6	0	0	5	1	3	1	0	7	66	
34	New Madrid	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	32	
	Pemiscot	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
35	Dunklin	0	57	6	0	0	20	3	2	272	0	59	508	
	Stoddard	0	192	4	1	0	46	0	34	8	1	103	481	
36	Butler	1	28	14	0	0	7	1	1	19	1	12	101	
	Ripley	0	13	5	0	0	3	5	0	6	0	12	51	
37	Carter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	
	Howell	2	14	3	0	0	0	61	0	2	1	41	138	
	Oregon	0	5	0	0	0	1	29	0	0	0	4	39	
	Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	1	10	
38	Christian	0	37	0	1	1	5	4	4	13	6	12	101	
	Taney	6	86	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	11	113	
39	Barry	0	42	1	0	0	1	2	0	19	2	11	78	
	Lawrence	0	47	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	0	31	104	
	Stone	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	45	104	
40	McDonald	0	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	54	
	Newton	0	106	19	0	16	18	0	0	7	3	47	229	
41	Macon	0	20	3	0	0	3	8	20	4	0	35	164	
	Shelby	0	22	0	0	0	0	7	9	1	0	6	91	
42	Crawford	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	
	Dent	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	14	
	Iron	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	3	64	138	
	Reynolds	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	40	51	
	Wayne	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	12	21	
43	Caldwell	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Clinton	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	17	
	Daviess	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
	DeKalb	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
	Livingston	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	17	
44	Douglas	0	18	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	27	
	Ozark	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	
	Wright	0	26	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	6	46	
45	Lincoln	3	52	16	1	0	10	0	0	110	2	5	217	
	Pike	1	34	2	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	29	77	
Total		297	5,072	677	82	212	412	1,055	792	1,580	235	2,756	2,204	15,374

Appendix E: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

	Circuit/County	Misc.	People	Property	Peace Disturb	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
1	Clark	6	2	2	0	0	100	32	142
	Schuyler	2	1	11	0	0	19	56	89
	Scotland	0	3	1	0	0	28	44	76
2	Adair	54	25	33	7	28	175	101	423
	Knox	4	1	1	0	0	40	9	55
	Lewis	10	9	7	0	7	132	49	214
3	Grundy	6	13	21	6	3	72	71	192
	Harrison	2	6	19	2	9	18	59	115
	Mercer	0	2	3	0	0	4	14	23
	Putnam	2	6	20	1	9	8	38	84
4	Atchison	2	6	6	0	4	27	51	96
	Gentry	6	3	12	2	9	14	10	56
	Holt	5	4	1	0	1	20	10	41
	Nodaway	4	10	18	2	13	67	102	216
	Worth	0	1	2	0	1	8	14	26
5	Andrew	7	13	26	0	3	59	0	108
	Buchanan	89	178	183	135	37	328	48	998
6	Platte	15	50	112	5	40	47	17	286
7	Clay	73	142	271	26	126	55	219	912
8	Carroll	7	12	10	7	8	55	4	103
	Ray	20	80	55	5	24	71	30	285
9	Chariton	1	2	0	0	0	54	7	64
	Linn	4	5	16	0	3	137	41	206
	Sullivan	2	8	17	0	12	141	21	201
10	Marion	22	24	37	25	23	76	38	245
	Monroe	7	9	24	5	2	18	21	86
	Ralls	4	9	4	6	5	19	17	64
11	St. Charles	324	371	721	120	319	340	181	2,376
12	Audrain	30	28	45	4	23	118	25	273
	Montgomery	5	7	16	0	2	44	27	101
	Warren	38	13	74	3	21	136	96	381
13	Boone	45	303	395	153	102	823	289	2,110
	Callaway	51	83	79	37	32	178	94	554
14	Howard	2	6	7	2	3	30	14	64
	Randolph	24	64	74	35	20	302	162	681
15	Lafayette	26	52	72	15	34	87	33	319
	Saline	24	62	48	7	15	62	27	245
16	Jackson	506	462	505	63	74	95	1,312	3,017
17	Cass	140	89	158	8	46	218	174	833
	Johnson	48	28	34	1	13	174	123	421
18	Cooper	16	21	41	2	5	114	3	202
	Pettis	84	101	60	18	52	129	34	478
19	Cole	56	157	132	86	84	289	241	1,045
20	Franklin	71	81	122	19	58	181	105	637
	Gasconade	5	38	19	19	17	18	5	121
	Osage	0	4	5	3	0	26	5	43
21	St. Louis Co.	1,516	1,323	2,656	288	616	1,512	1,601	9,512
22	St. Louis City	316	566	933	46	87	358	674	2,980
23	Jefferson	182	447	328	36	191	355	473	2,012
24	Madison	8	29	35	10	8	47	22	159
	St. Francois	37	157	117	36	28	234	41	650
	Ste. Genevieve	12	40	33	9	18	47	4	163
	Washington	10	69	33	7	11	78	60	268
25	Maries	5	19	5	1	1	28	90	149
	Phelps	25	139	82	5	25	265	639	1,180
	Pulaski	20	75	79	8	14	407	894	1,497
	Texas	10	52	64	9	18	375	479	1,007

Appendix E: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Misc.	People	Property	Peace Disturb	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total	
26	Camden	29	61	43	10	36	84	99	362
	Laclede	14	34	35	1	22	118	202	426
	Miller	23	38	43	13	30	121	82	350
	Moniteau	7	3	11	1	4	18	16	60
	Morgan	1	32	17	5	15	25	30	125
27	Bates	16	23	39	0	10	131	101	320
	Henry	7	31	31	2	16	119	183	389
	St. Clair	0	2	8	1	2	23	69	105
28	Barton	35	56	22	3	22	45	147	330
	Cedar	19	30	35	21	12	51	51	219
	Dade	3	3	8	1	1	25	46	87
	Vernon	51	72	66	4	29	151	122	495
29	Jasper	69	147	240	90	90	288	700	1,624
30	Benton	0	25	31	3	14	92	87	252
	Dallas	15	33	38	3	10	44	120	263
	Hickory	0	5	9	0	1	17	31	63
	Polk	5	65	64	9	20	78	119	360
	Webster	6	54	50	5	18	140	140	413
31	Greene	59	554	537	56	201	432	526	2,365
32	Bollinger	15	10	18	1	10	22	35	111
	Cape Girardeau	183	71	115	43	44	146	106	708
	Perry	7	19	30	0	17	38	95	206
33	Mississippi	6	54	29	32	14	41	43	219
	Scott	58	65	78	29	49	177	66	522
34	New Madrid	10	7	31	20	17	93	32	210
	Pemiscot	0	7	10	1	1	4	14	37
35	Dunklin	16	45	79	43	22	64	508	777
	Stoddard	25	50	40	10	47	118	481	771
36	Butler	22	112	101	20	15	129	101	500
	Ripley	3	32	23	1	4	61	51	175
37	Carter	2	8	4	0	2	24	3	43
	Howell	41	25	65	3	40	459	138	771
	Oregon	3	3	12	0	5	39	39	101
	Shannon	2	0	10	0	2	39	10	63
38	Christian	41	150	102	10	60	249	101	713
	Taney	8	85	130	4	35	115	113	490
39	Barry	12	47	52	2	18	55	78	264
	Lawrence	2	28	32	2	15	37	104	220
	Stone	7	41	51	11	14	48	104	276
40	McDonald	9	24	28	10	8	15	54	148
	Newton	33	72	84	31	32	105	229	586
41	Macon	27	23	21	7	5	103	164	350
	Shelby	7	7	11	1	4	32	91	153
42	Crawford	8	21	17	2	13	54	37	152
	Dent	10	27	14	1	5	26	14	97
	Iron	3	13	17	2	5	63	138	241
	Reynolds	3	6	2	0	0	19	51	81
	Wayne	1	3	2	0	1	24	21	52
43	Caldwell	3	4	4	2	4	20	4	41
	Clinton	9	30	57	18	24	106	17	261
	Daviess	4	2	8	0	0	3	9	26
	DeKalb	9	9	15	1	2	25	6	67
	Livingston	6	22	26	2	3	20	17	96
44	Douglas	2	5	18	1	5	15	27	73
	Ozark	1	2	3	2	2	7	12	29
	Wright	9	23	29	6	11	40	46	164
45	Lincoln	27	36	119	9	21	328	217	757
	Pike	13	27	20	3	9	48	77	197
Total		4,996	7,993	10,718	1,842	3,442	13,875	15,374	58,240

Appendix F: Referrals by Type, Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Other Felony	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Infrac	Juv	Other Misd.	Misd. A	Misd. B	Misd. C	Ord	Missing	Total	
1	Clark	0	0	0	0	1	0	132	0	3	1	1	4	0	142
	Schuyler	0	0	1	3	0	0	75	0	5	4	0	1	0	89
	Scotland	0	0	0	1	2	0	72	0	1	0	0	0	0	76
2	Adair	2	0	1	10	1	0	327	20	30	15	14	3	0	423
	Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	0	2	0	0	0	0	55
	Lewis	0	1	0	3	0	0	189	3	12	2	4	0	0	214
3	Grundy	0	1	0	9	1	5	145	0	17	6	6	3	0	193
	Harrison	0	0	0	2	0	1	77	9	12	11	3	0	0	115
	Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	4	0	1	0	0	23
	Putnam	0	0	1	16	1	0	46	8	7	5	0	0	0	84
4	Atchison	0	0	0	4	0	0	78	2	7	1	4	0	0	96
	Gentry	0	0	1	0	2	1	28	6	13	5	0	0	0	56
	Holt	0	0	0	3	0	0	30	1	6	0	1	0	0	41
	Nodaway	0	0	0	10	0	0	169	9	21	2	6	0	0	217
	Worth	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	0	1	1	1	0	0	26
5	Andrew	2	0	0	6	3	1	59	2	15	11	4	5	0	108
	Buchanan	0	2	6	40	14	22	405	9	293	144	56	13	0	1,004
6	Platte	1	3	1	16	5	1	69	15	115	24	33	4	0	287
7	Clay	7	4	19	46	38	7	298	36	361	42	37	18	9	922
8	Carroll	0	0	1	6	2	0	64	3	10	6	12	0	0	104
	Rav	1	0	1	14	1	2	114	16	48	19	69	0	0	285
9	Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	0	3	0	0	0	0	64
	Linn	0	1	0	2	3	2	179	1	5	11	2	0	0	206
	Sullivan	1	1	0	4	2	0	162	8	12	9	2	1	0	202
10	Marion	0	1	1	10	2	0	136	8	33	32	22	0	0	245
	Monroe	0	0	0	13	3	0	42	0	15	7	6	0	0	86
	Ralls	0	0	0	0	4	0	39	3	5	7	6	0	0	64
11	St. Charles	22	23	38	120	38	44	702	90	853	317	65	72	6	2,390
12	Audrain	1	0	1	13	7	1	144	15	51	20	0	21	0	274
	Montgomery	1	0	0	5	2	2	74	1	11	6	0	0	0	102
	Warren	1	2	1	16	5	5	243	8	60	14	3	24	0	382
13	Boone	7	15	14	70	18	13	1,115	16	554	124	162	4	1	2,113
	Callaway	0	0	3	21	4	4	311	8	113	51	38	3	1	557
14	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	1	8	8	6	0	0	67
	Randolph	0	0	3	11	13	12	476	9	65	48	44	0	0	681
15	Lafayette	2	0	1	26	15	5	130	21	36	39	44	1	0	320
	Saline	0	1	3	16	14	1	92	15	41	17	44	3	0	247
16	Jackson	46	49	75	273	162	20	1,823	4	388	157	28	1	2	3,028
17	Cass	2	2	8	38	8	13	439	16	167	34	24	82	0	833
	Johnson	2	3	3	11	4	0	317	1	27	19	17	17	0	421
18	Cooper	0	2	1	5	1	8	119	1	37	14	9	7	0	204
	Pettis	1	0	3	69	27	6	198	8	66	25	41	34	0	478
19	Cole	1	4	7	25	15	4	556	34	176	123	101	2	0	1,048
20	Franklin	1	4	4	24	8	13	324	46	152	46	12	4	1	639
	Gasconade	1	2	0	6	7	2	24	10	47	21	3	0	0	123
	Osage	0	0	1	0	1	0	31	0	6	4	0	0	0	43
21	St. Louis Co.	77	54	151	679	205	19	4,217	173	3,039	862	31	30	137	9,674
22	St. Louis City	129	28	84	247	53	13	1,126	4	793	178	284	43	6	2,988
23	Jefferson	1	15	10	144	49	13	892	60	645	118	67	0	0	2,014
24	Madison	0	0	1	4	7	1	69	5	47	12	12	1	0	159
	St. Francois	4	2	7	34	20	13	278	5	174	74	32	10	0	653
	Ste. Genevieve	1	2	2	8	1	5	52	9	53	21	4	8	0	166
	Washington	0	0	1	10	10	2	138	4	78	9	14	2	0	268
25	Maries	0	0	0	3	0	1	119	0	10	0	15	1	0	149
	Phelps	0	0	1	17	6	2	911	1	83	30	118	11	0	1,180
	Pulaski	3	0	4	19	0	4	1,305	3	70	22	66	4	0	1,500
	Texas	1	0	4	16	11	0	857	12	85	18	3	0	0	1,007

Appendix F: Referrals by Type, Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Other Felony	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Infrac	Juv	Other Misd.	Misd. A	Misd. B	Misd. C	Ord	Missing	Total	
26	Camden	1	0	4	16	14	0	187	15	41	17	46	21	0	362
	Laclede	5	0	2	19	8	1	320	3	31	7	21	9	0	426
	Miller	0	4	1	18	7	1	206	14	41	20	31	7	0	350
	Moniteau	0	0	0	2	0	1	37	4	9	6	2	0	0	61
	Morgan	1	0	3	9	2	0	56	6	15	12	21	0	0	125
27	Bates	0	0	0	6	1	3	236	7	34	17	8	8	0	320
	Henry	0	0	2	10	10	0	303	9	25	13	15	2	0	389
	St. Clair	0	0	0	0	1	3	92	2	4	3	0	0	0	105
28	Barton	5	1	1	8	2	3	212	16	64	4	2	12	0	330
	Cedar	0	0	2	8	7	5	116	9	37	29	3	3	0	219
	Dade	0	0	1	1	2	0	72	0	8	2	0	1	0	87
	Vernon	2	1	2	20	13	13	291	19	97	13	6	18	0	495
29	Jasper	7	1	16	58	23	11	1,009	36	251	139	78	3	0	1,632
30	Benton	0	1	0	6	4	2	179	5	29	7	20	0	0	253
	Dallas	0	0	1	11	16	2	164	2	27	19	24	0	0	266
	Hickory	0	0	1	3	0	0	48	0	5	6	0	0	0	63
	Polk	0	1	1	18	11	4	198	5	42	26	54	0	0	360
	Webster	0	2	2	13	12	5	282	5	45	8	40	0	1	415
31	Greene	7	1	19	145	31	4	961	66	936	175	28	0	4	2,377
32	Bollinger	0	0	3	6	2	1	57	5	26	9	2	0	0	111
	Cape Girardeau	2	4	15	27	16	5	270	15	248	58	48	1	0	709
	Perry	0	0	1	10	3	0	139	10	18	11	15	0	0	207
33	Mississippi	0	0	0	13	10	0	84	3	49	17	45	0	0	221
	Scott	4	2	4	25	10	1	273	23	97	41	35	19	0	534
34	New Madrid	0	0	0	3	5	0	132	12	17	38	3	0	0	210
	Pemiscot	0	0	0	6	3	0	18	0	4	4	2	0	1	38
35	Dunklin	2	1	6	34	8	2	578	10	36	64	36	0	0	777
	Stoddard	3	1	10	14	11	0	616	29	59	27	3	0	0	773
36	Butler	2	2	0	29	9	5	243	2	74	60	75	0	0	501
	Ripley	1	1	0	14	8	1	112	0	20	8	11	0	0	176
37	Carter	0	0	0	1	4	0	27	0	7	2	2	0	0	43
	Howell	1	0	3	11	11	1	634	22	72	12	6	1	0	774
	Oregon	0	0	0	6	2	0	78	4	4	8	2	0	0	104
	Shannon	0	0	0	1	6	0	49	1	6	1	1	0	0	65
38	Christian	7	3	13	36	4	13	366	12	208	38	13	0	0	713
	Taney	3	2	3	16	8	8	229	3	136	37	46	0	0	491
39	Barr	0	0	2	20	1	0	137	4	85	14	3	2	0	268
	Lawrence	0	0	0	6	1	1	142	7	52	8	3	0	0	220
	Stone	0	0	1	7	0	0	155	2	95	15	10	1	1	287
40	McDonald	1	2	8	12	1	2	69	2	40	10	1	0	0	148
	Newton	7	6	1	27	3	12	339	12	141	28	9	3	0	588
41	Macon	0	0	0	4	18	0	289	2	24	6	7	0	0	350
	Shelby	0	0	1	3	1	3	126	4	12	1	2	0	0	153
42	Crawford	0	0	2	14	4	0	91	3	16	4	13	6	0	153
	Dent	0	0	0	5	11	3	42	1	18	6	8	4	0	98
	Iron	0	2	1	9	1	3	201	2	9	6	7	0	0	241
	Reynolds	0	0	0	1	0	0	73	0	6	1	0	0	1	82
	Wayne	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	1	6	0	0	0	0	52
43	Caldwell	0	0	0	4	0	0	25	0	9	1	0	2	0	41
	Clinton	0	0	2	21	20	4	127	11	59	14	2	1	0	261
	Daviess	0	0	0	1	1	0	13	0	5	1	2	3	0	26
	DeKalb	0	0	0	3	11	0	31	2	10	4	1	5	0	67
	Livingston	0	0	3	5	8	0	38	0	18	12	9	3	0	96
44	Douglas	1	0	2	5	5	0	43	2	11	4	0	0	0	73
	Ozark	0	0	1	1	0	0	19	1	5	2	0	0	0	29
	Wright	0	1	2	11	3	0	86	2	41	13	6	4	0	169
45	Lincoln	0	0	8	36	4	1	553	8	107	35	1	4	0	757
	Pike	1	0	2	4	4	1	131	4	32	12	5	1	0	197
Total		381	262	616	2,970	1,177	393	31,864	1,183	12,614	3,951	2,410	581	171	58,573

Appendix G: Out of Home Placements by Circuit

Circuit	Court Res. Care		DMH		DFS		DYS*		Relative		Private Agency		Public Agency		Other		Total
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
1	0	0%	0	0%	38	93%	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	41
2	0	0%	0	0%	32	78%	1	2%	3	7%	0	0%	4	10%	1	2%	41
3	0	0%	0	0%	20	83%	0	0%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	24
4	0	0%	0	0%	66	89%	3	4%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	74
5	61	62%	0	0%	16	16%	15	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	6%	98
6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10
7	0	0%	0	0%	35	40%	29	33%	0	0%	5	6%	17	19%	2	2%	88
8	0	0%	0	0%	8	25%	23	72%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	32
9	0	0%	0	0%	10	63%	3	19%	3	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16
10	0	0%	0	0%	18	62%	9	31%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	29
11	0	0%	0	0%	85	37%	97	42%	45	19%	0	0%	1	0%	3	1%	231
12	0	0%	0	0%	23	74%	6	19%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	31
13	2	1%	0	0%	161	90%	4	2%	3	2%	0	0%	7	4%	2	1%	179
14	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6
15	0	0%	0	0%	52	74%	17	24%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	70
16	14	6%	0	0%	202	85%	16	7%	4	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	237
17	0	0%	1	2%	26	57%	7	15%	7	15%	1	2%	4	9%	0	0%	46
18	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4
19	4	11%	0	0%	27	71%	4	11%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	1	3%	38
20	1	1%	0	0%	68	87%	8	10%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	78
21	0	0%	1	0%	213	50%	53	12%	79	18%	1	0%	60	14%	23	5%	430
22	4	1%	0	0%	179	60%	94	32%	17	6%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	297
23	4	1%	0	0%	93	26%	58	16%	178	50%	5	1%	19	5%	0	0%	357
24	4	4%	0	0%	49	46%	38	36%	9	8%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	106
25	0	0%	0	0%	148	79%	22	12%	11	6%	4	2%	2	1%	1	1%	188
26	5	4%	0	0%	106	77%	6	4%	19	14%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	137
27	0	0%	0	0%	70	90%	5	6%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	78
28	1	2%	0	0%	35	60%	20	34%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	58
29	5	2%	1	0%	148	58%	25	10%	72	28%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	254
30	0	0%	0	0%	47	67%	19	27%	1	1%	2	3%	1	1%	0	0%	70
31	3	1%	0	0%	321	90%	22	6%	9	3%	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	358
32	0	0%	0	0%	47	46%	37	36%	7	7%	0	0%	0	0%	12	12%	103
33	0	0%	0	0%	45	52%	28	32%	14	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	87
34	0	0%	0	0%	12	67%	0	0%	5	28%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	18
35	1	0%	0	0%	110	47%	4	2%	121	51%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	236
36	0	0%	0	0%	19	43%	18	41%	7	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	44
37	0	0%	0	0%	19	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	22
38	0	0%	0	0%	139	84%	26	16%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	166
39	2	2%	0	0%	118	92%	7	5%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	128
40	1	1%	0	0%	86	69%	25	20%	13	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	125
41	6	10%	0	0%	41	67%	9	15%	4	7%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	61
42	0	0%	0	0%	68	84%	4	5%	4	5%	2	2%	0	0%	3	4%	81
43	1	1%	1	1%	41	47%	37	43%	3	3%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	87
44	0	0%	0	0%	55	87%	7	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	63
45	1	1%	0	0%	68	68%	10	10%	21	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	100
Total	120	2%	4	0%	3,170	63%	833*	17%	679	14%	40	1%	121	2%	60	1%	5,027

* Number is based on a disposition of Allegation Found True - Out-of-home Placement and will not necessarily match DHS commitments.

Appendix H: In Home Services by Circuit

Circuit	Supervision By Court		DMH		DFS		DYS		Private Agency		Public Agency		Other		Total Cases
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	
1	91	61%	0	0%	42	28%	0	0%	14	9%	1	1%	0	0%	148
2	85	74%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	28	24%	0	0%	0	0%	115
3	106	74%	6	4%	17	12%	0	0%	15	10%	0	0%	0	0%	144
4	105	71%	4	3%	9	6%	0	0%	20	14%	7	5%	2	1%	147
5	277	87%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	37	12%	3	1%	320
6	123	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	4	2%	35	21%	163
7	88	93%	0	0%	7	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	95
8	80	89%	5	6%	0	0%	1	1%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	90
9	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3
10	182	88%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	8	4%	11	5%	0	0%	206
11	506	88%	0	0%	18	3%	1	0%	8	1%	5	1%	36	6%	574
12	205	63%	48	15%	18	6%	0	0%	51	16%	2	1%	0	0%	324
13	543	96%	0	0%	20	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	563
14	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
15	84	83%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	7	7%	3	3%	5	5%	101
16	30	39%	0	0%	46	61%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	76
17	428	89%	4	1%	29	6%	0	0%	13	3%	6	1%	1	0%	481
18	114	68%	34	20%	9	5%	0	0%	10	6%	0	0%	1	1%	168
19	115	69%	2	1%	13	8%	0	0%	22	13%	13	8%	1	1%	166
20	123	99%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	124
21	202	63%	2	1%	104	33%	0	0%	2	1%	3	1%	6	2%	319
22	683	87%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	88	11%	3	0%	11	1%	788
23	338	94%	0	0%	20	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	358
24	249	60%	28	7%	21	5%	1	0%	54	13%	62	15%	1	0%	416
25	82	94%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	87
26	65	46%	8	6%	53	38%	0	0%	7	5%	2	1%	5	4%	140
27	218	68%	21	7%	71	22%	0	0%	10	3%	0	0%	0	0%	320
28	128	96%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	133
29	193	66%	0	0%	42	14%	2	1%	21	7%	32	11%	4	1%	294
30	78	55%	0	0%	30	21%	1	1%	23	16%	9	6%	0	0%	141
31	347	99%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	352
32	605	79%	4	1%	59	8%	0	0%	15	2%	54	7%	26	3%	763
33	318	82%	11	3%	4	1%	0	0%	37	10%	10	3%	6	2%	386
34	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
35	89	85%	1	1%	13	12%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	105
36	45	44%	3	3%	26	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	28	27%	102
37	122	85%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	21	15%	144
38	293	99%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	296
39	57	76%	5	7%	6	8%	0	0%	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	75
40	23	53%	0	0%	19	44%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	43
41	76	58%	7	5%	30	23%	0	0%	3	2%	7	5%	7	5%	130
42	136	74%	2	1%	8	4%	1	1%	14	8%	22	12%	0	0%	183
43	173	99%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	174
44	84	97%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	87
45	187	97%	0	0%	4	2%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	192
Total	8,083	81%	197	2%	759	8%	13	0%	489	5%	296	3%	203	2%	10,040

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


Circuit	Unknown	Caucasian		African		Hispanic		American Indian		Asian		Total
	Male	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
5	0	12	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
7	0	14	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
8	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
9	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
10	0	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
11	0	38	3	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	52
12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
13	0	1	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	13
14	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
15	1	11	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	21
16	0	4	1	32	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	43
17	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
18	0	2	1	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	9
19	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
20	2	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
21	0	6	0	48	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
22	0	4	0	92	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	105
23	0	23	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	35
24	0	19	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
25	0	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
26	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
27	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
28	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
29	0	38	16	0	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	62
30	0	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
31	0	24	5	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	40
32	0	8	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	18
33	0	14	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
34	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
35	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
36	0	11	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
37	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
38	0	23	4	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	33
39	0	5	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
40	0	22	9	0	1	3	2	0	0	2	0	39
41	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
42	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
43	0	12	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
44	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
45	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Total	4	401	95	250	35	26	4	2	2	2	1	822

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

Circuit	Caucasian		African American		Hispanic		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
13	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	3	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	21
18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
21	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	12
22	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
33	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
34	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
35	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
36	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
39	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
42	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
43	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
45	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	21	1	49	2	0	0	1	0	74

Appendix K. Map of Missouri's 45 Judicial Circuits

Missouri's 45 Judicial Circuits



Office of State Courts Administrator, P.O. Box 104480, 2112 Industrial Drive,
Jefferson City, MO 65110